

The *Huayan Sūtra* as ‘Our Sūtra’: A Reappraisal of Kaneko Daiei’s Huayan Thought

ITŌ Makoto

Introduction

Kaneko Daiei (金子大榮, 1881–1976), a Shin Buddhist priest and scholar known for his innovative modern views on Pure Land thought, was also an avid reader and researcher of the *Huayan Sūtra* (*Kegon-gyō*, 『華嚴經』). Later in his life, he confessed that people see something ‘Huayan-like’ (*kegon-teki*, 華嚴的) in his Buddhist thought.¹ Although he left a considerable amount of writings—books, journal papers, magazine articles, etc.—on this sūtra, in recent years, they have received little attention in academic circles and among the general readership.² In view of this, a reappraisal of Kaneko’s views on the *Huayan Sūtra* will be significant in two ways. Firstly, it will bring back to light a significant part of Kaneko’s Buddhist studies. Secondly, his views on the teachings of the *Huayan Sūtra* with a focus on the relevance to our soul and the realities of our life invite us to read this sūtra in a new light. Through an examination of Kaneko’s reading of the *Huayan Sūtra*, this paper aims to reevaluate the significance that the sūtra had for Kaneko and how this ancient sūtra may be relevant for us today.³

As this paper will show, Kaneko’s works reveal innovative insights into the nature and teachings of the *Huayan Sūtra*. He argued that traditional doctrines and hermeneutics, established mainly by the Chinese Tang dynasty Huayan School patriarch Fazang (Hōzō, 法藏, 643–712, also known as Xianshou Dashi, Jp. Genju Daishi, 賢首大師), were theoretically supreme but “provide no resonance with my soul”.⁴ Similarly, Kaneko acknowledged that the *Huayan Sūtra* itself expounds vast, profound teachings that seem far removed from the realities and anxieties of the common person (*bonbu*, 凡夫). What, then, was it in the *Huayan Sūtra* that attracted Kaneko? As Kaneko asked, how can this sūtra be “our own sūtra”?⁵ Kaneko believed that the Samantabhadra-caryā (*fugengyō*, 普賢行. Hereafter: *fugengyō*) expounded, especially in the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu (Nyūhokkai-bon, 入法界品), to be the essence of this sūtra, teaching the bodhisattvas’ practices that the common person can intimately relate to: “a way that is relevant to us”.⁶

1. Kaneko's writings on the *Huayan Sūtra*

1-1. Kaneko's life and the *Huayan Sūtra*

Kaneko Daiei, a Shin Buddhist Ōtani sect (Shinshū Ōtani-ha, 真宗大谷派) priest from today's Niigata Prefecture, attended the sect's Shinshū University in his youth.⁷ At the time, it was located in Tokyo under the presidency of Kiyozawa Manshi,⁸ whose 'Spiritual Movement' (*seishinshugi*, 精神主義) and the activities of his Kōkōdō (浩々洞) group of young Shin Buddhist priests exerted a lifelong influence on Kaneko.⁹ However, at Shinshū University, instead of the sect's official Shin Buddhist studies (*shūjō*, 宗乘), Kaneko chose Huayan studies as his major. Biographers have speculated that Kaneko avoided majoring in Shin Buddhism with a view to studying Buddhism from a wider perspective, but they have not been able to determine why he chose Huayan over others.¹⁰ His graduation thesis discussing the basic structure of the *Huayan Sūtra* later became a series of articles in the journal *Mujintō* (『無尽灯』) published by the university.¹¹

Although Kaneko returned to his family temple after graduation in 1904 to perform his duties as a priest, he continued to contribute academic papers and other articles to the *Mujintō*, the popular Buddhist monthly *Seishinkai* (『精神界』) published by the Kōkōdō group, and local newspapers. In 1915, he was invited to Kōkōdō to become the representative of the group and chief editor of their magazine. He also taught briefly at Toyo University in 1916, before becoming professor at Shinshū Ōtani University in Kyoto that same year. He was assigned to teach introductory courses on Buddhism and Huayan thought, both of which formed the bases of his subsequent publications in the field.

Doctrinal disputes within the Ōtani sect forced him to resign from the professorship in 1928 and to renounce his priesthood in 1929. However, he continued to publish extensively, mostly on Shin Buddhism, until being reinstated to his priesthood in 1940 and to his professorship in 1941. During this period, he also continued to write on the *Huayan Sūtra*, including a publication of one full volume titled *Essentials of the Huayan Sūtra* (*Kegon-gyō no Kōyō*, 『華嚴經の綱要』, 1934. Hereafter: *Essentials*) which proved popular enough to be reprinted in various forms and titles over the years.¹²

1-2. List of Kaneko's writings on the *Huayan Sūtra*

Clearly, Kaneko's faith was centered on Shin Buddhism throughout his lifetime. However, with his background in Huayan studies, Kaneko left a significant number of writings on the *Huayan Sūtra*. A tentative list of academic papers, magazine articles, and books with titles related to the *Huayan Sūtra* is given on the next page.¹³ He also discussed Huayan teachings in writings not

focused solely on the *Huayan Sūtra*, such as in the *Outline of Buddhism* (*Bukkyō Gairon*, 『仏教概論』, 1919. Hereafter: *Outline*) and *Various Issues on Buddhism* (*Bukkyō no Shomondai*, 『仏教の諸問題』, 1934. Hereafter: *Various Issues*).

- (1) “Two Great Virtuous Priests of the Huayan School in Japan” (“Nihon ni okeru Kegon-shū no ni-daitoku”, 「日本に於ける華嚴宗の二大徳」), *Mujintō*, vol. 9 (2), 1904.
- (2) “Essentials of the Seven Venues and Eight Assemblies of the *Huayan Sūtra*” (“Kegon-gyō shichisho hachi-e no kōyō”, 「華嚴経七處八会の綱要」), serially published in three parts in *Mujintō*, vol. 11 (11), November 1906, vol. 12 (3), March 1907, vol. 12 (4), April 1907.
- (3) “Ideas in the *Huayan Sūtra*” (“Kegon-gyō no shisō”, 「華嚴経の思想」), *Seishinkai*, vol. 60 (1), 1916.
- (4) *Lectures on the Chapter on the Ten Stages in the Huayan Sūtra* (*Kegon-gyō Jucchi-bon Kōgi*, 『華嚴経十地品講義』), Shinshū Ōtani-ha Retreat Office (真宗大谷派安居事務所), 1927.¹⁴
- (5) “Fugengyō and the Contemplation on Emptiness: on the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-nāma-mahāvaiṣṭya-sūtra*” (“Fugengyō to kūgan: Daihōkōbutsukegon-gyō ni tsuite”, 「普賢行と空観——大方広仏華嚴経に就て」. Hereafter: “On Emptiness”), *Annual of the Nippon Buddhist Research Society*, 3rd year (『日本仏教学協会年報』第3年), 1931.
- (6) “On the *Huayan Sūtra*” (“Kegon-gyō ni tsuite”, 「華嚴経について」), *Bukkyō Seikatsu* (『仏教生活』), 1933.¹⁵
- (7) *Essentials of the Huayan Sūtra* (*Kegon-gyō no Kōyō*, 『華嚴経の綱要』), Tōhōshoin (東方書院), 1934.¹⁶
- (8) “Learning from the Youth Sudhana” (“Zenzai-dōji ni manabu”, 「善財童子に学ぶ」), 1950.
- (9) “On the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu” (“Nyūhokkai-bon ni tsuite”, 「入法界品に就て」), before 1955.¹⁷
- (10) “The World of Huayan” (“Kegon no sekai”, 「華嚴の世界」), *Nanto Bukkyō* (『南都仏教』), vol. 2, 1955.¹⁸

In the above publications, Kaneko mostly tried to describe the basic tenets of the *Huayan Sūtra* in general, rather than to explore a particular topic. However, it is notable that there are works focused on the bodhisattva’s practice, namely *fugengyō*. He often discussed this in relation to the pilgrimage of the youth Sudhana depicted in the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu. His focus on *fugengyō* will be examined in section 3 of this paper.

