

Dharmadhātu

An Introduction to Hua-yen Buddhism

KANG-NAM OH

CHINESE BUDDHISM is not a mere extension of Indian Buddhist ideas, but represents reinterpretations and restatements of concepts which were evolved to meet the intellectual and spiritual needs of the times and the people.¹ Among the schools of Chinese Buddhism, the Hua-yen and T'ien-t'ai have been esteemed the most theoretical and systematic presentation of Buddhist ideas in distinctively Chinese modes of thought and expression.² The Hua-yen played an unquestionably significant role in the religious history of China, Korea, and Japan. In regard to the profound impact which Hua-yen philosophy had on Zen, D. T. Suzuki points out that "Zen is the practical consummation of Buddhist thought in China and the [Hua-yen] philosophy is its theoretical ultimatum. . . . The philosophy of Zen is [Hua-yen] and the teaching of [Hua-yen] bears its fruit in the

* The author wishes to express his gratitude to the Canada Council for the generous grant which made this research possible.

¹ For brief surveys of Chinese Buddhism, see Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China* (Princeton, 1964), pp. 297-364; or J. Takakuru, *The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy* (Honolulu, 1947), pp. 57-191. An extensive study of early Chinese Buddhist history is presented in E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China* (Leiden; rev. ed. 1972). Developments in the Sui-T'ang periods are dealt with in Yūki Reimon, "Zui-tō jidai ni okeru Chūgoku-teki Bukkyō seiritsu no jijo ni tsuite no kōsatsu," *Nihon Bukkyōgakkai nempō* xxx (1954), pp. 79-96.

² Wm. Theodore de Bary et al., ed., *Sources of Chinese Tradition* (New York, 1960), p. 369: "The two schools [T'ien-t'ai and Hua-yen] have been able to serve as the philosophical foundation of Chinese Buddhism in general." See also Wing-tsit Chan, *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, 1963), p. 406; and Yamakami Sogen, *Systems of Buddhist Thought* (Calcutta, 1912), p. 287.

DHARMADHĀTU

life of Zen."³ In the evaluation of Nakamura Hajime, Hua-yen philosophy is "the greatest adaptation of Mahāyāna Buddhism among the various philosophical systems organized by the Chinese."⁴ With a view to understanding what gives Hua-yen thought its particular character and depth, this paper will attempt to explore the basis of these statements through the Hua-yen notion of *dharmadhātu*.

I

Classical and modern scholars are virtually unanimous in regarding *dharmadhātu* as the basic tenet around which all other Hua-yen teachings revolve.⁵ Etymologically, *dharmadhātu* is a Sanskrit compound of *dharma* and *dhātu*, two terms which are notorious in having extremely broad and diverse meanings.⁶ While none of the following conveys the varied connotations of the original, *dharmadhātu* may be rendered as "the realm of all elements," "dharma-element," "the reality (or essence) of dharmas," "the noumenal ground of phenomena," "the essence of reality," "ultimate reality," "supreme reality," or even "the element of elements."⁷

A number of passages from the Pāli Nikāyas indicate that the clear discernment of *dharmadhātu* is the primary source of extraordinary knowledge.⁸ In the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the Buddha relates his knowledge about a

³ His introduction to B. L. Suzuki's *Mahayana Buddhism* (London, 1959), p. xxxiv. See also his *Essays in Zen Buddhism*, volume 3 (London, 1939), p. 68 f.

⁴ H. Nakamura, *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples* (Honolulu, 1964), p. 245. Also K. Kawada and H. Nakamura, eds., *Kegon Shisō* (Kyoto, 1960).

⁵ Fa-tsang's *T'an-hsüan-chi* 禪玄記, T35.120a, 522a *et passim*. As to opinions of modern scholars, see for example, Takakusu, p. 113; Ch'en, p. 316; de Bary, p. 369; and Chan, p. 407.

⁶ *Dharma* has various meanings such as "element," "constituent," and "existence"; *dhātu* is often referred to as "realm," "element," or "constituent" in the context of Buddhist ontological discourse.

⁷ For other renderings of *dharmadhātu*, see Takakusu, p. 39 *et passim*; E. Conze, *Buddhist Thought in India* (Ann Arbor, 1967), p. 95; T. R. V. Murti, *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism* (London, 1960), p. 345; Soothill and Hodous, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms*, p. 271; Th. Stcherbatsky, *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāna* (The Hague, 1965), p. 33.

⁸ In the *Samyutta Nikāya*, Śāriputra is praised for having well penetrated the *dharmadhātu* and for having correctly answered some questions (for translation, see Rhys Davids and Woodward, trans., *The Book of Kindred Sayings*, part II, Pali Text Society, 1922). See also

number of the Buddhas of the past. Hearing this the bhikkhus ask themselves:

How wonderful a thing, brethren, and how strange is the great genius, the master mind of the Tathāgata, that he should remember the Buddhas of old. . . . Now, what think you, brother? Has this principle of truth [*dharmadhātu*] been clearly discerned by the Tathāgata so that by his discernment of it he remembers all those facts about the Buddhas of the past? Or have gods revealed this matter to the Tathāgata, so that thereby he remembers?⁹

The Buddha, hearing this conversation, answers that it is through his clear discernment of the *dharmadhātu* that he is able to remember all of these things about the Buddhas, while gods have also revealed these matters to him.¹⁰ *Dharmadhātu*, here translated as "principle of truth," has also been rendered as "the causal nature of things" and "the constitution of [dharma]."¹¹

In contrast to such a general, diffuse meaning of the term, a different but subsequently more common understanding of *dharmadhātu* is that found in the *Samyutta Nikāya*, in which it is listed among the eighteen *dhātus*, one of the three most common classifications of dharmas in early Buddhism.¹² As the seventeenth *dhātu*, *dharmadhātu* is regarded as the object of the mind (*manas*), in the same way as color is the object of the eye or sound is the object of the ear.¹³ This notion of *dharmadhātu* is evident in the

Majjhima Nikāya, vol. 1 (PTS, 1888), p. 395 f (translated by I. B. Horner in *The Middle Length Sayings*, vol. II, p. 63 f).

