

# Wang Enyang's Response to Modern Science in Early Twentieth Century

By Huaiyu Chen

## ABSTRACT

*Modern science was first introduced to China by the Jesuits as early as seventeenth century. However, since then over two hundred years, this introduction remained fragmentarily and selectively. In the second half of the nineteenth century, a number of treaties between the Qing Empire and the Western powers brought the second wave of introducing modern science into China, which was much more comprehensive and systematic. The theory of evolution, social Darwinism, and other social thoughts were also introduced along with modern science to China. The twentieth century was one of the most traumatic historical periods in Chinese history. Thousand millions of people died of the devastating wars, the fatal epidemic diseases, the radical social thoughts, and numerous natural disasters. In the early twentieth century, the invasion of the Western imperialist powers brought overwhelming challenge to Chinese society. In response to the political, economic, and social as well as spiritual crisis in this era, Chinese thinkers sought intellectual resources from both Chinese traditions and the newly-introduced Western modern sciences. Yet many intellectuals were skeptical toward Chinese intellectual traditions. Confucianism as the long-term state ideology of Chinese empire was widely criticized and therefore less resourceful. Buddhism experienced the enduring decline. Interestingly, compared to other Buddhist traditions, Yogācāra Buddhism particularly attracted many intellectuals who revived this tradition. Despite having various motivations and purposes, many modern intellectuals have made China become an experimental laboratory for the social thoughts they brought from Japan and the West. Among these social thoughts, in the first twenty years of the twentieth century, it seems those intellectuals preferred to Darwinism, Socialism, Communism, Capitalism, and Nationalism over to Anarchism, Federalism, Republicanism, and Constitutionalism. However, with the rise of the Movement of New Culture around 1919, democracy and science became two rigorous voices among Chinese intellectuals, especially for those who were teaching and publishing in two of the biggest cities, Beijing and Nanjing. After the death of Yuan Shikai 袁世凱 (1859-1916) in 1916, the Republican state was firmly established. Yet the Treaty of Versailles signed in 1919 did not bring China many benefits from the victory of the World War I. The diplomatic failure of Chinese government resulted in the students' movement all over the country. Since then, Nationalism became the mainstream of social thoughts in modern China.*

## Introduction

In 1920, Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929), as one of leading Chinese intellectuals who were also disappointed with the Western modern civilization after the World War I, wrote a travel account titled *Record of the Shadow of Mind in Traveling to Europe* (*Ou you xinying lu* 歐遊心影錄) to criticize European civilization for its responsibility in the breakout of the World War I.<sup>1</sup> Liang

Qichao's skepticism toward Western modern civilization also inspired many Chinese intellectuals in 1920s. Some Chinese intellectuals turned to study Buddhism and to revive Buddhist learning.<sup>2</sup> Chinese Buddhist society also responded the invasion of modern Western civilization in China. For Chinese Buddhist intellectuals, their response mainly focused on Western religion, science, and philosophy. In early republican era, once the Western sciences and philosophies were introduced into China, Buddhism faced many challenges. As Master Yinshun 印順 pointed out:

“Traditional Buddhism has Chan tradition as its marrow, yet the image of Chan Buddhists was lost. Tiantai and Huayan traditions are in silence and Vinaya institution was left behind for a long time. Common people only view paying homage to the Buddha, chanting Buddha's name and withholding spells as *Buddhadharma*. In the past, the friends and enemies of Buddhist culture were only Confucianism and Daoism. Nowadays, in addition, Buddhist culture's new friends and enemies have added religion, philosophy and science. Since the situation has been unusually changed, the old Buddhist tradition since late Tang period could not continue in its own way without shaking its mind.”<sup>3</sup>

It is clear that Buddhism was in decline in the early Republican era and that Buddhism faced challenges from modern science of the West.

A lot of Buddhist intellectuals including both monastic and lay Buddhists have been aware of these challenges. Master Taixu 太虛 apparently was among those eminent monks who proposed to reform Chinese Buddhism in responding the modern world.<sup>4</sup> Ouyang Jingwu 歐陽競無 (1871-1943) and his followers especially Wang Enyang 王恩洋 (1897-1964) represented the response of the lay Buddhists. Ouyang Jingwu states that Yogācāra Buddhism was a powerful weapon to resist the invasion of western religion and philosophy as well as science. For him, if one studies *Dharma-character learning* 法相學 there will be no myth in a religion; and if one studies *consciousness-only learning* 唯識學, there will be no superstitious emotion in a religion. So Yogācāra Buddhism, as a true *Buddhadharma*, is different from the Western religion, science and philosophy.<sup>5</sup> Wang Enyang echoes some points his master made, and also supplements with some of his own ideas. This paper examines how Wang Enyang responded to the challenges presented by modern science.

Wang was born and grew up in Sichuan. In 1919, he entered Beijing University to study philosophy, and he was particularly attracted to Indian philosophy taught by Liang Shuming 梁漱溟 (1893-1988). In 1922, Liang introduced him to study with Ouyang Jingwu in Chinese Buddhist College (*Zhina neixue yuan* 支那內學院) in Nanjing.<sup>6</sup> Since then he wrote many important works on Yogācāra Buddhism. He particularly focuses his learning on two works: Vasubandhu's *Treatise in Twenty Verses on Consciousness-only* (*Viṃśatikakārikā*, *Ershi weishi lun* or *Weishi ershi lun* 唯識二十論) and *Treatise on the Demonstration of Consciousness-only* (*Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi*, *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論).<sup>7</sup> In 1927, he went back to his hometown in order to promote local

Buddhist education. He soon became a famous contributor to Buddhist education in Sichuan. In 1942, he helped establish the famous Research Institute for Oriental Culture and Education (*Dongfang wenjiao yanjiuyuan* 東方文教研究院) in Neijiang, Sichuan Province. Wang was traditional model of erudite Chinese scholars who received the education in both Chinese classics and Buddhist learning. Besides his numerous writings on Consciousness-only learning, his writings cover a broad range of subjects, from intellectual biographies of Confucius, Laozi, Xunzi, to the commentaries on the *Analects*, *Mencius*, and the *Book of Changes*, and poems, art, and philosophy, as well as education. He also wrote about *Lixue* of the Song and Ming dynasties and the revival of Confucianism. He also wrote several works on Buddhist logic and paid attention to the Buddhist art in Dazu area.

Contemporary scholarship has neglected Wang Enyang for a long time. His ten-volume collected works only came out from Sichuan People's Publishing House from 1999 to 2001. Several articles in Chinese have been published to introduce his main ideas and his intellectual links with other Buddhist scholars,<sup>8</sup> yet most articles are more descriptive than analytical, either the introduction to the editions of Wang's works or the compilation of the bibliography of Wang's works. These articles fail to examine Wang's ideas in a broader intellectual context in the early twentieth century. The contemporary scholarship in other languages rarely mentioned Wang Enyang. No single article or monograph in a non-Chinese language devoted to him at all. There are two reasons for this neglect of Wang in contemporary scholarship. First of all, most scholars working on the revival of Yogācāra Buddhism in modern China pay more attention to several big names, such as master Taixu, Ouyang Jingwu, Liang Qichao, and others. As a disciple and follower of Ouyang Jingwu, Wang's thoughts are less important to most contemporary scholars. It seems to easily assume that Wang just followed Ouyang's teachings, without his own invention. Second, Wang's works are difficult to obtain, so they are not well known and widely circulated. If Ouyang Jingwu was an intellectual figure with a national wide influence, Wang was only a regional figure, whose influence was limited in Sichuan. Now, Wang's works are reprinted and easily accessible. Due to the limited scope of this paper, it is impossible to offer a comprehensive analysis of Wang's Buddhist thoughts. Therefore, by reading Wang's early writings this paper will only explore how Wang responded to the challenge of modern science to Buddhism.

