

LINYU GU

DIPOLARITY IN CHAN BUDDHISM AND THE WHITEHEADIAN GOD

The continuing dialogue between Alfred North Whitehead and Japanese Zen Buddhism has increased our understanding of both. Unfortunately, because of a lack of exploration into the origins of Zen in Chan Buddhism, there have been some fundamental oversights. Within the scarce space and time here, I should not appeal to these problems.¹ My aim in this study is to revive a particular understanding of the Chinese roots of Zen.

There are two reasons for the poverty of vision above. First, Chan Buddhism was transplanted by Dogen (1200–1253) to the land of Japan, and Japanese scholarly works have not given sufficient acknowledgement to this historical fact; also there were times when such an attention was deliberately neglected.² Second, mastery of Chinese language is not easy and such an accomplishment creates great difficulties in gaining firsthand knowledge of the Chinese classics. Also there is a general inadequacy in both Japanese and English translations of these sources. I believe that it is our intellectual responsibility to study the original materials of Chan Buddhism. Without such an intimate and diligent effort, studying of Zen could be likened to cleaving a tree from its roots and thereby preventing its living growth.

Given all this, we are faced with the following questions. What is the fundamental ground of comparison between Whitehead and Zen Buddhism? And how can this comparison be further developed in its richness and complexity? My response is: No answer can be given without recognizing that Chinese Buddhist thought was profoundly rooted in a particular mode of thinking, which is to be found in a Chinese classic: the *Yi Jing* (the *Book of Changes*, the *I Ching*, or the *Zhou Yi*).

To appreciate this thesis, it is necessary to discuss two pairs of dipolar concepts in the *Yi Jing* and Chan Buddhism. They are *yin / yang* and *xin* (mind) / *jing* (world). I believe such a comparison can

LINYU GU, Ph.D., managing editor, *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, University of Hawaii at Manoa. Specialties: Alfred North Whitehead, Chinese philosophy, Japanese thought. E-mail: linyu@hawaii.edu

yield a new way of understanding how Chinese Buddhism developed its own forms by appropriating the ways in which the *Yi Jing* influenced Chinese Buddhism. I shall argue that the *Yi Jing* shares with Whitehead a similar insistence on the importance of dipolarity. I have also developed this thesis in my essay, “Rethinking the Whiteheadian God and Chan/Zen Buddhism in the Tradition of the *Yi Jing*.”³ These studies emphasize the overriding importance of the ground of “oneness” shared by each above way of viewing realities.

I. DIPOLARITY IN *YIN / YANG* AND *XIN / JING* (MIND / WORLD)

It is quite singular that there is such coherence between the philosophy of *yin / yang*, the Buddhist idea of *xin / jing*, and Whitehead’s process thought on the unity of multiplicity. One can immediately sense the distinctive similarity between the following passage written by Whitehead and the overall tenor of the Chinese concepts of *yin* and *yang*, and *xin* and *jing*.

... the universe is to be conceived as attaining the active self-expression of its own variety of opposites—of its own freedom and its own necessity, of its own multiplicity and its own unity, of its own imperfection and its own perfection. All the “opposites” are elements in the nature of things, and are incorrigibly there. The concept of “God” is the way in which we understand this incredible fact—that what cannot be, yet is.⁴

Whether Whitehead, the thinker of the early 20th century in the West, had any opportunity to access Chinese ancient thought is questionable. However, these two great philosophies of cosmology finally have found each other on the same journey in seeking harmony in dipolarity.

First of all, it will be helpful to compare and contrast these two philosophies through a brief discussion of the development of Chan Buddhism. Buddhism was transmitted from India to China in the early Han dynasty, around 200 B.C.E. By the fifth century a number of various Chinese Buddhist schools (*zong*) were in existence: San Lun Zong, Lu Zong, Wei Shi Zong, Tian Tai Zong, Hua Yan Zong, Mi Zong, Jing Tu Zong, and Chan Zong. Some of these schools lost their identities, but the schools of Tian Tai, Hua Yan, Jing Tu, and Chan went on to develop their own forms of Buddhism. These schools reflected the ways in which the Chinese mind transformed certain basic Buddhist principles and moved away from the Indian system. From this point onward, Buddhism in Chinese land had changed forever.

