

The Sectarian Beginnings of Jōdo-shū: An Analysis of Hōnen's *Senjaku Hongan Nembutsu*

by Whalen W. Lai, *University of California, Davis*

Hōnen (1133-1212) left his mountain hermitage at Kurotani in 1175, and going among the people in Kyoto, proclaimed his doctrine of nembutsu (Buddha-name recitation) as the means to *ōjō* (rebirth in Amida's Pure Land). It was then, at the age of forty-three, that Hōnen, for some time devoted to Genshin's *Ōjyōshū*, discovered Zendo (Chinese: Shan-tao) and experienced a "conversion." Traditionally, this date is regarded as the founding of the Jōdo-shū. The founding of the Jōdo-shū signalled the emergence of the first truly Japanese sect, the ideology of which, like its social organization later, had known no precedence in China or Japan. The nembutsu movement broke away from the recognized eight schools in Heian and set the pace for the Kamakura Buddhist Reformation.¹

The present paper will analyze this historic breakthrough in the context of Hōnen's life, in relationship with Shan-tao's *Kuan-ching hsüan-i*² on which Hōnen "solely relied," and within the social setting of late Heian and early Kamakura. The focus will be on Hōnen's *Senjaku Hongan Nembutsu-shū*³ (*Senjakushū*) and its relationship with Shan-tao's work and Genshin's *Ōjyōshū*.⁴

The contention is that the *Senjakushū* was compiled consciously in 1198 so as to define the nature of the new sect, legitimized by a second dramatic conversion of Hōnen in a trance (*samādhi*) encounter with Shan-tao. This work gave institutional identity to the nembutsu movement and created a *Jōdoshūgaku* outlook that reached beyond Shan-tao's vision. The term *senjaku* (choice, selection, discrimination) underwent a subtle change of meaning: What was probably originally Hōnen's personal choice of nembutsu as his own path, albeit a path among paths, became Amida's Choice

(or Election in Calvin's sense) and the choice by all Buddhas. What was *apologetic senjaku* in Hōnen's personal faith became a mature sectarian doctrine, or *dogmatic senjaku*.

The *Senjakushū* was originally a tract that circulated privately within the inner circle of Hōnen's disciples. It was a compilation of scriptural and commentary passages with Hōnen's comments. Only the initial few lines were in Hōnen's own handwriting. The circumstances under which the work emerged were by normal standards rather extraordinary. In 1198, during the first month of Hōnen's 66th year, Hōnen attained *samādhi* in a dream encounter with Shan-tao who appeared to him in a luminous half-golden body. Later in the same year, Hōnen found a patron in Lord Hōjō Kujō at whose urging, the *Senjakushū* was compiled. Soon after, in 1204, Hōnen and his disciples drafted a *Seven-point Article*,⁵ urging the following to avoid excesses and disowning evil and foolish elements. In the next year, a counter nine-point critique launched by the Old Heian Schools charged that Hōnen's "private designation of a (new) sect was most inappropriate."⁶ Since the *Senjakushū* was the treatise that set the definition of the new sect and since it seemed to have touched off the above charges and countercharges, some modern scholars would see the real beginning of the Jōdo-shū in 1198 and not 1175.⁷ The new thesis tends to stress the possible political association between Hōnen and Hōjō but it is not unchallenged by more traditional scholars.⁸ After considering the conflicting opinions, I would like to suggest the following compromise.

Hōnen entered the Tendai order at seventeen from a low samurai family. As one of the many conscientious lower clerics dissatisfied with

the hierocratic politics at Mount Hiei, Hōnen retired as a hermit and holy man (*hijiri*) in a common form of protest. The personal conversion at forty-three to the nembutsu path of Shan-tao was genuine and the act of leaving a solitary life and, like other active young monks, mingling with the people in Kyoto, definitely signalled an evangelical zeal to make known his personal choice of the Pure Land path. An amorphous following developed; fellow-monks in the Tendai establishment also chose to cultivate this private devotional practice *without disassociating themselves from the Tendai school*. By one account, Hōnen himself seemed to have remained an "outward Tendai monk, with inward nembutsu faith"⁹ as late as his sixties. He was probably in the footstep of a popular living saint like Kūya, known for a "style" more than for an independent philosophical position. It would be reading too much later sectarian self-consciousness into the early Hōnen if one assumes that immediately after his 1175 "conversion," Hōnen intended to found a sect of his own. However, unlike Genshin, something in the nature of Hōnen's appropriation of Shan-tao pointed ahead to an unavoidable break with Tendai.