### **Wang Enyang on Modern Science**

In my reading of Wang's works, it seems that modern science has interrelated two implications in Wang's discourse: as a discipline in itself, and as an approach to Buddhism. By advocating Yogācāra ideas, Wang rejects the modern scientific approach to Buddhism. He rejects the idea that Buddhist teaching experienced a history of constant evolution. He also insists that Buddhism is neither a philosophy nor a religion, and that therefore Buddhist studies should not be based in science. Consequently, he does not call Buddhism

*fojiao* 佛教 (teaching of Buddha) or *foxue* 佛學 (learning of Buddha, the study of Buddhism),<sup>9</sup> but *fofa* 佛法, the Law of Buddha, or in Sanskrit, *Buddhadharma*. Hence, in the following discussion, “*Buddhadharma*” will indicate Wang’s views. Wang suggests that as the Buddhist truth, *Buddhadharma* is historically stable and therefore Mahāyāna Buddhism was not a historical product. On the one hand, his idea certainly follows traditional Buddhist teaching, according to which people should rely on the Dharma, not the person. On the other hand, the rejection of the history of Buddhist evolutionary development seems to lack a historical sense of human society. This paper will focus on Wang Enyang’s comments on modern science and trace how Wang became known about modern science by looking at his biography and the intellectual circle surrounding him. It will also analyze Wang’s ideas on how Buddhism could contribute to the contemporary world as a moral and ethic force by saving it from the pitfall of material civilization. This paper will also briefly touch on the relationship between Wang Enyang’s Buddhist ideas and certain contemporary intellectual trends, such as nationalism and Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution.

For Wang Enyang, Buddhism is neither science nor philosophy. Modern scientific theory, particularly the theory of evolution, does not apply to the study of *Buddhadharma*. So he first rejects the idea of Mahāyāna Buddhism as a product of historical evolution, as many European and Japanese scholars have suggested. This evolutionary idea of Mahāyāna Buddhism resulted from European scholarship of comparative historical linguistics that read Sanskrit and Pāli manuscripts discovered mainly in Sri Lanka, India and Nepal. European Sanskrit and Pāli scholars suggest that Pāli was a canonical language for early Buddhism and therefore Pāli Buddhism was an original version of Buddhism, representing the authentic teachings of the Buddha himself. This interpretation of Buddhist history suggests that Mahāyāna scriptures preserved in Sanskrit or other Central Asian languages, representing Mahāyāna Buddhism, were not part of original Buddhism. This viewpoint profoundly undermines the principles held by some Chinese Buddhist intellectuals such as Wang Enyang, who believes that Chinese Buddhism was also the Buddha’s authentic teaching. Wang attacks this idea in his essay “Rejecting the idea that Mahāyāna Buddhism was not taught by the Buddha” (“Dacheng fei foshuo bian” 大乘非佛說辨). He points out that the evolutionary idea of Mahāyāna Buddhism originally came from Western scholars, was later accepted by Japanese scholars, and eventually agreed to by Chinese scholars as well. As Wang understood it, they all state that Mahāyāna scriptures are apocryphal, made by later generations, not the authentic messages left by the Buddha. This evolutionary construction of Buddhist history argues that the *Buddhadharma* or teaching results from the progressive development of an intellectual evolution of Buddhist ideas. These evolution theorists equate the World-honored One with Jesus and equate *Buddhadharma* with science and philosophy.<sup>10</sup> Wang’s rejection of these theories targets the approach of modern Chinese scholars to Buddhism. However, Wang accepted Liang Qichao’s idea on one of most influential Buddhist texts, *Treatise of Mahāyāna Awakening of Faith* (*Dacheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論), as a Chinese indigenous text. Liang Qichao was one of earliest Chinese scholars who heard about the debate on the original

Buddhism in Japan and introduced as well as developed the arguments on the authenticity of *Treatise of Mahāyāna Awakening of Faith*. Wang actually also disagrees the idea in Master Taixu's article "Review of A Study on *Treatise of Mahāyāna Awakening of Faith*" (*Ping Dacheng qixin lun kaozheng* 評大乘起信論考證). This article was published in 1923, serving a counterattack against Liang Qichao's evolutionary approach to the text. Wang believes that Liang's study on *Treatise of Mahāyāna Awakening of Faith* is convincing and plausible.<sup>11</sup> Wang's position in defending that Mahāyāna Buddhism was taught by the Buddha is weak. In his essay "Rejecting the idea that Mahāyāna Buddhism was not taught by the Buddha", he also claims that the Hīnayānists first initiated the idea that Mahāyāna Buddhism was not taught by the Buddha because the Hīnayānists failed to offer a coherent interpretation in their Buddhist doctrine. He uses Xuanzang's story as an example in suggesting that since Xuanzang's era Mahāyāna Buddhism as the teaching of the Buddha has been accepted as an established principle. Therefore, he suggests those scholars who support the idea that Buddhism was not taught by the Buddha should read more Buddhist works and know more about Buddhist history.<sup>12</sup> Apparently, in the Buddhist history, there were many debates on the nature of Mahāyāna Buddhism. However, it is unlikely true that the Hīnayānists stated that Mahāyāna Buddhism was not taught by the Buddha. As Alan Cole recently notes, it seems that most Chinese translations of Mahāyāna scriptures have a phrase called "spoken by the Buddha" in their titles, which denotes the authority of these Mahāyāna scriptures.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, it is still a question if this phrase emerged as a response to the accusation of the Hīnayānists.

Wang Enyang's idea rejects the individuality and historicity of Buddhism. He tries to advocate the universality and stability of Buddhism. Buddhadharma does not have an evolutionary development. For him, unlike science, Buddhadharma exhibits no internal contradictions, being ultimately coherent, consistent, and true. Buddhadharma is the highest wisdom, the ultimate principle for resolving the problems of both universe and human society. For him, modern science is related to materialism, to theory of evolution, to the degeneration of morality and ethics. Modern science is the reason for conflicts of material interests that lead to the breakout of the World War. This is not a new idea. Before Wang Enyang criticizes the Western materialistic civilization, some Chinese intellectuals have questioned the idea of "Science is all powerful" (Kexue wanneng). Liang Qichao and his followers particular advanced the skeptical attitude toward the omnipotence of modern Western science.<sup>14</sup>

First, we may take a look at Wang Enyang's critique of the materialism of modern science. Certainly Wang's accusations seem to focus on some features of scientific materialism. For him, the thought of consciousness-only is a resolution for the pitfall of material-only thought in Western civilization. Ian Barbour has discussed the religious accusation of scientific materialism. He says, "Materialism is the assertion that matter is the fundamental reality in the universe. Materialism is a form of metaphysics (a set of claims concerning the most general characteristics and constituents of reality). Scientific materialism makes a second

assertion: the scientific method is the only reliable path to knowledge. This is a form of epistemology (a set of claims concerning inquiry and the acquisition of knowledge).”<sup>15</sup> Barbour continues to question the problem of science in dealing with all so-called realities. He points out that science starts with reproducible public data, which religion lacks. However, Barbour argues that since every scientific discipline is selective and has its limitations, science cannot claim that the reality through scientific method is complete. Therefore, we do not have to conclude that mind, purpose, and human love are only byproducts of matter in motion. In his essay titled “An Introduction to Consciousness-only Buddhism” (*Weishi tonglun*), he states that modern science is only concerned with external materials, only consciousness can save human civilization.<sup>16</sup> Wang Enyang's critique might be due to the intellectual influence of both his master Ouyang Jingwu and his teacher in Beijing University, Liang Shuming. Wang mentioned two of Liang Shuming's works: *Eastern and Western Cultures and their Philosophies* (*Dongxifang wenhua jiqi zhexue*) and *Introduction to Indian Philosophy* (*Yindu zhe xue gailun*) in his article titled “Three Issues a Buddhadharma Scholar should Pay Attention to (Yanjiu fofa zhe xu zhuyi de sange wenti).”<sup>17</sup> In his preface of *Eastern and Western Cultures and their Philosophies*, Liang claims that he feels pity on the Westerners for they are much attached to material world.<sup>18</sup> This preface was written in 1921, reflecting that Liang has seen the weakness of Western civilization after the First World War.