⁹ Rhys Davids and Carpenter, eds., *Dīgha Nikāya*, vol. II (PTS, 1947 reprint), p. 8. For translation see Rhys Davids and Rhys Davids, trans., *Dialogues of the Buddha*, part II (PTS, 1910) p. 6 f.

¹⁰ *Dīgha Nikāya*, p. 10.

¹¹ Rhys Davids and Rhys Davids, C. A. F. Rhys Davids, and I. B. Horner, respectively.

¹² See *Samyutta Nikāya*, part II (PTS, 1898), p. 140 f. The other two classifications of dharmas are the five skandhas and the twelve āyatanas.

¹³ It is difficult if not impossible to know what exactly is meant by *manas* or "mind-object" here. What at least is fairly certain is that it does not here carry such a solemn cosmic meaning as is found in later Mahāyāna philosophy.

DHARMADHĀTU

Pāli Abhidhamma works,¹⁴ but it is especially predominant in the Abhidharma thought of the Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda traditions.¹⁵

In Mahāyāna Buddhist literature, *dharmadhātu* obtains a greater significance. As a result, it appears more frequently and, one might add, with more meaning. In the Prajñāpāramitā literature, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* is possibly the oldest and most basic of Prajñāpāramitā texts. Herein *dharmadhātu* appears as the "Absolute Dharma or simply the Absolute."¹⁶ In one passage the Buddha proclaims:

And as emptiness [*śūnyatā*] does not crumble, nor crumble away, so also the Signless, the Wishless, the Uneffected, the Unproduced, Non-existence, and the Realm of Dharma [*dharmadhātu*].¹⁷

In this and other passages, we may note that *dharmadhātu* is being exclusively expressed in negative terms such as emptiness, non-existence, or nirvana, without any indication of its being imbued with positive, dynamic qualities. *Dharmadhātu* is thus in several instances associated with the wholly negative notion of "space" (*ākāśa*), such negative characterization being typical of Prajñāpāramitā expressions for the Absolute.¹⁸

In its unsystematized, germinal form, Prajñāpāramitā thought was to find its fullest expression in the Mādhyamika philosophy which coalesced around the beginning of the Christian era. In Mādhyamika philosophy, however, there is little to indicate that *dharmadhātu* was ascribed any special significance. It may be conjectured that such terms as *dhātu* or *dharmadhātu* lend themselves too readily to the misleading impression that true reality is some sort of quasi-substantial entity. True reality (*tattva*) as defined by

¹⁴ See *Dhammasaṅgani* (PTS, 1885), *Vibhaṅga* (PTS, 1904) and, *Dhātukathā*; for English translations, there are Rhys Davids, *A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics* (PTS, 1900) for the former, and Narada, *Discourse on Elements* (PTS, 1962) for the latter. A general survey of Pāli Abhidhamma works is given in Nyanatiloka Mahathera, *Guide through the Abhidhamma-pitaka* (Kandy, 1971).

¹⁵ Studies of the *Abhidharmakośa*, a work of the realistic school of the Sarvāstivādin are found in Th. Stcherbatsky, *The Central Concept of Buddhism and the Meaning of the Word "Dharma"* (London, 1961); and Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu: Traduction et Annotation, Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, vol. xvi, tomes I-VI (1971).

¹⁶ E. Conze, *The Perfect Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines and its Verse Summary* (Bollingen, 1973), p. 314.

¹⁷ *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* XII. 256; for an English translation, see Conze, p. 173.

¹⁸ See, for example, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* VIII. 197; XII. 273, 283. See Conze, 146, 177.

Nāgārjuna, the systematizer of Mādhyamika philosophy, is “not caused by something else, peaceful, quiescent, unelaborated by discursive thought, indeterminate, undifferentiated, non-plural.”¹⁹ In such a system, true reality transcends all thought and predication; it cannot be conceived of in empirical terms. Any concept of ultimate reality as such would necessarily be the products of a pseudo-reality, convention (*samvṛti*) or concession (*vyāvahārika*), and hence false. Thus to designate ultimate reality (*paramārtha*), Mādhyamika philosophy finds more favorable the adopting of rather abstract terms, such as emptiness (*śūnyatā*), reality (*dharmatā*) or suchness (*tathatā*), rather than *dharmadhātu*, although in final analysis they are considered synonymous.²⁰

It is only in later Mahāyāna works composed or compiled after the heyday of orthodox Mādhyamika that positive expressions for ultimate reality are reintroduced—this time, however, carrying different, deeper meanings and emphases. Although the basic concept of ultimate reality as emptiness is accepted by later Buddhists, the orthodox Mādhyamika methodology of rejecting without qualification all phenomena precipitated a reaction to, or rather a modification of, the seemingly negativistic position of the teaching of emptiness (*śūnyavāda*). An example of this “reaction” is Yogācāra idealism, which contends that while phenomena should be rejected as unreal (*śunya*), they must still be considered as being rooted in some reality. Thus while everything is illusory, the illusion must still have a ground upon which the illusory projection can take place. Moreover, the imaginer of the unreal must also be understood to exist,²¹ and according to the Yogācāra, this ground or imaginer is consciousness (*viñāna*), which is truly real and which truly exists. *Dharmadhātu* in the Yogācāra system is basically understood to be one of the designations for the Absolute, along with *tathatā*, *ālayaviñāna*, and so on,²² with which it is identified. Another

¹⁹ *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* xviii. 9. See Frederick J. Streng, *Emptiness: A Study in Religious Meaning* (Nashville, 1967) and Kenneth K. Inada, *Nāgārjuna: A Translation of His Mūlamadhyamakakārikā with an Introductory Essay* (Tokyo, 1970), for translations.

²⁰ For the meanings of these terms and their relations, see H. Nakamura's article (in Japanese) in *Kezon Shisō*, pp. 95–127. For the original Sanskrit, see T. R. V. Murti, p. 246.

²¹ See Asaṅga's *Madhyāntavibhāga* quoted in A. K. Warder, *Indian Buddhism* (Varanasi, 1970), p. 440.

²² See *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭkā*, quoted in Conze, *Buddhist Texts through the Ages* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 170–172; Warder, p. 434. See also *Trīṃśikā*, ed. S. Levi (Paris, 1925), p. 41; and Hsüan-tsang's *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* 成唯識論 (T31. 48ab).