Inspired by the sixth patriarch, Huineng (638–713), the School of Chan was an especially strong stream, growing actively, widely, and influentially. It was named by a Chinese word, *chan*, for the Sanskrit

term, *dhyāna* (the state of deep meditation). Chan emphasizes one-minded meditation, *yi xin chuan xin* (mind-to-mind teachings), as the most profound method for achieving enlightenment. Therefore, this school is also called Fo Xin Zong (the School of Buddha Mind). Chinese Chan Buddhism made a unique development out of Mahāyāna Buddhism and has lived for two thousand years while spreading to Japan, Korea, Asia, and the West. Chan was the birth mother of Zen. An ancient Chinese proverb says: “*Yin shui si yuan* (Drink of the water, think of the source).” In this sense, a Zen scholar’s work could naturally be an incomplete and fragmentary piece without knowledge of how Chan gave birth to and nurtured contemporary Zen.

Chan Buddhism has helped to transform the religious discipline of *dhyāna* into something more congenial to the Chinese philosophical mind and soul. This fundamental change essentially involves the Chinese cultural fondness for the harmony between the dipolar sides of reality. These sides are expressed in a series of categorical pairs, such as *tian* (the universe) and *ren* (the human world), *yin* (the invisible) and *yang* (the visible), *you* (things) and *wu* (no thing), *xin* (mind) and *wu* (matter). Even though the Confucian and Taoist schools interpret these harmonious pairs differently, I wish to point out that both schools have cast the primary inspiration over Chan Buddhism.⁵ This is inevitable since the two schools are intimately entwined with the *Yi Jing* philosophy, the classical source of Chinese mind. The origin of essential thinking on the fundamental dipolar pairs, *yin* and *yang*, is from the philosophy of the *Yi Jing*, which continues to underlie all the related developments provided by Confucianism and Taoism.

Chan Buddhism is basically concerned with the relationship between *xin* and *jing*, namely, mind and the surroundings or the world. This emphasis is also found in other Chinese Buddhist schools, especially Tian Tai and Hua Yan. The Chan discipline concentrates only on a few Buddhist texts, and specifically emphasizes *yi xin chuan xin*, the mind-to-mind methodology, which directs to the understanding and attaining of *wu* (enlightenment). To stress, the essence of this mind-to-mind enlightenment is to discover an intrinsic harmonious state by breaking through the boundary between *xin*—the inner world—and *jing*—the outer world.

Liu Zu Tan Jing or *Tan Jing* (*The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* or *The Platform Sūtra*) states:

To practice *chan* is to keep mind above and out of all matters in the everyday world; to receive this *chan* enlightenment is to intrinsically see into one’s own mind.⁶

These words point out a particular philosophical issue in the dipolar relationship between mind and the world. The *Tan Jing* notes some thirty-six dipolar pairs, such as *sheng* (living) and *mie* (perishing), *you qing* (having feeling) and *wu qing* (having no feeling), *se* (appearance) and *kong* (emptiness), *yu yan* (language) and *fa xiang* (*dharmā*, truth). I would stress the fact that the issue of mind and the world is at the center of all discussions in the thirty-six dipolar relationships. The *Tan Jing* states further:

There are five pairs of opposites in the outer world: heaven and earth, sun and moon, dark and bright, hidden and exposing, water and fire. There are twelve pairs in the relation between language and truth. . . . There are nineteen pairs in the relation between mind and activities.⁷

In view of these opposite pairs, I take up mind and the world as the two fundamental confrontations for the interaction between mind (*xin*) and the world (*jing*), or the inner world and the outer world, and understand them to be at the heart of all dipolar contrasts.

