

Lecture 14

“One Mind Opens Two Doors” in the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*

Today we shall move forward from the *ālaya* [*alaya vijnana*, storehouse or originant consciousness] system of the Weishi [Consciousness-Only, Yogacara] school and continue to examine the development of Buddhism. In the development of Buddhist doctrine, the Weishi school was not the ultimate stage. Moving forward with the development of the Weishi school of thought we come to the doctrinal system of the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* [*Dasheng-qixin-lun*, *Mahayana Śraddhotpāda-sāstra*]. This system is concerned mainly with the Buddha-Womb [*Rulai zang*, Skt. *tathāgata-garbha*, Womb of Buddhahood],¹ namely “The Self-existent Pure Mind of the Buddha-Womb” [*Rulaizang zixing qingjing xin*]. In simple words, the thought of the *Awakening of Faith* is the system of “the True and Ever-Abiding Mind” [*zhenchang xin*, True and Constant, Eternal Mind].

According to the Weishi school, the *ālaya* consciousness [*alaiye shi*] is an illusory consciousness of arising and cessation (although tradition says it is without concealment and without marks, it is actually still benighted and ignorant), and like a rushing stream flows forever downward.² Thus insofar as the *ālaya* consciousness is illusory, it is impure and does not contain the “true mind.” And insofar as it is likened to a rushing stream it can be compared to the “constant flux” which is mentioned in the Platonic dialogues. Like a stream of water, it is subject to arising or cessation at any moment, being neither eternal nor constant and immutable. Thus the *ālaya* consciousness taught by the Weishi school is only the “consciousness mind” of arising and cessation, and not the true and ever-abiding “wisdom mind”—the pure mind.

As to the system proposed by the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*, it expounds the “Self-existent Pure Mind of the Buddha-womb”. Since the self-existent [*zixing*, self-nature, self-substance] is pure, it is not illusory nor defiled, and therefore it pertains to the True and Ever-Abiding Mind [*zhen chang xin*]. *Zhen* is true, not illusory. *Chang* means enduring and unchanging. According to Buddhism, this is the “wisdom mind.” And “wisdom mind” is the reverse of the “consciousness mind.” Thus the *ālaya* system of the Weishi school develops into the system of the True and Ever-Abiding Mind of the *Awakening of Faith*, a development that is inevitable in Buddhist doctrine. For the unfolding of questions in the

system of *ālaya* consciousness will naturally lead to the emergence of the philosophical system of “the Self-existent Pure Mind of the Buddha-Womb”.

We can explain the process of change in this intellectual development by looking at two issues. One issue emerged out of the necessity to explain the grounding or origin of all dharmas.³ The doctrinal system of the True and Ever-Abiding Mind⁴ maintained that the Self-existent Pure Mind of the Buddha-Womb is that upon which all dharmas depend and are grounded, which is a more complete explanation than that of the Weishi school. According to the Weishi school, all dharmas originate in the *ālaya* consciousness, and have their grounding-place in the *ālaya* consciousness, but *ālaya* is merely an illusory consciousness-mind. Adhering to this explanation of the *ālaya* consciousness, one can only explain the cycle of life and death of all dharmas and this cycle is simply the dharmas of arising and cessation. But not all dharmas are the polluted dharmas of a revolving flow of arising and cessation. There are the pure dharmas of merit. If so, then we can ask the Weishi school, what is the origin of the pure dharmas of merit? In other words, how do we explain the question of the grounding of pure dharmas?

Of course the Weishi school can say that the pure dharmas of merit come from “non-leaking seeds” [pure, undefiled, seeds, not leaking into the revolving cycle of birth and death, arising and cessation].⁵ However, the Weishi school’s theory of “non-leaking seeds” is also problematic, with the result that its explanation of the pure dharmas of merit seems not quite complete or thorough. For according to the explanation of the Weishi school, “the non-leaking seed” is formed by *a posteriori* right-hearing influences.⁶ If the non-leaking seed is formed by *a posteriori* right-hearing influences, and non-leaking seed is also the origin of all pure dharmas of merit, then obviously the origin of all pure dharmas must belong within the *a posteriori*, the empirical. Since this origin is *a posteriori* and empirical, then it naturally does not have any *a priori* necessity. Thus the pure dharmas that arise from the non-leaking seed also have no necessity to speak of.

Following the first question and going a step further we come to the second question, which is namely “whether there is any assurance of attaining Buddhahood.” We have previously pointed out that the Weishi school has used “non-leaking seed” as the origin of all pure dharmas of merit. This is the same as making non-leaking seed the ground of sentient beings attaining Buddhahood. However, since the non-leaking seed is formed through empirical right-hearing influences, then the ground of the sentient beings’

attainment of Buddhahood must also belong to the empirical, and since it is *a posteriori* and empirical, then the ground on which attaining Buddhahood rests has no necessary assurance. For the attainment of Buddhahood by sentient beings is grounded not only on *a posteriori* influences, but on meeting opportunities.⁷ If this is so, then it is impossible to determine when one can confirm Dao or attain Buddhahood. Thus making non-leaking seed the ground of attaining Buddhahood is somewhat weak.

This question forces one to go a step forward and find an *a priori* ground which is moreover transcendental and non-empirical. In other words, it forces out “the Buddha- Womb Self-existent Pure Mind” as the only way to thoroughly solve the question of the ground for attaining Buddhahood. A development of this kind is analogous to Kant’s explanation of causality. For causality as explained by David Hume cannot explain scientific knowledge, and under the pressure of this question Kant was forced to explain causality as being *a priori*. Thus in the internal doctrinal development of Buddhism this question forced one to push ahead and affirm the existence of a True and Ever-Abiding Mind and make this the transcendental ground for attaining Buddhahood. For once a True and Ever-Abiding Mind is affirmed as the transcendental ground for attaining Buddhahood, then our life contains *a priori* a certain transcendental force that is spontaneously generated and not completely dependent on the influence of *a posteriori* experiences. If it had to rely completely on the influence of *a posteriori* experiences, then when we encounter Buddha we can attain Buddhahood, but if we do not encounter Buddha would it not mean that we would never be able to confirm Dao and attain Buddhahood?

Under the pressure of these two questions, Buddhism in its development had to introduce the system of “the True and Ever-Abiding Mind”. And this system can be represented by the thought of the *Awakening of Faith*. In the textual criticism of Buddhist history, there are those who say that the *Awakening of Faith* was forged by Chinese hands, as if it were spurious,⁸ and not a translation from the Sanskrit of India. However, even if the textual critics can say this, the thought of the *Awakening of Faith* is not false. Its thought is developed from the later period of Indian Buddhism, namely from the Indian True and ever-abiding Sūtras of the later period. The sūtras on which it is based include the *Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra*, the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*, the *Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra* and other sūtras as well. These True and Ever-Abiding Sūtras were not fabricated by the Chinese but existed originally in India.

In the development of Indian Mahayana Buddhism, the first to appear was the Kong [Skt. Śūnyata, Emptiness] school, represented by Nāgārjuna [Longshu, founder, Mādhyamaka school, 2nd ? cent. CE]. Next appeared the Weishi [Consciousness Only, Mere-Ideation, Yogacara] school, represented by Asaṅga [Wu Zhuo, brother of Vasubandhu] and Vasubandhu [Shi Qin, born ca. CE 400? / late 4th ? cent. CE]. At the time these two schools of thought may be said to have been the major doctrines. Both schools have as their principal ground the canonical *śāstras*. Of course they were also based on the canonical sūtras. For example, the sūtra on which the Kong school was based was the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* [*Da-bore-jing*], while the Weishi school was mainly based on the *Sandhinirmocana-sūtra* [*Jie-shenmi-jing*]. But all the doctrinal principles which defined these schools were implied in the canonical *śāstras* on which the schools were based. So we can say that these schools of thought were centered around the *śāstras*. For example, the *śāstras* which formed the ground of the Śūnyata school included the *Mula-mādhyamaka-karika* [*Zhong lun, Middle Treatise*], the *Śata-śāstra* [*Bai-lun, One Hundred Treatise*], the *Dvāda-śanikāya-śāstra* [*Shi'er-men-lun, Twelve Gate Treatise*], and the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-śāstra* [*Da-zhidu-lun, Great Perfection of Wisdom Sastra*], all authored by Nāgārjuna. A student of the Kong school may not have to study the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, but he has to study these four *śāstras*. Likewise, one studying the Weishi school must be familiar with the *śāstras* on which it is based, such as the *Yogācāryabhūmi-śāstra* [*Yujia-shdii-lun, Yogacara-levels Sastra*], the *Mahāyāna-samparigraha-śāstra* [*She-dasheng-lun,, Mahayana Compendium*], *Vijñapti-mātratā-siddhi-śāstra* [*Cheng-weishi-lun, Establishment of Consciousness-Only Sastra*], *Madhyānta-vibhāga-śāstra* [*Bian-zhong-pian-lun, Sastra On the Relation between the Middle and Extremes*], and *Vyūharāja-sūtra-śāstra* [*Zhuangyen-jing lun*]. Accordingly, the study of these two schools of thought has generally “stressed *śāstras* and slighted sūtras.” For example, the later “San Lun [Three Śāstras, Madyamaka, school]” established [in China in reign of Emperor An Di (r.397-419) of the Eastern Jin dynasty] by Jiaxiang Jizang based its thought directly on the *Mula-mādhyamaka-śāstra*, the *Śata-śāstra*, and the *Dvāda-śanikāya-śāstra*, and not on the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*.

