A Study Of Chinese Hua-Yen Buddhism With Special Reference To The Dharmadhātu (Fa-Chieh) Doctrine

by

Kang Nam Oh,
M. A., B. A.

DHARMADHĀTU: A STUDY OF HUA-YEN BUDDHISM

A STUDY OF CHINESE HUA-YEN BUDDHISM WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE DHARMADHĀTU (FA-CHIEH) DOCTRINE

By

KANG NAM OH, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

October 1976

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1976) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(Religious Sciences) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: A Study of Chinese Hua-yen Buddhism with Special Reference to the Dharmadhātu (Fa-chieh) Doctrine

AUTHOR: Kang Nam Oh, B.A. (Seoul National University)

M.A. (Seoul National University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Yün-hua Jan

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 275

ABSTRACT

Hua-yen Buddhism is generally considered as the most theoretical and systematic presentation of Buddhist ideas among the various Buddhist schools that appeared in China during the Sui-T'ang period (589-900 A.D.). Furthermore, its philosophico-religious teachings played a significant role in the religious history of East Asia. In spite of such an importance, very little is known about Hua-yen Buddhism in the Western world. This thesis, therefore, attempts to achieve a proper understanding of Hua-yen Buddhism through an extensive investigation of its central doctrine of dharmadhātu(fa-chieh) as it occurs in the writings of the patriarchs of the Hua-yen school.

Part One, as a background study, examines first of all the etymological and contextual meaning of the term dharmadhātu. It also surveys the Avataṁsaka-sūtra(Hua-yen ching), the canonical scripture from which the Hua-yen school derived the idea of dharmadhātu as the central theme for teaching and meditation. In addition, it discusses the background and development of the Hua-yen school.

In Part Two, the main body of the study, the dharmadhātu doctrine of the Hua-yen school is examined in terms of its development. The basic writings of its five patriarchs and their ideas concerning the dharmadhātu are chronologically and systematically analyzed in detail. It is demonstrated that the dharmadhātu doctrine can be

said to have been, by and large, founded by Tu-shun, formulated by Chih-yen, systematized by Fa-tsang, and elucidated by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi.

Part Three, the concluding part, embarks upon an inquiry into the significance of the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine. It is argued that the dharmadhātu doctrine is not "a pointless exposition of empty words," as characterized by some outside critics, but that it contains solid "philosophical," "religious," and "historical" significance within it. First, it is clarified that the dharmadhātu doctrine is meant to lead man toward an insight into the interrelatedness, that is, the "mutual identification" and "interpenetration," of all the dharmas -- an insight which liberates him from all kinds of rigid philosophical preconceptions and dogmatism concerning reality. Second, it is also discovered that the dharmadhātu doctrine of mutual identification and interpenetration is relevant to the formulation of the religious conviction of the "instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood" upheld by the Hua-yen school. Finally, it is verified through concrete evidence that the dharmadhātu doctrine exerted a significant influence on the religious thought of China, especially on the Ch'an(Zen) and the T'ien-t'ai traditions, Taoism, and Neo-Confucianism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to all those who contributed directly or indirectly to the preparation of this thesis. First of all my deep gratidude goes to my supervisor Professor Yün-hua Jan whose suggestions, encouragements and guidance have been essential throughout the whole process of writing this thesis. I also wand to heartedly thank my supervisory committee members, Professor Paul Younger whose keen insight into the whole structure of the thesis was greatly appreciated, and Professor Koichi Shinohara who provided many valuable and stimulating criticisms and untiring advice. I am also deeply grateful to Professor Graeme MacQueen for his great length of time spent in reading the whole manuscript several times and making indispensable suggestions, especially in style and expression. I would also like to thank my colleague Mr. Young-ho Kim for his helpful proof-reading.

I would like to take this opportunity to gratefully acknowledge the generous financial assistance given by McMaster University and the Canada Council. The Doctoral Fellowship and travel grant awarded by the Canada Council enabled me to spend a year of special study at the University of Tokyo during the academic year 1973-1974. I wish to thank especially Professor Shigeo Kamata of the University of Tokyo who showed a keen interest in my study and kindly arranged that I could be permitted to the libraries of the University and of the Institute of Oriental Culture as well as to his private library during the time that I was in Japan.

Furthermore, the Canada Council also enabled me to attend the XIIIth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions held at Lancaster, England in 1975 to present a research report on the subject of this thesis and to discuss with many scholars the questions raised in connection with this study.

I cannot list all the names of the people to whom I would like to express my gratitude for their making this thesis possible. My warmest appreciation, however, goes to my wife not only for her indefatigable assistence in typing out the manuscript but also for her wisdom in arranging the family life of a graduate student in such a way that she made us parents of two children, Eugene and Dennis, and herself a registered pharmacist of Canada at the same time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to achieve an understanding of Chinese Hua-yen Buddhism with special reference to dharmadhātu(fa-chieh) doctrine. Buddhism, which was first introduced into China around the first century A. D., developed through various stages of interaction with traditional Chinese culture before it finally emerged as an integral part of the Chinese religious tradition. After the periods of preparation (ca. A.D. 65-317) and of domestication (ca. 317-589), Buddhism came to the stage of "independent growth" in the Sui-T'ang period (ca. 589-900).[1] In this period there flourished such schools as the San-lun(the Three-Treatise or Mādhyamika), the T'ien-t'ai(or Lotus), the Hua-yen(the Flower-Garland or Avataṁsaka), the Fa-hsiang(Dharma-Character or Dharmalakṣana), the Pure Land, and the Ch'an(or Meditation).[2]

---

[1]Arthur F. Wright's division of Chinese Buddhist history is adopted here for the sake of convenience. For a general survey of Buddhist history in China, see his Buddhism in Chinese History (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959). A similar division is found in Daijo Tokiwa, Shina Bukky no Kenkyu (A Study of Chinese Buddhism) (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1942), vol. III, pp. 1-70. For an extensive study on the early stage of Chinese Buddhist history, see E. Zürcher, The Buddhist Conquest of China (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, rev. ed., 1972).

[2]For a brief survey of Chinese Buddhist schools, see Kenneth Ch'en, Buddhism in China (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 297-364; J. Takakusu, The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy (Honolulu: Univeristy of Hawaii, 1956, 3rd ed.), pp. 57-191; Wm. Theodore de Bary et al. ed., Sources of Chinese Tradition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), pp. 327ff; etc.

The systems of thought of most of these Chinese Buddhist schools were not mere extentions of Indian ideas but were reinterpretations and restatements to meet the intellectual and spiritual needs of the time.[3] Among these schools, however, the Hua-yen and the T'ien-t'ai are considered the most theoretical and systematic presentation of Buddhist ideas within distinctively Chinese modes of thought and expression.[4]

Of these two, according to Professor H. Nakamura, the Hua-yen philosophy is "the greatest adaptation of Mahāyāna Buddhism among the various philosophical systems organized by the Chinese."[5] Professor Garma C. C. Chang makes the categorical assertion that "of all Buddhist Schools--Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna and Tantra alike--" the one which "truly holds the highest teaching of Buddhism" is the Hua-yen school of China.[6]

Whether or not one argues with these strong assertions, what is unquestionably evident is that the Hua-yen school and its philosophico-religious teaching played an important role in the religious history of

---

[3]Concerning the new situations of this time, see Pt. I, ch. III.

[4]de Bary, op. cit., p. 369. "...the two schools [T'ien-t'ai and Hua-yen] have been able to serve as the philosophical foundation of Chinese Buddhism in general." Cf. also Y. Sogen, Systems of Buddhist Thought (Culcutta: Calcutta University, 1912), p. 287, and Wing-tsit Chan, A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 406.

[5]Hajime Nakamura, Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples (Honolulu: East-West Center, 1964), p. 245, or in Japanese, Toyojin no Shii Hoho (Tokyo: Misuzu Shubo, 1948), I. p. 482.

[6]Garma C. C. Chang, The Buddhist Teaching of Totality (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1971), p. ix.

China, Korea and Japan.[7]

The influence of Hua-yen philosophy on Chinese religious history, however, has not been fully recognized. Western readers, influenced by the writings of the prominent Zen scholar, D. T. Suzuki, tend to believe that the Ch'an or Zen school is the predominent Buddhist sect in the East Asia. It is true that the strong influence that Ch'an has exerted on the spiritual world of East Asia cannot be overestimated. Nevertheless, it is equally true that Ch'an was very much influenced by Hua-yen philosophy in its formative stage in China. Dr. Suzuki himself acknowledges this point when he says that "Zen is the practical consummation of Buddhist thought in China and the Kegon(Avataṁsaka) [Hua-yen] philosophy is its theoretical ultimation," or that "the philosophy of Zen is Kegon and the teaching of Kegon bears its fruit in the life of Zen."[8]

Hua-yen influence is found not only in Buddhist thought but also in such general religious trends of China as Neo-Confucianism, which was revitalized, in part at least, by Hua-yen philosophy. In addition to these philosophical influences, many religious practices and artistic

---

[7]The influence of the Hua-yen school on Chinese religious history will fully be discussed later in Pt. Three, ch. III.

[8]In the Introduction to B. L. Suzuki's Mahayana Buddhism (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1959, 3rd ed.), p. xxxiv. His somewhat exaggerated evaluation of the Hua-yen philosophy is also found in the following statement: "Fa-tsang's systematization of [Hua-yen] ideas expounded in the Buddhist sūtra-group known as the Gaṇḍavyūha or Avataṁsaka... is one of the wonderful intellectual achievements performed by the Chinese mind and is of the highest importance to the history of world thought." D. T. Suzuki, Studies in Zen, ed. by Christmas Humphreys (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1955), p. 139.

themes were also directly or indirectly influenced by Hua-yen.[9]

In spite of its importance, very little is known about the Hua-yen school in the Western world.[10] Why and how did this school emerge and develop? What was the core of the teaching of this school? With what modes of expression did this school present its message and appeal to the intellectuals of the time? What is its philosophico-religious significance, and what is its historical context? In short, what is this school and how should it be appraised from both doctrinal and historical points of view?

This study will concern itself with these questions. In an attempt to answer them, we will concentrate on the Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu(fa-chieh), because it is, as almost unanimously accepted by

---

[9]For the influence of Hua-yen on Chinses art, for example, see Jan Fountein, The Pilgrimage of Sudhana (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967). One of the most outstanding examples of Hua-yen influence is found in the construction of the Daibutsu(the Great Buddha-Vairocana) image in the Todaiji Temple, Nara, Japan, which is said to be the largest bronze statue in the world. This was constructed from 745 to 749 A.D. at the command of Emperor Shomu, who was so deeply impressed by the teaching of Hua-yen that he adopted it as the guiding principle of the country. According to Nakamura, this is the central symbol of Japanese culture and its spirit is still alive in the lives of Japanese people. Cf. Nakamura, "Significance of the Buddhāvataṁsaka-sūtra in the World History of Ideas"(in Japanese), Kegon Shiso, edited by Kumataro Kawada and Hajime Nakamura (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1960), p. 143. In addition, the Pulguksa Temple, one of the oldest and most beautiful temples in Korea was built in accordance with Hua-yen thought. See Dietrich Seckel, Art of the World (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1964), p. 90.

[10]As far as I know, there is only one book exclusively devoted to the study of Hua-yen philosophy, that is, Garma C. C. Chang, op. cit. Another important study on Hua-yen is F. H. Cook, Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines--An Annotated Translation (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis of the University of Wisconsin, 1970).

both classical and modern scholars, the basic doctrine around which all the other important teachings of the school centre.[11] The dharmadhātu was such an important idea for the Hua-yen school that the school was sometimes called "dharmadhātu school"(Fa-chieh tsung).[12] It is hoped, therefore, that with a proper understanding of this idea we will achieve a clearer picture of the Hua-yen school and its philosophico-religious teachings.

In pursuing the study, the following approach will be used. Part One will be devoted to an introductory study. In this part the term dharmadhātu will be examined in terms of its etymological and contextual

---

[11]For the classical argument on this point, see Fa-tsang's T'an-hsüan-chi(探玄記 , Records on Searching for the Hsüan-Mystery), Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo, ed. by J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe (Tokyo: Daizokyo Kankyokai, 1924-34) (Hereafter referred to as T.), vol. 35, p. 120a, 522a, et passim. An English summary of this passage is given is Kuan-ju Kao, "Avatamsaka Sutra," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, ed. by Malalasakera (Colombo: The Government Press, 1967-), vol. II, p. 442b, where it reads as follows: "T'an-yen of the Ch'i dynasty has said that the chief tenet is about the 'unhindered Dharmadhātu.' Ling-yu held that the chief tenet is about the world of the 'very deep Dharmadhātu.' ...Hsien-shou Fa-tsang of the T'ang dynasty supplemented Hui-kuang's theory and maintained that the chief tenet of the sūtra is to show that the theory of causal origination actually refers to the Dharmadhātu.... This has become the view commonly held by later scholars of the Hsien-shou [Hua-yen] school." Cf. Ch'eng-kuan's Hua-yen Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching, T. 45, p. 672c, etc. As to the opinions of modern scholars on this matter, see, for example, J. Takakusu, op. cit., p. 113; K. Ch'en, op. cit., p. 316; de Bary, op. cit., p. 369; Wing-tsit Chan, op. cit., p. 407; etc.

[12]To take an example, Hsü-fa(續法 , 1684-1728), an eminent Buddhist monk-scholar of the Ch'ing dynasty, called the Hua-yen school "Dharmadhātu school"(Fa-chieh tsung) in his Fa-chieh-tsung wu-tsu liao-chi(法界宗五祖略記, A Concise Biography of the Five Patriarchs of the Dharmadhatu School). Cf. Hsü Tsang-ching (Supplementary Tripitaka in Chinese) (Taiwan: reprint 1967, from Manji Zokuzokyo), 134, pp. 271ff., and Bussho Kaisetsu Taijiten, vol. 10, pp. 8c-9a. For Hsü-fa, see Mochitzuki, Bukkyo Taijiten, p. 3146c. For the usage of the term dharmadhātu prior to Fa-tsang, see his Wu-chiao-chang (Essay on the Five Teachings), T. 45, p. 480c, and Oda, Bukkyo Jiten, p. 1594a.

meaning. In addition, a brief attempt will be made to survey both the Avataṁsaka-sūtra (Hua-yen ching) and the Hua-yen (Avataṁsaka) school.

Our main attention, however, will be focused on the development of the dharmadhātu doctrine within the Hua-yen school. In Part Two, therefore, we will examine the doctrine in terms of its development from one to another of its five patriarchs, who lived during the Sui-T'ang period. The question of how these patriarchs understood this idea of dharmadhātu and how they presented it in their own terms will be analyzed in detail.

In Part Three, on the basis of our investigation of the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine, we will inquire into the question of its significance. We will first examine some "philosophical" implications of dharmadhātu doctrine. Second, we will also discuss its "religious" meaning by asking whether it is, as characterized by some outsiders, "a pointless expostion of empty words," or whether it can be assessed in terms of its religious contribution to the Hua-yen tradition. And third, we will further explore the "historical" impact of the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine on Chinese religious history in general.

We will try to make the present study as comprehensive as possible within its own scope. However, since the primary purpose of the study is to assess Hua-yen philosophy through an investigation into the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine as presented in the writings of the patriarchs, subjects such as the detailed analysis of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra itself, the extensive verification of historical data, textual criticism, and comparison with Western thought will deliberately be put outside the scope of the present study.

The primary source of the study is the writings of the patriarchs, which will be listed in the Bibliography. The most important and most frequently consulted works among them are: Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, Chih-yen's I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men, Fa-tsang's Wu-chiao-chang, and the commentaries of Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi on Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men.

All the accessible secondary sources on the Hua-yen dharmadhātu and related topics will be consulted. The most helpful materials, however, are found in Professor Shigeo Kamata's Chukogu Kegon Shiso Shi no Kenkyu (Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press, 1965), and in Professor Ryoshu Takamine's Kegon Shiso Shi (Kyoto: Kokyo Shoin, 1942).

In translating the original Chinese texts for quotations, all the translations available in Western languages as well as those in Korean and Japanese will be consulted. In quoting from the texts, it will be adopted as a principle to place the Chinese originals in the footnotes whenever they are directly translated from the texts. In most cases translation will necessarily be made directly from the original sources, because most original sources have not been translated. Even those partial translations which exist now do not serve our attempt to attune the translation to the whole context of the study and to be terminologically consistent.

Among those few translations of Hua-yen works, F. H. Cook's Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines--An Annotated Translation (op. cit.) is found to be the most reliable and suggestive. The translations of some short Hua-yen treatises found in Garma C. C. Chang's The Buddhist Teaching of Totality (op. cit.) have to be consulted with caution because

of their extremely free translation.

What must be pointed out here is that even though Western philosophical terms such as phenomena, noumena, substance, and form will be used in the study, it is simply because of the lack of better terms. These terms, therefore, should be understood in the context of Hua-yen philosophy, not in the context of Western philosophical tradition.

As regards terminology, every effort will be made to translate the technical terms into English. However, some Sanskrit and Chinese words will be used, not to make the discussion more technical, but to avoid one arbitrary, limited rendering. The most important of these words are "dharmadhātu"(fa-chieh), and li-shih. As will be discussed later, not only have these terms no exact English equivalents, but also their transliteration is in conformity with modern scholarly practice in the Buddhist field.

PART ONE

BACKGROUND

I. THE TERM DHARMADHĀTU

A. The Etymological Meaning of "Dharmadhātu"

First of all, it is necessary to examine what the Sanskrit term dharmadhātu literally means. Needless to say, it is a compound of two words, "dharma" and "dhātu." Both of these words are notorious as having extremely broad and diverse meanings. For example, V. S. Apte, in his Sanskrit-English dictionary, lists twenty-two different meanings under "dharma" and fifteen under "dhātu."[1] Other dictionaries such as Monier-Williams',[2] the Pāli Text Society's[3] and Childers'[4] also give similarily various definitions and meanings for these words.

It is hoped, however, that by examining the etymological meaning of these two words separately the compound form of these two -- "dharmadhātu"

---

[1]V. S. Apte, The Practical Sanscrit-English Dictionary (Bombay: Gopal Narayen & Co., 1924), pp. 522 and 524.

[2]Monier Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899), pp. 510 and 513.

[3]T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede, ed., Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary (Surry: The Pali Text Society, 1921-1925), Pt. IV, pp. 173 and 175.

[4]R. C. Childers, A Dictionary for the Pāli Language (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., n.d.), pp. 118 and 121.

can be better understood.

What, then, does the term dharma mean? In spite of the most valuable "philological" study of Mrs. and Professor Geiger on the term[5] and Professor Th. Stcherbatsky's investigation from the "philosophical" standpoint,[6] still it can hardly be said that the term is now fully and exactly elucidated.

Etymologically speaking, "dharma" is the noun form derived from the verbal root dhṛ which means to uphold, to establish, to bear, etc. The primary meaning of "dharma" would be, therefore, "that which is upheld or established." "The thing which is upheld" can imply various things according to its application and scope. For example, if it is applied to something that is upheld by people in general in the realm of social relationship it may mean custom, law, manner, morality, or duty. If it is something that should be universally upheld as the highest ideal for human life, it would mean Truth, Wisdom, Enlightenment, Religion, or Principle; and when this is believed to have been expressed in words, then teaching, doctrine, or collection of the teaching would be considered as the thing which is universally upheld.

Dharma which is upheld universally, on the other hand, can also be thought of as an upholder, maintainer, sustainer, or supporter, because without this very "thing that is universally upheld" the universe

---

[5]Cf. Magdalene and Wilhelm Geiger, Pāli Dhamma (Munich: 1921).

[6]Th. Stcherbatsky, The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the Word Dharma (London: 1923, reprint, Culcutta: Susil Gupta Ltd., 1961).

or society would be entirely chaotic and could not be sustained. The universe(cosmos) is only possible by being supported by it. In this sense, "dharma" could mean a constituent or primary element of the world whether it is spiritual or physical.

As a specifically Buddhist technical term especially for ontological discussion, "dharma" has the meanings such as "element" of existence,[7] "state of existence, condition of being,"[8] "Element or Ultimate Constituent of Existence,"[9] "Reality, Fact, Thing, Element(created and not created), Mind-and-Matter, Idea-and-Phenomenon,"[10] etc. The meaning which is the primary concern in our study seems to fall in the last category, i.e., the ontological conception of the term "dharma" because the doctrine of the dharmadhātu is primarily concerned with an ontological problem, rather than with an ethical or social question, as will be clear later.

Next, what is the meaning of the word dhātu? The meaning of "dhātu" is as complicated as that of dharma. The noun form "dhātu" is derived from the verbal root dhā which, according to the above consulted dictionaries, means 1) to put, place, set, lay, put in or on; 2) to fix upon, direct (the mind or thought) towards; 3) to give, confer; 4) to

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 2, 3, et passim.

[8] F. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), p. 276.

[9] T. R. V. Murti, The Central Philosophy of Buddhism (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1955), p. 345.

[10] J. Takakusu, The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1956), p. 57.

establish, constitute; 5) to produce, make, create, cause; 6) to uphold, bear, support; 7) to accept, conceive (especially in the womb); 8) to possess, etc. The suffix "-tu" forms a nomen actionis (action-noun) or sometimes a nomen agentis (agent-noun) which means 1) the product of the action of the preceeding verbal root; 2) the place where the action is performed; 3) the means by which the action is done; and 4) the supporter or agent of the action.[11]

Therefore, if among the various verbal meanings of dhā, the meaning "establish," for example, is chosen, adding the suffix "-tu" to it, the word "dhātu" would mean: 1) the thing that has been established; 2) the place where anything is established, or foundation, ground; 3) the means by which anything is established; and 4) the establisher. Hence when these basic meanings of suffix "-tu" are applied to the various meanings of the verbal root dhā, the noun form dhātu has basically such various meanings as 1) constituent, ingredient, 2) an element, 3) layer, stratum, deposit, 4) essential element or ingredient of the body, namely, organs of sense, fluid or juice, humour or affection of the body, bone or the remains of the body after cremation, relic, 5) primary element of the earth, i.e., mineral, mine, ore, and 6) element of words, i.e., grammatical verbal root or stem.[12] In addition to these, F. Edgerton lists two other meanings: 1) sphere, region, world, state of existence,

---

[11]Cf. W. D. Whitney, A Sanskrit Grammar (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967[11]), p. 435, and K. Kawada, "Dharmadhātu," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, XI (1963), p. 680(17).

[12]See sub verbo in the above mentioned dictionaries.

and 2) mass, abundance, large quantity, the latter of which does not appear to be closely connected with the primary meanings of the word.[13]

Among these various meanings, what "dhātu" really and properly means as a typically Buddhist term and especially when it is used in the compound word dharmadhātu, we cannot now hastily conclude. The only thing to be noted is that the primary meaning of the word is twofold, viz., "element," and "the thing which possesses or causes this element," both of which have relevance to our study as will be clearer later.

Now on the basis of the preceding survey of its components we can dimly see the etymological meaning, at least, of the word dharmadhātu. To see it more clearly, however, it is also necessary to know what kind of compound is implied in the word dharmadhātu. Among the various kinds of compound[14] two are most possibly applicable in the case of dharmadhātu, i.e., tatpuruṣa(dependent compound) and karmadhāraya(descriptive).[15] According to the first class, dharmadhātu would be "dhātu of dharma" just like devasenā(senā of deva, army of gods) or yamadūta(dūta of Yama, Yama's messenger). According to the second, on the other hand, as seen in the cases of brahmarṣi(priest-sage) or rājarṣi(king-sage), the words could be understood as used appositionally. Hence, dharmadhātu can be interpreted as "dharma which is dhātu," or vice versa.

Between these two interpretations -- "dhātu of dharma" and "dharma-dhātu" -- a choice can only be made in terms of the contexts in which they

---

[13]Cf. Edgerton, op. cit., p. 283.

[14]Cf. W. D. Whitney, op. cit., pp. 480ff.(sections 1245ff.).

[15]Ibid., pp. 489ff.(sections 1262ff.).

are used. However, from the purely etymological point of view, one thing we can notice is that dharma and dhātu have very similar meanings. Therefore, it would be natural to see these two components of the compound as in apposition. In other words, they need not necessarily be considered as being in a genitive relation alone, as is often assumed.[16]

It is interesting to note that there are at least three words in Tibetan for rendering the term dhātu, i.e., khams, rigs, and dbyiṅs.[17] This indicates that the Tibetans were conscious of the several different meanings implied in the original. While the usual Tibetan word for dhātu is khams, after dharma it is usually rendered by dbyiṅs which means "sphere," "expanse," and the like. However, this does not necessarily mean that dharmadhātu was translated only as "chos kyi dbyiṅs." Sometimes chos kyi khams and chos kyi rigs are also found in the texts.[18]

The term dharmadhātu was translated into Chinese in most cases as "fa-chieh"(法界). In contrast to the fact that the Sanskrit dharma-dhātu has a wide variety of meanings, its Chinese equivalent fa-chieh has a rather definite meaning. Because fa is generally understood

---

[16]The one who newly emphasizes the appositive relation of these two components is K. Kawada. For the details on this question, see his "Dharmadhātu," op. cit., pp. 858f.(19f.).

[17]Edgerton, op. cit., p. 282. For the various meanings of these words, see H. A. Jäschke, A Tibetan-English Dictionary, pp. 39, 527, and 390, and Sarat Chandra Das, A Tibetan-English Dictionary, pp. 140f., 1180, and 914. Khams means element, realm; rigs means lineage, class, species, etc.

[18]Cf. E. Obermiller, The Supreme Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation Being a Manual of Buddhist Monism, Acta Orientalia, vol. IX (1931, reprint, Shanghai: 1940), pp. 103f., 141, 251, 248; and Gadjin Nagao, Index to the Mahāyāna Sutrālaṃkāra (Kyoto: 1958), pp. 121 and 124. See also Étienne Lamotte, ed. and tr. Saṁdhinirmoccana Sūtra, L'Explication des Mystères (Louvain: 1935), p. 104; and Jikido Takasaki, A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Rome: Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Orente, 1966), p. 291.

in relation to its Sanskrit original, dharma, and because the word fa itself has several different meanings, there was relatively little room to take it for granted that the word fa means only "law."[19] But chieh means definitely a "limit," a "boundary," or a "border," and when this character is used as a sort of suffix with other words preceeding to it, it means a "world," or "realm," as in the cases of "tung-wu-chieh"(動物界), a world of animal, "hsüeh-chieh"(學界), scholarly or educational world, etc.[20]

Therefore, it is natural that without a special knowledge of this technical term one would be led to understand fa-chieh as a "world or realm of dharma." In this translation there are no meanings such as "element," "reality," and "constituent" at all. It is evident that if the word is understood this way it has lost the flexibility in meaning which the original conveyed.

How the Hua-yen philosophers understood the idea of dharmadhātu through its Chinese translation fa-chieh is a question which will be answered later in this study.[21] However, what could be assumed is that it might be to avoid such misunderstanding as may occur when this narrower Chinese translation was used that the term dharmadhātu was also sometimes transliterated as ta-ma-t'o-tu(達磨馱都). It was also occasionally

---

[19]Cf. Wing-tsit Chan, A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy, op. cit., p. 786.

[20]H. A. Giles, A Chinese-English Dictionary (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1912), p. 185, and R. H. Mathews, Mathews' Chinese-English Dictionary (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 86.

[21]See below Part Three.

translated as fa-hsing(法性, dharma-nature) or shih-hsiang(實相, Reality).[22]

Now we are faced with the question of what would be a proper English translation of the term dharmadhātu. Before moving to our conclusion in this matter, it is useful to see how it has been translated into English by modern scholars of Buddhism.

F. Edgerton, a specialist in Buddhist Sanskrit terminology, translates dharmadhātu as "sphere of religion,"[23] which seems to have no specilized meaning at all. One of the bases of this translation, according to him, is the fact that Tibetan regularly renders it as chos kyi dbyiṅs whereas khams is the usual Tibetan for dhātu. However, as pointed out before, chos kyi dbyiṅs is not the only rendering for dharmadhātu. Therefore, his translation seems too one-sided.

T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede, in their Pāli dictionary, do not give a translation but interpret it as "the mental object considered as irreducible element; ...an ultimate principle of the Dh[amma]." This interpretation, which is based upon the Pāli canon, may be a good explanation,[24] but because this is not an actual translation of the term, it does not serve our present purpose.

W. E. Soothill and L. Hodous translate "dharmadhātu" as "Dharma-

---

[22]W. E. Soothill and L. Hodous, A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms (London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1934), p. 271. In the Chiu-ching-i-ch'eng pao-hsing-lun(Ratnagotravibhāga, T. 31, no. 1611), dhātu is translated in most cases as hsing(性, nature or essence). Cf. Takasaki, op. cit., pp. 238, 290 and 193. See also Louis de La Vallée Poussin, Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: La Siddhi de Hiuan-tsang, traduite et annotée (Paris, 1928-30), p. 753.

[23]Cf. Edgerton, op. cit., p. 278.

[24]This question will be discussed later in the next section.

element, -factor, or -realm."[25] It is interesting to note that the three main connotations of the term dhātu are included here. The definitions which follow this translation are equally interesting. Although we are not yet ready to evaluate them, it seems worth quoting them here.

> (1) A name for "things" in general, noumenal or phenomenal; for the physical universe, or any portion or phase of it. (2) The unifying underlying spiritual reality regarded as the ground or cause of all things, the absolute from which all proceeds....

Junjiro Takakusu, paying special attention to the term dharma-dhātu, gives several translations, such as "the Realm of Principle," "the Principle of Totality," and "Realm of Principle or Elements."[26] In one passage he describes it as follows:

> The term "Dharma-dhātu" is sometimes used as a synonym of the ultimate truth. Therefore, the translation "the Element of the Elements" is quite fitting. But at other times it means the universe, "the Realm of All Elements." The double meaning, the universe and the universal principle, must always be borne in mind whenever we use the term.[27]

E. Conze translates dharmadhātu in several ways such as "the Dharma-Element, " "the Element of Dharma," "the Realm of Dharma," and "element of dharma."[28] The word "Reality or Essence" is used by T. R. V. Murti, who equates the dharmadhātu with dharmatā("dharma-ness") and gives

---

[25] W. E. Soothill and L. Hodous, op. cit., p. 271.

[26] J. Takakusu, op. cit., pp. 39ff. et passim.

[27] Ibid., p. 113.

[28] E. Conze, Buddhist Texts through the Ages (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1954), p. 319; The Thirty of Buddhist Studies (Oxford: 1967), p. 11 et passim.

such definitions: "The Reality or Essence of Dharma(Elements of Existence); the Noumenal Ground or Phenomena; synonymous with Dharma-Kāya, Śūnyatā and Tathatā."[29]

D. T. Suzuki uses the word dharmadhātu without trying to give any English equivalent, while suggesting that it means some kind of mystical "universe" or "world."[30] His wife B. L. Suzuki, at one point, translates it as "Supreme Reality."[31] The other translations such as "the essence of Reality" (Th. Stcherbatsky),[32] "the ultimate reality" (A. K. Warder),[33] and "the World of Reality" (Y. S. Hakeda)[34] are similar to this.

Finally, let us see how two modern Hua-yen scholars handle this term. First, we find that F. H. Cook avoids translating the term dharma dhātu and never even tries to define it.[35] Garma C. C. Chang occasionally

---

[29]Murti, op. cit., p. 345.

[30]D. T. Suzuki, Essays of Zen Buddhism (third series) (New York: Samuel Weiser Inc., 1971[3]), pp. 78, 99, 149, et passim.

[31]B. L. Suzuki, "An Outline of the Avatamsaka Sutra," Eastern Buddhist, vol. VI. (July, 1934), pp. 280 and 284.

[32]Th. Stcherbatsky, The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāna (Leningrad: 1927, reprint, The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965), p. 33.

[33]A. K. Warder, Indian Buddhism (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970), pp. 424, 427, et passim.

[34]Y. S. Hakeda, tr. The Awakening of Faith (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 97.

[35]F. H. Cook, Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines -- An Annotated Translation (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis of the University of Wisconsin, 1970).

adopts the term "totality" as a translation of the term dharmadhātu, but he also uses the Sanskrit term dharmadhātu throughout his study.[36]

It seems that all of these English translations, when considered collectively, may give a general glimpse of the term dharmadhātu. None of them, however, convey the satisfying flexibility of the original meaning of the word. Even the scholarly disagreement on an English translation is a good indication that it is impossible or next-to-impossible to have a completely proper English translation for this term. Therefore, we will have to use the original word dharmadhātu to avoid the misleading connotations which would be carried in any of its English translations.

Strictly speaking, however, since we are dealing with the Chinese understanding of "dharmadhātu," it would be more accurate to use the Chinese traslation fa-chieh instead of the Sanskrit term dharma-dhatu. Nevertheless, "fa-chieh" has never been used in any English works on the subject. This rather peculiar scholarly tradition impels us to adopt the original Sanskrit word dharmadhātu rather than the Chinese term fa-chieh throughout this study.

---

[36]Garma C. C. Chang, The Buddhist Teaching of Totality (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971).

B. The Contextual Meaning of "Dharmadhātu" in the Indian Buddhist Literature

The foregoing etymological analysis of "dharmadhātu" can be supplemented with a contextual study in reference to Indian Buddhist literature. In this section, therefore, we will survey some major literary works representing the main streams of Indian Buddhist thought.

An early appearance of the term dhammadhātu, the Pāli equivalent to the Sanskrit dharmadhātu, is found in the Dīgha Nikāya.[1] Here the Buddha talks about a number of the Buddhas of the past. The Bhikkhus, hearing this, ask themselves:

> How wonderful a thing, brethren, and how strange is the great genius, the master mind of the Tathāgata, that he should remember the Buddhas of old.... Now, what think you, brother? Has this principle of truth [dhammadhātu] been clearly discerned by the Tathāgata, so that by his discernment of it he remembers all those facts about the Buddhas of the past? Or have gods revealed this matter to the Tathāgata, so that thereby he remembers?[2]

---

[1] The Dīgha Nikāya, ed. by T. W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter (Geoffrey Cumberlege: Oxford University Press, 1903, reprint 1947) vol. II. p. 8.

[2] Ibid. The underlining is mine. The original of the underlined part reads as follows: "Tathagatass' eva nu kho esā dhamma-dhātu suppaṭividdha yassā dhamma-dhātuyā suppaṭividdhattā Tathāgato atīte Buddhe [parinibbute... piti:]. The translation is from Dialogues of the Buddha, pt. II, tr. by T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids. Sacred Books of the Buddhists, vol. III. (London: Luzac & Co. Ltd., PTS. 1910, 1959), pp. 6f.

The Buddha, listening to this conversation, answers that it is through his clear discernment of the dhammadhātu that he is able to remember all of these things about the Buddhas, while gods also have revealed these matters to him.[3] Similar usages are found in the Saṁyutta-Nikāya[4] and the Majjhima-Nikāya.[5] What is discovered in all of these passages is that the primary source of this extraordinary knowledge is the penetration or clear discernment of this dhammadhātu, whether it is translated as "principle of truth"(T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids), "the causal nature of things"(Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids), "the constitution of dhamma"(I. B. Horner) or "the reality of phenomena"(A. K. Warder).[6]

In contrast to such a general, unfixed meaning of the term, a different but subsequently most common understanding of dhammadhātu is found in the Saṁyutta-Nikāya where it is listed as the seventeenth of "eighteen dhātus." The eighteen dhātus is one of the three most common classifications of dharmas in early Buddhism, the other two being

---

[3]Ibid., p. 10.

[4]The Saṁyutta-Nikāya, pt. II. ed. by M. Leon Peer (PTS, 1898, 1960), p. 56. For translation, see The Book of the Kindred Sayings, pt. II. tr. by Mrs. Rhys Davids assisted by F. L. Woodward (PTS, 1922, 1955) p. 41. In this passage Sāriputta(Sāriputra) is praised for having well penetrated the dhammadhātu and answered some questions correctly.

[5]The Majjhima-Nikāya, vol. I. ed. by V. Trenckner (PTS, 1888, 1964), pp. 395f. The translation is found in The Middle Length Sayings, tr. by I. B. Horner (PTS, 1957, 1970), vol. II. pp. 63f. Here the Buddha says to Prince Abhaya that when he is asked a question he answers immediately because he clearly discerns the dhammadhātu, just as the prince can answer the question about a chariot immediately because he fully knows all the particular parts of a chariot.

[6]See the preceding notes for these translations, and Warder, op. cit., pp. 101ff.

the five skandhas(Pali: khandhas, heaps or groups) and the twelve āyatanas(sense-fields). Here the dhammadhātu is understood as the object(visaya) of mind(manas) just as colour is the object of the eye, sound is the object of the ear, and so on.[7] It is impossible to know what is exactly meant by "mind-object" here. What is at least certain is that it does not here carry such a solemn cosmic meaning as is found in the later Mahāyāna philosophy.

This sort of understanding of dharmadhātu is predominent in the Abhidharma philosophy, especially in that of the Theravāda and the Sarvāstivāda. In the Pāli Abhidhamma works such as the Dhammasaṅgaṇi, the Vibhaṅga, and the Dhātukathā, we find reoccurrences of the term dhammadhātu in this context.[8] It is also the case in the Abhidharmakośa, a work of the realistic school of Sarvāstivādins.[9]

The term dharmadhātu appears in the Mahāyāna literature more

---

[7]Cf. The Saṁyutta-Nikāya, op. cit., pp. 140ff. and The Book of the Kindred Sayings, op. cit., pp. 101ff.

[8]For example, see Dhammasaṅgaṇi (PTS ed., 1885), pp. 58, 67, 147, etc. (English translation by Mrs. C. H. F. Rhys Davids, A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics, 1900); Vibhaṅga (PTS ed., 1904), pp. 87, 89; Dhātukathā (English tr. by U Narada, Discourse on Element, PTS, 1962), pp. 5, 32, etc. For a general survey of the Pāli Abhidhamma works, see Nyanatiloka Mahathera, Guide through the Abhidhamma-piṭaka (Kandy, Ceylon: Buddhist Publication Society, 1971), especially pp. 28f., 52ff., 100, etc.

[9]See Th. Stcherbatsky, The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the Word 'Dharma' (London: 1923, rep. 1961), esp. pp. 8f., and Louis de la Vallee Poussin, L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu: Traduction et Annotation in Melanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, vol. XVI, tomes I-VI (1971).

frequently and meaningfully. In the Prajñāpāramitā literature, particularly in the Aṣṭasahasrikā, possibly the oldest and basic Prajñāpāramitā text, it appears, according to E. Conze, as the "Absolure Dharma or simply the Absolute."[10] In one passage the Buddha is said to proclaim:

> And as emptiness [śūnyatā] does not crumble, nor crumble away, so also the Signless, the Wishless, the Uneffected, the Unproduced, Non-existence, and the Realm of Dharma [Dharmadhātu].[11]

In view of this passage, together with some others,[12] it can be observed that the dharmadhātu is described as belonging to the same category as Emptiness, the Signless, the Wishless, the Uneffected, etc. and moreover that it corresponds to Non-existence, Nirvāṇa, and Suchness(tathatā). What is noticed here, however, is that the dharmadhātu is exclusively connected with negative expressions. There is no indication that it is something which has positive dynamic qualities. In this sense it is only natural that in several places the dharmadhātu is compared to such a term as "space"(ākāśa).[13] This kind of negative description is in fact the characteristic feature of the Prajñāpāramitā understanding of the Absolute.

---

[10]E. Conze, The Perfect Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary (Bolinas: Four Seasons Foundation, 1973), p. 314. For the original, see The Aṣṭasahasrikā, ed. by R. Mitra in the Bibliotheca Indica (1888) and by Wogihara (Tokyo: 1932-35). For the date of the text, see Conze, ibid., p. xi, and Murti, op. cit., p. 83.

[11]Ch. XII, 256. Conze, ibid., p. 173.

[12]For example, see ch. XII, 283. Conze, ibid., p. 177.

[13]Chs. VIII, 197; XII, 273. Conze, ibid., pp. 146, and 177.

The germinal form of the Prajñāpāramitā philosophy found a fuller expression in the Mādhyamika system, which seems to have developed as a system around the beginning of the Christian era. The true reality (tattva) is, according to the definition of Nāgārjuna, the founder, "not caused by something else, peaceful, quiescent, unelaborated by discursive thought, indeterminate, undifferentiated, non-plural."[14] In other words, this reality is so transcendent of thought and predication that it cannot be theorized about or conceived of in terms of the empirical. It is just emptiness(śūnyatā), devoid of thought-determination, conceptualization, categorization, and theorization. All the concepts concerning this ultimate reality(paramārtha) are the fantasy of pseudo-reality, conventional or concessional(samvṛti or vyāvahārika), and hence false.

In such a line of thought it seems quite natural that there could be no room,especially in philosophical discussion, for terms like dhātu or dharmadhātu which might give the misleading impression of some sort of quasi-substantial entity. If it is necessary to designate the ultimate reality at all, the Mādhyamika seems to have thought it more favorable to adopt rather abstract terms such as śūnyatā, dharmatā("dharmaness") or tathatā("suchness") instead of dharmadhātu, although they were considered

---

[14]The Mūlamadhyamakakārikās, ch. XVIII, 9. For translations see F. J. Streng, Emptiness (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967); and Kenneth K. Inada, Nāgārjuna, A Translation of His Mūlamadhyamakakārikā with an Introductory Essay (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1970). Some selections are found Th. Stcherbatsky, The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa (rep. Hague: Moulton & Co., 1965); Jan W. de Jong, Cinq chapitres de la Prasannapadā (Paris: Geuthner, 1949); Stanislaw Schayer, Ausgewahlte Kapitel aus der Prasannapadā (Krakow: Naktadem Polskie, 1931), etc.

in the final analysis all synonymous.[15] Consequently we can find no example of special significance ascribed exclusively to the term dharmadhātu in the Mādhyamika system.

It was in the later Mahāyāna works composed or compiled after the heyday of the orthodox Madhyamika Śūnyavāda that the positive terms for the Ultimate were reintroduced -- obviously with different deeper meanings and with new emphases. Although the basic idea of the Madhyamika śūnyatā was accepted by later Buddhists, its unqualified rejection of all phenomena appeared to be an extremism or a sheer nihilism, and hence emerged some reaction against, or rather modification of, such an apparently misleading negativism. One of these reactions found its form in the Yogācāra Idealism which represents the "third turning of the wheel of Dharma(dharmacakra)."

The Yogācāra contends that phenomena should be rejected as unreal (śūnya) but they must be understood as rooted in some reality. Everything is illusory, but the illusion should have a ground on which the illusory projection can take place. Moreover, the "imaginer" of the unreal (abhūtaparikalpita) should be also understood to exist(asti). This ground or imaginer, according to Yogācāra, is Consciousness(vijñāna),

---

[15] Cf. "Śūnyatā tathatā bhūtakoṭiḥ dharmadhātur ityādi paryāyāḥ" Bodhi-cary-āvatāra-prajñika by Prajñākaramati (Bib. Ind.), p. 354, quoted in T. R. V. Murti, op. cit., p. 246. For the meanings of these terms and their relations in detail, see H. Nakamura, "The Significance of the Buddhāvataṁsaka-sūtra in the World History of Ideas,"(Japanese) in Kegon Shiso, ed. by K. Kawada and H. Nakamura(Kyoto: Hozokan, 1960), pp. 95-127.

and this is truly real.[16]

Strictly speaking, what is generally called "the third turning of the wheel of Dharma" should be understood to include by and large three streams of thought: 1) the tathāgatagarbha system, 2) the Yogācāra Idealism, and 3) the combined stream.[17]

1) "Dharmadhātu" in the tathāgatagarbha system: As a representative text for the first category, the Ratnagotravibhāga(or Uttaratantra)[18] can be taken, since the other works such as the Tathāgatagarbha-sūtra,[19] the Śrīmālā-devīsimhanāda-sūtra,[20] and the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra[21] are all extensively quoted by it and their basic ideas are all reflected in it.

---

[16]Cf. Asaṅga's Madhyāntavibhaga referred to in A. K. Warder, op. cit., p. 440. Stcherbatsky called this idea "an Indian Cogito, ergo sum." Buddhist Logic, vol. I (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1962, first ed. Leningrad, c. 1930), p. 12. Cf. also Vasubandhu's Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi, ed. S. Levi (Paris, 1925), p. 16.

[17]For more detail on this controversial matter, see Jikido Takasaki, A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga(Uttaratantra) Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism (Serie Orientale Roma, XXIII) (Rome: Institue Italiano per Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1966), especially pp. 58ff.

[18]The Sanskrit edition by E. H. Johnston (Patna: 1950) and Obermiller's translation from the Tibetan, The Supreme Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation," op. cit., and Takasaki's based on the Sanskrit, the Tibetan and the Chinese. T. 31, no. 1611. (究竟一乘宝性論).

[19]T. 16, no. 666 and no. 667.

[20]T. 12, no. 353 (勝鬘師子吼一乘大方便方廣經). Cf. Alex Wayman and Hideko Wayman, tr. The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974).

[21]T. 12, no. 374. (大般涅槃經).

The core doctrine of the Ratnagotravibhāga is the tathāgatagarbha theory which positively proclaims that "All living beings are possessed of the tathāgatagarbha(the Matrix of the Tathāgata)."[22] It is further explained that "the Absolute Body(dharmakāya) of the Tathāgata penetrates all living beings," and hence in every living being "there exists the Germ of the Tathāgata(tathāgatagotra)."[23] This innermost element of potentiality which is to be actualized into Buddhahood or Enlightenment is variously called gotra(germ), garbha(matrix), dhātu, or hetu(cause) of the Tathāgata[24] or of the Buddha. Thus there are found such terms as tathāgatagarbha, tathāgatagotra, buddhadhātu, buddhagotra, and tathāgatadhātu.

According to the text, this, and this alone, is the Absolute Reality. "Even though it is possessed of the adventitious faults by occasion, because of the virtues essential to its nature, it is immutable, the same in the beginning and afterwards."[25] It is "the foundation, the support, and the substratum" of all the elements.[26] It also has the characteristic of being both empty(śūnya) and non-empty(aśūnya): empty

---

[22]The Ratnagotravibhāga, tr. by Takasaki, op. cit., p. 196. For the key passages of the text translated into English, see Conze, Buddhist Texts through the Ages, op. cit., pp. 181-184.

[23]Ibid., p. 198.

[24]Cf. ibid., pp. 21, 59, 290, etc.

[25]Ibid., p. 234.

[26]Ibid., p. 292.

in the sense that it is by nature "devoid" of all the defilements(kleśa), and non-empty in the sense that it is full of the Buddha's qualities.[27] It is transcendental(lokottara), and moreover it is the Supreme Eternity, the Supreme Bliss, the Supreme Unity, and the Supreme Purity.[28] This ultimate reality is sometimes referred to in the text with such terms as Tathatā, cittaprakṛti(mind-nature), dharmakāya, and śūnyatā.[29]

The term dharmadhātu is applied as synonymous with all these designations of the Absolute Reality only to express it in a positive way. It says, "Essential nature(dharmadhātu) means the Matrix of the Tathāgata, which is not different from his own quality by nature."[30] "The Essence [dhātu] that exists since beginningless time is the foundation of all the elements."[31] However, it should be noted that even though dharmadhātu in this system is identified with the main theme tathāgatagarbha or gotra, the element in every living being(sattvadhātu), it refers rather to the aspect of its own proper nature, whereas the gotra or garbha refers rather to the ground-aspect from which this Absolute should emerge or at least be recognized. It is said that the dharmakāya should be known

---

[27] Ibid., p. 301.

[28] Ibid., pp. 291 and 298.

[29] Cf. ibid., pp. 100, 161, 229, etc., and Warder, op. cit., pp. 404f.

[30] The Ratnagotravibhāga, tr. by Takasaki, op. cit., p. 161.

[31] Ibid., p. 290. In many places the dharmadhātu or tathāgata-dhātu is called just dhātu. Cf. ibid., pp. 143, 187, 269, et passim.

"in two aspects: one is the dharmadhātu which is perfectly immaculate, and the other is its outflow."[32] In other words, the gotra which should be purified has the dharmadhātu as its own ultimate nature, and once purified it is rather called dharmadhātu which stands as it truly is in the absolute sense.[33]

2) "Dharmadhātu" in the Yogācāra Idealism: In the Abhidharma-samuccaya,[34] a compendium of the Yogācāra Abhidharma, Asaṅga, just as in the early Abhidharma system, gives a long list of dharmas totaling one hundred items. In this list the dharmadhātu is put as just one item among the eleven dhātus, i.e., five senses, and their corresponding objects, plus dharmadhātu.[35]

In addition to this, Asaṅga recognizes another special meaning of the term dharmadhātu. He admits that there are "the dharmadhātu which are not comprised among the aggregates." According to his interpretation, they are "the unconditioned(asamskṛta) eight in number." The first of these is said to be the "Suchness of good dharma"(kuśaladharma-tathatā). And to the question, "what is the Suchness of good dharma?" he answers that it is "No-self"(nairātmya), Emptiness(śūnyatā), "Signless-ness"(animitta), Reality-limit(bhūtakoṭi), Ultimate Reality(paramārtha)

---

[32] Ibid., p. 284.

[33] Cf. ibid., p. 290, and Warder, op. cit., pp. 401 and 409.

[34] The Sanskrit edition by Pralhad Pradhan in the Visvabharati Studies, 12, 1950. A French translation by W. Rahula is found in Le Compendium de la Super-Doctrine(Philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga (Paris: École Française D'Extreme-Orient, vol. LXXVIII, 1971). T. 31, no.1605.

[35] Le Compendium., p. 18.

and the dharmadhātu.[36] He further says that the Suchness is called dharmadhātu "because it is the fundamental sign of the Buddha's teaching for all the disciples and the Pratyekabuddhas."[37]

It is rather easy to admit that all these terms are synonymous, but the reason why they should be is not clear at all. The reason is given in the Madhyāntavibhagaṭīkā[38] in a little more detail. The alleged author of the kārikā, Maitreya or Asaṅga, states that the above mentioned terms are the synonyms of Emptiness. Vasubandhu, who comments on this stanza, gives the reasons why these are synonymous, at last saying that "it is the Element of Dharma [dharmadhātu] as the root cause of the dharmas of the saints." Further Sthiramati subcomments here saying that the word Element [dhātu] is also used to denote "something which has a (certain) form on account of its own marks," and gives "gold, copper or silver" as examples for "element."[39] According to Sthiramati, in addition to the above listed five synonyms, the others such as "non-duality, the realm of non-discrimination, the true nature of dharma, the inexpressible, that which has not been stopped, the Unconditioned, Nirvāṇa, etc." could also be adopted.

---

[36] Ibid., p. 18. The translator of the text, W. Rahula put this dharmadhātu into French as "l'element de la Loi" while he translated the term dharmadhātu as "l'element des objets mentaux" in other cases.

[37] Ibid., p. 19.

[38] The Sanskrit text was edited by S. Yamaguch (Nagoya, 1934). The English translation of the first chapter was done by D. L. Friedmann (Utrecht: 1937), and by Stcherbatsky in Bibliotheca Buddhica, XXX, (1936).

[39] Quoted in Conze, Buddhist Texts, op. cit., p. 170-172. Cf. also Warder, op. cit., p. 434.

This is better than the former explanation, but is still ambiguous. One thing, however, is clearly seen, i.e., that all these are the designations of Absolute Reality with specific emphasis on its various aspects. The name dharmadhātu, therefore, is one expression for the Absolute understood in the Yogācāra doctrine.[40]

3) "Dharmadhātu" in the Combined Stream: A typical literary work reflecting the combined stream is the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra,[41] which is a collection of the various Mahāyāna teachings, thus maintaining most of the salient features of both the Yogācāra doctrine and the tathāgatagarbha theory. Here in this sūtra, the doctrine of Mind(citta) or Mind-only (cittamātratā) is so cardinal that it appears as if "warp and weft of the sutra."[42]

To quote some representative passages concerning Mind from the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra as illustrations, they read as follows:

> [Mind] is beyond all philosophical views, is apart from discrimination, it is not attainable, nor is it ever born: I say, there is nothing but Mind.
>
> It is not an existence, nor is it a non-existence; it is indeed beyond both existence and non-existence; it is Suchness, it is even released from mind [intellection]: I say, there is nothing but Mind.

---

[40]For similar synonyms in Yogācāra philosophy, see Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi, ed. by S. Levi (Paris, 1925), p. 41. Cf. also Hsüan-chuang's Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun, T. 31, p. 48ab.

[41]Ed. by B. Nanjio in 1923. For Chinese translations, see T. 16, nos. 670-672. An English translation has been done by D. T. Suzuki, The Laṅkāvatāra sūtra (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1932, 1966). See also his Studies in the Laṅkāvatāra sūtra (London: Routledge & Paul Kegan Ltd., 1930, 1972).

[42]Suzuki, Studies, op. cit., p. 244.

> Out of Mind spring innumerable things, conditioned by discrimination and habit energy; these things people accept as an external world. I say, there is nothing but Mind.
>
> What appears to be external does not exist in reality, it is indeed Mind that is seen as multiplicity; the body, property, and above-all these, I say, are nothing but Mind.[43]

In addition, we find many phrases which seem to be summary statements of the central doctrine, e. g., "The world is nothing but Mind (cittamātraṁ lokam)."[44] "Nothing is to be seen outside the Mind (cittabāhyādarśanam)."[45] "The triple world is Mind itself (svacittamātraṁ traidhātukam)."[46] and so on.[47]

The Mind(citta) here is presented as something that constitutes the basis of the world, something left behind when all the forms of discrimination are eliminated, and something that goes beyond this world of particularization. It is something primordial from which all the multiplicity of an external world emerges. But when we cut off such mental activities as particularization, categorization, and discrimination which have been the cause of spiritual bondage and defilement, and if we penetrate into the very essence of these things, it appears in its pristine purity.