2. Kaneko's criticisms towards traditional Huayan thought¹⁹

How did Kaneko see traditional Huayan thought, especially the ideas of Fazang?²⁰ First, we need to acknowledge that in certain respects he regarded Fazang's works highly. His early studies on the *Huayan Sūtra* were inevitably based on the patriarch's interpretation as it was and has been the mainstream of Huayan hermeneutics almost throughout the history of Huayan studies in Japan.²¹ In his writings, Kaneko often quotes from Fazang's works such as the *Record of Exploration into the Profundity of the Huayan Sūtra* (*Huayan jing Tanxuan ji*, Jp. *Kegon-gyō Tangen-ki*, 『華嚴經探玄記』). Hereafter: *Tanxuan ji*) to clarify ideas or to define concepts found in the *Huayan Sūtra*. In his first major analysis of the sūtra, "Essentials of the Seven Venues and Eight Assemblies of the *Huayan Sūtra*" (1906–07), Kaneko almost exclusively draws on the *Tanxuan ji* and his discussion of the structure of the *Huayan Sūtra* is basically an exposition of Fazang's views. There, Kaneko makes little mention of *fugengyō* which later became an integral part of his own Huayan thought.

In his later works, however, Kaneko made numerous critical remarks against Fazang's ideas. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine each one in detail. Below are typical examples that reflect Kaneko's basic standpoint.²²

Regarding [the meaning of] the title of this sūtra, the interpretation of Xianshou [Genju, 賢首, Fazang] and others are excessively analytic that one finds it difficult to grasp the point.²³

In the [passage on] the Sixth Stage [*dairoku-ji*, 第六地], we find the famous line "the Three Realms are delusions, they are merely fabrication of the one mind, the twelve links all depend on the mind", but the theory of dependence on the mind [*eshin-setsu*, 依心說] in this sense...does not necessarily anticipate the thoughts on tathāgatarbha-hṛdaya [*nyoraiōshin*, 如來藏心] or ālayavjñāna [*arayashiki*, 阿賴耶識].²⁴

To examine Kaneko's criticisms towards Fazang from a comprehensive point of view, let us turn to the *Outline* (1919) where the gist of his views can be found. In this book, Kaneko claimed that his aim was not simply to describe "the different forms of the core tenets of various [Buddhist] schools" but to "reveal the fundamental spirit of Buddhism".²⁵ Therefore, the comments on Fazang's ideas in this book also reveal Kaneko's fundamental views towards Buddhism itself. Discussing Fazang's Huayan thought together with the Tiantai (Tendai, 天台) thought established by Zhiyi (Chigi, 智顛, 538–597), Kaneko notes:

The thoughts of the two patriarchs probably rank first in Buddhism in terms of sophistication of logic....However, I hesitate to hastily praise them as having revealed the essence of Buddhism just because of the sophistication of their logic. Likewise...we can say that people generally conclude that the thoughts of the two patriarchs are far removed from reality.²⁶

What Kaneko meant by Fazang's ideas being "far removed from reality" can be seen in the following comments regarding Fazang's (and Zhiyi's) approach to the realities and anxieties of life:

The thoughts of the two patriarchs...must still be seen as theoretical. Those who focus on true reality [*jissai*, 實際] value actual speech and action [*genkō*, 言行] more than ideas.

The ideal of Mahāyāna was to truly experience the One Way of neither abiding in [the suffering of] birth and death nor in nirvāṇa. However, seeing how exegetes such as Zhiyi [Chigi, 智顛] and Xianshou [Genju, 賢首, Fazang] dissolved this into [the doctrine of] non-obstruction and perfect interfusion [*muge en'yū*, 無碍円融], I cannot but harbor further doubts towards them....If this doctrine were applied to our reality without even a trace of anxiety, it would become one of mundane mediocrity [*bonzoku*, 凡俗] which rationalizes the status quo; if it were employed without reflection on reality, it would only end up justifying an escape [from reality] into the intoxication of ideal contemplation [*kan'nen zanmai*, 觀念三昧].²⁷

Kaneko's attacks on the doctrine of "non-obstruction and perfect interfusion" of all phenomena, a central doctrine in traditional Huayan thought, reveal that his criticism that Fazang's ideas are "far removed from reality" does not simply mean that they are too scholastic and abstract in nature; Kaneko goes further to condemn Fazang of not truly coming to grips with the anxieties of real life. We can see Kaneko's resentment towards the way how Fazang (in Kaneko's view) expeditiously tried to propagate a view of reality based on the theory of "non-obstruction and perfect interfusion", foreclosing the case on a theoretical level without giving full regard to the more practical concerns, especially of the soul.

After all, theories are the way of sages. It is a world which only a handful of wise ones can indulge in....However sophisticated they may be, I dare say that they provide not the slightest resonance with my soul.²⁸

Here, two contrasting faces of Kaneko can be discerned: one that shows a strong will towards

practice to reveal the true reality (*jissai*, 實際) and to live it; and the other acutely aware of himself being the common person (*bonbu*, 凡夫) and not a sage. Kaneko was a Buddhist priest as well as a scholar who, in the turbulent times of Japan's modernization, sought for a Buddhism that resonated with the modern soul. He harbored a dilemma within, which he expressed in the following way in "Ideas in the *Huayan Sūtra*", an essay he contributed to the *Kōkōdō* magazine *Seishinkai*:²⁹

Undeniably, the reality is that we constantly wish to pursue the truth [*shinjitsu*, 眞実] and never stop doing so. However, at the same time as the truth, we yearn for love, we yearn for the compassionate heart of sympathy. It is against the [moral] way to indulge in sensual pleasures, paralyzing our souls, and sabotaging the truth, and even to us [common persons] such falsehood would be unacceptable. Nevertheless, it would be even more unacceptable for us if we were to vainly shout for the truth and to sacrifice all love. Needless to say, there is no doubt that primarily the truth and love are one in principle. However, in our immediate daily life, I must say that the mind which seeks to go forward in the way of freedom unhindered by anybody and the mind which yearns for the wellspring of life based on the heart of love that seeks intimacy with everyone constantly give rise to a dilemma.³⁰

Kaneko's claim that Fazang's Huayan thought does not resonate with his soul—with his inner yearnings and anxieties—is significant in two ways: it reveals Kaneko's emphasis on the lived experience, that one must put teachings into practice, or perhaps rather, that teachings need to be ones that can actually be lived by its followers as they proceed on the way towards the truth; secondly, it speaks of Kaneko's acute awareness of the common person in him which seeks to hinder such a progress. These two perspectives together form the basis of Kaneko's reading of the *Huayan Sūtra*. What Kaneko expects of this sūtra are teachings and ideas that would sympathize with and reach the core of the common person's inner self and motivate the follower to actually live and experience the ways taught in the sūtra.

