

導師的話：研究佛法的立場與方法

印順導師

法光學壇
第五期（2001）

頁 1-24

©2001 法光佛教文化研究所
臺北市

頁 1 導師的話：研究佛法的立場與方法

法光學壇第五期（2001）

諸位（佛光山中國佛教研究院）同學，我這四年來人都病瘦了，大家的好意，到這裡來，雖然心裡非常歡喜，但是因身體不好，頭腦大概也差了，沒有什麼好的可以講來貢獻給諸位。

諸位現在是在學院裡修學，是研究佛法的階段。至於我自己，一般人看來，也是研究佛法的人。我是只有從太虛大師和法尊法師那裡，看看他們的文章，或者是隨便談談，這樣子有了一點啓發。我是沒有福報像諸位這樣能夠長期在學院裡修學，可以說是東翻西翻自己學來的。有人問我怎樣學的，我也說不出來，因為自己沒有好好的跟人學過，所以我也不會教別人。諸位今天來，我也只有將我從前學的，和我的想法，為什麼要學佛，我想學什麼樣的佛法等問題，隨便向大家報告，不一定合用，這總是從我過去修學的構想和過程而來的。

我在家鄉的時候，在偶然的因緣中，知道有佛法。我們海寧家鄉的佛法非常衰微，沒有臺灣這麼好，只是趕經懺。我知道佛法後，就找幾部經、論看看，看了以後，我生起兩種感想，一是佛法的理論很高深，佛法的精神很偉大；另一方面我覺得佛法是一回事，當前的佛教又是一回事。代表佛教的，如我家鄉的出家人，好像與我經上看到的佛法，有相當大的距離。但是我沒有像虛大師和你們院長那樣要來改善佛教，有振興改革佛教的心。只是想探究：佛法這麼好，這麼高深，為什麼同我們實際上的佛教距離這麼遠？這問題在那裡？

我在沒有出家以前，就有了一個反省：佛法這麼好，是一切智者之學，最高深的；為什麼佛教會成這個樣子，只是民間習俗的信仰。

像現在還有大學生在研究，從前是沒有的，至少到那個時期為止，佛教與佛法不太一致，爲什麼會這樣呢？後來，我自己看經，東翻西翻，總之也不好懂。後來父母去世了，自己也沒有什麼掛礙，跑出來出家。我修學佛法研究經論的意念，除了想要了解佛教究竟是什麼以外，還想了解佛法怎麼慢慢演變，其原因何在？這是存在我內心當中，推動我一直研究下去的力量。

本來在佛法上講，出家人應該只有三條路：上上等是修行，第二等才輪到學問，第三等才是修福，如廣修塔寺之類的事情。在佛法裡修學，說佛法好，總要對我們有點好處才好；若自己學了佛法，對自己一點好處都沒有，那麼我們叫人家學是不對的。我自己很慚愧，沒有能夠真正向修證的路子走。不過對佛法方面，還是爲了真理的追求，追求佛法的根本原理究竟是什麼樣？佛法如何慢慢發展？在印度有什麼演變？到中國來又爲什麼發展成現在的現象？我是基於這個意義來研究。

因此，我的學佛態度是：我是信佛，我不是信別人，我不一定信祖師。有人以爲中國人，就一定要信中國祖師的教理，我並沒有這個觀念。假使是真正的佛法，我當然信，假使他不對，那就是中國人的，我也不信。我是信佛法，所以在原則上，我是在追究我所信仰的佛法，我是以佛法爲中心的。

我對世界上的學問懂得不多，雖然也寫許多文章，我所說的主要是在追究佛法的真理。我要以根本的佛法，真實的佛法，作爲我的信仰。了解它對我們人類，對我個人有什麼好處，這是我真正的一個根本動機。

所以自己雖然沒有能夠在修證方面用功，但是這和有些人研究佛法的動機不同。有的人研究佛法，好像把它看成什麼學問一樣，在研究研究，提倡提倡，與自己毫不相干。原則的說，這不是我們學佛之人的態度。學佛的人，佛法要與我們自己發生關係，沒有關係你爲什麼要學呢？你都不曉得好處，爲什麼要叫人信呢？所以，我們越是能知道佛法的好處，越知道佛法超出世間的特質，越是能夠增加我們的

信心。

有人問我是什麼宗，我不曉得應該怎麼說。照一般人的想法，總該歸屬什麼宗才對。在我覺得，「宗」都是以佛法適應時代，適應特殊文化思想而發展成一派一派的。好像我們到山上，有好幾條路一樣。我沒有什麼宗，不過有人以為我是三論宗，有的稱我論師，我也不懂他們為何如此，其實我不是這樣的。怎麼叫都可以，我自己知道不是這樣就好了。

我是憑這一種意念來研究，漸漸發現到佛法最重要的根本原理，逐漸的了解一派一派的思想之間，有些什麼不同。諸位一定以為一派一派複雜得很，據我慢慢的研究起來，才曉得沒有那麼複雜。大概一個問題提出來的話，不是這樣，就是那樣，頂多兩三個看法。不過問題多了，錯綜起來，就好像有很多很多不同。我不是從事純宗派的研究，雖然各宗派也寫一點，都是粗枝大葉，沒有深刻研究，我不想做一宗一派的子孫，不想做一宗一派的大師。

我走的這條路子，可能有人說，是不合潮流，不合時宜的。我寫東西時，不管這些，寫出來有人看也好，沒有人看也好，寫好了就印在那裡，有人看沒人看我都不加考慮。只覺得我對佛法有這麼一點誠心，我要追究佛法的真理，想了解佛法的重要意義。在三寶裡面奉獻這一點，是好是壞，我也不太考慮，長期以來，我對佛法研究的態度就是這樣。