DHARMADHĀTU

form of expression in reaction to the Mādhyamika is the Tathāgatagarbha system as represented by the *Ratnagotravibhāga* which regards "the Essence [*dhātu*] that exists since beginningless time [as] the foundation of all elements."²³ Herein *dharmadhātu* is spoken of as being identical with the matrix of Tathāgata (*tathāgatagarbha*), the innermost element possessed by every living being to be actualized in Buddhahood or enlightenment.²⁴

In the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, a collection of various Mahāyāna teachings, the salient features of both the Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha systems are maintained. Here the doctrine of mind (*citta*) or mind-only (*cittamātratā*) is so cardinal that it appears as "warp and weft of the sutra."²⁵ In this work mind is presented as something that constitutes the basis of the world, as something left behind when all forms of discrimination are eliminated that goes beyond this world of particularization. It is something primordial from which emerges the myriad things of the external world. When we cut off such mental activities as particularization, categorization, and discrimination, which have been the cause of our spiritual bondage and defilement, providing we penetrate to the very essence of these things, reality appears in its pristine purity. Mind (*citta*) is this reality, which is taken hold of by a "sheer act of intuition . . . made possible by the working of non-discriminative wisdom (*avikalpa-jñāna*) or supreme wisdom (*ārya-jñāna*) or superior knowledge (*prajñā*) in the innermost recesses of consciousness (*pratyātma-gocara*)."²⁶ Spoken of as identical to *ālayavijñāna*²⁷ and *tathāgatagarbha*,²⁸ mind (*citta*) as presented in the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* has also been regarded as synonymous with *dharmadhātu*.²⁹ Here it is especially noteworthy that *dharmadhātu* now is invested with positive significance.

²³ Jikido Takasaki, *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra), Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, Serie Orientale Roma XXIII (IEMEO, 1966), p. 291. In many places the *dharmadhātu* or *tathāgatadhātu* is called just *dhātu*. See pp. 143, 187, 269, etc. The *Ratnagotravibhāga* is regarded as representative of this category of literature since other works such as the *Tathāgatha-garbha-sūtra*, *Śrīmālā-devīsīmaṅgalā-sūtra*, and the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* are all quoted in it and thus it reflects their basic ideas.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

²⁵ D. T. Suzuki, *Studies in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* (London, 1930), p. 244.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

²⁷ D. T. Suzuki, trans., *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* (London, 1932), p. 278 f.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 222, 223, 235, 278 et passim.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 154. See also Warder, p. 435.

II

In the above brief survey of Indian Buddhist literature, the notion of *dharmadhātu* is not without its developments to be sure, but it is not until it is taken up by the Chinese Hua-yen school that *dharmadhātu* is systematized and developed on such a major scale. The *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*³⁰ is the main source of inspiration for the Hua-yen's systematic exposition of *dharmadhātu*. Although the term *dharmadhātu* frequently appears in this sutra,³¹ there is no place in the sutra itself where the idea of *dharmadhātu* is separately or systematically dealt with or philosophically defined. Actually, we cannot expect to find any clearcut philosophical formulations in such a literary and poetic work.³² Here the primary meaning of *dharmadhātu* is almost always set forth in the context of the bodhisattva's career as the goal of spiritual attainment. It is given as something to be realized or to be "entered into."

Sudhana, the hero of the last chapter of the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* (also referred to as the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*), after his long journey of searching for the truth, finally comes to experience indescribable bliss which pervades his body and mind. He realizes that "in each particle of dust throughout the universe there is the *dharmadhātu*."³³ He now sees the universe not as ordinary people whose minds are covered with defilements see it, but as true bodhisattvas see it. He has thus truly "entered into" the *dharmadhātu*; he sees it as it really is, namely, as a universe of perfect harmony in which all things interpenetrate one another.

This basic account of the religious, mystical experience of *dharmadhātu* in the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* caused the rise of an independent school in China

³⁰ The *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* has three Chinese translations under the name of *Ta-fang-kuang-fo-hua-yen-ching*: 1) in sixty fascicles, translated by Buddhahadra in 418-420 (T9, no. 278); 2) in eighty fascicles, translated by Śikṣānanda in 695-699 (T10, no. 279); in forty fascicles, translated by Prajñā in 795-798 (T10, no. 293). The latter is basically equivalent to the last chapter of the previous versions, i.e., the *Chapter on Entering into the Dharmadhātu* (入法界品). This chapter is available in Sanskrit as an independent sutra called the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*, one edited by D. T. Suzuki and H. Idzumi (Kyoto, 1934-36), and the other edited by P. L. Vaidya, *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts* No. 5 (Darbhanga, 1960).

³¹ See *Index to the Taishō Tripitaka*, volume 5, Kegon-bu, pp. 292c-294c.

³² Warder, p. 429 f.

³³ T10. 840a.

DHARMADHĀTU

which derives its credo name "Hua-yen" from the Chinese translation of the Sanskrit word *Avatamsaka*. It was this school that brought the *dharmadhātu* doctrine into full, systematic development. The doctrine of *dharmadhātu* was set forth by the nominal founder of the school, Tu-shun 杜順 (557–640); formulated by its second patriarch, Chih-yen 智儼 (602–668); systematized by its third patriarch and actual founder, Fa-tsang 法藏 (643–712); and elucidated by Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀 (ca. 737–838) and Tsung-mi 宗密 (780–841), the fourth and fifth patriarchs, respectively.

The foundation of the *dharmadhātu* doctrine was firmly and decisively laid in a short treatise called *The Gate of Insight into the Dharmadhātu*³⁴ which has been ascribed to Tu-shun. This little meditation manual has been the source of inspiration for all later development of this doctrine. There is some controversy concerning its authorship,³⁵ but there is no room for doubt that this work—as rightly pointed out by Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321), the eminent Japanese Kegon (Hua-yen) scholar—has been the fundamental text upon which all subsequent Hua-yen philosophy is based.³⁶ As its full title—*The Gate of Insight into the Dharmadhātu of the Avatamsaka*—indicates, this text is based upon the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*. Since the contents of this sutra are so discursive and diffused, it is virtually impossible to grasp what the message is it is trying to convey. *The Gate of Insight* was in fact an attempt to apprehend the gist of that voluminous sutra. In this sense it was an overarching gate 門 (*men*) to the very essence of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*. Significant in this context is the fact that *The Gate of Insight* never touches upon the question of what the *dharmadhātu* is *per se*. Instead of indulging in scholastic exposition of the *dharmadhātu*, it seeks to lead people to an "insight" into the *dharmadhātu* itself. This is a position clearly indicated in its title in which *dharmadhātu* is the object of

³⁴ *Fa-chieh-kuan-men* 法界觀門 (full title, *Hua-yen Fa-chieh-kuan-men* 華嚴法界觀門). This text is not found separately in the Taishō, but is contained in the commentaries of Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi (T45. 672a–684b; 684b–692b). It also constitutes a part of Fa-tsang's *Hua-yen Fa-p'u-ti-hsin-chang* 華嚴發菩提心章 (T45. 652a–654a).

