

Bruno Petzold's Understanding of Shin Buddhism as Expressed in His Major Work:

The Classification of Buddhism: Bukkyō Kyōhan comprising the Classification of Buddhist Doctrines in India, China, and Japan

by Shohei Ichimura

INTRODUCTION

Bruno Petzold (1873-1949) is known in pre-war Japan to have been one of those Westerners who have contributed most to the post-Meiji Reformation Era of Japanese education, and also a unique scholar of Buddhist Studies in the sense that he accomplished in his own right a bridging of the Buddhist thought of the East and the modern thought of the West as a German by birth and culture. His Buddhist study is said to have begun in 1919 with Professor Daito Shimaji of the Imperial University of Tokyo until the latter's death, and then with Professor Shinsho Hanayama till the early 1940's. The work, the title of which is introduced above, truly represents his life work because it is as voluminous as nearly 2,000 typewritten pages in the editorially completed text. It is also truly a work of unique enterprise, because, as written in English and comprehensively covering all the schools of Buddhist doctrines developed in Northern Mahāyāna tradition, especially in China and Japan (exclusive of Tibetan tradition), the work embodies a universalist approach not only in trying to see the existing schools of Buddhist thoughts in terms of historical perspective, but also in trying to review them in terms of forthcoming trends of inter-religious and cultural perspective.

This paper is intended to introduce some of the basic criteria upon which Bruno Petzold organized his understanding of the Shin Buddhist thought in this particular work, which is yet to be published. Secondly, it is intended at this occasion to report the current status of my editorial task, in

which I have been engaged since January 1983 as requested by A.H. Petzold, the author's son (who died in 1985) and also as recommended by Professor Shinsho Hanayama.

KYŌ-HAN, OR CLASSIFICATION OF BUDDHIST DOCTRINES

In medieval Japan, the Kyō-hans or Classification of Buddhist Doctrines had an important role in Buddhist sectarian affairs, not only in providing the theoretical practical basis for a school to distinguish itself from other schools, but also in defining its position in absolute terms as the only path of Buddhist salvation. 'Kyō-han' or 'Kyō-sō Han-jaku' in full means a 'classification of Buddhist doctrines based on critical interpretation'; it is an intelligible system of Buddhist doctrines constructed out of a conglomerate of all the doctrines historically developed as a unified knowledge of Buddhist religion.

The term 'Chiao-p'an' was initially used by Chih-i (531-597) in China to signify his system of 'Five Periods and Eight Teachings' [Wu-shih-pachiao or Go-ji Hakkyō]. In China, the Kyō-han flourished during the Six Dynasties because it was through such systematization that Buddhist thinkers not only could make their respective position clear in the field of Buddhism, but also could critically examine all other schools as well as non-Buddhist schools from their individual standpoint. The trend took hold of itself until the latter part of T'ang Dynasty and then was introduced to Japan

during the Nara period, to begin with the Kyō-hans of those six scholastic schools, such as Kusha, Jōjitsu, Hossō, Sanron, Kegon, Nehan, and Ritsu, and then during the Heian period, Japanese Buddhist thinkers produced the Kyō-han of Esoteric Tendai and that of Shingon Esoteric Buddhism, which were followed in the subsequent Kamakura period by the Kyō-hans of the religious reformers, such as Hōnen, Shinran, Nichiren, and so forth. By then, the nature and function of Kyō-han, significantly changed from the theoretical scheme of doctrines organized in an intelligible system based on objective rationalization to the practical scheme of doctrines for exclusive choice and commitment of a certain doctrine and practice based on subjective force of faith. Shinran's Pure Land (Jōdo) Kyō-han, which subsequently became the basis of the Jōdo Shin School of Buddhism, was one such specimen.

VALUE AND MEANING OF KYŌ-HANS

From the point of view of modern and contemporary scholarship, as it has been based on historical exactness and linguistic and textual critique, such Kyō-hans appear to be mere curious products of theological fancy and entirely unsuited to be taken seriously for critical studies of Buddhism. Buddhist scholarship today has already replaced those medieval sectarian and dogmatic systems by a comprehensive system based on scientific and academic disciplines. Yet, for an individual modern man, in order not only to understand Buddhism as his own religion but also to make his own Buddhist standpoint clear in relation to secular forms of culture and ideology and especially in relation to non-Buddhist religions, such as Christianity and Islam, we are compelled to re-think the value and meaning of the past Kyō-hans and to freshly re-study Buddhism on the basis of particular forms of its doctrines and practices.