在這意義上，我學佛法和那開舖子的不太同。像百貨公司，樣樣都有，你要什麼就有什麼賣給你。我沒有這個觀念，我之所以東摸一點，西摸一點，只是在裡面找到根本佛法，與它所以發展的情形。這個發展，可能是相當好的，也可能不太好的。佛法有所謂「方便」，方便是有時間性，有空間性，在某一階段好得很，過了時，時代不同了，也許這個方便會成爲一種障礙。

『法華經』有一句話，我總覺得非常好：「正直捨方便，但說無上道」。怎麼捨呢？就是達到了某一階段，有更好更適合的就提倡這個，不適合的就捨掉。所以我研究的，不是樣樣都在提倡，我也不專

門批評。我這個人，生來是不太合時宜的，我覺得某些只是方便，不是究竟的東西，我不講是可以的，你要我講，我就這樣講，要我講好聽話奉承奉承，那我是不会的。我在原則上，帶點書呆子氣，總是以究竟佛法為重。自己這個樣子，能夠怎樣發展，能夠得到多少的信眾，我都不考慮。這許多就是我學佛的動機與態度——甚至可以說是，我就是這樣的人。

經過好多年以後，大概在民國三十年前，我對佛法有了大概的認識。佛法這樣演變發展，對現代來講，有些是更適合的，更適應現代的；某些，頂好不要談他，即使過去非常好的，但現在卻不太適合。我有了這個認識，當初我就寫了一本書叫做『印度之佛教』。這本書我想到就寫，只表示自己的意思而已，雖然引證，引證得很簡單，不像現代人寫書，受了近代文化的影響，你說的雖能表現你的思想；但總要把你的證據拿出來。所以我就想，把這本書改編寫成幾本大部的書，詳細引證，一切合起來，就可以表示我個人對佛法完整的看法和了解。

不過，對印度佛教的研究，我到現在只寫了兩本，一部是『說一切有部為主的論書與論師之研究』，一部是『原始佛教聖典之集成』。其他的，都是有別的因緣，不是我想寫的東西。現在病了以後，過去雖然有願要寫，大概也寫不成。不過，以我的想法，也沒有什麼遺憾，我們在這個無邊生死當中，能做多少，就做多少，盡自己力量去做就好了。能做多少，要靠福德因緣，以及時代種種關係配合，不是自己想做多少，就能做多少。我沒有什麼遺憾！假如身體還可以的話，我現在想寫最重要的一本書，說明從最初的佛法，演進到大乘佛法的過程。大乘佛法的本來意義是什麼？究竟什麼叫做大乘？我們不要口說大乘，實際上不是這麼一回事。不過能否寫成，自己也不曉得。人命無常，沒有幾天的時間也說不定。以上只是象徵性的談談自己的研究而已。

我以前寫過一篇文章，叫做『以佛法研究佛法』，有的人也許看過。怎樣來研究佛法呢？當然是研究經，論，各宗派裡面許多的道

理。但研究時要有一種方法，就是所謂的「方法論」。我的想法很頑固，我是一個佛教徒，我們要用我們佛教的方法。那麼我們怎麼來研究佛法呢？佛曾經說出一種現實世間的普遍真理，也可以說是，凡事實上的一切存在是離不開的普遍法則。這個法則，就是「諸行無常，諸法無我」。我覺得，我們研究佛法的時候，應該要引用這一方法來處理一切問題。

簡單的說，諸行無常，是說明現在世間所存在的東西，都是不停的在變化的。比方佛說出來的某句話，經後來佛弟子慢慢宏揚，它自然而然多多少少有了演變。又如佛所訂的制度，我們稱為戒律，這套戒律也會因區域而慢慢演變，你說完全不變，還是從前那樣，是不可能的。就是現在的泰國，他們的出家制度，人人可以出家，有的出家七天，有的出家十五天。嚴格講，出家受比丘戒，是要盡形壽受持的。沒有說，我發心去受七天的，或兩個月的比丘戒，這樣發心根本是不能得比丘戒的。那麼他們現在的辦法，你說好嗎？這不是好不好的問題，只要懂得這就是變化中的方便就是了！

說到「諸法無我」，是一切沒有獨存的實體，如一種制度，要考慮到時代因素，考慮同時的環境，如把時代，環境拋開了，講起制度來是抽象，不實際的。假如有了這個觀念，研究什麼問題，必須顧慮同時代的其它很多問題。這許多問題，你多一點了解，對研究問題的看法，也就會更加正確一點。

有人問我自己研究內容，我說不出來，我只是本著自己的理解去研究。不過，我看別人的書，多數是小範圍研究，其他什麼也不管。專門研究一個問題，有時候研究得很精細，好得很，可是從整個佛教來看，也許並不正確。我以為要擴大視界，研究才會有更多的成就。

如果不管其他的，縮小範圍，那麼研究出來的只是小問題，對整個佛教的意義，不可能有好的成就。我的研究，是從「無常」「無我」著眼的，無常是時代先後的演變；「無我」是同時的影響關係。將時間空間結合起來看問題，看它為什麼演變。所以，我告訴大家沒有別的研究方法。世間上的方法很多，我沒有看過，我不懂，我只用

我們佛法的基本方法——無常、無我，做為我研究的方法論。

諸位都還在學，將來不一定人人能繼續研究，有的出去弘法，或者修行，不過也許有人仍繼續研究佛法，所以我提到這點。

在研究的過程當中，有一點我看得很重要，佛法究竟有什麼不同，比世間其他的更好，可以分二方面來講。

一、釋迦牟尼佛時候，有一種完善的制度——戒律。傳到中國，後來有叢林制度，到現在也許有新的制度。不要以為制度都是一樣，佛的制度，實際上研究的人很少，我自己也沒有研究。中國現在講戒律是什麼樣的呢？晚上不吃飯，到廁所裡去要換鞋子，以為這是最要緊的。對戒律中真正重要的事情，好像不知道一樣。所以戒律的真正意義，我們出家人要有人發心去研究。