For the *Platform Sūtra* as well as for Chan in general, direct awareness of this interaction is the source of sudden enlightenment, the highest state called *dun wu*. It is an immediate process that completely breaks down the boundaries between the two worlds and causes the outer world to be transformed into the inner world by the way of a direct intuition of one's true nature. A famous and frequently cited verse in the *Tan Jing* supports this interpretation:

There is never a tree in *Bodhi*, nor is there a stand for a bright mirror; the mind of Buddha is forever clear and illuminative, where is the dust from?⁸

Here another, but equally significant, issue arises in discerning the relationship between mind and the world: by what process is the physical world to be transformed into the spiritual world? The essential dimension of this original experience lies beyond distinguishing the differentiations between mind and the world, and furthermore it is to be deepened by forming a unity of opposites. I would argue that it is the philosophical impact of the *yin / yang* theory in the *Yi Jing* that has provided such a deep vision for the framework of a dipolar categorical scheme in Chan.

Such an argument requires a return to the beginning when the transformation of the modest formation of Indian Buddhism grew out of Confucianism, Taoism, and other schools in the native land of China. All these native traditions were in fact influenced by the ancient thoughts in the *Yi Jing*.⁹ Among these thoughts, the *yin / yang* methodology on dipolar relations took pride of place throughout all levels of Chinese culture. Furthermore, it is clear that this methodology also has deeply inspired Buddhist teachings. For instance, by

accepting the idea of *yin* and *yang*, it is unquestionable that Chan Buddhism applied specialized ways of understanding its relation to the doctrine of *xin* / *jing*.

The theory of *yin* and *yang* is to be found at the heart of each of the thirty-six confrontations in the *Tan Jing*. Eventually all these confrontations live in one home. The *Yi Jing* consistently declares that *yin* and *yang* are essential and general symbols that can be used to express all the opposites. Since each side of the opposition transforms itself into the other, the mutual relationship between *xin* and *jing* could well present the basic movement of *yin* and *yang*. Such a transformation functions in a dynamic process of mutual harmonization. More literally expressed, the sixty-four diagrams in the *Yi Jing* are a collection of linear signs, in which each sign is formed by the two basic lines, *yin* and *yang*. *Yang* is represented by an unbroken line (—) and *yin* by a broken line (– –). The sixty-four diagrams are the images of events in the universe and human activities. The changes happening within the *yin* / *yang* relationships represent the processes of mutual growth, which constantly undergo changes and thus permit the transformation of the universe and the human world into each other. There is further evidence of the strong connection between the *Yi Jing* and Chan Buddhism.

Zongmi (780–841), one of the masters of the School of Hua Yan, illustrates this process in his well-known diagram of the *yin-yang* circle.¹⁰ Zongmi was a disciple of the Chan master, Daoyuan. Additionally, other studies of the *Yi Jing* also point out that the idea of *yin* / *yang* in the *gua ci* (the judgments of diagrams) of the *kan gua* (the diagram of *kan*) and the *li gua* (the diagram of *li*) runs through thirty-six dipolar pairs in the *Tan Jing*.¹¹

Still, the *Yi Jing* never ceases to assert the primacy of the dipolar pair of *yin* and *yang* as the two ultimate alternating forces among all the changes in both the universe and the human world. In an equally fundamental way, the *Yi Jing* underscores the position that the universe and human world are to be comprehended within a primal oneness, namely, Tai Ji.¹² It is to be conceived as a creative harmony, which arises from the constantly changing and transforming interaction between the two forces of *yang* and *yin*. (Once again it is important to note here that *yin* and *yang* symbolize the visible and the hidden, male and female, heaven and earth, day and night, summer and winter, the bright and the dark, the creating and the preserving . . .) The *Yi Jing* calls this act of change, Dao, namely, a universal way. The *Shuo Gua* (the *Discussion of the Diagrams*) in the *Yi Zhuan* (the *Commentaries of the Yi Jing*) states:

In the ancient time, the wise people compiled the *Yi Jing*. In order to present the Dao of the cosmos, they provided the names of *yin* and *yang*; to present the Dao of the earth, they named *rou* (gentle-

ness) and *gang* (firmness); for human activities, they applied the names of *ren* (humanity) and *yi* (righteousness).¹³