Furthermore, Wang Enyang criticizes that even modern science itself has always found its own contradictions. He says that Henri Bergson's theory comes from science yet rejects science, Bertrand Russell's analysis turns out to be phenomenon, and Einstein's discovery undermines the law and rules in the past hundred years. He argues that the strength of modern science is to study the tranquil, foolish, and senseless material world and modern science is not capable to study the changing mind and consciousness (*xinshi* 心識).<sup>19</sup> Here Wang explicitly draws a line between material world and human mind. He does not think modern scientific experiment can measure human mind and human consciousness. Wang Enyang does not offer a detailed account about what really these Western scientists and thinkers suggest. He does not offer a critical analysis of these thinkers' ideas. Wang's critique on Russell and Bergson might be inspired by his philosophical teacher Liang Shuming who in 1920 analyzed the problems in Russell and Bergson's philosophies in his *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies*.<sup>20</sup> Wang might also learn these ideas from contemporary magazines and non-Buddhist sources. For instance, Bergson became well known in 1920s and has been discussed by many Chinese scholars. Many of Bergson's writings had been translated into Chinese by Wang Enyang's time, which include *L'Evolution créatrice* (*Creative Evolution*) and *Matière et mémoire* (*Matter and Memory*) translated by Zhang Dongsun 張東蓀, *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics* by Yang Zhengyu 楊正宇, *The Force of Mind* by Hu Guoyu 胡國鈺, and *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience* (*Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*) by Pan Zinian 潘梓年. In 1922, the journal *Bell of People* (*Minduo* 民鐸) published a special issue on Bergson. Some famous intellectuals including Li Shicen 李石岑, Zhang

Dongsun and Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培 wrote articles introducing Bergson's ideas. It seems that Wang does not acknowledge that in the history of science, new theories always challenge old ones; and new discoveries always turns side down conventional rules. Isaac Newton's laws are challenged by quantum mechanics.<sup>21</sup> Einstein's theory of relativity starts a new era for the development of science. Wang claims that these challenges and new discoveries are contradictories within science overall.

It is worth noting that Wang Enyang's rejection of modern science might be influenced by some of his friends who studied in the West. Wang Enyang was mentioned in Wu Mi's 吳宓 diary. Wu Mi (1894-1981) studied European and American literature with Irving Babbitt (1865-1933) at Harvard. After his graduation with an MA degree, Wu Mi returned to China and first taught at Southeastern University in Nanjing in 1922. Along with friends Mei Guangdi and Hu Xiansu, Wu founded a journal called *Journal of Critical Review* (*Xueheng* 學衡). Wang Enyang published his famous article "Rejecting the Idea that Mahyna Buddhism was not Taught by the Buddha (Dacheng fei foshuo bian)" in the seventeenth issue of this journal under the editorship of Wu Mi. Wu Mi's diary in 1922 says that he was introduced by Wu Xizhen 吳希真 to Ouyang Jingwu 歐陽競無. During the meeting with Ouyang Wu Mi reported his intellectual life as well as Chen Yinke 陳寅恪 and Tang Yongtong's 湯用彤 Sanskrit studies at Harvard. Wu Mi's advisor at Harvard, Irving Babbitt was famous for his New Humanism that was inspired by French Classical Indologist Sylvain Levi (1863-1935). Irving Babbitt criticized Henri Bergson (1859-1941) for his idea of the transcendence of instinct over the intellectual in his essay "Buddhism and the Occident."<sup>22</sup> After having graduated from Harvard as a French major, Irving Babbitt studied in Paris with Sylvain Levi, but he also attended Bergson's lectures. It seems that he agreed with Levi more than Bergson on intellectual issues including the cultural implications of modern science. Irving Babbitt brought the intellectual sources to Wu Mi. And Wu Mi certainly discussed his ideas with Ouyang Jingwu, Wang Enyang's master, as well as Wang Enyang himself. Wu Mi accepted Babbitt's idea of New Humanism partially because of his commitment to cultural nationalism. As his dairy indicates, Babbitt told him that since Western powers earned the hegemony in the world and China faced the challenge from the West, Chinese intellectuals should shelter their own national culture. Wu Mi's initiative of the journal of *Critical Review* served his ideal of cultural nationalism. For Wang Enyang, the cultural nationalism has also contributed his idea of modern Buddhism. He remarks that the Western learning have attempted to undermine the Eastern culture and to replace the Eastern culture. This replacement would lead to the hopeless consequence that the people in the East eventually lost their boats to set out of the sea of sufferings.<sup>23</sup>

For Wang Enyang, Buddhist teaching is the highest wisdom to understand the highest principle of the universe and human life. Buddhist teaching can save contemporary world from the suffering of World War. In terms of reviving human being's deportment and dignity, by promoting morality and ethics,

Buddhist teaching should function as eyebrows and eyes of human beings, which guide the behaviors of human beings while they are doing things. In his essay "In Memory of Grand Master Taixu" (Nian Taixu dashi 念太虛大師), Wang Enyang responded Taixu's question on how Chinese Buddhists should take responsibility on the reconstruction of the world after the Second World War. Wang recalls as follows:

"Since the rise of the resistance war against Japanese invasion, Master Taixu came to Sichuan. In my master's birthday, in the tenth month of 1941, I went to the Buddhist College of Jiangjin 江津內學院 to visit my master. The Buddhist Association of Chongqing invited me to lecture on *Heart Sutra* for seven days. Master Taixu and the administrative director of Sino-Tibetan School for Buddhist Principles (Hanzang jiaoli yuan 漢藏教理院) came to welcome me to Mountain Jinyun 縉雲山. Taixu organized an academic conference and said that I fully understood both Confucianism and Buddhism and put them into practice, and I was truly a gentleman. So he asked me to discuss Buddhism. He asked how the plan of Chinese Buddhists could be contributing the reconstruction of the world after the World War. I answered immediately that contemporary problem of the world was very complicated and therefore no anybody could hand world diplomatic, military, political and economic affairs with a single plan. So for Buddhists, we should stand in our own position to make our contribution. What is the position of Buddhists? I call it as the eyebrows and eyes of the world. The eyes can not do things, nor walk on the way. They look useless. Although hands are for doing things and feet are for walking, without the guidance of the eyes they can not function very well. One might fall into deep pitfall without eyes and his body would be in danger. Nowadays the world looks like a person. The science is advanced and the industry is progressed. The prosperousness of civilization is never seen before. It can do things and can walk efficiently. However, without highest wisdom for understanding the highest principle of universe and human life, the world's behaviors only brought the horrific world war and human beings fell in danger. Isn't it miserable? Hereafter we Buddhists should advocate our Buddhist teachings to elaborate on the highest principle of the universe and human life in order to lead human beings to walk out from the dangerous way of the material civilization from scientific manufacture. Therefore, Buddhadharma becomes the eyes of the human beings. The eyebrows are useless too. But if there is no elbow, a person loses his deportment. The universe is same. If all people only care about their material interests without pursuing transcendent thoughts and behaviors, and if there is no person who acts by his own and is pure without pollution or who acts as role model leading others to the land of dignity and purity, the human beings lose deportment. They fight with each other for material interests, so they are not different from beasts and fowl which will bring disaster. Buddhadharma swears off killing, stealing and sexual misconduct and eliminates greed, hatred and delusion, transcending from the earthy surface, which makes the useless useful and becomes the deportment of human beings. So Buddhadharma is human beings' eyebrows. For the revival and reconstruction of human civilization after World War, I think what Buddhists should do is to observe their precepts in order to establish role models for people on inner side and on external side to advocate Buddhist principle to transform the world so that Buddhadharma can become the eyebrows and eyes of the world."<sup>24</sup>

Wang Enyang argues that as the highest wisdom Buddhism is the right principle

to save the world, to save the human beings.

