

*Zongmi*

COMMENTARY TO THE HUA-YAN DHARMA-REALM MEDITATION

(Translated, with an Introduction and Notes)

by

SALLIE BEHN KING  
B.A., Smith College, 1973

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department  
of  
Religious Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming to the  
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
September, 1975

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Religious Studies

The University of British Columbia  
2075 Wesbrook Place  
Vancouver, Canada  
V6T 1W5

Date September 12, 1975

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is a translation, with notes and introduction, of the Commentary to the Hua-yan Dharma-realm Meditation. This text is a commentary to the Dharma-realm Meditation, which is incorporated into the former. The core text is by the first patriarch of the Hua-yan school of Buddhism in China, Du-shun (557-640); the commentary is by the fifth patriarch of the Hua-yan school, Zong-mi (780-841). The text is both philosophical and meditational in nature, and is a concise statement of the key doctrines of the school.

The introduction to this text prepares the reader for the translation by providing the information and concepts necessary for an understanding of the text. This includes material on the translation of technical terms, a brief sketch of some Buddhist texts referred to by the authors, biographical information on the authors, historical and philosophical background to the Hua-yan school, a comment on the literary and meditational aspects of the text, and a general summary of the text by chapters.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgement	v
Purpose	1
Method	2
Introduction	3
Translation of Technical Terms	3
A Comment on Some Important Texts	12
Biographical Background	14
Du-shun	14
Zong-mi	16
Background to the Hua-yan School	21
Historical Background	21
Philosophical Background	25
The Text	37
Literary Aspect	37
Meditational Aspect	38
General Summary of the Text, by Chapters	41
Footnotes to the Introduction	48
Foreword to the Translation	55
Commentary to the Hua-yan Dharma-realm Meditation	
Introduction	56
Chapter One The Contemplation of Real Emptiness	60
Footnotes to Chapter One	81
Chapter Two The Contemplation of the Non-Obstruction of	
Noumenon and Phenomena	89
Footnotes to Chapter Two	110

Chapter Three The Contemplation of Universal Inclusion	116
Footnotes to Chapter Three	135
Chinese Characters	138
Bibliography	146

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to a number of people who have helped me in this effort. Above all, I want to thank Professor Leon Hurvitz for the many hours of supervision, criticism, and correction which he so generously gave. The intricacies of the Chinese language are sufficient to turn away all but the most knowledgeable and experienced enquirer; to have such a person as a guide makes all the difference between possibility and impossibility in an effort such as this. I have been most fortunate.

I also want to thank Professor Francis Cook of the University of California at Riverside, for originally suggesting the topic to me, and subsequently giving information and encouragement, and Professor Taitetsu Unno of Smith College, Massachusetts, for similar aid and inspiration. Thanks to Professor Joe Richardson for the guidance and general direction he provided, and to Alan Sponberg for help as only a senior graduate student can give. Finally, I would like to thank the Department of Religious Studies for the financial support I have enjoyed these years.

## PURPOSE

This thesis makes available in English a text which has played a key role in the formation of the Hua-yan school of Buddhism in China. This school is little known in the West, and less understood. While no longer extant in China, it took root in Japan and currently flourishes there. The present work is the translation of a core text, the Dharma-realm Meditation, and a commentary on it. While the core text is available in English (translated by Garma C. C. Chang in his The Buddhist Teaching of Totality The Philosophy of Hwa Yen Buddhism (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971), pp. 207-223), it was translated without commentary, and in that form it is virtually incomprehensible. Presented here with commentary, it can be seen to be a very concise statement of a profound and comprehensive philosophy.

## METHOD

I relied on the version of the text as found in the Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō, ed. Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaikyoku (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1924-34) #1884, Volume 45, pp. 683-692. I compared the core text with Taishō #1883, another commentary which incorporates the core text. I read the text and prepared a "crib", working with the aid and supervision of Professor Leon Hurvitz. Then I prepared a translation which was checked again by Professor Hurvitz. Finally, I wrote an introduction including all the background material I felt necessary to a proper understanding of the text for one familiar with the basic teachings of Buddhism. The system of transliteration used throughout the thesis is the "pinyin" system, without the marking for tones. I included many Chinese terms in the translation for the benefit of the Chinese reader, but relegated most of the characters to the end of the text, to avoid intimidating the non-Chinese reader.



## INTRODUCTION

Translation of Technical Terms

There are several terms, the translation of which require a foreword of explanation. While I tried to remain faithful to standard translation whenever possible, there were instances in which this practice would have been confusing, if not misleading. Several terms require different renderings in different contexts.

The most problematic terms is li 理, which was usually translated as "noumenon", but sometimes as "truth". I eschewed the perhaps standard translation, "principle" to avoid possible confusion with the Confucian use of the term, which denotes rational order, whether on the microcosmic level of the individual, the social level of government, or the macrocosmic level of the universe.<sup>1</sup> Though this is a use of the term which had evolved over the centuries, li was bound to evolve further, particularly when brought into the Buddhist framework. Zürcher focuses on Zhi Dun (Chih Tun), a fourth century monk, as a significant figure in this process. He states that with Zhi Dun, li "(as far as we know for the first time) acquires a new and more abstract significance, the Chinese concept of cosmic or natural order having merged with the Buddhist notion of transcendental Truth, Suchness (tathatā)."<sup>2</sup> Demiéville makes the same point, a bit more expansively:

Nous voilà en pleine métaphysique. De la multiplicité des êtres (wou 物) qui s'offrent à notre expérience bornée, de la diversité des faits (che 事), des événements sans cesse changeants, la Chine antique avait dégagé la notion d'un ordre universel, d'une 'rationalité' structurelle qui les totalisait et les unifiait. Mais ce li restait compris dans le monde: c'était une explication du monde et de la nature, non pas leur négation, même pas une négation niée à son tour par la dialectique des contraires. Avec Tche Touen [Zhi Dun] et le bouddhisme, on accède à une ambiance différente. Le li relève dès lors d'un ordre surnaturel, 'supramondain' à la manière indienne ou néo-platonicienne, en somme indo-européenne, tel que jamais la Chine n'en avait connu jusque là.<sup>3</sup>

However, the story of li does not end there. A continually evolving term, we find in the text at hand a very significant further development in its use. One of the most unmistakable points of the text is the immanence of this transcendental li. Over and over again we are shown that li and shi (事, phenomena) coalesce, enter each other, are like each other, are not different, etc. Hence, neither transcendence nor immanence is able to describe li, unless both terms are taken together in a dialectic, the resolution of which is li. Yet li remains always and inescapably the opposite of shi and thus does preserve something of a transcendental flavor, especially epistemologically. Hence my translation as "noumenon". The term is actually untranslatable, but this will do as long as one does not conceive of "noumenon" as a thing. For here, as in the rest of mainstream Mahāyāna thought, reification of terms that are intended only as pointers along the spiritual way, is a very serious error.

That li must be so treated is evident from another of its translations, "truth". Here the sense is close to "true principle", but these are always Buddhist truths, not truths of a Confucian rational

order. One may find scattered throughout the text such phrases as, "the Truth of the Middle Way", "the Truth of Real Emptiness", or "the Truth of no-self (anātman) in dharma". This is the same li that is also rendered as "noumenon" -- the epistemological character of the latter, then, is clear. In short, "noumenon" and "the Truth of Real Emptiness" are interchangeable terms.

I have already mentioned in passing the term shi 事, which I have consistently rendered as "phenomenon/phenomena". This term is used interchangeably throughout the text with the compound term, shi-fa 事法 which I have rendered somewhat awkwardly as "phenomena-dharma". The choice of term seems to rest on rhythmic grounds, with shi as the basic term, and shi-fa as the variant. In either case, the term generally means an affair, a matter, an event, etc., but is used somewhat interchangeably in this text with the term fa 法 which I have rendered by the Sanskrit "dharma", when this term is used to denote a thing. Shi, then, comes to signify any concrete, specific phenomenon occurring within the worldly spatio-temporal framework. It of course is empty of own-being and enters into the various relationships with li that will be shown in the text. In sum, li is in every case universal, and shi is in every case particular.

I have chosen to render fa 法 by the Sanskrit "dharma" as this is by now standard practice. The word is quite well known to English speaking students of Buddhism, who might be more confused than helped if the term were translated into an unfamiliar form. In addition to the sense of "thing", it also renders such abstract concepts as Truth, Teaching, Doctrine, Law, etc. The specific sense of the term can only be determined by the context of each occurrence.

Fa-jie 法界, "Dharma-dhātu" is easily rendered as "Dharma-realm", but more difficult to explain. In this text it seems to have two basic uses. First, less frequently used and less important, is the sense of the cosmos, or the totality of the universe. The phrase is used in this sense very specifically, and is not the sense which should be attributed to its use in, for example, the title of the work. However, the connotation of totalism, which is very important in the Hua-yan school, may be a desirable overlap of the first sense into the second.

The second sense is more abstract and is tied to the abstract senses of the word "Dharma". The realm of Dharma is the realm in which the Truth or the Doctrine is manifest. This is obviously the same as the cosmos, since the Truth is in fact a statement of the way things are. However, Dharma or Truth seems here to be interchangeable with li, and hence the phrase might mean realm of noumenon. However, as we saw before, this has basically an epistemological nature. Hence Dharma-realm also means the realm in which one realizes the Truth, or simply the experience of self-realization of the Truth. A further possibility is that "dhātu" should be taken in the sense of "ultimate element". Hence Dharma-realm would come to mean the ultimate reality of all dharmas and by extension simply ultimate reality. All these senses are present in the term and should be kept in mind. However, as the Chinese character jie 界 generally expresses a boundary, limit, region, or world, I have maintained the translation as "Dharma-realm".

A quite difficult problem is the variety of terms Zong-mi uses for "emptiness" (sūnyatā). The basic ones are kong 空, zhen kong 真空, and xu (kong) 虛. A fourth term, duan kong 斷空 is used only to show

what real emptiness is not, that is, it is not an emptiness of annihilation. A proper explanation of these terms requires a rather lengthy digression on the history of the translation of the term "śūnyatā" in China.<sup>4</sup>

Anyone studying the concept of "emptiness" in China must be shown that the understanding of this concept differs considerably from its Indian understanding. This was especially true in the early period of Buddhist influence in China, but remained a factor thereafter. Briefly, there were three practices in China which had decisive influence on the shaping of Buddhist doctrine as it came into China. These were at their height in the third and fourth centuries A.D. The first of these, which probably declined in popularity before the other two, was the practice of ge-yi 格義 or "matching meanings". In this practice, incoming Indian Buddhist terms and concepts were matched with indigenous Chinese terms and concepts which seemed to be similar. The sources of the latter were most frequently the Lao-zi 老子, Zhuang-zi 莊子, and Yi-jing 易經 -- all Taoist texts. This method was obviously very faulty, and resulted in an avoidance of any real appreciation of the new cultural material which was being offered. The practice was one of re-affirmation of old ideas and beliefs, without any broadening of horizons. Inevitably the Buddhist teachings were distorted.

Once Buddhism had made its first inroads into China, there arose the practices of qing-tan 清談 or "pure conversation", and xuan-xue 玄學 or "study of the abstruse". These practices were especially popular among the group of gentry in Southern China who had been recently displaced from their positions of prestige and power in the

North by an upsurge of barbarians.<sup>5</sup> The world of Han security steeped in Confucian ideology crumbling about them, these people were forced to question or abandon the philosophies they had inherited -- either to seek a reason for the collapse of their way of life, or to simply try to escape from a reality which was unbearable. Turning from the status-quo philosophy of Confucianism to Taoism, the philosophy of those who turned away from the norms of highly structured society, they were particularly interested in ontological problems.

In Buddhism, especially in the Prajñāpāramitā literature, they found a doctrine which seemed similar to Taoist doctrine and which "must have appealed just because of this seeming familiarity: because it handled what seemed to be the same fundamental concepts, at the same time, however, placing these ideas in a new perspective, giving them another and deeper significance, and surrounding them with the halo of a supramundane revelation."<sup>6</sup> This mingling of Taoist and Prajñāpāramitā teachings was xuan-xue. Qing-tan, the third of these practices, was a very sophisticated and witty exchange of remarks on the most highly abstract, metaphysical issues. The Taoist - Prajñāpāramitā amalgam of terms and concepts figured largely in the exchanges, and men of Buddhist learning were not infrequent participants. Buddhist teachings were often the center of discussion.

The enquiry into metaphysical matters revolved around the terms you 有 (being), wu 無 (non-being), and kong 空 (emptiness). Those who were involved in xuan-xue practiced,

the contemplation of the mystery behind all mysteries, the ultimate truth that is behind the phenomenal world. As these men contemplated the natural order of the universe, the regularity of the seasons, the orderliness of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, they speculated that there must be some absolute principle that is the origin of it all, some ultimate reality that brings about this universal harmony. Out of such speculation arose the concept of wu or nonbeing that is the basis of all things. . . . This nonbeing can function only in being, and is made manifest in being. Nonbeing itself is without substance or tangible appearance, but it can be manifested in the functioning of being.<sup>7</sup>

However, the meaning of the Taoist wu is difficult to determine, since all explicitly Taoist theories date to no earlier than the Six Dynasties, when the influence of Buddhism was already present.<sup>8</sup> Wu and you early came to take on abstract, cosmological significance; in the Lao-zi and Zhuang-zi they convey the senses of non-existence and existence, respectively. Later, you was used for the Sanskrit bhāva, "being", and wu for abhāva, "non-being".<sup>9</sup>

In China prior to the introduction of Buddhism we . . . find that the term wu had already two abstract meanings. First, it signified a primal unity in which, as it were, both existence and non-existence lay fused and undifferentiated. This unitive state was not, however, a mere 'nothing', for it contained all future possibilities for world manifestation. Moreover, although it was declared to be 'unnamable', at least one statement could be made about it: this was that it lay beyond the beginning of things. In the Taoistic sense, one could speak of such a state as pen wu [ben wu 本無], 'Original Non-existence'. Second . . . wu signified no more than the dualism implied in the contrast between the presence of something and/or its absence.<sup>10</sup>

The central problem of xuan-xue "is the relation between this 'fundamental non-being' . . . and 'final being' (mo-yu 未有) [the manifested world], a relation which is described as that of 'substance' (t'i 體) and function (yung 用)."<sup>11</sup> In sum, this term wu, or ben-wu was given the meaning of the unthinkable origin of all things, beyond the duality of

being and non-being (i.e., non-empirical, transcendental). It had the very definite and important temporal sense of the ultimate first, whence all things came. This will prove to be a major factor in the Chinese transformation of Buddhism.

Most of the first Buddhist schools or sects were actually little more than exegetical theories, "centered around an attempt to understand 'emptiness' or śūnyatā, as preached in the Prajñāpāramitā. This emptiness was often thought of as the Buddhist equivalent of the Taoist concept of 'non-existence' (wu), or of an 'original non-existence' (pen wu). T'ang Yung-t'ung has noted that, broadly speaking, the term pen wu may almost be said to be another name for the Prajñā study of this period."<sup>12</sup> Ben wu also renders tathatā, "Thusness".<sup>13</sup>

The result of this is a fundamental new element in Buddhism as it developed in China. Dao-an clearly "assumes a temporal process in world creation. We are told that, 'merged in darkness prior to creation, there was only a vast, illimitable emptiness.'"<sup>14</sup> No Indian Buddhist speaks of creation in this temporal framework. The idea that there is a unitary source from which all things came is something new to Buddhism, and is actually quite ill-suited to the Buddhist scheme. This concept, although played down in the following centuries, still maintains a subtle presence in Zong-mi's time.

For Dao-an there "is a prior state of non-manifestation which is contrasted with and exalted over a later state of manifestation. . . . The repeated pattern in this kind of thought is the pairing of wu, 'non-existence', the unmanifested conceived as the 'trunk', that is, that which is fundamental and original (pen wu 本無) with the latter,



contingent and ephemeral, 'twigs and branches of existence' (mo yu 末有).<sup>15</sup> The most obvious instance of this sort of thing in this text is the use of the term gui 歸, "return" or "revert" in such phrases as "form returns to emptiness", or "phenomena return to noumenon." It is hard to determine how much of a temporal sense there is in this, but there is certainly the sense of the manifested returning in some way to their origin, the unmanifested. In fact, Zong-mi uses the trunk and the twigs and branches as central images in his work, "Treatise on the Investigation of Man".<sup>16</sup> In that work he finds the source (ben 本) of man in Buddha-nature (fo-xing 佛性) or Real Mind (zhen xin 真心).

With that as background, we may return to Zong-mi's terms which render sūnyatā. Kong 空 is the standard term used by everyone. It means simply hollow or empty. Zhen kong 真空 "real emptiness" is the term Zong-mi uses to refer to the proper understanding of emptiness, to which the entire first chapter of the work is devoted. Xu 虛 is rather interesting as it can mean either empty space, empty in the sense of false, worthless, etc., -- or empty in the sense of zhen kong. Of course, empty space is an old equivalent for the abstract concept of Buddhist emptiness. In India, sūnya is a constant attribute of ākāśa.<sup>17</sup> In the Uttaratantra,<sup>18</sup> to name just one text, space is very frequently used to exemplify the nature of the Unconditioned. The interchangeability of the other two senses, however, can be rather startling at times. I have variously rendered xu as hollowness, the Void, empty space, insubstantial, etc., and xu-kong as either emptiness or empty space. Thus, unless it forms a compound with kong, xu seems to lack the specifically Buddhist sense of emptiness, and means "empty" in either a spatial or a negative sense. Zong-mi's exalted term is definitely zhen kong.

# A Comment on Some Important Texts

## 1) The Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra 大方廣佛華嚴經

This monumental text can be found in the Taishō, #278, #279, #293. In China, most of the indigenous Buddhist schools formed around the inspiration of one text, which the members of the school considered to contain the most perfect and complete teachings of the Buddha. This practice was determined by the historical and cultural situation in which Buddhism entered China. That is, Buddhist texts of quite variant teachings entered the country entirely haphazardly. The Chinese were faced with a dilemma in their attempt to understand how such different (and sometimes contradictory) teachings as the Prajñāpāramitā, Sarvāstivāda, Mādhyamika, Vijñānavāda, etc. could all be the Word of the Buddha. Their solution was that the Buddha had given different teachings at different times, modifying his doctrine according to the capacity of his listeners. Thus the problem became one of ordering the sacred literature, and evaluating the teachings according to the order. The Hua-yan school selected the Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra as the highest teaching of the Buddha, since according to legend it was spoken immediately after his Enlightenment, while he was still sitting under the Bodhi tree, still in the samudramudrā-samādhi (the concentration which is like the emblem of the ocean).<sup>19</sup>

There are three Chinese translations of this sūtra: one in 60 juan by Buddhabhadra, another in 80 juan by Śikṣānanda, and a third in 40 juan by Prājña, which is basically a translation of the Gaṇḍavyūha, one of the best-known sūtras of the text (which is really a collection). Another famous sūtra within the Avataṃsaka is the Daśabhūmika-sūtra.

## 2) Prajñāpāramitā texts, the "Perfection of Wisdom"

In his classification of Buddhist doctrine into the five teachings 五教, the Hua-yan master Fa-zang relegated the class of prajñā or śūnyatā literature to the stratum inbetween the dharma-lakṣaṇa (fa-xiang) teaching, which was considered inferior, and the "final" doctrine of the Mahāyāna, including such texts as the Laṅkāvatāra, the Mahāparinirvāṇa, and the Awakening of Faith.<sup>20</sup> Zong-mi, in his own classification scheme,<sup>21</sup> placed them in a similar position. This, however, seems more exalted in the latter case, as there is no "abrupt" teaching superior to the "final" teaching in Zong-mi's scheme, while there is in Fa-zang's.

The frequent quotation of Prajñāpāramitā texts by Zong-mi shows that he held them in quite high regard. I hope to show in my introduction to the philosophy of the school that śūnyavāda, though perhaps not as developed or advanced as other Mahāyāna teachings, laid the basic foundation for Hua-yan thought. As a result, it plays a very essential role in this school.

Some of the texts most frequently cited by Zong-mi are: 1) the "Heart Sūtra", Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya-sūtra, Taishō #250-255. This is a very popular, short text which was considered to have summarized the "heart" of the prajñāpāramitā teachings. Zong-mi (along with many other monks) appears to have had it memorized. 2) the Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra was translated into Chinese by Xuan-zang, and is actually a collection of many prajñāpāramitā texts. It occupies an entire volume in the Taishō collection (#220). The Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā(mahā)prajñāpāramitā-sūtra is included in this collection, but was also translated by Kumārajīva (Taishō #223). This is the text to which Zong-mi refers in his commentary;

whether he refers to the Kumārajīva or the Xuan-zang translation is not clear. The Pañca is known as the version in 25,000 lines, and is one of the standard longer versions of prajñāpāramitā literature. It seems to have been quite familiar to Zong-mi. 3) Though not a prajñāpāramitā text, the Mādhyamika Treatise 中言命 is considered a systematization of that teaching. Written by Nāgārjuna, translated by Kumārajīva (Taishō #1564), it is held in the highest regard by Zong-mi.

### 3) Tathāgata-garbha texts

Though these texts are not usually considered as a major subdivision of Mahāyāna doctrine, it is necessary to so consider them when dealing with Hua-yan. Both Fa-zang and Zong-mi rank them as superior to the prajñāpāramitā texts, Zong-mi considering them inferior only to the "perfect" doctrine of the Hua-yan,<sup>22</sup> Fa-zang considering them inferior to both the Hua-yan and the "abrupt" teachings.<sup>23</sup> Within this group of texts, those that were most important to Zong-mi were the Uttaratantra (Taishō Vol. 31, p. 813ff.), the Laṅkāvatāra (in three extant versions by Guṇabhadra, Bodhiruci, and Śikṣānanda), and the Awakening of Faith (in two extant versions by Paramārtha and Śikṣānanda). I will show in the section on philosophy what an important role this doctrine played in the formation of Hua-yan thought.

## Biographical Background

### 1) Du-shun (557-640) 杜順

Du-shun, the author of the core text on which Zong-mi commented, is considered the first Chinese patriarch of the Hua-yan school. (The school considered Āśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna to be their Indian patriarchs.)

In spite of this, there is very little biographical information available on him. His official biography (in the Xu Gao-seng-zhuan 續高僧傳, Chapter 25, Taishō Vol. 50, pp. 653-4) contains mostly legendary material.

His family name was Du 杜 and his Dharma name was Fa-shun 法順. When quite young he joined the army and was sent out to the border regions where he performed menial tasks such as carrying water and gathering firewood. At the age of seventeen, he abandoned the world and became a monk. He was taught by the Chan master Zhen 珍 of the Yin-sheng 因聖 monastery, who gave him instruction in meditation. It was for his meditation practice, and the miraculous powers that resulted from it, that Du-shun was to be revered. He lived in a retreat known as Ma-tou 馬豆頭, in a "spiritual cave". From there his fame spread, chiefly in respect to his miracle working. There are several instances in his biography of his curing the sick without medication -- even the deaf and dumb. It is said that the sick flocked to him, and he became known as the Dun-huang Bodhisattva. Zong-mi states in the text at hand that his biography proves he was a manifestation of Mañjuśrī. There is a legend to that effect.<sup>24</sup> Many were converted by this miracle-worker. One of those impressed was the Emperor Wen of the Sui dynasty 隋文帝, who daily sent three sheng 升 ("pints") of rice for his maintenance. Du-shun was also known for his frugality, self-control, and virtue. The only work attributed to him is the Meditation on the Dharma-realm.

The miracle stories of his biography include the following tales. 1) Once Du-shun was holding a gathering for a mass conversion. He got a patron to provide food for five hundred people, but when the day of the gathering arrived, there were twice that many people. The

patron was afraid, but Du-shun told him just to give completely all he had and there would be enough. So the thousand people came, and all had sufficient. 2) On another occasion, Du-shun led a group of people to a mountain for meditation throughout the summer. However, the ground was covered with ants and insects, which prevented them from planting vegetables (since their Buddhist precepts prohibited the harming of any living creatures).<sup>25</sup> But Du-shun caused the insects to move away so all was well.

3) Once Du-shun himself was sick with boils from which pus flowed freely. Someone cleaned the sores and wiped them with silk. It was later found that both the pus and the cloth had a very fragrant odor. 4) A monk was possessed by a poisonous dragon-demon. Du-shun was brought to the scene, bowed properly, and sat down facing the monk. The dragon said, "Since your Reverence, the Chan master, has come, the doctrine will not cease for a long time to come. I am very sorry for the trouble [I have caused.]" He thereupon released the monk. 5) Once Du-shun wanted to cross the Yellow River when it was in flood. He tried to ford it, but the bank was slippery, and he kept falling down. Suddenly the water stopped flowing, Du-shun crossed over, and the water started flowing again. 6) When he died, Du-shun was placed in a cave, in a sitting (meditation) position. Time passed, but his body did not decompose; on the contrary, his corpse gave off a fragrant odor. Fearing wrongdoing, his followers put his remains in a shrine.

## 2) Zong-mi (780-841) 宗密

Zong-mi was the fifth and last patriarch of the Hua-yan school. Shortly after his death the Hui-chang suppression of Buddhism was put into effect,

and the school faded away. Zong-mi's Buddhist interests were wide. He was a monk of the Chan he-ze 荷澤 school before he was a Hua-yan monk, and his written work is proof of his broad knowledge, both experiential and scholarly. The biographical information on Zong-mi is much better than that on Du-shun. The original sources from which I have drawn this material, are: 1) his official biography in the Sung Gao-seng-zhuan 宋高僧傳, Taishō Vol. 50, pp. 741-3, 2) the jin-shi cui-bian 金石萃編 which includes the epitaph written by Pei Xiu 裴休. In French there is a translation of an introduction to one of Zong-mi's texts, also written by Pei Xiu, which contains a useful summary of Zong-mi's achievements.<sup>26</sup> In English there is an article which focuses on Zong-mi as a Chan monk, which also has a very thorough biographical sketch.<sup>27</sup>

Zong-mi was born into the He 何 family in the Xi-zhong 西充 county of Guo-zhou 果州, which is in the central part of the present Si-chuan province.<sup>28</sup> His family was prosperous, and he studied the Confucian classics when young, in preparation for the civil service examinations. This was when he was between the ages of seven and seventeen.<sup>29</sup> Between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two he studied Buddhism as a lay Buddhist, often attending readings of Buddhist texts and listening to Buddhist discourses; from twenty-three to twenty-five he again studied Confucianism.<sup>30</sup> Apparently his parents died while he was rather young<sup>31</sup> (possibly in his twenties), and this, in addition to being an emotional shock he carried with him for the rest of his life, was quite a setback to his fortunes. As his biographer said, "He had to turn his back on his superior talents, and apprentice himself to an accountant."<sup>32</sup>

Two years later he traveled from home and chanced to meet a Chan monk, Dao-yuan 道圓, by whom he was greatly impressed. Zong-mi immediately decided to leave worldly life and become a monk. Dao-yuan performed the tonsure and accepted him as a novice. That year Zong-mi proceeded on and was fully ordained into the Samgha by Zheng 拯, a Vinaya teacher. Continuing his practice of travelling within the Buddhist community, Zong-mi met Zhang 張, his master's teacher, who encouraged him to become a preacher, saying, "You are by nature able to preach and teach. You should proclaim [the teachings] and instruct people in the Imperial Capital."<sup>33</sup> One of the decisive factors of his life was his obtaining a copy of the Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment (Yuan Jue Jing 圓覺經).<sup>34</sup> Upon reading this text he received a flash of enlightenment, and could not control his tears. When he told his master of his experience, he was sent off to propagate the doctrine.<sup>35</sup> This text was to be a fundamental source of inspiration for Zong-mi, and he was to write two commentaries on it, a short (in two chapters, now lost) and a long (in twelve volumes).<sup>36</sup>

The next turning point in his life was shortly thereafter, when a monk happened to give him a copy of a commentary on the Avatamsaka-sūtra written by Cheng-guan 澄觀.<sup>37</sup> He was able to study it by himself, and was soon lecturing on it, even though he had not yet read the Sūtra itself. He travelled to the Eastern capital, Le-yang, and reached Cheng-guan's temple, Yun-hua 雲花, where he continued to lecture on the Hua-yan doctrine. This led to a correspondence between Zong-mi and Cheng-guan, which culminated in the latter taking Zong-mi on as a disciple and a Hua-yan monk. He devoted himself absolutely to



Cheng-guan, who was a very prominent figure in the Buddhist world, having been awarded the honorary titles of "Imperial Master of the Pure, Cool Monastery" 清涼國師 and "Imperial Master and Superintendent of Monks" 國師統<sup>38</sup>

Thus began Zong-mi's acquaintance with the scholarly and political spheres. He closely attended Cheng-guan for two years, then lectured for two years, then, in 816, retired to the Zhong-nan mountain 終南 near Chang-an to live in seclusion and study the Tripitaka for three years.<sup>39</sup> In 819 he returned to Chang-an. During this period he wrote his first commentary on the Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment, and commentaries on the Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (Taishō #1701), and the Wei-shi san-shi-lun sung 唯言說三十論 夙 (Triṃśikā Vijñaptimātra Kārikā).<sup>40</sup> Here his wide-ranging interests already become evident.

