

TRIYANA VERSUS EKAYANA, OR THE
THREE VEHICLES IN CONFLICT
WITH THE ONE VEHICLE

The Hossō philosophy signifies a turning point in the history of Buddhist thought. Though being a Chinese school, the Hossō School stands, like the Sanron School, on the shoulders of an Indian school and therefore cannot be regarded as purely Chinese like the Tendai and Kegon Schools.¹ Though also it regards its own teaching quite naturally as the only true teaching, and therefore of a higher order than that of the so-called Pure Mahāyāna Schools, it cannot be denied, that from the point of view of the development of Buddhist thought, the Hossō School, like the Sanron School, represents a form of preliminary Mahāyāna teaching. This Indian provenance and this preliminary character are the reason why the Hossō School is generally considered as

¹ The *Hossō School*—meaning the School which teaches the 'Form of the Dharmas (i.e. Phenomena)'—founded by Hsüan-chuang (or Genjō Sanzō, as called by the Japanese), is the Chinese form of the Indian Vijñāna or Yogācārya School, established by Asanga and Vasubandhu in the 4th or 5th century A.D. Genjō Sanzō lived from 601–664 A.D.

The *Sanron School*—meaning the School of the 'Three Śāstras (i.e. philosophical treatises)'—founded by Kichizō or Kajō Daishi (as called by the Japanese), is the Chinese form of the Indian Madhyamika School, whose establishment is ascribed to Nāgārjuna, who may have lived in the 2nd century A.D. Kajō Daishi lived from 549–623 A.D.

The *Tendai School*—meaning the School of the Tientai Mountains in Chekiang—is based on the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra or Hokke Kyō and was established, or rather systematized, by Chiki (or Chisha Daishi, as called by the Japanese), who lived from 531–597 A.D. and was its 3rd patriarch.

The *Kegon School*—meaning the School of the Kegon Gyō or Avatamsaka Sūtra—is based on this text and was established or rather systematized by Hōzō or Genju Daishi (as called by the Japanese), who lived from 642–712 A.D. and was its 5th patriarch.

an earlier school, to which a place before the Tendai School and the Kegon School is assigned.

As a matter of fact, however, the Hossō School represents a reaction not only against the so-called 'nihilism' of the Sanron School, but also against the identity-teaching of the Higher Mahāyāna Schools, especially that of the Kegon School,—a quite deliberate return to a 'rationalism' from a 'transcendentalism,' regarded as vague and unsatisfactory. When we consider the antagonism in China between Genjō Sanzō (Hsüan-chuang), the founder of Hossō, and Genju Daishi (Fa-tsang), the great Kegon patriarch, and when we remember the vehemence of the controversy which, still in the ninth century, in distant Japan, was waged between the Hossō sect and the newly arisen Tendai sect, we can clearly see that the Hossō School considered itself vastly superior to the so-called Higher Mahāyānism and objected not only to the transcendentalism of the Kegon School, but also to that of the Tendai School.

The Tendai School, teaching a pantheistic realism, says that 'all dharmas have true form' (*sho hō jissō*), which means to say that all phenomena have absolute reality. The Kegon School, teaching a pantheistic idealism, acknowledges the universality of the mind, that is a panpsychism which considers all phenomena as the absolute mind itself. The Hossō School does not deny the existence of an absolute entity; however, it makes of it the mere shadowy and dim background of the world-theatre and does not allow it to take any active part in the performance. What is acting on the stage are the impersonifications of the individual human mind, which alone is acknowledged as really existing and as the only source, from which all phenomena emanate. To the Kegon axiom '*yui shin*' or 'the mind only' (i.e. the universal mind only) exists, the Hossō School opposes its principle of '*yui shiki*' or 'the consciousness only' (i.e. the individual consciousness only) exists. Thus to a transcendental panpsychism it opposes a subjective psychologism, taking great

pains in analysing it into its minutest details, by distinguishing eight kinds of consciousness (*shiki or vijñāna*), by demonstrating the 'seeds' (*bīja*) stored up in the highest of these consciousnesses (*shiki No. 8 or ālaya vijñāna*) and by mapping out a phenomenology of mental order that is indeed one of the most ingenious systems of Buddhist philosophy.

