

INTRODUCTION

The third patriarch of the Huayan tradition, Fazang 法藏 (643–712), is said to have built a Mirror Hall for Empress Wu 武 (r. 684–705) as a pedagogical device to illustrate the cardinal tenets of Huayan philosophy, the mutual interdependence and mutual interpenetration. According to later descriptions eight mirrors were placed in the four cardinal directions and four secondary directions, and one on the top, and one on the bottom. In the middle of the ten mirrors facing to one another, a Buddha statue was installed, along with a lamp or a candle to illuminate it. This setting produced an infinite number of Buddha reflections in the mirrors. When I visited the Huayan monastery on Zhongnanshan in the outskirts of Xi'an a few years ago, I was disappointed to see that the temple which collapsed sometime during the Qing dynasty (1644–1911) consists of only a small building, and only the abbot with his disciple live there. However, the reconstructed *stūpas* of Huayan patriarchs, Du Shun 杜順 (557–640) and Chengguan 澄觀 (738–839), can be seen in the yard of the monastery, preserving some glories of the past. The enthusiastic abbot showed me his reconstruction of Mirror Hall, a small building housing ten metal plates (as substitutes for mirrors) and a Buddha image in the center. Lighting up the the candle, infinite Buddha images became reflected on the metal plates. In this volume Huayan Buddhism is in the center, and the articles arranged around this topic reflect it from different aspects providing various perspectives for the viewers to discern it, hence the title *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huayan Buddhism*. The reader can get an insight into the development of Huayan Buddhism from the compilation of its base text, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* through the establishment of Huayan tradition as a special form of East Asian Buddhism to its visual representations.

The book consists of five chapters: 1. State of Field 2. *The Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* 3. Huayan in China 4. Hwaḥm/Kegon in Korea and Japan and 5. Huayan/Hwaḥm/Kegon Art. The first chapter gives a summary of the main results of research in the field of Huayan Buddhism in the West, Japan and China. Although the first publication on Huayan in the West, Garma C. C. Chang's book titled *The Buddhist Teaching of Totality* (1971) is rather unreliable, several studies have appeared which shed light on various aspects of Huayan Buddhism. Joerg Plassen in his article shows the main trends of the research focusing on the early history of the tradition. Robert Gimello's

unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, *Chih-yen* (1976) has remained the best study on the early history of Huayan and the religious and philosophical background of the formation of Huayan. Francis D. Cook and LIU Ming-wood contributed to our knowledge of the thought of Fazang who is said to have systematized Huayan philosophy. Fazang's historical role in Tang society is clarified by the works of Antonino Forte and Chen Jinhua. Peter Gregory's book, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism* (1991) is certainly a milestone in Huayan studies in the West. It provides a very detailed survey on the Huayan system of classification of teachings (*panjiao*), Huayan practice based on the cosmological implication of *Dasheng qixin lun*, and Huayan's relationship to other Chinese philosophies. Recently, Imre Hamar has published several works related to Chengguan's life and philosophy, to whom Zongmi is greatly indebted.

Scientific investigation of Huayan Buddhism started very early in the last quarter of 19th century in Japan, thus a huge amount of Huayan studies have been accumulated. It is no wonder that Western scholars primarily look for Japanese secondary sources, once they decide to explore one aspect of Huayan Buddhism. Given the great number of related articles and books on this topic, KIMURA Kiyotaka had to confine himself to introducing the major publications of some excellent scholars from different periods. First, he discusses the works of YUSUGI Ryōei, KAMETANI Seikei, SUZUKI Sōchū, TAKAMINE Ryōshū, KAMEKAWA Kyōshin who lived between the last quarter of 19th century and the first half of twentieth century. After 1950's Huayan research enters upon a new phase with such eminent scholars like SAKAMOTO Yukio, ISHII Kyōdō, KAMATA Shigeo and KIMURA Kiyotaka. Finally, he mentions scholars of next generation who worked under his guidance, including ITŌ Zuiei, NAKAMURA Kaoru, YOSHIZU Yoshihide and ISHII Kōsei. All these works Kimura listed in his article became the classics of Huayan studies, which are now indispensable handbooks for studies of any kind in this field. Kimura's article is supplemented by an appendix of the bibliography of Japanese articles on Huayan Buddhism in the past fifteen years. The abundance of publications clearly shows that the Japanese intensive interest in this form of Buddhism has not weakened.