It should have been a similar context and reason as to why Bruno Petzold, born and reared in the West and despite his rich cultural and relig-

ious heritage, found it necessary to affiliate himself with a particular school, such as the Japanese Tendai school, even holding a priestly rank in it, to carry out his career of Buddhist study and understanding of Buddhism as his own religion. Yet, may I quickly say, although he was a modern universalist endowed with scientific broad-mindedness, Petzold chose for his subject of study all the Kyō-hans that existed in the past, some of which still have their function today, obviously for the sake of finding his own system of Buddhism. This is very significant, precisely because he did not simply affiliate himself with a school of Buddhism but broadly sought his own system of Buddhism. As we are living today in the period of global communication and of all kinds of interreligious encounters, from violent confrontation to gentle dialogue, I believe that the precedence demonstrated by Petzold and his way of understanding varieties of Buddhist Kyō-hans should provide an excellent opportunity for us to find some new way for meeting the challenge of the present-day world.

PETZOLD'S CLASSIFICATION OF KYŌ-HANS

After going through an enormous number of Petzold's manuscripts and closely tracing his studies that cover the vast areas of past Buddhist worlds in India, China, and Japan, as well as over a millenium of time span from the Classical to the Medieval period, it is my distinct impression that Petzold succeeded with his ambitious enterprise to classify all the classifications of Buddhist doctrines into a unified whole despite the fact that the work was still incomplete in some parts of the systems he dealt with. As editor of Petzold's yet unpublished manuscripts, I feel obliged to inform the community of Buddhist scholars of Petzold as to the reason of its success and possible implication by commenting on the basic criteria he adopted and demonstrating how his criteria worked with his treatment of Shinran's Kyō-han.

The key criteria to which his success must be

attributed are the basic Japanese Tendai doctrines of Hongaku-mon [the Gate of Original Enlightenment] and Shikaku-mon [the Gate of Enlightenment having its Beginning]. Although he humbly introduced these criteria in his introductory chapter, saying that he appropriated these concepts from Prof. Shimaji's insight, I am compelled to surmise that, because of his deep understanding of these fundamental doctrines of Tendai, Petzold decisively converted himself to Mahāyāna Buddhism. In short, he saw the universal nature of human religiosity as best expressed in these doctrines and hence foresaw them as applicable not only to classifying all the systems of Buddhist religion, be it theoretical or practical, but also applicable, as he demonstrated in his introductory chapter, equally to his Western religious and cultural heritages.

HONGAKU-MON VERSUS SHIKAKU-MON

According to Petzold's exposition, the Hongaku-mon, or Gate of Original Enlightenment, encompasses the religiosity of Buddhism from the absolute standpoint, whereas the Shikaku-mon, or Gate of Enlightenment, having its beginning encompasses it from the relative standpoint. Whatever the former denotes belongs to the realm of freedom and pure reason, whereas whatever the latter denotes belongs to the realm of necessity and historical conditionality. While, thus, man in the Shikaku-mon follows the way of tradition in getting hold of the thought of absolute (being thereby inspired to ascend the passage of religion) the one who has realized the state of original enlightenment wants to comprehend the absolute in perfect freedom. In doing so, the man of Hongaku-mon endeavors to divest it as far as possible from all fetters of tradition and authority and of all conditionality imposed upon him by determined and acknowledged forms of religion, by moral precepts, laws, educational systems, and by time, space, and causality. In short the Hongaku-

mon stands for the realm of Paramārtha in the dual truth system of Buddhism, whereas the Shikaku-mon stands for the realm of Vyavahāra or the practicality of convention. Petzold expresses his own thought as to the relation between the two approximately as follows:

The Hongaku-mon becomes thus the real bearer of the religious paradox, by presuming that we, creatures of transient feelings, of passing caprices, of various and willful longings, and we, ignorant, fallible creatures of a day, who are in need of salvation, are able to discern what is absolute from what is relative, and are able to possess an intimate and immediate acquaintance with the plan of all things and get into direct touch with that power which is generally called 'Divine'.