Wang Enyang claims that Buddhadharma is Buddhadharma itself, neither religion nor philosophy.<sup>25</sup> But he constantly uses scientific discoveries and Western philosophies to support his ideas. He says that many of his contemporaries who applied religious and philosophical approaches to study Buddhadharma actually bring a lot of non-Buddhist elements to the studies of Buddhadharma.<sup>26</sup> For him, religious thinkers are concerned with where human beings came from and where the destiny of human beings is. So this idea actually admits that there is a transcendent or ultimately highest God or deity who is the destiny for all people and this God or deity has the highest authority to reward and punish us. And Wang says this is the indispensable requirement for a religion even though there are numerous religious sects. The religion Wang defines indicates Christianity and the God Wang defines here is the God in Christianity.<sup>27</sup> He uses a Chinese word “Shangdi 上帝” (Highest Emperor) to talk about Christian God. In his essay “Introduction to Consciousness-Only Buddhism” (“Weishi tonglun”), again, he again comments on Christian concept of the God. He asks about the nature of the God. If the God is the creator of human beings and all things, so what is the nature of the God? Is he kind or evil? If he is kind, why did he create evil beings? If he is evil, why did he also create the kind people? If the God is the cause for all things, what is the cause for the God? So this theory of creation must be wrong.<sup>28</sup> For Wang, the things were created by the karma and original dependence. Since the things are impermanent, there is no certain destiny for human beings. Wang seems to have a sense about Christian theory of creation, yet he does not have a profound understanding of Christianity as a religion. While discussing the human nature in Christianity, he merely doubts the nature of the God, without mentioning Christian concept of original sin of the human beings.

Wang Enyang does not view Buddhism as such a religion defined above by him. He says that Buddhism is especially powerful in undermining the sixteen heretics and wiping out the Atman and all gods. Since three realms are mind (*sanjie weixin* 三界唯心) and every Dharma is consciousness (*wanfa weishi* 万法唯識), so there is no so-called God’s creation. For him, mind and consciousness get rise for their own affinities and causes (*yinyuan erqi* 因緣而起). In Buddhism, every Dharma is without self (*zhufa wuwo* 諸法無我 *sarvadharmā anātman*), and whatever is phenomenal is impermanent (*zhuxing wuchang* 諸行無常). In his essay “The True Meaning of Buddhadharma” (Fofa zhenyi 佛法真義) Wang elaborates on the principle of Buddhadharma in details. For him, the Buddhadharma has four principles: all phenomena are impermanent (*zhuxing wuchang*), all aggregations are sufferings (*zhuyun jieku* 諸蘊皆苦), every Dharma is without self (*zhufa wuwo*), and all Dharmas are emptiness in nature (*zhufa xingkong* 諸法性空). For the first principle, Wang state that everything in this world that has a rise has an end. He uses human body and the natural world as an example to talk about the change. He says that human body has to experience a process of birth, aging, disease and death, which is like that the natural world also experiences the change from the sea to the field. He even cites

contemporary scientific discoveries to support his argument. He says that even the Earth and Star have their formations and their destructions, and the cells of human body might be refreshed with the circulation of blood system.

Besides, he uses a famous remark of a philosopher to talk about the change of the world: "You cannot step twice into the same river."<sup>29</sup> Wang does not give the name of this remark's author, yet we know this remark is from Ancient weeping philosopher Heraclitus of Ephesus (fl. 500 B.C.). Wang did not mention this Greek philosopher's name. He might have learned Greek philosophy in Beijing University before he headed to Nanjing to work with Ouyang Jingwu. While interpreting all aggregations are sufferings, Wang claims that all phenomena are constituents of three states of sensations (or *Vedanā*, which is called *sanshou* 三受): painful, pleasurable, and freedom. In his explanation, these three states of sensations cover all eight distresses in Buddhism: birth, age, sickness, death, parting with what we love, meeting with what we hate, unattained aims, and all the ills of the five aggregates (or the five *skandhas*). He raises smoking opium as a concrete example of people's attachment to seek happiness. Smoking opium is poisonous, yet brings happiness to people. Opium is dangerous to people's health, yet it also can help people mobilize energy. So Wang criticizes that people are attached to opium for the happiness, which results in delusion. Apparently, using opium smoking as an example to talk about Buddhaharma indicates that Wang has been very well aware of one of his contemporary social problems. Since the Opium War, opium has been identified as one of most dangerous foreign imported products to Chinese people. In late Qing dynasty and early Republican era, opium was commonly viewed as one of five poisons by some Chinese intellectuals.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, Wang Enyang explains the third principle of the Buddhaharma. First, he argues that all phenomena do not have innate nature. They do not come from themselves, nor come from others. Everything comes into being because of dependent originations. Then he explains the causes and effects (*yinyuan* 因緣) in the context of Yogācāra Buddhism. Particularly, he focuses on eight kinds of cognition, perception, or consciousness (*parijñāna*), which include five senses (*cakṣur-vijñāna*, *śrotra-vijñāna*, *ghrāna-vijñāna*, *jihvā-vijñāna*, and *kāya-vijñāna*, i.e. seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and touch), the sixth mental sense (*mano-vijñāna* 意識), the seventh discriminating and constructive sense (*kliṣṭa-mano-vijñāna* 末那識 or *ādāna* 阿陀那識), and the eighth storehouse (*ālaya-vijñāna* 阿賴耶識). The consciousness comes from dependent origination. He also says that five aggregates also do not have self, because only five aggregates get together and become five aggregates. Finally he explains the fourth principle of the Buddhaharma. First of all, he makes a distinction between name and reality. He says that in Chinese, dog is called "gou 狗" and "quan 犬", but they indicate same thing, so both "gou" and "quan" are illusory names, not reality. Second, he continues to argue that the illusory names cannot reflect the reality. For him, since illusory names differ, the reality should also differ. Thus names are not able to reflect the reality at all. Third, he questions the chronological order of name and reality. If the name is given before there is a reality, why is there such a name without reality? Fourth, if

the name is given after there is a reality; the reality might have nothing to do with the name. Since in either case above, neither name nor reality has innate natures, every phenomenon does not have innate nature.

Elsewhere, he also criticizes modern scientific discoveries and natural laws. He does not agree with that the energy is neither destroyed nor created, the material is real, and the natural laws can not be shaken. In his “Introduction to Consciousness-only Buddhism,” he criticizes the modern scientific idea that everything is constituted by the atoms – the smallest particles. He notes that the atom can be divided into electrons. Then the molecules are made up of the atoms. All materials are made up of the atoms and molecules. Then Wang thought that all things (*wanfa* 萬法, literally one thousand dharmas) are from the electrons. He also knows that this thought originated from Greek philosophy of the molecule.<sup>31</sup> Here he seems not to understand the progress of modern science very well. He has been aware of the existence of the electrons that was discovered by a Scottish scientist Joseph John Thomson (1856-1940) in 1897, but he does not mention the nucleus. The studies of Ernest Rutherford (1871-1937), Erwin R. J. A. Schrödinger (1887-1961), and Werner Karl Heisenberg (1901-1976) have confirmed that an atom can be divided into many subatomic particles, including electrons, neutrons, and protons. And in 1961, even the smaller quarks were discovered. However, Wang has already noted that, since the smallest particle discovered by contemporary scientists can be divided into even smaller particles in an endless way, the theory of the electrons is meaningless. For him, this scientific theory of the material structure is against the Buddhist idea of consciousness. For Buddhism, all things including both materials and minds have the interdependent origination.

