

## 略論當代學界對華嚴判教安立空有始教 與同別圓教之批評

李治華

華梵大學佛藝系助理教授

### 摘要

本文透過現代學者對華嚴宗判教中安立空有始教與同別圓教之批評，探討華嚴始教為何包含空有兩宗，圓教為何分為同別二教，並兼對比天台判教，以見華嚴始教與圓教較於天台判教再發展之處。本文指出：在始教上空有兩宗所說所證的緣起法性（空性、圓成實性）與境界實質相同，當為並列始教的根本理據。在圓教上法界緣起並無「所因處拙」、「緣理斷九」的問題，圓教必須充分表達出同別兩面，方為致極圓滿。

**關鍵詞：**華嚴宗、天台宗、判教、始教、圓教

# **A Brief Discussion on Contemporary Academic Criticisms of the Initial and Perfect Classification of Teachings in Huayan School**

Lee Chih Hua

Assistant Professor, Department of Buddhist Art Studies

Huafan University

## **Abstract**

This article will explore modern scholars' criticisms regarding the initial teaching and perfect teaching in the Huayan school to examine why the initial teaching includes two sects, the emptiness and existence, and why the perfect teaching is divided into two sects, the commonality and distinction, and contrasts them with Tiantai teachings, we can see the further development of Huayan teachings compared with Tiantai.

**Keywords :** Huayan school, Tiantai school, classification of teachings, initial teaching, perfect teaching

## 一、前言

### I. Introduction

隋代天台宗的判教可謂漢傳佛教史上第一次集大成的判教代表，繼之，唐代華嚴宗的判教則是第二次的代表。華嚴宗的小、始、終、頓、圓的五教判，若除去頓教，粗略可對應於天台宗的藏、通、別、圓的四教判。然而華嚴始教包含空、有兩宗，圓教又分同、別二教，這方面則與天台大異其趣。本文將透過現代學界對華嚴宗判教中安立空有始教與同別圓教之批評，探討華嚴始教為何包含空、有兩宗，圓教為何分為同、別二教，並兼對比於天台判教，以見華嚴始教與圓教較於天台的再發展之處。<sup>1</sup>

The classification of teachings (panjiao) in the Tiantai school during the Sui dynasty can be considered the first comprehensive representation of such classification in the history of Chinese Buddhism. Following this, the classification in the Huayan school during the Tang dynasty serves as the second significant example. The Huayan school's five classifications of teachings—small, beginning, final, sudden, and perfect—can roughly correspond to the Tiantai school's four classifications—藏 (Tripitaka), 通 (Common), 別 (Special), and 圓 (Perfect)—excluding the sudden teaching. However, the Huayan

---

<sup>1</sup> 本文由筆者博士論文《智儼思想研究——以初期華嚴宗哲學的創建過程為主軸》（新北：輔仁大學哲學系，2008年），節錄增補，修訂而成。

This article is excerpted, supplemented, and revised from the author's doctoral dissertation, *Study on the Thought of Zhiyan: Focusing on the Formation Process of Early Huayan Philosophy* (New Taipei: Fu Jen Catholic University, Department of Philosophy, 2008).

beginning teaching includes both the Emptiness and Existence schools, and the Perfect teaching is further divided into the Similar and Different teachings, which significantly differ from the Tiantai classification. This article aims to explore the criticisms of modern academia regarding the inclusion of both the Emptiness and Existence schools in the Huayan beginning teaching and the division of the Perfect teaching into the Similar and Different teachings. It also seeks to compare these aspects with the Tiantai classification to highlight the further development of the Huayan beginning and Perfect teachings in relation to the Tiantai classification.<sup>1</sup>

在印度佛教史上中觀派與瑜伽派著名的「空有之爭」僵持不下，如中觀派（空宗）的智光主張「為上根說無相大乘，辨心境俱空」，瑜伽派（唯識宗）的戒賢則認為「初（小乘）唯說有，即墮有邊；次唯說空，即墮空邊」。<sup>2</sup> 空有之爭也反映在華嚴宗的判教上，如何安排空有兩宗的高下位置？為何兩宗都是始教？如陳沛然即批評「兩宗入路之不同，重點也相異，其實空宗說『空』，唯識宗是說『有』（妙有），此又何能同置於第二重『始教』之中？」<sup>3</sup> 本文便將探究華嚴宗如何安排印度佛教判教上空有之爭的大問題。

---

<sup>2</sup> 〔唐〕法藏：《大乘起信論義記》，卷 1，CBETA T44, no. 1846, p. 242b16-17。

[Tang] Fazang: *Notes on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, Vol. 1, CBETA T44, no. 1846, p. 242b16-17。

<sup>3</sup> 陳沛然：《華嚴宗之法界觀與判教觀研究》（廣州：中山大學哲研所博士論文，1998 年），頁 90。

Chen Pei Ran: *A Study on the Huayan School's View of the Dharma Realm and Classification of Teachings* (Guangzhou: Doctoral Dissertation, Institute of Philosophy, Sun Yat-sen University, 1998),

In the history of Indian Buddhism, the famous “dispute between emptiness and existence” between the Madhyamaka (Emptiness School) and Yogācāra (Consciousness-Only School) has remained unresolved. For instance, Zhiguang from the Madhyamaka School asserts, “To those with superior faculties, I speak of the formless Mahayana, discerning both mind and environment as empty.” On the other hand, Jiexian from the Yogācāra School believes, “Initially (in the Hinayana), only existence is spoken of, falling into the extreme of existence; subsequently, only emptiness is spoken of, falling into the extreme of emptiness.”<sup>2</sup> This debate is also reflected in the doctrinal classifications of the Huayan School. How should the positions of the two schools, emptiness and existence, be arranged? Why are both schools considered the initial teaching? For example, Chen Pei Ran criticizes, “The paths of the two schools differ, and their focal points are also distinct. In fact, the Emptiness School speaks of ‘emptiness,’ while the Consciousness-Only School speaks of ‘existence’ (wondrous existence). How can they both be placed within the second tier of ‘initial teachings’?”<sup>3</sup> This article will explore how the Huayan School addresses the significant issue of the dispute between emptiness and existence in the doctrinal classifications of Indian Buddhism.

如何才稱得上是真正的圓教？這則是中國佛教判教的終極問題，也涉及了天台宗與華嚴宗的孰圓之辨。

---

p. 90.

What constitutes a true “perfect teaching”? This is the ultimate question in the classification of Chinese Buddhist teachings and involves the debate between Tiantai Buddhism and Huayan Buddhism over which is more complete.

佛教史上首先提出圓教之說的是南北朝時的慧光（468-537），當時佛教界甚為推尊《大方廣佛華嚴經》，<sup>4</sup> 慧光即以《華嚴經》為「圓教」，指出《華嚴經》是最圓滿的教法，闡述高高在上的、理想的佛境界。<sup>5</sup> 隋代實際開創天台宗義的智顗（538-597），對前人推崇《華嚴經》，輕忽《妙法蓮華經》，深感未

---

<sup>4</sup> 如〔隋〕吉藏（549-623）在《法華玄論》卷 1 說：「若如南方五時（慧觀等）之說、北方四宗（慧光等）之論，皆云《華嚴》為圓滿之教，《法華》為未了之說。」CBETA T34, no. 1720, p. 366a12-14。

As [Sui] Jizang (549-623) stated in Vol. 1 of the “Profound Discussion of the Lotus Sutra”: “If we follow the theories of the Five Periods in the South (such as Huiguan) and the Four Schools in the North (such as Huiguang), they all claim that the ‘Avatamsaka Sutra’ is the perfect teaching and the ‘Lotus Sutra’ is the incomplete teaching.” CBETA T34, no. 1720, p. 366a12-14。

<sup>5</sup> 〔唐〕法藏《華嚴一乘教義分齊章》卷 1 記載慧光的圓教：「為於上達分階佛境者，說於如來無礙解脫究竟果海，圓極自在秘密法門，即此經（華嚴）是也。」（CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 480b26-28）另載安廩（507-583）有圓宗之說：「第六名圓宗，明法界自在緣起無礙德用圓備，亦華嚴法門等是也。」（CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 480c9-15）此說亦源於慧光。

In Vol. 1 of [Tang] Fazang’s “Chapter on the Differentiation of the Teachings of One Vehicle of the Avatamsaka,” Huiguang’s perfect teaching is recorded as follows: “For those who ascend to the Buddha realm in stages, the teaching speaks of the Tathagata’s unobstructed liberation, ultimate fruition, and the ocean of ultimate results, the perfectly free and secret Dharma doors—this sutra (Avatamsaka) represents that.” (CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 480b26-28) Additionally, Anlin (507-583) is noted for his theory of the perfect school: “The sixth is called the perfect school, which elucidates the unobstructed arising of the Dharma realm’s inherent qualities and functions, and the perfect and complete application of the Huayan Dharma doors.” (CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 480c9-15) This theory also originates from Huiguang.

妥，<sup>6</sup> 其高揚《法華經》為純圓獨妙，反而判《華嚴經》為圓兼別教，這「別」教是指漸次、隔別、非圓融，是「曲逕紆迴，所因處拙」<sup>7</sup>。後來在唐代形成的華嚴宗分別以同（三乘同歸於別）、別（此「別」是指殊勝不共、圓融無礙）兩種型態的圓教來安排《法華經》與《華嚴經》，這是採取整合會通的方式，認為同別兩教具有一體兩面的性質。其後宋代天台宗的知禮（960-1028），又標舉天台圓教的「性具」指責華嚴圓教「緣理斷九」，力倡唯有台宗才是真正圓教。

In the history of Buddhism, Huiguang (468-537) of the Southern and Northern Dynasties was the first to propose the concept of “perfect teaching”. At that time, the Buddhist community greatly revered the *Avatamsaka Sutra*,<sup>4</sup> which Huiguang identified as the “perfect teaching”, stating it as the most complete doctrine, illustrating the lofty and ideal Buddha realm.<sup>5</sup> Zhiyi (538-597), who actually established the Tiantai doctrine during the

---

<sup>6</sup> [隋]智顗：《妙法蓮華經文句》，卷9：「舊云：『《華嚴》了義、滿字、常住，《法華》不了義、非滿、非常。』今以此文並之，若始入是了義，今入不了義者，始入是佛慧，今入非佛慧，若佛慧既齊了義亦等，滿字常住悉然（云云）。地人呼《華嚴》為圓宗，《法華》為不真宗，今亦用此文並之。」CBETA T34, no. 1718, p. 125c14-19。

[Sui] Zhiyi: *Textual Commentary on the Lotus Sutra*, Volume 9: “It was previously said, ‘The *Avatamsaka Sutra* is the consummate teaching, complete, eternal. The *Lotus Sutra* is not the consummate teaching, incomplete, not eternal.’ Now, according to this text, if one initially enters the consummate teaching and now enters the non-consummate teaching, it means initially entering the Buddha’s wisdom and now entering non-Buddha’s wisdom. If the Buddha’s wisdom is equal to the consummate teaching, it is also equal to the complete, eternal characteristics. People of the land call the *Avatamsaka Sutra* the perfect school and the *Lotus Sutra* the non-true school. Now, this text is also used to compare them.” (CBETA T34, no. 1718, p. 125c14-19)

<sup>7</sup> [隋]智顗：《妙法蓮華經玄義》，卷5，CBETA T33, no. 1716, p. 737a10-11。

[Sui] Zhiyi: *Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sutra*, Volume 5, CBETA T33, no. 1716, p. 737a10-11.

Sui Dynasty, felt uneasy with the previous high regard for the *Avatamsaka Sutra* and the neglect of the *Lotus Sutra*.<sup>6</sup> Zhiyi exalted the “Lotus Sutra” as purely perfect and uniquely exquisite and regarded the *Avatamsaka Sutra* as a combination of perfect and partial teachings. The “partial” teaching referred to gradual, separate, and non-harmonious aspects—“twisting and turning paths, flaws originating from their causes.”<sup>7</sup> Later in the Tang Dynasty, the Huayan School developed two types of perfect teaching—“same” (Three Vehicles unified into one) and “different” (referring to unique and unrivaled as well as harmonious and unobstructed )—to arrange the *Lotus Sutra* and *Avatamsaka Sutra*, adopting an integrative approach, recognizing the dual nature of “same” and “different” teachings. Subsequently, c (960-1028) of the Song Dynasty Tiantai School advocated the Tiantai perfect teaching of “innate nature”, criticizing the Huayan perfect teaching as “dependent on reason, cutting off the nine realms,” insisting that only the Tiantai School represented the true perfect teaching.

在現代學界上，牟宗三（1909-1995）依承天台宗的理路，從哲學立場考察圓教的形式與內容意義，而將此論爭推至新的高峰，主張華嚴宗將同別二圓並列，是判教上的不究竟，真正終極的圓教只能有一個，華嚴宗的二圓並存是消化不了天台的結果，真正的圓教是天台圓教。<sup>8</sup> 另一方面，承續華嚴宗圓教綜合同（法

---

<sup>8</sup> 參見牟宗三：《佛性與般若（上）》（臺北：臺灣學生書局，1989 年），頁 561。《中國哲學十九講》（台北：臺灣學生書局，1989 年），第十六講〈分別說與非分別說以及「表達圓教」之模式〉。



華經）、別（華嚴經）二教的進路，唐君毅（1909-1978）主張台嚴（同別）各有各圓，標準不同，並指出台宗有未及嚴宗之處；霍韜晦（1940-2018）認為台宗是存有論上的圓融，嚴宗是現象上的圓融；吳汝君指陳台宗是從涵攝眾生、包舉九界講圓，嚴宗是從絕對義及崇高義下講圓。陳沛然承續此等理路，進而直接批判牟氏之說。<sup>9</sup> 本文處理此同別問題即從檢視牟宗三、陳沛然之說為入路，又分別從圓教的內容與形式上考察。另杜保瑞承方東美之說，亦對牟說多加批判，而其特色在於從儒佛哲學與方法論的特質回應牟說，這涉及對佛教哲學宏觀的理解詮釋，本文避免節外生枝，存而不論。<sup>10</sup>

---

Refer to Mou Zong San: *Buddha-Nature and Prajnaparamita* (Vol. 1) (Taipei: Taiwan Student Bookstore, 1989), page 561. *Nineteen Lectures on Chinese Philosophy* (Taipei: Taiwan Student Bookstore, 1989), Lecture 16: “The Mode of Differentiated and Non-differentiated Teachings and the ‘Expression of the Perfect Teaching’”.