CONFLICT BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND RELIGION

Let me now give some examples to explain how and why Petzold considered the two Buddhist categories of Hongaku and Shikaku as applicable to analysis and classification of the pre-war Western trends of thought, culture, and religion. For instance, in parallel to the Hongaku and Shikaku categories, he distinguished the category of universal religion which is eternal and that of existing religions that are temporal, or between the category of original experience (*urerlebnis*) and that of cultural experience (*bildungserlebnis*). He also distinguished two equivalent categories between the irrational side and rational side of our philosophical consciousness, be it in idealism or realism, or between the dynamism of original experience and the inherent conflict of cultural experience, for whose unity the two categories ought to be harmonized, or between the category of meta-basis comparable to the Einsteinian principle of relativity and that of the Aristotelian individual which, being overruled by abstraction, nevertheless lies in the same sphere with the meta-basis. Finally, Petzold especially emphasized the fact

that the doctrine of original enlightenment and that of enlightenment having its beginning constitute a form of classification applicable not only to Buddhism but also to other higher religions. He asserts that the distinction underlying the two is comparable to the discrepancy between religion and theology in the West. For, the philosophers of religion frequently voiced, saying: "Religion is the enemy of theology and *vice versa*, precisely because the former tries to soar high transcending the latter, while the latter tries to imprison the former under the iron framework of its abstraction. For, over and over again, in the history of religion, theology failed to embody the higher truth to which religion had attained." Having thus described the discrepancy between the ideal and the actual, however, Petzold correctly expressed his opinion as to the relation between the Hongaku and Shikaku categories: "But the true inference surely is that religion and theology are reciprocal, to the effect that as religion develops, theology may be in advance of religion, just as that religion may be in advance of theology."

SHINRAN'S CLASSIFICATIONS

It is generally acknowledged that Shinran did not intend to establish an independent school apart from his master Honen's. As he named the seven patriarchs for his religious standpoint as Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu in India, T'an-luan (Donran), Tao-ch'o (Dōshaku), and Shan-tao (Zendō) in China, and Genshin and Genkū (Hōnen), he thought to have merely organized faithfully those classifications which his predecessors left behind. Nevertheless, because he felt from his inner force of faith and insight, he asserted his own standpoint as the absolute 'other power' [*tariki*] teaching by distinguishing it from the several schools of Pure Land [Jōdo] teaching which seems to him to take their stand on some mixed path between self-power [*jiriki*] and other power. Thus, Shinran was compelled by the existing historical context to formulate a set of relative

classification on the one hand and an absolute classification on the other, expressing his religious conviction that salvation, i.e., rebirth in the Pure Land, derives from total dependence on the power of Amitābha Buddha. Petzold rightly analyzed Shinran's two sets of classifications in terms of his two criteria of Hongaku and Shikaku doctrines.

The Pure Land doctrine of 'Other Power' had its beginning with Nāgārjuna's distinction between the difficult and easy passages toward the goal of religion. It was, however, T'an-luan (Donran, 476-542) in China who interpreted the two paths in terms of 'self power' and 'other power,' thereby suggesting an implication, such that the difficult and easy paths could be correlated with the Saintly Gate [Shōdō-mon] based on self power and the Pure Land Gate [Jōdo-mon] based on other power. Tao-ch'o (Dōshaku, c.645) then brought forth this distinction into the initial classification of the Saintly teaching and Pureland teaching in parallel with the Śrāvaka and Bodhisattva Vehicles, and introduced an absolute classification, to the effect that the Pure Land teaching is the only path through which one could enter into that land. Shan-tao (Zendō, c. 681) further added a distinction between gradual [Zen] and abrupt [Ton] teachings in parallel with the foregoing distinctions and another distinction within the Pure Land confinement between the Main Passage [Yō-mon] in which the saintly practice of meditation and other virtues admixed with the Pure Land practice of calling Amitābha's name on the one hand and the genuine Pure Land teaching based on the Universal Vow [Guganmon] specially willed by Amitābha Buddha. Now, coming to Japanese Pure Land thinkers, Genkū [Hōnen Shōnin] gave a clear system to Shan-tao's idea of distinction between the Main Gate and the Universal Vow Gate respectively inculcated in the *Kuan-wo-liang-shou-ching* [Kwan-muryōju-kyō] and in the large *Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra* [Wu-liang-shou-ching], and adopting Genshin's threefold distinction of the Pure Land practice of Buddha's name calling [Nembutsu], introduced the three

graded distinctions as follows: (1) 'Gradual teaching [Zen-kyō] based on self power toward termination of Defilements' comprising all Hinayāna and Mahāyāna open but temporal teachings, such as, Kusha, Hosso, Sanron, etc.; (2) 'Abrupt-in-gradual teaching based on self-power toward termination of Defilements' comprising Mahāyāna open and secret as well as true [*shih-chiao*, *jitsu-gyō*] teachings, such as Kegon, Tendai, Busshin, etc.; and (3) 'Abrupt-of-abrupt teaching based on both self and other power, though without termination of Defilements,' comprising the three Pure Land texts and Vasubandhu's treatise on the large *Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra*. Thus, Honen placed his Pure Land teaching in the last category of his classification.