After a year at Chang-an, Zong-mi once again retired to the seclusion of the mountains, this time Gui-feng mountain 圭峯 near Chang-an. In this period he wrote his long commentary on the Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment, his commentaries on the Hua-yan-jing and the Vinaya in Four Divisions (Dharmaguptaka-vinaya),<sup>41</sup> and his commentary on Du-shun's text which is the subject of the present study. He also wrote a large study of Chan Buddhism, particularly focusing on the philosophical bases of the various schools. Well aware that many of the schools would repudiate his efforts, he remained undaunted in his efforts to demonstrate that Chan, like the rest of Buddhism, had a theoretical as well as an experiential basis.<sup>42</sup> His other works include commentaries on the Awakening of Faith,<sup>43</sup> the Ritual of Avalambana (Taishō #1792), the Sūtra on the Realization of Vows, the Treatise on the Investigation of Man

above mentioned, and more. According to his biographer, his works total two hundred juan.<sup>44</sup>

Another aspect of Zong-mi's life which cannot be overlooked is his involvement in politics. On the positive side was his association with Pei Xiu, a devoted Buddhist layman who would later become prime minister and who admired Zong-mi greatly. He frequently wrote prefaces to his works, and wrote Zong-mi's epitaph. "It seems very likely that the best ones of the honorific posthumous titles conferred upon Tsung-mi [Zong-mi] by the throne were due to the initiative and support of P'ei Hsiu [Pei Xiu], because they were conferred while P'ei was premier and influential at the T'ang Imperial Court."<sup>45</sup> Zong-mi's "reputation at the T'ang court reached its peak in 728, when he was invited to attend the celebration of the imperial birthday held in the palace in the tenth lunar month. On that occasion he discoursed on Buddhism before the Emperor and greatly impressed him. As a reward for his discourse, a purple robe was bestowed upon Tsung-mi, and he was also put in the rank of Monks of Great Virtue (bhadanta)."<sup>46</sup>

Along with such honors, the dangers of political life were inevitable. Zong-mi was involved, apparently innocently, but nonetheless involved, in an anti-eunuch plot led by Li Xun 李訓.<sup>47</sup> In 835, Li, who was prime minister, organized a plot with five hundred men against the eunuchs. The plan failed and many were massacred. Li fled to Zong-mi's monastery at Zhong-nan mountain and asked Zong-mi to shave him and hide him in the monastery. As the two had been friends for a long time, Zong-mi wanted to help his friend, but was prevented from doing so by his disciples. Li had to run on and was soon captured and

killed. Chou Shi-liang 仇士良, the eunuch leader, arrested Zong-mi and kept him in the headquarters of the Left Army. He intended to execute him for failing to report the criminal. "Mi, undisturbed, said, 'I am a poor follower of the Way and have known Xun deeply for years. I also knew of his rebellion. Yet my original teacher [the Buddha] taught the Dharma of helping [the needy] even if the result were bitter [for oneself]. I do not so love my life, and am willing and content to die.' One of the eunuchs, Yu Heng-zhi 魚恒志 was impressed with him, and memorialized to the throne that he should be exonerated. When the courtiers heard of his release, they wrung their hands and wept."<sup>48</sup>

After this episode, Zong-mi became inactive and ceased writing. Presumably he was now in bad standing at court and decided to withdraw to a more contemplative life. He died in 841 and was cremated on his beloved Gui-feng mountain. After the Buddhist persecution of 842-845, Pei Xiu became prime minister, and Zong-mi's name was honored again. He was titled "Chan Master of Concentration and Wisdom" 定慧禪師 and it was decreed that the "Blue Lotus" 青蓮 pagoda should be built to house his remains.<sup>49</sup>

### Background to the Hua-yan School

#### 1) Historical Background

That the Hua-yan school of Buddhism was an aristocratic one can hardly be denied. With its extremely abstruse metaphysical doctrine and its emphasis on intellectual and scholarly matters, it was hardly suited to be a popular movement. Only those with a solid educational background

and a highly-developed intellect were able to appreciate the dazzling vista which Hua-yan offered.

This did not at all preclude the association of the school with the Imperial power. Each of the Chinese patriarchs of Hua-yan was honored and/or supported in some measure by the ruling family, Du-shun by both the Sui and the Tang rulers, and the other patriarchs by the Tang. Fa-zang is by far the most renowned in this respect for his support by the infamous usurper, the Empress Wu (technically not a member of the Tang dynasty). His famous essay "On the Golden Lion" was apparently written partially to instruct the Empress, and she in turn wrote a preface to one of his works. In general, the Hua-yan school could be said to have been associated with the Tang dynasty, much as the Tian-tai was with the Sui.

The Tang period is usually considered to be the "Golden Age" of Buddhism in China. There is certainly justification for this, as it was the era in which the truly Chinese schools of Buddhism were born (with the exception of the Tian-tai, which slightly preceded the Tang), the era in which Buddhism was popular with all classes of society, from the ruling élite to the masses, and in which the material wealth of the Church (in land, temple serfs, oil presses, precious metals, grain, mills, money-lending activities, etc.) was at its height. There are, however, those that take exception to this idea that Buddhism was at its peak during the Tang.<sup>50</sup>

One fundamental point is that the Tang rulers traced their lineage back to Lao-zi, and thus they considered themselves Taoists, if only by ancestral standards. Although Buddhism was powerful and popular,

it is also true that officially Buddhism was not supported by the State, that in fact it was controlled as firmly as possible by the State, a process which culminated in the suppression of 842-845. This control and suppression was of course largely a result of the above-mentioned power and popularity of the Church. Perhaps it is best to say that, much as a Chinese dynasty, the rise and the fall of the fortunes of Buddhism in China were determined by one and the same causes. That is, the growth and domination of the Church sowed seeds that inevitably caused its downfall. Chief among these causes was the great economic wealth of the Church which the State felt (particularly after the An Lu-shan rebellion of 756) as a threat. Briefly, the control measures that the State took against Buddhism were: control of the size of the Buddhist community, chiefly through the sale of ordination certificates, without which theoretically no one could become a monk; periodical defrocking of "undesirable" members of the Buddhist community; official limits to the number of Buddhist temples and monasteries that were permitted; official census of the Buddhist community; the appointment by the State of officials charged with overseeing the activities of the Buddhist Church (in 839 Chou Shi-liang, the eunuch leader who had arrested Zong-mi, was made one of these officials).

However, the State also made use of Buddhism to serve its own needs. Thus there were official State monasteries with monks charged to pray for the welfare of the State, especially in such matters as warfare and the harvest. The Empress Wu used a Buddhist text (adjusted to suit her needs) as ideological justification of her usurpation of power. This was the Da-yun-jing (Mahāmegha-sūtra or "Great Cloud" Sūtra),

adapted by the monk of convenience Xue Huai-yi to say that the Empress Wu was an incarnation of Maitreya and thus a Cakravartin, the perfect ruler (who unquestionably had the right to rule).<sup>52</sup> Emperors generally seemed to feel that the monks were at their beck and call. The former would frequently give orders for a certain religious ceremony to be carried out, and the monks would have to obey. Monks who had Imperial connections had to repeatedly request permission from the Throne whenever they wanted to leave the capital for a retreat in the mountains (perhaps to preserve their morality!)

There is a very interesting theory put forward by Ch'en<sup>53</sup> and, in a more developed form, by Weinstein,<sup>54</sup> concerning the relationship of the Hua-yan school and the Tang dynasty. As Ch'en puts it:

Summarizing, one may say that the epitome of Hua-yen thought consists of the following: there is a world of li or ultimate principle and a world of shih or phenomena, which are perfectly interfused with each other. At the same time each individual phenomenon is also unimpededly identified with every other phenomenon. A totalistic system is thus established, with everything leading to one point, the Buddha, in the center. It is no wonder that Empress Wu Tse-t'ien and the Japanese emperors favored the system, since it provided a religious sanction for their totalitarian schemes.<sup>55</sup>

Weinstein adds that since the Empress Wu saw herself as a universal monarch, she was quite pleased with the Hua-yan image of an orderly universe presided over by Vairocana Buddha, whose every act was reflected through countless worlds.<sup>56</sup> He goes on to say that the infusion of Chan influence into Hua-yan by Cheng-guan and Zong-mi is attributable to the support the two got from military men, among whom Chan was quite popular.

After the An Lu-shan rebellion, along with Imperial patronage, patronage by regional commanders and local rulers became quite significant. Thus, political affairs and the fortunes of Buddhist schools seem to be closely inter-woven.<sup>57</sup>

## 2) Philosophical Background

The Hua-yan doctrine is complex, grounded as it is on śūnyavāda, tathāgata-garbha, and Avatamsaka elements, with the added feature of a distinctly Chinese world-view. The school is popularly referred to as teaching totalism, which means it provides a sweeping view of an infinite universe, the parts of which are completely inter-related and interdependent, and each of which is totally capable of reflecting the totality of the universe. The technical name for this teaching is shi-shi-wu-ai 事事無礙, "the non-obstruction of the various phenomena among themselves". Before developing this any further, it will be best to backtrack to a review of the roots of the Hua-yan theories.

The most striking feature of the Hua-yan world-view is the exalted place which things or phenomena occupy. The Hua-yan treatises display "a universe in which phenomena have been not only restored to a measure of respectability, but, indeed, have become important, valuable, and lovely."<sup>58</sup> Why are phenomena thus admired? There are two basic reasons. First, each and every thing in the world reflects the noumenon, Thusness. This reason is based on tathāgatagarbha theories as we shall see. Second, the Hua-yan cosmology is a version of pratītyasamutpāda (conditioned co-origination) in which the focus is on the constitution of the entire universe at any given moment. To illustrate: every single thing in the universe is indispensable to the totality, which is

the universe. If one piece of any structure is removed, then the former structure is no more, and a new one has been formed. It is equally true that the single constituent part is what it is only by virtue of the totality of which it is a part. As there are no independent dharmas or phenomena, since the universe is totally inter-related and interdependent, all things are in this way relative. The whole and the part are mutually supporting and conditioning. In fact, the notion of "the whole" is here dispensable. "Since the whole is no more than the sum of its parts, it is clear that this system is really talking about the relationship of each part to all the other parts. To change the metaphor, the universe is a gigantic cosmic dance, in which each individual is necessary to the dance, and within which the individual dancer in his contributory and participatory role finds his meaning. To the eyes of an American, it is a square dance."<sup>59</sup>

The other thing which remains to be said for this Chinese world-view, which is a corollary of the above, is that it is basically positive and world-affirming. This should not be taken to mean it is dialectically opposed to a world-negating Indian world-view. No religion that attained the popularity of Buddhism in India could be totally world-negating. However, it is fair to say that the Hua-yan school extracted what was perhaps a latent and rarely overtly-expressed affirmation of the world which was present in the (Indian-born) tathāgatagarbha tradition, and made it a central and fundamental part of its expressed doctrine. That this is essentially a Chinese characteristic can be seen in the similarly world-affirming natures of the T'ien-t'ai and Chan schools of Buddhism in China.



Another factor which figures largely in the Hua-yan cosmology is the Avatamsaka-sūtra (Hua-yan-jing), which the school took as their inspiration and as the highest expression of the Truth. However, the Sūtra is basically not a philosophical text, but rather appears to be the expression of a vision experienced in samādhi which very definitely transcends the worldly spatio-temporal reference system and sees all phenomena as basically illusory. The Sūtra is a celebration of the path of the Bodhisattva (a future Buddha, or monk of the Mahāyāna path), in particular the psychic powers he attains through his ascetic and contemplative practices.<sup>60</sup>

The Hua-yan school does not incorporate much of this, but rather takes in the cosmology of the Sūtra, which, as mentioned above, is a product of contemplative trance. The picture is one of a Pure Land presided over by Vairocana Buddha, who is situated in the center of an infinite universe. Surrounding Vairocana's Pure Land in ten directions (ten for the Hua-yan is the perfectly "round" number, expressing infinity) are countless other worlds which perfectly reflect the central Pure Land in accordance with the principle of the inter-penetration of all phenomena.<sup>61</sup> According to the Gaṇḍavyūha, the Dharma-realm consists of two aspects: the undivided One, and the manifestations of the One. The latter are nothing but illusions.<sup>62</sup> It is this last step which the Hua-yan refused to take. Phenomena are empty, yes; but not purely illusory.

The Sūtra goes on to develop a very elaborate panorama of the magical powers, manifestations, and emanations of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, which, since all things are illusory, are as real as anything else.<sup>63</sup> However, when the Buddhas "present the representation of the

whole Principle-foundation [Dharma-realm] in one atomic particle by means of reflection they are presenting the true nature of all principles [dharmas]. Thus, a Buddha's reflection of all principles -- his production of illusory worlds, bodies and Bodhisattvas -- corresponds to the true nature of the world."<sup>64</sup> In sum, the Sūtra contains fantastic images of a world in which our ordinary concepts of time and space are meaningless, as the various phenomena inter-penetrate, and the entire universe can be contained within a mustard-seed. This imago was to be interpreted and explained, on the basis of śūnyavāda and tathāgatagarbha doctrines, by the Hua-yan school.

The importance and the misunderstanding of the concept of "emptiness" (śūnyatā) as it entered China has been shown above. Thus this concept became a fundamental plank in Chinese Buddhism in general. The Hua-yan school is certainly no exception. Their incorporation of the doctrine of emptiness was quite straight-forward and close to the original Indian concept.

Briefly, the theory of emptiness is that all things are lacking in own-being or self-hood; that is, "x" has no "x-ness" which is its substance or essence. This is a logical outcome of the doctrine of pratītyasamutpāda, which teaches that all things come into being strictly in dependence on other things. Since a thing depends on other things for its existence, it cannot be said to exist in itself or by itself. But since all things are thus dependent on other things, nothing can be said to exist in or by itself. Thus we find ourselves in a world, all the parts of which depend on other parts, which themselves are seen to be undependable! One quickly comes to the conclusion that existence is

an illusion. The more developed doctrine teaches that beings do have a purely empirical existence, with which we must cope in our daily activities, but that ultimately this existence is unreal, and therefore we should view things as unreal in order to be detached from them.

The spiritual basis of this philosophy is the unhappiness all human beings experience, due to the impermanence of everything in life. Nothing can be relied upon for happiness, since tomorrow it may be lost, destroyed or dead. Chief among these sorrows is the fact that each one of us must die. If one clings with attachment to this existence, he can only be miserable as he sees the death of family and friends, and his own death inevitably approaching. The solution to this dilemma is to contemplate the truth of the emptiness of all things, their ultimate unreality. When this is internalized to the extent that one can act and live from this knowledge, which must be experientially known, not just cognitively known, then and only then will one be free of misery.

Nāgārjuna, the founder of the Mādhyamika school which systematized the śūnyavāda doctrine (and who was considered an Indian patriarch of the Hua-yan school), very insistently made the point that emptiness itself is empty. That is, emptiness is not a thing; it is an epistemological construct, one of the points of which is to negate epistemological constructs. The Mādhyamikas denied that any assertion could correspond to any real thing, since no real thing could be found that existed. Thus, all views were considered false. This is definitely not to say, however, that emptiness is identical with negation. The Mādhyamikas negated all statements, but that did not leave negation as an end-product,

since negative statements were also denied. In fact, statements of "A", "not-A", "both A and not-A", and "neither A nor not-A" were all denied. (This is the tetralemma form of logic used by the Mādhyamikas.)

What remains from this radical dialectic of negation? Certainly not nothing. But what does remain is unspeakable, unthinkable; it is not even hinted at by the Mādhyamikas. It is left for the disciple to discover in his own contemplation.

There was a Chinese version of this school, the San-lun, founded on Kumārajīva's translations of Nāgārjuna's works. Once on Chinese soil, however, his concepts underwent a few changes. We have already seen the misunderstandings of the concept of emptiness which were widespread before Kumārajīva's time. With Kumārajīva, the doctrine was restored to something like its original form. Subsequently, however, his teachings underwent a further development, to the point at which, once again, Nāgārjuna might not have recognized them. Nonetheless, they were an absolutely essential element in the growth of Chinese Buddhist thought.

The final element which we must review as a source of Hua-yen thought is the tathāgatagarbha doctrine. This doctrine is frequently confused with the Vijñānavāda doctrine of the Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi and the Trīśikā. While it may be related to these, it should be kept distinct. Basically the tathāgatagarbha ("matrix of the Thus-Come, i.e., the Buddha) doctrine teaches that there exists One Mind (also known as the Real Mind, Original Mind, One Mind of Real Thusness) which has two aspects. Thus it has a pure form, Mind as tathatā, "Thusness", the ultimate reality, and Mind as samsāra, birth and death. In other words, the One Mind is all that is, but it has both a transcendental aspect

and a manifested form. These two are, however, but two aspects of a single Reality. Thus all things are said to be One Mind. The reason for this dual nature is variously explained. The standard explanation (in the Awakening of Faith and the Laṅkāvatāra) is that the Mind is like the ocean: in its depths it is calm and unmoving, but on the surface there are waves, formed by the winds of ignorance. It is to be noted that the dual nature of the One Mind is practically identical with the Dharma-realm in its two aspects of ultimate Reality and universe.

This concept is not taken into the Hua-yan whole cloth. In the Indian form of the doctrine, the manifested world is usually seen as the "defiled" aspect of the One Mind, and it is generally conceived as illusory. As with the Avatamsaka and śūnyavāda teachings, the Hua-yan does not generally accept this notion of the illusory nature of phenomena. For Hua-yan there definitely are defilements to get rid of, but these are human defilements, failings of the human nature which obscure the right vision of Reality. Chief among these, and mentioned over and over again the text, are the defilements of maintaining views (見, dr̥ṣṭi) which, just as for śūnyavāda, are inherently false, and heeding feelings 小情, in which we become lost, forgetting the true nature of Reality.

However, when these human defilements are gotten rid of, there is no more talk of any defilement at all. Phenomena (other than human mental phenomena) are spoken of neither as defiled, nor as illusory. In fact, phenomena themselves constitute the final and highest vision the Hua-yan has to offer. To be sure, one must see first that phenomena and noumenon are one (i.e., that the manifested world is the One Mind),

but once that point is thoroughly made, this text speaks no more of noumenon. The entire final chapter of the work is devoted to phenomena and the nature of the inter-relationship of the various phenomena. In sum, the tathāgatagarbha doctrine is the basic tool by which the Hua-yan school explains the relationship of noumenon and phenomena, but the Hua-yan goes one step further than the tathāgatagarbha doctrine in its exaltation of phenomena. This step was made necessary by the Chinese world-view which is generally world-affirming.

So much for the sources of Hua-yan thought. In the following description of Hua-yan doctrine itself, attention will be given primarily to Fa-zang's work. He is considered the systematizer and de facto founder of the school, so most of the scholarly work that has been done on Hua-yan (in the West) has concentrated on him. We shall return to Du-shun and Zong-mi in the next section of the introduction.

Fa-zang's writings were prolific, but perhaps the best known of them are his commentary on the Hua-yan-jing (Taishō #1733), his Essay on the Golden Lion (Taishō #1880), his Commentary on the Heart Sūtra (Taishō #1712), and his Treatise on the Five Doctrines (Taishō #1886). Of these, I shall concentrate on the latter. Though its ostensible purpose is to communicate the school's classification of Buddhist doctrines, it also contains a wealth of information on the general philosophy of Hua-yan which is related to our text. It is devoted to demonstrating the essential unity of all phenomena, and the interpenetration of phenomena.<sup>65</sup> All phenomena are the same, in that they are all empty, i.e., they are marked with the mark of emptiness; their own-being is emptiness. This is the ground of their unity.

Fa-zang brings in the Buddhist doctrine of the three natures (tri-svabhāva) to further elucidate this. The three are: parikalpita-svabhāva -- the completely imaginary, false nature of a thing, e.g. a rope which is seen as a snake by a man walking home at twilight; paratantra-svabhāva -- the empirically real but absolutely false nature of a thing; a thing in its nature of dependence on causes and conditions; pariniṣpanna-svabhāva -- the absolute nature of a thing. The latter is paratantra-svabhāva seen for what it really is, while parikalpita-svabhāva is totally misunderstood. Fa-zang shows these three natures to be really two natures, the relative and the absolute.<sup>66</sup> In fact, he needn't have bothered with the tri-svabhāva doctrine at all, as he is really expressing a teaching which is independent of it.

According to Fa-zang, the pariniṣpanna nature of a thing has two aspects: 1) it is immutable and unchanging (不變); 2) it "obeys conditions" (隨緣) i.e., it is conditioned by things outside itself and so manifests itself as the phenomenal world.<sup>67</sup> This is clearly classic tathāgatagarbha doctrine. But Fa-zang goes on to show that the paratantra nature of a thing also has two aspects: 1) it has quasi-existence (似有) or empirical existence (假有) i.e., conditioned, non-ultimate existence -- and this is identical with the conditioned aspect of the pariniṣpanna nature. 2) It lacks own-being; it is empty. The key to the whole system is found here: the empty nature of phenomenal things is identical with the immutable aspect of the absolute nature.<sup>68</sup> Thus whether one looks to phenomena or to transcendental Reality, one finds the same two aspects: the phenomenal and the transcendental.

In other words, emptiness is the highest Truth in the Buddhist teachings and is identical with Thusness (tathatā), Dharma-nature (dharmatā), Buddha-nature, etc. This too is not really a totally new teaching, but its explicit formulation in philosophical language is a step in the development of the radically new doctrines of Hua-yan. One should note in passing that emptiness here doesn't seem to be behaving like a purely epistemological construct; certainly there are at least overtones of an ontological nature. However, it should again be emphasized that here too emptiness is not a thing: it is the Truth of the absence of own-being in all phenomena and dharmas, but it is identical with the highest vision of Reality, of the nature of things, that the Buddhists have to offer: "Thusness". That this is at least partially an ontological matter can be known in that what is being discussed is definitely a something that impinges on what we call the consciousness of man. This something is not considered by Chinese Buddhists (at least Hua-yan and Tian-tai)<sup>69</sup> to be purely illusion; there is definitely something to the fact that we are "aware-of". Whether something is "really real" beyond this "awareness-of" is not worth discussion; it is certainly not conducive to salvation.

As mentioned above, the aim of Hua-yan is to expound the teaching of shi-shi-wu-ai 事事無礙, the non-obstruction of the various phenomena among themselves. The Hua-yan school has a way of manipulating phenomena to show their inter-relationships. It is called chong-chong-wu-jin-zhu-ban-ju-zu 重重無盡主伴具足,<sup>70</sup> In practice, this means that any phenomenon can be selected out of the infinite Dharma-realm of phenomena to be the "lord" or "chief" phenomenon; the others are secondary to it.



Then, with reference to this one phenomenon, all the others can be seen to contain it, be contained by it, enter it, be entered by it, be identical with it, be different from it, etc. All these relationships can be shown to occur simultaneously. Not only that, but simultaneously each one of the phenomena can be said to be the "chief" phenomenon, so that all these relationships occur in the infinite forms which are possible, all at the same moment. This is the nature of the Dharma-realm. If this seems bewildering, it is little wonder, as it is the final point of the Hua-yan teachings, and quite similar to the product of samādhi described in the Avatamsaka-sūtra. Let us backtrack again.

The teaching of shi-shi-wu-ai is based squarely on the teaching of li-shi-wu-ai 理事無礙, which corresponds to the teachings of the tathāgatagarbha.<sup>71</sup> Li-shi-wu-ai means the non-obstruction of noumenon and phenomena (noumenon corresponding to the One Mind in its immutable aspect, phenomena beings its form which "obeys conditions".) In our text it is shown that phenomena depend on noumenon as a base; noumenon itself is what requires no base. On the other hand, noumenon and phenomena are said to be alike and "not-different". Both of these are aspects of the tathāgatagarbha teaching. It is important to note that although shi-shi-wu-ai is the highest teaching of Hua-yan, it is not possible without the foundation of li-shi-wu-ai. The latter is certainly not abandoned in Hua-yan. "By retaining the idea of li-shih-wu-ai, religious practice and its fruits remain an important part of his [Fa-zang's] system, because li-shih-wu-ai means that behind phenomena lies the absolute. Our true nature is enlightenment, and transcendence becomes possible; within us we can find Buddhahood, enlightenment, and nirvāṇa."<sup>72</sup>

The outcome of this is that if each phenomenon is the same as noumenon, and if noumenon is the same as all phenomena, then every phenomenon is identical with every other phenomenon. Here we return to shi-shi-wu-ai. However, identity is not the only relationship between phenomena. According to Fa-zang, they also interpenetrate. (Du-shun shows several more relationships that exist between phenomena.) Interpenetration can be seen as the dynamic part of the relationship of which identity is the static part.<sup>73</sup>

However, the Hua-yan teaching is not that the differences of phenomena fade away to form an amorphous mass called the Dharma-realm. If this were so, Hua-yan could not be said to exalt phenomena as they do. To the contrary, the non-obstruction of noumenon and phenomena means that phenomena and noumenon co-exist, with each retaining its own characteristics and in no way being limited or constrained by the other. Thus phenomena do not become less phenomenal in order to participate in the transcendental Reality. Our text will emphasize this point: without moving from its original position, every phenomenon is completely noumenon. The result is a very dynamic image of a universe filled with phenomena vibrant with their (paradoxically) own nature, yet not one of which impinges in any way on any other, as their natures are all empty. In short, form is emptiness -- the nature of all phenomena is emptiness, which is identical with Thusness; and emptiness is form -- the distinctions among phenomena are maintained as real distinctions.<sup>74</sup>

To take one example to demonstrate the interpenetration of phenomena: on the Bodhisattva path, the stage of faith, which is the first stage of the path, is seen by the Hua-yan school to be identical

with Buddhahood. This is so while maintaining the fifty-two stages of the path. The reasoning behind this is the doctrine of mutual identity and interpenetration, which here is demonstrated as the identity of cause and effect. The cause (the stage of faith) and the effect (Buddhahood) are shown to be simply two mutually conditioning elements in a non-linear totality. That is, there is no progression from cause to effect, all elements are both cause and effect simultaneously. Buddhahood is the result of faith, yet "without the result stage of Buddhahood, the causal stage of faith is not a cause at all, because a cause is a cause only with regard to a definite result."<sup>75</sup> So Buddhahood is a conditioning factor which determines what faith is; in short, it is a cause of faith. Furthermore, the stage of faith and Buddhahood are identical, because in their mutual conditioning, both are seen to be empty. "Therefore, says the Hua-yan, if you acquire one [of the stages], you acquire all, because the whole 52 stages are each dependent on the others. If the stage of faith is perfected, this is tantamount to the acquisition of the rest of the stages, including Buddhahood."<sup>76</sup>

However, this does not imply that after one has reached the stage of faith there is nothing left to do. The Bodhisattva "while indeed being a Buddha at the stage of faith, will nevertheless continue his practices throughout the whole 52 stages. This apparent paradox can be resolved if it is kept in mind that . . . while it is true that the stage of faith is cause for all the remaining stages, including the stage of Buddhahood, it is equally true that the remaining stages are the cause of the stage of faith, and this means that without the remaining stages, the stage of faith is not the cause of Buddhahood.