3. Kaneko's reading of the *Huayan Sūtra*

3-1. Basic structure of the *Huayan Sūtra*

How did Kaneko read and understand the *Huayan Sūtra*? His most comprehensive views on the sūtra can be found in the *Essentials*. After providing an overview of the seven venues and eight assemblies of the Buddha's sermon,³¹ Kaneko describes the overall structure of the *Huayan Sūtra*.

On how we should see the eighth assembly [the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu], although

there have been various arguments since the ancient days, I think it is a just treatment to see it as one independent tome [*bu*, 部] of the *Huayan Sūtra*. Therefore, the *Huayan Sūtra* consists of two tomes, the first of which is formed by the [first] seven assemblies. The two tomes, while having their respective features, strictly accord with each other in content...In addition to the correspondence in content [with the First Tome], as the Chapter on Entry into the Dharmadhātu takes up almost a third of the sūtra, from its sheer size, it is not an overestimation to see it as the Second Tome of the sūtra.³²

His unique idea of seeing the *Huayan Sūtra* as comprised of two independent but consistent “tomes” reveals Kaneko’s high evaluation of the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu. In traditional Huayan thought, it is generally not awarded such an independent role.³³ However, first let us see how Kaneko understood the structure and content of the First Tome.

First, the Buddha is present at the Site of the Attainment of Extinction [of suffering] [*Jakumetsu dōjō*, 寂滅道場], which reveals the spiritual realm of the Buddha’s own enlightenment [*jinaishō no kyōgai*, 自内証の境界]....The five assemblies from the Dharma Hall of Universal Light [*Fukō-hōdō*, 普光法堂] onwards, rightly reveal the bodhisattva’s way. This is the ‘Adornment by Flowers’ [*kegon*, 華嚴] of the sūtra’s title. Furthermore, the fact that the Buddha returned [for the seventh assembly] to the Dharma Hall of Universal Light which is the realm of the Buddha’s own enlightenment, must surely demonstrate that the ultimate conclusion of the bodhisattva’s way is, at the same time, one with the Buddha’s enlightenment.³⁴

This effectively captures Kaneko’s view of the overarching structure and tenor of the First Tome of the *Huayan Sūtra*. He saw that the teachings in the sūtra progressively develops in the order of “the Buddha’s own enlightenment, the bodhisattva’s way, and the stage of culmination”.³⁵

3-2. The role of Samantabhadra Bodhisattva in the *Huayan Sūtra*

Commenting on the bodhisattva’s way propagated in this sūtra, Kaneko notes that the main preacher in the first assembly (Site of the Attainment of Extinction [of suffering], 寂滅道場) which reveals the Buddha’s own enlightenment and the last mentor whom the young pilgrim Sudhana (Zenzai dōji, 善財童子) meets in the final assembly (Double-storied Lecture Hall, 重閣講堂 in the Chapter on Entry into the Dharmadhātu) is Samantabhadra Bodhisattva (Fugen Bosatsu, 普賢菩薩). From this, Kaneko argues that ultimately, all the bodhisattvas that preach the way in the various chapters are symbolically integrated into Samantabhadra.

...in this sūtra which teaches that the bodhisattva's way is in itself totally the manifestation of the Buddha's own enlightenment, all the bodhisattvas are, without fail, unified into Samantabhadra Bodhisattva. Even Mañjuśrī [Monju, 文殊] is no other than Samantabhadra...in this sense, the *Huayan Sūtra* is totally a sūtra preached by Samantabhadra.³⁶

Kaneko's emphasis on Samantabhadra is also reflected in his interpretation of the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu. He remarks that "although the two noble bodhisattvas Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra are both indispensable for entry into dharmadhātu, as this entry is the experience of Mysterious Liberation [*fushigi gedatsu*, 不思議解脱]" symbolized by Samantabhadra, we must acknowledge that "Mañjuśrī is subsumed by Samantabhadra". Kaneko notes that Fazang tried to subsume all the fifty or so mentors of Sudhana that appear in the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu solely under Mañjuśrī. Kaneko criticizes this view, arguing that "from the perspective of the whole point of this sūtra...it should be Samantabhadra alone that subsumes them all".³⁷

Kaneko's praise of Samantabhadra is a notable characteristic of his view on the *Huayan Sūtra*. Traditionally, Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra have been regarded as playing an integral part in the sūtra as a set. Fazang claimed that Mañjuśrī symbolizes faith and wisdom conducive to entry into the realm of dharmadhātu, while Samantabhadra symbolizes practice and the realm of dharmadhātu itself; the two together symbolizing the causal realm that leads to the ultimate fruit of enlightenment of the Vairocana Buddha which is indescribable in words.³⁸ Li Tongxuan and Chengguan, albeit in slightly different formulations, propounded the doctrine of the 'perfect interfusion of the three sages' (*sansheng yuanrong*, Jp. *sanshō en'yū*, 三聖円融).³⁹ Although Kaneko acknowledges the vital functions of the two bodhisattvas as indispensable, his emphasis on Samantabhadra is conspicuous.⁴⁰ In Kaneko's view, "when one recites the *Huayan Sūtra*, it naturally makes the reciter infectiously affected by the vapor [*kūki ni kansen*, 空気に感染] called *fugengyō*": this sūtra is suffused with Samantabhadra's spirit of bodhisattva's practices.⁴¹ Then what is the nature of the bodhisattva's practices that Samantabhadra preaches as *fugengyō*?

3-3. *Fugengyō* and the *Huayan Sūtra*⁴²

Kaneko believed that *fugengyō* is expressed in the title of the *Huayan Sūtra* itself. He analyzes the title (*Daihōkō-Butsukegon-gyō*, 『大方広仏華嚴經』) as meaning 'mahāyāna sūtra on the adornment by buddha-flowers'⁴³ and that the sūtra's teaching is exhausted in the term 'adornment by buddha-flowers' (*butsuke-gon*, 仏華嚴). This, in turn, denotes *fugengyō*, because the buddha-flowers that adorn the land are the diverse flowers that bloom by virtue of the bodhisattvas' acts of altruistic cultivation of sentient beings and by their constant care towards those sentient beings (*rita kyōke*,

利他教化, *kōjun shujō*, 恒順衆生).⁴⁴ Kaneko turns to two passages in the *Huayan Sūtra* and to another in the *Larger Sukhāvāṭīvyūha Sūtra* (*Muryōju-kyō*, 『無量壽經』) to prove his point.⁴⁵

Revering and making offerings to all the buddhas...boundlessly teaching sentient beings...this is by virtue of the force of ‘adornment by flowers samādhi’ (*kegon-zanmai*, 華嚴三昧). (From the Chapter on Bhadramukha Bodhisattva [*Genju bosatu-bon*, 賢首菩薩品])⁴⁶

The samādhi practiced by Samantabhadra Bodhisattva, that samādhi is called ‘adornment by buddha-flowers’. (From the Chapter on Abandonment of the Mundane World [*Riseken-bon*, 離世間品])⁴⁷

As the practices of paying homage to the buddhas and saving sentient beings represent *fugengyō*, Kaneko claims that these passages show that *fugengyō* and ‘adornment by buddha-flowers’ are one and the same. The line that Kaneko cites from the *Larger Sukhāvāṭīvyūha Sūtra* as “a proof from outside [of the *Huayan Sūtra*]”, praises the bodhisattvas who “follow the virtues of Samantabhadra”. Those bodhisattvas “by the pervasive quiescent meditation (*kōfu jakujō*, 廣普寂定), have attained the ‘adornment by buddha-flower samādhi’ (*butsukegon-zanmai*, 仏華嚴三昧)”.⁴⁸ Based on these passages, Kaneko claims that “this sūtra can arguably be called a ‘*fugengyō sūtra*’ (普賢行經)”.⁴⁹ Then what actually is a bodhisattva expected to do in practicing *fugengyō*?