Much more apropos to the issue of *xin* and *jing* is how Chan Buddhism identifies the process of the transformation of mind and the world. This also develops the relationship between *xin* and *jing*, mind and the world. There is a telling discussion in the *Tan Jing*:

It is to be realized that in one's own nature the wisdom of *ban ruo* (prajñā) is originally there. It is to use one's own mind to lighten the wisdom, and it is not to depend on words and expressions. . . . It is as though . . . the rivers and seas watering and nurturing all living beings, all plants, all feelings and non-feelings. It is like all rivers and seas come together to the ocean and become one source. Therefore the wisdom of *ban ruo* is the only source and it gathers all natures of living beings.¹⁴

Ban ruo, prajñā, indicates the primitive and intuitive wisdom. These vivid and illuminating words help further an understanding of how *xin* and *jing* transform each other. Since everything owns the same nature as ourselves, the *Tan Jing* argues that it is not necessary to split our own mind from all creatures and all matters in the outer world. This bears upon the inherent character of the *yin / yang* polarity in which the contrasts and opposites live in a harmonious oneness. Chan teaches that in order to reach a pure depth, one must detach from all conceptual thoughts and subjective prejudices involving the phenomenal world. The realization of profound truth is not possible through the use of our everyday mind. Instead, it is to be found in a radically direct experience of the enlightenment that is already inside us. One will only walk away in failure and confusion if attachment and bondage continue to dominate our way of life. Even great effort in learning and practice cannot guarantee the experience of enlightenment.

To conclude: Chan understands Dao of enlightenment to consist in the direct experience of the fact that our mind is not separate from the Buddha mind or from everything in the world and vice versa. Buddha lives in our own being when the external world and the internal world are transformed into each other. This worldview clearly demonstrates that both the *Yi Jing* and Chan endorse the deep potential for unification to be found in the dipolar concepts of *yin / yang* and *xin / jing*.

II. DIPOLARITY IN THE TWO NATURES OF THE PROCESS GOD

Alfred North Whitehead seems very much in appreciation of the Chinese idea of the two forces *yin* and *yang* embracing each other in

a primal oneness. In order to offer a more detailed canvass, Whitehead constructs a categoreal scheme to articulate the process whereby opposites relate to each other. He sees reality as a world of “feelings” that express various modes of process. In such a process, the primary levels of feelings are set out as two: physical and conceptual. I propose that physical feelings are the equivalent of the *yang* side (the visible) of events, while conceptual feelings are the equivalent of the *yin* (the invisible or the hidden) side.

This is suggested by Joseph Grange’s language in which the above two concepts of Whitehead can be clearly understood along the lines of *yin* and *yang*:

Physical feelings establish solid, dense material presences that maintain their felt presence in a massive and energetic manner. . . . When dominant, conceptual feelings provoke a mood of expectancy.¹⁵

In presenting these basic features of Whitehead’s understanding of process, Grange’s words suggest an analogy between Whitehead’s cosmology and the Chinese *yin / yang* theory. Dipolar multiplicity is required for the creative transformations necessary in a world striving for unifications. There is yet another compatible position articulated in the *Commentaries of the Yi Jing*:

Qian (Heaven, the creative or yang) and *Kun* (Earth, the preserving or yin) are indeed the origins of changing. *Qian* represents the creative nature of the thing while *Kun* represents the preserving nature of it. Only when the two natures are joined, the righteousness and the formality of *yin* and *yang* are in the proper places. Therefore the relationship between *Qian* and *Kun* forms all the relationships between different names and sorts.¹⁶

As the following suggests, Whitehead would be in general accord with the doctrine of *yin* and *yang* understood as the hidden and the visible sides of process as reality:

Each experience enjoys a perspective apprehension of the world, and equally is an element in the world by reason of this very prehension. To every shield, there is another side, hidden. . . . The world within experience is identical with the world beyond experience, the occasion of experience is within the world and the world is within the occasion.¹⁷

Whitehead here implies that the unification must share the emerging aspect, which is felt, as well as the invisible aspect, which is potentially to be felt. These two faces of the reality are explained by Whitehead as physical feelings and conceptual or mental feelings.