However, it is not our intention to enter here into the high-ways and by-ways of the Hossō philosophy. Also we do not propose to compare in detail this philosophy with the Tendai philosophy on the one side and with the Kegon philosophy on the other. Our present essay has a more general scope, intending to make a comparison of the most fundamental points of the Hossō teaching with those of Pure Mahāyāna Buddhism, that is, with the views that are held in common by Tendai as well as by Kegon, or by the two Mahāyāna Schools whose metaphysics are most developed. We shall resume in the briefest possible way the arguments which fundamentally divide the Hossō School from the Pure Mahāyāna Schools, hoping that even by such short outline the inner thought of these schools will be understood much clearer.

The Hossō School is a Three Vehicle School (*Triyāna, San Jō*), acknowledging three means of salvation for the Arhat, the Pratyekabuddha, and the Bodhisattva; the schools of transcendental Mahāyānism are schools of the One Vehicle (*Ekayāna, Ichi Jō*), acknowledging the only Buddha Vehicle. From the standpoint of the Hossō School the Three Vehicles are true (*jitsu*) and the One Vehicle is temporal (*gon*) and a mere artifice (*hōben*), while from the standpoint of the Higher Mahāyāna Schools the One Vehicle is true and the Three Vehicles are mere artifice. The Hossō School teaches moreover the origin of the universe from the subjective ālaya vijñāna, the separation of the Noumenon from the Phenomena, and the differentiation of human beings into five classes. The schools of transcendental Mahāyāna, on the contrary, teach the origin of

the universe from the absolute substance itself, the fundamental oneness of the Noumenon and the Phenomena, and the essential sameness of human nature. This means to say that the Hossō School teaches, that the differences of human beings and the differences of the various dharmas (i.e. thoughts) are real; while the Higher Mahāyāna teaches, that these differences are only temporal,—all human beings and all dharmas being in their essence absolute and originally one and the same.

The Hossō School teaches the Middle Path. But it is the middle path of non-existence and non-emptiness, which steers between these two extremes, without neutralizing them. The Middle Path of the Higher Mahāyāna Schools—the so-called 'True Middle Path'—does away with these two extremes, by identifying them. The Hossō School says that the middle is neither existence nor emptiness; the Higher Mahāyāna Schools say that it is existence as well as emptiness. The Middle Path of Hossō is that of comparison and combination; the Middle Path of the Higher Mahāyāna Schools is that of identification. The one is the outcome of the principle of difference; the other the outcome of the principle of sameness.

We can also express it in this way, viz, that the Hossō School teaches the form (*sō*) of the dharmas; the transcendental Mahāyāna Schools teach the nature (*shō*), i.e. essence of the dharmas; the one being a 'School of Form' (*sō shū*), dealing with the Phenomena, the others a 'School of Nature' (*shō shū*), dealing with the Noumenon. Therefore the distinction between the rationalist Hossō School and the transcendental Kegon and Tendai Schools resumes itself into a distinction between the Three Vehicles and the One Vehicle, or between the Buddhism of Form and the Buddhism of Nature, i.e. between Phenomenal Mahāyānism and Noumenal Mahāyānism. As the Hossō School teaches the seeds (*shū ji*) of the dharmas, we might also describe the difference between this school and the Higher Mahāyāna

Schools to be a difference between the 'Seed School' (*shū shū*) and the 'Nature School' (*shō shū*).¹

These contrasts are, so to speak, patent. But if we enter still deeper into the teaching of these two most fundamental types of Mahāyāna Buddhism, we can construct the following *differences between the One Vehicle and the Triple Vehicle*:²

1

The *One Vehicle* teaches that human beings possess only one nature and that all become Buddha (*issō kai jō*).

The *Triple Vehicle* teaches that human beings possess five natures and are individually different (*go shō kaku ōtsu*).³

¹ These two terms were already used as contrasting terms in the Śāstras, but among modern scholars they were first employed by Prof. Tokiwa, from whose book '*Bushō no Kenkyū*' ('Investigation on Buddha Nature') we have condensed the following description.