Even though Japanese publications are quite numerous, the most important results are well-known, as they receive wide scholarly attention by referring to them. However, we know much less about Huayan studies in China, as they are seldom quoted in Western publications. ZHU Qingzhi's article, no doubt, fills in this gap by introducing studies of China in the past 25 years. Given the economic reforms in late 1970's, along with economy religious studies became very prosperous in Mainland China. However, up to the beginning of 1990's scholars of older generation, like REN Jiyu or FANG Litian focused on writing general histories of Chinese philosophy and Buddhism, and Huayan could be only a chapter of these comprehensive books. With the arrival of new generation of scholars specialized works started to appear. WEI Daoru wrote a comprehensive history of Huayan Buddhism in China which discusses the compilation of *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, the works of Huayan masters, and the impact of Huayan Buddhism on other schools and the literati. ZHU briefly introduces the works, mainly articles, of recent scholarship on various aspects of Huayan

Buddhism, i.e. Huayan theory, philosophy of Huayan masters, Huayan influence on other Buddhist schools, Neo-Confucianism and literature. Zhu also mentions a few Ph.D. dissertations written on Huayan Buddhism.

CHOE Yeonshik introduces the main trends of Huayan studies in Korea. His article is also a very important contribution to this volume, as even Huayan scholars do not use Korean secondary sources unless they are Koreanists, thus the results of Korean research are not well-known. Although the Hwaōm school as an independent school has not survived in Korea, it has become an important part of not only the monastic education but the Korean intellectual tradition, too. When the modern investigation of Huayan Buddhism began in the 60s, scholars tended to apply foreign methods in research, and focused on the philosophical writings of patriarchs instead of studying the *Huayan jing* and its commentaries. The Korean research on Huayan Buddhism can be divided into two parts: 1. study on the theoretical system of the Chinese Huayan tradition 2. study on the Korean Hwaōm tradition. Choe lists the main publications related to these two areas.

As it is widely known, the Huayan tradition of East Asian Buddhism received its name from the Chinese translation of *Mahāvaiṣṭhīya Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, *Dafang-guang fo huayan jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經. This is one of the most voluminous Mahāyāna sūtra, Thomas Cleary's English translation covers more than 1500 pages. This sūtra, which is thought to be preached right after Buddha's experience of enlightenment under the *bodhi* tree, is regarded as the highest teaching according to the classification of teachings by the Huayan tradition. Being the literary product of the relatively unknown Mahāyāna movement, this work is of uncertain provenance. As the original Sanskrit manuscripts of two Chinese translations are said to have been brought from Khotan, some scholars suspect that this sūtra was compiled here or somewhere in Central Asia. In Chapter Two, which includes three articles on this huge Mahāyāna sūtra, Ōtake Susumu in his article titled *On the Origin and Early Development of the Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* puts forward that *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* was actually known in India, thus he seems to argue for the Indian origin. He shows that Sanskrit equivalent for the Chinese term "Huayan" is not "Gaṇḍavyūha," as long surmised, but "Avataṃsaka". He provides a very clear explanation of the term "Buddhāvataṃsaka" which is the key element in the title of this Mahāyāna sūtra. According to the Sarvāstivāda tradition *Buddhāvataṃsaka* is a miracle that only Buddha can perform. In this miracle a large number of Buddhas seated on lotus blossom become manifested, and each of these Buddhas in turn manifest a large number of Buddhas seated on lotus blossoms. This multiplicity of Buddhas reach as far as the Akaniṣṭha heaven. Ōtake succeeded in finding some passages describing this kind of miracle in the *Bhadraśrī*, a chapter of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. In his article, he also demonstrates that the title *Buddhāvataṃsaka* was used before the compilation of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. He finds four sūtras bearing this title and regards them as the original *Buddhāvataṃsaka* group. He adds three other sūtras to this group, because he finds some similarities among these works. The most important is that all these seven sūtras were preached at the meeting held