³⁵ For the discussion on the controversial question of the authorship, see K. Kimura's article (in Japanese) in *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 41–195 (1968), pp. 47–74. Also Yūki Reimon, "Kegon no Shōso Tojun to Hokkai kanmon no chōsha to no mondai," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* xviii, 2 (1969), pp. 32–38, and references therein.

³⁶ *Hokkai gikyō* 法界鏡鏡, Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho, Kegon shōbushū, p. 300b. See also *Kamakura Kyū-Bukkyō*, Nihon shisō taikai 15 (Tokyo, 1971), p. 424, with Japanese translation by Kamata Shigeo, p. 292.

insight 觀 (*kuan*; skt., *vipaśyanā*), that is to say, spiritual insight, an undistorted intuitive "seeing" or contemplative observation.³⁷

The Gate of Insight recommends "threefold insight" which, according to the text, is: (1) insight into true emptiness; (2) insight into the non-obstruction of *li* 理 (noumenon) and *shih* 事 (phenomena); and (3) insight into the all-pervading and all-embracing nature of the myriad things.³⁸ Each of these sections further enumerates ten items,³⁹ thus forming thirty items for meditation. This means that although there is but one single absolute *dharmadhātu*,⁴⁰ it can be observed from different angles so that its various strata or dimensions can be discerned. The *dharmadhātu*, in other words, is seen in thirty different ways. Here, as every item cannot be gone into, it will suffice to see the message of each section.

The first section deals with the insight into the two aspects of *dharmadhātu*, form (*rūpa*) and emptiness (*śūnyatā*), and their interrelationship. This is a schematized representation of the truth of *śūnyatā* proclaimed by the Prajñāpāramitā scriptures. Its aim is to show that the *dharmadhātu* in its ultimate state is beyond any kind of verbalization or categorization. It is absolute emptiness itself. At this stage words and understanding fall short; there can be nothing but absolute silence. In the words of the text, "It is not something to be discussed, nor is it to be understood; it is the realm of practice"⁴¹—practice in this context being the direct experience of the "essence of dharma" through true and clear insight.

In the second section one is led to see the *dharmadhātu* in terms of *li* and *shih* in their "interfusion and dissolution, co-existence and annihilation, adversity and harmony."⁴² Unlike the first section which emphasizes and establishes true emptiness, here the stress is shifted to the more positive

³⁷ Soothill and Hodous, p. 489. *Kuan* 觀 is usually associated with *chih* 止 (skt., *śamatha*) which means "stopping, tranquilization, cessation," of one's physical and mental disturbance. The doctrine of *chih-kuan* 止觀 was especially emphasized by the Chinese T'ien-t'ai school. Cf. Chih-i's *Mo-ho Chih-kuan*, T46. 1-140 and *Hsiao Chih-kuan*, T46. 462: 73.

³⁸ In Chinese these are: (1) 真空觀, (2) 理事無礙觀, and (3) 周遍含容觀.

³⁹ The number "ten" was considered by the Hua-yen school as a perfect and auspicious number which symbolized "inexhaustibility" (無盡) or "infinity" (無窮), and thus almost all classifications in the Hua-yen system adopted this number. See T45. 515a25; T45. 509b1 *et passim*.

⁴⁰ 一真法界.

⁴¹ T45. 652c20 f.

⁴² T45. 652c28.

DHARMADHĀTU

term *li*, which Ch'eng-kuan was later to call "the wondrous existence of the Tathatā"⁴³ and its relationship with *shih*. These two purely Chinese—more specifically, Taoist—terms *li* and *shih* were apparently first introduced into Chinese Buddhist philosophy by Chih-tun 支遁 (314–366) and Tao-sheng 道生 (ca. 360–434).⁴⁴ In *The Gate of Insight*, whereas *li* is spoken of as something fundamental with no differentiation, *shih* is something which has boundaries and differentiations.⁴⁵ *Li* is indivisible, but *shih* is an individual particular thing or event.⁴⁶ If Western terminology is used for the sake of convenience, *li* would be noumenon and *shih* phenomena in their broader sense. *Li* is the principle underlying all particular phenomena appearing in the universe. According to the text, *li* and *shih* are not two different entities, but should be seen as nothing other than two aspects of one and the same reality which is the inexpressible *dharmadhātu*: "This limited *shih* becomes perfectly identical, not partially, with this undivided, unlimited *li*, because *shih* without essence of its own is reduced to *li*."⁴⁷

The identification of *li* and *shih* in the second section may not be so notably different from the basic teaching of the Yogācāra or the Tathāgatagarbha theory. The third section, however, which developed from the twin truths of *li* and *shih*, is completely different in content from the teaching of any other system. Herein lies the unique contribution of *The Gate of Insight*. The third section deals with the realization of the truth that "*shih*, being identical with *li*, is interfusing, pervading, and inclusive of each other without obstruction."⁴⁸ This indicates that the phenomenal aspect is here being upheld and with special significance. Phenomena (*shih*) having been identified with noumenon (*li*), are now considered in turn as complete in themselves and become the starting point from which issues the observation of things. Every item in this section therefore is presented from the standpoint of phenomena.

The main point of interest here is the relationship between one phenom-

⁴³ 眞如之妙有; T45. 676a14.

⁴⁴ For a discussion of the development of these concepts, see especially Wing-tsit Chan, "The Evolution of the Neo-Confucian Concept Li as Principle," *Neo-Confucianism* (Hanover, 1969).

⁴⁵ 無分限 and 分位差別, respectively.

⁴⁶ 不可分 and 一一事, respectively.