As to stressing the *śāstras* over the sūtras, the Weishi school did this even more than the Kong school. The *śāstras* it was concerned with were both numerous and varied, and even the *Sandhinirmocana-sūtra* on which it was based bore less resemblance to a sūtra than to a *śāstra*. For a sūtra

usually contained many hymns and fables, and was less systematic and theoretical than the *śāstra*, whereas the *Sandhinirmocana-sūtra* not only contained many concepts and theoretical arguments, but it was extremely systematic, almost indistinguishable from a *śāstra*. Thus students of the Weishi school focused on *śāstras* and seldom read the sūtras. Preceptor Yin Shun [Yin Shun, 1906-2005] has criticized this defect of the Weishi school in “stressing *śāstras* and slighting sūtras.”

Students of Buddhism should really read the sūtras diligently. For the sūtras are the words of Buddha. What the sūtras represent are the concrete, the lively, relaxed, and open heart and mind, whereas the *śāstras* are the creations of bodhisattvas, intended to elucidate the doctrines taught by Buddha, and so they lean towards the theoretical. And because they are more theoretical, once the student falls into them, it will be as if he were caught in the “nets that spread over heaven and earth,” unable to see his way out. That is why it is best to spend more time on the sūtras, for they will, in contrast, make one’s mind more lively and open. This reminds me of the *Weimojie jing Xuanyi* [*The Esoteric Meaning of the Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] of Great Preceptor Zhiyi [538-597] of the Tiantai school in which he says that people think of the *śāstras* as being rich in content and the sūtras poor, but that is not so. The sūtras, which are more open and frank and so more heuristic, are really richer. “They are the proper base from which to enter Dao. To favor the *śāstra* over the sūtra is much to be lamented.”⁹ Zhiyi’s words were heartfelt, although they were not considered very important by the Tiantai school, and are usually not given much attention. But although statements like these do not seem to matter much, they come from genuine feeling, and deserve our attention.

It is like the people these days who look down on the *Analects* and for the very same reason. Westerners have always had the greatest difficulty in understanding the *Analects*. There was an Englishman who simply could not understand why the *Analects* occupied so exalted a position in China, as if it were the Bible. They think that statements such as “Confucius said: ‘Is it not a pleasure to learn and frequently review what you have learned? Is it not a joy when friends come from afar? Is it not a noble man who can remain unperturbed when he is not known?’” have nothing to do with philosophy. In the whole of the *Analects* there are not only no definitions, and no system, but there are not even inferences. This attitude of Westerners towards the *Analects* only goes to show how simple-minded they are. They

think philosophy must have definitions, concepts, principles, and systems, and such simple statements like those in the *Analects* have little value for them.

Because of the differences in culture and background, Westerners may be allowed these views, but in the historical tradition of China, no one has ever dared make such a judgement. Not only those people who revere Confucian thought, but even among the followers of Buddhism and Daoism no one has dared belittle the value of Confucianism.

That is why Great Preceptor Zhiyi of the Tiantai school uttered those words to make people who came after him realize that the sūtras are richer than the *śāstras*. For the *śāstras* merely expound a number of concepts. So you think the *śāstras* are very rich, well, they are actually very poor. It is like the treatises of Western theologians, which appear rich and finely wrought whereas the Bible in contrast appears simple and poor. But how tremendously instructive the Bible has been to succeeding generations! Whether you are a believer in Christianity or not, anyone who has read the four Gospels will be deeply affected. Because the four Gospels are rich in drama and present one form of the sage, it deserves to be read by everyone. In contrast, if you read St. Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica* you will probably not be much affected. And take Aristotle's philosophy, which analyzes this way and that, or take Spinoza's *Ethics*, which is even written in the style of geometry—what use is it to a man's faith? Thus all these works can only represent theory, whereas such things as the *Analects* and the Bible represent wisdom. So we can see that when the Weishi school in its later development studied the *śāstras* and not the sūtras they were wrong.

We have just sketched the development of the early stages of Mahayana Buddhism in India. As to the thought of the True and Ever-Abiding Sūtras [*zhenchang jing*], it was, although later in time, a dialectical development. In other words, first the thought of the Kong school emerged, then the thought of the Weishi school, leading up to the system of the True and Ever-Abiding Mind. Although the later period in India produced the True and Ever-Abiding Sūtras, no *śāstra* was produced, and because of the absence of *śāstras*, they have not been given attention by those who emphasized theoretical argumentation. But after Buddhism was transmitted to China, the Chinese--perhaps because they had a high level of intelligence, or perhaps being Chinese they had no great interest in the theoretical--though able to study the *śāstras*, did not find them of particular interest. Thus after the Yogacara school was transmitted to China, through Xuanzang [596-664] of the Tang dynasty and later Kui Ji [632-682], it dwindled after only two generations

of transmission. In the present age the *śāstras* of the Weishi school are read because of the stimulation from Western philosophy, out of a philosophical interest, that is, with philosophy as the point of departure. But in general people do not study Buddhism from the philosophical point of view. They become monks or devote themselves to cultivating Dao because they want to believe in Buddha's teaching. So from the perspective of a religious interest their focus is on the sūtras and not the *śāstras*. This attitude of the Chinese is right and proper. The Chinese do not have a strong interest in theory, nor are they sufficiently analytical by nature. This may be said to be a defect in the Chinese, but at the same time it is a strength. And because of this mentality in the Chinese, ever since they absorbed Buddhism they have valued the sūtras over the *śāstras*, believing that they should read the Buddhist sūtras directly. That is why although the system of the True and Ever-Abiding Mind of thought was short in *śāstras*, it was most readily accepted by the Chinese after its transmission into China.

There was a reason why the Chinese had a particular fondness for the True and Ever-Abiding Sūtras, for the doctrine implied in the True and Ever-Abiding Sūtras was congenial to the Chinese mentality. The Chinese found it easy to understand the thought propounded by the True and Ever-Abiding Sūtras, that "All sentient beings possess the Buddha-Nature"¹⁰ or "All sentient beings can become Buddha." For Mencius [371?-289? BCE] had right away stressed that "Everyone can become Yao and Shun [legendary sage-emperors, 3rd ? millennium BCE]"¹¹, at the same time pointing out that "Everyone has the sage-nature." When Mencius spoke of human nature being good, the "nature" he meant was the "sage-nature," one that emerged through the practice of virtue, and the highest state of practicing virtue was becoming a sage. Here sage-nature was not only the nature found in a sage, but the ground through which it was possible to become a sage. If we compare "Buddha-Nature" to "sage-nature," then everyone possessed the "Buddha-Nature" of Buddha's nature, which is to say that it was a nature that belonged not only to Buddha alone, but the ground by which it was possible to become Buddha. Because of the similarity in these two attitudes, the Chinese have had a greater appreciation of the True and Ever-Abiding Sutras produced by the later period of Buddhist development in India. And for this very reason, the thought of the Buddha-Womb True and Ever-Abiding Sūtras had a great influence on China.