in the Hall of Brightness, which is not a historical but a mythical place. The author suggests that this original *Buddhāvataṃsaka* group played an important role in the formation of large *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, as most of them were incorporated into this huge *sūtra*. Nonetheless, he calls attention to the fact that even though this group formed the nucleus of the large *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, this is not necessarily its oldest strata. All these works refer to the ten stages, thus the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* must have predated them.

Jan Nattier in her article titled *New Light on the Early History of the Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra: Evidence from Chinese Sources* also looks for the origin of this Mahāyāna *sūtra* and finds some texts that could be called the “Proto-*Buddhāvataṃsaka*.” First, she shows very convincingly that the oldest text in the Chinese translation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka* texts, *Dousha jing* 兜沙經, produced by Lokakṣema 支婁迦讖 in the latter part of the second century CE, can be matched with two other translations, the *Zhu pusa qiu fo benye jing* 諸菩薩求佛本業經 and the *Pusa shizhu xingdao pin* 菩薩十住行道品. Consequently, these three texts used to be one text translated by Lokakṣema, but during its transmission they became separated and were given different titles. The usage of terminology and the style of the translation substantiate this claim. Next, she finds that this reconstructed text is very similar to the *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經, translated by Zhi Qian 支謙 in the early to mid-third century, thus this must be a different recension of the same text. She regards this text, that we have two recensions of, a possible candidate for the title “Proto-*Buddhāvataṃsaka*,” or, at least, a scripture whose content resembled that of the “Proto-*Buddhāvataṃsaka*.” The larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* seems to be an expansion of this “original” *sūtra* by inserting other materials into the text without changing the sequence of the teachings. In addition, Nattier studies the content of this early *sūtra*, carefully comparing the two recensions and the related “pieces” in the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, in order to shed some light on the possible authors of the text and their practices. She points out that the bodhisattva, whose practice is depicted in this *sūtra*, is a male belonging to the wealthy and privileged class. A bodhisattva must wish the well-being of all living beings during his every-day activity, even while entering his harem. The *sūtra* does not reject but incorporates the non-Mahāyāna practices, nonetheless it emphasizes the Mahāyāna teachings, the attainment of Buddhahood through ten stages. This scripture, like the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, is a highly visual text. The bodhisattvas are told to see the Buddhas in meditation, and the new revelations are transmitted through bodhisattvas emerging from *samādhi*.

After discussing the origin of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* by Jan Nattier and ŌTAKE Susumu, Imre Hamar’s article titled *The History of the Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra: Shorter and Larger Texts* gives a survey of the texts related to this scripture. If *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* is mentioned, usually one has three texts in mind: Buddhābhadrā’s first Chinese translation titled *Dafangguang fo huayan jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經 in 420, Śikṣānanda’s second Chinese translation under the same title in 699, and the Tibetan translation titled *Sangs-rgyas phal-po-che zhes bya-ba shin-tu rgyas-pa*

chen-po'i mdo by Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, and Ye-shes-sde in the first quarter of the 9th century. We are tempted to call these texts the “complete” *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, however the comparative study of these texts reveals that they are different in many aspects. The number and sometimes the titles of the chapters are at variance, moreover in the Tibetan text we find two chapters that are missing from both Chinese texts, and there is one chapter which is missing from the earlier Chinese translation made by Buddhahadra but the other Chinese version and the Tibetan text include it. Thus it seems to be more appropriate to say that today we have three recensions of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, which could be called the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtras*. Although the Sanskrit text has not survived, we have some knowledge of its existence through the report of Chinese Huayan exegetes. Zhiyan recorded the title of the chapters of the Sanskrit manuscript he had seen. This could be called the fourth recension. Before and after the appearance of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* chapters were translated as freestanding works, and many of them are preserved in the Buddhist Canon. Hamar’s article ends with a comparative chart which relates the chapters of the four recension of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* to the extant freestanding translations.