Preliminary reflection and initial opposition before 1198 necessitated a doctrinal defense.¹⁰ The *samādhi* experience and the social (not necessarily political) support from Hōjō allowed Hōnen the time and energy to spell out, defensively and offensively, the first clear statement on the meaning of nembutsu. The *Senjakushū* so produced did not initiate the nembutsu movement. The nembutsu vogue went back to Heian times before Hōnen, and an amorphous nembutsu following that formed around Hōnen existed before 1198. The *Senjakushū* merely gravitated that loose body of associates and devotees into a self-conscious social and ideological unit. Despite its being a "limited edition for private circulation," the *Senjakushū* provided the first common Jōdo-shū catechism¹¹ that furthered the sectarian sentiment and the evangelical zeal especially among some extremists. Hōnen himself

as late as 1200 was ready to "stoop" to an un-Jōdo-like expediency¹² of praying for Hōjō's health and decried any sectarian conflict in the 1204 *Articles*, desiring only the right for him and his followers to practice their faith in peace.¹³ The *Senjakushū*, however, was of such a nature that it had to become the seedbed of "Either/Or" sympathy or antipathy, and the cause for the sectarian dissociation from Tendai, as well as for the initial persecution of 1207 and the reinstatement of Hōnen in 1211.

Therefore, the traditional dating of the origin of the Jōdo-shū at 1175 was not incorrect: Hōnen's private mission began then, even though he could not have anticipated the future sect-formation. The modern revision of the dating, regarding 1198 to be the founding of the Jōdo-shū, is also justified: the *Senjakushū* catapulted the movement into the socio-political arena of hierocratic conflicts. Hōnen consciously founded a *shū* (sect) but even so, he probably did not foresee the radicalization, controversy and Jōdo heresies ahead.

It is possible to see some of these subtle changes in the life and self-understanding of Hōnen in the *Senjakushū* itself. The following analysis of the work will first look into Hōnen's defense of his new "path" or "sect." The main body will analyze how Hōnen synthesized and transcended Genshin and Shan-tao. Finally, the term *senjaku*, selection, will be analyzed in terms of the "self-powered" and the "other-powered" dialectics.

THE SECTARIAN INTENTIONS OF *SENJAKUSHŪ*

The *Senjakushū* was written in classical Chinese-Japanese and was basically a compilation of scriptural and commentary passages. As such, its readership was limited by matters of literacy and secrecy. Being a dissertation defining the philosophical basis for the ongoing nembutsu movement, it was not intended to be a popular tract or even a personal statement, confession or com-

munication.¹⁴ The format—quotations with comments by Hōnen—might have grown out of Hōnen's private instructions or reflections; it was not in the style of a systematic *summa*. The main body dealt with doctrinal issues, but the opening and the closing chapters addressed themselves to current issues. The sectarian intentions were spelled out defensively in the first chapter, but the apologetical tone changed toward the end. The last chapter gave an authoritative, charismatic and revelatory basis to the foundation of the sect.

To establish a school at that time required (a) justification of a path, (b) a tenet-classification scheme to place the school within the multi-levelled teachings, (c) and a patriarchal lineage. Hōnen addressed himself to all three.

The *Senjaku-shū* began with Tao-cho's distinction of the Pure Land path from the Sage path.¹⁵ The Pure Land path was "qualitatively" easier than the Sage's search for wisdom. The Sage's path was the "harder" path in Nāgārjuna—T'an-luan's classification. Hōnen began with Tao-cho (instead of his favorite Shan-tao) because Tao-cho initiated the "Pure Land path" category and because Tao-cho associated this path with the need in the Age of the Degenerate Dharma.¹⁶ That age of corruption and evil commenced, in Tao-cho's calculation, 1500 years after Buddha's *parinirvana* (948 B.C. [sic]), that is, 552 A.D. The same anxiety recurred in late Heian when the date was set at 1052 A.D. instead. The *mappō* or *masse* eschatological mood was prevalent in Hōnen's time¹⁷ and the concern for the "timely" teaching—the Dharma that corresponded to the recipients' disposition (Ch: *chi*; Jpn: *ki*) reappeared in Hōnen's appropriation of Tao-cho.¹⁸ "The Jōdo-shū," said Hōnen, "established itself upon the intention of the teachings of the meditative master, Tao-cho."¹⁹

But Hōnen was not satisfied with a *path*. Had he designated his faith only as a path, he would not be charged with heresy by the Old Schools. Because Hōnen intended Tao-cho's classification to "encompass all Buddha's teachings,"

so he looked for and established the tradition of "The Threefold Amida Corpus"²⁰—the *Greater* and the *Lesser Amida Sutra* and the *Amida Meditation Sutra*—in conscious imitation of the other sets of Threefold Sutras then current in Japan: the *Lotus*, the *Mahāvairocana*, the *Nation-protecting* and the *Maitreya* collections. The Jōdo *Sanbukyō* category was unknown in China.