Whitehead’s philosophy also shares another profound dimension of Chan thought, namely, that all things in the world are made up of feelings (*qing*). For Chan, to preserve pure feelings is to keep distur-

bances away and therefore lessen the illusions that beset our visions. In seeking such super purification, the emotional feeling for the *jing* (the outer world) ought to be transformed into the non-feeling *xin* (the inner world of Buddha nature).

The theory of *yin / yang* in the philosophy of the *Yi Jing* subtly but brilliantly explicates why everything in the universe owns the same nature. It is the ultimate harmony, Tai Ji, which embraces *yin* and *yang* as well as all happenings within its oneness. For Whitehead, it is God who embodies such an excellent harmony, in which “the many” become one and “the one” reflects “the many.” It is in this sense that the Tai Ji motif in the *Yi Jing* philosophy most closely resembles the Whiteheadian God. For it is God’s dipolar nature (understood as both primordial and consequent) that best corresponds with the concepts of *yin* and *yang*. The first provides the mental feelings and the second the physical feelings. Stephen T. Franklin describes Whitehead’s understanding of God’s two levels in this way:

Finite entities originate from their physical pole because they originate out of their feelings of past entities and their feelings of God. God also is dipolar. God’s mental or conceptual pole is termed the “primordial nature,” and God’s physical pole is termed the “consequent nature.”¹⁸

Seeing from the interpretation of Whitehead by Franklin, undoubtedly, I wish to suggest, that the identification of God’s two natures with Chan’s understanding of the Buddha nature is not exact, for the Buddha nature may not be dipolar. However, the Primal Oneness, namely, Tai Ji, in the *Yi Jing* certainly displays its power within the *yin / yang* dipolar structure. It remains an extraordinary fact that both the *Yi Jing* and Whitehead consider the unification of dipolar reality as the outcome of harmony.

It should be remembered that, for Whitehead, God himself is an ultimately harmonious existence:

The consequent nature of God is the fulfillment of his experience by his reception of the multiple freedom of actuality into the harmony of his own actualization.¹⁹

And even more precisely:

The great Harmony is the harmony of enduring individualities, connected in the unity of a background.²⁰

But what is the essence of harmony? Joseph Grange has a particularly plausible interpretation:

A harmony provides room for difference by reason of its generosity . . . a harmony’s superior power resides precisely in its capacity to find room for what is essentially different in what is essentially together.²¹

Grange's insight into the power of harmony also suggests an extraordinary divine image. The process God is not merely a controlling power but a harmonious room in which vast multiplicities find welcome. This God exists as "creative-responsive love" but not "passionless absolute."²²

A harmony is made up of relations and a relation must have two participants. This duality is reflected in Whitehead's hypothesis that God's creativity begins within his primordial nature with its infinitely rich conceptual dimension and is completed by his consequent nature, which redeems temporal experience.²³ God is an individual entity that, on the one hand, is involved in his own self-creation and, on the other, provides reasons of attraction, novelty, and advance to the world. The two divine natures co-exist in order to fulfill the needs of experience for being both actual and present, and potential and everlasting. God is this harmonious place that allows Him to be a part of the world and the world a part of Him.²⁴

Likewise, Chinese thinking of the totality, Tai Ji, and its two complementary polarities, *yin* and *yang*, is similar to the Whiteheadian concept of the totality of God. Whereas *yang* identifies the creative, firm, visual sides of the event, *yin* contains the preserving, soft, hidden sides. Chung-ying Cheng writes:

What is important to note is that if change is possible at all as it is, the simplest way to experience or closely monitor changes as real is to see it as going from the stable, the hidden, the possible to the dynamic, the disclosed and the actual, and vice versa. . . . as there is a unity and whole to contain and present this contrast, this contrast is a harmony and balance which provides a richer experience of changes.²⁵

There remains the task of contrasting these two great philosophies. First, there is a fundamental difference that needs emphasis. In Chinese philosophy, human world, human life, and human activities are never the separate components of philosophical understanding and reasoning. The Tai Ji and the *yin / yang* relations in the *Yi Jing* offer profound inspirations for guiding human beings as they participate in their environment and society. Ideas such as the totality of *yin* and *yang* relations symbolize the harmonious achievement of human communities and human relationships. Therefore, for the *Yi Jing* in particular and for Chinese philosophy in general, Tai Ji is not to be understood as a divine image like God in Whitehead.