There are many Mahāyāna *sūtras*, but only few of them became very prominent in forming the characteristics of East Asian Buddhism. The *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* is undoubtedly one of them. It would be interesting to study the reason why this scripture was so influential. Is it due to the fact that it is said to be preached right after Buddha’s enlightenment depicting the ultimate truth, or its emphasis on the bodhisattva path, or its highly visual and imaginative nature? This way or that way, it gave rise to a special East Asian form of Buddhism which is called Huayan in Chinese, Hwaom in Korean, and Kegon in Japanese. It would be an exaggeration to regard it a “school” as it had no institutional background, thus “tradition” or “lineage” seem to be more appropriate terms. This lineage is usually described by five patriarchs: Du Shun 杜順 (557–640), Zhiyan 智嚴 (602–668), Fazang 法藏 (643–712), Chengguan 澄觀 (738–839), and Zongmi 宗密 (780–841). In addition to Zhiyan, Fazang and Chengguan, the lay hermit of Wutaishan Li Tongxuan 李通玄 (635?–730) and Fazang’s heretic disciple Huiyuan 慧苑 (673–743) wrote commentaries to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. These exegetical works became the main sources of understanding this huge scripture in East Asia.

Chapter Three discusses some aspects of Chinese Huayan Buddhism. ARAMAKI Noritoshi in his article titled *The Huayan Tradition in Its Earliest Period* has attempted to reconstruct the beginning of Huayan tradition before the so-called first patriarch right after Buddhahadra’s translation of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. Buddhahadra is said to teach meditation to Xuangao 玄高 (402–444), a monk who later played important role in the Buddhist development of Northern Wei Dynasty (386–534), but finally fell prey to the anti-Buddhist movement. Aramaki suspects that Buddhahadra took his translation of *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* with him to the North, and transmitted it to Xuangao, along with the *huayan samādhi*. Xuangao established a religious community with Daorong 道融, who is regarded as the first

transmitter of the bodhisattva *śīla sūtra*, the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經, at the Binglingsi 炳靈寺 cave. Aramaki calls attention to the parallel development of the Vairocana Buddha images accompanied by the “one thousand Buddha images” and Huayan Buddhism.

In terms of Huayan philosophy, Du Shun’s important contribution was the paradigmatic change of the concepts form/emptiness for phenomenon/principle. Zhiyan was an innovative thinker who advocated several key Huayan tenets, like the *dharmadhātu* dependent arising, nature-origination, classification of teachings, etc. Fazang was the person who formulated the system of Huayan philosophy, while Chengguan and Zongmi tried first to bring closer and later to harmonize this Buddhist philosophy with other Buddhist schools and Chinese thought. WEI Daoru in his article titled *A Fundamental Feature of the Huayan Philosophy*, discusses one very important Huayan concept called perfect interfusion (*yuanrong* 圓融). Huayan masters tried to understand the world with the help of this concept, and this was the goal that a practitioner is supposed to attain through Buddhist practice. Wei explains this concept from the perspectives of 1. substance and function as well as of essence and phenomena, 2. non-duality of the opposite sides in entity, 3. mutual inclusiveness and penetration of things or phenomena, 4. general relationship among things and phenomena, 5. practice.

