

Mind and Consciousness Discourse in East Asia: Spectrum of Three Countries, Korea, China and Japan, during 7th-8th century

Young-Seop Ko

This treatise discusses how the theory of ascetic exercises and realization was formed in the 7th to 8th century's three East Asian countries' (Korea, China and Japan) mind and consciousness discourse. Since the 7th to 8th century, Korea, China and Japan have been forming one civil sphere through the code 'Buddhism.' This was possible because these three countries acknowledged each other's existence and communicated with each other in the dependent arising world view of Buddhism.

The Buddhist cultural sphere has been forming much wider and deeper horizons than the Confucian cultural sphere through 'Chinese characters' and 'mind and consciousness.' Especially, in the 7th to 8th century, East Asian people's spectrum of understanding human beings and their recognition of the world was definitely the paradigms of 'Chinese characters,' 'Buddhism' and 'mind and consciousness.' The vessel for these paradigms was Vijñ

Yeong-Seop Ko is a Professor of Buddhist Studies at Dongguk University, Korea.

International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture September 2008, Vol.11, pp.75-104.

© 2008 International Association for Buddhist Thought and Culture

aptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra, the Avataṃsaka Sūtra and Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith. These texts containing the paradigms of Consciousness-only of Buddhism and Avataṃsaka's 'mind' and 'consciousness' was the reliance on sūtra and śāstra of the form of the contemporary religious body or thought.

Key words: Mind and Consciousness, Dependent Arising,
Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra, Avataṃsaka Sūtra,
Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith.

I. Introduction

From ancient times until quite recently in historical terms, the three East Asian countries, Korea, China and Japan, have shared a geographical commonality and in a major sense, have also held the one culture in common. However since the last century, these three countries have been isolated from each other and each in its own way has tried to enlarge its own power base and credibility without considering the others. All three nations shared a common ethical foundation prior to modern times but with the advent of Western capitalist influence in the region each of them 'sold out' their historical legacy to the highest bidder and the links cultivated over centuries and millenniums have been abandoned in the relationship of isolation and conflict.

But of course, everywhere now we see historical borders crashing down, and a major factor is internet that has been pivotal in seeding global inter-ethnic, inter-cultural connections around the globe, with little concern or respect for long-time borders. Human consciousness however, is not so fast to adjust; in our own East Asian history we have several millenniums connecting us back to our ancestors, and so three or four generations would seem of little consequence, in which case it would seem reasonable, based on a long prior alliance, to anticipate a happy and healthy future communication between our three East Asian countries. In this likelihood, it's perhaps timely to take a

look at what might be a common cultural code to unify Korea, China and Japan in contemporary times. (Ko, Young-Seop, 2006).

From the time Buddhism first found its way from India to China around 1st century, and then on to Korea and Japan, it has been instrumental in providing common cultural ground between the three nations. Certainly, Buddhism's influence historically in the East Asian region has been significant in its impact on politics, economics, society, culture, science, literature, history, philosophy, religion and art; in fact Buddhism could be regarded as the mind root of East Asian people, which makes it a suitable contender to offer a shared basis for renewing contemporary cultural links. In order to establish a solid ground for discourse it's important to consider each other's history in the light of distinctive and shared wisdom.

A good place to start perhaps is with the Chinese language culture and mind and consciousness, which has created wider and deeper connections than almost anything else. Although Confucianism has held sway as a central and dominant culture in all three countries, in my opinion, I cannot agree that it has been the most prominent unifying influence. I would say that Buddhism, with its close correspondence to Chinese characters, culture and mind consciousness from the 7th to 8th centuries on, is the most positive ground for re-establishing communication with each other. With this in mind, in this paper I will discuss the mutuality of the Buddhist influence in Korea, China and Japan onwards from the 7th century, from the perspective of the cultural development of mind and will.

II. Chinese Language Culture, Buddhist Culture, and Mind and Consciousness

Yesterday the bed was comfortable because I slept in a hollow (龕).
Today's bed is not comfortable because I sleep in a tomb.
Ah-ha! All phenomena appear because mind appears.
Hollow or tomb, these are not different when mind disappears.
The mundane world (三界) is just mind.
All phenomena are just mind appearances.

If all phenomena are only mind appearing
Then I won't go to Tang (Wonhyo 1987).¹

These days, East Asian intellectuals are turning away from their relatively recent romance with the Western paradigm of scientific rationalism and again seeking their reflection in the mirror of their own cultural roots; and in the desire to claim an East Asian identity, intellectuals have been busy formulating a so-called 'Theory of East Asian Culture.' Efforts in this regard are still in the embryonic stages but the most popular approach to date seems to be founded on anti-Western sentiment, by comparison of the two cultures from the stance of superiority and inferiority.²

Nevertheless, it would seem valid at this time to persevere with an East Asian discourse as a means to search for cultural homogeneity, historical inevitability, and justice as a basis for our newly emerging community. One could say that our recent indulgence is our impatience towards 'the west,' which has largely governed our discourse in this century; but I worry that while we are striving after homogeneity, inevitability and justice, and selecting culture, history and community as issues in order to produce a discourse on justice, we should not forget to reflect on our previous differences, exclusivity and alienation through the course of our shared East Asian history.³

When we speak of East Asia, we are usually referring to Korea, China and Japan which share a common cultural signature based on the mutual use

1 "前之寓宿，謂土龕而且安，此夜留宵，託鬼鄉而多崇，則知！心生故種種法生，心滅故龕墳不二。又三界唯心，萬法唯識，心外無法，胡用別求？我不入唐！" Wonhyo expressed his sermon of Buddha by changing the phrase, '心生則種種法生 心滅則種種法滅,' in *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (大乘起信論) to '心生故種種法生 心滅故龕墳不二' on his second journey to studying abroad. It is Wonhyo's superb enlightenment song, discerned through revelation of Ālaya Vijñāna, that is the absolute aspect of mind (不生不滅) and the phenomenal aspect of mind (生滅) is caused by operation of one mind.

2 The key of East Asian discussion, 'Cultural sameness and historical inevitability of Korea, China and Japan,' is not yet systemized, but its foundations are summarized as follows. ① Tradition of Confucianism rather than Buddhism and Taoist philosophy, ② Chinese characters as the language of communication, ③ View of nature searching for unification of human and nature, ④ Organic view of the world, ⑤ The ethics of community in priority to individualism, ⑥ Spiral or circulatory thinking instead of linear thinking. ⑦ The principle to practice coexistence in the pair of contradiction and conflict (Kim, Gwang-Eok 1998: 6).

3 For the history of alienation and unification of East Asian three countries, refer to the following thesis (Ko, Byeong-Ik 1995: 23-40).

of the ancient system of Chinese characters, in which case this would exclude Vietnam,⁴ Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore.⁵ Yet, I would say this is a little premature as East Asia is not yet free from the Asian culture.⁶

The term ‘East’ as distinct from ‘West’ has also been used by the Japanese in order to define the territory from the East Asian sea border around the coast of Java, to support their bid for supremacy (Tanaka 1995: 170-193). However, the term ‘East,’ in respect of East-West relations, had been used long before this.