<sup>9</sup> 陳沛然：《華嚴宗之法界觀與判教觀研究》，判教觀與附錄一、二，討論唐君毅、霍韜晦、吳汝君與牟宗三對此問題的不同看法。

Chen Pei Ran: *A Study on the Huayan School's Views on the Dharma Realm and Teachings Classification*, discusses the views on the classification of teachings and includes Appendices I and II, which cover the differing perspectives of Tang Jun Yi, Huo Tao Hui, Wu Ru Jun, and Mou Zong San on this issue.

<sup>10</sup> 杜保瑞：〈牟宗三對華嚴宗詮釋的方法論反思〉，《第三屆華嚴國際研討會論文集（二）》，2012 年。如說：「牟先生特別關切圓不圓的問題，且又有特定標準特定要求於此圓不圓之宗旨中，因此對各家皆有批評，而這正是筆者認為不必要的事……」（頁 55）、「如來藏識為救阿賴耶識弊端而說，只為處理修行者眾生之成佛必然保證性問題而設。」（頁 57）、「因此在談成佛問題時，對眾生所在之世界，是否說明了其存在之根源，這並不是佛教哲學的重要問題。」（頁 59）

Du Bao Rui: “Mou Zong San’s Methodological Reflections on the Huayan School’s Interpretations”, in the *Proceedings of the Third Huayan International Symposium (Volume II)*, 2012. As stated: “Mr. Mou was particularly concerned with the issue of completeness, and he had specific standards and requirements for the completeness of each school’s doctrines, which led to his criticism of various

In modern academia, Mou Zong San (1909-1995), following the Tiantai school's philosophy, examined the form and content of the perfect teaching from a philosophical perspective, bringing the debate to new heights. He argued that the Huayan school's dual coexistence of same and different perfect teachings is an incomplete classification. The truly ultimate perfect teaching can only be one, and the coexistence of the two perfect teachings in the Huayan school is a result of failing to fully assimilate the Tiantai teachings. The true perfect teaching is the Tiantai perfect teaching.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, Tang Jun Yi (1909-1978), continuing the Huayan school's approach of integrating the same (*Lotus Sutra*) and different (*Avatamsaka Sutra*) teachings, proposed that both Tiantai and Huayan have their perfect teachings, each with different standards, pointing out that Tiantai has aspects that do not reach Huayan. Huo Taohui (1940-2018) believed that Tiantai represents ontological integration, while Huayan represents phenomenological integration. Wu Ru Jun stated that Tiantai discusses the perfect teaching from the perspective of encompassing sentient beings and including the nine realms, whereas Huayan discusses it from the perspective of absolute meaning and sublime meaning. Chen Pei Ran further criticized Mou's view, continuing this line of thought.<sup>9</sup> This article addresses the issue of same and different perfect teachings by examining the views of Mou Zong

---

schools. However, the author believes this is unnecessary..." (p. 55), "The Tathagatagarbha consciousness was proposed to address the shortcomings of the Alaya consciousness, specifically to ensure the guaranteed attainment of Buddhahood for practitioners..." (p. 57), "Therefore, when discussing the issue of attaining Buddhahood, whether the origin of existence in the world of sentient beings is explained is not a significant issue in Buddhist philosophy." (p. 59)

San and Chen Pei Ran, investigating the content and form of the perfect teaching. Additionally, Du Bao Rui, following Fang Dong Mei's views, also criticized Mou, with his unique contribution being a response to Mou's views from the characteristics of Confucian-Buddhist philosophy and methodology. This involves a macro understanding and interpretation of Buddhist philosophy, which this article avoids delving into further.<sup>10</sup>

## 二、始教與空有之爭

### II. The Debate of Initial Teaching and Emptiness vs. Existence

在印度佛教史上中觀派與瑜伽派著名的「空有之爭」僵持不下，空有之爭也反應在華嚴宗的判教上，底下先將唐代華嚴諸祖各自特有的空宗與唯識宗的判分，列表如下：

In the history of Indian Buddhism, the famous debate between the Madhyamaka (Middle Way) School and the Yogacara (Consciousness-Only) School on “emptiness vs. existence” remained unresolved. This debate is also reflected in the classification of teachings (判教) in the Huayan School. Below is a table summarizing the unique classifications of the Huayan masters of the Tang Dynasty regarding the Emptiness School and the Consciousness-Only School:

空宗、 唯識宗 Emptiness School, Consciousness- Only School	五教 Five Teachings	十宗 Ten schools	四宗 Four Schools
智儼 Zhiyan	始教：唯識宗、空宗 Initial Teaching: Consciousness-Only School, Emptiness School		
法藏 Fazang	<p>《五教章》： 始教：空宗、（唯識宗） 終教：（唯識宗）、真常教 <i>Five Teachings Chapter</i>: Initial Teaching: Emptiness School, (Consciousness-Only School) Final Teaching: (Consciousness-Only School), True Nature School</p> <p>《十二門論宗致義記》： 始教依機：空宗、唯識宗 始教依理：唯識宗、空宗 <i>Notes on the Meaning of the Twelve Gate Treatise School Intent</i>: Initial Teaching Based on Capacity: Emptiness School, Consciousness-Only School Initial Teaching Based on Principle: Consciousness-Only School, Emptiness School</p>	一切皆空宗、 真德不空宗 （終教攝唯識） Everything Is Emptiness School, True Virtue Is Not Emptiness School (Final Teaching: Embraces Consciousness-Only School)	真空無相宗、 唯識法相宗 True Emptiness Without Characteristics School, Consciousness-Only Dharma Characteristics School

<p>澄觀 Chengguan</p>		<p>三性空有宗 (唯識宗)、 真空絕相宗 (空宗兼頓教) Three Natures Emptiness and Ex- istence School (Consciousness- Only School), True Emptiness Beyond Character- istics School (Emptiness School, also en- compassing Sud- den Teaching)</p>	
<p>宗密 Zongmi</p>	<p>大乘法相教、大乘破相教 Great Vehicle Dharma Charac- teristics Teaching, Great Vehi- cle Breaking Characteristics Teaching</p>		

智儼（602-668）、澄觀（739-839）、宗密（780-840），都將唯識宗置於空宗之下。智儼的理由是：

Zhiyan (602-668), Chengguan (739-839), and Zongmi (780-840) all placed the Consciousness-Only School below the Emptiness School. Zhiyan's reasoning is:

言始門者，如《百法明門論》六種無為，屬一切法攝，人、法二空，方入空攝得知。真如不及二空，二空為上。<sup>11</sup>

When speaking of the Initial Gate, as in the *Treatise on the Hundred Dharma Gates*, the six kinds of non-being belong to the category of all dharmas. The emptiness of both person and dharma is only known through entering the scope of emptiness. True suchness does not reach the level of the two kinds of emptiness; the two emptinesses are superior.<sup>11</sup>

在《百法明門論》中先述一切法，後說空，該論將六種無為法（實即「真如無為」）攝收在一切法中，之後才說人法二空，智儼即從這先有後空的次序指出，唯識教中的真如（真理）尚不及二空，所以這是始入空門。澄觀論空「心境兩亡，直顯體故」<sup>12</sup>，超越唯識宗的境空識有之說。宗密論空則是就破除法相之執來顯空理：「破前大小乘法相之執，密顯後真性空寂之理」<sup>13</sup>。法藏（644-712）之說顯得複雜：

---

<sup>11</sup> 〔唐〕智儼：《華嚴經內章門等雜孔目章》，卷 2，CBETA T45, no. 1870, p. 559a3-5。

[Tang] Zhiyan: *Miscellaneous Chapters and Gate Sections of the Huayan Sutra*, Volume 2. CBETA T45, no. 1870, p. 559a3-5.

<sup>12</sup> 〔唐〕澄觀：《大方廣佛華嚴經疏》，卷 3，CBETA T35, no. 1735, p. 521b29-c1。

[Tang] Chengguan: *Commentary on the Avatamsaka Sutra (Huayan Jing Shu)*, Volume 3. CBETA T35, no. 1735, p. 521b29-c1.

<sup>13</sup> 〔唐〕宗密：《原人論》，CBETA T45, no. 1886, p. 709c9-10。

[Tang] Zongmi: *Treatise on the Origin of Humanity*. CBETA T45, no. 1886, p. 709c9-10.

In the *Treatise on the Hundred Dharma Gates*, all dharmas are first discussed, followed by emptiness. This treatise includes the six kinds of non-action (which are essentially “true suchness non-action”) within the category of all dharmas, and only then discusses the two emptinesses of person and dharma. Zhiyan points out that, in the sequence of first existence and then emptiness, the true suchness (truth) in the Consciousness-Only teachings does not reach the level of the two emptinesses, hence this is the initial entry into the gate of emptiness. Chengguan’s discussion of emptiness—“Both mind and realm disappear, thus directly revealing the essence”<sup>12</sup>—surpasses the Consciousness-Only doctrine’s view of realm-emptiness and consciousness-existence. Zongmi’s discussion of emptiness reveals the principle of emptiness by breaking the attachment to the characteristics of dharma: “Breaking the attachment to the characteristics of both the greater and lesser vehicles, it subtly reveals the principle of true nature as empty and tranquil.”<sup>13</sup> Fazang’s (644-712) explanation seems to be complex:

(1) 《華嚴一乘教義分齊章》（簡稱五教章）：在《五教章》中判始教為空義，而認為唯識宗除了說空（遍計所執性）之外，還說出不空（依他起性、圓成實性），而把唯識宗立宗的根本經典《解深密經》的「三時判」中的後二時（對應於空宗、唯識宗）分別指為始教、終教，而將唯識宗攝歸於終教，唯識宗顯然高於空宗。同書「十宗判」中似缺少唯識宗，其實法藏應即是將唯識宗攝歸在「真德不空宗」（終教）底下。唯識宗被攝在終教邊，但法藏在《五教章》的具體運用上又將空宗、唯識宗都列在始教中，產生以低（空）攝高（有）的不合

理結果，形成空有的上下標準混亂。據《五教章》的判分來看，法藏之意應是將唯識宗兼放在始教與終教，始教以空宗為主，終教顯不空義，以真常教為主，所以法藏在空有的對比上即將唯識宗攝於終教，而在唯識與真常的對比上則將唯識置於始教中。<sup>14</sup>

**(A) *The Teachings Differentiation Chapter of the Avatamsaka One-Vehicle Doctrine*** (commonly known as the *Five Teachings Chapter*): In the *Five Teachings Chapter*, the initial teaching is classified as the doctrine of emptiness, while the Yogacara school, besides discussing emptiness (the nature of imagined conceptions), also explains the non-empty (the nature of dependent origination and the nature of ultimate reality). The fundamental scripture of the Yogacara school, “The Detailed Analysis of the Three Times” in the “Sutra of Elucidating the Profound Secrets,” attributes the latter two periods (corresponding to the doctrines of emptiness and Yogacara) respectively to the initial and final teachings, thus categorizing the Yogacara school under the final teaching, which is evidently superior to the doctrine of emptiness. The same book, the “Ten Schools Classification,” seemingly lacks the Yogacara school. In fact, Fazang includes the Yogacara

---

<sup>14</sup> 《解深密經》之判、十宗見〔唐〕法藏：《華嚴一乘教義分齊章》，CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 481b13、481c9-482a11，另法藏在《十二門論宗致義記》、《起信論義記》、《探玄記》等書中視唯識宗為始教。

“The Interpretation of the *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra* and the Views of the Ten Schools” by [Tang] Fazang: *The Chapter on the Differentiation of the Teachings of the Huayan One Vehicle*, CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 481b13, 481c9-482a11. Additionally, Fazang regarded the Consciousness-Only School as the initial teaching in his works such as *Notes on the Meaning of the Twelve Gate Treatise*, *Notes on the Awakening of Faith*, and *Exploring the Mysteries*.



school under the “School of True Virtue and Non-Emptiness” (final teaching). Although the Yogacara school is categorized under the final teaching, in the practical application of the Five Teachings Chapter, Fazang places both the doctrines of emptiness and Yogacara under the initial teaching. This results in the unreasonable outcome of the lower (emptiness) subsuming the higher (existence), causing a confusion of the hierarchical standards between emptiness and existence. According to the classification in the Five Teachings Chapter, Fazang’s intention seems to place the Yogacara school simultaneously under both the initial and final teachings. The initial teaching is primarily the doctrine of emptiness, while the final teaching reveals the doctrine of non-emptiness, focusing on the doctrine of true permanence. Therefore, in the comparison of emptiness and existence, Fazang categorizes the Yogacara school under the final teaching, while in the comparison of Yogacara and true permanence, he places the Yogacara school under the initial teaching.<sup>14</sup>

