

## Putting a Human Face on *Panjiao*: Kaneko Daiei's Critique of Fazang's Classification of the Buddha's Teachings

Visiting Researcher, The Institute of Oriental Studies, Toyo University  
ITO Makoto

### Abstract

Tenet classification (*jiaoxiang panshi*, 教相判釋 or *panjiao*, 判教) was “a fundamental exegetical practice in East Asian Buddhism, in which scriptures or Buddhist teachings were ranked in order of their supposed relative profundity” and often used as “a polemical tool to demonstrate the superiority” of the exegetes’ own traditions (Buswell Jr. and Lopez Jr. 2014, 385r). In this respect, the tenet classification of the Five Teachings (*wujiao*, 五教) by the Huayan School patriarch Fazang (法藏, 643–712)<sup>1</sup> can also be seen as an attempt to establish the supremacy of the *Huayan sūtra*, thereby advocating the superiority of the Huayan School (*Huayan zong*, 華嚴宗). Consequently, from ancient times to the present, discussions on *panjiao* have focused on the doctrinal and polemical nature of the classification in question.

In contrast, Kaneko Daiei (金子大榮, 1881–1976), a modern Japanese Shin Buddhist priest and scholar of Huayan thought,<sup>2</sup> tried to see *panjiao*, including Fazang’s, from a different perspective. Kaneko argued that tenet classifications must be based on the advocate’s profound insight into (1) the human character (*jinkaku*, Ch. *renge*, 人格) of the Buddha and (2) one’s own spiritual capacity and corresponding practices. This paper focuses on Kaneko’s critique of Fazang’s tenet classification and illustrates how Kaneko discerned the two mutually interfused aspects of the “Buddha of wisdom” (*zhahui fo*, 智慧佛) and the “Buddha of compassion” (*cibei fo*, 慈悲佛) from Fazang’s theory, while criticizing Fazang’s view as being insufficient from a spiritual perspective and slanted towards politico-religious interests of his time. Through this, we may say that Kaneko tried to put a human face on the often lofty, doctrine-oriented exegetical practice of tenet classification.

**Keywords:** Huayan, tenet classification, *panjiao*, Fazang, Kaneko Daiei

---

<sup>1</sup> Kaneko uses the honorific name of Genju Daishi (*Xianshou dashi*, 賢首大師) throughout, but in this paper, I use the more popularly known name of Fazang except in direct citations from Kaneko’s writings.

<sup>2</sup> Kimura Kiyotaka (木村清孝) defines “Huayan doctrine” (華嚴教學) as the systematic ideas established by the people regarded as belonging to the Chinese, Korean, and Japanese Huayan schools and “Huayan thought” (華嚴思想) as ideas in general based on and inspired by the *Huayan sūtra* (Kimura 1992, 2). Hence, for example, the ideas of Chengguan (澄觀) belong to the former, while those of Li Tongxuan (李通玄) belong to the latter. This paper follows Kimura’s distinction of the two terms, adding “Huayan teachings” (《華嚴經》的教說) as the teachings found in the *Huayan sūtra*.

## 1. Kaneko Daiei and Huayan Thought

Kaneko Daiei, who lived through the tumultuous age of Meiji-Taishō-Showa Japan,<sup>3</sup> was a Shin Buddhist Otani-ha sect (*Shinshu Otani-ha*, 眞宗大谷派)<sup>4</sup> priest who majored in Huayan studies at the sect-affiliated Otani University, later assuming professorship for nearly half a century at the university. He was known both for his passionate faith in the Shin Buddhist Pure Land doctrine of the belief in the Other Power (*tariki*, 他力) of the Amitābha Buddha propagated by the Shin Buddhist patriarch Shinran and for his avid pursuit of academic studies on and innovative insight into the *Huayan sūtra* and East Asian Huayan thought.

Kaneko was born the eldest son of a resident priest of Saikenji (最賢寺), a Shin Buddhist Otani-ha sect temple in Niigata prefecture on the north-western coast of Japan. His father offered him opportunities to explore the Buddhist faith from academic viewpoints; Kaneko moved to Kyoto in 1894 at the age of fourteen to study at the sect-affiliated Shinshu Middle School and moved on to be enrolled in the Buddhist studies department at the Shinshu University in 1901, newly moved and re-established in Tokyo with Kiyozawa Manshi (清澤滿之, 1863–1903) as the president.<sup>5</sup>

Kaneko's studies at the university had a lasting influence on his faith and his Buddhist studies. Kiyozawa, an innovative Otani-ha sect priest who had earlier led an unsuccessful bureaucratic reform movement of the sect in Kyoto, was known as the

---

<sup>3</sup> Description and discussion on some of the major politico-social as well as religious problems and conflicts Japanese Buddhists and their established groups faced after the fall of the Tokugawa Shogunate and the beginning of a rapid modernization process in Japan can be found in Ketelaar 1990 (especially chapters two, three, and five), and from a wider perspective in Josephson 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Established in the Edo period in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Shin Buddhist Otani-ha sect is one of the largest Pure Land school sects in Japan today, along with the Shin Buddhist Hongwanji sect from which it separated at the time of its founding. Based at the mother temple Otani Honbyo located in Kyoto (popularly known as Higashi [East] Honganji in contrast to Nishi [West] Hongwanji of the Hongwanji sect), the Otani-ha sect adheres to the teachings of the Shin Buddhist patriarch Shinran (親鸞, 1173–1262, or 1263 depending on the method of conversion to the modern calendar), an innovative Buddhist priest of the early Kamakura period. In this paper, transliteration of Japanese names and terms follow the Hepburn system of romanization except where different forms are generally in use or given by the persons or organizations concerned; hence Higashi Honganji for the popular name of the Otani-ha sect's mother temple, but Nishi Hongwanji for that of the Hongwanji sect, for example. Transliteration in Romanized Chinese is given to Chinese terms and terms common to Chinese and Japanese.

<sup>5</sup> Kiyozawa resigned from the presidency the next year due to administrative disputes within the university. The university was eventually moved back to Kyoto in 1913 and renamed the Shinshu Otani University. It continues on with its tradition today as the Otani University. Chronological information in this paper is generally based on Hataya and Tatsudani 1993. A historical examination of the complex political and administrative situations surrounding the Otani-ha sect around the time of Kiyozawa's resignation and his position within the sect can be found in Fujiwara 2022.

propagator of the Spiritual Movement (*seishinshugi*, 精神主義) which focused on the inner spiritual faith of each individual Buddhist adherent. Kiyozawa's Spiritual Movement marked a pivotal move in establishing what the historian Yoshida Kyūichi called "modern Buddhist faith" (*kindai bukkyō shinkō*, 近代佛教信仰).<sup>6</sup> Kaneko, although not totally in agreement with Kiyozawa's ideas, regarded himself proudly as one of the successors of the Spiritual Movement, himself emphasizing the inner human soul and individual spiritual experience.<sup>7</sup> Later, in 1915–16, he was invited to the post of chief editor of the monthly magazine *Spiritual Realm* (*Seishinkai*, 《精神界》) which Kiyozawa and a group of young Shin Buddhist priests had founded as a medium to propagate their Spiritual Movement.