3-3-1. Two core practices of *Fugengyō*

The Chapter on Abandonment of the Mundane World (*riseken-bon*, 離世間品) is known for the two thousand practices that Samantabhadra lists up for the bodhisattva to practice.⁵⁰ Samantabhadra expounds the various virtues and practices in different categories each consisting of ten items, such as the ten mentors (*jisshu zenchishiki*, 十種善知識), ten commendable thoughts (*jisshu kidokusō*, 十種奇特想), ten efforts (*jisshu shōjin*, 十種精進), etc. Among these, Kaneko found two categories to be especially significant: Arousing the universally virtuous mind (*hotsu fugenshin*, 發普賢心, the 21st set of practices) and the Universally virtuous teaching of prayer and practice (*fugen gangyōhō*, 普賢願行法, the 22nd set).⁵¹

Firstly, among the ten universally virtuous minds, Kaneko took the first one to be central: arousing the mind of great compassion, which means cultivating the minds of all sentient beings (*kaike shujō*, 開化衆生). Next, among the ten prayers and practices, he chose the second: revering and making offerings to all future buddhas (*kugyō kuyō mirai issaibutsu*, 恭敬供養未來一切仏).⁵² Taken together, it can be construed that *fugengyō* is nothing but making offerings to the buddhas

and saving sentient beings (*kubutsu-doshō*, 供仏・度生).⁵³

Kaneko presents a further analysis from the perspective of the respective practices. First, Kaneko interpreted 'all future buddhas' that the ancient sūtra taught followers to revere to mean 'all sentient beings of the present age'. Kaneko observed that "if all sentient beings have buddha nature (*issaishujō shitsu'u busshō*, 一切衆生悉有仏性), it means that a buddha is to be found within each and every person". Therefore, making offerings to all buddhas (*kuyō-shobutsu*, 供養諸仏) is effectively fulfilled by respecting all sentient beings around us as buddhas. Conversely, by revering the sentient beings as buddhas, "offering teachings to them rather than *administering* teachings" from a superior position (emphases are mine), the act of cultivating the minds of sentient beings becomes truly possible: "making offerings to the buddhas" and that of "cultivating the minds of all sentient beings mutually work on each other and fulfill the practice of *fugenyō*".⁵⁴

It should be emphasized that this mutual dynamics stands on the recognition that all sentient beings, who are at the same time recognized as buddhas, lead their lives in our world of suffering. Therefore, Kaneko stresses that although the *Huayan Sūtra* may seem to exalt all practices to lofty heights, "in fact it is the very opposite. It aims to reveal that the way of the great bodhisattva lies in a really familiar place [*kiwamete hikin naru tokoro*, 極めて卑近なところ]. Adornment [of the land] by buddha-flowers is carried out extensively in the vast land of sentient beings' afflictions [*shujō no bonnō no daichi*, 衆生の煩惱の大地]".⁵⁵ Here, we can see Kaneko's effort to make this sūtra relevant to the actual life of the common person, stressing that the bodhisattva's practices should be firmly grounded in our world of delusions and suffering.

3-3-2. *Fugenyō* and the teaching of emptiness

The identity of buddhas and sentient beings that we confirmed in the previous section is an integral part of Kaneko's analysis of *fugenyō* based on the perspective of emptiness. Let us turn to Kaneko's thesis that "*fugenyō* is the embodiment of the contemplation on emptiness" (*kūgan no shinshō*, 空観の身証).⁵⁶ Focusing on a passage in the Chapter on Practice of Samantabhadra Bodhisattva (*Fugenbosatsugyō-bon*, 普賢菩薩行品), Kaneko defines *fugenyō* as acts of great compassion:

According to the teaching [in the chapter], first it lists the hundred hindrances caused by anger: "Children of the Buddha, should the bodhisattva-mahāsattva arouse a single mind of anger, there will be no evil among all evils that surpasses this"....Anger hinders compassion. If so, preaching the hindrance caused by anger with an aim to preach *fugenyō* surely reveals that *fugenyō* is identical with the practice of great compassion [*daihigyō*, 大悲行].⁵⁷

Kaneko significantly remarks that arousal of anger is not simply about being angry with others; it is also “the mind that distances oneself from others” which inevitably “leads to a ‘biased virtue’ [*henken*, 偏賢] where oneself alone is deemed to be the virtuous”.⁵⁸ Conversely, great compassion which tries to universally salvage all sentient beings will lead the practitioner to ‘universal virtue’ (*fugen*, 普賢). Kaneko warns us that we “must not think of the buddhas and sentient beings as two different entities”.⁵⁹

As the buddhas are not separate from sentient beings and sentient beings are not different from the buddhas, making offerings to the buddhas [*kuyō shobutsu*, 供養諸仏] itself becomes the act of guiding sentient beings [*kaike shujō*, 開化衆生], and always caring for sentient beings [*kōjun shujō*, 恒順衆生] is transformed into revering the buddhas [*kugyō shobutsu*, 恭敬諸仏]. Thus sentient beings are empty [*kū*, 空] just as the buddhas are empty. Herein lies the embodiment of the contemplation on emptiness that is [expressed as] “to skillfully distinguish all things as non-existent”.⁶⁰

The true intention of contemplation on emptiness should rightly be to break the attachment to the individual self and to practice the great compassion of the oneness of the self and others [*jita ichinyō*, 自他一如].⁶¹

It is the acknowledgement of the emptiness of all, including both the sentient beings and the buddhas, that enables the practitioner to perform non-discriminatory acts of universal salvation of all sentient beings. Kaneko points out that the bodhisattva’s way begins by “observing the Tathāgata that is truly empty and universal [*shinkū-fuhen*, 真空普遍]”. He concludes that the *Huayan Sūtra* reveals that *fugengyō* is no other than the embodiment of the contemplation on emptiness”.⁶²

4. The *Huayan Sūtra* as a sūtra of human practice

Kaneko’s emphasis on the teaching of emptiness is a significant characteristic of his Huayan thought. As we saw earlier, Kaneko was critical towards Fazang’s posture of trying to expeditiously and abstractly affirm the reality we confront through his formula of ‘non-obstruction and perfect interfusion’ [*muge-en’yū*, 無碍円融]. However, how does the emphasis on the teaching of emptiness in the *Huayan Sūtra* distinguish itself from those found in the *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtras (*Hannya-kyō*, 『般若經』)?