Conscious that Tendai and Shingon, the two major schools in Heian, claimed unbroken patriarchal transmission, a hypothetical questioner asked how this teaching of Hōnen came about. In the first chapter of the *Senjaku-shū*, Hōnen admitted that there were three Pure Land lineages in China.²¹ He did not even say that he relied on the Shan-tao lineage, although it is clear from subsequent discussion that he did. Hōnen remained "objective" in so categorizing the various lineages of Pure Land patriarchs in China. This is because his original conversion in 1175 was largely due to his reading Shan-tao's commentary on the *Amida Meditation Sutra*. That intellectual conversion was not, by the standards current in Heian, sufficient to establish a spiritual link with Śākyamuni's teachings.

The question of patriarchal linkage was doubly crucial in late Heian. By this time, the Tendai school had become thoroughly esotericized. *Taimitsu* (Esoteric Tendai) had adopted elements of *Hongaku* thought and the cult of an esoteric passage of teaching from master to master. This secret transmission was "from mouth to mouth," or "from mind to mind," or by way of a secret formula written "on a piece of paper."²² In that atmosphere, Hōnen picked initially one Shan-tao lineage from three then available in China, but this rational decision was not enough. In the last chapter, Hōnen finally returned once more to this issue and outlined his *esoteric* legitimacy. The following is a *précis* of an exchange in that chapter:

Q. Of the many interpretations of Pure Land piety, why do you follow Shan-tao?

A. Shan-tao alone followed the Pure Land piety

at the exclusion of the Sage Path.

Q. But were there not other Pure Land masters who did the same?

A. True, but only Shan-tao had touched off a *samādhi* (in me, Hōnen).

Q. But a disciple of Shan-tao also had such an experience, why do you not follow him?

A. He, being only a disciple, cannot be followed as his greater master can be.

Q. What then about Tao-cho who was the teacher of Shan-tao?

A. Tao-cho depended on Shan-tao. . . And Shan-tao had a revelatory experience (as evidenced by a description in his commentary) so that he could declare his commentary to be so sacred that "not one word should be misquoted." (In other words,) his work was inspired and he was a manifestation of Amida on earth, a *nirmanakāya* of Amida.²³

The implication in this exchange was to lend mystical support to Hōnen's earlier conversion. Hōnen's encounter with Shan-tao's text was not an encounter with an ordinary commentary. Rather, the commentary was sacred, revealed by Amida and authored by Amida incarnate. Furthermore, in 1198, Hōnen had a dream encounter with Shan-tao which touched off a *samādhi*²⁴ (highest state of enlightenment) in Hōnen, thus verifying his calling. The Jōdo-shū was no creation of man; it was predestined by this esoteric transmission of the Dharma.

Eventually in the official doctrine of the Jōdo-shū, the two attendant bodhi-sattvas of Amida Buddha (Avalokiteśvara and Mahāsthāmaprāpta) were identified with Shan-tao and Hōnen. The mystical status Hōnen saw in Shan-tao, his spiritual "tutor," was similarly extended by Hōnen's followers to Hōnen himself. The skeptic might wonder if the *samādhi* experience in 1198 was nothing more than a legitimization device, but the historian of religion will note that such dream-encounters were not uncommon in medieval hagi-

ography and should be seen at times as genuine forms of inspiration. Just as charismatic authority was claimed in the founding of the first Sinitic Mahayana school, T'ien-t'ai,²⁵ so a similar "break-through" manifested itself in the birth of the first truly Japanese Buddhist sect.²⁶

THE *SENJAKUSHŪ* SYNTHESIS OF GENSHIN'S ZEAL AND SHAN-TAO'S FAITH-RELIANCE

Doctrinally speaking, the *Senjakushū* symbolized the synthesis of the two key influences in Hōnen's thinking: Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū* with its fervor for rebirth and Shan-tao's *Kuan-ching hsüan-i* with its definite dependence on Amida. Prior to his acquaintance with Shan-tao's work, Hōnen, a mountain *hijiri*, was impressed primarily by Genshin. Genshin unknowingly pointed him towards Shan-tao. When the *Senjakushū* took shape, Hōnen had digested the two masters and forged his own path.

Genshin's early influence was perhaps retained in the opening couplet of the *Senjakushū*. In Hōnen's handwriting and as a resumé of the movement:

Namu Amida Butsu

Of all works (karma) leading to birth beyond (ōjō),

Priority belongs to nembutsu.²⁷

The couplet was a virtual citation from the *Ōjōyōshū*.²⁸ As it stands, it retains a "primitive, naive" phase in Hōnen's piety. The emphasis then was on the act (work, karma) of nembutsu. (The proper shift to faith and total dependence on Amida, forsaking even the last element of *ōjō* by work, came later in Shinran). It made nembutsu the "prior" means, *without ruling out other means or other ends aside from ōjō*, and without making nembutsu explicitly the sole means or even the one basis (*i hon*).²⁹ This couplet was closest to the

popular teaching of Genshin that Hōnen once followed. The success of the mature Jōdo-shū movement, however, was due to the popularist ōjō zeal corrected by Shan-tao's faith-reliance.

