

[3.] 1. Contemplating the Sense Fields While Sitting Properly in Meditation
[52b18–100b16]

1. Contemplating Objects as Inconceivable [52b18–55c26]

The first [mode of] “contemplating thoughts” 觀心 is [to contemplate] objects as inconceivable. It is very difficult to explain these objects [as incon-

Contemplating objects as inconceivable 觀不可思議境: this section is one of the most important and influential of all of Chih-i’s work, especially his analysis of (what Chan-jan identifies as) the “three thousand realms in a single thought or moment of consciousness” 一念三千 (Jpn. *ichinen-sanzen*). There is room for debate as to whether or not Chih-i meant the exact term of the “three thousand realms in a single thought” to be taken as *the most essential* phrase that exemplifies his thought. I will argue below that the presentation of the “three thousand realms in a single thought” is the expression of objects as inconceivable on the level of the contemplation of conventionality, one aspect of “threefold contemplation,” and that Chih-i goes on to expound “objects as inconceivable” at the other levels, namely of the contemplation of emptiness and the contemplation of the Middle. Thus it may not be appropriate to take this phrase as the final and highest expression of Chih-i’s thought. Admitting this is not to deny the influence of this phrase, especially in the Japanese Tendai and Nichiren traditions. Hurvitz focuses on this section in his work on Chih-i (see *Chih-i*, 271–318); Kanno Hiroshi’s book based on a translation of this section is entitled *Ichinen sanzen to wa nani ka* [What is “the three thousand realms in a single thought”] (1992).

The first [mode of] “contemplating thoughts” 觀心 is [to contemplate] objects as inconceivable 一觀心是不可思議境: or, to give a more traditional reading, “the first [mode of contemplation] is to contemplate thoughts (or, “the mind”)

as inconceivable object[s].” However, it is the “skandhas, sense entrances, and sense realms” (which includes “consciousness” or “mind”) that are “inconceivable objects,” not just “mind” or “thoughts.” The question is this: is it the mind itself (or “thoughts”) that is/are the inconceivable object(s), or is it that one contemplates all phenomenal objects (including the “skandhas, sense entrances, and sense realms,” including the mind, or thoughts) as inconceivable—that is, as beyond conceptual understanding, and incapable of being “apprehended” or “obtained”? Does Chih-i mean that the mind contemplates only itself or its own thoughts as “objects” (a position that involves the danger of a mistaken reification of a “mind” independent of mental functions, e.g., “a mind and its thoughts”), or does he intend to say that the “objects” are the wider phenomena “beyond” (though only apprehended and experienced through) the mind or mental functions (a more “realist” position). I believe that the second position more closely approximates Chih-i’s intention.

Grammatically speaking, one can take the two characters 觀心 as a compound, or one can take “contemplating” 觀 to modify the whole phrase. The second reading is the traditional one, giving the interpretation “contemplating the mind (or ‘thoughts’) as an inconceivable object.” See the readings of Sekiguchi, *Makashikan* 1, 279; Kanno, *Ichinen sanzen*, 143; and the *kaeriten* of the standard *Mo-ho chih-kuan* texts (see BT–III, 235), as well as in the Taishō canon (T 46.52b18–19). Hurvitz (*Chih-i*, 302–303) avoids the problem by

ceivable], so first I will clarify [the meaning of] objects as conceivable. Then it will be easy to manifest [the meaning of] objects as inconceivable.

1. Contemplating the Conceivable [52b20]

Conceivable dharmas are as follows. The Hinayāna also teaches that all

translating as “the contemplation of the ‘realm of the inconceivable.’” Actually this is an accurate translation by Hurvtiz of the first entry of the ten objects of contemplation (52b1), not of the phrase that appears here on 52b18.

Perhaps such a distinction is not important, and the dilemma only appears when trying to translate the phrase into a Latin language. In the section above and in what follows, Chih-i is careful to point out that in any case there are no actions that we do or phenomena we can experience outside of our thoughts, or the workings of our “mind,” and that there is no radical separation between a mind, thoughts, and the world that is experienced (see line 52b26: “The mind that contemplates also does not remain or abide from thought to thought”). The important factor is what we do to contemplate, comprehend, interpret, and utilize the experience of these phenomena.

More important is the meaning here of “mind” or “thoughts,” and the interpretation of these terms has traditionally been controversial. Chih-li, for example, criticized the interpretation of “the mind of contemplation” as referring to a Buddha-nature-like “pure” or “real” mind, and argued that “mind” or “thoughts” here refers to ordinary, ignorant thoughts (see Ikeda, *Makashikan kenkyū josetsu*, 1986, 230–52). This was a crucial point in the debate between the “on-mountain” and “off-mountain” T’ien-t’ai interpreters of Chih-li’s time.

I have chosen the interpretation and translation of “contemplating objects as inconceivable” because I think that it bet-

ter reflects the context. This is the opening phrase for explaining the first of the ten modes of contemplation, which is part of the first of “the ten objects of contemplation.” It makes sense to understand “inconceivable objects” as the focus of the “contemplating thoughts,” and not just mind or thoughts as inconceivable, though of course “mind” and “thoughts” are included in the objects of contemplation and Chih-i focusses on contemplating thoughts as the most accessible of “objects.” A few lines earlier (52b1) where the ten methods of contemplation are listed, the two characters “contemplating thoughts” are clearly taken as a compound. Thus, the first “type” or “mode” of “contemplating thoughts” is “contemplating objects as inconceivable.”

Finally, the closing sentence of this section (54a18) describes the relationship between thoughts and their objects (“all phenomena” [*sarva-dharma*]) as “beyond conceptual understanding and verbalization,” and thus “the inconceivable objects.” It seems likely that in this section Chih-i is teaching that both thoughts and external phenomena—all mental functions and their objects—are inconceivable, and not just “the mind.”

Objects as inconceivable 不思議境: or, “this inconceivability of objects.”

Conceivable dharmas 思議法: this phrase is very ambiguous, depending on how you interpret “dharma”—as phenomenal object, as teaching, as method or way, as the practice of contemplation?—and whether or not the term “object” 境 is implied following the term “conceivable”

dharmas arise through the mind, that is, [in terms of the teaching of the cycle of] cause and effect in the six destinies [from hell to gods] and transmigration in the triple world [of desire, form, and no-form]. [According to this teaching,] if you wish to depart from the ordinary [realm of deluded beings] and seek the noble [realm of the sages], you should abandon what is below and reach what is above, that is, the wisdom of extinction [of consciousness] and the reduction of the body to ashes. This includes [the understanding of] the Four [Noble] Truths as “created” [that is, as “arising-and-perishing”]; these are dharmas that are conceivable.

The Mahāyāna also clarifies [the teaching that] all dharmas arise through the mind, that is, [in terms of the teaching of] the ten dharma realms [from hell to Buddhahood]. [According to this teaching,] if in contemplating thoughts [you contemplate objects] as existing, [you realize that] there are

思議. Thus, this phrase could be translated as, “phenomena that can be conceived,” “the way or method to conceive (objects),” “the way or method [to contemplate the mind or objects] as conceivable,” or, “the conceivable teachings.” I have chosen to leave it ambiguous.

Wisdom of extinction and the reduction of the body to ashes 灰身滅智: one of the four phrases used in T’ien-t’ai to express the (“inferior”) Hīnayāna understanding of nirvana: “warped” in understanding, “clumsy” in their means of salvation, and involving the belief that nirvana means a reduction of the body to “ashes” and the extinction of consciousness, and is analogous to the travelers in the parable of the conjured city who tarry “near” the city rather than advancing further on the way to the final goal. See “warped, clumsy, ashes, and near” in the Glossary. See also the use of this term in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* above at 23c29–24a1.

Four [Noble] Truths as “created” 有作四諦: or, “involving action”; the first of the four kinds of understanding of the Four Noble Truths, at the level of those of the Tripiṭaka Teaching, which emphasizes the constant arising and perishing of the interdependent web of causes and conditions that are phenomena. For an

analysis of these four types see Swanson, *Foundations*, 9–11, and the translation of Chih-i’s analysis of these four types in the *Fa-hua hsiian-i* (T 33.700c–702a) in Swanson, 226–34. See also the discussion of these four categories earlier in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* at 5b13–6a6.

Following the pattern of the threefold truth and the *Middle Treatise* verse 24:18, this interpretation corresponds to the first level of “the dependent arising of all dharmas.”

These are dharmas that are conceivable 思議法: in this case it is fairly clear that “dharma” refers to “phenomena,” namely phenomena as the causes and effects of the arising and perishing of things. Phenomena in this sense can be conceptually understood. Still, it is not impossible to interpret “dharma” here as “teaching,” that is, the Hīnayāna teachings that can be conceptually understood.

If in contemplating thoughts [you contemplate objects] as existing 觀心是有: “If you contemplate thoughts as existing” would be a more natural reading of the Chinese, but the discussion that follows clearly is discussing types of “existences” or “destinies,” not just good and evil thoughts; though for Chih-i there is no hard separation between “thoughts”

good and there are evil [existences]. There are three kinds of evil [thoughts and existences]: the causes and results of the three [evil] destinies [of hell, hungry ghosts, and beasts]; and there are three kinds of good [existences]—the causes and results of asuras, human beings, and gods. If you contemplate these six kinds [of existences] as transient and as arising-and-perishing, then [you realize that] the mind that contemplates also does not remain or abide from thought to thought.

Both that which contemplates and that which is contemplated arise through conditions. Because they arise through conditions they are empty. Both are the causes and results of phenomena [as understood] by those of the two vehicles [of the śrāvaka and pratyekabuddha].

If through contemplating this emptiness of existence you fall into the two extremes [of eternalism or annihilationism]—by drowning in emptiness or stagnating in [delusions concerning] Being—you should arouse great compassion and “re-enter” conventional existence to save and transform [other] beings. Although you do not really have a [physical] body, you conventionally create a body; though in reality there is no [substantial] emptiness, [52c] you conventionally teach emptiness and thus guide and transform [other beings]. This is [the understanding of] the causes and results of phenomena by the bodhisattva.

In contemplating these phenomena [in this way]—those who save and

and the “realm of existence”; what one is thinking is the realm within one dwells. Thus in this case also I take “contemplating thoughts” 觀心 as a compound.

There are three kinds of good: the causes and results of asuras, human beings, and gods 善則三品脩羅人天因果: these phrases are found in the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.280a22–23, though it is not clear whether or not Chih-i was consciously “quoting” the *Ta chih tu lun*.

The mind that contemplates also does not remain or abide from thought to thought 能觀之心亦念念不住: perhaps a reference to a passage in the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.372b19–21:

There are two types of “transience.” First is the extinction from thought to thought. All conditioned phenomena do not last or abide for even one momentary thought. Second is the transience that

is so-named because of the destruction of all dharmas that continue [one after the other].

Note that this passage denies an ongoing, fundamental (“pure”) mind.

Both that which contemplates ... by those of the two vehicles: following the pattern of the threefold truth and the *Middle Treatise* verse 24:18, this interpretation corresponds to the second level of “emptiness” and the Shared Teaching.

If through contemplating this emptiness ... by the bodhisattva: following the pattern of the threefold truth and the *Middle Treatise* verse 24:18, this interpretation corresponds to the third level of “conventionality,” the Distinct Teaching.

In contemplating these phenomena ... by the Buddha: following the pattern of the threefold truth and the *Middle Treatise* verse 24:18, this interpretation corre-

those who are saved—[you realize that] all phenomena have the true aspect of the Middle Way and are ultimately pure. What is good and what is evil? What exists and what does not? Who is saved and who is not saved? [These distinctions are not ultimately real.] All dharmas are just like this—this is [the understanding of] the causes and results of phenomena by the Buddha.

These ten dharma[-realms from hell to Buddhahood] are adjoined and wind from the shallow to the profound; [in any case] they all arise through the mind. [This understanding] is included in the Mahāyāna [interpretation of] the Four [Noble] Truths as “immeasurable.” This still concerns objects as conceivable, and this is not what is contemplated in the current [practice of] cessation-and-contemplation [as taught in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*].

2. Contemplating the Inconceivable [52c6]

[The contemplation of] objects as inconceivable is as follows. As it says in the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*: “The mind is like an artist that creates the various five skandhas [like a painter creates images with various colors]; But in all the world there is nothing that is not created through the mind.” “The various five skandhas [or aggregates]” refers to the five skandhas of the ten dharma realms as explained above.

1. The Ten Dharma Realms [52c9]

“Dharma realm” has three meanings. The number “ten” refers to that which

sponds to the fourth level of “the Middle” and the Perfect Teaching.

Four [Noble] Truths as “immeasurable” 無量四諦: the third of the four types of understanding the Four Noble Truths which emphasizes the “immeasurable” aspects of conventional existence. See note above on the four types of Four Noble Truths.

The mind is like an artist that creates the various five skandhas; But in all the world there is nothing that is not created through the mind 心如工畫師造種種五陰。一切世間中莫不從心造: see the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*, T 9.465c26–27. The *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* text is slightly different: “The mind is like an artist; it draws with the various five skandhas. But in all the world there is

no dharma that is not so produced.” For a full translation of the context, see the note under *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 8b23.

“Dharma realm” has three meanings 法界者三義: corresponding to the pattern of the threefold truth and similar to the threefold reading of the phrase “ten suchlikes” as explained below and in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (T 33.693b5–694a8); see Swanson, *Foundations*, 179–84. In short, emphasizing the individual and specific aspects of the *ten* dharma realms is to emphasize the aspect of their conventionality, emphasizing the common essence of the *ten dharma realms* is to emphasize their emptiness, and to take the “ten dharma realms” as a whole is to emphasize the aspect of the Middle. This reading

depends 能依 [that is, their multifarious conventionality]; the “dharma realms” refers to that which is depended upon 所依 [that is, their emptiness], and since they are merged together they are called “ten dharma realms” [which corresponds to the Middle].

Again, each of the ten dharma [realms] has its own causes and it own results that are not mixed or confused with the others; therefore they are called “ten dharma realms.” Again, these ten dharma [realms] are each in themselves and in essence all the Dharma realm (*dharmadhātu*), therefore they are called “ten *dharma realms*,” and so forth.