(2) 四宗判：法藏在《大乘起信論義記》、《大乘法界無差別論疏》與《入楞伽心玄義》中皆有隨相法執宗、真空無相宗、唯識法相宗、如來藏緣起宗的四宗判，唯識宗在空宗之上，介於空宗與終教之間，基本上符合《五教章》的架構。<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> 四宗判見〔唐〕法藏：《大乘起信論義記》，CBETA T44, no. 1846, no. 243b；《大乘法界無差別論疏》，CBETA T44, no. 1838, p. 61c；《入楞伽心玄義》，CBETA T39, no. 1790, p.426b。

“Views of the Four Schools” by [Tang] Fazang: “otes on the Meaning of the Mahayana Awakening of

**(B) Four Schools Classification:** Fazang, in his works *Notes on the Meaning of the Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, *Commentary on the Theory of Indistinguishability in the Mahayana Dharma Realm*, and *The Profound Meaning of Entering the Lankavatara Sutra*, classifies the teachings into four schools: the School of Following Phenomena and Attachment to Dharma, the School of True Emptiness and No-Phenomena, the School of Consciousness-Only and Dharma Characteristics, and the School of Tathagatagarbha and Dependent Origination. In this classification, the Yogacara school is placed above the Doctrine of Emptiness, situated between the Doctrine of Emptiness and the final teaching. This classification aligns with the structure presented in the *Five Teachings Chapter*.<sup>15</sup>

（3）《十二門論宗致義記》、《華嚴經探玄記》：《五教章》與四宗判中，唯識總在空宗之上。《十二門論宗致義記》與《探玄記》中注重融通印度的空有之爭，大體以契機、契理兩方面安排唯識與空宗，其說唯識宗的三時判，分別攝小乘、大乘（空宗）、兼大小乘（唯識），唯識宗依「攝機」之廣故為了義；空宗的三時判，分別為有、境空心有、空，此乃依「理」的顯了次第。在此，明確依據顯示真理的層級，而將空宗置於唯識宗之上。<sup>16</sup>

---

*Faith*, CBETA T44, no. 1846, p. 243b; *Commentary on the Treatise on the Non-differentiation of the Mahayana Dharma Realm*, CBETA T44, no. 1838, p. 61c; *Profound Meaning of the Heart of the Lankavatara Sutra*, CBETA T39, no. 1790, p. 426b

<sup>16</sup> 參見〔唐〕法藏：《十二門論宗致義記》，CBETA T42, no. 1826, p. 213bc；《探玄記》，CBETA T35, no. 1733, p. 112ab。

(C) *Notes on the Doctrine of the Twelve Gateways and the Exploration of the Avatamsaka Sutra*: In both the *Five Teachings Chapter* and the *Four Schools Classification*, the Yogacara school is consistently placed above the Doctrine of Emptiness. *The Notes on the Doctrine of the Twelve Gateways and the Exploration of the Avatamsaka Sutra* focus on harmonizing the disputes over emptiness and existence from Indian philosophy. Generally, they arrange the Yogacara and the Doctrine of Emptiness based on conditions and principles. In these texts, the Three Periods Classification of the Yogacara school includes Hinayana, Mahayana (Doctrine of Emptiness), and the inclusive teachings of both Hinayana and Mahayana (Yogacara). The Yogacara school is considered ultimate due to its broad applicability. On the other hand, the Three Periods Classification of the Doctrine of Emptiness is divided into existence, the emptiness of external objects with the existence of consciousness, and pure emptiness. This classification is based on the levels of revealed principles. Here, the true hierarchy of truth is clearly demonstrated, placing the Doctrine of Emptiness above the Yogacara school.<sup>16</sup>

《五教章》是法藏早期作品，四宗判符應《五教章》的判教架構，而《十二門論宗致義記》則不同。《十二門論》是空宗的精要論典，可能在註解此論中促使法藏仔細思考空有之爭的問題，並明確依理判攝空宗勝於唯識宗，而不同於早期見解，《宗致義記》、《探玄記》應為法藏較晚的定論。如此，法藏之說便同

---

Refer to Fazang from the Tang Dynasty: *Notes on the Meaning of the Twelve Gate Treatise*, CBETA T42, no. 1826, p. 213bc and *Exploring the Mysteries*, CBETA T35, no. 1733, p. 112ab.

於智儼、澄觀、宗密。一般有說，法藏之時唯識宗大盛，法藏採取「性（真常）相（唯識）融會」，澄觀之時唯識宗沒落，澄觀則「性相決判」，不過據《宗致義記》，其實在真理層級上法藏也已「性相決判」，終究說來華嚴宗是一致認為空宗高於唯識宗，且將唯識宗並於列始教空義中。

The *Five Teachings Chapter* is an early work of Fazang. The Four Schools Classification aligns with the teaching structure of the *Five Teachings Chapter*, but differs from the *Notes on the Doctrine of the Twelve Gateways*. The *Twelve Gateways* is a key treatise of the Doctrine of Emptiness and may have prompted Fazang to carefully consider the dispute between emptiness and existence, ultimately concluding, based on principles, that the Doctrine of Emptiness is superior to the Yogacara school, differing from his earlier views. The *Notes on the Doctrine of the Twelve Gateways* and the *Exploration of the Avatamsaka Sutra* are likely Fazang's later definitive conclusions. Thus, Fazang's stance aligns with those of Zhiyan, Chengguan, and Zongmi. It is generally said that during Fazang's time, the Yogacara school was flourishing, and Fazang adopted a "harmonization of true permanence (Tathagatagarbha) and characteristics (Yogacara)." In Chengguan's time, the Yogacara school was declining, and Chengguan adopted a "distinct judgment of true permanence and characteristics." However, according to the *Notes on the Doctrine of the Twelve Gateways*, Fazang had already made a "distinct judgment of true permanence and characteristics" on the level of truth. Ultimately, the Huayan school consistently considers the Doctrine of Emptiness to be superior to the Yogacara school and classifies the Yogacara school under the doctrine of emptiness of the initial teaching.

陳沛然對於始教分為空有兩宗，提出相當具有意義的問題：

Chen Pei Ran raised a significant issue regarding the division of the initial teaching into two schools, emptiness and existence:

華嚴宗固然能夠將前人之成就吸納於其中，但是，順手拿來而建立之涵攝架構，雖建立了新的模式，但於內涵之判攝上產生毛病。……原初杜順之五教，未有判攝法相唯識宗於其內，及至法藏才把此宗納入「始教」，遂與般若佛教區分出來，般若空宗是「空始教」，法相唯識宗是「相始教」。雖然好像把般若學之後而有的唯識學定了位，此其實亦是不大妥當。……兩宗入路之不同，重點也相異，其實空宗說「空」，唯識宗是說「有」（妙有），此又何能同置於第二重「始教」之中，以「空」作為此層的範疇，則是不恰當了。故此，雖是把唯識宗攝入「始教」，此反而令第二層所言之「空」義變得夾雜不純，又或者從般若學的立場來說，此乃未能給予空宗之共法一個獨立的地位（而天台宗則以「通教」而顯示此獨立的重要性）。<sup>17</sup>

The Huayan school is able to incorporate the achievements of its predecessors, but the structure built with this approach, though establishing a new model, has

---

<sup>17</sup> 陳沛然：《華嚴宗之法界觀與判教觀研究》，頁 90。

Chen Pei Ran: *The Study of the View of the Dharma Realm and the Classification of Teachings in the Huayan School*, page 90.

inherent flaws in its classification. The original Five Teachings of Dushun did not include the Dharma Characteristics (Yogacara) school. It was only Fazang who included this school under the “initial teaching,” distinguishing it from Prajnaparamita Buddhism, where the Prajnaparamita school is termed the “initial teaching of emptiness” and the Dharma Characteristics (Yogacara) school is termed the “initial teaching of characteristics.” While it seems to position Yogacara, which emerged after Prajnaparamita, this is actually not quite appropriate. The paths of the two schools are different, and their focal points also differ. In essence, the Prajnaparamita school speaks of “emptiness,” while the Yogacara school speaks of “existence” (wondrous existence). How can they be placed together in the second level of the “initial teaching”? It is inappropriate to use “emptiness” as the category for this level. Therefore, although the Yogacara school is included under the “initial teaching,” this results in the meaning of “emptiness” in the second level becoming impure. From the standpoint of Prajnaparamita, this fails to give the common law of the Doctrine of Emptiness an independent status (while the Tiantai school uses “universal teaching” to highlight this independence).<sup>17</sup>

引文涉及五個問題，前兩點屬根本問題，後三點是外圍問題：

The citation involves five issues, the first two being fundamental issues, and the last three being peripheral issues:

（1）同居始教：清代華嚴學集大成者續法（1641-1728）對始教定義的闡釋：「大乘始教者，亦名分教。但明諸法皆空，未盡大乘法理，故名為始；但明一切法相，有成佛不成佛，故名為分。」<sup>18</sup> 這其中就含空有兩宗。陳沛然質問空有兩宗：「何能同置於第二重始教之中？」法藏在建構「五教十宗」時說五教十宗是「就法分教」、「以理開宗」，<sup>19</sup> 澄觀解釋：「夫立教必須斷證階位等殊，立宗但明所尚差別。」<sup>20</sup> 這說明了在判教層級的劃分中必須在證真與階位的層次上有所差別，而在相同的教下，其所宗尚的個別真理觀又容許有所差別。若據空有兩宗所說之理，兩宗所指、所證的法性應當相同，空宗所謂緣起法的「空性」，就是唯識宗所說二無我（人法二空）後所見的「非空非有」的「圓成實性」，兩宗對於法性雖然立有不同名稱，但實質上卻是修證相同的緣起法性，因而才可同為始教。其次，空宗在立教精神上突顯般若空理，強調以般若空慧破除執著，判空宗高於有宗；有宗認為空宗以空說一切緣起法，不免一偏，遂只說空是空去執著（遍計所執性），緣起法本身仍是有的（依他起性、圓成實性），判唯識宗高於空宗。兩宗重空重有的理路不同，各有立場，所尚差別，相持不下。由上可知，同為始教，卻分兩宗之理。

<sup>18</sup> 〔清〕續法：《賢首五教儀》，卷2，CBETA X58, no. 1024, p. 646a14-16。

〔Qing〕Xufa: *The Five Teachings of the Wise Head*, Volume 2, CBETA X58, no. 1024, p. 646a14-16.

<sup>19</sup> 〔唐〕法藏：《華嚴一乘教義分齊章》，卷1，CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 481b5-6。

〔Tang〕Fazang: *The Division and Integration of the One Vehicle Teaching of Huayan*, Vol. 1, CBETA T45, no. 1866, p. 481b5-6.

<sup>20</sup> 〔唐〕澄觀：《大方廣佛華嚴經疏》，卷3，CBETA T35, no. 1735, p. 521c17-18。

〔Tang〕Chengguan: *The Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra*, Volume 3, CBETA T35, no. 1735, p. 521c17-18.

**(A) Coexisting in the Initial Teaching:** The Qing Dynasty Huayan scholar Xufa (1641-1728) explained the definition of the initial teaching: “The initial teaching of the Mahayana is also called the partial teaching. It only clarifies that all phenomena are empty, and does not fully explain the Mahayana Dharma principles, hence it is called initial; it only clarifies the characteristics of all phenomena, whether they lead to enlightenment or not, hence it is called partial.”<sup>18</sup> This includes both the emptiness and existence schools. Chen Pei Ran questions the inclusion of both schools: “How can they be placed together in the second level of the initial teaching?” Fazang, in constructing the “Five Teachings and Ten Schools,” said that the Five Teachings and Ten Schools are “classified according to the Dharma” and “founded based on principles.”<sup>19</sup> Chengguan explained: “Establishing teachings must be based on distinct levels of realization and certification, while establishing schools only clarifies the differences in what is valued.”<sup>20</sup> This indicates that in the classification of teaching levels, there must be differences in the levels of verification and position, and within the same teaching, the individual truths valued by each school may differ. According to the principles of the emptiness and existence schools, the nature of the Dharma they refer to and realize should be the same. The emptiness school’s “emptiness nature” of dependent origination is the “ultimate reality nature” seen after the realization of the two non-self (emptiness of person and dharma) in the Yogacara school. Although the two schools have different names for the nature of Dharma, they essentially realize the same nature of dependent origination, and hence can be classified together in the initial teaching. Furthermore, the emptiness school, in its



teaching spirit, emphasizes the prajna principle of emptiness, highlighting the use of prajna wisdom to eliminate attachments, thus ranking the emptiness school above the existence school. The existence school believes that the emptiness school, by speaking of all phenomena as empty, is somewhat biased, and therefore only states that emptiness is used to eliminate attachments (the nature of imagined conceptions), while the phenomena themselves still exist (the nature of dependent origination and ultimate reality), thus ranking the Yogacara school above the emptiness school. The logical paths of emphasizing emptiness and existence are different for the two schools, each having their own standpoint and valued differences, leading to an unresolved contention. From this, it can be seen that although both are classified under the initial teaching, they are divided into two schools.

