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1. PREFACE

The findings of this article should be of interest to anyone with even a remote understanding of Chinese Pure Land Buddhism, for Ching-ying Hui-yüan (523-592 A.D.) has long been regarded as the definitive representative of the heretical interpretations of orthodox Pure Land Buddhism. It turns out, however, that he made major contributions to the doctrinal development of Pure Land Buddhism in China as well as in Korea and Japan.

This article is concerned with one such contribution by Hui-yüan, one which no previous modern writer has reported. It is in Hui-yüan’s writings that we find the earliest occurrence of the abbreviated titles of two of the major Pure Land scriptures. The significance lies not only in the possible reasons for the abbreviation but also in the irony that orthodox Pure Land Buddhists have utilized, since this period in the sixth century, the same titles that a “non-orthodox” Pure Land figure had earlier adopted, if not coined. This fact reinforces my contentions that the early Chinese Pure Land movement was much broader in scope than is generally accepted, and that it cannot be accurately explained with the traditional sectarian categories which neatly demarcate the “orthodox” from the “heretical” Pure Land Buddhists.

2. BACKGROUND

Hui-yüan was an exegete and lecturer of great acumen and an ecclesiastic leader of distinguished prominence within the Buddhist community from the latter part of Northern Ch’i (550-577) to his death in 592 in the early years of the Sui period (581-618). Hui-yüan’s accomplishment as an exegete is remarkable in terms of the vast size and scope of his writings. No doctrinal study of this period (ca. 550-592) spanning Northern Ch’i, Northern Chou and early Sui periods in north China can be complete without a thorough study of Hui-yüan’s works, of which ten have come down to us, either in part or in their entirety. In fact, there are almost as many extant works by Hui-yüan as there are by all other writers combined from this group, thereby attesting to the importance of his writings for modern research.

Hui-yüan brought significant innovation to the development of two major doctrinal issues of the Sui-T’ang period, the tathāgatagarbha (Buddha-womb or nature) and dālayāvijñāna (storehouse consciousness) theories. This fact acquires heightened interest, because according to Kamata Shigeo, Hui-yüan’s views served as one of the bases for the fully-developed theories of the later Hua-yen and T’ien-t’ai traditions. Moreover, among the works ascribed to him is the Ta-ch’eng i-chang (henceforth, TCIC), an encyclopedic work of Buddhist concepts and terms that not only served as a reference text for writers of the Sui and T’ang period but is today a valuable source for the understanding of that period’s doctrinal development.

Despite the importance and availability of Hui-yüan’s writings, they have suffered surprising neglect and, thus, his doctrinal contributions have been relatively unknown. This resulted in large measure from the failure of his writings to attain canonical status in later Buddhist schools, as did the writings of the T’ien-t’ai master Chih-I. Further, the size and the broad range of sūtras and sūtras encompassed by his writings have
complicated a ready understanding of his overall thought. There is no clear, committed doctrinal position from which Hui-yüan carried out his exegesis. Thus, our present knowledge of Hui-yüan's thought remains fragmentary. Most modern writings on Hui-yüan have focused on narrowly-defined doctrinal topics such as “Buddha-nature” and “pure land,” based primarily on those chapters in the encyclopedic TCIC dedicated specifically to these topics.5

The modern image of Hui-yüan, in my estimation, persists as that of an academician rather than of a practitioner as in the case of Hsin-hsing (540-594) of the Three Stage school, Hui-szu (515-577) of the T'ien-t'ai and Tu-shun (558-640) of the Hua-yen traditions. According to Kamata, Hui-yüan did not actively incorporate his meditative experience into his doctrinal system but, instead, concentrated on the intellectual understanding of the scriptures.6 For this reason Kamata excludes Hui-yüan from the “new Buddhism” of Sui and early T'ang mentioned earlier, and instead characterizes him as a “transitional” figure bridging the old and new Buddhism.7

While this portrayal of Hui-yüan retains some truth, it so obscures his other traits and accomplishments that we have had an incomplete picture of him as an individual. The account of Hui-yüan’s gallant debate in defense of Buddhism against Emperor Wu’s (Wu-ti, 543-78) persecution testifies to his fervor and commitment to Buddhism. He also effectively communicated the teaching, as evidenced by the large number of students who flocked to study with him. He was not uninterested in practice, openly lamenting that his ecclesiastic duties left him little time for pursuing meditation.8

3. HIS COMMENTARY ON KUAN WU-LIANG-SHOU CHING

Among his works that have survived are commentaries on the Pure Land sūtras, Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching (henceforth, KWC) and Wu-liang-shou ching (henceforth, WLSC). Both of these are the earliest known Chinese commentaries on the respective sūtras, Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching (henceforth, KWC) and Wu-liang-shou ching (henceforth, WLSC). The KWCIS, in particular, became precedent and has served as model for many subsequent commentaries on the same sūtra.9