---

[43] Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra, pp. 153f. The page numbers are according to the Nanjio edition which are easily identifiable in Suzuki's translation. This English translation is from Suzuki, Studies, p. 242.

[44] Nanjio ed. p. 73.

[45] Ibid., p. 42.

[46] Ibid., pp. 80, 42, 123, et passim.

[47] For further references, see Suzuki, Studies, pp. 243.

This reality taken hold of by a "sheer act of intuition which is made possible by the working of non-discriminative wisdom(avikalpa-jñāna), or supreme wisdom(āryajñāna), or superior knowledge(prajñā) in the inmost recesses of consciousness(pratyātma-gocara)" -- this is called the Mind.[48]

This Mind(citta), in the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra, identified with ālayavijñāna(store-house consciousness)[49] and again with the tathāgata-garbha(the matrix of the Tathāgata),[50] is picked up as a synonym of dharmadhātu.[51] It is especially significant that dharmadhātu is now connected primarily with positive terms,[52] because the Hua-yen understanding of dharmadhātu stands, as will be clear, in this line of tradition.[53]

---

[48]Ibid., p. 279.

[49]Laṅkā., Nanjio ed., pp. 278, et passim.

[50]Ibid., pp. 222, 223, 235, 278, et passim.

[51]Ibid., p. 154.

[52]For the detailed explanation of the positive character of citta-mātratā(Mind-only) in contrast to the Yogācāra idea of vijñāptimātratā (representation-only), see Suzuki, Studies, pp. 181f., and 278-282.

[53]Cf. Takadaki, Ratna., op. cit., p. 8.

II. THE AVATAṂSAKA-SŪTRA

The idea of dharmadhātu is the most significant contribution of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra. This idea was taken up and made the central theme for teaching and meditation by the Hua-yen school. It is, therefore, necessary to examine both the sūtra and the school as a prelude to a detailed discussion of the dharmadhātu in the Hua-yen school. The present chapter will deal with the Avataṁsaka-sūtra in terms of its history and its basic structure, with the next chapter being devoted to an examination of the Hua-yen school.

A. The History of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra

The complete Sanskrit title of the sūtra is Buddhāvataṁsaka-mahāvaipulya-sūtra.[1] The Sanskrit text as a whole with this title is

---

[1] Avataṁsaka generally means "flower garland," and mahāvaipulya "great." Gaṇḍavyūha is another name of the sūtra. Gaṇḍa means "stalk" and vyūha "decoration" or "array." Gaṇḍavyūha, however, is usually used as a title of an independent sūtra which corresponds to the last chapter of the Avataṁsaka. For a discussion of the title, see K. Kawada, "Wreath of Buddha" (in Japanese), Kegon Shiso, ed. by Kumataro Kawada and Hajime Nakamura (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1960), pp. 7ff. The Chinese title, "Ta-fang-kuang-fo-hua-yen-ching"(大方廣佛華嚴經) is the literal translation of the original. But in China many fancy interpretations were later added to each character of the title. Cf. H. Nakamura, Ways of Thinking of Eastern People (Hawaii: East-West Center, 1964), p. 223.

not now extant.

How did this sūtra come into existence? When and by whom was it written? Nothing certain is known about the history of the sūtra except some traditional legends concerning it. According to a legend, which Hua-yen followers firmly believe, the teaching of the sūtra was uttered by the Buddha himself. Not only was the authorship of the sūtra ascribed to the Buddha, it was also believed that the sūtra is the only genuine expression of the Buddha's enlightenment experience. It is said that during the second week after his enlightenment[2] the Buddha, still beneath the tree of bodhi, sat immersed in the Sāgara-mudrā-samādhi,[3] the 'ocean-like concentration,' and during this time he delivered the truth of the Avataṁsaka, i.e., the teaching of dharmadhātu, to the bodhisattvas, devas and others who visited him from the ten directions of the universe. The teaching, however, was so profound and difficult that none of these listeners could understand a single word of it, as if they were "deaf and dumb." Consequently, he began thereafter to present the truth in a form more suited to the capacities of his audience. The other scriptures, starting with the four Āgamas(Nikāyas), are all the results of this concession to the understanding of his listeners, while the Avataṁsaka is a direct revelation of the truth that the Buddha

---

[2]T. 45, p. 590b, et passim.

[3]For the discussion of the importance of this samādhi in the Hua-yen school, see S. Kamata, "Kaiinzammai no Sekai"(The World of Sāgaramudrā-samādhi), in his Chugoku Bukkyo Shiso Shi Kenkyu (Tokyo: Shunjunsha, 1968), pp. 403-425; and Cook, op. cit., pp. 26 and 543.

realized in his enlightenment. The Avataṁsaka, therefore, is called technically the "fundamental teaching or dharma-wheel"(mūladharmacakra, 根本法輪) in contrast to the other "minor branch teachings"(śākhā-dharmacakra, 枝末法輪).[4]

According to another legendary story, the sūtra was brought from the Dragon palace by Nāgārjuna, as were supposedly most of the other Mahāyāna sūtras.[5]

> The master Tripitaka, Paramārtha, said that the tales of the Western Regions [India] said that Nāgārjuna went to the Dragon's Palace and saw three texts of the Avataṁsaka, the Great Inconceivable Liberation Sūtra: the longest text contained ślokas as numerous as the atomic particles of ten chiliocosm of three grades and chapters as numerous as those of the four spheres; the middle text contained 498,800 ślokas in 1200 chapters; the smallest text contained 100,000 ślokas in 48 chapters. As the longest and the middle texts were beyond the power of ordinary mortals to comprehend, they lay hidden and were not propagated; only the smallest was made prevalent in India.[6]

---

[4]Cf. Ch'eng-kuan's Hua-yen-ching-sui-shu yen-i-ch'ao(華嚴經隨疏演義鈔) T. 36, p. 7, or HTC, 8, p. 182c. "Hua-yen is the fundamental teaching"(華嚴為根本法輪). These terms were originally used by Chih-tsang(吉藏, 549-623) of the San-lun school to characterize the teaching of the Avataṁsaka and the others repectively in contrast to the teaching of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka which is the teaching of "returning to the original while integrating the derivative"(攝末歸本法輪). Cf. also Fa-tsang's statement on this question, T. 35, p. 111b, ll. 1-4. This categorization was refuted by Ch'eng-kuan in his Hua-yen-ching-shu(華嚴經疏, the Commentary on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra) T. 35, p. 509b, and its sub-commentary, HTC, 8, p. 230ab. Cf. also Oda, Bukkyo Daijiten(A Great Dictionary of Buddhism) (Tokyo: Daijo Shuppansha, 1972 revised), pp. 506a, 669b, 760a.

[5]Cf. A. K. Warder, op. cit., pp. 354f, 373f.

[6]Fa-tsang's Hua-yen-ching-chuan-chi(華嚴經傳記, The Records on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra), T. 51, p. 153a-b. Quoted in Kao, Kuan-ju, "Avataṁsaka Sūtra," Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, ed. by G. P. Malalasekera, (Colombo, Ceylon: the Government Press, 1967) vol. II, p. 437b. Cf. also T'an-hsüan-chi, T. 35, p. 122b, and Hua-yen-ching wen-i-kang-mu, T. 35, p. 493a-b.

To what extent these legends are relevant to the historicity of the sūtra, we do not know. It may be assumed that they were an attempt to ascribe more authority to the sūtra by putting a mythical halo around its origin. In any case, from considerable evidence, both external and internal, it is impossible to accept the idea that this tremendously voluminous scripture could have been written by one person at a certain period of time.

Therefore, it can safely be said that the sūtra as a whole was gradually composed in many smaller parts, which accumulated over a considerable length of time.[7] In fact, it would appear that some chapters were circulated independently as separate sūtras.[8] Among them the most popular, and still extant in Sanskrit, are the Daśabhūmika-sūtra[9] and the Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra.[10] Even in China these separate chapters were translated

---

[7]For similar arguments, see H. Nakamura, "The Significance of the Buddhāvataṁsaka-sūtra in the World History of Ideas" (in Japanese) in Kegon Shiso, op. cit., p. 84f, Ryoshu Takamine, Kegon Shiso Shi (Kyoto: Kokyoshoin, 1942), p. 7, and F. H. Cook, op. cit., p. 28 and Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism(3rd series), p. 180.

[8]Cf. Kao, op. cit., p. 438a.

[9]The Sanskrit editions are as follows: Daśabhūmikasūtra et Bodhisattvabhūmi, chapitres Vihāra et Bhūmi, par J. Rahder, (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1926), (Societe Belge d'Etudes Orientales); Dasabhūmika-Sūtram, Seven stages, ed. and tr. by J. Rahder, Acta Orientalia, 4(1926), pp. 214-256; The Gāthās of the Daśabhūmika-sūtra, ed. by J. Rahder and Shinryu Susa, the Eastern Buddhist, 5(1929-31), pp. 335-359; Daśabhūmiśvaro nama Mahāyāna-sūtram ed. by Ryuko Kondo (Tokyo: The Daijyo Bukkyo Kenkyu-kai, 1936), etc. See also Megumu Honda, "Annotated Translation of the Daśabhūmika-sūtra," in Studies in South, East, and Central Asia, ed. by D. Sinor (New Delhi, 1968), pp. 115-276.

[10]The Sanskrit text for the Gaṇḍavyūha is The Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra, 4 parts, ed. by D. T. Suzuki and H. Idzumi (Kyoto: The Sanskrit Buddhist Texts Publishing Society, 1934-36), Gaṇḍavyuhasūtra, ed. by P. L. Vaidya, Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 5. (Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960).

and quoted as independent works.[11]

In spite of the dark veil covering the historicity of this sūtra, professor H. Nakamura, after a thorough examination of the text in terms of its references to stupa-worship, image-worship, certain names of places, ideas, and so on contained in it, suggested that this sūtra, especially the Gaṇḍavyūha, probably originated among the people of Southern India who were engaged in navigation and trade. He continued to say that the present form of the Gaṇḍavyūha must have been fixed in North-West or Middle India and that the sūtra as a whole was apparently formed somewhere in Central Asia around 100-200 A.D.[12]

As mentioned before, there were many translations of a particular chapter or part of the sūtra into Chinese. The first of this kind was the Tou-sha-ching(兜沙經) translated by Lokakṣema or Lokarakṣa (in Chinese: Chi-lou-chia-ch'an, 支婁迦讖) during the Later Han dynasty in the Middle of the second century A.D.[13] However, a complete version of the Avataṃsaka-sūtra did not appear in China until its full-length translation by

---

[11] As to the Chinese translations of these separate chapters, see Kao, op. cit., pp. 436f., which is based on Seng-yu's Ch'u-san-tsang-chi-chi(出三藏記集, The Collection of the Records of the Tripiṭaka Translations). Cf. also Ryoshu Takamine, Kegon Shiso Shi (Kyoto: Kokyo Shoin, 1942), pp. 3f.

[12] Nakamura, op. cit., pp. 90ff. There are various assumptions on this matter, e.g., cf. Takamine op. cit., pp. 10ff., where he argues that the present form of the sūtra appeared only around 250-350 A.D. The meticulous investigation of the dates and origin of the sūtra is out of the scope of our study. For more detail, see the references which Nakamura snd Takamine made in their studies.

[13] T. 10, no. 280, pp. 445-446. This is a shorter version of the chapter "Ju-lai-ming-hao-p'in"(如來名号品) of the later translation.

Buddhabhadra(359-429)[14] with the help of Fa-yen, Hui-yen, Hui-kuan and others during 418-420 in the Eastern Tsin dynasty. Its original text contained 36,000 śloka, and the translation was finally composed of thirty-four chapters in sixty fascicles(chüan). Its title was the Ta-fang-kuang-fo-hua-yen-ching(大方廣佛華嚴經), but to be distinguished from the later translations which have the same title it is usually called the "Tsin Translation," "Hua-yen in Sixty," or "Old Translation."[15]

The second translation was done by Śikṣānanda[16] from an original text of 45,000 śloka during 695-699 in the T'ang dynasty. Such monk-scholars as Bodhiruci, I-ching, Fa-tsang, and Fu-li helped with the work. This version contained thirty-nine chapters with eighty fascicles. It is now commonly called the "T'ang Translation," "Hua-yen in Eighty," or "New Translation."[17]

The translation of the Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra is usually designated as the third version of the sūtra. It was translated from an original

---

[14]His Chinese name was transliterated as 佛馱跋陀羅. For his biography, see Liang-kao-seng-chuan(梁高僧傳, Biographies of Eminent Monks written in the Liang Period), T. 50, p. 334bff., p. 339b. See also T. 36, 113a.

[15]The text is found in T. 9, no. 278, pp. 395-788.

[16]Cf. Fo-tsu t'ung-chi(佛祖統紀, A General Record of the Buddha and Patriarchs), T. 49, p. 370b, etc. His Chinese name was 實叉難陀. His biography is found in Hua-yen-ching-chuan-chi, op. cit., T. 51; K'ai-yüan shi-chiao-lu(開元釋教錄, Catalogue of the K'ai-yüan Era on Buddhism), T. 55, p. 566a; Sung-kao-seng-chuan(宋高僧傳, Biographies of Eminent Monks compiled in the Sung Period), T. 50, p. 718c.

[17]T. 10, no. 279, pp. 1-444.

of 16,700 ślokas presented by the king of Uḍra(Orissa) in south India to the Emperor Tai-tsung of the T'ang dynasty. Prajñā[18] translated it with Chinese assistants such as Ch'eng-kuan during 795-798, dividing it into forty fascicles.[19] Although the words and stanzas were greatly increased and sometimes newly added, this translation is basically equivalent to the last chapter of the previous versions, that is, the Chapter on Entering into Dharmadhātu(入法界品), and, therefore, cannot be considered as a third translation. However, perhaps, in view of the magnificence and profundity of its contents, it was regarded as the third translation of the sūtra with the same title as the other two versions.[20]

The Avataṁsaka-sūtra was also translated into Tibetan by two Indians, Jinamitra and Surendrabodhi, and a Tibetan, Ye-śes-sde, titled Saṅs-rgyas phal-po-che shes-bya-ba śin-tu-rgyas-pa-chen-poḥi mdo. The original title corresponding to this translation was said to be the Buddhāvataṁsaka-nāma-mahāvaipulya-sūtra. This, by and large, corresponds to the T'ang translation, with two additional chapters, viz., the eleventh and the thirty-second.[21]

---

[18]In Chinese 般若 . Fu-tsu-t'ung-chi, op. cit., T. 49, p. 380a. His biography is found in Sung-kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 722a-b. Cf. P. C. Bagchi, Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine (Paris: 1927 & 1938), p. 582.

[19]T. 10, no. 293, pp. 661-851. For details about this event, see Yün-hua Jan, "On Chinese Translation of 'Avataṁsaka Sūtra' Originally from Uḍra," The Orissa Historical Research Journal, vii(1960), p. 125f.

[20]Its Sanskrit title is Gaṇḍvyūha, which is equivalent, in meaning, roughly to Avataṁsaka.

[21]Cf. Kao, op. cit., p. 437.

B. The Basic Structure of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra

There are many sūtras in Mahāyāna Buddhism which have excellent literary or dramatic styles, such as the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra,[1] the Śrīmālā-sūtra,[2] and the Vimalakīrti-sūtra,[3] together with the Avataṁsaka-sūtra. The Avataṁsaka-sūtra, however, is generally considered to be the most eminent in its scale and plot as well as in its profundity of thought.[4]

The structure of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra is that of a large-scale drama with seven scenes and nine acts. Traditionally it was described, according to the new version, as "seven places(sthāna) and nine assemblies (parsad).[5]

The first two scenes open on earth. The first one takes place

---

[1]T. 9, no. 262. Saddharma-Puṇḍarika or The Lotus or the True Law, trans. by H. Kern, The Sacred Books of the East, vol. XXI (Oxford: 1884); The Sutra of the Lotus Flower of the Wonderful Law, trans. by Bunno Kato, revised by W. E. Soothill and Wilhelm Schiffer (Tokyo: Rissho Kosei-kai, 1971).

[2]T. 12, no. 353. Alex Wayman and Hideko Wayman, tr. The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā -- A Buddhist Scripture of the Tathāgatagarbha Theory (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974).

[3]T. 14, no. 475. Cf. L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa), tr. by Etinne Lamotte (Louvain: Universite de Louvain, 1962); The Vimalakīrti Nirdeśa Sūtra, tr. by Lu K'uan Yu(Charles Luk), (Berkley: Shambala, 1972); Another English translation by H. Idumi is found in the Eastern Buddhist, vol. III (1924-1925) and vol. IV (1926-1928); German translation by Jakob Fischer is also available.

[4]For the argument on this point, see K. Kawada, "Wreath of Buddha," in Kegon Shiso, op. cit., p. 22 and reference in it.

[5]"七處九會." In the old translation, it is eight assemblies instead of nine. Our summary hereafter is based on the new translation.

under the bodhi tree in the Grove of Urvilve, in the country of Magadha where the Buddha (here Buddha Vairocana) attained his enlightenment. The Buddha, bright with his perfect and innumerable merits, sits in silence on a diamond throne. An infinite number of bodhisattvas, narayanas, devas and others gather together from the ten directions of the universe and chant in praise of the Buddha. Bodhisattva Samantabhadra, relying upon the mysterious power of the Buddha, tells them the truths about the universe and the Buddha, and the like.[6] The second scene takes place in the Hall of Universal Illumination not far from the first place where again beings from all the worlds praise the enlightened Buddha by singing hymns. Mañjuśrī, at this time, with the power of the Buddha relates the doctrines such as the Four Noble Truths.[7]

Next come four scenes in the heavens. The first one is in the palace of Indra(Śakra devanam Indra) on the top of Mt. Sumeru. Here also the Buddha keeps silent, while Bodhisattva Dharmamati and others praise him. Dharmamati, also relying on the majestic power of the Buddha, describes the "ten dwellings"(daśa-vihāra).[8] The second scene in heaven opens in the palace of Yamah-deva, where Bodhisattva Gunavana talks about the "ten practices"(caryā).[9] The next is in the palace of Tuṣita-deva

---

[6]T. 10, no. 279, pp. 1-57, chs. 1-6.

[7]Ibid., pp. 57-80, chs. 7-12.

[8]Ibid., pp. 80-99, chs. 13-18.

[9]Ibid., pp. 99-115, chs. 19-22.

where Bodhisattva Vajradhvaja, also with help of the Buddha's power, explains the methods of ten turnings(*parināmas*).[10] The last scene in heaven is in the palace of Paranirmita-vasavartin. Here Bodhisattva Vajradhvaja again talks about the ten stages(*bhūmis*) and the doctrines of entering these stages.[11] In the same place there gathers another assembly where the subjects such as the profound methods of the ten kinds of *samādhi*, the ten ubiquitous supernatural powers, the ten kinds of patience, longevity, and *bodhisattvas*' living places are expounded to the listeners.[12]

The next scene is again on earth. The Buddha is in the Hall of Universal Illumination. Samantabhadra answers many questions asked by other *bodhisattvas* such as those concerning the *bodhisattvas*' confidence and deeds, and the Buddha's entering *Parinirvāṇa*.[13]

Then follows the climax and finale of the drama in the thirty-fourth chapter, or the thirty-ninth in the old version, entitled "Chapter on Entering into the *Dharmadhātu*," or separately entitled "*Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*." Here is the last assembly,[14] held in the Grove of Jetavana where

---

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 115-178, chs. 23-25.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 189-210, ch. 26.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 211-278, chs. 27-37.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 279-318, ch. 38.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 319-444, ch. 39. For this chapter, however, I consulted the translation of Prajñā in T. 10, no. 293, pp. 661-848 for fuller information.

the Buddha is with five thousand great bodhisattvas, headed by Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra, five hundred great śrāvakas and the innumerable lords of all the worlds(lokendras). All of them are waiting for the Buddha's preaching. The Buddha, knowing their minds and moved with his great compassion(karuṇā), enters the "lion's yawning"(simhavijṛmbhita) samādhi and radiates an all-illuminating light. Suddenly the Grove of Jetavana becomes so wide as to embrace innumerable worlds of beauty and glory. The ten great bodhisattvas each from the ten directions of the universe gather together to worship the Buddha by paying tribute with various wonderful offerings and by chanting hymns of praise to him.

Samantabhadra then talks about the ways of entering the "lion's yawning" samādhi. The Buddha with various miraculous powers illuminates all the bodhisattvas and all the universe. The bodhisattvas and others thereby are filled with great compassion(karuṇā) to benefit all beings in the universe.

Mañjuśrī, with a great number of bodhisattvas and others, go out from the Buddha toward the south to preach the truth to the people. When he preaches the doctrine in the temple in the Śāla Grove on the east of Dhanyākara (City of Bliss), more than two thousand people come forward to listen to him. In this audience is a handsome youth of a good family, Sudhana, the hero of the drama.[15] He is full of the "aspiration for enlightenment"(bodhicitta) and most earnestly asks for instruction in the search for the path to perfect bodhi. Mañjuśrī, perceiving Sudhana's

---

[15]For the study on this story and its influence on Oriental art, see Jan Fontein, The Pilgrimage of Sudhana (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967).

aspiration, advises him to see a "good friend"(kalyāṇamitra, 善知識), Bhiksu Guṇanmegha in Mt. Sugrīva in the country of Rāmāvarānta. Sudhana then sets out on his journey southward and visits Guṇanmegha, who tells him a specific teaching and sends him again to another friend. Sudhana, in this way, gradually proceeds to pay visits to many other "good friends," totaling fifty-three.[16] After this long journey he meets Bodhisattva Samantabhadra again. Looking at his unlimited supernatural and mysterious powers(rddhi), Sudhana finally experiences indescribable bliss, which pervades his mind and body. In each part of the body and each pore of the skin of Samantabhadra he is able to see the innumerable worlds of the ten directions of the past, the present and the future, interpenetrating each other without disturbance or confusion. He realizes that in each particle of dust(paramāṇu) in all the universe there is the dharmadhātu.[17] He sees the universe not as ordinary people whose minds are covered with defilements see it but as the true bodhisattvas see it. He also hears all kinds of sounds in the universe as the bodhisattva does. Moreover, he gains the ten "perfections of wisdom"(prajñāpāramitās) and immerses himself in innumerable samādhi. Now he has really "entered into the Dharmadhātu." He sees it as it really is, i.e., the universe of the perfect harmony and interpenetration of every component part of it. He has now become equal of Samantabhadra and all the Buddhas in every respect, such as enlighten-

---

[16]For the summary of the names of those friends and their teachings, see Kawada, op. cit., pp. 54ff.; Nakamura, op. cit., pp. 88f.; and J. Foutein, op. cit., pp. 6ff.

[17]T. 10, p. 840a.

ment, power, compassion, etc.[18] Samantabhadra finally advises Sudhana to practise a very practical and concrete teaching which is composed of a ten-fold vow(praṇidhāna).[19] At last with Samantabhadra's hymns praising the Buddha's sea of merits, the curtain of the drama falls.[20]

This kind of summary offers but a glimpse of a work on such a large scale. The scale and contents in the work are so vast and huge that the only description which correctly characterises it may be, as the text often says, "far beyond description"(anabhilāpyānabhilāpya). The best way to feel the grandeur of the work is to read it, or even a portion of it, for oneself. D. T. Suzuki, after reading it for himself expressed his

---

[18]T. 10, p. 284a.

[19]The translation of this section is found in Suzuki, Studies in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, op. cit., pp. 230-236; Garma C. C. Chang, op. cit., pp. 187-196, etc. The ten vows are as follows: (1) reverence toward all the Buddhas, (2) adoration of the Buddhas, (3) the practice of offering and giving, (4) confession, penitence, and absolution, (5) emulation of meritorious deeds, (6) entreating the Buddhas to turn the wheel of truth, (7) entreating them to live among human beings forever, (8) perpetually observing Buddhist discipline, (9) constantly adapting oneself to fellow being, and (10) the practice of the universal dedication. Quoted from M. Anesaki, "Vow(Buddhist)," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by James Hastings (New York, 1921), vol. XII, p. 644. He refers to Samantabhadra-charī-praṇidhāna-gāthā, and K. Watanabe, Die Bhadracarī (Leibzig, 1912). Cf. Mochizuki, Bukkyo Jiten, vol. 5, p. 4403; and Jes Peter Asmussen, The Khotanese Bhadracaryadesana (København, 1961); Hokei Idzuki, "The Hymn of the Life and Vows of Samantabhadra," in The Eastern Buddhist, vol. V (1929-1931), pp. 226-247. This Bhadracarīpraṇidhāna is one of the most famous sets of vows, being well remembered and practised in oriental countries even today.

[20]As to the contents of individual chapters of the Chinese new version, a brief English summary of K. Kuo is helpful. See his article, op. cit., pp. 438-441. There are also many outline introductions written by classical Chinese Hua-yen scholars. A typical example of such outline introductions are found in Fa-tsang's Hua-yen-ching wen-i-kang-mu(The Outline of the Meanings of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra), T. 35, no. 1734.

impression as follows:

> As to the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, it is really the consummation of Buddhist thought, Buddhist sentiment, and Buddhist experience. To my mind, no religious literature in the world can ever approach the grandeur of conception, the depths of feeling, and the gigantic scale of composition, as attained by this sūtra. It is the eternal fountain of life from which no religious mind will turn back athirst or only partially satisfied.[21]

Now one may ask what is the leitmotiv or main thesis of this great sūtra. To this question, the Hua-yen school will immediately answer that it is the doctrine of dharmadhātu. Others will answer that the sūtra is a prime source for the idea of tathāgatagarbha(the Matrix or womb of the Tathāgata).[22] Traditionally it was also said that the sūtra should be interpreted as the collection of teachings on four items, viz., "faith," "understanding," "practice," and "Enlightenment."[23] Obviously, it is most difficult to find any specific philosophical standpoint in this voluminous work. Even about the Gaṇḍavyūha alone, A. K. Warder

---

[21]Suzuki, Studies in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, op. cit., p. 95.

[22]Cf. J. Takasaki, op. cit., pp. 32, 35f. But it is difficult to assume on the textual basis that the tathāgatagarbha idea is directly connected with the sūtra, because the word is not found here. In the Chinese versions the Chinese term equivalent to the tathāgatagharbha, i.e., ju-lai-tsang appears a few times (T. 10, p. 426c; T. 9, p. 631a, and p. 774c), but their Sanskrit original is "Buddhagarbha," and "Tathāgata-guhya," not "tathāgatagarbha." See Nakamura, op. cit., p. 94, Jikido Takasaki, "The Hua-yen Philosophy and the Tathāgatagarbha Theory"(in Japanese), in Kegon Shiso, op. cit., pp. 280ff.

[23]In Chinese: 信解行證 . Cf. Yuishin Saito, Kegon-gaku Koyo (Tokyo: Shuseisha, 1920), p. 63.

expresses the difficulty of this by saying:

> The Gaṇḍvyūha is usually assumed to reflect the idealist view, but perhaps makes nothing like a definitive statement of such a position. Since it is a literary and poetic work we should probably not expect to find in it clear philosophical formulations....[24]

Apart from these descriptions, however, several characteristic features in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra are discernible. First of all, unlike the other sūtras, especially the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras which were mainly concerned with the theoretical explanation of emptiness(śūnyatā), what is found here in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra is the concrete and detailed description of the whole career of a bodhisattva(bodhisattvacaryā). The goal of the career is most clearly portrayed as the final attainment of entrance into the dharmadhātu, and this is vividly emphasized throughout the sūtra. Practice, rather than philosophical speculation, is the prime concern of the whole text.

Second, throughout the sūtra, instead of the Buddha himself, various bodhisattvas -- most notably Samantabhadra and Mañjuśrī -- speak, by virtue of the Buddha's majestic power. Of course, the Buddha is the source of inspiration for these narrators and actually it is he who reveals the truths. Nevertheless, stylistically speaking, he himself for the most part keeps silent. According to H. Nakamura, this is the unique and striking stylistic feature of the sūtra;[25] and if he is right this may indicate

---

[24]A. K. Warder, Indian Buddhism (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970), pp. 429ff. Cf. also J. Fontein, op. cit., p. 16.

[25]Nakamura, op. cit., p. 86.

that the authors or editors had spiritual background quite different from those concerned with other sūtras. They may have tried to present truths somewhat different from the traditional by adopting a somewhat different literary style.

Third, the social positions of the fifty-three "good friends" Sudhana visits in his journey in search for the path to bodhi reveal another characteristic feature of the sūtra. Among those fifty-three, there are five bodhisattvas, five bhikṣus(monks), one bhikṣuni(nun), two brāmaṇs, about a dozen deities, and a ṛsi(seer). All of the others are lay people, such as householders, a physician, laymen and laywomen, "good boys and girls," kings, a perfume seller, a sailor, a slave, and so on.[26] It can be seen that the emphasis is upon lay people rather than bhikṣus. In view of this kind of Mahāyāna tendency, it can be assumed that the sūtra tries to stress the universal truth, applicable to all people rather than to a particular group of people.

Fourth, throughout the sūtra we find the constant enumeration of degrees of progress in the path to enlightenment. In fact, fifty-two stages are enumerated, namely, ten faiths(信, śraddhā), ten dwellings(住, vihāra), ten practices(行, caryā), ten transfers(迴向, pariṇāma), ten stages(地, bhūmi), the perfect enlightenment(等覺), and the wondrous enlightenment(妙覺).[27] It seems at first glance contradictory that the Mahāyāna, which was partly a reaction against the troublesome classifications

---

[26]For an exact classification of these people, see Nakamura, op. cit., pp. 88f.

[27]For the components of these tens, see Hurvitz, Chi-i, pp. 263ff.

and numerations in the Hīnayāna teaching, should indulge in such a practice. However, when seen in context, the uniqueness of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra is again evident, in that even though it mentions these stages its insistent message put forth in its unique logic is that "the very beginning is the end." One of the most typical verses expressing this idea is: "When one first awakens the aspiration(cittotpāda) for Supreme Enlightenment(anuttarasamyaksaṁbodhi), he has already attained it."[28]

Finally, one important point should be made in connection with the dharmadhātu idea in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra. Although the term dharma-dhātu appears extremely frequently in the text, there is no place where the idea of dharmadhātu is separately or systematically dealt with or philosophically defined.[29] As pointed out earlier, we cannot expect to find any clear-cut philosophical formulations in such a "literary and poetic work." Here the primary meaning of dharmadhātu is set forth almost always in the context of a bodhisattva career as the goal of spiritual attainment. This seems to confirm that it is not the subject of speculation but something to be realized or to be "entered." This basic attitude toward dharmadhātu seems to have been transmitted to the Hua-yen philosophers, especially to Tu-shun as seen in his Fa-chieh-kuan-men, which will be discussed in Part Two.

---

[28]"初發心時便成正覺" in T. 9, p. 449c, or "初發心時即得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提" in T. 10, p. 89a. Cf. also T. 9, p. 452. For the meaning of cittotpāda, see Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, op. cit., pp. 170ff., and M. Winternitz, A History of Indian Literature (New York: Russell and Russell, 1971, 1st pub. in 1933), p. 376.

[29]Cf. Index to the Taisho Tripiṭaka, vol. 5, Kegon-bu, pp. 292c-194c.

III. THE HUA-YEN SCHOOL

A. The Background of the School

The Avataṁsaka-sūtra was originally composed in India, but there is no record of an independent school in India named after the Avataṁsaka. It was in China that the Avataṁsaka-sūtra and its teaching led to the rise of an independent school which had "Avataṁsaka" or "Hua-yen" as its credo-name. How did this school emerge and grow in China? In the present chapter we will investigate the background of the emergence of this school and its historical development.

According to the literature available now, it was apparently Ch'eng-kuan(澄觀, ca. 737-838 A.D.), traditionally regarded as the fourth patriarch of the school, who used the name "Hua-yen(Avataṁsaka) school," or "Hua-yen tsung"(華嚴宗) for the first time.[1] It may be that there was no sectarian consciousness before Ch'eng-kuan, and hence no need for the name.[2] In any case, what is certain is that long before Ch'eng-kuan, around the Sui and early T'ang periods, there was a group

---

[1] Cf. Ch'eng-kuan's Hua-yen-ching-shu(The Commentary on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra), T. 35, p. 529b, and Hua-yen-ching-suei-shu-yen-i-ch'ao (Sub-commentary on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra), T. 36, pp. 51c, 292c, etc.

[2] Cf. Kamata, op. cit., p. 51, and R. Yuki, op. cit., pp. 276ff.

of people who were primarily engaged in upholding the teachings of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra. Their influence was fairly strong, and objectively speaking, they could well be called a "school" or "sect."

How did this group or "Hua-yen" school emerge on the scene of Chinese religious history? This question will be examined both from the standpoints of doctrinal influences and social circumstances.

In the first place, from a Buddhist doctrinal point of view, the Hua-yen school can be traced back to a school named Ti-lun(地論), founded by the group of people who studied the Daśabhūmikasūtraśāstra (Shih-ti-ching-lun)[3] of Vasubandhu(Ca. 350 A.D.).[4] Since the Daśabhūmika-sūtra comprises, as was mentioned before, a chapter in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, it is natural that the masters of the Ti-lun school should have contributed to the general study of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra and thus to laying the groundwork for the development of the Hua-yen school.[5]

---

[3]Cf. T. 26, no. 1522.

[4]This commentary on the Daśabhūmika-sūtra was translated by Bodhiruci and Ratnamati around 511 A.D. According to certain documents, Buddhasanta is also mentioned as a co-translator. Cf. R. Takamine, op. cit., p. 73. In the course of time, there appeared a split in the school between the disciples of Bodhiruci and those of Ratnamati because of differences of opinion on the matter of the relation between ālayavijñāna (storehouse consciousness) and tathatā("thusness") or tathāgatagarbha. Between the two branches, the Hua-yen school, especially with Chih-yen and Fa-tsang, was more closely related to that of Ratnamati. It is also worth noticing that Ratnamati translated also the Ratnagotravibhāga (Chiu-ching-i-ch'eng pao-hsing-lun) which upheld the tathāgatagarbha theory. See Takasaki, op. cit., p. 7.

[5]As to the formation of the Ti-lun school and its split into the "Branch of the Northern Path" and the "Branch of the Southern Path" and their points of dispute, see Takamine, op.cit., pp. 76-114, Y. Sakamoto, op. cit., pp. 362-396, etc.

In addition, the formation of the Hua-yen was partly due to the She-lun(攝論) school, which was founded on Asanga's writing Mahāyāna-saṃgraha (She-ta-ch'eng-lun),[6] first translated by Paramārtha in 563 A.D. This work is a "compendium" of the Yogācāra philosophy dealing with the proposition of vijñāptimātra(Ideation-only). The She-lun school was the forerunner of the Chinese Fa-hsiang or Dharmalakṣana school started by Hsüan-chuang(玄奘, 596-664 A.D.)[7] and his disciple, K'uei-chi(窺基, 632-682). The philosophical discourse of the text of the She-lun on various points, however, was so closely connected with the Hua-yen school that one can safely say that the full-fledged Hua-yen system would hardly have been possible without the She-lun.[8]

As to the doctrinal background of the emergence of the Hua-yen school, the influence of The Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna(Mahāyāna-śraddotpāda-śāstra)[9] cannot be overestimated. This treatise, allegedly

---

[6]T. 31, nos. 1592-94. Cf. French translation based mainly on the Tibetan version, La Somme du Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga, 2 vols. (Louvain: 1938-39), tr. by E. Lamotte.

[7]He himself translated the text again during 648-649 A.D.

[8]For the history and philosophy of the She-lun school in more detail, see Takamine, op. cit., pp. 115-139, J. Takakusu, op. cit., pp. 81-83.

[9]Cf. an English translation by Yoshito S. Hakeda, The Awakening of Faith (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967). Other translations are also available in D. T. Suzuki, Aśvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna (Chicago, 1900); Timothy Richard, The Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna doctrine -- the New Buddhism (Shanghai, 1907); and Dwight Goddard, ed., A Buddhist Bible (New York: 1952), pp. 357-404. The Sanskrit title is a reconstructed form from the Chinese title Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin-lun.

written by Aśvaghoṣa, is a very comprehensive summary of the essentials of Mahāyāna Buddhist doctrine. An independent school was not founded on the basis of this text in China, but throughout history this short tract exerted a strong influence on Chinese Buddhism, and especially on the Hua-yen school. Its philosophical concepts such as Mind(citta), dharmadhātu, "Suchness"(Tathatā), and "Matrix or Womb of the Tathāgata" (Tathāgatagarbha), acted as a stepping-stone to Hua-yen philosophy. This is seen, for example, in the fact that Fa-tsang, traditionally regarded as the third patriarch and the greatest theoretical systematizer of the school, wrote a commentary on it[10] and used this text as a foundation in building up his more advanced philosophy of Hua-yen.[11]

From the standpoint of doctrinal history, therefore, one can point to the Ti-lun school, the She-lun school, and The Awakening of Faith as a background to the rise of the Hua-yen teaching. Without these forerunners, the rise and development of Hua-yen philosophy in its particulars would have been impossible.

However, it cannot be assumed that these theoretical influences

---

[10]The three commentaries regarded as the best are those of Hui-yüan(慧遠 , 523-592), Wŏn-hyo(元曉 , 617-686), and Fa-tsang(法藏 , 643-712). They are found in T. 44, pp. 175-201, pp. 202-226, and pp. 240-287, respectively.

[11]For the influence of the text on Hua-yen, see Takamine, op. cit., pp. 64f. and 140-144, Kobayashi, "Kishinron Kaishaku no hensen-kegon kyogaku tenkai no kontei toshite"(The Changes of the Interpretation of the Awakening of Faith -- as the Basis for the Development of the Hua-yen Doctrine), Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, XIII, no. 2(26), March 1965, pp. 668-672.

account completely for the appearance of the Hua-yen school. Hua-yen was not merely a philosophical trend but also a school which was developed in response to the particular needs of society. A discussion of the background of the Hua-yen school, therefore, would be incomplete without referring to some of relevant social situation of Sixth and Seventh century China. In dealing with the social situation, we will consider three major factors: 1) the Avataṁsaka faith, 2) religio-intellectual atmosphere, and 3) political condition.

1) The Avataṁsaka Faith: According to Professor Shigeo Kamata, a leading scholar in the field of the history of the Hua-yen school, the faith in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra which prevailed in northern China during the sixth century A.D. should be regarded as essential to the founding of the Hua-yen school as a school rooted in both the élite and the masses of society.[12]

Among the expressions of faith in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra were reciting, or chanting(讀誦), and copying it. These practices must have been grounded on the promise found at the end the sūtra itself, where it is written that anyone who recites or copies any item of the ten vows of the sūtra will be granted various kinds of merit, blessings, and even the privilege of being born in the "blissful land."[13]

Whatever the grounds, it was widely believed at that time that

---

[12] S. Kamata, Chugoku Kegon Shiso Shi no Kenkyu (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku Shuppankai, 1965), pp. 17-50.

[13] Cf. for example, T. 10, p. 846b, c.

one who chanted all or a portion of the sūtra repeatedly could experience supernatural powers and miraculous things. An example of such belief is found in the following story of a eunuch.

In the time of the Emperor Kao-cho of the Northern Wei, a eunuch, with the permission of the emperor, went to a mountain to join the monastic life and "chanted the Avataṁsaka-sūtra day and night." And then, "even before one summer was over, at the end of the sixth month of the year, beard started to grow on him and he was restored a manly feature. The emperor was so surprised to hear of this he ordered the country to respect the Avataṁsaka [sūtra]."[14]

Many similar examples could be given.[15] What is seen from these historical records is that there was a belief in the supernatural, or magical, power of the Avataṁska-sūtra, and that this belief prevailed not only among a certain class of people but among monks, the aristocratic class, the common people, and even among Taoists.

Furthermore, there are a number of records which reveal that those who believed in the mystical power of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra organized some sort of special meetings called "Hua-yen-chai-hui"(華嚴齋會).[16]

---

[14] Ta-t'ang-nei-tien-lu(大唐内典錄), vol. 10, T. 55, p. 339b. Cf. also T. 52, p. 686, T. 51, p. 156c, etc. "華嚴晝夜讀誦…一夏不滿至六月末 鬚髯生 復丈夫相 以狀聞 帝大驚重之於是國敬華嚴"

[15] For the detailed documentation on this matter, see Kamata, op. cit., pp. 20-42.

[16] It was usually called in an abridged form, 'Hua-yen-chai.' In other cases 'Fang-kuang'(mahāvaipulya) was used instead of 'Hua-yen' (Avataṁsaka).

The "Chai-hui" was originally a service or feast in which vegetarian food was offered to monks. Later, however, although some food might still be provided, it gradually changed into an assembly primarily for the spiritual training of monks and lay people. The "Hua-yen-chai-hui" became a kind of spiritually oriented meeting especially arranged for chanting the Avataṁsaka-sūtra.[17]

The first organization of this kind of meeting was apparently promoted by Hsiao Tzu-liang(蕭子良), Prince Ching-ling(竟陵) somewhere around 484-495 A.D. during the Southern Ch'i dynasty.[18] In this meeting, it is said, not only the sūtra was chanted but also the knotty passages were explicated.[19]

Another meeting is reported to have been held around this time under the leadership of Dharma-master Hung(宏法師). About fifty to sixty members gathered together on the fifteenth day of the month, and "everyone chanted one fascicle from the Avataṁsaka-sūtra; having finished chanting the sūtra [the group] dispersed in all directions."[20]

---

[17]K. Ch'en called this meeting "Society for the Recitation of the Avataṁsakasūtra." Cf. his The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 293f., and 210f. Here he described a meeting held in the ninth century A.D. The similar meetings were also held for chanting the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra. They were called "P'u-hsien-chai"(普賢齋). Cf. T. 50, p. 407a, T. 51, p. 14a, T. 50, p. 369b, etc.

[18]For his patronage of Buddhism, see K. Ch'en, Buddhism in China (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 123ff., E. Zürcher, The Buddhist Conquest of China (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), p. 439, no. 149, etc.

[19]T. 50, p. 460b.

[20]T. 51, p. 172a. "人各誦華嚴一卷…各誦其經畢而方散."

Further evidence shows that these assemblies, gathered primarily for chanting the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, gradually grew in number and size and also in quality. Later, these assemblies went a step further and developed into "Hua-yen Societies" which embraced as many as a hundred thousand people, including both monks and lay believers.[21] It would seem that the Avataṁsaka-sūtra permeated almost every stratum of the society. In other words, the spiritual soil of the time was sufficiently well cultivated to produce a school dedicated to propagating the truth of this sūtra.

One may ask here how faith and practice connected with the Avataṁsaka-sūtra is relevent to the lofty theoretical system of Hua-yen philosophy. It is obvious that practical beliefs among the people at large were rather different from the philosophical discourses of the Hua-yen theoreticians. However, it is also true that philosophy can often be regarded, to a certain extent, as an attempt to give a logical foundation to practices already prevailing among the people. In this sense it can be assumed that the grand philosophical system of the Hua-yen school might have been developed partly as a theoretical justification and articulation of these popular beliefs, and it is in this sense that these popular beliefs in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra are thought to have played a significant role in the rise of the Hua-yen school.

2) Religio-intellectual Atmosphere: Around the end of the Nothern and Southern Dynasties, Buddhism, after five centuries of existence

---

[21] For the detail of the Hua-yen Societies, see Kamata, op. cit., pp. 235-249.

in China, now faced a stalemate from both the institutional and the doctrinal points of view. This two-fold crisis is aptly summarized by T. Unno as involving 1) a "growing degeneration of the monastic order, stemming primarily from the abuse of its privileged political and economic position;" and 2) a "mounting agitation among the concerned priests who saw that the imported disciplines proved ineffective in surmounting the impending collapse of the church."[22]

The chaotic situation of the monastic order of the time can even be seen in the number of monks and nuns. According to the Pien-cheng-lun(Essay on the Discussion of the Correct) of Fa-lin(法琳, 572-640), during the Northern Wei dynasty the total number of monks and nuns converted was over two million. Wei Shou(魏收), the official historian of the Northern Wei dynasty, reported that at the end of the dynasty the number present in north China was two million. Fei Ch'ang-fang(費長房), in his Li-tai san-pao-chi(Record of the Three Treasures through the History) said that the number of monks and nuns returned to the laity during the persecution of 574-577 was three million.[23]

Whether these numbers are somewhat exaggerated or not, they are enough to indicate that the number of monks and nuns was amazingly high at that time. Considering that many of them were the pseudo-clergy who flocked into the monasteries merely to avoid military and labor services,

---

[22]Taitetsu Unno, "The Dimensions of Practice in Hua-yen Thought," Yuki Commemorative Volume (Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1964), p. 52.

[23]Cf. K. Ch'en, op. cit., pp. 203f.

or to be exempt from taxation, or even to hide their criminal acts, the moral and spiritual condition of the monastic order can easily be understood. The moral, economical, and political corruption and degradation of the order was a natural corollary of such a condition.[24]

Under such circumstances, there appeared a kind of eschatological outlook on history, which is known as the idea of mo-fa(末法) or "the decay of the True Law." According to this idea, the decay of the Buddhist religion was inevitably at hand. It is true that this idea was not a Chinese invention. The prophecy that the Buddha's true teaching would decline under certain conditions is found even in the Pali canon.[25] An example is as follow:

> If Ānanda, women had not received permission to go out of the household life and enter the houseless state, under the doctrine and discipline proclaimed by the Tathāgata, then would the pure religion, Ānanda, have stood fast for a thousand years. But since, Ānanda, women now have received the permission, the pure religion, Ānanda, will not last so long, the Good Law would now stand fast for only

---

[24]For concrete examples, see Ryoshu Michibata, Chugoku Bukkyo Shi (中国仏教史) (Kyoto: 1939, 5th improved ed. 1956), pp. 90f.

[25]For the historical development of the idea, see É. Lamotte, Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien (Louvain: Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 43, 1959) ch. XII and "Prophéties relatives à la Disparition de la Bonne Loi," in Présence du Bouddhisme (France-Asie, XVI. nos. 153-157, 1959), pp. 657-668; L. Joshi, Studies in the Buddhistic Culture of India (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967), pp. 384ff.; Ki-young Rhi, "Chŏng-pŏp Ŭnmolsŏl e Kuanhan Chonghap-chŏk Pip'an," (Critical Synthesis of the Different Arguments on the Decay of True Law) in the Bulgyo Hakpo (Seoul: Dongkuk University, 1963), 1(1963), pp. 231-270, etc. The last one is an excellent study based on extensive sources.

five hundred years.[26]

Similar ideas are also found in Sarvastivādin literature and, with some different reasons for the decay of the True Law, in the various Mahāyāna scriptures.[27] It seems, therefore, that such an outlook on the destiny of Buddhism was a rather persistent tradition in Buddhist countries.

According to the traditional formula of this belief, the life-span of the true Dharma(Saddharma, 正法) of the Buddha would be shortened by five hundred years after the Buddha and it would be followed by the period of the counterfeit Dharma(dharmapratirūpaka, 像法) of another five or ten hundred years. After this there comes the last period of the total decay of Dharma(dharmavipralopa, 末法) which would last ten thousand years until the future Buddha Maitreya comes from the Tuṣita heaven to establish a new era of the Saddharma(True Law).[28]

The Buddhists of sixth century China, seeing the degeneration of

---

[26]Cullavagga X, 1. Quoted in L. Joshi, Studies in the Buddhistic Culture of India (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967), p. 384. Cf. also H. C. Warren, Buddhism in Translation (New York: Atheneum 1973[6]), p. 447. Similar passages appear in the Anguttara-Nikāya, PTS Pali edition Pt. IV, p. 278, and trans. vol. IV, pp. 184f.; Saṃyutta-Nikāya, PTS ed. vol. II. p. 224, trans. vol. II. p. 152.

[27]For examples, see above mentioned references and Buston, History of Buddhism, op. cit., I, pp. 102ff., 178. In the Mahāyāna texts, the admission of women into the saṅgha is not found as the reason. See Rhi, op. cit., p. 261.

[28]There are some variations in regard to the durations of the first and the second periods: 500-500; 500-1,000; 1,000-500; or 1,000-1,000. Of these four, the second one was most widely accepted. Since Chinese Buddhists of the sixth century generally believed that the Buddha entered the Nirvāṇa in 949 B.C., The third period for them would begin around 550 A.D. Cf. K. Ch'en, op. cit., pp. 298, 345, and R. H. Robinson, op. cit., p. 82. Robinson calls the third period the period of "the Latter-day Dharma."

their own community, could not but feel that they were really entering the last period of decay of the Dharma. It was not so much an objective theory of history as it was a concrete fact they could feel and see right in their own experience. And it was Hui-ssu(515-577) of the T'ien-t'ai school who recorded this idea for the first time in the context of their own situation.[29] Such a crisis-consciousness was even more intensified by the Northern Chou persecution of 574 A.D.[30] It is quite understandable that to the Buddhists of that time that disastrous suppression of Buddhism seemed to indicate "the end of the Dharma."

From the historical point of view, however, such a series of events was not merely a catastrophe, but served altogether as a stepping stone for the leap toward the stage of the "independent growth of Chinese Buddhism." In the case of Northern Chou persecution the Buddhism that had been destroyed was that of the period of disunity which on the surface appeared glorious and grand but in reality was little more than a shadow of Indian Buddhism. In the ashes and ruins of it there sprung forth a fresh bud which was to flourish as a characteristically Chinese Buddhism prepared to meet the spiritual and cultural needs of the Chinese people of the time. The institutional and doctrinal deadlock, the

---

[29]See his Li-shih yüan-wen(立誓願文, Record on Taking the Vows) written in 558. T. 46, p. 786c. For details, see Yuki, "Shina Bukkyo ni okeru Mappo Shiso no Koki(The Rise of the Mo-fa Idea in the Chinese Buddhism)" Toho Gakuho VI(1936), 205-215, Ryojo Yamada, "Mappo Shiso ni tsuite"(Concerning the Mo-fa Idea), Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, vol. IV, no. 2 (March, 1956), pp. 361-370.

[30]For the details of this persecution, see Ch'en, op. cit., pp. 186ff.

following persecution, and the idea of mo-fa[31] -- all of these were, so to speak, a "challenge," and the attempt to successfully "respond" to it was the main motivation for the transformation of Buddhism in the period of the Sui-T'ang dynasties.

With such motivations and incentives the Chinese schools such as the San-chieh-chiao(三階教), Hua-yen, T'ien-t'ai, Pure Land, Ch'an, etc.[32] were founded or reinforced by Hsin-hsing(信行, 540-594), Tu-shun(557-640), Chih-i(538-584), Tao-ch'o(道綽, 562-645), Hui-k'e(慧可, 487-593), respectively.

According to these Chinese Buddhist schools, the foremost and most appropriate method to cope with the situation of the time was the practical or applicable and accessible method for salvation. The most striking example may be found in Hsin-hsing of the San-chieh-chiao or the Sect of the Three Stages and in Tao-ch'o of the Pure Land school. According to Hsin-hsing, in the third period, i.e., the Dharma-decaying period in which people are blind, heretic and lawless, the methods of the Ekayāna (One Vehicle) of the first period and the Triyāna(Three Vehicles) of the second were inappropriate. Only the practical method of strict austerity,

---

[31]For the different views of the eminent monks of the Sui-T'ang periods concerning Mo-fa, see Takao, "Mappo Shiso to Zui-to Shoka no Taido" (The Mo-fa Idea and the Attitudes of the Sui-T'ang Monks toward It), in his Chugoku Bukkyo Shiron, pp. 54-96. For modification of its conclusion, see Yuki, op. cit., pp. 92f.

[32]The Fa-hsiang and the San-lun were not mentioned here, because they are usually called "Buddhism in China" instead of "Chinese Buddhism." But it is worthy of note that in the case of the Fa-hsiang not Hsüan-chuang, who mainly transplanted the Indian Yogācāra school, but K'uei-chi, who tried to systematize it within a Chinese frame of thinking, was regarded as the founder of the school.

as prescribed by him, was the way out of this age of evil and chaos.[33] Tao-ch'o also similarly argued that in the degenerate age of the corrupted Dharma, the "difficult path"(難行道) or the "holy path"(聖道) is no longer applicable and that consequently the only possible recourse practicable for emancipation is the "easy path"(易行道) or the "gate of the Pure Land" (淨土門).[34]

Such a general tendency toward practicable methods for spiritual emancipation was expressed, according to Yuki, most remarkably in an attempt to grasp the underlying purport of any given sūtra in terms of several (usually three) items for insight or meditation(觀門). Yuki says that this formation of meditational items on the ground of truths found in the sūtras is the very phenomenon that can truly be called the distinctive characteristic of the "new Buddhism" of the Sui-T'ang periods.[35]

Chih-i of the T'ien-t'ai school explicitly showed this when he said, "by means of three-fold insight, the meaning of a part of this [Saddharmapuṇḍarīka] sūtra is interpreted," and further, "this period of the last age, the bodhisattvas, whether they renounced household life or not, if they want to learn the Buddhist truth and seek the inconceivable

---

[33]For this rarely known school (actually chiao means teaching), see K. Ch'en, op. cit., pp. 279-300, and as the most extensive study, see Keiki Yabuki, Zen Kyo no Kenkyu (Study on the Zen-chieh-chiao) (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1927, 1974) and its review by A. Waley, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 5, 1, pp. 162-169, together with Yuki's above mentioned articles.

[34]Cf. his An-lo-chi(安樂集, Collection of Essay on Bliss), T. 47, p. 13c.