⁴⁷ T45. 653a5 f.

⁴⁸ T45. 653c16 f.

enon and other phenomena. The interrelationship among the phenomena is spoken of as "embracing," "pervading," "including," "permeating," "penetrating," and "co-existing."⁴⁹ In such a relationship there is said to be no obstruction or hindrance whatever. The universal and the particular, the broad and the narrow, have no impeding boundaries. This is the climax of the mystical insight into the *dharmadhātu* in which one can experience the realization of the truth that "each particle of dust, even though its characteristic is not expanded, can embrace the boundless *dharmadhātu*."⁵⁰ Again it is said that "the *shih* of one speck of dust is beyond the hindrance or obstruction of broadness and narrowness, vastness and minuteness."⁵¹

This final insight into the *dharmadhātu*, the relationship between one phenomenon and other phenomena, was formulated by the second patriarch Chih-yen as the "ten mysteries"⁵² in his *The Ten Mysteries of the One Vehicle of the Avatamsaka*.⁵³ Here Chih-yen enumerates the ten categories of dharmas, such as teachings and meanings, *li* and *shih*, and so on, by which the myriad things in the infinite universe can be represented. These ten categories of dharmas, Chih-yen argues, function in their infinite interrelationships. He then formulates anew the ten principles which he believes can show the complete and inexhaustible interrelationships governing all dharmas in the *dharmadhātu*. This set of principles for him is the *dharmadhātu pralītyasamutpāda*,⁵⁴ which has become a key word for the Hua-yen tradition.

These ten principles will not be dealt with in detail here. In brief they point to the Hua-yen tradition that the myriad things in the universe freely interrelate with each other without loss of their individual identity. Each and every manifested object of the *dharmadhātu* simultaneously includes within itself all qualities of other objects. Consequently all qualities such as hidden and manifest, pure and impure, one and many, subtle and minute, cause and result, big and small, and the like, are all simultaneously and completely compatible in any given dharma.

This mystery of the infinite interrelationship of an infinite number of

⁴⁹ 容, 遍, 攝, 交參, 入, and 相在, respectively.

⁵⁰ T45. 653c: 25 f.

⁵¹ T45. 654a: 8 f.

⁵² See Ch'eng-kuan's statement, T45. 683a: 11 f.

⁵³ *Hua-yen I-ch'eng shih-hsüan-men* 華嚴一乘十玄門, T45, no. 1868, pp. 514a-518c.

⁵⁴ 法界緣起.

DHARMADHĀTU

things is illustrated by Chih-yen with the metaphor of Indra's net. According to this metaphor from the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*, far above in the heaven of the great god Indra, there is a net infinite in size made of glittering jewels which decorate each of its eyes. So ingeniously is this net displayed that each and every jewel in its shining surface reflects every other jewel. What is more, reflected again are all the multiple reflections in the facets of each of the other jewels. Hence the reflections of reflections of reflections *ad infinitum* are established.⁵⁵ This is in other words the infinite interpenetration and mutual identification of the things.

Fa-tsang, having inherited this basic teaching of Chih-yen, fully systematized it on the basis of his grand theoretical foundations.⁵⁶ The *dharmadhātu* doctrine in the form of Tu-shun's threefold insight and Chih-yen's ten mysteries was given without any highly elaborate theoretical justifications, but in Fa-tsang it was presented in a broader and more explicit theoretical context. In his *Essay on the Five Teachings*,⁵⁷ the ten mysteries is dealt with in conjunction with three other topics, thus making the following four topics: (1) the identity and difference of the three natures; (2) the six meanings of *pratītyasamutpāda* in terms of the causal-aspect; (3) the non-obstruction of the *pratītyasamutpāda* of the ten mysteries; and (4) the perfect interfusion of the six characteristics.⁵⁸ These four topics are actually the climax of the treatise and constitute the basis of his system. Among these, however, the third one is the core of the system, the first

⁵⁵ Chih-yen called this “重重現影成其無盡復無盡” (T45.516b12). This was also demonstrated by Fa-tsang when he put ten huge mirrors, one at each of the eight points of the compass as well as the ceiling and floor, with an image of the Buddha illuminated by a torch in the center of the room. See Fung Yu-lan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, Vol. I (Princeton, 1953), p. 353, and G. C. C. Chang, *The Buddhist Teaching of Totality* (University Park, 1971), pp. 22 f.

⁵⁶ D. T. Suzuki writes in an evaluation of Hua-yen which may be somewhat exaggerated that “Fa-tsang's systematization of ideas expounded in the Buddhist sutra-group known as the *Gaṇḍavyūha* or *Avatamsaka* . . . is one of the wonderful intellectual achievements performed by Chinese mind and is of the highest importance to the history of world thought” (*Studies in Zen*, New York, 1955, p. 139).

⁵⁷ *Wu-chiao-chang* 五教章 (full title, 華嚴一乘教義分齊章), T45, no. 1866. An English translation is found in F. H. Cook's *Fa-tsang's Treatise on the Five Doctrines—An Annotated Translation* (an unpublished doctoral dissertation; University of Wisconsin, 1970). See also Cook's recently published *Hua-yen Buddhism: The Jewel Net of Indra* (University Park, 1977).

⁵⁸ 三性同異, 緣起因門六義, 十玄緣起無礙, and 六相圓融, respectively.

two providing its theoretical groundwork and the last one being its application.

Fa-tsang adopted first the orthodox Yogācāra theory of three natures (*trisvabhāva*) from the Wei-shih 唯識 school to substantiate the Hua-yen theory of the ten mysteries.⁵⁹ In dealing with this three nature theory, however, he was not concerned with epistemological problems as the Vijnānavāda was, nor was he interested solely in establishing the truth of the unreality of phenomenon as was the Śūnyavāda. His primary task was to show the interrelationship of dharmas. According to him, each of the three natures partakes of the two aspects of emptiness (essence, 空) and existence (appearance, 有). In other words, all dharmas are grasped in terms of noumenal substantiality and phenomenal particularities. This is to say that all dharmas are mutually identifiable in essence and at the same time are different from each other, retaining their own identities as phenomena.