Despite this acknowledged importance of Hui-yüan’s KWCIS in the early development of Pure Land Buddhism, the KWCIS has not been seriously studied on its own terms. The little discussion that exists on the KWCIS invariably occurs in the context of comparison with Shan-tao’s Kuan Wu-liang-shou fo shu (henceforth, Shan-tao Commentary).10 The KWCIS has not escaped playing its polemic role as a “straw man” in Japanese orthodox Pure Land scholarship (shūgaku). Since pre-modern times, shūgaku scholarship has produced massive studies extolling the virtues of Shan-tao’s interpretation, while debunking the vices attributed to Hui-yüan and others.11

These debunked opponents (which include Hui-yüan) are usually referred to collectively as “shōshō” (Masters) based on Shan-tao Commentary,18 or those of the “shōdōmon” (the Gate of the Path of the Sages). Although the other two commentaries on KWC, attributed to Chih-i and Chi-tsang, also disagreed with many of the views expressed in the Shan-tao Commentary as did the KWCIS, Hui-yüan, nevertheless, has continued to be the “spokesman” of the “Masters” and their “heretical” position.

The primary reason for the focused criticism of Hui-yüan by the orthodox Pure Land Buddhists can be traced in large measure to the severe criticism by Shan-tao Commentary leveled at a doctrinal position which resembles one found in Hui-yüan’s KWCIS. Shan-tao’s main point of contention dealt with the ranking of the nine grades of rebirth (chū-p’ in wang-sheng) which appears in the KWC. In keeping with his fundamental advocacy of the Pure Land teaching’s availability to the prthagjanas (Jan-fu, ordinary beings), Shan-tao ranked the nine grades much lower on the Buddhist path system (mārga). In
contrast, Hui-yüan ranked them much higher so that even bodhisattvas of the bhumis or the aryajas (sheng-jién, adepts) were included among those re-born in the Pure Land.12

Shan-tao must have deemed this difference crucial for validating the uniqueness of his basic interpretation of the KWC, for he devotes much of the first chapter criticizing Hui-yüan’s position.13 Another point of contention was that, in Shan-tao’s view, Hui-yüan incorrectly categorized all sixteen visualizations as “meditative good acts” (tiod-shan). Instead he regarded only the first thirteen as “meditative good acts,” and the last three as “non-meditative acts” (san-shan).14

4. THE TITLE “TA-CHING”

Throughout the KWCIS Hui-yüan refers to the WLS C as “Ta-ching” (the Large Sutra), the same title by which the later Pure Land commentators called this sūtra. The Japanese Pure Land Buddhists also used the same epithet “Daikyō,” as in Shinran’s Kenjō shinjitsujōgyōshō monru.15 In modern times, Max Muller, in translating the Sanskrit text of this sūtra, rendered its title as “The Larger Sukhāvatī-yyūha.”16 Despite the widespread practice of referring to this sūtra as the “Large Sūtra,” the earliest surviving reference to this sūtra as “Large Sūtra” (“Ta-ching”) is in Hui-yüan’s KWC17

Texts compiled after KWCIS contain numerous references to this sūtra as either “Ta-ching” or as inclusive of the character “Ta” (Large) in its title. The Tao-ch’o’s An-lo chi, Chia-ts’ai’s Ching-t’u lun and the Shan-tao Commentary, for example, refer to the WLS C as “Ta-ching.”18 It should be noted that this work is known by other abbreviated titles, “Ta-pên” (the Large Text),19 “Shou-ching” (Sūtra on [the Buddha of Immeasurable Life]),20 and “Shuang-chuan ching” (the Two Fascicle Sūtra).21

It appears that Hui-yüan abbreviated a longer title to Ta-ching just as he had abbreviated the titles of other texts into two characters such as, “Kuan-ching” for KWC.22 On one occasion he refers to the sūtra as “Wu-liang-shou ta-ching” (183b9-10), so that Ta-ching could very well have been the abbreviation of this full title by which Hui-yüan knew this sūtra. If this were the full title, it would be rendered as “The Large Sūtra on the [Buddha] of Immeasurable Life.” However, this is the only occurrence of such a title in either the KWCIS or in his other writings, including the WLS C Commentary. All the other occurrences of its full title are invariably “Wu-liang-shou ching” (Sūtra on the [Buddha] of Immeasurable Life) and never include the character “Ta.” Among subsequent commentators, Tao-ch’o refers to the sūtra as “Wu-liang-shou ta-ching.”23

Yet, these titles with the character “Ta” appear to have been anomalies in the overall picture. The extant catalogues compiled up to the second half of the seventh century do not refer to this sūtra with the character “Ta” as part of the title. For example:


4) In Li-tai fa-pao chi by Fei Chang-fang: a) “Wu-liang-shou ching” and b) “Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching.”27

5) In Chung-shing mu-lu by Ching-t’ai: “Wu-liang-shou ching.”28

These catalogues indicate that the common full title by which the sūtra was known was either “Wu-liang-shou ching” or “Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching” but not “Wu-liang-shou ta-ching.” Further, Hui-yüan himself also referred to this sūtra by its full title as “Wu-liang-shou ching,” with the exception of that one occasion when he called it “Wu-liang-shou ta-ching.” Of course, Hui-yüan’s reference to this latter title is not the only occur-
rence among Chinese Buddhist texts that include the character "Ta" in its full title. As alluded above, Tao-ch’o also referred to the sūtra as "Wu-liang-shou ta-ching." The Ching-t’u shih-i lun (believed to have been compiled sometime between 695-774) also refers to a "Ta Wu-liang-shou ching." 29 An entry with the same title appears in Üich’on’s (11557-1101) catalogue, the Sinp’yon chejong kyojang ch’ongnok. 30 But all of these references appear in texts that were compiled subsequent to Hui-yüan’s KWCIS.

The above findings support arguments that the titles which include "Ta" (Large or Great)—be it Ta-ching or Wu-liang-shou ta-ching—reflect the enhanced regard which this sūtra came to acquire. For instance, those who regard the Nirvāṇa-sūtra as a main canonical scripture symbolized their high esteem by referring to it by the more elevated "Ta-ching." While Hui-yüan used the title Ta-ching in reference to this sūtra, there is no reason to believe that he regarded the WLSC as the most important scripture for either exegetical or devotional purposes. As discussed earlier, no compelling evidence demonstrates that the WLSC played a central role in his doctrinal position or devotional commitment.

Another possibility is that "Ta" implied size and that it functioned to set it apart from a related sūtra of shorter length. Unfortunately, Hui-yüan himself nowhere refers to a title that includes the word "Hsiao" (Small). One likely candidate for this shorter sūtra could have been the "Hsiao Wu-liang-shou ching," translated by Guptabhadra (377-431), which is recorded in Yen-tsung’s Chung-ch’ing mu-lu. 31 Another possibility is the A-mi-t'o ching (or the "Smaller Sukhāvatiyūha Sūtra,"') which became one of the major Pure Land sūtras and, in Japan, one of the triple canonical sūtras of the Jodo and Jodo Shinshu schools. However, Hui-yüan does not mention this sūtra in either the KWCIS or the WLSC Commentary.

Tao-ch’o’s An-lo chi is the oldest extant treatise other than Yen-tsung’s catalogue to associate the character “Hsiao” with the title of Smaller Sukhāvatiyūha Sūtra. Tao-ch’o refers to this as "Hsiao-chuan Wu-liang-shou ching," 32 and it is listed along with "Ta-ching" and "Kuan-ching" as three of the six sūtras that he recognized as advocating the abandonment of this world and the aspiration for the Pure Land. 33 Whether Tao-ch’o consciously juxtaposed the "Hsiao-chuan Wu-liang-shou ching" with the "Ta-ching" is unclear in his case, but his use of the word "small" in the same context as "Ta-ching" is significant. In some later works, the word "small" in the title of this Smaller Sukhāvatiyūha Sūtra is contrasted instead with an early recension of the Larger Sukhāvatiyūha Sūtra translated by Chih-ch’ien. 34

The rationale remains uncertain not only for Hui-yüan’s reference to this sūtra as "Ta-ching" but also for his inclusion of the word "Ta" in the title. However, it appears quite certain that the KWCIS is the earliest surviving text to refer to this sūtra by a common title which later Pure Land Buddhists in China and Japan then employed. This strongly strengthens the possibility that the practice of referring to the WLSC as "Ta-ching" emerged outside the orthodox Pure Land milieu.

5. "WANG-SHENG LUN" IN THE CONTEXT OF HUI-YÜAN’S POSSIBLE REASONS FOR WRITING THE KWCIS

Several reasons may have motivated Hui-yüan to write his commentary on the KWC. On this matter Ōchō Enichi states:

Though I have yet to examine the KWCIS and WLSC Commentary thoroughly, it would be safe to assume that Hui-yüan took a deep interest in Amitābha’s Pure Land because of the influence of his teacher Fa-shang’s devotion to Maitreya cult.