We have previously mentioned that there are those who say that the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* was forged by the Chinese. Others have said that it first made its appearance in China and was

authored by the Chinese. Such statements are really very vague. If you say it was forged by the Chinese, who exactly forged it? As to saying that it was produced in China, then it was not necessarily produced by someone Chinese, which is to say that “produced in China” and “forged by the Chinese” are different things, because not all people in China were Chinese. According to my own inference, it was simply authored by Preceptor Paramārtha [*Zhendi Sanzang*]. Paramārtha was a monk who came to China in the *datong* year [535 CE] of the Liang dynasty [502-557]. In China he devoted himself to promoting the Weishi [Yogacara] school of thought. To label the *Awakening of Faith* as the work of Bodhisattva Aśvaghosa [Maming Pusa, c.100 A.D.] is to borrow the bodhisattva’s name to increase the authority of the *śāstra*. As to labeling it as translated by Paramārtha, in my opinion it is indeed the work of Paramārtha. Of course it was not necessarily authored by Paramārtha alone; perhaps many Chinese monks helped him do it.¹² How can we deduce that the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* was authored by Paramārtha? On the ground that Paramārtha’s thought consisted of integrating *ālaya* [storehouse consciousness] into the Buddha-Womb [*tathagata-garbha*], and the *Awakening of Faith* was precisely a full and complete expression of this integration.

So even though there are many people who say that the *Awakening of Faith* did not originate in India but was forged in China, there are still many who value this *śāstra* and appreciate the implications contained in it. In the China Metaphysical Institute [Zhina Neixue Yuan 支那內學院], Preceptor Ouyang [Ouyang Jian 歐陽漸, 1871-1943] was vehement in attacking the *Awakening of Faith*, while men like Lu Qiuyi 呂秋逸 and Wang Enyang 王恩洋 were very hostile towards it.¹³ Nonetheless the *Awakening of Faith* occupies an important position in Buddhism, one that is unassailable. For the development of problems in Buddhism must inevitably flow into the doctrinal principles of the *Awakening of Faith*. In other words, if we are to address the crux of the problems, we cannot but attach importance to the intellectual framework of the *Awakening of Faith*. The attitude of the China Metaphysical Institute towards the *Awakening of Faith* is unsound.

The doctrines of the *Awakening of Faith* derive mainly from the *Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra* [*Shenman-furen-jing*] and the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* [*Lengjia-jing*]. This means that if we are to understand the *Awakening of Faith* we must start with these two sūtras.

The doctrines of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* are not very clear nor is it well edited and translated.¹⁴ The translation of the *Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra* reads more fluently, and some statements are expressed very lucidly. The principal feature of the *Awakening of Faith* which is grounded on these two True and Ever-Abiding Sutras is its introduction of the concept of “One Mind Opens Two Doors,” which is to say that it affirms the existence of a transcendental True and Ever-Abiding Mind, and from this True and Ever-Abiding Mind there emerges two doors, “door of True Suchness” [*zhenru*, Skt.*bhūtatathatā*] and “door of arising and cessation”¹⁵ If we do not affirm the existence of a True and Ever-Abiding Mind, then we will only explain all dharmas [all things, phenomena] from the ground of the *ālaya* consciousness, with the result that all that our life possesses originally will only be the *ālaya* consciousness, for the pure non-leaking seed rises later, produced by *a posteriori* right-hearing influences. Therefore, the Tiantai school leveled this charge against the Weishi school: “How could *ālaya* from the very beginning be the ground out of which all dharmas arise?”¹⁶ “How could” means “it couldn’t.” For if *ālaya* consciousness is used from the very beginning to explain all dharmas, and *ālaya* consciousness is merely illusory consciousness, then what arises from this consciousness is only impure and polluted dharmas that flow and revolve in an endless cycle of *samsara* [birth, suffering, death, and rebirth]. This can only be called “One mind opens one door,” while the door of the pure dharmas of non-leaking seed cannot be produced and opened. That is why the Weishi school’s doctrine of *ālaya* consciousness can only explain the one door of the dharmas of the repeated cycle of birth and death.

As to the “mind” introduced by the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*, it is a transcendental True and Ever-Abiding Mind, the ultimate ground [*yi zhi*] of all dharmas. All dharmas include all dharmas that are subject to the continuous cycle of *samsara* as well as all dharmas that are pure and non-leaking [not leaking into the *samsara* cycle]. These two sides of all dharmas are all grounded in the Self-existent Pure Mind of the Buddha-Womb. “*Yi* [ground]” means the *yi* [grounded on] of *yikao* [ground on]; “*zhi* [stop, grounding-place]” is like the “*zhi*” of “grounding [*zhi*] in the ultimate good” [*zhi yu zhishan* 止於至善]. All dharmas are grounded in the Self-existent Pure Mind of the Buddha-Womb. This means that the Self-existent Pure Mind of the Buddha-Womb can produce and open two doors. One is the door of arising and cessation, meaning the phenomena of revolving life, death, and transmigration, where change takes place in a fleeting moment, or so-called “All actions [*xing*] are without permanence, all dharmas are without self.”¹⁷

The other is the door of True Suchness, namely opening the door of the realm of pure dharmas. True Suchness¹⁸ refers to the non-leaking pure dharmas. With this, the framework for “One mind opens two doors” is laid out. This is a very important framework in philosophical thought. Its contribution to human thought is enormous, and it should not be regarded as merely a Buddhist theory. We can look upon it as a model for all to share. It has universal applicability and can be used to address a very important philosophical question, a view I arrived at only after many years of reflection.

Here let us first say a few words about “One mind opens two doors.” The “one mind” here refers to the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind, namely the transcendental True and Ever-Abiding Mind. The dharmas explained through this Self-existent Pure Mind are the pure non-leaking dharmas, and therefore we can say that all pure dharmas are grounded on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind. However, although the self-nature of our true mind is originally pure, our practical life flows and revolves within the stream of birth and death, which indicates that our life contains at the same time dharmas of arising and cessation. How is it possible for the impure dharmas, dharmas of vexation which revolve in the stream of arising and cessation, to be grounded on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind? How can they originate from the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind just like the non-leaking pure dharmas? We may ask further: Since the self-nature is pure, how can it suddenly become impure? According to the mentality of formal logic, we are allowed to pose this question. That is why people have said that both the system of Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind and the system of *ālaya* consciousness are problematic. For according to the *ālaya* consciousness system, what are produced directly from the conscious mind are the impure dharmas that revolve in the stream of arising and cessation, and it is very easy to explain this aspect of the transience of arising and cessation. But it is not easy to explain how the impure consciousness can produce non-leaking pure dharmas. Likewise, what the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind produces directly are non-leaking pure dharmas. How can it also produce the impure dharmas that revolve in *samsara*? This is the same kind of difficulty encountered by the Weishi school’s system of *ālaya* consciousness, except that it faces another direction.

This attitude of mechanical inference is wrong. Superficially the problems of the two systems appear alike, but in fact they are not. Yin Shun Fashi considered this problem to be very serious.¹⁹ He held that the system of Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind and the Weishi school’s *ālaya* system each harbored

its own problem. Explaining the paradox of the Buddha-Womb system, he quoted the words in the *Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra*: “World-honoured [Buddha]! However, there is vexation, there is the troubled impure mind; it is hard to fully understand the Self-existent Pure Mind that has defilement”, to explain the paradox of the Buddha-Womb system, and said that this “Undefined but defiled, defiled but undefiled” is muddling. He held that this kind of problem is “hard to fully understand,” with only Buddha able to understand it. Actually the Buddha-Womb system is not really problematic. This problem is really very easy to understand. Yin Shun Fashi simply exaggerated the problem. As to the sūtra, it naturally glorified the great powers of the Buddha, for only the Buddha, who attained a high level of self-cultivation and virtuous conduct, can fully understand such perplexities as “Undefined but defiled, defiled but undefiled,” which is very mystical. On the basis of this passage from the *Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra*, Yin Shun Fashi held that it was not quite easy nor quite comprehensible for the Buddha-Womb system to use “undefiled but defiled” to explain the defiled dharmas of transmigration. If so, then he was simply intimidated by those words of the *Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra* and did not really understand the concept of the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind.

In the statement “One mind opens two doors,” opening the door of *samsara* and opening the door of purity are not the same. They must be explained in two different ways, and similarly in the Weishi school’s *ālaya* system. For example, the *ālaya* consciousness can directly lead to the opening of the arising-and-cessation door, but not directly to the opening of the door of purity. The latter is only opened after a twisting process. According to the Weishi school, non-leaking seeds comes from another origin. They do not issue directly from the *ālaya* consciousness, but are formed through the influence of right-hearing influences. As the *Mahāvāyāna-samparigraha-śāstra* [*She-dasheng-lun*] says, right hearing means to hear the teachings preached by Buddha.²⁰ What we hear with our ears every day is not right hearing, and therefore their influence cannot form the non-leaking seed, and for the same reason we cannot attain Buddhahood. Only when we hear the teachings preached by Buddha, and recite and study the Buddhist sūtras, can we form non-leaking seeds from the influence of right hearing. Clearly, these non-leaking seeds do not originate in the *ālaya* consciousness but in right hearing. They are formed only through the influence of right hearing. After such seeds are formed, they reside temporarily in the *ālaya* consciousness. This takes place through an indirect path. Thus the origins of the pure dharmas and the impure dharmas

that the system of *ālaya* consciousness speaks of are different. Although the system of *ālaya* consciousness gives an explanation for the pure dharmas, the explanation is not sufficiently sound, complete, or thorough. Besides, this sort of explanation has an adverse effect, which is that it makes the statement “All sentient beings can become Buddha” lack full justification.