Shinran (1173-1262) introduced three relative classifications: (1) the classification of Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings [Nai-ge Sōtai], which compares Buddhist religion and non-Buddhist ones, involving selection, namely: throwing away non-Buddhist teachings and taking up Buddhist teaching, which is common to all Buddhist schools; (2) The classification of Sainly and Pure Land paths [Shō-Jō Sōtai], which compares the teaching of Sainly passage [Shōdō-mon] and that of Pure Land passage [Jōdo-mon] and is known by the name of 'Ni-sō Shi-jū' literally meaning: 'Two Pairs Four Piles' or 'two pairs of alternatives combined into four alternatives,' and is intended to distinguish the Pure Land path to salvation from those non-Pure Land teachings; and (3) the classification of True and Temporal teachings [Shinōke Sōtai], which compares the true and temporal Pure Land teachings in view of distinguishing the unmixed Pure Land practice from those mixed ones with non-Pure Land forms of practice in reference to the four criteria of 'teaching' [*kyō*] practice' [*gyō*], 'faith' [*shin*], and 'enlightenment' [*shō*]. Now, the Absolute Classification that is unique to Shinran, hence also to the Shin-shū School, denies all the teachings that implicate self-power and affirms the teaching that centers upon other power alone as the sole teaching. Shinran

expressed it, stating: "There is the only way of the Jodo teaching which is able to go through and enter into the Pure Land [*yui-u-jōdo-ka-tsū-nyū-ro*]" and also "Tens of thousand forms of practice and varieties of good are nothing but temporal gates to enter into the Pure Land [*man-gyōsho-zen kore kemon*]."

The classification of 'Two Pairs combined into Four Alternatives' [Ni-Sō Shi-jū] can be obtained by combining the pair of 'going out' [*shutsu*] and 'passing over' [*chō*] and that of 'lengthwise' [*jū*] and 'crosswise' [*ō*] thereby to categorize the four different ways through which each practitioner would realize the goal of entering into and being born in, the Pure Land: (1) 'Lengthwise going out' [*jū-shutsu*] embodying the gradual teaching of the saintly path, the hardest of all, which comprises the Śrāvaka and Pratyeka Vehicles and Mahāyāna temporal teaching based on self power; (2) 'Lengthwise passing over' [*jū-chō*] embodying the abrupt teaching of the saintly path, the harder one, which comprises the Mahayana true teaching based on self power; (3) 'Crosswise going out' [*ō-shutsu*] embodying the gradual teaching of the Pure Land path based on both self power as well as other power, the less hard one, which comprises the *Kan-muryōju-kyō*'s teaching, such as, sixteen forms of fixed and unfixed meditation and varieties of virtues to be practiced by three kinds of practitioners each differentiated into three qualities [San-pai Kyū-bon]; (4) 'Crosswise passing over' [*ō-chō*] embodying the abrupt teaching of the Pure Land path exclusively based on other power, which comprises the large *Sukhāvatīvyūha-sutra*'s absolutely true teaching based on Amitābha's original vow, the easiest of all, which Shinran deemed to be the basis of his religion. The True and Temporal Classification [Shin-ke Sō-tai] is further intended to make the distinction clearer between the last two teachings, namely, between the temporal Pure Land teaching based on self as well as other power and the true Pure Land teaching exclusively based on self power. The rationale behind was that despite

Honen's distinction between the Main Gate [Yō-mon] equivalent to the third path here and the Wide-Vow Gate [Gu-gan-mon] equivalent to the fourth, his disciples could not understand the true idea of the fourth path and went astray into various kinds of the third path. It was in such a context that Shinran is said to have been compelled to make manifest his teacher's true opinion.