據我的了解，佛教的戒律是一種集體的生活，修行也就是集體生活中去鍛鍊。依戒律的觀點，佛法並不重於個人去住茅蓬修行——這是共世間的，雖然一般都很尊敬這種人。佛教戒律有什麼特色？它是道德的感化和法律的制裁，兩者統一起來。犯了錯誤，戒律中有種處罰的規定，但不止於此，而是在充滿道德精神感化之下，有一種法律制裁的限制。所以在佛的時代，真正出家的一個個都了不得，就是動機不純正的，在這裡面多住幾年，經過師友的陶冶，環境的熏習，慢慢也會成為龍象的。在這個集體生活裡，大家都有共同的信念，淨善的行爲，彼此和睦，這就是佛教戒律的特質，而發生偉大的作用——正法住世。

這種組織，與社會上的組織不太相同，它是道德感化與法律制裁相綜合的。在這裡面，是很平等的、是法治的。每一律制，不是對某些人而訂的。如在學院的話，如果是學生不許可，老師也絕對不許可。佛的制度是平等的，即使釋迦牟尼佛在世，佛也一樣的依法而行。佛的律制，是真正的平等、民主。在這道德感化、法律制裁之下，人人都修持佛法、研究法義，各盡其力去發揮。

當然，嚴格的說，現在並沒有這個東西——依律而住的僧團。假使我們去研究，把這裡面真正精神原則拿出來，用現在的方式去實踐

的話，我想會比照著自己的想法，搞一套組織，或是參照政治或其他組織，照人家的辦法也來一套，我想會更合於佛法。這是佛法偉大的特質，在我認識釋迦牟尼佛不像世俗一般那樣，我在研究中加深了我的信心。

二、另一方面，是理論的。佛一方面用制度，一方面開示，用法來指導。在當時，沒有現在那樣，研究『法華經』、『華嚴經』，一大部一大部的。不過在義理上，或在修行的方法上，作簡單的指導。佛所說明的，著重在什麼地方呢？那些與世間不同呢？依我的了解，佛法確有不共之法，與世間法不同。我想，諸位讀了好幾年，應該對佛法與世間法不太相同的有所了解。我們必須確認佛法的不共之法！世界上的宗教很多，中國的、印度的、西方的，佛教至少有一種與他

們不同的地方。又如哲學，從東方到西方，哲學家不曉得有多少？但佛法至少要有與他們不同的地方。假如自以為佛法偉大，而佛法所講的與他們所說的一樣，那就糟了，因為既然一樣，有了他的，更何必再要佛法？

就世間法所沒有的——不共世間的來說——當然就是「緣起性空」。空，這就是佛法的不共之法。「諸行無常，諸法無我」，都是依此而顯示出來。緣起是說世間的一切，無論是天文、地理、自然界、動物界，乃至我們個人生理上、心理上的現象，都是依緣而存在的。佛說「緣起」，是最通遍的法則。從這裡才會了解佛的制度與其他的所以不同。理論與制度有關，佛法稱為「依法攝僧」。把握緣起的原則，在思想上、制度上，及實際的修持上，都會有與世間不同處。世間上有許多進步的思想，有的近於緣起，但他們不能夠徹底的完全的達到目標。

我們為什麼信佛？是因為佛是大徹大悟了的。佛的大徹大悟是怎樣呢？你不曉得，我也不曉得。既然不曉得，那怎麼生信呢？佛坐菩提樹下大徹大悟以後，為了使人也能徹悟，所以說法。佛所說出來的法義，來指導出家人應做的生活軌範——律制，與世間不同；這表示了他證悟的內容與別人不同，這是可以了解的。在心裡我們不知道，



說出來、做出來，總可以看到一點。研究佛教制度的根本原則，從理論事實的統一中，我發覺佛法義理超越世間特殊的地方。佛老人家的證智，我們都不知道，但從他表現出與世間不同的，特別偉大，我是從這些上，深深信得佛真正的證悟。

我有很多看法，與別人的看法不大相同，譬如說，某人在修行，某人開悟了！修行、開悟當然是好事情，不過，不只是佛法講「修行」。世界上的宗教都要修行的，道家有修持的方法，中國儒家也有一點，印度婆羅門教，六派哲學都有修行的方法，西洋的神教也有啦！他們的禱告也是修行的一類。如真的修行，自然會身心有些特殊的經驗，這是信仰宗教的人所應相信的，不管你自己有沒有得到，這是絕對可信的。在內心當中或身體上得到特殊經驗，宗教的終點，就是要靠這種特殊經驗。在佛法當中，神通就是其中的一類。

所以，單講修行，並不一定就是佛法，世界上各種宗教都有修行呢！你說你看到什麼東西，經驗到什麼？這並不能保證你經驗的就是佛法。那麼用什麼方法來區別呢？這有兩個方法：一、與佛法的根本義理是否相合。二、行為表現是什麼樣子。且舉一件事來說，我們中國人有時候真自覺得驕傲，美國西皮有很多人