Therefore, no person has completed the stage of faith who has not become a Buddha; conversely, no person becomes a Buddha who has not perfected the stage of faith."<sup>77</sup> This is shi-shi-wu-ai, and it applies to all phenomena of time and space. "One's enlightenment in one place implies the enlightenment of all persons in all places; Śākyamuni's enlightenment in the sixth century B.C. occurs every instant of the past, future, and present. When the Bodhisattva extinguishes one fault, all are extinguished, and when one practice is perfected, all are perfected."<sup>78</sup>

To sum up: li-shi-wu-ai is the ground of the inherent connectedness of all things. It is also an expression of the exaltedness of all things: the lowliest pile of dust is a manifestation of bhūtata-thatā, Real Thusness, the highest Truth of Buddhist doctrine. It contains the noumenon within itself, not partially, but totally. Thus it is not in the least lowly; it is supreme. Shi-shi-wu-ai is basically an ecstatic expression of absolute freedom, grounded in li-shi-wu-ai. The image it creates is a bewildering one to those of us who cannot join in the ecstatic vision, but to those who can, the world is the playground of the gods, and every thing in the world is such a god.

### The Text

#### 1) Literary Aspect

Du-shun, the first Chinese patriarch of the Hua-yan school, wrote only one work that we know of. This is the Fa-jie guan-men 法界觀門. Garma C. C. Chang evaluates it thus:

The most original and important piece of work in the literature of Hwa 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 -- Chih Yen, Fa Tsang, Ch'eng Kuan, and Tsung Mi -- all gained their inspiration from this essay and wrote their works following the principles and arguments laid down therein. With regard to philosophy, this treatise is no doubt the most important piece of work of Hwa Yen Buddhism.<sup>79</sup>

This work does not exist on its own. It exists incorporated into texts with commentary by Cheng-guan (Taishō #1883) and Zong-mi (Taishō #1884). The latter was the basis for this translation, though I did consult the former comparatively. A third commentary by the Song monk Ben-song 本嵩 exists (Taishō #1885), but I did not consult this text.

## 2) Meditational Aspect

The word guan 觀 in the title of this text signals that the author considered it to be a meditation text. The first line of Zong-mi's commentary refers to meditation, zhi-guan 止觀. Clearly, those concerned with the writing of this text had meditation as one of their chief concerns. However, a casual reading of the text leads one to the conclusion that this is a philosophical text, not a meditation text. Certainly there are no passages on how to sit properly, clear one's mind, observe the flow of breathing, or the like. In fact this text is both philosophical and meditational in its concerns and approach.

The word zhi 止 is the Chinese translation of the Sanskrit śamatha, and guan renders vipaśyanā. The former, in the Sanskrit context, means: quiet, tranquillity, absence of passion, tranquillization, calm, or quietude of the heart. The latter means: right knowledge, correct knowledge, correct insight, inward vision, intuition, introspection.

Together: "la pensée parfumée par le śamatha (calme) peut obtenir par la vipaśyanā (intelligence; elsewhere vision, contemplation) la vinukti".<sup>80</sup>

The Chinese interpreted both of these in two ways: 1) ting-zhi 停止 -- "once one has arrived at the truth, to stop and not move"; 2) zhi-xi 止息 "to put an end to false notions"; 3) guan-da 觀達 "to realize one's own identity with Reality through perceptive wisdom"; 4) guan chuan 貫穿 "to probe the kleṣas with one's mind and thus annihilate them."<sup>81</sup> In our text, zhi is rarely mentioned -- the emphasis definitely seems to be on guan. It appears that for Du-shun and Zong-mi, zhi meant a preliminary step in meditation, i.e., ridding oneself of one's ordinary preoccupation with false views (見) and feelings (情). Once one is free of those hindrances, then one can go on to guan, meditation proper. In this text, meditation is based on discursive reasoning (which is provided by the text). However, this doesn't mean the meditation itself is discursive, to the contrary, the text frequently states that the Truth is inaccessible to reasoning or thought, and that one must abandon understanding in order to truly grasp it. The text itself, though, is quite logical and well-reasoned.

At regular intervals, when a point is made, the disciple is told "contemplate this" (觀之). The only possible conclusion we can draw is that this text and contemplative practice were designed to go hand-in-hand, neither being complete without the other, but that specific instruction in contemplative practice was left to oral instruction. Pei-Xiu himself makes this point in his preface to the text:<sup>82</sup> "If one wishes to gaze at the ancestral temples' profound beauty, or to look at the Imperial capital's great marvels, certainly only if he unrolls a map and

climbs a high terrace can he completely get [a good view]. If he unrolls the map without climbing, he can't speak of truly seeing. If he were to climb the height without unrolling the map, he would be dim-sighted and lacking discrimination. Therefore all the Dharma-realm's three great qualities<sup>83</sup> which comprise the myriad things are found completely in the mind, not in the Sūtra. The clarification of cause and effect, the classification of deeds and stations of the [Bodhisattva's] way, the display of Dharma and meaning, the encouragement of [religious] joy and the production of faith are found completely in the Sūtra [i.e., the Avatamsaka-sūtra], not in meditation. Meditation enables one to reach the Dharma of the Sūtra. The text [of Du-shun] is the gateway by which one enters the meditation. The commentary [of Zong-mi] is the key to the gateway. Therefore, if one wants to realize the nature and excellence of the Dharma-realm, nothing is as good as the Sūtra. If one wants to penetrate the meaning of the Sūtra's Dharma, nothing is as good as meditation. If one wants to enter the many-layered mysteries of meditation, one must certainly go through the gateway. If one wants to open the mysterious gateway of the three types of meditation [found in this text], one must certainly do so by means of the key." He later adds to this list of interdependent necessities:<sup>84</sup> "One who seeks the Way certainly must rely on the wisdom eye. But the wisdom eye isn't able to open itself. Thus one must seek out a teacher to pierce the membrane [of the wisdom eye, i.e., get rid of that which clouds one's vision.] If this membrane of feelings has not been pierced, even if one had the gateway, how would he be able to enter it? Even if the gateway be broad, how will he profit by it?"

## General Summary of the Text, by Chapters

### Introduction

What I call the "introduction" to this work consists of Du-shun's title and by-line, plus a statement that the text is concerned with the cultivation of the meditation on the Dharma-realm, as taught in the Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra. Zong-mi's commentary fills out the text with brief explanations of the Buddhāvataṃsaka and the Dharma-realm, and a short biographical sketch of Du-shun. There is also an outline of the chapters of the text.

### Chapter One: The Contemplation of Real Emptiness

This chapter contains four contemplations: 1) the contemplation in which one understands that form reverts to emptiness. This contemplation is based on the teaching of the Heart Sūtra that form is emptiness. There are four subdivisions here. A) Real emptiness is not emptiness by annihilation. B) The signs of things are not real emptiness, yet things have no substance and therefore are empty. Thus there is no particular thing or quality of a thing which one can point to and say, "that's emptiness!", yet all things are empty. Zong-mi here offers three further clarifications of emptiness. 1) Emptiness is not an empty space with boundaries, and thus has no outside. 2) Neither is emptiness a space with an inside. 3) Emptiness is not a space that contains form, because this notion turns emptiness into a thing or object which would then be in conflict with form (other objects), which real emptiness is not. Zong-mi points out that emptiness and form differ in two ways: emptiness is non-material and form is material; emptiness (and here he uses the term for "empty space") is empty and penetrable, and form is solid and obstructing.



Unfortunately, his statement that emptiness  $\equiv$  empty space is empty and penetrable is a contradiction of the arguments he used immediately above in denying that emptiness was a thing to be penetrated by forms. C) Form is the same as real emptiness, because form lacks substance and so "reverts" to emptiness. This is a denial of emptiness as a transcendental entity. The above three propositions wipe out feelings, and the following establishes noumenon. D) Form and all other dharmas are the same as real emptiness because they all lack own-nature.

2) The second contemplation is the one which clarifies that emptiness is the same as form. Again there are four subdivisions, which are basically the same as in the first contemplation. It is taught here that emptiness is that on which other things rely, while it does not rely on anything else. Thus for the sake of what relies on it, it becomes a base, which is form. Thus emptiness is shown both to be and not to be the same as form. This is a key passage.

3) The contemplation of the non-obstruction of form and emptiness. Here form and emptiness are shown to be the same.

4) The contemplation of cutting-off and abodelessness. Here we find a cutting-off of all views, similar to Mādhyamika. With all verbalization negated, we reach the necessity of practice, i.e., meditative practice. We are taught that understanding cannot arrive at the Truth, but that one's practice must be based on understanding.

## Chapter Two: The Contemplation of the Non-obstruction of Noumenon and Phenomenon

This chapter discusses the variety of relationships that exist between noumenon and phenomena; these relationships should be understood to hold

both between noumenon and the total group of phenomena, and between the former and each individual phenomenon. Zong-mi tells us that here we move away from purely theoretical knowledge to practical knowledge, i.e., now Thusness functions in its relation with phenomena.

There are ten subdivisions to this chapter. 1) shows that noumenon pervades phenomena, which means that each and every phenomenon contains the entire noumenon. 2) is by far the longest of these gateways -- it is longer than all the others combined. This leads us to conclude that it is the heart of the chapter. Here we learn that phenomena pervade noumenon. This means that since they lack substance they are like noumenon. Being the same as noumenon, a single phenomenon can contain the entire universe. Realizing that this may be rather difficult for his readers to digest, Du-shun provides an illustration in the form of the relationship between the ocean and a wave, followed by questions and answers that further clarify the relationship, and bring the terms of illustration back to noumenon and phenomena (in this case, one atom). The overall point which is made is that noumenon and phenomena are neither the same nor different, thus they interpenetrate (each can act as the other) without obstructing each other.

3) shows that phenomena are produced in dependence on noumenon. This is just like dharmas coming into being in dependence on the Buddha-matrix (tathāgatagarbha). 4) shows that phenomena manifest noumenon. 5) shows that phenomena are snatched away by means of noumenon. This is to say that apart from noumenon, there are no phenomena. Thus all the characteristics of phenomena are exhausted. 6) shows that phenomena conceal noumenon. This balances out the fifth

LEAF 44 OMITTED IN PAGE NUMBERING.

teaching. Noumenon causes phenomena to be manifested, but is not itself made manifest. 7) shows that Real noumenon is the same as phenomena. Thus noumenon is never found outside of phenomena, but neither can there ever be phenomena without noumenon, since phenomena are empty. Only because noumenon is phenomena, can it be rightly called noumenon. 8) shows that phenomena are noumenon. Since phenomena lack own-being, they are Real. This leads to the conclusion that all beings are Thusness. 9) shows that Real noumenon is not phenomena. Though they are the same, still they are different, because that which is dependent is not that which can be depended on. 10) shows that phenomena are not noumenon.

We are told that all the above doctrines have to do with one and the same topic: conditioned arising (pratītyasamutpāda). There follows a list of the relations that exist between noumenon and phenomena. We learn that all these relations exist simultaneously without obstructing each other.

### Chapter Three: The Contemplation of Universal Inclusion

This is the contemplation of the non-obstruction of the various phenomena among themselves. Zong-mi makes clear that we must remember that this doctrine includes the principle already learned, namely, that phenomena are like noumenon. If this were not so, then from the point of view of phenomena, there would be mutual obstruction, and from the point of view of noumenon, all distinctions would vanish. The "theme" of the chapter tells us that phenomena blend without obstruction, and intermingle, perfectly freely. Here too there are ten subdivisions.

1) teaches that noumenon is like phenomena. There is not the least bit of the noumenon-nature that is hidden, nor that fails to manifest itself as phenomena. 2) demonstrates that phenomena are like noumenon. They are all utterly ubiquitous, and thus one atom pervades the entire Dharma-realm.

3) is the pivotal point of the chapter. It shows that one single phenomenon (selected according to the principle of chong-chong-wu-jin-zhu-ban-ju-zu, discussed above) includes both noumenon and all other phenomena. Zong-mi clearly and carefully explains that since a single phenomenon contains noumenon in its entirety (as has already been shown), and since all the remaining phenomena (i.e., the Dharma-realm) and noumenon are the same, as a consequence, one phenomenon contains all phenomena. Yet the only reason it can do this, is that it is not different from noumenon. Not only one phenomenon, but all dharmas are able to do this. There follows a list of the various ways one and all can contain each other.

4) teaches the non-obstruction of the ubiquitous and the bounded. This and the following teaching are basically extensions of number three. 5) shows the non-obstruction of the broad and the narrow. 6) demonstrates the non-obstruction of pervading and containing. Here Zong-mi introduces the example of the ten mirrors and the lamp to illustrate the principles which are being discussed. 7) shows the non-obstruction of embracing and entering. This is parallel to the non-obstruction of pervading and containing. The only difference is that with pervading and containing the author is referring to many phenomena, while with embracing and entering

he is speaking of one. It is basically a grammatical distinction he is making, not a doctrinal point. Again the illustration of the mirrors is used.

8) demonstrates the non-obstruction of interpenetration. In this and the following teaching, there is a list of the various ways one and all can embrace and enter each other. The mirrors are again used to illustrate. 9) shows the non-obstruction of each being in the other. Finally, 10) demonstrates universal blending without obstruction. Zong-mi proceeds with a comprehensive cataloging of the inter-relationships of the above teachings to demonstrate this point, referring to the mutual blending of primary and secondary (the zhu and ban of chong-chong-wu-jin-zhu-ban-ju-zu).

The final word is that one must contemplate these teachings and cause the perfectly luminous to be manifest.

## FOOTNOTES

## INTRODUCTION

<sup>1</sup>See Leon Hurvitz and Arthur Link, "Three Prajñāpāramitā Prefaces of Tao-an," Mélanges Paul Demiéville, Vol. 2. Limoges (France): Imprimerie A. Bontemps, 1975.

<sup>2</sup>E. Zürcher, The Buddhist Conquest of China (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959), p. 125.

<sup>3</sup>Paul Demiéville, as cited by Hurvitz and Link, p. 413. On Zhi Dun see also Leon Hurvitz, "Chih Tun's Notions of Prajñā," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 88, No. 2, June, 1968, pp. 243-260.

<sup>4</sup>Some of the sources I have used for this are: E. Zürcher, Hurvitz and Link, Hurvitz, "Chih Tun", and Arthur E. Link, "The Taoist Antecedents of Tao-an's Prajñā Ontology," History of Religions, Vol. 9, Nos. 2 and 3, November 1969/February 1970, pp. 181-215.

<sup>5</sup>See Etienne Balazs, "Nihilistic Revolt or Mystical Escapism," Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy, trans. H.M. Wright, ed. Arthur F. Wright (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), pp. 226-254.

<sup>6</sup>Zürcher, p. 73.

<sup>7</sup>Kenneth Ch'en, Buddhism in China (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 61-2.

<sup>8</sup>Hurvitz and Link, p. 410.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 417.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Zürcher, p. 87.

<sup>12</sup>Hurvitz and Link, p. 416.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 419.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>原人言命, Taishō #1886, translated by Paul Masson-Oursel into French, "Le Yuan Jen Louen," Journal Asiatique, Onzième Série, Tome 5, 1915, pp. 299-354.

<sup>17</sup>Herbert V. Guenther, "Words Denoting 'Emptiness'," Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference. 16th session, 1951. (University of Lucknow, 1955), pp. 251-261.

<sup>18</sup>Translated from the Tibetan by E. Obermiller, "The Sublime Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation," Acta Orientalia, Vol. 9, 1931, pp. 81-306.

<sup>19</sup>Francis H. Cook, Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines: an Annotated Translation (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 188-9.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., see pp. 76-103 and 173-182.

<sup>21</sup>Masson-Oursel, see pp. 304-5.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>Cook, Five Doctrines, pp. 188-9.



<sup>24</sup> Garma C. C. Chang, The Buddhist Teaching of Totality The Philosophy of Hwa Yen Buddhism (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971), second printing, 1974, pp. 232-3.

<sup>25</sup> The Vinaya forbids the monk to practice agriculture at all, for this very reason. In China, the monks had to choose between practicing agriculture and dying out.

<sup>26</sup> Masson-Oursel, pp. 312-319.

<sup>27</sup> Jan Yun Hua 冉雲華, "Tsung-mi, his analysis of Ch'an Buddhism," T'oung Pao, Vol. 58, 1972, pp. 1-54.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Sung Gao-seng-zhuan, Taishō Vol. 50, p. 741.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Taishō #842. This was most likely a Chinese forgery, and was quite popular among Chan followers.

<sup>35</sup> Pei Xiu's preface; see Masson-Oursel, p. 314.

<sup>36</sup> Available in Xu-zang-jing 續藏經, I/14/2. Jan, p. 14.

<sup>37</sup>Taishō #1735-1737.

<sup>38</sup>Jan, p. 12.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. The first and last mentioned commentaries are lost.

<sup>41</sup>Both these commentaries are lost.

<sup>42</sup>圭峯(藺)若亦單藏 or 亦單源諸言全 of which only  
the preface remains, Taishō #2015.

<sup>43</sup>Jan, p. 15. This can be found in the Tokyo edition of the Chinese Tripitaka, section Tiao 言固, Vol. 8.

<sup>44</sup>Sung Gao-seng-zhuan, p. 472a.

<sup>45</sup>Jan, p. 16.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-17.

<sup>47</sup>The following account is taken from Jan, pp. 17-18, and Sung Gao-seng-zhuan, p. 742a-b.

<sup>48</sup>Sung Gao-seng-zhuan, p. 742a-b.

<sup>49</sup>Jan, p. 21.

<sup>50</sup>Stanley Weinstein, "Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T'ang Buddhism," Perspectives on the T'ang, Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett, eds. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), pp. 265-306.

<sup>51</sup>Jan, p. 20.

<sup>52</sup>See Shotaro Iida, "New Light on the Empress Wu and Buddhism," unpublished paper, University of British Columbia, Department of Religious Studies.

<sup>53</sup>Ch'en, p. 319.

<sup>54</sup>Weinstein, pp. 302-3.

<sup>55</sup>Ch'en, p. 319.

<sup>56</sup>Weinstein, pp. 302-3.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., pp. 304-5.

<sup>58</sup>Cook, Five Doctrines, p. 2.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., pp. 5-6.

<sup>60</sup>See Luis Gomez, Selected Verses from the Gaṇḍavyūha: Text, Critical Apparatus and Translation (Ph.D., Yale University, 1967).

<sup>61</sup>Weinstein, p. 301.

<sup>62</sup>Gomez, p. lxxix.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., pp. lxxix-lxxx.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. lxxxi.

<sup>65</sup>Francis H. Cook, "The Meaning of Vairocana in Hua-yen Buddhism," Philosophy East and West, Vol. 22, No. 4, October, 1972, p. 404.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., pp. 404-5.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 406.

<sup>69</sup>See Zhi-yi's concept of miao-you, footnote 53, Chapter 2 of this work.

<sup>70</sup>See Cook, Five Doctrines, pp. 6ff.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., pp. 25-6.

<sup>79</sup>Chang, p. 207.

<sup>80</sup>Edgerton et al., as cited in Leon Hurvitz, Chih-I An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk, Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, Vol. 12, publiés par L'Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises. Bruges (Belgique): Imprimerie Sainte-Catherine, 1963, p. 319, footnote. Italics omitted.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid.

<sup>82</sup>Taishō Vol. 45, pp. 683c-684a.

<sup>83</sup>I.e., the greatness of the Real Thusness in its essence; the greatness of its attributes (wisdom, compassion, etc.), and the greatness of its functions.

<sup>84</sup>p. 684a.

## FOREWORD TO THE TRANSLATION

In order to keep them distinguished, Du-shun's text is written in ALL CAPITALS, and Zong-mi's commentary is written in regular type.

The footnotes are at the end of each chapter. Chinese characters (keyed to the text by small, super-script letters) are at the end of the translation.

All material in brackets was added by this writer. This material has two purposes. 1) When the material in brackets stands on its own, it is used to bring together a phrase or sentence written by Du-shun that was divided by Zong-mi in such a way as to be unintelligible or confusing as it stood. 2) When the material in brackets is found in the middle of a sentence, its function is to supply information implicit, but not expressly stated in the Chinese.

COMMENTARY TO THE HUA-YAN DHARMA-REALM MEDITATION  
(zhu hua-yan fa-jie guan men)<sup>a</sup>

by the Monk Zong-mi of Gui-feng Monastery

INTRODUCTION

[THE GATEWAY TO THE CULTIVATION OF THE BUDDHAVATAMSAKA'S  
DHARMA-REALM MEDITATION.]

CULTIVATION

This refers to the reach of the perfuming effect (xun-xi)<sup>b,1</sup> of meditation (zhi-guan)<sup>c</sup>.

OF THE BUDDHAVATAMSAKA'S (da fang guang fo hua-yan)<sup>d</sup>

This is the sūtra on which the meditation is based. The great Vaipulya (da fang guang)<sup>e,2</sup> is the Dharma to which witness is borne. The Buddhavataṃsaka declares it to men. "Great" (da)<sup>f</sup> refers to substance (ti)<sup>g</sup>, that is, the Mind-substance of all Buddhas and all beings. The "broad Vaipulya" (fang guang)<sup>h</sup> is the marks (xiang)<sup>i</sup> and the function (yong)<sup>j</sup> of this substance. Buddhahood (fo)<sup>k</sup> is the fruit (guo)<sup>l</sup>; the Hua-yan is the cause. The flower (hua)<sup>m</sup> symbolizes the myriad deeds (xing)<sup>n</sup>; the adornment (yan)<sup>o</sup> is the great wisdom. The great wisdom is the agent (zhu)<sup>p</sup> which revolves the wheel of the myriad deeds. The adornment is great, broad, and far-reaching, and achieves the fruit of Buddhahood. The character for sūtra (jing)<sup>q</sup> is omitted, as the meaning is not in the written word.

DHARMA-REALM (fa-jie)<sup>r</sup>

Cheng-guan's<sup>s,3</sup> commentary on the Buddhavataṃsaka-sūtra<sup>4</sup> says, "In all, there is only one real Dharma-realm. This means [the one Dharma-realm]

comprises all the myriad things and accordingly they are One Mind. From another point of view, the Mind blends with the myriad things and becomes the four kinds of Dharma-realm."

The first [of the four kinds of Dharma-realm] is the Dharma-realm of phenomena (shi)<sup>x</sup>. The meaning of the realm is division (fen)<sup>y</sup>, every thing is distinguished from every other thing because each thing is limited. The second [kind] is the Dharma-realm of noumenon(li)<sup>z</sup>. The meaning of the realm is fundamental nature (xing)<sup>aa</sup>, because the inexhaustible phenomena-dharmas (shi-fa)<sup>ab</sup> have one and the same nature. The third is the Dharma-realm of the non-obstruction of noumenon and phenomena (li shi wu ai)<sup>ac</sup>. The meaning of the realm combines both fundamental nature and division, because fundamental nature and division do not obstruct each other. The fourth is the Dharma-realm of the non-obstruction of the various phenomena among each other (shi shi wu ai)<sup>ad</sup>. That is to say, each and every limited (fen-qi)<sup>ae</sup> phenomenon-dharma blends in the manner of fundamental nature, with inexhaustible layering.

#### MEDITATION (guan)<sup>af</sup>

With meditation, feelings (qing)<sup>ag</sup> are exhausted and false views (jian, drsti)<sup>ah,5</sup> are removed; they are blended into the three [other, that is, the non-phenomenal] Dharma-realms.

#### GATEWAY (men)<sup>ai</sup>.

These eight or nine pages focus on the perfection of meditation.

IN SUM THERE ARE THREE KINDS [OF DHARMA-REALM DISCUSSED IN THE TEXT.]

Du-Shun put aside the Dharma-realm of phenomena because phenomena are not independent. Thus our school acknowledges no solitary dharmas.



If you independently consider it, [you will find] it is a realm of sensation and intellectual calculation; it is not a realm of meditative wisdom. If you analyze the gates in terms of meaning, then there are four, but in terms of what is suitable for meditative wisdom, there are only three kinds. These three are still but three aspects<sup>6</sup> of one Way (dao)<sup>ak</sup>. The twists and turns<sup>7</sup> [of these divisions] are dark and subtle. It is not a case of there being apart from the first Dharma-realm a second or third. Nor is it a case of three separate entities standing side by side. Therefore he speaks of three kinds; he doesn't speak of three steps [i.e., one realm being on top of another.]

BY SHI DU-SHUN OF THE ZONG-NAN MOUNTAIN OF THE CAPITAL (jing zhong nan shan shi Du-shun ji)<sup>am</sup>.

His surname was Du<sup>an</sup> and he was called Fa-shun<sup>ao</sup>. In the time of early Tang he practiced converting others. The wonders he achieved were extremely many. In his biography there is evidence that proves he was a manifestation of Mañjuśrī.<sup>8</sup> Two texts attest that he was the first patriarch of the Hua-yan.<sup>9</sup> The venerable Yan [Zhi-yan<sup>aq</sup>] was the second patriarch. Kang-zang [Fa-zang<sup>ar</sup>], State Preceptor, was the third patriarch, and the initiator (chuang-zhi)<sup>as</sup> [of the school as such]; in principle one should say [he was the] creator (zuo)<sup>at</sup> [of the school]<sup>10</sup>.

Now the fact that I speak of the compiler (ji-zhe)<sup>au</sup> [Du-shun] is because the founding patriarch [in his writings] confined himself to his self-realized wisdom. He realized that within the Hua-yan are all Buddhas and all living beings, whether bodies and minds, or countries and lands. He saw that each and every thing is the substance and function (ti yong)<sup>av</sup> of the Dharma-realm, and further, that such objects of

perception are infinite. Thereupon with respect to this infinite realm, he compiled his assorted doctrinal statements. He grouped them into three layers. By merely writing on paper, he produced contemplative wisdom in others. It is not the same as merely composing written words. Therefore I speak only of the compiler. This then is a collection of doctrine; it is not merely a collection of written words.

#### CHAPTER 1: REAL EMPTINESS (zhen kong)<sup>aw</sup>

This is the Dharma-realm of noumenon (li)<sup>z</sup>. Upon probing to the source of real substance (shi ti)<sup>ax</sup> one only finds it to be the Original Mind. Here, when one selectively denies false and insubstantial thoughts and imaginings, one speaks of the Real (zhen)<sup>ay</sup>. When one eliminates the obstruction-nature and the characteristics of form (se xiang)<sup>az</sup>, one speaks of emptiness (kong)<sup>ba</sup>.

#### CHAPTER 2: THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA

(li shi wu ai)<sup>ac</sup>.

This is what one calls the Dharma-realm.

#### CHAPTER 3: UNIVERSAL INCLUSION (zhou bian han rong)<sup>bb</sup>.

This is the Dharma-realm of the non-obstruction of the various phenomena among themselves.

## CHAPTER 1

## THE CONTEMPLATION OF REAL EMPTINESS

THE CONTEMPLATION OF DHARMAS AS REAL EMPTINESS IS SUMMED UP BY THE OPENING OF TEN GATEWAYS IN FOUR EXPRESSIONS. 1) THE CONTEMPLATION IN WHICH ONE UNDERSTANDS THAT FORM (se)<sup>bc</sup> REVERTS TO EMPTINESS (kong)<sup>ba</sup>. 2) THE CONTEMPLATION WHICH CLARIFIES THAT EMPTINESS IS THE SAME AS FORM. 3) THE CONTEMPLATION OF THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF FORM AND EMPTINESS (kong se wu ai)<sup>bd</sup>. 4) THE CONTEMPLATION OF CUTTING-OFF (min-jue)<sup>be</sup> AND ABODELESSNESS (wu ji)<sup>bf,11</sup>. ACCORDINGLY, FIRST THERE ARE FOUR GATEWAYS.

