

# Earliest Usage of "Ta-ching" (Daikyō) and "Wang-shêng lun" (Ōjōron) by a Non-Orthodox Pure Land Buddhist: Its Implication for Chinese Pure Land Buddhism

by Kenneth Tanaka

## 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.<sup>1</sup>

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 *ālayavijñāna* (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.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, among the works ascribed to him is the *Ta-ch'êng 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.<sup>3</sup>

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 śāstras 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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-szū (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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup>

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

Among his works that have survived are commentaries on the Pure Land sūtras, the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu* (henceforth, *KWCIS*) and the *Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu* (henceforth, *WLSC Commentary*). 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.<sup>9</sup>

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*).<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

These debunked opponents (which include Hui-yüan) are usually referred to collectively as "shoshi" (Masters) based on *Shan-tao Commentary*,<sup>12</sup> 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 (*chü-p'in wang-shêng*) which appears in the *KWC*. In keeping with his fundamental advocacy of the Pure Land teaching's availability to the *prthagjanas* (*fan-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 *bhūmis* or the *āryajanas* (*sheng-jen*, adepts) were included among those reborn in the Pure Land.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup> Another point of contention was that, in Shan-tao's view, Hui-yüan incorrectly categorized all sixteen visualizations as "meditative good acts" (*ting-shan*). Instead he regarded only the first thirteen as "meditative good acts," and the last three as "non-meditative acts" (*san-shan*).<sup>14</sup>

#### 4. THE TITLE "TA-CHING"

Throughout the *KWCIS* Hui-yüan refers to the *WLSC* as "*Ta-ching*" (the Large Sūtra), the same title by which the later Pure Land commentators called this sūtra. The Japanese Pure Land Buddhists also used the same epithet "*Dai kyō*," as in Shinran's *Ken jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō monrui*.<sup>15</sup> In modern times, Max Muller, in translating the Sanskrit text of this sūtra, rendered its title as "*The Larger Sukhāvati-vyūha*."<sup>16</sup> 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 *KWCIS*.<sup>17</sup>

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 *WLSC* as "*Ta-ching*."<sup>18</sup> It should be noted that this work is known by other abbreviated titles, "*Ta-pên*" (the Large Text),<sup>19</sup> "*Shou-ching*" (Sūtra on [the Buddha of Immeasurable] Life)<sup>20</sup> and "*Shuang-chuan ching*" (the Two Fascicle Sūtra).<sup>21</sup>

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*.<sup>22</sup> 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 *WLSC 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*."<sup>23</sup>

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:

- 1) In *Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi*: a) "*Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching*" and b) "*Wu-liang-shou ching*."<sup>24</sup>
- 2) In *Chung-ching mu-lu* by Fa-ching, et al.: a) "*Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching*" and b) "*Wu-liang-shou ching*."<sup>25</sup>
- 3) In *Chung-ching mu-lu* by Yen-tsung, et al.: "*Wu-liang-shou ching*."<sup>26</sup>
- 4) In *Li-tai fa-pao chi* by Fei Chang-fang: a) "*Wu-liang-shou ching*" and b) "*Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching*."<sup>27</sup>
- 5) In *Chung-shing mu-lu* by Ching-t'ai: "*Wu-liang-shou ching*."<sup>28</sup>

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*."<sup>29</sup> An entry with the same title appears in Üich'ön's (1155?-1101) catalogue, the *Sinp'yon chejong kyojang ch'ongnok*.<sup>30</sup> 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 Guṇabhadra (377-431), which is recorded in Yen-tsung's *Chung-ching mu-lu*.<sup>31</sup> Another possibility is the *A-mi-t'o ching* (or the "*Smaller Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra*,") which became one of the major Pure Land sutras and, in Japan, one of the triple canonical sutras of the Jodo and Jodo Shinshu schools. However, Hui-yüan does not mention this sutra 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*

*Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra*. Tao-ch'o refers to this as "*Hsiao-chuan Wu-liang-shou ching*,"<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> 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 Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra* is contrasted instead with an early recension of the *Larger Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra* translated by Chih-ch'ien.<sup>34</sup>

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 thoroughgoing 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*.

sūtra.