[35]Cf. his article, "Zui-to no Chugoku-teki Shinbukkyo Shoshiki no Ichirei to shite no Hegon Hokkai Kanmon ni tzuite," op. cit., pp. 590ff.

emancipation, cannot go apart from the dharma-gate of the three-fold insight."[36]

Within this historical context, it is completely understandable that Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, the most practical manual of meditation and the "fundamental text" of the Hua-yen school, appeared in that particular time of history. It was, as it were, an outcome of the urgent demand to develop a practicable method with which to make the true intention of the traditional Buddhist teachings realized "here and now." The emergence of the Hua-yen school, at least in its first stage, should be understood in such a historical context.

3) Political Conditions: The persecution of 574 A.D. by Emperor Wu of the Northern Chou was severe but did not last long, because the Emperor died in 578 and was succeeded by his son Yu-wen Pin, who was somewhat more sympathetic to Buddhism. Moreover, three years later, in 581, the Northern Chou was superceded by an army officer and Pin's father-in-law, Yang Chien, who thus founded the Sui dynasty and became Emperor Wen(文帝). Soon after, in 589, by conquering the Ch'en dynasty in the south he unified China once again after nearly three hundred years of disunion.

During the early years of his reign, Emperor Wen, in an attempt to win support for his new dynasty, consciously showed respect toward all three religions.[37] For example, in order to justify his assumption of

---

[36]Chih-i's San-kuan-i(三觀義 , Meaning of Three-fold Insight), HTC. 2, 4, p. 51d. "用三觀段比經一部義" "末世出家在家菩薩欲學佛法 求不思議解脫者 不可出三觀法門也."

[37]For Emperor Wen and his attitude toward the three religions, see Arthur F. Wright, "The Formation of Sui Ideology, 581-604," in John

power and to gain support from the Confucianists, he performed a ceremony in which he informed Heaven of his receiving the "heavenly mandate." He established schools and a college for the study of Confucian classics, and promoted filial piety by exempting filial sons from taxation and the labor service. Likewise, for Taoism, despite his suspicion of Taoist adepts, he took measures for the revival of Taoist practice and promotion of the Lao-tzu cult.

However, born into a Buddhist family and brought up and educated under Buddhist influence, Emperor Wen bestowed his greatest favours upon Buddhism, by initiating various projects to restore and promote the Buddhist religion which had been severely damaged during the persecutions of the previous years. In all of these calculated measures, however, he wanted Buddhism to be a unifying ideology for his newly unified empire. In other words, for the unity which he now most needed, he chose Buddhism to work as a religion unifying the empire.

It is not necessary here to enumerate all the measures embraced in this line of policy.[38] Nor is it desirable to investigate all of the similar policies taken by the succeeding Emperor Yang and the emperors of the following T'ang dynasty. The only thing to be pointed out here is that the idea of unity in a unified country must have had something to do with the characteristics of Sui-T'ang Buddhism. It is quite understand-

---

K. Fairbank, ed., Chinese Thought and Institutions (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 71-104. For the relation of the Sui Emperors to Buddhism, see Jan, A Chronicle..., op. cit.

[38] For detail, see ibid., pp. 93ff, and his Buddhism in Chinese History, op. cit., pp. 65ff., and K. Ch'en, op. cit., pp. 191ff.

able that Buddhist intellectuals, entrusted with building ideas which could serve in an ideology of unity for a newly unified country, could not but formulate comprehensive, embracing and unifying systems such as would fit that purpose. It is, therefore, not a matter of accident that those Buddhist schools, including Hua-yen, which emerged around that time all developed highly systematic and comprehensive doctrinal structures which show the universal, organic characteristics of wholeness.[39]

The group of people centered on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra had been equipped with doctrinal foundations inherited from the Ti-lun school, the She-lun school, and the Awakening of Faith, as well as the Avataṁsaka-sūtra itself. They were also keenly aware of the particular social needs of the time. Now they were prepared to launch a school or sect, both as a doctrinal tradition and as a religious congregation. Under such circumstances, Tu-shun appeared around the turn of the Seventh century A.D., and people were soon attracted to his religious leadership.

---

[39] One of the best examples of the relationship between the political situations and doctrinal systems is found in the case of Fa-tsang, the greatest systematizer of Hua-yen, and his patroness Empress Wu Tse-t'ien. As to the socio-political elements in Fa-tsang's system, see Kamata, op. cit., pp. 107f.; and for Marxist interpretations, see Wai-lu Hou(侯外廬) ed., Chung-kuo Ssu-hsiang t'ung-shih(中国思想通史) (Peking: People's Publishing House, 1959), vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 235ff.; and C. Jen(任繼愈), Han-T'ang Chung-kuo Fo-chiao-ssu-hsiang lun-chi(漢唐中国佛教思想論集) (Peking: 1963), p. 72.

B. The History of the School

As part of the background survey it is necessary to investigate now how the tradition of the Hua-yen school itself was formulated. For this purpose we shall briefly survey the biographical documents on the lives of the five patriarchs.[40] What should be kept in mind is that the main interest in this survey is not merely to follow those documents to reconstruct the authentic lives of the patriarchs but rather to assess their academic background connected with their building up the doctrine of dharmadhātu.

Tu-shun(杜順, 557-640) has traditionally been regarded as the founder of the Hua-yen school. It was Tsung-mi(宗密, 780-841) who first mentioned the lineage of the patriarchs of the school.[41] According to him the first patriarch of the school was Tu-shun, the second Chih-yen (智儼, 602-668) and the third Fa-tsang(法藏, 643-712). At a later time, Ch'eng-kuan(澄觀, c. 737-838) and Tsung-mi himself came to be regarded as the fourth and the fifth respectively. It can be assumed that this lineage was firmly fixed by the time of the Sung dynasty when a famous Buddhist historian, Chih-p'an, enumerated these five as the patriarchs of

---

[40] It should be mentioned here that a few portions of those documents on the lives of the first four patriarchs have been translated by Garma C. C. Chang, but without critical evaluation of the text or interpretative comment on the contents. Cf. op. cit., pp. 231ff.

[41] Cf. Chu-Hua-yen-fa-chieh-kuan-men, op. cit., T. 45, p. 684c.

the school.[42]

There was little argument concerning this lineage of the patriarchs until modern scholarship raised questions as to the actual founder of the school. The first one who doubted Tu-shun as the founder was Hoyo Sakaino. According to his argument, the founder of the Hua-yen school must have been Chih-cheng(智正 , 559-639) instead of Tu-shun.[43] Daijo Tokiwa, then, arguing against him on the basis of literary evidence and a field survey of the historical places connected with the school, advocated the traditional lineage with Tu-shun as the authentic founder.[44] In the meantime, Sochu Suzuki, criticizing the arguments of both Sakaino and Tokiwa, contended that Chih-yen should be taken as the founder.[45] Tokiwa again argued against both of them and maintained his former opinion.[46] Recently Reimon Yuki has supplemented Tokiwa's argument from the historical standpoint and reaffirmed the traditional position.[47]

---

[42] To-tsu-t'ung-chi, op. cit., T. 49, p. 292c. Concerning Chih-p'an and his comment on the Hua-yen school, see below pp. 224f.

[43] K. Sakaino, Shina Bukkyo-shi Kowa (Tokyo: 1929), vol. II. pp. 498-499. For the biography of Chih-cheng, see Hsü-kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 538b, c.

[44] Tokiwa, "Shina Kegonshu Dentoron," Toho-gakuho, no. 3, pp. 1-96.

[45] S. Suzuki, Genshi Kegon Tetsugaku Kenkyu (Tokyo: Daido Shuppansha, 1934), pp. 1-126.

[46] D. Tokiwa, Shina Bukkyo no Kenkyu (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1938), pp. 309-434, and "Zoku Kegonshu Dentoron," Toho-gakuho, no. 5, pp. 1-35.

[47] R. Yuki, "Zuito no Chugoku-teki Shih-bukkyo Soshiki no Ichi-rei toshiteno Kegon Hokkai Mangon ni tsuite," Indo-gaku Bukkyo-gaku Kenkyu, VI. 2 (1958), pp. 276-281, and "Kegon no Shoso Tojun to Hokkai Mon-non no Chosha tono Mondai," ibid., XVIII, 2 (1969), pp. 32-38.

Kamata also agrees with this position.[48]

In dealing with the question of who was the founder, it is necessary to remember several factors. As was mentioned above, until the time of Ch'eng-kuan there had been no sectarian consciousness among the different religious groups leading them to call themselves by the name of "school" or "sect"(tsung). Accordingly, for those who had no consciousness of "school" there could be no founder of the school and hence no need to formulate any formal lineage of the patriarchs going back to that founder. In this sense, the "founder" did not exist or at least was not designated in the beginning of the Hua-yen school. It was only in the later part of the T'ang period when there appeared a competitive spirit among the religious groups that the necessity was generally felt to establish a formal name and a lineage of patriarchs for one's group. Because of this situation, by the time of Ch'eng-kuan the name "Hua-yen-tsung" was put to this sect,[49] and by the time of Tsung-mi the lineage of the patriarchs was formally recognized.

If by "founder" it is meant the one who founds an organization on the basis of a grand theoretical system of doctrine or dogma, then Fa-tsang, the great systematizer of Hua-yen doctrine and philosophy, may well fit this category.[50] Obviously, Tu-shun, who was a religious man of

---

[48]Kamata, op. cit., p. 52.

[49]It is interesting to note that Ch'an-jan(湛然, 711-782), Ch'eng-kuan's older contemporary, first began to use the name "T'ien-t'ai-tsung" to designate his school. Cf. Y. Sakamoto, op. cit., pp. 1ff.

[50]This is why the Hua-yen school is also known as the "Hsien-shou(Fa-tsang) school." See below p. 81.

practice rather than a theoretical systematizer, was not that kind of founder.

Generally speaking, however, the beginning of any religious sect[51] owes as much to a "charismatic"[52] religious leader as to its theoretical systematizer. Both are indispensable for the continuous

---

[51]Here I deliberately use the word "sect" instead of "school" to avoid the impression of the word "school" as a purely academic tradition.

[52]According to Max Weber's definition, "charisma" is "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader." Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, tr. by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free Press, 1947), pp. 358f. What is to be noted here is that charisma is not a characteristic of a leader as such but rather a quality ascribed to him by his followers. Weber pointed this out when he said: "What is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority, by his 'followers' or 'disciples' .... It is recognition on the part of those subject to authority which is decisive for the validity of charisma." Ibid., p. 359. In other words, the primary source of charisma is not so much the leader himself as the recognition of people around him. The "mass base," to use the sociological terms, is the prerequisite for the process of charisma. The masses must exist first and it is they who "regard" the leader as a possessor of "supernatural" and "superhuman" powers. Cf. Joseph S. Roucek, "The Changing Concept of Charismatic Leadership," Internationales Jahrbuch für Religionssoziologie(III) (Koln, 1969), p. 92. For the discussion of the place of charisma in religious phenomena, see also Peter Berger, "Charisma and Religious Innovation," American Sociological Review, vol. 28, 5 (Dec., 1963), pp. 940-950; J. T. Marcus, "Transcendence and Charisma," Western Political Quarterly, vol. 14 (1961), pp. 236-241; Edward Shila, "Charisma, Order, and Status," American Sociological Review, vol. 30, 2 (April, 1965), pp. 199-213; Joachim Wach, Sociology of Religion (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944, 1967); S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), etc.

stable growth of the sect, but, at least in the first stage of development, the appearance of the leader with charismatic power and influence more directly contributes to its foundation. Most of the founders of the Buddhist sects in the Sui-T'ang periods were such charismatic religious leaders. For example, before Chih-i(智顗 , 538-597),[53] the doctrinal systematizer of the T'ien-t'ai sect, there had been figures such as Hui-wen(慧文 , flour. c. 550) and Hui-ssu(慧思 , 515-577),[54] whose biographies are full of wondrous elements.

When we consider that there was a large group of people who were in search of miraculous power it is only understandable that Tu-shun, who had been believed to possess such extraordinary power, emerged as another charismatic leader around whom was built a religious organization or movement. As the leader of such a group it is natural that as this group gradually took shape as the "Hua-yen school" he should have come to be regarded as the "first patriarch" of the school.

Tu-shun's charismatic character as a founder is clearly seen in the light of his somewhat mysterious biography.[55]

---

[53]For his life and thought, see Leon Hurvitz, Chih-i, An Introduction to the life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk (Bruxelles: Bruges, Imprimerie Sainte-Catherine, S. A., 1962)

[54]For the lives of these two, see ibid., pp. 86-99.

[55]His biography is found in Hsü-kao-seng-chuan(續高僧傳 , Further Biographies of Eminent Monks), T. 50, pp. 677b-684a; Hua-yen chieh-chuan-chi, op. cit., T. 51, pp. 163b and 166c; Shen-seng-chuan(神僧傳, Records of Mystical Monks), T. 50, p. 994c; Fo-tsu-li-tai-t'ung-tsai(佛祖歷代通載 , General Records on the Buddha and Patriarchs throughout History), T. 49, p. 570c; Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, op. cit., T. 49, pp. 290c-293a, etc.

Although, of course, his life story must have been embellished to fit the general tastes of his followers, it gives us enough material to infer how he was pictured by those people who made him the first patriarch.

According to the records, Tu-shun was a native of Wan-nien county in Yung-chou, present Sian in Shensi. His Buddhist priest name was Fa-shun(法順), but since his original surname was Tu(杜) he was generally called Tu-shun. He was a man of a good and gentle character. At the age of eighteen(seventeen by Occidental reckoning), he took monastic orders under the Ch'an master Seng-chen(僧珍). Not very much is known about this teacher except that he was diligently engaged in the practice of meditation, traveling from place to place, even sleeping outdoors. From this fact we may suspect that his disciple Tu-shun, like his teacher, was also not so much a scholastic figure as a man of practice. It is reported that Tu-shun himself advised his disciples to practise "the practice of Samantabhadra"(Samantabhadra-caryā, 普賢行).[56] Although it is not at all certain what the contents of this practice were, from the fact that the third and the ninth items in ten items of vow of Boddhisattva Samantabhadra are "the practice of offering and giving" and "constantly adapting oneself to fellow beings,"[57] it seems likely to have been concerned with some action taken for the benefit of society. Such a philosophy, not surprisingly, appealed to the people who needed charitable care either physically or spiritually.

---

[56]Cf. T. 51, p. 166.

[57]For the Samantabhadra's ten-fold vow, see above, p. 48.

Moreover, it appears that the deference of the people towards Tu-shun had a second basis, that of the miraculous powers believed to be possessed by him. In many cases he was described as a kind of saint-magician who could perform various miracles. For example, it is said that he could heal people from far and near with all kinds of diseases, even those born deaf and dumb, without any medication. He also converted a thoroughly evil man named Chang into a very good man. He could give to the thousand people who gathered in his assembly a hearty meal with the food prepared for only five hundred. When he came to cross the Yellow River, which was in flood, the flood let up and allowed him to cross to the other shore.[58]

Once he was asked to give advice regarding the illness of the Emperor T'ai-tsung of the T'ang dynasty. Tu-shun advised him to grant a universal amnesty to the nation. After this was carried out the Emperor recovered. The Emperor was so grateful that he invited Tu-shun to his palace and gave him the honorary title of "the Venerable One of the Imperial Heart"(帝心尊者).[59] When Tu-shun was about to die, he called his disciples to give them his final instructions. After he had finished, he sat upright as if engaging in samādhi, and finally passed away.

These are only a few examples among many similar stories. Whether all of these stories are based on fact or not is irrelevant here. What is important is that his followers ascribed these supernatural qualities to

---

[58]For more details, see Garma C. C. Chang, op. cit., pp. 231-234.

[59]T. 49, p. 292c.

him. In other words, he was actually so "regarded" as to appear as a qualified founder, or more correctly a venerable first "grandfather," of the sect. According to the report of Tao-hsüan(道宣), the author of the Further Biographies of Eminent Monks, Tu-shun was genuinely respected and followed by "monks and laymen, the noble and the common," -- all the classes of people in those days.[60] From this background it is clearly seen why Tu-shun came to be considered the founder of the Hua-yen sect.

As the writings of Tu-shun two works have traditionally been listed: Hua-yen Wu-chiao-chih-kuan(華嚴五教止觀, The Tranquillization and Insight in the Five Doctrines),[61] and Hua-yen Fa-chieh-kuan-men(華嚴法界觀門, the Gate of Insight into the Dharmadhātu).[62] The former, however, has been proved not to be his work on the basis of textual evidence,[63] and the authorship of the latter is also a matter of controversy, as shall be discussed later.

One of the eminent disciples of Tu-shun was Chih-yen(智儼), who later became the second patriarch of the school. According to his

---

[60]T. 50, p. 652c. "道俗貴賤"

[61]T. 45, no. 1867, pp. 509-514a.

[62]The text is not found separately in the Taisho but contained in the commentaries of Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi(T. 45, pp. 672a-684b; 684b-692b), and it constitutes a part of Fa-tsang's work; Hua-yen Fa-p'u-ti-hsin-chang(華嚴發菩提心章, T. 45, pp. 652a-654a).

[63]Cf. R. Yuki, "Gokyo-shikan Sanjutsusha Ronko"(An Essay on the Author of the Wu-chiao-chih-kuan), Shukyo Kenkyu, VII, New Series 2 (1930), pp. 73-93. And Takamine, op. cit., pp. 147ff. Yuki contends that this must have been a draft of Fa-tsang's Hua-yen Yu-hsin-fa-chieh-chi(華嚴遊心法界記, T. 45, no. 1877, pp. 642c-650c.)

biography,[64] Chih-yen was outstanding in his intelligence even as a little boy. While playing outside he often erected stupas with bricks and made canopies with flowers. Sometimes he gathered his playmates as listeners and preached to them as if he were a priest. When Chih-yen was twelve, Tu-shun, having heared of this little genius, came to his house and asked the parents to give the child to him. The request was granted and Tu-shun then entrusted Chih-yen to his disciple, Ta(達) in the Chih-hsiang Monastery(至相寺), where he studied day and night. Soon after two Indian monks visited there and, being surprised at Chih-yen's extra-ordinary intelligence, taught him Sanskrit, which he mastered easily.

With regard to Chih-yen's academic background, it is said that he first studied the Mahāyānasaṃgraha(攝大乘論) under Fa-ch'ang(法常, 567-645),[65] who was a She-lun scholar. It is probably because of this that many quotations from this text are found in Chih-yen's writings.[66] Afterwards, he also studied various other texts of the Vinaya, Abhidharma, Satyasiddhi, Daśabhūmika, Mahānirvāṇa under Seng-pien(僧辨, 568-642)[67] who was a Wei-shih(Yogācāra) scholar.

---

[64] For Chih-yen's biography, see Hsü-kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 654a, and Hua-yen-ching chuan-chi, op. cit., T. 51, p. 164a.

[65] For Fa-ch'ang's biography, see Hsü-kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, pp. 540c-541b.

[66] Cf. T. 45, p. 546b, p. 579a-b, T. 55, p. 117b, etc.

[67] Cf. T. 50, p. 540a-c. This teacher might be also Ling-pien (靈辨, 536-603). For the identification of them, see Kamata, op. cit., p. 81.

By this time, however, he became troubled by the complexity of the Buddhist scriptures. He wanted to choose one text out of all of this confusing and self-contradicting canon that he might solely rely upon. He stood before the sūtras and picked up one at random praying that it would be the proper one to guide his future spiritual way. The sūtra chosen in this fashion was the Avataṁsaka-sūtra. He then went to Master Chih-cheng to listen to his lecture on this text. Being dissatisfied with the old-fashioned interpretations he heard, he decided to study the entire sūtra and all available commentaries on it with no help from anyone. After reading a commentary written by Kuang-t'ung(光統), a Ti-lun scholar, he began to understand the idea of the "infinite Dependent Origination in the Special Teaching of One Vehicle"(別教一乘無盡緣起).

Soon after, he was advised by a"strange monk" to study the meaning of "six characteristics"(六相) expounded in the Daśabhūmika chapter in order to understand the meaning of the One Vehicle. After study and contemplation in seclusion for several weeks, he finally came to understand it, and wrote a commentary on the sūtra. This was when he was around twenty-seven years old.

According to Fa-tsang's report, Chih-yen wrote about twenty works, the sentence of which were concise and brief, but full of originality.[68] Among these twenty, about sixteen are identifiable in the records, his important works being Hua-yen i-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men(華嚴一乘十玄門 ,

---

[68] T. 51, p. 164a, and T. 49, p. 1007a.

The Ten Mysteries of the One Vehicle of the Hua-yen),[69] Wu-shih yao-wen-ta(五十要問答 , The Fifty Essential Questions and Answers on the Hua-yen Doctrine),[70] Hua-yen k'ung-mu-chang(華嚴孔目章 , The Hua-yen Doctrine in Outline),[71] Hua-yen-ching sou-hsüan-chi(華嚴經搜玄記, Records on Probing the Hsüan--Mystery)[72]

Throughout these writings it can be seen that Chih-yen set the Hua-yen system on a more refined theoretical foundation. Whereas Tu-shun was an enthusiastic leader of the sect, Chih-yen was a calm thinker and **theoretician.** He might have taken his basic inspiration from Tu-shun's teaching. On the basis of the teacher's practical instructions he developed his own theory and handed it down to his followers. In fact, even though in primitive form, most of the important Hua-yen ideas, among them the "classification of teachings," the "six characteristics," and dependent origination, were developed in his writings.[73] In this sense, Chih-yen can rightly be considered as a transitional figure, whose teachings were an important stepping-stone to the fuller doctrinal development of the Hua-yen school.

Among his many disciples, Ŭi-sang(義湘, 625-702) and Fa-tsang

---

[69]T. 45, no. 1868, pp. 514a-518c.

[70]Ibid., no. 1869, pp. 519a-536b.

[71]Ibid., no. 1870, pp. 536c-539b.

[72]T. 35, no. 1732, pp. 13ff.

[73]These topics will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

(643-712) were the most eminent. Ŭi-sang went back to his home country to establish a Korean Hua-yen (or Hwa-ŏm in Korean pronunciation) school,[74] and Fa-tsang became the third patriarch of the school.[75]

While he was designated as the third patriarch, Fa-tsang was considered by many as the actual founder of the school in the strict sense of "school." It was due to Fa-tsang's contribution that the Hua-yen school was provided with beautifully refined doctrinal and theoretical system. He was the greatest Hua-yen systematizer, and as such was given the honorary titles "Hsien-shou"(賢首 , the Head of the Worthy) or "Kuo-i"(國一 , The Best of the Country). It is for this reason that the Hua-yen school is also known as the "Hsien-shou school."

What was his family and scholarly background? According to his biography,[76] his grandfather came from the country of Sogdia, present Sinkiang and Russian Central Asia, but he himself was born and raised in

---

[74]His biography is found in Sung Kao-seng-chuan, T. 50, p. 729a-c, Sam-guk-yu-sa(三國遺事 , A History of the Three Kingdoms), T. 49, pp. 1006c-1007b. For more details, see Hung-hwa Yi, Chosŏn Pulgyo T'ong-sa(朝鮮佛教通史 , General History of Buddhism in Korea), (Seoul: Pomyunkak, 1972, reprint), vol. I, pp. 80-85, vol. III, pp. 119-125. The Chinese pronunciation of his name is I-hsiang.

[75]Concerning the friendship of these two, especially Fa-tsang's letter to Ŭi-sang, see Sam-guk-yu-sa, op. cit., T. 49, pp. 1006c-1007a, etc. The studies on this letter are found in following works: Peter H. Lee, "Fa-tsang and Uisang," Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 82 (1962), pp. 56-59; Pyŏng-do Yi, Wŏnmun pyŏng yŏkchu Samgukyusa (Seoul, 1956) and his Kuksa Taewan (Seoul, 1957, reprint 1972), pp. 136ab.

[76]For his biography, see Ch'oi Ch'i-wŏn(崔致遠), Tang-tea-ch'ŏn-bok-sa ko-sa-ju pŏn-gyŏng-tai-dŏk Pub-jang Hwa-eang chŏn(唐大薦福寺故寺主翻經大德法藏和尚傳), T. 50, pp. 280c-286b; Sung Kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 742c-b; Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, op. cit., T. 49, p. 293a, p. 370b-c; Fo-tsu-li-tai-t'ung-tsai, op. cit., T. 49, p. 584b-c, etc.

Ch'ang-an, the cultural center of T'ang China. At the age of seventeen he entered the T'ai-pei Mountain in search of a good teacher, but in vain. In the Yün-hua Monastery, however, he listened to Chih-yen's lecture on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra and was so deeply impressed that he decided to become Chih-yen's disciple.

Other than the Hua-yen doctrine inherited from Chih-yen, it is not clear what teaching he had. But he was well versed in Sanskrit, and assisted in the translation of several Sanskrit scriptures into Chinese.[77] Therefore, it is assumed that Fa-tsang based the elaborate structure of Hua-yen philosophy upon such fundamentals as well as upon the teachings of his master Chih-yen.

Throughout his life Fa-tsang put forth unremitting efforts in teaching and writing on Hua-yen philosophy. He was sometimes asked by Empress Wu Tse-t'ian(則天武后) to give lectures on Hua-yen doctrine for her. At one time in 699 A.D., while preaching to her he used the golden lion in the Imperial Hall as a visual aid to illustrate his metaphysical argument. This is the famous Essay on the Golden Lion (金獅子章).[78] His written works in essays, commentaries, and dictionaries

---

[77] In Sung-kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 732a, it is said that Fa-tsang helped the translation work in Hsüan-tsang's translation centre. Takamine and Hamata think it doubtful because Fa-tsang was only twenty-one (twenty in Western reckoning) when Hsüan-tsang died. They argue that Fa-tsang was too young to be admitted into the centre. Takamine, op. cit., p. 210, Hamata, op. cit., p. 130. It seems, however, that this argument based only upon his age is not solid. Fa-tsang also assisted I-ching in his various translation. Cf. K'ai-yüan shi-chiao-lu, T. 55, pp. 564a and 566a, c. The Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra was translated by Śikṣānanda with the assistance of Fa-tsang. It is of course well-known that he revised the Tsin version of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra based on the Sanskrit text brought by Yüeh-chao(月照) (699 A.D.), and that he assisted in the translation of the T'ang version of the sūtra (695 A.D.).

comprise more than one hundred fascicles. Among them the most important are the T'an-hsüan-chi(探玄記, Record on Searching for the Hsüan-Mystery) which is his unfinished commentary on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra,[79] and the Hua-yen i-ch'eng chiao-i-fen-ch'i-chang(華嚴一乘教義分齊章, Essay on the Division of the Teaching and Meaning of the One Vehicle of Hua-yen) usually known as Wu-chiao-chang(五教章, Essay on the Five Teachings).[80]

One of his disciples, Shim-sang(審祥, ?-742), the Korean, went to Japan and gave the first lecture on Hua-yen in Japan.[81] Fa-tsang's leading disciple was Hui-yüan(慧苑, ca. 673-743). He finished the commentary on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra left unfinished by Fa-tsang. But he expressed some different view-points from those of his master, especially on the problems of "classification of teachings" and "ten mysteries," he was condemned by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi so severely as to be considered as a heretic in the Hua-yen tradition.[82] Hence, Ch'eng-kuan, who was born

---

[79]T. 45, no. 1730, pp. 663-667. For English translations, see Fung, A History of Chinese Philosophy, tr. Derk Bodde (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), vol. II. pp. 341-359; de Bary, op. cit., pp. 329-333; Chan, op. cit., pp. 409-414; and Chang, op. cit., pp. 222-230.

[80]T. 35, no. 1733.

[80]T. 45, no. 1866. English translation is found in F. H. Cook, Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines - An Annotated Translation (Ph.D. Thesis of the University of Wisconsin, 1970).

[81]Chinese pronunciation is Chen-hsiang, Japanese, Shinsho. For more information about him, see Takamine, op. cit., pp. 375ff., and T. Hirasoka, "Sinagi no Shinsho no Kyogaku ni tsuite" (Concerning the Teachings of Shin-sang of Silla), Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, vol. XX. no. 2 (March, 1972), pp. 578-586.

[82]Because of this fact his biography is found only in Sung Kao-

twenty-seven years after Fa-tsang's death, came to be considered as the "orthodox" successor to him and thus somewhat awkwardly as the fourth patriarch of the school.[83]

Ch'eng-kuan was a man of great learning. His knowledge was so comprehensive as to cover almost all the branches of learning of his day. He was well versed not only in the teachings of various Buddhist schools but also in Sanskrit literature, Chinese classics, and the arts. He was truly an encyclopedic man.

In regard to the background of Ch'eng-kuan, particularly as a Buddhist scholar, it is said that he renounced household life at the age of eleven or so to wholly engage himself in the study of various sūtras and śāstras. According to his epitaph, the texts which he most dearly cherished and pored over in his youth were Seng-chao's(僧肇, 374-414) Ssu-chüeh-lun(四絶論), Tao-sheng's(道生, d. 434) Shih-ssu-k'o-i(十四科義), Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men(法界觀門), Chih-i's T'ien-t'ai-Chih-kuan(天台止觀), and Fa-tsang's Wang-chin-huan-yüan-kuan(妄盡還源觀). The influence of these works on the mind of this young student must have been decisive and enduring, for their ideas are repeatedly seen in his

---

seng-chuan, T. 50, p. 739. For the most extensive study of Hui-yüan and his ideas, see Y. Sakamoto, op. cit., pp. 1-297. Cf. also Takamine, op. cit., pp. 262ff.

[83]For Ch'eng-kuan's biography, see Sung Kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 737 a-c. Fo-tsu-T'ung-chi, op. cit., T. 49, p. 393b-c. Fo-tsu-li-tai-t'ung-tsai, op. cit., T. 49, pp. 609bf., 616b, 634c, Chou-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 1004b-c, etc. The most reliable document on his life and academic background is found in his epitaph written by P'ei-Hsiu(裴休, c. 787-860). The text from its rubbed copy possessed by Professor R. Yuki is found in Hamata, op. cit., pp. 157f. and plate no. 3. The dates connected with his life are all variant. He was born in 737 or 738, or even 760 and died in 838 or 839 or somewhere between 806 and 820 according to various documents.

various writings.

In addition, he studied under various masters from such Buddhist schools as the Vinaya, the T'ien-t'ai, the San-lun(Mādhyamika), the Ch'an (Zen) as well as the Hua-yen.[84] As regards his relation to the Hua-yen tradition, it is said that he inherited the Hua-yen doctrine from a Hua-yen scholar, Fa-shen(法詵, 715-778).[85] Fa-shen, according to Sung Kao-seng-chuan, learned the Hua-yen teaching from a Great Master En-chen(思貞大師). The identity of the Master is not certain. But on the basis of the report of Gyonen(凝然, 1240-1321), a most learned Japanese Hua-yen monk, saying that Fa-shen was a student of Hui-yüan,[86] Sakamoto equates the Master En-chen with Hui-yüan.[87] If this is the case, as it seems to be, the academic lineage of the Hua-yen should be Fa-tsang - Hui-yüan - Fa-shen - Ch'eng-kuan.

Ch'eng-kuan wrote many essays and commentaries,[88] in all more than thirty. Among them his opus magnum is the Commentary on the Avatamsaka-sūtra(Hua-yen-ching-shu, 華嚴經疏) which numbers over four

---

[84]For the details on his relation to these schools, cf. ibid., pp. 169-181.

[85]Cf. Sung-kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, p. 737a, etc. For the biography of Fa-shen, see, ibid., p. 736ab, Ch'uan T'ang-wen(全唐文) ch. 918. His name was also known as Fa-hsien(法銑).

[86]Cf. Kegon hokkai-mikyo(華嚴法界義鏡), Dai Nihon Bukkyo Zensho(大日本佛教全書), vol. 13, p. 203a, and Kumokucho-hotsuro-ki(孔目章發悟記), ibid., vol. 7, p. 251c. A Japanese translation of the former text was done by Kamata in Kamakura Kyubukkyo(鎌倉旧佛教), Nihon Shiso Daikai, No. 15 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1971).

[87]Y. Sakamoto, op. cit., pp. 51ff.

hundred fascicles and took him approximately four years to complete.[89] His own sub-commentary on this commentary, namely, Hua-yen-ching-sui-shu-yen-i-ch'ao(華嚴經隨疏演義鈔) is also a tremendous work which shows his comprehensive and mature knowledge.[90] Here he quoted frequently from the literature of Confucianism and Taoism as well as from the literture of different schools of Buddhism.

It is important to note that Ch'eng-kuan wrote a commentary on Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men entitled Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching(法界玄鏡), for this is one of the best sources for his ideas of dharmadhātu. As was seen before, he was deeply impressed by this text in his youth. Hence he expounded it for the spiritual benefit of others.[91]

Ch'eng-kuan was extremely influential spiritually and at the same time politically. He served as the Imperial Master for seven successive emperors.[92] Consequently he was granted many honorary titles,

---

[88]For an extensive study on Ch'eng-kuan's writings, see Kamata, op. cit., pp. 191-220.

[89]The text is found in T. 35, no. 1735. It is the commentary on the New(T'ang) Translation of the Sūtra. In some documents it is said that it took "fifteen years" which probably includes the years spent for preparation and collection of the materials. Cf. T. 36, p. 601a.

[90]This is found in T. 36, no. 1736.

[91]The text is in T. 45, no. 1885. The fact that it was written for the lay Buddhist officials is seen in T. 49, p. 609c.

[92]T. 49, p. 385c. Garma C. C. Chang mentions only six. Cf. op. cit., p. 239. For his relation with the T'ang Court, see Jan, A Chronicle of Buddhism in China (581-960 A.D.) (Santiniketan: Visva-Bharati Research Publications, 1966), pp. 75, 76, 79, 94.

the best-known being the Ch'ing-liang Kuo-shih(清涼國師, Imperial Master of Purity and Coolness). Much of the influence and popularity of the Hua-yen school at that time was actually due to his contribution.

Ch'eng-kuan had a great number of disciples. It is said that more than a hundred disciples were qualified to transmit the Law and more than a thousand students to expound it. Among them thirty-eight became famed as masters of the Law. Only Seng-jui (僧叡) and Tsung-mi are reported to have attained the true deep meaning of Ch'eng-kuan,[93] and the latter, eventually, became considered the fifth patriarch of the school.

Tsung-mi(780-841)[94] holds a special position in Chinese Buddhism. Even though he was revered as the fifth patriarch of the Hua-yen school, he was also portrayed as an inheritor of the Ch'an tradition. He was a man who was "able to earn an inter-religious and inter-sectarian reputation and respect."[95]

---

[93]Cf. T. 50, p. 737c, his epitaph reprinted in Hamata, op. cit., p. 158.

[94]The best study on Tsung-mi so far is found in Yün-hua Jan, "Tsung-mi, His Analysis of Ch'an Buddhism," T'oung Pao, LVIII, 1972, pp. 1-54.

[95]Ibid., p. 2. His biography is also divided into two groups: that which described him as a Hua-yen master and that as a Ch'an teacher. As for the former group, see Sung-kao-seng-chuan, op. cit., T. 50, pp. 741-743a; Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, op. cit., T. 49, p. 293c, etc.; and for the latter group, see Fo-tsu-li-tai-t'ung-tsai, op. cit., T. 49, pp. 635b-636a; Ying-te-chuan-teng-lu(景德傳燈錄, The Transmission of the Lamp), ed. by Tao-yüan, T. 51, pp. 305c-309b, etc. A kind of autobiography is found in his Yüan-Chüeh-ching-ta-shu-ch'ao(圓覺經大疏鈔), HTS. 14; and Yüan-chüeh-ching-liao-shu-ch'ao(略疏鈔), T. 39, p. 576c-578a.

He first studied the Confucian classics up to the age of seventeen, but to his disappointment he was dissatisfied with the answers which these classics offered to his ultimate questions. He began studying Buddhism when he was eighteen and continued to do so until he was twenty-three. For the next two years he returned to the study of Confucianism, perhaps to prepare himself for a public career in accordance with his family's expectations. His writings, especially the Yüan-jen-lun(原人論, The Original Nature of Man)[96] show that he had a thorough understanding of Confucianism.

At the age of twenty-seven, when he by chance attended sermons delivered by a Ch'an monk, Tao-yüan(道圓), he was fully converted to Buddhism and renounced the worldly life to become his disciple. This Ch'an monk belonged to the Ho-tse(荷澤) sect, whose founder was Shen-hui (神會), the well-known champion for the Southern school of Ch'an. Tsung-mi learned not only from this monk but also from this monk's master Wei-chung (惟忠) for a while.[97] This Ch'an influence on Tsung-mi later emerged as an integral part of his thought.

When he was still a member in his master's monastery, he was invited to a layman's house where he found a copy of the Yüan-chüeh-ching (The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment). He was so impressed by it that tears flowed from his eyes. The influence of this sūtra on him was tremendous

---

[96] See below note 100.

[97] For the controversial information about this monk and his relation to Tsung-mi, see Jan, "Tsung-mi, His Analysis of Ch'an Buddhism," op. cit., pp. 9f.

and enduring, so much so as to make him devote unsparing and indefatigable efforts in preaching and writing on it, just as Ch'eng-kuan did on the Avatamsaka-sūtra.

However, the most important event occurred at the age of thirty when he came to read and study Ch'eng-kuan's commentary on the Avatamsaka-sūtra. The teaching found there seemed to him so profound and interesting that he started to lecture on it. After corresponding with Ch'eng-kuan a few times he decided to become his disciple. In 812 when he was thirty-two, he met his new seventy-four year-old master, Ch'eng-kuan, under whom he spent the next two years studying Hua-yen philosophy. Thereafter, he remained as a Hua-yen scholar until his death at the age of sixty-two. However, he never abandoned the Ch'an tradition, but rather tried to harmonise the practice of Ch'an with the theory of Hua-yen(教禪一致), and this was appreciated as his unique contribution to Chinese Buddhism. This fact is clearly shown in his literary activities, which covered both Ch'an and Hua-yen.

Among his various writings, which were over two hundred fascicles,[98] the most important were his commentaries on the Yüan-chüeh-ching, and his famous Kuei-feng lan-jo Ch'an-tsang(圭峯蘭若禪藏 , The Ch'an Tripiṭaka of Kuei-feng Monastery) or better known as Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'uan-chi(禪源諸詮集 , Various Explanations on the Source of Ch'an),[99] the Yüan-jen-lun

---

[98] Cf. T. 50, p. 742a.

[99] The text is lost but its preface survives with the title Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'uan-chi tu-hsu(都序), T. 48, no. 2015. An annotated English translation is coming forth from Yün-hua Jan, while some excerpts from it are found in his op. cit., pp. 36ff. The recent Japanese translation was done by S. Hamata, Zen no Goroku, no. 9 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1971), pp. 1-263.

(原人論),[100] and the Commentary on the Hua-yen Fa-chieh-kuan-men(注華嚴法界觀門).[101]

With Tsung-mi, the formal lineage of Hua-yen as a school was broken and there appeared no other patriarchs. The main external reason for this break is that four years after Tsung-mi's death, in 845, there broke out the so-called Hui-ch'ang persecution which swept away almost all institutional Buddhism and marked a pivotal point in the history of Buddhism in China.[102] Furthermore, there followed the Period of the Five Dynasties(五代), which was characterized as a time of chaotic confusion and social disorder.

After the Hui-ch'ang persecution and the confusion which followed it, the dominant Buddhist school in China was the Ch'an sect. This sect could survive such oppression primarily because of its independence of such externals as scripture and images, which are so vulnerable under such circumstances, and because of its emphasis on productive manual labour, which vitiated the charge that monks were parasites on society.[103] It should be remembered, however, that this does not mean that the Hua-yen philosophy as such was completely abolished from scholary circles of

---

[100]T. 45, no. 1886, pp. 707c-710c. An English translation of the text is found in Wm. Th. de Bary, ed., The Buddhist Tradition (New York: The Modern Library, 1969), pp. 179-196. See also in German, Hans Haas, "Tsungmi's Yuen-zan-lun, eine Abhandlung über den Ursprung des Menschen aus dem Kanon des chinesischen Buddhismus," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, Bd. XII (1909), pp. 491-532.

[101]T. 45, no. 1884.

[102]For detail, see K. Ch'en, op. cit., pp. 226-233.

[103]Cf. ibid., p. 363f.

Buddhism. On the contrary, it continued to exert its influence to a great extent on Buddhist philosophy in particular and on Chinese thought in general, as will be shown in a later chapter.

PART TWO

THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE IN THE HUA-YEN SCHOOL

INTRODUCTORY

In an earlier chapter a brief effort was made to see how the idea of dharmadhātu was understood in Indian Buddhist literature. In addition to gaining some clearer picture of the dharmadhātu idea in India, it was also found that no Indian school of Buddhism ever developed the doctrine on a full-fledged, systematic scale. As will be clear later, it was in the Chinese Hua-yen school that the dharmadhātu doctrine was most fully and systematically developed, so much so that the school was sometimes called "dharmadhātu school."[1]

What, then, is the dharmadhātu doctrine in the Hua-yen school? Before going into a discussion of the dharmadhātu doctrine, however, one may rightly ask here what is meant by the term dharmadhātu in Hua-yen philosophy. Tu-shun, the first patriarch of the school, and Chih-yen, the second, did not try to give a clear-cut definition of "dharmadhātu" even though their whole essays were concerned with this cardinal concept.

As far as we know from the extant records, it was Fa-tsang, the third patriarch, who first tried to define this term. According to his definition, the dharma in the compound word dharmadhātu has something to do with "self-nature," "law" or "regulation" and the like; whereas dhātu

---

[1] See above Introduction, p. 6, note 12.

means cause, nature or essence, and differentiations. In his own words, it goes as follows:

> Fa(dharma) has three meanings: 1) that which upholds self-nature, 2) the law or regulation, and 3) the meanings corresponding [to these two]; chieh(dhātu) has also three meanings: 1) the cause by which the holy way comes into existence, 2) the nature [or essence] upon which all dharmas are dependent, and 3) the differentiation by which all the characteristcs appearing in dependent origination are possible without confusing each other.[2]

Fa-tsang here does not give any indication which meaning are primary and which of lesser importance. He does not even give the meanings of the compound word dharmadhātu. All that is seen in his definition is that "dharmadhātu" has something to do with both the underlying essence and the manifestations particularized or differentiated in accordance with the principle of "dependent origination"(pratītyasamutpāda).

A clearer but similar type of definition of dharmadhātu is found in the writings of Ch'eng-kuan, the fourth patriarch of the school.[3] But his more straightforward definition reads: "The deep dharmadhātu is the

---

[2] T'an-hsüan-chi, T. 35, p. 440b, ll. 9ff. "法有三義 一是持自性 二是軌則義 三對意義 界亦有三義 一是因義依生聖道故 ... 二是性義謂是諸法所依性故... 三是分齊義 謂是緣起相不雜故." The meaning of "對意" is not clear to me.

[3] Cf. Ta Hua-yen-ching liao-ts'e(大華嚴經略策), T. 36, p. 707c. Here it is said: "What is meant by the dharmadhātu(fa-chieh)? Fa(dharma) means rule and its observance; Chieh(dhātu) means two things: 1) from the standpoint of the phenomenal world it means differentiation, for it particularizes according to particular phenomena, and 2) from the standpoint of the noumenal world it means nature or essence, for the essence of all dharmas is immutable."(法界何義... 法者軌持為義 界者有二義 一約事說界即分義 隨事分別故 二約性義 約理法界為諸法性不變易故."

substance of Mind of all the Buddhas and sentient beings."[4] When Emperor Hsien-tsung(憲宗) of the T'ang dynasty asked him, "What is the dharmadhātu?" he also answered: "The dharmadhātu is the substance of the nature of all sentient beings."[5]

Tsung-mi, the fifth patriarch, in his commentary on Fa-chieh-kuan-men, borrowed Ch'eng-kuan's definition: "the one true dharmadhātu is that which includes the myriad things and this is the One-Mind."[6] Tsung-mi further said that "all the Buddhas, all the sentient beings, body and mind, and Buddha lands, all of these are the essence and function of this dharmadhātu."[7] In his preface to Tsung-mi's commentary on Fa-chieh-kuan-men, P'ei Hsiu(裴休) said that he had heard Tsung-mi saying that "dharmadhātu

---

[4]T. 45, p. 672a. "... 深法界者 諸佛衆生之心体也."

[5]Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, T. 49, p. 381a, ll. 6f. "法界者 衆生之性体也 "

Cf. also Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching, T. 45, pp. 672c-673a. Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'in-shu, Hsü Tsang-ching (Supplementary Tripiṭaka in Chinese) (Taiwan, reprint 1967 from Manji Zokuzokyo) vol. 7, p. 249b, c, etc. (Hereafter Hsu Tsang-ching will be referred to as HTC.)

[6]Chu Hua-yen-fa-chieh-kuan-men, T. 45, p. 684b, ll. 24f. "統唯一真法界 謂總該萬有即是一心."

[7]Ibid., p. 684c. "一切諸佛一切衆生身心國土一一是此法界体用."
Tsung-mi was also careful to define the dharmadhātu in contrast with the tathāgatagarbha by saying: "The nature of dharmadhātu and the tathāgatagarbha are identical in essence but different in meaning. The difference is two-fold: 1) in terms of sentient beings it is called the tathāgatagarbha; while in terms of non-sentient beings, the nature of dharmadhātu. This is the difference between the "buddha-nature" and the "dharma-nature" as explained in the Chih-lun(Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-śāstra); 2) If the term dharmadhātu is used, it refers to [the state in which] sentient beings and non-sentient beings are interpenetrating and mind and mind-object are undifferentiated; if the term tathāgatagarbha is used, it refers only to the pure original Source and the substance of mind of all the Buddhas and

is the true substance of the myriad phenomena, the original source of the myriad practices, and the 'fruit-ocean' of the myriad virtues."[8] He himself added that it is "the original essence of bodies and minds of all sentient beings."[9]

These are some examples of the definitions concerning the dharmadhātu that can be found in the works of the Hua-yen patriarchs. In their definitions, it is noted that they did not understand "dharmadhātu" in the etymological sense of the Chinese translation, "fa-chieh." They tried to define the term in the frame of Buddhist, more specifically, Hua-yen, philosophical tradition. It is because of this that in spite of such a simple, even one-sided, Chinese word, "fa-chieh," "the world of law," the term was understood as having notably flexible connotations such as "cause" (因), "nature" or "essence"(性), "substance"(体), "One-Mind"(一心), "original source"(本源), and the like. The dharmadhātu, in this case, was interpreted as the underlying reality or principle from which all

---

the sentient beings. Ta-fang-kuang-yüan-chüeh-hsiu-to-lo liao-i-ching-liao-shu-chu(大方廣圓覺修多羅了義經略疏鈔), T. 39, p. 535c, 11. 22-26. "法界性與如來藏体同義別 別有其二 一者有情數中名如來藏 在非情數中名法界性 如智論明佛性法性之異 二者謂法界則情器交徹 心境不分 如來藏則但說諸衆生清淨本源心体." "Chih-lun" here refers to the Ta-chih-tu-lun(大智度論), T. 25, no. 1509, ascribed to Nāgārjuna and tr. by Kumārajīva in a hundred fascicles. For detail, see K. Verkata Ramanan, Nāgārjuna's Philosophy - as Presented in the Mahā-Prajñāpāramitā-Śāstra (Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo: Charles E. Tutle Co. Inc. 1966), and a French translation done by E. Lamotte, Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna, 3 vols. (Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1944, 1949, & 1970).

[8]Chu Hua-yen fa-chieh-kuan-men, op. cit., p. 683c, 11. 5f. "法界萬象之源体 萬行之本源 萬德之果海."

[9]Ibid., p. 683b, 1. 4. "一体衆生心之本体."

particular phenomena are manifested or transformed. In this sense, "dharmadhātu" seems to mean first "the element of all dharmas," "the cause of all things," "the essence of all things," and the like.

On the other hand, it was also described as "the one true dharmadhātu"(一眞法界) which "includes the myriad of things." In this case, "dharmadhātu" seems to indicate primarily something like the Universe which embraces the totality of things. Consequently, it might be called "the realm of all dharmas," "the All-embracing," "the ground of all," or "the totality" itself.

It should be noted, however, that the dharmadhātu doctrine in Hua-yen philosophy cannot fully and properly be dealt with merely by finding definitions of it, for Hua-yen philosophers did not occupy themselves with definition. They were not interested in formulating a theory regarding the conceptual nature of dharmadhātu. Whether it be called the Absolute, the Ultimate Reality, the Essence, the Totality, or the All-embracing, the definition of the term was not the main business of the Hua-yen school. Their interest was not in the dharmadhātu per se, but, as will be seen later, in its function--its various aspects and their interrelationships. Rather than discussing what it is, penetrating into how it functions was the main focus of their discourses. By the term "function"(用), they meant the "infinite interrelationship" of all dharmas in the dharmadhātu, and this was, in the Hua-yen technical terms, the "dependent origination of dharmadhātu"(dharmadhātu-pratītyasamutapāda).[10]

---

[10]"Pratītyasamutpāda" can also be translated as "dependent co-arising," "dependent co-origination," "interdependent origination," etc. Throughout this study "dependent origination" is used for pratītyasamutpāda or, in Chinese, yüan-ch'i(緣起).

Historically speaking, it was Tu-shun who for the first time associated the doctrine of dharmadhātu with dependent origination. In the summary remark of the second section of his Fa-chieh-kuan-men, he said that all the ten items of truth concerning the dharmadhātu in the section were, in fact, grounded on the principle of "dependent origination"(緣起).[11] This means that to see the truth of dharmadhātu is to discern the truth of dependent origination; this particular truth of dependent origination, in this case, is "the dependent origination of dharmadhātu"(法界緣起), for it is considered here as being applied particularly and exclusively to the dharmadhātu. At the same time, to put it otherwise, the dharmadhātu here is also "the dharmadhātu of dependent origination"(緣起法界) in the sense that its truth is grasped only in terms of dependent origination.[12] In short, the dharmadhātu doctrine in the Hua-yen tradition was from the outset the doctrine concerning a particular type of dependent origination theory which was regarded as being applied to the interrelationship of the various components

---

[11] T. 45, p. 653c, l. 12.

[12] In the Hua-yen Wu-chiao-chih-kuan(華嚴五教止觀) which had traditionally been ascribed to Tu-shun until Yuki argued that it should be Fa-tsang's work, dharmadhātu-pratītyasamutpāda(法界緣起) and pratītya-samutpāda-dharmadhātu(緣起法界) are used as interchangeble. Cf. T. 45, p. 512b. Here appear the phrases: "entering the great pratītyasamutpāda-dharmadhātu"(入大緣起法界), (line 15), and "entering the dharmadhātu-pratītyasamutpāda"(入法界緣起), (lines 18 and 21). It is also said: "If there is an intuition into the fact that dharmas such as rūpa, etc. are dependently originating, it is dharmadhātu-pratītyasamutpāda."(l. 11: 若有直見色等諸法從緣即是法界緣起) and "nature and characteristics are interfused and completely reduced into one moment. This is the reason why seeing dharmas [as they are] is entering the great pratītyasamutpāda-dharmadhātu."(ll. 20f.: 性相相渾融全收一際所以見法即入大緣起法界中也."

of, and in, the dharmadhātu.[13]

The attempt to understand the dharmadhātu in terms of its various aspects and their interrelationship rather than in terms of its essence, reality, or entity was more explicitly expressed by Chih-yen when he spoke of "the meaning of the dharmadhātu which is the self-essence of the dependent origination of the Ekayāna"(One Vehicle, i.e., the Hua-yen).[14] As a matter of fact, it was apparently Chih-yen who used the term "dependent origination of dharmadhātu" in the Hua-yen sense for the first time.[15] And this was such an important truth to him that the aim of his Hua-yen I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men, according to him, was to elucidate this truth, which seemed to him to be the purport of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra as well.

In the case of Fa-tsang such a tendency was most obviously set forth when he stated that "the central theme [of the Avataṁsaka] is the dharmadhātu of truth-reality(satyatā bhūtakoṭi) which is the dependent origination of cause and effect(hetu-phala)."[16] And he further elaborated as follows:

---

[13]For a discussion on the development of the dependent origination idea through Buddhist history, see Pt. Three, ch. I.

[14]Hua-yen I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men, T. 45, p. 514a. "一乘緣起自体法界義."

[15]Historically the first who used this term is Hui-yüan(慧遠, 523-592), who is different from the man of the same name (334-416) of the Lu Mountain. But he did not use this in the way Chih-yen did. Cf. Kamata, op. cit., pp. 538f.

[16]T'an-hsüan-chi, T. 35, p. 120a, l. 23, and HTC, 4, p. 45b. "因果緣起 理實法界為宗." Cf. Chih-yen's statement: "因果緣起 理實為宗趣." in T. 35, p. 14c, l. 5. See Kawada, "Dharmadhātu," op. cit., p. 855(22).

> The dependent origination of cause and effect surely has no self-nature, and because of its having no self-nature it is the dharmadhātu of truth-reality. The truth-reality of dharmadhātu surely has no fixed nature [of its own], and because of its having no fixed nature it establishes the dependent origination of cause and effect. Therefore, these two are not two but one and the same truth of non-obstruction and sovereignty, and this is the central theme.[17]

What is clearly seen from this account is that for Fa-tsang too the truth of dharmadhātu was none other than the truth of dependent origination. This basic premise is repeatedly expressed in his systematic explanations of dharmadhātu. To take a few examples, when he summarized the fundamental teachings of Hua-yen philosophy in the Essay on the Golden Lion, "the elucidation of dependent origination"(明緣起) was the first item among the ten in the article.[18] In the conclusion of his Hua-yen-ching chi-kuei he also said that all the truth he expounded about the dharmadhātu therein was "one great principle of dependent origination."[19] Furthermore, the title "ten mysteries"(十玄門) or "ten mysterious gates" formulated by Chih-yen was changed by him as "the ten-fold mysterious dependent origination" (十玄緣起). Moreover, the theoretical ground for it was to him "the six meanings of dependent origination in the causal aspect"(緣起因門六義) and "the mutual reliance in dependent origination"(緣起相由).