Another major influence from his studies at the Shinshu University was his lifelong interest in Huayan studies. It is unclear why he chose Huayan studies over Pure Land thought as his major at the university. His biographers imagine that Kaneko had a view to studying Buddhism in general from a wider perspective rather than specializing in the sect's official Pure Land doctrines.<sup>8</sup> After graduating from the university, he went back to his home temple in Niigata, but continued to publish journal articles not only on Shin Buddhist faith and doctrines but also on Huayan thought.<sup>9</sup> This was sustained throughout his life, most notably after moving to Tokyo in 1915 to take up the editorship of the magazine *Spiritual Realm* and after assuming professorship at Shinshu Otani University from 1916 to 1949.<sup>10</sup> His reading of the *Huayan sūtra* was based on his view that the

---

<sup>6</sup> Yoshida Kyūichi emphasized Kiyozawa's focus on faith and the spiritual fulfillment of the modern individual person contrasting it with the more scientifically and philosophically oriented views on Buddhism advocated by earlier modern Buddhist thinkers such as Inoue Enryō (井上圓了, 1858–1919) and Murakami Senshō (村上專精, 1851–1929), both incidentally from the Otani-ha sect (Yoshida 1998, 90–91, 133–135). Although Yoshida praised Kiyozawa as having established "modern Buddhist faith", opening a new era in Japanese Buddhism, it should be noted that Yoshida characterized Kiyozawa's internalization of Buddhist faith as advocating "anti-modern" values, a reaction against the competitive principles that characterized early Japanese capitalism in a rapidly modernizing and industrializing Japan of the Meiji and Taisho periods (Yoshida 1993, 11).

<sup>7</sup> See Kaneko 1986, 10, 86 and also Itō 2021B, ft.9, for Kaneko's comments on being a successor of the Spiritual Movement. For his critical views towards Kiyozawa, see Kaneko 1986, 83–87.

<sup>8</sup> Hataya and Tatsudani 1993, 268.

<sup>9</sup> His graduation thesis on the structural characteristics of the *Huayan sūtra*, which was published later as a series of papers in the university bulletin *Inexhaustible Lamp*, (*Mujintō*, 《無盡燈》), reveals an early influence from Fazang which is also apparent in his summary account of the teachings found in the *Huanyan Sūtra* published in the magazine *Spiritual Realm* (《精神界》) in 1916 ("Kegongyō sichisho hachie no kōyō" 〈華嚴經七處八會の綱要〉《無盡燈》 vols. 11(11), 12(3), 12(4), 1906–07; "Kegongyō no shisō" 〈《華嚴經》の思想〉《精神界》 16(1), 1916). However, he would later voice strong criticism towards Fazang's sophisticated Huayan doctrine (see ft. 11). For a list of Kaneko's writings on Huayan thought, see Itō 2021A, 51–52.

<sup>10</sup> Kaneko was obliged to resign from his professorship in 1928 and to renounce his priesthood in 1929 due

doctrines of *sūnyatā* (*kong*, 空) and *samantabhadra-caryā* (*puxianxing*, 普賢行) form the core of Huayan teachings. Although he revealed both positive and negative views towards Fazang's Huayan doctrines, as can be seen in his analyses of Fazang's tenet classification, he was critical towards Fazang's tendency of focusing on theoretical and doctrinal sophistication rather than on actual spiritual problems and practice.<sup>11</sup>

## 2. Kaneko's Theoretical Critique of Fazang's Tenet Classification

Among Kaneko's many writings on Huayan thought, this present paper focuses on his article in the Shinshu University bulletin *Inexhaustible Lamp* of 1918 (*Mujintō*, 《無盡燈》, vol. 23, No. 8), titled "The Method of Tenet Classification and Its Significance" ("Kyōsō hanjaku no hōhō to oyobi sono igi", 〈教相判釋の方法と及其意義〉).<sup>12</sup> In this article, Kaneko takes as his object of examination the first fascicle (*shangjuan*, 上卷) of Fazang's *Treatise on the Five Teachings According to Huayan* (*Huayan wujiao zhang*, 《華嚴五教章》, hereafter, *WJZ*).<sup>13</sup> This short but significant article reveals Kaneko's unique approach centered on the human experience and spiritual depth of the classifier.

---

to doctrinal disputes with the sect's bureaucracy. His priesthood was revived in 1940 and Kaneko returned to his teaching position in 1941. He was stripped of his professorship again in 1949 under the educational purge policy by the GHQ of the Allied Occupation Forces due to his cooperation to war efforts during World War II. He was reinstated as professor emeritus in 1951 and continued to lecture at the university until 1974 (Hataya and Tatsudani 1993, 286–290; 301–303).

<sup>11</sup> On Kaneko's critical views towards Fazang's Huayan doctrines, see Itō 2021, 319, 伊藤 2020, 188–189.

<sup>12</sup> This article (hereafter, "Method") was later included in Kaneko's collection of articles *The Essence of Buddhism* (*Bukkyō no honshitsu*, 《佛教の本質》, hereafter, *Essence*) in 1921, which was republished in volume 2 of *The Collected Works of Kaneko Daiei* (*Kaneko Daiei Chosakushū*, 《金子大榮著作集》, hereafter, *CW*) published in 1977. I cite from the *CW* in this present paper.

<sup>13</sup> Two popular versions of this text by Fazang are extant: the so-called Japanese Text (*wa-hon*, 和本) brought to Japan in the eighth century and the Song Text (*sō-hon*, 宋本) compiled during the Zhao Song (趙宋) dynasty in China. Judging from the names of the sections Kaneko mentions and from his quotations from the *WJZ*, he most likely used the Japanese Text. The major difference between the two texts is the order of the second and third fascicles (*zhongjuan*, 中卷 and *xiajuan*, 下卷). However, as those two latter fascicles are not discussed in Kaneko's article, the distinction between the Japanese Text and the Song Text is not a major point of contention for this present paper. Therefore, for the ease of reference, this paper cites from the Song Text in the *Taishō Tripitaka*, indicating the differences between the texts as needed (I have referred to the text in Kamata 1979 for the Song Text to confirm the differences). For a detailed discussion on the variant texts including those transmitted to Korea, see Yoshizu 1991, Section 2 of Chapter 3. Yoshizu, mainly based on his analysis of the order of fascicles two and three, argued the Japanese Text to be the more authentic which preserves Fazang's original aim, namely, of distinguishing the Five Teachings. Yoshizu also points out that the correct title of the *WJZ* is *Huayan yicheng jiaofen ji* 《華嚴一乘教分記》 which accords with Fazang's aim in writing this text and also with the title *Huayan Wujiao Zhang* 《華嚴五教章》 as it later came to be known. Yoshizu rejects the Song Text title of *Huayan yicheng jiaoyi fenqi zhang* 《華嚴一乘教義分齊章》 as reflecting a later understanding of the purport of the text focused more on the principle of the *dharmadhātu* (*fajie*, 法界) rather than on the Five Teachings (Yoshizu 1991, 184–185).

He first analyzes the methodological theories of tenet classification with a focus on Fazang's taxonomy elaborated in the *WJZ*. Kaneko then proceeds to examine Fazang's classification based on his premise that any classification of Buddhist teachings should be based not on mere logical textual analyses but on the classifier's understanding of the Buddha, which Kaneko argues would inevitably reflect the classifier's own experience and level of practice.