The first three clear away feelings (qing)<sup>ag</sup>; the last one manifests noumenon (li)<sup>z</sup>. Within the first three, number one clears away the idea of emptiness as annihilation (duan kong)<sup>bg</sup>. The conclusion of the text says what we are dealing with here is reality, not annihilation. Number two clears away the idea that form is objective reality (shi se)<sup>bh</sup>.

I say this for the following reason. When the text says "emptiness devoid of substance is neither green nor yellow, and therefore it is called real form (shi se)<sup>bh</sup>," the author has in mind [the tendency of the ordinary man] to confine himself to false sensation (wang qing)<sup>b1</sup> and intellectual calculation (ji)<sup>bj</sup>, imagining that their objects are real of an absolute certainty, and that they have their own substance (zi ti)<sup>bk</sup>. This is why this text does not in terms of form and color distinguish the real from the false. The author has in mind [the same tendency of the ordinary man] to reckon in terms of form and color as

reality. However, this text makes color<sup>12</sup> stand for form and color<sup>13</sup>. Number three clears away both of these misconceptions together.

The text only speaks of understanding form reverting to emptiness (hui se gui kong)<sup>bl</sup>. Within emptiness there is certainly no form. Therefore, according to the meaning, phrase by phrase, one clears away sensation and calculation, the idea of emptiness as annihilation, and the idea that form is reality. According to the text then, the first two statements supplement each others' deficiencies and help clarify each other. Then number three clears away the two.

The Jewel Nature Treatise (bao xing lun)<sup>bm,14</sup> also clears away three misconceptions of emptiness: the confused thought, the beginning Bodhisattva's idea, and the calculating intellect's conception (luan yi pu-sa ji san zhong kong)<sup>bn</sup>. I fear this may belabor the reader's contemplation and wisdom. You won't necessarily be able to piece it together and understand it. Also the two understandings<sup>15</sup> are not perfectly alike.

1) FORM IS NOT EMPTINESS BECAUSE IT IS EMPTINESS.

This is the theme.

WHY?

This introduces the proof. The following sentences will explain it. At the very end is the concluding remark. The rest of the section follows this pattern.

FORM IS NOT EMPTINESS BY ANNIHILATION (duan kong)<sup>bg</sup>, THEREFORE IT IS NOT EMPTINESS.

This explains the first part of the sentence. Annihilation-emptiness means hollowness, a chasm (xu huo)<sup>bo</sup>, annihilation, and destruction

(duan mie)<sup>bp</sup>. It does not refer to Real Mind (zhen shi xin)<sup>bq</sup>.

Annihilation-emptiness lacks wisdom and function. It is unable to manifest itself among the myriad dharmas. There are two types of annihilation-emptiness: 1) the idea of emptiness as the absence of form<sup>16</sup>; 2) the idea of emptiness as annihilation and destruction. In the absence of form type, emptiness is seen to be outside of form. For example, a place occupied by a wall is not empty; the emptiness is outside the wall. In the annihilation and destruction type, the destruction of form brings emptiness to light. For example, digging a well and removing dirt brings out emptiness. For this kind you must eliminate matter.

However, my clarification differs from this. Therefore I say what we are dealing with is not annihilation-emptiness. Thus in the Mādhyamika Treatise (zhong lun)<sup>bs,17</sup> it says, "First there is something, and later there is nothing." This is what is called annihilation and destruction. And yet non-Buddhists and the Hīnayāna both have annihilation and destruction. The non-Buddhist annihilation and destruction means reversion to the great void (tai xu)<sup>bu, 18</sup>. The two vehicles [of the śrāvaka and the pratyekabuddha] consider that annihilation and destruction revert to Nirvāṇa. Thus the Book of Zhao (zhao lun)<sup>bv,19</sup> says, "Of all calamities, none is like having a body (shen)<sup>bw</sup>. Therefore they seek to destroy the body and thereby return to nothingness (wu)<sup>bx</sup>. Of all things toilsome, none is like having wisdom. If you cut off wisdom you are thereby engulfed in the Void (xu)<sup>by</sup>." It also says, "Form is fetters; wisdom is mixed poisons." The Lāṅkāvatāra-sūtra (leng-jia)<sup>bz,20</sup> says, "If the mind's essence were destroyed, it would

not differ from the non-Buddhists' speaking of annihilation and destruction."

BECAUSE THE ENTIRE SUBSTANCE OF FORM IS REAL EMPTINESS (zhen kong)<sup>aw</sup>, I SAID, "BECAUSE IT IS EMPTINESS."<sup>21</sup>

This explains the latter part of the sentence [i.e., that form is real emptiness.] Form and everything else are fundamentally the One Mind of Real Thusness (zhen ru yi xin, bhūtatathatā)<sup>cb</sup>, which blends with things that come into being and perish and is called "Ālayavijñāna" (a-li-ye-shi)<sup>cc,22</sup>, etc., and under those names transforms things. These transformations originate in the three realms of the sense organs (gen)<sup>cd</sup>, the body (shen)<sup>bw</sup>, and the "vessels" [i.e., the environing world (qi)<sup>ce</sup>]. Because of this, we speak herein of "form and other dharms." Therefore we now push one [i.e., form] forward.<sup>23</sup> All lack substance (wu qi ti)<sup>cf</sup> and revert to the emptiness of the Real Mind (zhen xin zhi kong)<sup>cg</sup>. It is not proper to reduce (gui)<sup>ch</sup> them to the emptiness of annihilation and destruction, because fundamentally they are not altered forms of annihilation-emptiness. That which is called "reverting" (gui)<sup>ch</sup> will be treated in the text below.

INDEED BECAUSE IT IS REAL EMPTINESS, IT IS NOT ANNIHILATION-EMPTINESS.

This ties up the explanation.

THIS IS WHY I SAY IT IS EMPTINESS (IN THE SENSE OF REAL EMPTINESS), THEREFORE IT IS NOT EMPTINESS (IN THE SENSE OF ANNIHILATION (duan)<sup>ci,24</sup>).

With this he ties up the theme. The former part ties up the latter, and vice versa.

2) FORM IS NOT EMPTINESS BECAUSE IT IS EMPTINESS. WHY? BY VIRTUE OF THE TRUTH THAT THE SIGNS (xiang)<sup>1</sup> OF GREENNESS AND YELLOWNESS ARE NOT REAL EMPTINESS (zhen kong)<sup>aw</sup>, I SAY [FORM] IS NOT THE SAME AS EMPTINESS.

This explains the first part of the sentence. When [the average man] hears the sūtra preach that form is emptiness, he doesn't understand that form is empty by nature (se xing kong)<sup>cj</sup>. Accordingly, he grasps the signs of form and considers them to be real emptiness. Therefore we must clear this away. Here we will clear away the mistakes of the common man and the early stage Bodhisattva (chu xin pu-sa)<sup>ck</sup>. We will not dispose of the attitude of the Hīnayāna as they do not consider form identical with emptiness.

AND YET GREEN AND YELLOW HAVE NO SUBSTANCE (wu ti)<sup>cl</sup>. THERE IS NOTHING THAT ISN'T EMPTY.<sup>25</sup> THEREFORE I SAY FORM IS IDENTICAL WITH EMPTINESS.

He is speaking of real emptiness. This explains the latter part of the sentence. Yet he first spoke of form in its entire substance being real emptiness. The statement we find here, namely that green and yellow have no substance and so there is nothing that isn't empty, even though it refers to greenness and yellowness, includes such things as being long or short, etc. This is because without fail, when there is solidity and obstruction (zhi ai)<sup>cm</sup>, there are green and yellow, and so forth.<sup>26</sup>

There are three senses in which emptiness is a denial of form.

1) The sense of infinity (wu bian ji)<sup>cn</sup>. This means that if emptiness had boundaries, there would be form-dharmas outside of the realm of emptiness. Since emptiness does not have limits, it occupies to the

limit the space that exhausts the ten directions. It has no outside. Where in addition to this could there be form and all the other dharmas?

2) The sense of indestructibility (wu huai)<sup>co</sup>. The meaning is as follows: The misled say, "even if emptiness has no outside, how does this prevent form, etc. from being exclusively within the realm of emptiness?"<sup>27</sup> It is to counter this idea that one speaks of indestructibility. This means that if it were the case [as the questioner thinks] that something entered (ru)<sup>cp</sup> into emptiness, then depending on the great or small size and quantity of the object, there would be a breach made into emptiness whereby the object would be inserted. Just as a post enters the ground, and nails, awls, etc. pierce into wood; as in every case of this, depending on the size and quantity of the post, etc., there is a breach made into the ground, etc. If the ground, etc. is not pierced, then it cannot admit entry to any posts, etc.

To save his argument, the questioner says, "If water cannot be pierced and opened up, and yet admits the things that enter the water, what is to stop empty space (xu kong)<sup>cq, 28</sup> from being thus?" To destroy that argument we say, "Even though water isn't breached, and yet at the same time things enter it, depending on the size and quantity of the things, they displace the water, and thereby it admits the things. This is because water doesn't stop, but flows, moves, circulates and turns about, and thus the nature of water is extremely yielding. Surely empty space isn't like water? Can it be pushed aside, moved, and rolled about?"



3) The sense of unmixed (wu za)<sup>cr</sup>. The meaning is as follows: The misled further say, "The realm of emptiness has no outside and the substance of emptiness is indestructible. Yet these characteristics don't obstruct the myriad things from being within emptiness. This is because emptiness is capable of containing, as it is vacant (xu)<sup>by</sup>, can be pervaded (tong)<sup>cs</sup>, and is non-obstructing (wu gui)<sup>ct</sup>."

To destroy this argument we say, "If all things were within emptiness, and emptiness were indestructible and immovable, then material things should get mixed up with emptiness. Take for example a single, compact lump of matter one foot square: since the emptiness of the space occupied by this quantity of a square foot is indestructible and immovable, in the last analysis, if this space were in a place that measured one square foot in size, then how could it be anything but mixed with an object that measured one foot square? If you say they aren't mixed, then one of them must go to make room for the other. If you say that both are retained together and also aren't mixed, then a portion of one foot, in every case occupies five inches of the space.<sup>29</sup> If the argument rolls about like this, then its parts are not mutually appropriate. The truth cannot be that they coexist and yet each pervades the whole one foot square."

Why do I say this? Because of the two differences by which form and emptiness are opposed. They [i.e., form and emptiness] cannot in their entire substance share everywhere in one location. What is meant by these two differences? 1) Emptiness is non-material (wu-wu)<sup>cw</sup> and form is material (you-wu)<sup>cx</sup>. 2) Space is empty and penetrable and form is solid and obstructing. Concerning a space

one foot square, one may not first say that the whole is not material, and then say again that the whole is material. Nor can you say that the whole is insubstantial (xu)<sup>by</sup> and omnipresent (tong)<sup>cs</sup>, and then on the other hand say the whole is substantial (zhi)<sup>cy</sup> and obstructing (ai)<sup>cz</sup>. How is this possible (qi you zi li ye)<sup>da</sup>? That is why above it was said that the signs of greenness and yellowness are not to be equated with the Truth of emptiness. That is what is meant by, "of [signs such as] greenness and yellowness, there is nothing that isn't empty."<sup>30</sup> This is to know that since empty space has no boundaries, is indestructible and unalloyed, therefore within emptiness there is positively no form. It is in this sense that the text says form is emptiness.

INDEED BECAUSE THE EMPTINESS OF GREENNESS' AND YELLOWNESS' SUBSTANCE<sup>31</sup> IS NOT THE SAME AS THE GREEN AND YELLOW THEMSELVES, I SAY FORM "IS NOT IDENTICAL WITH EMPTINESS."

Citing their emptiness in the sense of their having no substance (qi wu ti zhi kong)<sup>db</sup>, the author unites [this non-substantiality] with a denial of the characteristics of form. He makes clear that emptiness is not being (kong fei you)<sup>dc</sup> -- how then could it possibly be form?

3) FORM IS NOT EMPTINESS BECAUSE IT IS EMPTINESS. WHY? BECAUSE WITHIN EMPTINESS THERE IS NO FORM, FORM IS NOT IDENTICAL WITH EMPTINESS. IF WE UNDERSTAND THAT FORM HAS NO SUBSTANCE, THEN IT IS IDENTICAL WITH EMPTINESS. INDEED BECAUSE WE UNDERSTAND THAT FORM REVERTS TO EMPTINESS, WITHIN EMPTINESS THERE IS CERTAINLY NO FORM.

This certainly refers to annihilation-emptiness. The Prajñāparamitā-hṛdaya-sūtra says, "This is why within emptiness there is no form, no

sensation, notion, karma-formations, cognition, no twelve sense-fields, no eighteen spheres, no twelve-fold chain of conditioned origination, no four Truths, etc."<sup>32</sup> The Fo-ding<sup>dd,33</sup> says, "What does 'within' (zhong)<sup>de</sup> mean? One thing contains another."<sup>34</sup>

THIS IS WHY BECAUSE FORM IS EMPTINESS (IN THE SENSE OF NOT EXISTENT (wu)<sup>bx</sup>), THEREFORE FORM IS NOT EMPTINESS (IN THE SENSE OF REAL (zhen)<sup>ay</sup> EMPTINESS.)

The above corresponds to the beginning statement.

THE ABOVE THREE GATEWAYS, BY MEANS OF THE LAW (fa, Dharma)<sup>df</sup>, WIPE OUT FEELINGS AND ARE DONE WITH THEM.

This generally concludes the three gateways.

4) FORM IS EMPTINESS. WHY? IN EVERY CASE THESE FORM-DHARMAS ARE CERTAINLY NOT DIFFERENT FROM REAL EMPTINESS, BECAUSE ALL FORMS ARE CERTAINLY WITHOUT OWN-NATURE (xing)<sup>aa</sup>.

Since they exist from conditions, they are interdependent (yi ta wu xing, paratantra)<sup>dg</sup>. In this very fact lies their perfect (yuan cheng, pariniṣpanna)<sup>dh</sup> nature.<sup>35</sup>

THIS IS WHY FORM IS EMPTINESS.

In as much as emptiness neither destroys form nor retains form, it is neither identical with nor different from form. Therefore form is real emptiness. Emptiness is a denial of material signs (se xiang)<sup>az</sup> and is devoid of the purely imaginary (bian ji, parikalpita)<sup>di</sup> nature. The true principle of interdependent lack of own being (paratantra ni-svabhāva) is identical with the perfect nature (pariniṣpanna svabhāva). The ancients said, "When form departs it does not leave behind emptiness. Emptiness is not a dwelling with boundaries."

AS FORM IS EMPTY, SO IN THE SAME WAY ALL DHARMAS ARE THUS.

CONTEMPLATE THIS.

Form is the chief of all the marks of dharmas (fa xiang)<sup>dj</sup>. It is the first of the five skandhas. Thus whenever all sūtras wish generally to preach the doctrine of emptiness, they all preach with exclusive reference to form. If the Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra<sup>36</sup> lists more than eighty items in its categorized lists of names (ming shu)<sup>dl</sup>, all are based on the analogy of form.

If you lift out the essentials and exhibit them, they can be stated thus: All beings of the six destinies (liu dao)<sup>dm,37</sup>, the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of all the directions, and the monks of the two vehicles [Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna] are nothing but the five aggregates (skandhas, yun)<sup>do</sup>, twelve sense-fields, and eighteen realms. Because in our school the polluted and the pure do not have two separate sets of marks, one should say sensation, notion, karma-formations and cognition are not annihilation-emptiness, etc. The passage on greenness, yellowness, etc. accordingly means the marks of sensation (ling na)<sup>dp</sup>, and everything up to all Buddhas, are not the Truth of real emptiness. This is to say, the marks of supernatural qualities (shen)<sup>dq</sup>, omnipresence (tong)<sup>cs</sup>, brightness (guang)<sup>dr</sup>, illumination (ming)<sup>ds</sup>, etc. are not the true principle (li)<sup>z</sup> of real emptiness, because it is impossible to see the Thus-Come (ru-lai, tathāgata)<sup>dt</sup> in terms of physical signs.

[1-B] THE MEDITATION ON THE UNDERSTANDING OF EMPTINESS AS FORM, IN FOUR PARTS.

The first [part] clears away feelings , the second makes manifest the explanation, the third indicates the theme and the fourth unties bonds. They are each and every one as before [in Chapter 1]. The four gateways are mutually supportive in wording and mood. The passages to come on the non-obstruction of form and emptiness, and on cutting-off and abodelessness correspond to the passage in the Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra on emptiness being form, etc.<sup>38</sup> Only the third proposition [the non-obstruction of form and emptiness] does not complement the others. Even so, the meanings are not opposed. Each and every one of the four turns back to the superior meaning and thereby they confirm (cheng)<sup>du</sup> the Middle Path. Again, there is no difference in meaning.

1) EMPTINESS IS NOT FORM BECAUSE EMPTINESS IS FORM. WHY? ANNIHILATION-EMPTINESS IS NOT FORM. THEREFORE I SAY EMPTINESS IS NOT FORM.

This explains the first part of the proposition.

REAL EMPTINESS IS CERTAINLY NOT DIFFERENT FROM FORM, THEREFORE I SAY EMPTINESS IS FORM.

This explains the latter part of the proposition.

IN SUM, SINCE REAL EMPTINESS IS FORM . . .

This concludes the latter part of the proposition.

AS A CONSEQUENCE, ANNIHILATION-EMPTINESS IS NOT FORM.

This concludes the former part of the proposition.

2) EMPTINESS IS NOT FORM BECAUSE EMPTINESS IS FORM. WHY?  
BECAUSE THE TRUTH OF EMPTINESS IS NOT GREENNESS OR YELLOWNESS, THERE-  
FORE I SAY IT IS NOT FORM.

This explains the former part of the proposition.

AND YET IT IS NOT DIFFERENT FROM GREENNESS AND YELLOWNESS,  
THEREFORE I SAY EMPTINESS IS FORM.

This explains the latter part of the sentence.

BECAUSE OF A NECESSITY IT IS NOT DIFFERENT FROM GREENNESS  
AND YELLOWNESS, THAT IS WHY IT IS NOT THE SAME AS GREENNESS AND  
YELLOWNESS.

This is the conclusion of the explanation.<sup>39</sup>

THIS IS WHY EMPTINESS BOTH IS AND IS NOT FORM.

This concludes the theme.

3) EMPTINESS IS NOT FORM BECAUSE EMPTINESS IS FORM. WHY?  
EMPTINESS IS THAT ON WHICH OTHER THINGS RELY (suo yi)<sup>dv</sup>; IT DOES NOT  
RELY ON ANYTHING ELSE (fei neng yi)<sup>dw</sup>. THEREFORE IT IS NOT FORM.  
This explains the first part of the proposition. Vis-à-vis the above  
phrase, "within emptiness there is no form," we see that formlessness  
(wu se)<sup>dx</sup> is the very thing on which form relies. Just as the brilliance  
within the mirror [i.e., the quality that makes a mirror able to  
reflect] itself has no reflection.

IT MUST FOR THE SAKE OF WHAT RELIES ON IT BECOME A BASE (suo  
yi)<sup>dv</sup>. THEREFORE IT IS FORM.

This explains the latter part of the proposition. Because it itself  
is formless it can be a base for form. Just as the brilliance within  
the mirror has no reflection, all it can do is be a base for reflection.

Therefore it is not a reflection. What is being said here does not oppose what was said above. To say that within emptiness there is no form -- this is supported by both reason and scripture. But to say that within form there is no emptiness -- this is supported by neither reason nor scripture.<sup>40</sup> Thus the author is simply confining himself to the clarification of the base of support and what rests on that base.

The support of reason: Within a fine jewel there are certainly no dark blemishes of form.<sup>41</sup> The support of scripture: The following is just as quoted above:<sup>42</sup> The Sūtra says, "This is why within emptiness there is no form, no sensation, notion, etc." The opposition of reason: When a gem glitters and gives off color, where that color is, there must be a gem.<sup>43</sup> The opposition of scripture: Within the sages' teaching, you will not find anywhere in scripture a passage that says, "Within form there is no emptiness."

INDEED BECAUSE EMPTINESS IS WHAT IS RELIED UPON, THEREFORE IT ISN'T FORM. BECAUSE IT IS THAT WHICH IS RELIED UPON, THEREFORE IT IS FORM.<sup>44</sup> THIS IS THE REASON THAT BECAUSE IT ISN'T FORM, THEREFORE IT IS FORM.<sup>45</sup>

By means of doctrine, he concludes the theme.

THE ABOVE THREE GATEWAYS BY APPEAL TO DOCTRINAL TRUTH CLEARED AWAY FEELINGS AND MADE DONE WITH THEM.

4) EMPTINESS IS FORM. WHY? IN EVERY CASE, REAL EMPTINESS IS NOT DIFFERENT FROM FORM BECAUSE OF THE TRUTH OF THE ABSENCE OF SELF (wu wo, anātman)<sup>dy</sup> IN DHARMAS.

This very truth is the substance of real emptiness, which means that it is the Real Thusness (zhen ru, bhūtatathatā)<sup>dz</sup> manifested by the two emptinesses.<sup>46</sup>

THEREFORE BECAUSE IT IS NOT ANNIHILATION-EMPTINESS . . .

Real Thusness does not maintain any own-being. The above is all fully explained.

THIS IS THE REASON EMPTINESS IS FORM.

This is the conclusion.

IF EMPTINESS AND FORM ARE LIKE THIS, SO ARE ALL DHARMAS.

CONTEMPLATE THIS.

Since real emptiness is not different from form, all dharmas are not different from this. You should view this on the previous analogy.

#### [1-C] THE CONTEMPLATION OF THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF FORM AND EMPTINESS

Even though there are the two words "emptiness" and "form", the basic meaning can be reduced to emptiness. This is because form has empty names and empty signs,<sup>47</sup> which in turn is due to the fact that it doesn't have even the tiniest atom of substance. Thus the meaning of the cultivation of this contemplation lies herein. In the text, when the author focuses on form, he says it is the manifestation of emptiness (kong xian)<sup>ea</sup>. When he focuses on emptiness though, he doesn't call it the manifestation of form. But on the other hand, he does speak of emptiness not being hidden. This is why he only calls this the meditation on real emptiness. He doesn't speak of a meditation on real emptiness and false form.



THE MEANING IS THAT THE ENTIRE SUBSTANCE OF FORM IS NOT DIFFERENT FROM EMPTINESS, BECAUSE THERE IS EMPTINESS TO THE TOTAL EXHAUSTION OF FORM. THEREFORE FORM IS EXHAUSTED AND EMPTINESS IS MANIFESTED. THE ENTIRE SUBSTANCE OF EMPTINESS IS NOT DIFFERENT FROM FORM, BECAUSE THERE IS FORM TO THE TOTAL EXHAUSTION OF EMPTINESS. THEREFORE EMPTINESS IS FORM AND EMPTINESS IS NOT HIDDEN (bu yin)<sup>eb</sup>. The passages on emptiness and form each have two parts. They both first point out the why and how of non-obstruction and then bring out the characteristics of this non-obstruction. The meaning is that if form were real form (shi se)<sup>bh</sup>, then it would obstruct emptiness. If emptiness were annihilation-emptiness, then it would injure form. But since in reality form is illusory form (huan se)<sup>ec</sup>, it doesn't obstruct emptiness. And since emptiness is real emptiness, it doesn't injure form. There is a text that says, "Form is not exhausted and emptiness is manifested."<sup>48</sup> This is also alright, [if you take it to mean] there is no case in which form must disappear for emptiness to be manifested (bu ru wu)<sup>ed</sup>.

THIS IS THE REASON WHEN THE BODHISATTVA SEES FORM, HE NEVER FAILS TO SEE EMPTINESS. WHEN HE CONTEMPLATES EMPTINESS, THERE IS NO CASE OF NOT SEEING FORM. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO OBSTRUCTION INVOLVED, AS THE TWO ARE A DHARMA OF ONE TASTE (yi wei fa)<sup>ee</sup>. IF YOU CONTEMPLATE THIS IT CAN BE REALIZED.

[1-D] THE CONTEMPLATION OF CUTTING-OFF AND ABODELESSNESS (min jue  
wu ji)<sup>ef</sup>

The text has two parts. The first explains this contemplative view. The latter part generally distinguishes four gateways. Within the first part are two sections. The first of the two concerns cutting-off proper, and the latter part explains and proves the why and how of this cutting-off. In the first part when the text says, "It cannot be" (bu ke)<sup>eg</sup>, etc., since the text basically explains itself, even if I didn't comment on it, you would understand it. The tone of the latter part of the text is such that it says varied things in varied ways. Even so, I will simplify this, arrange it by headings, and match the text with explanation below.

THE MEANING IS THAT WHAT IS CONTEMPLATED HERE, NAMELY REAL EMPTINESS, CANNOT BE (bu ke)<sup>eg</sup> SAID TO BE THE SAME AS FORM; If emptiness were the same as form, then the saint, the same as the ordinary man, should see false form (wang se)<sup>eh</sup>, and the ordinary man should, the same as the saint, see real emptiness. In that case, there wouldn't be two truths.<sup>50</sup>

BUT NEITHER CAN IT BE SAID TO BE DIFFERENT FROM FORM. If it were not the same as form, one would see emptiness outside of form, there would be no means to achieve the superior wisdom, the ordinary man and the saint would be eternally distinct, and then sagehood could not be obtained from the ordinary state of being.

The above two propositions [that it can neither be said that emptiness is identical with nor different from form], dispose of part 1-B [which stated that emptiness both is and is not form.]

BUT IT ALSO CANNOT BE SAID THAT FORM IS EMPTINESS;

If form were the same as emptiness, the ordinary man mistakenly seeing form, should, the same as the saint, see emptiness. Under these conditions the two truths would be lost.

NOR THAT IT ISN'T EMPTINESS.

If form were not the same as emptiness, then the ordinary man on seeing form wouldn't be deluded, the form which he sees would be permanently separate from real emptiness, and he would eternally be unable to achieve sainthood. The above two statements dispose of the first contemplation.

"ALL DHARMAS" CANNOT BE (yi qie fa bu ke)<sup>ei</sup>;

This disposes of the above concluding analogies. Above it said, "If form and emptiness are like this, so are all dharmas." That is the meaning of this.<sup>51</sup>

"CANNOT BE" ALSO IS NOT ACCEPTED (bu ke yi bu ke)<sup>ej</sup>.

Seeing that all the other statements are not acceptable, here too he would be guilty of discrimination.<sup>52</sup>

THESE WORDS ARE ALSO NOT ACCEPTED.

Acceptance is a form of thought (shou ji shi nian)<sup>ek</sup>.

TOTALLY CUT-OFF AND ABODELESS,

The perfection of wisdom comes up before you.<sup>53</sup>

THIS IS NOT A THING WHICH WORDS CAN REACH.

The path of language is cut off (yan yu dao duan)<sup>el</sup>.

IT IS NOT A THING WHICH UNDERSTANDING ARRIVES AT.

Because thought's field of action (xin xing chu)<sup>em</sup> vanishes, and therefore through wisdom cannot be known.

THIS IS CALLED "FIELD OF PRACTICE" (xing jing)<sup>en</sup>.

There are two of these fields. 1) The first is the action's field (xing zhi jing)<sup>eo</sup>, in which mind and field coalesce. When mind is blended away (ming xin)<sup>ep, 54</sup>, wisdom is left behind. Then and only then can one reach this field, since obviously only practice can arrive at this field which is not a field of understanding (fei jie jing)<sup>eq</sup>. 2) The second like this is a coalescing, and as such it is real practice (zhen xing)<sup>er</sup>. Here, practice and field are one and the same.

WHY IS THIS? BECAUSE WHEN MENTAL ACTIVITY IS PRODUCED, ONE AGITATES THOUGHTS AND SO ONE PERVERTS THE DHARMA-NATURE, AND LOSES RIGHT-MINDFULNESS (zheng nian)<sup>es</sup>.