So here we have these two aspects of ‘East Asia’ to consider; the Chinese language cultural characteristic shared by Korea, China and Japan, and the East-West paradigmatic configuration.

Historically, ‘East Asia,’ embraces 7th-8th century Tang China, Korea’s Silla dynastic period and Japan’s Nara (奈良) Heian (平安) period.

The spectrum for understanding the East Asian world and people of this time is contained in the paradigm which embraces ‘Chinese Character’ and Buddhism’s mind and consciousness discourse. And the vessel supporting this paradigm is the Buddhist scriptures, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi-śāstra*, *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* and *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (大乘起信論). Consciousness-only (法相) and Huayan (法性), were the two key Buddhist doctrines at that time, especially the philosophical concepts of mind (心) and consciousness (識), whose light permeated the collective mind of these three countries where Buddhism was already established.

4 Vietnam gave up Chinese characters as a common language a long time ago. Now English is their daily language.

5 During two days from October 10-11, 1998, the meeting of three countries, Korea, China and Japan, the 3rd ‘International Conference about Comparative East Asian Culture’ was held in Peking University. At the conference about 100 scholars majoring in East Asian thought were gathered. Jo, Dong-II, professor of the Department of Korean Language and Literature, Seoul National University, asserted that the concept of East Asia should include Yugu, Ainu, Taiwan and the minority races of China, as well as Korea, China and Japan. Moreover, Pr. Jo connected a Chinese ‘ism’ (華夷), an East Asian ideology from the middle age, to the development of poetry and song in East Asia. He suggested the necessity for common letters and showed an empirical spirit by writing the paper in old Chinese characters (共文), but pronouncing it in his native language (Kim, Tae-Jun 1998).

6 Originally, Chinese merchants called it ‘the sea around Java’ but Japanese in this century renamed it the ‘East’ with a view to supremacy in regard to their belief that ‘modern Japan is the most advanced country in Asia so it is on an equal status with Europe; different and superior to China culturally, intellectually and structurally.

Chan (禪法) and Pure Land thought, which were popular around the same time, also had a great impact on the cultural mind and consciousness development during this period. But the main focus of communication between Korea, China and Japan was Consciousness-only and Huayan thought. This can be confirmed by tracing historical philosophical developments and formations of religious bodies, as well as considering the quantity and quality of writings from that time that were particularly concerned with Consciousness-only and Huayan.

Although the language of each the three countries has individual characteristics, the Chinese characters are common to all, and in the context of East Asian Buddhism, ‘mind and consciousness’ were the keywords connecting the discourse.

Originating in India, Early Buddhism had at its core Dependent Arising and the Middle Way teachings. But over subsequent centuries the teachings progressed through Abhidharma to Mahāyāna. Mahāyāna Buddhism’s *Prajñā Sūtra* teachings arose largely in response to a popular but somewhat misguided mania for worshipping pagodas, thus, a whole body of teachings on prajñā wisdom gave rise to such perennial philosophies and religious sects as the *Tiantai Lotus sect*, *Pure Land*, *Huayan*, *Saṃdhinirmocana* and *Tathāgatagarbha thought*.

Through Nāgārjuna and Aryadeva’s legacy, Bhāvaviveka, Candrakīrti and Buddhapālita formulated the *Prajñā Mādhyamika* doctrine; while Maitreya, Asanga, and Vasubandhu bequeathed the *Yogācāra* doctrine and Buddhist Logic (因明) which were interpreted and founded by Dharmapāla, Sthiramati, Dignaga, Dharmakīrti. These two streams became the principal axes of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism.

When the Indian Kumarajīva settled in China and translated the *Mādhyamika Śāstra*, *Treatise of the Twelve Aspects* and *Śata Śāstra*, the original *Prajñā Mādhyamika* doctrine was reinterpreted as the ‘Three Treatise Thought’ (三論學). This early version of ‘Three Treatise Thought’ was later established as the ‘New Three Treatise Thought’ (攝嶺學) on the basis of Seungnang’s fresh interpretations during the Goguryeo period of late 5th and

early 6th centuries and was distinguished in the wearing of blue robes by devotees (青衣, 青納). Sengquan and Falang were the successors to this doctrine and a few years later it was synthesized with the ‘New Three Treatise Thought’ by Jicang (552-612), and Huijun (慧均).

Yogācāra was interpreted as Vijñānavadā by Bodhiruci (菩提流支) and Paramārtha (真諦), who translated Maitreya’s *Discourse on the Stages of Concentration Practice* (瑜伽師地論) and *Compendium of the Great Vehicle*, by Asanga. These doctrinal streams later split into the Dilun (持論) - Shelun (攝論), Faxiang (法相), Huayan (華嚴) schools. The Northern Buddhist School (北道派), a branch of the Dilun School, interpreted the phrase ‘three realms are only a manifestation of mind’ (三界唯心說) from *Scripture on the Ten Stages* (十地經), on the basis of consciousness-only theory, which regarded Ālaya Vijñāna⁷ as ‘the mixed with true and false consciousness’ (真妄和合識), and so adopted the ‘9 consciousness’ theory. After that time, the Northern Buddhist School was merged with the Shelun School but this school soon disappeared.

However, the Dilun School of Southern Buddhist schools (南道派), regarded Ālaya Vijñāna as ‘pure consciousness’ (淨識). The Dilun School advocated the sameness of Tathāgatagarbha and Ālaya Vijñāna (藏識) but also embraced *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* which for the first time, acknowledged its Tathāgatagarbha roots. Later, the Dilun School, one of the Southern Buddhist schools, was subsumed into the Huayan School which continued to thrive under Zhiyan-Fazang’s leadership.

Xuanzang (玄奘, 602-664), returning to China after 17 years study in India, where he translated the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* (成唯識論), *Discourse on the Stages of Concentration Practice* (瑜伽師地論) and ‘consciousness-only’ thought came to be known throughout East Asia as New Vijñānavadā. Later, Xuanzang’s disciple, Kuiji (窺基, 632-682), established the Cien (慈恩) School on the basis of these texts (6經 11論) and Muna (文雅)

7 Analysis of the Middle and the Extremes, *Scripture on the Ten Stages* (十地經論) and *Compendium of the Great Vehicle* expresses the 8th consciousness (Ālaya Vijñāna, 阿賴耶識), *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (大乘起信論) expresses it as ‘阿梨耶識’ and, newly translated sūtras and treatises such as *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* and *Discourse on the Stages of Concentration Practice* (瑜伽師地論) after the age of Xuanzang expresses it as ‘阿賴耶識.’

of Silla also passed it on to Dojeung (道證), Seungjang and Taehyeon through the Seomyeong scholastic lineage (西明學統).

Lotus and Tiantai legacies, which Huiwen (慧文), Huisi (慧思) and Tiantai (天台, 538-597) helped to prosper by establishing them both within a recognized framework for cultivating textual study and meditation (教觀雙修), passed to Guanding (灌頂, 561-632) and prospered under the influence of Zhanran (湛然, 711-782). Huayan doctrine, originating with Dushun (杜順, 557-640), was made popular by Zhiyan (智儼, 602-668), Uisang (義湘, 625-702) and Fazang (法藏, 643-712).