Proceeding from this, Fa-tsang now explains the infinite interrelationship of all dharmas in terms of the causal-aspect. By way of referring to such ideas as power, conditions, and so on,⁶⁰ he attempts to demonstrate that the interrelationship of all dharmas is also seen in a dynamic and functional dimension. These two groundwork theories—namely, the identity and difference of the three natures and the six meanings of *pratītyasamutpāda* in terms of their causal-aspect—actually establish the two cardinal principles of Hua-yen: mutual identification and interpenetration of all dharmas.⁶¹ According to Fa-tsang's conclusion, "because of the concepts of emptiness and existence, there is the truth of mutual identification; because of the concepts of having power or lacking power, there is the truth of interpenetration."⁶² He further says that it is from the standpoint of essence that mutual identification is seen, and that it is from the standpoint of function that interpenetration is seen to function.⁶³

In Fa-tsang's *Record on Searching for the Mystery (T'an-hsuan-chi)* he adds a new item: "The perfect and brilliant compatibility of the qualities of the primary and secondary."⁶⁴ This has been considered one of the most

⁵⁹ See T45. 499a.

⁶⁰ 力 and 緣, respectively.

⁶¹ 相即 and 相入, respectively.

⁶² T45. 503a12 f. See Cook, *Fa-tsang's Treatise*, p. 467.

⁶³ 體 and 用, respectively.

⁶⁴ 主伴圓明具德門.

DHARMADHĀTU

comprehensive and representative items of the ten mysteries. What is implied here is that any given object can be simultaneously both chief (主 *chu*) and retinue (伴 *pan*), that is, primary and secondary. In Fa-tsang's own words, "When one direction becomes primary, the other ten directions become secondary, and this applies to the rest of the directions."⁶⁵ In other words, when A becomes the primary center of attention, B, C, and so on, become secondary; but when B in turn becomes the center of attention, A, C, and so on, become secondary. Therefore, the quality of primary and secondary is not intrinsic in any given dharma, but is endowed to it in the nexus of mutual relationship. There is no static situation in which any given object is always exclusively primary, while the others are always secondary. Things are not fixed as either primary or secondary; they are fluid in the sense of being both primary and secondary at the same time.

It was the fourth patriarch Ch'eng-kuan who constructed the so-called "fourfold *dharmadhātu* theory" (四種法界) upon the basis of the doctrine of *dharmadhātu* handed down from his predecessors.⁶⁶ This neat presentation of the fourfold *dharmadhātu* has subsequently become known as the standard formulation of Hua-yen *dharmadhātu* doctrine. In his commentary on Tu-shun's *The Gate of Insight* known as *The Mirror of the Mystery of the Avatamsaka*,⁶⁷ Ch'eng-kuan enumerates the fourfold *dharmadhātu* as follows:

- (1) the *dharmadhātu* of *shih*;
- (2) the *dharmadhātu* of *li*;
- (3) the *dharmadhātu* of the non-obstruction of *shih* and *li*;
- (4) the *dharmadhātu* of the non-obstruction of *shih* and *shih*.⁶⁸

According to the explanation of these terms given in his *Commentary on the*

⁶⁵ T35. 124a2.

⁶⁶ Various classifications were made by Hua-yen scholars before Ch'eng-kuan. See *Hwa-ōm-kuōng Mui-si-yo-kyōi-man-tap* 華嚴經文義要決問答 of P'yo-won 表員, a Korean monk-scholar of the Silla dynasty (Manji Zokuzōkyō 1. 12. 340d f. According to this document, Hui-yüan 慧苑, who was Fa-tsang's head disciple but was later condemned in Hua-yen tradition for his doctrinal differences with Fa-tsang, had a formular "fourfold *dharmadhātu*" similar to Ch'eng-kuan's; see Sakamoto Yukio, "Hokkai-engi no Rekishi-teki Keisei" in Miyamoto Shōson, ed., *Bukkyō no Kompon Shinri* (Tokyo, 1956), p. 931.

⁶⁷ *Fa-chieh-hsüan-ching* 法界玄鏡, T45. 672a-683a.

⁶⁸ In Chinese: (1) 事法界, (2) 理法界, (3) 事理無礙法界, and (4) 事事無礙法界.

Chapter on Vows and Practices in the Avataṃsaka-sūtra,⁶⁹ the *dharmadhātu* of *shih* is that which is particularized or phenomenalized into innumerable concrete things,⁷⁰ that is, the dimension perceptible by our consciousness.⁷¹ The *dharmadhātu* of *li* is essence or nature (性), which is the foundation of all phenomena. He also says that this is the state of true emptiness as presented in *The Gate of Insight*.⁷² The third, the *dharmadhātu* of the non-obstruction of *shih* and *li*, is the *dharmadhātu* in which phenomena and noumena interfuse with one another. The fourth, the *dharmadhātu* of the non-obstruction of *shih* and *shih*, according to Ch'eng-kuan, points to the truth of the ten mysteries, which teaches the twin principle of interrelationship of all phenomena: mutual identification and interpenetration.

The Hua-yen philosophy which had developed up to the time of Ch'eng-kuan was assimilated and utilized most thoroughly by Tsung-mi, and it was through Tsung-mi that the Hua-yen became widely known in Chinese history. Although differing in interest and emphasis, his *dharmadhātu* doctrine is more or less similar to that of his predecessors, especially to that of Ch'eng-kuan.

III

Having surveyed the basic Hua-yen idea of *dharmadhātu*, it is logical to raise the question of its significance in both philosophical and religious contexts. We have seen that the Hua-yen took a "functional" approach, rather than, say, a purely ontological or substantialistic approach, in dealing with the question of *dharmadhātu*. Rather than discussing what it is, penetrating into how it *functions* was the main interest of their discourses, especially in the truth of the ten mysteries. The infinite interrelationship of all phenomenal things, which was understood by them as *dharmadhātu pratītyasamutpāda*, was the central theme for all Hua-yen philosophers.⁷³ It was regarded as "great function" or "wondrous function."⁷⁴

Now the question is why the Hua-yen philosophers tried to see the *dharmadhātu* in terms of its functional aspect. According to them, the reason

⁶⁹ *Hua-yen-ching hsing-yüan-p'ien-shu* 華嚴經行願品疏.

⁷⁰ *Manji Zokuzōkyō* 1.7.249.7 f.

⁷¹ 意識所知.