(2) **始教為空**：陳氏說：「以空作為此層（空有兩宗）的範疇，則是不恰當」。不過，空有兩宗所說的法性（空性、圓成實性）既然實質相同，如此將兩宗並列始教，就證真層級上看應是諦當的，這是基本定調。接下來，為何要以空義為準，不以唯識說的非空非有的法性為準？本文認為，若依印度的空有之爭來看是難有定論的，但在五教判中因為在空有兩宗之上另有真常教，判別空有高低自須依據真常教作為判準，唯識宗從空走向有，如此看來似乎法藏的《五教章》與四宗判是正確的，但其實從真常教看唯識宗說的有，其「有」全屬「空」，並

非真正的真常實有，唯識宗說的有畢竟是空，這點唯識宗未了，<sup>21</sup> 就此，空宗便高於唯識宗，這是依真諦（真理）並非依俗諦（契機、風格等）講。華嚴宗判空宗高於唯識宗，即應從此後設（或隱含）的判準（真常教）去理解，才能充分證成空宗高於唯識宗。

**(B) The Initial Teaching as Emptiness:** Chen said, “It is inappropriate to use emptiness as the category for this level (emptiness and existence schools).” However, since the nature of Dharma (emptiness nature and ultimate reality nature) discussed by both schools is essentially the same, classifying the two schools together under the initial teaching is appropriate in terms of the level of realization. This is the basic conclusion. Next, why use the principle of emptiness as the standard and not the non-empty, non-

---

<sup>21</sup> 唯識宗認為「無性」之說是不了義，如〔唐〕玄奘譯：《成唯識論》卷 9：「即依此前所說三性，立彼後說三種無性，謂即相、生、勝義無性，故佛密意說一切法皆無自性，非性全無。說密意言，顯非了義，謂後二性雖體非無，而有愚夫於彼增益妄執實有我法自性，此即名為遍計所執。為除此執，故佛世尊於有及無總說無性。」CBETA T31, no. 1585, p. 48a3-9。

The Yogācāra school believes that the concept of “no nature” is not a definitive teaching. For example, in [Tang] Xuanzang’s translation of *Cheng Weishi Lun (Vijnaptimatratasiddhi)*, Volume 9, it is stated: “Based on the previously mentioned three natures, the later teaching establishes three kinds of non-natures, namely the non-nature of characteristic (lakṣaṇa), the non-nature of arising (utpatti), and the ultimate non-nature (paramārtha). Therefore, the Buddha, with his profound intention, said that all dharmas have no self-nature, which does not mean that nature is entirely absent. By saying ‘profound intention,’ it reveals that it is not a definitive teaching. Although the latter two natures are not inherently non-existent, foolish people falsely attribute real self-nature to them, which is known as ‘parikalpita.’ To eliminate this attachment, the Buddha, the World-Honored One, in terms of both existence and non-existence, generally taught non-nature.” CBETA T31, no. 1585, p. 48a3-9.

existent nature of Dharma as taught by the Yogacara school? This article argues that, considering the emptiness and existence debate in India, it is difficult to reach a definitive conclusion. However, in the Five Teachings Classification, since there is the True Permanence teaching above the emptiness and existence schools, the classification of the superiority of emptiness and existence must be based on the True Permanence teaching. The Yogacara school transitions from emptiness to existence, making it seem that Fazang's *Five Teachings Chapter* and the Four Schools Classification are correct. However, from the perspective of the True Permanence teaching, the existence discussed by the Yogacara school is entirely empty and not truly real permanence. The existence discussed by the Yogacara school is ultimately empty, a point that the Yogacara school has not yet fully realized.<sup>21</sup> Thus, the emptiness school is superior to the Yogacara school. This is based on the ultimate truth (true principle) rather than conventional truth (conditions, styles, etc.). The Huayan school's classification of the emptiness school as superior to the Yogacara school should be understood from this implicit or underlying standard (the True Permanence teaching) to fully substantiate the superiority of the emptiness school over the Yogacara school.

不過，華嚴宗本身似乎未講得如此明白，如智儼只是從《百法明門論》中先論一切法，後論空，即從這先有後空的次序指出，該教中的真如（真理）尚不及空；法藏、澄觀直就空理肯定心境皆空；宗密講空則是就破除法相之執來顯空理；但其實，唯識宗講空主要是針對實踐進路，不是羅列百法的存有進路，所以

才把空擺在百法之後，先談存有而後講空、無執的進路，並不能依此證成空義高於唯識，兩者進路與對象不同，而若直就空理肯定空宗，這本是唯識宗所反對的，原就無法證成空宗高於唯識。然而，若從真常教看，始教空有兩宗畢竟都是空義，「判」教畢竟並非依各教自說而定，而是依所立的判準來判別諸教。

However, the Huayan school itself does not seem to have made this very clear. For example, Zhiyan first discusses all phenomena in the *Treatise on the Hundred Dharmas and Clear Gates* and then discusses emptiness, indicating that the truth in this teaching is not as high as emptiness based on the sequence of existence followed by emptiness. Fazang and Chengguan directly affirm the emptiness of mind and phenomena based on the principle of emptiness. Zongmi discusses emptiness in terms of eliminating the attachment to phenomena to reveal the principle of emptiness. However, the Yogacara school discusses emptiness primarily from a practical approach, not from an ontological approach of listing the hundred dharmas. Therefore, placing emptiness after the hundred dharmas, first discussing existence and then emptiness and non-attachment, cannot prove the superiority of emptiness over Yogacara. The paths and objects of the two are different. Directly affirming the emptiness school based on the principle of emptiness is fundamentally opposed by the Yogacara school and cannot prove the superiority of the emptiness school over Yogacara. However, from the perspective of the True Permanence teaching, both the emptiness and existence schools in the initial teaching are ultimately teachings of emptiness. The classification of teachings is not determined by the self-assertions of each teaching, but by the criteria established for distinguishing the teachings.

(3) **五教來源**：陳氏說：「（法藏）順手拿來（杜順五教）而建立之涵攝架構，雖建立了新的模式，但於內涵之判攝上產生毛病。……原初杜順之五教，未有判攝法相唯識宗於其內」，其實五教判顯然是智儼創立的，來源並非誤傳為杜順（558-642）所作的《華嚴五教止觀》，<sup>22</sup> 在此誤傳的基礎上，不免又會引生學說發展上的錯誤推論，遂說法藏順手安插唯識宗於五教內，造成系統上的不協調。

**(C) The origins of the Five Teachings:** Chen stated, “Fazang conveniently adopted Dushun’s Five Teachings and established its inclusive framework. Although a new model was established, it led to issues in the internal classification. ... The original Five Teachings of Dushun did not classify the Dharma Characteristics Yogācāra school within it.” In fact, it is clear that the Five Teachings were created by Zhiyan, and the source is mistakenly attributed to Dushun (558-642) as the author of *The Meditation and Contemplation on the Five Teachings of the Huayan*.<sup>22</sup> Based on this misconception, it inevitably leads to erroneous inferences in the development of the doctrine, thus it is said that Fazang conveniently inserted the Yogācāra school into the Five Teachings, causing systematic disharmony.

---

<sup>22</sup> 可參見李治華、陳琪瑛合著：《智儼大師：華嚴宗義創建者》（臺北：經典雜誌，2023 年）中「智儼建立五教判」，頁 244-286。

You can refer to the co-authored work by Lee Chih Hua and Chen Qi Ying, *Zhiyan Master: The Founder of Huayan School Doctrine* (Taipei: Classic Magazine, 2023), in the section “Zhiyan Establishes the Five Teachings Classification,” pages 244-286.

（4）**空有兩宗**：空宗、唯識宗，華嚴學上一般也稱之為「空始教」、「相始教」，當然這是就兩宗重點與對比來說，但陳氏說：「唯識宗是說有（妙有）」，可是「妙有」之說一般是用在真常教（終教以上），唯識宗說的「有」（如百法）以雜染法居多，用「妙有」形容並不妥當。

**(D) The two schools of Emptiness and Existence:** The Emptiness School and the Yogācāra School are generally referred to as the “Initial Teaching of Emptiness” and the “Initial Teaching of Characteristics” in Huayan studies. This distinction highlights the focus and comparison between the two schools. However, Chen stated, “The Yogācāra School speaks of existence (wondrous existence),” but the term “wondrous existence” is usually applied to the True Nature Teaching (above the Final Teaching). The “existence” discussed by the Yogācāra School (such as the Hundred Dharmas) mainly involves defiled dharmas. Therefore, using “wondrous existence” to describe it is not appropriate.

（5）**天台通教**：陳氏說：「天台宗則以通教而顯示此獨立的重要性」，這凸顯空義為通教，確實是天台判教的優點，但其判教中卻並無別開唯識宗的位置。唯識宗於唐代由玄奘（600-664）傳來，隋代天台智顗之時尚未傳入中國，唐代華嚴宗之判則統合了唯識宗與空宗俱為大乘始教。

**(E) The Tiantai General Teaching:** According to Chen, “The Tiantai School uses the General Teaching to highlight this independent significance.” This underscores the concept of emptiness as the General Teaching, which indeed is an advantage of Tiantai’s

doctrinal classification. However, within its classification, the Tiantai School does not separately position the Yogācāra School. The Yogācāra School was introduced to China by Xuanzang (600-664) during the Tang Dynasty, while during the time of Tiantai Zhiyi in the Sui Dynasty, it had not yet been transmitted to China. The doctrinal classification of the Huayan School in the Tang Dynasty integrated both the Yogācāra School and the Emptiness School as the Initial Teaching of Mahayana.

### 三、圓教的內容與形式

#### III. The Content and Form of Perfect Teaching

##### (一) 圓教的義理內容

##### (I) The Theoretical Content of Perfect Teaching

在圓教的內容上，牟宗三在《佛性與般若》中主張華嚴宗立基於唯心思想，因此「所因處拙」、「緣理斷九」。底下先述陳沛然對牟氏的批判，<sup>23</sup>再談本文的看法。

In the content of Perfect Teaching, Mou Zong San, in his book *Buddha Nature and Prajñā*, advocates that the Huayan School is based on idealistic thought, hence it is “inherently clumsy” and “cut off from reasoning.” Below, I will first outline Chen Pei Ran’s critique of Mou’s view,<sup>23</sup> followed by my perspective.

<sup>23</sup> 牟、陳兩說皆參見陳沛然：《華嚴宗之法界觀與判教觀研究》的附錄一，頁 7-10。

Both Mou and Chen’s statements can be found in Chen Pei Ran’s appendix of *The Study of the Huayan Sect’s View of the Dharmadhātu and Doctrinal Classifications*, pages 7-10.

## 1. 所因處拙

### A. The Inherent Clumsiness

牟宗三對「所因處拙」之主要批評在於，唯一之真心隨緣起現之時（因地），有隨不到的可能，因為所隨之緣是敞開的、不決定的，故此隨不隨到只具經驗上之偶然性，而無必然性，所以真心隨緣不能圓具一切法，故華嚴之圓教實有問題。若說還滅後之真心圓滿具足一切法（果地），此難免令人置疑，需以「神通作意」此觀念以補足之，是「有作」之無量。<sup>24</sup> 陳沛然回應：

Mou Zong San's main criticism of "inherent clumsiness" lies in the fact that when the one true mind arises in dependence on conditions (causal stage), there is a possibility of failing to follow these conditions. Since the conditions to be followed are open and indeterminate, whether they are followed or not is only contingent on experiential chance, without necessity. Therefore, the true mind following conditions cannot comprehensively encompass all dharmas, thus the Perfect Teaching of Huayan has real problems. If it is said that the true mind, after cessation, is completely endowed with all dharmas (fruition stage), this inevitably raises doubts, needing the concept of "supernatural intention" to supplement it, which involves the infinite of "action".<sup>24</sup> Chen Pei Ran's response:

---

<sup>24</sup> 牟說參見，牟宗三指導，賴光明：《華嚴宗法界緣起思想之研究》（香港：新亞研究所碩論，1989年），頁91-92。

For further reference on Mou Zong San's views, see: Mou Zong San's guidance, Lai Guang Ming: *Research on the Thought of Huayan School's Dependent Origination of the Dharma Realm* (Hong Kong: New Asia Research Institute, Master's Thesis, 1989), pages 91-92.



(1) 在原則上真心能隨緣而起現一切法，而現實上固然有隨不到的地方，卻不礙在原則上證立真心隨緣之可能，不構成對真心隨緣之原則有所動搖。

(A) In principle, the true mind can arise in dependence on conditions and manifest all dharmas. While in reality, there may be instances where it fails to follow conditions, this does not hinder the establishment of the principle that the true mind can follow conditions, and does not constitute a shake-up of the principle of the true mind following conditions.

(2) 華嚴宗之緣起乃收歸於毗盧遮那佛法身之上，最後仍可透過神通作意而使一切法性起現，作為圓具一切法起現之最後保證。天台宗雖可譏之為「有作」之圓具無量法，以之為「拙」，但華嚴宗卻可不以為然，反而可以覺得「不作」「無作」則不能性起。

(B) The dependent origination of the Huayan School is ultimately attributed to the Dharma body of Vairocana Buddha. In the end, it can still rely on the supernatural intention to make the nature of all dharmas manifest, serving as the final guarantee for the complete manifestation of all dharmas. Although the Tiantai School may criticize it as the “produced” complete manifestation of infinite dharmas and deem it “clumsy,” the Huayan School may not agree and might instead consider that without action or production, it cannot manifest nature.

要之，陳沛然主張真心隨緣起現的原則，有圓具一切法的可能，以及起現上確有偶然之問題，最後以佛神通作意保證真心能普緣、圓具一切法。

In summary, Chen Pei Ran argues that the principle of the true mind arising in dependence on conditions has the possibility of completely manifesting all dharmas, and while there is indeed the issue of contingency in manifestation, ultimately the supernatural intention of the Buddha guarantees that the true mind can universally follow and completely manifest all dharmas.