² The term 'Triple Vehicle' denotes the Hossō School only by excluding the Saumon School. Though the Saumon School is commonly also classified as a Three Vehicle School, it is, in regard to the problem of Buddha-nature, to be reckoned among the One Vehicle Schools. The Triple Vehicle means here and in the following the 'Seed School' (*shū shū*), while the One Vehicle means the 'Nature School' (*shō shū*),—these being the terms used by Prof. Tokiwa.

³ A fundamental Hossō doctrine says that all human beings are to be divided into Five Classes, namely people having:

1. Srāvaka nature—*Shōmon shō*—Srāvakayānābhisamaya-gotraḥ.
2. Pratyekabuddha nature—*Engaku shō*—Pratyekabuddhayānābhisamaya-gotraḥ.
3. Bodhisattva nature—*Bosatsu shō*—Tathāgatayānābhisamaya-gotraḥ.
4. Undetermined nature—*fu jō shō*—Aniyata-gotraḥ.
5. No nature after all (i.e. complete absence of nature)—*hikkō mu shō*—Agotrakāḥ.

No. 1. can gain no higher 'fruit' (i.e. effect) than that of an Arhat. No. 2. no higher 'fruit' than that of a Pratyekabuddha. Class No. 3. attains Buddhahood. Those belonging to class 4. can become either Arhat, or Pratyekabuddha, or Buddha, according to the degrees of their practice. The 5th class is barred from all grades of real enlightenment, not being favoured with 'entering into the path of salvation,' and their highest attainment consists therefore in being reborn in one of the deva-heavens or as human beings; those belonging to this last

2

The *One Vehicle* teaches that all living creatures without exception possess Buddha-nature (*issai shu jō shitsu u busshō*).

The *Triple Vehicle* teaches that a part of the living creatures does not possess Buddha-nature (*ichi bun mu shō*).

3

The *One Vehicle* understands the Buddha-nature which is possessed by all, to be the Buddha-nature of reason (*ri busshō*), and as being identical with True Likeness (*shin nyo*).

The *Triple Vehicle* understands the Buddha-nature which is not possessed by all, to be the Buddha-nature of practice (*gyō busshō*), and as being identical with the originally-possessed pure seeds (*honnu mu ro shū ji*).

4

The *One Vehicle* holds that the so-called beings who have no Buddha-nature (*mu shō u jō*) are the people who have no indirect causes by which their innate reason-nature of True Likeness (*shin nyo ri shō*), which is the direct cause of salvation, can be brought into appearance. So the non-possession of Buddha-nature—from the point of view of the *One Vehicle*—depends merely upon the non-possession of class can never leave the three worlds, but must remain for ever in the stream of transmigration.—Thus we see that this doctrine of Five Natures reserves the privilege of gaining Buddhahood to the selected few of Bodhisattva-nature, i.e. to the 3rd class and to a part of the 4th class.

The Five Natures, as taught by the Kegon School, are not as many varieties of living beings, but five steps of spiritual progress—five different 'dwelling positions' (*jā i*)—of one and the same being. The '*go shō*'—theory of Kegon could therefore be affirmed along with its '*isshō kai jō*'—theory, as it is essentially different from the '*go shō*'—theory of Hossō. For the Hossō School the five natures are differences of seeds and have a priori causes; for the Kegon School they have a posteriori causes.

the indirect causes (*mu en*). Through a higher degree of religious practice these indirect causes will however be supplied and the latent Buddha-nature will reveal itself.

Thus in the One Vehicle teaching the so-called Icchantika or people who, for the time being, are excluded from salvation, are called '*mu en no shu jō*,' i.e. 'people who have no indirect cause,' namely no religious practice. However, it would be wrong to call them '*mu in no shu jō*,' i.e. 'people who have no direct cause, namely no Buddha-nature which is considered to be changeable as well as unchangeable.

The *Triple Vehicle* holds that the beings who have no Buddha-nature are the people who have no direct cause of salvation, namely no a priori pure seeds (*honnu mu ro shū ji*) and will for ever be deprived of such seeds. This non-possession of any direct causes (*mu in*) excludes them for ever from salvation, and even the highest degree of religious practice would be of no avail to them.