⁷² T45. 672c.

⁷³ See, for example, T45. 659c, T45. 514a, T35. 120a, T45. 687b.

⁷⁴ *Manji Zokuzōkyō* 1. 4. 445b, and T45. 687b. 大用 and 妙用, respectively.

DHARMADHĀTU

is that since *dharmadhātu* as essential reality or Being itself (*esse ipsum*) is beyond any categorization and free from any distinction, there is no way to deal with it other than by approaching it through its "causal-aspect"—this for us is being. "The *dharmadhātu* as true nature," it is said, "transcends the [common-sense] feeling and is beyond [intellectual] view."⁷⁵ It is the object of insight (觀 *kuan*) and insight is an intuition made possible only after "exhausting [commonsense] feeling and wiping out views."⁷⁶ Since it is inexpressible (*anabhilābya*) and inconceivable (*acintya*)⁷⁷ in its result-aspect (果門), that is, in its pure substantiality, what should be grasped is its process of functioning—becoming, identifying, penetrating, permeating, pervading, actualizing, and so forth, on the phenomenal level. *Pratītyasamutpāda* in Hua-yen philosophy refers to this interacting, inter-relating causal aspect.⁷⁸

Of course, in the ultimate sense of Buddhist philosophy there can be no "process," no "becoming," etc., because in the Absolute there is only quiescence or the state of nirvana. For Hua-yen, this is the goal which is sought for by philosophical observation, but it is not the object of this observation. It is the realm of a mystical experience which is far beyond the grasp of discursive reasoning. All we can perceive is the functional aspect or process-aspect of *dharmadhātu*, perceptible only on the provisional, *upāya* level. Hua-yen philosophy, in this particular sense, might therefore be called a philosophy of process. It is not a philosophy of static essence or being, but a philosophy which deals primarily with the dynamic relational process working among various components or manifested existences of the Absolute, bracketing the Absolute itself at least temporarily.

Seen from the standpoint of *pratītyasamutpāda*, nothing in the world has divine determinism. Nothing can have an isolated existence or fixed value. This view of *pratītyasamutpāda* which sees everything as relative is not new. Whether "relative" in the temporal sense as in early Buddhism or in the essential sense as in the Mādhyamika, the relativity of dharmas has been held throughout Buddhist history as a distinctively Buddhist idea. Nevertheless the peculiarity of Hua-yen is its thoroughgoing emphasis on and neat systematic formulation of this idea, particularly in terms of inter-relationship on the phenomenal level.

⁷⁵ T45. 683c3, 法界真性超情離見。

⁷⁶ T45. 684c2, 情盡見除。

⁷⁷ 不可說 and 不思議, respectively.

⁷⁸ See T45. 514b6-8, and T45. 477a14-17.

The best and clearest example of this is found in the Hua-yen doctrine of the "perfect interfusion of the sixfold characteristics" (六相圓融).⁷⁹ To take Fa-tsang's own simile, house, pillars, rafters, and so forth, are meaningless apart from the total context of interrelatedness. It goes without saying that but for the pillars, rafters, and so on, there can be no house. But it is simultaneously true that without the concept of house, the concept of pillar, rafter, etc., cannot be established, because the pillar is a pillar only insofar as it is counted in the context of the house. In this sense the concept of house is included in the concept of pillar, and vice versa. Moreover, the pillar cannot be a pillar without rafters, tiles, etc., because the pillar, to be a pillar, presupposes the existence of a house. But the house needs other components, and consequently, the pillar needs the other components to be a pillar. It is the same with rafters, tiles, and the infinite components of the house. There is no pillar *per se* or rafter *per se*. It is possible only in relationship to other things. In the concept of rafter, there is included everything such as house, pillar, roof, tiles, etc. It is even possible to say that a rafter is a house, a rafter is a pillar, and so forth. Each and everyone of these are, likewise, interrelated—interpenetrating and mutually identifying, to use Hua-yen terms.

Such an outlook can be called "totalistic" or "organic" in the broader sense of the words.⁸⁰ Whether organic or totalistic, its basic attitude toward the phenomenal order of the world is to try to relate them in terms of inexhaustible and infinite interrelationship. In this sense it may rather be designated as "relativistic" or, more specifically, "relationistic." Everything in the world is seen in its relationship to other things. All qualities of all things are simultaneously found in a given object. The same step, for example, is too high for a child and too low for an adult, or too wide for a child and too narrow for an adult, and so on. The step is high and low, wide and narrow, all at the same time, only with different frames of reference.

In such a philosophical insight, there can be no room for a dogmatic assertion concerning any particular thing. A theoretical polarity of good and bad, right and wrong, happy and unhappy, profane and sacred, is completely removed. Static views (*dṛṣṭi*) or dogmas melt away in such a

⁷⁹ T45. 507c. See Cook, *Hua-yen Buddhism*, p. 76 f.; Takakusu, p. 122; Chang, p. 168; Chan, p. 413; de Bary, p. 333.

⁸⁰ See Chang, pp. 169, 170; Takakusu, pp. 15, 109, *et passim*.

DHARMADHĀTU

flexible attitude toward dharmas. Hua-yen philosophy is in this sense a philosophy of liberation which sets a person free from all rigid and stubborn dogmatism, prejudice, and preconception. The bondages of localization, provincialism, artificial restrictions, sentimental bias, intolerant self-centeredness, and worldly attachment are all broken away and there remains only absolute spiritual freedom.⁸¹

One may ask here whether there is any practical significance in such a highly theoretical system. Is the Hua-yen system not a mere "galaxy of concepts" or "the pointless exposition of empty words" as characterized by some outsiders?⁸² On a surface level, it is in fact difficult to find some concrete religious meaning in Hua-yen philosophy. On a deeper level, however, one finds that the doctrine of *dharmadhātu* is not a mere philosophical pursuit undertaken for the sake of wondering (*thaumazein*) but, like other doctrines of Buddhism, it has a soteriological intention within it.⁸³

The first thing to be noted in this context is that the *dharmadhātu* doctrine of "mutual identification" and "interpenetration" is extremely relevant to the formulation of the Hua-yen doctrine of enlightenment. Whereas Indian Buddhism generally held that the progress of enlightenment was usually gradual,⁸⁴ in China since Tao-sheng and those of his predilection, the common belief was in "sudden or instantaneous enlightenment."⁸⁵ Hua-yen philosophy theoretically justified and reinforced this general Chinese outlook on enlightenment. The principle of mutual identification and mutual inclusion, and every philosophical proposition derived from it, such as identity of prior and subsequent, beginning and end, primary and secondary, cause and effect, one and all, and the like,

⁸¹ One might be strongly reminded of the principle of relativity taught in Taoist philosophy, especially in Chuang Tzu's teaching of "equality of things and opinions." See Fung Yu-lan, p. 230 f.