底下本文評論牟、陳之說，先將諸論點表列如下：

Below, this article critiques the views of Mou and Chen, with the main points listed as follows:

<b>真心隨緣</b> <b>True Mind Following Conditions</b>	<b>經驗界→法界緣起</b> <b>Experiential Realm → Dependent Origination of the Dharma Realm</b>
牟宗三 Mou Zong San	偶然→過去因地經驗映現，需以佛神通作意補足，是有作 Contingency → That Manifestation of Past Causal Experience Requires the Supplement of Supernatural Intention of the Buddha is Action
陳沛然 Chen Pei Ran	偶然→佛神通作意即全然，性起必是有作 Contingency → The Buddha’s Supernatural Intention is Complete, and the Manifestation of Nature Must Be Action
本文 This article	全然，且不作意→十方三世一切法圓融 Complete and Without Supernatural Intention → The Perfect Harmony of All Dharmas in the Ten Directions and Three Times

(1) 真心普緣一切法並不受制於經驗的偶然性：在真心隨緣上，真心是經驗界的本體，萬法唯心造，如海起波，波必在海中，如何可能有隨不到之緣？這是從原則上就肯定真心隨緣必然圓具一切法，雖說落實在經驗界，眾生確有隨不到的問題，那也只能說是妄心隨不到，並非真心隨不到。

**(A) The true heart's universal conditions for all dharmas is not subject to the randomness of experience:** In aligning with the true heart following conditions, it is the essence of the experiential world; all phenomena are mind-made. Like waves arising from the ocean, the waves must be within the ocean. How could there be an affinity that is not reached? This principle asserts that the true heart's alignment inevitably encompasses all phenomena. Although in the experiential world, beings do encounter issues of not aligning, it can only be said that the deluded mind fails to align, not the true heart.

(2) 法界緣起不待神通作意：牟、陳兩說以佛的神通作意來說法界緣起，此作意之說乃依天台判教中別教為「有作無量四諦」之理路，其實並不合於真心隨緣的體用之理與華嚴宗之說。真心自體本具隨緣性，如明鏡本具明現性，本性常如此，不待對緣作意神力變化，如智儼《十玄門》說：

**(B) The arising of conditions in the Dharma realm does not rely on the deliberate effort of supernatural power:** Mou's and Chen's theories discuss the arising of conditions in the Dharma realm through the deliberate effort of the Buddha's supernatural power. This theory is based on the Tiantai teaching classification, which explains the distinctive teachings as the principle of 'having produced innumerable Four Noble Truths.'

However, this does not align with the principles of the true heart's inherent adaptability and the Huayan school's doctrines. The true heart inherently possesses the nature of adaptability, just as a bright mirror inherently possesses clarity. This nature is always so and does not rely on the deliberate effort of supernatural power to change conditions. As Zhiyan stated in *The Ten Mysterious Gates*:

此即是其法界緣起，如智如理實德如此，非即變化對緣方便故說。若是大乘宗所明，即言神力變化，故大小得相入……此宗明相入不論神力，乃言自體常如此者。<sup>25</sup>

This is precisely the arising of conditions in the Dharma realm. The true wisdom and inherent virtues are like this, not spoken of as the convenient method of change regarding conditions. If it is the doctrine of the Mahayana school, it directly mentions the supernatural power of transformation, thereby allowing mutual penetration of the great and the small... This school speaks of mutual penetration without relying on supernatural power, stating that the inherent nature is always so.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> 〔唐〕智儼：《華嚴一乘十玄門》，CBETA T45, no. 1868, p. 516b20-25。

[Tang] Zhiyan: *The Ten Profound Gates of the One Vehicle of the Avatamsaka*, CBETA T45, no. 1868, p. 516b20-25.

其中特別指出「大乘宗」對《華嚴經》的無礙緣起是以神力變化來詮釋，而華嚴宗則不如此說！總之，真心本具隨緣性，必然隨緣，隨緣中又必全然圓具一切法。

It specifically points out that the Mahayana school interprets the non-obstructive arising of conditions in the *Avatamsaka Sutra* through supernatural transformation, while the Huayan school does not explain it this way! In summary, the true heart inherently possesses the nature of adaptability, inevitably follows conditions, and within these conditions, it fully encompasses all phenomena.

(3) 法界緣起非只因地映現：牟宗三從「真心隨緣不能圓具一切法」，進而主張「故華嚴之圓教實有問題」，這是他對《華嚴經》斷章取義所致：

**(C) The arising of conditions in the Dharma realm is not merely a reflection of the causal ground:** Mou Zong San asserts that “the true heart’s adaptability cannot encompass all phenomena,” and thus claims “the perfect teaching of the Huayan school has problems.” This is due to his selective interpretation of the *Avatamsaka Sutra*.

十十法門表主伴具足，圓滿無盡，此並是佛法身法界之法。而此佛法身法界無盡之法亦實是因中歷別緣修所修者倒映於佛法身，並非外此自有一套無盡之法也。亦可說因中無量四諦轉為果地即是佛法身無盡之法。因中普解普行久遠所修者于海印定中一時頓現即成為佛法身上之大緣起陀羅尼，

亦即佛法身上之法界緣起。

而自佛法身言，則曰佛之神力之所示現。

而善財童子亦可仗菩薩神力，依自己之善根力，得見此莊嚴事。就頓現、得見，假說為法界緣起，此緣起即是因地中緣起事之緣起相之倒映。<sup>26</sup>

The Ten Gateways manifest full completeness with principal and supporting factors. They are complete and perfect, and are the Dharma of the Buddha's Dharma body realm. This endless Dharma of the Buddha's Dharma body realm is actually a reflection of what was cultivated through various conditions during the causal stage, and not an independent set of endless Dharma. It can also be said that the countless Four Noble Truths in the causal stage are transformed into the endless Dharma of the Buddha's Dharma body in the result stage. What was universally understood and practiced for a long time during the causal stage is instantly manifested in the oceanic reflection samadhi, becoming the great causation dharani on the Buddha's Dharma body, which is also the arising of conditions in the Dharma realm on the Buddha's Dharma body.

From the perspective of the Buddha's Dharma body, it is said to be manifested by the Buddha's supernatural power.

Additionally, Sudhana can rely on the Bodhisattva's supernatural power and his

---

<sup>26</sup> 牟宗三：《佛性與般若（上）》，頁 494-495、518、497。

Mou Zong San: *Buddha-nature and Prajnaparamita* (Vol. 1),” pp. 494-495, 518, 497.

own virtuous roots to witness this magnificent affair. Speaking of instant manifestation and witnessing, it is hypothetically called the arising of conditions in the Dharma realm, and this arising of conditions is the reflection of the arising condition phenomenon during the causal stage.<sup>26</sup>

牟氏以為「海印三昧」、「法界緣起」只是佛法身以神力隨緣映現過去的因地經驗，如善財童子參訪善知識，善知識為其映現過去的種種修行。但在《華嚴經》中顯示出，佛一念即普入十方三世，並且十方三世所有一切圓融無礙。<sup>27</sup> 圓現十方三世一切法，這才是華嚴宗所指的「海印三昧」、「法界緣起」之境界，並非局限在因地中隨緣偶然經驗的法上，牟氏將法界緣起掛在真心隨緣成妄的偶然經驗之法上講，如此法界緣起當然並不圓足。

Mou believes that “Ocean Seal Samadhi” and “Dependent Origination of the Dharma Realm” are merely the experiences of the Buddha’s Dharma body reflecting past experiences with divine power according to circumstances. For example, when the boy Sudhana

---

<sup>27</sup> 如〔東晉〕佛馱跋陀羅譯：《大方廣佛華嚴經》卷 3：「一一塵中無量身，復現無量莊嚴刹。於一念中皆悉見，是無障礙淨法門。三世所有一切劫，於一念中能悉現。」（CBETA T09, no. 278, p. 407c20-23）另《十玄門》中舉有多例。

This passage, translated by the East Jin monk Buddhabhadra, is from the third volume of the *Great Vast Buddha Flower Adornment Sutra*. It discusses the concept that within every particle of dust, innumerable bodies can be manifested, and countless adorned lands can be seen. In a single thought, all this can be perceived, illustrating the unobstructed pure Dharma gate. Furthermore, all the past, present, and future kalpas can be manifested in a single thought. (CBETA T09, no. 278, p. 407c20-23) The *Ten Profound Gates* presents several examples of this concept.

visited enlightened teachers, the teachers would reflect on various past practices for him. However, the *Huayan Sutra* reveals that with one thought, the Buddha penetrates the past, present, and future in all ten directions, and everything in the past, present, and future in all ten directions is perfectly interpenetrated without obstruction.<sup>27</sup> Manifesting all the Dharma of the past, present, and future in all ten directions is the true state of “Ocean Seal Samadhi” and “Dependent Origination of the Dharma Realm” as referred to in the Huayan School, which is not limited to incidental experiences according to circumstances in the causative stage. Mou’s interpretation of “Dependent Origination of the Dharma Realm” ties it to incidental experiences of the true mind turning into delusion according to circumstances. Hence, his interpretation of “Dependent Origination of the Dharma Realm” is naturally not comprehensive.

## 2. 緣理斷九

### B. Cutting Off the Nine Realms Based on Conditional Principles

牟宗三主張：「緣理斷九」是以真如理為依靠，由此而斷掉九界，此即九界與佛界不能相即，由是無明與法性不能同體、而是異體，由是佛法界只能懸于塔頂之上，本末相隔，不能體同而真正圓融。<sup>28</sup> 陳沛然從兩方面回應：

Mou Zong San advocates that “cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles” relies on the principle of True Suchness. This principle cuts off the nine realms,

---

<sup>28</sup> 參見牟宗三：《佛性與般若（上）》，頁 559-561。

Refer to Mou Zong San: *Buddha-nature and Prajnaparamita* (Vol. 1), pp. 559-561.



meaning that the nine realms and the Buddha realm cannot be identical. As such, ignorance and the nature of Dharma cannot be identical in substance; they are distinct entities. Consequently, the realm of the Buddha can only be suspended at the top of the pagoda, separated from the base, and cannot be identical in substance to achieve true interpenetration and perfect harmony.<sup>28</sup> Chen Pei Ran responds from two aspects:

(1) **主體實踐**：天台宗提出「性惡」的目的在於「但除其病，不除其法」，不除其法而保留其法，作用是以之為教化眾生的工具。華嚴宗之「緣理斷九」，正是從實踐之性起觀點，斷除九界之毛病，以顯清淨純善之法界，並無問題。

(A) **Subjective Practice**: The Tiantai School proposes the concept of “innate evil” with the purpose of “eliminating the illness without eliminating the method.” By not eliminating the method but preserving it, it serves as a tool for educating sentient beings. The “cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles” in the Huayan School, from the perspective of practical nature, eliminates the flaws of the nine realms to reveal the pure and wholesome Dharma realm, which presents no problems.

(2) **十界圓融**：天台宗主張「性具」，染淨善惡乃同體不二。從其客觀存在之性具意義下，以為華嚴「緣理（淨善）」則「斷九」。其實，華嚴宗是在實踐上「緣理斷九」，在客觀存在上九界之染和無明煩惱均可被保存下來，佛界與

九界既是相奪而亦可相即相入，如此「緣理斷九」非但不是貶義，反而顯出天台宗只具「相即」義而未能「由相奪而顯相即相入」義，實可說華嚴宗之圓融較天台為高。

**(B) Interpenetration of the Ten Realms:** The Tiantai School advocates “inherent nature,” where defilement and purity, good and evil are non-dual and of the same essence. From the standpoint of inherent nature in objective existence, the Tiantai School believes that the Huayan School’s “conditional principles (purity and goodness)” leads to “cutting off the nine realms.” In fact, the Huayan School practices “cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles,” while in objective existence, the defilements and ignorance of the nine realms can be preserved. The Buddha realm and the nine realms are both mutually exclusive and can also interpenetrate. Thus, “cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles” is not derogatory but rather highlights the Tiantai School’s limitation of only advocating “interpenetration” without “revealing mutual interpenetration through mutual exclusion.” It can be said that the interpenetration in the Huayan School is more advanced than in the Tiantai School.

底下本文評論，先列表如下（V 表成立，X 不成立）：

Comments on the text below are listed as follows (V indicates valid, X indicates invalid):

緣理斷九 Cutting Off the Nine Realms Based on Conditional Principles	主體實踐 Subjective Practice	十法界 Ten Dharma Realms	本體 Essence
天台知禮 Tiantai School's Zhili			V
牟宗三 Mou Zong San		V	V
陳沛然 Chen Pei Ran	V	X	
本文 This article	V	X	X

(1) 陳沛然從華嚴宗的立場，以主體實踐（除病）與十法界的相奪（染淨）相即（不除法）來詮釋華嚴的「緣理斷九」之風格，分判精到，殊為難得。

(A) Chen Pei Ran, from the perspective of the Huayan School, interprets the style of 'breaking the nine realms through conditioned causality' by applying the principles of subjective practice (removal of illness) as well as the mutual elimination (defilement and purification) and unity (without eliminating the Dharma) within the Ten Dharma Realms. His analysis is precise and remarkable.

(2) 牟宗三誤解法界緣起只是因地偶有之經驗倒映在果地上的境界，若果如此，佛界自是緣理斷九，如其所說：

(B) Mou Zong San misunderstands that the dependent origination of the Dharma realm is merely the occasional experience in the cause realm reflected in the effect realm.

If this were the case, the Buddha realm would naturally break the nine realms through conditioned causality, as he states:

然此卻並非說佛即九法界而為佛，如天臺宗之所說，此乃只是佛心之映現。這些事當初只是隨緣起現，故隨緣還滅成佛後，復透映過來而于佛海印定中映現而為法界緣起也。

However, this does not mean that the Buddha draws near to the Nine Dharma Realms and becomes the Buddha, as the Tiantai School suggests. This is merely a reflection of the Buddha's mind. These matters originally emerged following dependent origination and, after achieving Buddhahood, are reflected back through the ocean-like imprints of the Buddha, manifesting as the dependent origination of the Dharma realm.