Next, let us take a look at how the system of Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind goes about explaining “One mind opens two doors.” Of course what issues directly from the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind are non-leaking pure dharmas. If so, how does it explain the existence of leaking impure arising-and-cessation dharmas? We can use the direct method to explain pure dharmas through Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind, but in explaining the leaking impure transience of arising and cessation we cannot use the direct method. To explain it we must go through a twisting, stumbling process. This twist is simply the intervention of ignorance, which is what the *Awakening of Faith* speaks of in these words: “That which is non-arising and non-ceasing,,,,, is mixed with arising and cessation, and is neither the same nor different, is named *ālaya* consciousness.” Non-arising and non-cessation refers to the aspect of Self-existent Pure Mind, while arising and cessation refers to the dharma of transmigration. When non-arising and non-cessation is mixed with arising-and-cessation, becoming neither the same nor not the same, then this is called *ālaya* consciousness. Here the system of *ālaya* consciousness is merged, with the result that *ālaya* can connect on both ends. *Ālaya* being open-ended on both ends means that *ālaya* has its transcendent character as well as its immanent character, meaning that *ālaya* has a double character. When the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* explains the Buddha-Womb, it points out the double character of *ālaya*.²¹ And when D. T. Suzuki [鈴木大拙] of Japan explains the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*, he also uses the term “double character.”²² According to the Weishi school’s *ālaya* system, the *ālaya* consciousness has only one character, namely the illusory, impure character, while it lacks the transcendent pure character. But in the *Awakening of Faith*, *ālaya* is brought in and explained as “non-arising and non-ceasing and is mixed with arising and cessation, not the same nor different,” where its double character is quite apparent. Looking realistically at the *ālaya* mixed consciousness, its original character (namely immanent character) is impure and subject to arising and cessation, but at the same time it also has a transcendent character that has non-arising and non-cessation. Although in the practical life it is not manifested, it is latent. Thus we can say that the *ālaya* consciousness is open on both ends.

This kind of philosophy very obviously has absorbed the *ālaya* system, which is to say it has used the Buddha-Womb system to subsume the *ālaya* system. After this twisting and stumbling, the *ālaya* consciousness has taken a position in the system of Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind that resembles the situation when in our body the blood vessels are occluded and the vessels bulge out. It also resembles the situation when our muscles are in spasm. We can also describe the relation of *ālaya* consciousness to the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind as resembling “an earthen bump on the smooth ground.”²³ The smooth and solid refers to pure dharmas, while the neither smooth nor solid refers to the impure dharmas. The original nature of our true mind is pure (non-arising and non-ceasing). Then what explains the existence of impure dharmas (arising and ceasing)? How are the intervening twist and stumble produced? This is all due to the intervention of ignorance. In other words, they are the result of “The wind of ignorance moving.”²⁴ For although our true mind is originally pure, if we should for a moment become torpid, or if we lose alertness in a single thought, then we immediately fall into ignorance. And ignorance is without root, without substance. It is simply a certain phenomenon of torpor that appears in a moment of inadvertence. *The Awakening of Faith* uses wind as a metaphor for ignorance. As soon as the wind of ignorance blows, the calm waters of the lake of the mind will give rise to waves. The waves are not the original nature of water. They originate in the wind making the water move. But wind has no root, only the perturbation of air. Hence when the wind stops, the waves will also vanish.

As to why we should in a moment’s inadvertence become ignorant, where does this wind of ignorance come from? We can say that the perturbation of air can produce wind, and wind moves the water, producing waves. But we cannot say that ignorance is produced by the perturbation of the air. In the past this sort of question was very perplexing, which is why the *Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra* called it “difficult to fully understand.” But now we can make use of some new terminology to explain it, making it easier to understand. This question is very easy to answer in Kant’s philosophy. According to Kant, our will is not the Holy Will, while our maxims are often at variance with our moral law. Why is this so? This is because we have sensibility. Because we have sensibility, we are often led by material inclinations, which give rise to ignorance and torpor. This is an indication of man’s finite existence, and so man’s will is not the Holy Will. As for God, He has no sensibility. God’s will is holy, and God is without impediment.

Here what Kant calls “sensibility” is what Confucianism calls man’s selfish desires, such as what Wang Yangming [1472-1528] calls “thoughts arising from the bodily shell.” Normally our thoughts come from the promptings of our bodily shell and not our *liangzhi* 良知 [a priori autonomous moral sense or intuition]. If we followed our *liangzhi*, we would not have a single ignorant [unenlightened], torpid thought. Nor would there be the “earthen bump on the smooth ground.” But simply because we have a bodily shell, and have sensibility and selfish desires, we have ignorance and torpor. This question can only be explained and analyzed so far. If someone asks: Why does man have sensibility and selfish desires? These questions don’t become questions; otherwise they would really be “difficult to fully understand.”

Through this twist, the system of Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind draws in ignorance (namely the *ālaya* consciousness), and thereby can explain the cycle of arising and cessation. In this way, dharmas of revolving birth and death is then grounded on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind indirectly and not directly. For the Self-existent Pure Mind is itself a True and Ever-Abiding Mind, and since it is mind it has movement (movement that moves without moving). As soon as the mind starts to form a thought (movement that moves), it immediately turns into *ālaya* consciousness, producing ignorance. Continuing with the explanation of this aspect, although the *ālaya* consciousness and the True and Ever-Abiding Mind are not one, they are also not different. In terms of their being not different, they are homogeneous, and because they are homogeneous the arising-and-cessation dharmas directly arising from the *ālaya* consciousness can reach the True and Ever-Abiding Mind, which means that they are grounded on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind.

We can use “waves of the water” as a metaphor to explain this kind of dependent relationship. Although waves are not water, they are grounded on water for their emergence. If we replace water with wooden planks, no waves will form no matter how the wind blows. Clearly water must form the ground for waves arising. Or let us take ripening wheat as an illustration. When the wheat is tall, the tassels of wheat will move when the wind blows, forming vivid “waves of wheat.” Although waves of wheat and waves of water are both waves, when waves blow on water, no waves of wheat will form since water and wheat are different in nature. Thus waves of water must be grounded on homogenous water before they can arise. And the dharmas of revolving arising and cessation must be grounded on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind for the same reason.

Thus we say that the dharmas of revolving arising and cessation are grounded on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind indirectly, and that there is an intervening twist (assuming we go through practice). This twist is what Hegel calls a dialectical process. Therefore when the dharmas of revolving arising and cessation are subsumed under the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind, this is itself a kind of dialectical process. Only by going a step further and speaking of the practice of the way of the bodhisattva can we elucidate the dialectical development of this process. Suppose that from the Buddha Self-existent Pure Mind and passing through practice we self-consciously want the dharmas of revolving arising and cessation, there is in this also a certain dialectical process. This is like “retaining delusion [*huo*] to water life.” *Huo* [doubt, delusion] means perplexity or vexation. The bodhisattva is certainly able to end delusion and care, but he retains this delusion (of course self-consciously) for the sake of lubricating all sentient beings. For the bodhisattva as bodhisattva is too pure, and thus “has difficulty being muddied-muddled [*hutu*].” This is like “If water is pure then there is no fish.” If the bodhisattva is too pure and cannot live together with sentient beings, how will he be able to ferry them across to salvation? Consequently only because of the bodhisattva’s compassion can he self-consciously retain delusion in order to lubricate sentient beings. This is wisdom, theory, but at the same time also practice. This is exactly what I have called self-negation.²⁵ It is a self-conscious dropping down, a self-conscious self-negation.

Therefore there are two ways for one mind to open two doors. To speak of the non-leaking pure dharmas is a direct and easier way. To speak of leaking impure dharmas is an indirect way, which means that all the dharmas of revolving arising and cessation are indirectly grounded on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind. In what sense is this Buddha-Womb the ground for the dharmas of revolving arising and cessation? According to Buddha’s preaching, the Buddha consciousness directly giving rise to pure dharmas is called “arising cause [*shengyin*].”²⁶ But to the leaking dharmas of arising and cessation it is not “arising cause” nor “cessation cause” but “dependent cause [*pingyi yin*].” In other words, the impure dharmas of arising and cessation are only grounded on Buddha-Womb for their emergence; they do not directly arise from the Buddha-Womb. In this way, the question of “How can the Self-existent Pure Mind give rise to the impure dharmas?” no longer exists, for the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind is only the dependent cause not the arising cause of the dharmas of arising and cessation, the dharmas of arising and cessation having to depend on the Buddha-Womb to emerge.