要學禪，寒山也很吃香，簡直崇拜得不得了。然在我的想法，若以此為典型，作為我們學佛的模範，大家這樣學，這成什麼樣子！因為佛教也好，其他宗教也好，都要教你正常，修行的人也要正常。中國佛教過去許多大師，能夠組織佛教，能夠發揚都是平淡正常的。又如釋迦牟尼佛教化，有所謂「神通輪、教誡輪、記心輪」，身業、語業、意業都可以教化，可是佛法的重點是教誡輪。用語言來引導你，啟發你，使你向上。現在有些人，稍為修行，就說前生後世，說神通，這不是真正的佛法。從佛的證悟以後，佛所表現出來，對弟子之間的活動的歷史事實，不是那些怪模怪樣的——寒山式、濟公式、瘋子喇嘛式的。佛老人家，生在我們人間，主要用教誡來引導，不是侈談神通。因為外道也有神通，從神通來建立佛教，佛教就和外道一樣了。我對佛法的研究著重在這兩方面，這兩方面的了解，能使我信心增強，推動支持我很衰弱

頁 9 導師的話：研究佛法的立場與方法

法光學壇第五期（2001）

的身體，在佛法之中，多少奉獻自己的一分心力。

我研究的重點是重在根本，假使你們請我講唯識學，我是講不好，但若講唯識的「基本」思想，我倒是知道一些。我讀書還有中國人的習性；讀書貴識大體。我現在寫作，也要引證，那是適應這個時代罷了！

我們研究佛法，當然要看古代的書，印度翻譯的經論，中國古代的註解。第一步，要讀懂他講些什麼，但這是不夠的，孔子說：「溫故知新」，我們不是看古典的書，不只懂了就好，那就停止了，永遠不進步，你要從「溫故」中、從古典中，要有一種新的了解。當然不一定每一個人看書，就能寫出心得，而且寫出來的心得，不一定是正確的，也不一定要去發表，你放在心裡，只是你看書的感受。這樣研究，我們佛法才能進步，才能發揚起來。

如果只是照本宣科，從前怎麼講，我還是這麼講，一點不錯，一點不錯算得了什麼？「沒有進步了」。這個世界永遠在變，諸行無常，你停止了，就等於退步，學問也是這樣。

諸位讀書，有的人不會讀，死讀，死記，老師這麼講我也把他記下來，將來我好照著講。假如研究學問的話，這樣連入門都談不上，豈止沒有進步而已。我們讀書的時候，要有點新的領會，最初看書的時候，有一點自己的想法，後來知道自己想錯了，知道錯，就是進步了。假使三年以前以為這樣，到現在還是這樣，說明你沒有進步。我們一定要自己時常想，使理由更充份，這個地方錯誤在那裡？

我們在不斷的糾正過程當中，不斷的糾正我們認識上的錯誤，那麼對佛法的認識就越來越正確，越來越有好的貢獻大家。所以，我們要培養溫故知新的精神，不僅是看懂，記住，會背會講。

另一點，佛法是宗教的，我們學了以後，你覺得這個理論在你的心裡起些什麼作用？有沒有一點用處？佛法總是要我們減少煩惱，叫我們增長慈悲心，叫我們對佛教有熱心，來護持聖教；覺得眾生非常苦惱，應該如何救度……。假使我們學了這些，學了以後，自己不起這些觀念，那是你純粹在書本子看見些「概念」，沒有變成自己的。

頁
10

導師的話：研究佛法的立場與方法

法光學壇第五期（2001）

不必談真正的修證，即使我們在研究學問，或是幫助佛教，從事福德事務，我們也要時常用佛法來指導自己，把佛法的基本原理時常放在心理，時常拿來指導自己，警策自己，那末雖然深的沒有，至少對自己仍有點好處。如果你越學越煩惱，一天到晚苦苦惱惱的。或者你學了自己覺得了不得，瞧不起人，看看師父、師兄、師弟都不如我，那你這個人就越來越增加困惱。真正學佛的人，要諒解人家的苦痛，要用佛法來熏陶自己，應該時常在佛法裡改變氣質，向來時常發脾氣，脾氣慢慢少發了，向來懶懶的不肯做事，慢慢肯發心了，這至少就有一點好處了！佛法究竟是宗教，不是世間的知識，希望諸位在學習當中，不要忘了這點，忘了這點，就與研究世間的學問一樣，變成非佛教的。即使你研究得很好，寫了幾大部書擺在圖書館裡，仍不得用處。

『華嚴經』善財童子到處參訪，他去參訪的人，大都不會講別的，總是講自己所作的。並不是你想要聽禪，就講些禪給你聽，你要什麼就講什麼……。我向來沒有能夠好好做修證的工夫，只是在研究佛法，我也只能在這一方面，講一點給諸位參考。希望我們學習，研究，能在佛法的領域上研究，能使所研究的，對自己有好處，對佛教有貢獻，不只是做學問而已。希望大家記住！學佛是長期性，學菩薩需要經過三大阿僧祇劫，至少我們這一生學佛，也不只是幾年的事情，希望大家要繼續精進！

（本篇錄自《華雨選集》第 225-243 頁）

Studying Buddhadharma in Depth: On Attitude and Method

Master Yin-Shun

Dear Students (of the Chinese Buddhist Research Institute, Fokuang shan): Sick for four years, I have become skinny. Your kind invitation makes me very happy but, lacking in physical health, I am afraid my mind is, too, not longer what it used to be and I have nothing worthwhile to share with you.

At present, all of you are enrolled in a seminary; this is the time for you to study buddhadharma in depth. As to myself, in general view, I also belong to those who engage in in-depth study of buddhadharma. However, the only instructions I received came from reading the articles written by great master T'ai-hsü and dharma master Fa-tsun or from chatting with them. I didn't have merits like you which would have allowed me to be enrolled in a seminary for some considerable amount of time. One might well say I taught myself by thumbing through various books. Sometimes people ask me how I studied but I don't know which reply I should give since I didn't really learn properly under some mentor. Here, too, lies the reason for my inability to teach others. Thus, though you have come here today, the only thing I can do is to tell you in a loose way what I learnt in the past or what I think today, questions like "Why is the emulation of the Buddha important?", "What kind of Buddhadharma do I want to learn?" etc. This is not necessarily useful for you but it is something deriving from the concepts and experience of my past studies.