Part 1-B explained and proved that the true nature of real emptiness (zhen kong li xing)<sup>et</sup> is basically unique to itself (ben zi ru ran)<sup>eu</sup>. However, because people are confused about it, and because they agitate thoughts and grasp at signs, it is necessary to expel, destroy and clear away feelings, and manifest Truth (li)<sup>z</sup>. Generally feelings are forgotten (qing wang)<sup>ev, 55</sup>, and wisdom is submerged. But only wisdom is the original reality (ben zheng)<sup>ew</sup>. Why bring in newly produced analyses by categories (jie shu)<sup>ex</sup>? This agitates thoughts. If thoughts are agitated, mental activities are produced. Then one loses right mindfulness. Right mindfulness means knowing without thinking (wu nian er zhi)<sup>ey</sup>. But if one is totally ignorant, how could that be called right mindfulness?<sup>56</sup> From here below are generally distinguished four gateways.

FURTHERMORE, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THESE FIRST FOUR PROPOSITIONS<sup>57</sup>, THE FIRST TWO PROPOSITIONS IN EIGHT GATEWAYS<sup>58</sup> BOTH CLEARED AWAY FEELINGS . . .

In the case of the first three of the four sub-divisions of each;

AND MANIFESTED EXPLANATION.

In the case of the last [sub-division] of each.

PART 1-C<sup>59</sup> EXPLAINED THE FINAL GOAL OF PRACTICE. 1-D<sup>60</sup> PROPERLY COMPLETED THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PRACTICE.

The above has properly analyzed and explained practice. What has gone before and what is to come are both mutually reflecting, and mutually necessary, just as the eyes and the feet are dependent on each other.

Furthermore, the first proposition made clear that form reverts to emptiness. Thus it is free of the criticism of superfluous increase (wu zeng yi bang)<sup>fa</sup>. The second showed that emptiness is form. Thus it is free of the criticism of unnecessary detraction (wu sun jian bang)<sup>fb</sup>. The third, the non-obstruction of emptiness and form, does not negate both its members and thus is free of the criticism of failing to make any statement (wu xi-lun -- prapañca -- bang)<sup>fc</sup>.

The fourth, cutting-off and abodelessness, is not both form and emptiness taken together and thus is free of the criticism of self-contradiction (wu xiang wei bang)<sup>fd</sup>. Since criticism on the four grounds is not possible, the hundred faults are here cut off. As such this corresponds to the eight collections of the Prajñāparamitā<sup>61</sup>, and to the signless, ultimate endpoint of the Mahāyāna. How much more so are the following two contemplations<sup>62</sup> profound in their twists and turns!

Moreover, the first proposition corresponds to "form is emptiness"; the next corresponds to "emptiness is form"; the third corresponds to "form is not different from emptiness and emptiness is not different from form"; the fourth accordingly corresponds to "neither production nor destruction . . . down to, no wisdom and no attaining."<sup>63</sup>

Further, when one hastily looked at the characteristics of the text, it seemed that in the first proposition, the contemplation of emptiness (kong guan)<sup>fe</sup> was real truth (zhen di)<sup>ff</sup>. It seemed the next proposition was a contemplation of unreality (jia guan)<sup>fg</sup> and hence was worldly truth (su di)<sup>fh</sup>. Both three and four seemed to be contemplations of the Middle Way (zhong dao guan)<sup>fi</sup> and hence were the supreme truth (di yi yi di, paramārtha)<sup>fj,64</sup>. It seemed the third proposition was a clarification of the middle by mutual illumination<sup>65</sup>, and that the fourth was a clarification of the middle by mutual denial<sup>66</sup>. But when one minutely examines the teaching of this contemplation text, one sees it isn't so. In view of the words, "even though there are the two words 'emptiness' and 'form',"<sup>67</sup> etc., all one does is to achieve the contemplation of real emptiness (zhen kong)<sup>aw</sup>. The title of the chapter clearly says this. So emptiness: false (jia)<sup>fn</sup>, true (zhen)<sup>ay</sup>, and worldly (su)<sup>fo</sup>, three contemplations, three truths have been completed.<sup>68</sup>

Next is [Chapter 2] the non-obstruction of noumenon and phenomenon. What is there further to contemplate? We know that it is not the case that there is nothing further to view because from here on practice and theoretical understanding are interdependent and reflect each other. The author says . . .

IF ONE DOESN'T HAVE A CLEAR AND COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE PREVIOUS EXPLANATION, ONE WON'T HAVE THE MEANS TO ASCEND COMPLETELY TO THIS PRACTICE.

By relying on what has been said above, we prove this.

IF ONE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THAT THIS PRACTICE OF THE DHARMA IS CUT OFF FROM THE PREVIOUS EXPLANATION, ONE WON'T HAVE THE MEANS TO ACHIEVE THE CORRECT UNDERSTANDING.

Cutting off understanding (jue jie)<sup>fp</sup> is real understanding (zhen jie)<sup>fq</sup>.

By means of this one perfects what has been discussed before.

IF ONE HOLDS ON TO UNDERSTANDING AND DOESN'T RENOUNCE IT, ONE WON'T HAVE THE MEANS TO ENTER THIS RIGHT PRACTICE (zheng xing)<sup>fr</sup>.

If one renounces understanding, one perfects practice.

THIS IS THE REASON PRACTICE RELIES ON UNDERSTANDING, BUT PERFECT PRACTICE IS RAISED UP FROM WHERE UNDERSTANDING IS CUT OFF.

## FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER 1

<sup>1</sup>This is a standard Buddhist idea which illustrates the manner in which ignorance, meditation, etc. were conceived to transmit their effects. That is, the influence of these things moves subtly, like perfume, smoke, or fog.

<sup>2</sup>Mahāvaiṣṭya, or sūtras of the Mahāyāna, of which the Buddhāvataṃsaka is one. The terms refer to the great breadth and extension of the purview of the texts.

<sup>3</sup>Here Qing-liang,<sup>t</sup> the fourth Hua-yan patriarch, and Zong-mi's teacher.

<sup>4</sup>The text does not specifically mention this as a commentary to the Buddhāvataṃsaka, but I have assumed this. I have not been able to locate this quotation. It should be found in either: da fang guang fo hua-yan shu<sup>1</sup>, Taishō #1735, or da fang guang fo hua-yan jing sui shu yan yi chao<sup>v</sup>, Taishō #1736, or possibly da hua-yan jing lue ci<sup>w</sup>, Taishō #1737.

<sup>5</sup>For the Buddhist, any view is false. This doctrine is perhaps best stated in the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra, where it is repeated over and over that any theory, doctrine, or philosophy is at best only a vague pointer to a truth which is essentially unspeakable and unthinkable, and must be self-realized (ordinarily by meditative means) in order to have any validity. At their worst, views lead one astray from the wordless truth, since we intellectualizing, rationalizing human beings tend to become attached to them, fill up our minds with them, and thus obscure our ability to perceive correctly.

<sup>6</sup>(shu qiong)<sup>aj</sup>; I don't fully understand this term, which I have taken from the sense of small and deep to the extended meaning used in the translation. The phrase might also mean the three are but one Way which is established for investigation.



<sup>7</sup>(zhan-zhuan)<sup>al</sup>; this term has several connotations. It refers to the subtle implications of the text, but also implies that the more one investigates, the more mysterious the matter becomes.

<sup>8</sup>(wen-shu)<sup>ap</sup>; Mañjuśrī is the Bodhisattva of wisdom.

<sup>9</sup>The text is not clear here. It makes a reference to two commentaries, an old and a new, to an unknown text. If these were supposed to have been written by Du-shun, I was able to find no record of them. If these were supposed to be proof of the following list of the Hua-yan patriarchs, again, it is not clear what these texts are that offer this evidence.

<sup>10</sup>Fa-zang is usually given the credit for the establishment of the school as such, for organizing its doctrines, etc. Du-shun, however, is held to be the initiator of the unique doctrine of the Hua-yan and hence is perhaps the source of inspiration of the school, while Fa-zang is its systematizer.

<sup>11</sup>That is, the contemplation of the fact that there is nothing on which one relies or to which one commits oneself.

<sup>12</sup>I.e., the yellow and green of Du-shun's text.

<sup>13</sup>I.e., all dharmas.

<sup>14</sup>Taishō Vol. 31, p. 813ff. I was unable to find this quotation in the text.

<sup>15</sup>I.e., those of Zong-mi and of the "Jewel Nature Treatise".

<sup>16</sup>The text has: wei li se ming kong,<sup>br</sup> but the ming here is clearly an interpolation, as is shown by the repetition of the phrase below, where it lacks this word.

<sup>17</sup>I was not able to find this exact quotation. However, in the Treatise it does say several quite similar things, the closest of which is: xian you er jin wu,<sup>bt</sup> (Taishō Vol. 30, p. 20b.27) "First there was something, and now there is nothing."

<sup>18</sup>Here he refers to general Taoist ideas.

<sup>19</sup>Taishō #1858, Vol. 45, pp. 150-161. The first quotation can be found in a slightly different form on page 158a.19-21. The second quotation can be found on page 158a.22.

<sup>20</sup>Taishō #671 (the Bodhiruci version) has, p. 522a.20-21: ro a-li-ye-shi mie-zhe. ci bu yi wai-dao duan jian xi-lun.<sup>ca</sup> This was the closest of the three versions.

<sup>21</sup>I.e., form is real emptiness, therefore form and emptiness are the same.

<sup>22</sup>The Ālayavijñāna is the "store consciousness", one of several consciousnesses (to which the "etc." refers.) The Ālaya is so called because it stores the seeds (bīja) which are the traces of past actions, until they fulfill their destiny by determining another action which is in some sense a result of the past action. Thus the concept of the Ālayavijñāna explains the mechanics of karma, and is responsible for keeping the wheel of life and death revolving.

<sup>23</sup>I.e., any dharma would do as an example, but form was chosen to represent them all.

<sup>24</sup>The material in parentheses renders inter-linear notes.

<sup>25</sup>The gloss here says that "emptiness" is used in the sense of "nonbeing" (wu)<sup>bx</sup>, but from Zong-mi's commentary, this seems to be mistaken.

<sup>26</sup>I.e., these colors represent all characteristics of solid, obstructing matter.

<sup>27</sup>I.e., granted that emptiness has no outside, that doesn't stop it from having an inside. If it has an inside, then form and the other dharmas can be within emptiness.

<sup>28</sup>The above questioning in terms of emptiness is simultaneously to be taken in the sense of empty space.

<sup>29</sup>Ten cun<sup>cu</sup> or "inches" equals one chi<sup>cv</sup> or "foot". Thus if two things are in space enough for one of them, the object in the space (which in a sense is seen here as another object) can only measure half of the total space.

<sup>30</sup>Greenness and yellowness here again symbolize all things.

<sup>31</sup>This is to be understood in the sense of a substance that is no substance, i.e., an empty substance.

<sup>32</sup>This is not a verbatim quotation, but the sense of what Zong-mi says is certainly the same as the Sūtra. Cf. Taishō #250-255 (Vol. 8, pp. 847-850). This is of course the famous passage of the Heart Sūtra which denies all the fundamental Buddhist precepts: 1) the five skandhas - form (rūpa), sensation (vedanā), notion or perception (saṃjñā), karma-formation (saṃskāras), and cognition (viññāna); 2) the twelve āyatana or sense-fields, which are the six sense organs and their respective objects; 3) the eighteen dhātus or elements, which are the six sense organs, their objects, and the six consciousnesses which result; 4) the Sūtra has the twelve links of the chain of pratītyasamutpāda and the extinction of each link, while Zong-mi simply names the chain; 5) the Four Holy Truths (suffering, origination of suffering, stopping of suffering, and path); 6) finally, Zong-mi covers the rest with "etc.", while the Sūtra says there is no cognition, no attainment, and no non-attainment.

<sup>33</sup>I could identify neither this text (whether it be a full essay, sūtra, chapter, or verse) nor the quotation.

<sup>34</sup>I.e., each by turn contains the other.

<sup>35</sup>Though not essential to his argument, Zong-mi's introduction of this Yogācāra doctrine may perhaps clarify his point to those familiar with the tri-svabhāva theory. He shows the relationship of form and emptiness to be similar to that of paratantra and pariniṣpanna. Thus form has worldly validity but is ultimately empty, i.e., unreal. Here we see the foundation of Hua-yan doctrine on Nāgārjuna type śūnyatā theory. All things (form in this case) are interdependent, thus lack own-being and are not to be relied on. To realize that this lack of own-being or emptiness is the very source of the ultimacy and sacredness of form is pariniṣpanna. This latter aspect is the same as emptiness understood as a synonym of Thusness (bhūtatathatā), a more joyously expressed version of the nature of the world than the constant negations of the śūnyatā school. This progression from pratītyasamutpāda → ni-svabhāva → śūnyatā → bhūtatathatā, is really the heart of the Hua-yan school.

<sup>36</sup>da ban ro (bo lo mi do) jing,<sup>dk</sup> Taishō #220. This reference is most likely to the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā(mahā)prajñāpāramitā, translated by Kumārajīva, Taishō #223, however, I was unable to trace it.

<sup>37</sup>Also known as liu gu<sup>dn</sup>, that is, the destinies of those in the hells, the hungry ghosts, animals, malevolent spirits, humans, and gods.

<sup>38</sup>The Kumārajīva version has (my translation): "O Śāriputra, it is not the case that form is different from emptiness, nor is emptiness different from form. Form is the same as emptiness, and emptiness is the same as form. Sensation, notion, karma-formations, and cognition are also like this."

<sup>39</sup>Such as it is. Zong-mi must have assumed he had already well enough established that all form arises dependent on conditions, and thus is empty by nature.

<sup>40</sup>I.e., within emptiness there is no form -- just as the mirror's brilliance has no reflection; within form there is emptiness -- because form needs a non-form base on which to rely, namely emptiness.

<sup>41</sup>I.e., no discoloration, streaks, etc.

<sup>42</sup>from the Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra, see footnote 32.

<sup>43</sup>The color represents form, and the gem represents emptiness. Thus the manifestation relies on the base.

<sup>44</sup>Because form relies on emptiness, therefore within form there is emptiness.

<sup>45</sup>Because it is the base of form, it both is and is not form.

<sup>46</sup>Presumably zhen<sup>ay</sup> and xu<sup>by</sup>.

<sup>47</sup>I.e., its names and signs have no ultimate reality.

<sup>48</sup>Contrast this with the above line of Du-shun.

<sup>49</sup>I.e., in the next line of Du-shun's text.

<sup>50</sup>I.e., worldly truth and ultimate truth -- sapvṛti and paramārtha.

<sup>51</sup>I.e., this statement is what is disposed of here.

<sup>52</sup>The statement of inacceptability is also not acceptable.

<sup>53</sup>Getting rid of error and delusion is wisdom itself.

<sup>54</sup>I.e., when mind no longer exists as a separate entity.

<sup>55</sup>I.e., we are unmindful of sensations and take them for granted, contrary to the precept of right mindfulness spoken of by Du-shun.

<sup>56</sup>This is not a challenge to wu-nian<sup>62</sup>, but a clarification.

<sup>57</sup>I.e., all of Chapter 1, "The Contemplation of Real Emptiness".

<sup>58</sup>I.e., 1-A, "The Contemplation in which One Understands that Form Reverts to Emptiness," and 1-B, "The Contemplation which Clarifies that Form is the Same as Emptiness," with their sub-divisions.

<sup>59</sup>"The Contemplation of the Non-obstruction of Form and Emptiness"

<sup>60</sup>"The Contemplation of Cutting-off and Abodelessness"

<sup>61</sup>I.e., the sum total of literature on the perfection of wisdom.

<sup>62</sup>Chapter 2, "The Non-obstruction of Noumenon and Phenomena," and Chapter 3, "Universal Inclusion".

<sup>63</sup>Cf. Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya-sūtra, footnote 32.

<sup>64</sup>These three truths are apparently a Chinese invention that crept into the tradition through a forged text. The Indian tradition of course spoke of only two -- worldly truth and absolute truth. "Satō . . . professes to trace the three truths . . . to an attempt on the part of the Chinese Buddhists to answer the question of Existence and Non-Existence [you wu<sup>fk</sup>] which so exercised Chinese thinkers during the Six Dynasties. Their answer was that either formulation was a 'mundane' one [shī dī<sup>fl</sup> or su dī<sup>fh</sup>], while the 'supra-mundane' and only true formulation was one that transcended both Existence and Non-Existence. Unlike the Indians, for whom the two truths represented two different ways of looking at the same thing, these Chinese Buddhists placed the supramundane truth on a plane distinctly superior to the mundane truth, and the problem of reconciling them arose as a result. A solution to this problem was found in the invention of a third truth."\* (Hurvitz, Chih-I, p. 274.) In the forged text, the terms are shī dī<sup>fl</sup>, zhen dī<sup>fh</sup>, and dī yī yī dī<sup>fl</sup>. "As an equivalent for samvṛtisatya or lokavyavahārasatya, shih ti [shī dī] is perfectly valid. But chen ti [zhen dī] and tī ī ī tī [dī yī yī dī] are two Chinese equivalents for the same word, paramārthasatya." (Hurvitz,

Ibid., pp. 274-5.) Di yi yi di was also called zhong dao di yi yi di<sup>fm</sup>. Zong-mi's only substitution for a member of this list is su di<sup>h</sup> for shi di<sup>l</sup>. However, it seems unlikely that he uses these terms for any reason other than as a matter of tradition. Certainly the Hua-yan school does not take existence and non-existence as the base of their problematic: the interaction of phenomena and noumenon is the main theme of the work at hand. (\*The Chinese characters in the above quotation were removed to the list of characters at the end of the work.)

<sup>65</sup>Of the two extremes, i.e., form and emptiness.

<sup>66</sup>Of the two extremes.

<sup>67</sup>Zong-mi is quoting himself. To continue the quotation:  
". . . the basic meaning can be reduced to emptiness."

<sup>68</sup>Zong-mi seems to be jumbling his categories here, but the point is clear: different contemplations, and hence different levels of truth are established to correct different misapprehensions.

## CHAPTER 2

THE CONTEMPLATION OF THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA  
(li shi wu ai guan)<sup>fs</sup>

[This is] the contemplation of the non-obstruction of noumenon and phenomena. Even though we first spoke of form (se)<sup>bc</sup>, it was a clearing-away of feelings and intellectual calculation in order to establish the view of real emptiness. "The non-obstructions of form and emptiness" and "cutting-off and abodelessness" -- all they are is the Truth of Real Thusness (zhen ru zhi li)<sup>ft</sup>. They do not yet clarify the subtle functioning (miao yong)<sup>fu</sup> of Thusness. Thus [Chapter 1] was only the gateway to the contemplation of real emptiness, we have not yet dealt with the non-obstruction of noumenon and phenomenon.<sup>1</sup> But now the class of phenomena (shi)<sup>x</sup> and noumenon (li)<sup>z</sup> clearly coalesce. That is how one arrives at the name of this contemplation. There are three parts to this chapter: 1) theme, 2) explanation, 3) conclusion and exhortation.<sup>2</sup>

[IT IS MERELY THAT NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA FUSE AND BLEND.]

IT IS MERELY THAT NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA . . .

When compared, noumenon is superior, because it is the foundation on which phenomena are based (suo yi ben)<sup>fr</sup>.

FUSE (rong)<sup>fw</sup> . . .

This is a blending of fusion and means the preliminary linking.

AND BLEND (rong)<sup>fx</sup>.

This is a harmonious blending and means the parts complement each



other. Fusing noumenon and phenomena, and the harmonious blending of noumenon and phenomena, are the first two gateways. These two gateways also coalesce (hu rong)<sup>fy</sup>, and thus together include everything.

PRESERVATION (9 AND 10) AND EXTINCTION (7 AND 8); CONFLICT (5 AND 6) AND CO-OPERATION (3 AND 4) -- ALTOGETHER THIS MAKES TEN GATEWAYS.<sup>3</sup>

This is the theme. Only the totality of these ten do we call "the contemplation of the non-obstruction of noumenon and phenomenon." Contemplating inwardly is called "contemplation". Contemplating phenomena corresponds to conventional [truth]; contemplating noumenon corresponds to [contemplating] the Real [truth] (zhen)<sup>ay</sup>. But now when one contemplates the non-obstruction (wu ai)<sup>fz</sup> [of noumenon and phenomena], one achieves the contemplation of the Supreme Truth of the Middle Way (zhong dao di yi yi)<sup>ga</sup>; then compassion (bei)<sup>gb</sup> and wisdom spontaneously guide each other to the achievement of the practice of not-dwelling (wu zhu)<sup>gc,4</sup>. This already corresponds to the ultimate endpoint of the Common Teaching of the Mahāyāna (da sheng tong jiao zhi ji zhi)<sup>gd,5</sup>. Thus, the third contemplation [Chapter 3, "Universal Inclusion"] is the Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle, which is totally different from all other teachings (bie jiao yi sheng)<sup>ge,6</sup>.

The above explained what was indicated by the theme and is finished with it. Next is a separate explanation of the ten gateways. There are five pairs [the members of which]: 1) mutually make up the whole; 2) are mutually complementary; 3) are mutually injurious; 4) are mutually identifying; and 5) are mutually denying. Within the

first pair there are four parts: 1) the explanation proper; 2) the praise of the profundity; 3) the illustrations; and 4) the questions and answers. The first of these is further divided into two parts.

1) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS NOUMENON PERVADES PHENOMENA

(li bian yu shi men)<sup>gg</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT NOUMENON, WHICH IS THE PERVADER (neng bian zhi li)<sup>gh</sup> IS OF A NATURE WITHOUT PARTS OR LIMITS. It is the Real Truth which is empty by nature (xing kong zhen li)<sup>gi</sup>, because the one mark is no mark (yi xiang wu xiang)<sup>gj,7</sup>.

PHENOMENA, WHICH ARE PERVADED (suo bian zhi shi)<sup>gk</sup> ARE DISTINGUISHED BY HAVING SEPARATE POSITIONS.

Polluted and pure mind-objects (xin jing)<sup>gl</sup> arise through mutual conditioning. In the time-periods of rise and extinction, they mutually inform each other (xiang mao)<sup>gm,8</sup>. All of this is too much to detail.

WITHIN EACH AND EVERY PHENOMENON, NOUMENON PERVADES ENTIRELY; If it didn't pervade each one entirely, then it could be divided.

IT IS NOT A DIVISIBLE UBIQUITY.

The Sūtra says, "The Dharma-nature (fa-xing)<sup>gn</sup> is everywhere and in all places -- in all beings and lands. It is totally in the three times<sup>9</sup> with no remainder.<sup>10</sup> Thus it has no shape or form that can be taken hold of." The first two statements<sup>11</sup> refer to total pervasion (quan bian)<sup>go</sup>; the final statement refers to indivisibility (bu ke fen)<sup>gp</sup>.

WHY? BECAUSE THAT REAL NOUMENON (zhen li)<sup>gq</sup> CANNOT BE DIVIDED. This explains the why and how of total pervasion.

THIS IS THE REASON EACH AND EVERY MINUTE ATOM CONTAINS THE UNLIMITED REAL NOUMENON, PERFECTLY AND ENTIRELY.

2) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS PHENOMENA PERVADE NOUMENON (shi bian yu li men)<sup>gr</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT PHENOMENA, WHICH ARE THE PERVADEES, HAVE BOUNDARIES AND LIMITATIONS. NOUMENON, WHICH IS PERVADED, OF A NECESSITY HAS NO BOUNDARIES OR LIMITATIONS. THESE PHENOMENA WITH DIVISIONS AND NOUMENON WITHOUT DIVISIONS, ARE ENTIRELY THE SAME, NOR PARTIALLY THE SAME.

Because of this total sameness (quan tong)<sup>gs</sup>, it is called "ubiquitous" (bian)<sup>gt</sup>.

WHY? BECAUSE PHENOMENA HAVE NO SUBSTANCE (wu ti)<sup>cl</sup>, THEY ARE, AFTER ALL, LIKE NOUMENON.

It is not like floating clouds pervading the sky (kong)<sup>ba</sup>.

THIS IS THE REASON ONE ATOM IS NOT BROKEN UP AND YET PERVADES THE DHARMA-REALM (fa-jie)<sup>r</sup>. AS IS ONE ATOM, SO ARE ALL DHARMAS. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

The above explanation proper in two gateways is completed. From here below we will conclude with a praise of the profundity.

THIS GATEWAY OF TOTAL PERVASION TRANSCENDS FEELINGS AND PARTS FROM VIEWS (jian, drsti)<sup>gu,12</sup>.

Since one atom has no limits or divisions, what dharma can there be that corresponds to feelings? <sup>13</sup> Accordingly, phenomena and noumenon cannot be cognized by means of cognition (shi, vijñāna)<sup>gv</sup>. The Real Noumenon (zhen li)<sup>gq</sup> is entirely within the atom, but with what five eyes could it be observed? <sup>14</sup> Accordingly, it cannot be known through knowledge (bu ke yi zhi zhi)<sup>gw</sup>. There is a text that says, "It is difficult to perceive."<sup>15</sup> This seems to indicate clearly the admissibility of visible parts, and yet this does not go so far as saying "separate" [from views] (li)<sup>gx,16</sup>.

IT CANNOT BE ILLUSTRATED BY MEANS OF ANY WORLDLY ILLUSTRATION. The Sūtra says, "The three realms (san jie, triloka)<sup>gy,17</sup> of all conditioned and unconditioned dharmas (you wu yi qie fa)<sup>gz</sup> are something inaccessible to comparisons." Herein by a praise of the profundity, he clears away all future possible illustrations. Nor can one understand it by means of worldly sensations and views. For how can worldly people see an entire ocean in one wave? Above we have finished with the explanation and the concluding praise of the profundity.

From here below there is an illustration in three parts:  
 1) the illustration of the non-obstruction of great and small; 2) the illustration of the non-obstruction of identity and difference;  
 3) the illustration which shows that among all dharmas, each and every one is ubiquitous in each of the others. Here by means of the ocean and a wave we merely indicate the relative positions (wei)<sup>ha</sup> of noumenon and phenomena. By dividing the various aspects of meaning, we show it is not entirely a parable.<sup>18</sup>

FOR EXAMPLE, THE ENTIRE OCEAN IS IN ONE WAVE AND YET THE OCEAN IS NOT SMALL.

Because the ocean is not two and in its entirety is salty and wet.

JUST AS ONE SMALL WAVE ENCOMPASSES THE GREAT OCEAN,

Because it is the same as the ocean,

AND YET THE WAVE IS NOT GREAT.

Because its form is not destroyed. This illustrates and finishes the above stated ubiquity of noumenon and phenomena each in the other.

AT THE SAME TIME, THE OCEAN IS PERVADED BY ALL THE WAVES BUT ISN'T DIFFERENTIATED; AT ALL TIMES EACH WAVE CONTAINS THE GREAT OCEAN, AND YET THE WAVES AREN'T ONE.

The waves and the ocean are neither one nor different. Below the author poses questions and answers them to show this clearly.

FURTHER, WHEN THE GREAT OCEAN IN ITS ENTIRETY PERVADES ONE WAVE, IT IS NOT HINDERED FROM PERVADING ALL OTHER WAVES IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE (ju ti)<sup>hb</sup>. WHEN ONE WAVE ENCLOSES THE GREAT OCEAN IN ITS ENTIRETY, ALL OTHER WAVES ALSO ENCLOSE IT IN ITS ENTIRETY. NEITHER OBSTRUCTS THE OTHER. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

The urging to contemplate means one should take this illustration and apply it to noumenon and phenomena. If you just read "great ocean" as "Real Noumenon", and read "wave" as "phenomena", you will see the realm of meaning. Therefore the text below doesn't apply [the illustration] to them.<sup>19</sup> The above explanation of part three, "illustration" is finished.

Next part four, "questions and answers" is minutely explained. There are two layers of questions and answers: 1) in respect to the first two sections of the illustration there is a question and answer; 2) in respect to the latter section of the illustration there is a question and answer. The first says,

QUESTION: SINCE NOUMENON IS ENTIRELY CONTAINED WITHIN ONE ATOM, WHY ISN'T IT SMALL?

Because of total containment, he attacks the idea of smallness.

SINCE IT IS NOT THE SAME AS AN ATOM AND SMALL LIKE IT, HOW CAN YOU SAY IT IS IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE CONTAINED IN ONE ATOM?