The dependent relationship of the dharmas of arising and cessation to the Buddha-Womb can be explained with an example. Consider the rich men of the past all of whom had numerous servants. When you wanted to call on a high official or distinguished personage you had to first pass through the family servants. These family servants would first ask you for a tip and you would have to bribe them. Otherwise they would put difficulties in your way, for as they say, “The god of the underworld is easy to meet; it’s the small devils that are most troublesome.” That is why the great slaves and wicked servants of the official world used to go out and commit misdeeds in the name of their masters. Although those misdeeds were not committed by the masters, the reckoning fell on them. In the same way the *ālaya* consciousness depends on the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind in order to give rise to the dharmas of revolving birth and death, but the reckoning falls on the Buddha-Womb, and the Buddha-Womb is obliged to shoulder the responsibility. So we see that the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind is only the dependent cause and not the arising cause. Moreover, this one mind opening two doors comes about through two ways. If we can understand this, then there is no longer a question that is “difficult to fully understand.”

Continuing along the line of “One mind opens two doors,” what we will focus on today is the importance of the framework of “One mind opens two doors” in philosophical thought. For in the development of the philosophical quest for the ultimate, this framework has a unique significance. We can regard it as a universal, commonly shared paradigm which can be applied to the three doctrines of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Daoism, and can even subsume Kant’s system. If it is seen as a metaphysical problem, then this kind of problem belongs to “practical metaphysics,” and not to the ordinary “theoretical metaphysics.” According to Kant, metaphysics can be divided into “immanent metaphysics” and “transcendent metaphysics.”²⁷ Immanent metaphysics refers to “transcendental analysis” in Kant’s philosophy,²⁸ namely the *a priori* synthetic knowledge that has objective validity. Transcendent metaphysics refers to the “ideas” supplied by reason. For example, “the immortality of the soul” that rational psychology speaks of in “The Transcendental Dialectic” belongs to transcendent metaphysics.²⁹ Also such ideas of cosmology as “first cause,” “finitude,” “infinity,” and “God’s existence,” are all ideas supplied by reason. Of course these ideas have no objective reality in speculative reason. They are merely empty reason because the objects of these ideas cannot be verified by speculative reason. But these ideas can be supplied by reason, and to speculative reason these ideas are transcendent

metaphysics. This sort of transcendent metaphysics can only reach objective reality after passing through practical reason.

Here, the ultimate development of transcendent metaphysics through practical reason is what Kant calls “moral theology.” This moral theology is comparable to the Confucian “moral metaphysics”, which is not “metaphysical ethics.” We may compare it to Kant acknowledging only moral theology and not acknowledging “theological ethics.” Likewise Confucianism only acknowledges moral metaphysics and not metaphysical ethics. Morality cannot be grounded on metaphysics. We may only speak of metaphysics as being grounded on morality. By the same token, Kant insisted that theology should be founded on morality or practical reason, and not our morality founded on theology or God. For if we were to discuss morality according to God’s will, then, according to Kant, this kind of morality would pertain to “heteronomy,” it would be conditional.

Through the above comparison, we can see that the “One mind opens two doors” of the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* belongs to the level of moral metaphysics or transcendent metaphysics. Therefore this framework only has significance in moral metaphysics or transcendent metaphysics. Only here can it make a contribution. To say has significance or make a contribution of course is to speak in terms of Kant’s philosophical system. According to Kant’s philosophy, “free will,” “soul,” and “God,” while having reality in practical reason, are still “postulates,” which cannot be reached by our knowledge. Their reality belongs to practice and not to theoretical knowledge. For we do not have intuition of these ideas, making it impossible for these ideas to “present themselves.” Kant’s problem lay in the fact that although he stressed man’s practical reason, he did not affirm that man possessed intellectual intuition. He did not acknowledge that man possessed the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind affirmed by the *Awakening-of-faith-in Mahāyāna*, or the mind which signified the *liangzhi* [innate moral sense] of Wang Yangming, or even the “original mind” [*benxin*] of Lu Xiangshan [1139-1193] which he based on Mencius. And for the very reason that Kant did not acknowledge that man possessed a True and Ever-Abiding Mind, his “freedom” and other ideas are “postulates” which cannot present themselves concretely. But in *Practical Reason* Kant assigns “freedom” to the “intelligible world,” and the actions that arise in conformance with freedom or autonomy he assigns to the “sensible world.” This shows that he also acknowledges that the actions of the sensible world have causes that belong to the intelligible world, and

that these two worlds are separate. This is analogous to the *ālaya* consciousness of the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, for the *ālaya* consciousness is formed by the “non-arising, non-ceasing, mixed with arising and cessation, they are neither one nor different,” and thus it possesses the double character of being transcendent and immanent, and because of this double character, it can through one mind open two doors. It would be reasonable to say that even if Kant in his philosophical system speaks of “freedom” as merely a postulate, it can produce two doors. For although Kant explains action (or result) as belonging to the sensible world, and must obey natural causality, according to Buddhism it belongs to the door of arising and cessation. But the “cause” of action belongs to the intelligible world. Granted this, then action itself should be able to reach above to the door of purity; but this is a level of thought that Kant has omitted.

Let us take an example by way of illustration. Suppose I want to smoke a cigarette. Smoking a cigarette is an action which is a phenomenon belonging to the sensible world. Then does the action of smoking a cigarette signify “the thing-in-itself”? This is a question Kant has not clarified. Strictly speaking, since there is a “phenomenon” there should correspondingly be a “thing-in-itself,” phenomenon and thing-in-itself being two sides of the same thing, merely two presentations [*chengxian*, manifestations]. Thus an action can sometimes be a phenomenon, sometimes be a thing-in-itself. Then what did Kant mean when he said “action”? As soon as he spoke of an action, he relegated it to phenomena, forgetting that the action itself, in addition to having the status of a phenomenon, at the same time also has the status of a thing-in-itself. Here he was speaking too fast, sliding over it in a blink.

We cannot say that our actions in themselves are phenomena, and that the transcendental ground, such as free will, of these actions means its thing-in-itself, for this does not make sense. The thing-in-itself is the thing-in-itself, not the transcendental ground through which it originates. If an action has the meaning of a being-in-itself, this meaning is the purity [*qingjin xiang*], the suchness [*ruxiang*] of the action and not the transcendental ground through which the action originates. Kant regarded the free will as a cause (a noumenon belonging to the intelligible [noumenal] world),³⁰ and regarded behavior (or action) as the effect. This kind of causality Kant called “special causality,” also called “causality of freedom,”³¹ something totally different from the “causality of nature.” In special causality, the cause belongs to the intelligible world, while the effect belongs to the sensible [empirical, phenomenal] world. Thus the action itself which is the effect has only the meaning of phenomenon and not the meaning of the thing-in-itself.

From this it is clear that when Kant speaks of action, he slides at once into the phenomenal world. And for the same reason, his philosophical system can only be described as “One mind opens one door,” where he can only open the door of arising and cessation of the sensible world but has failed to open the door of purity of the intelligible world.

Actually, since action itself is a “thing,” then it should have the status of being the thing-in-itself. If turning to the action of smoking a cigarette you perceive that smoking itself is not only a phenomenon but has at the same time the meaning of the thing-in-itself, then the situation that Buddhism describes as “One mind opens two doors” can occur here. In Chinese philosophy, be it Confucianism (from Mencius down to the Mind-philosophy [*xinxue*] of Wang Yangming) or Buddhism or Daoism, philosophers never regarded things and events as merely phenomena, for if a blade of grass or a tree is a thing, it means that there is its being-in-itself. Therefore in regard to the action in front of us, not only can we regard it as a phenomenon (it is a phenomenon to our sensibility or our understanding), we can also at the same time regard it as a thing-in-itself. For not only are the phenomena of the physical world, such as mountains, rivers, and land, but even actions themselves can be regarded as the objects of sensible intuition, namely phenomena. Since they can be regarded as phenomena, then they can also be regarded as things-in-themselves. Here, if we can find the meaning of the things-in-themselves of things and events, then the doctrine of the Buddhist “One mind opens two doors” will reveal its unique significance. In other words, we would then be able to use the framework of “One mind opens two doors” of Buddhism to digest the philosophical system of Kant. We could then see the contribution of Chinese philosophy to Western philosophy. Such are the natural results of keeping close to each philosophical question and working it out and not simply a matter of making arbitrary and vague analogies.