⁸² An example of such a doubt is expressed by R. H. Robinson, *The Buddhist Religion* (Belmont, 1970), p. 85. As a classic example, see K'ai-an's 體理 criticism of Hua-yen found in Chih-p'an's 志磐 *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi* 佛祖統紀, T49. 292c8 f. and 293a28-293b: 2.

⁸³ For the soteriological meaning in Buddhist philosophy, see E. Conze, *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies* (Oxford, 1967), p. 213, and H. Nakamura, "Unity and Diversity in Buddhism," in *The Path of the Buddha*, ed. K. Morgan, (New York, 1956), p. 373.

⁸⁴ See Warder, pp. 12 and 295.

⁸⁵ One of the best examples of the different attitudes of Indian and Chinese thinkers on this question is found in the debate held in Tibet in the eighth century. See P. Demiéville, *Le Concile de Lhasa* (Paris, 1952) and G. Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, part II (Rome, 1958).

constituted a solid basis upon which the so-called doctrine of "instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood" could be constructed.⁸⁶

According to Hua-yen doctrine there were fifty-two stages from the first stage of faith to the Buddhahood of "wonderful enlightenment," but because of the principle of mutual identification and simultaneity of cause and effect, the very first stage of faith is in fact identical temporally and essentially with the last stage of Buddhahood. This is the so-called "attainment of Buddhahood with the fulfillment of the stage of faith."⁸⁷ One becomes the Buddha in one moment or even in no moment.⁸⁸

In addition to such a theoretical substantiation of the instantaneous attainment of Buddhahood, the Hua-yen doctrine of *dharmadhātu* was also applied to the formulation of the theory of the critical classification of the Buddhist teachings (教判 *chiao-p'an* or *p'an-chiao*). The classification of Buddhist teachings was based upon a certain unifying principle, and for the Hua-yen classification into the five teachings, the understanding of the *dharmadhātu* or dharma doctrine served as this principle or criterion.

According to the Hua-yen classification in general, there were five teachings:⁸⁹ (1) the Hinayāna teaching held the *shih dharmadhātu* maintaining that phenomenal dharmas are really existent; (2) the elementary teaching of the Mahāyāna had the *li dharmadhātu*, taking solely a unifying noumenal order; (3) the final teaching of the Mahāyāna held to the *dharmadhātu* of the non-obstruction of *li* and *shih*; (4) the sudden teaching of the Mahāyāna rejected all kinds of conceptualization or verbalization, and thus no special view of the *dharmadhātu* was expressed; and (5) the perfect teaching of the Mahāyāna taught the *dharmadhātu* of the non-obstruction of *shih* and *shih*.⁹⁰

In other words, these five teachings, according to Hua-yen, were actually the five grades or degrees of insight concerning the *dharmadhātu*.

⁸⁶ 速疾成佛 or 疾得成佛. T45. 517b, 519c-520a, 586c, 596b, 491a.

⁸⁷ 信滿成佛. T45. 491a, 595c, 596a, etc.

⁸⁸ 一念成佛 and 無念成佛, respectively. T45. 518a and 585c.

⁸⁹ For the different ideas of individual patriarchs on this question, see Chih-yen: T45. 516a, 519c, 520a, 521c, 537a, 542c *et passim*; Fa-tsang: T45. 481b, 509a, 642c, T35. 115c *et passim*; Ch'eng-kuan: T36.196c, Manji Zokuzōkyō 1. 8. 250d f.; and Tsung-mi: T48. 403a f., T45. 708c, etc.

⁹⁰ It is perhaps in this context that Chang is right when he makes the categorical assertion that "of all Buddhist schools—Hinayāna, Mahāyāna and Tantra alike—" the one which "truly holds the highest teaching of Buddhism" is the Hua-yen school of China (p. ix).

DHARMADHĀTU

The classification of the teachings, for Hua-yen believers, was not an arbitrary method by which they could boast the exclusive superiority of their own teaching, but rather the expression of a sincere aspiration to seek after the foundation for harmony among the various teachings. The Hua-yen *dharmadhātu* provided the guideline for this practical and imperative undertaking.

IV

Buddhism was introduced into China around the first century AD. After the periods of preparation (ca. 65–317) and of domestication (ca. 317–589), it came to the stage of “independent growth” in the Sui-T’ang period (ca. 589–900).⁹¹ As one of the Buddhist schools which flourished in this period, the Hua-yen proved itself, as we have seen, to be a great ingenious synthesis of Indian Buddhist thought and the indigenous Chinese ways of thinking. In this respect, it tremendously helped Buddhism to emerge as an integral part of the Chinese religious tradition as a whole.⁹² Although Hua-yen Buddhism as an organized institution and as a separate philosophical system disappeared by the end of the T’ang era, the core of its thought and its influence was never exterminated in history. Rather, it has continued, in different forms, to live throughout the ages that followed.

⁹¹ Arthur F. Wright’s division of Chinese Buddhist history is adopted here for the sake of convenience. See his *Buddhism in Chinese History* (Stanford, 1959). A similar division is found in Tokiwa Daijō, *Shina Bukkyō no Kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1942), vol. III.

⁹² This has been aptly pointed out by an outstanding scholar of Hua-yen, S. Kamata, “Kegon Shisō no Honshitsu,” in *Bukkyō no shisō 6, Mugen no Sekaitan—Kegon*, ed., Kamata and Ueyama, (Tokyo, 1969), p. 164. See his other important works on Hua-yen Buddhism, particularly *Chūgoku Kegon Shisōshi no Kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1965). For a detailed discussion of the Hua-yen influence on Chinese religious thought, see my *A Study of Chinese Hua-yen Buddhism* (PhD Thesis, McMaster University, 1976), p. 239 f.