---

[17] Ibid., "因果緣起必無自性 無自性故 即理實法界 法界理實必無定性 無定性故 即成因果緣起 是故此二無二唯一無礙自在法門以為宗."

[18] T. 45, p. 663c. In the Hua-yen-ching i-hai-pai-men, the discourse of this topic comes first out of a hundred. Cf. T. 45, p. 627b.

[19] T. 45, p. 569c, l. 8. "總合一大緣起法."

Such an attitude was accepted by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi. Ch'eng-kuan pointed out the relational or functional aspect more vividly when he said: "this sutra takes the inconceivable dependent origination of dharmadhātu, the cause and effect of the truth-reality as its central theme.... This dependent origination is called the great function of essence."[20] The important truth for him too was this "great function" (大用) of the dharmadhātu, not any static substantial entity itself. For Tsung-mi this great function was also called the "wondrous function"(妙用) which can not be dealt with in the aspect of substantiality.[21] In this light it is no wonder that there are found so frequently the terms "power and function"(力用) or just "function"(用) in Hua-yen writings.[22]

The Hua-yen philosophy of dharmadhātu is, likewise, a specific type of dependent origination theory. The dependent origination, in this case, is, as will be seen, a theory of "interrelationship" of the components of dharmadhātu, the components being most frequently represented by li and shih or noumenon and phenomena.[23] The Hua-yen philosophical discussions, therefore, centered around the "interrelationship" of these two: relationship between li and shih and that between shih and shih, which they called

---

[20] The Hua-yen-ching liao-ts'e, HTC, 4, p. 445b. "此經以法界緣起理實因果不可思議為宗也... 緣起者稱体之大用."

[21] T. 45, p. 687b, l. 7.

[22] For example, see T. 45, pp. 503b, l. 10; 514b, l. 29; 515c, l. 29; 597a, l. 6; 627a, l. 28; 631bc; 665a, l. 10; etc.

[23] For the meaning of the terms li and shih, see below pp. 114ff.

"dharmadhātu of non-obstruction of li and shih"(li-shih wu-ai, 理事無礙) and "dharmadhātu of non-obstruction of shih and shih"(shih-shih wu-ai, 事事無礙), respectively.

Our study of the Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu, therefore, should be directed to the questions such as how the Hua-yen philosophers understood the "infinite interrelationship" of things, how they expressed this relationship in religio-philosophical terms, and how they systematized it within their own context.

In pursuing these questions throughout the present part(Part Two), attention will be focused on an examination of the development of the dharmadhātu doctrine as presented in the writings of the Hua-yen patriarchs. It will be argued that the doctrine can by and large be said to have been 1) founded by Tu-shun, 2) formulated by Chih-yen, 3) systematized by Fa-tsang, and 4) elucidated by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi. The examination here will be mainly descriptive and analytical on the basis of the texts. The philosophico-religious meaning of the dharmadhātu doctrine and its historical context in Chinese thought will be discussed separately in Part Three.

I. THE FOUNDATION OF THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE LAID BY TU-SHUN

The foundation of the dharmadhātu doctrine in the Hua-yen school was definitively laid in a short treatise, Fa-chieh-kuan-men(法界觀門, the Gate of Insight into the Dharmadhātu), which has been ascribed to Tu-shun.[1] The importance of this little religious tract cannot be

---

[1]Tu-shun's authorship had been accepted until this traditional view was questioned in recent times. K. Sakaino, for the first time, argued that the real author of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men was Chih-cheng(智正, 559-639) instead of Tu-shun. (For the references concerning the authorship of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, see those in the section on Tu-shun's foundership, Pt.One,ch. III.) D. Tokiwa supported the traditional position of Tu-shun's authorship, which was again challenged by S. Suzuki who thought that the text was originally part of Fa-tsang's Hua-yen fa-p'u-t'i-hsin-chang(華嚴發菩提心章, The Awakening of the Bodhicitta), being extracted by Tsung-mi. R. Yuki recently substantiated the traditional opinion on historical grounds. This last theory of Yuki was accepted by many as definitive. See K. Kimura, "Who was the Author of Fa-chieh-kuan-men" (in Japanese), Shukyo Kenkyu, 41-195 (June, 1968), pp. 50ff. But K. Kimura has raised further questions arguing that the text was taken out of Fa-tsang's above-mentioned work by someone he declined to specify. Ibid., pp. 47-74, especially pp. 60-64. Yuki, in answering Kimura, has made several points in favour of the authorship of Tu-shun in his recent article, "Kegon no Shoso Tojin to Hokkai Kanmon no Chosha tono Mondai" (The Question of the Founder of the Hua-yen school, Tu-shun and of the Author of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men), Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, XVIII, 2 (1969), pp. 32-38. Unless we have more substantial evidence against the traditional position, it would seem hasty to completely discard it. This view was shared by H. Ui, Bukkyo Shiso Kenkyu (A Study of Buddhist Thought) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940,1966), p. 287. In addition, it is quite difficult to believe that Ch'eng-kuan or Tsung-mi deliberately excerpted a part of Fa-tsang's work and ascribed it to Tu-shun, or otherwise that they were deceived so completely as to write their own commentaries in the belief that it was Tu-shun's work. See T. 45, p. 672a, and p. 684c. In short, on the basis of both external and internal evidence such as given in Yuki's argument, it is not unreasonable to accept Tu-shun's authorship of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men. Moreover, since we are dealing with the text rather than the author, the question of authorship itself is not of crucial importance to this study.

over-emphasized, for it has been a source of inspiration throughout the later development of this doctrine. There is some controversy concerning its authorship, but as Gyonen(凝然, 1240-1321), the most comprehensive Hua-yen scholar and monk of thirteenth century Japan, rightly pointed out, this work has been the "fundamental text" upon which all subsequent Hua-yen philosophy was based.[2] As will be clear later, the idea of li and shih, their mutual identification and interpenetration, the classification of teachings, and so on are all found in their primitive forms in this germinal work.[3]

What is the reason the Fa-chieh-kuan-men has been considered as such an important work? As its full title Hua-yen Fa-chieh-kuan-men indicates, it is a work based upon the Avataṁsaka-sūtra.[4] The Avataṁsaka-sūtra, as has been seen, is such a voluminous text that average people could not even get through it, and if they did, its highly discursive and diffuse nature would hinder their understanding of its message. The

---

[2]Cf. a similar statement made by Garma C. C. Chang: "The most original and important piece of work in the literature of Hwa Yen[Hua-yen] Philosophy is no doubt Tu Shun's Fa Chieh Kuan, On the Meditation of Dharmadhātu. The germinal thoughts and characteristic approach of Hwa Yen Philosophy are clearly visible in this essay. The four famous masters subsequent to Tu Shun...all gained their inspiration from this essay and wrote their works following the principle and arguments laid down therein." Op. cit., p. 207.

[3]Hokkai-gikyo(法界義鏡), Dai Nihon Bukkyo Zensho Kegon Shobushu (大日本佛教全書 華嚴小部集), p. 300b: "華嚴法界觀一卷 杜順大師述 一宗高祖是根本章." A more easily accessible text is found in Kamakura Kubukkyo(鎌倉旧佛教) Nihon Shiso Daikai, No. 15 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1971), p. 424; its Japanese translation by S. Kamata, p. 292.

[4]Cf. T. 45, p. 672a, ll. 24f. Here Ch'eng-kuan says that the Avataṁsaka-sūtra is the "sūtra depended upon"(所依之經) and the Fa-chieh-kuan-men the "insight which depends" on it (能依之觀).

Fa-chieh-kuan-men was an attempt to grasp the gist of this huge text. It was a systematic rearrangement of the subject-matter loosely expressed in the sūtra. Its author, having fully understood and digested the contents and intents of the Avataṁsaka, tried to lead people to the same goal toward which he thought the sūtra was attempting to guide them. This idea is explicitly expressed by P'ei Hsiu when he wrote in his preface to Tsung-mi's commentary on the Fa-chieh-kuan-men as follows:

> Although this sūtra [the Avataṁsaka-sūtra] is circulating in the world, few can fully understand it. The Monk Tu-shun lamented: "Great indeed is the sūtra of dharmadhātu. Unless one has advanced to the [bodhisattva's] stages, how can he understand its words and see its truth? I will establish a gate to it and let it be shown." Hence he wrote the Fa-chieh-kuan[-men] in which he established the three-fold gate... thereafter that they may enter into the dharmadhātu of the Avataṁsaka[-sūtra].[5]

The same idea is seen even more clearly and concisely in a statement made by Ŭi-ch'ŏn(義天, 1009-1101), a Korean prince and monk who had a thorough knowledge of Buddhist literature through his extensive collection. When he introduced the Fa-chieh-kuan-men in his catalogue, he said:

> Hence in summing up the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, he [Tu-shun] wrote the Fa-chieh-kuan[-men], in which the entire purport is embraced in terms of three gates. The text, though not more than a few pages, completely provides the true meaning of the whole sūtra.[6]

---

[5] T. 45, p. 683b, ll. 18ff. "然此經雖行於世而罕能通之 有杜順和尚歎曰 大哉法界玄經也 自非聖地 何能披其文 見其法哉 吾設其門以示之 於是 著法界觀而門有三重... 然後可以入華嚴之法界矣."

[6] Manji, 2, 8, 5, p. 124a. "是乃約華嚴經撰法界觀 包總要義 列為三門 其文不過數紙 而備盡一經之意."

Prior to the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, of course, there had been many studies of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, especially, as mentioned before, in the circles of the Ti-lun school. Most of these studies were, however, word-for-word explanations of the sentences of the sūtra.[7] The Fa-chieh-kuan-men is completely different from them in that it has nothing to do with a verbatim commentary on the text of the sūtra. It is rather an overarching "gate" or "gateway"(men, 門) to the very essence of the bulky Avataṁsaka-sūtra. It reveals the focal point of the sūtra and shows how to attain the goal the sūtra describes as ultimate.

As a matter of fact, such an approach to particular sūtras was a newly developing method at that time. In the Sui-T'ang period there emerged a tendency to try to grasp the meaning of the somewhat abstruse teachings of a given canonical work by reorganizing or rebuilding them into several items of insight(kuan,觀). This tendency had actually an epoch-making significance in the history of Chinese Buddhism because it marked the stage of the so-called "independent growth" of Buddhism on Chinese soil.[8]

The Fa-chieh-kuan-men itself, however, is the most outstanding

---

[7]For example, see Hui-yüan's(慧遠) Shih-ti-ching-lun-i-chi(十地經論義記) and Ling-pien's(靈辯) Hua-yen-ching-shu(華嚴經疏) which are said to have been in one hundred volumes. See Yung-t'ung T'ang(湯用彤), Han Wei liang-chin nan-pei-ch'ao fo-chiao shih(漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史), 2 vols. (Shanghai: 1938, reprint Taipei: 1968), p. 546.

[8]This tendency and its historical significance in making Buddhism a truly Chinese religion was discussed in Part One, ch. III. A.

example of this tendency.[9] Moreover, this first resystematization of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, together with the sūtra itself, enabled the emergence of the Chinese Hua-yen(Avataṁsaka) school,[10] and provided the cornerstone for the foundation of Hua-yen philosophy, especially as regards the doctrine of dharmadhātu.

In view of these historical considerations, it becomes clear that the Fa-chieh-kuan-men is well qualified to serve as a base point in our study from which subsequent developments of the dharmadhātu doctrine can be measured and understood. If the work is to be thus fundamental to this study, a more extensive examination and analysis of it may be called for.

Let us now see what the Fa-chieh-kuan-men says about the dharmadhātu. What should be noted first is that it never touches on the question as to what the dharmadhātu is in itself. Instead of indulging in a scholastic exposition of the concept of dharmadhātu, it tries to lead people to have "insight" into the dharmadhātu for themselves. Its principal attitude is that the dharmadhātu is not a thing to be talked about, but a truth and reality to be meditated upon and "entered" into.

This attitude is clearly seen even in its title Fa-chieh-kuan-men. "Fa-chieh" is a translation of dharmadhātu; and "kuan" means originally

---

[9]Cf. R. Yuki, "Zui-to no Chugoku-teki Shin-bukkyo no Ichirie toshite no Kegon Hokkai Kanmon ni tsuite" (Concerning the Hua-yen Fa-chieh-kuan-men as an Example of the Systematization of New Chinese Buddhism in the Sui-T'ang Period." op. cit., pp. 276-281.

[10]See above Pt. I. ch. III.

"to behold," "to gaze," "to see," "to observe" and so on. But in Chinese Buddhism kuan carries a special meaning,[11] for it is a translation of the Sanskrit word vipaśyanā, which basically means "correct insight," "clear observation," discerning," "vision," and the like.[12] Furthermore, it is mystical contemplation, undistorted intuitive seeing, and even mentally entering into the truth.[13] What the title indicates, therefore, is that the dharmadhātu is none other than the object of such spiritual insight and observation.[14]

In what way, then, does the Fa-chieh-kuan-men see, or more precisely, ask people to see, the dharmadhātu? It recommends "three-fold insight"(三重觀) into the dharmadhātu. This is, according to the text, the insight into:

A. the True Emptiness,
(真空觀)

B. the non-obstruction of li and shih, and
(理事无礙觀)

C. the all-pervading and all-embracing [shih].
(周遍含容觀)

---

[11]This kuan is usually associated with chih(止, śamatha) which means "stopping, tranquillization, cessation, etc." of one's physical and mental disturbance. The doctrine of chih-kuan was especially emphasized by the T'ien-t'ai school in China. Cf. Chih-i's Mo-ho Chih-kuan, T. 46, pp. 1-140, and Hsiao Chih-kuan, T. 46, pp. 462-73.

[12]Cf. Edgerton, op. cit., p. 491. For the meaning of kuan, especially in Shan-tao, see Julian F. Pas, "Shan-tao's Interpretation of the Meditative Vision of Buddha Amitayus," History of Religion, vol. 14, no. 2, (November, 1974), pp. 96-116, esp. pp. 101f.

[13]Cf. Soothill, op. cit., p. 489a.

[14]Cf. Kamata in Kegon Shiso, op. cit., p. 421. Here he said that when the kuan-fa(觀法) is mentioned in Hua-yen fa actually means the dharmadhātu.

From this it is observed that to have an insight into the dharmadhātu, according to the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, is to see, in a spiritual vision or meditative observation, the dharmadhātu in terms of the "interrelationship" of its components, which, later in the Hua-yen tradition, was designated as "dependent origination of dharmadhātu."

In each of these three sections there follow ten items, thus forming thirty altogether. The dharmadhātu, in other words, is seen in terms of thirty different ways. But the number "ten" should not be accepted at its face value. This number was considered by the Hua-yen school as a perfect and auspicious number which embraces everything in itself, and thus almost every categorization or classification adopted this number. In Hua-yen writings it is repeatedly mentioned that the number ten symbolizes "inexhausibility" or "infinity"(無盡，無窮) because it is the "perfect number"(圓數).[15] Therefore, the "ten" in this scheme must be understood to have a symbolic and didactic value rather than a numerical reality.

The first section in this insight, namely, insight into "True Emptiness," deals with the two aspects of the dharmadhātu, i.e., "form[16] and emptiness," and their interrelationship. This is in fact a schematized

---

[15]Cf. for example, Chih-yen's Hua-yen i-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men, T. 45, p. 515c, l. 25; Fa-tsang's Wu-chiao-chang, T. 45, pp. 503b, l. 2, 505a, l. 12, 507a, l. 12, etc.

[16]Form or matter(色, rūpa) here is used as representative of all phenomenal things, just as used in the Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā (Diamond sūtra). It is used as representative of all phenomenal things because it is the first of five skandhas. Cf. T. 45, p. 652b. "如色空餘陰一切法亦然."

re-presentation of the truth of emptiness(śūnyatā) proclaimed by the prajñāpāramitā(perfection of wisdom) scriptures.[17] The only difference, however, is that emptiness here is dealt with exclusively in relation to form(rūpa). In other words, here in this section, emptiness and form are juxtaposed and throughout the section the mutual "relationship" of these two is highlighted for contemplative observation.

This section is subdivided into four, and the first two subdivisions are divided again into four, thus making up ten altogether. They are as follows:

A. The insight into the True Emptiness:

1) Form is merged into Emptiness.
(會色歸空觀)

(1) Form is not emptiness, because it is Emptiness.
(色不即空 以即空故)

(2) same as above.

(3) same as above.

(4) Form is Emptiness.
(色即是空)

2) Emptiness is understood as form.
(明空即色觀)

---

[17]Cf. Tsung-mi's view on this point in T. 45, p. 687a, ll. 17ff.

[18]Hereafter the text included in Fa-tsang's Hua-yen fa-p'u-t'i-hsin-chang, T. 45, no. 1878 will be used for reference. Because there is no interference from commentaries the text is convenient for through reading and quick reference. The texts included in Ch'eng-kuan's and Tsung-mi's commentaries are mixed with commentary, and thus it is difficult to have a quick glance at the text. For a translation of the text, see Garma C. C. Chang, op. cit., pp. 205ff., which I have consulted but not depended upon because of its highly questionable free translation.

(1) Emptiness is not form, because Emptiness is form.
(空不即色 以空即色故)

(2) same as above.

(3) same as above.

(4) Emptiness is form.
(空即是色)

3) Non-obstruction of Emptiness and form.
(空色無礙觀)

4) Complete dissolution and non-attachment.
(泯絶無寄觀)

In item one, "Form is merged into Emptiness," there occurs three times the seemingly paradoxical statement: "Form is not emptiness, because it is Emptiness."[19] As an explanation for such a perplexity it points out two kinds of emptiness(空), viz., common-sense emptiness or emptiness as a sheer non-existence(斷空) and True Emptiness(眞空).[20] Form is not emptiness as understood on the common-sense level, nor is it a mere non-existence as viewed superficially. Form, from the higher standpoint, is "True Emptiness" itself. It is "merged" into True Emptiness, and is never different from it, because all dharmas of form are ultimately without independent reality or self-nature(nihsvabhāva).[21] Hence, the fourth statement, "Form is [True] Emptiness," comes as an affirming conclusion.

Whereas the first item is a statement made from the standpoint of form,

---

[19] T. 45, p. 652b, ll. 14f. "色不即空 以即空故."

[20] To make this distinction in English translation, I capitalize "E" if used in the latter sense.

[21] Cf. ibid., p. 652c, ll. 25f. "以是色法必不異眞空 以諸色心無性故."

this item two is from that of Emptiness. But both of these together constitute a succint representation of the Prajñāpāramitā Śūnyavādin's two-fold formula, "Form is Emptiness, and Emptiness is form"(rūpaṁ śūnyatā, śūnyataiva rūpaṁ).[22] These two items aim to make this truth more impressive and persuasive through the use of seemingly paradoxical and puzzling statements. Such statements are like a disconsonant note in a piece of music used to surprise and awaken the dormant spirit.

Items one and two, according to the text, are given to help us "to discern common-sense [knowledge] and develop true understanding."[23] The mutual identification of Emptiness and form is hereby logically established. But according to item three, this very understanding or logic will be terminated and experience alone will be encouraged. Item three, "Non-obstruction of Emptiness and form," leads one to the experience of the bodhisattva, in which when he "observes the form, he cannot fail to see Emptiness, and when he observes Emptiness, he cannot fail to see form. And this is called the dharma of one taste which has neither hindrance nor obstruction."[24] This means that the non-obstructive mutual identification of Emptiness and form is affirmed in one's own experience.

In item four, "Complete dissolution and non-attachment," comes the culmination of the realization concerning the interrelationship of

---

[22]Cf. for example, The Śatasāhasrika, para. 118, and The Heart Sutra [Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra] tr. by E. Conze in his Buddhist Wisdom Books (New York: Harper & Row, 1972[2]), p. 81.

[23]T. 45, p. 652c, l. 23. "揀情顯解"

[24]Ibid., ll. 16f. "觀色竟不見空 觀空竟非見空 竟障無礙名為一味法."

Emptiness and form. The dharmadhātu in this aspect is completely beyond empirical conceptualization. It is not confined in the realm of mutuality, for it has nothing to do with the question whether Emptiness is identical with or different from form. It is beyond such a category. According to the text:

> True Emptiness cannot be said to be either identical with or different from form. Nor can [form] be said to be either identical with or different from Emptiness. All dharmas are impossible, and this impossibility is impossible; futhermore, this statement itself is unacceptable. There is only complete dissolution and non-attachment. It is not a thing that can be communicated through words, nor is it a thing that can be reached by understanding. It is the realm of experience.[25]

At this stage words and understanding recoil. All kinds of verbalization or categorization are "completely dissolved," and there can be "no attachment" whatsoever. In conjunction with this tremendous experiential truth there can be nothing but absolute silence. It is so totally transcendent to thought that it is, as the text says, only the "realm of experience," the experience in this context being the direct entering into the "essence of dharma"(法体) through true and clear insight of it.[26]

Next comes the second section in which the Fa-chieh-kuan-men leads

---

[25] Ibid., ll. 18-22. "眞空不可言 即色不即色 亦不可言 即空不即空 一切法 皆不可 不可亦不可 此言亦不受 迴絶無寄 非言所及 非離所到 是為行境."

[26] Here 空觀=正觀=正行. Cf. Jitzugen Kobayashi, "Kegon Kanmon no Tenkai to Kyogaku no Hensen," Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, no. 20 (1964), p. 32.

people to see the dharmadhātu in terms of "shih and li in their interfusion and dissolution, co-existence and annihiliation, adversity and harmony."[27] This is, it says, the theme of this section. As in the first section where the relationship of Emptiness and form was observed, here it is recommended that the aspects of li and shih and their various mutual relationships be discerned. But unlike the former section in which "True Emptiness" was emphasized and established, here in the second section the stress is shifted to the more positive term li, which Ch'eng-kuan later called "wondrous Existence of the Tathatā" (真如之妙有).[28] Here the relationship of li and shih is observed in ten items as follows:

B. The insight into the non-obstruction of li and shih.

1) Li pervades shih.
(理遍於事)

2) Shih pervades li.
(事遍於理)

3) By means of li, shih is established.
(依理成事)

4) Shih is able to reveal li.
(事能顯理)

5) By means of li, shih is destroyed.
(依理奪事)

6) Shih is able to conceal li.
(事能隱理)

---

[27] T. 45, p. 652c, l. 28. "理事錯融存と逆順"

[28] T. 45, p. 676a, l. 14.

7) True li is nothing but shih.
(真理即事)

8) Dharma of shih is nothing but li.
(事法即理)

9) True li is not shih.
(真理非事)

10) Dharma of shih is not li.
(事法非理)

The first two items, "Li pervades shih" and "Shih pervades li," refer to the interfusion or interpenetration of li and shih. But what are meant by li and shih here? The concept of li-shih, especially the concept of li, has been one of the most important ideas in Chinese thought in general.[29] It is necessary, therefore, in this context to see briefly how this concept developed in the history of Chinese thought and how it was incorporated in the Hua-yen system.

The term li in the sense of principle does not occur in the ancient Confucian classics. According to Wing-tsit Chan, li was used in the sense of principle for the first time in the Mo-tzu(墨子).[30] But because the Moist movement soon declined in the fourth century B.C., there was no significant advance in the Moist philosophy. The early development of the concept, therefore, was mostly due to Taoist philosophy.

---

[29]For an extensive study on this topic, see Ch'un-i T'ang(唐君毅), Chung-kuo che-hsueh yüan-lun(中國哲學原論), vol. I, on Yüan-hsing(原性) (Taiwan: 1968).

[30]Neo-Confucianism etc.: Essays by Wing-tsit Chan (Hanover, N. H.: the Oriental Society, 1969), p. 48. He refers to the Mo-tzu, ch. 23, Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an(四部叢刊) edition 6:7b; ch. 3, 1:7a, 1:6b, 9:18a, 9:19b; ch. 42, 10:9b; ch. 43, 10:21b; ch. 44, 11:6b, ch. 45, 11:7a. See also A Concordance Mo Tzu (Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Idex Series, Supplement No. 21).

In the Tao-te-ching, the term li itself does not appear, but in the Chuang-tzu it appears thirty-eight times. Here in the Chuang-tzu, for the first time in Chinese history li was equated with Tao. Moreover, the Principle of Heaven(天理) is contrasted with human affairs (人事), which is "anticipating the sharp contrast of principle[li] and facts in Chinese Buddhism."[31]

Although there were some developments in Hsün-tzu (c. 313-238 B.C.), a Confucianist who is said to have lived immediately after Chuang-tzu, and in some others, the idea of li as the universal principle was most fully discussed by the Neo-Taoist Wang Pi(王弼, A.D. 226-249) and Kuo Hsiang(郭象, d. A.D. 312). Both of them interpreted Tao in terms of li, and for them li was "universal principle," "necessary principle," "principle by which things are as they are," "ultimate principle," etc.[32] However, while Kuo Hsiang advocated the immanent and plural li, Wang Pi upheld the transcendental, absolute li, and it was through Wang Pi that the development of the concept of li took place in Buddhism during the next several centuries.

If Wang Pi was the connecting link between Neo-Taoism and

---

[31] Ibid., p. 49. Chan refers here to ch. 14, Ssu-pu-ts'ung-k'an ed. 5:38a, as the foundation of his argument. It reads: "夫至樂者 法德之以人事 順之以天理 行之以五德 應之以自然." Chan further says, "the book mentions more than once the great li(ta-li, 大理) and that li is common to all things(t'ung-li, 同理). Thus li is not only a principle but a universal one. It 'cannot be seen,' 'cannot be named,' and 'infinite and without limit.' In other words, it is absolute." And for this he refers to ch. 17, 6:11b; and ch. 25, 8:60a.

[32] Cf. ibid., pp. 57ff. and Fung, op. cit., pp. 179ff, and 205ff. In Chinese, "通理," "必然之理," "所以然理," "至理."

Buddhism on the Neo-Taoist side, the Buddhist side of the link was Chih-tun(支遁, 314-366), who is also known as Chih Tao-lin(支道林). According to the Kao-seng-chuan,[33] Chih-tun was very much acquainted with Neo-Taoist philosophy, and came to realize the "extraordinary principle(li)"(非常之理)[34] when he was very young. He had many friends among the famous Neo-Taoists of the age and was a leading personality in the Buddhist-Taoist dialogues.

According to Chih-tun, "li is not mutability and mutability is not li ... the thousand mutabilities and the ten thousand transformations are not outside of li."[35] Li was likewise contrasted with phenomenalized things called pien or "transformation." This li is for him ultimate non-being(至無) or original non-being(本無). For him Wang Pi's concept of transcendental non-being or absolute li was also equated with the Buddhist concepts such as Wisdom(prajñā) or "Thusness"(tathatā).[36] Concerning such a transition of Buddhist ideas of the Absolute in Chih-tun, K. Ch'en says:

---

[33]T. 50, p. 348b, translated in Fung, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 250f. See also Zürcher, op. cit., pp. 116-130, Liebenthal, op. cit., pp. 138ff. For details on Chih-tun's thought and his relation to Wang Pi and Kua Hsiang, see Koshiro Tamaki, Chugoku Bukkyo Shiso no Keisei(The Formation of Chinese Buddhist Thought) (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1971), ch. IV. "Chih-tun and Chinese Thought" pp. 165-258.

[34]This can be also translated as "the principle of impermanence," as in Fung. I followed Chan's translation. See note 32.

[35]Quoted in Seng-yu's Ch'u-san-tsang-chi chi(出三藏記集), T. 55, p. 55b, "理非乎變 變非乎理 ... 千變萬化莫非理外."

[36]For the details on Chih-tun's idea of li, see Chan, op. cit., pp. 61f., P. Demieville, "La pénétration du bouddhisme dans la tradition philosophique chinoise," in Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, 3, I (1956), pp. 19-38, etc.

> It was Chih Tun who was responsible for a change in the meaning of the very important Chinese concept of li. According to Chinese classical thought this li refers to natural order of the universe or reason. Under the influence of Prajñā philosophy Chih Tun invested this term with new metaphysical meaning, and interpreted it as the transcendental absolute principle, a concept unknown to the Chinese until then. In the writing of the Buddhists from the fourth to the tenth centuries, li as the absolute was regularly opposed by shih, mundane events or facts of empirical experience.[37]

In view of the Neo-Taoist concept of li, especially that of Wang Pi, Ch'en's assumption that li as transcendental absolute principle was unknown until Chih-tun can hardly be accepted. But he is right in pointing out that Chih-tun's interpretation of li was the starting-point for the further development of the concept in the various branches of Buddhist philosophy, including Hua-yen.

Chih-tun's disciple Hsi Ch'ao(郗超, 336-377) made the concept of li even clearer. He mentioned, "spiritual li(神理) penetrating everywhere," "true li(真理) never interrupted," and so on.[38] He also said, "although concrete things are displayed in terms of things(shih) and functions (yung), when one ceases to perceive them, li becomes effaced."[39] This line of thought concerning li was further developed by Hui-yüan(慧遠,

---

[37]K. Ch'en, Buddhism in China, op. cit., p. 66.

[38]Kao-seng-chuan, T. 50, p. 349a, ll. 10, 11. "神理所通," "真理不絕." Cf. Chan, op. cit., p. 62.

[39]Hau Ch'ao's article, Feng-fa-yao(奉法要), preserved in Hung-ming-chi(弘明集) T. 52, p. 89a, ll. 23f. "器象雖陳於事用 感絕則理冥." Cf. translation in Zürcher, op. cit., p. 175, and somewhat strange one in Liebenthal, op. cit., p. 142. Liebenthal translates li as "Cosmic Order."

334-416), Seng-chao(僧肇, 384-414), and most notably by Tao-sheng (道生, c. 360-434).[40]

Tao-sheng is especially famous for his theory of "sudden enlightenment"(頓悟). Although the general spiritual tendency in Chinese Buddhist circles of the age was toward sudden enlightenment as against gradual enlightenment(漸悟), Tao-Sheng is credited with having laid special emphasis on it and formulated a theory corresponding to the emphasis. As a consequence, he was called "the Great Master of Sudden Enlightenment," while Seng-chao, Chih-tun, Tao-an, and the rest were called "the Small Masters of Sudden Enlightenment."[41] Furthermore, he was also designated as "Master of a New Theory."[42]

The theoretical basis of sudden enlightenment for Tao-sheng was the truth that li cannot be divided(不可分). For him too, li is non-being(無), mysteriously wonderful(妙), dark and deep(冥), empty(空), and so on,[43] but the indivisibility or non-duality(無二) of li is its most important aspect for him, because he thought that as li is indivisible, so is the realization or attainment of it, or the identification with it.

---

[40]For the concept of li in Hui-yüan and Seng-chao, see Chan, op. cit., pp. 63f. The best study on Tao-sheng is Liebenthal, "A Biography of Tao-sheng," Monumenta Nipponica, 11, 3 (1955), pp. 64-96; "The World Conception of Chu Tao-sheng," ibid., 12, 1-2 (1956), pp. 65-104; 12, 3-4 (1956), pp. 73-100; (1957), pp. 241-268.

[41]Cf. T. 45, p. 121c. "大頓悟師" and "小頓悟師."

[42]Hsieh Ling-yun(謝靈運, 385-433), in Pien-tsung-lun(辨宗論) contained in the Kuang-hung-ming-chi(廣弘明集) T. 52, p. 225b. "新論者士."

[43]Cf. Liebenthal, "Tao-sheng," op. cit., pp. 74, 76, 86, 95, 92, 100, etc.

"The li of true reality is originally immutable."[44] "True li is Self-so(自然)."[45] "If one goes astray from such a li and is deluded, there will necessarily be the myriad differentiations. On the other hand, if enlightened, li is [understood as] non-dual, and the way of the Tathāgata unique."[46] "When one enters li, words cease."[47] This state of enlightenment is complete and needs no supplement. If it is attained, it is in toto, and not in a piecemeal fashion.

The concepts of li and shih in the Fa-chieh-kuan-men stand in this line of tradition. Here in this work, li is also used to denote something fundamental that has "no differentiation or limitation"(無分限), whereas shih is understood as something which has "boundaries and differentiation."(分位差別). Li is "indivisible"(不可分), but shih is "an individual and particular thing, fact, or event"(一一事).

Li, as seen above, is usually translated as "principle" or "order," and shih as "facts" or "events."[48] But in the case of Hua-yen philosophy, "noumenon" for li and "phenomenon" for shih might be better translations.[49] In their wider senses, li is the unique universal

---

[44]Quoted in Ta-nieh-p'an-ching-chi-chieh(大涅槃經集解), T. 37, p. 395c, "真實之理 本無變也."

[45]Ibid., p. 377b. "夫真理自然."

[46]Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching-shu(妙法蓮華經疏), quoted in Liebenthal, op. cit., pp. 76, 93. "衆理為惑 惑必萬殊 反而悟理 理必無二 如來道一."

[47]The Kao-seng-chuan, T. 45, p. 366c. "入理則言息."

[48]Cf. Wing-tsit Chan, A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy, op. cit., pp. 260, 320, 408, et passim; Fung, op. cit., II, pp. 32, 341, 444, etc.

[49]These translations are used in Fung, op. cit., pp. 341ff.

noumenon underlying all the particular phenomena appearing in the universe, shih being those particular phenomena. The terms noumenon and phenomenon, however, should not be understood here in the Kantian sense, because for Kant the dichotomy of noumenon and phenomenon is primarily to distinguish the unknowable(a thing-in-itself) from the knowable(appearance).[50] Whereas Hua-yen idea of li and shih is meant, as will be seen below, to refer to the relationship between the universal, undivided, and undifferentiated aspect of reality and the particular, individual, and differentiated aspect of it, the Kantian dichotomy is to emphasize the difference between the noumenon as object or event independent of our cognitive faculty and the phenomenon as object or event appearing to our experience. To avoid the possible confusion resulting from the use of such meaning-loaded terms as noumenon and phenomenon and to give a measure of interpretative freedom to the readers, we will use, in most cases, the transliterations, li and shih.

According to the first two items of the second section of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, li and shih "pervade" each other. In essence, they are not two different entities but should be seen as nothing but two aspects of one reality, which is the inexpressible dharmadhātu. "This limited shih," the text says, "becomes perfectly identical, not partially, with this undivided, unlimited li, because shih, without essence of its own, should return to li."[51]

---

[50]Cf. Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, tr. by Norman Kemp Smith (New York: St. Matin's Press, 1965), pp. 257ff.

[51]T. 45, p. 653a, ll. 5f. "此觀之事於無限之理 全同非分同 何以故 以事無体還如理故."

This relationship of li and shih, i.e., their interfusion and mutual identification, "transcends common-sense understanding and views, and cannot find a suitable metaphor in this world."[52] But as a closest metaphor of it the relation between ocean and wave is given as follows:

> It is somewhat like the fact that the ocean is present in one wave and yet it does not become dwarfed; one small wave is present in the great ocean, and yet it does not become expanded. The ocean is present in all waves simultaneously, and yet it does not become different; all waves are present in the ocean simultaneously, and yet they do not become same. When the ocean is present in one wave nothing hinders its essence from pervading all the other waves; when one wave is present in the ocean all the other waves are also present and there are no obstacles among them.[53]

By item three, "By means of li, shih is established," it is meant that "shih has no other essence [than li], and thus it can be established only by virtue of true li."[54] As the waves are possible only with water, so is shih possible only in connection with li. It is interesting to note that the author here introduces the idea of tathāgatagarbha(the matrix or womb of the Tathāgata) when he says that because of it all the dharmas come into existence.[55] It seems that in this context the tathāgatagarbha is equated with li, in that both of them are described as the producer of all the phenomenal dharmas in the universe.

---

[52] Ibid., l. 8. "超情離見非世喻能況."

[53] Ibid., ll. 8-13. "如全大海在一波中而海非小如一小波在於大海而波非大同時全遍於諸波而海非異 假時各在於大海而波非一 大海全遍一波時不妨舉体全遍於諸波 一波全遍大海時諸波亦各在不相妨礙."

[54] Ibid., p. 653b, ll. 16f. "事無別体 要由真理而得成立."

[55] Ibid., ll. 18f. "依如來藏 得有諸法."

In item four, "Shih is able to reveal li," it is said that even though shih is not real in the final analysis, because of this very unreality, the reality of li prevailing in all shihs is vividly manifested. The waves are unreal in the ultimate sense, but because of them the essence of water or "waterness" is revealed.[56]

Item five, "By means of li, shih is destroyed," shows that "apart from the true li, not a single piece of shih is possible," because the only universal reality is "the unique true li."[57] In this sense, li has power to deprive shih of its existence as particularity or individuality as well as to establish it.

Item six, "Shih is able to conceal li," means that although li establishes the various phenomenal things, because of these manifest phenomena li is considered as hidden. In this sense shih is concealing li. The waves in the ocean, which cause the aspect of motion to be predominantly manifest, conceal the original calmness of the water.[58]

Items seven and eight, "True li is nothing but shih," and "Dharma of shih is nothing but li," once again articulate the mutual identification of li and shih, this time on the basis of the truths of dependent origination(pratītyasamutpāda) and no-self(anātman). Because all the shihs are dependent in origination, and thus have no self-nature or substance, they are in the ultimate sense nothing but the manifestations

---

[56] Ibid., ll. 19ff.

[57] Ibid., ll. 23ff.

[58] Ibid., ll. 26ff.

of the true li.[59]

But in items nine and ten, "True li is not shih;" "Dharma of shih is not li," there is issued the final warning against the danger of superficially taking phenomenal things as true li. It is said that provisional distinction should be made between "the true(真) and the illusory(幻), the real(實) and the unreal(虛), that which is depended upon(所依) and that which is dependent(能依)," [60] and so on. Of course, in the final analysis li and shih are interfusing and identical in the sense that li is the unique underlying principle of shih and shih is ultimately merged to its origin li, but their separate identities should be retained. "The waves are not always water, for motion [of waves] is not identical with the wetness [of water]." [61]

The concise and systematic nature of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men and its peculiar way of grasping the truth of dharmadhātu in terms of the relationship between Emptiness and form and between li and shih are by now obvious. Nevertheless, the true uniqueness of this treatise is not yet so clear. The first section, as we have seen, was basically an invitation to the Mādhyamika truth of emptiness(śūnyatā) and the second was a recapitulation of the truth concerning the relationship between the absolute and the phenomenal which was not remarkably different from the basic teaching of the Yogācāra or the tathāgatagarbha

---

[59] Ibid., 1. 29-c, ll. 1-6.

[60] Ibid., c, l. 6.

[61] Ibid., ll. 11f. "波恒非水 以動義非濕故."

(the matrix of the Tathāgata) theory. But the third section which developed from the two foregoing truths is completely different from any other Buddhist system and herein lies the unique contribution of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men. The principles expressed in this section, which Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi regarded as the seedbed of "non-obstruction of shih and shih"(shih-shih wu-ai),[62] exerted a tremendous influence upon subsequent patriarchs in their building of the system of Hua-yen philosophy, as will be discussed later.

This section, according to the text, is about the realization of the truth that "shih, being identified with li, is interfusing, pervading, including, and inter-permeating without any obstruction."[63] This indicates that shih, the phenomenal aspect, is upheld here with special significance. Shih, having been identified with li, is now considered in turn as complete in itself and becomes a starting-point from which the observation about things proceeds. Every item in this section is, therefore, presented from the standpoint of shih. The main interest here is shifted from the relationship between noumenon and phenomenon to that between one phenomenon and the other phenomena.

The outline of this section is as follows:

C. The insight into the all-pervading and all-embracing [shih].

1) Shih is identified with li.
(事如理)

---

[62] T. 45, pp. 672c, l. 22 and 680a, ll. 24f.; and pp. 684c, l. 24 and 689c, l. 24.

[63] Ibid., p. 653c, ll. 16f. "事如理 融通攝無礙交參自在."

2) Li is identified with shih.
(理如事)

3) Shih embraces both li and shih without obstruction.
(事含理事无碍)

4) Non-obstruction of the universal and the particular.
(通局无碍)

5) Non-obstruction of the broad and the narrow.
(广狭无碍)

6) Non-obstruction of the all-pervading and all-embracing.
(编容无碍)

7) Non-obstruction of the including and the entering.
(摄入无碍)

8) Non-obstruction of interrelation.
(交涉无碍)

9) Non-obstruction of the mutual existence.
(相在无碍)

10) Non-obstruction of universal interpenetration.
(普融无碍)

Items one, "Shih is identified with li," and two, "Li is identified with shih," are the restatement of the identification of shih and li which has been established in the second section. These are given here again as a step leading to the truth about the shih and its relation to all the other shihs which is to be set forth in the following eight items.[64]

The basic truth about shih starts with item three, "Shih embraces both li and shih without obstruction." Here it is said that "all the shihs and li are not one, and thus each shih preserves its particularity,

---

[64]Cf. Ch'eng-kuan's commentary, T. 45, p. 680b, ll. 13-16.

and yet it can embrace all."[65] This is a really remarkable "leap" in the meditative process. Up to now shih has been seen as embracing li or shih only because it is in the ultimate sense reduced into li. In other words, shih has to first lose its identity by being melted into the all-embracing universal li in order to be considered as embracing anything. The particular should become the universal if it is to embrace the universal in itself. But now it is said that shih even in its individuality is able to embrace everything. This means that once shih is identified with li, shih itself is now li, and shih as it is now is the absolute reality. Shih is "endowed with" the quality of li and with this quality it should be regarded as li at the same time. A thing as it is now is absolute. This is a way of seeing things from the standpoint of shih, and it is because of this that one can say, "shih embrace both li and shih."

Here we see, in fact, the climax of the mystical insight into the dharmadhātu, in which one can experience the realization of the truth that each phenomenal thing embraces the whole universe "just as one particle of dust, even though its form is not expanded, can embrace the boundless dharmadhātu."[66] This is what is described in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra as Sudhana's final experience realized after his long pilgrimage in search of truth.[67] The Fa-chieh-kuan-men formulates four principles

---

[65] T. 45, p. 653c, ll. 24f. "諸事法與理非一故有事一事而能廣容."

[66] Ibid., ll. 25f. "如一微塵其相不大而能容攝無量法界."

[67] Cf. the Hua-yen-ching, T. 10, p. 840a. See also Chapter II. B. 1, b, on Sudhana's experience.

of interrelationship realized in this direct intuitive vision as follows:

One in one;
One in all;
All in one;
All in all.[68]

In items from four to ten, the non-obstructive interrelationship of shih and shih is contemplated from different perspectives. Item four, "Non-obstruction of the universal and the particular," shows that shih is seen as both universal and particular at the same time, not as either one or the other. There can be no hindrance or obstacle for shih to be both the universal and the particular. It is said that a phenomenal thing does not leave one place, and yet pervades all the particles of dust in the ten directions. It is beyond the limitations of locality such as nearness and farness, being everywhere and being in one place.[69]

The interpenetration and universal permeation of the phenomenal is described in terms of their broadness and narrowness in item five, "Non-obstruction of broadness and narrowness." It is said that one particle of dust, without being impaired, can broadly embrace all the universes. "The shih of one speck of dust is beyond the hindrance or obstruction of being both broad and narrow, vast and small."[70]

Item six, "Non-obstruction of the all-pervading and the all-

---

[68] T. 45, p. 653c, ll. 28f. "一中一, 一切中一, 一中一切, 一切中一切."

[69] Ibid., p. 654a, ll. 2-5.

[70] Ibid., ll. 8f. "一塵之事 即廣即狹 即大即小 無障無礙."

embracing" is the synthesis of the previous two items, which emphasized the pervading aspect(遍) and the embracing aspect(容) of shih, respectively. It is shown here that these two principles are simultaneously working in this dimension of dharmadhātu. It is said: "While this one particle of dust pervades the others, the others at the same time pervade it. It can both embrace and enter simultaneously and pervade and include with no obstruction."[71] As the title of this item indicates,[72] this reveals the central idea of this section, and the following items are only the different schematization of this insight.

Items seven, "Non-obstruction of including and entering," eight, "Non-obstruction of interrelation," and nine, "Non-obstruction of mutual existence," are elaborations of the above insight in terms of mutual inclusion(攝) and penetration(入) or entering. In item seven it is said that "entering the others is including the others... including the others is entering the others."[73] In other words, to include the others is to be included by the others at the same time. In this extraordinary relationship there is no distinction or "obstruction" between entering and including. In the penetrating insight all are seen as "mutually co-existent" in a mystical way. This non-obstructive relationship is expressed in the text in a pair of four-fold principles as follows:

---

[71] Ibid., ll. 13f. "此一塵自遍時即他遍自 能容能入同時遍攝無礙."

[72] Cf. 周遍含容 and 遍容無礙

[73] Ibid., ll. 15 and 17. "入他即是攝他 ... 攝他即是入他."

One includes all and enters all;
All includes one and enters one;
One includes one dharma and enters one dharma;
All includes all and enters all.[74]

Including one while entering one;
Including all while entering one;
Including one while entering all;
Including all while entering all.[75]

Item ten, "Non-obstruction of universal interfusion," is the general conclusion of the section saying once again that "all and one are universally simultaneous... universally interfusing without any obstruction."[76]

The third insight, i.e., insight into "the all-pervading and all-embracing" shih, is likewise the insight into the interrelationship of the phenomenal things which has been symbolized as "embracing," "pervading," "including," "permeating," "penetrating," "co-existing," and the like. In such a relationship, it is said, there is no impediment or hindrance whatsoever, because every and each phenomenal thing like a speck of dust is endowed with and possessed of all the qualities such as universality and particularity, broadness and narrowness, vastness and smallness, and so on.

Thus far the basic doctrine of the dharmadhātu as presented in the Fa-chieh-kuan-men has been analysed. To sum up, the dharmadhātu here is seen as an object of meditative insight. "Entering into the

---

[74] Ibid., ll. 20-22. "一攝一切一入一切，一切攝一一切入，一攝一法一入一法，一切攝一切一切入一切."

[75] Ibid., ll. 23f. "攝一入一，攝一切入一，攝一入一切，攝一切入一切."

[76] Ibid., ll. 25 and 26f. "一切皆一皆皆同時... 皆融無礙."

dharmadhātu," according to this text, is seeing it in terms of three sets of interrelationship: emptiness and form, li and shih, and shih and shih. This specific doctrine of the relatedness of things in the dharmadhātu is the foundation upon which the later structure of the doctrine came to be built. We now turn to Chih-yen, the second patriarch and formulator of the Hua-yen doctrine of the dharmadhātu.

II. THE FORMULATION OF THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE BY CHIH-YEN

The basic doctrine of dharmadhātu as presented in Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men was handed down to his disciple, Chih-yen, the second patriarch of the Hua-yen school. Chih-yen, in turn, developed and neatly formulated it in his work, Hua-yen I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men(華嚴一乘十玄門, The Ten Mysteries of the One Vehicle of the Hua-yen).[1]

According to the title page of this little treatise, it was "written by Chih-yen inheriting what had been taught by Tu-shun." It is difficult to determine to what extent Chih-yen depended on his master's teaching in writing this text. However, as will be clear later, what is certain is that whereas the basic ideas of this work are from Tu-shun, as far as its creative reorganization and neat formulation are concerned it should be credited to Chih-yen.[2]

In this text, Chih-yen, like his master, tries to see the dharmadhātu in terms of interrelationship of its components. He argues that the truth of dharmadhātu is realized by grasping the principle of "the dependent origination of dharmadhātu," which is to him none other than the truth of infinite interrelatedness of dharmas. According to him,

---

[1] T. 45, no. 1868, pp. 514a-518b.

[2] Cf. Takamine, op. cit., pp. 158 and 162.

the aim of this important work is, in fact, to elucidate this fundamental Hua-yen truth.[3]

Chih-yen, for this aim, formulates ten principles which he believes can show the complete and inexhaustible interrelationships governing all the dharmas in the dharmadhātu. He calls them "ten mysteries"(十玄),[4] which Fa-tsang later considers as the core of Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine and more specifically calls the "ten-fold mysterious dependent origination"(十玄緣起).[5] These "ten mysteries" are, as both Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi rightly pointed out,[6] traceable to the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, especially to the third section which deals with the ten principles related to the "all-pervading and all-embracing" quality of phenomena.

---

[3]T. 45, p. 514a.

[4]The term "mysteries" here is a translation of hsüan(玄), which means mystery, profundity, deep truth, subtleness, darkness, and the like. This was the key word used in the writings of Hua-yen philosophers, such as Chih-yen's Sou-hsüan-chi, Fa-tsang's T'an-hsüan-chi, and Ch'eng-kuan's Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching. As is well-known, the idea of hsüan is originally found in Taoist philosophy. The first chapter of Lao-tzu's Tao-te-ching, for example, contains a phrase, "the mystery of mysteries"(玄之又玄). Cf. Wing-tsit Chan, The Way of Lao-tzu (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1963), p. 97. The translation, "mystery of mysteries" is found in Fung, A History of Chinese Philosophy, op. cit., vol. I. p. 178. Chan avoids the word "mystery" as associated with "irrationality." But "mystery" in the true sense of the word is not something irrational or occult but supra-rational and beyond logical or empirical conceptualization. Cf. Rudolf Otto, Mysticism, East and West (New York: 1932, 1962), p. 159, and William James, The Varieties of Religious Experience (London: 1912), pp. 379ff. For the Hua-yen usage of the term hsüan, see, for example, T. 35, p. 503a, T. 36, p. 8a, etc.

[5]See the next chapter.

[6]T. 45, p. 683a, ll. 11f., and T. 45, p. 692b, l. 4. Cf. also T. 35, p. 515a and HTC. 8, 268d. "圓通含容即事無礙 且依古德顯十玄門."

Needless to say, the "ten mysteries" do not exactly correspond with the ten principles listed in the third section of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men.[7] But what is significant is that both of these point to one and the same truth that all dharmas are infinitely interrelated and that by penetrating into this interrelatedness one can see the dharmadhātu.

Before going into a detailed discussion of these ten mysteries, Chih-yen classifies dharmas. According to him, all the dharmas in the universe are divided into "ten" categories. They are: 1) teaching and meaning(教義); 2) li and shih(理事); 3) understanding and practice(解行); 4) cause and effect(因果); 5) men and dharmas(人法); 6) divisions of realms and stages(分齊境位);[8] 7) dharma and wisdom, teacher and disciple(法智師弟); 8) the primary(chief) and the secondary(attendants), sentient beings and the environmental world(主伴依正);[9] 9) the contrary and the conforming, essence and function(逆順体用); and 10) response

---

[7]Cf. T. 45, p. 638a, ll. 3ff. Here Ch'eng-kuan tries to match each of ten mysteries with each of ten principles found in the third "insight" of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men as many as possible. He says, for example, the first mystery is essentially identical with the tenth principle, the second with the ninth, the third with the eighth, the fourth with the third, and so on. It should be noted, however, that he himself admits that the lists do not correspond to each other exactly one by one.

[8]境 here means the object of wisdom(智), 位 is the stage reached by practice(行). So later in Fa-tsang the combinations 境智 and 行位 are used.

[9]Originally "i-cheng"(依正) means the two forms of karma-result: 正報 and 依報. The former means sentient beings(有情世間, sattva-loka) and the latter the environmental worlds(器世間, bhājana-loka). But here such an original meaning is not clearly seen, because it is said that "if one is taken as the chief or primary(主), then the others become the attendants(伴). The chief becomes cheng(正) and the attendants become i(依). T. 45, p. 515c, ll. 18f. Therefore, at least in this context it may be reasonably translated as "chief and dependent" with correspondence to the former phrase "the primary and the secondary"(主伴).

and stimulus(隨生根欲性).[10]

At first glance this classification of the dharmas of the universe seems somewhat absurd or at best unreasonable. It is not clearly seen what these ten categories exactly mean. But what is to be noted here is that this classification does not seem to intend to enumerate all dharmas one by one but simply to show that the myriad things in the infinite universe can be classified in terms of these items, and more specifically and importantly by the number "ten."[11] When viewed in the whole context, it becomes clear that the importance of this list lies not so much in these concrete items themselves as on the number "ten" in terms of which they are arranged.[12] Ten, as mentioned before, is a symbol of infinity.

These "ten" categories of dharmas, namely, "all" dharmas, according to Chih-yen, are infinitely interrelated. Such a holistic view of interrelationship of all things he expresses in terms of ten mysteries, which as presented in the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men are as

---

[10]This tenth item is not clear to me. I follow Fa-tsang's interpretation. Fa-tsang first in the Wu-chiao-chang slightly modified this into "隨其根欲示現" but later in the T'an-hsüan-chi replaced it with "應感"(reponse and stimulus). Cf. T. 45, p. 505a, l. 7, and T. 35, p. 123b, ll. 6ff. Ch'eng-kuan followed the latter interpretation. T. 45, p. 672c, ll. 16ff.

[11]Cf. T. 45, p. 515c.