SHINRAN'S ABSOLUTE CLASSIFICATION

Shinran's absolute classification is known by the name of 'San-gan Ten-nyū' or 'Three Vows Rolling and Entering.' Of the 18th, 19th, and 20th vows out of the forty-eight that are enumerated in the large *Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra* as attributed to Amitābha Buddha, Shinran selected the 18th vow as the primary vow of that Buddha, and for this reason he regarded the large *Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra* as the only real Sūtra of his Pure Land teaching. The passage of the 18th vow reads:

If I (Amitābha Buddha himself) should become Buddha, all living beings in the ten directions should raise their faith in me, feel joy with their sincerest mind, wish to be born in my land, and meditate upon my name ten times at the utmost, and should they not be born in the Pureland, then I would not accept the perfect enlightenment, except for those who committed the five deadly sins or abuse the true teaching.

Now, for Shin-shū followers, unlike those of the Jōdo school, calling the name of the Buddha is not a necessary cause for being born in the Pure Land, but it is the faith in the power of the Buddha's vow that counts for their salvation. The 19th vow, on the other hand, implies the elements of self power as it refers to those people who raise the thought of enlightenment (*bodhicittotpāda*, *hotsu-bodai-shin*) and start to practice various virtues, wishing to see the Buddha's appearance at the time of their death. While this is the Jōdo

School's position, Shin-shū followers do not necessarily expect such appearance. The 20th vow, which, though implicates some elements of self power, refers to those people who hear the name of the Buddha and are engaged in cultivating various virtues, and by the effect of their virtues, meditate on the Pure Land, wishing to be born in that land, is more in harmony with and nearer to the 18th vow than the 19th one. Thus, Shinran classified the 19th vow as the Main Gate [Yō-mon] set forth by the Buddha in the *Kwan-muryōju-kyō*, the 20th vow as the True Gate [Shin-mon] set forth in the small *Sukhāvativyūha*, and the 18th vow as the Universal Vow Gate [Gu-gan-mon] revealed in the large *Sukhāvativyūha*.

It is now plain that the role of this absolute classification is to activate a dialectical process between the aforementioned three vows to culminate into the 18th vow. The doctrine that denotes this process, namely, 'Three Vows Rolling and Entering' [San-gan Ten-nyū] means that initially from the faith in the 19th vow (i.e., the Yō-mon), a practitioner enters into the faith of the 20th vow (i.e., the Shin-mon) by throwing away the former and taking up the latter, and then further from the faith of the 20th vow, he enters into the faith of the 18th vow (i.e., the Gu-gan-mon) by throwing away the Shin-mon and taking up the Gu-gan-mon. Shinran deemed the state of believing in this last vow to be the ultimate teaching of his religion, namely: 'Hon-gan Ichi-jō' or 'One Vehicle of the Original Vow,' and characterized it as the most abrupt teaching [*ton-gyō*], the swiftest teaching [*ton-soku*], the teaching of perfect harmony [*en-yū*], the teaching of perfect fullness [*en-man*], and the teaching of absolute non-duality [*zettai-funī*] and one real truth [*ichi-jitsu-shinnyō*].

PETZOLD'S UNDERSTANDING OF SHINRAN'S SYSTEM

Having thus briefly laid down both the relative and absolute classifications of Shinran in accordance with Petzold's writings and notes and

in consultation with Prof. Hanayama's dissertation: *Bukkyō Kyōhan Ron no kenkyū* [A Study of the Treatises on Buddhist Doctrinal Classifications] handed to the University of Tokyo in 1921, I am obliged to make two points clear as to my evaluation of Petzold's understanding of the Shinshū system. First, although, while going through both [i.e., works of Petzold and Hanayama], I tried to find anything different between the opinions of these two scholars, I have not been able to find any passage that can be interpreted as distinctly Petzold's understanding as different from Hanayama's. This means that Petzold accepted whatever Hanayama lectured and outlined along with his dissertational scheme. It is true that the Jōdo system was Petzold's last subject of study and that his writing was not yet well organized while many portions of it were in the form of notes taken from Hanayama's lecture. Therefore, he may not have had enough time to make out his own critical or appraisal statements. Yet, I am strongly inclined to believe that Petzold did not really need to change anything over what he learned from his teacher consultant in order to suit Shinran's system to his own overall scheme of writing. Secondly, therefore, my attempt to find Petzold's own understanding of Shinshū teaching must be shifted toward examining the degree of correlation between his criteria of Hongaku and Shikaku doctrines in the way he understood them and Shinran's classifications as laid down above by Petzold along with Hanayama. For, the criteria of Hongaku and Shikaku which Petzold applied to studying Buddhism were from the very beginning, his own basis, of which he must have been convinced since the time he was studying under Prof. Shimaji. Thus, in evaluating Petzold's understanding, I am prepared to comment on some points concerning the said correlation between Shinran's system and Petzold's criteria of Hongaku and Shikaku principles.