Four centuries separated Shan-tao and Hōnen. Shan-tao was an early T'ang figure while Hōnen came at the end of the "High Medieval" Heian period in Japan. In the years in between, two new motifs developed within Far Eastern Buddhism: (1) the ōjō genre, and (2) the cosmic optimism of *Hongaku* (Ch: *Pen-chüeh*) thought.

The ōjō genre tells of legends of Birth in Pure Land. It began as twenty biographies in the later sections of Chia-ts'ai's *Ching-t'u-lun*,³⁰ and then became an independent genre by the middle of T'ang, and flourished in Sung China³¹ and Japan. As a popular tradition of "miraculous deliverance to Pure Land," it took root only after Shan-tao, who was a young contemporary to Chia-ts'ai.³² Shan-tao was responsible for making the Pure Land path a "prestigious, sublime" path—Amida's Pure Land, a Reward Land (belonging to the *Sambhogakāya* level of reality), was opened, for the first time, to *nien-fo* (nembutsu) commoners.³³ Through his evangelical work, Shan-tao helped to popularize the ōjō tradition. Unlike Hōnen though, Shan-tao did *not* know a dynamic ongoing ōjō tradition.

Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū* came towards the end of the ōjō genre tradition. In late medieval Heian, it attained a popularity second to none. When it is compared to the first Japanese ōjō collection (985) *Nihon Ōjō Gokurakuki*,³⁴ it can be seen that two important new elements had been added. Whereas the old collection was rather elitist (dealing with famous monks and aristocratic devotees like Prince Shōtoku), the later collections were longer, more embellished, dramatic and "democratic." This change reflected the spread of Buddhism and the popularity of nembutsu in Heian. The Heian aristocracy was said to be practicing "(Tendai) Lotus confession in the morning and (Amida) nembutsu in the evening." The extension of ōjō to more

people led to the advent of *akunin ōjō*, stories of "evil men" gaining birth.³⁵ For example, a blood-thirsty *samurai* had a change of heart, he practiced nembutsu and was received into Pure Land. Although the salvation of the "evil man" here did not involve the kind of existential self-awareness of evil and the decision to abandon oneself to the saving power of Amida's vow that one finds in Hōnen and Shinran, nevertheless the interest in saving the common people anticipated later Jōdo and Jōdo-Shin sect's popularism. Heian ōjō piety, as a whole, however, placed more emphasis on the "descent of the Amida host to welcome the departed soul"³⁶ than on ōjō. There is an aesthetical mystery, an aristocratic melancholia, in Heian Amida piety.³⁷

By the second half of Heian, with the rising consciousness of *mappō*, a second element penetrated the ōjō genre: the inclusion of the counterpart to paradise, i.e., the torments of hells.³⁸ The beginning portions of the *Ōjōyōshū* were so devoted to a detailed and awesome description of the various hells. The mood of anxiety lent a darker color to the genre and evoked a more zealous longing for the Pure Land.³⁹ I suspect the native Shintō notion of purity and pollution ("good" and "evil") added a Japanese touch to the fears. The plebeian aspiration for their "right" to rebirth in lavish paradises might also have instilled a greater sense of worthlessness of the self. *Samurai*, "contaminated by taking life," and commoners segregated from the sanctity of the theocratic elite had always been made to feel their socio-spiritual inferiority. More than Shan-tao, Hōnen showed a sympathy for the handicaps of the lowly.

The *Ōjōyōshū* did not generate a nembutsu sect, and had not Hōnen rediscovered Shan-tao, he would still be part of the Tendai establishment. Despite the emotional dualism of heavens and hells in Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū*, Genshin at heart and in his other works still supported the Tendai monism. The esoteric Genshin lineage, the *Eshinryū*, was especially well-known for its adherence to the

totalistic optimism of *Hongaku*, a faith in the inalienable *a priori* Buddhahood of all men. As long as Genshin was committed to this philosophy, it would be impossible to develop Hōnen's type of utter dependence on Amida. Now Shan-tao was immune to such optimism by virtue of temperament and because the mature *Hongaku* thought in China developed *after* his time. Hōnen's critique of Genshin was therefore based on his returning to a pre-*Hongaku* thinker (Shan-tao) to undermine the presumptuousness of Heian *Taimitsu* thought. The Jōdo-shū movement was built therefore upon a "Late Medieval" (that is, Kamakura) plebeian piety that relied upon an early "High Medieval" realism (Shan-tao). It signalled the collapse of the eternal, changeless sacred canopy that Tendai *Hongaku* thinkers had built for its own aristocratic, High Medieval era in Heian.⁴⁰