The “ten dharma realms” are also known as [various amalgamations of] the [five] aggregates (*skandha*), the [twelve] sense entrances (*āyatana*) and the [eighteen] sense realms (*dhātu*), but in reality they are [each] not quite the same. The three [evil] destinies consist of defiled and evil skandhas, sense realms, and sense entrances. The three good [destinies] consist of defiled yet good skandhas, sense realms, and sense entrances. Those of the two vehicles [of the śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas] consist of undefiled skandhas, sense realms, and sense entrances. The bodhisattvas consist of both defiled and undefiled skandhas, sense realms, and sense entrances. A Buddha consists of neither defiled nor undefiled skandhas, sense realms, and sense entrances. The *Treatise* says, “The supreme dharma is nirvana”; thus this dharma is nei-

seems more forced than the similar interpretation of the threefold readings of “ten suchlikes.”

Ten dharma realms 十法界: this is the aspect of the immeasurable variety of existence as conventionally existent.

Each in themselves and in essence all the Dharma realm 十法——當體皆是法界: or, each dharma realm has its own individual identity and character, but all are in the same way empty yet in essence part of the Dharma realm that is *dharmadhātu*. Chih-i is playing with words here, first using the term “dharma realm” 法界 to refer to each of the individual destinies or realms of existence from hell to Buddhahood, and then using the same term “Dharma realm” 法界 as the translation of *dharmadhātu* to convey the participation of each phenomenon in the totality of reality.

Therefore they are called “ten dharma realms” 故言十時[法]界: this is the aspect of

the dharma realms as universally empty of substantial existence. Note that the Taishō text (T 46.52c12) has “ten time realms” 十時界 here, but this does not make any sense and later editions (see BT-III, 243) correct this to “ten dharma realms.” Perhaps it was a copyist’s error, as the term “ten times” appears below.

And so forth: Chih-i skips the third aspect of the ten dharma realms as the Middle.

Skandhas, sense realms, and sense entrances 陰界入: for some unknown reason, the usual order of the *āyatana* and *dhātu* is reversed in this section.

Both defiled and undefiled 亦有漏亦無漏: they are “defiled” (that is, still involve “outflows” of passions] because they choose to remain in this defiled world to help others.

The supreme dharma is nirvana 法無上者涅槃是: the *Ta chih tu lun* says “Among

ther defiled nor undefiled. The *Sūtra of Immeasurable Meanings* says, “The Buddha does not have any of the [five] elements [of earth and so forth] or skandhas or sense realms,” but this means that [the Buddha] has none of the skandhas, sense entrances, or sense realms of the first nine destinies. Now, to say that [the Buddha] does have [skandhas and so forth] means that he has the constantly dwelling skandhas, sense realms, and sense entrances of nirvana. The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* says, “By extinguishing transient form (*rūpa*) you attain permanent form, and the same is the case with [the other skandhas of] sensation, conception, volition, and consciousness.” For bliss and eternity to overlap is the meaning of “accumulation,” and to be covered with compassion is the meaning of “overshadowing.” Since the types of skandhas in the ten realms are not the same, they are called the “world of the five skandhas.”

all the dharmas, nirvana is the supreme dharma, just as the Buddha is supreme among all sentient beings” (T 25.72b3–4). There is no mention of being “neither defiled nor undefiled.”

The Buddha does not have any of the elements or skandhas or sense realms 佛無諸大陰界入: see the verses in the *Sūtra of Immeasurable Meanings*, T 9.384c29–385a3, which read:

Great is the great awakened one, the great noble Lord;

Who is without defilement, without contamination, and without attachment.

He is the master of gods, men, elephants and horses,

His moral breeze and fragrance of virtue permeates all.

Serene is his wisdom, calm his emotion, and stable his prudence.

His thought is settled, his consciousness extinct, and his mind quiescent.

Long since he has severed dreamlike and deluded thoughts;

Neither does he have any of the [five] elements or the skandhas, sense entrances, or sense realms....

See also *The Threefold Lotus Sutra*, 6.

By extinguishing transient form you attain permanent form, and the same is

the case with sensation, conception, volition, and consciousness 因滅無常色獲得常色。受想行識亦復如是: this phrase from the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (T 12.838b16–18) has been quoted before in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, at 23b29. The full context reads:

Form is transient. By extinguishing form you attain liberation and the form of constant dwelling. It is the same for sensations, conceptions, volitions, and consciousness. By extinguishing consciousness you attain the consciousness of constant dwelling.

For bliss and eternity to overlap is the meaning of “accumulation,” and to be covered with compassion is the meaning of “overshadowing” 常樂重沓即積聚義。慈悲覆蓋即陰義: hence the connection with “the skandhas” (the “aggregates”). These two terms—“accumulation” and “overshadowing darkness”—are used at the beginning of this section as synonyms of the five skandhas; see *Mo-ho chih-kuan* above at 51c22–23.

World of the five skandhas 五陰世間: one of three categories 三種世間 (as expounded in the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.402a) into which the world is divided, that is, the world of the five skandhas, the world of sentient beings 衆生世間, and various lands 国土世間.

[The accumulation of various factors that are made of] the mixture of the five skandhas is customarily called “a sentient being,” but sentient beings are not all the same. The mixture of the five skandhas of the three evil destinies is sentient beings full of offense and suffering. The mixture of the skandhas of human beings and gods is sentient beings who experience bliss. The mixture of undefiled skandhas is a true and noble sentient being [such as a śrāvaka or pratyekabuddha]. The mixture of skandhas of compassion is a sentient being that is a [bodhisattva-]mahāsattva. The mixture of the skandhas of constant dwelling [of nirvana] is a sentient being of ultimate honor [that is, a Buddha]. The *Ta chih tu lun* says, “The supreme sentient being is the Buddha.” How can it be said that [the Buddha is] the same as the ordinary and inferior [being]? The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* [also] says, “From the time of *kalala* [the first week of a fetus in the womb] the names [for a sentient being] are different, until at the time of old age the names are different [and yet it is the ‘same’ human being]. At the stage of a sprout the names are different, up to the time of becoming a fruit the names are different.” When examined from the perspective of a complete life [from conception to death], you can distinguish ten periods. [in a single human being]; how can you not see dif-

[Bodhisattva-]mahāsattva 大士: lit. “great being,” or *mahāsattva*; one of the synonyms for a bodhisattva.

The supreme sentient being is the Buddha 衆生無上者佛是: another paraphrase from the *Ta chih tu lun* passage quoted above, T 25.72b3–4.

From the time of *kalala* ... the names are different 歌羅邏時名字異乃至老時名字異。芽時名字異: a considerably abbreviated version of a longer exposition illustrating the transiency of physical form (*rūpa*) in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.688a8–29:

Form is transient; fundamentally [that is, substantially] it does not arise, because as it arises it is already perishing. [When a fetus is] in the womb within the body, at the time of *kalala* [the first week after conception] fundamentally it does not arise, because as it arises it is already perishing. Outside, all sprouts and stems [of plants] fundamentally do not arise, because as they arise they are already perishing. Therefore it should be known

that all phenomenal dharmas of form are transient.

Good sons. Forms that exist within [the body] change over time. At the time of *kalala* it is different; at the time of *arbuda* [the second week] it is different; at the time of *ghana* [the fourth week] it is different; at the time of *peśi* [the third week] it is different; at the time of *praśākhā* [the fifth week] it is different; at the time of birth it is different; at the time of infancy it is different; at the time of childhood it is different; and so forth, up to at the time of old age and so forth, each stage [in the development of a human being] is different and involves change. Outer forms [such as plants] are also likewise. A sprout is different, a stem is different, a branch is different, a leaf is different, a flower is different, and a fruit is different.

Again, good sons, the flavors are different,... the powers are different,... the appearances are different,... *the names are different* ... [and so forth].

Ten periods 十時: see the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.836a21–24. The ten

ferences between sentient beings of the ten realms? [53a] Therefore these are called the “world of sentient beings”.

The places where the ten types [of sentient beings] dwell is commonly called “various lands” and are as follows: hell, in which beings dwell in red[-hot] iron; [the land of] beasts, which dwell in the earth, water, and sky; the asura, who dwell near the seashore and under the sea; human beings dwell on the earth; and gods dwell in [heavenly] palaces. The bodhisattvas of the six perfections dwell on the earth, the same as human beings. As for the bodhisattvas of the Shared Teaching, those who still have not yet extinguished their delusions dwell the same as human beings or gods, and those who have severed and extinguished their delusions dwell in the land where skillful means [remain]. As for bodhisattvas of the Distinct and Perfect Teachings, those who have not yet extinguished all delusions dwell the same as human beings or gods, or in the land where skillful means [remain], and those who have severed and extinguished their delusions dwell in the land of true recompense. Tathāgatas dwell in the land of eternal quiescent light. As it says in the *Jen-wang ching*, “Those in the three levels of erudition and the ten

periods are: 1. membrane 膜; 2. foam 泡; 3. in the placenta 胞; 4. ball of flesh 肉團; 5. growth of limbs 身支; 6. infancy 嬰孩; 7. childhood 童子; 8. youth 少年; 9. mature adult 盛壯; and 10. decrepit old age 衰老.

The “world of sentient beings” 衆生世間: the second of the three types of worlds into which the realm of experience is divided.

“Various lands” 國土世間: the third of the three types of worlds into which the realm of experience is divided.

Red[-hot] iron 赤鐵: the use of the compound “hot iron” is more common, so I have translated this as “red-hot iron.” See, for example, the description of hell in the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.175c-176c.

Dwell near the seashore and under the sea 海畔海底住: see, for example, the *Long Āgama*, T 1.129c2-3: “The Buddha said to the monks, ‘At the bottom of the sea to the north of Mount Sumeru, there is a city of the asura.’”

Bodhisattvas of the six perfections 六度菩薩: that is, bodhisattvas of the Tripi-

taka Teaching.

Land where skillful means [remain] 方便土: one of the “four [Buddha] lands” as taught in the T’ien-t’ai system.

Dwell the same as human beings or gods 同人依地住: perhaps the “land where ordinary people, divine beings, sages, and so forth dwell together,” one of the “four [Buddha] lands.”

Land of true recompense 實報土: another one of the “four [Buddha] lands,” a state wherein a bodhisattva enjoys the well-deserved rewards of his good karma.

Land of eternal quiescent light 常寂光土: another one of the “four [Buddha] lands.” The phrase is from the *Contemplation of Samantabhadra*, T 9.392c16.

Three levels of erudition 三賢: in this case referring to the three groups of ten abodes, ten levels of practice, and ten levels of merit transference, not the three levels of practice prior to attaining arhatship.

Those in the three levels of erudition and the ten noble stages dwell with the fruit of their reward, and only the Bud-

noble [bodhisattva] stages dwell with the fruit of their reward, and only the Buddha alone dwells in the Pure Land.” Each of these lands is not the same; [as the others]; therefore they are called “various lands.”

These thirty types of worlds are all created through the mind.

2. *The Ten Suchlikes* [53a10]

Again, each and every one of the ten types of five skandhas [from the beings of hell to Buddhahood] is endowed with ten characteristics: suchlike 1. appearance, 2. nature, 3. essence, 4. power, 5. activity, 6. causes, 7. conditions, 8. results, 9. recompense, and 10. the beginning and end ultimately equal. First I will give a general interpretation, and then an interpretation according to type [of dharma realm].

1. General interpretation of the ten suchlikes [53a12]

1. “Appearance” [or “marks”] has its point of reference externally. As the *Ta chih tu lun* says, “It is called ‘appearance’ because it is easily known, as the

dha alone dwells in the Pure Land 三賢十聖住果報唯佛一人居淨土: verbatim from the *Jen-wang ching*, T 8.828a1.

Thirty types of worlds 三十種世間: that is, the ten destinies each contain the three types of worlds, giving thirty types of experiential realms.

Suchlike 如是: “suchlike” is an awkward phrase, but implies the meaning of “as things truly are.” See the following note.

Suchlike appearance 相, **nature** 性, **essence** 體, **power** 力, **activity** 作, **causes** 因, **conditions** 緣, **results** 果, **recompense** 報, **and the beginning and end ultimately equal** 本末究竟等: this list is based on a passage from the second chapter on “Means” of the *Lotus Sūtra* (T 9.5c11–13) as translated by Kumārajīva, which, as Hurvitz points out, is so different from the extant Sanskrit that he devotes a long note to discussing the differences (see Hurvitz, *Lotus Sūtra*, 349–50 [317–18]). Hurvitz translates the Chinese as follows:

Concerning the prime, hard-to-understand dharmas, which the Buddha has perfected, only a Buddha and a Bud-

dha can exhaust their reality, namely, the suchness of the dharmas, the suchness of their marks, the suchness of their nature, the suchness of their substance, the suchness of their powers, the suchness of their functions, the suchness of their causes, the suchness of their conditions, the suchness of their effects, the suchness of their retributions, and the absolute identity of their beginning and end.

This is a prime example of the importance and influence of Kumārajīva’s translations for the development of T’ien-t’ai and Chinese Buddhist thought. See Hurvitz’s lengthy discussion of this issue in his *Chih-i*, 271–318.

For a discussion of Chih-i’s analysis of the same topic in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* see my *Foundations*, 131–35; for a fully annotated translation of the section of the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (T 33.694a10–696a3), see 184–96. See also KANNO 1992.

It is called ‘appearance’ because it is easily known, as the difference between water and fire is known by their appearance 易知故名爲相如水火相異則易可知: from the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.91a25, in

difference between water and fire is known by their [different] appearance.” This is like people [revealing] all their happiness [and sorrow, good and] evil through the visible form of their faces; you can know [what they are like] internally by observing their external appearance or marks.

In the [distant] past the “marks” of Sun and Liu were manifest, and the “marks” of Ts’ao were hidden, so that the diviner cried out in a great voice, “[The land between] the four seas will be divided into three, and the people will suffer greatly.” Thus, even if there are marks, people who are in the dark

answer to the question “What is that called ‘appearance or mark’ (*lakṣaṇa*),” in the context of a discussion of the Buddha’s thirty-two major physical “marks.” Lamotte, *Le Traité* 1, 280, translates:

Question. Pourquoi les appelle-t-on marques (*lakṣaṇa*)?

Réponse. Parce qu’elles sont faciles à reconnaître. Ainsi l’eau, qui diffère du feu, se reconnaît à ses marques.