His interest may not have been as thorough-going as the [teaching based on] nien-fo (recitation or contemplation of the Buddha) of the Other-Power [Tariki; ta-li], but was related to [his interest in Pure Land Buddhist concepts] such as the Buddha land espoused in the Vimālakīrtinirdeśa-
As was the case with Fa-shang, Hui-yüan's interest [in Pure Land teaching] was rooted in his disillusionment with the state of affairs brought on by the destruction of Dharma [hometsu; fā-mieh], but not in an introspective realization of his nature as an inferior and incapable being [bonpu; fan-fu].

Mochizuki Shinkō similarly points out Fa-shang's Maitreya devotion as a major factor in contributing to Hui-yüan's interest in Pure Land thought. Initially, Ōchō's and Mochizuki's suggestions seem curious, since a pure land (ching-t'u) such as Amitābha's Sukhavati and a heavenly realm (t'ien) such as Maitreya's Tuṣita clearly belong to different cosmological categories. The former is beyond the three realms of existence, while the latter belongs to the Kāma realm.

But this may not be as unreasonable as it appears from the traditional Buddhist standpoint. In the chapter on the pure lands in his *TCIC* Hui-yüan treats the heavenly realms and pure lands as virtually identical. Further, Mochizuki suggests that Hui-yüan treated Maitreya's Tuṣita as one of these heavenly realms. Such a treatment was not totally foreign to popular understanding during the Nan-pei Chao period, as syncretistic fusion of Maitreya and Amitābha and their respective lands appear in numerous epigraphic inscriptions from this period. One such inscription reads, “I request that my deceased son rid himself of this defiled [physical form], meet Maitreya and be reborn in the Western Realm [of Amitābha].”

Despite the apparent affinity of the two traditions, it still does not adequately answer why he wrote commentaries on the sūtras pertaining to Amitābha rather than to Maitreya, as one would expect. Several sūtras on Maitreya were already translated into Chinese before Hui-yüan’s time:


But the striking absence of a single commentary by Hui-yüan on any of the Maitreya sūtras weakens all arguments which accounts for his interest in Pure Land sūtras in terms of his personal devotion to Maitreya.

Ōchō also cites the “destruction of Dharma” as a motivating factor. Normally expressed as the arrival of the “end of Dharma” (mo-lā), this concept has been the standard reason of orthodox scholars for the emergence of Pure Land Buddhism in sixth century China. This suggestion assumes that the events destructive to Buddhism, such as the Northern Chou persecution, led Hui-yüan to take an interest in the *KWC*, a teaching which was appropriate for the decadent times. The mere recitation of the Name of Amitābha was sufficient for rebirth. Though he did not reject oral recitation as a legitimate cause for rebirth, Hui-yüan regarded the “samādhi of Buddha-visualization” as the main import of the *KWC*. His remarks to his fellow monks after his gallant defense of Buddhism in his debate with the Northern Chou negate despair over the future of the *Dharma*:

Truth must be expressed. How can I be concerned about my own life! . . . Such is the fate of the time! But even the Sage cannot banish the [Dharma]. The fact that we cannot presently serve the [Dharma] is a great regret. The *Dharma*, however, is truly indestructible. Oh Venerables, please understand this, and I ask that you not be so sad and distressed.

Such an affirmation renders Ōchō's explanation of Hui-yüan's writing of the *KWCIS* unacceptable.
Another factor that requires mentioning concerns the apparently active presence of Amitābha devotion among Hui-yuán’s predecessors and contemporaries in the so-called “Hui-kuang lineage.” The earliest known description of the lineage for the transmission of Pure Land teaching in China is T’ao-ch’o’s Six Worthies (Lu ta-tê) mentioned in his An-lo ch’i. The six are: 1) Bodhiruci, 2) Dharma Master Hui-lun, 3) Dharma Master Tao-ch’ang, 4) Dharma Master T’an-luan, 5) Meditation Master Ta-hai and 6) the Ecclesiastical Head (Shang-t’ung) of the Ch’i Dynasty. Putting aside their alleged status as actual devotees of the Pure Land teaching or as famous names employed for authenticating Pure Land Buddhism, one cannot ignore their collective association with the “Hui-kuang” lineage.

Bodhiruci was a teacher of Hui-kuang (468-537 A.D.) and is intimately associated with Pure Land Buddhism, especially in his role of converting T’an-luan to Pure Land teaching. Reportedly he gave T’an-luan a text called the “Kuan ch’ing,” which has sparked controversy among modern scholars to the identity of this “Kuan-ch’ing.” Also, included among the numerous texts that he translated was Vasubandhu’s Wang-shêng lun, which has perhaps been the most influential Indian Sûtra of Pure Land Buddhism in China as well as in Japan. According to Mochizuki, the second in the lineage, Hui-lung, refers to Tao-lung. Like Hui-kuang he was a disciple of Bodhiruci and regarded as a rival to Hui-kuang as head of the Northern branch of the Ti-lun school. Next in the lineage was Tao-ch’ang, a disciple of Hui-kuang. T’an-luan, the fourth Worthy, was converted to Pure Land teaching by Bodhiruci. Lastly, the Ecclesiastical Head, none other than Fa-shang, was a disciple of Hui-kuang and Hui-yuán’s direct master.