The *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* employs philosophical expressions, the wording is also speculative,

that it takes on an appearance of what should rather be called an *upadeśa* [*ronkyō*, 論經]. In contrast, the *Huayan Sūtra* does not preach to *do* contemplation on emptiness [*kūgan suru*, 空観する], but rightly reveals the spiritual state of *doing* contemplation on emptiness [*kūgan shiteiru*, 空観してゐる]....Therefore, its expression is artistic, its wording symbolic, and takes on an appearance of a typical sūtra.⁶³

The *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* represented by Mañjuśrī *theoretically explains* [*risetsu*, 理説] the *mental attainment* [*shinshō*, 心証] of the bodhisattva's way based on the contemplation on emptiness *in general* [*ippan-ni*, 一般に], while the *Huayan Sūtra* represented by Samantabhadra *describes* [*kijutsu*, 記述] the *embodied attainment* [*shinshō*, 身証] ... *specifically* [*kotoni*, 殊に]. Therefore, we can say that the *Huayan Sūtra* is all the more a concrete teaching than the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*.⁶⁴

It is interesting to see that Kaneko illustrates the contrast he points out in the above passages further by comparing the two young bodhisattvas whose stories of their quest in the bodhisattva's way appear in the two sūtras respectively. Kaneko comments on the story in the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* of Sadāprarudita Bodhisattva (Jōtai Bosatsu, 常啼菩薩)⁶⁵ that as the youthful bodhisattva seeks to experience the truth of emptiness, he is unconcerned with his life or status, shedding blood as he sacrifices his body as offerings. In contrast, in the *Huayan Sūtra*, Sudhana visits his mentors with a more leisurely posture, seeking teachings one by one. Kaneko remarks that the former reminds one of wisdom and Mañjuśrī, while the latter speaks of great compassion and Samantabhadra. He concludes the comparison by declaring that when one finds so many lay followers and women among Sudhana's mentors, it is discernible that *fugengyō* is about salvation on this earth, and that therefore, the *Huayan Sūtra* preaches a veritable life based on Buddhism.⁶⁶

His emphasis on Sudhana and the life of practice in the mundane world reveals the core focus of Kaneko's consistent approach to the *Huayan Sūtra*. Similar to his comparison between the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* and the *Huayan Sūtra*, in a short essay "On the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu" (1955), Kaneko remarks that while the First Tome of the *Huayan Sūtra* expounds the principle, the Second Tome teaches the practice.⁶⁷ He acknowledges that had this sūtra lacked the Second Tome, "its teachings would have seemed a lofty way of the sages, probably having nothing to do with actual people". Therefore, it is the story of Sudhana "through which we can realize that the [bodhisattva's] way [preached in the sūtra] is one that is relevant to us of the real world".⁶⁸

Conclusion

In this paper, we examined Kaneko's Huayan thought with the aim of exploring how he tried to make the *Huayan Sūtra* relevant to the modern person, i.e. to read it as "our own sūtra".

Although the teachings in the *Huayan Sūtra* may seem grandiose and removed from our everyday life, Kaneko argued that "the *Huayan Sūtra* does not merely try to expound the world as seen with the Buddha's wisdom. Through that it tries to give True Eyes [*shinjitsu-no me*, 真実の眼] to the people lost in the flow of karmic sufferings".⁶⁹ In one of his post-war essays, Kaneko came to the conclusion that "it is a 'religion of practice' [*gyō no shūkyō*, 行の宗教]. He declared that "it is also abundantly clear that there is no one to practice *fugengyō* apart from humans. And being a human invariably means being aware that one is the common person [*bonbu*, 凡夫]".⁷⁰ Pointing out that Sudhana's mentors each had only one dharma to teach, Kaneko reminds us of what he found in Sudhana's story:

None of them [the mentors] declared that they were all-knowing. Herein lies the significance of *fugengyō*. Universal virtue [*fugen*, 普賢] is modest because it knows the interminable way. It is by being moved to dedicate oneself fully to the way in accordance with one's own capacity that we gain the joy of confidence. It is through this that the Lotus-store World [*rengedō-sekai*, 蓮華藏世界] is gradually glorified.⁷¹

Here, we find Kaneko's answer to his task of making the *Huayan Sūtra* more relevant to the modern person: it had to be centered on the lived experience; it had to address the acute awareness of the common person in us. Let us conclude with the following remark from Kaneko.

Samantabhadra's wisdom is the wisdom of great compassion. The wisdom of great compassion is the wisdom of one who deeply senses human suffering. It is somber in its great compassion, and bright in its wisdom. The ray of the *Huayan Sūtra* truly penetrates into the darkness of the human world. And that is the light that disperses the darkness.⁷²

It will be encouraging to remember that the Buddha and sentient beings are not separate entities. Samantabhadra in the above passage is no other than each of us ourselves and his wisdom of great compassion will hopefully be ours, too. Kaneko observes that "those who wish to make the world of Huayan one's own should make the practice of universal virtue [*fugen no gyō*, 普賢の行] one's essence. Therefore, the practice of universal virtue must be one that can be appreciated by the common person. Only then will the *Huayan Sūtra* be our own sūtra".⁷³

Notes

- 1 Preface to the Additional volume No. 1 of the *Selected Writings of Kaneko Daiei* (hereafter: *SW*), 2nd page (no page number).
- 2 Although Kaneko has not been as influential to popular readers of Buddhism in Japan today compared with figures such as Kiyozawa Manshi (清沢満之, 1863–1903) or D. T. Suzuki (鈴木大拙, 1870–1966), it is notable that the most popular versions of *On Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Enlightenment* (*Kyōgyōshinshō*, 『教行信証』), the magnum opus of Shinran (親鸞, 1173–1262) and *A Record in Lament of Divergences* (*Tannishō*, 『歎異抄』) by Shinran’s disciple Yuien (唯円, 1222–89) remain today the Iwanami Bunko paperback editions edited and annotated by Kaneko. However, we can only find his writings on—and writings which include major treatment of—the *Huayan Sūtra* in the *SW* series and the *Collected Writings of Kaneko Daiei* (hereafter: *Writings*) series for which one would have to search among the stacks of university libraries or major public libraries to read. See Azuma 2016, 2018, 2020, Murayama 2011 for recent studies on Kaneko.
- 3 This paper forms a part of my recent researches on how Buddhists in pre-war Japan, especially during the Meiji and Taisho periods, read the *Huayan Sūtra* from modern viewpoints. The aim of the researches is to find innovative perspectives free of traditional hermeneutics that will help make this sūtra more relevant to today’s readers and Buddhists. See Itō 2019, 2020a, and 2020b. On the significance of studying pre-war modern Japanese Buddhism, see Yoshida 1998, p. 3, for example. See Itō 2019, fn. 1 for other sources on this point.
- 4 *Outline of Buddhism* (*Bukkyō Gairon*, 『仏教概論』), in *Writings*, vol. 1, p. 167.
- 5 “The World of Huayan” (“Kegon no sekai”, 「華嚴の世界」), in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 132.
- 6 “On the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu” (“Nyūhokkai-bon ni tsuite”, 「入法界品に就て」), *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 117.
- 7 Chronology and basic facts on Kaneko’s life are based on Hataya and Tatsudani 1993 unless otherwise noted. Romanization of names of Japanese organizations follow the styles used by the organizations themselves.
- 8 Shinshū University was still located in Kyoto when Kaneko joined the preparatory course (*yoka*, 予科) in 1899. It was moved to Tokyo a month after Kaneko joined the regular course (*honka*, 本科) in 1901. Kiyozawa resigned from the presidency the following year. Later, the university underwent organizational changes and moved back to Kyoto to become Shinshū Ōtani University in 1911 (see <http://www.otani.ac.jp/annai/nab3mq000000zwa.html>, accessed Oct. 12, 2020).
- 9 Matsubara Yūzen (松原祐善, 1906–1991), a student of Kaneko, recounted that shortly before his death Kaneko expressed his deep appreciation on knowing that his *Writings* had been planned by the publisher as a project in tandem with the publication of the collected works of Kiyozawa and Soga Ryōjin (曾我量深, 1875–1971), formerly a Kōkōdō fellow and Kaneko’s senior colleague at Shinshū Ōtani University. Kaneko remarked to Matsubara that the publication of his *Writings* was a historical proof that he belonged to the lineage of the Kōkōdō together with Kiyozawa and Soga, which he felt was the greatest honor of his lifetime (Matsubara 1977, p. 2).
- 10 Hataya and Tatsudani 1993, p. 268.
- 11 See the list of writings in section 1-2 of this paper.
- 12 See the list of writings in section 1-2 of this paper.
- 13 The list is not exhaustive; it is based on the chronology of Kaneko’s life in Hataya and Tatsudani 1993, pp. 376–388, cross-checked with a list of Kaneko’s books in the journal *Otani Gakuho* (『大谷学報』), vol. 57 (1), 1977, pp. 73–78 (an identical list can be found in *Shinran Kyōgaku*, vol. 30, 1977, pp. 143–150), and on Kaneko’s works which I have been able to access. The same list is included in Japanese in Itō 2020b. A more extensive research is needed to compile a complete list.