Because of smallness, he attacks the idea of total containment. The above both attack the proposition by taking a stand on noumenon and looking at phenomena.

IF AN ATOM ENCLOSES THE NOUMENON-NATURE (li-xing)<sup>hc,20</sup> IN ITS ENTIRETY, WHY THEN ISN'T IT GREAT?

Because of total containment he attacks the idea of greatness.

IF AN ATOM IS NOT BROAD AND GREAT LIKE NOUMENON, HOW CAN IT TOTALLY PERVADE THE NOUMENON-NATURE?

Because of greatness, he attacks the idea of total containment. The above both attack the proposition by taking a stand on phenomena and looking at noumenon.

SINCE THERE HAS BEEN CREATED AN INHERENT INCONSISTENCY (mao dun)<sup>hd,21</sup>,  
The lance (mao)<sup>he</sup> is a kind of spear. The shield (dun)<sup>hf</sup> is something that wards off blows. Formerly a man was selling them together. He expressed admiration for the superiority of each object. He praised his shield saying, "A spear which tries to pierce it can't enter it." He praised his spear saying, "It can pierce ten layers of shield." A clever fellow said to him, "If I were to buy your spear and stab your shield [with it], whether it went in or not, you wouldn't be able to make an excuse."

THE MEANING IS EXTREMELY SELF-CONTRADICTIONARY.

The question in terms of great and small has the sense of uniting the same and different. The answer in terms of the same and different unites the great and small.

ANSWER: NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA INTEND EACH OTHER (xiang wang)<sup>hh,22</sup>. THEY ARE NEITHER THE SAME NOR DIFFERENT. THEREFORE EVEN IF BOTH ARE ACCEPTED (shou)<sup>hi</sup>, EVEN SO THEIR FUNDAMENTAL POSITIONS (ben wei)<sup>hj</sup> ARE NOT DESTROYED.<sup>23</sup> FIRST, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF NOUMENON INTENDING (wang)<sup>hk</sup> PHENOMENA, THERE ARE FOUR PROPOSITIONS. The first two propositions consist of the explanation proper for the marks of something which is entirely contained within an atom and yet is not small.

1) BECAUSE NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA ARE NOT DIFFERENT,  
This is the reason.

THE REAL NOUMENON (zhen li)<sup>sq</sup> IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IS  
WITHIN ONE PHENOMENON.

This is the teaching. Above was the "totally pervading" part; below is the "not small" part.

2) BECAUSE NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA ARE NOT THE SAME, THE  
SUBSTANCE AND NATURE OF THE REAL NOUMENON IS CONSTANT AND INFINITE.  
The above settles the central principle; below is the answer proper  
to the objections.

3) BECAUSE THEIR NON-IDENTITY IS THEIR NON-DIFFERENCE (yi fei yi ji fei yi gu)<sup>hl</sup>,  
This is the reason.

THE INFINITE NOUMENON-NATURE IS TOTALLY WITHIN ONE ATOM.  
This is the teaching.

4) BECAUSE THEIR NON-DIFFERENCE IS THEIR NON-IDENTITY, THE  
NOUMENON-NATURE OF AN ATOM HAS NO DIVISIONS OR LIMITS (fen xian)<sup>hm</sup>.

The teaching and the reason are analagous to the above. Taking "non-identity is non-difference" as the reason, he replies with the teaching that noumenon entirely pervades phenomena and yet is not small.

NEXT, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF PHENOMENA INTENDING NOUMENON, THERE ARE ALSO FOUR PROPOSITIONS. 1) PHENOMENA-DHARMAS (shi-fa)<sup>ab</sup> AND NOUMENON ARE NOT DIFFERENT. THEREFORE THE FORMER ENTIRELY ENCLOSE NOUMENON-NATURE (li-xing)<sup>hc</sup>. 2) PHENOMENA-DHARMAS AND NOUMENON ARE NOT THE SAME. THEREFORE THE LATTER DOES NOT IMPAIR ONE ATOM.<sup>24</sup> Here too the above settles the teaching; the below responds properly.

3) BECAUSE NON-IDENTITY IS NON-DIFFERENCE, ONE MINUTE ATOM ENCLOSSES THE INFINITE TRUE NATURE (wu bian zhen xing)<sup>hn</sup>. 4) BECAUSE NON-DIFFERENCE IS NON-IDENTITY, ONE ATOM ENCLOSSES THE INFINITE NOUMENON AND YET THE ATOM IS NOT GREAT. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

The teaching and the reason are analagous to the above. Taking "non-identity is non-difference" as the reason, he replies with the teaching that an atom totally encloses noumenon, and yet isn't great. The first question and answer are completed.

Second, in respect to what was illustrated in the latter section, there is the question and answer:

QUESTION: WHEN THE INFINITE NOUMENON-NATURE IN ITS ENTIRETY PERVADES ONE ATOM, IN ALL PHENOMENA OUTSIDE THAT ONE, IS THERE OR IS THERE NOT NOUMENON-NATURE?

The above unlocks two barriers; the below heaps them up and thus makes its objections.



IF OUTSIDE THE ATOM THERE IS NOUMENON, THEN IT IS NOT A CASE OF PERVADING THE ATOM WITH ITS TOTAL SUBSTANCE. IF OUTSIDE THE ATOM THERE IS NO NOUMENON, THEN IT ISN'T A CASE OF TOTALLY PERVADING ALL PHENOMENA. ALL IN ALL, THE TWO SENSES CONTRADICT EACH OTHER ABSOLUTELY. In each case reading "noumenon-nature" as "great ocean" and "phenomena" as "wave", rephrasing the question thus, you will also get it.

ANSWER: BECAUSE THE NOUMENON-NATURE IS A BLENDING (rong)<sup>fx</sup>, He will indicate below that he is speaking from the point of view of noumenon, in four propositions.

AND BECAUSE THE MANY PHENOMENA ARE NON-OBSTRUCTING, He will indicate below that he is speaking from the point of view of phenomena, in four propositions. These both are the reason.

THEREFORE, NOUMENON CAN BE BOTH TOALLY INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF A PHENOMENON, WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION (wu zhang wu ai)<sup>ho</sup>. This is the teaching.

EACH [OF THE ABOVE PARTS TO THE REASON] HAS FOUR PROPOSITIONS. THE FIRST ADDRESSES ITSELF TO NOUMENON, IN FOUR PROPOSITIONS.

1) WHEN THE NOUMENON-NATURE WITH ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IS IN ALL THINGS, IT IS NOT PREVENTED FROM BEING, WITH ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE, IN THE LOCATION OF ONE ATOM. THIS IS THE REASON BEING OUTSIDE IS THE SAME AS BEING INSIDE.

First there was the question whether outside [the atom that noumenon enters] all phenomena have or don't have the noumenon-nature. He replied they have. Again there was the question if they have, then the noumenon-nature can't enter in its totality into the one atom. But he replied it does enter totally. This means that noumenon and

the many atoms are not different. Therefore the noumenon-nature in its entire substance pervades the many atoms, but also is not different from one atom. Thus it is not hindered on the other hand, from [in its totality] pervading this one atom. Moreover, if we concentrate on the wording, it is just like one father regarding ten sons: he is totally father to each one.

2) WHEN NOUMENON IS IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IN ONE ATOM, IT ISN'T OBSTRUCTED FROM BEING IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IN THE REMAINING LOCATIONS OF PHENOMENA.

In response to the former question, whether or not [in the atoms outside the one the noumenon-nature enters] there is or is not the noumenon-nature, he replied there is. This is the opposite of the father and sons example above.

THIS IS THE REASON BEING INSIDE IS BEING OUTSIDE.

3) BECAUSE THE NON-DUAL [NOUMENON] NATURE IS ENTIRELY IN EACH INDIVIDUAL THING, IT IS BOTH WITHIN AND WITHOUT.

Because noumenon is not different from "inside" and "outside", at the same time it pervades both inside and outside.

4) BECAUSE THE NON-DUAL [NOUMENON] NATURE IS NOT THE SAME AS ALL THINGS, IT IS NEITHER INSIDE NOR OUTSIDE.

Although the noumenon-nature pervades both inside and outside, it is never both inside and outside.

THE FIRST THREE PROPOSITIONS MEAN THAT NOUMENON IS NOT DIFFERENT FROM ALL DHARMAS. THE LAST PROPOSITION MEANS THAT NOUMENON ISN'T THE SAME AS ALL DHARMAS. INDEED IT IS BECAUSE THEY ARE NEITHER THE SAME NOR DIFFERENT, THAT NOUMENON IS NOT OBSTRUCTED WITHIN OR WITHOUT.

Formerly there was the objection that if the phenomena outside [the one atom] have noumenon, then noumenon doesn't pervade in its entirety the one atom. If it pervades in its entirety the one atom, then it isn't all pervasive in the phenomena outside the one. But here because noumenon and phenomena are neither the same nor different, noumenon is whole both inside and outside, and there is no obstruction.

NEXT WE APPROACH THE QUESTION FROM THE STANDPOINT OF PHENOMENA, IN FOUR PROPOSITIONS.

Because he already generally indicated the non-obstruction of the many phenomena [one against the other], here what he means by "from the standpoint of phenomena" is as follows. First there was questioning about what was lacking (suo wu)<sup>hp,25</sup>. There was the illustration of the wave and the ocean to show there was [nothing lacking, but rather] a plenitude (you)<sup>hq</sup>. Now he brings out an auxiliary argument, as if someone had asked, "When one atom entirely pervades noumenon, do all phenomena also pervade noumenon, or not? If they do pervade it, then there is the fault of having a many-layered noumenon. If they do not pervade it, then the many phenomena are not like noumenon." (bu ru li)<sup>hr,26</sup>

1) WHEN ONE ATOM ENTIRELY ENCOMPASSES NOUMENON, IT DOES NOT OBSTRUCT ALL PHENOMENA-DHARMAS FROM ALSO ENCOMPASSING NOUMENON. THIS IS THE REASON BEING INSIDE IS THE SAME AS BEING OUTSIDE.

One thing pervading noumenon does not obstruct many things from pervading it. This means one atom and noumenon are not different, and therefore all the other atoms are the same.

2) WHEN AMONG ALL DHARMAS, EACH AND EVERY ONE ENCOMPASSES NOUMENON-NATURE, THIS DOESN'T OBSTRUCT ONE ATOM FROM ALSO ENTIRELY ENCOMPASSING IT. THIS IS THE REASON BEING OUTSIDE IS THE SAME AS BEING INSIDE.

Many pervading does not obstruct one from pervading. This is the opposite of the father and sons example above.

3) BECAUSE AMONG ALL DHARMAS, EACH AND EVERY ONE SIMULTANEOUSLY ENCOMPASSES NOUMENON, NEITHER "ENTIRELY INSIDE" NOR "ENTIRELY OUTSIDE" IS OBSTRUCTED.

"All dharmas at the same time pervading noumenon" -- this means "inside" and "outside" are not different from noumenon. At the same time, both inside and outside encompass the noumenon-nature.

4) BECAUSE AMONG ALL PHENOMENA-DHARMAS, EACH DOESN'T INJURE (huai)<sup>hs</sup> THE OTHERS, THESE VARIOUS PHENOMENA-DHARMAS, WITH RESPECT TO EACH OTHER (xiang wang)<sup>hh</sup> ARE NEITHER WITHIN NOR WITHOUT.

The forms of the one and the many are kept distinct and not injured. Thus [noumenon] nature is neither one nor many. Therefore, nature, just as it is (ju ran)<sup>ht,27</sup>, is neither inside nor outside.

CONTEMPLATE THIS.

The questioning first took up a position on noumenon and regarded phenomena. When noumenon was taken as being in one, it was considered inside; when in many, it was considered outside. Now what is meant by "inside" and "outside"? The answer also took the one and the many to be inside and outside. However, the former [set of answers] first raised up noumenon, while the latter first raised up phenomena. Therefore he divided the two gateways and that's all. It is, however, of

course only one kind of question. Because the one and the many both are noumenon, they both entirely pervade noumenon. It is not that there are many noumena. Each and every phenomenon pervades it. Therefore the fourth proposition says, "It is neither inside nor outside."

3) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT PHENOMENA ARE PRODUCED IN DEPENDENCE ON NOUMENON (yi li cheng shi men)<sup>hw</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT PHENOMENA HAVE NO SEPARATE (bie)<sup>hv</sup> SUBSTANCE AND MUST COME INTO BEING IN DEPENDENCE ON THE TRUE NOUMENON.

Above is the teaching; below is the reason.

ALL THINGS ARISE DUE TO CONDITIONS (yi zhu yuan qi)<sup>hw,28</sup>. . . There are two reasons for this.

BECAUSE THEY LACK OWN-NATURE (zi-xing)<sup>hx</sup>,  
This is the first.

AND SINCE ONLY IN DEPENDENCE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF NO OWN-NATURE (wu xing li)<sup>hy</sup> ARE PHENOMENA PRODUCED.

This is the second. Real Thusness (zhen ru, bhūtatathatā)<sup>dz</sup> accords with conditions (sui yuan)<sup>hz</sup>. Therefore the Mādhyamika Treatise says,<sup>29</sup> "Because there is the Truth of emptiness, all dharmas come into being." The Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra says,<sup>30</sup> "If all dharmas weren't empty, there would be no path and no fruit [of attainment]."

JUST AS A WAVE INHERENTLY MUST DEPEND ON WATER TO BE ABLE TO COME INTO BEING, IN DEPENDENCE ON THE BUDDHA-MATRIX (ru-lai-cang, tathāgatagarbha)<sup>ia,31</sup> IT IS POSSIBLE FOR DHARMAS TO EXIST. IT IS TO BE KNOWN THAT THIS TOO IS JUST LIKE THAT [DEPENDENCE]. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

The Śrīmālādevī-siṃhanāda-sūtra says,<sup>32</sup> "In dependence on the Buddha-matrix there is birth and death."<sup>33</sup> In dependence on the Buddha-matrix there is nirvāṇa." The Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra also says,<sup>34</sup> "The Buddha-matrix does the deeds and reaps the retribution." The Awakening of Faith Treatise says,<sup>35</sup> "In dependence on the Buddha-matrix there are the thoughts of birth and extinction, etc." The "Questions Concerning Understanding" Chapter says (wen ming)<sup>ib,36</sup> "Dharma-nature (fa-xing)<sup>gn</sup> originally is birthless (wu sheng)<sup>ic</sup>; it makes itself manifest, and then there is birth, etc."

4) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT PHENOMENA MANIFEST NOUMENON (shi neng xian li men)<sup>id</sup>. Just as reflections manifest the mirror's brightness, so consciousness (shi, viññāna)<sup>gv</sup> and wisdom (zhi)<sup>ie</sup> manifest the Original Nature (ben xing)<sup>if</sup>. The Awakening of Faith says,<sup>37</sup> "Because nescience (wu ming, avidyā)<sup>ig</sup> knows names and their meanings, we speak of true enlightenment (zhen jue)<sup>ih</sup>, etc."

THIS MEANS THAT BECAUSE PHENOMENA GRASP (lang)<sup>ii</sup> NOUMENON, PHENOMENA ARE UNREAL (xu)<sup>by</sup> AND NOUMENON IS REAL (shi)<sup>ij</sup>. BECAUSE PHENOMENA ARE UNREAL, THE NOUMENON WITHIN ALL PHENOMENA IS SELF-EVIDENTLY DISCLOSED IN THEM. BECAUSE THE FORM OF A WAVE IS UNREAL,<sup>38</sup> IT CAUSES THE BODY OF THE WATER TO BE DISCLOSED. IT IS TO BE KNOWN THAT THE TRUTH OF THE MIDDLE WAY (zhong dao li)<sup>ik</sup> IS ALSO LIKE THIS. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

The "Sumeru" verse (xu mi)<sup>il,39</sup> says, "One should thoroughly realize that the own-nature (zi-xing)<sup>hx</sup> of all dharmas is not something they

have.<sup>40</sup> If in this way one understands Dharma-nature (fa-xing)<sup>gn</sup>, one immediately view Vairocana (lu she na)<sup>im,41</sup>."

5) THE GATEWAY WHEREIN PHENOMENA ARE SNATCHED AWAY BY MEANS OF NOUMENON (yi li duo shi men)<sup>in</sup>  
Following from the preceeding gateway in which noumenon manifests itself, phenomena are snatched away.

THIS MEANS THAT SINCE PHENOMENA GRASP NOUMENON, AS A CONSEQUENCE, ALL THE CHARACTERISTICS OF PHENOMENA ARE EXHAUSTED. THUS ONLY THE ONE REAL NOUMENON MANIFESTS ITSELF WITHOUT DIFFERENTIATION. Above is the teaching; below is the reason.

THIS IS BECAUSE APART FROM THE REAL NOUMENON, NOT A SPECK OF PHENOMENON CAN BE OBTAINED. JUST SO, WHEN WATER SNATCHES AWAY THE WAVE AND NOT A SINGLE WAVE REMAINS, THE WATER IS RETAINED BY MEANS OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WAVE WHICH IS CONSEQUENTLY EXHAUSTED. The "Manifestation" Chapter (chu xian)<sup>io,42</sup> says, "Even if all living beings in a single moment of thought completely realized Right Insight (zheng jue, sambodhi)<sup>ih</sup>, that would be no different from not realizing Right Insight. This is just like a conjured-up man with a conjured-up mind achieving conjured-up Right Insight (hua)<sup>ip,43</sup>."

6) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT PHENOMENA CONCEAL NOUMENON (shi neng yin li men)<sup>iq</sup>.  
Since the third [gateway] establishes phenomena, accordingly they can conceal noumenon.

THIS MEANS THAT THE REAL NOUMENON IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONDITIONS ESTABLISHES ALL PHENOMENA-DHARMAS, AND YET THESE PHENOMENA-DHARMAS BYPASS (wei)<sup>ir</sup> NOUMENON. CONSEQUENTLY IT CAUSES PHENOMENA TO BE MANIFESTED, AND YET IT ITSELF IS NOT MADE MANIFEST. JUST AS

WHEN WATER FORMS THE WAVES THE MOTION IS MANIFEST, BUT THE STILLNESS IS HIDDEN. THE SŪTRA SAYS, "THE CIRCULATION OF THE DHARMA-BODY (fa-shen, dharmakāya)<sup>is</sup> IN THE FIVE DESTINIES<sup>44</sup> IS CALLED 'ALL BEINGS'. WHEN IT CAUSES ALL BEINGS TO BE MANIFESTED, THE DHARMA-BODY ITSELF ISN'T MANIFESTED."

The "Questions Concerning Understanding" Chapter also says,<sup>45</sup> "There has never before existed one dharma that obtained entry into the Dharma-nature."<sup>46</sup>

7) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT THE REAL NOUMENON IS THE SAME AS PHENOMENA (zhen li ji shi men)<sup>it</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT IN EVERY CASE THE REAL NOUMENON IS NEVER OUTSIDE OF PHENOMENA.

Above is the teaching; below is the reason.

BECAUSE OF THE TRUTH OF NO-SELF (wu-wo, anātman)<sup>dy</sup> IN DHARMAS, PHENOMENA MUST BE BASED ON NOUMENON. THIS IS BECAUSE THEY ARE VOID (xu)<sup>by</sup> AND LACK SUBSTANCE (wu ti)<sup>cl</sup>.

If the Real Noumenon were nothing but emptiness, it would be outside of phenomena and therefore different from them. But actually we take the identity with dharmas to be the Truth of no-self. Apart from phenomena, how could there be any noumenon?

THIS IS THE REASON THAT THIS NOUMENON IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IS ALL PHENOMENA. ONLY BECAUSE IT IS ALL PHENOMENA, IS IT THE REAL NOUMENON. JUST AS WATER IS THE SAME AS WAVES, SINCE THERE IS NOTHING THAT MOVES<sup>47</sup> THAT IS NOT WET<sup>48</sup>, THEREFORE, WHATEVER IS WATER IS WAVES. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

8) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT PHENOMENA-DHARMAS ARE NOUMENON (shi-fa ji li men)<sup>iu</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT PHENOMENA-DHARMAS WHICH ARE



DEPENDENT ON CONDITIONS CERTAINLY HAVE NO OWN-BEING (wu zi-xing)<sup>iv</sup>.  
 BECAUSE THEY HAVE NO OWN-BEING, IN THEIR ENTIRE SUBSTANCE THEY ARE  
 REAL (zhen)<sup>ay</sup>. THEREFORE WE SAY ALL BEINGS ARE THUSNESS (ru, tathatā)<sup>iw</sup>  
 AND DON'T HAVE TO WAIT FOR EXTINCTION (mie)<sup>ix,49</sup>.  
 The Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra (qing ming)<sup>iy,50</sup> says, "All beings are  
 Thusness." It also says, "All beings are marked with marks of extinction  
 (ji-mie)<sup>iz</sup>. They won't be extinguished again (wu fu geng mie)."

JUST AS THE MOVEMENT-CHARACTERISTIC OF THE WAVES IS, IN ITS  
 TOTALITY, THE SAME AS THE CHARACTERISTIC OF THE WATER, WITH NO DIFFERENCE  
 WHATSOEVER.

The previous gateway dealt with the circulation of the Dharma-body,  
 which was called "all beings". This gate deals with the extinction  
 of all beings, which is the same as the Dharma-body. The meaning is  
 one, though the names are different.

9) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT THE REAL NOUMENON IS NOT  
 PHENOMENA (zhen li fei shi men)<sup>jb</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT NOUMENON, WHICH  
 IS THE SAME AS PHENOMENA, STILL IS NOT IDENTICAL WITH PHENOMENA.  
 THIS IS BECAUSE TRUE AND FALSE (zhen wang)<sup>jc</sup> ARE DIFFERENT, AND  
 BECAUSE SOLIDITY IS NOT VOIDNESS (shi fei xu)<sup>jd</sup>, AND BECAUSE THAT  
 WHICH IS DEPENDENT IS NOT THAT WHICH CAN BE DEPENDED ON (suo yi fei  
 neng yi)<sup>je</sup>.

The doctrine of the last gateway [Number 10] opposes these three  
 comparisons one by one. However, the written word is a little different  
 and that's all.<sup>51</sup>

JUST AS THE WATER WHICH IS THE SAME AS THE WAVES STILL IS NOT  
 IDENTICAL WITH THE WAVES, BECAUSE MOVEMENT AND WETNESS ARE DIFFERENT.

10) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT PHENOMENA-DHARMAS ARE NOT NOUMENON (shi-fa fei li men)<sup>jf</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT THE PHENOMENA WHICH ARE ENTIRELY NOUMENON, ARE NEVER NOUMENON, BECAUSE THEIR NATURES (xiang xing)<sup>jq</sup> ARE DIFFERENT.

Formerly he spoke of true and false, real and unreal. Now however, there is only one opposing pair.

BECAUSE THAT WHICH IS DEPENDENT (suo yi)<sup>dv</sup> IS NOT THAT WHICH IS DEPENDED ON, WE HAVE SOMETHING THAT IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE IS COMPLETELY NOUMENON, AND YET IS PHENOMENAL. THESE TWO ENTITIES ARE MUTUALLY YIELDING (yuan-ran)<sup>jh,52</sup>. JUST AS THE WAVES WHICH ARE ENTIRELY WATER ARE NOT THE WATER ITSELF, BECAUSE MOTION DOES NOT MEAN THE SAME AS WETNESS.

Gateways seven and eight with respect to interpretation (jie)<sup>ji</sup> [showed that noumenon and phenomena] are always one. Nine and ten with respect to Truth (di)<sup>jj</sup> showed them to be always two. From here below are the conclusion and exhortation [to practice]. First he ties up the former meaning.

THE ABOVE TEN DOCTRINES ALL HAVE TO DO WITH ONE AND THE SAME TOPIC: CONDITIONED ARISING (yuan qi, pratityasamutpada)<sup>jk</sup>.

Real emptiness (zhen kong)<sup>aw</sup> has four meanings. 1) The first does away with self (ji)<sup>jl</sup> and identifies with other (ta)<sup>jm</sup>. This is the third gateway [in which phenomena are shown to have no independence and to totally rely on noumenon.] 2) The second submerges other and retains self. This is number five [in which noumenon "snatches away" phenomena, again by virtue of the total dependence of the latter on the former.] 3) In the third both self and other are preserved. This

is number nine [in which we find that Real Noumenon is not the same as phenomena, and each retains its own identity.] 4) In the fourth, both self and other are submerged. This is number seven [in which Real Noumenon is seen to be the same as phenomena, due to the Truth of no-self.]

"Transcendental being" (miao you)<sup>jn,53</sup> has four meanings.

1) The first hides other and retains self. This is the sixth gateway [in which phenomena are able to obscure noumenon, as they are the manifest member of the coalition.] 2) The second manifests other and exhausts self. This is number four [in which phenomena are able to manifest noumenon, yet they themselves are seen to be fundamentally unreal due to their grasping character.] 3) The third is number ten [i.e., phenomena-dharmas are not noumenon. Presumably here both self and other are submerged.] 4) The fourth is number eight [i.e., phenomena-dharmas are the same as noumenon. Presumably here both self and other are manifested.] Gateways one and two are general and so are not matched with anything else. The above is the tying-up. Below is a separate list of ten headings.

BRIEFLY, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF NOUMENON LOOKING AT PHENOMENA, THERE ARE: COMING INTO BEING (cheng)<sup>du</sup> (#3) AND DISINTEGRATION (huai)<sup>hs</sup> (#5); IDENTITY (ji)<sup>jo</sup> (#7) AND SEPARATION (li)<sup>jp</sup> (#9). FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF PHENOMENA LOOKING AT NOUMENON, THERE ARE: MANIFESTATION (xian)<sup>jq</sup> (#4) AND CONCEALMENT (yin)<sup>jr</sup> (#6); SAMENESS (yi)<sup>js</sup> (#8) AND DIFFERENCE (yi)<sup>jt</sup> (#10).

[CONTRARIES AND ACCORDANCES ARE PERFECTLY AT HOME WITH EACH OTHER, AND ARE ABSOLUTELY WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION.]

CONTRARIES (ni)<sup>ju</sup> . . .

[These are gateways number] 5,6,9, and 10.

AND ACCORDANCES (shun)<sup>jv</sup> . . .

3,4,7, and 8.

ARE PERFECTLY AT HOME WITH EACH OTHER (zi zai)<sup>jw, 54</sup>,

Coming to be is the same as disintegration, and so forth.

AND ARE ABSOLUTELY WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION.

Coming to be does not obstruct disintegration, and so forth.

AT THE SAME TIME THEY SPONTANEOUSLY (dun)<sup>jx</sup> ARISE.

It is not a matter of earlier and later. Furthermore, phenomena,

having no substance, depend on conditions. They may be called

produced or disintegrated, etc., but not hidden or manifest, etc.

The noumenon-nature is fundamentally existent (ben you)<sup>jy</sup>. It may be called hidden or manifest, etc., but not produced or disintegrated.

He doesn't refer [in this last list of comparisons] to the first two gateways, because they are general characteristics. The remaining eight gateways are established in dependence on those. Furthermore, these two mutual pervasion (xiang bian)<sup>jz</sup> gateways have no separate or distinct characteristics, because they aren't distinguished as hidden or manifest, etc. From here below he exhorts [one to practice.]

ONE SHOULD DEEPLY CONTEMPLATE THIS TO LET THE MEDITATION CLEARLY MANIFEST ITSELF. THIS IS CALLED, "THE CONTEMPLATION IN WHICH NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA PERFECTLY BLEND WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION."

## FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER 2

<sup>1</sup>In other words, the text has dealt with the abstract theory of Thusness, but not the practical aspect of how it is related to ordinary worldly phenomena.

<sup>2</sup>To put the practice into action.

<sup>3</sup>Along with the first two just named by Zong-mi.

<sup>4</sup>I.e., the practice of taking no stand on anything.

<sup>5</sup>That is, the teaching common to all Mahāyāna schools.

<sup>6</sup>Also known as yuan jiao<sup>gf</sup>, i.e., the Hua-yan teaching of the non-obstruction of the various phenomena.

<sup>7</sup>The one mark is emptiness.