First of all, the Tendai doctrine of Hongaku and Shikaku was the general basis of Japanese Buddhism upon which all the subsequent sectarian

offshoots had their foundations in common. This very reason alone justifies the assertion that the Hongaku and Shikaku doctrines can provide the fundamental framework within which any sectarian Buddhist doctrines developed from that original system of doctrines. In his introductory chapter, Petzold characterized the Hongaku-mon, the fountainhead of Buddhist religiosity, and its reciprocal relation with the Shikaku-mon in the following terms: (1) The Hongaku-mon [Original Enlightenment] constitutes paradoxical affirmation and negation as common to all Buddhist doctrines; (2) the Hongaku-mon is the spontaneous consciousness, whereas the Shikaku-mon is the formal expression; (3) the Hongaku-mon embodies the paramount absolute, whereas the Shikaku-mon the relative conditionality; (4) the Hongaku-mon, as absolute, comprehends all that falls in the category of Shikaku-mon and hence is harmonious with all. Moreover, I must also introduce here some of theoretical contrasts by which Petzold tried to explain the Hongaku and Shikaku categories: (1) mon-duality *versus* duality; (2) factuality *versus* ideality; (3) transcendentality *versus* phenomenality; and (4) experientiality *versus* analyticity. In reference to the foregoing set of conceptual schemes, Petzold is justified to characterize Shinran's relative classifications as belonging to the Shikaku category, precisely because they constitute formal expressions based on the principle of logical duality, abstract ideality, temporal phenomenality, and analyticity, but should eventually be forsaken (denied) before the occurrence of spontaneous consciousness of the original enlightenment [Hongaku-mon] in terms of non-duality, factual directness, transcendental freedom, and experiential comprehension.

DIALECTICAL PROCESS UNDERLIES BUDDHIST DOCTRINES

The fact that Petzold understood a dialectical process as underlying all Buddhist doctrines in common is significant and crucial to his successful

treatment of Shinran's absolute classification to which all his relative classifications culminate. Petzold commented, to some detail, on Murakami Sensho's exposition of the dialectic of 'San-gan Ten-nyū.' In fact, the term 'dialectic' is not used in Petzold's writing, nor in Hanayama's nor in Murakami's, but for the sake of convenience, I have taken the liberty of using this term as denoting the process of simultaneous negation and affirmation involved in all Buddhist doctrines. Petzold took up Murakami's insight, such that the three basic principles underlie every and any doctrinal classification, namely (1) that of dividing or analyzing; (2) that of dual process of picking up one and throwing away another, both being involved in selection process of anything; (3) that of unifying or comprehension. Petzold, along with Hanayama, understood 'absolute' as meaning 'absolute affirming' and 'absolute negating.' He wrote thus: "Therefore, having made selection after selection [i.e., from the 19th vow to the 20th, from the 20th vow to the 18th], we come to the 'absolute negation' of other theories, and when we enter into the absolute belief of the highest teaching [i.e., the 18th vow], then we affirm absolutely all other teachings which we negated once before. Therefore, the term 'absolute' must have two sides, namely it must be 'affirming' as well as 'negating'."

In order to clarify how Petzold understood this dialectical process, the crucial aspect of Shinran's absolute classification, I am obliged to comment on another point worthy of attention. If faith in the 18th vow [the Wide Vow Gate, Gu-ganmon] which Shinran praised as 'the One Buddha Vehicle of Amitābha's Vow' is considered to be one of the two gates [i.e., in contrast to the Main Gate of the 19th vow and the True Gate of the 20th vow], the Wide Vow Gate of the 18th vow must still be regarded as relative as it has its comparable alternatives. On this point, Petzold argued approximately as follows: The divisions into two or three (as mentioned above) speak of Amitābha's vow in reference to the capacity of the people who