## 2-1. Structure of Fascicle One of the *WJZ* and Tenet Classification

Before we examine Kaneko's reading of the *WJZ* and his critique of Fazang's tenet classification elaborated therein, let us briefly confirm the structure of the text and some basic points of the first fascicle. The *WJZ* is comprised of the following ten sections with sections one to eight in fascicle one, section nine in fascicle two, and section ten in fascicle three:<sup>14</sup>

- 1) Establishing the vehicles (建立乘第一)
- 2) Merits of the teachings and their purports (教義攝益第二)
- 3) Description of past and current establishment of teachings (敘古今立教第三)
- 4) Differentiating the teachings and clarifying the purports (分教開宗第四)
- 5) Separating and unifying the vehicles and teachings (乘教開合第五)
- 6) Order of the rise of teachings (教起前後第六)
- 7) Determining the significance in order [of the teachings] (決擇前後意第七)
- 8) Illustrating the different aspects [of the teachings] (施設異相第八)
- 9) Distinguishing the purport and principle (義理分齊第九)
- 10) Distinction of afore revealed teachings (所詮差別第十)

The main points of the eight sections in fascicle one are summarized by Yoshizu as follows:<sup>15</sup> Fazang first distinguishes the One Vehicle (*ekayāna*, Ch. *yi cheng*, 一乘), i.e. Huayan teachings, from the Three Vehicles (*triyāna*, Ch. *san cheng*, 三乘) in the first two sections. Then he lists up and describes the various historical tenet classifications devised in China (section three) before elaborating on his own classification in section four, categorizing the various vehicles under the Five Teachings (*wujiao*, 五教): the teachings of the Small Vehicle (*xiaocheng jiao*, 小乘教), Elementary Teachings of Mahāyāna

<sup>14</sup> The titles and the order of the sections are according to the Japanese Text. The order of sections nine and ten are switched in the Song Text.

<sup>15</sup> Yoshizu 1991, 225–240.

(*dacheng shi jiao*, 大乘始教), Final Teachings of Mahāyāna (*dacheng zhong jiao*, 大乘終教), Sudden Teachings (*dun jiao*, 頓教), and Perfect Teaching (*yuan jiao*, 圓教), i.e. Huayan teachings. Section five establishes the essential, superior position of the Perfect Teaching, at the same time, acknowledging the significance of the Three Vehicles as teachings of skillful means. In section six, Fazang points out that the Huayan teachings were revealed in the second week after the Buddha's enlightenment, emphasizing the fundamental nature of the Huayan teachings as the Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle (*biejiao yicheng*, 別教一乘). Then in section seven, he goes on to explain the significance of the other teachings as aimed at followers with different capacities. Finally, in section eight, differences between the One Vehicle and the Three Vehicles in the various aspects of edification such as the venue, time, preacher and audience, etc. are examined, summarizing the discussions elaborated in the previous sections.<sup>16</sup>

As we can see from above, the *WJZ* is structured upon Fazang's tenet classification, most notably summarizing some of the major preceding classifications in section three and outlining the Five Teachings in section four. Generally, although he does utilize the categorization of the Five Teachings, his distinction of the Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle from all other teachings plays an important part in most of his discussions, penetrating the whole work. Much of Kaneko's critique of Fazang's tenet classification is also focused on this point.

## 2-2. Kaneko's theoretical critique on the methods of tenet classification

Let us look into Kaneko's analyses of Fazang's discussions on the various teachings in the first fascicle of the *WJZ*, focusing on Kaneko's views on the principles and methods of tenet classification.

Kaneko defined the aim of tenet classification simply as "integration of the Buddha's teachings" ("Methods", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 75). In the article "Methods" he does not elaborate further. However, a slightly more detailed discussion can be found in his *Outline*

---

<sup>16</sup> As for fascicles two and three, Yoshizu explains that section nine (fascicle two) is focused on clarifying the basic purport of the Perfect Teaching, namely, the theory of dependent co-arising of the *dharmadhātu* (*fajie yuanqi*, 法界緣起), whereas section ten (fascicle three), following up on the previous section, reveals the different theories of dependent co-arising among the different teachings. Yoshizu also points out that Fazang limits the Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle (*biejiao yicheng*, 別教一乘) to the teachings of the *Huayan sūtra* while designating the *Lotus Sūtra* as the Common Teachings of the One Vehicle (*tongjiao yicheng*, 同教一乘), a category lower in profundity than the former. See Yoshizu 1991, 235–240.

of *Buddhism* (*Bukkyō gairon*, 《佛教概論》, hereafter, *Outline*),<sup>17</sup> where Kaneko notes that there are two approaches in classifying the Buddha's teachings:

The first is the view that although Śākyamuni advocated the same one truth consistently throughout, those who heard the teaching interpreted it according to one's own capacity (*konki*, Ch. *genji*, 根機). According to this view, as diverse people [of differing capacities and understanding] transmitted the sūtras that we find today, they reveal a miscellany of contents, thus if one earnestly reads through all the sūtras, they would certainly find the great spirit of Śākyamuni which singularly penetrates [all the sūtras]. (*Outline*, *CW*, vol. 1, 32)

The other approach...is the view that Śākyamuni offered the dharma which conformed with the interlocuter's respective capacity....Therefore, if we classify the diverse doctrines and study the relationships to each other, we will be able to find out the highest truth from among what Śākyamuni taught, at the same time, we can find out the teaching that Śākyamuni regarded as his true aim. (*Outline*, *CW*, vol. 1, 33)

Basically, Fazang's tenet classification takes the second approach. However, as we shall see in section 3–1 of this present paper, Fazang also discussed the diversity of the dharma from an approach similar to the first one in a part of the *WJZ*, which prompted Kaneko to try to make sense of it.

In his critique of Fazang's tenet classification, Kaneko starts by clarifying what he means by "integration" of the Buddha's teachings. Kaneko distinguished between what he called "logical integration" (*ronriteki tōitsu*, 論理的統一) and "systematic integration" (*taikeiteki tōitsu*, 體系的統一) of the diverse sūtras and teachings of the Buddha, arguing that they are both indispensable for tenet classification. This dual mode of integration would make a tenet classification a robust one, as we shall see in the case of Fazang's classification of the Five Teachings.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Outline of Buddhism* is based on Kaneko's lectures of the same title at Shinshu Otani University where he took up professorship from 1916. First published by Iwanami shoten (岩波書店) in 1919, reissued by Zenjinsha (全人社) in 1947, it was later included in *CW*, vol. 1 in 1980. I have referred to the *CW* for this paper. Kaneko discusses tenet classification in Chapter 2, "A Research on the integration in tenet classification" ("Kyōsō no tōitsu kenkyū", 〈教相の統一研究〉) of Part 1, "Study on tenet classification" ("Kyōsō gaku", 〈教相學〉) and critiques the tenet classifications of Zhiyi and Fazang.

Kaneko claimed that the aim of “logical integration” is to pursue and clarify the “universal idea” (*fuhenteki kan'nen*, 普遍的觀念) behind all the sūtras and teachings (the “horizontal” [*yoko*, 橫] dimension). A possible basic method would be an empirical approach (*kinōteki hōhō*, 歸納的方法), whereby the classifier compares the various teachings against each other. However, Kaneko argues that through this method one can only discover merely “common ideas” (*kyōtsū kan'nen*, 共通觀念) such as “eliminating pain and giving consolation” (*bakku yoraku*, Ch. *baku yule* 拔苦與樂) or “discarding unwholesome deeds and practicing wholesome deeds” (*haiaku shuzen*, Ch. *fei'e xiushan*, 廢惡修善), which fall short of a “universal idea” and which could be formally comprehensive but shallow in content. In contrast, he claimed that an intuitive approach (*chokkanteki hōhō*, 直觀的方法) based on fundamental wisdom (*konponchi*, Ch. *genben zhi*, 根本智) should be employed. He noted that while an empirical approach tends to integrate the diverse teachings through a “minimum” commonality, an intuitive approach, by contrast, integrates the teachings at the “highest” level (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 75).<sup>18</sup>

Kaneko goes on to argue that the logical integration gives the systematic integration a theoretical basis as the latter is an elaboration on the development of the universal idea clarified in the former. He notes that although the ultimate [universal] idea discerned as the logical integrator may not be apparent in some teachings, those teachings should nonetheless be seen as pinned down by the universal idea and thereby relating to each other to form one great organization (*ichidai soshiki*, 一大組織) of integration. This he calls the systematic integration (the “vertical” [*tate*, 豎] dimension) which organizes the diverse teachings in the order of the development of their thought, namely, as an unfolding (*kaiten*, 開展) of a singular universal idea.<sup>19</sup> Thus the two methods of integration are actually fused into one (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol.2, 76). This makes Kaneko’s view of tenet classification a three dimensional one, and not merely a horizontal comparison between the diverse teachings.