Wang Enyang says that for Buddhadharma, there is no destiny for a person. The mental state without abiding and rewarding (*wuzhu wude* 無住無得) is nirvana. Wang also responds to the scholars of religion that Buddhadharma does not have a God to make a judgment for a person’s behaviors or deeds, because the reward and punishment automatically depend on one’s own karma. So the religious superstition and religious authority should be excluded from Buddhadharma. Everybody can become a Buddha because everybody is equal, without difference. He also responds to the question of modern science about how to approach the Buddha and Bodhisattva logically and how to observe Buddhist paradise and hell by telescope and microscope. He says that the true Dharma realm comes from nowhere and goes to nowhere. In other words, the true Dharma cannot be pursued from the external matter.<sup>32</sup> Since three realms are consciousness only, and all Dharmas are consciousness, so all realms of hell, hungry ghosts, human are not extant. Earth, fire, water and wind are not extant at all. All is consciousness. It seems that Wang’s consciousness-only thought becomes the only source in challenging Western philosophy and science.

### **Wang Enyang on Scientific Study of Buddhism**

Apparently, as Ouyang's disciple, Wang Enyang also use Yogācāra Buddhism as a powerful weapon to challenge the dominance of modern science, and the scientific study of religion and philosophy. In 1922, in a lecture given in Philosophical Society of *Advanced Normal University of Nanjing* 南京高師, Ouyang explained that Buddhadharma is neither a philosophy nor a religion, remarking that philosophy is a technical term originating in Western academic discourse and is inadequate to the study of the magnificent Buddhadharma.<sup>33</sup> This idea clearly criticizes the argument of one of most influential Ouyang's contemporary intellectuals, Zhang Taiyan 章太炎 (1869-1936). Zhang claims that Buddhism is a philosophy in his essay "On the Relationship of Buddha's Teachings to Religion, Philosophy and Reality."<sup>34</sup> Actually Master Taixu also has similar idea to Zhang. He claims that Buddhadharma is the only religion which does not contradict scientific truth and the scientific discovery serves to confirm the insights in Buddhist scriptures. He also states that Buddhadharma embraces all religions and philosophies, but also transcends all religions and philosophies.<sup>35</sup> Taixu even compares Buddhism with some modern sciences, such as philosophy, physics, physiology, biology, psychology and so on and claims that Buddhadharma has a better solution for his contemporary social problems.<sup>36</sup> For him, Buddhist truth is not limited to the scientific truth.<sup>37</sup> It seems that both Ouyang and Taixu emphasize the independence and transcendence of Buddhadharma from Western learning, as some scholars have suggested. So does Wang Enyang.<sup>38</sup>

Wang Enyang not only rejects modern materialism of science, he also rejects the scientific approach to Buddhism. For him, the scientific study of Buddhism is also a Western learning (xixue 西學). He admits that the Western learning, including both modern science and philosophy, has created challenges to Buddhadharma. However, for him, the Western learning embraces many contradictions, full of radical claims and statements, which has led people off the right path toward the brightness or enlightenment. He does not think the Western learning can help Chinese people or the Western modern scientific study of Buddhism is sufficient to understand Buddhism.

More specifically, he also rejects the idea of viewing Buddhism as a philosophy.<sup>39</sup> For him, philosophical approach has to use technical terms, notions, concepts, arguments, as well as philosophical methodologies including deduction and induction. Philosophical methodologies all depend on rationality and instinct.<sup>40</sup> Whatever in philosophy is called intellectual play of discrimination (*fenbie xilun* 分別戲論) in Buddhism, because in this case everyone has his or her own argument and reasoning and therefore thousand people have thousand ideas. After many years passed, all these ideas become vanish and valueless. Even Russell and Bergson's philosophies would lose their values in the future. Only Buddhadharma is not like that. Buddhadharma came from practice, from demonstration, from visualization of emptiness, from disposing phenomenon (*qianxiang* 遣相). Wang Enyang also rejects that the relativity of the truth in philosophy. He claims that in Buddhism there is only one truth.

Furthermore, Wang Enyang also criticizes philosophy for its goal of pursuing knowledge. He says that philosophers manifest their success in pursuing their learning and knowledge. However for Buddhadharmā, the goal is to pursue enlightenment and nirvana. Three baskets (*tripikata*) and twelve-section scriptures are just tools saving Buddhist practitioners.<sup>41</sup> Wang Enyang criticizes modern physiologists and psychologists for their ideas of the function of mind coming from the movement of neurons (*shenjing xibao* 神经细胞) and coverings of brain (*naomo* 腦膜) as well as grey matter (*huizhi* 灰質) and modern scientists also state that human beings result from the evolution of single-cell animal. Wang also mentions that Bergson suggests animals and plants came from the creation and evolution of an original force. Wang views this idea as illusory and absurd.<sup>42</sup>

Wang Enyang also says that in Western scientific studies, because of the diachronic study of Buddha's life and the rule of Darwin's theory of evolution,<sup>43</sup> the Buddha sounds like an ideal figure in ancient Indian myth rather than a historical figure. He warns there are three dangers in modern scientific studies of Indian culture and Buddhadharmā. First, he suggests that one should be aware that India is a non-historical civilization or a civilization without history and nowadays we have no way to trace the tracks of the evolution of Indian civilization depending on trustworthy history. So for Wang, seeking the value of Indian culture can not be reached by observing its history, instead one should root out its value by reading the remained scriptures. Second, Wang Enyang says so-called scientific study of Buddhism is impossible, because science is only for studying material world and natural world. However, Buddha's Dharma is mind only, not material only. The studying objects of Buddha's Dharma are transcendent over the material and natural world.<sup>44</sup>

Wang suggests that the theory of evolution from the West is not universally applicable. So using theory of evolution in studying Indian history and Buddhadharmā is improper. His understanding of theory of evolution includes the following ideas: first, the natural evolution is a process from the simple to the complicated, from the single to the plural, from the savage to the civilized, and from the foolish to the wise. Second, this theory of evolution argues that the latter came from the former. And third the conflict between two sorts of forces brings the birth to the third sort of force. According to this logic, then before the rise of the Buddha, it was full of heretics in India. Yet the rise of Buddha challenged all heretics, rather than was brought into being from the evolution based on heretics. However, once the idea of consciousness only came into being, Buddhism disappeared from India. Wang Enyang argues therefore that theory of evolution does not function in this case. Wang continues to argue that from Buddha's era to the era of the reign of King Harsha (590-647, 戒日王) Indian civilization was flourishing, which could not be dreamed about by the best philosophers in the era of the developed and advanced modern civilization. It seems that Wang views Indian civilization was a higher civilization than modern one. And his statement is based on his assumption that the civilization of Buddhism was the most flourishing one, for from Buddha's era to King Harsha's era Buddhism was flourishing in India. Using the rise of Islam in India as an

example, Wang also rejects the third viewpoint of the theory of evolution, which suggests the third force came from the conflict between two existing forces is invalid. He says that Islam in India did not come from the conflict between Buddhadharma and local heretics. He also criticizes that the modern studies of Buddhism based on Western scientific approach has viewed early Buddhist history as the barbarian myth.<sup>45</sup> It seems that Wang does not recognize the evolutionary progress of the human society from the past and the present, at least, Buddhism was not the case. He does not agree with most scholars who accept the idea in which the West was the developed modern civilization, and the East was the developing traditional civilization. At this point, his position is different from his philosophical teacher, Liang Shuming. In his book *Eastern and Western Cultures and their Philosophies*, Liang makes a distinction between Eastern and Western cultures. He echoes the voice of Chang Naide that the Eastern culture is the traditional one and the Western culture is the modern one, the Eastern culture is the backward one and the Western culture is the advanced one.<sup>46</sup>