[12]Fa-tsang's opinion on the same subject is found in T. 45, p. 504c, l. 24.

follows:[13]

1) Simultaneous completion and mutual correspondence.
(同時具足相應門)

2) The realm of Indra's net.
(因陀羅網境界門)

3) The secret of simultaneous establishment of the hidden and the manifested.
(秘密隱顯俱成門)

4) The mutual inclusion and peaceful co-existence of the subtle and minute.
(微細相容安立門)

5) The distinct formation of separate dharmas of the ten times.
(十世隔法異成門)

6) The complete compatibility of the simple and the mixed in all dharmas.
(諸藏純雜具德門)

7) The mutual inclusion of one and many, and their differences.
(一多相容不同門)

8) The sovereignty of mutual identification of all dharmas.
(諸法相即自在門)

9) The excellent formation through the transformation of the Mind-only.
(唯心回轉善成門)

10) Fostering understanding by revealing dharmas through shih.
(託事顯法生解門)

The first mystery, "Simultaneous completion and mutual corres-

---

[13]These items are later elaborated by Fa-tsang et al. with slight changes. Some of Fa-tsang's lists have been translated into English. For various English translations of these phrases, see such works as Takakusu, op. cit., pp. 120f., Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed., op. cit., pp. 331ff., F. H. Cook, op. cit., 496ff., Garma C. C. Chang, op. cit., pp. 140, 155ff., 229ff., Wing-tsit Chan, op. cit., pp. 411ff., and Yu-lan Fung, op. cit., pp. 349ff.

pondence," shows the basic principle of interrelationship which covers all the subsequent nine mysteries. As a matter of fact, all of these ten mysteries are no more than ten different ways of expressing one and the same basic truth of interrelatedness of things.[14] According to the text, this first mystery, and accordingly the nine other mysteries, were realized by means of "the ocean-like samādhi"(sāgara-mudrā-samādhi),[15] the samādhi in which the Buddha was immersed when he delivered the truth of the Avataṁsaka. This seems to imply that these "mysteries" are ultimately based upon supra-rational vision which can only be attained by the practice of mystical insight. This may be also an allusion to Chih-yen's belief that the truth of the Avataṁsaka, namely, that of the dharmadhātu and these "ten mysteries" are in essence one and the same truth that can be realized through such a deep insight.

This first mystery is mainly devoted to argument for the simultaneity of "cause and effect," which later becomes one of the typical Hua-yen beliefs. But it does not fail to assert that not only cause and effect but also all the other pairs of dharmas listed above are also "simultaneously complete and mutually corresponding."[16] It is said here that because the myriad things in the universe are freely interrelated with each other by penetrating into each other, each and every object in

---

[14]Cf. T. 45, pp. 517a, ll. 4ff., 517c, ll. 1ff. et passim.

[15]See above p. 37.

[16]T. 45, p. 516a, ll. 28ff.

this dharmadhātu includes simultaneously all the qualities of all the other objects within itself. Consequently, any given object can be simultaneously cause and effect, big and small, manifested and hidden, and one and many.

This basic principle of simultaneous compatibility and completion of all the qualities of all dharmas in a given dharma is illustrated in the second mystery, "The realm of Indra's net." This is a metaphor used in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra and often quoted by the Hua-yen thinkers as the best illustration of the mystery of the infinite interrelationships of the infinite things in the universe.

According to the metaphor, far above in the heaven of the great god Indra, there is a net which is infinite in size. This net is made of an infinite number of glittering crystal jewels, each decorating each of its eyes. The net is so ingeniously stretched that each and every one of these brilliant jewels reflects every other jewel in its shining surface. Moreover, it reflects all the multiple reflections reflected in each of those other jewels. In addition, it also reflects itself which is reflected in and at the same time reflecting all the other jewels. Hence, reflections of reflections of reflections ad infinitum are established.[17] This is, in other words, the infinite interrelatedness of

---

[17]The text describes this as "重重現影成其無盡復無盡也 ." Ibid., p. 516b, l. 12. This was also demonstrated by Fa-tsang when he put ten huge mirrors, each at the eight compass points as well as the ceiling and floor with an image of the Buddha illuminated by a torch in the centre of the room. Cf. Chang, op. cit., pp. 22ff.

the infinite things.

To support this truth, Chih-yen quotes the Avataṁsaka-sūtra as follows: "In every single particle of dust, millions(nayutas) of countless millions(kotis) of Buddhas are shown preaching the Dharma.... In every single particle of dust, there are manifest countless Buddha-lands, Mt. Sumeru, the Diamond Enclosing Mountains....[18] In one single particle of dust three evil destinations [hell, hungry ghosts, beasts], gods, men, and Asuras....[19] Just as in a single particle of dust appear [all these], so do they in all the particles of dust. Hence, in a particle appear the Buddha-lands, and in the Buddha-land the particles."[20] "Therefore," he concludes, "this establishes infinity upon infinity, and this is the dependent origination of dharmadhātu."[21]

Having established the basic truth that any given dharma is endowed with all the qualities of all the other dharmas completely and simultaneously in the first mystery and having illustrated this truth by means of the metaphor of Indra's net, Chih-yen now tries to show the truth in different terms. In fact, as Ch'eng-kuan suggested later, this basic truth corresponds to the concluding item of the third section of

---

[18]These mountains are "enclosing" or "encircling"(圍) because they were believed to encircle the earth.

[19]The six gatis in Sanskrit: naraka-gati, preta-g., tiryagyoni-g., asura-g., manuṣya-g., and deva-g.

[20]T. 45, p. 516b, ll. 13ff. "於一微塵中各示那由他無量無邊佛於中而說法…於一微塵中現無量佛國須彌金剛圍…於一微塵中現有三惡道天人阿修羅…如一微塵所示現一切微塵亦是故於微塵現國土國土微塵復示現."

[21]Ibid., l. 20. "所以成其無盡復無盡."

Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, viz., the truth of universal and simultaneous interfusion.[22] It seems that here in I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men, the fundamental principle comes first as the basis for the subsequent mysteries.

The third mystery, "The secret of simultaneous establishment of the hidden and the manifest," is the one which shows the truth of interrelationship in term of the hiddenness and the manifestedness. According to Chih-yen, these two contrasting qualities are by no means mutually exclusive but rather inclusive. Any given dharma is seen as both hidden and manifest at the same time. The half moon is given here as an analogy: the fullness and halfness, the hiddenness and manifestedness can all simultaneously be affirmed in one and the same moon.[23] Another interesting analogy is the number "ten." When the number one is counted and thus manifested, the numbers two, three and up to ten are hidden, but when the number two in turn is counted, the numbers one, three and up to ten are hidden.[24] The qualities of hiddenness and manifestedness, in this way, are simultaneously present in a given object, although according to the point of view only one aspect is perceived.[25]

---

[22]See above p.

[23]T. 45, p. 516c, ll. 11f.

[24]Ibid., ll. 17f.

[25]This rather puzzling proposition is made clearer in Fa-tsang's example given in his Essay on the Golden Lion. In this metaphor of the "golden lion," it is said, if we contemplate the lion as lion, there appears only the lion and no gold. This means, according to him, that the lion is manifested while the gold is hidden. If we contemplate the gold, the opposite becomes true. And if we contemplate the gold and the lion, both are hidden and manifested simultaneously. Cf. T. 45, p. 665bc. The

The fourth mystery, "The mutual inclusion and peaceful co-existence of the subtle and minute," is a restatement of mutual inclusion and identification in terms of the contrasting concepts of the immense and the minute. Any given dharma is related with all the other dharmas and endowed with all the qualities of them, and thus it is both small and great simultaneously and completely. Here it is said that the minute form like a small particle of dust and the great form like the countless Buddha-lands, Mt. Sumeru, Mt. Diamond, and so on are mutually embracing and peacefully co-existing without any obstruction or impediment.[26]

The above mentioned ten categories of dharmas, namely, all things, are likewise all mutually inclusive regardless of their minuteness or immensity. The large and the many are inclusive in the small and the one without suffering any harm or uneasiness. To put it otherwise, minuteness and immensity are present in one and the same thing at the same time.

---

translation is found in W. -t. Chan, op. cit., pp. 411f. This principle is further elaborated in Fa-tsang's Hua-yen Fa-p'u-t'i-hsin-chang(發菩提心章, Essay on the Awakening of the Bodhicitta) in terms of the relation between li and shih. Another common and more easily comprehensible example for this truth is given in Cook's translation: "...a single person who may be said to have various names in relation to others of his family. To his parents, he is a son, to his wife a husband, to his own children a father, to his older brother a younger brother, and to his younger brother an older brother. He is all these at the same time, but if we consider only his relationship to his parents, he is only a son. In this case, his qualifications as a son are manifested, while his qualifications as father, husband, etc., are, in this circumstance, unmanifested, or hidden. In any case, it is only one person we are looking at." Cook, op. cit., p. 517.

[26] T. 45, p. 516c, ll. 21-23.

The fifth mystery, "The distinct formation of separate dharmas of the ten times," deals with the mutual inclusion of the "ten times." Each of the three times, past, present, and future has its own past, present, and future -- thus making nine times. These nine times, which exist in a single thought-instant(一念, ksana), make altogether one unit of time -- thus forming the "ten times."

Chih-yen argues that just as five fingers do not lose their individuality in the fist, so the three times or the ten times, although they are in a relationship of "mutual identification"(相即) and "interpenetration"(相入), do not lose their distinctiveness. Thus these ten times, past, present, and future eons(劫, kalpas), long and short eons, and the like, still keeping their identity, mutually include and identify themselves with each other. But in the final analysis, because of the very principle of mutual identification and interpenetration on the ultimate level, all these distinct times and "inexhaustible and incalculable eons are dissolved into a single thought-instant which is neither long nor short."[27]

By the sixth mystery, "The complete compatibility of the simple and the mixed in all dharmas," it is meant that if any given dharma is seen as identical with all others, it is "simple," or "pure"(純), whereas if it is seen as containing all other things in itself, it is "mixed," or "impure"(雜).[28] It is said that "from the beginning to the end there is

---

[27] Ibid., p. 517a, ll. 9f. "無盡無数劫能作一念頃非長非短."

[28] Because the English terms "pure" and "impure" have moral implications which are not desired in this context, the terms "simple" and "mixed" were chosen here for Chinese words, 純 and 雜.

nothing but one single thought-instant, so it is called 'simple.' As a single thought-instant contains the myriad practices, it is called 'mixed.'"[29] Every dharma has these two aspects simultaneously, but because there is no mutual hindrance or obstruction whatsoever between them it is called "complete compatibility." To take the number "one" as an example, "when 'one' is included in nine or ten, and nine or ten and so on are all identical with one, it is called 'simple.' But when 'one' is regarded as possessing nine, ten, etc. in itself , it is also called 'mixed.'"[30] In other words, all dharmas are considered as both simple and mixed at the same time and there is perfect compatibility between these two qualities.

In the seventh mystery, "The mutual inclusion of one and many and their difference," the emphasis is shifted to the identity and difference of "one and many." It is said that one penetrates into many and many into one: hence it is called "mutual inclusion." In essence there is no priority or subsequence, but the characteristics of one and many are not lost: hence "difference."[31] Quoting from the Avataṃsaka-sūtra, Chih-yen elucidates this truth: "One Buddha-land fills up [the others in] the ten directions; [those in] the ten directions enter the one without omission. The intrinsic form of the universe, however, is not

---

[29] Ibid., ll. 28f. "從始至終不出一念即名為純而此一念中具於萬行即名為雜."

[30] Ibid., p. 517b, ll. 9ff. "一攝於九十而九十等皆是一是故為純而一內即九十等是故復名雜."

[31] Cf. ibid., ll. 16ff.

destroyed.... The bodies of all sentient beings are included in the body of any one sentient being and the body of any one sentient being is included in the bodies of all other sentient beings.... All the universes are made to be included in one particle of dust; yet there is no crowding, nor is there confusion in the universe. Even Mt. Sumeru is included in one mustard seed."[32]

Next comes the eighth mystery, "The sovereignty of mutual identification of all dharmas." As far as length is concerned, this seems central, for it occupies nearly one third of the space devoted to the whole ten mysteries. In fact, as the title itself indicates, it contains the clearest statement of the two central concepts of "mutual identification"(相即) and "mutual inclusion or interpenetration"(相入). It is said that even though this seems similar to the truth expressed in the second and fourth mysteries, i.e., "the realm of Indra's net" and "the mutual inclusion and peaceful co-existence of the subtle and minute," in the present case the emphasis is laid on "mutual identification and interpenetration."[33]

Moreover, the truth of this mystery is seen here as applicable to practical matters such as faith and the attainment of the Buddhahood. It is most clearly seen here that the philosophy of mutual identification

---

[32] Ibid., ll. 19ff. "以一佛土滿十方 十方入一無餘 世界本相亦不壞.... 一切衆生身入一衆生身 一衆生身入一切衆生身.... 一切諸世界合入一塵中世界不積聚 亦復不離亂 復彌入舍子."

[33] Ibid., p. 517c, ll. 5f.

and interpenetration is not merely a pale scholastic speculation, but has strong practical, religious implications.[34] According to the text, because prior and subsequent, and cause and effect, are mutually identical and inclusive, it becomes possible that, as proclaimed in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, "when one first awakens the aspiration for enlightenment he has already attained it."[35] Further quoting from the sūtra it says that in the realm of mutual identification and interfusion beginning and end, one and all are the same; hence if the beginning is obtained, the end is obtained; if one is obtained, all are simultaneously obtained. Therefore, the moment we attain the first stage in our progress to enlightenment, we have already attained all the other stages. Among the fifty-two stages of ten faiths, ten dwellings, ten practices, ten transfers, ten stages, round and subtle enlightenments, if the first stage of faith is perfected all the others are perfected at the same time, because "any one stage includes all the qualities of all the stages."[36]

In this case, a question naturally arises: If the beginning includes the subsequent, then the first stage is sufficient; and what is the necessity of all the further stages? Chih-yen answers that without the remainder the first is impossible. It is just like the number "one" which is impossible without the other numbers, in the sense that one is

---

[34]The practical or religious meaning of Hua-yen philosophy will be dealt with in detail in a separate chapter.

[35]Cf. ibid., ll. 10f.

[36]Ibid., l. 24. "一地普攝一切諸地功德"

one only in relation to the other numbers. Only by presupposing the existence of other numbers does "one" become meaningful. The same is true of all the other numbers. It is said that one tenth of a bushel is meaningless if there is no bushel. And again it is also true that without one tenth of a bushel the bushel too is impossible. Therefore, the number one is both a cause and a result, in the sense that it makes other numbers possible and at the same time is itself made possible by other numbers. Likewise, even though in the first stage of rousing the aspiration for enlightenment one becomes a Buddha, this does not mean that the other stages are nullified. It is true that "in a single thought-instant one attains Buddhahood"(一念成佛), but this is not to say that he has no further to go. "Water in the rivers and streams is also real water, but it is not yet the same as water in the great ocean."[37]

The next two mysteries touch upon the fundamental bases of the infinite interrelationships of dharmas. In the ninth mystery, "The excellent formation through the transformation of the citta-mātra(Mind-only)," it is explained on the basis of cittamātra and tathāgatagarbha (matrix of the Tathāgata). It is significant that citta(Mind) and tathāgatagarbha are understood here as the same, and each is considered as the ground for the truths presented here.

According to Chih-yen, all dharmas are established by the Tathāgatagarbha, the True Mind or One Mind.[38] As said in the sūtra,

---

[37] Ibid., p. 518a, l. 23. "如諸江河亦得是水 未得同於大海之水."

[38] "True Mind"(真心), "One Mind"(一心), "Mind-only"(唯心) and Tathāgatagarbha(如來藏) are used here interchangeably.

"the triple world is illusory and is nothing but the manifestation of the Mind-only." Even saṁsāra and nirvāṇa are nothing else than this Mind.[39] Together with the doctrine of śūnyatā, the doctrines of cittamātratā and the tathāgatagarbha are picked up here as one way of grasping the mystery of the dharmadhātu. Of course the other mysteries are also connected with these doctrines implicitly or indirectly, but this one is so much devoted to presenting citta and tathāgatagarbha that li rather than shih becomes predominant.

Nevertheless, in the tenth mystery, "Fostering understanding by revealing dharmas through shih," the emphasis is again shifted to shih. Here it is said that "through shih" the reality of all dharmas is manifested, and thus, only thus, true understanding is fostered. "All streamers, all umbrellas and so on" are in actuality substance, and through the penetrating insight into these phenomenal things one can see the true dharmadhātu.

The above is Chih-yen's basic doctrine of dharmadhātu as presented in the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men. From this it is clear now that for him too the dharmadhātu is realized by grasping the supra-rational principles of the interrelationship of dharmas. As far as he tries to see the dharmadhātu in terms of "interrelationship," he completely agrees with Tu-shun. According to Chih-yen, as well as to Tu-shun, this interrelationship can be described as "simultaneously completing," "mutually corresponding," "simultaneously establishing," "co-existing," "mutually includ-

---

[39] Cf. Ibid., p. 518b, ll. 17ff.

ing," "compatible," "mutually identifying," and so on. In such a relational interaction, all the contrasting qualities such as hiddenness and manifestedness, minuteness and immensity, simplicity and mixedness, one and many, and so forth are simultaneously and completely present in any given dharma. In such a fundamental outlook, Chih-yen is faithful to Tu-shun.

This, of course, does not imply that there is no originality in Chih-yen. When we compare the ideas as expressed in the two works, i.e., Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men and Chih-yen's I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men, we can find considerable differences, which might justifiably be acknowledged as evidence of "development" on Chih-yen's part. Some distinctive features found in the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men can be listed as follows:

First of all, the most discernible difference is found in the title, "I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men." This work, unlike Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, declares itself as a work of the "I-ch'eng," One Vehicle(Ekayāna). At the very beginning of the essay, Chih-yen makes it clear that the purpose of the work is to proclaim the truth of the One Vehicle or Hua-yen, which he claims is different from those of the Small Vehicle(Hīnayāna), the Great Vehicle(Mahāyāna) or the Three Vehicles(Triyāna), and so on.[40]

This use of "I-ch'eng" reflects Chih-yen's consciousness of the "Hua-yen" as a distinctive tradition in contrast to the other Buddhist traditions. In view of this, it can safely be said that the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men is the first Hua-yen "Credo" in terms of which the distinctive

---

[40] T. 45, p. 514a. Cf. also ibid., p. 516a, ll. 2f. et passim.

Hua-yen beliefs are explicitly expressed.

A second difference between Chih-yen's I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men and Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men is found in the use of terminology. Although many terms are shared by both of them, the most striking element in Chih-yen's work is that the most important Hua-yen technical terms, "mutual identification"(相即) and "interpenetration"(相入), are used here for the first time in the Hua-yen tradition.[41] These two extremely important terms, together with other newly introduced terms such as "common essence"(同体), "different essence"(異体), "the primary and the secondary"(主伴), "essence and function"(体用), are, as will be seen later, indispensable categories for Fa-tsang's grand mosaic structure.

Third, it should also be noted that the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men introduces the question of "time" in the context of the ten mysteries. For Chih-yen, the principle of mutual identification and interpenetration is applicable in temporal terms as well as in spatial terms. He sets forth one item in the ten mysteries, namely, the fifth, "the distinct formation of separate dharmas of the ten times," solely to make this point explicit. The "ten times," according to him, are mutually inclusive and penetrating, and thus an aeon and a single thought-instant are essentially identical.

This is a significant step leading toward the formation of a cardinal Hua-yen doctrine of "attainment of Buddhahood in a single thought-instant"(一念成佛), which is discussed in the eighth mystery, "the sover-

---

[41] See for example, T. 45, p. 516b, l. 23; p. 517a, ll. 13, 20, 22, b, l. 29, c, 6, 7, 11, et passim.

eignty of mutual identification of all dharmas." As far as the Hua-yen tradition is concerned, Chih-yen is the first who emphasized the so-called doctrine of "instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood"(速疾成佛 or 疾得成佛), and, as will be explained in a later chapter, herein lies one of his unique contributions to the Hua-yen spiritual tradition.

Fourth, another distinctive feature in the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men is found in its classification of dharmas. In the case of Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, the interrelationship is observed in terms of the three categories of relationship, viz., relationship between 1) Emptiness and form, 2) li and shih, and 3) shih and shih. The intuitive observation of these three categories of relationship is expressed by thirty principles, ten for each category.

On the other hand, in Chih-yen's case, the interrelationship is seen in terms of "ten" categories of relationship such as "teaching and meaning," "li and shih," and "understanding and practice." According to him, any relationship in the universe can be understood in terms of this all-inclusive principle of "ten mysteries."

It is also interesting to note that Chih-yen ignores the relationship between "Emptiness and form" which is the first category in Tu-shun's scheme. This may imply that Chih-yen considered this element to be included in such an item as "li and shih." In any case, since he does mention "ten" categories of relationship which is supposed to include "all" the pairs of dharmas inexhaustibly, it may not matter very much whether any particular item is listed or not. In essence, the "ten mysteries" are the mysterious principles applicable to "all" the relations in the universe, including those between "Emptiness and form," "li and

shih," and the like.

In view of this, it becomes clear that the argument given by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi that the "ten mysteries" are derived from the third section of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, which deals exclusively with the relationship between shih and shih, should be accepted with qualification.[42] As mentioned above, the ten mysteries are applicable not only to the relationship of shih and shih but also to that of "li and shih." Apart from this, however, it is true that the two sets of principles, namely, the ten mysteries in the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men and the ten principles in the third section of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men substantially correspond to each other in their articulation as well as in their meaning.

The last but most important mark of distinction in Chih-yen's I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men is that the truth of interrelationship is most succinctly formulated in terms of "ten mysteries." It goes without saying that all of the afore-mentioned distinctive features are the contribution of the work to the development of Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu. The major contribution, nevertheless, lies in its formulation of "ten mysteries." The theory of ten mysteries here becomes the core of the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine. It is, so to speak, the corner-stone of the Hua-yen doctrinal structure. It needs only a genius to set it in its proper place in the overall structure. The genius is found in Fa-tsang, whose systematic ideas will be discussed next.

---

[42] See above notes 6 and 7.

III. THE SYSTEMATIZATION OF THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE BY FA-TSANG

Fa-tsang, the third patriarch of the Hua-yen school, inherited the fundamental Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine formulated by Chih-yen and organized it within his finely refined theoretical system. Whereas Chih-yen's "ten mysteries" had been simply set forth without elaborate philosophical justification, in Fa-tsang it is presented in a wider and clearer theoretical context. In him it becomes the truly central doctrine with all other doctrines related to it -- some as its logical prelude and some as its logical corollary -- thus constituting the organic whole of a doctrinal system. It is no more an isolated topic. It is now ingeniously incorporated in the web of his grand system.[1]

The general structure of Fa-tsang's system is most clearly seen in his famous work, Essay on the Golden Lion. When he is asked to expound the gist of Hua-yen philosophy to Empress Wu, Fa-tsang, using a golden lion in the Imperial Hall in an object lesson,[2] deals with ten essential topics of Hua-yen doctrine. The topics are: 1) dependent origination(緣起), 2) form and Emptiness(色空), 3) the three natures(三性), 4) the non-existence of characteristics(無相), 5) non-coming-into-existence

---

[1]For the socio-political circumstances in which he tried, or had to try, to make such a grand system, see above p. and below p.

[2]For a historical account of this event, see above p. 82. See also the Sung-kao-seng-chuan, T. 50, p. 732.

(無生), 6) the five teachings(五教), 7) the ten mysteries(十玄), 8) the six characteristics(六相), 9) bodhi or enlightenment(菩提), and 10) nirvāṇa(涅槃); and all of these topics are explained in terms of gold (essence or substance) and lion(form, appearance, or characteristic).

It is seen here that in the structure of Fa-tsang's system the theory of the ten mysteries is given as the seventh topic. Fa-tsang presents the truth of dependent origination as the first principle for the entire Hua-yen teaching. He teaches that just as the form of the golden lion arises owing to "the artistry of the skillful craftman," so all phenomenal things are the result of causation, and hence have no self-nature or reality.[3]

Fa-tsang goes on to the second topic, "form and Emptiness," and says: "The form(or shape) of the lion is unreal; what is real is only gold. The lion is not existent, while the substance of the gold is not non-existent."[4] It is also pointed out that even though Emptiness has no characteristics of its own, it manifests itself through the form. Here it is seen that the identification of form and Emptiness upheld in Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men is once again confirmed.

In the third topic, Fa-tsang introduces the theory of "three natures," or more precisely, "three degrees of reality." According to him, the lion has 1) the "common sense existence"(情有) or imagined existence(parikalpita, 遍計), and 2) the "quasi-existence"(似有) or

---

[3]T. 45, p. 663c.

[4]Ibid., p. 663c, ll. 10ff. "師子相虛 唯是真金 師子不有 金体不無."

interdependent existence(paratantra,依他), whereas the substance of gold has 3) the immutability(不変) or Perfect Reality(pariniṣpanna,圓成).[5]

As the fourth topic, Fa-tsang describes the truth of "non-existence of characteristics." "Since the gold comprises the lion completely," he says, "apart from the gold, there can be no independent characteristics or forms of the lion."[6] Here we are told that the phenomenal forms are all reduced into the noumenal, and they are, in the ultimate sense, non-existent.

Together with this truth, there follows the truth of "non-coming-into-existence" as the fifth topic. Since there is nothing apart from the gold, even if we see that the lion comes into existence, it is not the lion but the gold that actually comes into existence. Therefore, neither the lion nor the gold comes into existence, for the substance of gold never increases or decreases.[7]

Fa-tsang also touches upon the classification of teachings in the sixth topic. According to him, depending on their understanding of gold and lion, that is, of the Absolute and the phenomenal, the Buddhist traditional teachings are classified as five: 1) Hīnayāna teaching, 2) the Elementary teaching of the Mahāyāna, 3) the Final teaching of the Mahāyāna, 4) the Sudden teaching of the Mahāyāna, and 5) the Perfect teaching of the Ekayāna.

---

[5]Ibid., p. 664a. This topic will be discussed in detail later. See below pp. 158ff.

[6]Ibid., ll. 22ff. "以金收師子盡 金外更無師子相可得."

[7]Ibid., p. 664b, ll. 1ff.

After these topics, there comes the set of "ten mysteries." The titles of the ten mysteries are exactly identical with Chih-yen's. The only difference is the rearrangement of the order of the items. The order here is 1), 6), 7), 8), 3), 4), 2), 10), 5), and 9) in comparison with Chih-yen's.[8] Another peculiarity here is, as expected, that every item is illustrated by the metaphor of the golden lion. To take a few examples, of the first mystery, "Simultaneous completion and mutual correspondence," it is said: "Both the gold and the lion can stand together, simultaneously, perfect and complete."[9] And in the case of "The secret of simultaneous establishment of the hidden and the manifest," it is said: "If we contemplate the lion, there appears only the lion and no gold; this means that the lion is manifest while the gold is hidden. If we contemplate the gold, there is only the gold and no lion; this means that the gold is manifest and the lion is hidden. If we contemplate both of them, they are both hidden and manifest. Being hidden they are secret and being manifest they are revealed.[10]

Having dealt with the ten mysteries, the essay ends with the presentation of "six characteristics," "bodhi," and "nirvāṇa." But there is no elaboration of any of these topics.

---

[8]For the list of the items, see above p.136 , and for a comparion of the various lists, see Takamine, op. cit., pp. 254f.

[9]T. 45, p. 665a, l. 19. "金與師子 同時成立 圓滿具足."

[10]Ibid., 665b, ll. 27ff. "若看師子唯師子無金 即師子顯金隱 若看金唯金無師子 即金顯師子隱 若兩處看 俱隱俱顯 隱即秘密 顯即顯著."

The Essay on the Golden Lion is an excellent analogy in which we can see how and where Fa-tsang places the theory of the ten mysteries in his theoretical structure. Moreover, there is no doubt that it is the best summary of the gist of Hua-yen teachings concisely organized in a tangible and visible way. The entire structure and sequence starting with the principle of dependent origination and ending with the ultimate goal, nirvāṇa, is undeniably evident here. Nevertheless, the essay is too summary, and there is no theoretical elaboration as to how all of these ten topics are organically and logically coherent with each other. The explanation of the ten mysteries entirely in terms of gold and lion is, as will be clear later, an over-simplification at the sacrifice of the other related theoretical bases. In view of the fact that this essay was meant for lay people like Empress Wu, it is understandable that such a simplification was inevitable.

The best scholarly work in which we can see how Fa-tsang fully substantiates the theory of the ten mysteries is his Hua-yen I-ch'eng chiao-i-fen-ch'i-chang(Essay on the Division of the Teachings and Meanings of the One Vehicle of Hua-yen), which is commonly called Wu-chiao-chang.[11] Here in this work, it seems at first glance that Fa-tsang faithfully follows the items of Chih-yen's formula. The ten categories or pairs of dharmas enumerated in Chih-yen's works appear here in this work, with only the ninth and the tenth items interchanged and a slight alteration of

---

[11]Hereafter this work will be referred to as Wu-chiao-chang. F. H. Cook's Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines--An Annotated Translation is a translation of this work.

wording in the seventh and the tenth.[12] In the case of the "ten mysteries" proper, Fa-tsang calls it the "ten-fold mysterious or profound dependent origination"(十玄緣起), but as in the Essay on the Golden Lion, apart from the rearrangement of the order of the item, there is no change whatsoever from Chih-yen's list.[13] Since no specific reason for such rearrangement was given by him, one might think that there is no substantial difference between the two. On the surface level this seems correct, but when viewed in the wider context a significant difference emerges between the two expositions of the ten mysteries.

In the case of Chih-yen, the truth of the ten mysteries was presented as a result of direct meditative vision, which he called "ocean-like samādhi." There was no attempt to give any logical elaboration as to why the principle of mutual identification and interpenetration is possible at all. It was categorically true: that was enough. If there were any theoretical basis at all, it was in the theories of cittamātratā(Mind-only) and tathāgatagarbha (the matrix of the Tathāgata).[14] But in the case of Fa-tsang as presented in the Wu-chiao-chang, there is given a logical justification on the basis of his newly developed theoretical foundation.

The topic of the "ten mysteries" or the "ten-fold mysterious or profound dependent origination" is dealt with in the tenth chapter of his

---

[12]Cf. T. 45, p. 505a.

[13]This is also true in the other works of his early days. For example, see Wen-i-kang-mu (文義綱目, An Outline of the Meaning of the Text [of the Avataṁsaka]), T. 35, p. 501bc, ll. 17ff.

[14]See above p. 146. Cf. also Kamata, op. cit., p. 139.

Wu-chiao-chang.[15] In this most important chapter it is presented in conjunction with three other topics, thus making four topics as follows: 1) the identity and difference of the three natures(三性同異), 2) the six meanings of dependent origination in the causal aspect(緣起因門六義), 3) the non-obstruction of the ten-fold mysterious dependent origination (十玄緣起無礙), and 4) the perfect interfusion of the six characteristics (六相圓融). These four topics are actually the climax of the treatise and constitute the basis of Hua-yen thought. Among these four, however, the third one is the core of the system, the first two being the theoretical groundwork for it and the last being the application of it.[16]

As one of the theoretical bases Fa-tsang introduces the theory of three natures(三性 , trisvabhāvas). Of course, Chih-yen also mentioned the "three natures" in his Hua-yen Wu-shih-yao-wen-ta(Fifty Essential

---

[15]There are two basic editions of this text available now: one is called the "Sung text"(宋本) and the other the "Japanese text"(和本). Between these two texts, there is generally no difference except some insignificant variants. But a noticeable difference is the order of the last two chapters in the two texts. The ninth and the tenth chapters in the Sung text are the tenth and the ninth in the Japanese text. Cf. Bussho kaisettsu taijiten, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 44ff. Cook, op. cit., pp. 103f. Cook says that while the Sung text seems to be "consistent with the internal structure," the Japanese text seems to be "more logical." But he does not speculate on the reason why the orders of the chapters are different. As the reason for this difference Chi-kyŏn Kim suggests that it is because the so-called Japanese text was the text brought from Korea where its ninth and tenth chapters had already been exchanged by Ŭi-sang who, having received the text from the author for revision, might have considered that order as better for the sake of the logical sequence. Cf. Chi-kyŏn Kim, "ki-kaido-sho kō"(寄海東書考) in Gakujutsu nenpo(學術年報), 1, (Tokyo: April, 1971). In the Taisho the order of Sung text is followed and by "tenth chapter" here is meant the tenth in the Sung text.

[16]Cf. T. 45, pp. 499aff. See also Cook, op. cit., pp. 404 and 469.

Questions and Answers on the Avataṁsaka).[17] But this was a general discussion, having no direct logical connection with the ten mysteries. Unlike Chih-yen, Fa-tsang adopts this theory from the Wei-shih school to substantiate the Hua-yen theory of the ten mysteries.[18] It is noted, however, that even though it is borrowed from the orthodox Vijñānavāda doctrines of pariniṣpanna(perfected), paratantra(interdependent), and parikalpita(imagined), his interpretations and applications are peculiar to his own system.[19]

According to Fa-tsang, the three natures, which comprise all dharmas, each have two aspects. They are as follows:[20]

1. Pariniṣpanna
   - (a) immutability(無變)
   - (b) obedience to conditions(隨緣)
2. Paratantra
   - (a) naturelessness(無性)
   - (b) quasi-existance(似有)
3. Parikalpita
   - (a) essential non-existence(理無)
   - (b) common-sense existence(情有)

---

[17] Cf. T. 45, p. 524b. Question 35.

[18] As regards Fa-tsang's inclusion of the Yogācāra doctrine of three natures, a few additional reasons are suggested. In addition to the need to utilize it to give a rationalization of his doctrine of mutual identification and interpenetration, there is mentioned his ambition to make his system complete by including in it all the available main doctrines of prevailing schools. With such a desire it is natural for him not to miss the trisvabhāva theory of the Vijñānavāda, which was influential in those days through the efforts of Hsüan-chuang. Furthermore, it is also said that his desire to win the favour of Empress Wu, who patronized the Hua-yen school and identified her own reign with the universe taught in Hua-yen philosophy, is seen in his inclusion of the Wei-shih system. That is to say that for the Empress who usurped the throne from the preceding reign, which patronized the flourishing Wei-shih school, the superiority of the Hua-yen system to the Wei-shih system had to be demonstrated, and this was done by including the latter in the former by Fa-tsang. Cf. Kamata, op. cit., pp. 139f., and 146ff., and Cook, op. cit., pp. 46f.

Parikalpita-svabhāva or "imagined" reality, according to Fa-tsang, is something which appears to be real and existent to the common-sense but which from the standpoint of essence does not exist. So it is both "sentiently existent"(情有) and "ultimately or essentially non-existent" (理無). In the case of paratantra-svabhāva, or "interdependent" reality, it is regarded as relatively real because it arises according to the principle of dependent origination, and thus has some sort of existence "similar" to ultimate reality. This is "quasi-reality" or "quasi-existence"(似有). But on the other hand, because of the very fact that it is dependent within the frame-work of dependent origination it is without self-nature. Anything that is dependent on another for its existence is without a nature of its own, and hence it is "naturelessness"(無性).

In these explanations of parikalpita-svabhāva and paratantra-svabhāva there is almost no difference from the Vijñānavāda doctrine, except for the emphasis on the dual aspects of each item as well as new terminology.[21] The peculiarity of Fa-tsang's interpretation is most

---

[19]The peculiarity of Fa-tsang's interpretation of the three natures, especially in contrast to the corresponding Indian Yogācāra theory, is well examined in Nagao Gadjin, "Hozo no Sanseisetsu ni taisuru jakkan no gimon"(Some Doubts concerning Fa-tsang's Discussion on the Three Natures), Fifty-year Aniversary Commemorative Anthology of the Kyoto University Department of Arts and Letters (Kyoto: 1956), pp. 183-205, and Cook, op. cit., pp. 30ff.

[20]T. 45, p. 499a.

[21]For a discussion of the Yogācāra doctrine of the three nature, see The Saṅdhinirmocana, ch. VII, 10ff.; Asaṅga's Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra, ch. XI, 38-41; Vasubandhu's Vijñāptimātratāsidhī, Levi, ed., pp. 39ff. and A. K. Chatterjee, The Yogācāra Idealism (Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1962), pp. 199ff. A good summary of "the three nature" is found in E. Conze, Buddhist Thought in India, op. cit., pp. 257ff.

obvious in the case of parinispanna-svabhāva, the "Perfect" or Absolute Reality. As far as the first aspect of it, that is, immutability(不變) is concerned, there is little difficulty with it. The Absolute is by nature beyond any change or transformation. But Fa-tsang's view that that immutable Absolute is "obedient to conditions"(隨緣), seems to have no direct counterpart in the Vijñānavāda theory of three natures.[22] The fact that Fa-tsang quotes from tathāgatagarbha texts such as the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra and the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna to support this argument indicates that the real source of this view is found not in Yogācāra theory but rather in tathāgatagarbha theory. The two aspects of the Absolute, in fact, are derived from the famous twin phrases, "Mind in terms of the Absolute"(心眞如門) and "Mind in terms of phenomena"(心生滅門) which are found in the Awakening of Faith.[23]

In using this three-nature theory Fa-tsang is not concerned with epistemological problems as the Vijñānavāda was, nor is he interested solely in establishing the unreality of phenomena as the Śūnyavāda was. His primary task is to show that all dharmas are mutually identical in essence, and at the same time are different from each other in so far as they keep their own identities as phenomena. He adopts the material from the Vijñānavāda only to explain his own view about dharmas.

According to Fa-tsang's scheme, each of the three natures

---

[22]See above pp. and cf. also Cook, op. cit., pp. 34ff.

[23]Cf. Hakeda, tr. op. cit., pp. 31ff.

partakes of the two aspects of "emptiness"(空) and "existence"(有). The aspects of immutability(不變), naturelessness(無性), and "essential non-existence"(理無), in parinispanna, paratantra, and parikalpita represent "emptiness"; those of "obedience to conditions"(隨緣), "quasi-existence"(似有), and "common-sense existence"(情有) in those three natures represent "existence." In Fa-tsang's theory, all dharmas are both empty and existent. From the standpoint of emptiness, i.e., of essence, all dharmas are devoid of all empirical qualities or attributes and they are ultimately identical; but from the standpoint of existence, i.e., of appearance, each of them has its own characteristic.[24] In short, there are both essential unity and apparent differences between noumenon and phenomena and between phenomena and the other phenomena.

Here is seen an emerging theoretical principle on which Fa-tsang bases the idea of mutual identification and interpenetration of all dharmas. The point he is making in discussing the three natures of dharmas is that all dharmas are grasped in terms of "emptiness" and "existence" which represent noumenal and phenomenal aspects respectively.

Proceeding from this basic premise, Fa-tsang presents another related theoretical principle for the doctrine of the mutual identification and mutual inclusion of all dharmas. It is the so-called theory of the "six meanings of dependent origination in the causal aspect" which is given in the second section of the tenth chapter of the Wu-chiao-chang.

---

[24]Cf. T. 45, p. 499a.

This is also found in Chih-yen's works[25] and is originally based on the formula found in Vasubandhu's Mahāyānasaṃgraha[26] and other places.[27] But here again Fa-tsang utilizes this material to justify his own views on the interrelated components of the dharmadhātu. He incorporates it into his system in conjunction with the three-nature theory.

While in the previous section he tried to demonstrate the interrelationships of all dharmas primarily in terms of essence, namely, in terms of their ontological natures, in this section it is discussed in terms of their causal relationships, i.e., in terms of their functional aspects. The mutual identification and interpenetration of things are thus shown within the context of both essence and cause. The two aspects of emptiness and existence of all dharmas are identical not only from the standpoint of essential reality but also from that of causal function.

According to Fa-tsang, all dharmas are causes and the causes have six meanings. They are 1) "the cause which is empty, has power, and does not require conditions"(空有力不待緣); 2) "the cause which is empty, has power, and requires conditions"(空有力待緣); 3) "the cause which is empty, lacks power, and requires conditions"(空無力待緣); 4) "the cause which is existent, has power, and does not require conditions"(有有力不待緣); 5) "the cause which is existent, has power, and requires conditions"(有有力待緣); and 6) "the cause which is existent, lacks power, and requires

---

[25]T. 35, p. 66ab, T. 45, pp. 530c-531c, and T. 45, p. 544c.

[26]T. 31, p. 115c, 165bc, 389a, et passim.

[27]For other sources see Cook, op. cit., pp. 57, 445, and 460.

conditions(有無力待緣). And each of these six meanings is explained in terms of the six categories found in the Mahāyānasaṁgraha: 1) "momentary extinction"(刹那滅), 2) "co-existence"(具有), 3) "requiring all conditions"(待衆緣), 4) "being fixed"(決定), 5) "attracting its own result"(引自果), and 6) "continuously following and transmigrating" (恒隨轉).[28]

It would be beyond our purpose to embark on an explanation of these in detail in connection with the epistemological theory of the Yogācāra.[29] Briefly speaking, however, it is an attempt to state that the mutual relatedness of dharmas can be seen not only from the point-view of "emptiness" and "existence" but also from the other two standpoints, i.e., from the standpoints of "power" and "condition."

From the standpoint of "power or powerlessness"(力無力), suppose that one thing(A, 自) had complete power, and that because of this power the other(B, 他) were able to exist: this would mean that B has no power whatsoever of its own and thus is included in A. On the other hand, when the opposite is the case, that A is able to exist by B: this means that B has power while A has no power, and thus A is to be reduced to B. Hence, everything, according as it has power or not, includes, or is included in, the other. Consequently, all things are mutually inclusive

---

[28]These six items appear in slightly different forms according to different translations. The phrases in this text are found in T. 31, p. 389a.

[29]For a detailed exposition, see Cook, op. cit., pp. 54ff. and 444ff., Takamine, op. cit., pp. 183ff., and 249ff., etc.

and penetrating each other.[30]

Futhermore, from the standpoint of "requiring or not requiring conditions"(待緣不待緣 two categories are discerned: "common essence" (同体) and "different essence"(異体).[31] According to Fa-tsang, if it is said that A requires the other conditions, it implies that those other conditions have their own identities, for, to be called conditions at all, they should have different essences or identities. This is the aspect of "different essence" which is also called "mutual reliance(相由)." And in contrast, if it is said that A does not require any other conditions it means that A is possessed of all the other conditions within itself and that by its inclusion of all other dharmas within it there is no other essence left. This is the aspect of "common essence" or "not being mutually reliant(不相由)."

These explanations are rather complicated, but it suffices to see in the above-listed categories Fa-tsang's attempt to emphasize the "functional" aspect together with the "essential" one[32] in establishing the doctrine of the dependent origination of dharmadhātu. By introducing the idea of "having or not having power, requiring or not requiring conditions" in explaining the principles of the interrelationship of things, he tries to make it more explicit that that interrelationship is dynamic

---

[30]Cf. T. 45, p. 503b, ll. 17ff.

[31]Ibid., p. 503b, ll. 3-6.

[32]The terms "functional" and "essential" are used here in the sense of the Chinese concepts of t'i-yung(essence and function). Especially the term "functional" is adopted here simply to refer to the interactional aspect of the interrelationships of the dharmas, and should not be understood in the sociological sense.

and functional as well as static and essential. Whether viewed essentially or functionally, all things are interrelated and interfused in terms of the principle of mutual identification and interpenetration. This is what he tries to show when he concludes the section as follows:

> Because of the concepts of emptiness and existence, there is the truth of mutual identification; because of the concepts of having power and lacking power, there is the truth of interpenetration; because of the concepts of requiring conditions and not requiring conditions, there is the category of common essence and different essence. Because of these concepts and categories, it is possible that even a pore of the skin embraces [all] the lands and oceans.[33]

These theories, namely, "three natures" and "six meanings of dependent origination in the causal aspect," are two bases which Fa-tsang established to give philosophical support to the theory of the "ten mysteries." Apart from these two theoretical groundworks, his presentation of the theory of the ten mysteries itself, as found in the Wu-chiao-chang,[34] also betrays some peculiarities. To take a few examples, whereas in Chih-yen's discussion on common essence and different essence in the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men was carried out in terms of the number "ten," Fa-tsang makes it more concrete by using an analogy of "ten coins"(十錢).[35]

---

[33] Ibid., 503a, ll. 12-14. Cf. Cook. op. cit., p. 467. "又由空有義故有相即門也．由有力無力義故有相入門也 由有待緣不待緣故有同体異作門也．由有此等義門故得毛孔容刹海事也.

[34] Cf. ibid., pp. 505aff.

[35] Ibid., p. 503b, l. 1, et passim. For the usage of the "ten," see above p. 140. According to one source, Chih-yen explained the principle of interdependence interms of ten coins for a man from the East(東土人), Ŭi-sang(?) from Korea. Cf. T. 45, p. 760b. Among the extant documents,

Another important peculiarity of Fa-tsang's interpretation of the mysteries is his clear division of mutual identification(相即) and mutual inclusion or interpenetration(相入) in terms of t'i(体, essence) and yung(用, function), respectively.[36] For the first time he employed the dichotomy of t'i and yung, applying each of these to the two cardinal principles of the Hua-yen world-view. He says:

> Concerning different essence there are two aspects: 1) mutual identification, and 2) mutual inclusion. The reason why there are these two aspects is that all dharmas originating interdependently have the following two principles: 1) emptiness and existence: this from the standpoint of self-essence(自体); and 2) having power and lacking power: this is from the standpoint of power and function(力用). Because of the first principle, mutual identification is possible, and because of the second principle, mutual inclusion is possible.[37]

Fa-tsang, however, does not forget to insist that in the final analysis mutual identification and mutual inclusion are not two different principles but only two aspects of a single principle. He clearly says: "When essence(体) is subsumed under function(用), there is no separate essence, and thus there is only mutual inclusion; when function is subsumed under essence, there is no other function, and thus there is only

---

however, Ŭi-sang's Hua-yen I-ch'eng fa-chieh-t'u(華嚴一乘法界圖) is the first one to use this analogy of the "ten coins." Cf. T. 45, p. 714b. In fact, in this part of the Wu-chiao-chang, Fa-tsang seems to have heavily depended on this work of Ŭi-sang, his senior colleague under Chih-yen. For a comparison of the two works, see Sakamoto, op. cit., pp. 438ff.

[36] The question of t'i-yung will be discussed in more detail later.

[37] T. 45, p. 503b, ll. 6ff. "就最体中有二門一相即二相入所以有此二門者以諸緣起法皆有二義故一空有義此望自体二力無力義此望力用由初義故得相即由後義故得相入."

mutual identification."[38] These two are, as it were, the results of two different angles from which the principle of interrelationship is seen.

This idea of t'i-yung is found not only throughout this work but in almost all of his other writings. Furthermore, his followers, Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi, also adopt and use it as one of the basic categories in elaborating their theories.[39] This dichotomy of t'i and yung, according to W. Liebenthal, is the "pattern" which is "fundamental in all Chinese thinking."[40] Strictly speaking, however, t'i-yung is originally derived from Taoist philosophy. It was Wang Pi(王弼, 226-249) who used the terms in a metaphysical sense for the first time in the history of Chinese thought.[41] Ever since he interpreted the thirty-eighth chapter of the Tao-te-ching in terms of t'i-yung,[42] this idea has

---

[38]Ibid., ll. 21ff. "又以用攝体更急別体故 唯是相入 以体攝用無別用故 唯是相即."

[39]For example, Chih-yen: T. 35, p. 15b, l. 5, p. 15c, l. 15, p. 46a, l. 13, p. 48a, ll. 26, 28, etc. Fa-tsang: T. 45, p. 502b, p. 635a, l. 3, p. 637ab, etc. Ch'eng-kuan: T. 45, p. 672b, l. 16, etc. Tsung-mi: T. 45, p. 684c, l. 16, etc.

[40]W. Liebenthal, Chao Lun (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1968), p. 17.

[41]For the historical development of the t'i-yung idea, see Kenji Simada, "Taiyo no rekishi ni yosete"(A Contribution to the History of the Concept of T'i-yung) in Essays on the History of Buddhism presented to Professor Zenryu Tsukamoto (Kyoto: Naigai Printing Co., 1961), pp. 416-430. Here he mentions Hsün-tzu as the first user of the term itself. Liebenthal and Chan, however, agree that Wang Pi is the first who used the term in a metaphysical sense.

[42]A part of Wang Pi's commentary is found in Wing-tsit Chan, The Way of Lao Tzu, op. cit., p. 168, and his A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy, op. cit., pp. 322f.

become the basic principle for explaining the relation between reality and its manifestations. On this point Wing-tsit Chan aptly says:

> The concept of substance [t'i] and function [yung] first mentioned here, were to play a very great role in Neo-Taoism, Buddhism, and Neo-Confucianism.... In fact, the Chinese have conceived everything to be in the relationship of substance (the nature of a thing), and function (its various applications).[43]

Needless to say, the Hua-yen usage of t'i-yung is not identical with that of Taoists. For examples, whereas for Wang Pi, t'i-yung was used to refer to "non-being" and its substance,[44] for Fa-tsang t'i-yung was adopted not only to show the dual aspect of essence and its various functions or manifestations, but also to explain mutual identification (相即) and interpenetration(相入).[45] Fa-tsang's idea of t'i-yung is most clearly expressed in the following passage:

> When one understands that worldly things are not produced and have no nature of their own but are of one taste, [he sees] the essence (t'i); when the prajñā illuminates the li and there clearly appears the non-obstructive characteristic of shih, it is [the state of seeing] the function(yung). Although the shih is clearly discernible, it has no self-existence, and thus function is identical with essence.... Because li and shih are mutually interfused, essence and function are unimpeded [to be identical]. If from the standpoint of mutual inclusion, it is the function which makes various differentiations possible; if from the standpoint of

---

[43] The Way of Lao Tzu, op. cit., p. 168.

[44] Cf. ibid., p. 168.

[45] Cf. T. 45, p. 503b.

> mutual identification, it is the essence which is always of one taste.[46]

Here Fa-tsang mentioned t'i as the essence which is of "one taste" or without differentiation, and yung as various phenomenal manifestations. But his primary concern was to explain the cardinal Hua-yen idea of mutual identification and interpenetration in terms of t'i and yung. It is apparent that such an expression of t'i-yung, together with some other usages of it,[47] is quite different from the traditional Taoist interpretation.

But regardless of whether the content might be different from the traditional Chinese understanding, the fact is that the "pattern of t'i-yung," which Liebenthal desceibes as "dynamic," became an integral part of the Hua-yen philsophy. This becomes especially evident when it is taken into consideration that the general Buddhist pattern in this respect is the famous triad of t'i-hsiang-yung(体相用) or essence-characteristic-function. Although this is mentioned from time to time,[48] the t'i-yung pattern is predominant. It should also be remembered that in Hua-yen philosophy the dynamic aspect of t'i-yung was so intensified that not only the relationship between essence and its manifestations but those between one manifestation and the other manifestation, were equally, if not more, emphasized.

---

[46] Hua-yen i-hai pai-men(華嚴義海百門), T. 45, p. 635a, ll. 3-8. "了達塵無生無性一味是体 智照理時不礙事相宛然是用 事雖宛然恒無所有 是故用即体也... 由理事互融故 体用自在 若相入則用開差別 若相即乃体恒一味."

[47] Cf. above pp. 167, and T. 45, p. 637a-c.

[48] Cf. T. 45, p. 672a, l. 26, b, l. 9, etc, p. 684b, l. 21, etc.

With regard to the theory of the ten mysteries itself we can find more striking evidences of doctrinal progress in his other works, such as T'an-hsüan-chi and Hua-yen-ching chih-kuei(華嚴經旨歸, The Essentials of the Avataṃsaka-sūtra). It is not known exactly when these works were written. The theory of the ten mysteries expounded therein is traditionally known as the "new ten mysteries"(新十玄). Strictly speaking, however, it may not be the case, for the Hua-yen-ching chih-kuei was probably written before the Essay on the Golden Lion,[49] yet the latter contains the so-called "old ten mysteries."

In any case, according to the "new" system of the ten mysteries, the ten categories of dharmas are concisely reorganized. They are: 1) teachings and meanings(教義), 2) li and shih(理事), 3) realm and wisdom (境智), 4) practice and stages(行位),[50] 5) cause and effect(因果), 6) environmental world and sentient beings(依正), 7) essence and function (体用), 8) men and dharmas(人法), 9) the contrary and conforming(逆順), and 10) response and stimulus(應感).[51]

Having enumerated these ten items, the Hua-yen-ching chih-kuei teaches that these ten sets of contrasting pairs, being simultaneous and corresponding with each other, constitute the non-obstructive and interfusing principle of dependent origination.[52] This free and infinite

---

[49]Cf. Bussho kaisetsu taijiten, op. cit., vol. 3, pp. 72f., and p. 74.

[50]For the meanings of these terms, see above p. 134.

[51]T. 35, p. 123b, ll. 6-8, or HTC. 4, p. 48d, and T. 45, p. 594a.

[52]T. 45, p. 594a, ll. 23f.

principle of the interrelationship of all things is expressed here as functioning in ten, that is, in all, fields of dharmas. This is the so-called "ten non-obstructions"(十無礙). Strictly speaking it is the "non-obstruction in ten aspects," to wit, the non-obstruction in 1) nature and appearance(性相), 2) the broad and the narrow(廣狹), 3) one and many (一多), 4) mutual inclusion(相入), 5) mutual identification(相即), 6) the hidden and the manifest(隱顯), 7) the subtle and the minute(微細), 8) Indra's net(帝網), 9) the ten times(十世), and 10) the primary and the secondary(主伴).

This rather simplified set of "ten non-obstructions" is actually synonymous with the theory of "ten mysteries," especially with the "new" one found in the T'an-hsüan-chi.[53] This new form in the T'an-hsüan-chi is different from the old one in several respects. The order of the items is different.[54] But what is more important is that some items are replaced: 1) "the secret of the simultaneous establishment of the hidden and the manifest," 2) "the complete compatibility of the simple and the mixed in all dharmas," and 3) "the excellent formation through the transformation of the Mind-only" in the lists of the "old ten mysteries" are replaced by 1) "the simultaneous establishment of the secret and the revealed"(隱密顯俱成門), 2) "the sovereighty and non-obstruction of the broad and the narrow"(廣狹自在無礙門), and 3) "the perfect and brilliant compatibility of the qualities of being the primary

---

[53]T. 35, p. 123a, ll. 28ff.