- 14 Later published as Additional vol. 1 of *Writings* in 1985.
- 15 Listed in the chronology of Hataya and Tatsudani 1993, p. 133. I have not been able to access this article, hence bibliographical details are unclear. Publication of this magazine was discontinued after three volumes were published in 1933.
- 16 This was published under the title *Huayan Sūtra* (*Kegon-gyō*, 『華嚴經』) as the fourth installment of the *Lectures on Japanese Religion* series (Nippon Shūkyō Kōza, 日本宗教講座). The chronology in Hataya and Tatsudani 1993, p. 380 also gives the title as above. However, the title on page 1 of the book is *Essentials of the Huayan Sūtra* (*Kegon-gyō no Kōyō*, 『華嚴經の綱要』). This book was reprinted in different forms, such as the Zenjinsha (全人社) version in 1948 whose title is *Overview of the Huayan Sūtra* (*Kegon-gyō Gaisetsu*, 『華嚴經概説』), with the title on page 1 as *Essentials of the Huayan Sūtra*. It was included in the Additional vol. 1 of *SW* in 1961 as *Essentials of the Huayan Sūtra*.
- 17 Articles (8) and (9) are included in the *SW*, Additional vol. 1. The *SW* gives no bibliographical data except that the former was originally published on Jul. 12, 1950. In the *SW*, the latter precedes the paper “The World of Huayan” published in 1955. The chronology in Hataya and Tatsudani 1993 does not mention these two works.
- 18 Later included in *SW*, Additional vol. 1.
- 19 This section builds on a part of my presentation “Kaneko Daiei’s interpretation of the doctrine of non-difference of the mind, buddha, and sentient beings” given on July 5th, 2020 at the 71st annual conference of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies (JAIBS, 日本印度学仏教学会) hosted online by Soka University (創価大学). The gist of the presentation has been published in a brief paper (Itō 2020b).
- 20 In this paper, I use the term ‘traditional Huayan thought’ as meaning the doctrines and hermeneutics established by Chinese Huayan School patriarchs such as Zhiyan (Chigon, 智儼, 602–668), Fazang, and Chengguan (Chōkan, 澄觀, 738–839) which have been the main objects of study in the Japanese Huayan School tradition (Kegonshū, 華嚴宗) and to a large extent in modern scholarship. Kimura Kiyotaka distinguishes between ‘Huayan doctrinal studies’ (*kegon kyōgaku*, 華嚴教学) of the patriarchs and scholar priests belonging to the Huayan School and the broader ‘Huayan thought’ (*kegon shisō*, 華嚴思想) of others (see Kimura 1992, p. 2). ‘Traditional Huayan thought’ in my usage corresponds to the former. Kaneko’s interest in Traditional Huayan thought is mostly limited to the ideas of Fazang.
- 21 The Kamakura period Huayan-Shingon monk Myōe (明恵, 1173–1232) is an exception. He turned to Fazang’s works for theoretical ideas and to Li Tongxuan’s (Li Tsūgen, 李通玄, 635–730) for practical ideas. Li was a lay practitioner who advocated a Huayan thought distinct from those of the Huayan School patriarchs. Although Kaneko discussed the person and ideas of Myōe and Gyōnen (凝然, 1240–1321) in an early paper “Two Great Virtuous Priests of the Huayan School in Japan” (1904), Kaneko only makes a brief mention of Li Tongxuan. Kaneko did acknowledge, however, that “it seems that Myōe revered [Li] Tongxuan [(Li) Tūgen, (李) 通玄] as his master rather than the Huayan [school]’s authentic lineage [*seikei*, 正系] of Xianshou [Genju, 賢首, Fazang], Chengguan [Chōkan, 澄觀], etc.” (*Mujintō*, vol. 9 (2), p. 96).
- 22 For other critical remarks aimed at Fazang’s ideas, see for example: *SW*, Additional vol. 1, pp. 52, 71, 96, 115, 126.
- 23 *Essentials*, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 94. Kaneko makes an almost identical point on the title of the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu (hereafter in the footnotes: Chapter on Entry), (same source, p. 82).
- 24 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 107. The line in the *Huayan Sūtra* is from T9, No. 278, p. 558c (三界虛妄但是心作。十二緣分是皆依心。). Fazang explains the line in length employing the consciousness-only (*yuishiki*, 唯識) and tathāgatagarbha (*nyoraijō*, 如来藏) theories (*Tanxuan ji*, T35, No. 1733, pp. 346c–347c).