Chodron (1, 234) translates:

Question. Why are they called marks (*lakṣaṇa*)?

Answer. Because they are easy to recognize. Thus water, which is different from fire, is recognized by its marks.

As can be seen in this example, 相 is the Chinese translation of *lakṣaṇa*. Although usually translated as “marks,” “characteristics,” “signs,” or “features,” I have chosen to translate it usually as “appearance” in this context, though sometimes “marks” is more appropriate. For Chih-i it is a single term that he uses in various senses that cannot be conveyed with a single consistent English translation.

Happiness [and sorrow, good and] evil 休否: this translation follows the explanation given by Chan-jan (BT-III, 256).

In the [distant] past the “marks” 相: that is, the evidence that allows a person who can “read the signs” to predict the future, or “read” someone’s personality.

Sun 孫, Liu 劉, and Ts’ao 曹: famous generals who occupied a prominent place

during the wars of the Three Kingdoms in the third century AD. See note below for details.

The diviner 相者: lit., “one who can [interpret] the marks,” that is, a soothsayer or fortune teller.

The four seas will be divided into three, and the people will suffer greatly 四海三分百姓荼毒: Chan-jan (BT-III, 256-57) explains: This example is given to illustrate how physical “marks” indicate or foretell the future. At the end of the Han period (third century, just before the period of the “Three Kingdoms”), these three people together visited a diviner. The “marks” were apparent that Sun and Liu would reign over a kingdom, and they were told so. Ts’ao’s marks were first concealed from the diviner. But Ts’ao knew that the diviner’s [predictions?] were unavoidable and so he lifted up his robes and showed [what formerly he had hidden?]. When the diviner finished his examination he cried out in a loud voice that the land under heaven and between the four seas would be divided into three and that there would be much suffering. By the end of the Later Han the fruits [of the labors] of these three people was such that they divided and took possession of the three areas of China. Sun (182-252) took possession of the Wu, Liu (161-223) took possession of the Minor Han, and Ts’ao (155-220) took possession of the Wei. [see opening section of Watson’s translation of “The Three Kingdoms”]

[and don't know how to interpret them] do not know [what they mean]; [on the other hand,] even if there are no [clear] marks, a diviner can reach a penetrating understanding [of them]. You should follow a good diviner (or reader of signs), and believe that people's external faces embody all the marks [that indicate their inner nature and true self].

The mind is also like this; it includes all marks. The marks of sentient beings [as to their future potential or Buddhahood] are hidden, the marks of Maitreya [that reveal his enlightenment] are manifest. The Tathāgata knows these [marks] well, and therefore can predict the near and distant [future]. Those who cannot perceive [these things] well and do not believe that the mind includes all marks should follow one who can perceive accurately and truly, and believe that the mind includes all marks.

2. Suchlike nature: nature has its point of reference internally. Generally speaking, this has three meanings:

1. "Nature" is also called "that which does not change." The *Sūtra of Non-activity* uses the term "unmoving nature."
2. Again, "nature" is called "individual nature." This is the meaning [of the characteristics] of specific types, which are not the same from one to the other [divisions or individuals], and each do not change.
3. Again, "nature" is "true nature," that is, [it participates in] the nature of reality, the ultimate reality that is without deficiency; this is another name for the Buddha-nature.

The "unmoving nature" corresponds to emptiness, the specific [indi-

Unmoving nature 不動性: see the *Sūtra on the non-activity of all dharmas* 諸法無行經, T #650. This text contains many references to "unmoving" or "immobile" marks, but not to "unmoving nature." See, for example T 15.756b21–29:

All sentient beings realize the nature of *bodhi*-wisdom; therefore it is said that all sentient beings attain *bodhi*. However, this *bodhi* is not a mark that is attained. Why? Because the nature of sentient beings is that of *bodhi*. Therefore for all sentient beings to attain *bodhi* is called "the unmoving mark (or characteristic)" [of sentient beings].

The World Honored One said: All sentient beings fulfill all wisdom; this is

called an "unmoving mark (or characteristic)."

Manjuśrī said: Why is this called an "unmoving mark (or characteristic)?"

The World Honored One said: All sentient beings are without a [substantial] nature. Because they are without a [substantial] nature, they can realize the Tathāgata's state of equanimity. From the beginning they have this nature of all wisdom. Because this nature is the same [whether one is an ordinary ignorant being or an enlightened one], it is called an "unmoving mark (or characteristic)."

Individual nature 性分: that is, the individual or personal characteristics with which one is born.

vidual] nature corresponds to conventionality, and the “true nature” corresponds to the Middle.

Now I will clarify [only the first meaning, that of] the inner nature as unchanging. Take, for example, the nature of fire [existing as a potential] within bamboo. Although [this nature] cannot be seen, it cannot be said to be nothing, for if dried grass is kindled, all will be burned away. The mind is also like this; it includes the natures of all of the five skandhas. Although these cannot be seen, they cannot be said to be nothing. If you contemplate this with the eye of wisdom [53b], [you can realize that] all natures are included therein.

[The misconceptions of] the people of the world [concerning the idea of “unchanging”] are laughable. They evaluate [the teachings of] the perfect sūtras on the basis of a one-sided hearing. Because the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* clarifies that the Buddha knows that sentient beings have Buddha-nature, they conclude that this means an “ultimate permanence.” Because the *Lotus Sūtra* clarifies that the Buddha knows the suchlike nature of all phenomena, they conclude that [everything is] transient. Why should it be concluded that [the teaching of] permanent [nirvana] is of little wisdom, and [the teaching of] transiency is of much wisdom [when both perspectives should be taken into account]? The *Lotus Sūtra* also says that the Buddha knows all phenomena, that all are of “one type and one nature.” These words,

Now I will clarify...: actually Chih-i launches into a discussion of the need for a balanced understanding of “permanence” and “transiency,” presumably as the correct way to understand the meaning of “unchanging.”

It cannot be said to be nothing for if there is a kindlier with dried grass, all will be burned away 不得言無燧人乾草遍燒一切: Chan-jan (BT-III, 259) and the classical commentaries link this analogy to the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*; see the passage at T 12.689b2–6:

Good sons. Take, for example, the arousing of fire by means of tinder, or by rubbing sticks, or by hand, or with dried cow’s dung. The tinder does not say, “I am able to arouse fire,” nor do the sticks, hands, or cow’s dung say “I am able to arouse fire.” The fire does not say, “I am able to arouse fire.” The Tathāgata is also like this.

The Buddha knows that sentient beings have Buddha-nature 佛知衆生有佛性: see, for example, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.643b7–8, 648b, and 767b.

The Buddha knows the suchlike nature of all phenomena 佛知一切法如是性: see the passage of the *Lotus Sūtra* quoted above, T 9.5c11–12.

The Buddha knows all phenomena, that all are of one type and one nature 佛知一切法皆是一種一性: supposedly from the same passage in the *Lotus Sūtra*, T 9.5c, though Chih-i seems to be rephrasing the passage in his own way. See also a later passage in the *Lotus Sūtra*, T 9.13c7–10, at the end of the parable of the burning house; Hurvitz (*Lotus Sūtra*, 63–64 [59–60]) translates:

Then he gives the Great Vehicle equally to all, not allowing any of them to gain passage into extinction for himself alone,

then, should also be of “little [wisdom]”; how, then, can they [one-sidedly] evaluate [the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* as teaching merely the idea of permanence and the *Lotus Sūtra* as teaching merely the idea of] transiency?

Again, there are teachers who assess the ten suchnesses in the *Lotus Sūtra* and say that the first five are tentative and belong to ordinary people, and that the last five are real and belong to the sages. If we rely on this interpretation, then ordinary people have no [relation to] the real, and will forever be unable to attain sagehood, and the noble sages have no [relation to] the tentative and thus cannot have true universal knowledge. This is truly a capricious attitude; it slanders the Buddha and ridicules ordinary people.

but conveying them all to the extinction of the Thus Come One. To all these living beings who have escaped the three worlds he gives the Buddhas’ dhyāna-concentration, their deliverance, and other devices of enjoyment, *all of one appearance, of one kind*, all praised by the saints, all able to bring about the prime, pure, and subtle joy.

Little [wisdom] 亦少: like above, where people conclude that the teaching of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* is of “little wisdom” because it speaks of a permanent and “constant” nirvana.

How, then, can they evaluate transiency 何故判為無常: in other words, the “perfect” teaching includes a balance of the ideas of permanent or constant abiding and transiency, which is beyond adequate verbal expression.

First five are tentative and belong to ordinary people, and that the last five are real and belong to the sages 前五如屬凡是權後五屬聖為實: in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* this theory is attributed to “teachers from the northern lands” in an extension of his criticism of Fa-yün’s position. The passage (T 33.693b26–c5) reads:

Next, in classifying the tentative and the real, Fa-yün classified the first five suchlikes as the tentative that belong to ordinary ignorant people. The next four suchlikes were classified as the real that belong to sages. The last suchlike is a gen-

eral one that brings together the tentative and the real. This verse [from the *Lotus Sūtra*] is quoted as proof: “the suchlike great results and recompense” Because they are “great,” therefore you can know the real. Because of “various meanings of nature and appearance” you can know the tentative.

I think that this [interpretation by Fa-yün] is mistaken. There are three meanings to the word “great”: large, many, and superior. If you accept “large” to be the meaning of the real, then you should also accept the meanings of “many” and “superior.” But is not the fact of having various names [which is the defining characteristic of conventional existence] the meaning of many? If you say that the tentative belongs to ordinary ignorant people, does that mean that ordinary people lack [participation in] the real? If the real belongs to the sages, then does that mean that sages lack [participation in] the tentative? If you examine this position, you can see that it is unreliable.

Also, the northern Masters say that the first five are the tentative and the later five are the real. This [interpretation is based on] human emotions [and not on wisdom, and so is unacceptable.]

For details see the annotated translation in my *Foundations*, 181–82.

A capricious attitude 專輒: lit., “concerned only with the side of the chariot where the arms are carried.”

Again, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* clarifies that “all sentient beings without exception have Buddha-nature,” and this is taken to imply “permanence.” The *Vimalakīrti Sūtra* says that “all sentient beings have the marks of *bodhi*-wisdom,” and this is taken to imply “transiency.” If the marks of Buddha-nature and *bodhi*-wisdom are different, then you could say that one is permanent and the other is transient. If they are not different [as it surely is the case], then this assessment [that one represents permanence and the other transiency] is a great error. It is like a diviner perceiving the marks and nature of a king and concluding that he will rise to the highest position; [in the same way] how can it be said that the marks of Buddha-nature and *bodhi*-wisdom are not the same?

3. Suchlike essence: that which is the central quality [of something] is called its “essence.” The skandhas of these ten dharma realms have the [respective] functioning of their form and mind as their essential quality.

4. Suchlike power: this is the enduring [potential] power to function. It is like a king’s champion who has thousands of myriads of skills; when he is sick none of them are any good, but when the disease is healed he recovers these functions. The mind is also likewise; it includes [the potential for] all powers, but because of the passionate afflictions one is not able bring them into play. If observed as it truly is, then [you will realize that the mind] includes all powers.

5. Suchlike activity: that which activates and constructs is called “activity.” There is nothing that is activated independently of the mind. Therefore know that the mind includes all activity.

6. Suchlike causes: that which solicits results are “causes”; they are also called “karmic deeds.” The karmic deeds of the ten dharma realms arise from

All sentient beings without exception have Buddha-nature 一切衆生悉有佛性; see, for example, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.767a29.

All sentient beings have the marks of *bodhi*-wisdom 一切衆生即菩提相: see the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra*, T 14.542b16. This passage has been quoted before in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*; for a full translation of the context see the notes at 18b4.

This is taken to imply “transiency” 判是無常: it is not clear to me how this passage implies “transiency.” It strikes me more as implying a “permanent” nature,

unless “marks” here refer to the “transient” thirty-two major and eighty minor physical marks of a Buddha. Or is it because *bodhi*-wisdom implies insight into the true nature of emptiness and transiency?

The mind includes all activity 心具一切作: thus “power” is the potential for activity, and “activity” is the actual functioning of activity.

Suchlike causes 如是因: in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i*, “causes” are defined as “repetitive causes” (*vipākahetu*), and “conditions” are defined as “auxiliary causes.” It is not clear why Chih-i leaves this explanation out in

the mind; if only there is mental activity, then all karmic deeds are included therein. Therefore it is called “suchlike causes.”

7. Suchlike conditions: “conditions” gets its names from [the term] “conditioned origination.” Auxiliary karmic conditions all have the sense of “conditions.” Ignorance, passions, and so forth are able to stimulate karmic deeds; hence mental activity becomes a condition.

8. Suchlike results: bringing in a harvest is called a “fruit” or “result.” The “repetitive causes” (*vipākahetu*) come first repeatedly, and then the “repetitive results” (*niṣyandaphala*) are harvested. Therefore these are called “suchlike results.”

9. Suchlike recompense: “retributive causes” are called “recompense.” Repetitive causes and repetitive results are together called causes for recompense in the future. This recompense is punishment [which naturally arises] from such causes.

10. Suchlike beginning and the end ultimately equal: “Appearance is the “beginning” and “recompense” is the “end.” The “beginning” and “end” all arise from conditions. Because they arise from conditions they are empty. The beginning and end are all empty; because of this emptiness they are all “equal.”

Again, “appearance” is only a word and “recompense” is also only a word. These are all conventional [verbal] constructions; because they are merely conventional terms, they are all “equal.” Again, the beginning and end mutually reflect each other. You first perceive appearances, then later recompense is manifested; by later perceiving the recompense, you can know the original appearances. It is like knowing wealth by perceiving [the act of] charity, and knowing charity by seeing wealth. The beginning and the end exist together. This is the presentation of “equality” from the perspective of conventionality.

Again, [the fourfold possibilities of] appearance, non-appearance, both-non-appearance-and-appearance, and neither-appearance-nor-non-appearance; recompense, non-recompense, both-recompense-and-non-recompense, and neither-recompense-nor-non-recompense—each one of these are included in the limits of reality. This is the presentation of “equality” from the perspective of the Middle.

the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, since he uses the phrases in his definition below of results and recompense.