Whitehead's cosmology can be compared to an artistic work, say a quilt, and the categorical scheme he articulated can be seen as an abstract picture of the experience of "actual occasions." In this picture, the world is the dynamic process of transmitting feelings to feelings, and from the physical to the conceptual and back again until

the end of time but there is no end. God is everywhere in this picture and scheme of the world. God exists in the background as the source of inspiration and appropriate design. His primordial and consequent natures compose the actual and possible dimensions of experience. In the philosophy of Tai Ji, there is no definitive theistic character. In consciously trying to reconstruct traditional theism, Whitehead sees God as part of the world and not above it. God's creativity is a loving lure encouraging creatures toward the perfections that are possible for them. There is a strong theistic presence in Whitehead's philosophy that is quite unlike the philosophy of the Tai Ji.²⁶

In closing I wish to reassert my proposition for the central issue in this article that the *Yi Jing* is at the root of Chan (Zen) Buddhism, and that it provides a valuable comparative opportunity for understanding contemporary process thought as well as discloses a misleading growth in Zen studies.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA
Honolulu, Hawaii

ENDNOTES

At his fourth anniversary, I would like to dedicate this article to the profound memory of Professor David L. Hall, who inspired and encouraged me to know of Whitehead and the power of speculative thinking. I also wish to thank Professor Joseph Grange for generously giving his expert support and help to this work.