---

<sup>18</sup> Although Kaneko contends that the discernment of a universal idea should be grounded in fundamental wisdom, it is unclear what guarantees that one’s intuitive grasp is correct and not merely subjective. Perhaps we would need to judge the authenticity based on the profundity of the discerned universal idea, an undertaking which could also be subjective.

<sup>19</sup> Kaneko writes that a systematic integration should reveal the totality of the teachings as the unfolding of the “singular one” (*yui-itsu sha*, 唯一者), an ambiguous term which he does not define. From the context, it seems to be synonymous with “universal idea” or “ultimate idea” (*saikō kan'nen*, 最高觀念) which Kaneko uses synonymously with the universal idea (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol.2, 78).



We should take note that Kaneko's use of the terms "vertical" and "unfolding" does not necessarily mean organizing the teachings in temporal, historical order. The function of systematic integration is more soteriological; in Kaneko's view, its aim is to give each different teaching a unique significance, albeit a relative one compared to the ultimate idea, within the whole system of thought. He points to Fazang's discussion of "encapsulation through teachings" (*yuejiao*, 約教) in section five ("Separating and unifying the vehicles and teachings") of the *WJZ* as exemplifying this interrelatedness in one whole system, each teaching being inseparable from the integrating principle. Kaneko turns our attention to how Fazang describes the Five Teachings as encompassing each other in interfused penetration (*xiangshe rongtong*, 相攝融通) and that they can be seen as one teaching on the one hand and also as five separate teachings on the other ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol.2, 77–78).<sup>20</sup> Kaneko quotes Fazang's closing passage of section five of the *WJZ* to emphasize his point: "this means that the main and lesser passages of the diverse teachings [of the Buddha] form a net [of teachings]. The skillful means of the Great Sage cultivates the opportune ties; nowhere does it not thoroughly pervade"<sup>21</sup> ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 79; *WJZ*, T45, No. 1866, 482b13–15).

Based on the above analysis, Kaneko described how Fazang's tenet classification is based on the two types of integration: the logical and the systematic. Kaneko saw Fazang's notion of the Distinct Teaching (*bekkyō*, Ch. *biejiao*, 別教) which propagates the supremacy of the One Vehicle of the Huayan teachings, i.e. a universal idea behind all teachings of the Buddha and strictly distinct from the Three Vehicles, as the linchpin of logical integration. It is the ultimate reality beyond words (*kabun fukasetsu*, Ch. *guofen bukeshuo*, 果分不可說) which the Buddha awoke to within his Ocean Seal Samādhi (*kai'in sanmai*, Ch. *haiyin sanmei*, 海印三昧); it supersedes the Three Vehicles, while at the same time subsuming them.<sup>22</sup> In contrast, Kaneko saw Fazang's notion of the Shared Teaching (*dōkyō*, Ch. *tongjiao*, 同教) as exemplifying the systematic integration, giving relative

<sup>20</sup> Although Kaneko does not quote from the *WJZ*, the relevant passage is: 初約教者，然此五教相攝融通有其五義。一或總爲一。謂本末鎔融唯一大善巧法。……五或散爲五。(T45, No. 1866, 482a13–15, 21).

<sup>21</sup> 是則諸教本末句(數)結成(教)網。大聖善巧長養機緣，無不周盡。(T45, No. 1866, 482b13–15). The characters in parentheses do not appear in the Japanese Text (nor are they included in Kaneko's quotation), but exists in the Song Text (hence also in the Taishō Tripitaka version).

<sup>22</sup> [是]一性海果分，[當]是不可說義。(T45, No. 1866, p. 477a14–15). Characters in brackets only appear in the Japanese Text (*wa-hon*, 和本). 故地論云，因分可說，果分不可說者是也。(T45, No. 1866, p. 477a16–17). The passage Fazang claims to be from the *Shidi jing lun* (《十地經論》) cannot be found in Vasubandhu's treatise. Although Kaneko does not explicitly cite from Fazang, the function of subsumption is stated as follows in the *WJZ*: 二該攝門者，一切三乘等[法]本來悉是彼一乘法。(T45, No. 1866, p. 478b24–25). The character in brackets appears only in the Japanese Text.

significance to the teachings of the Three Vehicles which are, as noted above, ultimately subsumed under the One Vehicle (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 76–77). Kaneko’s view basically accords with Fazang’s discussions in the first fascicle of *WJZ*, most notably sections two, five, and seven.

As we can see, Kaneko acknowledged the significance of Fazang’s method of tenet classification. To this, I find two points worth noting here. Firstly, although Kaneko did not apply the same analytical examination to other tenet classifications such as those Fazang lists in section three “Description of past and current establishment of teachings” (*xu gujin lijiao disan*, 敘古今立教第三) of the *WJZ*, it would be worth studying the “universal idea” at the core of integration and how it is systematically employed progressively in the various tenet classifications, in Zhiyi’s (智顓) for example. This would help us grasp the characteristics of the tenet classifications from a three dimensional perspective.

Secondly, we should be aware that Kaneko’s theory rests on the premise that a fundamental teaching forms the foundational source which pervades, directly or indirectly, all other diverse teachings. This is understandable as tenet classification is an attempt at understanding the diverse and possibly contradicting ideas found in different sūtras as forming a cohesive, comprehensive whole (supposedly) taught by the Buddha. Here, we should be mindful of the fact that the fundamental teaching the classifier identifies from among the diverse teachings is not an abstract idea which appeared from nowhere; it needs be justifiable as the fundamental teaching of the Buddha.<sup>23</sup> In this respect, the fundamental teaching discovered by the classifier should reflect their view of the Buddha himself as Kaneko suggests. If not, its significance will be limited to doctrinal, philosophical sophistication or in advancing sectarian, polemical interests rather than a soteriological one. Moreover, it is important to acknowledge, as Kaneko reminds us, that the classifiers’ views of the Buddha would be influenced by diverse

---

<sup>23</sup> Ancient Chinese exegetes stood upon the premise that all the diverse and often disparate sūtras and the teachings were preached by the historical Buddha, Śākyamuni, a view which lost validity with the rise of modern Buddhist studies (the sources of which can be found both in certain views proposed already in the late-Edo period in Japan and more importantly in Western philological studies). Kaneko gives an interesting view saying that “if we acknowledge that the Śākyamuni revealed in the tenet classifications of Zhiyi and Xianshou (賢首) is no longer the actual [historical] Buddha but clearly a Buddha as principle (*lifo*, 理佛), we need not take [a limited view of] all the [diverse] teachings in Buddhism as those preached by the historical Buddha, and freely view them in the context of the whole history of Buddhism” (*Outline, CW*, vol. 1. 37). It means taking the idea of the Buddha as a symbolic figure who can be regarded as the preacher of the dharma of all the diverse teachings developed and transmitted over the ages and applying this even in the analyses of historical tenet classifications (this Kaneko actually does, as we shall see later).

conditions pertaining to the classifiers themselves, such as the doctrinal position, depth of spiritual or intellectual understanding of the teachings, or the modes and levels of their own practices. How the above factors might influence a tenet classification is what Kaneko tackles following his theoretical analyses. An examination of Kaneko's views on tenet classifications will not be complete without considering these points.