<sup>8</sup>"Inform" is used in the sense that each is the formative principle of the other. The Chinese characters indicate that this is in the specific sense of giving form.

<sup>9</sup>Past, present, and future.

<sup>10</sup>That is, there is no Dharma-nature that is somehow outside of time.

<sup>11</sup>I.e., all Du-shun has said so far in this gateway.

<sup>12</sup>I.e., false views; see footnote 5, Chapter 1.

<sup>13</sup> Apparently for Zong-mi, feelings are complex, hence they consist of more than one dharma.

<sup>14</sup> The five eyes are: 1) the ordinary, fleshy eye; 2) the eye of the gods of the material realm; those who cultivate meditation can obtain it; 3) the wisdom-eye of the Hīnayāna; 4) the means by which the Bodhisattva ferries all beings to the other shore; 5) the Buddha's wisdom-eye which is the perfection of the previous four.

<sup>15</sup> This is a soft way of saying "impossible".

<sup>16</sup> My interpretation of this passage is uncertain. It seems that for Zong-mi, the highest truth is essentially immanent, yet cannot be known by any worldly categories.

<sup>17</sup> These are: the kāmadhātu - the realm of sense and desire; the rūpadhātu - the realm of form; and the arūpadhātu - the realm of the formless or unconditioned.

<sup>18</sup> This translation is problematic; the text appears corrupt.

<sup>19</sup> That is, the text doesn't do this for the reader, who is urged to do so for him/herself.

<sup>20</sup> I.e., the fundamental nature of everything existent.

<sup>21</sup> This is a reference to a famous tale from Han Fei-zi<sup>hg</sup> which Zong-mi relates in brief below.

<sup>22</sup> This term is impossible to translate. My translation is based on a meaning of "intend" which may be archaic, i.e. "direct", "turn", or "bend". The sense is that each is what it is in itself only because of what it is with regard to the other, and yet these two ways of being are of course inseparable.

<sup>23</sup> That is, they can be taken together, even though they are not alike, without making either any less itself.

<sup>24</sup>I.e., of its atom-hood.

<sup>25</sup>He is referring to the idea that there should be some of the noumenon lacking either inside or outside of the atom it pervaded, if it was said to pervade all phenomena simultaneously.

<sup>26</sup>I.e., not equal to noumenon, inferior.

<sup>27</sup>I.e., staying where it is, without moving.

<sup>28</sup>Here Du-shun's grammar and Zong-mi's division of the phrases seem to indicate two distinct things. I have above translated Zong-mi's version, as indeed was incumbent on me. The following is Du-shun's version, taken alone: All things that arise by virtue of causes are all without own-nature, because they depend on noumenon.

<sup>29</sup>zhong lun<sup>bs</sup>, Taishō #1564, written by Nāgārjuna, translated by Kumārajīva.

<sup>30</sup>I was unable to trace this quotation.

<sup>31</sup>The Sanskrit word can mean two things: the Buddha-embryo, which is in all things; or the Buddha-womb, from which all things are produced. Zong-mi appears to take the latter meaning. Some of the quotations below (e.g. from the Lankāvatāra) may take the embryo meaning.

<sup>32</sup>勝鬘師子吼一乘大方便方廣經  
Taishō #353, translated by Guṇabhadra. The first half of the quotation can be found on page 222b.5. I could not find the second half in the Sūtra.

<sup>33</sup>I.e., saṃsāra.

<sup>34</sup>I could not find this exact quotation. The closest I could find is the following, from Guṇabhadra (Taishō #670, p. 510b.4-5)

and Śikṣānanda (Taishō #672, p. 619c.1) both: 如來(之)藏是善  
因不善因能遍興造一切趣生。

### 35 大乘起信論

da sheng qi xin lun, Taishō #1666 by Paramārtha, #1667 by Śikṣānanda. This work now appears to have been a Chinese original, though the Chinese themselves early considered it a translation of a Mahāyānaśraddhotpādaśāstra, attributed to Aśvagoṣa., Cf. Walter Liebenthal, "New Light on the Mahāyāna-Śraddhotpāda Śāstra," T'oung Pao, Vol. 46, 1958, pp. 155-216 for full treatment of the possible author of this treatise. This particular quotation can be found in the Paramārtha version on page 276b.8, and in the Śikṣānanda version on page 585a.4.

<sup>36</sup>This quotation can be found in the Avataṃsaka-sūtra, Chapter 10, "The Bodhisattva's Questions Concerning Understanding," p. 66b.18.

<sup>37</sup>The Paramārtha version has: 有不覺妄想心、故能知名義  
為言說眞覺。 The Śikṣānanda version is rather different in this passage.

<sup>38</sup>It is unreal because it is ephemeral.

<sup>39</sup>I have been unable to locate either this verse or this quotation. I suspect, however, that it can be found somewhere in the Avataṃsaka-sūtra (Taishō #278, 279), and indeed there are passages and language similar to this therein.

<sup>40</sup>Reading 無所有 as either 非所有 or  
無所有之生。

<sup>41</sup>The "Sun" Buddha; the Buddha of the Hua-yan-jing, and hence especially dear to the Hua-yan school.

<sup>42</sup>This is the "Thus-Come One's Manifestation" Chapter of the Śikṣānanda version of the Avataṃsaka-sūtra (Taishō #279). The quotation can be found on page 275b.7-8.

<sup>43</sup>This is a reference to the māyā-like or magically unreal nature of existence.



<sup>44</sup>See above, footnote 37, Chapter 1.

<sup>45</sup>This quotation can be found in the Avatamsaka-sūtra, Chapter 10, "The Bodhisattva's Questions Concerning Understanding," p. 66c.20.

<sup>46</sup>The relation of this quotation to the above is difficult to determine.

<sup>47</sup>I.e., waves.

<sup>48</sup>I.e., water.

<sup>49</sup>I.e., they don't have to pass out of their worldly, finite, material state in order to be real. This is a statement on the fundamental Mahāyāna thesis that samsāra and nirvāṇa are one.

<sup>50</sup>This Sūtra can be found in the Taishō by the following translators: Zhi-qian (#474), Kumārajīva (#475), Xuan-zang (#476), Dharmarakṣa (#477), Upaśūnya (#478), and Jñānagupta (#479). The first quotation can be found in the Kumārajīva version, p. 542b.12. The second is a non-verbatim citation of the same version, p. 542b.18-19.

<sup>51</sup>I.e., there is only one comparison.

<sup>52</sup>Each is just as it is and yet is utterly the other, because its own-nature is the same as the other's.

<sup>53</sup>The best source for an understanding of this terms is Leon Hurvitz's Chih-I, cited above. For Chih-I (and I suspect for Zong-mi as well), "a prime emphasis on 'emptiness' could not but be unsatisfactory. . . . The truth was a truth of being, not of the absence of being, but of being seen through a different pair of eyes. The technical term for it is miao yu 妙有." (p. 272) "The cognizing mind and the cognized objects are interdependent, and the sphere in which they exist in a state of interdependence is a third realm transcending both of them." A footnote to the terms "exist" in this passage states: "The word is used advisedly. Though he might insist

that he is a true disciple of Nāgārjuna, Chih-I would not accept the latter's formulation that things neither exist nor do not exist. For him things definitely exist, but in a miao yu way." To illustrate: ". . . the world of miao yu is like the scene on which mirror images appear, if one will ignore the objects that provide the mirror with the reflections. . . . There is, however, one important difference. The surface of the mirror remains, whether anything is reflected in it or not. The mind, on the other hand, as interpreted by Chih-I, has no independent existence as a substantial entity, but stands in a relationship of interdependence with the objects that are reflected in it. . . ." (pp. 272-3)

<sup>54</sup>This term, though very descriptive, is impossible to translate. On the face of it, it is close to the sense of being at home with oneself, but it has an added sense of perfect freedom and of the state of things as they should be.

## CHAPTER 3

THE CONTEMPLATION OF UNIVERSAL INCLUSION  
(zhou bian han rong guan)<sup>ka</sup>

The contemplation of universal inclusion is the [realm of] the non-obstruction of the various phenomena among themselves (shi shi wu ai)<sup>kb</sup>. The text has three parts: 1) theme, 2) explanation, and 3) conclusion and exhortation.

PHENOMENA, LIKE NOUMENON, BLEND (rong)<sup>fx</sup>.

Each and every phenomenon is like noumenon, therefore phenomena blend and pass through each other (rong tong)<sup>kc</sup>. This means if we only look into this from the point of view of phenomena, then the various phenomena obstruct one another. If we only look into this from the point of view of noumenon, then a mutual obstruction is not possible, but also a universal inclusion is not possible (bian rong)<sup>kd,1</sup>. But now because phenomena, like noumenon, blend, there are ten gateways of non-obstruction.

THEY EVERYWHERE EMBRACE (she)<sup>ke</sup> WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION,

Noumenon contains the myriad potentialities (wan de)<sup>kf,2</sup>. There is nothing that can be likened to it. In sum, noumenon has the two meanings of empty space (xu)<sup>by</sup> and real emptiness (kong)<sup>ba</sup> and is called "universally inclusive" (pu bian han rong)<sup>kh,3</sup>.

AND INTERMINGLE (jiao can)<sup>ki</sup> . . .

They pass through (she)<sup>kj</sup> and enter (ru)<sup>cp</sup> each other.

PERFECTLY FREELY (zi zai)<sup>jw</sup>.

Simultaneously, each acts upon the others and is acted upon by the others (hu wei neng suo)<sup>kk</sup>.

IN SUM, WE DISTINGUISH TEN GATEWAYS.

The first is the basis of Dharma and doctrine (fa yi)<sup>kl</sup>, and substance and function (ti yong)<sup>km</sup>. The second is universality (zhou bian)<sup>kn</sup>. The third is inclusion (han rong)<sup>ko</sup>. When these three are complete, then [gateway] 4 explains 2, 5 explains 3, 6 and 7 both comprise (shou)<sup>hi</sup> 4 and 5. 8 and 9 blend with and embrace 6 and 7. 10 comprises 8 and 9.

1) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THAT NOUMENON IS LIKE PHENOMENON (li ru shi men)<sup>kp</sup>.

Because this Real Noumenon (zhen li)<sup>gq</sup> is entirely phenomenal, like phenomena it is manifested, like phenomena it is differentiated (cha bie)<sup>kq</sup>. Like phenomena it is great and small, one and many, subject to transformation and change limitlessly and inexhaustibly. There is a [copy of the] text, the theme of which says, "Noumenon, like phenomena, is manifested; phenomena, like noumenon, are universal." This is because when one first looks at the explanation, one finds both the meanings of manifestation and universality. However, upon careful investigation of the complete circumstances, one finds omitted any sign of further meanings [other than manifestation].<sup>4</sup>

THIS MEANS THAT SINCE PHENOMENA-DHARMAS ARE VOID (xu)<sup>by</sup>, THERE IS NO SIGN (xiang)<sup>i</sup> THAT FAILS TO BE EXHAUSTED.

They don't have to wait to be extinguished (min)<sup>kr</sup>.

THE NOUMENON-NATURE IS TRUE REALITY (zhen shi)<sup>ks</sup>. ITS SUBSTANCE NEVER FAILS TO MANIFEST ITSELF.

When the Real Noumenon is together with all the things of the thousand's and ten-thousand's of differences and distinctions, then it is plainly manifest. For example, it is the objects of the eyes and the ears; it is a pot of mustard, or refined gold. When things take the shape of a Buddha, Bodhisattva, monk, and so forth, extending to all beings and all forms in the six destinies, then, at any given moment, of all the shapes which are manifested, there is not the least bit that is hidden (yin)<sup>jr</sup>. Also, there is not the least bit that does not take shape. Now the noumenon-nature is also like this. There is not the least bit that is hidden, nor is there the least bit that isn't phenomenal (shi)<sup>x</sup>. This is not the same as [chapter 1's] contemplative view of real emptiness. Also, in the "Phenomena are Snatched Away by Means of Noumenon" gateway [Chapter 2, #5], it was only noumenon that was manifest. Therefore, next he says,

THERE IS NO PHENOMENON THAT IS NOTHING BUT PHENOMENON, BECAUSE ALL OF NOUMENON IS PHENOMENAL.

Above is the explanation. Below he uses humans to demonstrate it.

THIS IS THE REASON EVEN THOUGH A BODHISATTVA SEES PHENOMENA, THIS SEEING IS A CONTEMPLATION OF NOUMENON. AND YET HE SAYS THESE PHENOMENA ARE NOT THE SAME AS NOUMENON.

Because noumenon doesn't injure the phenomena.

2) THE GATEWAY THAT DEMONSTRATES THE PHENOMENA ARE LIKE NOUMENON (shi ru li men)<sup>kt</sup>.

Each and every phenomenon, like noumenon, is ubiquitous (pu bian)<sup>ku</sup>, broad, and great; like noumenon, each penetrates the three times;

like noumenon, each dwells continually as it did originally (chang zhu ben ran)<sup>ku,5</sup>.

THIS MEANS THAT ALL PHENOMENA-DHARMAS ARE NOT DIFFERENT FROM NOUMENON.

First he brings out the reason for [phenomena's] ubiquity. Because of the first gateway's statement that noumenon is like phenomena, phenomena are not different from noumenon, and therefore each is universal. So this makes one pair with the preceding gateway. Furthermore, in the later gates [3 and 4], by setting "not-same" and "not-different" against each other, ubiquity (neng bian)<sup>kw</sup> and inclusion (neng han)<sup>kx</sup> make another pair.

THEREFORE PHENOMENA, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NOUMENON, ARE UTTERLY UBIQUITOUS (yuan bian)<sup>ky</sup>.

This is the general theme of the teaching. Below he separately demonstrates the characteristics of ubiquity.

THIS CAUSES ONE ATOM TO UNIVERSALLY PERVADE THE ENTIRE DHARMA-REALM (fa-jie)<sup>r</sup>. WHEN THE DHARMA-REALM IN ITS ENTIRE SUBSTANCE PERVADES ALL DHARMAS, THIS ONE MINUTE ATOM ALSO, LIKE THE NOUMENON-NATURE, IS ENTIRELY WITHIN ALL DHARMAS.

Provisionally citing one phenomenon, he explains it as an example.

AS ONE MINUTE ATOM, SO ARE ALL PHENOMENA-DHARMAS. Analogously, all Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, pratyekabuddhas<sup>6</sup>, śravakas<sup>7</sup>, and so forth, extending to all beings in the six destinies -- each and every one is like this.

3) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS ONE PHENOMENON INCLUDES BOTH NOUMENON AND ALL PHENOMENA (shi han li shi men)<sup>kz</sup>.

The text has two parts. The first is the explanation proper of this gateway. The second is the general blending of the first two gateways.

THIS MEANS THAT BECAUSE ALL PHENOMENA-DHARMAS ARE NOT THE SAME AS NOUMENON, IF YOU MAINTAIN ONE ORIGINAL PHENOMENON (cun ben)<sup>1a</sup>, IT STILL IS CAPABLE OF BROAD INCLUSION (guang rong)<sup>1b</sup>. JUST SO, ONE MINUTE ATOM, THOUGH ITS FORM IS NOT LARGE, STILL CAN CONTAIN THE INFINITE DHARMA-REALM. INDEED SINCE ALL DHARMAS OF ALL COSMOSES ARE NOT SEPARATE FROM THE DHARMA-REALM, ALL ARE MANIFESTED WITHIN ONE ATOM.

This points out the one [phenomenon provisionally cited above] as an example. Because the above mentioned one phenomenon includes noumenon, all the remaining phenomena and this noumenon which is included are not different in substance. In keeping with the noumenon which is included, all [phenomena] are manifested within the one phenomenon. And yet it also is not different from noumenon, and this is the only reason that it can contain them. Merely with regard to the theme's indication of the non-identity [of the phenomena and noumenon], the reason he focuses on keeping the original one phenomenon as a containing dharma, is because it thus contrasts with the former gateways.<sup>8</sup>

AS ONE ATOM, SO ALL DHARMAS ARE THUS. BECAUSE THIS NOUMENON AND PHENOMENA BLEND AND PERMEATE EACH OTHER, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE NEITHER THE SAME NOR DIFFERENT, GENERALLY THERE ARE FOUR PROPOSITIONS. From the point of view of what includes, all [the following] contain the sense of being not the same as, and not different from noumenon.

Because they are not the same, there is a nature which is potentially inclusive (you ti wei neng han)<sup>1c</sup>. It is only because they are not different that there is the actualization of inclusion (you yong fang neng han ye)<sup>1d</sup>.

1) INSIDE ONE IS ONE.

The first "one" contains the second "one". The first "one" is the includer (neng han)<sup>1e</sup>; the second "one" is what is pervaded (suo bian)<sup>1h</sup>. The remaining three propositions can be understood analogously.

2) INSIDE ALL THERE IS ONE. 3) INSIDE ONE THERE IS ALL.

4) INSIDE ALL THERE IS ALL. EACH HAS ITS REASON. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

Discussing these four together, we say the following. In every case, the first member is what includes and hence it corresponds to what is pervaded. The latter member is what pervades and hence corresponds to what is included. If you liken this to the mutual relationship of the one and the many, then it is a bit different. In that case, #2 is the "pervasion" meaning,<sup>9</sup> #3 is the "inclusion" meaning,<sup>10</sup> the final proposition is both inclusion and pervasion, and the first one is neither. In this final case, one can only speak in terms of embracing (she)<sup>ke</sup> and entering (ru)<sup>cp</sup>. When you arrive at the following, that should be clear.

4) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF THE UBIQUITOUS AND THE BOUNDED (tong ju wu ai men)<sup>1i</sup>.

This explains gateway #2. The second gateway only dealt with ubiquity (tong)<sup>cs</sup>. But now without doing damage to this characteristic, we also have the non-ubiquitous. Thus ubiquity comprises the bounded as well.



THIS MEANS THAT ALL PHENOMENA-DHARMAS AND NOUMENON'S BEING NON-IDENTICAL IS THE SAME AS THEIR BEING NON-DIFFERENT. CONSEQUENTLY, THESE PHENOMENA-DHARMAS, WITHOUT SEPARATING FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE PLACES, ENTIRELY PERVADE ALL ATOMS OF THE TEN DIRECTIONS. BECAUSE THEIR NON-DIFFERENCE IS THE SAME AS THEIR NON-IDENTITY, THEY ENTIRELY PERVADE THE TEN DIRECTIONS WITHOUT MOVING FROM THEIR RESPECTIVE POSITIONS. ACCORDINGLY, DISTANT IS NEAR, AND ALL-PERVASIVE [IN THE SENSE OF GOING EVERYWHERE] IS STATIONARY, ABSOLUTELY WITHOUT HINDRANCE OR OBSTRUCTION.

5) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF THE BROAD AND THE NARROW (guang xia wu ai men)<sup>1j</sup>.  
This explains the third gateway.

THIS MEANS THAT BECAUSE PHENOMENA AND NOUMENON'S NON-IDENTITY IS THE SAME AS THEIR NON-DIFFERENCE, A SINGLE ATOM IS UNHARMED AND YET BROADLY CONTAINS THE LANDS AND SEAS IN ALL TEN DIRECTIONS. BECAUSE THEIR NON-DIFFERENCE IS THE SAME AS THEIR NON-IDENTITY, [AN ATOM] BROADLY CONTAINS THE TEN DIRECTIONS OF THE DHARMA-REALM, AND YET THIS MINUTE ATOM IS NOT LARGE. SO IT IS, THEN, THAT ONE ATOM OF PARTICULARITY (yi chen zhi shi)<sup>1k</sup> IS BROAD AND NARROW, GREAT AND SMALL, WITHOUT HINDRANCE OR OBSTRUCTION.

6) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF PERVADING AND CONTAINING (bian rong wu ai men)<sup>1l</sup>.  
The two gateways #6 and #7 pair up (he)<sup>1m</sup> with #4 and #5; [#4 and #5] unite (jian)<sup>1n</sup> with #2 and #3. Because broadly containing (guang rong)<sup>1b</sup> and universally pervading (pu bian)<sup>ku</sup> are not separate from each other, although #2 and #4 only pervade, and #3 and #5 only

contain, now we pair them. At the same time it is only because he deals with these two modes alternately from the point of view of the one and the many, that he completes the two gateways #6 and #7. In the text there are two pairs. 1) First he makes clear that pervading is the same as containing. 2) Later he shows that containing is the same as pervading.

THIS MEANS THAT THIS ONE ATOM LOOKS TO ALL (wang)<sup>hk,11</sup>, BECAUSE UNIVERSALLY PERVADING IS THE SAME AS BROADLY CONTAINING.<sup>12</sup> When one looks to the many, there are the senses of pervading and containing. This is because each and every [one of] the many can be pervaded, and because each and every one can be contained. If the many were looking to the one, there wouldn't be this sense. This is because if what is looked to is only one, it would be improper to speak of pervading or containing. One should only speak of embracing and entering. This corresponds to the later gateway [#7].

THEREFORE WHEN ONE ATOM PERVADES (bian)<sup>gt</sup> ALL, IT ALSO, ON THE OTHER HAND, EMBRACES (she)<sup>ke</sup> ALL DHARMAS, WHICH ALL SETTLE (zhu)<sup>lo</sup> WITHIN IT.

This means when the one pervades the many, it once again embraces within itself the many that are pervaded. Using mirrors and a lamp to illustrate:<sup>13</sup> If in the four points and the four mid-points, and also above and below, one displays eight mirrors; and if in each place one puts a mirror, this makes ten. And if inside all of these one places one lamp, then the ten mirrors enter each other (hu ru)<sup>1p,14</sup>

FURTHERMORE, BECAUSE BROADLY CONTAINING IS THE SAME AS UNIVERSALLY PERVADING, THIS ONE ATOM ONCE AGAIN PERVADES EACH OF THE DISCRETE DHARMAS WHICH ARE [CONTAINED] WITHIN ITSELF.

Reversing the above [illustration], when one contains nine, this is the same as its pervading nine.

THIS IS THE REASON WHEN THIS ATOM ITSELF PERVADES THE OTHERS, IT IS THE SAME AS THE OTHERS PERVADING IT. THE THING THAT BOTH CONTAINS AND ENTERS, SIMULTANEOUSLY PERVADES AND EMBRACES, WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

7) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF EMBRACING AND ENTERING (she ru wu ai men)<sup>14</sup>. THIS MEANS ALL THE OTHERS LOOK TO THE ONE DHARMA.

This reverses the above [#6]. Therefore both the written word and the meaning are distinguished. Here too are two pairs.

BECAUSE ENTERING OTHERS IS THE SAME AS EMBRACING OTHERS, "Entering" is the same as "pervading", which was formerly used; "embracing" is the same as "containing" which was formerly used. Since the many are looking to the one, there are no "many" which can be pervaded.<sup>15</sup> Therefore he speaks of entering. There are no "many" which can be contained, therefore he speaks of embracing.<sup>16</sup>

WHEN ALL ENTIRELY ENTER INTO ONE, THIS ENABLES THE ONE TO ONCE AGAIN BE WITHIN EVERYTHING WHICH IS WITHIN ITSELF, SIMULTANEOUSLY AND WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

When the many enter the one, they once again embrace the one which they entered, so that it, which is within them, again enters them. Just as when nine mirrors enter into the one mirror, this is the same as their embracing the one mirror, so that it is within the nine mirrors [that enter it]. They are simultaneous and reciprocal (jiao hu)<sup>17</sup>. Therefore he says there is no obstruction.

FURTHERMORE, BECAUSE EMBRACING OTHERS IS THE SAME AS ENTERING OTHERS,

Reversing the above "entering" he has "embracing".

THEREFORE, ONE DHARMA,

This is what is embraced (suo she)<sup>1t</sup>.

WHEN IT IS ENTIRELY WITHIN ALL,

The many embrace it (she zhi)<sup>1u</sup>.

IN RETURN CAUSES ALL . . .

This is what enters (neng ru)<sup>1v</sup>.

TO BE ALWAYS WITHIN ONE,

The one is what is entered (suo ru)<sup>1w</sup>.

SIMULTANEOUSLY AND WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION. CONTEMPLATE THIS.

This means every single one of the nine embraces the one. When the one is inside the nine, the nine altogether enter into the one mirror.

8) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF INTERPENETRATION (jiao she wu ai men)<sup>1x</sup>.

The two gateways #6 and #7 focus on the one and the many looking to each other. Because of the difference in meaning between activity and passivity (neng suo)<sup>1y</sup>, there was distinguished pervading and containing, embracing and entering. But now the many embracing one and entering one is identical with the one embracing the many and entering the many. In general, activity is passivity, embracing is entering, one is many. All simultaneously and universally contain all, without obstruction. Therefore he speaks of interpenetration (jiao she)<sup>1z</sup>. This means "mutually (jiao xiang)<sup>ma</sup> interconnected (guan she)<sup>mb</sup>".

THIS MEANS WHEN ONE DHARMA LOOKS TO ALL THERE IS EMBRACING AND ENTERING. TO UNDERSTAND THIS THERE ARE FOUR PROPOSITIONS.

Although it may seem that there are eight propositions, it is because they are in pairs. If it were asked, "Since you are combining the above two gateways, how can you only speak of uniting and entering, and not speak of pervading and containing?" the answer would be, "He first focused on separating the meanings of the one and the many looking to each other and so distinguished the two gateways by name. But now, since they are simultaneous and mutually identical, pervading is the same as entering, and containing is the same as embracing. If I were to explain further the four propositions of pervading and containing, there would be duplication of wording and sense. If proposition by proposition, I were to say, 'embraces and contains all, pervades and enters all,' etc., then the wording of the text would be verbose and confusing. Therefore I only say 'embrace' and 'enter'. It is the same as 'pervade' and 'contain'."

If someone were to ask, "If the one and the many are mutually identical, then why do we again get this theme saying 'one looks to all,' and a later gateway [#9] saying, 'all look to one'?" the reply would be, "Although you raise up 'the one' as subject, there is also simultaneity and mutuality (hui hu)<sup>mc</sup>. For that reason, in the explanation, the first phrase, 'one looks to all' says embraces and enters, and in the following phrase, 'all looks to one' says embraces and enters. The third is one looking to one and the fourth is all looking to all, and in them the wording is apparent. Granted that the two gateways [#8 and #9] are paired with each other, and that

each raises up one case, in fact, each reciprocally contains all of them within itself. Therefore the tenth gateway sums them up and names them 'universal blending' (pu rong)<sup>md</sup>. Yet there is no duplication in the meanings of the gateways. When we get to the last gateway, we will demonstrate that."

[THIS MEANS THE ONE EMBRACES ALL AND ENTERS ALL.]

THIS MEANS THE ONE EMBRACES . . .

If you cite an eastern mirror as something that embraces, simultaneously it is identical with something that enters and with that which is embraced.<sup>17</sup> This refers to the characters "one enters" (yi ru)<sup>me</sup> which occur below. This enterer (neng ru)<sup>lv</sup> is the same as the other, which is embraced (suo she)<sup>lt</sup>. The embracer (neng she)<sup>mf</sup> is the same as the other, which is entered (suo ru)<sup>lw</sup>. "Other" (bi)<sup>mg</sup> means "all" (yi qie)<sup>mh</sup>. Thus the above explanation says activity is passivity, embracing is entering, one is many.

ALL;

If you cite nine mirrors as what is embraced (suo she)<sup>lt</sup>, simultaneously, they are identical with what is entered (suo ru)<sup>lw</sup> and the embracer (neng she)<sup>mf</sup>. This is identical with the characters "all" later cited. Each and every one of the members of the above cases can be exchanged for its opposite.

ONE ENTERS . . .

The above "one" which embraces, simultaneously is this enterer and is what is embraced.

ALL.

This is the same as the above member that is embraced. Simultaneously then it is identical with that which is entered and with the embracer. Therefore one can consider the two propositions as one. According to this statement, from the vantage point of the one looking to the many, one may only say "pervade" and "contain"; one may not say "embrace" and "enter". But now because these gateways by turns become the same as each other, they take each others places without obstruction.

#### ALL EMBRACES ONE.

This is precisely the same as the above "one enters all."