Perfect interfusion of nature (*xing* 性) and characteristics (*xiang* 相) also played an important role in establishing two important terms, *faxiangzong* 法相宗 and *faxingzong* 法性宗. Imre Hamar in his article titled *A Huayan Paradigm for the Classification of Mahāyāna teachings: The Origin and Meaning of Faxiangzong and Faxingzong* challenges the widespread view that *faxingzong* refers to the Huayan tradition. Fazang criticized Xuanzang’s 玄奘 (600–664) Yogācāra by using the pejorative term, *faxiangzong* implying that this school only investigates the characteristics of the *dharmas*. However, the invention and frequent application of the term *faxingzong* must be attributed to Chengguan. He is the first to use this term for Madhyamaka in the classification of Buddhist teaching that Dīvākara is said to relate to Fazang. The term *xing*, as Fazang used, can be connected with both Madhyamaka and Tathāgatagarbha philosophies, as it can denote the emptiness of self-nature or the Buddha-nature. Chengguan seems to elaborate this meaning in his explanation of ten differences between *faxiangzong* and *faxingzong*. Under the rubric of *faxiangzong* he propounds the tenets of Yogācāra, while *faxingzong* includes not only the Madhyamaka teachings but also the Tathāgatagarbha ones. One of the most important difference is that *faxiangzong* claims that the Absolute is immovable, thus it does not have anything to do with the phenomenal world, while according to the *faxingzong* the outer world evolves out of the Absolute mind. In examining the scriptures that are quoted to substantiate these stances we find that some scriptures belong to both *faxiangzong* and *faxingzong*. Thus we can conclude that this pattern is used as a transscriptural hermeneutical device for classifying various Buddhist teachings. In addition, *faxingzong* cannot be identified with Huayan tradition, as it represents only the advanced teaching of Mahāyāna, while Huayan is the perfect teaching.

Although Chengguan tried to restore Huayan orthodoxy founded by Fazang, he made several concessions to the indigenous Chinese philosophies and other Buddhist schools. He often referred to Chinese classics in his commentaries to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, but he often added that he borrowed only the words and not the meaning in order to explain Buddhist philosophy to his audience, mainly elit literati. He studied under several Chan masters of different schools, and the influence of Chan Buddhism in his works is undoubted. He explains the sudden enlightenment in great details, and his disciple, Zongmi who was also the patriarch of Chan school, elaborated further this discussion. Zongmi claims the unity of Chan and doctrine, advocating the importance of sudden enlightenment followed by gradual practice. KIMURA Kiyotaka in his article titled *Huayan and Chan* gives a very clear summary of the relationship between Huayan and Chan. First of all, as is mentioned above *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* is a highly visional text depicting the world of Buddha's enlightenment. One of the Buddha's characteristics in this scripture is "moving without leaving", that is to say the Buddha goes to other places without leaving his original location under the *bodhi* tree in order to preach. However, in fact, he mainly remains silent, and other bodhisattvas deliver his teachings. Thus the *sūtra* itself can be regarded a sort of *dhyāna sūtra*. In addition, the scripture explicitly state the existence of a special kind of meditative state, the ocean-seal *samādhi*. Huayan exegets defined this state as Buddha's great meditation that makes the truth appear the same way how the calm ocean reflects images. Among the works of Huayan masters *Contemplation of the Realm of Reality* (*Fajie guanmen* 法界觀門) and *The Ending of Delusion and Return to the Source* (*Wangjin huanyuan* 妄盡還源) are the major works which discuss meditation. The lay hermit, Li Tongxuan is famous for his theory on the contemplation of Buddha-light which shows how to unify the self with the light. Huayan philosophy made great impact on Chan school, several Chan masters were well versed in this literature. Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063–1135), the compiler of *Biyān lu* 碧巖錄, seems to comprehend this abstruse philosophy through his own religious experience.

Bearing in mind the Chan slogan of not relying on scriptures, it can be perplexing to read Jana Benická's article titled (*Huayan-like*) *Notions of Inseparability (or Unity) of Essence and its Function (or Principle and Phenomena) in some Commentaries on "Five Positions" of Chan Master Dongshan Liangjie*, which shows how deeply some Chan masters were immersed in sophisticated philosophical issues under the influence of Huayan Buddhism. She discusses how two Chan masters, Caoshan Benji 曹山本寂 (804–901) – a direct disciple of Dongshan Liangjie – and Yongjue Yuanxian 永覺元賢 (1578–1657) interpreted the "five positions" (*wu wei* 五位) of Dongshan Liangjie" 洞山良價 (807–869), a founder of the Caodong 曹洞 school. These five positions are: 1. the biased within the right; 2. the right within the biased, 3. coming from within the right, 4. arriving at within together [the right and the biased], 5. going within together [the right and the biased]. These five positions were regarded a Chan version of the well-known Huayan tenet, the four *dharmadhātus*, as the right/biased paradigm can be replaced by the Huayan principle/phenomena para-

digm. In their explanations both masters emphasize the Huayan concept of inseparability of principle and phenomena.