Thus in the Three Vehicle teaching the Icchantika or people who for ever are excluded from salvation, are called '*mu in no shu jō*,' i.e. 'people who have no direct cause,' namely no original pure seeds. However, it would be wrong to call them '*mu en no shu jō*,' i.e. 'people who have no indirect cause,' namely no True Likeness of Reason-Nature which is considered to be entirely static and unchangeable.

5

The *One Vehicle* takes the absolute nature itself, that is, the universal True Likeness, as the foundation for religious practice.

The *Triple Vehicle* takes the a priori pure seeds as the foundation for religious practice.

6

The *One Vehicle* connects a twofold meaning with the Absolute (*shin nyo*), namely that of unchangeableness (*fu hen*) and that of dependent origination (*zui en*). This

means that the Absolute itself never changes, yet nevertheless produces the whole universe, involving innumerable changes. The One Vehicle consequently considers that ālaya vijñāna (*araya shiki*) possesses the two meanings of enlightenment (*kaku*) and non-enlightenment (*fu kaku*). Shin nyo and araya shiki, from the point of view of the One Vehicle, are therefore in the relationship of 'not one' and 'not different,' i.e. their relation is monistic.

The *Triple Vehicle* considers shin nyo as an entirely transcendent entity (*mu i hō* or *asaṃskṛita dharma*), being without any impurities (*mu ro*), and unchangeable, while it considers araya shiki as a phenomenal entity (*u i hō* or *saṃskṛita dharma*) containing impurities (*u ro*), and being changeable. Shin nyo and araya shiki, from the point of view of the Triple Vehicle, are therefore quite different, i.e. their relation is dualistic.

7

The *One Vehicle* acknowledges that impurity (*u ro*) can change into purity (*mu ro*), namely that the impure araya shiki can be transformed into a pure araya shiki, or that the effect of the pure mind can be brought out from an impure mind. This conviction lies at the bottom of the One Vehicle theory, that there is 'no necessity to cut away the nature of evil' (*shō aku fu dan*).

The *Triple Vehicle* does not acknowledge that impure seeds (*u ro shū ji*) can be transformed into pure seeds (*mu ro shū ji*), but that a change can only be performed by cutting away or destroying the impure seeds by the power of the pure seeds, namely by replacing impure seeds by pure seeds. The axiom of the Triple Vehicle 'by changing vijñāna one attains wisdom' (*ten jiki toku chi*)¹ is to be understood in this meaning. Therefore whoever does not possess pure seeds, can never give birth to the effect of purity.

¹ That is to say, the 'great perfect mirror-wisdom' (*dai en kyō*)

8

The *One Vehicle* considers the harmonization of the objective reason (*ri*) and of the subjective wisdom (*chi*) as its goal, and this harmonization is reached by the transformation of the impure vijñāna into a pure vijñāna,—the final harmony between *ri* and *chi* being represented by amāta vijñāna, the *ninth* consciousness.

The *Triple Vehicle* places the 'right wisdom' (*shō chi*) and 'True Likeness' or 'Suchness' (*nyo nyo*) for ever into opposition, so that the Absolute or 'Suchness' remains always the object for the 'right wisdom,' and there is no possibility of unifying this subjective wisdom with the objective truth.

If we look for *similarities between the One Vehicle and the Triple Vehicle*, we can find them in the two following facts:

1. Both recognize that the Reason-Nature of True Likeness (*ri shō shin nyo*) is universal to all living creatures, or that all living creatures possess the Buddha-Nature of Absolute Reason (*ri busshō*).

2. Both recognize that religious practice is needed in order to become Buddha.

Regarding the first similarity, the reader will remember that, from the point of view of the Triple Vehicle, even such people who have no original pure seeds, and who are therefore for ever excluded from salvation, i.e. the Icchantika, are nevertheless in possession of the True Likeness of Reason Nature, which however is considered to be entirely static and unchangeable. Of course the other two classes of beings, which according to the Hossō teaching cannot become Buddhas, also possess this True Likeness of Reason Nature. Thus the axiom of the Triple Vehicle, i.e. of Hossō, that a part of the living beings does not possess Buddha-nature, really means to say that a part of the living beings does not possess *chi*), by which the innermost nature of all beings is seen face to face.

such Buddha-nature that will enable them to become Buddhas.