1. For example, so elementary a question as "What is the linguistic root of the word 'zen'?" often goes unanswered. "Zen" is a foreign pronunciation of "chan" in the Chinese language, and this Japanese pronunciation has inherited the same Chinese character over the last thousand years. Not only scholars but also general readers have failed to acknowledge this basic historical fact. Certainly many Zen practitioners are unaware of this vital connection.
2. Even some classic works on Zen, such as those of Abe Masao and Suzuki Daisetz Teitaro, ignore this fundamental connection. As a result, important philosophical questions become obscured and we remain without sufficient knowledge of the real connections between both ways of understanding reality.
3. "Rethinking the Whiteheadian God and Chan/Zen Buddhism in the Tradition of the *Yi Jing*," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 29, no. 1 (March 2002): 81-92.
4. Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality* (New York and London: The Free Press, 1978), p. 350.
5. Most studies of Chan Buddhism claim that Taoism functions as a major influence to the birth of Chan, but others believe (i.e., Fang, Litian's *Fo Jiao Zhe Xue* (Chinese Buddhist Philosophy), Beijing: People's University Press, 1991, p. 266) that Confucianism was the primary influence. Both claims have their value as long as it is remembered that both Confucianism and Taoism originated from the *Yi Jing*, which remains the essential source of Chinese Chan as well as the fundamental ground of the Chinese mind.
6. Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch: the Text of the Tun-Huang Manuscript* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 8 of the Chinese version of the Tun-Huang Text.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 23 of the Chinese text.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 4 of the Chinese text.
9. This position is greatly based upon a view originally proposed by Chun-ying Cheng. For his further discussions, see *New Dimensions of Confucian and Neo-Confucian Philosophy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 9.
10. Brian Carr and Indira Mahalingam, ed., "Buddhism in Chinese Philosophy (by Whalen Lai)," *Companion Encyclopedia of Asian Philosophy* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 591.
11. Zai Tingjin, Zhao Qinglin, and Zhou Shan, ed., *Zhou Yi Yu Hua Xia Wen Ming* (Zhou Yi and the Ancient Chinese Civilization) (Shanghai: People's Press, 1998), p. 157.
12. Commonly it is interpreted "Ultimate Being." I suggest "Primal Oneness" in order to bring out the original Chinese meaning.
13. Huang Shouqi and Zhang Shanwen, *Zhou Yi Yi Zhu* (the Interpretations and Commentaries of Zhou Yi) (Shanghai: Chinese Classics Press, 1989), p. 615.
14. Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch: The Text of the Tun-Huang Manuscript* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 12 of the Chinese version of the Tun-Huang Text.
15. Joseph Grange, *Nature: An Environmental Cosmology* (Albany: State University of New York, 1997), p. 22.
16. Huang Shouqi and Zhang Shanwen, *Zhou Yi Yi Zhu* (The Interpretations and Commentaries of Zhou Yi) (Shanghai: Chinese Classics Press, 1989), p. 589.
17. Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York and London: The Free Press, 1961), p. 228.
18. Stephen T. Franklin, "God and Creativity: A Revisionist Proposal within a Whiteheadian Context," *Process Studies* 29, no. 2 (2000), p. 281.
19. Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality* (New York and London: The Free Press, 1978), p. 349.
20. Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York and London: The Free Press, 1961), p. 281.
21. Joseph Grange, *The City: An Urban Cosmology* (Albany: State University of New York, 1999), p. 213.
22. Process theology interprets this process God by providing five illuminating expositions. See John B. Cobb, Jr., and David Griffin's *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976).
23. In his article, Denis Hurtubise argues that there is a third understanding of Whitehead's two natures of God, which centers on a counter image of the temporal God. See Hurtubise's discussions in "One, Two, or Three Concepts of God in Alfred North Whitehead's *Process and Reality*," *Process Studies* 30, no. 1 (2001): 78–100. Furthermore, see his debate with J. M. Breuvert, entitled "Clarifications and Further Thoughts: A Response to J. M. Breuvert's Review of *Relire Whitehead*," *Process Studies* 32, no. 2 (2003): 301–302, which regards a third nature of God as superjective nature.
24. In applying "him" here, I do not wish to prejudice the gender issue.
25. Brian Carr and Indira Mahalingam, ed., "The Origins of Chinese Philosophy (by Chung-ying Cheng)," *Companion Encyclopedia of Asian Philosophy* (London and New York: 1997), p. 503.
26. However, I agree that Whitehead does not seem confident about reasoning how a divine entity like God can be both consequent and conceptual, both temporal and non-temporal. Lewis S. Ford explains this by supposing that Whitehead did not have the idea of the process God from the beginning and discovered it when writing *Process and Reality*. See his thorough analysis in "On the Origins of Process Theism," *Process Studies* 32, no. 2 (2003): 270–297.

CHINESE GLOSSARY

<i>ban ruo</i>	般若	San Lun Zong	三論宗
<i>chan</i>	禪	<i>se kong</i>	色空
Chan Zong	禪宗	<i>sheng mie</i>	生滅
Dao	道	<i>Shua Gua</i>	《說卦》
Daoyuan	道遠	Tai Ji	太極
<i>fa xiang</i>	法相	<i>tian ren he yi</i>	天人合一
Fo Xin Zong	佛心宗	Tian Tai Zong	天台宗
<i>gua ci</i>	卦辭	Wei Shi Zong	唯識宗
Hua Yan Zong	華嚴宗	<i>wu qing</i>	無情
Huineng	慧能	<i>xin jing</i>	心境
Jing Tu Zong	淨土宗	<i>xin wu</i>	心物
<i>kan gua</i>	坎卦	<i>Yi Jing</i>	《易經》
<i>kun</i>	坤	<i>Yi Zhuan</i>	《易傳》
<i>li gua</i>	離卦	<i>yi xin chuan xin</i>	以心傳心
<i>Liu Zu Tan Jing</i>	《六祖壇經》	<i>yin yang</i>	陰陽
Lu Zong	律宗	<i>yin shui si yuan</i>	飲水思源
Mi Zong	密宗	<i>you qing</i>	有情
<i>qian</i>	乾	<i>you wu</i>	有無
<i>ren yi</i>	仁義	<i>Zhou Yi</i>	《周易》
<i>rou gang</i>	柔剛	Zongmi	宗密

Copyright of Journal of Chinese Philosophy is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.