How did Wang Enyang come to know about the theory of evolution? In fact, Wang's friend Hu Xiansu 胡先驕 (1894-1968) was involved in discussing theory of evolution in 1920s. Hu was active in editing the *Journal of Critical Review* (*Xueheng* 學衡) in Nanjing. Both Wang and Hu were frequent contributors to the journal. Darwin's theory of evolution has been known by the Chinese since 1873 when some American missionaries including J. MacGowan (Chinese name: Maikaowen 麥考文) translated a British scholar C. Lyell's book *Principles of Geology* (*Dixue qianlun* 地學淺論) into Chinese. In the same year, a piece of short news about new publications in Western languages was published in *Shenbao* 申報 in Shanghai. This news mentioned that Darwin published his work titled *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. Since in 1895, Yan Fu (1854-1921 嚴復) began translating Thomas Henry Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* and then published a book in 1898. In 1902-1903, Ma Junwu 馬君武 translated two chapters of Darwin's book *The Origin of Species* into Chinese. Later on, a lot of scholars were involved in either translating works about theory of evolution or introducing related articles. In 1922, Chen Jianshan 陳兼善 claimed that "The theory of evolution nowadays is able to change the direction of the intellectual trend. No matter what it is, philosophy, ethics, education, and social organization, religious spirit, as well as political settings, everything is under its influence" in his essay *A Brief History of the Flourishing of Theory of evolution in China* (*Jinhua lun fada lueshi* 進化論發達略史) in a journal called *Bell of People* (*Minduo* 民鐸 3: 5, 1922).<sup>47</sup> Among these scholars, Hu Xiansu especially is important in our discussion on Wang Enyang's response to theory of evolution. Although Hu was an expert in botanical science, he was also involved in local cultural activities during his stay in Nanjing. He was Wu Mi's ally in the school of *Xueheng* 學衡派, which is considered a force against so-called New Cultural Movement led by Hu Shi 胡適 and Chen Duxiu 陳獨秀. Wang Enyang must have been familiar with theory of evolution by learning from Hu Xiansu.

Both Wang Enyang and Liang Qichao were involved in the debate on the

nature of Mahāyāna Buddhism in early twentieth century, which was initiated by European scholars who developed their studies based on Sanskrit and Pāli manuscripts discovered from South Asia. Yet Wang and Liang approach this issue from very different perspectives. Liang followed Western and Japanese scholars to question the authenticity of Mahāyāna Buddhism and to make a distinction between early Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism by accepting the evolutionary history of Buddhist thought. However, his perspective was rejected by master Taixu.<sup>48</sup> Liang was relatively familiar with Western scholarship. Liang even was aware of newly discovered inscriptions on the pillars of the King Aśoka. Without a thorough investigation, Wang simply rejects the idea of Western scholars as well as Japanese scholars. On the one hand, Wang's intellectual circle was mainly constituted with Chinese scholars, and Wang was not capable in reading non-Chinese scholarship. In contrast, Liang understood Japanese language and also visited many institutions in Europe and Japan for intellectual exchange, including earning a comprehensive understanding overseas Buddhist scholarship.<sup>49</sup> Wang also seems to be a cultural conservative, like Wu Mi. Wang never had a chance to study in Western countries, nor in Japan. His friendship with Wu Mi as well as other cultural conservatives might have an intellectual impact on his attitude toward modern science and modern Buddhist studies. Wang does not agree with those scholars that Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures were not spoken by the Buddha.<sup>50</sup> Ironically, he uses the ideas of Zhang Taiyan 章太炎 on Sanskrit and Pāli texts as the textual evidence to support his suggestions,<sup>51</sup> yet Zhang was not capable of understanding Sanskrit and Pāli texts, even he does not know much about Western scholarship on those manuscripts from India, Nepal, Ceylon, and some Central Asian regions.

Wang Enyang also denies the historical thought of materialism. He remarks that, this historical thought suggests that the change of the world and the evolution of the human history result from the change of the economic force. Therefore, all histories became the history of the change of the materials. Then the human minds and ideas all are the consequences of the change of materials. Wang rejects this evolutionary thought of materialism by comparing human beings and animals. He says that the animals have been dwelling on the same planet with the human beings and have needs in food and other materials, yet the animals still live in an economic life without the same evolution as the human beings experienced. So the only reason for explaining this difference is that the consciousness and mind as well as the intelligence of the human beings have made the evolution possible.<sup>52</sup> He further discusses that the change of the environment is also due to the influence of human minds and customs. In sum, if the historical thought of materialism is not valid, it should be used to study Buddhadharma.

Wang Enyang's understanding of the so-called Western learning is very limited. He gives a brief introduction to the Western learning in his writing titled "Dharma-character learning" ("Faxiangxue" 法相學). In his understanding, the Western learning originated from Greece. The Greek learning started from astronomy, mathematics, physics, and philosophy. Greek philosophy Aristotle was

the person who comprehensively constructed the Greek philosophy, which laid the foundation for modern Western learning. After Greece fell, Roman Empire escalated Jesus' religion (yejiao 耶教) as its national religion. After that, the religion suppressed the philosophy and learning for more than one thousand years, which is called the Dark Age of Western Europe. Since the Renaissance, modern science and philosophy have made numerous progresses, which led European civilization to its peak in the twentieth century and became the hegemony all over the world. The conflicts between the learning and the religion have also led the World War. Therefore, for Wang, the history of Western learning can be also viewed as that of the conflicts between philosophy and religion. Wang continues to analyze that religion teaches people faith, science tells people knowledge, and philosophy teaches people rationality. Knowledge, rationality and faith as three key elements maintain the normal state of human life. However, according to Wang's evaluation, the Western religion worships the God, who is the only deity for human beings, yet science tells people rationality. This monotheistic faith must have conflict with rationality. This conflict between religion and science, or between spiritual pursuit and material life, creates the problem. Therefore, neither philosophical nor scientific study leads a happy life. For Wang, Dharma-character Learning (*faxiangxue*) is the only thing that is none of religion, philosophy, or science, yet it plays the role of religion, philosophy and science, covering faith, rationality, and knowledge.<sup>53</sup> It is worth noting that Wang calls Christianity as Yejiao, Jesus' religion, not Christ's religion (*Jidujiao* 基督教), not Heavenly Lord's religion (*Tianzhujiao* 天主教). Nowadays, Yejiao becomes a very generic term referring to Christianity. Yet, in current Chinese Christian community, only Protestant Christianity was called Christ's religion, *Jidujiao*; Catholicism was called Heavenly Lord's religion, *Tianzhujiao*. Interestingly, Christian missionaries invented Buddhism as a term referring to Buddha's religion. Yet in Buddhism, Dharma has a higher status than Buddha himself, though Buddha was often viewed as the founder of Buddhism. In this sense, missionary image of Buddhism seems not to indicate the true meaning of Buddhadharma. In Chinese understanding of Christianity, Jesus was viewed as the founder of religion, so the religion was called Jesus' religion.