From the point of view of Ekayāna, the possession of Buddha-nature necessarily implies the ultimate attainment of actual Buddhahood, and the expression: 'creatures that have no Buddha-nature' becomes synonymous with the expression: 'creatures that can never become Buddha.' The real existence of such creatures is acknowledged by Hossō only; for the Ekayāna they are merely hypothetical. However, the Ekayāna use of the term gained currency value in the discussions on the Hossō philosophy, perverting in some way the Hossō-axiom.

Consequently, if it is stated here, that both the One Vehicle and the Triple Vehicle recognize that all living creatures possess the Buddha-Nature of Absolute Reason (*ri bussō*), the whole emphasis is placed on the expression 'absolute reason' (*ri*). The One Vehicle and the Triple Vehicle are in accord, that all creatures possess a Buddha-nature considered as an entirely abstract entity; but they *disagree fundamentally* in regard to the general possession of a Buddha-nature, that is considered as an absolute dynamic power.

In regard to the other similarity between the One Vehicle and the Triple Vehicle the following observation must be made: assuredly, both recognize that religious practice is needed, in order to become Buddha. However, by the fact that the One Vehicle applies this practice to the absolute substance of True Likeness, considering it as the direct cause of salvation, while the Triple Vehicle applies its practice to the a priori pure seeds, considering them as the direct cause of salvation, and True Likeness only as the indirect cause, we may conclude that these two 'houses' or schools of Buddhism are also here *fundamentally in discord*. All other differences follow from these two differences that appear outwardly as similarities.

Prof. Tokiwa, whose views we have resumed and partly

interpreted here, is however not satisfied with merely pointing out the differences and similarities of the One Vehicle and the Triple Vehicle. He is at pains to evaluate their strong points and their weak points, and proposes the creation of a new and perfect Buddhist system of metaphysics, by eliminating the weak points of the 'Nature School' as well as of the 'Seed School,' and by harmonizing their good points.

The *good points of the One Vehicle*, as understood by Prof. Tokiwa, are:

1. The One Vehicle makes the universe originate from the Absolute (*shin nyo* or *bhūtatathatā*), and 2. consequently acknowledges the existence of the power of enlightenment inside the subjective consciousness (*ālaya vijñāna*). Hereby the One Vehicle identifies the ideal world with the real world.

The *weak points of the One Vehicle* as he sees them, are:

1. Its vague and conflicting interpretations of 'Buddha-nature' (*bussō*).

By taking its stand on the world beyond, where objective truth (*ri*) and subjective wisdom (*chi*) are harmonized, all people are considered actually to possess Buddha-nature (or to be Buddhas). But the world beyond is the world of the absolute wisdom, or the world of effect (*kwa*), while the problem of Buddha-nature belongs to the sphere of subjective consciousness (*shiki*) in the world of cause (*in*). The One Vehicle fails to make a sharp distinction between cause and effect.

It deepened and widened the meaning of 'Buddha-nature' by identifying it with the 'womb of the Buddha' (*nyorai zō* or *tathāgatagarbha*). At the same time, however, it thereby became a term of various colours, since we can distinguish at least three meanings of 'Nyorai zō':

First may we consider it as synonymous with '*shin nyo*' (True Likeness) or '*nyo nyo*' (Likeness-Likeness) or '*hokkai*' (Dharma-world),—each of these three terms being above comparison, as each includes all purity and impurity. Hence

arises the idea that *nyorai zō* is the fundamental origin of birth and death (*shō ji* or transmigration—*saṃsāra*) as well as of Nirvāṇa (*nehan*). The view that *Nyorai zō* is the fundamental origin of Nirvāṇa leads to the second meaning given to this term, namely that of ‘*ji shō shō jō shin*,’ i.e. the absolute pure mind, or ‘hosshin’ (*dharmakāya*), while the view that *Nyorai zō* is the fundamental origin of birth and death leads to the third meaning given to this term, namely that it is identical with ‘sin’ (*bonnō*) or with ‘all common people’ (*shu jō, satva*).