Another example of Huayan influence on other schools of Chinese Buddhism is introduced by HUANG Yi-hsun in her article titled *Huayan Thought in Yanshou's Guanxin xuanshu: Six Characteristics and Ten Profound Gates*. Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975) is known to have established the syncretism of Chan and Pure Land schools. His major work is the *Records of the Tenet-Mirror (Zongjing lu 宗鏡錄)* which is a large Buddhist encyclopedia that covers more than five hundred Taishō pages. His own thought is better reflected in his shorter works, thus Huang chose the work *Profound Pivot of the Contemplation of Mind (Guanxin xuanshu 觀心玄樞)* to show Yanshou's indebtedness to Huayan philosophy. Yanshou underlines the importance of contemplation of mind for common people, and states that any activity helping others to attain enlightenment can be qualified as Buddha deed. In his elucidation of contemplation of mind and Buddha deeds he had recourse to two basic Huayan concepts, the six characteristics and the ten profound gates. However, he reinterpreted these tenets in order to comply with his predilection for mind-only philosophy. Fazang used the six characteristics to describe the relationship between the *dharmadhātu* and phenomena dependently arisen from *dharmadhātu*, while Yanshou replaced the *dharmadhātu* with one-mind in order to give an account of the relationship between one-mind and various aspects of mind. The same way, Yanshou explains the ten profound gates in terms of the relationship between one-mind and the deluded aspects of mind. In the new set of ten profound gates Fazang deleted the gate “creation through the transformation of the mind-only”, but Yanshou reintroduced this, and listed as the last gate implying its fundamental importance.

Huayan Buddhism was spread into Korea and Japan, where it is called Hwaōm and Kegon, respectively. Some aspects of the Korean and Japanese development is discussed in Chapter Four. Ūisang 義湘 (625–702) was Fazang's fellow-student under Zhiyan, and he transmitted Huayan teachings to Korea. Traditionally he is regarded as the author of the work titled *Ilśūng pōpkyedo 一乘法界圖*, which is a diagram formed by 30 verses. Joerg Plassen in his article titled *Some remarks on the authorship of the Ilśūng pōpkyedo* summarizes the main points of the recent debate over the authorship of this short nonetheless very influential text, and provides his view based on his reading some Korean texts. The dispute was caused by the discovery of the introductory lines and the seal at Yangshan (70 km Southwest of Peking) in 1996. This introduction credits a Huayan master with the composition of this work. YAO Changshou concludes that this Huayan master is non other than Zhiyan, thus he is the author of *Ilśūng pōpkyedo 一乘法界圖*, and not Ūisang. This assumption, of course, provoked Korean scholars to defend Ūisang's authorship. Plassen traces the sources that could substantiate Ūisang's authorship, and finds that this attribution is not very firm. The quotations from the earliest extant explanations of *Ilśūng pōpkyedo* seem to support Zhiyan's authorship of the verses, and Ūisang supposedly arranged the verses in a diagram and added a vermilion line to the seal. His invention gave a

new dimension of the original text that now could be used in Huayan meditation which aimed at realizing ocean-seal *samādhi*.