[54]For a comparison of the order in the various texts, see Takamine, op. cit., pp. 254f.

and the secondary"(主伴圓明具德門).

Since the first one merely involves a smoothing of the awkward phrasing of the old one, there is no significant change in meaning. The second one is an adoption of an item from the third section of Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, and is similar to the second item of the previous ten non-obstructions. The most striking difference is in the third one, in which Fa-tsang seems to have aimed at a double purpose.

First, unlike the other items which plainly describe the ways in which the principle of interrelationship is working, this item seems to show the ground on which phenomena come into existence and function, i.e., the cittamātratā. It seems, therefore, that in order to get rid of such an inconsistency, he offers instead a more matter-of-fact description. Such a fundamental principle as cittamātratā must have seemed to him to be separately dealt with in the other context, and it was actually presented later as one of the "ten reasons" why the interrelatedness of all things is possible.[55]

The second, more important reason seems to be that this item alone gives the impression that it is based upon the tathāgatagarbha tradition of the so-called "Final Teaching of the Mahāyāna"(大乘終教). In Chih-yen, this is clearly seen when he says that this principle is "that which is established by the pure and true Mind of the tathāgatagarbha-nature."[56] It is true that even Fa-tsang himself, in his early work,

---

[55]Ch'eng-kuan has also an explanation for this alteration. He thinks that because this item of cittamātratā is basic to the whole system of the Hua-yen doctrine it should not be enumerated as a separate item. Cf. Hua-yen-ching sui-shu-yen-i-ch'ao(華嚴經隨疏演義鈔), T. 36, p.75b.

[56]T. 45, p. 518b, ll. 17f. "如來藏性清淨眞心之所建立."

Wu-chiao-chang, explained this item in terms of the tathāgatagarbha.[57] But here in a later stage of doctrinal development, he seems to have tried to elevate this item completely to the level of "the Perfect Teaching"(圓教), by removing this fundamental but rather heterogeneous or foreign element from his pure Hua-yen system.[58]

In fact, the new item — the "perfect and brilliant compatibility of the qualities of being both the primary and the seconary" — is traditionally considered as the most comprehensive and representative among the ten. What is implied here is that any given object can be simultaneously chu(主) and pan(伴), primary and secondary, chief and retinue. In Fa-tsang's own analogy: "When a given direction becomes primary, ten directions become secondary, and this applies to all other directions. Therefore, the primary and the secondary do not conflict with each other. The primary and the secondary and the secondary and the primary are perfectly and brilliantly compatible!"[59] In other words, when A becomes the primary centre of attention, then B, C, and so on become secondary; but when B in turn becomes the centre of attention, A, C, and so on become secondary. Therefore, the quality of primary or secondary is not intrinsic in any dharma but is given to it in the nexus of relationship. There is no static situation where a given object is

---

[57]Cf. T. 45, p. 507a, ll. 9ff.

[58]For a similar argument, see Kamata, op. cit., pp. 135, 553, and Cook, op. cit., p. 522.

[59]HTC. 4, p. 496c. T'an-hsüan-chi, T. 35, p. 124a, ll. 2f. "一方為主十方為伴 餘方亦爾 是故主主伴伴各不相見 主伴伴主 圓融具德."

always primary nor are the others always secondary. Things are not fixed as simply primary or secondary but are fluid enough to be both primary and secondary at the same time.

Another distinctive point noticed in the T'an-hsüan-chi and the Hua-yen-ching chih-kuei in contrast to the Wu-chiao-chang and others is that Fa-tsang gives the "ten reasons"(十門) for the system of ten mysteries. In the T'an-hsüan-chi the "ten reasons" for the ten mysteries are listed as follows:

1) Because of the mutual reliance in dependent origination (緣起相由故)

2) Because of the universal infusion of the dharma-nature (法性融通故)

3) Because everything appears by means of the Mind-only (各唯心現故)

4) Because [all dharmas] are like illusion and have no essence (如幻不實故)

5) Because largeness and smallness are not fixed (大小無定故)

6) Because there are infinite causes (無限因生故)

7) Because the attainment-qualities are absolutely perfect (果德圓極故)

8) Because of the excellent transcendental power (勝通自在故)

9) Because of the great function of samādhi (三昧大用故)

10) Because of [the power of] the inconceivable liberation (acintya-vimokṣa) (難思解脫故)[60]

---

[60] T. 35, p. 124a, ll. 10ff. In the Hua-yen-ching chih-kuei, the phrases are slightly different. Cf. T. 45, p. 594c-595b.

The first thing to be noted is that even though these ten items are given here this does not mean that all of them are collectively required for the principle of the perfect interrelationship of all dharmas. Each of them in itself is a complete reason for the principle, and the "ten reasons" simply make the point that this principle can be seen from various standpoints. As Fa-tsang says: "Even if any one of these ten is applied, all dharmas can be [seen as] interfused without impediment."[61] Nevertheless, it seems true that to Fa-tsang the first item, sometimes together with the second, must have been the most important or representative of all, because in most cases he eleborates on this item alone.

Secondly and more importantly, this set of ten reasons is basically the same as the theoretical bases presented in the Wu-chiao-chang. This is even seen in the explanation of, for example, the first item: "Because of the mutual reliance in dependent origination." In the T'an-hsüan-chi,[62] under this item Fa-tsang lists again the "ten meanings": (1) the differences of conditions(諸緣各異), (2) mutual pervading and complementing(互遍相資), (3) complete compatability without obstruction (俱存無礙), (4) mutual inclusion of different essences(異体相入), (5) mutual identification of different essences(異体相即), (6) interfusion of essence and function(体用雙融), (7) mutual inclusion in common essence(同体相入), (8) mutual identification in common essence(同体相即), (9) complete interfusion without obstruction(俱融無礙), and (10) perfect

---

[61] T. 45, pp. 594c, l. 29-595a, l. 1. "於此十中隨一即能含諸法混融無礙."

[62] T. 35, p. 347.

endowment with the common and the different(具足相應). It becomes evident that most of the fundamental ideas which were already so laboriously expounded in the Wu-chiao-chang are neatly presented here.[63]

The fact that these ten reasons are a reorganization of the theoretical bases for the ten mysteries which were given before, especially in the Wu-chiao-chang, is more clearly seen in the Hua-yen-ching chih-kuei. While explaining the first item of the "ten reasons" Fa-tsang mentions all the fundamental ideas such as "essence and function," "emptiness and existence," "having or not having power," and "common and different essence."[64] Needless to say, these are exactly identical with those found in the Wu-chiao-chang, except for the fact that they are not directly connected with the "three-nature theory" or the "six meanings of the dependent origination in the causal aspect." This set of ten reasons is surely an indication of how Fa-tsang tried to present everything in a concise, organized, systematic way, especially in the form of ten items.

Thus far Fa-tsang's grand system of dharmadhātu doctrine has been examined. It has been seen that the basic doctrine of the interrelationship of things transmitted to him by Tu-shun and Chih-yen finds its fullest systematic expression in his philosophical exposition. It is by Fa-

---

[63]Cf. Sakamoto, "Hokkai-engi no rekishiteki keisei"(Historical Development of the Dharmadhātu-pratītyasamutpāda), in Shoson Miyamoto, ed., Bukkyo no kompon shinri(The Fundamental Truth of Buddhism) (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1956), p. 951. Here a chart clarifying the interrelationships of these items is given.

[64]T. 45, p. 595a-b. The similar passages are also found in his other works. See T. 45, p. 622a-b, and T. 45, p. 646c.

tsang that the theory of ten mysteries is put in a wider context, and hence firmly footed on highly refined theoretical bases such as the "three-nature theory" and the "six meanings of dependent origination in the causal aspect." The idea of ten mysteries is no longer an isolated set of meditational items, but part of an organic system substantiated in terms of "emptiness and existence," "having power and lacking power," "requiring conditions and not requiring conditions," and so on. It is also by him that the cardinal twin principle of Hua-yen philosophy, namely,"mutual identification" and "interpenetration" or "mutual inclusion," is first clearly systematized in connection with ideas of "essence and function." As far as theoretical systematization is concerned, it may rightly be said that Fa-tsang represents the culmination in the development of the dharmadhātu doctrine, for both Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi, as will be seen later, accept Fa-tsang's system with few modifications. Of course, this does not mean that Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi merely offer photocopies of Fa-tsang's system. As their spiritual and intellectual situations were different, so were the problems they faced and the emphases they developed.

IV. THE ELUCIDATION OF THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE BY CH'ENG-KUAN AND TSUNG-MI

Ch'eng-kuan inherits the traditional dharmadhātu doctrine of the "ten mysteries" and its related theories, which he repeats in his writings such as the Hua-yen-ching-shu(華嚴經疏, Commentary on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra),[1] its sub-commentary, Hua-yen-ching-sui-shu yen-i-ch'ao(華嚴經隨疏演義鈔),[2] and the Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'in-shu(華嚴經行願品疏, Commentary on the Forty Fascicle Avataṁsaka-sūtra).[3] Here he adopts the so-called "new ten mysteries" as the standard system in contrast to the "old" form found in the works of Chih-yen and Fa-tsang's Wu-chiao-chang. Apart from his explanations of why a few items in the "old" were replaced in the "new,"[4] and of the meaning of the order of the ten items, it is difficult to find any uniqueness in Ch'eng-kuan's presentation of the main doctrine. His unique contribution to the development of the dharmadhātu doctrine, therefore, should be found somewhere else, not in the theory of "ten mysteries" itself.

As a matter of fact, the foremost contribution of Ch'eng-kuan to

---

[1] T. 35, p. 515a-c.

[2] T. 36, p. 75bf.

[3] HTC. 7, p. 246af.

[4] Cf. for example, T. 36, p. 75b, HTC. 8, p. 269ab, and p. 186ab, etc.

the Hua-yen philosophical tradition consists in his elucidation of dharmadhātu doctrine in terms of the so-called theory of "four-fold dharmadhātu"(四種法界). Of course, the idea that the dharmadhātu is expressed in four dimensions was upheld, as Ch'eng-kuan himself admits, by his predecessors, but it is solely to his credit that this idea was finally formulated as the theory of "four-fold dharmadhātu," which subsequently became a standard doctrine of the dharmadhātu in the Hua-yen tradition.[5]

Ch'eng-kuan's standard formula regarding the four-fold dharmadhātu can be found in the Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching(法界玄鏡), his commentary on Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, which reads as follows:

> The characteristics of the dharmadhātu are seen in three ways, but they have altogether four dimensions: 1) shih dharmadhātu(事法界), 2) li dharmadhātu(理法界), 3) dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of li and shih(理事無礙法界), and 4) dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih(事事無礙法界).[6]

These are actually the four dimensions from which the dharmadhātu is seen. In other words, according to the dimensions of one's spiritual insight, one can see the dharmadhātu as either 1) dharmadhātu of phenomena, 2) dharmadhātu of noumenon, 3) dharmadhātu of the non-obstructive interrelation of noumenon and phenomena, or 4) dharmadhātu of the non-obstructive interaction of phenomena and phenomena. As D. T. Suzuki aptly points out, these are "four ways of viewing the Dharmadhātu."[7]

---

[5]Cf. Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, third series, op. cit., p. 150.

[6]T. 45, p. 672c, ll. 11ff. "法界之相雖唯有三 然總具四種 一事法界 二理法界 三理事無礙法界 四事事無礙法界."

Before going on to a detailed investigation of Ch'eng-kuan's theory of four-fold dharmadhātu, it seems necessary first to survey some earlier theories which might directly or indirectly be connected with the formulation of his own theory.

According to the Hwa-ŏm-kyŏng mun-ŭi-yo-kyŏl mun-tap(華嚴經文義要決問答)[8] of P'yo-wŏn(表員, flou. c. 750, A. D.), a Korean monk-scholar of the Silla dynasty, Master Lin(憐師)[9] advocated the theory of the four-fold dharmadhātu: 1) "dharmadhātu which follows conditions"(隨緣法界), 2) "dharmadhātu which responds to conditions"(對緣法界), 3) "dharmadhātu which forgets conditions"(忘緣法界), and 4) "dharmadhātu of dependent origination"(緣起法界).[10]

According to P'yo-wŏn's explanation, the first one is the aspect of the dharmadhātu where the differentiations such as "realm and wisdom,"

---

[7]Suzuki, op. cit., p. 151. He further explains the "four ways of viewing the Dharmadhātu" as follows: "(1) the Dharmadhātu as a world of individual objects, in which case the term dhātu is taken to mean 'something separated'; (2) the Dharmadhātu as a manifestation of one spirit (ekacitta) or one elementary substance (ekadhātu); (3) the Dharmadhātu as a world where all its particular existences (vastu) are identifiable with one underlying spirit; and (4) the Dharmadhātu as a world where each one of its particular objects is identifiable with every other particular object, with which whatever lines of separation there may be between them all removed."

[8]Concerning this work Cook says: "an anonymous collection of questions and answers concerning various problems in Hua-yen philosophy. The various answers are drawn from the writings of Fa-tsang, Hui-yüan (Fa-tsang's pupil), and several other.... It is very useful for not only study of various treatments by Hua-yen masters of a given problem." Op. cit., p. 110. Kamata also recommends this work as an excellent introduction to various topics of Hua-yen philosophy and as an indispensible source for Hui-yüan study. Op. cit., pp. 537f.

[9]The dictionaries accessible to me do not carry any information about "Master Lin" or his work "Fa-ching-lun"(法鏡論).

[10]HTC. 12, p. 341a.

"form and Mind," "particularities," "various tastes," and so on arise according to conditions. The *dharmadhātu* in this aspect, it is said, has no substance or essence of its own, and in fact it is only a provisional aspect derived from the absolute *dharmadhātu* which is beyond any division. The second one is the aspect in which the *dharmadhātu* is viewed from the prescriptive standpoint. "For those who are entrapped in the disease of being(*asti*)," for example, "non-being(*nāsti*) is preached for healing." Likewise, this is the *dharmadhātu* which appears only as remedy or *upāya* for the sake of treatment of diseases, and thus this too has no essence of its own. The third is the *dharmadhātu* in which everything is forgotten. Here both the appearances based upon conditions and the treatments for them are forgotten; being and non-being, duality and non-duality, even the forgetting itself -- all are forgotten. Not only the names but the essence and function of the *dharmadhātu* are also forgotten. The fourth aspect of the *dharmadhātu* is the state which emerges after forgetting everything. This is the state of the true reality which transcends all phenomenal aspects and in which "all *dharmas* as such are the 'true nature,' originally neither born, nor destroyed, neither increasing nor destroyed, neither existing nor non-existing, and yet existing and non-existing."[11] Here existence and non-existence, and all other categorizations totally vanish. Here "Thusness" itself is the essence of *dharmadhātu*; the non-obstruction of dependent origination is its function.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 341b. "一切法如如実相本無生今亦無滅無增無減無有無無.而有而有也."

This last aspect of the dharmadhātu is further subdivided into four.[12] These four items can be ignored here, because they are basically similar to those of Wŏn-hyo and Fa-tsang, on which we now focus our attention.

Again according to P'yo-wŏn's report, Wŏn-hyo(元曉, 617-686) of the Silla dynasty of Korea had the idea of a four-fold dharmadhātu, which went as follows: 1) conditioned dharmadhātu(saṃskṛta-dharmadhātu, 有為法界), 2) unconditioned dharmadhātu(asaṃskṛta-dh., 無為法界), 3) both conditioned and unconditioned dharmadhātu(亦有為亦無為法界), and 4) neither conditioned nor unconditioned dharmadhātu(非有為非無為法界). It seems that this is a reorganization of Master Lin's "dharmadhātu of dependent origination," but because Wŏn-hyo's Hwa-ŏm-kyŏng-so(華嚴經疏), which is the source of this theory, is lost, it is impossible to be sure how it is different from Master Lin's and what is its true meaning.

However, Fa-tsang, who owed much to Wŏn-hyo,[13] adopted Wŏn-hyo's classification in his T'an-hsüan-chi[14] and added just one more item, viz., dharmadhātu of non-obstruction(無障礙法界). Therefore, it may be said that Wŏn-hyo's idea of the dharmadhātu is represented, by and large, in

---

[12]Cf. ibid., p. 341bf.

[13]Fa-tsang's debt to Wŏn-hyo becomes evident in a comparison of their commentaries on the Awakening of Faith, found in T. 44, pp. 202-226, and pp. 240-287 respectively. Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi also frequently refer to Wŏn-hyo's commentary.

[14]T. 35, p. 440b, ll. 25f.

Fa-tsang's presentation.[15]

According to Fa-tsang's explanation, the first "conditioned dharmadhātu" is the realm of "seeds of all dharmas"(諸法種子) and all differentiated "dharmas of the three times"(三世諸法). The second one, "unconditioned dharmadhātu," is the dimension of the absolute Emptiness for which Fa-tsang enumerates two aspects, namely, "the nature of original purity"(性淨門) and the nature "purified from stains or defilements"(離垢門). By the third "dharmadhātu of both conditioned and unconditioned," it is meant that the dharmadhātu has both the aspect which reveals itself in various characteristics or appearances(隨相門) and the aspect which is beyond any obstruction(無礙門) between "Mind in terms of the Absolute"(心真如) and "Mind in terms of phenomena"(心生滅). The fourth "dharmadhātu of neither conditioned nor unconditioned" shows the realm in which all forms of conditioned and unconditioned are simply taken away(形奪門) and there can be no attachment whatsoever(無寄門). The fifth is the "dharmadhātu of non-obstruction" in which universal embracing(普攝門) and perfect interfusion(圓融門) are realized. This last aspect of the dharmadhātu is also called, in Fa-tsang's own term, "One [without second] dharmadhātu"(一法界).

The first two aspects of the dharmadhātu, namely, the conditioned dharmadhātu and the unconditioned dharmadhātu, correspond exactly to the aspects of shih and li of the four-fold dharmadhātu system of Ch'eng-kuan.

---

[15] HTC. 12, p. 343af. Here P'yo-wŏn mentions the similarities and differences between the theories of Wŏn-hyo and those of Fa-tsang. We can see that in most cases they share common explanations and canonical quotations.

Fa-tsang himself understands that these two aspects of dharmadhātu are the basic interrelated components of the dharmadhātu when he says: "If the characteristics of nature (性) were abolished, there would be the dharmadhātu of li; if the characteristics of shih were apparent without hindrance, this would be the dharmadhātu of shih. When both are combined, it is the dharmdhatu of the non-obstruction of li and shih!"[16] The following three items, then, point to the harmonious interrelationship of these two basic elements. The fifth especially is an insight into the state in which not only li and shih but also even shih and other shihs are in a perfect interrelationship of permeating and including. It is evident, therefore, that even though Fa-tsang does not here use the phrase, "dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih" as used in Ch'eng-kuan, the idea is implied in this item.

P'yo-wŏn also touches upon the dharmadhātu theory of Hui-yüan (慧苑), Fa-tsang's chief disciple who was condemned as a heretic by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi. What is especially noted here is that Hui-yüan is said to have mentioned the four-fold dharmadhātu which is exactly the same with Ch'eng-kuan's in the titles of the items.[17] If P'yo-wŏn is correct,

---

[16] T. 45, p. 627b, ll. 24ff. "若性相不存則成理法界 不礙事相宛然是事法界 合理事無礙法界" In view of the context, in translating this passage it is difficult to agree with Wing-tsit Chan, who translates as follows: "If neither nature nor character exists, it becomes the realm of dharmas of principle. When both fact and character are clearly in existence without obstacle, it becomes the realm of dharmas of facts. When principle and fact are combined without obstacle, the two are at the same time one and one is at the same time two." Op. cit., p. 415.

[17] HTC. 12, pp. 340d, and 343c, d.

it is certain that Hui-yüan is the first who formulated the so-called four-fold dharmadhātu. Yukio Sakamoto, an authority on Hui-yüan's philosophy, assumes that the four-fold dharmadhātu theory of Ch'eng-kuan, at least as regards the titles of the items, were actually derived from Hui-yüan's.[18] It may be possible that Ch'eng-kuan knew those terms used in Hui-yüan's works, but it is also possible that he independently derived them from the Hua-yen tradition in general, for those terms, except the "non-obstruction of shih and shih," are very frequently used in the works of Tu-shun, Chih-yen and Fa-tsang. Furthermore, as Sakamoto rightly points out, while Hui-yüan's and Ch'eng-kuan's are identical with each other in forms, they are different in contents.[19] In any case, it is interesting that those four terms connected with the dharmadhātu were first used by Hui-yüan.

What then does Ch'eng-kuan say about the "four-fold dharmadhātu" in his writings? In the Hua-yen-ching sui-shu yen-i-ch'ao, he introduces the five-fold dharmadhātu of Fa-tsang without modification.[20] In the Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'en-shu,[21] he admits that he adopts Fa-tsang's system again,[22] but in this case he applies his "four-fold dharmadhātu"

---

[18]Cf. his article on the historical development of dharmadhātu, op. cit., p. 903. See also his Kegon Kyogaku no Kenkyu, op. cit., for a detailed study of Hui-yüan's Hua-yen thought.

[19]Hui-yüan's four-fold dharmadhātu is entirely devoted to the explanation of his idea of "classification of teachings." For contents, see HTC. 12, pp. 340d, and 343c, d.; and Sakamoto's article, pp. 902f.

[20]Cf. T. 36, p. 654b.

[21]This is Ch'eng-kuan's commentary on the third translation of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, or Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra, i.e., Hua-yen-ching in " forty fascicles."

[22]HTC. 7, p. 249d.

idea to it. Here, Ch'eng-kuan begins his discussion of dharmadhātu as follows:

> The dharmadhātu is neither a dhātu nor a non-dhātu, neither a dharma nor a non-dharma. In spite of its namelessness if one is forced to name it, it is the so-called dharmadhātu of non-obstruction and non-hindrance, which is still and vacant, infusing deeply, including broadly, and embracing the myriad things. This is One Mind, whose essence is beyond being and non-being, and whose characteristics have nothing to do with birth and death.... If one understands this, he will be greatly awakened; if deluded about this, there will be no end to birth and death.[23]

Then he goes on to analyse the dharmadhātu into the shih dharmadhātu, the li dharmadhātu, and the dharmadhātu of non-obstruction, the last one being subdivided as the dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and li and the dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih, thus making four altogether. In diagram it is as follows:

1. shih dharmadhātu..... I
2. li dharmadhātu..... II
3. dharmadhātu of non-obstruction:
    1) dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and li.....III
    2) dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih..... IV

Ch'eng-kuan now explains these four dimensions of dharmadhātu

---

[23] Ibid., p. 249c. "然其法界 非界非不界 非法非不法 無名相中 強為立名 是曰無障礙法界 寂寥虛曠 沖深包博 總該萬有 即是一心 体絶有無 相非生滅 ... 解之則廓爾大悟 迷之則生死無窮."

one by one. First, in the case of the shih dharmadhātu, he again says, the dhātu(chieh) means "division", "differentiation," or "particularization"; and shih means an "immeasurable" number of things, which can be summerized in ten categories such as "teaching and meanings, men and objects, causes and effects, essence and function, and the conforming and contrary."[24] In short, this is the dharmadhātu particularized or phenomenalized into innumerable things. It is the phenomenal world "perceptible by consciousness."[25]

Second, in the case of li dharmadhātu, "dhātu" means "essence" or "nature"(性). According to Ch'eng-kuan, the infinite number of phenomenal things are all identical with this one nature.[26] The true li which is still and void is the very nature of dharmas.[27] And this nature, Ch'eng-kuan, like Fa-tsang, says, is seen as having two aspects: 1) the "nature of [original] purity"(性淨門) and 2) the nature "purified from stains"(離垢門). By the former is meant that this nature is originally pure and permeates all things with one taste(一味) and sameness (平等). By the latter is meant that even though the originally pure nature may be concealed with dirt, by getting rid of impurities superimposed upon

---

[24]For his other lists of the dharmas, see T. 45, p. 672c, and HTC. 7, p. 244b.

[25]HTC. 7, p. 249d, ll. 7f.

[26]T. 45, p. 673a, l. 1.

[27]HTC. 7, p. 250a, l. 6.

it it can be restored to its original purity even as pure gold appears after refinement.

Third, Ch'eng-kuan contends that "dhātu" in the case of the dharmadhātu of non-obstruction means both essence and particulars. That is to say that there is no differentiation in this state of totality. Nothing is hindered from being both essence and at the same time the particular. This truth, according to him, can be grasped in three aspects: 1) non-obstruction of mutual identification(相即無礙門), 2) the deprivation of forms, and non-attachment(形奪無寄門), and 3) the interfusion and complete transcendence of essence and characteristics and their perfect harmony(雙融俱離性相渾然門).

According to Ch'eng-kuan, the first one means that the two aspects of the dharmadhātu, i.e., Mind as the Absolute(心眞如), and Mind as phenomena(心生滅), are not exclusive ofeach other. These two constitute the whole universe without any confusion or hindrance whatsoever. It is seen here again that Ch'eng-kuan relies upon the basic idea of the Awakening of Faith,[28] as did his predecessor Fa-tsang.

The second aspect means that in the dimension of the non-obstruction of li and shih there can be no distinction between li and shih, the conditioned and the unconditioned, form and Emptiness, and so on. They are all beyond description. "The dharma-nature is not [confined] in language or discourse; speechless and unspeakable, it is always quiescent."[29]

---

[28]About his dependence on this text, especially through Wŏn-hyo's commentary on it, see Takamine, op. cit., p. 272; Kamata, op. cit., pp. 525f., etc.

[29]Ibid., p. 250b, ll. 12f. "法性不在於言論無說雜說恒寂滅等."

The third aspect points more emphatically to the state in which li and shih, and shih and shih are all harmoniously interfusing each other and further constitutes the complete transcendence of any duality of the phenomenal and the real. For this third aspect, Ch'eng-kuan again enumerates the ten items. Among them, he says, the last three items specifically point to the transcendental truth of the non-obstruction of shih and shih.[30] The dharmadhātu in this state is the dharmadhātu in the purest sense of the word in that it includes all and is identified with all.

Although in his Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'in-shu Ch'eng-kuan mentions the four-fold dharmadhātu, he does not elaborate on the "dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of li and shih" and the "dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih" here because these two items were supposed to be understood in the context of the "dharmadhātu of non-obstruction" which was said to comprise these two. Therefore, a detailed explanation of these two items must be found somewhere else.

His understanding of the dharmadhātu of li and shih and that of shih and shih is most explicitly found in the Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching, his commentary on Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men. According to Ch'eng-kuan, the true Emptiness(真空), the non-obstruction of li and shih(理事無礙), and the all-pervading and all-embracing [shih](周遍含容) found in Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men represent the li dharmadhātu, the dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of li and shih, and the dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction

---

[30] Cf. ibid., p. 250c, ll. 4ff.

of shih and shih, respectively.[31] Consequently, in many places where he explains the dharmadhātu of li and shih, he simply introduces the ten items which were expounded in the second section of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men,[32] with some of his own comments and some canonical quotations.

As regards the dharmadhātu of li and shih, Ch'eng-kuan, in his commentary on the second section of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, reorganizes the ten items of principles.[33] He classifies them into five pairs of mutual relationship between li and shih.[34] These are the so-called "five kinds of mutuality"(五對) of li and shih. Item 1) and 2) in the Fa-chieh-kuan-men, namely, "Li pervades shih," and "Shih pervades li," according to Ch'eng-kuan, constitute the truth of "mutual pervasion"(相遍) of li and shih. He says that "this is the foundation of the following four kinds of mutual relationship."[35] In other words, this is the basic truth of the non-obstruction of li and shih. Items 3) and 4), "By means of li, shih is established," and "Shih is able to reveal li," are said to show "mutual establishment"(相成), whereby li enables shih to be established and shih

---

[31] Cf. Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching, T. 45, p. 672c. "真空則理法界 二如本名三則事事無礙法界."

[32] See, for example, the Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'in-shu, HTC. 7, p. 244cff., the Hua-yen-ching-shu-ch'ao-hsüan-t'an, HTC. 8, pp. 264bff., the Hua-yen-ching-shu, T. 35, p. 514a, the Yen-i-ch'ao, T. 36, p. 72a, etc.

[33] See above p.125f.

[34] Cf. Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching, T. 45, p. 676b, ll. 9ff.

[35] Ibid., p. 676c, l. 3. "此對為下四對之本"

allows li to be revealed and manifested. Items 5) and 6), "By means of li, shih is destroyed," and "Shih is able to conceal li," he says, means "mutual destruction"(相害), because of the fact that if seen from the standpoint of li, li alone is essentially existent and shih is deprived of its existence, and if from the standpoint of shih, li is concealed and shih alone is perceived. This can be regarded in a sense as "harming" or "destroying" each other, although there can be no destroying either of li or of shih from the highest viewpoint.[36] Items 7) and 8), "True li is nothing but shih," and "Dharma of shih is nothing but li," are summed up by Ch'eng-kuan as the relationship of "mutual identification" (相即) of li and shih, and Items 9) and 10),"True li is not shih," and "Dharma of shih is not li," are regarded as the relationship of "mutual difference"(相非) or "non-identity"(不即).[37]

With regard to the last one, Ch'eng-kuan makes an interesting observation. According to him, if the difference of li and shih is not presupposed, the principle of mutual pervasion, identification, and so on is unthinkable.[38] If something is to "permeate," for example, it has to have something besides itself to permeate. In short, any relationship presupposes two different parts which have their own identities. In this sense li and shih should be understood as different from each other. Of course, they are seen as identical in the process of spiritual discipline.

---

[36] Ibid., p. 679a, ll. 12ff.

[37] Ibid., p. 679b, l. 11.

[38] Ibid., pp. 679b, ll. 15f., 680a, l. 9. Cf. T. 36, p. 75a.

But, Ch'eng-kuan says, the vision of non-differentiation is possible only in the state of "calm and extinction"(寂滅), i.e., nirvāṇa, and as long as we live in a world which "follows conditions"(隨緣), the difference of shih and li is inevitable.[39] Nevertheless, the difference itself does not constitute anything desirable. The provisional idea of difference of li and shih should be gotten rid of so that the truth of their non-obstructive relationship of identity may finally be realized. The goal is the state of nirvāṇa or enlightenment in which there is no distinction of subject and object, li and shih, and the like, but only the one totality of undifferentiated dharmadhātu.

Concerning the fourth aspect of dharmadhātu, namely, the dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih, Ch'eng-kuan also equates it with the principle of "the all-pervading and all-embracing"(周遍含容) aspect of shih which constitutes the third section of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men. Since he thinks that this section teaches the truth of the "ten mysteries"(十玄),[40] the truth of the non-obstruction of shih and shih is finally equated with the ten mysteries. In other words, for Ch'eng-kuan these three teachings, i.e., the "dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih"(事事無礙法界), the "ten mysteries"(十玄), and the "all-pervading and all-embracing"(周遍含容), are all essentially pointing to one and the same truth of the interrelationship of phenomenal things.[41]

---

[39]Cf. T. 45, p. 679b, ll. 15ff.

[40]See above p.133, note 6, and p. 134, note 7.

[41]Cf. T. 45, pp. 672c, 673a, HTC. 7, pp. 245df., HTC. 8, pp. 184cf., and 268df., etc.

Consequently, in many places where he is supposed to explain the dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih he simply discusses the principle of the ten mysteries instead.[42] As mentioned before, his basic idea of the ten mysteries is not much different from that of Fa-tsang.

But one thing to be noted in this respect is that while Fa-tsang gave detailed explanations of the ten meanings of "mutual reliance in dependent origination"(緣起相由) among the ten reasons(十由) for the principle of the ten mysteries, Ch'eng-kuan, in addition, gives now the ten meanings(十義) of "the universal infusion of the dharma-nature"(法性融通).[43] Whereas the "mutual reliance in dependent origination" refers primarily to the mutual relationship of phenomenal things, the "universal infusion of dharma-nature" points chiefly to the interrelationship between the Absolute and the phenomenal. What is implied here, therefore, is that to Ch'eng-kuan the relationship between the Absolute and the phenomenal is at least as important as that between a phenomenon and other phenomena. The significance of this difference seems to be that since Fa-tsang had already fully emphasized the latter, it must have seemed to be Ch'eng-kuan's task to emphasize the former. Accordingly, he does appear to be laying more stress on the former.

---

[42]For example, see the Hua-yen-ching-shu, T. 35, p. 515a, the Hua-yen-ching-shu-ch'ao hsüan-t'an, HTC. 8, 268d. "第四圓通含容即事無礙且依古德說十玄門."

[43]Ibid., p. 284a-d, HTC. 7, p. 248b-c., etc.

It is true that although Ch'eng-kuan, like Fa-tsang, advocates both the non-obstruction of li and shih(li-shih wu-ai) and that of shih and shih(shih-shih wu-ai), he unlike Fa-tsang, does not neglect the importance of the former as the foundation for the latter. He admits that the truth of shih-shih wu-ai is the culmination of the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine, but he believes that due attention should be paid to the truth which he thinks makes this shih-shih wu-ai possible.[44] In many of his works he makes this idea explicit. To take an example, he says:

> The dharmadhātu of the non-obstruction of shih and shih(shih-shih wu-ai dharmadhātu) is the central meaning of the [Avataṃsaka-] sūtra.... The reason why while each shih differs from each other, there can yet be non-obstruction(wu-ai) is that there is the non-obstruction of li and shih.... By means of the non-obstruction of li and shih, the non-obstruction of shih and shih becomes truly possible.... Because li infuses shih, shih can infuse li, and thus the inclusion of myriad differentiations without obstruction. In this case the non-obstruction of shih and shih can truly be said.[45]

What is the reason Ch'eng-kuan emphasizes the non-obstruction of li and shih? He himself does not give an answer to this question.

---

[44] As to the difference between Fa-tsang and Ch'eng-kuan on this question, see Koshio Tamaki, "Pursuit of Cittamātra — Intercourse of Thought and Experience," (in Japanese) in Kegon Shiso, op. cit., pp. 399ff., Kamata, op. cit., pp. 523ff., Takamine, op. cit., pp. 289ff., etc.

[45] Yen-i-ch'ao, T. 36, p. 9ab. Cf. also ibid., pp. 5b, 319c, and 326b; Hua-yen-ching-shu, T. 35, p. 908b; Hua-yen-ching-shu-hsüan-t'an, HTC. 8, p. 184c, etc. "事事無礙法界為經旨趣 … 所以、事事不同而得無礙者、以理融事故… 由理事無礙方得事事無礙… 以理融事故云事得理融則千差涉入而無礙 此正辨事事無礙."

However, it might be inferred from the historical situation of his time. Unlike Fa-tsang, Ch'eng-kuan, living at the time when the influence of the Ch'an school is ever increasing, cannot ignore their practical teachings. In such circumstances it is natural that he puts a due stress on practical methods of insight applicable in everyday life. Ch'eng-kuan might think that for ordinary people it is impossible to see directly the non-obstructive relationship of shih and shih in this world of phenomena. It is therefore the relationship between li and shih that average people should start with in their spiritual insight, for it is the earlier, and thus more accessible, stage to be realized in the process of meditative penetration. In other words, to Ch'eng-kuan who is a scholar of practical concern, the non-obstruction of li and shih, as a starting-point for meditation, must be seen as much more worthy of emphasis than that of shih and shih, although he clearly knows that the latter is the more advanced and significant truth of Hua-yen philosophy.

It is perhaps because of this practical purpose that Ch'eng-kuan insistently upholds throughout his writing the truth of "interpenetration of the true and the illusory"(真妄交徹),[46] for this is another expression of the truth of the non-obstruction of li and shih. As the locus classicus of this idea he always refers to the Awakening of Faith, especially with

---

[46]This expression was used first in Fa-tsang's T'an-hsüan-chi, T. 35, p. 214c, "真妄交徹 喻謂依真起妄如金現色 ..." A similar passage is found in his Wu-chiao-chang, T. 45, p. 499. "是故真該妄末 妄徹真源. 性相通融 無障無礙." But in Ch'eng-kuan's case, this becomes an important technical term which is to characterize the Hua-yen philosophy in contrast to the Fa-hsiang school. Cf. his Yen-i-ch'ao, T. 36, p. 8a; Hua-yen-ching-shu, T. 35, p. 503a, etc. For his famous "gāthā on the true and the illusory"(真妄頌), see the Yen-i-ch'ao, T. 36, p. 464c, and for the discussion on it, see Kamata, op. cit., pp. 525ff.

regard to its doctrine of "Mind in terms of the Absolute" and "Mind in terms of phenomena."[47] And he argues that because of this mysterious principle, man's religious experience here and now becomes possible. He makes this clear when he says: Because of the principle of "the interpenetration of the true and the illusory, the Mind of the Buddha [the Sacred] can be seen right in the minds of profane people."[48] This is, in other words, the "interpenetration of sentient beings and the Buddha"(生佛交徹).[49]

Connected with this, is Ch'eng-kuan's emphasis on the idea of the so-called hsing-ch'i(性起, "manifestation from nature," utpatti or sambhava).[50] The idea of hsing-ch'i was discussed by Chih-yen and Fa-tsang, but it was firmly established by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi as a characteristic Hua-yen doctrine.[51] Although a similar idea is found in the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, especially the chapter on the Tathāgata-utpatti-sambhava(如來性起品), and the Ratnagotravibhāga, its development as

---

[47]See note 28.

[48]Cf. Hua-yen-ching-shu, T. 35, p. 503a. "迷妄交徹 即以心而見佛心."

[49]Cf. Hua-yen-ching-lüeh-ts'e, T. 36, p. 704c, and HTC. 4, p. 448c.

[50]Takamine, op. cit., p. 290. Ch'eng-kuan's discussion on this topic is found in his Yen-i-ch'ao, T. 36, p. 615ab, etc.

[51]This doctrine was emphasized in the Hua-yen school in contrast to the T'ien-t'ai doctrine of hsing-chu(性具, the doctrine that the Buddha-nature(性) is possessed(具) of both good and evil. Cf. Soothill, op. cit., p. 258b, and Ono, op. cit., p. 769a.

a doctrinal theory was carried out by the Hua-yen philosophers.[52] In brief, it is the doctrine that everything "arises"(起) from "nature" or "essence"(性). Strictly speaking, whereas the theory of yüan-ch'i(緣起, dependent origination) emphasizes primarily the relationship between phenomena and phenomena by trying to see how everthing "arises" from the secondary "causes" or "conditions"(緣), the hsing-ch'i idea stresses the relationship between the primal nature and the manifestations of it. In the final analysis, however, hsing-ch'i and yüan-ch'i in the Hua-yen philosophy both point to the same truth that ultimately all things are related to each other.[53] The only difference is the matter of emphasis. From the standpoint of the absolute aspect, it is a question of hsing-ch'i, and from the standpoint of the phenomenal aspect, it is a matter of yüan-ch'i.[54]

What is primarily interesting to Ch'eng-kuan is to see the Buddha or the Absolute through the phenomena, rather than to see the relationship of phenomena with phenomena as such, which was emphasized as the dharmadhātu-pratītyasamutpāda in Fa-tsang's system. In other words, while Fa-tsang's

---

[52]For a discussion of its development prior to the Hua-yen philosophy, see J. Takasaki, "Kegon kyogaku to Nyoraizo shiso"(The Hua-yen Philosophy and the Tathāgatagarbha Theory), in Kegon Shiso, op. cit., pp. 277ff.

[53]Cf. ibid., p. 328. For a study of the hsing-ch'i theory in the Hua-yen philosophy, see K. Tamaki, "Kegon-no Shoki ni tzuite"(Concerning the Hsing-ch'i in the Hua-yen), in Ui Commemorative Volume (Tokyo, 1961), pp. 281-309, Kamata, op. cit., pp. 565-574, etc.

[54]Cf. Fa-tsang's Hua-yen-ching wen-ta, T. 45, p. 610b. Cf. also Kamata, op. cit., p. 571.

philosophy was more concerned with the systematic presentation of what is reflected in the awareness of an enlightened one, i.e., the truth of the non-obstruction of shih and shih which is intuited by transcendental insight or enlightenment, Ch'eng-kuan is making his endeavours more in clarification of the way of getting to such a state of enlightenment.[55]

The Hua-yen philosophy seen thus far was most thoroughly digested and utilized by Tsung-mi, the fifth patriarch, and it was largely through him that it became widely known down through Chinese history.[56] However, as far as the dharmadhātu idea is concerned, it is difficult to find any new development in him. Although throughout his writings Hua-yen principles were the basis for arguments, he wrote only a few works on Hua-yen thought proper, one of which is his commentary on Tu-shun's Fa-chieh-kuan-men, and another of which is his sub-commentary on Ch'eng-kuan's commentary on the Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'in, the forty-fascicle Avataṁsaka-sūtra. When the former is compared with Ch'eng-kuan's commentary, we can see how faithfully he followed Ch'eng-kuan. To take an example, while explaining the dharmadhātu Tsung-mi says:

> In Ch'ing-liang's [Ch'eng-kuan's] commentary on the new [translation of the Avataṁsaka] sūtra it is said: "the one true dharmadhātu

---

[55]Kamata makes this point repeatedly: ibid., pp. 547, 572f., et passim. I agree with him in maintaining that Fa-tsang and Ch'eng-kuan are different in emphasis, but I disagree with his opinion that Fa-tsang was primarily interested in mainly scholastic philosophizing. It seems to me that even though Fa-tsang's presentation of the doctrine seemed to be scholastic, there was soteriological interest as well. See below pp. 224ff., which deals with the religious meaning of it.

[56]For his historical position see above pp. 87ff. and below pp. 244 and 259.

which includes the myriad things is One-Mind."[57]

Then he introduces Ch'eng-kuan's theory of four-fold dharmadhātu with no alteration.

In fact it is evident that Tsung-mi wrote this commentary making full use of Ch'eng-kuan's.[58] It can be seen that many of his quotations and arguments are borrowed from Ch'eng-kuan's commentary. Consequently, although there are differences in style and elaboration, there are no significant changes in basic content and ideas. But one point that Tsung-mi makes clear is that the dharmadhātu should not be understood as being three or four. It is one without a second. Therefore, it is "three-fold" or "four-fold" dharmadhātu, not "three" or "four" dharmadhātus. He said that "apart from the first dharmadhātu, there is no separate second or third."[59]

Another characteristic of Tsung-mi's commentary is that it is a word by word annotation of the text, while Ch'eng-kuan's is a general commentary on and clarification of each passage. This is clearly expressed in Tsung-mi's original title, in the word "chu"(注), which actually

---

[57]T. 45, p. 684b, ll. 24f. "清涼新經疏云 統唯一真法界 謂總該萬有即是一心."

[58]Kamata argues that Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi used different texts of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men in their commentaries, because Tsung-mi pointed out one variant reading in "another text"(有本云), which in fact is found in Ch'eng-kuan's text. Cf. op. cit., pp. 71f. This may be the case, but it does not necessarily mean that Tsung-mi did not read Ch'eng-kuan's commentary. Since they correspond in so many canonical quotations and so on, it is impossible that it is a mere coincidence.

[59]T. 45, p. 684c, l. 8. "非初法界外 別有第二第三."

means "explanatory note." According to P'ei Hsiu(裴休), who wrote the preface to it, this chu is the "cardinal key to the gate" of Fa-chieh-kuan-men and it should be "concise yet complete."[60] And in fact this commentary is so complete as not to skip a single word in the Fa-chieh-kuan-men and so concise that it is less than three times the length of the text itself.[61]

Tsung-mi's dependence on Ch'eng-kuan becomes further obvious when we look into his sub-commentary on Ch'eng-kuan's Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'in-shu. Even though there are naturally some elaborations and omissions, in substance it accepts Ch'eng-kuan's basic ideas on such topics as shih dharmadhātu, li dharmadhātu, dharmadhātu of non-obstruction.[62]

This does not mean, of course, that Tsung-mi is like Ch'eng-kuan in every respect. The first significant difference that can be noticed is that Tsung-mi does not elaborate upon the problem of the "ten mysteries." At the end of his commentary on the Fa-chieh-kuan-men he simply suggests that the ten items of the last section of the work constitute the meaning of the ten mysteries.[63] But unlike Ch'eng-kuan he does not mention their

---

[60] T. 45, pp. 683c, l. 29-684a, l. 1, and p. 684b, l. 3. "注者門之樞鑰也." "故其注簡而備."

[61] Tsung-mi's commentary, including the text, comprises eight pages in the Taisho edition. The text itself, found in the Hua-yen fa-p'u-ti-hsin-chang, T. 45, pp. 652b-654a, is two pages. This means that the commentary itself is about six pages. Because there is a space left between a given word of the text and Tsung-mi's comment on it, it is actually less than six pages.

[62] HTC. 7, pp. 249dff., and pp. 424bff.

[63] T. 45, p. 692b, l. 4.

contents at all. In the sub-commentary on Ch'eng-kuan's Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'in-shu, the term "ten mysteries" does appear,[64] but he totally ignores Ch'eng-kuan's detailed discussion of the ten mysteries and the ten reasons for them.[65] In contrast to his omission of the ten mysteries, he takes up the term "One Mind"(一心) from Ch'eng-kuan's statement that "the one true dharmadhātu which includes the myriad things is One Mind," and elaborately discusses its meaning and significance in the various Buddhist traditional teachings.[66]

The significance of this would seem to be that Tsung-mi, even if he is a Hua-yen patriarch, occupies a very peculiar position. His peculiarity, of course, does not lie in any new idea he developed in contradiction to Hua-yen tradition in general, but in his difference of interest and emphasis. As has been seen before, Tsung-mi was an ardent advocator of the Yüan-chüeh-ching (the Sūtra of the Perfect Enlightenment) and a diligent student of the Ch'an tradition before he met Ch'eng-kuan. This academic background might have made his outlook on Hua-yen philosophy quite different from Ch'eng-kuan's, as well as from those of the other patriarchs.

What is distinctive in Tsung-mi is his keen interest in Ch'an. One finds that he uses Ch'an terminology more often than any other Hua-yen philosopher. In his writings one very frequently comes across terms such

---

[64] HTC. 7, p. 399c, l. 14.

[65] Cf. HTC. 7, p. 246a. If Tsung-mi had mentioned it, it should be around ibid., p. 421c.

[66] Cf. ibid., pp. 422b-423b.

as "Real Substance"(实体), "Substance of Mind"(心体), "Original Mind"(本心), "True Mind"(真心), "True Nature"(真性), "the Mind-ground"(心地), "One Mind"(一心), "Original Source"(本源), "Enlightenment"(覺), "sudden Enlightenment"(頓悟), "gradual Enlightenment"(漸悟), and many others.

It is true that Ch'eng-kuan was also interested in Ch'an, which was emerging as an influential spiritual power at that time, but Tsung-mi's attitude toward it was considerably different from that of Ch'eng-kuan. While Ch'eng-kuan considered the Hua-yen system as superior to Ch'an and thus tried to include the latter in the former, for Tsung-mi Hua-yen and Ch'an are simply two aspects of one and the same truth and thus should be harmonized.[67] Such an outlook was his unique contribution to Buddhist history in China, and led him to have his own opinion on the question of the classification of teachings(教判).

Another peculiarity of Tsung-mi is his emphasis on the relationship of li and shih. It has been mentioned that this was stressed by Ch'eng-kuan. Now it seems that this line of thinking is reinforced by Tsung-mi. Throughout his writings his primary interest is to clarify the process by which the Absolute becomes the phenomena, and vice versa. As in the case of Ch'eng-kuan, hsing-ch'i(性起) is also an important principle to him. Therefore, he says:

> With regard to the fact that the one Dharmadhātu-Mind constitutes all the dharmas, there are two aspects: 1) the aspects of hsing-ch'i and 2)

---

[67]Cf. Kamata, op. cit., p. 588; see Yün-hua Jan, "Conflict and Harmony of Ch'an Buddhism,"(forthcoming).

> the aspect of yüan-ch'i.... In the aspect of hsing-ch'i, hsing(nature) means the true dhatu, and ch'i(arising or manifestation) means all the dharmas.... All the dharmas, whether transcendental or not, are all [results] of the principle of hsing-ch'i; and there is no other dharma apart from hsing. Therefore, all the Buddhas and sentient beings are mutually penetrating; the pure lands and impure lands are interfusing; dharmas are mutually including; particles of dust embrace all the universe; mutual identification, interpenetration, non-obstruction, and melting and fusion endowed with the ten mysteries, infinite and inexhaustible -- all these are indeed because of this [principle of] hsing-ch'i.[68]

This practical bent of Tsung-mi is most vividly exemplified in the diagrams he made in his Ch'an-yüan-chu-ch'uan-chi(Various explanations of the Source of Ch'an).[69] Here in these diagrams, which were formulated on the basic principles of the Awakening of Faith, he tries to show the process of enlightenment and delusion. In this process the important relationship is that between the Absolute and phenomena, rather than that between a phenomenon and other phenomena. In other words, for Tsung-mi what seems more urgent and relevant for the practical purpose of enlightenment is non-obstruction of li and shih rather than that of shih and shih.

That Tsung-mi's emphasis shifted from the non-obstructive relation

---

[68]HTC. 7, p. 399c. "一法界心成諸法者 總有二門 一性起門 二緣起門...性起者性即上句真界 起即下句萬法 ... 世出世間一切諸法 全是性起則 性外更無別法 所以諸佛與衆生交徹 淨土與穢土融通 諸法皆彼此互收 塵塵悉皆含世界 相即相入無礙鎔融 具十玄門 重重無盡 自由全是性起."

[69]Cf. T. 48, pp. 410-413.

of shih and shih to that of li and shih is also seen in the Yüan-jen-lun(the Original Nature of Man), one of his best-known works. Here in this apologetic work written from the standpoint of Hua-yen he again discusses the Absolute, but not the interrelationship between phenomena and phenomena. Of course the basic principle of Hua-yen philosophy is made clear when he states as follows:

> The Ekayāna [Hua-yen], which teaches about revealing nature or essence, preaches that all sentient beings have universally been possessed of the true Mind of original enlightenment, which from the beginningless beginning has been constant and pure, luminous and non-obscured, clear and always cognizant. This is also called the Buddha-nature or the Tathāgatagarbha.[70]

But this shows also that for Tsung-mi the teaching of Hua-yen is primarily concerned with the relationship between sentient beings and their original Source, which is variously called "True Source"(眞源), "True Mind"(眞心), "True Nature"(眞性), "the Source of Mind"(心源), and so on. This is quite different from Chih-yen and Fa-tsang, or even from Ch'eng-kuan, for whom the truth of the "non-obstruction of shih and shih" and the "ten mysteries" was the distinctive characteristic of the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine. Such an attitude might have been the result not only of his own personal inclination but also of the general tendency of his time, when the Ch'an outlook became gradually predominent. In any case, what is certain is that as a Hua-yen philosopher Tsung-mi also concentrates on the truth of

---

[70] T. 45, p. 710a. "一乘顯性教者 說一切有性 皆有本覺眞心 竟始以來 常住清淨 昭昭不昧了了常知 亦名佛性 亦名如來藏."
For a English translation of the whole text, see Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed., The Buddhist Tradition in India, China, and Japan (New York: the Modern Library, 1969), pp. 179-196.

dharmadhātu in terms of the interrelationship of its component parts.

Thus far we have seen the Hua-yen tradition of the dharmadhātu doctrine. What is striking throughout the tradition is that all of these Hua-yen philosophers tried to see the dharmadhātu in terms of interrelationship, most notably interrelationships between li and shih, and between shih and shih. To sum up the development of the Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu, it was founded by Tu-shun in his "three-fold insight," which was the spiritual insight into the three levels of interrelationships, that is, relationships between Emptiness and form, li and shih, and shih and shih. These basic and fundamental ideas were formulated by Chih-yen in terms of "ten mysteries" which he thought would cover the principles of the interrelationship of all dharmas. Fa-tsang gave a theoretical justification to the theory of the ten mysteries by setting it in its proper place in the overall structure. Hua-yen philosophy as a system of thought reached its culmination in Fa-tsang, and in the case of Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi the main task was to get it more applicable, practical and understandable. Thus it can be seen that while the Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu which was founded by Tu-shun, formulated by Chih-yen, and systematized by Fa-tsang was peculiarly Hua-yen, the doctrine developed by Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi was flexible enough to provide a common ground with other systems, especially with Ch'an. Nevertheless, these differences are not so much a matter of contents as one of emphasis. Both Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi advocated the principle of the dharmadhātu of the non-obstructive relationship of shih and shih(shih-shih wu-ai dharmadhātu). While their interest and emphasis were directed more to the relationship of li and shih, they did not ignore the importance of the truth of the

relationship of shih and shih. But the result of their stress on the li-shih aspect of the dharmadhātu was that Hua-yen philosophy came to be located in the wider spiritual context of Chinese thought in such a way that it could have a more solid base for contact with other religio-philosophical traditions.

PART THREE

CONCLUSION

I. THE PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE

Having examined the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine in terms of its development within the school, we may now embark upon an inquiry of its significance. First of all, what are its philosophical implications?

It has been seen that the Hua-yen philosophers tried to understand the dharmadhātu in terms of the "interrelationship" of all dharmas, which they called technically the "dependent origination of dharmadhātu" (dharmadhātu-pratītyasamutpāda). It has also been made clear that the dharmadhātu doctrine of Hua-yen was, therefore, a special type of dependent origination theory. How should such a doctrine be appraised from the philosophical standpoint in general, and in the context of Buddhist doctrinal tradition in particular?