According to HSKC, Hui-kuang himself also appears to have been a devotee. He constantly aspired to be reborn in a Buddha’s land, and at the end of his life he specifically prayed for rebirth in the “Land of Peace and Sustenance” (An-Lo shih-chüaï). Another disciple of Hui-kuang, T’ai-p’in, reportedly desired rebirth in the Western region and had a vision of light at his deathbed. T’ai-p’in’s disciple, Ling-yü died facing the western direction of Sukhavati Pure Land and is credited with commentaries on the KWC and the Wang-shêng lun.

The treatment of Vasubandhu’s Wang-shêng lun (Treatise on Rebirth) is evidence of greater Amitabha Pure Land devotion among members of the “Hui-kuang” lineage than previously thought. It suggests the possibility that Amitabha devotion was far more extensive than has been previously believed. To my knowledge, the following consideration has not been addressed before; that is to say, the KWCIS appears to be the oldest extant text which refers to Vasubandhu’s treatise by the short title, Wang-shêng lun, the title by which later commentators in China as well as in Japan have known this treatise. It is a strong possibility that the practice of referring to this short title began among the members of this “Hui-kuang” lineage. Their deployment of the short title serves to emphasize the devotional aspect of this treatise.

In the Taishō edition, the full title of the Wang-shêng lun is Wu-liang-shou ching you-po-t’she yuian-shêng chi (Treatise on the Sûtra of the [Buddha] of Immeasurable Life and Verses on the Vows for Rebirth). This treatise is also known by another title, Ching-t’u lun (Treatise on the Pure Land). It is by these two shorter titles that this treatise has been commonly known, especially within Pure Land Buddhism. For example, orthodox Japanese Pure Land tradition knows this work as Ōjô ron (Wang-shêng lun) or Jôdo ron (Ching-t’u lun). In fact, today, these shorter titles are often used as if they were the original. It is not surprising, therefore, that the present examination does not uncover any previous study on the origins for referring to the treatise by these shorter titles.

One would expect T’an-luan’s commentary on the Wang-shêng lun-chu to be the earliest to employ the shorter titles, since it is not only the oldest extant but also the earliest known commentary on Vasubandhu’s treatise. However, no reference to the shorter titles occurs either in his com-
mentary or in his other shorter works. Thus, the KWCIS by Hui-yüan is the earliest surviving text to refer to this treatise by one of the two shorter titles. In fact, KWCIS never refers to this treatise by its full title but only by "Wang-sheng lun."

Despite the scriptural status that it has enjoyed in China, and especially in Japanese Pure Land schools, no one has pointed out that the KWCIS by Hui-yüan is the earliest extant writing which uses the title Wang-sheng lun. For example, in one of the best-known studies on T'an-luan's Wang-sheng lun-chu, Mikogami Eryü suggests early T'ang as the first usage of the short title on the basis of Chia-ts'ai's (ca. 620-680) reference to the treatise as a "Wang-sheng lun." But Mikogami fails to note that this short title had already been used in Hui-yüan's KWCIS more than half a century earlier.

In the earliest catalogues, none of the entries refer to either Wang-sheng lun or Ching-t'ü lun; instead, they use "Wu-lilIng-shou you-po-t'i-shê ching lun." Among exegetical works written after Hui-yüan, Tao-ch'o's An-lo chi is the oldest work to employ the short title, the "Ching-t'ü lun." "Wang-sheng lun" is found, for example, in the previously-alluded Ching-t'ü lun by Chia-ts'ai and in the Ching-t'ü shih-i lun.

In sum, the KWCIS is the oldest extant text to designate the title as "Wang-sheng lun." Moreover, some evidence suggests that this short title was coined by members of the "Hui-kuang" lineage. The HKSC credits Ling-yü, a member of the "Hui-kuang" lineage and a contemporary of Hui-yüan, with a commentary to the Wang-sheng lun, unfortunately now lost. There are no other references to a text from the sixth century as "Wang-sheng lun."

Not unexpectedly, Ling-yü is credited with a commentary on this Sāstra, for this Sāstra would be held in high esteem by a member of the "Hui-kuang" lineage. The author of the Sāstra was the eminent Vasubandhu, whose writings, particularly the Dasabhumika-sāstra, constituted the focus of study and lectures by those of this lineage. Even though the interest of this lineage focused on the "Yogācāra" doctrine, derived primarily from the latter treatise, it should not be surprising that members of this lineage, such as Ling-yü and Hui-yüan, also valued Wang-sheng lun as one of Vasubandhu's works.