Repetitive causes 習因: causes that bring about a result similar to the cause, such as a good deed bringing about good results. A “habitual” cause.

Repetitive results 習果: results that are the same as its cause, such as an evil thought resulting in more evil thoughts. A “habitual” result.

This recompense is punishment 報酬: that is, for evil karmic deeds performed in the past.

2. Interpretation of the ten suchlikes according to type of dharma realm
[53c6]

Second, interpreting [the ten suchlikes] according to type involves bundling the ten dharma [realms] into four types.

[1.] Suffering is the “appearance” or “mark” made manifest by those in the three evil destinies. Their “nature” is to accumulate certain set evil [characteristics, deeds, recompense, and so forth]. Their “essence” is the pounding and breaking of body and mind (*rūpa-citta*). Their power is to tread on blades and enter [boiling] cauldrons. Their “activity” is to arouse the ten evil deeds [from killing to having false views]. Their “causes” are their defiled and evil karmic deeds. Their “conditions” are passions, attachments, and so forth. Their “results” are the evil repetitive results. Their “recompense” is [to be reborn in] the three evil destinies. These [three realms] are the same in that ignorance is both their beginning and end.

[2.] The [three] good [destinies are as follows.] Their appearance or

Ten suchlikes according to type of dharma realm: compare the discussion of this topic in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i*, T 33.694a19–696a3, which contains a more detailed analysis; for an annotated translation see my *Foundations*, 184–96. For Hurvitz’s analysis of this passage in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i*, see his *Chih-i*, 289–302.

Bundling the ten dharma [realms] into four types 東十法爲四類: that is, into the four categories of 1. the three evil destinies or dharma realms (hell, hungry ghosts, beasts), 2. the three good destinies (asura, human beings, gods), 3. the realms of the two vehicles (*śrāvaka* and *pratyekabuddha*), and 4. the two realms of the bodhisattva and Buddha. Note that in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* the first category includes the *four* evil destinies (including the asura), and the second category consists of the two “good” destinies of human and divine beings. This categorization makes more sense to me than the one found here in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*.

Pounding and breaking of body and mind 摧折色心: the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694b1–4) elaborates: First in this life they

abuse their minds, and so in the next life their material body is abused. Also, the results and retributions from this world in which the mind and body is abused are such that in the next world the results and retributions will consist of the abuse of mind and body. Therefore the abuse of body and mind is the essence [of those in the four evil destinies].

Tread on blades and enter [boiling] cauldrons 登刀入鑊: Hurvitz (*Chih-i*, 309), interprets this as referring to “being carved and cooked, whether in Hell by demons or [as beasts] on earth by men for food.” It could also refer to the propensity of beings to abuse themselves, even up to “climbing over the blades of swords or entering cauldrons of boiling water,” in futile attempts to satisfy their appetites.

Defiled and evil karmic deeds 有漏惡業: that is, since they actively commit evil deeds, these serve as karmic causes and lead to “evil repetitive results.”

Evil repetitive results 惡習果: That is, the “evil” results that come from the causes of evil deeds.

marks is the manifestation of bliss. Their nature is to accumulate certain set good [characteristics, results, and so forth]. Their essence is a mind and body that ascends [toward enlightenment]. Their power is [their potential] to experience bliss. Their causes are good deeds. Their conditions are a passion and attachment for good. Their results are good repetitive results. Their recompense is [to be reborn] as humans and gods. Their equality, from the perspective of their conventional designation, is that the beginning and end mutually exist in each other.

[3.] The two vehicles [are as follows.] Their appearance or mark is the manifestation of nirvana. Their nature is that of liberation. Their essence is to be endowed with five [virtuous] qualities [of keeping the precepts, concentration, wisdom, liberation, and the knowledge-insight of liberation]. Their power is [the potential] to be free from bondage [to passionate afflictions and so forth]. Their activity is the [thirty-seven] steps on the path. Their causes are the undefiled practice of [intellectual] wisdom. Their conditions are the practice of [experiential] practice. Their results are the four

Accumulate certain set good 定善聚: In the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* Chih-i uses the terms “white” (*śukla-dharma*) and “black” to describe the natures, respectively, of the “good” and “evil” destinies.

A mind and body that ascends 升出色心: in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694b29) Chih-i uses the term “peaceful mind and body.”

[Their potential] to experience bliss 樂受: in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694b29) Chih-i uses the term “enduring potential for good.”

Good deeds 白業: lit, “white karmic actions.”

Good repetitive results 善習果: in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694c1) Chih-i uses the phrase “the spontaneous arising of the results of a good mind.”

Humans and gods 人天: here Chih-i does not include the asura as a “good” rebirth, thus reverting to the categorization of two good destinies in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i*.

Five [virtuous] qualities 五分[法身]: or, the fivefold qualities of the Dharma body; in T’ien-t’ai, the highest attainment pos-

sible by those of the Hinayāna.

Free from bondage 無繫: the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694c5) has “the ability to appear and move about [in this triple world] and the potential capacity to attain the path.”

Steps on the path 道品: the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694c6) has “to strive diligently.”

[Experiential] practice 行行: lit., “the practice of practice.” This compound is used in contrast to the above “practice of wisdom” 慧行. In the *T’zu-ti ch’an-men*, T 46.535b13–17, Chih-i defines these terms as follows:

There are two types of practice. The first is the practice of wisdom, and the second in the practice of practice.... The practice of [experiential] practice is so-called because through this practice one conquers and destroys all passions. The second practice of [intellectual] wisdom consists of severing delusions concerning reality through correct contemplation of the four noble truths, twelvefold conditioned arising, and true emptiness.

See also the extensive explanation of these terms earlier in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* at 30b13–28.

fruits [of the stream winner, once-returned, no-more-returned, and arhat]. As they will have no more rebirth in the fields [of this triple world], they have no recompense. And so forth [with regard to all being “equal.”]

[4.] That of the bodhisattvas and Buddhas is as follows. Their appearance or marks are the conditions and causes [that bring about wisdom]. Their nature is the complete cause [for realizing Buddhahood]. Their essence is the direct cause. Their power is the Four Universal Vows. Their activities are the myriad practices of the six perfections. Their cause is the “adornment of wisdom.” Their condition is the “adornment of virtue.” Their result is perfect wisdom (*saṃbodhi*). Their recompense and reward is great nirvana. And so forth [with regard to all being “equal”].

[There is a] contrary and regular 逆順 [flow of] causes and conditions.

As they will have no more rebirth in the fields [of this triple world], they have no recompense 既後有田中不生故無報: the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694c7-15) provides a more detailed analysis:

[According to Hīnayāna teachings, there is no recompense for śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas, for three reasons.] First, since śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas are without further rebirth, they have no recompense. The reason is that when the [understanding] of the real is aroused, this is the [ultimate] result and there is no need to discuss any further recompense. Second, if undefiled dharmas arise as the recompense for repetitive causes, then repetitive results will be attained. Since the lack of further birth from having no defilements [a characteristic of arhats] is not a condition wherein one is shackled by further birth, there is no later recompense. Third, the first three [i.e., the stream-enterers, once-returned, and non-returned] have recompense, because they have remaining [mistaken] conceptions which have not been severed. Therefore the stream-enterers, once-returned, or those reborn in the realm of form, do not share in the [lack of] recompense [gained from total] non-defilement. Therefore [according to Hīnayāna teachings] these beings have nine and not ten [suchlike characteristics].

According to Mahāyāna doctrine, even this [so-called] non-defilement [of śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas] contains some defilement. The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (T 12.767b21-29) says, “The adornment of virtue” means being conditioned and defiled. This refers to the śrāvakas. They are not completely undefiled. They have not gotten rid of all delusions and they still experience rebirth in the world of transmigrations. If complete non-defilement is the cause and ignorance the condition, then one is reborn in the realm of transformations. Therefore they do have recompense.

See Hurvitz’s note on 297-99 for a different interpretation and lengthy discussion of this section. Chih-i picks up on some of these points a few lines below.

Bodhisattvas and Buddhas: in contrast to the terse analysis that follows, the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* (694c15-696a3) gives a long analysis of this classification in terms of the bodhisattvas of the Tripitaka, Shared, and Distinct Teachings, and a long discussion of the ten characteristics of the Buddha realm in terms of the Middle Way. See *Foundations*, 189-196.

Conditions and causes 緣因, **complete cause** 了因, **direct cause** 正因: these are the three aspects of threefold Buddha nature.

The “regular” [flow of] birth and death consists of defiled karmic actions as the causes and passions and attachments as the conditions. The “contrary” [flow of] birth and death consists of undefiled wisdom as the cause and the practice of [experiential] practice as the conditions; together these [causes and conditions] prevent rebirth [in unwelcome destinies] and destroy delusions. Even when one is in the cycle of birth and death in the realm beyond delusions, undefiled wisdom is still the cause, and [the still unsevered propensity toward] ignorance is the condition. If you go contrary to the [ordinary flow of] life-and-death (samsara), then the wisdom of the Middle Way is the cause, and the myriad practices [of the six perfections] are the conditions; together these prevent (the continued cycle of) birth and death that is a transformation beyond conceptual understanding. Since this is the case for causes and conditions, the contrary and regular [flow] of the other [characteristics] can be surmised and known [in the same way].

If we depend on [the Hīnayāna teaching of] the śrāvaka, then they only have nine [suchlike characteristics] and not ten [because they have no “recompense”]. But if we depend on the Mahāyāna teaching of the threefold Buddha, then [even] the Buddha has a “body of recompense.” If you depend on [only] the meaning of extinction through the severing of delusions [to understand this issue], then [you must conclude that] there is no later reward or retribution. The issue of nine or ten [characteristics for śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas] should be understood in this context.

The world of sentient beings is that of conventional designation and lack of [substantial] essence that can be distinguished; [it is just that] real phenomena are taken and established conventionally. So [it includes] the appearances, nature, essence, [54a] power,... and ultimate equality of sentient beings of the evil destinies, and so forth [also for sentient being of the good destinies]. So also for the appearances, nature, essence, power,...

Birth and death that is a transformation beyond conceptual understanding 變易生死: in contrast to the “ordinary” cycle of birth and death of people in samsara. This distinction is based on a passage in the *Śrīmālādevī Sūtra*, T 12.219c, to account for differences (from the Mahāyāna perspective) between ordinary people and the “rebirth” of those who have supposedly severed all delusions.

Mahāyāna teaching of the threefold Buddha 大乘三佛義: that is, that the Buddha consists of three “bodies”: the

Dharma body (*dharmakāya* 法身); the body of enjoyment, in which the Buddha enjoys the “fruits” (rewards or recompense) of his enlightenment 報身; and the body of transformation, that is, the historical manifestation of the Buddha 應身.

Should be understood: for details see the section of the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* quoted in the note above.

Real phenomena 實法: that is, our actual experience of the objects of our senses as interpreted through our mind.

and ultimate equality of undefiled sentient beings [such as the śrāvaka and pratyekabuddha], and for the appearances, nature, essence, power,... and ultimate equality of the Dharma realm of bodhisattvas and Buddhas. This can all be understood in accordance with the examples given above.

The world of various lands also includes the ten dharma realms, that is the appearances, nature, essence, power and so forth of the evil lands; of the good lands; of the undefiled lands; the appearances, nature, essence, power and so forth of the lands of the bodhisattvas and Buddhas.

3. Three Thousand Realms in a Single Thought: The Contemplation of the Conventional [54a5]

[Thus] a single thought includes the ten dharma realms. A single dharma realm includes the [other] ten dharma realms, so there are one hundred dharma realms. One realm includes thirty types of worlds [that is, each of the ten dharma realms are included in each of the three types of worlds: the world of sentient beings, the world of the five skandhas, and various lands], multiplied by one hundred dharma realms. This results in the inclusion of three thousand types of worlds. These three thousand [worlds] exist in a single momentary thought.

If there is no thought, that is the end of the matter. If there is even an ephemeral thought, this includes three thousand [realms]. But we cannot say that the single thought has prior existence, and that all phenomena (*sarva-dharma*) exist later, nor can we say that all phenomena have prior existence, and that the single thought exists later. For example, it is like a thing that changes through eight aspects [of arising, abiding, changing, and

A single thought 一心: lit, “one mind,” but I have chosen to translate this compound as a “single thought” to avoid the implication of a reified “mind” as separate from mental functioning and “objects” that are experienced. Chih-i also uses the phrase “one thought-moment” 一念, sometimes interchangeably with “one mind.” In any case, it refers to the almost instantaneous occurrence of a single mental function.

A single momentary thought 一念心: as Chih-i has explained earlier in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, a “single momentary (thought)” refers to an extremely short amount of time. For example, “A sūtra says that a single thought-moment has six hun-

dred arisings and perishings. *Satyasiddhi* masters say that there are sixty moments in a single thought-moment” (see notes at *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 27c23–24); and “even an ephemeral thought 介爾 surely arises through the senses, and there is not one dharma that does not arise through conditions. To arise through conditions means that each and every phenomenon is transient. It is said that one thought lasts for sixty moments (*kṣaṇa*), and others say for three hundred trillion moments. A *kṣaṇa* does not abide, and thoughts do not remain from one to the other” (see the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, 32b2–7).

Eight aspects 八相: the “original” and “following” aspects of arising, abiding,

perishing]; it is not that things exist prior to these aspects and are caused to change through them, nor do the aspects exist prior to things and are caused to change through them [but things and their passing through arising, abiding, and so forth occur together]. There can be no priority nor posteriority [since it occurs simultaneously]. It is just that things are said to change by passing through these aspects, and these aspects are said to occur to things.

Thoughts are also like this. If all phenomena arise from a single thought, this is a horizontal [relationship]; if a thought in one moment encompasses all phenomena, this is a vertical [relationship]. But these are neither [merely] vertical nor [merely] horizontal. It is just that thought is all phenomena, and all phenomena is thought. Therefore [the relationship of thought and phenomena, the mind and objects] is neither [merely] vertical nor horizontal; they are neither the same nor different. This is mysterious and sublime, profound in the extreme, cannot be grasped conceptually, and cannot be verbalized. This is what is called [contemplating] “objects as inconceivable.” This is the meaning here [in terms of conventionality].

changing, and perishing, giving eight aspects. See Paramārtha’s translation of the *Abhidharmakośa*, T 29.185c11–13.