Huayan's 4th and 5th patriarchs, Chengguan (澄觀, 738-838), and Zongmi (宗密, 780-841) respectively, sought to harmonize Huayan with Chan. The so-called four Mahāyāna Buddhist schools (四家大乘)—Faxiang (法相), Sanlun (三論), Tiantai (天台) and Huayan (華嚴) were already related in this way in China.

Chan (禪法) was originally introduced by the Indian monk, Dharma (達磨), who was a student of Prajñadhara, 27th patriarch in the Indian lineage. He became the first patriarch of the East Asia Chan lineage and his legacy was passed on to Huike (慧可), Sengcan (僧璨), Daoxin (道信) and Hongren (弘忍). The Chan School was divided between Shenxiu (神秀) in the north and Huineng (慧能, 638-713) in the south. Another branch inherited by Zhishen (智詵) and Chuji (處寂), prospered under the Silla monk, Musang (無相, 684-762), as 'calm meditation for lay practitioners' (靜衆禪). However Chan, although already widespread in China by then, was still little known in Korea and Japan.

So during the 7-8th centuries, Consciousness-only and Huayan thought were at the center of philosophical thought in East Asia,⁸ and together they established the paradigm of consciousness (識) and mind (心). The main

8 Japanese professor, Kamata Shigeo (鎌田 茂雄), names the 1st century from the beginning of the period that Fazang (法藏, 643-712), who inherited Dushun-Zhiyan and completed Huayan school, lectured *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* to Zetianwuhou (則天武后) 30 times after war, in case of Korea, from the period that Uisang (義湘, 625-702) constructed Buseoksa as the place for attaining Hwaecom enlightenment with the command of king in 676 to the period that Yeon-gi constructed Hwaecom stone sculpture in Hwaemonsa located in Mt. Jiri and, in case of Japan, from the period that *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* was introduced by Daoxuan of Tang (702-760) to the period that Vairocana Buddha (毘盧遮那佛) was constructed as the great Buddhism work in 752 as the age of Kogen (Kamata 1990).

leaders of the Consciousness-only School during this period were Chinese Xuanzang (玄奘), Korean Muna (文雅), and Japanese Zenzyu (善珠); Huayan proponents were Chinese Zhiyan and Fazang, Korean Uisang, Yangbyeon, and Japanese Sinzyo, Zikun; Korean Wonhyo harmonized Consciousness-only and Chinese Huayan; Huineng and Korean Musang championed Chan.

As the practice goal of Consciousness-only is to ‘attain wisdom through evolution of consciousness’ (轉識得智)—in other words, by way of wisdom to become increasingly aware of suffering in the concept of Huayan’s dharma realms (法界緣起) and ‘arising from original nature’ (性起)—this contributed both tension and elasticity to recognition and mind. Consciousness-only and Huayan popularity of this period is typified in Wonhyo’s *Superb Enlightenment Song*; Wonhyo being the originator of the phrase ‘mind’s universality’ (一心) which he adopted from *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* and the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*; this doctrine having originated in his enlightened recognition that hollow (龕) and tomb (墳) are not separate, the three worlds are only mind, and all dharma (萬法) is Consciousness-only.

During this 7-8th century period there were no hostilities between Korea, China and Japan, but the Silla and Tang dynasties were estranged as Tang had destroyed Goguryeo and Baekje. Yet, from a cultural perspective, the mutual use of Chinese language, ‘Buddhism,’ and ‘mind and consciousness’ thought, bound them together.

And thus, the whole spectrum of East Asian Buddhism was communicated during this period in light of ‘mind’ and ‘consciousness’ communication between the leading Buddhist thinkers of these three countries; the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*, *Avatāmsaka Sūtra* and *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* being the major texts for sharing discourse.

III. Great Works of Consciousness-only Thought (法相) School and Discourse on *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*

Consciousness-only thought regards all existence as one image, reflected

on the mind-screen. In other words, Consciousness-only is a monistic-consciousness philosophy (識一元論) in that every distinct object (境) is void of existence, only consciousness (識) exists. In the *Saṃdhinirmocana Śūtra*'s chapter on 'an analysis of the practice of meditative union' (分別瑜伽品), sameness of 'image' and 'mind' are explained as follows:

Bodhisattva Maitreya asked Buddha again. "Buddha! Are all images of samadhi (毘鉢舍那三摩地) the same as mind or different?"

Buddha replied to Bodhisattva Maitreya, "O son of a virtuous family! They are the same because the image is just Consciousness (識). O son of a virtuous family! Objects of consciousness are only an expression of consciousness."⁹

'Objects of consciousness is only an expression of consciousness' is at the core of Consciousness-only philosophy. 'Because the thing created by variants of consciousness is vain discrimination and the thing classified by vain discrimination is not an actual thing, everything is just Consciousness.'

There are two different systems in the viewpoint of Consciousness. One is based on the Nirākāra Vijñāna (無相唯識) which denies the reality of recognizing distinct subjects appearing in mind, while the other is based on the Sākāra Vijñāna (有相唯識) which admits the reality of recognizing subjects in the mind. Here, the two scholastic lineages which represented Korean Consciousness-only and Chinese Consciousness-only in this 7th-8th century period are contrasted; they are the Cien scholastic lineage, which was inherited by Dharmapāla - Śīlabhadra - Xuanzang and which adopted the Sākāra Vijñāna recognition theory, and the Seomyeong scholastic lineage inherited by Sthiramati - Paramārtha - Muna and which adopted Nirākāra Vijñāna theory.

Muna Woncheuk (文雅圖測, 613-696), a renowned philosopher of the period, describes this in his commentary on *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*. Muna established his own philosophical foundation on the basis of the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*, about which he wrote five kinds of commentary. His direct disciples, Dojeung, Seungjang, and Taehyeon, also wrote their own commentaries on the text; and although no longer extant, Wonhyo also wrote

9 *Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra* no.3, the 'analysis of practice of meditative union,' no.6 (T.16.698).

Doctrinal Essentials of Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra (成唯識論宗要).

Kuiji - Huizhao - Zhizhou inherited the Cien scholastic mantle and left many writings on the text, and Zenzyu (善珠) of Japan did likewise. Thus, the main reference for Consciousness-only discourse in the 7th-8th century was the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*, which appeared after *Compendium of the Great Vehicle* (攝大乘論).

1. China's Xuanzang, Kuiji, Huizhao and Zhizhou

In the 7th~8th century period Xuanzang created a new paradigm for East Asian Buddhism, when he returned to China after studying in India for 17 years. Xuanzang's experience opened the doors for a renewed Buddhism in East Asia through his translations of sūtras and treatises, 76 volumes and 1,347 books. The New Vijñānavāda that he had inherited from Dharmapāla (法護) and Śīlabhadra, was different from the earlier Old Vijñānavāda recognition framework which had been based on discourse related to *Compendium of the Great Vehicle*. In particular, the translations, *Discourse on Practicing the Stages of Concentration* and *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*, were influential in supporting the growth of the New Vijñānavāda thought.