An exhaustive analysis of *Hongaku* thought is not possible here and an outline will have to suffice.⁴¹ *Hongaku* (*pen-chüeh*) meant literally "a priori enlightenment" or "omnipresent Buddhahood." The statement "All men are Buddhas" can be taken in various degrees of critical, literal, or mystical reading, depending on the degree of *Hongaku* radicalism of the person. As a monistic philosophy, collapsing the distinction between opposites, the formula went back to the *prajñāpāramitā* tradition that "All forms are empty," man as well as Buddha. Nirvana is samsara; samsara is nirvana. That *negativistic* formulation received a more objective and affirmative reinforcement in the T'ien-t'ai (Tendai) appropriation of the Mādhyamika philosophy, namely, in its doctrine that there is an objective harmony of the three aspects of reality. The apparent contradictions of (things being) Empty, Provisionally Real and the Mean can be resolved in a harmonious whole; the Three are ultimately One. Actually both Chih-i (of Chinese T'ien-t'ai) and Saicho (of Japanese Tendai) should be considered *Shikaku* thinkers, upholders of "Incipient Enlightenment."⁴² However, in Japan, Tendai was soon esotericized

and adopted very strong *Hongaku* sentiments. The following example, from Genshin himself, will show the "mystery" involved. "(In the name A-mi-da), the sound *A* represents the aspect of Emptiness, the sound *Mi* represents the aspect of Provisional Reality and the sound *Da* represents the Mean" (*Kanshinrakuyōshū*).⁴³ The unity of the name "Amida" therefore represented the Unity of the Three Aspects. Since the Three Aspects were also said (by Chih-i) to belong to the One Mind, the mental representation of Amida (uttered in nembutsu) actually meant the mystical identification of the Mind with All Realities, or Amida and with the basic Unity. The mouth might recite the name "A-mi-da," but the utmost unity should be actualized within the mind.⁴⁴ This esoteric understanding of Amida (as Ultimate Reality) and this use of the name as a *mantra* were central to Genshin's faith. Some elements of this also reappeared, perhaps in unguarded moments, in Hōnen's own thinking.⁴⁵

The "objective, affirmative" Unity of Three Aspects could find a still more *Hongaku* expression in a "subjective idealism" which can say that all realities are *immediately* the Mind itself. This idealism was developed more in the camps of Hua-yen (Jpn: Kegon) and Ch'an (Zen). Opposites like good and evil, Suchness (the Buddhist Absolute) and ignorance (its antithesis) could be seen as being *dynamically*⁴⁶ fused in the Mind that comprehended and transcended them. At first, the Chinese detailed different levels of sublimating the opposites, but in the Zen tradition of Shen-hui and Tsung-mi, the immediate identity of the Mind with Suchness was taken in mystical seriousness.⁴⁷ The phrase: "Suchness *Hongaku*" or "*Hongaku* True-Mind" no longer designated the subjective mind because it is simultaneously the objective (cosmic) Mind. An example, again from Genshin, will afford us the necessary contrast later with Hōnen:

According to the *Engakuyō* (*Yuan-chüeh-ching*, *Round Enlightenment Sutra*), it is said in a *gatha*

that the Beginningless Ignorance of all sentient beings is resting on the basis of the Mind of Perfect Enlightenment of all the Buddhas. Therefore, samsara is nirvana, defilement is enlightenment. Nothing can ever obstruct this mutual penetration; therefore, All is One and Indifferentiable.⁴⁸ (*Ōjōyōshū*)

The above Cosmic Mind can further be dramatized in an even more extreme formulation of *Hongaku* mystery, as that mystery drives toward a more immediate, actual, down-to-earth, immanent Monism. The first line from the following citation from Genshin is representative of the final mystery that "Everything, as it is, immediately is Buddha;" a line that has its root in Chih-i's *Mo-ho-chih-kuan*:

Every color and smell is nothing other than the Middle Path (the "Absolute" in Mahayana).... All the burdens of mental defilements and ignorance are none other than enlightenment.... All the sins of sentient beings are by nature empty and nothing is really there (in sinning).⁴⁹

Every blade of grass is Buddha; even an evil thought is enlightenment. Such mystical statements can be found in Genshin, especially in those *Hongaku* works attributed to him.⁵⁰ Genshin's branch (the *Eshinryū* in esoteric Tendai) was especially known for its radicalism. This branch emphasized the immediate immanence of the Transcendental ("in a downward movement" that is, the Whole manifesting itself in every particular; "from result to cause"⁵¹). When it said, "Every blade of grass is Buddha," the proper reading is not that the flowering grass is *in appearance* a blade of grass while *in essence* it is like the Buddha. It is not that the blade is transformed ("transubstantiated") into a numinal reality, stripped off all mundane substance. The proper reading is that the blade of grass, without being in any way other than what it is (i.e., a blade of grass), is immediately the

Buddha. Or, to reverse the order, the Buddha in essence *is* the grass.