In the region where I grew up I came to learn quite fortuitously about buddhadharma which was in extreme decline in this area, Hai-ning, not like in Taiwan. They performed only ceremonies for the dead. After I realized that there is something called buddhadharma, I tried to locate a few texts, and when I had read them two thoughts occurred to me. On one hand I sensed that the theory of buddhadharma was very exalted and profound, and that its spirit was really noble, but on the other hand I felt that

buddhadharma was quite different from the Buddhism I saw at that time . There seemed to be a huge gap between the representatives of Buddhism in my home county, the monks for example, and the buddhadharma about which I read in the texts. However, I didn't think about improving the condition of Buddhism like great master T'ai-hsü or the dean of your seminary, I had no ambition to breathe new life into Buddhism or to reform it. I only wanted to understand thoroughly how it could be possible that buddhadharma which was so good, so lofty, so deep differed vastly from real life Buddhism. Where did the problem lie?

Before I became a monk, I reflected like that: buddhadharma is so good and most profound, the lore of the omniscient one. But why has Buddhism turned into some belief in folk customs? Today there are university students who study buddhadharma in depth you wouldn't find this at that time. At least up to this period, there existed a certain discrepancy between Buddhism and buddhadharma. What was the reason? Later, when I read scriptures on my own, I did so in an unsystematic fashion. Anyway, the texts were not easy to comprehend. Then my parents passed away and, since I didn't cling to anything particular, I left home to become a monk. The reason for me to practice buddhadharma and study the texts in depth was not only the wish to understand what Buddhism actually was but also the desire to realize how it had changed gradually and for which reasons. This was the force in my mind which gave me the impetus to continue with this in-depth study all along.

From the point of view of buddhadharma, there are only three ways for an ordained person: the best one is to practice, the second concerns scholarship, the third engagement in merit making, e.g. building many temples and pagodas etc. If you practice buddhadharma and say it is good, it should be of some benefit to you. If you practice but don't benefit at all it would be wrong to encourage others to have faith in the Buddha. I regret very much that I was unable to really walk the path of practice and realization. However, in terms of buddhadharma, I studied in depth because I wanted to find the truth: what is the basic principle underlying buddhadharma? How did buddhadharma develop gradually in the course of time? What changes did it

undergo in India? How did it turn into its present form after its arrival in China?

Thus my attitude towards the emulation of Buddha was that I am trusting the Buddha, not other people. I do not necessarily have faith in the patriarchs. Some people feel that as a Chinese you have to have faith in the teachings of the Chinese patriarchs. I don't think so. If the teachings are real buddhadharma, I accept them of course, but if there are mistakes I don't have faith in them even though they are Chinese. Since I am trusting buddhadharma, I am trying in principle to get to the bottom of the buddhadharma I have trust in. My emphasis is on buddhadharma.

As to worldly learning, my knowledge is limited. Though I've written quite a lot most of what I said is trying to probe into the depths of the truth of buddhadharma. I want the object of my faith to be root buddhadharma, true buddhadharma. I want to understand which benefits humankind as a whole and myself as an individual can derive from it. This is my real main motivation.

Thus, although I was not able to put forth efforts in terms of practice and realization, there is still a difference to the motivation out of which some other people study buddhadharma in depth. Some do it as if buddhadharma were like worldly learning. They study and study and put forth all kinds of ideas, but all this without any relation to themselves. In principle, this is not the attitude someone who is emulating the Buddha should have. For those, buddhadharma has to relate to oneself. If it does not relate to you, then why do you want to engage in it? If you don't understand its benefits, why should you encourage others to have faith? Thus, the more you are able to understand the benefits of emulating the Buddha -the more you realize that the special quality of buddhadharma is transcending worldly things- the more you will have faith in it.

Sometimes people ask me which school I am adhering to which leaves me quite speechless. Generally people think the right thing to do is to belong to some school. I, however, feel the schools arose so that buddhadharma could meet the needs of a specific time or fit some particular cultural concept. It is as if you were climbing mountains and had to choose between a number of paths. I don't belong to any school

but some people think I am an adherent of the Three Treatises School. Some even call me “master of treatises”! I really don't know why they do this because I am not like that. Yet it doesn't matter what you call me, it is enough that I myself know that it is not true.

My in-depth study was based on this attitude and gradually I came to realize the most important basic principle of buddhadharma and began to understand what the difference between the thought of the individual schools were. You might think that the schools are a complicated topic. It took me long-term research to realize that it is not so. Usually when one question is discussed there are only two views or at the most three diverging ideas. However, if the topics debated are numerous and you look at them at the same time, it seems to be a complicated multitude. My research was not limited to the schools. I have written a little bit about the individual schools, but these are only rough outlines, not profound studies. I do not intend to inherit one specific lineage or to become a great master within one specific school.

Maybe some people think the path I have been treading does not fit our times. I don't care about this when I am writing. It is fine with me if someone is reading these papers, and if nobody does I don't care either. They are printed when I have finished them and it is not of my concern whether people go to read them or not. I only feel that my attitude towards buddhadharma is honest: I want to get to the bottom of its truth, I want to understand its important meaning. I do not really think about whether it is good or not to make this offering among the three jewels. All along, my attitude towards studying buddhadharma in depths has been thus.

In this respect, the way I am studying buddhadharma differs from someone who opens a business. In a department store you will find everything, whatever you need they will sell you. My point of view differs. The reason for me to work a little bit on this and then a little bit on that is that I try to find out basic buddhadharma and its developments. These developments may be positive or negative. You will find the term “expedient means” in buddhadharma but expedient means depend on a specific time and space. An expedient means which on one stage of development is excellent

may become an obstacle at a different time.