This is the meaning here [in terms of conventionality] 意在於此: many commentators have identified “the three thousand realms in a single thought” as the ultimate expression of Chih-i’s thought and the content of contemplating objects as “inconceivable.” However, in this section (54a5 [or earlier?]-54a19) Chih-i is speaking in terms of “contemplating conventionality,” one of the three types of threefold contemplation. If so, then understanding the “three thousand realms in a single thought” is not the fullest or final expression of objects as inconceivable. In the next section (54a19-55a15), Chih-i discusses the inconceivable in terms of contemplating emptiness, and finally (55a15-b10) in terms of contemplating the Middle. Thus the ultimate expression of objects as inconceivable is this last passage, which speaks not only about the inclusion (and exclusion) of all thoughts in one thought, but also the inclusion (and exclusion) of all senses in

one sense experience, all sentient beings in one sentient being, all lands in one land, and so forth, that one is all, all is one, and things are neither “one” nor “all.” It is the threefold truth, not the expression “three thousand realms in a single thought” that is the more fundamental insight. What prompted Chan-jan to identify the “three thousand realms in a single thought” as the key to Chih-i’s thought, thus making this a central idea in the history of T’ien-t’ai Buddhism in China and Korea—and in Tendai and Nichiren Buddhism in Japan—is an important topic for further research.

Note also the curious order of this discussion. In almost all other cases in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, a subject is interpreted in the threefold pattern, first as empty, then as conventional, and finally as the Middle. Here the interpretation in terms of the conventional (as the “three thousand realms in a single thought”) comes first, followed by the empty and the Middle. One may argue that this reflects the importance of “contemplating conventionality” over the more abstract contemplation of emptiness and the Middle.

4. “Objects as Inconceivable” From the Perspective of Emptiness and in Terms of the Tetralemma [54a18]

Question: The arising of thoughts is necessarily dependent on certain [objective] conditions. If so, are the three thousand dharmas included in the thoughts, included in the conditions [that is, the objects], included in both [thoughts and their objects], or included separate from [thoughts and their objects]? If they are included in the thoughts [themselves], then thoughts arise [by themselves] and do not need [objective] conditions[, which is obviously impossible]. If they are included in the [objective] conditions, then, being included in the objects themselves, there is no involvement with mental activity[, which is also impossible]. If they are included together, that means that when they are not yet together then neither side has [the three thousand dharmas], but then how can [thoughts and their objects] have [the three thousand dharmas] when they are together? If they are included separate from [thoughts and their objects,] then [the three thousand dharmas] are already separate from thoughts and their objects; but then how can they suddenly be included in thoughts [as in the teaching of the three thousand realms in a single thought]? None of the four options are obtainable. What does it mean, then, to say that the three thousand dharmas are included [in one momentary thought]?

Answer: Scholars of the *Treatise on the Ten Stages (Ti-lun)* say that all understanding and ignorance, truth and delusion are dependent on the support of the nature of dharmas (*dharmatā*). The nature of dharmas sup-

[Objective] conditions 緣: generally this term refers to “indirect causes” in contrast to “direct causes” 因, but here it refers specifically to “conditions” in the sense of the objects of our thoughts. Earlier in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* (8a14–15) Chih-i says, “Mental activity does not arise by itself, but necessarily depends on conditioned arising 緣起. The mental sense organ is the cause [of thoughts], the multifarious objects [of mental activity] are the conditions, and the mental thoughts which thus arise are the dharmas that are thus produced.”

Are the three thousand dharmas included in the thoughts, included in the conditions, both, or separate 爲心具三千法爲緣具爲共具爲離具: thus the relation of thoughts and their objects are considered

with the four options of the tetralemma: a, b, both, or neither. To put it another way, do thoughts arise from themselves, from responding to or with objective conditions, both, or neither? Earlier in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* (8a29–c1) Chih-i says, “Though we say in a deluded [provisional] way that thoughts ‘arise’, in this arising there is actually no own-being, nor other-being, nor both together, nor an absence of causes.”

Note that in the T’ien-t’ai system the use of the tetralemma represents the level of the Distinct Teaching, which emphasizes the perspective of emptiness.

All understanding and ignorance, truth and delusion are dependent on the support of the nature of dharmas. The nature of dharmas supports truth and

ports truth and delusion, and truth and delusion depend on the nature of dharmas. The *Summary of the Great Vehicle (She-lun)* says that the nature of dharmas is not defiled by delusion, nor purified by truth. Therefore the nature of dharmas neither supports [delusion] nor is dependent [on the truth]. The *ālaya*-consciousness is that which supports and that on which things are dependent, and which gathers and supports all the seeds of undying ignorance. If we follow the scholars of the *Ti-lun*, we would say that all dharmas are included in the mind; if we follow the scholars of the *She-lun*, we would say that all dharmas are included in [objective] conditions.

These two kinds of scholars each represent one extreme. If [following the *Ti-lun* scholars] we say that the nature of dharmas gives birth to all dharmas, then this “nature of dharmas” [is something that] is neither mind nor [objective] conditions[, but this is impossible because there is nothing outside of thoughts and their objects]. [54b] If we say that all dharmas arise from the mind because [the nature of dharmas] is not thoughts, then it follows also that all dharmas arise from [objective] conditions because [the nature of dharmas] is not [objective] conditions[, but this doesn’t make any sense]. How, then, can you arbitrarily say that the nature of dharmas is the support of truth and delusion? If [following the *She-lun* scholars] we say that the nature of dharmas is not the support [of thoughts and their objects], but that the *ālaya*-consciousness is, then this implies that there is an *ālaya*-consciousness that supports [thoughts and their objects] but is outside of and separate from the nature of dharmas, that is, has no relation with the nature of dharmas. [But this is impossible.] If it is said that the nature of dharmas is not separate from the *ālaya*-consciousness, then what is supported by the *ālaya*-consciousness is also supported by the nature of

delusion, and truth and delusion depend on the nature of dharmas 一切解惑真妄依持法性。法性持真妄真妄依法性也: the *Kōgi* (BT-III, 295) says that this is from “section 10/2” of the *Treatise on the Ten Stages*, but I could not locate a corresponding passage (see T 26.179–180?). It is not clear if Chih-i is actually quoting the *Treatise on the Ten Stages*, or is only summarizing a teaching of the *Ti-lun* scholars.

The nature of dharmas is not defiled by delusion, nor purified by truth. Therefore the nature of dharmas neither support nor is dependent 法性不為惑所染不為真所淨故法性非依持: once again, it seems that Chih-i is summarizing a teach-

ing of the *Summary of the Great Vehicle*, or a teaching of the *She-lun* scholars, rather than quoting a specific passage of the treatise itself.

Ālaya-consciousness 阿黎耶: the *ālaya-vijñāna*, the “store consciousness.” A concept of the Yogācāra school, which taught the existence of an underlying consciousness, a “pre-consciousness,” that unifies into one experiential whole all the diverse operations of conscious activity.

Undying ignorance 無沒無明: lit., “(ignorance) that does not sink or become extinct.” A Chinese translation of *ālaya* which interprets the term as *a-laya*.

dharmas. How, then, can you arbitrarily say that the *ālaya*-consciousness is the support [of mind and its objects]? This is contrary to what is in the sūtras. A sūtra says, “Neither internal, nor external, nor somewhere in between, nor always existing on its own.” It is also [different from the teaching of] Nāgārjuna. Nāgārjuna says, “Dharmas do not arise from themselves, and they do not arise from another, nor together, nor without causes.”

Let us examine the issue by using an analogy. Do you have a dream because of mental functions, or have a dream by sleeping, or have a dream by the coming together of sleep and mental functions, or have a dream by being separate from mental functions and sleeping? [None of these options are acceptable.] If you say that you have a dream because of mental functions, then you could have a dream without sleeping[, but in fact you cannot]. If you

Neither internal, nor external, nor somewhere in between, nor always existing on its own 非内非外亦非中間亦不常有: a summary of a passage in the *Pañcaviṃśati Sūtra*, T 8.272a14–28:

Śāriputra said to Subhūti: Why do you say that dharmas have nothing on which they depend?

Subhūti said: The nature of form is always empty. It does not rely on something internal, nor rely on something external, nor rely on something in between these two. The nature of sensation, conception, volition, and consciousness is always empty. It does not rely on something internal, nor rely on something external, nor rely on something in between these two. The nature of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching, and thinking is always empty. It does not rely on something internal, nor rely on something external, nor rely on something in between these two. The nature of form is always empty, and the nature of dharmas is always empty. It does not rely on something internal, nor rely on something external, nor rely on something in between these two. The nature of the perfection of giving is always empty, [and so forth for the six perfections] through the nature of the perfection of wisdom is always empty. It does not rely on something internal, nor rely on

something external, nor rely on something in between these two. The nature of internal emptiness is always empty, and the nature of emptiness of both existing and non-existing dharmas is always empty. It does not rely on something internal, nor rely on something external, nor rely on something in between these two. Śāriputra, the nature of the four mindfulnesses is always empty, [and so forth] through the nature of universal wisdom is always empty. It does not rely on something internal, nor rely on something external, nor rely on something in between these two. What is the reason? Śāriputra, all dharmas are without dependence, because their nature is empty. Śāriputra, when the Bodhisattva-mahāsattvas practice the six perfections they should in this way purify their form, sensations, conceptions, volitions, and consciousness, and purify their universal wisdom.

Dharmas do not arise from themselves, and they do not arise from another, nor together, nor without causes 諸法不自生亦不從他生不共不無因: a famous verse from the opening of the *Middle Treatise* (T 30.2b6–7) which concludes with the phrase “therefore know that there is no [substantial] arising.” This verse has been quoted previously in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*; see at 22a1–2 and 29a27–29.

say that you have a dream by sleeping, then a dead person is “sleeping” and should have a dream[, but he does not]. If you say that you have a dream by the coming together of sleep and mental functions, then why is it that some people do not dream even when they are sleeping? Also, if having a dream is part of both sleep and mental functions, and you have a dream when the two factors come together, then in fact each factor does not include dreaming, and you cannot [dream] when they come together. If you say that you have a dream separate from mental functions and separate from sleep, then since empty space is separate from these two factors [of mental functions and sleep], it should always involve dreaming.

By examining dreams with the tetralemma we see that none [of the options] are obtainable. How, then, do we see all sorts of things in a dream when we sleep? Here “mental functions” are analogous to the nature of dharmas and “sleep” is analogous to the *ālaya*-consciousness. How can you lean to one side and say that either “the nature of dharmas” or “the *ālaya*-consciousness” gives rise to all dharmas? You should know that the mental functions are unobtainable through the four options [of the tetralemma]; by examining the three thousand dharmas [with the tetralemma we see that they] also are unobtainable. We thus see that horizontally, through the tetralemma, the arising of the three thousand dharmas is unobtainable.

Then [to examine the matter in a vertical fashion], do the three thousand dharmas arise from the extinction of one momentary thought? The extinction of a thought cannot give rise to one dharma, so how can it give rise to three thousand dharmas? Do the three thousand dharmas arise from both the extinction and non-extinction of a thought? But the nature of extinction and non-extinction are different, like water and fire; the two cannot stand together. Then how can this give rise to three thousand dharmas? Do the three thousand dharmas arise from neither the extinction nor the non-extinction of a thought? But [the option of] “neither extinction nor non-extinction” does not provide the power nor the place 非能非所 [to give rise

Empty space 虛空: an example of an “unconditioned” dharma.

“Mental functions” are analogous to the nature of dharmas and “sleep” is analogous to the *ālaya*-consciousness 心喻法性夢喻黎耶: the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* text has “dreams” instead of “sleep,” but the flow of the argument suggests that “sleep” is what is really meant. Chan-jan

(BT-III, 298) adds: “It is likely that this is a copyist’s error. In the analogy the contrast is always between sleep and mental functions, so here it should be the case that mental functions are analogous to the nature of dharmas and sleep is analogous to the *ālaya*-consciousness. The activity of dreaming would be analogous to the arising of dharmas.”

to even one dharma], so how can there be the power or place to give rise to three thousand dharmas?

Thus we see that the three thousand dharmas are unobtainable if we seek them both in a horizontal and vertical fashion. The three thousand dharmas are also unobtainable if we seek them in a neither horizontal nor vertical fashion. This is beyond words; discursive thought is inadequate. Therefore they are called “inconceivable objects.”

The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* says, “the arising of arising is unexplainable; the non-arising of arising is unexplainable; the arising of non-arising is unexplainable; the non-arising of non-arising is unexplainable.” [54c] This is the meaning [of what I am trying to say] here. You should know from the perspective of the supreme [truth], that even a single dharma cannot be obtained, how much less so three thousand dharmas. From the perspective of the mundane truth, one thought contains immeasurable dharmas, not to mention three thousand dharmas. As the Buddha said to the nun when she asked, “Is ignorance internal?” [he answered,] “No.” “Is it external?” “No.” “Is it both internal and external?” “No.” “Is it neither internal nor external?” “No?” Then the Buddha said, “This is the way it is...” Nāgārjuna said,

This is beyond words 言語道斷; discursive thought is inadequate 心行處滅: lit., “the way of words and discourse is severed” (*sarva-vāda-caryā-uccheda*) and “the locus of discursive thought is annihilated” (*citta-pravṛtti-sthīti-nirodha*). These phrases have been used before by Chih-i to express that one has come to a point where one can only admit the inadequacy of verbal expression and conceptual understanding. See especially the note at *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 21b7.

Therefore they are called “inconceivable objects” 故名不可思議境: or, “this is called the inconceivable realm.”

The arising of arising is unexplainable; the non-arising of arising is unexplainable; the arising of non-arising is unexplainable; the non-arising of non-arising is unexplainable 生生不可說。生不生不可說。不生生不可說。不生不生不可說: see the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.733c9–20. This passage also has been quoted by Chih-i previously; see the note at 3a12–14. For Chih-i, these four phrases represent

the Fourfold Teachings respectively of the Tripitaka, Shared, Distinct, and Perfect. See Chart 1 in Swanson, *Foundations*, 358–59. These phrases are discussed in detail at 60a10–62a14.