### Conclusion

In sum, by accusing the inner contradiction of modern science and the scientific study of religion, Wang Enyang has followed Ouyang's idea of Buddhadharma as neither philosophy nor religion. For him, the main problem of modern science is its materialism, which lowered the morality and ethics and therefore led to the breakout of World War. Yet Buddhadharma becomes a new weapon in resisting this scientific materialism. In his understanding, religion, as a modern idea, indicates Christianity. Although Wang does not know much about Christianity, he criticizes Christianity for its contradictory concepts of the God and its theory of creation by introducing the Buddhist idea of original dependence. By talking about Buddhist karma theory, he rejects the God's authority of punishing and rewarding people for their behaviors. It seems that Wang also

warns the invasion of modern Buddhology that was developed mainly by Japanese and European scholars. In particular, he does not accept the evolutionary development of Buddhist texts which were based on Western scholarship of comparative historical linguistics on Sanskrit and Pāli texts. He insists that Mahāyāna scriptures were also taught by the Buddha.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Liang Qichao, *Ouyou xinying lu* (Taipei: Zhonghua shuju, 1956, reprinted ed.). Liang Shuming cites this work in talking about how the Westerners were disappointed with the problem of their civilization after the First World War; see *Dongxifang wenhua zhexue* (Taipei: Liren shujum, 1983, reprinted from the edition of 1922), p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> For a general overview of Chinese Buddhist scholarship in late Qing and early Republican era, see Ma Tianxiang 麻天祥, *Wan Qing foxue yu jindai shehui sichao* 晚清佛學與近代社會思潮 (Taipei 臺北: Wenjin chubanshe 文津出版社, 1992). This work mainly focuses on summarizing main ideas of some leading scholars of Buddhist studies, especially those non-Buddhist scholars. It does not offer much space to the discussion on social thoughts at that time. For a sketch of Buddhism in Republican China, see Holmes Welch, *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism, 1900-1950* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967). For a recent study on Buddhism in late Qing and early Republican period, see Francesca Tarocco, *The Cultural Practices of Modern Chinese Buddhism: Attuning the Dharma* (London: Routledge, 2007).

<sup>3</sup> Yinshun 印順, “Zhongguo fojiao shilue 中國佛教史略,” *Fojiao shidi kaolun* 佛教史地考論, Taipei: Zhengwen chubanshe, 1992, p. 92.

<sup>4</sup> For a study on Taixu, see Don A. Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism: Taixu's Reforms* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001). There are numerous studies on Ouyang and Taixu's contribution to modern Chinese Buddhism. For one of recent presentations, see Gotelind Mueller-Saini, “Buddhism and Modernity in Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century China -- The Case of Ouyang Jingwu and Taixu,” a paper presented to the Workshop “Is there a ‘Dharma of History?’” organized by Alexander Mayer and Axel Schneider, Leiden, May 29-31, 2006.

<sup>5</sup> Ouyang Jingwu, “Yu Zhang Xingyan shu與章行嚴書,” *Ouyang Jingwu wenji*, p. 232. Xie Jinliang 謝金良, “Ouyang Jian fofa fei zongjiao fei zhexue sixiang yanlun 歐陽漸非宗教非哲學思想衍論,” *Xiandai zhexue* 現代哲學 3 (2005), pp. 83-89; He Shanchuan 何善川, “Zhongguo fojiao dui jindai kexue zhuyi de huiying 中國佛教對近代科學主義的回應,” *Henan shifan daxue xuebao* 河南師範大學學報 30: 3 (2003), pp. 7-10.

<sup>6</sup> In his preface of *Dongxifang wenhua zhexue*, Liang Shuming says only Ouyang Jingwu's religion is Buddhism, and only Ouyang's Buddhist learning if the learning of Buddhism; see “Preface,” in *Dongxifang wenhua zhexue*, p. 4. At that time, Liang was an adherent to Buddhism. Soon later he turned to Confucianism.

<sup>7</sup> Wang Enyang, “Fofa zhenyi,” in *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue* (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2003), p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Huang Xianian, “Wang Enyang xiansheng zaonian qipian lunwen tiyao,” *Guangdong fojiao* 5 (1998); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng zhushu xiaokao (1925-1926),” *Wutaishan yanjiu* 3 (1998); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng 1924nian zhuzuo kaoshu,” *Zongjiaoxue yanjiu* 3-4 (1998); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng zhushu mulu,” *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 4 (1998); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng zhushu xiaokao (1920-1923),” *Foxue yanjiu* (1998); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng de weishixue zhuzuo,” *Zhejiang fojiao* (2000); idem., “Pingmin jiaoyujia Wang Enyang xiansheng jiaoyu sixiang chutan,”

---

*Shehui kexue yanjiu* 2 (2001); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng yu *Wudeng huiyuan*,” *Shijie zongjiao wenhua* 4 (2001); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng yu Dayu fashi,” *Chan* 6 (2001); idem., “Wang Enyang yu Nan Huaijin wutan chanzong,” *Zhejiang fojiao* 4 (2001); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng yu chanzong siti,” *Chanxue yanjiu* 5 (2003); idem., “Wang Enyang xiansheng yu Chongqing fojiao,” *Chongqing shifan daxue xuebao* 3 (2006), pp. 98-105. Shi Weixian, “Huainian enshi Wang Enyang xiansheng,” *Foxue yanjiu* (1998).

<sup>9</sup> However, in his essay “A Concise Interpretation of Buddhism” (“Foxue tongshi 佛學通釋”), he does use the term “foxue.” He also makes a distinction between Buddhist learning (foxue 佛學) and worldly learning (shixue 世學). He continues to refer “shixue” to modern science, philosophy, political science, and legal studies. He says that the Buddhist learning aims to eliminate all defilements and to achieve the ultimate enlightenment. The worldly learning pursues worldly desires, such as food, houses, clothes, national security and wealth, and so on; see Wang, *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 301.

<sup>10</sup> Wang Enyang, “Dacheng fei foshuo bian (Rejecting the Idea that Mahayana Buddhism was not taught by the Buddha),” in *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2003, p. 115.

<sup>11</sup> Wang Enyang, “Dacheng qixin lun liaojian,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 94.

<sup>12</sup> Wang Enyang, “Dacheng fei foshuo bian,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, pp. 118-119.

<sup>13</sup> Alan Cole, *Text as Father: Paternal Seductions in Early Mahāyāna Buddhist Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), pp. 14-18.

<sup>14</sup> Zhang Pengyuan, *Liang Qichao yu minguo zhengzhi* (Taipei: Shihuo chubanshe, 1978), pp. 186-187; Huang Ko-wu, “Liang Qichao yu zhongguo xiandai shixue zhi zhuixun,” *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo jikan* 41 (2003), pp. 181-213; Zheng Shiqu, “Ouzhan hou Liang Qichao de wenhua zijue,” *Beijing shifan daxue xuebao* 3 (2006), pp. 49-59.

<sup>15</sup> Ian G. Barbour, *When Science Meets Religion: Enemies, Strangers, or Partners?* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2000), p. 11.

<sup>16</sup> Wang Enyang, “Weishi tonglun,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 193.

<sup>17</sup> Wang, “Yanjiu fofa zhe xu zhuyi de sange wenti,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, pp. 41-49.

<sup>18</sup> Liang Shuming, *Dongxifang wenhua jiqi zhaxue* (Taipei: Liren shuju, 1983, reprinted), p. 3.

<sup>19</sup> Wang Enyang, “Fofa zhenyi (The True Meaning of Buddha's Dharma),” in *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishi xue*, p. 35.

<sup>20</sup> Liang Shuming, *Dongxifang wenhua jiqi zhaxue*, pp. 92-96, 214-218.