I always like one quote from the Lotus Sutra-“give up the expedient means and teach only the highest path.” How does one give up? It means that when you have reached a certain level, you will promote what is better and more fitting while discarding what is not useful. Thus I do not promote everything I study in depth, nor do I indulge exclusively in critique. Since birth I didn't fit my times. I feel I need not talk about some things which are not ultimate but only expedient means. If you want me to talk about them I will tell you like this. I will not engage in talk to please or flatter. In principle, I somewhat resemble an intellectual who always emphasizes ultimate buddhadharma. This is my way wherefore I do not care about what kind of career I will have and how many disciples I can gather. All of this just explains my motives and attitudes, or one could even say what kind of person I am.

After many years, approximately before 1941, I gained some understanding of buddhadharma: the development of buddhadharma brought some aspects which fit our present, modern times better but some one would prefer to keep silent about since they are out of tune though they may have been excellent in the past. When I developed this understanding I wrote a book entitled Indian Buddhism. I wrote it quite intuitively and it represents only my personal opinion. Quotes are kept to a minimum and simple not like the books written by modern scholars who are influenced by present day culture where what you write still reflects your thoughts but you have to document your sources. Thus I thought about rewriting this book into several larger works with detailed quotation. Together they could represent a complete picture of my view and understanding of buddhadharma.

However, as far as the study of Indian Buddhism is concerned, I have only finished two volumes so far. One is A Study on the Treatises and Masters Concentrating on the Sarvāstivādins, the other is The Compilation of the Texts of Primitive Buddhism. The other publications are not what I really intended to write, there were other situations. Now, as I have fallen sick, I might not be able to finish what I was hoped to write in the past. However, in my mind, there is nothing to regret. How much we

can do in this boundless circle of birth and death, this much we do. It is fine to do what is within one's power. How much one can accomplish depends on one's merit and all kinds of historical conditions. It is not up to one's wishful thinking. I don't regret anything. If my physical condition allows, I will write the most important book in order to explain how, from the earliest form of buddhadharma, the development of the Mahāyāna occurred, what the original meaning of Mahāyāna buddhadharma is, what is exactly called the “Greater Vehicle”. We shouldn't call something Mahāyāna while in fact it is something quite different. I don't know, though, whether I will be able to write this work. Human life is impermanent, maybe I have just a few days left. So far it has been a symbolic talk about my own in-depth study.

I wrote a paper entitled “In-depth Study of Buddhadharma through Buddhadharma.” Maybe some of you have been reading it. How does one study buddhadharma in depth? Of course, one does research on the texts and the many teachings of the various schools. But when you study you need a method. “Methodology” deals with this. I am quite stubborn in this respect: I am a Buddhist so I have to use the methods offered by Buddhism. So then, how does one study buddhadharma in-depth? The Buddha taught one general real world truth, or one could say a general law which is related to all factual existence. This law is “all conditioned things are impermanent, all phenomena are without self”. I feel that when we study buddhadharma in-depth we should use this method to deal with all problems.

To put it simply, “all conditioned things are impermanent” explains that everything existing in the universe now is continuously changing. For example, one sentence uttered by the Buddha will naturally change after being spread by his disciples. Another example is the discipline established by the Buddha which we call “rules.” The rules will slowly change in conformity with different regions. If you say they haven't changed and are preserved as they were in the beginning, this is impossible. Even in Thailand today, their regulation for monks is that everybody can become ordained, so some lead a monk's life for seven or fifteen days. Yet strictly speaking, taking full ordination should be for one's whole life. It didn't happen that someone would

say “I am determined to take the monk's ordination for seven days or for two months.” With this kind of mentality you do not received the monks precepts at all. So do you think the way they do it now is good? Actually it is not a matter of good or bad, it is enough to understand that there are changing expedient means.

As to “all phenomena are without self,” it means nothing has something substantial which exists independently. In terms of system, for example, one has to take the time into consideration, the environment at that time. If you don't care about time and environment, it becomes totally abstract and unrealistic to talk about a system. If you accept this concept, whenever you research a problem you have to take many other problems which existed at that time into consideration. The more you understand about these manifold problems, the correcter your opinion will be about the problem you study.

Sometimes people ask me regarding the contents of my research. I don't know how to reply. I am only doing in-depth study based on my own understanding. However, when I read the books authored by others, it is generally small scale research and I don't care about the rest. If you concentrate on research of one problem sometimes it is possible to go into great detail which is excellent but in terms of Buddhism as a whole you could still go wrong. I think it is important to broaden one's view. Only then one can accomplish more with one's research.

If you don't care about the rest and make the field of research smaller in scope, what you can study will only be a minor problem, it will be impossible to get some good results in terms of the meaning of Buddhism as a whole. Whatever I study, I approach it from the viewpoint of “impermanence” and “selflessness”. Impermanence refers to the changes in time, selflessness points to synchronic influence and relationships. If you combine time and space when you look at problems you can see why they change. Thus I am telling everybody that there is actually no other research method. There exist many methods in the world, I haven't studied them and am ignorant in this respect. In my own research, I only use the root method offered by buddhadharma - impermanence and selflessness.

You are still students but in the future it is not certain that all of you will be able to continue research. Some may devote themselves to the spread of the teaching or to practice, but maybe some will go on with their in-depth study of buddhadharma. Therefore I would like to mention a few points.

In the course of doing research, I pay special attention to one point: what makes buddhadharma different? In which respect is it better than worldly study? This can be discussed from two sides.