Xuanzang suggested a new Buddhist framework by denying the 9 consciousness theory that was popular then, and replacing it with Ālaya Vijñāna consciousness, which represents subject recognition. However, he did not include the clean, clear aspect that is one mind (一心) in the 9th consciousness; he defined this instead, as pure consciousness (淨分) inherent in the 8th storehouse consciousness, this Ālaya Vijñāna theory being Dharmapāla's legacy.

And on the basis of Dharmapāla's theory, Xuanzang and his direct disciple, Kuiji, proposed the theory of 'Difference between Essential Nature and Characteristic,' which states that suchness (眞如), philosophy, ideal and reality do not communicate, but instead, maintain parallel lines on the basis of the theory of observing the reason for common customs (理世俗). Xuanzang and Kuiji's thorough mind analysis regarded the 5 (眼耳鼻舌身識), 6th (了別

境識), 7th (末那識) and 8th consciousnesses (阿賴耶識) as separate things.

Regarding the analysis (心分說) of Ālaya Vijñāna, Cien scholars proposed the theory of four aspects of ‘subjective cognition’ (見分), which involves recognizing sensory operation, sensory object (相分), self-witnessing (自證分), and voluntary recognition of the interplay between the subjective and objective aspects of witnessing (證自證分).

In regard to the above, Huizhao (慧沼, 650-714) and Zhizhou (智周, 668-723) of the Faxiang (法相) School, analyzed mind in such detail during this period, that it became distorted in excessive speculation and troublesome philosophy, and thus, losing its popularity it disappeared. This is a good example of how a philosophy can become the discourse of a minority.

2. Korea’s Muna, Dojeung, Seungjang and Taehyeon

Muna was introduced to Consciousness-only through meeting with Xuanzang; he adopted Paramārtha and Xuanzang’s ideas and established his own theory based on the Middle Way which is at the core of Buddhist doctrine. He selected the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* as his main text and composed 5 commentaries on it. Muna’s view is clearly revealed in his criticism of the antagonistic relationship between India’s *Mādhyamika Śāstra* philosophy and Consciousness-only philosophy, which he describes in the *Eulogy of the Heart Sūtra* (般若心經贊).

Although Buddhism had one taste a thousand years ago, emptiness and existence have struggled for a thousand years. After Buddha passed away, two Bodhisattvas from the country located in South India, and of the same age, established the emptiness school (無宗) and existence school (有宗) respectively, so people could know the Buddha’s teachings. Both of them, therefore, exhibited Buddhist will. Bhāvaviveka rid attachment to existence by adopting emptiness and abandoning existence (有) and Dharmapāla rid attachment to emptiness by adopting existence and abandoning emptiness. Thus, Bhāvaviveka’s emptiness is not contrary to Dharmapāla’s theory that existence is emptiness and non-emptiness, (非無) nor is it contrary to the theory that emptiness is existence. If you understand that it is

emptiness and existence at the same time, you can attain the twofold truth (二諦), and if you understand that it is not emptiness and existence at the same time, you understand the middle way; this is the core of Buddhism. Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla affected each other and both tried to help people understand Buddhism in such a way that it is not contrary to Buddhist will.¹⁰

Muna chose to re-explicate the Middle Way teachings, in order to resolve the antagonism between Bhāvaviveka's Mādhyamika and Dharmapāla's Consciousness-only. Muna's goal was to help the infatuated person (迷謬者) attached to existence to attain emptiness, and thereby, enable him to be reborn as one who is wise (悟解者) and has mastered emptiness while also understanding existence.

He explains that he does not attach to the view that knows emptiness but does not know existence (勝無者, Bhāvaviveka), or to the view that follows vivid reason (如應者, Dharmapāla), and so the only difference between negation (遣) in affirming emptiness, and affirmation (存) in affirming existence in order to attain truth, is method; therefore, the gate entering to reason is not just one.

The arguments of Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla are therefore not different but are based on one meaning. Muna explains that Mādhyamika (中觀) and Consciousness-only (唯識) take different positions in order to help people understand Buddhism from varying perspectives.

Muna's position is well illustrated from the Buddhist viewpoint of the 'theory of three natures' (三性論), which posits on one hand, the 'consciousness-only' view with its analysis of the delusory world of the unenlightened (theoretical aspect), and on the other hand, the 'practice of meditative union' (瑜伽行), with its focus on recognizing the true world (practical aspect), and understanding that these two are the same.

Moreover, Muna does not follow the Nirākāra Vijñāna assertion, although it stands against its position, and he criticizes Sākāra Vijñāna for adopting wrong view on the reason for middle way. In other words, he accepts the Shelun School's 9th consciousness (阿摩羅識) by adopting the

10 Muna, *Eulogy of the Heart Sūtra* (般若波羅密多心經贊) (HBJ. vol.1, no.3).

Ālaya Vijñāna theory of New Vijñānavāda, rather than the 9 consciousness theory of Old Vijñānavāda which describes pure consciousness as Ālaya Vijñāna.

Unlike Xuanzang and Kuiji, Muna asserts that all people have Tathāgatagarbha from the viewpoint of original Buddhism, thus, a Bodhisattva's compassionate mercy can rescue all existences. In this view he allows for a flexible understanding of Buddhism by denying the Cien view that 'five seed natures have Buddha nature' (五性各別說) and asserting the view that all 'one seed natures have Buddha nature' (一性皆成說).

Muna's unique interpretation was passed on to Taehyeon, the original founder of Haedong yoga, by way of Dojeung and Seungjang. Furthermore, it was used actively to describe Dunryun (遁倫) and Gyeondeung (見登). After that time, the followers of the Silla Consciousness-only School communicated with each other on the basis of the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* and the *Discourse on Practicing the Stages of Concentration*.

However, as was the case with China, Silla's Consciousness-only Schools also pretty much died out after the middle of the 8th century, and Huayan took its place as a major school.

3. Japan's Zenzyu

Buddhism was introduced to Japan from Baekje, Silla, Gaya and Goguryeo. Ancient Japan then reconstructed itself with support of Buddhist culture and pursued deep study of Buddhist doctrine onwards from the 7th-8th century. Just as China and Korea's main schools were centered on Consciousness-only and Huayan, mind (心) and Consciousness (識), so too was the case in Japan.

During the Nara period (奈良), Zenzyu (善珠) undertook deep study of Consciousness-only thought. Although Goguryeo Hyegwan (慧觀)'s Three Treatise thought, and Saizyo (最澄, 767-822)'s Tiantai doctrine were also studied, Consciousness-only and Huayan were definitely at the center of popularity in Japanese Buddhism at that time.

Huizhao, a direct disciple of Kuiji, interpreted Muna's and Dojeung's work according to his own interest in undermining the Seomyeong School's credibility. This was due to his hasty extraction of a partial phrase which denied him the opportunity to see the whole aspect of the problem and to therefore exercise rational logic in this regard.