Such irrationality (irrational by our everyday, ethical, logical standards) sounds intolerable. Within *Hongaku* thought, such "irrationality" is perfectly permissible and even "rational" because *Hongaku* thought derived its "sense" not from logic, dialectics, or sophistry but ultimately from an intuitive recognition of a supernatural and extremely powerful Reality, sometimes associated with the Cosmic Womb of the Buddha (*tathāgatagarbha*⁵²). In this all-encompassing, Absolute Reality, no "second" (no dualities, no other realities) could be. The philosophical refinements of what ultimately was a mystical experience were developed into what is known as *Tendai Hongakuron*, something uniquely Japanese, because it drew upon the primitive Shinto pananimism emerging then in *ryōbūshintō* speculations, and in the esoteric mysteries of Shingon (Mantrayāna).⁵³ Incompatible though it might appear, mature *Hongaku* thought developed simultaneously with Hōnen's anti-*Hongaku* thought.⁵⁴ Hōnen was the pessimist who revolted against Heian thought, when the threat of the Last Age was hanging in the air.

Even as the few citations from Genshin above can show, Genshin himself had both the monistic *Hongaku* as well as the dualistic *ōjō*-desire. This dissonance did not bother Genshin. To the eclectic minds of Tendai masters, the varying interpretation of reality and the correspondingly different acts of piety, can be harmonized. To pursue *one path* as if it is the *only* path and to insist that everybody else should follow that *one* path and *no* other—that would be the immoderate mark of the "protestant reformer" (like Luther, the later Hōnen, Shinran) and not the character of a broad "catholic mind" (like Aquinas, Genshin, Myōe).⁵⁵ Genshin designed two paths: "In words, to recite the name of the Buddha (nembutsu in the sense of verbal praise); in the heart, to meditate on the Buddha (nembutsu in the sense of contemplative

identification, for in the end, all is mind)." Genshin also wrote for different audiences: the *Ōjōyōshū* was his "popular seller" while his "esoteric" treatises were for the inner circle. In the end, Genshin, however condescending to the people, divided the path still according to the Sage-monk path and the Commoner-layperson path. The former's calling contemplation on the True Body of Amida⁵⁶ (in its *Dharmakāya* Oneness) remained the superior path. There all dualities would indeed be transcended. That meditative Oneness was not available to Hōnen. Either he had abandoned it or else it had abandoned him.⁵⁷ At any rate, he liberated the naive nembutsu, faith-*ōjō* path from the tutelage of the higher nembutsu and initiated the revolt of the laity in Kamakura Japan.⁵⁸ In terms of Tendai's Four *Samādhi*, the historic shift was from the second to the fourth: (1) sitting *samādhi*, Zazen; (2) walking *samādhi*, Amida-remembrance; (3) half-sitting, half-walking *samādhi*, Lotus meditation; (4) neither-sitting nor walking *samādhi*, Kannon (Avalokiteśvara) meditation/nembutsu (to be practiced in daily activities). The first three are tailored for clerics, aristocrats, *Dharmatā*, *Hongaku*, the Tendai meditative vision as the fourth is for laity, plebes, thanksgiving and reliance.

Shan-tao's *Kuan-ching hsūan-i* provided Hōnen with the means to transcend Genshin by effectively eliminating the "higher" Sage path. Space does not allow for a full discussion on the *Kuan-ching* and Shan-tao's commentary such that a resumé again have to suffice.⁵⁹ The *Kuan-ching*, the *Amida Meditation Sutra*, listed sixteen *kuan* (objects) which contemplatives could visualize. The last three dealt with the nembutsu birth of the Three Grades of Men. Nembutsu, *buddhanusmṛti*, (buddha-recall), meant originally, in the Sanskrit text (of the *Amida sutra*) a contemplative recall of the Buddha. Strictly speaking then, the sixteen *vipaśyanās* should be considered to be meditational means taught by the Buddha. In that vein, the Chinese masters understood it until Shan-tao broke with tradition and concluded that the first thirteen

were orientated towards *samādhi* and that the last three were directed at "elimination of evil." Shan-tao thus considered the *Kuan-ching* to be, firstly, a meditative text and secondly, a nembutsu (by that he meant eventually name-recitation) treatise. He concluded his commentary by insisting that the second was the *real* intention of the sutra. These three last *vipaśyanās* were considered to be freely preached by the Buddha (Śākyamuni) *out of his compassion*. They were for the Three Grades of Men, *all* considered by Shan-tao (again departing from older interpretations) to be grades of commoners. *By relating the nembutsu means taught here for common men's entry into Pure Land with Amida's vow that he would let "filial and loyal" men of faith to enter into his own Reward Land*, Shan-tao formulated a doctrine of *nembutsu ōjō* based on the desires of Amida himself. He says:

This precisely is the superlative nature of the nembutsu path, for its results are not attainable by other miscellaneous means....The person who can perpetually recite the Buddha's name is indeed very rare, incomparably rare....This man would indeed be the good man among men, the saintly man, the highest of the high, the best of all men. Although this sutra teaches two paths (the meditative first thirteen means and the last three means "to remove evil" by Buddha's compassion), in view of the "original wish" (*hongan*, taken more narrowly by Jōdo-shū in Japan to refer to the 18th vow of Amida), the final intention of the sutra is that all sentient beings (of the Three Grades) call solely upon Amida's name (to regain birth in his Pure Land).⁶⁰

This final statement of Shan-tao could not but impress Hōnen. Shan-tao had no illusion about "the evilness of common men," no illusion about the necessity of "compassion" from above to "eliminate human evil," and no wavering doubt about the efficacy of Amida's vow and the neces-

sity of nembutsu for *ōjō*. Armed with Shan-tao's vision, Hōnen toppled the *Hongaku* presumptions of Heian Buddhism. Having seen Shan-tao, a meditative master of great renown, finally forsaking the meditative path for the path of nembutsu, Hōnen confidently moved beyond the cautious qualifications of Genshin's nembutsu piety. If the sectarian community was not yet a living reality in 1175, the sectarian mentality and the seeds for future controversy were sown in Hōnen's first conversion experience. By way of Shan-tao, Hōnen had transcended the piety of Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū*.

Where Hōnen, who confessed that he solely relied upon Shan-tao, moved beyond Shan-tao is a question much harder to answer. Hōnen was not as systematic a thinker as Shan-tao and did not seem to have passed through a successful, meditative career as did Shan-tao. Some of the crucial doctrinal hurdles that Shan-tao overcame for the future Pure Land tradition were not the ones that Hōnen had to deal with centuries later.⁶¹ However, whereas Shan-tao defended nembutsu on scholarly grounds, passages like the one below show Hōnen reflecting more simply on the necessity of economy and equality in Mahayana universal salvation:

Because it is the easy path, therefore nembutsu can comprehend all, whereas the harder paths (in hierarchies) necessarily exclude others (lower ones). The Original Vow (*Hongan*) of the Buddha was to forsake the harder paths and to embrace the easy path in his desire that all men shall gain *ōjō* equally. If that vow had been the building of statues, then the poor would be excluded for they could not afford it. And the wealthy are few and the poor many. If wisdom were made the basis of *ōjō*, then, the foolish would be excluded. And the wise are few while the foolish many. If purity in monastic conduct be the key, then the *vinaya*-breakers and people without *vinaya*-ordination would be excluded. And the latter are many ... and so on.⁶²

Shan-tao had levelled the Three Grades of man

(actually subdivided into nine in the *Kuan ching*) but he still admitted of grades within the commoners.⁶³ Hōnen (and later Shinran) showed greater sympathy and identification with the lowest grade of "evil commoners." In their self and other concern, they desired the economy of the nembutsu. The passage cited above shows Hōnen apologetically referring to the path as the easy path (a distinction made by Tan-luan). In more confident passages, Hōnen would call it (more appropriately) the *superior* path.⁶⁴

Because Hōnen began his philosophizing where Shan-tao left off, he was more a "purist" nembutsu devotee.⁶⁵ Armed with Shan-tao's conclusion and free from working through Shan-tao's initial premises, Hōnen naturally placed greater emphasis on the 18th vow of Amida and referred to this vow explicitly and systematically as the *Hongan*, the original or the basic vow. Inheriting some of the *Hongaku* mysticism (in which any one item in the universe can be said to contain all the other items) Hōnen would refer to the *Hongan* as the vow that included all the other vows.⁶⁶ This selectivity of one vow out of forty-eight was never an explicit doctrine in the Chinese Pure Land traditions. It was a Japanese innovation that Yang Wen-hui, in the last century, when he learned of the Jōdo tradition in Japan, felt uncomfortable with. There are two other departures from Shan-tao in the thoughts of Hōnen: the mystique of *senjaku* and the elimination of the *bodhicitta* as the "basic cause" of *ōjō*.

The *bodhicitta* originally implied in Sanskrit the act of arousing a determined mind toward enlightenment, but in China it comes to mean ontologically "the mind of enlightenment." It was regarded by major masters in China and Japan—Hui-yüan, Chih-i, Chi-tsang, Wñhyō Kūkai, Genshin—to be the necessary "material (basic) cause" for any spiritual achievement. The *bodhicitta* was the innate Buddha-seed (Buddha-nature). In the *Amida Meditation Sutra*, it was clearly stated that even at the last minute the lowest grade of men would still have to arouse this *bodhicitta*.

In order to gain birth in Pure Land one must arouse this aspiration for wisdom. T'an-luan had made it the prerequisite for *ōjō*, but in the Pure Land masters listed below, there was a significant shift.⁶⁷

Tao-cho: *Bodhicitta* is absent in the Middle and Lower Grade but will be present upon *ōjō*. Ten vows and ten deeds are necessary for *ōjō*.

Shan-Tao: *Bodhicitta* is the mind that desires rebirth and loathes this world.⁶⁸ The deathbed desire of the most evil man can effect *ōjō*.