Another important figure of Hwaōm tradition was Wōnhyo 元曉 (617–686). Charles Muller in his article titled *Wōnhyo's Reliance on Huiyuan in his Exposition of the Two Hindrances* focuses on one important Yogācāra doctrine, the two hindrances to show Wōnhyo's contribution to the East Asian understanding of Yogācāra philosophy and his indebtedness to Huiyuan 慧遠 (523–592). The first of the two hindrances is the afflictive hindrances, which include various type of emotional imbalances, such as anger, jealousy, etc. These hindrances are closely connected to the cognitive hindrances, which are due to the misconception of reality and recognizing the existence of “self”. The *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* are concerned with the removal of the first type of the hindrances, while bodhisattvas also wish to get rid of the second type of hindrances in order to be able to develop the wisdom of expedient means necessary to teach other beings. One of the most influential work in East Asian Buddhism, the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, however, has a different definition of the two hindrances. The afflictive hindrances are explained as the first movement of mind, called “intrinsic ignorance” or non-enlightenment, while the cognitive hindrances are regarded as the inability to perceive suchness. Wōnhyo as a hermeneutic solves the contradiction by designating the Yogācāra stance as exoteric and the view of *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* as esoteric. This exoteric/esoteric distinction must have been inspired by Huiyuan who in his commentary on *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* elaborates the two hindrances very extensively, and explains them on three levels in terms of the five entrenchments found in Tathāgatagarbha works.

Bernard Faure in his article titled *Kegon and Dragons: A Mythological Approach to Huayan Doctrine* argues that mythological elements also must be taken into consideration in explaining the Huayan impact on East Asian culture. He regards Ūisang's *Diagram* as being rather a Tantric *maṇḍala* with four assemblies than a Chinese seal, and emphasizes its possible ritual function like other similar diagrams. In addition, Sudhana's pilgrimage depicted in *Gaṇḍavyūha* is the root-metaphor of the *Diagram*, as it starts and ends with the character Dharma, just like Sudhana who returns to his starting point. Ūisang and Wōnhyo became very popular figures in Japanese Buddhism. They are described as persons of opposite characters: Ūisang went to China to study, kept strictly his monastic vows, while Wōnhyo returned before arriving to China, and frequented taverns and brothels. Their relation with dragons and dragon-palaces also played an important role in their influence on Japanese Buddhism. As the legend has it, a young girl Shanmiao 善妙 fell in love with Ūisang, but the monk converted her. Shanmiao became a magnificent dragon, and carried Ūisang's boat on her back. This story is depicted in the Japanese illustrated scroll known as *Kegon engi emaki* 華嚴緣起絵巻. This legend eventually influenced the Japanese Kegon monk Myōe who had a dream of a young woman with snake-body. He made Shanmiao (J. Zenmyō) the central figure of worship in Zenmyōji, a subtemple of his temple, Kōzanji.

Huayan Buddhism was transmitted to Japan through Korea, and Kegon became one of the six schools of Nara. Emperor Shōmu (r. 724–749) regarded Kegon as a

state ideology, and started to construct the Great Buddha, representing Mahāvairocana, the Buddha of Kegon in Tōdaiji in 747. Frédéric Girard showed in his article titled *Some aspects of the Kegon doctrines at the beginning of the Kamakura Period* that even if Kegon Buddhism declined after the Nara period, it yielded certain influence on Buddhism of Heian and Kamakura periods. In Kūkai's 空海 (774–835) explanation of the realization of Buddhahood in one's own body the influence of Kegon is very obvious, as he states the unity and nonobstruction of thought, Buddha and sentient beings. Kegon served as a theoretical foundation for the Yūzū nenbutsu 融通念佛 sect established by Ryōnin 良忍 (1072–1132). This school advocated the Buddha Amida invocation in a fusional interpenetrating way. One person's invocation is fused with other persons' invocation, thus it includes all the merits accumulated through the invocations, and this will lead to the birth of all people in the Paradise of Amida. The outstanding Kegon monk of Kamakura period, Myōe 明恵 (1173–1232), who is famous for his dream diary, was a creative thinker. He boldly drew upon various tenets current at this time in order to accommodate his words to his audience. We can also detect some indirect influence of Kegon on the Zen monk, Dōgen 道元 (1200–1253) who seems to accept Kegon as the foundation of his worldview, however he disputed its doctrinal system.