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; fa-mieh*], but not in an introspective realization of his nature as an inferior and incapable being [*bonpu; fan-fu*].<sup>35</sup>

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.<sup>36</sup> Initially, Ōchō's and Mochizuki's suggestions seem curious, since a pure land (*ching-t'u*) such as Amitābha's Sukhāvatī 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.<sup>37</sup> Further, Mochizuki suggests that Hui-yüan treated Maitreya's Tuṣita as one of these heavenly realms.<sup>38</sup> 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]." <sup>39</sup>

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:

- 1) *Mi-lê hsia-shêng ching*. Dharmarakṣa (239-316) transl. T 453.14.

- 2) *Mi-lê hsia-shêng ch'êng-fo ching*. Kumārajīva (350-409) transl. T 454.14.

- 3) *Mi-lê ta-ch'êng-fo ching*. transl. Kumārajīva. T 456.14.

- 4) *Kuan Mi-lê p'u-sa shang-shêng tou-shuai-t'ien ching*. Ch'ü-ch'ü Ching-shêng, transl. (ca. 400). T 452.14.

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-fa*), this concept has been the standard reason of orthodox scholars for the emergence of Pure Land Buddhism in sixth century China.<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup>

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-yüan's predecessors and contemporaries in the so-called "Hui-kuang lineage."<sup>42</sup> The earliest known description of the lineage for the transmission of Pure Land teaching in China is Tao-ch'o's Six Worthies (*lu ta-tê*) mentioned in his *An-lo chi*. 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.<sup>43</sup> 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 ching*," which has sparked controversy among modern scholars to the identity of this "Kuan-ching." Also, included among the numerous texts that he translated was Vasubandhu's *Wang-shêng lun*, which has perhaps been the most influential Indian *sūtra* of Pure Land Buddhism in China as well as in Japan. According to Mochizuki, the second in the lineage, Hui-lun, 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-yüan's direct master.<sup>44</sup>

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-chiai*). Another disciple of Hui-kuang, Tao-p'in, reportedly desired rebirth in the Western region

and had a vision of light at his deathbed. Tao-p'in's disciple, Ling-yü died facing the western direction of Sukhāvātī Pure Land and is credited with commentaries on the *KWC* and the *Wang-shêng lun*.<sup>45</sup>

The treatment of Vasubandhu's *Wang-shêng lun* (Treatise on Rebirth) is evidence of greater Amitābha Pure Land devotion among members of the "Hui-kuang" lineage than previously thought. It suggests the possibility that Amitābha 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'i-shê yüan-shêng chi* (Treatise on the Sūtra of the [Buddha] of Immeasurable Life and Verses on the Vows for Rebirth).<sup>46</sup> This treatise is also known by another title, *Ching-t'u lun* (Treatise on the Pure Land).<sup>47</sup> 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 *Ōjō ron* (*Wang-shêng lun*) or *Jōdo 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.<sup>48</sup>

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.<sup>49</sup> Thus, the *KWCIS* by Hui-yüan is the earliest surviving text to refer to this treatise by one of the two shorter titles.<sup>50</sup> In fact, *KWCIS* never refers to this treatise by its full title but only by "*Wang-shêng 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-shêng lun*. For example, in one of the best-known studies on T'an-luan's *Wang-shêng lun-chu*, Mikogami Eryū 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-shêng lun*."<sup>51</sup> 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-shêng lun* or *Ching-t'u lun*; instead, they use "*Wu-liang-shou ching lun*" or "*Wu-liang-shou you-po-t'i-shê ching lun*."<sup>52</sup> 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'u lun*." "*Wang-shêng lun*" is found, for example, in the previously-alluded *Ching-t'u lun* by Chia-ts'ai and in the *Ching-t'u shih-i lun*.<sup>53</sup>

In sum, the *KWCIS* is the oldest extant text to designate the title as "*Wang-shêng 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-shêng lun*,<sup>54</sup> unfortunately now lost. There are no other references to a text from the sixth century as "*Wang-shêng lun*."

Not unexpectedly, Ling-yü is credited with a commentary on this *śāstra*, for this *śāstra* would be held in high esteem by a member of the "Hui-kuang" lineage. The author of the *śāstra* was the eminent Vasubandhu, whose writings,

particularly the *Daśabhūmika-śāstra*, 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-shêng lun* as one of Vasubandhu's works.