According to the first interpretation the Buddha-nature is a combination of purity and impurity; according to the second view it is all purity; according to the third it is all impurity. Among these various meanings, attributed to the term ‘Buddha-nature,’ it is indeed difficult to discover the real meaning.

2. Its vague views on ‘ignorance’ (*mu myō*—mental darkness or *avidyā*).

The One Vehicle neither explains the origin of ignorance which is inherent in its system, nor the relation between ignorance and the Absolute (between *mu myō* and *shin nyo*, between *avidyā* and *bhūtatahatā*). The One Vehicle considers this origin and this relation merely as ‘beyond our comprehension’ (*fu shigi*, a term which corresponds to the Sanskrit *acintya* or *acitta*, meaning: beyond the realm of mentation, beyond understanding, inconceivable or mysterious). *Mu myō* is said to be ‘without beginning’ (*mu shi*), and the influence of *Mu myō* upon *Shin nyo* is described as an ‘incomprehensible perfuming’ (*fu shigi kun*). Similarly the origination of the universe from the unchangeable Absolute (*fu hen shin nyo*) is called an ‘incomprehensible change’ (*fu shigi hen*).

The *Triple Vehicle* wishes to escape from this vagueness of the One Vehicle, and that is considered by Prof. Tokiwa as the *good point* of this school. It makes a clear distinction between the Phenomenal and the Absolute (*u i* and *mu i, san-*

skṛita and *asaṃskṛita*), between impurity and purity (*u ro* and *mu ro*), between the world of cause (*in*) and the world of effect (*kwa*). It endeavours not to lower the absolute True Likeness to the level of the phenomenal world and confines the explanation of this actual world to the activities of the subjective mind (*ālaya vijñāna*). It makes of the impure *ālaya vijñāna*—the store-house consciousness furnished with unclean seeds—the fundamental origin of all phenomena, and has no need to recur to a special *mu myō*- or *avidyā*-entity, in order to explain the origin of all phenomena. While *mu myō*, in the One Vehicle schools, is a great mystery, whose origin cannot possibly be explained, it is for the Triple Vehicle simply the result of the activity of *vijñāna* No. 7, which mistakes the 'seeing part' (*kem bun*) of *vijñāna* No. 8 for an ego and thereby gives rise to all false conceptions.

The world-view of the Triple Vehicle, as resumed above, may be called sober and rational, as it always seeks for positive causes. Even in the logical construction of this system however there is a *weak point*, namely the doctrine that 'the originally-possessed pure seeds depend on, and are attached to, *ālaya vijñāna*.' One theory is that the originally-pure seeds depend on, and are attached to, the 'form part' (*sō bun*) of *ālaya-vijñāna*; another theory is that they depend on, and are attached to, the 'self substance part' (*jī tai bun*) of *ālaya vijñāna*.

They are considered 'to depend on and to be attached to' *ālaya vijñāna*, because, being originally pure, they could not be possessed by, or included in, an *ālaya vijñāna* of impure nature. What then is the precise difference between the conception of 'depending on and being attached to,' and the other of 'being possessed by' or 'included in'? Again if there be a clear difference, how can a priori pure seeds (*asaṃskṛita*) depend on and be attached to an impure phenomenal (*saṃskṛita*) entity? The Hossō scholars do not give any satisfactory answer to this question. They fail to make

clear how a priori pure *bījas* can be the driving power of phenomenal *ālaya vijñāna* of impure nature. Here a discrepancy arises which weakens the sober rationalism of the Yui Shiki system, as it introduces an incongruent supernatural element into its phenomenology.

These weak points of the Triple Vehicle, as well as of the One Vehicle, Prof. Tokiwa proposes to eliminate.

The *One Vehicle* ought accordingly to descend a step from its pinnacle of True Likeness (*shin nyō*) or Womb of the Absolute (*nyorai zō*) and to base its theory of universal Buddha-nature directly on *ālaya vijñāna*.