### 3. Kaneko's Critique of Tenet Classification from a Human Viewpoint

#### 3-1. The Classifier's View of the Buddha

Following his examination of the structure of tenet classification from a methodological, theoretical viewpoint with a focus on Fazang's classification, Kaneko points out that as *panjiao* is a critical analysis of Buddhist doctrines, "it also becomes a critical analysis of the propagator of the doctrines", namely, the Buddha. In Kaneko's view, "how one interprets and distinguishes the doctrines will reveal, at the same time, how one sees the human character (*jinkaku*, Ch. *renge*, 人格) of the Buddha". If one fails to pay attention to this, a classification will "display, unwittingly, a bizarre feature that it regards the human character of the Buddha as utterly worthless" ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 80). Kaneko adds that such classifications can actually be found in history.<sup>24</sup>

We can see that the point Kaneko makes is closely connected to his discussion on the dual integration demanded of a tenet classification; he argues that "if a classification does not try to integrate the Buddha's teachings under a superior idea and merely integrates them through the shallow idea of concepts found in common and taking the diversity of teachings simply as varying prescription of ready-made solutions to different illnesses (*ōbyō yoyaku*, Ch. *yingbing yuyao*, 應病與藥), the Buddha would be seen merely as a great popular orator" (*tsūzokukōen no taika*, 通俗講演の大家) ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 80–81). Kaneko elaborates on his critical assessment of past classifications in terms of their insight into the person of the Buddha:

If one pushes the view that the Buddha "preached the dharma in one voice and the sentient beings attain enlightenment each according to one's kind",<sup>25</sup> [it would mean that] Śākyamuni exclusively engaged in soliloquy all his life, making him a

<sup>24</sup> Kaneko also states in *Outline* that the study on tenet classification is not only concerned with the characteristics of the teachings; at the same time, it is about the human character of Śākyamuni as the preacher [of those teachings]" (*Outline, CW*, vol. 1, 37).

<sup>25</sup> Kaneko cites the passage 佛以一音演說法眾生隨類各得解 in classical Chinese from Fazang's *WJZ* (T45, No. 1866, 480b14–15), section three, which describes Bodhiruci's (菩提流支, ?–527) tenet classification.

person lacking appreciation of the sentient beings' [diverse] capacities. In turn, a tenet classification which categorizes the sermons in temporal order would give us the impression that Śākyamuni was a high-minded educator who taught [in an order] according to his own plan under a grand scheme.<sup>26</sup> In contrast, if a tenet classification asserts that the teachings preached throughout the Buddha's life were not planned beforehand and that they were [progressively] discovered anew according to his capacities and opportunities, it will make us think of Śākyamuni as a religious seeker (*gudōsha*, 求道者).<sup>27</sup> ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 81)

What he finds significant, then, is a sincere contemplation on the human character of the Buddha:

In this sense, a tenet classification that lacks the readiness to contemplate the human character of Śākyamuni is effectively without much value. Genuine integration of Buddhism can only be devised through the heart of sincere contemplation of the Buddha (*nembutsu*, Ch. *nianfo*, 念佛). Therefore, a tenet classification is no other than a product created by the mind which contemplates the Buddha (*nembutsu shin*, Ch. *nianfo xin*, 念佛心). ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 81)<sup>28</sup>

We may interpret Kaneko's argument with a focus on the human character of the Buddha as an attempt to put a human face on the traditional act of tenet classification.

---

<sup>26</sup> This may be a reference to what Fazang calls Xuanzang's (玄奘, 602–664) "Teachings in Three Kinds" (*sanzhong jiao*, 三種教) in section three of the *WJZ* (T45, No. 1866, 481a143–23). Yoshizu Yoshihide pointed out that Fazang generally gives an objective account of historical classifications but strongly criticizes the one by Xuanzang (Yoshizu 215–217). Fazang argued that it gives no place to the *Huayan sūtra* (which Fazang believed to have been the earliest preaching) as Xuanzang defines the first kind "Turning of the wheel of dharma" (*zhuanfalun jiao*, 轉法輪教), which is the earliest kind of teachings of the three, as the teachings of Hīnayāna: 此三法輪中，但說〈攝〉小乘及三乘中始終二教，不攝別教一乘。何以故。(以)華嚴經在初時說，非是小乘故。彼持法輪在後時說，非是華嚴故。是故不攝華嚴法門也。(T45, No 1866, 481a20–23). The character in angle brackets is found in the Japanese Text in place of the preceding character in the Song Text; the one in parentheses is lacking in the Japanese Text. As we can see, Kaneko's criticism is aimed at a different point.

<sup>27</sup> Kaneko's intention here is somewhat vague as "a religious seeker" could have both positive and negative meanings. However, from the context it seems adequate to be taken as a negative term meaning, a religious seeker in training rather than a fully enlightened one.

<sup>28</sup> The term *nembutsu* here is used synonymously with "contemplation" (*okunen*, Ch. *yinian*, 憶念) and not in the more Shin Buddhist sense of reciting the name of the Amitābha Buddha.

### 3-2. Kaneko's assessment of Fazang's tenet classification

Kaneko proceeds to make his assessment of Fazang's tenet classification which he saw as advocating the Distinct Teaching as the fundamental idea behind the logical integration of the Buddha's teachings and the Shared Teaching as the core of systematic integration. Kaneko asks: "what kind of a human character does Xianshou's (賢首) tenet classification portray the Buddha to be?" ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 81).

In Kaneko's view, Fazang saw the Buddha's human character as two-faceted. He defined the Buddha that propagated the Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle as "the Buddha of wisdom" (*chie butsu*, Ch. *zhihui fo*, 智慧佛) who pursued the ultimate truth of the dharma. In contrast, he depicted the Buddha who offered the teachings of the Three Vehicles as one who focused on dispersing the sentient beings' delusions depending on their different capacities, calling this aspect "the Buddha of compassion" (*jihi butsu*, Ch. *cibei fo*, 慈悲佛). He described the former human character as one following solely his own spiritual intent (*zuiji 'i-teki jinkaku*, 隨自意的人格) and the latter as one following the spiritual intent of others (*zuita 'i butsu*, 隨他意佛), the Buddha who would not fear to compromise the ultimate teaching for the sake of saving the souls of sentient beings ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 81).

Kaneko's above analysis gave rise to an issue that needed to be solved: to explain how two opposing characters could co-exist in one single person, the Buddha, without making the sage look like a dual-natured man of split personality (*nijū jinkaku*, 二重人格). Kaneko had to find "something that integrates them on a fundamental level" ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 82). To this question, Kaneko believed the idea of the Shared Teaching (of the One Vehicle) (*dōkyō [ichijō]*, Ch. *tongjiao [yicheng]*, 同教[一乘]) to be the key that "reveals the secret": it connects the One Vehicle with the Three Vehicles, showing that the latter flows out from the former as its skillful means, thereby revealing the principle of systematic integration.

This means that although following [the intent of] oneself (*zuiji*, 隨自) and following [that of] others (*zuita*, 隨他) may seem to contradict with each other, the latter is executed by having the former as a foothold, and the former [in turn] is further bolstered by the latter....Śākyamuni's human character constantly fluctuates (*ryūdō*, 流動) between following [the intent of] oneself and following [that of] others; between wisdom and compassion; between according with the dharma and accommodating the [different] capacities [of sentient beings]. ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 82)

How can this “fluctuation” not be a contradictory instability of human character? Kaneko suggested that when the Buddha’s human character “reaches an extraordinary state of consummation”, we find there the spiritual realm of wisdom which encompasses compassion, the following of one’s own intent embracing the following of the intent of others. Contrarywise, when the human character of the Buddha “descends to the bottom of leniency”, there we find a spiritual realm of compassion where wisdom may even appear to be non-existent although it is latently there. The two may look polarized but they are actually mutually inclusive and the interaction between the two enhances the two facets of the Buddha’s human character.