The arising of nationalism in Japan before the Japan–US war gave a new impetus to the application of Kegon philosophy by leading intellectuals. ISHII Kōsei in his article titled *Kegon Philosophy and Nationalism in Modern Japan* introduces the main figures of this movement and their understanding of Kegon philosophy in the context of nationalism. The Kyoto school scholars believed that Kegon philosophy, which described the relationship between “individual” and “whole” could substantiate the new world order which is a Japanese led integration of Asia. In addition, Japanese Buddhist community also tried to establish connection between Kegon philosophy and nationalism, in order to defend itself from the Shintō chauvinists who wanted to eliminate Buddhism. However, the extreme nationalists belonged to Nichiren, Jōdoshin, Zen and other sects. Kegon philosophy seemed to be too profound for everyday political propaganda. KAMETANI Seikei 亀谷聖馨 (1858–1930) viewed Kegon philosophy from modern perspective, and regarded the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* as the supreme Buddhist scripture. KIHIRA Tadayoshi 紀平正美 (1874–1949) emphasized the superiority of Kegon over Hegelian philosophy, but was afraid of the tenet of non-obstruction between distinct phenomena, as it could lead to a Western democracy. Thus he underlined the merit of the imperial family. TSUCHIDA Kyōson 土田杏村 (1891–1934) developed his own epistology based on Kegon, and in his late years his stance was close to the state socialism. TAKAKUSU Junjirō (1866–1949), the editor of the Taishō edition of the Buddhist Canon, argued for the totalitarianism in Japan as an ancient model that should be followed in his days. D. T. SUZUKI (1870–1966) was the first Buddhist scholar who made distinction between the philosophy of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra* and that of Kegon school. He thought that the doctrine of non-obstruction between distinct phenomena could provide an ideal basis for building up a democratic Japan after the war.

The Chapter Five definitely provides a rather neglected perspective on Huayan Buddhism, that is Huayan art and, in connection with the function of visual representations, Huayan ritual. Dorothy Wong's article titled *The Huayan/Kegon/Hwaōm Paintings in East Asia, 9th–13th Centuries* focuses on the so-called *Huayan bian* 華嚴變, or “transformation tableaux” that has not received much scholarly attention. These paintings were made to show the teaching of *sūtra* in pictorial format. First, she discusses two large portable Huayan paintings in the Pelliot collection that were recently discovered and published. One of them depicts the *Seven Locations and Nine Assemblies* while the other shows the *Ten Stages of Bodhisattvahood*. The popularity of *Huayan bian* in Dunhuang is attested by the growing number of *bianxiang* murals within a cave-chapel. Interestingly, we find almost all of them on the north wall or the north slope of ceiling, and the *bianxiang* of *Lotus Sūtra* is found on the south wall. The *bianxiang* of the *Ten Stages of Bodhisattvahood* shows the Huayan trinity, Vairocana, Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra, however among their entourages we also find Sudhana, the protagonist of the last chapter of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*, the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, who visits spiritual friends in order to receive instructions on his quest for enlightenment. Thus this painting draws parallel between the two chapters of the *sūtra*. The style of murals and paintings are similar, thus we may conclude that they were executed by the same workshop or artists. Wong shows how the Huayan paintings from Kamakura period of Japan differed from earlier Chinese representations. The differences must be attributed to the incorporation of new styles from Song China and Myōe's synthesis of Kegon with esoteric Buddhism. Unfortunately, early Hwaōm paintings were destroyed by Hideyoshi's campaign in the sixteenth century in Korea, but Hwaōm paintings of eighteenth century have survived in Buddhist monasteries. These paintings seem to follow the Chinese Dunhuang examples, but the influence of later traditions also can be detected. Finally, the recent discovery of *Gaṇḍavyūha* illustrations of eleventh century in Tabo Monastery of Western Himalayas is introduced. Here, the ritual application of these illustration is quite obvious: during the ritual performance of circumambulation the practitioner follows the stages of Sudhana attaining higher level of consciousness.