The *Triple Vehicle*, in order to get rid of its weak points, ought to select one of the two following ways: either it must acknowledge that from impure seeds (*u ro shū ji*) there can arise pure dharmas (*mu ro hō*), which would clear the way for an *ālaya vijñāna* of truly uniform character, having no need for any a priori pure seeds, in order to be purified. Or, a second way of purging the Hossō teaching from its weaknesses would be the change of its doctrine regarding the originally-possessed pure seeds (*hon nu mu ro shū ji*), by developing it from an '*ichi bun e fu*' theory (a theory which maintains, that only a part of the people possess the originally-pure seeds, depending on, and being attached to, *ālaya vijñāna*) into a '*zēma bun e fu*' theory (a theory which contends that all people possess the originally-pure seeds, depending on and being attached to, *ālaya vijñāna*).

In this way the *One Vehicle* teaching and the *Triple Vehicle* teaching would be brought into line and *harmony between the two* established.

The common ground on which, according to Tokiwa, the teachings of both 'houses' could meet, is the *ālaya vijñāna* theory of the 'Shō Dai Jō Ron' and of the 'Ki Shin Ron.' The 'Shō Dai Jō Ron'—or 'Mahāyāna Saṃparigraha Sāstra,' by Asanga, which is a Hossō authority—understands *ālaya vijñāna* to be a connexion of impure parts (*zēma bun*) and pure parts (*shō jō bun*). The 'Ki Shin Ron'—

or 'Mahāyāna Śraddhopāda Śāstra,' attributed rightly or wrongly to Aśvaghosha, a great authority for all Pure Mahāyāna Schools—understands ālaya vijñāna as possessing the two meanings of enlightenment (*kaku*) and non-enlightenment (*fu kaku* or *mu myō*). Though the point of departure of the one śāstra is the idea of impurity, and that of the other the idea of enlightenment, they meet in the conception of ālaya vijñāna, regarding which the views of the two texts are similar.

"I think"—concludes Tokiwa—"that our real form (*jissō*) is shown best by these theories, i.e. of 'Shō Dai Jō Ron' and 'Ki Shin Ron.' If the Three Vehicle House would adopt the idea of enlightenment (*kaku*) from the One Vehicle House, and if the One Vehicle House would adopt the idea of impurity (*zen ma*) from the Three Vehicle House, then the Buddha-nature theory of the Buddhist teaching of the past would reach the most developed formulation." Though this connexion of the One Vehicle House and the Three Vehicle House, on the basis of the ālaya vijñāna teaching of the 'Shō Dai Jō Ron' and the 'Ki Shin Ron,' may outwardly appear a return to Buddhist origins, when Buddhism was not yet divided into Triyāna and Ekayāna Schools, yet it would, according to Tokiwa, really mean a new development, namely the establishment of an ideal and perfect Buddha-nature theory, whereby Buddhist metaphysics would be placed on a new and solid foundation, combining the strongest points of the Triyāna and Ekayāna teachings.

This résumé of the noted Japanese scholar's views will be found helpful to a proper understanding of the distinctions which separate the Hossō teaching from that of the Higher Mahāyāna Schools. At the same time the reader may by it be enabled to grasp the deeper thoughts underlying the Ekayāna. Nevertheless we wish to make it clear that we cannot accept the learned author's views in regard to the bearing of his proposed changes, and that we feel

rather sceptical concerning the *possibility of harmonizing the Triple Vehicle and the One Vehicle.*

The author says: "By adopting '*zē bun e fu setsu*' (i.e. the theory of original pure seeds depending on and adhering to the ālaya vijñāna of all people) instead of '*ichi bun e fu setsu*' (i.e. the theory of original pure seeds depending on and adhering to the ālaya vijñāna of a part of the people), Yui Shiki (i.e. the philosophy of Hossō) will really come to accept the 'nature of understanding' (*ge shō*) inside ālaya vijñāna, namely it will acknowledge the 'pure part' (*jō bun*) of ālaya vijñāna, and the meaning of 'enlightenment' (*kaku*) inside ālaya vijñāna; and by such slight adjustments the fundamental theory of Yui Shiki will not come to grief in any way and will not be affected even to the slightest degree."—To us these adjustments seem, on the contrary, so far-reaching in their bearing, that they amount to a complete revolution of the Hossō teaching. Hossō, adjusted in this way, would indeed be no longer Hossō.