Firstly, at the time of Shakyamuni Buddha there was a complete discipline, the rules. When Buddhism came to China, it developed into the system of the great monasteries, and maybe now there will be another system. We should not think that these disciplines are the same. There are only a few people who really study the discipline founded by the Buddha, and I am not one of them. But what are the rules now mentioned in the Chinese tradition? Not to eat at nighttime, to change one's shoes when going to the toilet -these seem to be the most important items. It looks as if there were no understanding of what is really important in terms of the rules. Thus some of us ordained people should decide on studying in depth the real meaning of the precepts.

As far as I understand, the Buddhist rules are concerned with communal living. Practice is engaged in within the context of communal living. From the viewpoint of the vinaya, buddhadharma does not emphasize that the individual practices living in a hermitage. This it has in common with the world though people like that are generally well respected. What are the special characteristics of Buddhist rules? It is the combination of transformation through ethics and constraint through law. For mistakes committed, there are all kinds of regulations regarding punishment in the vinaya. It doesn't stop here, though. Full of the spirit of ethical transformation, restrictions are placed by law. Thus in the Buddha's times everyone who really left the home life was outstanding. Even if someone's motive was not pure, after some years living there, being guided and influenced by teachers and friends, the beneficial influence of the environment would gradually transform them into outstanding personalities. In this communal living, everyone shared common believes and pure behaviour, staying

together in harmony. This is the special feature of Buddhist regulations which had an important function -the true dharma remained in the world.

Such an organization is quite different from other organizations in society since it is a combination of ethical transformation and legal restriction. In it, equality and the law reign. Each arrangement has been made not in response to some people. In a seminary, what the students are not allowed to do, the teachers are forbidden also. Buddhist regulations are equal. Even Shakyamuni dwelt in accordance with the system. The Buddha's regulations are truly equal and democratic. Under this moral transformation and legal restriction, everybody was practicing buddhadharma and studying the meaning of dharma in depth, developing one's potential as much as one could.

Of course, strictly speaking, an order living in accordance with the vinaya does not exist any longer but if you go and do some research to find out its true spiritual principle and then put it into practice in a modern way, this would, in my opinion, conform more to buddhadharma than to develop an organization according to one's personal ideas or by copying political or other organizations. This is the great peculiarity of buddhadharma. When I came to understand that Shakyamuni Buddha wasn't like the general worldling I gained more trust from my research.

Secondly, the other aspect is theoretical. On one hand, the Buddha used regulations, on the other hand he was teaching and employed dharma to lead. At that time, people didn't study huge texts like the Lotus Sutra or the Avatamsaka Sutra. They taught in terms of theory or practical methods in a simple way. Where was the emphasis of what the Buddha had explained? What was its difference compared with the world? As far as I understand, buddhadharma contains indeed something uncommon which you cannot find in worldly dharmas. I guess you must have been studying for many years and thus understand what the difference is between buddhadharma and worldly dharma. We have to gain a clear understanding of what makes buddhadharma different! There are many religions in the world, in China, in India, in the West. There must be at least one thing in which Buddhism differs from

those. Like in philosophy, from the East to the West, there have been so many philosophers! But still, bud-

dhadharma must have something not in common with them. It would be a mess if you think buddhadharma is great but what it is teaching does not differ from what others said because, if it is the same, then it would be enough to have those and there would be no need for buddhadharma.

What is lacking in worldly dharma or what is different from it is of course “empty of nature due to dependent arising”. Emptiness, this is the special teaching of buddhadharma. The concepts of “all conditioned things being impermanent and all phenomena without self” are all developed from this basis. Dependent arising means everything in the world, from the sky to the earth, from inanimate nature, the animals up to our own physiological and psychological phenomena, exists based on conditions. Dependent arising taught by the Buddha is the most common law. Based on this one can realize why the Buddha's regulations differ from the rest. Theory and regulations are connected. This is what is called “gather the congregation based on the law” in buddhadharma. If you have a grasp of the principle of dependent arising, then the thought, the regulations, and practical cultivation will differ from worldly ones. There is much progressive thought in the world some of which comes close to dependent arising but still fails to reach its goal in a thorough and comprehensive way.

Why do we believe in the Buddha? Because the Buddha is completely awakened. In what does his complete awakening consist? You don't know, nor do I. How can we have trust if we don't know? After the Buddha attained awakening under the bodhi tree he started to teach so that other people, too, could awaken completely. The teachings he gave showed a proper way of living for the monks, i.e. the regulations which differ from worldly ones. It is easily comprehended that this showed that what he had awakened to differed from that of other people. Something in the mind, we cannot know. But as soon as you say it or do it, it is possible to get some impression. If you do in-depth research on the basic principle behind the Buddhist system, from the unity between theory and fact I discovered the special place where the principals of buddhadharma excel worldly ones. The wisdom realized by the Buddha

we have no way of knowing, but judging from his expression of greatness which differs from the world I firmly believe that the Buddha was really awakened.

Many of my ideas are not shared by others. For example, to say someone is practicing, someone has awakened. Of course, it is good to practice or to become awakened but not only buddhadharma talks about practice. All the religions in the world want you to practice -the Taoists have practices, even the Confucians in China have some, the Brahmins and the six philosophical schools in India, all of them practice, even Western religions which believe in God. What they call prayer is also a kind of practice. If you really practice, of course, you will have some particular bodily or mental experiences. Everybody who believes in a religion will accept this; no matter whether you yourself have this achievement, it can be absolutely trusted. In the end, religions rely on this, that you have some special physical or spiritual experience. In buddhadharma, supernatural powers belong here.