Kaneko saw that the Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle expresses the “Buddha’s fundamental soul” (*kongenteki naru tamashii*, 根元的なる魂), while the Shared Teaching of the One Vehicle and the Three Teachings show “the fundamental soul of the Buddha actually at work in the realities of life” (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 82).<sup>29</sup> He comments that it is for this reason that the *Huayan sutra*, which propagates the ultimate revelation of the Buddha following solely his own spiritual intent, also elaborates in great detail on the bodhisattva path to save all sentient beings.

Kaneko’s emphasis on the function of the Shared Teaching is significant. However, modern scholarship has revealed that Fazang precisely relegated the Shared Teaching to second place in an effort to establish the superiority of the Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle: Fazang “designates the *Huayan sūtra* as being solely the Distinct Teaching of the two teachings of the distinct and the shared...splitting the two teachings [in two], declaring the Distinct Teaching to be superior and the Shared Teaching to be a lower one on the same level as the Three Vehicles.” (Yoshizu 1991, 332). The weight of such a distinction by Fazang will be assessed at the end of our examination in this paper.

There remains one more point to be addressed. In section seven “Determining the significance in order [of the teachings]” of the *WJZ*, Fazang discussed how the perception of the diversity of the Buddha’s teachings arises depending on how the followers understand the teachings according to their different capacities. Thus, for example, a follower with a limited capacity to understand only the Hīnayāna teachings and refuses to believe in the Mahāyāna would take all the different teachings to be expounding

---

<sup>29</sup> The text says “*dōkyō-sanjō*” (同教三乘) which looks like a compound meaning “the Shared Teaching of the Three Vehicles”. However, from the context, they should be taken as two words: “the Shared Teaching [of the One Vehicle] and the Three Vehicles”.

Hīnayāna doctrines.<sup>30</sup> This difference or shift in perspective that Kaneko identified generally does not pose a grave problem. It is seen as explaining how the different capacities of the followers make them interpret the diverse teachings in different ways, and not how the diversity actually arose out of the different capacities of the followers.<sup>31</sup> However, Kaneko suggests that here, Fazang “totally shifts from what he had explained earlier”, that is, from Fazang’s prior approach of explaining the diversity “exclusively as the differences in the teachings themselves”. Kaneko asserts that, instead, Fazang declares that the Buddha’s teaching is ultimately unfathomable (*fukashigi*, Ch. *bukesiyi*, 不可思議) and tries to “explain everything based on the differences in the capacity [of the sentient beings]”<sup>32</sup> seeing the diversity of the teachings from the perspective of the sentient beings (“Methods”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 83).

Kaneko established his theory of dual interconnected integration of the logical and the systematic approaches which focuses on the universal idea of the Buddha; the theory that the fundamental idea of the Buddha flows out from the highest Distinct Teaching of the One Vehicle to develop into the diverse teachings, penetrating and encompassing them. Therefore, Kaneko needed to make sense of what he saw as Fazang’s shift in perspective which seemed to contradict with Kaneko’s theory.

Kaneko tried to solve this by saying that “there is no need to necessarily see it as a contradiction”.

Even if they saw differences in the teachings owing to their varied capacities, it does not mean that there is no diversity in the teachings themselves. There is no harm in seeing that Śākyamuni taught [the diverse teachings] in response to the diverse capacities [of the sentient beings]. (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 81).

How is this significant in Kaneko’s discussion of the Buddha’s character? He argues that this would “give us a more significant view of the Buddha compared to tenet classifications that depict him as a man of sheer determined soliloquy, a mere preacher,

---

<sup>30</sup> 一或有眾生，於此世中小乘根性始終定者，即〈則〉見如來從初得道乃至涅槃唯說小乘。未曾見轉大乘法輪。如〔諸〕小乘諸部執不信大乘者是。(T45. No. 1866, 483a21–24). The character in angle brackets is found in the Japanese Text in place of the preceding character in the Song Text; the one in brackets is lacking in the Song Text.

<sup>31</sup> See Yoshizu 1991, 232–233, Takemura 2009, 101. Explaining the diversity of the teachings from the diversity of the recipients is one mode of tenet classification that Kaneko stated in *Outline*, as we have seen earlier.

<sup>32</sup> From the context, we can take “everything” to mean the diversity of the teachings.

or one who simply followed through with his predetermined plan of preaching as in the case of Tiantai [classification]” (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 83–84). However, this is problematic as it would amount to making the Buddha look merely like a “great popular orator” who prescribed expedient solutions to different illnesses, a view Kaneko criticized as simplistic, as we have seen in the previous section.<sup>33</sup>

A way around this problem might be to reconfirm Kaneko’s view that all the teachings are founded upon the Buddha’s original enlightenment and that they all flowed out from that foundational source. Kaneko notes himself in *Outline* that “even though they cater to the capacities [of the sentient beings], they are not merely [teachings of] Śākyamuni’s skillful means; it is actually that the truth of the Perfect Teaching of the One Vehicle (*ichijō engyō*, Ch. *yicheng yuanjiao*, 一乘圓教) itself appears in answer to the various capacities [of the sentient beings]” (*Outline, CW*, vol. 1, 37). As Takemura Makio notes in his analysis of section seven of the *WJZ*, Fazang’s discussion can be seen to reveal that “all the teachings arise from the realm, as awoken to by the Buddha in his enlightenment, for the sake of us common persons; [therefore,] those teachings are all in some way the Buddha’s life itself” (Takemura 2009, 104). Takemura’s observation that the diverse teachings are “all in some way the Buddha’s life itself” accords with Kaneko’s assertion that a tenet classification must be based on the mind which contemplates the Buddha.

Kaneko concludes his discussion on the classifiers’ views towards the human character of the Buddha on a critical note towards historical tenet classifications:

Thus, tenet classification touches upon the issue of the Buddha’s human character. However, it is highly doubtful whether tenet classifiers from ancient times were aware of this. We may acknowledge that they were aware of it, in view of the fact that classifications are often discussed alongside the nature of the preacher of the teachings (*kyōshu*, Ch. *jiaozhu*, 教主). However, to what extent do those discussions on the preacher touch upon the human character of Śākyamuni? If we may be very frank, we should say that their speculation were grossly feeble. Since, if they had regarded the question of what to make of the human character of Śākyamuni as a more profound question than the act of integrating the teachings, it would seem that they could have come up with alternative types of tenet classifications [different from those they propagated]. (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 84)

---

<sup>33</sup> The “orator” is from “Method”, *CW*, vol. 2, 80–81 as previously shown.



Kaneko adds that the above criticism applies to Fazang, too. He gave a similar assessment of Fazang's tenet classification together with that of Zhiyi in his *Outline*. Kaneko remarked that "tenet classification is not only about categorization of the teachings: it is also concerned with the human character of Śākyamuni as the preacher of the teachings" and asked if the tenet classifications by Zhiyi and Fazang "do not discredit the human character of Śākyamuni." His verdict was that "the theory of the Five Periods [by Zhiyi] is too technically crafted (*gikō ni sugi*, 擬巧に過ぎ) and the theory of the Five Teachings [by Fazang] is too slanted towards logic (*ronri ni hensi*, 論理に偏し) that we cannot help feeling that they both make us lose sight of the actual person of Śākyamuni" (*Outline, CW*, vol. 1, 37). However, he praises Fazang for consequently "revealing the human character of the Buddha as one of perfect fulfillment (*enman*, Ch. *yuan man*, 圓滿) of wisdom and compassion" in his effort to integrate the diverse teachings on an ultimate level ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 84). We can see that although Kaneko regarded Fazang's theoretical sophistication highly, he found it lacking in the more human aspects that Kaneko expected tenet classifiers to delve into.