listen to the Buddha's preaching, and insofar as this is the case, they are relative classifications. It is only when the one Buddha-vehicle theory of vow speaks of the teaching itself on the part of the Buddha and not of the capacity of the listeners on the part of humanity, it is the absolute classification. In summarizing his argument, Petzold said: "In short, the absolute theory speaks only about the Dharma or the teaching of Truth and that is the general rule for Mahāyāna Buddhism, like the Kegon's 'absolute' or Tendai's 'absolute'. Therefore, the absolute doctrine of the Shin-shū does not contradict this general rule." This comment may have been Petzold's own, just as Hanayama's. In any case, the Dharma or Teaching of Truth on the part of the Buddha is one and the same, namely 'Bhūta-tathatā or the transcendental totality of all things as they are in themselves,' and hence it is absolute, but it is only on the part of the people who try to understand it that the Dharma is to be divided or analyzed into various forms as temporal, empirical, phenomenal or dualistic.

As an epilogue to my attempt to correlate Petzold's criteria of Hongaku and Shikaku doctrines and Shinran's system of Kyō-hans, especially concerning the relation between relative and absolute classifications, I am obliged to call attention to the fact that there underlies a dialectical process that activates abstract forms of classifications, which otherwise remain to be all relative, to acquire new meaning as part of the comprehensive totality of all things as they are in themselves. Considering the fact that the principles of difference and identity underlie all logical and linguistic phenomena, that the Buddhist insight of *sūnyatā* recognizes their simultaneous operation at every moment of consciousness, and that it is this dialectical process that provides all the distinctions and analyses in our empirical world and yet transcends them in terms of simultaneous identification and differentiation, I am inclined to say that Bruno Petzold rightly found his search for the principle of harmony within the dynamic force of dialectical negation and affirmation despite myri-

ads of analyses and distinctions with which he dealt.

PUBLICATION OF PETZOLD'S WORK

Since I succeeded my colleagues, a group of Buddhist scholars in Japan, in 1983 in taking up the formidable task of editing Petzold's manuscripts, four and a half years have passed. Because of the state of the manuscripts in the portion of the Jōdo system, I have not been able to advance as quickly as I wished in completing the initial but most time-consuming preparation. As this present paper indicates, my own research in understanding the Jōdo systems has been accomplished, at least as far as required for organizing the notes and papers for editorial purposes. Since Petzold's general conclusion is more or less in completed form, my initial step will be completed within this year. The edited text has been divided into two books, respectively dealing with Chinese and Japanese Buddhist Kyōhans. Altogether fourteen parts and thirty-four chapters have been set for expedience to meet the complex schemes of the work, of which a brief table of content is given after notes below. My appreciation is due to Prof. Shinsho Hanayama for providing me with the copy of his dissertation so that I could successfully edit Petzold's manuscripts on the Jōdo Kyōhans.

NOTES

1. For Section II here, esp. for Petzold exposition of Hongaku and Shikaku doctrines, refer to the edited text: Part I: General Introduction; Chap. 3: Hongaku-mon and Shikaku-mon [the Gate of Original Enlightenment and the Gate of Enlightenment having its Beginning].

2. For Section III, esp. for Honen's and Shinran's classifications as discussed here, refer to Pt. XII: The Jodo System; Chap. 31 and 32; also, to Hanayama, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, Chap. 10: The Jodo Kyohans.

3. For Section IV, refer to Pt. I, Chap. 3 and Pt. XII, Chap. 32.

4. *Brief Table of Contents: BOOK ONE:* Pt. I: General Introduction [Chaps. 1, 2, 3]; Pt. II: Indian Buddhism and Classifications [Chap. 4]; Pt. III: Chinese Buddhism and Primitive Chinese Classifications [Chaps. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]; Pt. IV: The Tendai system [Chaps. 11, 12, 13, 14]; Pt. V: The Sanron System [Chap. 15]; Pt. VI: The Hosso System [Chaps. 16, 17, 18]; Pt. VII: The Kegon System [Chaps. 19, 20, 21]; Pt. VIII: The Ritsu system [Chap. 22]; *BOOK TWO:* Pt. IX: The (Japanese) Shingon System [Chaps. 23, 24, 25]; Pt. X: The Esoteric Tendai System [Chap. 26]; Part XI: The Nichiren System [Chaps. 27, 28, 29]; Pt. XII: The Jodo System [Chaps. 30, 31, 32]; Pt. XIII: The Zen System [Chap. 33]; Pt. XIV: General Conclusion [Chap. 34]; Appendix: Glossarial Index and Various Charts.