Zenzyu highlighted Huizhao's shortcoming, in that he criticized Muna-Dojeung's theory on the basis of Kuiji's detailed argument on the objective stance. Hence, Zenzyu was only able to see Silla's unique Consciousness-only achievement from a third party view of Consciousness-only, aside from Chinese and Silla's views.

Seomyeong School's theory, quoted in Ryosan (良算)'s *Abridgement of a Fellow Researcher of Vijñāna* (唯識論同學鈔) which was published during the Kamakura period (鎌倉), offered proof to refute Huizhao's view. Japanese Consciousness-only scholars actively adopted the Seomyeong theory, which was the same as Silla Consciousness-only, rather than the Cien theory with its characteristic Consciousness-only. As with the fate of Consciousness-only in Korea and China, Japan also could not sustain major discussion. In my opinion, a reason for this might have been due to political and philosophical circumstances in East Asia at the time.

IV. Great Works of Huayan Framework (法性) and Discourse on the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*

Huayan doctrine teaches that the Buddhist world can only be expressed with Buddha intuition or realization, not with words. The question as to 'how should one experience the world' is therefore, a crucial issue for all, whether ordinary people or Buddhist saints. From this perspective we might ponder the importance in a phrase 'the three worlds are vain and consist of just one mind' (三界虛妄, 但是一心作), from 'Chapter on the Bodhisattva Stages' of the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*

The meaning here is that a human's experience of life varies according

to mind (心王) and mind's operation (心所). Mind changes according to whether it has wrong view, suffering view or sincere mind. The principal of Huayan discourse views the three worlds from the perspective of only mind and the relationship between mind, 'dependent arising' (緣起) and 'arising from original nature' (性起).

Dependent arising and 'arising from original nature' are Huayan keywords used alternatively to express 'cause and dependent arising' (理實法界) and 'knowledge of liberation.' In other words, if dependent arising is phenomenon (事), 'arising from original nature' is a noumenon (理). If dependent arising means conditioned phenomenon containing the aspect of logical structure and motive of time, 'arising from original nature' is the unconditioned principle containing the aspect of denial of concepts and language. Therefore, East Asian Huayan doctrine was balanced on principles of both tension and elasticity in the theories of dependent arising and 'arising from original nature.'

1. China's Dushun, Zhiyan, Fazang, Chengguan and Zongmi

Chinese Huayan originated from Dushun (557-640) who experienced the state of deep concentration and thoroughly achieved emptiness. He extracted the idea of dharma-gate from the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*, describing it as the gate of dharma-dhatu (法界觀門). In this way he formulated a practical system of Huayan logic with the view of Chan (禪觀).

Zhiyan also explained the eternal world view with the theory of 10 deep levels (十玄). Ten deep gates (十玄門) theory was a systematization of Dushun's theory which was inherited by his disciple, Fazang, and reinterpreted in a majestic view of world as, 'all beings are manifested and structured in a process of continuous interrelationship' (重重無盡緣起). Fazang developed his logic systematically and thoroughly by way of his own deep experience of emptiness (空觀).

He amended his five teaching classification (五教) and ten school classification (十宗判) to the four school classification, by adopting *Awakening*

of *Mahāyāna Faith* (大乘起信論) logic which allowed him to reconstruct a Huayan teaching classification on the basis of Tathāgatagarbha philosophy. In other words, Fazang's challenge in endeavoring to establish relationship between Mahāyāna Buddhism (大乘終教) and perfect Mahāyāna Buddhism (大乘圓教) was to determine whether all activities of unenlightened people can also be activities of Buddha (immanence of noumenon), or whether the world of unenlightened people is different from the Buddha realm (transcendence of phenomenon).

Fazang therefore, tried to establish a relationship between dependent arising (事, unenlightened people) and 'arising from original nature' (理, Buddha nature), based on an interplay of tension and elasticity. In the end he tired of trying to solve the problem of transcendence and immanence of the absolute aspect (理), and 'possibility to attain Buddhahood' and 'pressure of ascetic practice' in relation to phenomena (事).

For this reason, in formulating his four teaching classifications, Fazang employed Paramārtha's translation of *Compendium of the Great Vehicle* (攝大乘論), to explain the lineage of natural abiding (種性論) of religious Mahāyāna Buddhism, an equivalent to Tathāgatagarbha philosophy. He did so because, while reviewing the existing five teaching classifications he realized that the newly translated Consciousness-only (法相, 始教) qualified as the highest attainment of a Buddhist saint and was inferior to Dilun and Shelun School's classification. So it seemed that Fazang of the Huayan school newly proposed it as Huayan philosophy, by absorbing both the Dilun northern Buddhist school's view of 9 Consciousness and the southern school's Ālaya Vijñāna view that had been absorbed into the Shelun School.

Chengguan (澄觀) searched for a pathway to harmonize Doctrine (教) and Chan (禪) by constructing the practice of Huayan (華嚴觀法). Zongmi tried a mixture of Huayan (華嚴) and Chan in the manner of a Chan master. He progressed from Chengguan's (澄觀) Huayan practice and became an advocate of Huayan Chan (華嚴禪) in the increasingly popular stream supporting harmonization of Chan and doctrine schools.

In this example of a Huayan scholar we see how naturally the discourse

on Chinese Buddhism moved towards Chan. Many Seon masters of the late Silla-early Goryeo Nine Mountains sect (九山 禪門) studied Hwaeom as a compulsory component of Chan training, due to Uisang's expansive effort to establish a two-fold path, and to Huayan scholars such as Li Tongxuan, Chengguan and Zongmi.

2. Korea's Uisang, Pyohun, Dosin, Sang-won and Jitong

Uisang, founder of Haedong Hwaeom and Zhiyan's principal disciple, chose to study Huayan and Pure Land. He focused on the discourse of practicing 'arising of trueness' (眞性現起, 橫盡法界) rather than the 'theory of dharma-dhatu' (法界緣起, 豎盡法界).

In accordance with philosophical methodology for attaining the meaning of Huayan, Uisang defined nature (性) as 'arising from original nature,' Zhiyan's 'submission to reason' (順理), as 'real nature to practice truth itself,' because he understood that 'arising from original nature' symbolized the appearance of Tathagata as eternal dependent arising.

So, unlike Fazang's eloquent writings on dependent arising, Uisang's Hwaeom discourse was based on practice as he pursued the living path of a Huayan pilgrim. He tried to investigate Bohyeon's practice (普賢行) through his experience as a great enlightened master living among the people, hearing the dharma-gates and practicing the great practice (大行). Moreover, he wanted to enter the ocean seal samādhi and enjoy the Buddhist world through his acceptance of a great enlightened master's dharma-gates being 'as many as dust.'

When we consider that his main aspiration was to attain the Lotus Bank (蓮華藏世界), the Pure Land, and there to meet Vairocana (毘盧遮那), founder of the Huayan School, so as to enable all people to attain Buddhahood, this shows that Huayan's abiding goal is to attain Buddhahood through practice (菩薩道).