### 3–3. The classifier's view of the self

Kaneko contends that there is a further significance in tenet classification: that it is ultimately a critique of oneself. For example, one who indulges in doctrinal discussion would come up with a classification based on the view that the Buddha exclusively led a life of doctrinal contemplation. In the same way, Kaneko argues that Fazang's tenet classification of the Five Teachings reveals a system of classification that was apparent to those people who had the same level of capacity in common, Fazang being an exemplary figure of such people. Thus, in Kaneko's view, Fazang's classification of the Five Teachings "expresses Xianshou's own philosophical life (*shisō seikatsu*, 思想生活)". Kaneko believed Fazang was aware of this, too, as Kaneko saw Fazang's discussion in section seven of the *WJZ* as expounding how the different capacities of the classifiers give rise to different systems of tenet classification, as we have seen earlier ("Methods", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 84–85).

It is interesting to take note here, how Kaneko connects tenet classification to religious practice by saying that "tenet classifications candidly reveal the modes of contemplation (i.e. observations on the meaning [of the teachings]) practiced by the classifiers" ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 85).<sup>34</sup> Just as Kaneko took the

---

<sup>34</sup> Here, "contemplation of the mind" is "*kanjin*" (Ch. *guanxin*, 觀心) and "observations on the meaning

contemplation on the human character of the Buddha to be a decisive factor in the enterprise of tenet classification, likewise, he asserts the importance of meditating on one's own spiritual state. To Kaneko, tenet classification was not simply about intellectual, objective analyses or comparative studies of the different teachings. Kaneko boldly says that if one felt even a twinge of fear in regarding one's own human character as equal to the Buddha, they would refrain from judging and classifying the teachings in place of the Buddha himself and take refuge in a given teaching instead, "just as masters such as Daochuo (道綽, 562–645) or Shandao (善導, 613–681) did" ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 85).

In this respect, although Kaneko noticed a certain level of reflection of inner spiritual life in Fazang's tenet classification, he criticized it as revealing Fazang's "exterior life" (*gaiteki seikatsu*, 外的生活) more strongly than the inner life; he saw Fazang's classification as colored by his politico-religious interests. Kaneko acknowledged that "we cannot not reside exclusively in the realm of *dharmadhātu*; contrarily, we spend more time in the realm of sentient beings, moreover in the religious society (*kyōkai*, 教界)" ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 85). Therefore, Kaneko imagined that a celebrated person of Fazang's standing, "one who was socially acclaimed in the religious society of the time," would have been more concerned with trying to unify the politico-religious community ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 85–86).

To be fair, Kaneko commended Fazang's spirit of praising the predecessors such as Huiguan (慧光, Guantong Lushi, 光統律師, 468–537) and Zhiyi.<sup>35</sup> Although Kaneko was critical towards Fazang's approach to tenet classification, he did praise Fazang for not only criticizing the past formulations but also having tried to encompass the diverse views into his own classification. This was not, in Kaneko's view, necessarily a polemical attempt to subject others' views under his own theory. Kaneko found there a sense of being what he called fellow companions (*dōbō*, 同朋): "Truly, people within the religious society are fellow companions so long as they called themselves Buddhists" ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 85).

---

[of the teachings]" given in parentheses in the original text is "*kangi*" (Ch. *guanyi*, 觀義). From this, we may discern that *kanjin* is used to mean the act of contemplation, or meditation, rather than introspective observation of one's mind as it would usually mean. Meanwhile, *kangi* is added to explain the actual object of inner observation, namely, the meaning of the teachings of the Buddha.

<sup>35</sup> "Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 86. At the end of section three "Description of past and current establishment of [categories of] teachings" of the *WJZ*, Fazang commended basically all the ten exegetes, except perhaps Xuanzang, whose tenet classifications he examined. However, the most lavish praises are extended to Huisi (慧思, 515–577), Zhiyi, and Fayun (法雲, 467–529). 此上十家立教諸德竝是當時法將英悟絕倫。……聖說差異其宜各契耳。(T45, No. 1688, 481a23–481b04).

However, an attempt at comprehensiveness and sophistication in the theory or structure of a tenet classification does not mean it will have a motivational force without which Fazang's ideal of fellow companionship would become a hollow ideal. Furthermore, we can see that to Kaneko, who was not only a scholar of Huayan thought but a passionately earnest follower of the Shin Buddhist faith in the Pure Land tradition, integrating the whole array of teachings needed to ultimately lead to the act of having faith in a teaching that would lead one to salvation or enlightenment.<sup>36</sup> This view can be inferred from his closing comments in his article, the "Methods", where he concluded by giving a negative assessment of the all-encompassing, comprehensive nature of Fazang's grand theory of tenet classification and a critical remark towards the Buddhist society of his time:

However, An excessively versatile thing lacks inner power; an excessively grand structure cannot evade eventual rift. It is hardly surprising that Xianshou's thought did not flourish after him and that the enterprise called tenet classification also failed to produce any significant cases thereafter. Master Shandao's view of seeing the religious society as a gang of bandits and dreadful beasts stand in stark contrast to Fazang's view of the religious society as a [community of] fellow companions (*dōbō*, 同朋). Here, our examination [of tenet classification] may offer us a suggestion in regard to our views on the religious society of the modern times. ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 86)

## Conclusion

What significance might be found today in studying the ancient tenet classifications by Fazang and others, apart from making purely historical or philological findings? According to Kimura Kiyotaka, Fazang's tenet classification aimed to show the Huayan doctrine to be the highest, ultimate Buddhist thought. Kimura notes that Fazang's classification of the Five Teachings and the Ten Schools (*gokyō jissū*, Ch. *wujiao shizong*, 五教·十宗) was established under strong influence of Faxiang doctrine (法相教學) and that Fazang's major interest was to establish the superiority of Huayan doctrine over that of the Faxiang school (Kimura 1992, 128–129). Yoshizu Yoshihide also assesses Fazang's endeavor similarly, remarking that Fazang "took pains to give the *Huayan sūtra* the

---

<sup>36</sup> This is apparent from his comment mentioning Daochuo and Shandao that we have already seen ("Method", in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 85).

highest rank; the result of his exertion being his advocacy of the Five Teachings” (Yoshizu 1991, 217). Since tenet classification is an attempt at “determining the Buddha’s teachings as high or low, superior or inferior, and trying to comprehend them systematically in their totality” (Kimura 1992, 55), the former aim of determining the superiority of a certain doctrine will inevitably tend to give the act of tenet classification a polemical nature based on sectarian interests. It will also mean that the criteria of allocating ranks in terms of profundity of the teachings will tend to be doctrinal rather than practical. Kaneko, too, found Fazang’s tenet classification doctrinal and sectarian, remarking how it was colored by Fazang’s “exterior” life, strongly concerned with the contemporary “religious society”. These tendencies seem to limit the scope of significance in studying ancient tenet classifications today to that of historical interest. In view of this, Kaneko’s focus on the “human character” of the Buddha and the classifiers themselves in tenet classifications is unique. To conclude our examination, let us focus our attention to this point.