As the Buddha said to the nun ... “This is the way it is” 如佛告德女。無明內有不。不也。外有不。不也。內外有不。不也。非內非外有不。不也。佛言。如是有: a summary of a story in the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.101c20–102a8. Lamotte (*Le Traité* 1, 361–62) has:

Ainsi, dans le *Therīsūtra*, la Terī demande au Buddha, “Bhagavat! L’ignorance (*avidyā*) est-elle interne (*ādhyātmitika*)?”

—Non.

—Est-elle externe (*bahirdhā*)?

—Non.

—Est-elle interne et externe à la fois?

—Non.

—Bhagavat! Cette ignorance provient-elle de la génération précédente (*pūrvajanma*)?

—Non.

—Cette ignorance a-t-elle une naissance (*utpāda*) et une destructions (*nirodha*)?

—Non.

“[dharma] arise not from themselves, nor from others, nor together, nor without cause.” The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* says, “The arising of arising is unexplainable, and so forth, to the non-arising of non-arising is unexplainable. [Arising] due to causes and conditions is also unexplainable—this

—Y a-t-il un Dharma existant vraiment qui soit nommé ignorance?

—Non.

Alors la Therī dit au Buddha:

—Se l’ignorance n’est ni interne, ni externe, ni interne et externe à la fois, si elle ne passe pas de la génération précédente à la génération actuelle et de la génération actuelle à la génération suivante, si elle ne possède pas une vraie nature, comment l’ignorance (*avidyā*) est-elle la condition (*pratyaya*) des formations (*saṃskāra*) et ainsi de suite [pour les douze membres du *pratīyasamutpāda*] jusqu’à cette accumulation de la masse des douleurs (*duḥkha-skandhasyotpādaḥ*)? Bhagavat, c’est comme si un arbre (*vrkṣa*) n’avait pas de racine (*mūla*): comment pourrait-il produire un tronc (*skandha*), de noeuds (*granthi*), des branches (*śākhā*), des feuilles (*dala*), des fleurs (*puṣpa*) et des fruits (*phala*)?

Le Buddha répondit:

—Le caractère des Dharma, c’est le vide (*śūnya*). Néanmoins, le profane (*prthagjana*), ignorant (*āsrutavat*) et sans savoir (*ajñānavat*), produit à leur endroit toutes espèces de passions (*kleśa*), [dont la principale est l’ignorance]. Cette passion est la cause et condition (*hetupratyaya*) d’actes corporels, vocaux et mentaux (*kāyavāgmanaskarman*), lesquels sont la cause d’une nouvelle existence (*punarjanma*). En raison de cette existence, on éprouve de la douleur (*duḥkha*) ou du plaisir (*sukha*).

Chodron (1, 296) translates;

Thus, in the *Therīsūtra* the therī asks the Buddha: “O Bhagavat, is ignorance internal?”

“No.”

“Is it external?”

“No.”

“Is it both internal and external?”

“No.”

“O Bhagavat, does this ignorance come from the previous lifetime?”

“No.”

“Does it come from the present lifetime and does it pass to the next one?”

“No.”

“Does this ignorance have an arising and a cessation?”

“No.”

“Is there a truly existent dharma that could be called ignorance?”

“No.”

Then the therī said to the Buddha: “If ignorance is not internal, not external, neither internal nor external, if it does not pass from the previous lifetime to the present lifetime and from the present lifetime to the following lifetime, if it does not have a true nature, how can ignorance be the condition for the formations and so on [for the twelve members of *pratīyasamutpāda*] up to this accumulation of this mass of suffering? O Bhagavat, it is as if a tree has no root: how could it produce a trunk, knots, branches, leaves, flowers and fruit?”

The Buddha replied: “The nature of dharmas is emptiness. However, worldly people, ignorant and without knowledge, produce all kinds of afflictions in regard to dharmas, [of which the main one is ignorance]. This affliction is the cause and condition for actions of body, speech and mind which are the cause of a new existence. As a result of this existence we experience suffering or pleasure.

Nāgārjuna said: see note above, where Chih-i quotes the same phrase.

The *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* says: this passage also has just been quoted above.

refers to the causes and conditions of the four *siddhānta*. Although the four options of the tetralemma are hidden [from comprehension] and quiescent, [the Buddha,] with compassion and sympathy, teaches about that which has no name or form by using conventional words and forms.

5. “Objects as Inconceivable” From the Perspective of Emptiness and in terms of the Four *Siddhānta* [54c9]

If you use the worldly [method] to teach the inclusion of all dharmas in a thought, those who hear will rejoice. For example, to say that “there are no separate dharmas in the triple world which are apart from those created by the mind” is this kind of text. Or, if you teach that all dharmas arise from [objective] conditions, those who hear will rejoice. For example, sayings such as “the five [sensual] desires lead people to fall into evil destinies” or “a

Four *siddhānta* 四悉檀: or, “the four methods of instruction” used by the Buddha to teach sentient beings: the worldly, the individual, the therapeutic, and the supreme methods. In terms of the twofold truth, the first three *siddhāntas* are variations of the mundane truth, and the fourth corresponds to the supreme or real truth (*pāramārtha-satya*); see my discussion in Swanson, *Foundations*, 23–30. The four *siddhāntas* is the theme of the following section, *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 54c9–55a15.

With compassion and sympathy, teaches about that which has no name or form by using conventional words and forms 慈悲憐愍於無名相中假名相說: Chih-i does not indicate that he intends to quote a sūtra here, but see the opening of the *Sūtra of the Buddha Treasury* 佛藏經, T 15.782c24–25: “The World Honored One teaches with names and forms that which has no name and form, and teaches with words Dharmas that are beyond words.” This sūtra was quoted by Chih-i at 49a20.

The worldly [method] 世界說: the first of the four *siddhāntas*; to explain the Dharma in conventional terms so that worldly people will understand; presumably, this is why these sayings make those who hear rejoice.

There are no separate dharmas in the triple world which are apart from those created by the mind 三界無別法唯是一心造: see, for example, the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, T 9.558c10: “The triple world is an empty delusion; it is only made by the mind.” See also the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.276b10: “The existences of the triple world are all creations of the mind.”

The five desires lead people to fall into evil destinies 五欲令人墮惡道: it is not clear whether this is intended to refer to a specific sūtra passage. The *Kōgi* (BT–III, 306) identifies it as from the *I chiao ching*, but there is no exactly corresponding passage; the closest is on T 12.1111a12:

If you allow *the five senses to run free*, then not only will the five sensual desires become boundless and out of control, but this [situation] will be like a bad horse that is not reined in, causing the rider to fall into the gutter.

Ikeda (*Kenkyūchūshaku*, 354) points to a latter passage at 1111c5–10:

You bhikṣus, if you wish to be free from all suffering, should contemplate knowing sufficiency 知足. The dharma of knowing sufficiency is the place of abundant bliss and peaceful calm. People who know sufficiency experience peaceful bliss even though they sleep on the

good friend is a great cause and condition; that is, such a person can transform and guide you to attain the insight of a Buddha” are this kind of text. Or, if you say that all dharmas arise together along with their causes [that is, thoughts] and [objective] conditions, those who hear will rejoice. For example, to say “If mercury is blended with true gold, you are able to mold images of various forms” is such a text. Or, if you say that all dharmas arise separate from [objective] conditions, those who hear will rejoice. For example, to say that “the arising of twelvefold causes and conditions is not created by the Buddha, nor created by gods, people, or asura, but through its own nature” is such a text. Such are the four options of the tetralemma for the “worldly *siddhānta*” in teaching that the three thousand dharmas arise in the mind.

What about the “individual method”? Sayings [on the role of the mind] such as “The Buddha Dharma is like the sea; only those who have faith are

ground; those who do not know sufficiency are not satisfied even though they live in a heavenly mansion. Those who do not know sufficiency are poor even if they are rich; people who know sufficiency are rich even if they are poor. *Those who do not know sufficiency are constantly bound by the five [sensual] passions, and are to be pitied by those who know sufficiency. This is what is called “knowing sufficiency.”*

A good friend is a great cause and condition; that is, such a person can transform and guide you to attain the insight of a Buddha 善知識者是大因緣所謂化導令得見佛: a direct quote from the *Lotus Sūtra*, T 9.60c9–10, quoted previously by Chih-i. See notes at 3a28–b1 and 43a18–19. Hurvitz (329–30 [303]) has: “Let it be known that a good friend is a great cause and condition. This means that he converts and guides, making possible the vision of a Buddha and the opening up of the thought to anuttarasamyaksambodhi.”

If mercury is blended with true gold, you are able to mold images of various forms 水銀和真金能塗諸色像: the *Kōgi* (BT–III, 306) identifies this quote as from a “Treatise on the Nature of the Dharma Realm” 法界性論, but this is not extant in the current Chinese Buddhist canon.

The arising of twelvefold causes and conditions is not created by the Buddha, nor created by gods, people, or asura, but through its own nature 十二因緣非佛作。非天人修羅作其性自爾: see the *Miscellaneous Āgama*, T 2.85b23–25. This passage has been quoted by Chih-i previously in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* at 7a17.

The “individual method” 爲人悉檀: the second of the four *siddhāntas*; to explain the Dharma in accordance with the mental or spiritual capacity of the individual, which presumably is why it gives rise to faith.

The Buddha Dharma is like the sea; only those who have faith are able to enter 佛法如海唯信能入: see the first section of the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.63a14–15, which discusses the opening phrase *evam mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye*: “The person who does not have faith is not able to enter into the sea of my Dharma; as a parched tree cannot give forth flowers, such people cannot attain the fruits of the monk. Even though such persons shave their head, wear the dyed robe [of a monk], and read various sūtras and śāstras, it will be difficult for them to find answers.” Lamotte (*Le Traité* 1, 57) translates:

S'il n'a pas la foi, il ne peut pas entrer dans

able to enter,” “faith is the source of the way and the mother of virtue; all good dharmas arise from it,” and “you should arouse only the thoughts of (*anuttarasamyak*) *sambodhi*, and then you will be endowed with [the upholding of] all the precepts of prohibition of the home-departed-one,” are texts that arouse faith in those [individuals] who hear them. Or, there is the teaching that all dharmas arise through conditional objects. The saying that “if you do not meet a Buddha, then you will fall into a hell of suffering

la mer de ma loi. Comme un arbre pourri qui ne produit ni fleurs ni fruits, il ne gagne pas le fruit de la vie religieuse, il peut se raser la tête, teindre ses vêtements, étudier toutes espèces de sūtra et de śāstra, il ne tire aucun profit de la loi bouddhique.

Faith is the source of the way and the mother of virtue; all good dharmas arise from it 信則道源功德母一切善法由之生: a phrase from a section in the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* (T 9.433a26) on faith. The context [433a22–28] reads:

A profound mind and pure faith are indestructible.

Respect and pay homage to all Buddhas,

Honor the true Dharma and the noble monks,

Have faith in the three treasures, and as a result you will arouse *bodhicitta*.

Deeply believe in the Buddhas and the true Dharma,

And also believe in the path followed by bodhisattvas.

A true mind trusts in the Buddhas and his *bodhi*-wisdom;

Due to this the bodhisattvas arouse their first aspiration for enlightenment.

Faith is the basis of the way 道元 and the mother of virtue;

It increases all good dharmas.

Remove and extinguish all doubt and delusion,

And manifest and arouse the supreme Way.

You should arouse only the thoughts of *sambodhi*, and then you will be endowed with all the precepts of prohibition of

the home-departed-one 汝但發三菩提心是則出家禁戒具足: the *Kōgi* (BT-III, 307) identifies this quote as coming from the *Śrīmālādevī Sūtra*, section 9, and Ikeda (*Kenkyūchūshaku*, 355) points to a section at T 12.219b, but such a phrase does not appear in the Taishō edition of the *Śrīmālādevī Sūtra* (T #353). It is not clear which, if any, text Chih-i was citing here.

If you do not meet a Buddha, then you will fall into a hell of suffering for immeasurable eons; by seeing a Buddha you can attain a rootless faith, like an *eraṇḍa* plant giving rise to sandalwood 若不值佛當於無量劫墮地獄苦。以見佛故得無根信如從伊蘭出生栴檀: see the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.727c28–728a7, where King Ajātaśatru responds to the teachings of the Buddha:

World Honored One. I look at the world and see that an *eraṇḍa* seed gives birth to an *eraṇḍa* tree. I have not seen an *eraṇḍa* [seed] giving birth to a sandalwood tree. I now see for the first time an *eraṇḍa* seed giving birth to a sandalwood tree. [That is to say,] my body is the “*eraṇḍa* seed,” and my mind, with no roots of faith, is the “sandalwood tree.” To say “no roots” [of faith] means that at first I did not know or respect the Tathāgata, and did not have faith in the Dharma and Sangha. This is the meaning of “no roots.” World Honored One. If I did not meet the Tathāgata, the World Honored One, then I would have to dwell in a great hell for immeasurable, incalculable eons, and experience immeasurable suffering. But now I have seen the Buddha, and by see-

for immeasurable eons; by seeing a Buddha you can attain a rootless faith, like an *eraṇḍa* plant giving rise to sandalwood,” this gives birth to faith for those [individuals] who hear it. Or, there is the teaching that all dharmas arise through the merging [of thoughts and their conditions]. The sayings that “when the waters of the mind are clear and pure, the form of the jewel manifests itself” and “with the fundamental power of compassionate goodness, you can see things as they are,” are texts that arouse faith in those who hear them. Or, there is the teaching that all dharmas arise separate from [thoughts and their conditional objects]. The saying that “it is not through internal contemplation that you attain this wisdom, and so forth through [the idea that] it is not through either internal or external contemplation that you attain this wisdom; if you have any attachments, then you cannot attain even the small faith of Śrenika, much less abandon mistaken [views] and realize the right,” is a text that arouses faith in those who hear it. Such are the four options of the tetralemma for the “individual *siddhānta*” in teaching that the three thousand dharmas arise in the mind.

ing the Buddha I have attained virtuous qualities, and have destroyed entirely the evil mind of passionate afflictions that belongs to sentient beings.

A rootless faith 無根信: lit., a faith “without roots.” This does not imply “invalid” or “baseless,” but refers to receiving faith from or through the power or grace of the Buddha, and not based on one’s own deeds or power. It refers to one “without roots” in one’s own deeds or attitudes, such as taking refuge in and honoring the three treasures, to give rise to faith in the Buddha.