It is not easy to criticize Kant casually. From the perspective of the Western philosophical tradition and the Christian tradition, Kant’s thought may be the most correct. But from the perspective of the Chinese tradition, one can see where Kant’s philosophy falls short. We hope to enlist Chinese philosophical wisdom in properly digesting and pulling up his philosophy. According to the Buddhist perspective, in regard to what kind of Subject does “action” have the meaning of thing-in-itself? In regard to “*prajñā* wisdom” or “Self-existent Pure Mind” it has the meaning of thing-in-itself, because from the perspective of *prajñā* wisdom or Self-existent Pure Mind, action itself is non-leaking pure dharma. But if

we regard the cognitive mind as phenomenon, then there is naturally leaking dharmas of the cycle of arising and cessation. In this way it is one mind opening two doors

Here we may pursue it further and ask: The reason the Chinese have this doctrine is because the Chinese affirm that man has *prajñā* wisdom, has the Self-existent Pure Mind, whereas Kant does not affirm that man has this kind of wisdom (intellectual intuition). Correct, although Kant did not affirm that man has intellectual intuition, he has transcendently posited that man has free will, and has maintained that free will is a kind of postulate. If so, then why can we not say that when faced with this postulate, action itself is a thing-in-itself?

Perhaps the problem lies in Kant's regarding the idea of "free will" as only a postulate. Since it is only a postulate, it cannot be intuited, and it cannot be presented. The meaning of intuition in Kant's philosophy is different from what we usually understand it to be. For according to Kant, intuition is a kind of "principle of presentation." It can give one a thing or event, and can make a thing or event an object. In other words, where there is intuition, there the thing or event is presented. That is why in regard to knowledge we must speak of "sensible intuition." But sensible intuition cannot be applied to intelligible [noumenal] things of the intelligible world; only intellectual intuition can intuit intelligible things. But Kant does not acknowledge that man has intellectual intuition, with the result that such ideas as "free will" can only be postulated and cannot be presented.

Since free will is a postulate and not a given, Kant's explanation of practical reason starts from "Moral laws are facts of reason" and not from free will. Only when he has finished explaining moral laws does he force out free will, does he affirm free will. Although in actuality these two can amount to the same thing, Kant when he is analyzing morality maintains that one cannot begin from free will. For free will is not a "given" for us; it is not "data" from which we can begin to speak. Since freedom must undergo critical examination, it is merely a kind of "postulate." Practical reason, on the other hand, can by itself practice; it can by itself give us moral laws. This is a fact that is analytic and must be acknowledged without requiring critical examination. Hence Kant said that "Moral laws are facts of reason."

If we look at Chinese philosophy, Wang Yangming's *liangzhi* [innate *a priori* moral sense or intuition] is itself a kind of presentation. Or consider the "mind of four beginnings" Mencius speaks of;³² that is also something that can immediately present itself. That is why Wang Longxi [1498-1583], a

scholar of Wang Yangming's thought, liked to say "the immediate *liangzhi*." If *liangzhi* is only a kind of postulate, a kind of assumption, and cannot immediately present itself, then a profusion of words about moral laws would have no effect whatsoever. That is why when the Chinese teach moral practice, they always go from "[one's moral] nature is reason," to "[one's moral] mind is reason." In Confucianism, for instance, philosophers from Mencius down to Lu Xiangshan and Wang Yangming all emphasized "*liangzhi*" and one's "original mind [*benxin*]." Buddhism will always go from *ālaya* consciousness to Self-existent Pure Mind. According to the Three Teachings of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Daoism, we human beings have intellectual intuition, which is why our *liangzhi*, moral mind, or the Buddha-Womb Self-existent Pure Mind, can all present themselves immediately. (Intellectual intuition is simply the marvelous use of *liangzhi*, the moral mind, and Self-existent Pure Mind. When this marvelous use is applied to *liangzhi* itself, then *liangzhi* is presented; when applied to things then things-in-themselves are presented.) If these ideas are only assumptions, and can never present themselves, then the strength of moral practice will be extremely weak and then won't a lot moral theorizing be empty?

For this reason, the ultimate result of Kant's philosophy, if we strictly pursue the matter, must be: It is impossible in this world to realize unconditional moral laws, which is the same as saying that no real morality has ever appeared. Therefore, if we go by Kant's philosophy, to act in accordance with unconditional moral law can only be regarded as an ideal to which we may gradually approach. It will be ultimately impossible for one's "maxims" to integrate completely with moral laws, and we can at any time violate moral laws, for man's will, which is constantly wavering, is not the divine will. True moral practice must follow "the categorical imperative;" but in Kant's philosophical system, one may say that such moral action has never appeared, or has appeared occasionally, perhaps for a little while today and disappearing tomorrow. Given this situation, although a great deal of moral theory has been expounded, there is no true morality. This shows that the strength of moral practice is insufficient in Kant's philosophy. Therefore one cannot but attach importance to the question of "mind." The *liangzhi* and *benxin* that is emphasized in Chinese philosophy and the Self-existent Pure Mind taught by Buddhism are very important. Kant's philosophy does not say enough about "mind." His explanation of the mind is roughly the same as that of Zhu Zi [1130-1200]. Chinese philosophy affirms that man has intellectual intuition. Whether we speak of *liangzhi* or the Self-existent Pure Mind, they are a "given," and can present themselves immediately. Only

thus can one become a sage [*shengren*] or Buddha. Otherwise, if *liangzhi* and *benxin* or the Self-existent Pure Mind cannot present themselves immediately, then we would never be able to become a sage or a Buddha, and would only be able to view a sage or Buddha as an ideal. Because there would be no Buddhas in reality, we would only be able to approach, but never reach, Buddhahood. This cannot be permitted by Buddhism or Confucianism.

According to the framework of “One mind opens two doors”, action itself is not only phenomenon. If action is directly started by *liangzhi*, original mind [*benxin*], and Self-existent Pure Mind, then in the presence of *liangzhi*, original mind, and Self-existent Pure Mind, it does not have the status of phenomenon. It is itself the thing-in-itself. In Kant, action is treated right away as phenomenon, which deadens action. In his *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant said that when we face God there is no phenomenon. For God created only the being-in-itself and not phenomenon³³. So phenomenon was not created by Heaven, only the being-in-itself was created by Heaven. Since phenomenon was not created by God and only presents itself to the human being (one can do with or without it), then phenomenon is like an earthen lump on a smooth ground, a bend that presents itself to the Subject of sensibility or understanding. In other words, the being-in-itself is bent into phenomenon. I have described it as “wrinkling.” It is only by means of this analysis that we can understand what Kant means by phenomenon (not the same phenomenon that we usually mean by the word) and the being-in-itself.

From the above analysis we can see that Kant’s doctrine that “the human understanding prescribes the laws of nature” is very intelligible and very natural. There are some claims in Kant’s philosophy that give the appearance of being absurd and dubious, but which are actually certainties, not open to doubt or contradiction. For example when we ordinary people hear Kant say “Understanding prescribes the laws of nature” we find it dreadful. There are British scholars, and even Germans, who can never understand Kant. They think that Kant’s “Understanding prescribes the laws of nature” is too subjective, and everyone finds Kant’s subjectivism unacceptable. But from the standpoint of what Kant calls phenomenon, all those statements he makes are actually very reasonable. It is not easy to understand this philosophy, and it is only after great difficulty that we have come to grasp it. People generally approach Kant’s philosophy from the perspective of British and American Realism, or the views of Locke [1632-1704] or Leibniz

[1646-1716]. Generally speaking, the views of Locke and Leibniz are most consistent with ordinary commonsense. Thus Kant's philosophy is not generally understood.

When one studies Kant, it is not easy to grasp the core of his thought simply by following the *Critique of Pure Reason* closely. For when Kant's discussion proceeds inward from sensibility, his every step and every statement appears questionable and debatable. No wonder that an Englishman asserted that almost every statement of Kant's had an error. The fact is, he simply did not understand Kant. Similarly, it was only after I came to Kant's statements in the *Critique of Practical Reason* that God only created things-in-themselves and did not create phenomena that understanding suddenly dawned on me.