蓋此種圓滿無盡無碍只是佛法身的事……因為那是塔頂上的佛法自身之圓滿與圓融，並不預于九法界之權事。<sup>29</sup>

This kind of perfect, boundless, and unobstructed state is solely the affair of the Dharma body of the Buddha... Because it is the perfection and harmony of the Buddha's own Dharma on the top of the tower, it does not involve the provisional matters of the Nine Dharma Realms.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> 牟宗三：《佛性與般若（上）》，頁 528、560。

Mou Zong San: *Buddha-nature and Prajnaparamita* (Vol. 1), p. 528, 560.

(3) 天台宗知禮(960-1028)提出華嚴宗「緣理斷九」，是從「本體」上的「性淨」與「性具」上去分判，牟宗三也承繼此一進路。知禮《十不二門指要鈔》：

(C) Tian Tai School's Zhili (960-1028) proposed the Huayan School's concept of 'breaking the nine realms through conditioned causality' by distinguishing between 'intrinsic purity' and 'intrinsic inclusion' in the essence. Mou Zong San also followed this approach. Zhili's *Essentials of the Ten Non-Duality Gates*:

他宗明一理隨緣作差別法，差別是無明之相，淳一是真如之相，隨緣時則有差別，不隨緣時則無差別，故知一性與無明合，方有差別，正是合義，非體不二，以除無明無差別故。今家明三千之體隨緣起三千之用，不隨緣時三千宛爾，故差別法與體不二，以除無明有差別故。驗他宗明即，即義不成，以彼佛果唯一真如，須破九界差別歸佛界一性故。……故知他宗極圓祇云性起，不云性具。<sup>30</sup>

Other schools clarify a single principle that, following conditions, manifests as differentiated phenomena. Differentiation is the appearance of ignorance, while

<sup>30</sup> [宋]知禮：《十不二門指要鈔》，卷2，CBETA T46, no. 1928, p. 715b14-c2。

[Song] Zhili: 'Essentials of the Ten Non-Duality Gates,' Volume 2, CBETA T46, no. 1928, p. 715b14-c2.

purity is the appearance of true suchness. When following conditions, there is differentiation; when not following conditions, there is no differentiation. Therefore, it is understood that the unity of one nature and ignorance results in differentiation, which is the meaning of integration, not the non-duality of the essence, because removing ignorance results in no differentiation. Now, our school clarifies that the essence of the three thousand worlds arises following conditions, and the function of the three thousand worlds is manifested. When not following conditions, the three thousand remain as they are. Therefore, the differentiated phenomena and the essence are non-dual because removing ignorance results in differentiation. Verification of other schools' clarification of the concept shows that the principle of unity does not hold, as their Buddha fruit is a single true suchness, requiring the breaking of differentiation among the nine realms to return to the one nature of the Buddha realm. Hence, it is known that the extreme completeness of other schools refers to the arising of nature only, not the inclusion of nature.<sup>30</sup>

本文另舉譬來闡釋引文之意：性淨是本性清淨，如明鏡；九法界的差別全在無明，如鏡中萬象，萬象的差別性並不屬於明鏡的體性。性具則是本性具足一切差別性，差別的根源在於本性，而非無明上，如陽光透過稜鏡產生七彩，七彩的差別性原屬陽光的體性，不屬於稜鏡。性淨本身斷絕差別，所以，只有性具才能真正成立現象（差別）與本體的相即。如上，性淨與性具，從本體上看，確實不同。不過，若細察佛教真常本體論的說路，應是從作用（表現於現象上）說本

體，加於本體上的名義其實都是假立（假名）的，並非從本體自身上去界定本體的體性。<sup>31</sup> 所以，性淨和性具在本體論的規定上縱然不同，但以華嚴圓教及天台圓教來說，其本性緣起所呈現出的現象界卻毫無差別，一樣都是法法本來圓融無礙，所以本體論的差別只能是講法進路的不同，實質相同，正如澄觀說：

This article further illustrates the meaning of the quotation with an analogy: intrinsic purity is like a bright mirror; the distinctions among the Nine Dharma Realms lie in ignorance, like myriad reflections in a mirror. The differences in reflections do not belong to the mirror's nature. Intrinsic inclusion, however, means that the essence contains all distinctions within itself, with the root of differentiation in the essence rather than ignorance, like sunlight passing through a prism producing a spectrum. The distinctions in the spectrum belong to the nature of sunlight, not the prism. Intrinsic purity itself eliminates distinctions, so only intrinsic inclusion can truly establish the mutual integration of

---

<sup>31</sup> 如馬鳴菩薩造，〔梁〕真諦譯《大乘起信論》：「當知染法、淨法皆悉相待，無有自相可說。是故一切法，從本來已，非色非心，非智非識，非有非無，畢竟不可說相。而有言說者，當知如來善巧方便，假以言說，引導眾生，其旨趣者，皆為離念，歸於真如。」（CBETA T32, no. 1666, p. 580b8-13）或參見拙著〈佛教哲學的語言型態〉，《正觀》，第8期，1999年。

As composed by Bodhisattva Asvaghosa and translated by [Liang] Paramartha in the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*: 'You should know that both defiled and pure dharmas mutually depend on each other, and there is no independent nature to speak of. Therefore, all dharmas, from the very beginning, are neither form nor mind, neither wisdom nor consciousness, neither existent nor non-existent, ultimately indescribable in nature. However, when words are spoken, you should know that the Tathagata, with skillful means, uses provisional words to guide sentient beings, with the aim of leading them away from thoughts and returning to true suchness.' (CBETA T32, no. 1666, p. 580b8-13) You may also refer to my work "The Linguistic Form of Buddhist Philosophy" in *Zhengguan*, Issue 8, 1999.

phenomena (differences) and essence. As stated above, intrinsic purity and intrinsic inclusion are indeed different from the perspective of essence. However, when examining the approach of Buddhist metaphysics, it is from the perspective of function (manifested in phenomena) that essence is discussed. The names applied to the essence are actually nominal (provisional), and not from the essence itself that the nature of the essence is defined.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, even though intrinsic purity and intrinsic inclusion have different ontological definitions, from the perspective of Huayan's complete teaching and Tiantai's complete teaching, the phenomenal world manifested by their intrinsic nature of dependent origination shows no difference. Both inherently exhibit perfect harmony and unobstructedness of all dharmas. Hence, the ontological differences only reflect different approaches, but are essentially the same, as Chengguan stated:

云何深玄？欲言其有，同如絕相。欲言其無，幽靈不竭。欲言其染，萬累斯亡。欲言其淨，不斷性惡。……口欲辯而辭喪，心將緣而慮亡，亦猶果分不可說故。是知佛心即有即無……一一皆爾，圓融無礙，則令上諸義各隨一理不爽玄宗。<sup>32</sup>

What is the deep mystery? If one tries to speak of its existence, it is like absolute non-appearance. If one tries to speak of its non-existence, it is eternally subtle and

---

<sup>32</sup> [唐]澄觀：《大方廣佛華嚴經疏》，卷 49，CBETA T35, no. 1735, p. 878b18-29。

[Tang] Chengguan: *Commentary on the Avatamsaka Sutra*, Volume 49, CBETA T35, no. 1735, p. 878b18-29.



inexhaustible. If one tries to speak of its defilement, all burdens are eradicated. If one tries to speak of its purity, inherent evil is not severed. The mouth wishes to argue but loses its words; the mind seeks to consider but loses its thoughts, just as the fruit's division cannot be expressed. Thus, it is known that the Buddha's mind is both existent and non-existent... everything is like this, perfect and unobstructed, leading the above principles each to follow a single logic without deviating from the profound doctrine.<sup>32</sup>

澄觀從佛體性的實不可說而將染淨兩說融通。反之，堅持性淨與性具的本體論差異不融，並不合於佛家真常本體論的說路，知禮的弟子仁岳（992-1064）就批評知禮，「便認實相（本體）須存三千，而不知是心性所具俗諦（現象）之法……智者云：『第一義中，一法不可得，況三千法？』」<sup>33</sup>，定謂「（一念）心（性）具萬法」或「心無萬法」，難免墮於外道「因中計果」、「因中無果」的思維方式。<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> 〔宋〕可觀：《山家義苑》，卷 1，「辨岳師〈三千書〉」，CBETA X57, no. 956, pp. 75c20-76c8。

[Song] Keguan: Collection of Doctrines of the Mountain Family, Vol. 1, 'Discernment of Master Yue's "Three Thousand Writings" CBETA X57, no. 956, pp. 75c20-76c8.

<sup>34</sup> 〔隋〕灌頂《觀心論疏》卷 2：「若定謂一念之心具含萬法是如來藏者，即同迦毘羅外道，因中先有果計。若定謂心無萬法、修之方有者，即同毘樓僧迦外道，因中無果之計。若定謂心亦具亦不具，即同勒沙婆外道，因中亦有果亦無果之計。六師各有定執，乃至單四句複四句、具足之見等，並是外道所計。推准可知。所以聞心具萬法是如來藏，即謂如囊之盛沙，聞心無萬法即謂之如兔角，斯並永執邪見之人，何可論道者乎。」（CBETA T46, no. 1921, p. 597b28-c8）〔宋〕仁岳《十不二門文心解》，亦引用之。（CBETA X56, no. 928, pp. 354c20-355a1）

Chengguan harmonizes the notions of impurity and purity from the perspective of the ineffability of the Buddha-nature. On the contrary, insisting on the ontological differences between innate purity and inherent completeness without harmonization does not align with the Buddha's true ontological discourse. Zhili's disciple Renyue (992-1064) criticized Zhili, saying, "He believed that the true nature (essence) must contain three thousand phenomena, without realizing that these are phenomena of the conventional truth inherent in the mind... A wise person said: 'In the ultimate truth, not even one phenomenon can be obtained, let alone three thousand?'"<sup>33</sup> It is believed that 'the mind (essence) in a single thought contains all phenomena' or 'the mind contains no phenomena,' which inevitably falls into the Non-Buddhist way of thinking, where 'the effect is calculated in the cause' or 'there is no effect in the cause.'<sup>34</sup>

---

[Sui] Guanding: *Commentary on the Contemplation of the Mind*, Volume 2: 'If it is definitively asserted that the mind in a single thought contains all dharmas as the Tathagatagarbha, it is akin to the external path of Kapila, where the effect is calculated in the cause. If it is definitively asserted that the mind contains no dharmas and only through cultivation do they exist, it is akin to the external path of Purana Kassapa, where there is no effect in the cause. If it is definitively asserted that the mind both contains and does not contain dharmas, it is akin to the external path of Leśava, where there is both effect and no effect in the cause. Each of the six masters has a definitive attachment, including the single four propositions, the combined four propositions, and the comprehensive views, all of which are the calculations of external paths. This can be deduced. Therefore, hearing that the mind contains all dharmas as the Tathagatagarbha is like a bag containing sand; hearing that the mind contains no dharmas is like a rabbit's horn. Both are forever attached to false views, so how can one discuss the Way with them?' (CBETA T46, no. 1921, p. 597b28-c8) [Song] Ren Yue, *Explanation of the Ten Non-Dual Gates*, also quotes this. (CBETA X56, no. 928, pp. 354c20-355a1)

## （二）圓教的表述形式

### （II）Expression of the Perfect Teaching

牟宗三於《中國哲學十九講》的第十六講，從佛家語言模式中提出「非分別說」作為表達「圓教」的模式，深刻發掘出圓教語言哲學的特殊性。以下本文先闡釋牟氏之說，之後提出本文的看法。<sup>35</sup>

Mou Zong San, in the sixteenth lecture of *Nineteen Lectures on Chinese Philosophy*, proposes the “Non-differentiation Theory” from the Buddhist language model as a way to express the “Perfect Teaching,” deeply exploring the uniqueness of the philosophy of language in Perfect Teaching. This article first explains Mou’s theory and then presents the author’s own views.<sup>35</sup>

#### 1. 牟宗三：表示圓教，必須運用非分別說

##### A. Mou Zong San: To express the Perfect Teaching, one must use the Non-differentiation Theory.

「是什麼」，是分別說的方式。一用分別的方式，便是個特定的系統，就有一個系統的限定相。因此，分別說都是可爭法，各持己見而自圓其說，諸說皆無邏輯的必然性。相對於無爭的道理本身，分別說都只是權法、方便法。

<sup>35</sup> 「圓教的表述形式」節錄修訂自拙著〈佛教哲學的語言型態〉，《正觀》，第8期。

“Expression of the Perfect Teaching” is excerpted and revised from my humble work “The Language Patterns of Buddhist Philosophy,” published in *Zhengguan*, Issue No. 8.

“What is it” is the way of differentiation. Once differentiation is used, it becomes a specific system with limitations. Therefore, differentiation theories are all disputable, each holding its own view and self-justifying, with no logical necessity in their arguments. In contrast to the principle of non-disputation, differentiation theories are merely expedient methods.

非分別說是以手指月，要人照道理或意境本身如實地看，它就是一種呈現，一種展示。用非分別的方式把道理、意境呈顯出來，表示出這些道理、意境，不是用概念或分析可以講的；其中若兼用概念或分析來講，也只是一個線索，一個引路。如此所說之法即是不爭法，是無可爭辯的，所以有邏輯的必然性，因此它就不是權說的方便法。

The Non-differentiation Theory is like pointing to the moon with a finger, urging people to see the principle or the realm itself as it truly is. It is a form of presentation, an exhibition. Using the non-differentiation approach to reveal the principles or realms shows that these principles or realms cannot be expressed through concepts or analysis. If concepts or analysis are used, they only serve as a clue or guide. Thus, this method is an indisputable method, logically necessary, and therefore not an expedient method.