Eraṇḍa plant 伊蘭: a type of plant whose seeds are toxic and is famous (in contrast to sandalwood) for its foul smell; used to make castor oil.

When the waters of the mind are clear and pure, the form of the jewel manifests itself 心水澄清珠相自現: see the story of the people on a boat who drop a jewel in the pond and cannot find it until the water settles and becomes pure, in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.617c3–10. Chih-i has utilized this parable numerous times already; see the note at *Mo-ho*

chih-kuan 43a3.

With the fundamental power of compassionate goodness, one can see things as they are 慈善根力見如此事: perhaps this refers to the same passage of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* (see previous note), in which a wise person uses “skillful means” to see and recover the jewel.

...then you cannot attain even the small faith of Śrenika, much less abandon mistaken [views] and realize the right 若有住著先尼梵志小信尚不可得況捨邪入正: see the story of Śrenika and his attainment of universal wisdom through faith, in the *Pañcaviṃśati Sūtra*, T 8.236a11ff., especially lines 17–19. Śrenika is given as an example of one who attains wisdom by means of the perfection of faith, and that this attainment is “not through internal contemplation, nor through external contemplation, nor both internal and external contemplation, nor by no contemplation.” It concludes, “Śrenika attained universal wisdom through having faith in his mind. Therefore Śrenika had faith in the true aspects of all dharmas” (236a25–27). See also the note at *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 48c18.

[55a] What about the “therapeutic method”? [First, there is] the teaching that all evil is healed by the mind. The saying that “the attainment of single-mindedness extinguishes a myriad of mistaken [views]” is such a text. Or, there is the teaching that all evil is healed by objective conditions. The saying “By hearing of the great, supreme light of wisdom, the mind becomes concentrated and is immobile like the earth,” is such a text. Or, there is the teaching that all evil is healed by a combination of causes [thoughts] and [objective] conditions. The saying “part arises from your own conceptual thinking, and part comes from your teacher,” is such a text. Or, there is the teaching that all evil is healed separate from [thoughts and their objects]. [The saying] “I did not [actually] attain all dharmas when I sat on the seat of enlightenment, but I lured and saved all [as if] deceiving a small child with an empty fist” is such a text. Such are [the four options of the tetralemma

The “therapeutic method” 對治悉檀: the third of the four *siddhānta*; the teaching as a remedy for the maladies that afflict sentient beings, which presumably is why it heals or destroys evil.

The attainment of single-mindedness extinguishes a myriad of mistaken [views] 得一心者萬邪滅: verbatim from the *Sūtra on the Auspicious Appearances and Origins of the Prince Siddhārtha*, T 3.475a25. The phrase is followed by the explanation that “‘The way of single-mindedness’ refers to the arhat. The arhat is a true person. He is not corrupted by [the sensual desires] of sound or sight.”

By hearing of the great, supreme light of wisdom, the mind becomes concentrated and is immobile like the earth 聞無上大慧明。心定如地不可動: the *Kōgi* (BT-III, 307) admits that the source of this phrase is unknown.

Part arises from your own conceptual thinking, and part comes from your teacher 一分從思生一分從師得: the *Kōgi* (BT-III, 307) admits that the source of this phrase is unknown.

I did not attain all dharmas when I sat on the seat of enlightenment, but I lured and saved all [as if] deceiving a small child with an empty fist 我坐道場時

不得一切法。空拳誑小兒誘度於一切: that is, the Buddha taught as if he had “attained” all dharmas under the Bodhi tree (when there are no substantial dharmas to attain), as if fooling a child by making it think he had something in his fist when he did not? This phrase as given in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* is confusing and unclear. Its source in the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.211a4–5, is much clearer. The context consists of verses that illustrate the teaching that “since all dharmas arise through the merging of causes and conditions, therefore there is no self-sufficiency (*svabhāva*).” Lamotte (*Le Traité* 3, 1262–63) translates:

Enfin les dharma étant issus du complexe des causes et des conditions (*hetu-pratyayasāmagrī*), n’ont pas de nature propre (*niḥsvabhāva*). Leur nature propre n’existant pas, ils sont éternellement vides (*śūnya*) et, dans cet éternellement vide, l’être n’existe pas (*sattvo nopalabhyate*). C’est ainsi que le Buddha a dit:

Lorsque j’étais assis sur l’aire de l’illumination,

Ma sagesse était inexistante.

Comme le poing vide trompant les petits enfants,

J’ai sauvé tout le monde.

Vrai caractère (*bhūtalakṣaṇa*) des choses,

for] the “therapeutic *siddhānta*” for the teaching that all evil is destroyed by the mind.

What about the “supreme method”? [First, the teaching that] you attain insight into the principle [of the truth] with the mind is like the saying that “When the mind is opened and you understand, then you attain the way immediately.” Or, the teaching that you attain insight into the truth through conditional objects is like the saying “Anyone who hears this will attain ultimate and perfect wisdom.” Or, the teaching that you attain the path by a merging of causes [thoughts] and [objective] conditionals is like [the analogy of] the nimble horse that advances on the right road just by catching a glimpse of the whip. Or, the teaching that you are able to attain insight into the truth separate from [thoughts and their objects] is like the saying “Not attaining is attaining, and having attained is not attaining.” Such are the four

C'est la marque des êtres (*sattvānimitta*).

Mais saisir la marque des êtres,

C'est s'écarter loin du vrai Chemin.

Chodron (3, 1036) translates;

Finally, dharmas, coming from causes and conditions, have no intrinsic nature. Since their intrinsic nature does not exist, they are eternally empty and, in this eternal emptiness, the being does not exist. Thus the Buddha said:

When I was seated on the sphere of enlightenment,

My wisdom was non-existent.

Like the empty fist that deceives little children,

I have saved the entire world.

The true nature of things

Is the mark of beings.

But to seize the mark of beings

Is to stray far from the true Path.

The “supreme method” 第一義悉檀: the fourth of the four *siddhānta*; teaching the Dharma directly, the supreme truth just as it is; presumably this is why those who hear it attain insight into the principle of the truth.

When the mind is opened and you understand, then you attain the way immediately 心開意解豁然得道: the *Kōgi*

(BT-III, 308) attributes this phrase to “section 42/18” of the *Ta chih tu lun*, (T 25.369a–b), but I could not locate a corresponding passage.

Anyone who hears this will attain ultimate and perfect wisdom 須臾聞之即得究竟三菩提: from the tenth chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*, T 9.31a10–11. Hurvitz (*Lotus Sūtra*, 176 [161]) translates:

When this man preaches Dharma with joy, anyone who hears it for a moment shall straightway achieve ultimate anuttarasamyakṣambodhi.

The nimble horse that advances on the right road just by catching a glimpse of the whip 快馬見鞭影即得正路: see the analogy of the four types of good horses in the *Miscellaneous Āgama*, T 2.234a16–b20. Chih-i has referred to this analogy many times before; see note at 19a23. See also the appearance of this analogy in the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.62a7–8.

Not attaining is attaining, and having attained is not attaining 無所得即是得。已得無所得: the *Kōgi* (BT-III, p. 308) attributes this phrase to “section 1-13” of the *Viśeṣacintibrahmapariṣcchā*; the phrase is close to the teachings of this sūtra, but I could not locate a corresponding passage in this section of the text (T 15.36–37).

options of the “supreme (*siddhānta*)” for insight into truth [as emptiness]. How much more so for [the idea of] three thousand dharmas that arise in a [single] thought?

6. “Objects as Inconceivable” From the Perspective of Contemplating the Middle: Beyond All Dualities (Including “Non-duality”) [55a15]

The gist of the Buddha’s [teaching] is to exhaust and purify, and does not involve [merely the four options of] cause [thought], conditional objects, both, or neither; the worldly truth is [taught on the basis of] the supreme truth.

Again, any and all of the four options can [and should] be taught [in terms of the mundane truth]: you could assert cause [thought], conditional objects, both, or neither. If you attempt to explain [the whiteness of] milk to a blind person, saying it is like [the whiteness of] a shell, or like rice powder, or like snow, or like a [white] crane, the blind person will hear this explanation and reach [a certain] understanding of milk. [This illustrates that] the worldly truth is indivisible from the supreme truth [and vice versa].

How much more so for three thousand dharmas that arise in a thought 何況心生三千法耶: or, to translate more plainly: “What need is there to speak of three thousand dharmas that arise in a [single] thought? [Answer: none.]” Here Chih-i shifts to the perspective of the Middle. That is, from the perspective of the Middle, even the conventional spelling out of the idea of three thousand realms in a single thought is superfluous, or “unobtainable.” Ikeda’s interpretation (*Gendai-goyaku*, 287) goes so far as to translate this phrase: “Here we don not need the idea of the three thousand [dharmas] arising in a thought” [or, “in the mind”]. Kanno (*Ichinen sanzen*, 185), however, follows the opposite interpretation, opting for the importance of the idea of “three thousand in a single thought.” He translates: “It goes without saying that three thousand dharmas arise in a thought” [or, “in the mind”], reiterating the importance of the “three thousand dharmas.” The phrase is open to either interpretation, depending on one’s perspective; the tradition that emphasizes the centrality of the idea of

the “three thousand realms in a single thought” 一念三千 would naturally opt for the second interpretation. I prefer the former interpretation, that at the level of the Middle, even the idea of the “three thousand realms in a single thought” is “unobtainable,” perhaps even an “extreme view.”

The worldly truth is [taught on the basis of] the supreme truth 即世諦是第一義也: or simply, “the worldly truth is the supreme truth [and the supreme truth is the mundane truth].” This is the “positionless position,” the “inexpressible expression,” the “non-dualistic dualism,” the positive expression of ultimate negation, of the Middle. For similar expressions see *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.684c10–18.

Explain milk to a blind person 盲人說乳 ...: see the parable of the blind man in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.688c, which has been quoted frequently by Chih-i already. Note that, contrary to the interpretation given by Chih-i, the sūtra says that no matter how many examples are given (a shell, rice powder, snow, and a white crane), a blind person cannot know the true meaning of “white.”

Thus it should be known that “expounding throughout the day is [the same as] not expounding throughout the day, and not expounding throughout the day is [the same as] expounding throughout the day.” At all times both extremes are covered, and at all times both extremes are illumined, establishing while deconstructing, and deconstructing while establishing. [The teachings of] the sūtras and treatises are all like this.

Vasubandhu and Nāgārjuna internally had insight and were enlightened, and externally each responded appropriately to the needs of their times on the basis of tentative means. However, some [Buddhist] teachers have a one-sided understanding, and some scholars are carelessly attached [to their own limited interpretation], so that they [argue and fight uselessly,] like shooting arrows at a rock. They each maintain one extreme, and thus pervert

Expounding throughout the day is not expounding the day, and not expounding throughout the day is expounding throughout the day 終日說終日不說。終日不說終日說: this is reminiscent of the teachings of Chuang-tzu; see the twenty-seventh chapter of the *Chuang-tzu* on “Imputed Words.” Burton Watson (*The Complete Works of Chuang-tzu*, 304–305) translates the context:

With these goblet words that come forth day after day, I harmonize all things in the Heavenly Equality, leave them to their endless changes, and so live out my years. As long as I do not say anything about them, they are a unity. But the unity and what I say about it have ceased to be a unity; what I say and the unity have ceased to be a unity. Therefore I say, we must have no-words! *With words that are no-words, you may speak all your life long and you will never have said anything. Or you may go through your whole life without speaking them, in which case you will never have stopped speaking.*

At all times both extremes are covered, and at all times both extremes are illumined 終日雙遮終日雙照: the first phrase indicating the denial of the four options of the tetralemma and the possibility of explaining anything in words or with concepts, and the second phrase indicating the affirmation of the four options of the

tetralemma and the possibility of explaining things in words and with concepts.

Vasubandhu and Nāgārjuna internally had insight and were enlightened 天親龍樹內鑒冷然: lit., “internally [they reflected truth] like a mirror and had pure and spontaneous [enlightenment].” The first compound 內鑒 implies an internal insight that reflects reality clearly like a mirror. The second compound 冷然 is a variant of 冷然: 冷 means “cool” and 冷 means “pure and enlightened”; as a compound it implies pure, clear enlightenment. The compound was used to modify the pure sound of flowing water. Kanno (*Ichinen sanzen*, 195) points out that in the classical *Issaikyō ongi* 一切經音義 (T 54.73a), this compound is defined as meaning “awakened understanding” 解悟.

Each responded appropriately to the needs of their times on the basis of tentative means 外適時宜各權所據: I have translated rather freely here. Literally the text reads “externally, as appropriate to the demands of the times, each depended on tentative means.”

Like shooting arrows at a rock 矢石: my translation is rather free, but follows the interpretation given by Chan-jan (BT-III, 310): “‘Arrow-rock’ refers to shooting an arrow at a rock. The meaning does not penetrate, because each [of those who

the noble path. If you obtain this meaning, then you comprehend both the impossibility of verbal expression and the necessity of verbal expression.

If you were to respond appropriately [in accordance with tentative expressions], you should say that when ignorance shapes the dharmas according to Dharma-nature (*dharmatā*), then all dharmas arise as all things that happen in a dream are a result of the mind in a state of sleep. The merging of the mind with external conditions results in the three types of worlds [of the five skandhas, sentient beings, and various lands], and thus the three thousand [internal and external] features [of the three thousand realms] arise from the mind. A single internal feature is small or few, but it is not nothing; ignorance is multitudinous, but has no [substantial] Being. Why? If we focus on one thing as [an example of] many, the many are not many; if we focus on many as one, this one is not a few. Therefore these thoughts are called inconceivable objects.

[The gist of the Middle:] If [55b] it is understood that one thought is all thoughts, all thoughts are one thought, and these are neither one nor all, one skandha is all skandhas, all skandhas are one skandha, and these are neither one nor all; one sense entrance (*āyatana*) is all senses entrances, all sense entrances are one sense entrance, and these are neither one nor all; one sense realm (*dhātu*) is all sense realms, all sense realms is one sense realm, and these are neither one nor all; one sentient being is all sentient beings, all

argue their own limited understanding] rely on their own speculation, and does not realize the principle of the perfect [truth]. Thus this is like [shooting] arrows at a rock.” Kanno (*Ichinen sanzen*, 196) points out a different interpretation. He argues that arrows and stones are representative weapons and the compound merely indicates that the scholars argue and fight with each other. My translation incorporates both possibilities.