As to Kant's placing intellectual intuition in God, this is a concept not found in Chinese philosophy. The Chinese believe that it is quite sufficient to have *liangzhi*, original mind, or Self-existent Pure Mind. Outside of this, there is no necessity for the additional existence of God. According to Buddhist teaching, all dharmas that dependently arise from the Self-existent Pure Mind are equivalent to all dharmas created by God. In this way, the doctrine of one mind opening two doors becomes very easy to understand. Thus, from the perspective of Chinese philosophy, all things and events have the status of things-in-themselves before [in the presence of] *liangzhi*, one's original mind, or Self-existent Pure Mind. We can use a cliché to clarify this line of thought. For example, there is a Buddhist saying: "Not a single color, a single fragrance, is not the Middle Way." Here, "color" and "fragrance" are color and fragrance in the sense of things-in-themselves. Also, when Buddhism speaks of not adding, not subtracting, such such [*rushi rushi*], it is also the "such [*ju*]" in the sense of the being-in-itself, and not an abstract "emptiness." Of course, "emptiness" is to speak in terms of dharma. The meaning of the being-in-itself of dharma is simply "empty-suchness" [*kongru xiang* ,], which is simply what the *Prajñā Sūtra* [Wisdom Sūtra] describes as "realness is oneness, which is called noneness, is simply suchness" [*shixiang yixiang, so wei wuxiang, ji shi ruxiang* 實相一相，所謂無相，即是如相]. Realness is simply the thing-in-itself.

This kind of thought is even more evident in Daoism. Such things as "roaming [*xiaoyao* , wandering, roving]," "in oneself [*zizai*]", "by itself transformed [*duhua* 獨化]," all refer to the spiritual realm. Since one is "roaming and in oneself," one is naturally the being-in-itself.

From the above comparison and contrast, we can see that what Kant speaks of as the thing-in-itself is said in reference to the Subject of intellectual intuition, and has an elevating function. Thus it is not a concept of fact but a concept with a value-flavor (this is not the value concept of the study of values, and so we can only call it a value-flavored concept). According to Kant, what is represented through time and space, and determined by categories, is a “phenomenon.” If time, space, and categories are removed and it does not correspond to the Subject of sensibility and understanding, but returns to the thing-in-itself, then it is the “thing-in-itself.” This is very easy to understand for the Chinese mentality. It is like plain rice to the Chinese, something that hangs on their lips every day. But in Kant’s philosophy it is not easy to understand.

When the Chinese celebrate the New Year, they will paste couplets on their doors such as “The myriad things quietly contemplating, all collected in themselves; the four seasons joyfully rising, with men in identity.” Actually infinite philosophical wisdom is implicit in these lines. “The myriad things quietly contemplating, all in themselves”—does this not refer precisely to things-in-themselves? This does not refer to phenomena nor to scientific knowledge. Mencius once said: “The nature of the noble man is such that humanity, righteousness, reason, and wisdom are rooted in the mind. Its vitality appears vividly in the face, richly in the back, diffused in the four limbs. It is expressed without words.”³⁴ That “vitality appears vividly in the face, richly in the back” shows that the whole energy and appearance of the body is completely changed. At this instant, the “four limbs and hundred members” are not only phenomena, they are also things-in-themselves.

Lo Jinxi of the Taizhou branch of Wang Learning has also said: “A raise of the eyebrow, a glance of the eyes, it is all but the manifestation of the ontological understanding.” And in *Taizhou Studies* [*Taizhou Xue’an*], Wang Dongyai, the son of Wang Gen [1483-1540] was also fond of making these pretty statements, such as “Birds twitter, flowers drop, hills and peaks, rivers and streams, eating when hungry, drinking when thirsty, in summer cloth in winter fur, the ultimate Dao is without mystery. If it can break open, then Heaven and Earth revolve and grasses and trees flourish. If it cannot break through, then Heaven and Earth shut down and wise men go a-hiding.” Here the hills, streams, flowers, and birds cannot be seen simply as natural phenomena but must be seen as things-in-themselves. These statements were

regarded in the past as merely witticisms, pleasant for whiling away the time, but actually they hold deep philosophical truth.

Thus before *liangzhi*, one's original mind, or Self-existent Pure Mind, it is events-and- things-in-themselves that are presented. And when they are faced with the Subject of sensibility and understanding, they become phenomena. These phenomena can be presented through time and space and can also be determined by categories. They are determined by "natural causality." Is not this type of double-sided presentation simply what Buddhism calls "One mind opens two doors"? This interpretation does not contradict Kant's theory. On the contrary, it serves to digest the defects and deficiencies of Kant's philosophy. But if we convert Kant's "postulate" into "presentation," it is liable to provoke dispute, for Kant's philosophical system does not acknowledge that the human being has immediate *liangzhi* or Self-existent Pure Mind.

Nevertheless, we must still recognize that on this point Eastern and Western philosophies can be compared and can even debate each other, in order to bring out the distinctive characters of their doctrines. Eastern philosophy must affirm the framework of "One mind opens two doors," for otherwise all the statements quoted previously would be empty words. Although according to Kant they are all fantasies, from the perspective of Chinese philosophy they represent a philosophical realm that is in some ways an advance over Kant.

From the standpoint of the development of Western philosophy, Kant's philosophy certainly did advance Western philosophy a step further. But if we wish to take Kant's philosophy another step forward, then it has to be pitted against Chinese philosophy and be integrated with Chinese philosophy. At the same time, if we wish to make Chinese philosophy richer and advance further, then it must be connected with Western philosophy. Only then can it continue to be transmitted and live on. This kind of cultural exchange and flow demonstrates precisely the importance of the Buddhist framework of "One mind opens two doors."

Transcribed by Huey-jen You 尤惠貞

Copyright©2004,2014 Julie Lee Wei. All rights reserved.

¹ So-called Buddha-Womb [*tathagata-garbha*] refers to the store or womb of Buddha, or the pure Buddha Dharma-body [*Rulai fashen*] which is concealed by the avarice, anger, and vexations of all sentient beings. As the *Tathāgata-garbha-sūtra* [*Da fangdeng Rulaizang jing*] says: "With the Buddha eye I see all sentient beings in the midst of such vexations as greed, covetousness, anger, and foolishness. I have Buddha wisdom, Buddha eyes, Buddha body, and sit cross-legged, gravely without moving. Good youths, all sentient beings, although you are within bodies of various vexations, you have the Buddha-Womb that is constantly without pollution. Your virtuous forms are abundant and you are no different from me." Also, the *Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra* [*Da bo niepan jin*] says: "The Buddha says: 'Good youths! 'I' means the Buddha-Womb. All sentient beings have Buddha-Nature, which is what 'I' means.'" And the "Dharma-body [*dharmakaya*, body of Truth and Law]" chapter of the *Śrīmālā-devi-simhanāda-sūtra* [*Shengman-furen-jing*, *Lady Śrīmālā Sūtra*] also says: "Therefore this is the Buddha Dharma-body, the Store that is unadulterated with vexations and which is named the Buddha-Womb."

² The *Sandhinirmocana-sūtra* [*Jie shenmi jing*, *Explanation of Deep Mysteries Sūtra*] says: "*Adānavijñāna* (another name for *ālaya* consciousness) is exceedingly profound and subtle, all its seeds like a rushing torrent. To the vulgar and foolish I do not explain it for fear that they will attach to it as being the self."

³ See *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* [*Da zhidu lun*, *Great Wisdom to Salvation śāstra*, also *Perfection of Wisdom Śāstra*], *juan 2* says: "All-dharmas are of three kinds: First, the dharmas of action [*youwei fa*]; second, the dharmas of non-action [*wuwei fa*]; third, the dharmas that cannot be spoken [*buke shuo fa*]. These encompass all dharmas." Also, *juan 44* says: "Buddha told Subhuti: 'All-dharmas mean good dharmas and not-good dharmas, marked dharmas and unmarked dharmas [*ji fa wuji fa*], worldly dharmas and other-worldly dharmas, leaking [defiled] dharmas and non-leaking dharmas, dharmas of action and dharmas of nonaction, shared dharmas and unshared dharmas. Subhuti! These are called all-dharmas.'"

⁴ In his book, *Indian Buddhism*, Yin Shun Fashi classifies the sects and doctrines of Mahayana Buddhism into three systems: "Substance-empty name-only doctrine" and "Illusion and consciousness-only doctrine", and later on, after these advanced in position, receiving influences which made them grow and increase, they became the "True and Ever-Abiding Mind-only doctrine".