《法華經》的主要問題是就著佛的本懷「開權顯實」。凡是分別說的都是權，而非分別說才是實。所以此經未說佛法是什麼，而呈現行住坐臥等一切法都

是佛法。因此天台宗講《法華經》是佛教的大綱，照現在的辭語，這就是屬於第二層序，其它分別說的法，則屬第一層序。

The main issue of the *Lotus Sutra* is to reveal the true intent of the Buddha, “Opening the Provisional to Reveal the Real.” All differentiation theories are provisional, while the non-differentiation theory is the real. Therefore, this sutra does not state what the Buddha Dharma is, but rather presents all activities such as walking, standing, sitting, and lying down as the Buddha Dharma. Thus, the Tiantai school regards the *Lotus Sutra* as the outline of Buddhism. According to modern terminology, this belongs to the second level sequence, while other differentiation theories belong to the first level sequence.

從一切法的存在上說圓教，是圓教的本質意義，這不是《般若經》作用的圓，而是存有論的圓。從此意義，我們可以看出空宗（般若經）與天台宗（法華經）之不同，也顯出天台宗判教的意義來。

Speaking of the Perfect Teaching from the existence of all dharmas is the essential meaning of the Perfect Teaching. This is not the perfection of the function of the *Prajnaparamita Sutra*, but the perfection of the ontology of the Perfect Teaching. From this perspective, we can see the difference between the Emptiness school (*Prajnaparamita Sutra*) and the Tiantai school (*Lotus Sutra*), and also reveal the significance of the Tiantai school's classification of teachings.

圓教所以能稱為圓教，是從表達涅槃的方式圓不圓來判定，不是從涅槃本身說，於此是各圓其圓，唯證相應。所以任何透過分別說表達涅槃本身的方式，都不符合圓教的「形式」<sup>36</sup> 意義。圓教必須表達實法，不可爭而有邏輯的必然性。所以，《般若經》在作用上的不爭法，加上《法華經》在存有上的不爭法，一經一緯，兩個不爭法合在一起就是圓教。

The Perfect Teaching is called Perfect Teaching because it is judged based on how perfectly it expresses Nirvana, not on Nirvana itself. Here, each person achieves their own perfection through realization. Therefore, any way of expressing Nirvana through differentiation does not align with the “formal”<sup>36</sup> meaning of Perfect Teaching. Perfect Teaching must express real principles that are undisputable and logically necessary. Thus, the non-disputational method in the *Prajnaparamita Sutra*, combined with the non-disputational method in the *Lotus Sutra* in terms of existence, forms the Perfect Teaching. One is the principle, and the other is the method, together creating the Perfect Teaching.

---

<sup>36</sup> 牟氏原文無「形式」一詞，為本文加上的解釋。

The term “formal” does not appear in Mou’s original text; it was added as an explanation in this article.

## 2. 圓教必須具足非分別說與分別說

### B. The Perfect Teaching must include both the Non-differentiation Theory and the Differentiation Theory

本文認為非分別說可分遮詮及顯詮兩種，《般若經》的「不二說」乃遮詮思辨、執著的指意，《法華經》的「唯一說」（唯有一佛乘）乃表詮實存真理一致的指意，而遮詮、表詮一體兩面，一經一緯。

This article proposes that the Non-differentiation Theory can be divided into two types: negation and affirmation. The “Theory of Non-duality” in the *Prajnaparamita Sutra* negates conceptualization and attachment, while the “One and Only Theory” (the One Buddha Vehicle) in the *Lotus Sutra* affirms the consistent truth of real existence. Negation and affirmation are two sides of the same coin, one being the principle and the other the method.

完整表達「圓教」，一方面必須使用「非分別說」，以表達圓教的形式意義，另一方面尚須運用「分別說」，以說明不二、唯一之後，「一歸何處」。畢竟在「非分別說」的經緯之內，必然包裹著「分別說」的實際義理。

To fully express the “Perfect Teaching,” one must use the “Non-differentiation Theory” to convey its formal meaning, and also employ the “Differentiation Theory” to explain, after non-duality and uniqueness, “where does one return to.” Ultimately, within the framework of the “Non-differentiation Theory,” the practical meaning of the “Differentiation Theory” is inevitably encompassed.

圓教的形式意義（非分別說的不可爭）與內容意義（分別說的可爭）不可偏廢，形式意義只是純粹方法學的規定，呈現圓教（以一最高真理）圓滿地統攝、彰顯一切真理，而一歸何處即屬（分別說的）不共內容。圓教必須同時具足形式與內容，是分析性的一體兩面。在圓教上，《法華經》正是華嚴宗所謂「同教一乘圓教」，是形式上的廣而高，《華嚴經》則是「別教一乘圓教」，是內容上的至高圓融，同別兩圓是一體兩面，《華嚴經》頓陳一乘，如日出先照高山，《法華經》會三歸一，如日沒還照高山，始終相生，成一圓周。因此，華嚴宗說圓教兼備「同教一乘」與「別教一乘」是諦當的。但牟氏批評此同別兩圓並存之說：

The formal meaning of Perfect Teaching (undisputable aspect of Non-differentiation Theory) and the content meaning (disputable aspect of Differentiation Theory) must not be neglected. The formal meaning is purely a methodological stipulation, presenting the Perfect Teaching (as the supreme truth) comprehensively and manifesting all truths, while “where one returns to” belongs to the unique content of the Differentiation Theory. Perfect Teaching must include both form and content, representing two sides of the same coin in an analytical sense. In terms of Perfect Teaching, the *Lotus Sutra* is what the Huayan School calls the “Perfect Teaching of the One Vehicle,” which is formally broad and high. The *Avatamsaka Sutra*, on the other hand, is the “Separate Teaching of the One Vehicle,” which is the highest integration in terms of content. The integration of these two aspects represents two sides of the same coin: the *Avatamsaka Sutra* presents the One Vehicle suddenly, like the sun rising and first shining on the high mountains, while the *Lotus Sutra* unifies the three into one, like the sun setting and still shining on the high



mountains, forming a perfect cycle. Thus, the Huayan School's assertion that Perfect Teaching combines both the "One Vehicle of the Same Teaching" and the "One Vehicle of the Separate Teaching" is accurate. However, Mou criticizes the coexistence of these two aspects:

若謂賢首立教，本是兩圓並存，依《華嚴》說別教圓教，依《法華》說同教圓教，未曾單指《華嚴》為圓也。若如此，則兩圓非一，而其關係又不明，即無終極的圓，如是，則兩圓皆復圓而不圓矣。<sup>37</sup>

If one claims that the establishment of teachings by Xianshou originally involves the coexistence of the two Perfect Teachings—relying on the *Avatamsaka Sutra* to speak of the Separate Teaching of the Perfect Teaching, and on the *Lotus Sutra* to speak of the Same Teaching of the Perfect Teaching—then it was never solely referring to the *Avatamsaka Sutra* as the Perfect Teaching. If this is the case, the two Perfect Teachings are not one, and their relationship remains unclear, leading to the absence of an ultimate perfection. Consequently, both Perfect Teachings end up being perfect yet not perfect.<sup>37</sup>

牟氏以為，華嚴宗的圓教同別兩圓並存具有雙重標準，關係不明，因此判教不妥不盡。於此，本文已指出，圓教必須同時具足形式（同）與內容（別），是分析

<sup>37</sup> 牟宗三：《佛性與般若（上）》，頁 565。

Mou Zong San: *Buddha-nature and Prajnaparamita* (Vol. 1), p. 565.

性的一體兩面，同別的關係很清楚，只是古德未用這些抽象術語表達罷了。在此架構下，同別各有其圓：

Mou believes that the coexistence of the two Perfect Teachings, the Same and the Separate, in the Huayan School has a double standard, with an unclear relationship, making their classification of teachings inappropriate and incomplete. In this regard, this article has pointed out that the Perfect Teaching must simultaneously include form (Same) and content (Separate), representing two sides of the same coin analytically. The relationship between the Same and the Separate is clear, though ancient masters did not use these abstract terms to express it. Within this framework, each has its own perfection:

從內容、義理與境界上說，華嚴別教是究竟的圓教。南北朝諸師、華嚴諸祖等尊崇《華嚴》圓教，大抵是據此而論，而天台宗、牟氏基本上不由此進路界定圓教。

From the perspectives of content, principles, and realms, the Separate Teaching of Huayan is the ultimate Perfect Teaching. The reverence for the Perfect Teaching of Huayan by the masters of the Northern and Southern Dynasties and the patriarchs of the Huayan School is generally based on this. However, the Tiantai School and Mou do not primarily use this approach to define the Perfect Teaching.

從形式意義、教化方便上說，法華同教是究竟的圓教。天台宗、牟氏以《法華經》的「會三歸一」、「開權顯實」、「發迹顯本」為純圓，批評《華嚴經》

「曲逕紆迴，所因處拙」、「緣理斷九」等，揚《法華》抑《華嚴》，牟氏又分辨圓教的形式規範，這些都應以此進路作為標準，若非以此方便進路作為標準，而認為「所因處拙」（唯心）、「緣理斷九」（佛界與無明界的斷絕）是存在上的片面與隔絕，這是未能掌握到（華嚴宗所闡釋的）真心體性與圓融的意義。又呂澂（1896-1989）說：「以圓教屬華嚴，和佛說法的次第以及佛教流行的先後（傳說《華嚴》為佛成道後最初的說法，而弘傳流布則在後），都配合不攏來，倒不如天台家以《法華》《涅槃》為最後佛說，更來得自然。」<sup>38</sup> 其意應在說，圓教不當是佛最初的說法，圓教也不當被密藏龍宮，後才被取出，此說也應從圓教（同教）的教化意義下來理解。

From the perspective of formal meaning and skillful means of teaching, the Perfect Teaching of the One Vehicle in the *Lotus Sutra* is the ultimate Perfect Teaching. The Tiantai School and Mou regard the principles of “uniting the three into one,” “opening the provisional to reveal the real,” and “manifesting the original through the traces” in the *Lotus Sutra* as purely perfect. They criticize the *Avatamsaka Sutra* as being “twisting and turning paths, flaws originating from their causes,” and “cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles,” thus promoting the *Lotus Sutra* while downplaying the *Avatamsaka Sutra*. Mou also differentiates the formal norms of Perfect Teaching, stating that these principles should be the standard approach. Otherwise, considering concepts such

<sup>38</sup> 呂澂：《中國佛學思想概論》（臺北：天華出版公司，1988年），頁396。

Lü Cheng: “Outline of Chinese Buddhist Thought” (Taipei: Tianhua Publishing Company, 1988), page 396.

as “flaws originating from their causes” (consciousness-only) and “cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles” (disconnect between the Buddha realm and the realm of ignorance) as one-sided and isolating in existence fails to grasp the true nature and harmonious meaning conveyed by the Huayan School. Furthermore, Lü Cheng (1896-1989) said: “Attributing the Perfect Teaching to the Huayan School doesn’t align with the sequence of the Buddha’s teachings and the chronological spread of Buddhism. The legend says that the *Avatamsaka Sutra* was the first teaching after the Buddha attained enlightenment but was propagated later. It seems more natural for the Tiantai School to regard the *Lotus Sutra* and *Nirvana Sutra* as the Buddha’s final teachings.”<sup>38</sup> The intention behind this statement is that the Perfect Teaching shouldn’t be considered the Buddha’s earliest teaching, nor should it be hidden in the Dragon Palace to be revealed later. This interpretation should be understood from the perspective of the educational significance of the Perfect Teaching (the Same Teaching).

本文主張，圓教必須充分表達出同別兩面，方為致極圓滿。華嚴宗在天台之後，看到圓教的一體兩面，將南北朝諸師以來尊崇的《華嚴》圓教與天台發揮的《法華》圓教，兩經以同別兩教並列圓教，雙揚不抑，各有所圓，正是消化了天台，因此，華嚴宗將圓教下開同別二門，諦當合理，並無問題，非如牟氏指為判教不盡，不能消化天台，未有終極的一圓。反之，牟氏對華嚴宗的批評，既誤解了華嚴的核心思想法界緣起，又忽略了佛教本體論的說路以及圓教應具有形式與內容的一體兩面性。

This article argues that the Perfect Teaching must fully express both the Same and Separate aspects to achieve ultimate perfection. The Huayan School, following the Tiantai, recognized the two sides of the Perfect Teaching. It placed the Perfect Teaching of the *Avatamsaka Sutra*, revered by masters of the Northern and Southern Dynasties, alongside the Perfect Teaching of the *Lotus Sutra* developed by Tiantai. Both scriptures were included as equal Perfect Teachings, each being promoted without suppressing the other, achieving their own completeness. This integration reflects the digestion of Tiantai teachings. Therefore, the Huayan School's categorization of the Perfect Teaching into the Two Gates of the Same and Separate is appropriate and reasonable, contrary to Mou's criticism that this classification is incomplete and fails to digest Tiantai, lacking an ultimate perfection. On the contrary, Mou's criticism of the Huayan School not only misunderstands the core concept of Dependent Origination in the Dharma Realm but also overlooks the ontological discourse of Buddhism and the dual aspects of form and content that the Perfect Teaching should encompass.