<sup>21</sup> D. Howard, “What Makes a Classical Concept Classical? Toward a Reconstruction of Niels Bohr's Philosophy of Physics,” in Faye and Folse, *Niels Bohr and Contemporary Philosophy*, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science, vol. 158, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1994), pp. 201-229.

<sup>22</sup> Irving Babbitt, “Buddhism and the Occident,” in *Dharmapada*, p. 70?

<sup>23</sup> Wang Enyang, “Fofa yu waidao zhi chabie ji fofa zhi genju,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 56.

<sup>24</sup> Wang Enyang, “Nian Taixu dashi,” *Wang Enyang xiansheng lunzuo ji*, vol. 10, Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chubanshe, 2001, p. 656.

<sup>25</sup> For discussion on philosophy and religion, see Taitetsu Unno, “Religious-Philosophical Existence in Buddhism,” *Eastern Buddhist* 23: 2 (1990), pp. 1-17; Abe Masao, “What is Religion?” *Eastern Buddhist* 25: 1 (1992), pp. 51-69.

<sup>26</sup> Wang Enyang, “Fofa zhenyi,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 42.

<sup>27</sup> Interestingly, Wang understands religion merely as Christianity. It seems that he views

“religion” purely as a Western concept, there was no religion in China. However, in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, other religions other than Christianity were realized by the British scholars; for a detailed discussion, see Peter Harrison, *Religion and the Religions in the English Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

<sup>28</sup> Wang Enyang, “Weishi tonglun,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 205.

<sup>29</sup> Wang Enyang, “Fofa zhenyi,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue* (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2003) p. 2.

<sup>30</sup> These five poisons included opium smoking, prostitution, gambling, money laundering, and secret societies. Keith McMahon, “Opium and Sexuality in late Qing Fiction,” *Nan nü* 2: 1 (2000), pp. 129-179; Alan Baumler, “Playing with Fire: The Nationalist Government and Popular Anti-Opium Agitation in 1927-1928.” *Republican China* 21:1 (1995), pp. 43-91. Yet Hu Shih says five poisons in Chinese society include poverty, stupidity, greed, disease, and violence.

<sup>31</sup> Wang, “Weishi tonglun,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 206.

<sup>32</sup> Wang, “Fofa zhenyi,” in *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, pp. 34-35.

<sup>33</sup> Ouyang Jingwu, *Ouyang jingwu ji* 歐陽競無集 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1995), p. 2.

<sup>34</sup> Zhang Taiyan, *Zhang Taiyan ji* 章太炎集, p. 6.

<sup>35</sup> Taixu, “Fotuo xuegang 佛陀學綱,” in *Taixu dashi quanshu* 太虛大師全書, vol. 1, Hong Kong: Taixu dashi quanshu yingyin weiyuanhui, 1956, p. 230.

<sup>36</sup> Taixu, “Foxue jiangyao 佛學講要,” in *Taixu dashi quanshu*, vol. 1, pp. 282-285.

<sup>37</sup> Pittman offers a brief discussion on the relationship between Buddhist truth and scientific truth in Taixu’s writings; see Don A. Pittman, *Toward a Modern Chinese Buddhism: Taixu’s Reforms* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001), pp. 165-168. Wing-tsit Chan says that Taixu did not know much about Einstein and his relativity theory; see his *Religious Trends in Modern China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), p. 89.

<sup>38</sup> Yet Wang criticized Taixu’s idea on *Mahayana Awakening the Faith*. See Li Guangliang 李廣良, *Xinshi de lilian: Taixu weishixue sixiang yanjiu* 心識的力量：太虛唯識學思想研究 (Shanghai: Huadong shida chubanshe, 2004), pp. 40-41, 131 on Wang’s critique on Taixu.

<sup>39</sup> Western philosophy has an impact on Buddhism in modern Japan, see Judith Snodgrass, “The Deployment of Western Philosophy in Meiji Buddhist Revival,” *Eastern Buddhist* 30: 2 (1997), pp. 173-198.

<sup>40</sup> Gao Shanshan discusses how five members of Chinese Buddhist College studied and spread Western philosophies, but Wang Enyang is not in the list; see “Zhina neixue yuan yu xiyang zhaxue,” *Waiguo zhaxue* 3 (2006), pp. 51-67.

<sup>41</sup> Wang, “Fofa zhenyi,” in *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 44.

<sup>42</sup> Wang Enyang, “Dacheng qixin lun liaojian,” in *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 76.

<sup>43</sup> For some other modern approaches, see Shin’ichi Hisamatsu, “Zen: Its Meaning to Modern Civilization,” *Eastern Buddhist* 1: 1, 1965, pp. 22-47. Keiji Nishitani, “Science and Zen,” *Eastern Buddhist* 1: 1, 1965, pp. 79-108.

<sup>44</sup> Wang Enyang, “Dacheng fei foshuo bian,” in *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 127.

<sup>45</sup> Wang Enyang, “Dacheng qixin lun liaojian,” *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 95.

<sup>46</sup> Liang Shuming, *Dongxifang wenhua jiqi zhaxue*, p. 13.

<sup>47</sup> James Reeve Pusey, *China and Charles Darwin* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 1983).

<sup>48</sup> Taixu, “Ping Dacheng qixin lun kaozheng,” Zhang Man tao ed., *Dacheng qixin lun yu*

---

Lengyanjing kaobian 大乘起信論與楞嚴經考辨, Taipei: Dacheng wenhua chubanshe, 1978, p. 82. Also see Zhou Zhihuang 周志煌, "Jindai zhongguo fojiao gaige sixiang zhong huisu yuandian zhi yihan jiqi shijian jinlu: yi Taixu, Yinshun, Ouyang Jingwu zhi lundian wei hexin de zhankai 近代中國佛教改革思想中「回溯原典」之意涵及其實踐進路——以太虛、印順、歐陽竟無之論點為核心的開展, *Zhonghua foxue yanjiu* 中華佛學研究, vol. 1, 1997, pp. 157-193, esp. 187.

<sup>49</sup> For Liang's Buddhist studies and its political background, see Wang Junzhong 王俊中, "Jiuguo, Zongjiao yi zhexue: Liang Qichao zaonian de foxueguan jiqi zhuanzhe, 1891-1912," 救國、宗教抑哲學?——梁啟超早年的佛學觀及其轉折(1891—1912), *Shixue jikan* 史學集刊第 31 期(1999.06), pp.93-116. For other discussion on Liang's Buddhist studies, see Marianne Bastid – Bergère, "Liang Qichao yu zongjiao wenti," in *Tōhō gakuho* 70 (1998); Mori Noriko, "Liang Qichao and Buddhism," in Joshua Fogel ed., *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao's Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China* (China Research Monograph, no. 57. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2004); Axel Schneider, "Liang Qichao's changing views of history -- evidence for Buddhist influence," a paper presented to the Workshop "Is there a "Dharma of History?" organized by Alexander Mayer and Axel Schneider, Leiden, May 29-31, 2006.

<sup>50</sup> Wang, "Dacheng fei foshuo bian," *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, p. 128.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 129. For a discussion on Zhang Taiyan's understanding of evolutionary thinking, see Viren Murthy, "Zhang Taiyan's Buddhist Response to Evolutionary Thinking and its relation to History," a paper presented to the Workshop "Is there a "Dharma of History?" organized by Alexander Mayer and Axel Schneider, Leiden, May 29-31, 2006.

<sup>52</sup> Wang, "Weishi tonglun," *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, pp. 208-209.

<sup>53</sup> Wang, "Faxiang xue," *Zhongguo zhexue yu weishixue*, pp. 314-315; the similar ideas can also be found in his essay "Yinming ru zhengli lun shi," *Zhongguo fojiao yu weishixue*, pp. 407-409; on p. 412, he criticizes the Western logic.