One may ask here whether the way of grasping the truth in terms of dependent origination is peculiar only to Hua-yen philosophy. Of course it is not. Even the Buddha himself is reported to have said: "Whosoever sees the dependent origination sees the Buddha, and whosoever sees the Buddha sees the Dharma."[1] Since then, it has been a cardinal or central doctrine in every school of Buddhism.[2] Buddhism is distinguished

---

[1] Majjhima-Nikāya I. 191, T. 1, p. 467a.

[2] Cf. David J. Kalupahana, Causality: The Central Philosophy of Buddhism (Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1975).

from traditional Indian thought by its "clear-cut theory of causation."[3]

The interpretation of dependent origination, however, has varied in different schools.[4] In the early Buddhist schools, it was taken to imply that everything is produced as a result of a cause in a temporal sequence. This denied that there is any permanent reality in visible forms. It was in the Mādhyamika system that it was interpreted as the principle of "essential dependence of things on each other."[5] By essential dependence they meant that not only visible forms but all the dharmas are empty of self-nature. Dependent origination in the Mādhyamika, therefore, was equivalent to emptiness(śūnyatā) itself. Its real intention was to show the interdependence of dharmas and, consequently, their emptiness and unreality.

The Hua-yen school was faithful to the Buddhist tradition, particularly to Mādhyamika philosophy, in this respect. For Hua-yen philosophers too, dependent origination meant the interdependence or emptiness of dharmas. However, they went a step further; the very inter-

---

[3]K. N. Jayatilleke, Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge (London: 1963), p. 445.

[4]For the various classifications of the dependent origination theories, see Takakusu, op. cit., pp. 29-45, and his "Buddhism as a Philosophy of 'Thusness'" in The Indian Mind, ed. Charles A. Moore (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1967), pp. 86-117. The other relevant books concerning this topic are H. Ui, Bukkyo Shiso Kenkyu(Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940, 1966); T. H. Kim, Pulkyo-hak Keasŏl (Seoul: Poryŏngak, 1954, 1972); K. Kamekawa, Engi no Kuzo (Kyoto: Zenjinsha, 1944); etc.

[5]Murti, op. cit., p. 7. Cf. also pp. 86, 122, 136ff., 191ff. For the Mādhyamika understanding of the dependent origination, see also F. Streng, op. cit., pp. 58-68. For a general study, see Shoson Miyamoto, "A Re-appraisal of Pratitya-samutpada," in Studies in Indology and Buddhology presented in Honour of Prof. Susumu Yamaguchi on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1955), pp. 152-164.

dependence and emptiness common to all dharmas became the logical foundation for their principle of mutual identification and interpenetration. According to Hua-yen teaching, things are empty of their own nature, and thus "the things there existing" as they now are must be something other than mere illusory things; therefore, they are manifestations of the Real, or, in the ultimate sense, they are the Real itself. Whereas the Mādhyamika, for example, was satisfied with the insight into the unreality of phenomenal things, the Hua-yen philosophers realized that their empirical reality resulted from their being identified with Reality itself. In other words, both the Mādhyamika and the Hua-yen took dependent origination as the principle of the interdependence of things; but they differed in that for the former it was used to emphasize the unreality of things that are empty of the Real, while for the latter it was used to stress the reality of existing things which are identified with the Real.[6]

Why then did Hua-yen try to see Reality through the interrelationship of dharmas? According to Hua-yen, since the dharmadhātu as Being-itself is beyond any categorization and free from any distinction, there is no way to deal with it other than by approaching it through the causal aspect(緣門). "The dharmadhātu as true nature," it is said, "transcends [common-sense] feeling and is beyond [intellectual] views."[7] It is the

---

[6]For Fa-tsang's statement on the difference between Mādhyamika and Hua-yen, see his Wu-chiao-chang, T. 45, p. 502c; Cook, op. cit., pp. 461f. Tsung-mi also discusses the differences between these two systems in terms of ten categories. See Ch'an-yüan chu-ch'uan-chi tu-hsu, T. 48, pp. 406aff.; and Kamata's Japanese translation, op. cit., pp. 153ff. A similar distinction is found in Ch'eng-kuan's writings, as well. Cf. ibid., p. 155.

[7]T. 45, p. 683c, l. 3. "法界眞性 超情離見."

object of kuan(insight); and as Tsung-mi said, kuan is an intuition made possible only after "exhausting [common-sense] feeling and wiping out views."[8] As Cook further explains, "when there is enlightenment, the true state of the dharmadhātu as the content of enlightenment is inexpressible."[9] In other words, because it is inexpressible(不可說, anabhilāpya) and inconceivable(不思議, acintya) in its result aspect(果門) or its pure originality and substantiality, what can be grasped are only its process of becoming, functioning, actualizing, identifying, penetrating, permeating, and so on. This process within the dharmadhātu is summed up in the Hua-yen technical term, "dependent origination."[10]

This is clearly stated by Chih-yen in the following passage:

> Now with regard to distinguish between the two aspects of cause and result: the perfect result [aspect] is beyond expressible characteristics and, therefore, cannot be discussed by means of words or speech; the causal aspect, however, can be elucidated as skillful means(upāya) for preliminary practice(緣修),[11] and therefore, can be briefly discussed.[12]

Fa-tsang also began his Wu-chiao-chang with a statement of the same purport:

---

[8] T. 45, p. 634c, l. 2. "觀 情盡見除"

[9] Cook, op. cit., p. 487.

[10] The distinction between "causal aspect" and "result aspect" is persistent in the Hua-yen writings. See for example, T. 45, p. 514ab; T. 45, p. 477a and p. 503a; and T. 45, p. 597a.

[11] For the meaning of this term in contrast to 眞修, see Ono, op. cit., p. 1317b.

[12] T. 45, p. 514b, ll. 6-8. "今辨此因果二門者 因果絶言說相 所以不可以言說而辨 因即明其方便緣修 是故略辨也."

> There are two parts to the first category [of the distinctive doctrine]; one is the ocean of nature which is result, and this is inexpressible. Why? because it is unrelated to teaching. It is identical with the ten Buddhas' own realm.... The second is dependent origination which is the causal part.13

What these passages imply is that whereas the "result-aspect" is inexpressible, the "causal aspect" which is shown in terms of dependent origination is accessible for spiritual observation and discussion. The dharmadhātu as essential Reality or Being-itself is the realm of mystic experience that is far beyond the grasp of discursive reasoning. All that can be perceived on the upāya level is the functional aspect or becoming process of the dharmadhātu.

Of course, in the sense of Buddhist philosophy there can be no "process" or "becoming" as the ultimate, for in the Absolute there is only "quiescence," the state of nirvāṇa. This absolute state, for Hua-yen, is the goal which they try to reach by intuitive observation, but is not a subject for discussion. As far as philosophical discussion is concerned, Hua-yen tries to see this "process" aspect of dharmadhātu.

Hua-yen philosophy, in this particular sense, might be called a "philosophy of process," because it is more concerned with the process which ensues as a result of the interaction between the phenomenal and the Absolute or between one phenomenon and other phenomena. It is not a philosophy concerned with a static essence or being but a philosophy dealing primarily with the dynamic relational process working among various component parts or manifested existences of the Absolute.

13T. 45, p. 477a, ll. 14-17. Quoted from Cook's translation, pp. 113f

For this reason we have translated hsiang-chi(相即) as "mutual identification" instead of "mutual identity." Whereas mutual identity alludes to the state in which two or more things have been or are mutually identical, mutual identification implies that they are in the process of becoming mutually identified. It is true, of course, that things have always been identical "from beginningless beginning" in the ultimate sense, and to that extent temporality is meaningless; thus the "state of mutual identity" is also acceptable. Nevertheless, Hua-yen philosophers put this aspect in brackets, at least temporarily, because this state of mutual identity is beyond the limit of their comprehension. Their intuitive attention was focused on the process in which things are now becoming identical, i.e., the dynamic aspect of mutual relationship. Mutually identifying, interpenetrating operation and transaction, not the state or result, was the object of their meditative observation.

Seen from the standpoint of dependent origination, there is no determinism whatsoever. All dharmas are relative, and they are all dependent upon and related to each other. Nothing can have an isolated existence or fixed value of its own. As indicated before, the view of dependent origination which sees everything relative is not new. Whether "relative" in a temporal sense as is typical in early Buddhism, or in an essential sense indicative of the Mādhyamika, the relativity of dharmas has been maintained throughout the history of Buddhist thought as a distinctively Buddhist idea. The uniqueness of Hua-yen philosophy, however, lies in its thoroughgoing emphasis on and neat systematic formulation of this idea, particularly in terms of the interrelationship of dharmas on the phenomenal level. The best and clearest example of this interpretation is found in the Hua-yen doctrine of "the perfect interfusion of the six

characteristics"(六相圓融).[14]

According to this doctrine, all dharmas have six characteristics in three pairs, which complement each other: universality and speciality (總別), similarity and diversity(同異), and integration and disintegration (成壞).[15] Fa-tsang's own example[16] states that a house should be considered as having these six characteristics. The house as a whole is seen as a thing of "universality" which includes such components as pillars, rafters and so forth. But the same house, if seen from a different angle, is a thing of "speciality" composed of individual pillars, rafters and so on, which, though forming the whole, preserve their own special characteristics. The same is true with similarity and diversity. The house is a thing of "similarity" in the sense that its components have pooled their various strengths in order to form the house, and are all equally and harmoniously co-related to it. At the same time the house is a thing of "diversity" if it is seen as an entity composed of the various components which have diverse and special relations and functions in relation to the whole of the house. In the case of integrity and disintegrity, if the house is seen as a thing consisting of parts which are working together to form a unitary being or house, it is then regarded as a thing of "integrity";

---

[14]This was first formulated by Chih-yen and later used by Fa-tsang in connection with the "ten mysteries." Cf. T. 45, pp. 507cff. See also Cook, op. cit., pp. 527ff., and Ono, op. cit., p. 1823b.

[15]T. 45, p. 507c, and p. 666b. For the translations of the terms, see Cook, op. cit., p. 527. Takakusu, The Essentials, op. cit., p. 122, Garma C. C. Chang, op. cit., p. 168, Chan, A Source Book, op. cit., p. 413, de Bary, op. cit., p. 333, Fung, op. cit., p. 355.

[16]T. 45, p. 507c, ll. 20ff.

whereas if its parts are all functioning differently, in different positions and angles, the house consisting of these different parts is considered as a thing of "disintegrity." In short, what is implied here is that, as J. Takakusu says, "no elements(dharmas) have single and independent existence, each possessing the Sixfold Nature in itself."[17] Everything is co-related and interdependent, or in specifically Hua-yen terms, mutually identifying and interpenetrating.

In elaborating upon the six characteristics, Fa-tsang points out that the house, pillars, rafters and so forth are meaningless without being considered within the total context of interrelationship. It goes without saying that apart from the pillars, rafters, and so on there can be no house. But it is simultaneously true that without the concept of house the concept of pillar, rafter, etc. cannot be sustained, because the pillar can be a pillar only as far as it is acknowledged within the context of the house. Thus the concept of house is included in the concept of pillar, and vice versa. Apart from the house there cannot be the pillar, and apart from the pillars there can be no house. These two concepts are, therefore, interpenetrating or mutually inclusive.[18]

---

[17]Takakusu, The Essentials, op. cit., p. 123. According to Takakusu, of these six characteristics, 1) universality and speciality are concerning "character itself," 2) similarity and diversity are about "the relation of beings," 3) integration and disintegration are connected with "the state of becoming." He further states that universality, similarity, and integration are of the "nature of equalization and unification" while speciality, diversity and disintegration are "of the nature of discrimination and distribution." See ibid., pp. 122 and 123.

[18]Cf. T. 45, p. 507c.

This is also the case among the various components of the house themselves. Without the house the name of "pillar" would lose its meaning. The house cannot be constructed by the pillars alone and, therefore, the pillars, to be pillars at all, require the other components of the house such as rafters, tiles and so forth in order that they retain their identity as pillars. It is the same with rafters, tiles, and the infinite number of components which constitute the house. It is a rafter only as long as there exist all the other elements related to it. There is no rafter per se. In the concept of rafter, there is included everything such as house, pillar, roof, tile, and so on. Each and every one of these is, likewise, interrelated -- interpenetrating and mutually identifying.

Such an outlook could be called "totalistic" or "organic," as some scholars suggest.[19] Whether it is totalistic or organic, its basic attitude toward the phenomenal orders of the world is to try to relate them in terms of the twin principles of mutual identification and interpenetration. In its insistent emphasis on such an interrelatedness of dharmas Hua-yen philosophy may rather be designated as "relativistic" or more specifically "relationalistic." Everything is seen, in this system, as infinitely related to other things. Apart from this relatedness, nothing has an existence of its own. Every dharma finds its existence only in its relationship to others. Moreover, the inexhaustibility and infinity of

---

[19]Cf. Cook, op. cit., p. 531. G. C. C. Chang, op. cit., pp. 169 and 170. Chang used the terms "totalistic and organic approach" and "organic and totalistic orientation." Also see Takakusu, The Essential, op. cit., pp. 15, 109, et passim. Here Takakusu called Hua-yen philosophy "totalism" or "totalistic."

these relationships is vigorously emphasized. Everything should be viewed in all possible relationships with all possible things. Every possible level and every available dimension should be applied to a certain thing. In other words, any given object in the world is subject to infinitely numerous and different frames of reference. Depending upon the different relationships the same person can be a father, a son, a brother, a husband, a teacher, or a traveler. In addition, he is also seen as a compound of chemical elements by a chemist, as a living organism by a biologist, as an object to be portrayed by an artist, or even a thing to be eaten by a tiger. He is all of these "simultaneously." Nothing can have a fixed, intrinsic, or static value nor be judged by a determined standard. Everything in the phenomenal order is fluid, flexible, and relative.

The same step is too high for a child and at the same time too low for an adult. The same step is also to wide for a child and too narrow for an adult. The same step has, therefore, the qualities of being high and low, wide and narrow, and so on, all simultaneously. The truth of the "ten mysteries" lies in pointing out these relativistic or relationalistic qualities of all dharmas. The first mystery, "the simultaneous completion and mutual correspondence(同時具足相應門), for example, is saying that all qualities are simultaneously complete in a given dharma and all of these are corresponding or relative to each other. All dharmas are free from being either narrow or broad; they are both narrow and broad, and many more without obstruction. This is the so-called mystery of "the sovereignty and non-obstruction of the broad and the narrow." The truth of "the perfect and brilliant compatibility of the qualities of being both the primary and the secondary" conclusively affirms this relativistic

outlook of Hua-yen philosophy.

In such a transcendental insight, there can be no room for dogmatic assertions concerning any particular thing. A theoretical polarity of good and bad, right and wrong, happy and unhappy, profane and sacred, and the like is completely removed.[20] Static views(drṣṭi) or dogmas[21] have no place in such a flexible and comprehensive attitude toward dharmas. Hua-yen philosophy is in this sense a philosophy of liberation which sets a person free from all rigid and stubborn dogmatism, prejudice, and preconception. The restraints and bondages of localization, categorization, artificial restriction, conceptual construction, sentimental bias, provincialism, intolerant self-centeredness, and worldly attachment, are all broken down and there remains only absolute spiritual freedom which keeps one from partial judgement but leads to a perfect and round perspective of things. Those things which have been seen by common-sense knowledge as essentially distinctive, categorically different, and spatio-temporally separate from each other are here in this Hua-yen meditative intuition of a higher level, completely dissolved into the totalistic harmony of the dharmadhātu of non-obstruction and non-hindrance. There is only the one unique reality(一眞法界) in which every fixed distinction, discrimination or particularization has no room. Terms such

---

[20] This is not to assert an advocating of a-morality on the level of everyday life. It is simply to indicate that Hua-yen insight is beyond the common-sense moral value. It is, as to were, supra-moral but not contra-moral.

[21] It is interesting to note that the Sanskrit term drṣṭi(view or theory) is derived from the verbal root "to see"(dṛṣ), just as "dogma" is from the Greek verb "to see"(δοκέω). Both of these may point to the superficial seeing or perception which is harmful to true insight and wisdom.

as "mutual identification"(相即), "interpenetration"(相入), "inclusion" (攝入), "melting and infusing"(鎔融), "pervasion and universalization" (周遍), "interpermeation" (交參), are expressions of such a world view.

What is important to remember here is that such a thoroughgoing relativistic and relationalistic understanding of dharmas does not exclude the absoluteness of the Ultimate Reality, which is dharmadhātu as the ground or essentia of dharmas. As indicated before, the only reason that the absolute aspect is not elaborated upon is that the essential aspect, according to Hua-yen philosophy, is beyond the reach of direct human logic or reasoning, and thus inaccessible and inexpressible. Consequently all Hua-yen philosophers can do is to deal with the manifestations of Reality, viz., the phenomenal or existential aspect of it. They believe in the identification of "noumenon and phenomena," just like other systems, but they go a step further to emphasize the non-obstructive interrelationship of "phenomena and phenomena." By doing so they point out the absolute relativity of the phenomenal order. Their principal intention, however, does not stop here; it is to lead man to the point at which he can realize the relative character of phenomenal things and liberate himself from them; this in turn will lead ultimately to the final goal of experiencing the Ultimate Reality. In terms of philosophy, Hua-yen philosophers have a relativistic outlook, in the sense that they consider the relative aspect of reality in their philosophical discussion. From the religious viewpoint, however, they believe in the Absolute to the extent that they regard the experience of the Absolute as their religious goal.

Hua-yen is in the same line with other Buddhist schools such as

the Mādhyamika, for example, in maintaining the relatedness or relative character of all existing things. The intention of the religious pursuit of both schools is to experience that Ultimate Reality which is absolute, or more strictly speaking, which is even beyond such distinctions as absolute or relative. In the final analysis, Hua-yen, as well as Mādhyamika, holds the Ultimate or Real as being of prime importance for their religious life as well as philosophical contemplation. However, whereas Mādhyamika is consistently emphasizing the emptiness of phenomenal existence using primarily a via negativa, Hua-yen wants to stress the interrelationship of that phenomenal existence. Of course, it cannot be denied that even for Hua-yen philosophers what is originating dependently is empty of self-nature. They are faithful to this fundamental truth, which is the basis of their philosophical structure. Nevertheless their main task is not to elucidate this, but rather to emphasize the infinite mutual relationships of things. It is significant to note that in the formula of the "ten mysteries," which is a cardinal dharmadhātu doctrine, not even a single word of "emptiness"(空, śūnyatā) is found.[22] As presented in the Fa-chieh-kuan-men the truth of emptiness is the first preliminary stage in contrast to the second and the third which teach the relations

---

[22]Stcherbatsky translated śūnyatā as "relativity" in his Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, op. cit., passim. Streng criticized him saying that the term "relativity" expressed "only a metaphysical principle as it applies to particles of existence or different phenomena in existence" but "not to the highest spiritual truth." See his Emptiness, op. cit., p. 167. As far as the "ten mysteries" of Hua-yen philosophy is concerned, however, the term "relativity" seems very fitting because every item of the ten mysteries is teaching the relativity of dharmas rather than the "highest spiritual truth" itself and also because "relativity" has a less negative connotation than the term "emptiness."

between the noumenon and phenomena and those between a phenomenon and other phenomena, respectively.

It is frequently the case in the Buddhist tradition that the differences between various systems are those of emphasis rather than those having to do with fundamental variances in content. Consequently, it appears that Hua-yen philosophy is not so much a reaction against previous traditions as it is a different accentuation of certain ideas which already had germinated or sprouted in those earlier systems. Hua-yen, as the inheritor of Mādhyamika, Yogācāra, and tathāgatagarbha traditions, quite naturally received all necessary doctrinal elements from them. But in a different situation and with different peoples, it emerged as an important variant of the previous schools.

The main difference is that for Hua-yen the particular or the phenomenal is not considered completely detrimental for religious purposes. On the contrary it is helpful in the sense that it is through the apprehension of it that Reality can be approached. Without the particulars it is impossible to realize the Truth. Cook points out: "In Hua-yen Buddhism, the first thing we notice is that things count. This is striking in view of the traditional Buddhist suspicion of the phenomenal world."[23] But what should be kept in mind is that even though Hua-yen regards phenomenal things as important, its ultimate goal is to penetrate them and reach to the Absolute, just as with traditional Indian Buddhism. We should be careful when saying that things are important in Hua-yen, because it is true only on the upāya level, not in an ultimate sense. In the last

---

[23]Cook, op. cit., p. 3.

analysis, Hua-yen thinkers, too, pursue the Real, not the phenomenal. The point is that Hua-yen took up this phenomenal realm as one through which true insight into the Real could be sought. The phenomenal world, when it is correctly intuited and recognized as it really is, serves as a spring board from which the higher dimension of spiritual insight can be entered. In emphasizing this aspect of reality, I think, lies the uniqueness of Hua-yen philosophy; and this is one of the most significant philosophical implications of the dharmadhātu doctrine of Hua-yen.

II. THE RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE

Having discussed the philosophical implications of the dharmadhātu doctrine of the Hua-yen school, it is appropriate to investigate some of its religious significances. The first question which should be asked is whether or not there are any religious or practical elements in such a highly theoretical system at all. In fact, it seems, at least on the surface, quite doubtful that there are any practical religious applications in Hua-yen philosophy. Such skepticism is expressed by Richard H. Robinson, who says:

> The Hua-yen doctrine is not so much a rational philosophy as a galaxy of concepts arrayed for contemplation. It is indeed sublime to look at, but it is not good for much else. This kind of intellectual yoga is a very hard road to samādhi, and in any place or time very few are ready for it.[1]

Such a negative evaluation of the Hua-yen philosophy is an age-old one. One of the most typical criticisms is found in the Fo-tsu t'ung-chi, compiled by the famous 13th century Buddhist historian Chih-p'an(志磐), who quotes K'ai-an(鎧菴, i.e., Wu K'e-chi, 吳克己, 1140-1214) as saying:

> The Five Teachings [of the Hua-yen school] do not provide the method of sundering and overcoming [defilements]. Therefore, whether it

---

[1] The Buddhist Religion (Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Company, 1970), p. 85.

> be the teaching or [the method of] insight, they are the pointless exposition of empty words. Consequently, they lack the way of cultivating realization.[2]

After a few passages it is added:

> Mahāyāna teachings of Elementary doctrine, Final doctrine, Perfect doctrine, or Sudden doctrine [as classified by Fa-tsang] are all wanting in the method of sundering and overcoming [defilements] and of cultivating realization. When they came to preach the method of insight upheld in The Awakening of Faith, they said that its method of cultivation was similar to the T'ien-t'ai's Mo-ho-chih-kuan. Is it not the case that they have [theoretical] teaching without [practical method of] insight.[3]

Even if we take into account the fact that K'ai-an was a T'ien-t'ai apologist and that Chih-p'an was "an enthusiastic orthodox monk of the T'ien-t'ai Sect,"[4] these remarks still betray a general understanding, or perhaps a misunderstanding, of Hua-yen teaching. Is the Hua-yen system then really a mere "galaxy of concepts" or "the pointless exposition of empty words," as it is characterized by these outsiders? The aim of this

---

[2]T. 49, p. 292c, ll. 8ff. "五教並斷伏分齊 然則若教若觀 徒張虛文 應無修證之道." We have consulted Unno's translation, "The Dimensions of Practice in Hua-yen Thought," in Yuki Commemorative Volume (Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1964), p. 51.

[3]Ibid., p. 293a, l. 28 - 293b, l. 2. "始終圓頓四教 皆無斷伏 修證分齊 至說起信論觀法 則云 修之次第如天台摩訶止觀 豈非有教無觀耶."

[4]For the detail on Ch'i-pan, see Yün-hua Jan, "The Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, a Biographical and Bibliographical Study," Oriens Extremus (April, 1963), 10. Jahrgan. Heft 1, pp. 61-82. Quotation is from p. 66. Kamata and Unno mistakenly quote the above mentioned passages as sayings of Chih-p'an himself. But they are K'ai-an's. Cf. Kamata, in Kegon Shiso, op. cit., p. 438, and T. Unno, op. cit., p. 51.

chapter is to argue that this is not the case. On a deeper level, it becomes evident, as will be seen, that the Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu is not a pure speculative system, but that it provides a theoretical tool with which to solve concrete religious needs and problems.[5]

According to Hua-yen believers, regardless of how philosophical or theoretical it may seem, the Hua-yen teaching has definite spiritual "benefits," helping people attain enlightenment here and now.[6] Every philosophical or theoretical statement has something pertaining to the enlightenment of sentient beings. E. Conze aptly expressed the existence of such a soteriological intention in the Buddhist theoretical tradition, with which Hua-yen philosophers would completely agree:

> The cornerstone of my interpretation of Buddhism is the conviction, shared by nearly everyone, that it is essentially a doctrine of salvation, and that all its philosophical statements are subordinate to its soteriological purpose. This implies not only that many philosophical problems are dismissed as idle speculations, but that each and every proposition must be considered in reference to its spiritual

---

[5]It is in this sense that I use the terms "religious" and/or "practical" in this section to describe this aspect of the dharmadhātu doctrine. It is to stress that the dharmadhātu doctrine is not a mere scholastic pursuit undertaken for the sake of "wondering"(thaumazein) or curiosity but has some degree of applicability for religious problems. That the doctrine has a practical meaning does not necessarily mean that it is directly related to religious practice such as ritual or liturgy. It simply means that it is not a theory for theory's sake, nor is it sheer speculative abstraction engaged upon to satisfy philosophical curiosity or logical consistency. Obviously, whether the doctrine itself is theoretical or not is irrelevant here. The issue is whether or not it contains anything applicable to practical concerns.

[6]Cf. Hua-yen chih-hsüeh, T. 45, pp. 595c-596c. Here Fa-tsang mentions "ten benefits"(十益), some of which will be dealt with later.

> intention and as a formulation of meditational experience acquired in the course of the process of winning salvation.[7]

Apart from general religious implications of Buddhist philosophy, in what way can the Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu be considered as practical or, more specifically, soteriological? The first point that can be made in this connection is that the dharmadhātu doctrine of mutual identification(相即) and interpenetration(相入) is relevant to the formation of their doctrine of enlightenment. This is to say that this basic philosophical idea enabled them to firmly adhere to the doctrine of the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood(一念成佛，速疾成佛，or 疾得成佛).

Although there had been some controversies over the process of enlightenment in terms of its being sudden or gradual even among the early Buddhist schools,[8] Indian Buddhism generally held that progress is usually gradual.[9] In China, however, the general view on the process of enlightenment was that it comes suddenly or instantaneously.[10] This general tendency toward sudden enlightenment is found in the thought of such pioneer Buddhist scholars as Seng-jui(僧叡,378-444?), Tao-sheng(道生, ca. 360-434), T'an-

---

[7] E. Conze, Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1967), p. 213. A similar statement is found in H. Nakamura, "Unity and Diversity in Buddhism," in The Path of the Buddha, ed. by K. Morgan (New York: Ronald Press, 1956), p. 373.

[8] Cf. Points of Controversy(Katha-Vatthu) tr. by S. Z. Aung and Mrs. Rhys Davids (London: PTS, 1915, 1969), pp. 145f.

[9] A. K. Warder, op. cit., p. 12, and "Another characteristic doctrine found in the Sthaviravāda is that progress in understanding all at once, 'insight'(abhisamaya) does not come 'gradually'(successively-anupūrva). Here again only the Mahīśāsakas shared their view, all the other schools holding that insight was gradual...." p. 295. Cf. also Jayatilleke, op. cit., p. 466.

luan(曇鸞, 476-542), and Hui-ssu(慧思, 515-576).[11]

This general characteristic of Chinese Buddhism in its formative period is most explicitly seen in Hsieh Ling-yun(謝靈運, 385-433), who dealt with this question in his P'ien-tsung-lun(辨宗論, Discussion of Essentials) in conjunction with Tao-sheng's "new theory" of sudden enlightenment.[12] According to Hsieh, while Indian Buddhism guarantees universal enlightenment but requires innumerable rebirths, Chinese Confucianism upholds it as within one's reach in this lifetime but denies its universality so much as to say that even Yen Hui, the great disciple of Confucius, only came close to reaching it. And he argues that Chinese Buddhism should combine those elements which would make enlightenment both universal and yet attainable in one's own lifetime, by saying:

> Now I would discard the Buddha's(doctrine of) gradual enlightenment, but accept his(belief in the) possibility of attaining (to Truth). I would discard Confucius' (statement about)

---

[10]One of the best examples of the different attitudes of Indians and Chinese on this question is found in the debate held in Tibet in the eighth century. See Paul Demieville, Le Concile de Lhasa, une Controverse sur le Quiétisme entre Bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIII[e] Siecle de l'Ère Chrètienne (Bibliotheque de l'Institute des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, vol. VII) (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France, 1952), Guiseppe Tucci, Minor Buddhist Texts, Part II. (First Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla) (Roma: Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1958).

[11]Cf. Enichi Ozo(横超慧日), "Sokushitsu Jobutzu no Shiso"(速疾成佛の思想)"(Idea of Sudden Attainment of Buddhahood), Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, III. no. 1, pp. 113-118, and Hu, Shih, "Development of Zen Buddhism in China," Chinese Social and Political Science Review, vol. 15 (1931), esp. pp. 483ff.

[12]Preserved in the Kuang-hung-ming-chi(廣弘明集), T. 52, pp. 224c-225b. Fully discussed in Fung, op. cit., vol. II., pp. 274ff.

> almost reaching it, but accept his (view) that it is one and final. One and final means it is different from gradual enlightenment, and being able to attain to it is not the same as almost reaching it. Thus what is to be discarded from Truth sets it apart from either Confucius or the Buddha, though it borrows from both.[13]

And he further mentioned the reason why the Buddha and Confucius have emphasized the Gradual accumulation of learning and the sudden enlightenment respectively:

> The difference between the two teachings is a manifestation of geography, resulting from the differences of the lands in which they have evolved. Roughly compared, they reflect the peoples (of these two lands). Thus the people of China have a facility for mirroring (i.e., intuitively comprehending) Truth, but difficulty in aquiring learning. Therefore they close themselves to the (idea of) accumulating learning, but open themselves to that of the one final ultimate. The foreigners (of India), on the other hand, have a facility for acquiring learning, but difficulty in mirroring Truth. Therefore they close themselves to (the idea of) instantaneous comprehension, but open themselves to that of gradual enlightenment.[14]

Whether the above-mentioned reason is accurate or not, what is implied in this passage is that the idea of the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood was generally upheld by Chinese Buddhists at that time.

Hua-yen philosophy, in accordance with this trend, adopted the

---

[13] T. 52, pp. 224c-225a. Quoted in Fung, op. cit., p. 275.

[14] Ibid., p. 276.

idea of the instantaneous achievement of enlightenment, and found in its doctrine of mutual identification and interpenetration of all dharmas a comprehensive theoretical foundation. One may further assume that the whole of the Hua-yen doctrine of dharmadhātu was actually formulated as an effort to theoretically substantiate this practical postulate of the time.[15] In other words, Hua-yen philosophy was not ultimately a purely theoretical system, but a service to the religious or practical needs of man.

It is Chih-yen who most explicitly expresses Hua-yen's support of the doctrine of instantaneous enlightenment. In the I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men, he mentions this concept in connection with the eighth truth of the ten mysteries, i.e., "the sovereignty of the mutual identification of all dharmas." Here he argues that because of the principle of mutual identification and inclusion and because of simultaneity and pervasiveness, the prior and the subsequent, cause and effect become all mutually identical and inclusive. Consequently the dictum of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra: "when one first awakens the aspiration for enlightenment(bodhicittopada) he has already attained it"[16] is verified.

Chih-yen continues to elaborate upon this issue:

To discuss in general the meaning of "the attain-

---

[15]Kamata and Unno emphasize this point: "...the thought of the ten mysteries, etc., were the philosophical bases for the argumentation of the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood." Kamata, op. cit., p. 101, and pp. 96, 106, and Unno, op. cit., p. 60.

[16]Cf. above p.52, "初發心時便成正覺 " and its variations are found throughout the writings of the Hua-yen patriarchs.

> ment of Buddhahood in one single thought-instant"(一念成佛):[17] According to the Hīnayāna teaching, it requires the cultivation and practice of three great incalculable eons(asaṁkhyeya kalpas) and fully a hundred eons(kalpas) of accumulating good karma, after which, and only then, can one realize Buddhahood. If, however, the practice is not fulfilled, then even though one aspires to attain to Buddhahood, he cannot attain to it. Therefore, there is no idea of the attainment of Buddhahood in a single thought-instant[here in the teaching of the Hīnayāna].[18]

In the case of Mahāyāna, Chih-yen continues, there are two varieties of interpretation concerning the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood. Both of these, Chih-yen argues, illustrate the idea of instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood in the sense that they teach that the attainment itself takes place in a moment, instantaneously. But, he says, they still maintain that the attainment of Buddhahood requires the practice of the three great incalculable eons, namely one to get to the first stage(bhūmi), another to move from the first stage on to the seventh, and a third one to lead from the eighth to the tenth stage. In the Ekayāna alone, at the first moment, which is identified with the last moment, one attains Buddhahood, and this is, according to Chih-yen, the true meaning

---

[17] The term "i-nien"(一念) is a translation of the Sanskrit word "kṣaṇa" which means "moment." But the Chinese term itself has another meaning -- "one thought." Therefore "一念成佛" can be translated as either the attainment of Buddhood in "one moment" or "moment of one thought."

[18] Op. cit., p. 513a, ll. 23ff. "通辨一念成佛義者 若小乘說要三大阿僧祇劫滿百劫 修行相好業始得成佛 行若滿意欲成佛亦不得 故無一念成佛義." According to the marginal note, the fourth phrase is read as 行若不滿意欲成佛亦不得, which I have followed here.

of the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood.[19]

In the Hua-yen K'ung-mu-chang, Chih-yen further advances the idea by introducing the concept of "the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood in no moment"(無念疾得成佛).[20] He says: "All dharmas are not arising and all dharmas do not cease. If one is able to apprehend this, one sees the true Buddha."[21] In the realm of complete mutual identification, we are as we are now in reality the very Buddha. In addition, Chih-yen emphasizes the simultaneity of enlightenment by saying, "the attainment of Buddhahood is accomplished simultaneously [repeated ten times] by all sentient beings, and afterwards [repeated ten times] all sunder their defilements again and again, yet they are not abiding in the stage of learning but have already achieved perfect enlightenment."[22] From these passages, it becomes apparent that every philosophical conclusion derived from the principle of mutual identification and interpenetration, such as the identity of beginning and end, of one and all, and so on is not merely a logical corollary but a base upon which the doctrine of the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood is constructed.

In most cases Fa-tsang reiterates Chih-yen's idea of instantaneous

---

[19]Cf. op. cit., p. 518a, l. 26-b, l. 1. A similar statement is found also in his Hua-yen Wu-shih-yao-wen-ta. Ibid., pp. 519c-520a.

[20]Cf. T. 45, p. 585c, ll. 4ff.

[21]Ibid., ll. 24f. "一切法不生 一切法不滅 若能如是解 是人見無佛故."

[22]T. 45, p. 586c, ll. 6ff. "成佛亦一切衆生同時同時...成佛. 後後... 皆新新斷惑 亦不住学地 而成正覺也."

attainment.[23] But in Fa-tsang, as expected, that theoretical basis is more systematically and clearly organized. This is clearly seen in the ninth chapter of his Wu-chiao-chang, in which Fa-tsang neatly summarizes the "time unit of cultivations"(修行時分) in various teachings.[24] According to him, in the Hīnayāna teaching the time requirements for enlightenment vary according to the different capacities of individuals. Among persons of inferior capacities, i.e., śrāvakas, the very quick ones require three lives: the first for planting the roots of goodness for emancipation, the second for conforming to the four aids to intellectual penetration (決擇, nirvedha), and the third for sundering defilements(漏, āvaraṇas) and acquiring the fruit of arhatship. The very slow ones need sixty eons(kalpas), twenty for each of three stages. Among those individuals of medium capacities i.e., pratyekabuddhas, the very quick ones take four lives for enlightenment and the very slow ones a hundred eons. It takes three incalulable eons(asaṁkhyeya kalpas) for the person of superior capacities, i.e., the Buddha Śākyamuni, to become perfect.[25]

In the Elementary teaching of the Mahāyāna, Fa-tsang argues, cultivation requires at least three greatly expanded innumerable and

---

[23]For example, he quotes Chih-yen's above-mentioned passage in T. 45, p. 506a, ll. 4ff.

[24]T. 45, pp. 490bff. Cf. Cook, op. cit., pp. 284ff.

[25]T. 45, pp. 490bff.

incalculable eons. The Final teaching of the Mahāyāna has two time requirements: one fixed and the other unfixed. The former is three great incalculable eons, the latter remains variable and can be adjusted depending upon the various natures of time. In the Sudden teaching of the Mahāyāna, because time is inexpressible, the time element is inconceivable. "One moment is identical with no moment, and time is identical with no time."[26]

As for the Perfect teaching of the Mahāyāna, that is, Hua-yen, Fa-tsang says:

> All the time units are unfixed, because all the kalpas interpenetrate, become mutually identified, and completely pervade all the worlds such as that of Indra. Consequently, according to circumstances, whether one single instant or incalculable kalpas [are spoken of], it does not contradict the law of [given] time.[27]

This implies that since every unit of time is mutually identified with and included in each other, moment and kalpas have no difference. "One instant may be identical with incalculable kalpas and incalculable kalpas with one instant. One life may be identical with innumerable lives."[28] Therefore, when one first awakens, he is at once and forever the Buddha.

In addition to such a new concept of the time element with regard

---

[26] T. 45, p. 491a, ll. 6f. "一念者即無念也時者即無時也."

[27] T. 45, p. 491a, ll. 7ff. "一切時分悉皆不定何以故謂諸劫相入故相即故該通一切阿陀羅等諸世界故. 仍各隨處或一念或無量劫等不違時法也."

[28] Hua-yen-ching chih-kuei, T. 45, p. 596b, ll. 19f. "或一念則無量劫無量劫則一念一生則無量生."

to the attainment of Buddhahood, Fa-tsang repeatedly emphasizes the other related fundamental principles of his philosophy as the bases of instantaneous enlightenment. One of the most solid foundations for instantaneous enlightenment is the mutual identification of cause and effect.

In the Hua-yen principle of mutual identification and interpenetration, the common sense notion of cause and effect undergoes a drastic change. Normally it is thought that the cause comes first and the effect follows. But there is no room in Hua-yen for such a fixed notion. Cause (A) and effect(B) are interrelated and essentially identical with each other. The cause(A) is not a cause at all without a definite effect(B). In other words, a cause(A) is a cause only so far as there is an effect (B). In this sense the effect(B) has played the role of cause in order that cause(A) can be identified as a cause in the true understanding of the word; thus cause(A) is the result of the effect(B) and the effect(B) has functioned as a cause. In this way "cause and effect are simultaneous, interpenetrating, and mutually identifiable."[29] Everything is a cause and at the same time an effect. Every cause intrinsically includes the nature of effect at the same time, and every effect that of cause. This idea, which is also found in Chih-yen,[30] is aptly expressed by Fa-tsang:

> In the meaning of this Ekayāna(Hua-yen), cause and effect are of the same essence and constitute one Dependent Origination. If one is acquired, the

---

[29]Cf. T. 45, p. 505c, ll. 9f. "因果俱時相攝相即."

[30]Cf. T. 45, p. 516a, ll. 1ff., et passim.

> other is also acquired, because the one and the other are identifiable. If there is no effect, the cause would not be a cause. Why? Because it did not have [corresponding] effect, it cannot be the cause.[31]

Such an identification of cause and effect had a special bearing on the Hua-yen view of the spiritual progress towards enlightenment. As mentioned before, Hua-yen doctrine acknowledges fifty-two stages from the first stage of faith(śraddhā) up to the Buddhahood of wonderful enlightenment(妙覺). But because of the principle of mutual identification and simultaneity of cause and effect, the very first causal stage of faith is simply identical temporally and essentially with the last result-stage of Buddhahood.[32] Therefore, if the first stage of faith is perfected, the stage of Buddhahood, together with all the other stages, is simultaneously perfected. This is the so-called "attainment of Buddhahood with the fulfillment of the stage of faith"(信滿成佛).[33] It is most clearly expressed in the following passage of Fa-tsang:

> The characteristics of the stages of the Ekayāna, the higher or the lower, are all equalized. Therefore, each stage embraces all stages, and hence all the stages, including that of Buddhahood, are included in the stage of faith. The same is true with each of the

---

[31] T. 45, p. 505c, ll. 18ff. "此一乘義 因果同体成 緣起得此即得彼 由彼相即故 若不得果者 因即不成因 何以故 不得果等[故]非因也."

[32] Cf. T. 45, p. 489b, ll. 26ff.

[33] Cf. T. 45, p. 490a, l. 14, ibid., pp. 595c, ll. 26, 27, 596a, l. 1, 7, 8, etc. As for the importance of faith, see also T. 45, p. 645b, ll. 22ff. In addition to this term, Fa-tsang also used many others expressing "quick attainment"(e.g.速至佛果, 疾得, 速證, 速入).

other stages.[34]

It is further said, "because all stages and the stage of Buddhahood are mutually identical, cause and effect are not different, the beginning and end are non-obstructing, and one is both a Bodhisattva and a Buddha at every one of these stages."[35]

Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi accept the same idea. Ch'eng-kuan says that many eons(kalpas) and a thought-instant(kṣaṇa) are identical, and thus once the faith stage is fulfilled, at that moment one has arrived at the stage of Buddhahood.[36] This is more clearly seen in the following statement of Tsung-mi.

> One stage is identical with all stages, and
> all stages are identical with one stage.
> Therefore if [the stage of] the ten faiths is fulfilled
> in mind all five categories of stages
> are included therein.[37]

And in his own commentary on this passage, he said that this is possible because in the dharmadhātu of non-obstruction of shih and shih(事事無礙) cause is effect, and vice versa. Therefore, he said, the truth that when one first awakens the aspiration for supreme enlightenment he has already attained it becomes a reality.[38]

---

[34] T. 45, p. 484a, ll. 15ff. "一乘所有位相上下皆齊仍一一位中攝一切位 是故乃至佛等諸位 在信等位中. 餘位亦然"

[35] T. 45, p. 489c, ll. 2f. "以諸位及佛地等相即等故即因果無二始終無礙 於一一位上即是菩薩即是佛者."

[36] Hua-yen-Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching, T. 45, p. 683a, ll. 10f.

[37] Yüan-chüeh-ching-shu, HTC, 14, p. 116a, ll. 11f."一位即一切位 一切位即一位 是故十信滿心即攝五位."

[38] Yüan- chüeh-ching-shu-ch'ao, HTC, 14, p. 263c.

The doctrine of dharmadhātu has changed the view of enlightenment not only in terms of time but also in terms of space. The idea of mutual identification and interpenetration leads to a reconsideration of the concepts of the attainment of Buddhahood in spatial terms, as well as in temporal terms. This is to say that if someone had attained Buddhahood in one place, it would mean that all other persons had attained it in all other places because that "someone" is identical with the others. According to this line of thinking, as Cook rightly points out, Śākayamuni's enlightenment in sixth century B.C. in India occurs not only in every insant of the past, future, and present, but also everywhere in the world.[39]

A totally absurd song of a Ch'an monk, Fu Ta-shih(傅大士, 497-569)[40] which runs:

> A cow ate grass in Chin-Chou, but the horse
> in I-Chou became satiated.[41]

is now understandable in the light of the Hua-yen doctrine of mutual identification and interpenetration of all dharmas in the dharmadhātu.

---

[39]Cf. Cook, op. cit., p. 26.

[40]He is also known as Shan-hui(善慧), etc. Cf. Shih Bukkyo Jiten, ed. by Ishida et al. (Tokyo: Seishin Shobo, 1962), p. 441. For more on his gāthās, see John C. H. Wu, The Golden Age of Zen (Taipei: The Chinese Library, 1967), pp. 253f., Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series) (New York: Grove Press: 1949, 1961), p. 272.

[41]Quoted in Garma C. C. Chang, op. cit., p. 113.

III. THE HISTORICAL INFLUENCE OF THE DHARMADHĀTU DOCTRINE

In dealing with the significance of the Hua-yen dharmadhātu doctrine, we have discussed some of its philosophical implications and religious meanings. In the present chapter, we will finally examine its historical influence on Chinese thought.[1] In this project the influence of Hua-yen will be investigated in terms of three major areas of thought: 1) the other schools of Buddhism, especially Ch'an and T'ien-t'ai, 2) Taoism, and 3) Neo-Confucianism.

1) Other Schools of Buddhism

A first example of Hua-yen influence is found in the Ch'an (or Zen) tradition. It is known, of course, that the streams of influence on Ch'an such as Taoism, Confucianism, and T'ien-t'ai, are important. It is also known that the Hua-yen philosophy, particularly in Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi, was enriched by Ch'an insights. But this is not the place to deal with these issues.[2] Our task at this point is to single out the

---

[1]The Hua-yen influence on Chinese art is interesting, but since this is not the place to go into this topic, anyone interested may be referred to Jan Fontein, The Pilgrimage of Sudhana -- A Study of Gaṇḍavyūha Illustrations in China, Japan and Java, op. cit., and the references therein.

[2]For these questions, see Takamine, Kegon to Zen to no Tsuro(The Passage between Hua-yen and Ch'an) (Kyoto:Nando Bukkyo Kenyu-kai, 1956).

most evident Hua-yen influence on the Ch'an tradition.

It is often thought that since the Ch'an ideal was "the attainment of Buddhahood by realizing self-nature"(見性成佛), "not by depending on words or letters"(不立文字),[3] it had nothing to do with any particular canonical scriptures or articulate teachings. To some extent this is true in that the Ch'an school did not approach the scriptures for scholastic purposes. But it is incorrect to assume that Ch'an was totally anti-canonical and anti-philosophical. Historically speaking, there are many instances within the Ch'an tradition of interest in the study of scriptures and their philosophical implications.

To take a few examples of Ch'an's connection with the scriptures, it is said that Bodhidharma, the nominal founder of the Ch'an, recommended that his disciple Hui-k'e study the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra. This sūtra has been studied since then mainly by Ch'an followers. Furthermore, the Vajracchedikā-sūtra(Diamond sūtra) came to be considered as an important text by the time of Hung-jen(弘忍, 602-675) and Hui-neng(慧能, 638-713), the fifth and the sixth partriarchs. It is said that Hui-neng was awakened when he heard a man reciting this sūtra and was urged to visit Huang-mei Mountain where Hung-jen was said to have been teaching this sūtra.[4] In

---

[3]Other phrases with a similar purport are: "A special transmission apart from the scriptures"(教外別傳), "transmission from mind to mind"(以心傳心), "pointing directly to the mind of man"(直指人心).

[4]Shen-hui(神會, 670-758), the influential disciple of Hui-neng, even declared that it was the Vajracchedikā that was recommended by Bodhidharma to Hui-k'e. Cf. Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, op. cit., p. 18.

addition to these two, we also find in Hui-neng's sermons many quotations from the sūtras, such as the Nirvāṇa, Vimalakīrti, Amitābha, Bodhisattva-śīla, Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.[5]

From this evidence it can be inferred that the Avataṁsaka-sūtra and Hua-yen philosophy were not beyond the reach of the Ch'an masters. Although the connection of the Ch'an with Hua-yen thought did not become full-scaled until the time of Tsung-mi, even the early Ch'an masters, as both D. T. Suzuki and R. Takamine point out, were well acquainted with the ideas of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra. According to Suzuki:

> The Avataṁsaka Sūtra was quoted by Zen masters even prior to Tu-shun, for according to the Masters and Disciples of the Laṅka, Hui-k'e [the second patriarch of the Ch'an school] extensively refers to the sūtra in support of his view, while Tao-hsin[580-651, the fourth patriarch and a contemporary of Tu-shun] also quotes a passage from the sūtra saying that a particle of dust contains innumerable worlds within itself.... in the case of the Avataṁsaka, the reference is more than local and specific, it is concerned with entire thought pervading the sūtra.[6]

Takamine also says that not only in the writings of Hui-k'e and Tao-hsin but also in those of Seng-ts'an(僧璨, d. 606), the third patriarch of the Ch'an school, there are some traces of Hua-yen thought. In Seng-ts'an's Hsin-hsin-ming(信心銘),[7] there are expressions such as

---

[5]It is said that Hui-neng had a knowledge of at least seven great sūtras. Cf. Heinrich Dumoulin, A History of Zen Buddhism (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 89, and John C. H. Wu, The Golden Age of Zen (Taiwan: The Chinese Library, 1967), p. 77.

[6]Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, op. cit., p. 21.

[7]T. 48, no. 2010.

"the smallest is identical with the largest," or "one is all and all is one."[8] Moreover, in the Tsui-shang-ch'eng-lun(最上乘論), a work of the fifth partriarch Hung-jen, there are quotations from the Avataṁsaka-sūtra.[9]

Clearer signs of Hua-yen influence on Ch'an are found in the teachings of the Northern branch of the Ch'an school, which was also known as "the Hua-yen Ch'an"(華嚴禪). In the Ta-ch'eng-wu-fang-pien(大乘五方便), a text discovered at Tun-huang recently, and attributed to Shen-hsiu(神秀, 605?-706), the founder of this branch, the Avataṁsaka-sūtra was recommended as a text which was believed to teach the truth of unhindered interpenetration of all dharmas and thus the way to the spiritual emancipation.[10] In addition, the idea of mutual identification (相即) of li and shih is dealt with here just as in the Hua-yen school. It is also known that Shen-hsiu wrote a commentary on the Avataṁsaka-sūtra in thirty fascicles.[11] In fact, it is not surprising that as a contemporary of Chih-yen and Fa-tsang he picked up Hua-yen ideas, which were so influential at Ch'ang-an at that time.

---

[8]Takamine, op. cit., pp. 160ff. See also Kamata, "Kegon Shiso no Honshitsu" in Bukkyo no Shiso, no. 6, Mugan no Sekaikan - Kegon, ed. by Kamata and Yamaue (Tokyo: Katokawa Shoten, 1969), pp. 159f.

[9]For the quotations, see Kamata, ibid., p. 160. Cf. Takamine, op. cit., pp. 168-172.

[10]Cf. Seizan Yanagida, "Chugoku Zenshushi"(A History of Ch'an in China) in Koza Zen, ed. by K. Nishitani (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967), vol. III, p. 33. See also H. Ui, Zenshu shi Kenkyu(A Study of Zen History) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1935, 1966[4]), pp. 356ff., esp. p. 366.

[11]S. Yanagida, op. cit., p. 32, and Suzuki, op. cit., p. 20.

In the Southern branch, Ma-tsu Tao-i(馬祖道一, 709-788), the most important figure during the third generation after Hui-neng, and Lin-chi I-hsüan(臨濟義玄, d. 866), the founder of the powerful Lin-chi (Japanese: Rinzai) sect or house of Ch'an, also show Hua-yen influence in their thought. In Ma-tsu's sayings we find clear indications that he picked up such concepts from the Hua-yen system as dharmadhātu, li and shih, Dependent Origination of infinity, and Manifestation of Nature. The idea of "ocean-like samādhi"(sāraga-mudrā-samādhi) expounded in Fa-tsang's Wang-chin-hüan-yüan-kuan is also found in his sayings.[12] With regard to Lin-chi, Suzuki, who himself belongs to the Rinzai sect, declares that "Lin-chi's 'Fourfold Liao-chien'[料簡] too may be traced back to the system of Fa-tsang."[13]

The influence of Hua-yen on Ch'an is not limited to this. According to Suzuki, Shih-t'ou Hsi-ch'ien(石頭希遷, 699-790), whose influence was second only to that of Ma-tsu, and Tung-shan Liang-chieh (洞山良介, 807-869), the founder of the Ts'ao-tung(Japanese: Soto) sect which was equal to the Lin-chi in influence, explicitly show that they were influenced by Hua-yen philosophy. To quote Suzuki:

---

[12]Takamine, op. cit., p. 186. Kamata, "Kegon Shiso no Honshitzu," op. cit., pp. 161, and 162f.

[13]Suzuki, op. cit., p. 19. For an extensive study of Lin-chi and his teachings, see his first two volumes of Essays in Zen Buddhism (London: 1927 and 1933, new editions, 1958, etc.) For the meanings of "liao-chien," see Chang Chung-yuan, Original Teachings of Ch'an Buddhism (New York, Vintage Books, 1969), pp. 97-101. Here he translates the term into "Four Processes of Liberation from Subjectivity and Objectivity." Cf. also Oda, op. cit., p. 1810c. Lin-chi-lu has been translated into French by Paul Demiéville, Entretiens de Lin-tsi (Paris: Fayard, 1972).

> ...Shih-t'ou in his 'Ode on Identity' depicts the mutuality of Light and Dark as restricting each other and at the same time being fused in each other; Tung-shan in his metrical composition called 'Sacred Mirror Samādhi' discourses on the mutuality of P'ien [偏], 'one-sided', and Cheng [正], 'correct', much to the same effect as Shih-t'ou in his Ode.... This idea of Mutuality and Identity is no doubt derived from Avataṁsaka philosophy, so ably formulated by Fa-tsang.[14]

In the relationship between Hua-yen and Ch'an, Tsung-mi(779-841) stands in a unique position. The fact that he was the fifth patriarch of the Hua-yen school and at the same time was regarded as a head of one of the influential Ch'an sects of the time made him a kind of connecting link between the two schools. For Tsung-mi, the Buddha-truth is one and the same both in Hua-yen and Ch'an, but the Hua-yen doctrine is the highest expression or teaching of that inexpressible truth.[15] It was through him that Ch'an practitioners came to make an attempt to express the Ch'an experience by means of philosophical system. In other words, they began to use the philosophical system of Hua-yen, which was introduced by Tsung-mi, to interpret Ch'an, which until then had not been systematically presented. In this sense Tsung-mi's contribution to the Ch'an tradition

---

[14]Suzuki, ibid., p. 19. For details on Tung-shan's theory of p'ien(the relative or the phenomenal) and cheng(the Absolute or the noumenal) see Wu, op. cit., pp. 178ff. and Dumoulin, op. cit., pp. 114ff. A detailed discussion on the relationship between Hua-yen and the Ts'ao-tung sect is found in Chang Chung-yuan, op. cit., pp. 41ff.