Uisang made a lot of notes on aspiration which is a reflection of his efforts to construct the Hwaeom Pure Land religion by connecting a belief in

Pure Land with the Hwaeom School. His personal predilection was for practice-based Hwaeom belief, in contrast to the Chinese Huayan's theoretical base.

Thoughts of Pyohun (表訓), Dosin (道身), Sang-won (相源) and Jitong (智通), cited in Gyunyeo's writings and *Hwaeom's Dharma-World Chart* (法界圖記叢髓錄), show Uisang's influence. From this period, Korean Huayan discourse was noted in exchanges with Chan.

3. Japan's Sinzyo, Yangbyeon and Zikun

There are many theories about Sinzyo (審祥, ?-742)'s origins (出自) and dharma lineage¹¹ and the Japanese Kegon School. One theory postulates that he was from Silla, while another regards him as Japanese. It is known that Sinzyo was active in Gyeongju, Silla, and went to Tang where he studied Huayan under Fazang. Although it would require further study to be sure whether or not he was Silla born, or a learned monk from Japan who studied for a time in Gyeongju, Silla, it is certainly clear that he was the founder of Japanese Kegon doctrine.

Sinzyo learned Wonhyo and Uisang's Hwaeom doctrine during his extended stay in Silla and then returned to Japan in the Silla era of King Seongdeok, where he lectured on the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* for 3 years, and in Todaiji temple by an imperial order (勅請) in the period of King Shomu of Japan, from the 4th year of King Hyoseong of Silla (740). Sinzyo nurtured several disciples, including Yangbyeon (良辨) and Zikun (慈訓), through his lectures on the *Avataṃsaka sūtra* over 3 years (60 books-20 books a year).

In particular, his Kegon doctrine which was inherited by Yangbyeon, entered the mainstream of Japan's Kegon scholarship. Japan's Kegon was organically linked to Korean and Chinese doctrines and together they formed the mainstream discourse. In Japan's case, there are almost no extant records

11 Although Sinzyo was spelled as 審祥 and 審詳, according to 「新羅學生大安寺審祥大德記」(凝然撰, 三國佛法傳統緣起 所引) in his disciples' publications it was spelled as '審祥'. It is impossible to know the year of his birth. Regarding the date that he died, common view hold it was 742 but some say 744 (Jan. 14, the 16th year of 天平) (Yang 1994: 72-98).

of Kegon discourse from the 7th-8th century period so it is impossible to make specific reference.

Through catalogs¹² that Sinzyo delivered to Japan, we know that Silla's Consciousness-only and Hwaeom was introduced to Japan without alteration. This includes major works on Korean Consciousness-only by Hwaeom scholars who were active in Silla and Tang. Especially, Myoe (明惠, 1173-1232), a Japanese Kegon scholar in the Kamakura age, who propagated Silla Hwaeom and composed *Biographies of Eminent Monks Who Sought the Dharma* (求法記) based on Wonhyo and Uisang in the *Emaki of Huayan* (華嚴緣起會圖). These are important records that enable us to know the character of Japanese Kegon as it was absorbing Silla Hwaeom's achievements. It was through this exchange of Huayan doctrine that Japan was able to absorb the high achievements of both Korean and Chinese Huayan.

V. Great Works of Wonhyo and Discourse on *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*

Wonhyo was not attached to one school. His philosophical ground reflected his wide understanding of the whole Buddhism. In relation to East Asian Buddhism's main discourse of the 7th-8th century, he wrote many books concerned with Consciousness-only or the reasoning of Consciousness-only.¹³

12 The Silla Catalogs list of Simsanaskyongrok (審祥師經錄) contain 51 kinds of descriptions such as one of Wongwang, 5 of Muna (圓測), 32 of Wonhyo, 1 of Dojeung, 1 of Uisang, 2 of Hyeonil, 8 of Uijeok and 1 of Gyeongheung (Yang 1994: 90-91).

13 Among Wonhyo's writings, the number of the studies concerned with sūtras and treatises of Consciousness-only, is 20 volumes and 62 books, so it more than anything else. The number of studies concerned with Buddhist Logic is 5 volumes and 5 books; the number of studies concerned with sūtras and treatises on Prajñā and Mādhyamika are 9 volumes and 27 books, the number of studies concerned with *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (大乘起信論) are 9 volumes and 10 books; the number of studies concerned with Chan documents are 4 volumes and 15 books; the number of studies concerned with Vinaya philosophy are 11 volumes and 34 books; the number of studies concerned with Pure Land are 16 volumes and 18 books; the number of studies concerned with Huayan doctrine are 5 volumes and 15 books; the number of studies concerned with Lotus doctrine are 4 volumes and 4 books; the number of studies concerned with Nirvana doctrine are 2 volumes and 7 books; the number of studies concerned with *Vimalakīrti Sutra* are 2 volumes and 4 books; the

Besides the commentary concerned with the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*¹⁴, Wonhyo composed 8 or 9 kinds of commentaries concerned with *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (大乘起信論).¹⁵ Moreover, he composed 5 kinds of books concerned with the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*. It is not usual for one philosopher to publish many books on the one text but the extant *Expository Notes on Awakening of Faith* and *Commentary on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* both show how much he focused on this text.

Although Fazang was renowned in relation to the Chinese Huayan School, he also had a deep understanding about Consciousness-only. His five teaching classification (五教) and ten school classification (十宗判) succeeded Kuiji's eight school classification (八宗判). The amended 'four school classification' (四宗判) later influenced the Shelun School in that the Shelun School's position on the 9th Āmala Vijñāna as *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*'s one mind, so called, sincere aspect of the 8th consciousness have change to the absolute aspect of mind, and the indiscretion of aspect of the 8th consciousness have change to the phenomenal aspect of mind. It is the same position as 'one mind and two gates' (一心二門) in *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*. Besides this, we also see that Fazang was influenced by the Shelun School.

Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith (大乘起信論), a main Mahāyāna text, was the major discourse in the three countries of East Asian Buddhism during the 7th-8th century. *Three Commentaries on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* refers to *Commentary on Awakening of Faith* (淨影疏, 2 books) by Huiyuan

number of studies concerned with *Śrīmālā Sūtra* are 1 volume and 3 books; the number of studies concerned with *Suvarṇaprabhāsātarmarva Sūtra* are 1 volume and 3 books; the number of studies concerned with *Ratnagotravibhāgamahāyānottaratantra Śāstra* are 2 volumes and 2 books; the number of studies concerned with *Vaipulya Sūtra* (方廣經) are 1 volume and 1 book; the number of studies concerned with Reconciliation of Disputes in Ten Aspects are 1 volume and 2 books; the number of studies concerned with six Mahāyāna repentances (大乘六情懺悔) are 1 volume and 1 book; the number of studies concerned with others are 12 volumes and 12 books (Eun 1996: 98). However the paper premises the number of Wonhyo's books as 107 kinds and 231 books and classifies them in this way. It does not accord with the number of his books as 87 kinds and 180 books.

14 Although Wonhyo wrote about the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* (宗要, 1 book), it does not exist now.