The learned author again says that the theory of five natures especially, so characteristic of the Hossō philosophy, would not be obliterated by his proposed adjustments. But how can the theory of Five Natures be harmonized with the theory of One Nature? How can the principle of Difference be harmonized with the principle of Sameness? The only truly philosophical solution to this problem, in the history of Buddhism, has been offered by the teaching of Identity of the Tendai and Kegon Schools, to which however Tokiwa objects, as it confuses the world of cause and the world of effect.

This transcendental philosophy of Tendai and Kegon does not seem to have been taken fully into consideration by the learned author in his estimate of the One Vehicle. He does not thrash out the pros and cons which might be evinced in regard to the metaphysics of these two schools,—a very painful process indeed, but through which one has to go,

before the theoretical foundations of a new and perfect Buddhism can be established. Tokiwa contents himself with eliminating, in a casual manner, what he considers the weak points of Triyāna and Ekayāna, and combines their good points.

Can we however, by such a procedure, really get a new philosophy? Or would we not ultimately be faced by an artificial and illogical construction only? Combining the good points of Triyāna and Ekayāna can mean anything or nothing. Only by isolating each of the many metaphysical problems of Buddhism, by discussing them critically, and by comparing the conflicting answers given by the various schools to each problem, can we discover without falling into contradictions, if such a combination is possible.

Tokiwa objects to the avowal of incomprehensibility of some fundamental theorems advanced by the One Vehicle House. But is it possible to make everything comprehensible? Is not the open avowal of incomprehensibility a proof rather of the sincerity of the One Vehicle teaching? Tokiwa objects also to the introduction of supernatural elements into the teaching of the Three Vehicles. Yet is it possible to reject such supernatural elements from any philosophical system which is not averse to religion? If the Hossō philosophy admits them, is it not simply accepting the inevitable, because of its teaching being not only a philosophical, but also a religious one? Both weaknesses to which Tokiwa objects, seem to us unavoidable, and inherent in any system which desires to explain eternal truths by the reasoning of the human mind, and any efforts to eradicate such weaknesses seem to us futile and destined to deceive him who attempts them.

By adopting the 'Shō Dai Jō Ron' and the 'Ki Shin Ron' as the basis, the problem of impurity and enlightenment and their relation to purity and unenlightenment is certainly not brought nearer its solution. Or is the relation between *mu myō* and *ālaya vijñāna* in the 'Ki Shin Ron'

teaching not quite as incomprehensible as the relation between *mu myō* and *shin nyo* in the so-called One Vehicle teaching? And cannot the same be said of the relation between purity and *ālaya vijñāna* in the 'Shō Dai Jō Ron' teaching, as compared with the other Three Vehicle teaching? The 'Shō Dai Jō Ron' and the 'Ki Shin Ron' consider *ālaya vijñāya* as a variety of *shin nyo*, i.e. an a priori substance of absolute purity and enlightenment, involving as an element of tension another contradictory element, namely impurity and unenlightenment, which however does not in the least depreciate the unity and absoluteness of the a priori substance. This axiom is perhaps the most incomprehensible among all metaphysical axioms advanced by the various Buddhist schools, and therefore the least likely to give general satisfaction.

Moreover we cannot possibly lay the foundation of a new Buddhism by paying attention only to the theoretical schools and ignoring the practical schools. By practical schools we understand those of the Zen sect and Japanese Buddhism as it has developed since the Kamakura Era, i.e. the Nembutsu and Nichiren Sects. This Buddhism has deliberately turned away from philosophy, expecting all from intuition, belief or prayer. Thus would it appear that the Buddhism of that country which may be regarded as representative of the most advanced and vigorous Buddhism, i.e. Japan, considers theory of little worth, though it includes a fair number of Buddhist scholars who are engaged in the noble work of research in Buddhist philosophy.

At any rate, before laying the new foundation of Buddhist metaphysics, we have to consider the relationship of Buddhist theory to Buddhist practice, and to answer the question, how any fundamental change in the theory may react on its practice. A metaphysical foundation which does not agree with the practical stand of the above-mentioned schools would certainly not be to their liking.

BRUNO PETZOLD