- 25 Preface to the first edition of the *Outline*, in *Writings*, vol. 1, p. 5.
- 26 *Outline*, in *Writings*, vol. 1, pp. 162–163.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 163, pp. 48–49. For Kaneko’s usage of the term *Kan’nen*, see Murayama 2011 and Azuma 2016.
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 167.
- 29 This was published as a special supplement in the 1916 New Year’s issue of the *Seishinkai* magazine of which he was chief editor at the time, shortly before he began his lectures (in September) on the *Huayan Sūtra* at Shinshū Ōtani University. The lectures at Shinshū Ōtani University formed the basis of the *Outline*.
- 30 “Ideas in the *Huayan Sūtra*”, *Seishinkai*, vol. 16 (1), p. 18. Kaneko also notes the contrast between the *Huayan Sūtra* and the *Lotus Sūtra*, claiming that the former “seeks to embrace love in the truth” while the latter “seeks to discover the truth in love” (p. 18). “Love” here should be understood as one close to obsession or craving (*trṣṇā* or *rāga*) and not the compassionate love of a buddha or a bodhisattva which is one with the truth as Kaneko notes.
- 31 They are: the Site of the Attainment of Extinction [of suffering] (*Jakumetsu dōjō*, 寂滅道場), the Dharma Hall of Universal Light (*Fukō-hōdō*, 普光法堂) which appears twice, top of Mt. Sumeru (*Shumisenchō*, 須弥山頂, *Tōritengū*, 忉利天宮), the Palace in the Heaven of the god Yāma (*Yamatengū*, 夜摩天宮), the Palace in the Tuṣita Heaven (*Tosotsutengū*, 兜率天宮), the Palace in the Heaven of Gods freely partaking in creations of other heavens (*Takejizaitengū*, 他化自在天宮), the Double-storied Lecture Hall (*Jūkaku-kōdō*, 重閣講堂) in Jetavana (*Giju-gikkodoku-on*, 祇樹給孤獨園).
- 32 *Essentials*, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, pp. 13–14.
- 33 Both Zhiyan and Fazang regard the chapters from the Chapter on Vairocana Buddha [*Rushanabutsu-bon*, 盧舍那仏品] to the Chapter on Entry as comprising a single main body (*shōshū bun*, 正宗分) of the sūtra (Zhiyan: T35, No. 1732, p. 16a–b, Fazang: T35, No. 1733, p. 125a). However, they focused much of their attention on chapters preceding the Chapter on Entry. In contrast, Li Tongxuan famously argued that the Chapter on Entry is the main body (T36, No. 1733, p. 770b).
- 34 *Essentials*, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 12. Kaneko took the Dharma Hall of Universal Light to be the same place as the Site of Attainment of Extinction (p. 9).
- 35 “*Butsu jishō no kyō, bosatudō, sono kukyōji*” (仏自証の境、菩薩道、その究竟地). *Essentials*, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 13. In Kaneko’s view, this structure also applies to the Second Tome.
- 36 *Essentials*, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 16.
- 37 *Ibid.*, p. 84.
- 38 This idea is expressed by Fazang as “*yinfen keshuo, guofen bu keshuo*”, (*inbun kasetsu, kabun fukasetsu*, 因分可説・果分不可説). See *Tanxuan ji*, T35, No. 1733, 298c, 441c.
- 39 Li Tongxuan’s doctrine is found in his *Xin Huayan jing lun* (*Shin Kegon-gyō ron*, 『新華嚴經論』), T36, No. 1739, 946a, etc.; for a discussion of his view, see Kojima 1987. Chengguan’s doctrine is found in his short essay *Sansheng Yuanrong Guanmen* (*Sanshō En’yū Kanmon*, 『三聖円融観門』), T45, No. 1882, pp. 671a–672a; for a discussion of his doctrine, see Kimura 1992, pp. 225–226, Gimello 1997. On the early history of artistic representation of the Three Sages, see Kamata 1996.
- 40 On the relationship between Samantabhadra and the Vairocana Buddha, Kaneko notes that Vairocana is the ‘preacher’ (*sessha*, 説者) while Samantabhadra is the representative character of the ‘hearer of the law’ (*monsha*, 聞者) and that in this sense, Samantabhadra’s practices as a bodhisattva is inseparable with the Vairocana Buddha (“On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 99).
- 41 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 94, p.93.
- 42 Kaneko discussed *fugengyō* in detail in the paper “Fugengyō and the contemplation on emptiness” (1931) and in *Various Issues* (1934) in which he devoted to the subject a full part (Part 5) consisting of four chapters. A full, detailed analysis of his views in *Various Issues* is beyond the scope of this paper as Kaneko discusses *fugengyō* from a wider perspective not limited to Huayan thought.

- 43 The Sanskrit rendering (which Kaneko does not mention) of the title based on the Tibetan text is *Buddhāvataṃsaka-nāma-mahāvaiṣṭya-sūtra*. It can be translated as “great vast (mahāyāna) sūtra called the garland of buddhas”, meaning that it is a mahāyāna sūtra that depicts the gathering of numerous buddhas that can be likened to a garland of flowers. (Mizuno et al. 1977, p. 86l, Kajiyama 1995, pp. 442–443).
- 44 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, pp. 94–95.
- 45 *Ibid.*, pp. 94–95.
- 46 T9, No. 278, p. 434c: 恭敬供養一切仏、…教化衆生無有量、…華嚴三昧勢力故。Kaneko points out that the name of the samādhi is correctly ‘adornment by buddha-flowers samādhi’ [*butsukegon-zanmai*, 仏華嚴三昧] as in the Tang translation of the sūtra. T10, No. 279, p. 74a: 如是一切皆自在以 仏華嚴三昧力。
- 47 T9, No. 278, p. 631c: 普賢菩薩正受三昧、其三昧名仏華嚴。Kaneko adds that the term ‘adornment’ (*yan*, Jp. *gon*, 嚴) is more correctly rendered in the Tang translation (*zhuangyan*, Jp. *shōgon*, 莊嚴). T10, No. 279, p. 279b: 爾時普賢菩薩摩訶薩入廣大三昧、名仏華莊嚴。
- 48 Passages from the *Larger Sukhāvāṭīvyūha Sūtra* which Kaneko cites here in part are from T12, No. 360, p. 265c: 皆遵普賢大士之德; p. 266b: 広普寂定、深入菩薩法藏。得仏華嚴三昧。宣揚演說一切經典。 Kaneko remarks that “interaction [*kōshō*, 交涉] between the *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha Sūtra* and the *Huayan Sūtra* can be found in various points” and that it makes him “think of the closeness of the two sūtras in that they both reveal the identity of *fugenyō* and adornment by buddha-flowers [*butukegon*, 仏華嚴]” (“On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, p. 95).
- 49 *Various Issues*, in *Writings*, vol. 4, p. 196.
- 50 T9, No. 278, pp. 631b–675a.
- 51 T9, No. 278, p. 634c, p. 653a. Kaneko omits the ‘arousal’ (*hotsu*, 発) of the original term ‘arousing the universally virtuous mind’. For an analysis of these two virtues, see Takamine 1976, Chapter 6.
- 52 The first of the ten prayers and practices is “to practice bodhisattva’s practice until all future *kalpas* are exhausted” (T9, No. 278, p. 635a: 尽未来劫行菩薩行普賢願行法。). Kaneko remarks that this simply signifies that the bodhisattva’s practices are without end and that it is the second on the list that describes the actual practice more concretely (*Various Issues*, in *Writings*, vol. 4, p. 208).
- 53 *Various Issues*, in *Writings*, vol. 4, pp. 208–209.
- 54 *Ibid.*, p. 209, p. 211. As Kaneko mentions, these two virtuous acts can also be found among the Ten Great Prayers of Samantabhadra [*jittaigan*, 十大願] in the 40-volume Tang translation of the Chapter on Entry (T10, No. 293, p. 844b). See “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol. 1, pp. 103–104.
- 55 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, pp. 104–105.
- 56 *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 100. The original Chinese text is from T9, No. 278, p. 607a: 佛子。若菩薩摩訶薩、起一瞋恚心者、一切惡中無過此惡。
- 58 *Various Issues*, in *Writings*, vol. 4, p. 212.
- 59 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, pp. 103–104.
- 60 *Ibid.*, p. 104. The quote from the *Huayan Sūtra* is from the Chapter on Abandonment of the Mundane World (T9, No. 278, p. 634c: 巧分別一切法無所有。).
- 61 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 106.
- 62 *Ibid.*, p. 112. There is ample evidence in the *Huayan Sūtra* establishing the emptiness of the Buddha. For example, a verse in the Chapter on Enlightenment by the Tathāgata’s Ray (*Nyorai kōmyō kaku-bon*, 如来光明覺品) declares that “the Tathāgata is empty and quiescent like a created illusion” (T9, No. 278, p. 426c: 如来空寂滅猶幻化).
- 63 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 113. Emphases are in the original text.
- 64 *Ibid.*, pp. 113–114. Emphases are in the original text.