#### 四、結論

#### IV. Conclusion

在始教上，空有兩宗所說的緣起法性（空性、圓成實性）實質相同，並列始教。空有兩宗孰高，若依印度的空有之爭難有定論，但在五教判中因為在空有兩宗之上另有真常教，判別空有高低自須再依真常教作為判準，從真常教看唯識宗

說的有，其「有」全屬「空」，並非真正的真常實有，唯識宗說的有畢竟是空，這點唯識宗未了，所以空宗高於唯識宗。華嚴宗判空宗高於唯識宗，應是隱含了這後設的判準（真常教），雖然華嚴宗本身似未講得如此明白。唯識宗於唐代由玄奘傳來，隋代天台智顗之時尚未傳入中國，所以天台判教中並無別開唯識宗的位置，唐代華嚴宗之判則統合了唯識宗與空宗俱為大乘始教。

In the initial teachings, the principles of Dependent Origination (emptiness and perfectly fulfilled nature) as explained by the Two Schools of Emptiness and Existence are essentially the same and are classified as initial teachings. Whether the Two Schools of Emptiness and Existence are superior cannot be conclusively determined based on their debates in India. However, in the five classifications of teachings, there is the True Eternal Teaching above the Two Schools of Emptiness and Existence. To determine the superiority of these two schools, one must rely on the True Eternal Teaching. From the perspective of the True Eternal Teaching, the “existence” asserted by the Consciousness-Only School is entirely “empty” and not truly real eternal existence. The Consciousness-Only School’s assertion of existence is ultimately empty, a point not fully realized by the school itself, hence the Emptiness School is considered superior to the Consciousness-Only School. The Huayan School’s classification of the Emptiness School as superior to the Consciousness-Only School likely implies this higher criterion (the True Eternal Teaching), though the Huayan School may not explicitly state it this clearly. The Consciousness-Only School was introduced to China during the Tang Dynasty by Xuanzang. During the Sui Dynasty, when Tiantai Zhiyi was active, it had not yet been introduced to China, hence the Tiantai

classification does not separate the position of the Consciousness-Only School. In contrast, the Tang Dynasty Huayan School's classification integrates both the Consciousness-Only School and the Emptiness School as initial Mahayana teachings.

在圓教上：（1）華嚴宗的法界緣起並無「所因（唯心）處拙」（天台別教）的問題，因為真心本然普緣一切法，並不受制於經驗的偶然性，法界緣起不只是因地的映現（非「有量」），不待神通作意（非「有作」）。（2）法界緣起並非「緣理斷九」，緣理斷九原是從「本體」上的「性淨」與「性具」上去分判，性淨本身斷絕差別，性具則含攝差別，性淨與性具從本體論上看，確實不同。不過佛教真常本體論的說路，應是從作用（表現於現象上）說本體，加於本體上的名義其實都是假立（假名）的，並非從本體自身上去界定本體的體性。性淨和性具在本體論的規定上縱然不同，但以華嚴圓教及天台圓教來說，其法性緣起呈現出的現象界卻毫無差別，一樣都是法法本來圓融無礙，所以本體論的差別只能是講法進路的不同，實質相同，如澄觀即從佛體性的實不可說而將染淨兩說融通。反之，若堅持性淨與性具的本體論差異不融，這並不合於佛家真常本體論的說路，而是以概念規制本體的方式，落於佛教所批判的「因中計果」、「因中無果」的外道之論。（3）圓教必須充分表達出同別兩面，方為致極圓滿。華嚴宗在天台之後，看到圓教的一體兩面，將南北朝以來諸師尊崇的《華嚴》圓教與天台發揮的《法華》圓教，兩經分以別同教並列圓教，雙揚不抑，各有所圓，諦當合理，並無判教不盡、不決的問題。相對來說，《華嚴經》的佛境界（別）是

理想的（正），《法華經》的方便同歸與天台宗的色香中道是現實的（反），華嚴宗吸收了天台注重現實的精神，依《華嚴經》展開現象絕對論，又並列同別二圓，則兼顧了理想與現實（合）。

In terms of the Perfect Teaching: (1) The Huayan School's concept of Dependent Origination in the Dharma Realm does not have the problem of "flaws originating from their causes (consciousness-only)" (Tiantai Separate Teaching), because the true mind inherently relates to all dharmas and is not subject to empirical contingency. Dependent Origination in the Dharma Realm is not just a manifestation of the cause stage (not "quantifiable") and does not require the intentional effort of supernatural powers (not "constructed"). (2) Dependent Origination in the Dharma Realm does not involve "cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles." "Cutting off the nine realms based on conditional principles" originally refers to the distinction between "pure nature" and "inclusive nature" from the ontological perspective. Pure nature itself negates differences, while inclusive nature encompasses differences. From the ontological viewpoint, pure nature and inclusive nature are indeed different. However, the Buddhist ontology should be explained from the perspective of function (manifestation in phenomena), and the names assigned to the ontology are provisional (nominal) and do not define the inherent nature of the ontology itself. Although pure nature and inclusive nature differ in ontological stipulations, both Huayan's Perfect Teaching and Tiantai's Perfect Teaching show that the phenomenal realm manifested by their Dependent Origination is identical, with all phenomena inherently harmonious and unobstructed. Thus, the ontological differences



are merely different approaches to explanation, with essentially the same nature. As Chengguan demonstrated, he integrated the two teachings of defilement and purity through the ineffable nature of the Buddha's true essence. Conversely, insisting on the unintegrated ontological differences between pure nature and inclusive nature does not align with the Buddhist True Eternal Ontology but falls into the conceptual regulation of ontology criticized by Buddhism, such as "result calculated in the cause" and "no result in the cause" theories. (3) The Perfect Teaching must fully express both the Same and Separate aspects to achieve ultimate perfection. The Huayan School, after Tiantai, recognized the two sides of the Perfect Teaching. It regarded the Perfect Teaching of the *Avatamsaka Sutra*, revered by the masters of the Northern and Southern Dynasties, alongside the Perfect Teaching of the *Lotus Sutra* developed by Tiantai. Both scriptures are classified as equal Perfect Teachings, each being promoted without suppressing the other, achieving their own completeness. This classification is appropriate and reasonable, without issues of incomplete or indecisive classification. In comparison, the Buddha realm (Separate) in the *Avatamsaka Sutra* is ideal (positive), while the expedient unification and the Middle Way of the Tiantai School in the *Lotus Sutra* are practical (negative). The Huayan School absorbed Tiantai's focus on reality, developed the absolute theory of phenomena based on the *Avatamsaka Sutra*, and combined the two aspects of the Same and Separate, thus balancing idealism and reality (synthesis).

## 參考書目 References

### 一、藏經 Buddhist scriptures

〔東晉〕佛馱跋陀羅譯：《大方廣佛華嚴經》，CBETA T09, no. 278。  
[Eastern Jin] Translated by Buddha-bhadra: *Avatamsaka Sutra*, CBETA T09, no. 278.

〔唐〕玄奘譯：《成唯識論》，CBETA T31, no. 1585。  
[Tang] Translated by Xuanzang: *Treatise on the Establishment of Consciousness-Only*, CBETA T31, no. 1585.

馬鳴菩薩造，〔梁〕真諦譯：《大乘起信論》，CBETA T32, no. 1666。  
Composed by Bodhisattva Asvaghosa, translated by [Liang] Paramartha: *Mahāyāna śraddhotpāda Śāstra*, CBETA T32, no. 1666.

〔隋〕智顗：《妙法蓮華經玄義》，CBETA T33, no. 1716。  
[Sui] Zhiyi: *Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sutra*, CBETA T33, no. 1716.

〔隋〕智顗：《妙法蓮華經文句》，CBETA T34, no. 1718。  
[Sui] Zhiyi: *Textual Exegesis of the Lotus Sutra*, CBETA T34, no. 1718.

〔隋〕吉藏：《法華玄論》，CBETA T34, no. 1720。  
[Sui] Jizang: *Profound Discussions on the Lotus Sutra*, CBETA T34, no. 1720.

〔唐〕法藏：《華嚴經探玄記》，CBETA T35, no. 1733。  
[Tang] Fazang: *Explorations on the Avatamsaka Sutra*, CBETA T35, no. 1733.

〔唐〕澄觀：《大方廣佛華嚴經疏》，CBETA T35, no. 1735。  
[Tang] Chengguan: *Commentary on the Avatamsaka Sutra*, CBETA T35, no. 1735.

〔唐〕法藏：《入楞伽心玄義》，CBETA T39, no. 1790。

[Tang] Fazang: *Profound Meaning of the Lankavatara Sutra*, CBETA T39, no. 1790.

〔唐〕法藏：《十二門論宗致義記》，CBETA T42, no. 1826。

[Tang] Fazang: *Commentary on the Twelve Gate Treatise*, CBETA T42, no. 1826.

〔唐〕法藏：《大乘法界無差別論疏》，CBETA T44, no. 1838。

[Tang] Fazang: *Commentary on the Treatise of the Indivisible Dharma Realm*, CBETA T44, no. 1838.

〔唐〕法藏：《大乘起信論義記》，CBETA T44, no. 1846。

[Tang] Fazang: *Commentary on the Mahāyāna śraddhotpāda Śāstra*, CBETA T44, no. 1846.

〔唐〕法藏：《華嚴一乘教義分齊章》，CBETA T45, no. 1866。

[Tang] Fazang: *Treatise on the Classification of the One Vehicle Teaching of the Huayan*, CBETA T45, no. 1866.

〔隋〕杜順：《華嚴五教止觀》，CBETA T45, no. 1867。

[Sui] Dushun: *Contemplative Meditation of the Five Teachings of the Huayan*, CBETA T45, no. 1867.

〔唐〕智儼：《華嚴一乘十玄門》，CBETA T45, no. 1868。

[Tang] Zhiyan: *Ten Profound Gates of the Huayan One Vehicle*, CBETA T45, no. 1868.

〔唐〕智儼：《華嚴經內章門等雜孔目章》，CBETA T45, no. 1870。

[Tang] Zhiyan: *Miscellaneous Topics and Inquiries on the Avatamsaka Sutra*, CBETA T45, no. 1870.

〔唐〕宗密：《原人論》，CBETA T45, no. 1886。

[Tang] Zongmi: *Treatise on the Origin of Humans*, CBETA T45, no. 1886.

〔隋〕灌頂：《觀心論疏》，CBETA T46, no. 1921。

[Sui] Guanding: *Commentary on the Treatise on Mind Contemplation*, CBETA T46, no. 1921.

〔宋〕知禮：《十不二門指要鈔》，CBETA T46, no. 1928。

[Song] Zhilie: *Essentials of the Ten Non-dual Doors*, CBETA T46, no. 1928.

〔宋〕仁岳：《十不二門文心解》，CBETA X56, no. 928。

[Song] Renyue: *Textual Interpretation of the Ten Non-dual Doors*, CBETA X56, no. 928.

〔宋〕可觀：《山家義苑》，CBETA X57, no. 956。

[Song] Keguan: *Garden of Meanings from the Mountain Home*, CBETA X57, no. 956.

## 二、現代著作 Modern Writings

方立天：《法藏》，臺北：東大圖書公司，1991 年。

Fang Li Tian: *Fazang*, Taipei: Tungta Book Company, 1991.

牟宗三：《佛性與般若》（上），臺北：臺灣學生書局，1989 年。

Mou Zong San: *Buddha-nature and Prajnaparamita* (Vol. 1), Taipei: Taiwan Student Book Co., 1989.

牟宗三：《中國哲學十九講》，臺北：臺灣學生書局，1989 年。

Mou Zong San: *Nineteen Lectures on Chinese Philosophy*, Taipei: Taiwan Student Book Co., 1989.

呂澂：《中國佛學思想概論》，臺北：天華出版公司，1988 年。

Lü Cheng: *An Overview of Chinese Buddhist Thought*, Taipei: Tienhwa Publishing Company, 1988.

李治華：〈佛教哲學的語言型態〉，《正觀》，第 8 期，1999 年。

Lee Chih Hua: "The Language Patterns of Buddhist Philosophy," *Zhengguan*, Issue No. 8, 1999.

李治華：《智儼思想研究——以初期華嚴宗哲學的創建過程為主軸》，新北：輔仁大學哲學系博士論文，2008 年。

Lee Chih Hua: *A Study on Zhiyan's Thought—Focusing on the Creation Process of Early Huayan Philosophy*, New Taipei: Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Philosophy, Fu Jen Catholic University, 2008.

李治華、陳琪瑛合著：《智儼大師：華嚴宗義創建者》，臺北：經典雜誌，2023 年。

Co-authored by Lee Chih Hua and Chen Qi Ying: *Master Zhiyan: Founder of the Huayan Doctrine*, Taipei: Jingdian Magazine, 2023.

杜保瑞：〈牟宗三對華嚴宗詮釋的方法論反思〉，《第三屆華嚴國際研討會論文集（二）》，2012 年。

Du Bao Rui: "Methodological Reflections on Mou Zong San's Interpretation of the Huayan School," *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Huayan*, Vol. 2, 2012.

陳永革：《法藏評傳》，南京：南京大學出版社，2006 年。

Chen Yong Ge: *A Critical Biography of Fazang*, Nanjing: Nanjing University Press, 2006.

陳沛然：《華嚴宗之法界觀與判教觀研究》，廣州：中山大學哲研所博士論文，1998 年。

Chen Pei Ran: *A Study on the View of Dharma Realm and Classification of Teachings in the Huayan School*, Guangzhou: Ph.D. dissertation, Institute of Philosophy, Sun Yat-sen University, 1998.

賴光明：《華嚴宗法界緣起思想之研究》，香港：新亞研究所碩士論文，1989 年。

Lai Guang Ming: *A Study on the Thought of Dependent Origination in the Dharma Realm in the Huayan School*, Hong Kong: Master's thesis, New Asia Research Institute, 1989.



正文翻譯：張惠平

Main Text Translator: Zhang Hui Ping