#### ALL ENTERS ONE.

This is precisely the same as the above "one embraces all." For the general import of the text, in every case go back to the above,<sup>18</sup> and interpret it on that basis.

#### ONE EMBRACES ONE AND ENTERS ONE.

Just as when the eastern mirror embraces the other western mirror, causing the latter to enter into the original eastern mirror. At that very moment, the original eastern mirror enters into the western mirror.

#### ALL EMBRACE ALL AND ENTER ALL.

Just as expressed in this proposition is the perfect, complete, and constant [nature of things] (yuan man chang)<sup>mi</sup>. But since words cannot immediately manifest this, there were provisionally the first three propositions. Those three statements however, all refer to ubiquity.

#### THEY INTERPENETRATE SIMULTANEOUSLY AND WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION.

This simultaneity is as was explained in full in the above commentary.

9) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS THE NON-OBSTRUCTION OF EACH BEING IN THE OTHER (xiang zai wu ai men)<sup>mj</sup>.

The "self" (wo)<sup>mk,19</sup> embraces all the remaining dharmas and is in the other (ta)<sup>jm</sup> dharmas. The others also embrace the remaining dharmas and are in the "self" dharma. This and that are in each other.

Therefore he speaks of each being in the other.

THIS MEANS THE ALL LOOK TO THE ONE.<sup>20</sup>

Taking the "all" at the beginning, this is the opposite of [gateway] #8.<sup>21</sup> So it is equally true that one looks to all. Now come the four propositions.

ALSO HERE THERE ARE ENTERING AND EMBRACING IN FOUR PROPOSITIONS.

These are not the same as the former propositions. The former merely had "this" and "that" embrace and unite at the same time. But now when [the self] is about to enter the other, [the self] must inevitably embrace the remaining dharmas. Taking these along, it enters the others. This gives rise to a continuous and inexhaustible force.<sup>22</sup>

ONE IS ENTERED AND EMBRACED (she yi ru yi)<sup>ml</sup>.

The first "one" is what is embraced; the second "one" is what is entered. Both are passive. Thus it is evident that the above must separately have the dharma that embraces as subject. It was feared in the original text that the propositions would be confusing and difficult to understand, so the author abbreviated them. The remaining three propositions are also thus. Furthermore, in this proposition he should have said, "One embraces one and enters one." Just as the eastern mirror embraces the southern mirror, and takes this along to enter the western mirror, right then the eastern mirror is that which



does the embracing and entering, the southern one is what is embraced, and the western one is what is entered. This is the same as the World-Honored One, Śākyamuni, embracing the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and entering into Samantabhadra. The simple act of citing all Buddhas as the agents is also alright.

ALL ARE EMBRACED AND ONE IS ENTERED (she yi qie ru yi)<sup>mn</sup>.

This is just as when the eastern mirror embraces the remaining eight mirrors, and takes them along to enter the western mirror. Right then the eastern mirror is what embraces and enters, the eight mirrors are what is embraced, and the western mirror is what is entered. Thus one Buddha embraces all Buddhas and all beings, and takes them all along to enter one being. In every case, if one treats the nine mirrors and all Buddhas as the agents, that is also alright.

ONE IS EMBRACED AND ALL ARE ENTERED.

Just as the eastern mirror embraces the southern mirror to enter the eight mirrors, or those nine mirrors all embrace the eastern mirror which is going to enter the nine mirrors.

ALL ARE EMBRACED AND ENTERED.

In this is the explanation proper of the mutual embracing and entering of all dharmas with and into each other: simultaneous and perfect totality continuing on and on inexhaustibly (yi shi yuan man chong chong wu jin)<sup>mn</sup>. The first three propositions tend provisionally toward citing one<sup>23</sup> [as the agent or subject of the propositions], and caused one by degrees to come to see the sense and its practical implications.<sup>24</sup> He argues that all dharmas' interpenetration and presence within each other is due to simultaneity. But now when

one sees mirrors and lamps before one's very eyes, which only enter one lamp in the midst of them, right then simultaneously in each and every mirror are all the various and many lamps.<sup>25</sup> It is not a matter of earlier and later. With regard to all Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and beings of the six destinies, if they don't exist, that's the end of it (bu you ji yi)<sup>mo</sup>; if they do exist, then in one instant (yi cha-na, kṣapa)<sup>mp</sup> they penetrate past, present, and future, the ten directions, and all people, both commoners and saints.<sup>26</sup>

THEY INTERPENETRATE SIMULTANEOUSLY AND WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION.

The first three propositions are all contained in the fourth and so it is called "simultaneous" (tong shi)<sup>mq</sup>.

10) THE GATEWAY THAT SHOWS UNIVERSAL BLENDING WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION (pu rong wu ai men)<sup>mr</sup>. THIS MEANS THAT THE ONE AND THE ALL UNIVERSALLY SHARE THE SAME TIME AND MUTUALLY LOOK TO EACH OTHER.<sup>27</sup> With regard to propositions #8 and #9, each had what the other lacked.

EACH AND EVERY THING IS IN FULL POSSESSION OF BOTH AFOREMENTIONED HEADINGS [I.E., THE MUTUALLY FULFILLING GATEWAYS #8 AND #9] IN FOUR PROPOSITIONS, WHICH UNIVERSALLY BLEND WITHOUT OBSTRUCTION. The universal blending of eight and nine causes each at one time to be immediately self-sufficient (ju)<sup>ms</sup>. Therefore he says each and every one is in full possession of both aforementioned headings in four propositions. This being the case, he also generally blends the first nine [gateways] because each of them proceeds from the others. He doesn't get away from [the relationship of] one and all because they mutually look to each other. These first nine also are not suddenly manifested. Therefore this embracing [i.e., one embracing

all] causes them to share in one instant, since the general and the particular share the same time, continuing on inexhaustibly.

WEIGH THIS [GATEWAY] IN TERMS OF THE FORMER [GATEWAYS].  
CONTEMPLATE THIS.

As a first step, one is to contemplate this gateway by weighing it in terms of gateways eight and nine. According to the eighth gateway, the first proposition says, "One embraces all and one enters all." When tentatively one understands this as the self-same "one" (wo zhi zi yi)<sup>mt</sup> embracing the other "all" (ta yi qie)<sup>mu</sup>, this "one" again is the single-self (dan ji)<sup>mv</sup> which enters the other "all". He had not yet said that it was taking along the "all" which are embraced, to go on and enter the other "all".

When the ninth gateway says the self (wo)<sup>mk</sup> "embraces one and enters one," etc., he merely makes clear what is embraced and what is entered. He doesn't explain that one and all mutually look to each other. All are embracers and enterers. Now when we combine these two gateways, and have one looking to the many, then it is the same as the many looking to the one. Simultaneously, each and every one is both active (neng)<sup>mw,28</sup> and passive (suo)<sup>mx,29</sup>. Thus are completed the two headings in four propositions.

First, if we take one dharma and regard it as the embracer and enterer, by matching this [one dharma] one by one with the four propositions, we get what is embraced and what is entered: 1) One dharma embraces one and enters one. This is the third proposition of the eighth gateway. It is a perfect match with the first proposition of the ninth gateway. 2) One dharma embraces all and enters one.

This is the first half of the first proposition of the eighth gateway, and the second half of the third proposition. It is a perfect match with the second proposition of the ninth gateway. 3) One dharma embraces one and enters all. This is the first half of the third proposition of gateway eight, and the second half of the first proposition. It is a perfect match with the third proposition of the ninth gateway. 4) One dharma embraces all and enters all. This is the entirety of the first proposition of the eighth gateway. It is a perfect match with the fourth proposition of the ninth gateway.

Next, taking all dharmas and regarding them as the embracer and enterer, by matching them one by one with the four propositions, we get what is embraced and entered: 1) All dharmas embrace one and enter one. This is the entire second proposition of the eighth gateway and is a perfect match with the first proposition of the ninth gateway. 2) All dharmas embrace all and enter one. This is the first half of the last proposition of the eighth gateway and the second half of the second proposition. It is a perfect match with the second proposition of the ninth gateway. 3) All dharmas embrace one and enter all. This is the first half of the second proposition of the eighth gateway, and the second half of the last proposition. It is a perfect match with the third proposition of the ninth gateway. 4) All dharmas embrace all and enter all. This is the last proposition of the eighth gateway, and is a perfect match with the last proposition of the ninth gateway.

The two gateways belong to one class and intertwine like this, continuing on inexhaustibly. The gateway of this mutual blending of

primary (zhu)<sup>my</sup> and secondary (ban)<sup>mz</sup> is opened wide. If you take these ten gateways, and everywhere match them to the meaning of all dharmas, then and only then will you perfect [your understanding of] the ten profound meanings. But then all you need do is take up these ten [gateways] and match them with the ten profundities, and the wording and the sense of the text will be distinct.<sup>30</sup>

YOU SHOULD CAUSE THE PERFECTLY LUMINOUS (yuan ming)<sup>na</sup> TO BE MANIFEST, AND MATCH IT WITH THE REALM OF PRACTICE (xing jing jie)<sup>hb</sup> WITHOUT HINDRANCE OR OBSTRUCTION. DEEPLY CONTEMPLATE THIS AND MAKE IT APPEAR BEFORE YOU.

THE END  
of the  
COMMENTARY TO THE HUA-YAN DHARMA-REALM MEDITATION

## FOOTNOTES

## CHAPTER 3

<sup>1</sup>That is, if solely considered from the point of view of noumenon, the multitude of phenomena would lose their diversity and individuality.

<sup>2</sup>Used for de<sup>kg</sup>. The potentialities are of course the myriad phenomena.

<sup>3</sup>It is difficult to see why this discussion of noumenon is placed here.

<sup>4</sup>The text is problematic and my translation is tentative. The problem seems to be one of a misreading of Du-shun's text in one version.

<sup>5</sup>That is, each fundamentally undergoes no change.

<sup>6</sup>A "private Buddha", meaning both one who is self-enlightened, and one who does not teach others.

<sup>7</sup>A Hīnayāna monk.

<sup>8</sup>This last sentence is far from clear, but seems to emphasize the turn the argument has taken -- here we learn what one phenomenon can do, instead of phenomena in general.

<sup>9</sup>I.e., one pervades all.

<sup>10</sup>I.e., one includes all.

<sup>11</sup>I have struggled to translate this term above. Here the sense is that one is one only in contrast to all. If there were no "all"

there could be no "one". It is with this idea in mind that Hua-yan teaches that "all" includes or contains "one". The members can be simply reversed.

<sup>12</sup>As the preceding footnote showed, "all" contains "one" can easily be transformed to "one" contains "all". (In the sense that "all" only is "all" by contrast to "one", etc.) These statements can be exchanged with their alternates: "all" pervades "one" and "one" pervades "all". If these antithetical statements are both true, then it is a short step to the equation of the antithetical modes.

<sup>13</sup>This illustration was used before Zong-mi by Fa-zang. Fa-zang, however, had a Buddha lit by a lamp in the center of the ten mirrors. See Kenneth Ch'en, p. 317.

<sup>14</sup>I.e., there are infinite reflections.

<sup>15</sup>The term "pervasion" (bian)<sup>gt</sup> implied to Du-shun and Zong-mi the pervasion of many, hence was inappropriate in the case of one.

<sup>16</sup>It is similar for "contain" (rong)<sup>lr</sup> as for pervasion.

<sup>17</sup>The latter two are the same even in terms of worldly language and logic.

<sup>18</sup>I.e., Zong-mi's commentary.

<sup>19</sup>This "self" (wo)<sup>mk</sup> is not to be taken in the Buddhist sense of the fetter of the ego, but in the general sense of self as opposed to other.

<sup>20</sup>I.e., the following propositions proceed from that point of view.

<sup>21</sup>Which had one looking to all.

<sup>22</sup>I.e., this situation applies to every single dharma.

<sup>23</sup>As opposed to all.

<sup>24</sup>This section is quite problematic and seems to contain some corruption. The translation is conjectural.

<sup>25</sup>Although Zong-mi only spoke of one lamp at the beginning of this illustration, he now shows there are an infinity of lamps as reflected in all the mirrors.

<sup>26</sup>In other words, every phenomenon in the universe penetrates all of space and time at any given instant.

<sup>27</sup>That is, they exist as they are only because they are inter-related. Du-shun is describing an absolutely relative universe.

<sup>28</sup>Or agent.

<sup>29</sup>Or object.

<sup>30</sup>That is, one must relate this teaching to worldly experience, and must not just contemplate on an abstract level.



## CHINESE CHARACTERS

All Chinese terms are transliterated within the text and written in character form here, with the exception of long titles, quotations, and some footnoted material.

a. 注華嚴法界觀門

b. 重習

c. 止觀

d. 大方廣佛華嚴

e. 大方廣

f. 大

g. 骨豐

h. 方廣

i. 相

j. 用

k. 佛

l. 果

m. 華

n. 行

o. 嚴

p. 主

q. 經

r. 法界

s. 澄觀

t. 清涼

u. 大方廣佛華嚴經正疏

v. 大方廣佛華嚴經隨正疏  
演義金鈔

w. 大華嚴經略策

x. 事

y. 分

z. 理

aa. 性

ab. 事法

ac. 理事無礙

ad. 事事無礙

ae. 分齊

af. 觀

ag. 小青

ah. 則

ai. 門

aj. 豎窮

ak. 道

al. 展轉

am. 京終南山果杜順集

an. 杜

ao. 法順

ap. 文殊

aq. 智嚴

ar. 法藏

- as. 創制  
 at. 作  
 au. 集者  
 av. 體用  
 aw. 真空  
 ax. 實體  
 ay. 真  
 az. 色相  
 ba. 空  
 bb. 周遍含容  
 bc. 色  
 bd. 容色無礙  
 be. 混糸色  
 bf. 無寄  
 bg. 斷空  
 bh. 實色  
 bi. 妄小青  
 bj. 計  
 bk. 自體  
 bl. 會色歸空  
 bm. 寶性論  
 bn. 善意菩薩計三種空  
 bo. 虛害谷  
 bp. 斷滅  
 bq. 真實心  
 br. 言謂色明空  
 bs. 中論  
 bt. 先有而今無  
 bu. 太虛  
 bv. 肇論  
 bw. 身  
 bx. 無  
 by. 虛  
 bz. 楞伽  
 ca. 若阿梨耶識滅者此不異外道  
     隨見戲論  
 cb. 真如一心  
 cc. 阿梨耶識  
 cd. 根  
 ce. 器  
 cf. 無其體  
 cg. 真心之空  
 ch. 歸  
 ci. 斷  
 cj. 色性空  
 ck. 初心菩薩  
 cl. 無體  
 cm. 質礙  
 cn. 無邊際  
 co. 無土壤  
 cp. 人  
 cq. 虛空  
 cr. 無雜

cs. 通	ds. 明
ct. 無罣	dt. 如來
cu. 寸	du. 成
cv. 尺	dv. 所依
cw. 無物	dw. 非能依
cx. 有物	dx. 無色
cy. 質	dy. 無我
cz. 礙	dz. 真如
da. 豈有此理耶	ea. 空理
db. 其無體之空	eb. 不隱
dc. 空非有	ec. 幻色
dd. 佛頂	ed. 不如無
de. 中	ee. 一味法
df. 法	ef. 泯絕無寄
dg. 依他無性	eg. 不可
dh. 圓成	eh. 妄色
di. 遍計	ei. 一切法不可
dj. 法相	ej. 不可亦不可
dk. 大般若(波羅蜜多)經	ek. 受即是念
dl. 名叢	el. 言語道斷
dm. 六道	em. 心行處
dn. 六趣	en. 行境
do. 蘊	eo. 行之境
dp. 領納	ep. 冥心
dq. 神	eq. 非解境
dr. 光	er. 真行

es. 正念  
 et. 真空理性  
 eu. 本自如然  
 ev. 情忘  
 ew. 本真  
 ex. 解數  
 ey. 無念而知  
 ez. 無念  
 fa. 無增減謗  
 fb. 無損減謗  
 fc. 無戲論謗  
 fd. 無相違謗  
 fe. 空觀  
 ff. 真諦  
 fg. 假觀  
 fh. 俗諦  
 fi. 中道觀  
 fj. 第一義諦  
 fk. 有無  
 fl. 世諦  
 fm. 中道第一義諦  
 fn. 假  
 fo. 俗  
 fp. 絕解  
 fq. 真解  
 fr. 正行

fs. 理事無礙觀  
 ft. 真如之理  
 fu. 妙用  
 fv. 所依本  
 fw. 金容  
 fx. 融  
 fy. 互融  
 fz. 無礙  
 ga. 中道第一義  
 gb. 悲  
 gc. 無住  
 gd. 大乘同教之極致  
 ge. 別教一乘  
 gf. 圓教  
 gg. 理遍於事門  
 gh. 能遍之理  
 gi. 性空真理  
 gj. 一相無相  
 gk. 所遍之事  
 gl. 心、境  
 gm. 相貌  
 gn. 法性  
 go. 全遍  
 gp. 不可分  
 gq. 真理  
 gr. 事遍於理門

gs. 全同  
 gt. 遍  
 gu. 見  
 gv. 識  
 gw. 不可以智知  
 gx. 離  
 gy. 三界  
 gz. 有無一切法  
 ha. 位  
 hb. 舉體  
 hc. 理性  
 hd. 矛盾  
 he. 予  
 hf. 盾  
 hg. 韓非子  
 hh. 相望  
 hi. 攬  
 hj. 本位  
 hk. 望  
 hl. 以非一即非異故  
 hm. 分限  
 hn. 無邊真性  
 ho. 無障無礙  
 hp. 所無  
 hq. 有  
 hr. 不如理

hs. 土震  
 ht. 居然  
 hu. 依理成事門  
 hv. 別  
 hw. 以諸緣起  
 hx. 自性  
 hy. 無性理  
 hz. 隨緣  
 ia. 如來藏  
 ib. 問明  
 ic. 無生  
 id. 事能顯理門  
 ie. 智  
 if. 本性  
 ig. 無明  
 ih. 真覺  
 ii. 攬  
 ij. 實  
 ik. 中道理  
 il. 須彌  
 im. 盧舍那  
 in. 以理奪事門  
 io. 出現  
 ip. 化  
 iq. 事能隱理門  
 ir. 違

is. 法身	js. 一
it. 真理即事門	jt. 異
iu. 事法即理門	ju. 逆
iv. 無自性	jv. 順
iw. 如	jw. 自在
ix. 滅	jx. 頓
iy. 淨如	jy. 本有
iz. 寂滅	jz. 相遍
ja. 無復更滅	ka. 周遍含容觀
jb. 真理非事門	kb. 事事無礙
jc. 真妄	kc. 融通
jd. 實非虛	kd. 遍容
je. 所依非能依	ke. 攝
jf. 事法非理門	kf. 萬德
ig. 相性	kg. 得
jh. 宛然	kh. 溥遍含容
ji. 解	ki. 交參
jj. 言帝	kj. 涉
jk. 緣起	kk. 互為能所
jl. 己	kl. 法義
jm. 他	km. 體用
jn. 文少有	kn. 周遍
jo. 即	ko. 含容
jp. 離	kp. 理如事門
jq. 顯	kq. 差別
jr. 隱	kr. 泯

- ks. 真實  
 kt. 事如理門  
 ku. 通遍  
 kv. 常住本然  
 kw. 能遍  
 kx. 能含  
 ky. 圓遍  
 kz. 事含理事門  
 la. 存本  
 lb. 廣容  
 lc. 有體為能含  
 ld. 有用方能含也  
 le. 能含  
 lf. 所含  
 lg. 能遍  
 lh. 所遍  
 li. 通局無礙門  
 lj. 廣陬無礙門  
 lk. 一塵之事  
 ll. 遍容無礙門  
 lm. 合  
 ln. 兼  
 lo. 住  
 lp. 互入  
 lq. 攝入無礙門  
 lr. 容  
 ls. 交互  
 lt. 所攝  
 lu. 攝之  
 lv. 能入  
 lw. 所入  
 lx. 交涉無礙門  
 ly. 能所  
 lz. 交涉  
 ma. 交相  
 mb. 網涉  
 mc. 迴互  
 md. 溥融  
 me. 一入  
 mf. 能攝  
 mg. 彼  
 mh. 一切  
 mi. 圓滿常  
 mj. 相在無礙門  
 mk. 我  
 ml. 攝一入一  
 mn. 攝一切入一  
 mo. 一時圓滿重重無盡  
 mp. 不有即已, i.e. 已  
 mq. 一刹那  
 mr. 同時  
 ms. 溥融無礙門

ms. 具

mt. 我之自一

mu. 他一切

mv. 單己

mw. 能

mx. 所

my. 主

mz. 伴

na. 圓明

nb. 行境界



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. REFERENCE WORKS

DING FU-BAO 丁福保, ed. Fo xue da ci dian 佛學大辭典  
Shanghai: Yi xue shu ju, 1921, 1926. Reprinted in Taipei, 1946.

HARVARD-YENCHING INSTITUTE. Sinological Index Series, Index No. 11, Vol. 1-3, "Combined Indexes to the Authors and Titles of Books and Chapters in Four Collections of Buddhistic Literature." Republic of China: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1966. Taiwan Authorized Reprint, printed by: Ch'eng-Wen Publishing Company, P.O. Box 22605, Taipei, Taiwan, The Republic of China. Distributed by: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, Inc., P.O. Box 22048, Taipei, Taiwan, The Republic of China.

MATHEWS, R. H. Mathews' Chinese - English Dictionary. Shanghai: China Inland Mission and Presbyterian Mission Press, 1931. Revised American Edition - Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

NELSON, ANDREW NATHANIEL. The Modern Reader's Japanese - English Character Dictionary, Revised Edition. Tokyo: Charles A. Tuttle, Co., 1962.

ONO GEMMYO 改訂再版, ed. Busscho kaisetsu daijiten 佛書解言  
大辭典. Tokyo: Da dong chu ban she, 1933-36. Reprinted in 13 Volumes, 1964.

SOOTHILL, WILLIAM EDWARD and LEWIS HODOUS. A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1937. Reprinted - Taipei: Ch'eng-Wen Publishing Co., 1970.

TAKAKUSU JUNJIRO and WATANABE KAIKYOKU, eds., Taishō shinshū daizōkyō.  
大正新修大藏經 Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1924-34.

\_\_\_\_\_. Taishō shinshū daizōkyō sakuin. 大正新修  
大藏經索引 Index to the Taishō Tripiṭaka. Research  
Association for the Terminology of the Taishō Tripiṭaka.  
Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. Hōbōgirin; Fascicule Annexe. Tables du Taishō  
Issaikyo, nouvelle édition du Canon bouddhique chinois.  
Tokyo: Maison franco-japonaise, 1931.

#### B. PRIMARY SOURCES

CHENG-GUAN. Hua-yan fa-jie xuan-jing. 華嚴法界玄鏡 Taishō  
shinshū daizōkyō, #1883.

Da sheng qi xin lun. 大乘起信論 Taishō shinshū daizōkyō,  
#1666.

Sung gao-seng-zhuan. 宋高僧傳 Taishō shinshū daizōkyō,  
Vol. 50, pp. 741-3.

WANG-CHANG. Jin-shi cui-bian. 金石萃編 (Selected Epigraphical  
Texts from Metal and Stone Inscriptions.) Shanghai: zui-liu-  
tang, 1893. 114/7d.

Xu gao-seng-zhuan. 續高僧傳 Taishō shinshū daizōkyō, Vol.  
50, pp. 653-4.

ZONG-MI. Zhu hua-yan fa-jie guan men. 注華嚴法界觀門 Taishō  
shinshū daizōkyō, #1884.

#### C. SECONDARY SOURCES

BALAZS, ETIENNE. Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy. Trans., H. M.  
Wright, ed. Arthur F. Wright. New Haven: Yale University Press,  
1964.

CHAN WING-TSIT. "Syntheses in Chinese Metaphysics," The Chinese Mind,  
ed. Charles A. Moore. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1967,  
pp. 132-147.

- CHANG, GARMA C. C. The Buddhist Teaching of Totality The Philosophy of Hwa Yen Buddhism. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.
- CH'EN, KENNETH. Buddhism in China. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- CONZE, EDWARD. The Prajñāpāramitā Literature. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1960.
- COOK, FRANCIS H. Fa-Tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines: An Annotated Translation. Ph.D.: University of Wisconsin, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meaning of Vairocana in Hua-yen Buddhism," Philosophy East and West, Vol. 22, No. 4, October, 1972, pp. 403-415.
- FUNG YU-LAN. A History of Chinese Philosophy, Vol. 2. Trans., Derk Bodde, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- GOMEZ, LUIS OSCAR. Selected Verses from the Gaṇḍavyūha: Text, Critical Apparatus and Translation. Ph.D.: Yale University, 1967.
- GUENTHER, HERBERT V. "Words Denoting 'Emptiness'," Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference. 16th session, 1951. University of Lucknow, 1955, pp. 251-261.
- HAKEDA, YOSHITO S., trans. The Awakening of Faith. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- HURVITZ, LEON. Chih-I An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk. Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, Vol. 12, publiés par L'Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises. Bruges (Belgique): Imprimerie Sainte-Catherine, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Chih Tun's Notions of Prajñā," Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 88, No. 2, June, 1968, pp. 243-260.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and ARTHUR LINK. "Three Prajñāpāramitā Prefaces of Tao-an," Mélanges Paul Demiéville, Vol. 2. Limoges (France): Imprimerie A. Bontemps, 1975.

- IIDA, SHOTARO. "New Light on the Empress Wu and Buddhism," unpublished paper, Department of Religious Studies, University of British Columbia.
- JAN YUN-HUA, 冉雲華. "Tsung-mi, his Analysis of Ch'an Buddhism," T'oung Pao, Vol. 58, 1972, pp. 1-54.
- LIEBENTHAL, WALTER. "New Light on the Mahāyāna-Śraddhotpāda Śāstra," T'oung Pao, Vol. 46, 1958, pp. 155-216.
- LINK, ARTHUR E. "The Taoist Antecedents of Tao-an's Prajñā Ontology," History of Religions, Vol. 9, Nos. 2 and 3, November, 1969/February, 1970, pp. 181-215.
- MASSON-COURSEL, PAUL. "Le Yuan Jen Louen," Journal Asiatique, Onzieme Série, Tome 5, 1915, pp. 299-354.
- OBERMILLER, E. "The Sublime Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation," Acta Orientalia, Vol. 9, 1931, pp. 81-306.
- REISCHAUER, EDWIN O., trans. Ennin's Diary The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ennin's Travels in T'ang China. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1955.
- ROBINSON, RICHARD. Early Mādhyamika in India and China. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- SUZUKI, DAISETSU TEITARO. Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. trans. The Lankavatara Sutra. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1932.
- TAKAKUSU, JUNJIRO. "Buddhism as a Philosophy of 'Thusness'," Philosophy East and West, ed. Charles A. Moore. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970.

- TAMAKI, KŌSHIRŌ. "The Development of the Thought of Tathāgatarbha from India to China," Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū, Vol. 9, No. 1, January, 1961, pp. 378-386.
- UEDA, YOSHIFUMI, "Two Main Streams of Thought in Yogācāra Philosophy," Philosophy East and West, Vol. 17, No. 1-4, January - October, 1967, pp. 155-165.
- UNNO TAITETSU, "Dimensions of Practice in Hua-yen Thought," Bukkyō Shisō Shi Ronshū (Yūki Commemorative Volume). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1964.
- WEINSTEIN, STANLEY. "Imperial Patronage in the Formation of T'ang Buddhism," Perspectives on the T'ang, Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett, eds. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973, pp. 265-306.
- WRIGHT, ARTHUR F. "T'ang T'ai-tsung and Buddhism," Perspectives on the T'ang, Arthur F. Wright and Denis Twitchett, eds. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973, pp. 239-263.
- YU, DAVID C. "Skill-in-means and the Buddhism of Tao-sheng: A Study of Chinese Reaction to Mahāyāna of the Fifth Century," Philosophy East and West, Vol. 24, No. 4, October, 1974, pp. 413-427.
- ZÜRCHER, E. The Buddhist Conquest of China. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959.