- 65 See for example, the Chapter on Sadāprarudita in the *Smaller Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T8, No. 227, p. 580a.
- 66 “On Emptiness”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 114.
- 67 Kaneko remarks that this contrast is parallel to that of the *Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra* and the *Contemplation Sūtra* (*Kan Muryōju-kyō*, 『観無量寿経』), which is an interesting observation. There is much to be explored on the relationship between Pure Land teachings and Huayan teachings in Kaneko’s Buddhist thought, which is regrettably beyond the scope of this paper.
- 68 “On the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 117.
- 69 “The World of Huayan”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 131.
- 70 “On the Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 121, “The World of Huayan”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 135.
- 71 “The World of Huayan”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 135–136. This is also emphasized in his short essay “Chapter on Entry”, pp. 119–120. It should be noted that the notion of dedicating oneself “in accordance with one’s capacity” (*jishin no bun ni oite tsukusu*, 自身の分に於いて尽くす) can also be seen earlier in Kaneko’s war-time ideas in line with Japanism (*Nihonshugi*, 日本主義), which effectively subjugated the individual initiative to that of serving the total body (*zentai*, 全体), namely the national polity (*kokutai*, 国体). See Azuma 2020, pp. 130–137 (sections ‘Pure Land and “Japan” and ‘Conclusion’).
- 72 “The World of Huayan”, in *SW*, Additional vol.1, p. 126.
- 73 *Ibid.*, p. 132.

Abbreviation

T: *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*, Daizō Shuppan (『大正新脩大藏経』、大蔵出版).

(Texts from the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* in this paper are from the SAT Daizōkyō Database, ver. 2008, with punctuation marks revised and edited where needed by the present author and Chinese characters changed to the new character form. <http://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/>)

JIBS (『印仏研』): *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Japan Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies (『日本印度学仏教学研究』、日本印度学仏教学会).

Bibliography

[Works by Kaneko Daiei]

Collected Writings of Kaneko Daiei, vol.1: 1980, vol. 4: 1979, Additional vol. 1: 1985, Shunjūsha (*Kaneko Daiei Chosakushū*, 『金子大栄著作集』, 春秋社).

Selected Works of Kaneko Daiei, Additional vol. 1: 1961, Zaïke Bukkyō Association (*Kaneko Daiei Senshū*, 『金子大栄選集』, 社団法人在家仏教協会).

[Sūtras and treatises]

Huayan Sūtra: T9, No. 278 (Jin translation), T10, No. 279 (Tang translation), No. 293 (Tang translation of Chapter on Entry into Dharmadhātu).

Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra: T12, No. 360.

Chengguan (澄観), *Sansheng Yuanrong Guanmen* (『三聖円融観門』): T45, No. 1882.

Fazang (法藏), *Record of Exploration into the Profundity of the Huayan Sūtra (Huayan jing Tanxuan ji, 『華嚴経探玄記』)*: T 35, No. 1733.

Li Tongxuan (李通玄), *Xin Huayan jing lun* (『新華嚴経論』): T36, No. 1739.

[Reference sources]

Azuma Shingyō 東真行. 2016. “Jōdo no Kan’nen ni okeru jōdo kan” 「『浄土の観念』における浄土観」. *Research Report of the Graduate School of Otani University* 『大谷大学大学院研究紀要』 vol.33.

——— 2018. “Benefit for others in Kaneko Daiei’s thought: His view of the Pure Land and the religious organization”. *Annual Memoirs of the Otani University Shin Buddhist Comprehensive Research Institute* 『真宗総合研究所研究紀要』 vol. 35.

——— 2020. “Shōtoku Taishi to nihonshugi: Kaneko Daiei o chūshin ni” 「聖徳太子と日本主義——金子大栄を中心に」. In *Kindai no Bukkyōshisō to Nihonshugi* 『近代の仏教思想と日本主義』, Ishii Kōsei (石井公成) et al. eds. Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

Gimello, Robert. 1997. “Ch’eng-kuan’s Meditations on the “Three Holy Ones””. In *Kegongakuronshū* 『華嚴学論集』, Kamata Shigeo hakase koki kinenkai ed. Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版.

Hataya Akira and Tatsudani Akio 幡谷明・龍溪章雄. 1993. “Kaneko Daiei: Monshi no kyōgakusha” 「金子大栄——聞思の教学者」. In *Jōdobukkyō no Shisō* 『浄土仏教の思想』 vol. 15. Kodansha 講談社.

Itō Makoto 伊藤真. 2019. “Akegarasu Haya ni okeru Kegon-gyō no rikai” 「暁烏敏における『華嚴経』の理解」. *JIBS* 『印仏研』 vol. 67 (2).

——— 2020a. “Sasaki Gesshō ni okeru Kegon-gyō no rikai” 「佐々木月樵における『華嚴経』の理解」. *JIBS* 『印仏研』 vol. 68 (2).

——— 2020b. “Kaneko Daiei ni okeru ‘Shin butsu gyū shujō’ san musabetsu setsu” 「金子大栄における「心仏及衆生」三無差別説」. *JIBS* 『印仏研』 vol. 69 (1).

Kajiyama Yūichi 梶山雄一. 1994. *Satori e no Henreki* 『さとりへの遍歴』 1st volume. Chuokoronsha 中央公論社.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1996. “Kegon sanshō-zō no keisei” 「華嚴三聖像の形成」. *JIBS* 『印仏研』 44(2).

Kimura Kiyotaka 木村清孝. 1992. *Chūgoku Kegon Shisōshi* 『中国華嚴思想史』. Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店.

Kojima Taizan 小島岱山. 1987. “Ritsūgen ni okeru sanshō en’yū shisō no kaimei” 「李通玄におけ

る三聖円融思想の解明」. *Kegongaku Kenkyū* 『華嚴学研究』 vol.1.

Matsubara Yūzen 松原祐善. 1977. “Kaneko Daiei Sensei o Tsuioku shite” 「金子大榮先生を追憶して」. *Shinran Kyōgaku* 『親鸞教学』 vol.30.

Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元 et al. eds. 1977. *Butten Kaidai Jiten* 『仏典解題事典』. Shunjusha 春秋社.

Murayama Yasushi 村山保史. 2011. “Kaneko Daiei to seiyō tetsugaku” 「金子大榮と西洋哲学」. *Studies in Comparative Philosophy* 『比較思想史研究』 vol. 37.

Takamine Ryōshū 高峯了州. 1976. *Kegonronshū* 『華嚴論集』. Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会.

Yoshida Kyūichi 吉田久一. 1998. *Kingendai Bukkyō no Rekishi* 『近現代仏教の歴史』. Chikuma Shobo 筑摩書房.

Keywords

Kaneko Daiei, Huayan Sūtra, Samantabhadra-caryā, Fazang, Shin Buddhism

(金子大榮、華嚴經、普賢行、法藏、浄土真宗)

日本語論題

「われらの経典」としての『華嚴経』——金子大榮の華嚴思想の再評価