[15]For his idea on the relationship of three kinds of Ch'an and three kinds of teaching, see Ch'an-yüan-chu-ch'uan-chi, T. 48, pp. 402bff., sections of Three Sects of Ch'an(禪之三宗) and Three Sects of Teaching (教之三宗). Cf. Kamata's translation, op. cit., pp. 85ff. Yün-hua Jan's English translation is forthcoming.

can hardly be overestimated. This of course does not mean that Ch'an followers accepted Tsung-mi with one accord. Needless to say, there were some who rejected his Hua-yen doctrine. But negatively or positively it was mainly Tsung-mi and his Hua-yen doctrine that provided the Ch'an sects of the Sung-period with the strong incentives and direction for their systems, with which to explain their real but hitherto unexpressed spiritual insight in systematic and rational terms. Suzuki again rightly points this out as follows:

> The influence of Avataṁsaka philosophy on Zen masters grew more and more pronounced as time went on, and reached its climax in the tenth century after the passing of Tsung-mi, the fifth patriarch of the Avatamsaka School in China.[16]

The movement toward the unity of Ch'an with philosophical teachings technically called "ch'an-chiao-i-chih"(禪教一致), thus initiated by Tsung-mi, gradually became a general tendency in Buddhist circles after him. A remarkable example of Ch'an masters who utilized Hua-yen philosophy for the systematic explanation of Ch'an is found in Fa-yen Wen-i(法眼文益, 885-958). Suzuki describes the situation thus:

> It was Fa-yen Wen-i, the founder of the Fa-yen branch of Zen Buddhism, who incorporated the philosophy of the Avataṁsaka into his treatment of Zen. Though he did not belong to their school he must have been greatly impressed with the works of Tu-shun(died 640) and Fa-tsang(died 712), and other Avataṁsaka philosophers; for there is evidence of his having made his pupil study their writings as an aid to the mastery of Zen. He also wrote a commentary on Shih-

---

[16]Suzuki, op. cit., p. 19.

> t'ou's 'Ode on Identity,' which is... based on the metaphysics of the Avataṁsaka.[17]

Especially interesting to Fa-yen was the Hua-yen doctrine of six characteristics(六相) of being, which he thought served to illustrate the aspects of reality which are neither identical nor different, or are both. In his own words:

> The meaning of the six attributes in Hua-yen is that within identity there is difference. For difference to be different from identity is in no wise the intention of all the Buddhas. The intention of all the Buddhas is both totality and distinction. How can there be both identity and difference? When the male body and female body enter samādhi, no reference to male and female body remains. When no reference remains terms are transcended. The ten thousand appearances are utterly bright, there is neither reality nor phenomena.[18]

The culmination of this tendency to harmonize Ch'an with Hua-yen philosophy comes with the Ch'an master Yen-shou(延壽, 904-975), the third generation of the sect (house) of Fa-yan, in his monumental work Tsung-ching-lu(宗鏡錄)[19] in a hundred fascicles. Here he attempted not only to unite Ch'an with the Hua-yen teachings, taking the latter as the theoretical base, but a step further, "to melt all the differences of Buddhist thought,"[20] under the slogan, "All the dharmas are but manifes-

---

[17] Ibid., pp. 19f.

[18] T. 47, p. 591, and T. 49, p. 655. Quoted in Dumoulin, op. cit., p. 111. Another translation of this passage is found in Chang Chung-yuan, op. cit., p. 230. Cf. also Takamine, op. cit., pp. 234ff.

[19] T. 48, no. 2016.

[20] Suzuki, op. cit., p. 20.

tations of the mind."[21]

Judging from this, it becomes clear that Suzuki is right when he describes the relationship of Ch'an and Hua-yen by saying that "Zen is the practical consummation of Buddhist thought in China and the Kegon (Avataṁsaka) [Hua-yen] philosophy is its theoretical culmination." He continues:

> So in China the philosophy of Zen[Ch'an] is Kegon [Hua-yen] and the teaching of Kegon bears its fruit in the life of Zen. It was only when this perfect mutuality or identification was affected that Buddhism began to start a new life in the Far East, shedding off its old Indian coat which proved to be no longer capable of keeping the inner spirit in healthy condition."[22]

Historically speaking, however, the relationship between Hua-yen and Ch'an became so close in the later period that it can even be said that Hua-yen thought was completely merged in Ch'an. To quote Dumoulin, "During the Sung era the inner affinity of Zen to Kegon [Hua-yen] led to a complete assimilation of the latter by the Chinese Zen [Ch'an] masters."[23] This complete assimilation, however, does not mean that Hua-yen became totally insignificant. It is true that as a school or sect, Hua-yen ceased with the passing of Tsung-mi, but in its spirit and influence it never disappeared from the Chinese religious current. It may rightly be said

---

[21]K. Ch'en, op. cit., p. 404. For more detail about Yen-shou's debt to Hua-yen, see Takamine, op. cit., pp. 237, 248.

[22]In his Introduction to B. L. Suzuki's Mahayana Buddhism, op.cit. p. xxxiv.

[23]Dumoulin, op. cit., p. 41.

that although the Hua-yen system as such stopped flourishing, its thought continued in different forms, most notably in the form of Ch'an. Kamata, in concluding the section on Hua-yen influence on Ch'an, aptly expresses a similar idea as follows:

> Although Hua-yen as philosophical Buddhism disappeared in the middle of the T'ang era, the core of its thought -- the idea of hsing-ch'i(the Manifestation of Nature) had firmly been established in Ch'an, serving as a theoretical foundation to sustain it. Hua-yen thought was never exterminated; rather, in a different form, it continues to live in history.[24]

Hua-yen influence is also discernible in T'ien-t'ai philosophy. It is not generally known that Chih-i(538-597), the actual founder of the T'ien-t'ai school, had a very close relationship with the Avataṁsaka-sūtra throughout his life. His basic idea of the tenfold dharmadhātu (十界 or 十法界), and the theory of "the trischiliocosm in a moment of consciousness"(一念三千) based upon it, are in fact, as Chih-i himself says,[25] derived originally from the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, not from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra as may be expected.[26] Nevertheless, since he

---

[24]Kamata, "Kegon Shiso no Hinshitsu," op. cit., p. 164.

[25]Cf. T. 46, p. 52c.

[26]Hurvitz says that this theory is "ultimately based" on the second chapter of the Lotus Sūtra. See his Chih-i, op. cit., pp. 275ff. The translation of the term "trischiliocosm in a moment of consciousness" is from Hurvitz. For detailed argument, see Toshio Ando(安藤俊雄), Tendai-shu -- Konpon Shiso to sono Tenkai(T'ien-t'ai Doctrine -- the Fundamental Thought and Its Development) (Tokyo: Heirakuji Shoten, 1968), pp. 148, 152ff., 121f., 129ff., et passim. For Chih-i's relation to the Avataṁsaka, see especially pp. 145ff.

lived even before Tu-shun(557-640), there can be no question of his having been directly influenced by the doctrine of the Hua-yen school itself. Consequently his idea of the tenfold dharmadhātu and related theories show a divergent development from that of the Hua-yen school.

The most evident and most important instance of Hua-yen influence on T'ien-t'ai philosophy is found in conjunction with the heated controversy between the orthodox and heterodox branches of the T'ien-t'ai school,[27] which took place in the Sung period during a space of about forty years. It is out of the scope of this study to deal with the content of the complicated scholastic controversy between them.[28] The point to be made here is that the main issue of this significant controversy was chiefly caused by the Hua-yen doctrine of li and shih.[29]

After Chan-jan(711-782), the sixth patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai school, introduced the basic ideas of the Awakening of Faith into T'ien-t'ai philosophy, there appeared a group of people among the school who accepted these ideas in connection with such Hua-yen doctrines as li-shih and Manifestation of Nature.

---

[27]The so-called orthodox branch called itself the "Mountain [T'ien-t'ai] Branch(山家派), and the heterodox the "Out-of-the Mountains Branch"(山外派).

[28]For details, see ibid., pp. 329ff., and Ryodo Shioiri(塩入良道), "Tendai Shiso no Hatten"(The Development of T'ien-t'ai Thought) in Tovo Shiso, ed., by H. Nakamura et al., vol. 6, Bukkyo Shiso II. Chugoku-teki Tenkai (Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press, 1967), pp. 162ff.

[29]Cf. ibid., p. 167, and Wai-lu Hou, op. cit., p. 235.

It was in response to this tendency toward Hua-yen that Chih-li (知禮, 960-1028), the fourteenth patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai school, vigorously advocated the traditional orthodox doctrine of the school. It was also because of this theoretical controversy that many doctrinal questions which hitherto had not been developed in T'ien-t'ai philosophy were articulated and crystalized. The neat system of Chih-li,[30] which otherwise could not have emerged, revitalized the school and made it reach its apex in the history of T'ien-t'ai thought. It is in this sense that the contribution of Hua-yen thought to the development of T'ien-t'ai philosophy might be regarded as significant.

2) Taoism

It has been pointed out earlier that Taoist philosophy exerted great influence on the Hua-yen system. There are many examples, however, which show that Hua-yen later contributed to the formation of Taoism, especially in the case of Taoist religion. A few will be taken for discussion here.

A famous Taoist named Sun Ssu-mo(孫思邈, 581-682) of the T'ang period is said to have been an ardent student of the Avataṁsaka-sūtra. According to Fa-tsang's Hua-yen-ching chuan-chi, Sun urged people to read the sūtra, while he himself copied seven hundred and fifty sets of the

---

[30] His T'ien-t'ai doctrines are concisely itemized in Ando, op. cit., pp. 341ff. and Shioiri, op. cit., pp. 167ff.

sūtra for circulation.[31] He was such a great man in Taoist circles that Emperor Kao-tsu(高祖) invited him to court and asked what he should practice for merit. Sun Ssu-mo advised him to read the Avataṁsaka-sūtra, and said:

> [The] Dharmadhātu mentioned in [the] Avataṁsaka-Sūtra is the universal theory. Any of its methods can be developed into thousands of fascicles of sutras. [The] Prajñā-pāramitā sūtra is only one of the methods of [the] Avataṁsaka.[32]

Sun Ssu-mo died ca. 682 A.D., when he was over a hundred years old. This means that he was a contemporary of Tu-shun, Chih-yen and Fa-tsang. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that he knew not only the Avataṁsaka-sūtra but also Hua-yen philosophy based upon it.

Since his "Essay on the Harmonization of Three Religions"(會三教論) is lost and his extant works mainly deal with the technique of "nourishing nature," it is impossible to discern his understanding of Hua-yen thought. But what can be inferred is that since he was very much influenced by Hua-yen, and his position in Taoist tradition was so high as to be called Chen-jen(True Man or Immortal), it seems most likely

---

[31] Cf. T. 51, p. 171bc. He is also mentioned in the Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi(佛祖統紀) T. 49, p. 368b; The Fo-tsu-li-tai-t'ung-tsi(佛祖歷代通載), T. 49, p. 583c; and Sung-kao-seng-chuan(宋高僧傳), T. 50, p. 790c, Chiu T'ang-shu(舊唐書), ch. 191, etc. See also Jan, A Chronicle, op. cit., pp. 41f.

[32] Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, T. 49, p. 368b, 11, 16-18. The translation is from Jan, ibid., p. 42.

that Hua-yen influence permeated Taoist thought through him.[33]

Another great Taoist Tu Kuang-t'ing(杜光庭), who lived around the end of the T'ang dynasty, shows strong Hua-yen influence in his thought.[34] He was a great compiler and writer of Taoist literature. But he was versed not only in Taoist thought but in Buddhism as well. In his writings, he utilized the San-lun, T'ien-t'ai, and Ch'an, along with Hua-yen. According to Kamata, however, his ideas, especially his classification of doctrines into five and his system of threefold or fourfold insight, were probably moulded after the Hua-yen pattern.[35]

Besides these examples, there are also a number of Taoist canonical works which show Hua-yen elements,[36] demonstrating that this syncretic Taoist religion with an "observe-and-absorb" attitude accepted the Hua-yen thought which was influential at that time.

3) Neo-Confucianism

As has been seen, the concept of li was mainly developed in Neo-Taoism and Buddhism, and most outstandingly in Hua-yen philosophy.

---

[33]For more details on his life and contribution, ibid., p. 42, note 136., H. A. Giles, A Chinese Biographical Dictionary (Shanghai, 1898), p. 1921. See Kamata, Chugoku Kegon... op. cit., pp. 290-296, Tokiwa, op. cit., p. 653, etc.

[34]For his biography, see Ch'uan T'ang-Wen(全唐文), ch. 929, etc.

[35]Kamata, op. cit., p. 302ff. and Tokiwa, op. cit., pp. 662ff.

[36]For the details on the Buddhist influence on Taoist scriptures, see Kamata, ibid., pp. 314ff., and his Chugoku Bukkyo Shiso Shi Kenkyu, op. cit., part one.

While the Neo-Taoists and Buddhists were engaged in the investigation of this all-important concept from the fourth century on, Confucianists were not aware of it at all. Wang T'ung(王通, 584-617) mentioned "investigation of li and development of human nature"(窮理盡性), but did not know the new development of the term in the Neo-Taoist and Buddhist circles. Li Ao(李翱, fl. 798) used the term li, but only twice in his famous Fu-hsing shu(復性書), and only three times in his seven other essays; moreover, he did not use it in a metaphysical sense. The famous Confucian scholar Han Yü(韓愈, 768-824), who severely attacked Buddhism,[37] was totally unaware of the term li both in his essays and in his memorial against Buddhism. As Wing-tsit Chan aptly says, "So far as the evolution of the concept of li is concerned, for a thousand years the Confucianists were completely out of the current."[38]

In view of this, it is surprising that in the eleventh century the concept of li became the central question in Confucianism, so much so that the main stream of Neo-Confucianism was then called "the Learning of li"(理学) in China. Starting with the Five Masters of the Northern Sung, viz., Chou Tun-i(周敦頤, 1017-1073), Shao Yung(邵雍, 1011-1077), Chang Tsai(張載, 1020-1077), Ch'eng Hao(程灝, 1032-1085), and Ch'eng I

---

[37]Tsung-mi's Yüan-jen-lun(the Original Nature of Man) is said to be a counterattack against his contemporary Han Yü. See Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed. The Buddhist Tradition in India, China and Japan (New York, The Modern Library, 1969), p. 179.

[38]Chan, op. cit., p. 67.

(程頤, 1033-1107),[39] the concept of li was fully developed by Chu Hsi (朱熹, 1130-1200), who synthesized all the important elements of these Neo-Confucian predecessors. In Chu Hsi the li concept reached its climax. But another view emerged in his contemporary, Lu Hsiang-shan(陸象山, 1139-1193), who become the founder of the rival so-called "Idealist school" (心学), in contrast to the "Rationalistic school"(理学).[40] All of these Neo-Confucianists, whether or not they agreed with each other, built their basic philosophical systems around the concept of li.

What could be the reason for this? There is probably no single reason for such a great change in the trend of the Confucianist way of thinking.[41] But there is evidence that the major factor directly connected with such a tendency was the influence of Buddhism, particularly Hua-yen philosophy.[42] H. Nakamura, quoting from Yoshi Takeuchi, says, "The development of this abstract meaning [of li in Neo-Confucianism] is

---

[39]For details of these Neo-Confucian thinkers, see Fung, op. cit., pp. 434-532; Carsun Chang, The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 137-241; etc.

[40]For these terms, see Fung, op. cit., p. 572, and Carsun Chang, op. cit., pp. 285 and 309. Chang calls the former "empiricism." The Idealist school is also called "Lu-Wang school" representing Lu Hsiang-shan and Wang Yang-ming, while the Rationalistic school is called "Ch'eng-Chu school" representing Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi.

[41]For several factors responsible for Neo-Confucian revival, see Carsun Chang, op. cit., pp. 67f.

[42]Cf. A. F. Wright, Buddhism in Chinese History, op. cit., pp. 90f. in which he says: "The molders of neo-Confucianism lived in a climate suffused with Buddhist influence. Even the language and the modes of discourse at their disposal had developed in the ages of Buddhist dominance. The new dimensions of meaning which they discovered in the ancient Chinese classics were dimensions which experience with Buddhism had taught them to seek and to find."

generally attributed to the influence of Buddhist scholars, particularly those of the Hua-yen sect, who set up the distinction and contrast between li and shih."[43] Wing-tsit Chan expresses a similar opinion:

> Hua-yen exercised considerable influence on Neo-Confucianism chiefly because of this organic character. Its famous metaphor of the big ocean and the many waves was borrowed, with modification, by Chu Hsi(1130-1200). The main concepts of Neo-Confucianism, those of principle and material force [li-ch'i], were derived through, if not from, those of principle and fact [li-shih] in Hua-yen. Its one-is-all and all-is-one philosophy shows unmistakable Hua-yen imprints.[44]

Now these two great Neo-Confucianists, i. e., Chu-Hsi and Lu Hsiang-shan can be taken as examples of how Hua-yen thought exercised influence upon Neo-Confucianism. In his early years Chu Hsi studied Buddhism together with Taoism, and "it was only when he was about thirty that he finally denounced them in favor of Confucianism."[45] According to his own statement that "Somewhere around the age of fifteen or so I engaged myself also in Buddhist studies,"[46] it can be seen that Buddhism played a role in the formative stages of his thought. The Buddhism in which he was much interested at that time was the Ch'an known to him mainly through Ta-hui(大慧宗杲, 1089-1163) of the Lin-chi sect. But his knowledge of Buddhism was not limited to this sect. His statement and

---

[43]Nakamura, Ways of Thinking of Eastern People, op. cit., p. 179.

[44]Chan, A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy, op. cit., p. 408.

[45]Fung, op. cit., p. 532. For details on his life, see Carsun Chang, op. cit., pp. 246ff.

[46]Quoted in D. Tokiwa, Shina ni okeru Bukkyo to Jukyo Dokyo, op. cit., p. 378.

criticism of Buddhism show that he was acquainted with the various sūtras, including the Avataṁsaka, and with many Buddhist scholars, including Tsung-mi.

With such a background in Buddhism, Chu Hsi could not help reflecting Buddhist influence whether positively or negatively. As Wing-tsit Chan points out, Chu Hsi's basic idea of li and ch'i consciously or unconsciously reflects the Hua-yen doctrine of li and shih.[47] This is clearly seen in statements such as the following:

> "Fundamentally there is only one Great Ultimate... yet each of the myriad things has been endowed with it and each in itself possesses the Great Ultimate in its entirety." In other words, principle is one but its manifestations are many. "There is only one principle. As it is applied to man, however, there is in each individual a particular principle." As to the relation between principle and material force [ch'i] "there has never been any material force without principle or principle without material force." "Fundamentally... principle and material force cannot be spoken of as separate entity. It exists right in material force. Without material force, principle would have nothing to adhere to."[48]

It is interesting to note that the "House of Fa-yen," the Ch'an

---

[47]For further details on the possible theoretical impact of Hua-yen on the Ch'eng-Chu philosophy, see Hou, op. cit., pp. 256ff.

[48]Quoted from Chan, "The Evolution of the Neo-Confucian Concept Li as Principle," op. cit., pp. 77. He refers to the Chu-tzu Ch'uan-shu (朱子全書), 1714 ed., 49. This portion of translation is found also in de Bary, ed., Sources of Chinese Tradition, op. cit., pp. 481ff. For English translations of some of Chu Hsi's works, see The Philosophy of Human Nature, tr. J. Percy Bruce (London: Probsthain, 1922); Reflections on Things at Hand: The Neo-Confucian Anthology, tr. Wing-tsit Chan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967). The last one(Chin-ssu-lu) was translated also in German by Olaf Graf, Djin-si lu (Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1953) in 3 volumes.

sect which showed the strongest Hua-yen influence in its spirit, was highly praised by Chu Hsi as the most congenial to the Neo-Confucian spirit. Despite his severe criticism of Buddhism in general,[49] he said of the House of Fa-yen, "There is a certain current in Buddhist thought which is very similar to our Confucian traditions." After quoting a gāthā of Hung-shou of Hang-chou(杭州洪壽), a Ch'an master of the House of Fa-yen, he continued:

> Just think what marvellous insights there are! How could the ordinary Confucian scholars of today hope to measure up to those men of high vision? What wonder if they are beaten to the ground? Now, the above insights represent the essential points of the house founded by the Ch'an master Fa-yen.[50]

In the case of Lu Hsiang-shan, it is not at all clear to what extent he was influenced by Buddhism in his early years. But we know that Lu was accused by Chu Hsi of being a follower of the Ch'an sect.[51] In fact, it is true that in many respects he resembles the Ch'an, as shown, for example, in his advocation of the practical method of "quiet sitting"(靜坐) for the attainment of self-enlightenment.[52]

---

[49]About his criticism of Buddhism, see Galen E. Sargent, Tchou Hi contre Bouddhisme (Paris, 1955). Tokiwa, op. cit., pp. 351ff. Chan, A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy, op. cit., pp. 646ff. Y.-h.Jan's unpublished article, "Li P'ing-shan and His Refutation of Neo-Confucian Criticism of Buddhism."

[50]Chu Hsi Yü-lei-chi-lioh(朱熹語類輯略), vol. 7, pp. 233f. Quoted in John Wu, op. cit., pp. 243f.

[51]Tokiwa, op. cit., p. 386, and H. G. Creel, Chinese Thought (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953, 1972[8]), p. 211.

[52]Lu himself, however, pointed out the major difference between himself and Buddhists. See Chan, A Source Book, op. cit., pp. 575ff.

As regards the concept of li, Lu Hsiang-shan was different from Chu Hsi in that while the latter, as was seen before, understood things in terms of li and ch'i, the former believed that everything that exists is nothing but li. Chu Hsi advocated that we should seek knowledge by the so-called "investigation of things"(格物), i.e., that we should examine not merely the li, but its concrete manifestations. On the other hand, Lu, with his purely monistic view, argued that since all things are essentially one li, what we should investigate is nothing else than this universal li. It is significant to note that for him this universal li is the "Mind"(心).

> "The mind is principle [li]." "The universe is my mind and my mind is the universe".... "all things are luxuriantly present in the mind." What permeates the mind, emanates from it, and extends to fill the universe is nothing but principle[li].

And concerning the relationship of tao or li and shih, he said, "Apart from tao there is no shih; apart from shih there is no tao."

In fact, it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain to what extent these ideas were influenced by Buddhism, particularly by the Hua-yen philosophy of dharmdhātu. Obviously it cannot be imagined that such great thinkers built their systems on any single thought. But the remarkable degree of resemblance between these two streams of thought in pattern and inspiration certainly suggests that Hua-yen was one of

---

[53]Chan, The Development of Neo-Confucianism, op. cit., p. 78. He refers to Hsiang-shan ch'uan-chi(象山全集), Sau-pu pei-yao(SPPY), 11, etc. English translations of some of Lu's works are available in Lyman Van Law Cady, The Philosophy of Lu Hsiang-shan, A Neo-Confucian Monistic Idealist (Union Theological Seminary Thesis, 1939), in addition to Chan's translations in his A Source Book, op. cit., pp. 574ff. and de Bary, Source, op. cit., pp. 509ff.

the major influences exerted upon them.

Fung's authoritative but somewhat categorical evaluation of the significance of Hua-yen, and specifically that of Tsung-mi, on Neo-Confucianism can be quoted here to conclude this section on Hua-yen influence on Neo-Confucianism:

> Tsung-mi, with this treatise [The Original Nature of Man], made the view of Neo-Confucianism a part of truth. This was the harbinger of the Neo-Confucianism of the Sung-Ming dynasties. In this treatise there are many ideas which influenced the Sung-Ming Neo-Confucianists. The idea about the origination of the world, as mentioned above, exerted great influence upon Neo-Confucianism. A phrase quoted here as "primal material force and physical substance" probably had an influence on the Neo-Confucian idea of ch'i-chih. Furthermore, what should be especially noticed is that the controversial doctrines set forth between the two schools of Ch'eng-Chu and Lu-Wang of Neo-Confucianism are found in this treatise, and it prepared the way for them. It is said: "Man's physical endowment, when traced to its origin, can be reduced to the Primal Spirit of Undifferentiated Oneness. The mind which arises with it, if traced back to its source, is the Spiritual Mind of True Oneness." This is the statement concerning the relation between Mind and Material force, and the theories of the relation between li and material force in the Ch'eng-Chu school are the doctrinal developments of this aspect. And the dictum of the Lu-Wang school that "the Universe is my mind" was the development of the idealist outlook expressed as follows: "In the final analysis, there are no phenomena(dharma) outside the Mind. The Primal spirit also follows the transformations of the Mind."[54] Therefore, it can be said that the influence of Tsung-mi's doctrine was tremendous. With regard to this treatise Tsung-mi was not only the summation of the Buddhist studies before him but also the forerunner of the Neo-Confucianism

---

[54]Tsung-mi's Yüan-jen-lun, T. 45, p. 710b-c. The translation of Tung-mi's statements are quoted from Wm. de Bary, ed., The Buddhist Tradition, op. cit., pp. 194 and 195.

of later days.[55]

If Fung is right, and if it is taken into account that in the last seven or eight hundred years Neo-Confucianism has been the predominant spiritual current in China, it seems reasonable to suggest that the Hua-yen influence on Chinese thought was of crucial significance.

---

[55]Yu-lan Fung, Chung-kuo Che-hsüeh shih (reprint, Hong Kong: 1961), pp. 798f. In his A History of Chinese Philosophy, op. cit., this portion of the original on Tsung-mi has not been translated, but replaced by a chapter from Spirit of Chinese Philosophy, tr. E. R. Hughes, pp. 157-174.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

A. The Avataṁsaka-sūtra:

Hua-yen-ching. Tr. Buddhabhadra, 418-420 A.D. T.* 9, no. 278.

Hua-yen-ching. Tr. Śikṣānanda, 695-699 A.D. T. 10, no. 279.

Hua-yen-ching. Tr. Prajñā, 795-798 A.D. T. 10, no. 293.

The Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra. 4 parts. Ed. by D. T. Suzuki and H. Idzumi. Kyoto: The Sanskrit Buddhist Texts Publishing Society, 1934-1936.

Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra. Ed. by P. L. Vaidya. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 5. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960.

B. Works of the Hau-yen Patriarchs:

Tu-shun. Hua-yen Fa-chieh-kuan-men. Included in T. 45, nos. 1878, 1883, and 1884.

Chih-yen. Hua-yen-ching Sou-hsüan-chi. T. 35, no. 1732.

_____. Hua-yen I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men. T. 45, no. 1868.

_____. Hua-yen K'ung-mu-chang. T. 45, no. 1870.

_____. Hua-yen Wu-shih-yao-wen-ta. T. 45, no. 1869.

Fa-tsang. Chin-ssu-tzu-chang or The Essay of the Golden Lion. T. 45, no. 1880.

---

*Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo, ed., by Takakusu and K. Watanabe (Tokyo: Daizokyo Kankyokai, 1924-1934) has been referred to throughout the study as T.

_____. Hua-yen Fa-p'u-ti-hsin-chang. T. 45, no. 1878.

_____. Hua-yen-ching Chih-kuei. T. 45, no. 1871.

_____. Hua-yen-ching chuan-chi. T. 51, no. 2073

_____. Hua-yen-ching Wen-i-kang-mu. T. 35, no. 1734.

_____. Hua-yen-ching Wen-ta. T. 45, no. 1873.

_____. Hua-yen Yu-hsin-fa-chieh-chi. T. 45, no. 1877.

_____. T'an-hsüan-chi. T. 35, no. 1733.

_____. Wu-chiao-chang or Hua-yen I-ch'eng-chiao-i-fen-ch'i-chang. T. 45, no. 1866.

Ch'eng-kuan. Hua-yen-ching shu. T. 35, no. 1735.

_____. Hua-yen-ching shu-ch'ao-hsüan-t'an. HTC.** 8.

_____. Hua-yen-ching sui-shu yen-i-ch'ao. T. 36, no. 1736.

_____. Hua-yen Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching. T. 45, no. 1883.

_____. Ta Hua-yen-ching liao-ts'e. T. 36, no. 1737.

Tsung-mi. Ch'an-yüan-chu-ch'uan-chi tu-hsu. T. 48, no 2015.

_____. Chu Hua-yen Fa-chieh-kuan-men. T. 45, no. 1884.

_____. Ta-fang-kuang-yüan-chüeh-hsiu-to-lo liao-i-ching liao-shu-chu. T. 39, no. 1795.

_____. Yüan-chüeh-ching ta-shu-ch'ao. HTC. 14.

_____. Yüan-jen lun. T. 45, no. 1886.

C. Other:

Chih-p'an. Fo-tsu t'ung-chi. T. 49, no. 2035.

Chih-sheng. K'ai-yüan shih-chiao-lu. T. 55, no. 2154.

Hsü-fa. Fa-chieh-tsung wu-tsu liao-chi. HTC. 134.

** Hsü Tsang-ching (Taiwan: reprint 1967 from Manji Zokuzokyo) has been referred to throughout the study as HTC.

Hui-chiao. Liang Kao-seng-chuan. T. 50, no. 2059.

Gyonen. Hokkai-gikyo. Nihon Shiso Daikai, no. 15, Kamakura Kubukkyo (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1971).

Il-yŏn. Sam-guk-yu-sa. T. 49, no. 2039.

Nien-ch'ang. Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai. T. 49, no. 2036.

P'yo-wŏn. Hwa-ŏm-kyŏng mun-ŭi-yo-kyŏl mun-tap. HTC. 12.

Tao-hsüan. Hsü Kao-seng-chuan. T. 50, no. 2060.

Tsan-ning. Sung Kao-seng-chuan. T. 50, no. 2061.

D. Translations:

Chan, Wing-tsit, tr. A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

_____, tr. The Way of Lao-tzu. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1963.

Conze, Edward, tr. Buddhist Texts through the Ages. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1954.

_____, tr. Buddhist Wisdom Books. New York: Harper & Row, 1972[2].

_____, tr. The Perfect Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary. Bolinas: Four Seasons Foundation, 1973.

Cook, Francis Harold, tr. Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines -- An Annotated Translation. Ph.D. Thesis of the University of Wisconsin, 1970.

de Bary, Wm. Th., tr. The Buddhist Tradition in India, China & Japan. New York: The Modern Library, 1969.

_____ et al. tr. Sources of Chinese Tradition. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Guenther, Herbert V., tr. The Jewel Ornament of Liberation, by Sgam-po-pa. London: Rider, 1959, 1970.

Hekeda, Y. S., tr. The Awakening of Faith. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Kern, H., tr. Saddharma-Pundarīka or The Lotus of the True Law. The Sacred Books of the East, vol. XXI. Oxford: 1884.

Liebenthal, W., tr. Chao Lun. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1968.

Demiéville, Paul, tr. Le Concile de Lhasa, une Controverse sur le Quiétisme entre Bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIII^e Siecle de l'Ère Chrètienne (Bibliotheque de l'Institute des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, vol. VII). Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France, 1952.

_____, tr. Entretiens de Lin-tsi. Paris: Fayard, 1972.

Inada, Kenneth, tr. Nāgārjuna, A Translation of His Mūlamadhymakārikā with an Introductory Essay. Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1970.

Jan, Yün-hua, tr. and ed. A Chronicle of Buddhism in China 581-960 A.D. Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan: Sri Gouranga Press of Calcutta, 1966.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de, tr. Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi: La Siddhi de Hiuan-tsang. Paris, 1928-30.

Lamotte, Étienne, tr. L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti(Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa). Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1962.

_____, tr. and ed. Saṁdhinirmoccana Sūtra, l'Explication des Mystères. Louvain: 1935.

_____, tr. La Somme du Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga, 2 vols. Louvain: 1938-39.

_____, tr. Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna, 3 vols. Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1944, 1949, and 1970.

Obermiller, E, tr. The Supreme Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation Being a Manual of Buddhist Monism, Acta Orientaliz, Vol. IX. 1931, reprint, Shanghai: 1940.

Rahula, W., tr. Compendium de la Super-Doctrine (Philosophie) (Abidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga. Paris: École Française D'Extreme-Orient, vol. LXXVIII, 1971.

Richard, Timothy, tr. The Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana Doctrine -- The New Buddhism. Shanghai, 1907.

Suzuki, D. T., tr. Aśvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna. Chicago: 1900.

_____, tr. The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1932, 1966.

Tucci, Guiseppe, tr. Minor Buddhist Texts, Part II. (First Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla). Roma: Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1958.

Wayman, Alex and Wayman, Hideko, tr. The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

Yu, Lu K'uan (Charles Luk), tr. The Vimalakīrti Nirdesa Sūtra. Berkley: Shambala, 1972.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

Ando, Toshio. Tendaigaku -- Konpon Shiso to sono Tenkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1968.

Apte, V. S. The Practical Sanscrit-English Dictionary. Bombay: Gopa Narayen & Co., 1924.

Bagchi, P. C. Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine, Les Traducteurs et les Traductions. Paris: 1927, 1938.

_____. India and China: A Thousand Years of Cultural Relations. Bombay, 2nd ed., 1950.

Bodde, Derk. "Harmony and Conflict in Chinese Philosophy," Studies in Chinese Thought, ed. by A. F. Wright. Chicago: 1953, pp. 18-80.

Chan, Wing-tsit. Neo-Confucianism etc.: Essays by Wing-tsit Chan. Hanover, N. H.: The Oriental Society, 1969.

_____. "Transformations of Buddhism in China," Philosophy East and West, VII. 3 and 4 (1957-1958), 107-116.

Chang, Carsun. The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought. New York: Bookman Associates, 1957.

Chang, Chung-yüan. Original Teachings of Ch'an Buddhism. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

Chang, Garma C. C. The Buddhist Teaching of Totality. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.

Chatterjee, A. K. The Yogācāra Idealism. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1962.

Ch'en, Kenneth K. S. Buddhism in China. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.

_____. The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Childers, R. C. A Dictionary for the Pāli Language. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., n.d.

Conze, Edward. Buddhist Thought in India. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967.

_____. Material for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1967.

_____. Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies. London: Luzac, 1967.

Davids, T. W. Rhys and William, Stede, ed. Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary. Surry: The Pāli Text Society, 1921-1925.

Dayal, Hal. The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1932.

de Jong, J. W. "The Absolute in Buddhist Thought," in Essays in Philosophy Presented to Dr. T. M. P. Mahadevan on his Fiftieth Birthday. Madras: Ganesh & Co., 1962, pp. 56-63.

Demiéville, Paul. "La pénétration du bouddhisme dans la tradition philosophique chinoise," Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, 3, I (1956), pp. 19-38.

Dumoulin, Heinrich. A History of Zen Buddhism. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Dutt, N. Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism in Its Relation to Hīnayāna. London: Luzac, 1930.

_____. "The Place of the Aryasatyas and the Pratītyasamutpāda in Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna," Annals of the Bhandakar Oriental Research Institute, XI, pt. II, pp. 101-127

Dutt, Sukumar. The Buddha and Five After-Centuries. London: Luzac & Co., Ltd., 1955.

Edgerton, F. Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary, II. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953, reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

Fairbank, John K. ed. Chinese Thought and Institutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Fountein, Jan. The Pilgrimage of Sudhana -- A Study of Gandavyūha Illustrations in China, Japan and Java. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967.

Frauvallner, Erich. Die Philosophie des Buddhismus. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969.

Fung, Yu-lan. Chung-kuo Che-hsüeh shih. Reprint Hong Kong: 1961.

_____. A History of Chinese Philosophy. 2 vols. Trans. by Derk Bodde. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952-1953.

Geiger, Wilhelm and Magdalene. Pāli Dhamma. Munich: 1921.

Giles, H. A. A Chinese Biographical Dictionary. Shanghai, 1898.

_____. A Chinese-English Dictionary. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1912.

Guenther, Herbert V. Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma. Lucknow: Buddha Vihara, 1957.

Hayashiya, Tomojiro. "Kyohan-ron Josetsu," Bukkyo Kenkyu, III, 6 (1939), pp. 1-50.

Hiraoka, T. "Shiragi no Shinsho no Kyogaku ni tsuite," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, XX, no. 2 (March, 1972), pp. 578-586.

Hu, Shih. "Development of Zen Buddhism in China," Chinese Social and Political Science Review, 15 (1931).

Hou, Wai-lu. Chung-kuo Ssu-hsiang t'ung-shih. Peking: People's Publishing House, 1959.

Huang, Ts'an-hua. Chung-kuo Fo-chiao shih. Taipei: 1960.

Hurvitz, Leon. Chih-i, An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk. Bruxelles: Bruges, Imprimerie Sainte-Catherine, S. A., 1962.

Ishida, Z. et al. ed. Shin Bukkyo Jiten. Tokyo: Sheishin Shobo, 1962.

Ishii, Kyodo. Kegon Kyogaku Seiritsu Shi. Tokyo: Chuo Koron Jigyo Shuppan, 1964.

Jan, Yün-hua. "On Chinese Translation of 'Avataṁsaka Sūtra' Originally from Udra," The Orissa Historical Research Journal, vii (1960).

_____. "The Fo-tsu-t'ung-chi, A Biographical and Bibliographical Study," Oriens Extremus, 10. Jahrgan. Heft 1 (April, 1963), 61-82.

_____. "Tsung-mi, His Analysis of Ch'an Buddhism," T'oung Pao, LVIII (1972), 1-54.

Jayatilleke, K. N. Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge. London: Allan & Unwin, 1963.

Joshi, Lalmani. Studies in the Buddhistic Culture of India. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967.

Kamata, Shigeo. Chugoku Bukkyo Shiso Shi Kenkyu. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1968.

_____. Chugoku Kegon Shiso Shi no Kenkyu. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1965.

_____. "Hokkai Engi ni tsuite," Shukyo Kenkyu, 39-186 (1956), pp. 62-4.

_____. "Shoki Shiso no Seiritsu," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, V. 2 (1957), pp. 195-198.

Kamekawa, Kyoshin. Engi no Kuzo. Kyoto: Zenjinsha, 1944.

_____. Kegon-gaku. Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1949.

Kametani, S. Kegon Tetsugaku Kenkyu. Tokyo: Meikyo Gakkai, 1922.

Kaneko, Daiei. Kegonkyo Gaisetsu. Kyoto: Zenjinsha, 1948.

Kao, Kuan-ju. "Avataṁsaka Sūtra," in Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, vol. II. Ed. by G. P. Malalasekera. Colombo: The Government Press, 1967, pp. 435-446.

Karmnatillake, W. S. "Avataṁsaka School," in Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, vol. II. Ed. by G. P. Malalasekera. Colombo: The Government Press, 1967, 432-435.

Kawada, Kumataro. "Dharmadhātu," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, XI (1963) pp. 9-24.

_____. "Engi to Hokkai," Journal of the Faculty of Letters of the Komazawa Univeristy, 21 (1962), pp. 21-41.

_____. "Wreath of Buddha"(in Japanese), in Kegon Shiso, ed. by Kumataro Kawada and Hajime Nakamura (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1960).

Keith, A. B. Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon. 1st ed., 1923, reprint, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1963.

Kim, Chi-kyŏn. "Ki-kaido-sho ko," Gakujutsu nenpo, 1 (Tokyo: April, 1971).

Kim, Tong-hwa. Pulkyo-hak Keasŏl. Seoul: Poryŏngak, 1954, 1972.

Kimura, K. "Who was the Author of the Fa-chieh-kuan-men?" (in Japanese), Shukyo Kenkyu, 41-195 (June, 1968), pp. 47-74.

Kobayashi, J. "Hokkai Engi no Kenkyu Josetsu," Nando Bukkyo, 19 (1966), pp. 16-33.

_____. "Kegon Kanmon no Tenkai to Kyogaku no Hensen," Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, no. 20 (1964).

_____. "Kishinron Kaishaku no Hensen -- Kegon kyogaku Tenkai no Kontei toshite," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenyu, XIII, no. 2, 26 (1965), pp. 668-672.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. Theorie des douze Causes. Gnad, 1913.

Lamotte, Étienne. Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien. Louvain: Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 43, 1959.

_____. "Prophéties relatives à la Disparition de la Bonne Loi," Presence du Bouddhisme, France-Asie, XVI. nos. 153-157 (1959), pp. 657-668.

Law, B. C. "The Formulation of the Pratītyasamutpāda," Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1937, pp. 287-289.

Lee, H. "Fa-tsang and Uisan," Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 82 (1962), pp. 56-59.

Maspero, Henri. "La Religion Chinoise dans son developpement historique," in his Melanges posthumes sur les religions et l'histoire de Chine, vol. I. Paris: 1950.

Mathews, R. H. Mathews' Chinese-English Dictionary. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Michibata, Ryoshu. Chugoku Bukkyo Shi. Kyoto: 1939, 5th rev. ed., 1956.

_____. Chugoku Bukkyo Shi no Kenkyu. Kyoto: 1957, 2nd ed., 1967.

Matsunaga, Alicia. The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation, The Historical Development of the Honji-Suijaku Theory. Tokyo: Sophia University, 1969.

Miyamoto, Shoson. Kompon Chu to Ku. Tokyo: 1943.

_____. "A Re-appraisal of Pratītya-samutpāda," Studies in Indology and Buddhology Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1955, 152-164.

Mizutani, Kosei. "Dhātu and Gotra" (in Japanese), The Bukkyo Daigaku Kenkyu Kiyo, 36 (March, 1959), pp. 44-63.

Mochizuki, Shinko, ed. Mochizuki Bukkyo Daijiten, 10 vols. Tokyo: 1954-1963.

Monier-Williams, Monier. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899.

Mookerjee, Satkari. The Buddhist Philosophy of Universal Flux. Calcutta: 1935.

Moore, Charles A., ed. Indian Mind. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1967.

Morgan, K., ed. The Path of the Buddha. New York: Ronald Press, 1956.

Murti, T. R. V. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1955, 2nd ed., 1960, 3rd impression 1970.

Nagao, Gadjin M. "The Silence of the Buddha and Its Madhyamic Interpretation" in Studies in Indology and Buddhology Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1955, 137-151.

_____. Index to the Mahāyāna Sutralāmkāra. Kyoto: 1958.

_____. "Some Problems in Fa-tsang's Discussion of the Three Natures," Fifty Year Anniversary Commemorative Anthology of the Kyoto University Department of Arts and Letters. (in Japanese). Kyoto: 1957, pp. 183-205.

Nakamura, H. "The Significance of the Buddhāvatamsaka-sūtra in the World History of Ideas" (in Japanese), Kegon Shiso, ed. K. Kawada and H. Nakamura. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1960.

_____, et al. ed. Toyo Shiso, vol. 6, Bukkyo Shiso II, Chugoku-teki Tenkai. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press, 1967.

_____. Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples. Honolulu: East-West Centre, 1964.

Nakamura, Zuiryu. "Kai-dhātu ni tsuite," Kanakura Hakushi Koki Kinen: Indogaku Bukkyogaku Ronshu. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1966, pp. 275-291.

Narada, Thera. "Kamma, or the Buddhist Law of Causation," B.C. Law Volume, Pt. II. Poona: 1946, pp. 158-75.

_____. "Nairatmya and Karman," Louis de La Vallée Poussin Memorial Volume. Calcutta, n.d., pp. 429-64.

Nishitani, K. Koza Zen. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967.

Nyanatiloka, Mahathera. Guide through the Abhidhamma-pitaka. Kandy, Ceylon: Buddhist Publication Society, 1971.

Oda. Bukkyo Daijiten. Tokyo: Daijo Shuppansha, 1972 revised.

Oltramare, Paul. La Formule bouddhique des douze Causes: Son sens originel et son interpretation theologique. Geneve, 1909.

Ono, Genmyo, ed. Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten, 11 vols. Tokyo: 1964-67, reprint 1968-69.

Otto, Rudolf. Mysticism, East and West. New York: 1932, 1962.

Ozo, Enichi. "Sokushitsu Jobutzu no Shiso," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, III. no. 1, pp. 113-118.

Pas, Julian F. "Shan-tao's Interpretation of the Meditative Vision of Buddha Amitayus," History of Religion, vol. 14, no. 2 (November, 1974), pp. 96-116.

Ramanan, K. Verkata. Nāgārjuna's Philosophy - As Presented in the Mahā-Prajñāpāramitā-Sāstra. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co. Inc., 1966.

Rhi, Ki-young. "Chŏng-pŏp Ŭnmolsŏl e Kuanhan Chonhap-chŏk Pip'an," Bulkyo Hakpo. Secul: Dongkuk University, 1963.

Robinson, Richard H. The Buddhist Religion. Belmont, Calif.: Dickenson Pub. Co., Inc., 1970.

_____. Early Mādhyamika in India and China. Madison: The Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. La theorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra - Etude sur la soteriologie et la gnoseologie du bouddhisme. Paris: École Française d'Extreme-Orient, vol. LXX, 1969.

Saito, Yuishin. Kegon-gaku Koyo. Tokyo: Shuseisha, 1920.

Sakaino, Kōyō. Shina Bukkyo-shi Kowa, II. Tokyo: 1929.

Sakamoto, Yukio. "Hokaiengi no Rekishi-teki Keisei" in Shoson Miyamoto, ed., Bukkyo no Kompon Shinri. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1957, pp. 891-932.

_____. Kegon Kyogaku no Kenkyu. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1956.

Schayer, Stanislaw. Ausgewahlte Kapitel aus der Prasannapadā. Krakow: Naktadem Polskie, 1931.

Schmithausen, Lambert. Der Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt in der Viniścayasaṃgrahaṇī der Yogācārabhūmiḥ (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 264. Band, 2. Abhandlung). Wien: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1969.

Seckel, Dietrich. The Art of the World (Buddhism). New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1964. (German 1963.)

Simada, Kenji. "Taiyo no Rekishi ni yosete," Essays on the History of Buddhism presented to Professor Zenryu Tsukamoto. Kyoto: Naigai Printing Co., 1961, 416-430.

Sogen, Y. Systems of Buddhistic Thought. Calcutta, Culcutta University, 1912.

Soothill, W. E. and Hodous, L., ed. A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1934, reprint, Taipei: Ch'eng-wen Pub. Co., 1961.

Stcherbatsky, Th. Buddhist Logic, vol. I. New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1962, first ed. Leningrad, c. 1930.

_____. The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the Word 'Dharma.' Calcutta: 1961, first ed., 1923.

_____. The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa. Leningrad: 1927, reprint, The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965.

Streng, Frederick J. Emptiness - A Study in Religious Meaning. New York: Abingdon Press, 1967.

Suetsuna, Zyoichi. "Kegon Jugen Ko," Bukkyo to Bunka, Dedicated to Dr. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki in Commemoration of his Ninetieth Birthday. Kyoto, Suzuki Daisetz Hakushi Shoju-Kinenkai, 1960.

Suetsuna, Joichi. Kegon Kyo no Sekai. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1956, 1962.

Suzuki, B. L. "An Outline of the Avataṁsaka Sūtra," Eastern Buddhist, VI (July, 1934), pp. 279-86.

_____. Mahayana Buddhism. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1st ed. 1939, 3rd ed. 1959.

Suzuki, D. T. "The Avataṁsaka Sūtra, epitomized," Eastern Buddhist, I, nos. 1-4 (1921), pp. 1-12; 147-55; 237-42; 282-90.

_____. Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series). New York: Samuel Weiser Inc., 1953, reprinted 1971.

_____. "Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, or the Bodhisattva Ideal and the Śrāvaka Ideal, as Distinguished in the Opening Chapter of the Gaṇḍavyūha," Eastern Buddhist, VI, 1, pp. 1-22.

_____. "Notes on the Avataṁsaka Sūtra," Eastern Buddhist, I (1921-2), pp. 233-236.

_____. Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism. New York: Schocken Books, 1963, 1st ed. London: Luzac & Co., 1907.

_____. Studies in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1932, 1972.

Suzuki, Sochu. Genshi Kegon Tetsugaku Kenkyu. Tokyo: 1935.

Takakusu, Junjiro. The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1947, 3rd ed., 1956.

_____. "Buddhism as a Philosophy of Thusness," Philosophy East and West, ed. by C. A. Moore, Princeton, 1944, pp. 69-108.

Takamine, Ryoshu. Kegon Shiso Shi. Kyoto: Kokyoshoin, 1942.

_____. Kegon to Zen to no Tsuro. Kyoto: Nando Bukkyo Kenkyu-kai, 1956.

Takasaki, Jikido. "Dharmatā, Dharmadhātu, Dharmakāya and Buddhadhātu -- Structure of the Ultimate Value in Mahāyāna Buddhism," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, XIV, 2 (March, 1966), pp. 78-94.

_____. "Kegon kyogaku to Nyoraizo Shiso," Kegon Shiso, ed. by K. Kawada and H. Nakamura. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1960.

_____. A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra) Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Serie Orientale Roma, XXXIII. Roma: Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1966.

Tamaki, Koshiro. Chugoku Bukkyo Shiso no Keisei, vol I. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1971.

_____. "Kegon no Shoki ni tsuite," in Indo Tetsugaku to Bukkyo no Sho Mondai, Ui Commemorative Volume. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1961.

T'ang, Ch'ün-i. Chung-kuo che-hsüeh yüan-lun, vol. I. Taiwan, 1968.

T'ang, Yung-t'ung. Han Wei Liang-chin Nan-pei-ch'ao Fo-chiao Shih. 2 vols. Shanghai: 1938, reprint, Taipei: 1968.

_____. "On 'Ko-yi'," in W. R. Inge et al. ed., Radhakrishnan, Comparative Studies in Philosophy. London: Allen and Unwin, 1951, pp. 276-286.

Taya, R. et al. ed. Bukkyogaku Jiten. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1955, 1968.

Thomas, Edward J. The History of Buddhist Thought. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1933, 1967.

Tokiwa, Daijo. Shina Bukkyo no Kenkyu. 3 vols. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1942[2].

_____. Shina ni okeru Bukkyo to Jukyo Dokyo. Tokyo: 1930, 1966.

Tomoeda, Ryutaro. Shushi no Shiso Keisei. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1969.

Ui, Hakuju. Bukkyo Shiso Kenkyu. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940, 1966.

_____. Indo Tetsugaku Kenkyu, vol. 4. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965.

_____. Zenshu shi Kenkyu. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1935, 1966.

Unno, Taitetsu. "The Dimensions of Practice in Hua-yen Thought," in Yuki Commemorative Volume. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1964.

Verdu, Alfonso. Dialectical Aspect in Buddhist Thought -- Studies in Sino-Japanese Mahāyāna Idealism. Kansas: Center for East Asian Studies, The University of Kansas, 1974.

Wach, Joachim. Sociology of Religion. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944, 1967.

Warder, A. K. Indian Buddhism. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Tr. A. M. Henderson and Tarcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press, 1947.

Whitney, W. D. A Sanskrit Grammar. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967[11].

Winternitz, M. A History of Indian Literature, vol. II. Tr. Mrs. S. Ketka and Miss H. Kohn and revised by the Author. New York: Russell and Russell, 1971. First ed., 1933.

Wogihara, Unrai. The Sanskrit-Chinese Dictionary of Buddhist Technical Terms. Tokyo: Sankibo, reprint 1959.

Wright, Arthur F. Buddhism in Chinese History. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

_____. "Buddhism and Chinese Culture: Phases of Interaction," in Journal of Asian Studies, XVII (1957).

_____. "The Formation of Sui Ideology," in John K. Fairbank, ed., Chinese Thought and Institutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Wu, John C. H. The Golden Age of Zen. Taiwan: The National War College, 1967.

Yabuki, Keiki. Sankaikyo no Kenkyu. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1927, 1974.

Yamada, Ryojo. "Mappo Shiso ni tsuite," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, IV, no. 2 (March, 1956), pp. 361-370.

Yi, Nŭng-hwa. Chosŏn Pulgyo T'ong-sa. Seoul: Poryŏngak, 1918, rep. 1972.

Yi, Pyŏng-to. Kuksa Taekwan. Seoul: 1957, reprint 1972.

_____. Wŏnmun pyŏng yŏkchu Samguk'yusa. Seoul: 1956.

Yonha, Unho. Pulgyo Sachŏn. Seoul: Hongpŏpwŏn, 1961, 1971.

Younger, Paul. The Indian Religious Tradition. Varanas: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1970.

Yuki, Reimon. "Chugoku Bukkyo no Keisei," in Koza Bukkyo, IV (Tokyo: 1958), pp. 88-92.

_____. "Kegon no Shoso Tojin to Hokkai Kanmon no Chosha tono Mondai," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, XVIII, 2 (1969), pp. 32-38.

_____. "Shina Bukkyo ni okeru Mappo Shiso no Koki," Toho Gakuho, VI (1936), pp. 205-215.

_____. "Zuito-jidai no Chugoku-teki Shin-bukkyo Koki no Rekishi-teki Jijo," Nihon Bukkyogakkai Nenpo, XIX (1954), pp. 79-96.

_____. "Zuito no Chugoku-teki Shin-bukkyo Soshiki no Ichirei to shite no Kegon Hokkai Kanmon ni tsuite," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu, VI, 2 (1958), pp. 276-281.

Yutsugi, Ryoei. Kegon-gaku Gairon. Kyoto: Ryutani Daigaku Shuppansha, 1941.

_____. Kegon Taikei. Kyoto: Ryutani Daigaku Shuppansha, 1927[4].

Zürcher, E. The Buddhist Conquest of China. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, rev. ed., 1972.