15 Wonhyo left 8-9 kinds of books concerned with *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* such as *Expository Notes on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, *Commentary on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, *Doctrinal Essentials on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, *Summary on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* etc.

(523-592) of Sui, *Commentary on Awakening of Faith* (海東疏, 2 books) by Wonhyo and *Commentary on Awakening of Faith* (賢首義記, 3 books) by Fazang. Among these, Wonhyo's *Commentary on Awakening of Faith* is clearly the best East Asian commentary on *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* and had a profound influence on Fazang's later *Commentary on Awakening of Faith*.

Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith (大乘起信論) connects discourses of the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* and *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*. It is classified as a major discourse of the period. According to the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* discourse, the goal of Consciousness-only practice is 'attainment of wisdom through evolution of consciousness,' which is to recognize suffering consciousness (recognition) and achieve the wisdom (mind) of non-suffering.

According to the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* discourse, Mahāyāna and the mind of living beings are both explained through the absolute aspect (理, 覺, 性起) and phenomenal aspect (事, 不覺, 緣起) of mind, these two being aspects of one mind. Moreover, according to *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* discourse, it is explained that the three worlds are vain, so only mind (一心) is recognized. All texts created the great Buddhist discourse expressed as mind (心) and Consciousness (識).

The discourse on *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* which was of great interest to Wonhyo and Fazang, was preceded by *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra* and *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* discourses. Wonhyo promoted the 9th Āmala Vijñāna from the *Vajrasamādhi Sūtra* and its treatises, and Fazang's opinion was known through the concept of Tathāgatagarbha. Establishment of the 9th consciousness theory was based on Wonhyo and Fazang's dispositions and customs, but their discourse on the absolute and phenomenal aspects, the two aspects of one mind in *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, was based on the consciousness and mind discourse.

The Cien scholarship legacy was passed on to Xuanzang, Kuiji, Huizhao and Zhizhou as well as Wonhyo and Fazang; while the Seomyeong legacy was passed to Muna - Dojeung (道證), Seungjang (勝莊), Jaseon (慈善) and Taehyeon (太賢), who constructed their discourse around the paradigm of

consciousness and mind. The most important problem was whether to understand the clear aspect as Ālaya Vijñāna's 9th Āmala Vijñāna (法身), or Ālaya Vijñāna (如來藏). *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* explains that one mind is ordinary mind and Mahāyāna mind.

Muna, the great Seomyeong authority, asserted the theory of Ālaya Vijñāna and regarded ordinary consciousness and Buddha mind as same thing, because infinite positive eyes are projected towards the possibility of every being's attainment of Buddhahood. On the issue of consciousness and mind, based on the teachings of the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*, *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* and *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, it is not conclusive as to whether ordinary consciousness and Buddha mind should be discontinued or continued.

In other words, should it be accepted that ordinary people have access to the infinite possibility or not? If we think that besides Ālaya Vijñāna, there is also a 9th consciousness which is eternally abiding, and therefore has no operation, and if ordinary mind and Buddha mind are recognized as being the same, will people be reluctant to practice on the basis that they are already the same as Buddha?

It is possible however, to encourage people to practice by explaining both 8th and 9th Consciousness, which would mean that, whether 9th consciousness theory is right and Ālaya Vijñāna theory is wrong, or vice versa, it's not really important as it doesn't solve the problem. An alternative is to explain the theory of Ālaya Vijñāna and the theory of 9th consciousness, according to the core Buddhist doctrine of the Middle Way.

I think that the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*, *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* and *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* created major discourse at this time point because of this very issue. The real issue should be focused on 'how to attain Buddhahood' rather than how to classify consciousness and mind. It was the discourse formed by 'faculty of people.' In the discourses of the three Buddhist countries of East Asia we can know how tension and elasticity are contained.

The light penetrating the spectrum of East Asian Buddhism in the 7th-8th century was the paradigm of consciousness and mind. It has been said

that Buddhism's origin lies in factors concerning seeking a solution to the problem of life and death, which is the basis of human suffering; and how ordinary people can achieve realization (始覺) by overcoming discrimination of absolute (覺) and phenomenal (不覺) aspects, and attaining one mind (一心, universality). From this viewpoint, the target of discussions about the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra*, *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* and *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* are to the same end.

Therefore, during the 7th-8th century when the spectrum of Buddhist culture was widely and deeply impacted, Consciousness-only and Huayan discourse played an important role in discussing how to overcome the difficult realities of ordinary people. Furthermore, it became the main Buddhist discourse.

VI. Conclusion

East Asian Buddhism of the 7th-8th century was a golden age in the history of Buddhist philosophy. In this period, Three Treatises and Cien, Tiantai and Huayan, Chan and Pure Land, etc., prospered on the basis of Prajñā Mādhyamika doctrine (般若中觀學) and Yogācāra doctrine (瑜伽唯識學), the two axes of Mahāyāna Buddhism which originated in a fusion of early Buddhism and Abhidharma Buddhism. Among the four Mahāyāna schools of Three Treatises (三論), Cien (慈恩), Tiantai (天台), and Huayan (華嚴), Cien (慈恩) and Huayan (華嚴) in particular, pursued deep speculation on mind and consciousness, which was the major subject of discourse in East Asia during this period.

In understanding that attaining Buddhahood was the main discourse of the period, we can know something of the contemporary people's life quality. We find that Buddhists of this period preached according to people's different faculties and were considerate of the potential of ordinary people and Buddha, without qualification. In regard to effort, we know that 'realization' or 'attainment of Buddhahood' was the main discourse of communication between

the East Asian three countries.

As we know from Wonhyo's superb enlightenment song, non-agonized mind and agonized 'consciousness' are unified through the motive of mind transference, which provides all people with hope that everybody can make effort to attain Buddhahood and raise their quality of life. Although there were political and warring conflicts among the three countries, these conflicts did not destroy the combined efforts to develop mind and consciousness thought. On this point, we know that Buddhism has raised-up the life quality of East Asian people.

Today, when we are searching for a means of communication among the three countries of East Asia, to overcome the relatively recent period of alienation, we can recall the success of Buddhism's influence as a 'connector' by way of the Chinese language culture and mind and consciousness culture. When remembering the intention and extension of continuity and discontinuity from ancient times through the middle age and into the modern and present age, I am confident that the common denominator of all three countries is still Buddhism, because the Buddhist cultural code is still the discourse that gives hope for the future. For this reason I desire that Buddhism and the way to attain Buddhahood, be again recognized as 'the summit of life quality,' and once more becomes the central discourse in contemporary East Asia.