Thus just to talk about practice doesn't mean it deals necessarily with buddhadharma since every religion in the world has its practices. If someone says he saw something or experienced something this is no guarantee that what he experienced was buddhadharma. So how can one differentiate? There are two ways. First, to see whether it is in agreement with the basic teachings of buddhadharma; second, see how his behaviour is. Let me give an example: we Chinese are sometimes really proud that American hippies want to learn Zen. Han-shan is quite popular and revered very much. However, as I see it, if you take this as a norm, a paragon we should emulate when training to be a buddha, and everybody follows in their footsteps then how would this be like? Buddhism like the other religions wants you to be a normal person. As a practitioner, one should be normal. Many of the old Chinese Buddhist patriarchs were able to organize Buddhism and develop it because they were simple and normal. Also the teaching of Shakyamuni Buddha includes the so called “wheels of supernatural powers, instructions, and direct transmission to the mind”. He could teach with his body, speech and mind. The emphasis, however, has to be on the instructions. Using language to lead you, give you insights, let you move upwards.

Nowadays there are some people who practice just a little bit and then begin to talk about this life and past existences, about supernatural powers -this is not real buddhadharma. After the Buddha's awakening whatever he demonstrated, the historical facts of how he worked among his disciples, there is nothing strange and abnormal about it, nothing like Han-shan, Chi-kung, or the Crazy Lama. Buddha was born among us human beings and mainly relied upon instruction to guide. He did not indulge in chatter about supernatural powers. Also non-Buddhists do have these. If you want to establish Buddhism on the basis of supernatural powers, then there will no distinction between Buddhism and non-Buddhists. My in-depth study of buddhadharma emphasizes these two aspects. Understanding in both these regards helped me to strengthen my trust, supported my weak body to go on and make some trifling contribution to buddhadharma.

In my research, I placed the emphasis on the root. If you want me to talk on Mind Only, I will do a miserable job. But if you want me to talk on the basic thought of Mind Only I have some knowledge. I am following the Chinese tradition in my studies, which means I regard the understanding of the main frame to be most important. When I'm writing now, I cannot but quote the sources, but this is only in response to the present times.

Of course, we have to read the old texts if we want pursue in-depth study of buddhadharma, the ancient translations from Indian texts and the old commentaries written by the Chinese. The first step is to understand what is written there, but this is not enough. Confucius said one should review the old to know the new. It is not enough for us to read the classics and understand them and then stop there. Thus there would never be progress. From reviewing the old, the ancient texts, one should develop some new understanding. Of course, not everybody who is reading something will be able to formulate his impressions and not every written reflection is correct. There is also no need to publish that. Keep it in your mind, since it is your response to your reading. Only if you can study thus, buddhadharma can progress and be spread.

If you are teaching by slavishly reading from the textbook and just repeat how it

was taught in the past without the slightest mistake, what is this “without mistake” worth? There will be no progress. The world is changing all the time, “all conditioned things are impermanent,” but you are standing still. This means regression. It's the same with one's studies.

You are still studying. Some people don't know how to study. They study and memorize mechanically, they write down whatever the teacher says so that in the future they can repeat. If you want to do research, being like this, you will not be able to begin, let alone make some progress. When we study we need some new insights. Right at the beginning you have to have your own opinion. If you later realize that the opinion was wrong, this knowledge in itself means progress. If three years ago you were thinking like that and haven't changed in the meantime this proves that you have made no progress. We have to think often so that we have more reasons at hand in order to prove that here is a mistake. In this process of continuous correction we straighten out our own misunderstandings. Thus our understanding of buddhadharma becomes more and more correct and we can improve our service to others. Thus we have to cultivate the spirit of gaining new insights by reviewing the old. It is not enough to be able to read and to memorize and to speak about.

One more point. Buddhadharma deals with religion. What influence do you feel does this theory have on your mind after you have studied it? Is it helpful? The aim of buddhadharma is to reduce our mental afflictions, to increase our compassion, to be enthusiastic about Buddhism so that we are willing to protect the noble doctrine, to empathize with the suffering of sentient beings and think about ways to save them, etc. If you study these things but do not give rise to these thoughts yourself it means that you've read only about some “concepts” in the books but they have not become yours.

This is not necessary related to actual realizations. Even if we only pursue in-depth studies or support Buddhism, or engage in some meritorious activity, we still should all the time use buddhadharma to guide us, keep the basic principles of buddhadharma all the time in our mind to give ourselves direction and impetus. Though

you don't get to the profound, still it is of some benefit for you. If you become more emotional the more you study and are engulfed all day long by mental afflictions, if you have studied and feel you are something special and look down upon other people, if you are under the impression that the master and the dharma brothers can't compare with yourself, this means that you are more and more caught up in mental misery. Someone who is really emulating buddha has to have understanding for the suffering of others, has to use buddhadharma to transform himself, has to work on his character all the time and through dharmic means. If he was prone to explode in the past, now his fits of rage decrease; if he was lazy and not willing to work, now he is gradually becoming happy to get involved. These are at least some benefits! Buddhadharma anyway is a religion and not worldly knowledge. I hope all of you who are still studying will not forget this point. If you forget it then there is no difference with the pursuit of worldly scholarship and it turns into something which is not Buddhism. Even if you studied very well and wrote a couple of books which can be found in the library, still you didn't benefit from this all.

In the Avatamsaka Sutra, the young Sudhana is looking everywhere for mentors. Most of the teachers he is visiting don't talk about anything else but what they themselves do. This means it is not the case that you want to hear something about ch'an he will talk with you about ch'an. It doesn't mean that you get to hear what you want to hear. I never had a chance to really practice, I spent all my time on research. So it is only in this respect that I am able to share a little bit with you. I hope that if we study and research we do so in the field of buddhadharma and cause what we have learnt to be not mere learning but beneficial for oneself and a contribution to Buddhism. Please, remember this. Emulating buddha is a long term commitment. As a bodhisattva, you have to work for three countless kalpas. But at least in this life we emulate buddha and not only for a few years. May all of you continue with your efforts!