⁵ See *Cheng weishi lun* [*Treatise on the Establishment of Consciousness Only*, *Vijñapti-mātratā-siddhi-śāstra*], *juan 2*: "There are sentient beings who, before the beginning of time, had non-leaking seeds which were achieved without need of dharmas of influence. Later they achieve a position where they heard influence which made them increase and grow. This is the cause of the arising of non-leaking dharmas, and when they arise they in turn are influenced and become seeds." Also according to *She-dasheng-sun* [*Mahā-yāna-samparigraha-śāstra*, *Mahayana Compendium*], *juan 3*, pure mind seeds are "born from the flow of dharmas of right-hearing influences out of realms such as the realm of purest dharmas." Although *Cheng-weishi-lun* says "originally there were non-leaking seeds", these are not equivalent to the transcendental true mind, even if "originally there were". On this see Mou Zongsan, *Foxing yu Bore* [Buddha-Nature and Prajna] (Taipei: Xuesheng Shuju, 1977), vol. 2, ch. 2, sect.3.

⁶ See *Cheng-weishi-lun*, *juan 2*: "However, the original seeds through influences increase and grow before they can bear fruit. That is why we say that the seeds must undergo influence. The hearing of influences is not just by leaking dharmas, for when they hear correct dharmas, the original non-leaking dharmas are also influenced so that they increase and grow, and gradually give rise to the desire to leave the mundane world. That is why it is also called hearing influences."

⁷ See *She-dasheng-lun*, *juan 3*: "Who can here understand the characteristics that should be known? The Mahayana practitioners are able to accumulate the blessings and wisdom that provide the material and nourishment for becoming a bodhisattva because they continuously hear right influences, because they have met and served Buddhas appearing in the world, have attained understanding, and have done the good work of accumulating good roots."

⁸ On the authenticity of the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*, see *Dasheng Qixin Lun Zhenwei Bian* [*The Debate on the Authenticity of the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*]. This book has been included in the *Dasheng Wenhua Chuban She* [Mahayana Culture Publishing Co.]'s *Xiandai Fojiao Xueshu Zongkan* [Collected Journals on Contemporary Buddhism 35], appearing under the title *Dasheng-qixin-lun yu Lengyan-jing Kaobian* [Critical Examination of the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna and the Lankāvatāra-sūtra]. Also see Zhang Xincheng 張心澂, *Weishu Tong Kao* [A Comprehensive Study of Forged Writings].

⁹ See Zhizhe Dashi [Zhiyi], *Weimo-jing Xuanyi* [*Hidden Meaning of the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*], *juan 3*: "He asked: 'Since the four teachings penetrate all sūtras, why do you choose this one as the penetrated sūtra?' He replied: 'In now composing the principles of the four teachings to penetrate the sūtras I have my purpose. Let me state it in summary: Those who understand this sūtra know that this sūtra contains the four teachings that lead into the Way; therefore you should know its general meaning. But most teachers use the sūtras to explain the śāstras with the result that students these days all say that the śāstras are rich and the sūtras poor. I have now taken the śāstras to penetrate the sūtras in order to let students to know that the sūtras are rich and the śāstras poor. To respect the words of the true Buddha of Mahayana as of boundless merit is the proper course of entering the Way. To slight the sūtras and stress the śāstras is most lamentable.'"

¹⁰ See *Da-bo-niepan-jing* [*Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra*].

¹¹ See *Mencius*, 3A.1, "Teng Wen Gong": "When Duke Wen of Teng was heir to the dukedom he was on his way to visit Chu when he passed through Song and met Mencius. Mencius talked to him about human nature being good, always praising Yao and Shun." Also *Mencius* 6B.2, "Gaozi": "Cao Jiao asked: 'Is it true that everyone can become Yao and Shun?' Mencius said: 'Yes.'"

¹² See Mou Zongsan, *Foxing yu Bore* [Buddha-nature and Prajna] (Taipei: Xuesheng Shuju, 1977), vol. 1, p. 280.

¹³ See *Dasheng-qixin-lun Zhenwei Bian* [*Debate on the Authenticity of Faith in the Mahāyāna*].

¹⁴ There are three translations of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*: 1) the translation by Guṇabhadra [Qiu-na-bo-to-lo] of the Liu Song dynasty; 2) the translation by Bodhiruci [Pu-ti-liu-zhi] of the Yuan Wei dynasty; 3) the translation by Śikṣānanda [Shi-cha-nan-to] of the Tang dynasty.

¹⁵ The *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* says: "According to the truth of one mind there are two doors. What is meant by two? One is the mind's Real Such door. The second is the mind's door of arising and cessation. It means that these two kinds of doors each holds all dharmas."

¹⁶ See Zhizhe Dashi, *Fahua Xuanyi*, vol. 5B.

¹⁷This refers to the "San fayin" [Three dharma-marks, three proofs of a Hinayana sūtra] of Buddhism, namely "non-permanence of all dharmas, no-self-substance of all dharmas, and nirvana extinction." See *Zha a han jing* [*Samyuktāgāma*, Miscellaneous Hinayana Scriptures] 10.

¹⁸ See the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*: "All dharmas since their origin are separate from forms of speech, separate from forms of names, separate from mental conditions, and are ultimately equal, unchanging and unbreakable. This is the one mind and so it is called Real Such. For all speech is provisional names without substance but merely follows illusions and cannot be grasped. The Real Such is also without form. It means that in the ultimate of speech, speech drives away speech. In this Real Such substance there is nothing to drive off because all dharmas are real. Nor is there anything to establish because all dharmas are same-such. We should know that because all dharmas cannot be spoken, cannot be thought of, they are called Real Such."

¹⁹, See Yin Shun Fashi, *Yi Fofa Yenjiu Fofa* [*Using Buddhism to Study Buddhism*], the section on "The Study of Buddha-Womb" [Rulai Zang zhi Yanjiu].

²⁰ *She-dacheng-lun* [*Mahāyāna-samparigraha-sāstra*], *juan 3*: "...it means that the World-Honored One says that on the basis of listening to his words and each interpreting them internally according to one's reason, right views will arise."

²¹ See *Lengjia-jing* [*Lankāvatāra-sūtra*], *juan 4*.

²² [See D. T. Suzuki, *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*. (London: Routledge, 1930.)—Trans.]

²³ See *Xiangshan quanji* [*Complete Works of Lu Xiangshan*], *juan 34*, "Yulu [Dialogues]": "Sakyamuni's teachings aimed to deliver us from birth and death, but the root of its defect is that it concentrated on accomplishing the private. But with the world like this, there suddenly arose something called *chan* [Zen], which is naturally like waves rising without wind, an earthen bump rising on the smooth ground."

²⁴ The *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* says: "In this way sentient beings has the self-nature of the pure mind. But because of the wind of ignorance, mind and ignorance are both without shape and form, and cannot be separated from each other. But the mind is not of a moving nature, so that if ignorance is extinguished, its extinction follows. That is why the intelligent nature of the mind is unharmed."

²⁵ See Mou Zongshan, *Xianxiang yu Wuzhishen* [*Appearance and Thing-in-Itself*](Taipei: Xuesheng Shuju, 1975), page 123.

²⁶ According to the analysis of *yinming* [*hetuvidyā*, the science of cause; logic] in Buddhism, there are many kinds of *yin* [cause]. *Shengyin* [arising cause] is analogous to the seed being able to give rise to rice. *Liaoyin* 了因 is analogous to light able to illuminate an object.

²⁷ See Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, "The Transcendental Doctrine of Method", chapter 3, "Architectonic of Pure Reason". Translation by Norman Kemp Smith, page 662.

²⁸ See Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, the section on "Transcendental Analytic".

²⁹ See Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, "Transcendental Dialectic".

³⁰ See Mou, *Xianxiang yu Wuzhishen* [*Appearance and Thing-in-itself*], page 41.

³¹ See Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, the third antinomy, translation by Smith, 409.

³² See *Mencius* 2A,6.5-6: "The feeling [*xin*, heart-mind] of sympathetic concern [*ceyin*] is the beginning of humanity [*ren*]. The feeling of shame and loathing are the beginning of righteousness [*yi*]. The feeling of deference [*cirang*] is the beginning of propriety [*li*]. The feeling of right and wrong is the beginning of wisdom [*zhi*]. A person who has these four beginnings is like someone who has four limbs. A person who has four limbs and says he cannot rob himself. To say his lord is unable to rob his lord." [Mou says that *ceyin* 惻隱 means *bu an* 不安, unease or concern (in *Zhongguo zhexue de tezhi* 中國哲學的特質, *The Special Character of Chinese Philosophy*, 1963, 8th printing, 1994, page 43) --jw]

³⁴ See *Mencius* 7A.21.4.