Glossary of Chinese Terms

(K=Korean, C=Chinese, J=Japanese, S=Sanskrit)

Abridgement of a Fellow Researcher of Vijñāna 唯識論同學鈔

Ālaya Vijñāna (S) 阿賴耶識, 阿梨耶識, 藏識

Āmala Vijñāna (S) 阿摩羅識

Arising from Original Nature 性起

Avataṃsaka (S), Huayan (C), Hwaeom (K), Kogen (J) 華嚴

Avataṃsaka Sūtra (S) 華嚴經

Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith 大乘起信論

Baekje (K) 百濟

- Biographies of Eminent Monks Who Sought the Dharma* 求法記
 Bodhiruci (S) 菩提流支
 Bohyeon (K), Samantabhadra (S) 普賢
 Buseoksa (K) 浮石寺
 Chan (C), Seon (K), Zen (J) 禪
 Chengguan (C) 澄觀
 Chuji (C) 處寂
 Cien (C) 慈恩
 Commentary on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith 大乘起信論疏
Compendium of the Great Vehicle 攝大乘論
 Consciousness 識
 Consciousness-only 唯識
 Daoxin (C) 道信
 Daoxuan (C) 道璿
 Dependent Arising 緣起
 Dharma (S) 達磨
 Dharmapāla (S) 法護
 Dilun (C) 持論
Discourse on the Stages of Concentration Practice 瑜伽師地論
Doctrinal Essentials of Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra 成唯識論宗要
 Doctrinal Essentials on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith 大乘起信論宗要
 Dojeung (K) 道證
 Dosin (K) 道身
 Dunryun (K) 遁倫
 Dushun (C) 杜順
Emaki of Huayan 華嚴緣起會圖
Eulogy of the Heart Sūtra 般若心經贊
 Expository Notes on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith 起信論別記
 Falang (C) 法朗
 Faxiang (C) 法相
 Fazang (C) 法藏
 Gaya (K) 伽伽

- Goguryeo (K) 高句麗
Goryeo (K) 高麗
Guanding (C) 灌頂
Gyeondeung (C) 見登
Gyunyeo (K) 均如
Haedong (K) 海東
Heian (J) 平安
Hongren (C) 弘忍
Huijun (C) 慧均
Huike (C) 慧可
Huineng (C) 慧能
Huisi (C) 慧思
Huiwen (C) 慧文
Huizhao (C) 慧沼
Hwaeom's Dharma-World Chart 法界圖記叢髓錄
Hwaeomsa (K) 華嚴寺
Hyegwan (K) 慧觀
Hyoseong (K) 孝成
Jaseon (K) 慈善
Jicang (C) 吉藏
Jitong (K) 智通
Kamakura (J) 鎌倉
Kuiji (C) 窺基
Li Tongxuan (C) 李通玄
Lotus Sūtra 法華經
Mādhyamika Śāstra (S) 中論
Mind 心
Mt. Jiri (K) 智異山
Muna Woncheuk (K) 文雅 圓測
Musang (K) 無相
Myoe (J) 明惠
Nara (J) 奈良

- Nirākāra Vijñāna (S) 無相唯識
 Noumenon 理
 Paramārtha (S) 真諦
 Phenomenon 事
Prajñā Sūtra (S) 般若經
 Pure Land 淨土
 Pyohun (K) 表訓
Ratnagotravibhāgamahāyānottaratantra Śāstra (S) 究竟一乘寶性論
 Ryosan (J) 良算
 Saizyo (J) 最澄
 Sākāra Vijñāna (S) 有相唯識
Samdhinirmocana Sūtra (S) 解深密經
 Sang-won (K) 相源
 Sanlun (Three Treatise) 三論
 Śata Śāstra (S) 百論
Scripture on the Ten Stages 十地經論
 Sengcan (C) 僧燦
 Sengquan (C) 僧詮
 Seomyeong (K) 西明
 Seongdeok (K) 善德
 Seungjang (K) 勝莊
 Seungnang (K) 僧朗
 Shelun (C) 攝論
 Shenxiu (C) 神秀
 Shomu (J) 聖武
 Śīlabhadra (S) 戒賢
 Silla (K) 新羅
 Sinzyo (J) 審祥
 Śrīmālā Sūtra (S) 勝鬘經
 Suchness 真如
 Sui (C) 隋
 Summary on Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith 大乘起信論大記

Suvarnaprabhāsātarmarva Sūtra (S) 金光明經
Taehyeon (K) 太賢
Tang (C) 唐
Tathāgatagarbha (S) 如來藏
Tiantai (C) 天台
Tiantai Lotus Sect 天台法華宗
Todaiji (J) 東大寺
Treatise of the Twelve Aspects 十二門論
Uisang (K) 義湘
Vaipulya Sūtra 方廣經
Vairocana 毘盧遮那
Vijñānavadā (S) 唯識派
Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi Śāstra (S) 成唯識論
Vimalakīrti Sutra (S) 維摩詰經
Vinaya (S) 律
Wonhyo (K) 元曉
Xuanzang (C) 玄奘
Yangbyeon (K) 良辨
Yeon-gi (K) 緣起
Zenzyu (J) 善珠
Zetianwuhou (C) 則天武后
Zhanran (C) 湛然
Zhishen (C) 智詵
Zhiyan (C) 智儼
Zhizhou (C) 智周
Zikun (J) 慈訓
Zongmi (C) 宗密

Abbreviations

- HBJ *Han-guk Bulgyo Jeonseo* (韓國佛教全書: *The Collected Texts of Korean Buddhism*), Seoul: Dongguk University Press.
- K *Korean Tripitaka* (高麗大藏經: Korean Edition of the Buddhist Canon). Seoul. Dongguk University Press.

References

- Eun, Jung-Hui
1996 “Analysis on the capacity and characteristic of Wonhyo’s books.” The first edition of Wonhyo’s Study (元曉學研究).
- Kamata, Shigeo
1990 “Exchange of East Asian Buddhism in the 7-8th century.” The 6th International Academic Conference: Globalization of Korean Science, the Department of Philosophy and Religion, the Academy of Korean Studies, June.
- Kim, Gwang-Eok
1998 “Cultural meaning of East Asian discussion.” *A Study on Mental Culture* 21/1, SN.70:6.
- Kim, Tae-Jun
1998 “Travel Notes on Participation in the ‘International Conference about Comparative East Asian Culture.’” *Dongguk Graduate School Newspaper* 73rd edition, Culture Page, Nov. 5.
- Ko, Byeong-Ik
1995 “Mutual alienation and unification of East Asian countries.” *The issue and viewpoint in East Asia*. Moonji Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Ko, Young-Seop
2006 “Buddhism, Cultural Code of East Asian Three Countries.” Cheongam, Korea: Cheongam-sa Temple Buddhist University. March-April.
- Tananka, Stephen
1995 “Modern Japan and Creation of ‘East.’” In *Issue and View of East Asia*, Ed. by Jung Moon-Gil and others, Moonji Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Wonhyo
1987 “Táng Xīnlúguó Yìxiāngchuán (唐新羅國義湘傳).” In *Sòng Gāosēngchuán* (宋高僧傳), Ed. by Zǎnníng (贊寧), 4: 76. Beijing: Zhōnghuá Shūjú (中華書局).
- Yang, Eun-Yong
1994 “Simsang of Silla and Japanese Huayan doctrine.” *Journal of Kasan Buddhist Studies*. 3rd Ed. Institute of Kasan Buddhist Studies.