Unlike the original full title, the title of Wang-sheng lun centers on the highly devotional theme of "rebirth," i.e., "Wang-sheng," in the Pure Land. This poses the question as to its name. That is, the full title could instead have been easily shortened to "Wu-liang-shou ching lun," as it was Fa-ching's catalogue Chung-ching mu-lu. "Wang-sheng lun" is probably related to "Yuan-sheng" (Vow to be Reborn) of the full title (Wu-liang-shou ching you-po-t'i-shê yuan-sheng chi), since the ideas are very similar. However, the two are not exact, and the question still remains as to why "Wang-sheng lun," and not simply "Yuan-sheng lun," was selected.

Hui-yüan does not address this issue directly. But a passage in his WLSC Commentary might serve as a clue for its abridgement:

Question: When Vasubandhu compiled the Verses on Rebirth (Wang-sheng chi), he stated that women, the disabled and those of the class of the Two Vehicles are all unable to be reborn in the Pure Land.

Of particular interest is "the Verses on Rebirth," which refers to the verse, as opposed to the commentarial prose section of this treatise. If the "Verses on Rebirth" refers only to the verse section, then perhaps the commentarial prose section came to be called the "Treatise on Rebirth," i.e., "Wang-sheng lun." This suggestion finds support in Vasubandhu, who at the end of the verse section states, "I have compiled the treatise in order to explain the verses."

Evidence tends to identify the "Hui-kuang" lineage as the milieu in which the short title Wang-sheng lun was coined. This would add credence to
Mochizuki’s proposal that Pure Land Buddhism was quite active among those who are traditionally not counted among orthodox Pure Land Buddhists. In short, those who belonged to a lineage which is conventionally regarded as exclusively scholastic in fact may have had an interest in the devotional dimension represented in Pure Land Buddhism. Thus, the Hui-kuang lineage’s unexpectedly active interest in scriptures centering on Buddha Amitābha must be included as one of the factors motivating Hui-yuan’s writing of the KWCIS and WLSC Commentary.

6. CONCLUSION

In Hui-yuan’s KWCIS we see the earliest usage among extant texts of the shorter titles Wang-shêng lun and Tu-ch’eng for Vasubandhu’s treatise and the WLSC, respectively. Both of these titles became common for the Pure Land Buddhists in China as well as in Japan.

The above findings question the traditional practice of drawing a sharp demarcation between the orthodox and the non-orthodox Pure Land Buddhism, referred to often as the “Gate of Pure Land Path” and the “Gate of the Path of the Sages,” respectively. Those characteristics previously believed to be the monopoly of orthodox Pure Land Buddhism turn out, in fact, to have not only parallels but also antecedents outside its group: the recognition of oral recitation as a legitimate causal practice, the employment of the shorter titles for two of the Pure Land scriptures, the view that the KWC was for the prthagianas (inferior beings), etc. Moreover, it was Hui-yuan, rather than the orthodox Pure Land proponents, who is credited with the oldest extant commentaries on the KWC and the WLSC.

FOOTNOTES:

1. Hui-yuan’s surviving works include Ta-ch‘eng i-chang (T 1851) and nine commentaries on the following sūtras and sūtras: Daśabhumika-sūtra (ZZ 1.71.2 and 3), Ta-ch‘eng ch‘i-hsin lun (T 1843), Ti-ch‘ih ching lun (ZZ 1.Z1.3), Nirvāna-sūtra (T 1764.37), Vimalakirti-sūtra (T 1776.38), Śrīmāladevi-sūtra (ZZ 1.30.4), Wu-liang-shou ching (T 1745.37), Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching (T 1749.37), and Wei-shih ching (T 1793.39). For the seven surviving works by other authors from northern dynasties of this period, see Ochô Enichi, Chūgoku bukkyō no kenkyū Vol. 3 (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1979), p. 159.


3. T 1851.44. Yoshizu alludes to the impact that this treatise had on the writings of the later writers including Chi-tsang, Chih-i, Kue-ch‘i, Chih-yen, Fa-tsang, Ch‘eng-kuan. See Yoshizu Yoshihide, “Daijōgishō no seiritsu to Jōdoji Eon no shiso (I),” Sanzō 165 (1978): 2-3.

4. Ochô, Chūgoku bukkyō Vol. 3, p. 163. He states:

... Hui-yuan strove to maintain his objective approach and [unlike Chi-tsang] refrained from advocating in his writings the transmitted [doctrinal position] of his masters (of the “Hui-kuang lineage”).