A single internal feature is small or few, but it is not nothing 一性雖少而不無; or, the compound “one nature” 一性 could be interpreted as “the one [dharma-] nature” 一[法]性. Chan-jan [BT-III, 312] says “‘one-nature/feature, though small, is not nothing’ is because all dharmas arise through conditions 緣成法生.” The *Kōgi* more clearly interprets this phrase in terms of the Dharma-nature 法性. How-

ever, I take this 性 to refer back to the same character in the previous phrase, the “three thousand [internal and external] features [of the three thousand realms] 三千相性.”

One thought is all thoughts, all thoughts are one thought, and these are neither one nor all 一心一切心。一切心一心。非一非一切: “one is all” is the perspective of conventionality, “all are one” is the perspective of emptiness, and “neither one nor all”—that is, neither a simple unity nor a diversity—is the perspective of the Middle.

One skandha is all skandhas ... neither one nor all 一陰一切陰。一切陰一陰。非一非一切...: remember that this section is on “contemplation of the objects of the skandhas and sense fields (*skandha-āyatana-dhāta*).”

sentient beings are one sentient being, and these are neither one nor all; one land is all lands, all lands are one land, and these are neither one nor all; one mark is all marks, all marks are one mark, and these are neither one nor all; [and so forth for the other categories of the ten suchlike characteristics] up to and including one ultimate is all ultimates, all ultimates are one ultimate, and these are neither one nor all. Everything and anything that we experience; all are inconceivable objects. [This is the perspective of the Middle.]

7. Recapitulation in Terms of the Two Truths, Threefold Truth, Threefold Contemplation, and Threefold Wisdom [55b9]

If we say that the merging of ignorance and the Dharma-nature results in all phenomena, the skandhas and sense fields, and so forth, this is [to speak in terms of] the mundane truth [of conventionality]. If we say that all sense fields are one dharma realm, this is [to speak in terms of] the real truth [of emptiness]. [To say that] these are neither one nor all is [to speak in terms of] the supreme truth of the Middle Way. In this way, in everything and anything that we experience, there is nothing that does not involve the inconceivable threefold truth.

To say that one dharma is all dharmas is [an expression of the phrase from the *Middle Treatise*, verse 24:18, that] “things arise through causes and conditions” 因緣所生法. This refers to conventional designation 假名 and the contemplation of conventionality 假觀. To say that all dharmas are one dharma is [an expression of the phrase] “this I explain as emptiness” 我說即是空, which is the contemplation of emptiness 空觀. To say “neither one nor all” is the contemplation of the Middle Way 中道觀.

The emptiness of one [thing] is the emptiness of all; just because there are the meanings of conventional existence and the Middle does not mean that they are not empty. This is the general contemplation of emptiness. The conventionality of one [thing] is the conventionality of all; just because there are the meanings of emptiness and the Middle does not mean that they do not have conventionality. This is the general contemplation of conventionality. The Middle of one is the Middle of all; just because there are the meanings of emptiness and conventionality does not mean that they do not have Middleness. This is the general contemplation of the Middle. Thus, as the *Middle Treatise* explains, this is the threefold contemplation of a single thought [or, “the single-minded threefold contemplation (of objects)”] as inconceivable 不可思議一心三觀. All phenomena that we experience are also likewise.

If we say that all phenomena arise through [the interplay of] causes and conditions, this is [the perspective of] [skillful] means (*upāya*), “in accordance with feelings” [of sentient beings] 隨情, and the tentative wisdom of

the path 道種權智. If we say that all dharmas are one dharma, this is [the perspective of] “this I explain as emptiness,” “in accordance with wisdom” 隨智, and [the wisdom of] omniscience 一切智. If we say “neither one nor all,” again this is called the meaning of the Middle Way, that is, neither tentative nor real 非權非實, and universal wisdom 一切種智. Following this pattern, one tentative matter is all tentative matters, one real matter is all real matters, and all is neither tentative nor real; everything and anything that we experience involves the inconceivable three wisdoms.

“In accordance with feelings” is another way to say “in accordance with the thoughts of others,” and “in accordance with wisdom” is another way to say “in accordance with [the Buddha’s] own thoughts.” To say “neither tentative nor real” is another way to say “neither [in accordance with merely] the thoughts of others or [the Buddha’s] own thoughts.” Thus everything and anything that we experience is not unrelated to the inconceivable teaching of [the three types of] gradual, sudden, and variable [contemplations]. If you understand the sudden [teachings and contemplation], you understand [the workings of] the mind [or thoughts]. But the mind and its thoughts are unobtainable; how can it be said that they “incline” or “do not incline”? If you understand the gradual [teachings and contemplation], you understand that all dharmas are “inclined” to [or based on] the mind. If you understand the variable [teachings and contemplation], you understand that [all dharmas] do not transcend their inclination toward [or reliance on] the mind.

[55c] All of these are different terms but their meaning is the same. As a guiding track for practitioners, these are threefold teachings. That which

The inconceivable three wisdoms 不思議三智: Chih-i has already explained the three wisdoms; see the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* at 26b-c.

In accordance with the thoughts of others 隨他意 and **“in accordance with [the Buddha’s] own thoughts”** 隨自意: Chih-i has discussed these terms previously; see the glossary. For a long exposition on these terms see the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, T 12.820b2-821c3.

“Incline” 趣 or “do not incline” 非趣: that is, there is a “place” that is “the mind,” or that there is no “place” for mental functions; neither option obtains. See the *Pañcaviṃśati Sūtra*, T 8.333a-c; for details see note at *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 46c2-4. See also the note in Kanno, *Ichinen*

sanzen, 197-98, which provides the Sanskrit for this passage (from P. L. Vaidya, ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 4, 1960, 148): “*tat kasya hetoḥ śūnyatāgatikā he Subhūte sarvadharmāḥ / te tām gatiṃ na vyatīvartante!*” This indicates that the Sanskrit for 趣 is *gati*, “place of refuge” or “that which is relied on.”

As a guiding track for practitioners, these are threefold Dharma teachings 軌則行人呼爲三法: this could refer to the threefold pattern in Chih-i’s teachings in general (the threefold truth, three wisdoms, threefold Buddha-nature, and so forth; see charts in Swanson, *Foundations*, 358-59). Or, it could refer specifically to Chih-i’s categories of the “three tracks

is illuminated is the threefold truth. That which is aroused is threefold contemplation. [The content of] the perfection of contemplation are the three wisdoms. Teaching others involves threefold words. “Returning to the gist” involves three [meanings of] “inclination.” With this meaning, all types of teachings can arise. There are various flavors, and you should not disdain this because of its complexity.

[The analogy of the *maṇi* jewel:] This is like the wish-fulfilling (*maṇi*) jewel, which is the most supreme and heavenly treasure. It has a [small and round] shape like a mustard seed or grain of millet, but it has great and effective powers. Pure and sublime [objects] of the five desires, and the seven jewels and other gems [which can be provided magically by the wish-fulfilling jewel] are neither contained within it, nor do they come from the outside. [They appear] without being planned before or after, without a choice of many or few, without a crude or subtle production, but [the wish-fulfilling jewel] provides bountifully and carefully as it intends. [The wish-fulfilling jewel is like] the rain that falls abundantly, without [the need for] augmentation and without being exhausted. Even such a mundane object can act in this way; how much more so is the mind mysterious and sublime. How can it not include all dharmas?

[The analogy of the three poisons:] Again, the deluded thoughts of the

[of reality]” 三軌, that is, the true nature of reality itself 真性軌, the wisdom that illumines this true nature 觀照軌, and the practice that perfects one’s inherent disposition for wisdom 資成軌; see Chart 7 in Swanson, *Foundations*, 364. Chih-i outlines these categories in the *Fa-hua hsüan-i*, T 33.741b.

Teaching others involves threefold words 教他呼爲三語: that is, words that are in accordance with the thoughts of others, words that are in accordance with the thought of the Buddha himself, and words that are neither of the above. See the use of these terms a few lines above.

“Returning to the gist” involves three [meanings of] “inclination” 歸宗呼爲三趣: that is, 1. “inclining”—admitting the conventional existence of a mind; a “place” for thoughts to function and arise; this corresponds to the mundane truth or the truth of conventionality; 2. “not inclin-

ing”—denying any substantial mind or ground for thoughts or objective reality, that the mind “cannot be obtained”; this corresponds to the truth of emptiness or the real truth; 3. “neither”—corresponding to the Middle.

This is like the wish-fulfilling jewel, which is the most supreme and heavenly treasure 如如意珠天上勝寶: see, for example, the *Pañcaviṃśati Sūtra*, T 8. 291c–292a; at 291c27–28 it says, “The *maṇi* jewel is the most supreme divine treasure, the treasure of Jambudvīpa.”

It has great and effective powers 有大功能: see also the *Ta chih tu lun*, T 25.134a, where it lists the seven types of jewels and then adds (134a24):

[the wish-fulfilling jewel is] the most supreme in the world, and even the gods cannot obtain it. Why? Because it produces great and effective merits.

three poisons [of greed, anger, and ignorance] arise in the single thought of the mind, as well as eighty-eight passions, including the sharp passions, such as [the mistaken view of a substantial] body and extreme [views], and dull passions, up to eighty-four thousand passionate afflictions. If we say that these have previous existence, then why do they wait for certain conditions [before appearing]? If we say that they are originally nothing [or non-existent], why do they become manifest in response to certain conditions? They neither exist [as substantial Being] nor not exist [as nothingness] 不有不無. If we settle on [viewing them as] “existing,” this is a mistaken view. If we settle on [viewing them as] “not existing,” this is a delusion. You should know that they exist [conventionally], yet do not exist [as substantial Being]; they do not exist, yet they do exist. Deluded thoughts are likewise. How much more so the inconceivable single mind [or, “a single thought as inconceivable”]?

[The analogy of a dream:] Again, even if you see hundreds of thousands of millions of things in a dream while sleeping, when you are wide awake not even one remains, not to mention the other hundreds of thousands [or so things]. When you are not quite asleep, you neither dream nor are awake, and there is neither many [events in a dream] nor one [experience of being wide awake]. You experience many things through the power of sleep; you experience a few things through the power of being awake. Chuang-tzu dreamt that he was a butterfly, flittering here and there for a hundred years, but when he awoke he knew that he was not a butterfly, and that he

Eighty-eight passions, including the sharp passions, such as [the mistaken view of a substantial] body and extreme [views], and dull passions 身邊利鈍八十八使: the “eighty-eight passions” is a general term for all the passions. There are five “sharp passions”: 1. the false view that the body is substantial (身見 *satkāya-dṛṣṭi*), 2. extreme views (邊見 *antaḥgrāha-dṛṣṭi*), 3. mistaken views (邪見 *mithya-dṛṣṭi*), 4. attachment to false views (見取見; *dṛṣṭi-parāmarśa*), and 5. excessive attachment to the precepts (lit., “morality and vows”; 戒[禁] 取見; *śīlavrata-parāmarśa*). There are also five “dull passions”: covetousness/greed, anger, stupidity/ignorance, arrogance, and doubt.

Chuang-tzu dreamt that he was a butterfly, flittering here and there for a hundred years, but when he awoke he knew

that he was not a butterfly, and that he had not lived for all those years 莊周夢為蝴蝶翾翾百年寤知非蝶亦非積歲: among other things, Chih-i here is illustrating how “a hundred years” can be incorporated in a moment’s dream. Actually, the famous story of Chuang-tzu dreaming he is a butterfly goes like this:

Once Chuang Chou dreamt he was a butterfly, a butterfly flitting and fluttering around, happy with himself and doing as he pleased. He didn’t know he was Chuang Chou. Suddenly he woke up and there he was, solid and unmistakably Chuang Chou. But he didn’t know if he was Chuang Chou who had dreamt he was a butterfly, or a butterfly dreaming he was Chuan Chou. Between Chuang Chou and a butterfly there must be *some* distinction! This is called the Transformation of Things.

had not lived for all those years. [To perceive] ignorance [arising] on the basis of dharma-nature and for one thought to be all thoughts is like falling into a deep sleep. To have penetrating understanding of the indivisibility of ignorance and dharma-nature, and that all thoughts are one thought is like being wide awake. Again, suppose those who practice the practices of peaceful bliss are asleep and dreaming. First they arouse the aspiration [for enlightenment] and so forth until they become Buddhas and sit on the seat of enlightenment, turn the wheel of the Dharma, save sentient beings, and enter nirvana. Then they awaken and realize that this was all an event in a dream.

If you believe in [the meaning of] these three analogies [of the *maṇi* jewel, the three poisons, and the dream], you can believe in single-mindedness. This cannot be expressed verbally, nor can it be measured through [human] feelings.

What (Dharma) teaching can contain [the idea of] objects as inconceivable? [Understanding] these objects [in this way] arouses wisdom; what wisdom is not aroused? On the basis of [understanding] objects [as inconceivable, the vow [of aspiration for enlightenment] is aroused, and so forth to [the tenth mode] of [avoiding] passionate attachment to dharmas. What vow is not included herein, and what practice is not completed? When explaining it we follow the above order, but when practicing it, all thoughts are included within one thought.

See the last section of the second chapter of the *Chuang-tzu*; translated by Burton Watson, *Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, 49.

Suppose those who practice the practices of peaceful bliss are asleep and dreaming 行安樂行人一眠夢: the set of four practices based on chapter 14 of the *Lotus Sūtra*: the 1. physical, 2. verbal, and 3. mental practices to 4. realize the vow to attain peaceful bliss.

Then they awaken and realize that this was all an event in a dream 豁寤祇是一夢事: once again, this illustrates how a whole

life of practice and experience can take place in a single thought.

You can believe in single-mindedness 信一心: or, “you can believe in [the inclusion of all dharmas in] a single thought.”

The vow [of aspiration for enlightenment] is aroused 依此境發誓: this is the theme of the next of the ten modes of contemplation of the mind. See below, at *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 55c26–56b13.

[The tenth mode] of [avoiding] passionate attachment to dharmas: see below at *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 99c–100a.