As we have seen in the previous sections, Kaneko’s evaluation of Fazang’s approach to tenet classification is dual: he praised the comprehensive nature of his systematic integration of the diverse teachings, mentioning Fazang’s idea of fellow companionship (*dōbō*, 同朋), but criticized the excessive focus on theoretical sophistication. Regarding the former, Kaneko made an important point when he asked “However, if people each have different opinions, how can people not lose the sense of fellow companionship?” To this, he answered that “what opens a way in this regard is tenet classification” (“Method”, in *Essence, CW*, vol. 2, 85–86). Then, how can tenet classification, tending to be sectarian and polemical, lead us to think of Buddhists with different views as fellow companions? Kaneko states:

This is because tenet classification is ultimately about appreciating others’ theories and integrating them as components into one’s own system of thought. Therefore, if we can mutually encompass the views [of others and oneself] in one’s system of thought, we will not lose the sense of fellow companionship even while having different views. When we contemplate Fazang’s text in the sections [in the *WJZ*] on describing past and current establishment of teachings and determining the significance in order [of the teachings], we can clearly see his aspect of generosity (*kan’yō*, 寬容) towards the people in the Buddhist religious society. Moreover, this generosity did not stem from his ignorance; it is because he had in his mind a grand [vision of] organization that he was able not only to sharply criticize others in the

religious society but also to encompass them.... If Fazang's theory of integration and its sophistication, together with its versatility [to encompass the diverse teachings], had in it the real power to motivate the religious society, the religious society [of his time] would have been transformed into an ideal state. ("Method", in *Essence*, *CW*, vol. 2, 86)

This is why Kaneko regarded the comprehensiveness of Fazang's tenet classification positively.

Then what was it that made Fazang's classification powerless to motivate fellow Buddhists of the religious community of his time in the direction Fazang believed to be ideal? In Kaneko's view, it was the excessive theoretical sophistication focused on unifying the politico-religious society. What deprived Fazang's tenet classification of any practical thrust to move people, making his comprehensive approach and his idea of fellow companionship a hollow ideal, is precisely what Kaneko saw as a prerequisite of all tenet classifications: focus on the human character of the Buddha and the classifiers themselves.

Kaneko clarified that Fazang saw the Buddha as having two "faces": that of the Buddha of wisdom (*zhahui fo*, 智慧佛) and that of the Buddha of compassion (*cibei fo*, 慈悲佛). He contended that "to truly save others, one should start with compassion towards others, but its perfection means guiding them into the true wisdom one has actually experientially discovered (*jisshō*, 實証)". It is this mutual interplay of wisdom and compassion and a comprehension of others and oneself that would open the way to "broadly empathizing with others to lead the way of oneness of the self and others (*jita ittai*, 自他一體)" ("Method", in *Essence*, *CW*, vol. 2, 82).

Leaving the historical evaluation of Fazang's tenet classification aside, it will be worthwhile to turn our attention to Kaneko's two important propositions on tenet classification with regard to the significance they may hold for us today. One is his contention that how our views on the "human character" of the Buddha and ourselves are important elements in understanding the diverse Buddhist teachings. By exploring the human character of the Buddha depicted in the various sūtras and by making an assessment of one's own spiritual situation alongside this, we may acquire a clearer view to what we should aspire to be if one is to follow the Buddhist path. The human character of the Buddha that we may find in our reading of the sūtras may become a "role-model" which we may aspire to emulate the best we can in our own ways. The other significant

proposition in Kaneko's critique of tenet classification is his emphasis on the Shared Teaching of the One Vehicle, although, as we have seen in section 3–3, modern scholarship has revealed that Fazang himself gave it a much lower rank compared to the Distinct Teaching. Seeing the diverse teachings of the Buddha from this viewpoint will enable us to maintain a comprehensive view and the sense of what Fazang called the fellow companionship, freeing us from an excessively polemical and mutually exclusive approach towards both the Buddha's teachings which could include ideas we may not necessarily subscribe to and fellow Buddhists who may hold different views. A review of Kaneko's ideas which puts a human face on the *panjiao* will offer us an opportunity to reflect on our own views of the Buddha and our positioning towards the rich array of Buddhist teachings that have been passed down to us over the ages.

## Bibliography

### (Primary sources 1: Sutras and treatises)

法藏，《華嚴五教章》（《華嚴一乘教分記》《華嚴一乘教義分齊章》）。《大正藏》T45, No. 1866.

Citations from the above text in this paper are from the SAT Daizōkyō Database (The SAT Daizōkyō Text Database Committee), [https://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/index\\_en.html](https://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/index_en.html)

### (Primary sources 2: Works by Kaneko Daiei)

- 〈華嚴經七處八會の綱要〉，《無盡燈》，第 11 卷 11 號, 12 卷 3 號, 4 號，(京都：無盡燈社，1906–07 年)。
- 〈『華嚴經』の思想〉，《精神界》，第 16 卷 1 號，(東京：精神界發行所，1916 年)。
- 〈教相判釋の方法と及其意義〉，《無盡燈》，第 23 卷 8 號，(京都：無盡燈社，1918 年)。 Later included in 《佛教の本質》，(京都：文永堂書店，1921 年)，republished in 《金子大榮著作集》，第 2 卷，(東京：春秋社，1977 年)。
- 〈教相の統一研究〉，《佛教概論》，(東京：岩波書店，1919，全人社，1947)，republished in 《金子大榮著作集》，第 1 卷，(東京：春秋社，1980 年)。
- 《清澤先生の世界》，(京都：文明堂，1986 年)。

### (Secondary sources)

- 木村清孝 (Kimura Kiyotaka)，《中國華嚴思想史》，東京：平樂寺書店，1992 年。
- 竹村牧男 (Takemura Makio)，《《華嚴五教章》を読む》，東京：春秋社，2009 年。

- 伊藤眞 (Itō Makoto), 〈金子大榮 における〈心佛及眾生〉三無差別説〉,《印度學佛教學研究》,第 69 卷 1 號,東京:日本印度學佛教學會,2020 年,頁 181–191。
- 伊藤眞 (Itō Makoto)[Itō 2021A], 〈普賢行を可能にするもの—金子大榮における華嚴の菩薩道〉,《現代と親鸞》,第 45 號,東京:親鸞佛教中心,2021 年,頁 49–82。
- 吉田久一 (Yoshida Kyūichi),《近現代佛教の歴史》,東京:築摩書房,1998 年。
- 吉津宜英 (Yoshizu Yoshihide),《華嚴一乘思想の研究》,東京:大東出版社,1991 年。
- 幡谷明 (Hataya Akira), 龍溪章雄 (Tatsudani Akio), 〈金子大榮—聞思の教學者〉,《浄土佛教の思想》,第 15 卷,東京:講談社,1993 年。
- 藤原智 (Fujiwara Satoru) 〈清澤滿之と眞宗大學(東京)の運営〉,《現代と親鸞》,第 47 號,東京:親鸞佛教中心,2022 年,頁 256–274。
- 鎌田茂雄 (Kamata Shigeo),《佛典講座 28—華嚴五教章》,東京:大藏出版社,1979 年。
- Buswell Jr., Robert E. and Lopez Jr., Donald S. eds. 2014. *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Itō, Makoto. 2021 [Itō 2021B]. “The Huayan sūtra as ‘Our Sūtra’: A Reappraisal of Kaneko Daiei’s Huayan Thought.” *Toyo University Oriental Studies* 《東洋學研究》 58: 315–334.
- Josephson, Jason Ānanda. 2012. *The Invention of Religion in Japan*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ketelaar, James Edward. 1990. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