5. Kamata’s article (in Chugoku bukkyō shiso-shi) is probably the first modern work to attempt to treat more than one doctrinal point. Yoshizu Yoshihide of Komazawa University has been the most prolific writer on Hui-yuan, whose studies have been published in numerous articles totaling over twenty and appearing mostly during the 1970s.

6. Kamata, Chûgoku bukkyô shisôshi, p. 306. Kamata contrasts Hui-yüan with the likes of T'an-Iuan of the Pure Land tradition, Hui-wen and Hui-szu of the T'ien-t'ai tradition and Tu-shun of the Hua-yen tradition, all of whom were meditators. He suggests this difference leads to the latter group becoming founders of the new schools, while Hui-yüan never gained such status. Ochô Enichi expresses a very similar view as he groups Hui-yuan with Chi-tsang as two individuals who were more compromising in their doctrinal assertion and less attuned to the conditions of the time, compared to Chih-i and Hsinhsing. See Ochô Enichi, Chûgoku bukkyô Vol. 3, p. 146.


8. HKSC, T 2060.50.490b5-491c15.
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20. Hui-kan's Shih ching-t'ü ch'ün-i ching, T 1950.47.43c15ff.


22. Other such abbreviations include Nirvâna-sûtra as Nieh-p'an, Vasubandhu's commentary on the Daśabhumika-sûtra as Ti-lun and the Pu-sa ti-ch'ih ching (T 1581) as Ti-ch'ih.
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30. T 2148.55.157a3. This entry is found next to that of Kumārajīva’s translation of the same sūtra, Wu-liang-shou fo ching.


32. Ibid., 19a12-19.

33. Ch’i’s (632-682) A-mi-t’o ching shu (T 1757.37.313a17, 18) refers to it as Hsiao A-mi-t’o, but in contrast to Ta A-mi-t’o ching (T 362.12). Similar titles are found in Chia-t’s’ai’s Ching-t’u lun (T 1963.47.92c20, 94b20).

34. Öchö, Chūgoku bunkyō Vol. 3 p. 159.

35. Mochizuki, Chūgoku jōdokyōri-shi, p. 90. There are reasons to believe that Hui-yüan did, in fact, take a personal interest in Maitreya devotion. There is also an account in the HKSC on the biography of Ling-kan, which relates a story of his being reborn in the Tūṣita Heaven and meeting Hui-yüan there. See T 2060.50.518b21.

36. T 1851.44.834a23-b28. Hui-yüan classifies the pure lands into three categories: 1) phenomenal pure lands, 2) form pure land and 3) true pure lands. Although the heavens are regarded somewhat inferior to Amitābha’s Sukhāvati, since the means for rebirth are “defiled pure acts” for the former as compared to “pure acts” for the latter, both are similarly included among phenomenal pure land.

38. See Mochizuki, p. 98.

39. See Mochizuki, Chūgoku jōdokyōri-shi, p. 135. For more examples of such inscriptions with a syncretistic outlook, see Matsumoto Bunzaburo, Shina bunkyō ibutsu (Tokyo: Kobundo, 1942), op. 286-299.

40. For example, Nogami, Chūgoku jōdokyōri-shi (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1981), pp. 69-79.

41. T 2060.50.490c26-29.

42. Mochizuki has alluded to this point, but not in any detail in connection with Hui-yüan. See Mochizuki, Chūgoku jōdokyōri-shi, pp. 63-69. A separate research is needed for a thorough treatment of its own to consider such topic as the role of devotion to a particular Buddha or bodhisattva among the scholar-monks.

Despite Hui-yüan’s purported association with the Ti-lun lun school in virtually all modern discussions, no evidence supports the traditional assumption that a school called “Ti-lun” existed. The appellation is of later attribution. I have, therefore, referred to Hui-yüan’s predecessors and contemporaries as “Hui-kuang lineage,” since textual evidence supports their associations with Hui-kuang (468-537).

43. T 1958.47.14b9-16.

44. Mochizuki, Chūgoku jōdokyōri-shi, p. 64.

45. T 2060.50.608a8-10 (Hui-kuang); T 2060.50.484c12-13 (Tao-p’ìn); T 2060.50.497b17-18 (Ling-yū). Cf. Mochizuki, pp. 67, 130.


47. One of the earliest surviving texts to use this short title was Tao-ch’o’s An-lo chi,
written around the mid-seventh century.
See T 1958.47.7c7.

48. The only discussion of this—and only an allusion at it—is found in Hirakawa Akira, "Jōdokyō no yōgo ni tsuite," p. 6. He suggests Tao-ch'ō's An-lo chi as the earliest to employ Ching-t'ū but remains silent regarding the usage of Wang-shēng lun.