Unlike the original full title, the title of *Wang-shêng lun* centers on the highly devotional theme of "rebirth," i.e., "Wang-shêng," 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*.<sup>55</sup> "*Wang-shêng lun*" is probably related to "*Yüan-shêng*" (Vow to be Reborn) of the full title (*Wu-liang-shou ching you-po-t'i-shê yuan-shêng chi*), since the ideas are very similar. However, the two are not exact, and the question still remains as to why "*Wang-shêng lun*," and not simply "*Yuan-shêng 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-shêng 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.<sup>56</sup>

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-shêng 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."<sup>57</sup>

Evidence tends to identify the "Hui-kuang" lineage as the milieu in which the short title *Wang-shêng 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-yüan's *KWCIS* we see the earliest usage among extant texts of the shorter titles *Wang-shêng lun* and *Ta-ching* 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 *prthagjanas* (inferior beings), etc.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, it was Hui-yüan, rather than the orthodox Pure Land proponents, who is credited with the oldest extant commentaries on the *KWC* and the *WLSC*.

## FOOTNOTES:

- 1A. I wish to express my appreciation to Professor T. Shigaraki and the Committee for the Commemoration of Professor Takamaro Shigaraki's Sixtieth Birthday for their permission to reprint this arti-

cle, which appeared in *Shinran to Jōdo-kyō*. Kyoto: Nagata bunshodō, 1986, pp. 89-109.

1. Hui-yüan's surviving works include *Ta-ch'êng i-chang* (T 1851) and nine commentaries on the following sūtras and śāstras: *Daśabhūmika-śāstra* (ZZ 1.71.2 and 3), *Ta-ch'êng ch'î-hsin lun* (T 1843), *Ti-ch'ih ching lun* (ZZ 1.61.3), *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* (T 1764.37), *Vimālakīrti-sūtra* (T 1776.38), *Śrīmāladevī-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 Ōchō Enichi, *Chūgoku bukkyō no kenkyū* Vol. 3 (Kyoto: Hozokan, 1979), p. 159.
2. Kamata Shigeo, *Chūgoku bukkyō shisō-shi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1968), pp. 318-326, 354.
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'êng-kuan. See Yoshizu Yoshihide, "Daijōgishō no seiritsu to Jōyōji Eon no shisō (1)," *Sanzō* 165 (1978): 2-3.
4. Ōchō, *Chūgoku bukkyō* Vol. 3, p. 163. He states:  
  
... Hui-yüan 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 shisō-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-yüan, whose studies have been published in numerous articles totaling over twenty and appearing mostly during the 1970s.