52. T 2146.55.141a26, T 2153.55.407c28-29, T 2154.55.541a22, T 2157.55.941a14, T 2149.55.269b3.

53. In An-lo chi, T 1958.47.7c7, 25ff. In Ching-t'ū shih-i lun, T 1961.47.78c5-6, 81a11.

54. T 2060.50.497c18. This, of course, assumes that this recorded title in the HKSC was the original title which Ling-yü himself used and not one subsequently ascribed to him by Tao-hsüan.


56. T 1745.37.107c10-11. For original passages, see T 1524.26.231a14, 232a3-4. The same passage appears once in the verse section and once in the prose section, respectively.

57. T 1524.26.231b5.

58. Hui-yüan recognizes recitation of the Buddha's Name as one form of devotion, which in turn is one of the four causes for rebirth (T 1749.37.183b7). Further, Hui-yüan regarded prthagianas as the group for whom the KWC was taught (173a9-10).

ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY:

A-mi-t'o ching 阿弥陀经
An-lo chi 安樂集
bonpu (bonbu) 凡夫
Ch'i 常
Chih-i 智頴
Ching-t'ū lun 涌土論
Ching-t'ū shih-i lun 涌土十疑論
Ching-ying Hui-yüan 涌影慧遠
Ching-t'ai chiu-p'in 涌愛親
Ch'ii-ch'ii Ching-sheng 潟智聖
Chung-ching Hui-yüan 沉經慧遠
Dai-kyō 持經
Dharma Master Hui-lun 觀音法師
Dharma Master Tao-ch'ang 道場法師
Dharma Master T'an-luan 持論法師
Emperor Wu (Wu-ti) 武帝
Fa-ching 法經
fa-mieh 法誦
Fa-shang 法上
fan-fu 凡夫
Fei Chang-fang 負長防
hōmetsu 法滅
HKSC = Hsu Kao-sèng chuan 韓高僧傳
Hsin-hsing 徐行
Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching 新無量壽經
Hsiao 小
Hsiao-chuan Wu-liang-shou ching 小経無量壽経
Hsiao Wu-liang-shou ching 小無量壽経
Hua-yen 燕頴
Hui-kuang 慧光
Hui-szu 慧遂
Hui-wén 慧文
Hui-yüan 慧遠
Jodo ron 持土論
Ken jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō mon'yū 頭浄土真教行証文頌
Kuan-ching 観經
Kuan Mi-lē p'u-sa shang-shēng tou-shuait-šen ching 観弥勒菩薩上生兜勒護生経
Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching 観無量壽経
Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu 観無量壽経 綸
KWC = Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching fo shu 観無量壽経 痴
KWCIS = Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu 観無量壽経 綸
by Hui-yüan 観無量壽経義 痴
Ling-yü 猴裕
Li-tai fa-pao chi 歴代法宝記
Lu ta-té 六大德
Meditation Master Ta-hai 大慈禅師
Mi-lê hsiia-shêng ching 弥勒下生經
Mi-lê hsiia-shêng ch'êng-fo ching 弥勒下生成佛經
Mi-lê ta-êng ch'êng-fo ching 弥勒大成佛經
Mo-fo 宗法
Nien-fo 念仏
Ojó ron 住生論
San-shan 散善
Shan-tao 勝導
Shan-tao Commentary = Kuan Wu-liang-shou fo ching 上統
Shang-t'ung 上統
Shêng-jen 聖人
Shinp'yon chejong kyojang ch'ongnok 新編諸宗教彙録
Shódomon 聖道門
Shoshi 聖師
Shou-ching 普經
Shuang-chuan ching 雙卷經
Shugaku 宗学
T = Taishô shinshû daijôkyô 大正新修大叢經
Tu A-mi-t'o ching 大阿弥陀經
Tu-chêng i-chang 大乘鏡章
Tu-ching 大經
Ta-êng 他力
Tairiki 他力
Tu Wu-liang-shou ching 大無量壽經
TCIC = Ta-chêng i-chang by Hui-yüan 大乘鏡 慧遠
Tao-p'în 定憑
T'îen 天
T'îen-t'ai 天台
Ti-lun 地論
Ting-shan 定善
Tu-shun 杜頤
Wang-shêng chi 往生偈
Wang-shêng lun 往生論
WLSC = Wu-liang-shou ching 大無量壽經
WLSC Commentary = Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu by Hui-yüan
Wu-liang-shou ching 無量壽經
Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu 無量壽燈疏
Wu-liang-shou ta-ching 無量壽大経
Wu-liang-shou ching you-pô-t'i-shê yüan-shêng chi 無量壽經優婆提僧伽 生偈
Wu-liang-shou you-pô-t'i-shê ching lun 無量壽經優婆提僧伽論
Wu-tî 武帝
Yen-tsung 慶宗
ZZ = Dai nihon zokuzôkyô 日本正教總書