- Some examples of articles on specific topics based on the *Ta-ch'êng i-chang* are: Fukihara Shoshin, "Jōyōji eon no busshō-setsu," in *Hokugi bukkyō no kenkyū* ed. Ōchō Enichi (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1970): 203-260; Takahashi Koji, "Eon to zendō no busshin-ron," in *Zendō kyōgaku no kenkyū*, ed. Bukkyō daigaku zendō kyōgaku kenkyūkai (Kyoto: Toyobunka shuppan, 1980): 79-96.
6. Kamata, *Chūgoku bukkyō shisōshi*, p. 306. Kamata contrasts Hui-yüan with the likes of T'an-luan of the Pure Land tradition, Hui-wen and Hui-szū 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. Ōchō Enichi expresses a very similar view as he groups Hui-yüan 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 Ōchō Enichi, *Chūgoku bukkyō* Vol. 3, p. 146.
  7. Kamata, *Chūgoku bukkyō shisōshi*, pp. 353-354.
  8. HKSC, T 2060.50.490b5-491c15.
  9. As examples of such a view, see Etani Ryukai, "Zui-tō jidai no kangyō kenkyū shikan," *Tsukamoto Hakushi shōju kinen: Bukkyō shigaku ronshū* (Kyoto: Tsukamoto Hakushi shōju kinen kai, 1961), p. 125; Fujiwara Ryōsetsu, *Nenbutsu no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Nagata bunshodo, 1957), p. 215.
  10. T 1753.37 (*Shan-tao Commentary*). Represented modern articles include: Etani, "Zui-tō jidai no kangyō kenkyū shikan," in *Tsukamoto Hakushi shōju kinen*, pp. 125-135; Yuki Reimon, "Kangyōsho ni okeru zendō shakugi no shisōshi teki igi," *Ibid.*, pp. 907-924.
  11. See Ryōtō, *Bussetsu kanmuryōjūkyō kōki* in *Shinshū Zenshō* Vol. 5, pp. 1-298. This has served as basis for many modern discussions, such as above article by Yuki.
  12. T 1749.37.182a13-c22 (*KWCIS*); T 1749.37.247c22-249b8 (*Shan-tao Commentary*).
  13. T 1753.37.247c22-249c9.
  14. *Ibid.*, p. 247b22-c8.
  15. T 2646.83.590a14ff.
  16. E.B. Cowell, F. Max Müller and J. Takakusu trls., *Buddhist Mahāyāna Texts. Sacred Books of the East* Vol. XLIX. (1985, reprint. Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass, 1965), p. 1.
  17. T 1749.37.179a6ff.
  18. T 1959.47.6b27ff, T 1963.47.86b28 and T 1753.37.246b10ff, respectively. The term is also found in *Chi-tsang Commentary*, but this does not appear to be a reference to the *WLSC*, since the latter is referred to as "*Shuang-chuan ching*." T 1752.37.234b19ff.
  19. *Chih-i Commentary*, T 1750.37.193b11ff.
  20. Hui-kan's *Shih ching-t'u ch'ün-i ching*, T 1950.47.43c15ff.
  21. *Chi-tsang Commentary*, T 1752.37.234c5ff.
  22. Other such abbreviations include *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* as *Nieh-p'an*, Vasubandhu's commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* as *Ti-lun* and the *P'u-sa ti-ch'ih ching* (T 1581) as *Ti-ch'ih*.
  23. T 1958.47.4c15-16, 5a3.
  24. T 2145.55. a) 11c12, 12a24 and b) 13a3, 14a22.

25. T 2146.55. a) 119b24, 25, 26 and b) 117c19, 23.
26. T 2147.55.158c4.
27. T 2034.49. a) 50b7, 91b14 and b) 89c16.
28. T 2148.55.191b20.
29. T 1961.47.78c12. Modern scholarship is in general agreement that this was not of actual work by Chi-i as the text states. For a summary of the findings of Japanese scholarship on this subject, see Leo Pruden, trans., "The Ching-t'u Shih-i lun," *The Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. 6-1 (May, 1973): 126-129.
30. T 2184.55.1171c19.
31. T 2147.55.157a3. This entry is found next to that of Kumārajīva's translation of the same sūtra, *Wu-liang-shou fo ching*.
32. T 1958.47.19a14.
33. *Ibid.*, 19a12-19.
34. 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-ts'ai's *Ching-t'u lun* (T 1963.47.92c20, 94b20).
35. Ōchō, *Chūgoku bukkō* Vol. 3 p. 159.
36. Mochizuki, *Chūgoku jōdokyōri-shi*, p. 90. There are reasons to believe that Hui-yūan 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 Tuṣita Heaven and meeting Hui-yūan there. See T 2060.50.518b21.
37. T 1851.44.834a23-b28. Hui-yūan 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 Sukhāvātī, 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 bukkō ibutsu* (Tokyo: Kobundo, 1942), pp. 286-299.
40. For example, Nogami, *Chūgoku jōdokyō-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-yūan. 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-yūan's purported association with the Ti-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-yūan'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'in); T 2060.50.497b17-18 (Ling-yü). Cf. Mochizuki, pp. 67, 130.
46. T 1524.26.
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’o’s *An-lo chi* as the earliest to employ *Ching-t’u* but remains silent regarding the usage of *Wang-shêng lun*.
49. His *Lueh-lun an-lo ching-t’u i* refers to *Wang-shêng lun* as *Wu-liang-shou lun*. T 1957.47.1a15. See Leo Pruden, transl., “A Short Essay on the Pure Land,” *The Eastern Buddhist* VIII no. 1, pp. 74-95.
50. T 1949.37.183a19, 184b11, 15, 22ff.
51. Mikogami Eryu, *Ōjōronchū kaisetsu*, p. 13.
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’u lun*, T 1963.97c12ff. In *Ching-t’u 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.
55. T 2124.50.141a26.
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 *prthagjanas* as the group for whom the *KWC* was taught (173a9-10).

# ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY:

- A-mi-t’o ching* 阿彌陀經  
*An-lo chi* 安樂集  
 bonpu (bonbu) 凡夫  
 Ch’i 基  
 Chih-i 智顗  
 ching-t’u 淨土  
*Ching-t’u lun* 淨土論  
*Ching-t’u shih-i lun* 淨土十疑論  
*Ching-ying Hui-yüan* 淨影慧遠  
 Ching-t’ai 靜泰  
 chiu-p’in wang-shêng 九品往生  
 Ch’ü-ch’ü Ching-shêng 沮渠京聲  
*Chung-ching mu-lu* 衆經目錄  
*Dai-kyō* 大經  
 Dharma Master Hui-lun 慧龍法師  
 Dharma Master Tao-ch’ang 道場法師  
 Dharma Master T’an-luan 曇鸞法師  
 Emperor Wu (Wu-ti) 武帝  
 Fa-ching 法經  
 fa-mieh 法滅  
 Fa-shang 法上  
 fan-fu 凡夫  
 Fei Chang-fang 費長房  
 hōmetsu 法滅  
*HKSC* = *Hsu Kao-sêng chuan* 統高僧伝  
 Hsin-hsing 信行  
*Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching* 新無量壽經  
*Hsiao* 小  
*Hsiao-chuan Wu-liang-shou ching* 小卷無量壽經  
*Hsiao Wu-liang-shou ching* 小無量壽經  
 Hua-yen 華嚴  
 Hui-kuang 慧光  
 Hui-szū 慧思  
 Hui-wên 慧文  
 Hui-yüan 慧遠  
*Jōdo ron* 淨土論  
*Ken jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō mon’rui* 顯淨土真実教行証文類  
*Kuan-ching* 觀經  
*Kuan Mi-lê p’u-sa shang-shêng tou-shuai-t’ien ching* 觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經  
*Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching* 觀無量壽經  
*Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu* 觀無量壽經義疏  
*Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching fo shu* 觀無量壽經仏疏  
*KWC* = *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching* 觀無量壽經  
*KWCIS* = *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching i-shu* by Hui-yüan 觀無量壽經義疏

Ling-yü 靈裕  
 Li-tai fa-pao chi 歷代法宝記  
 lu ta-tê 六大德  
 Meditation Master Ta-hai 大海禪師  
 Mi-lê hsia-shêng ching 弥勒下生經  
 Mi-lê hsia-shêng ch'eng-fo ching  
     弥勒下生成仏經  
 Mi-lê ta-ch'êng-fo ching 弥勒大成仏經  
 mo-fa 末法  
 nien-fo 念佛  
 Ôjô ron 往生論  
 san-shan 散善  
 Shan-tao 善導  
 Shan-tao Commentary = Kuan Wu-liang-  
     shou fo ching  
 shang-t'ung 上統  
 shêng-jen 聖人  
 Sinp'pyon chejong kyojang ch'ongnok  
     新編諸宗教藏總錄  
 shôdomon 聖道門  
 shoshi 諸師  
 Shou-ching 壽經  
 Shuang-chuan ching 雙卷經  
 shûgaku 宗學  
 T = Taishô shinshû daizôkyô  
     大正新修大藏經  
 Ta A-mi-t'o ching 大阿彌陀經

Ta-ch'êng i-chang 大乘義章  
 Ta-ching 大經  
 ta-li 他力  
 tariki 他力  
 Ta Wu-liang-shou ching 大無量壽經  
 TCIC = Ta-ch'êng i-chang by Hui-yüan  
 Tao-p'in 道憑  
 t'ien 天  
 T'ien-t'ai 天台  
 Ti-lun 地論  
 ting-shan 定善  
 Tu-shun 杜順  
 Wang-shêng chi 往生偈  
 Wang-shêng lun 往生論  
 WLSC = Wu-liang-shou ching  
 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 無量壽義疏  
 Wu-liang-shou ta-ching 無量壽大經  
 Wu-liang-shou ching you-po-t'i-shê yüan-  
     shêng chi 無量壽經優婆塞提捨願生偈  
 Wu-liang-shou you-po-t'i-shê ching lun  
     無量壽經優婆塞提捨經論  
 Wu-ti 武帝  
 Yen-tsung 彥宗  
 ZZ = Dai nihon zokuzôkyô