Hōnen: *Bodhicitta* is a doctrine of the Sage Path only. The deluded mind itself could and should arouse *nembutsu*.⁶⁹

Shinran: *Bodhicitta*, Buddha-nature, is natural and in accordance with the Dharma, and is derived from the *Hon-gan*. Power of faith and rebirth are derived from *Amida*.⁶⁹

Of these four positions, Hōnen's eliminated the prerequisite of a seed-nature⁷⁰ in man as a basis for entrance into Pure Land. (Shinran reintroduced elements of *Hongaku* thought in his notion of Buddha-nature,⁷² but he was also more systematically *tariki* on the matter of "means" for *ōjō*.) For precisely so rejecting the *bodhicitta* doctrine, Hōnen was criticized by Myōe who, as a Kegon monk of the old persuasion, relegated the Buddha-name recitation path to the auxiliary role;⁷³ the Proper or Major Paths are those based upon the notion of the *bodhicitta*. Hōnen's radical notion, alien to most Chinese, was the result of his being critical of *Hongaku* thought that emphasized the centrality of this mind. The *bodhicitta* ideology had been basic to Japanese Buddhism ever since its Shingon school selected the *Mahāvairocana sutra* as its highest text. The arousal of the *bodhicitta* in esoteric meditation was absolutely indispensable in the Shingon, the Taimitsu and the *Hongaku* traditions. Hōnen erased all that!

SENJAKU: THE DIALECTICS OF SELF-CHOICE AND OTHER-CHOICE

The major distinction between Shan-tao and Hōnen, however, rested with the peculiar fate of the word *Senjaku* in Hōnen's *Senjaku Hongan Nembutsushū*.

The terms *jiriki* and *tariki* ("self- and other-power") had become standard, analytical tools in the study of the Jōdo tradition in Japan, yet they played no significant role in the *Senjakushū*. A forerunner of this distinction was the more moderate, and dialectical concept of *senjaku*, or choice. There is a correspondence between the choice made by men and the Choice made by Amida. If faith is "accepting Acceptance" (in Tillich's framework), Hōnen's faith was choosing the Choice. That the term *senjaku* was a new element in Pure Land thought was recognized by the sect itself. An account said that Hōnen prided himself for founding the *Senjaku Hongan* path whereas Shan-tao (only) founded the *Hongan* path.⁷⁴

Senjaku (pronounced *senchaku* by Jōdo-shū followers) means "choice, selection" and more specifically, "choosing one item while discarding others."⁷⁵ Exactly when the term was first used and in what context within the Jōdo-shū is hard to tell,⁷⁶ but commonsense would alert us that when Hōnen first used the term, he could not have foreseen the future mystification of it. At least in one Zen text, the act of choosing was seen as the gravest of all flaws,⁷⁷ because it meant attachment to one item and regarding that as the absolute. Yet the difference between the "Catholic" (all-embracing) Tendai program—many different paths for the many predispositions of men—and the "reform" *nembutsu* (single-minded) program laid precisely in staking one's wager on one *chosen* path.⁷⁸ From what we said earlier of the life of Hōnen, it would appear that although the choice was made in 1175, it was probably not seen then as The Choice for all men, *sola fide* (better, *sola nembutsu*) of the mature Jōdo-shū dogma. Hōnen probably said in his early

mission days what he put in the beginning of the *Senjakushū*: "Of the (*many*) paths leading to *ōjō*, priority belongs to nembutsu (above and among other means)."

Hōnen had chosen one item (nembutsu) while discarding others. It was a subjective choice and acknowledged as such (*senjaku nembutsu*). As late as 1204, Hōnen discouraged his followers from deriding other paths that would only discredit the (total) Dharma taught by Śākyamuni.⁷⁹ Men of faith had often made such existential decisions in their lives; the personal, subjective nature of faith is a fact. There is, however, a difference between naively having a "subjective faith" in something regarded personally as Truth *for oneself* and writing a conscious treatise on the theme "*Subjectivity is Truth*"—which was what Kierkegaard eventually, upon reflection, wrote of his own private faith.⁸⁰ Hōnen did not go to that Kierkegaardian extreme to say, to wit, "*Selectivity is Truth*," but the *Senjakushū* written in 1198 should be considered as a Buddhological reflection on what once was a "personal choice." Before 1198, Hōnen, a Tendai monk in all outward appearance, had chosen to practice nembutsu as his personal calling. In 1198, as Hōnen carved out an independent sect freed from Tendai allegiance, that choice turned from apology to dogma. What was once *his* choice was overshadowed increasingly by the Choice made by Amida and by the key scriptures. He only "selected" what Amida, to wit, in his "Divine Election," had chosen for all sentient beings like him.

Included in the *Senjakushū* was the following biographical note telling of his earlier choice: "There are those who made the *bodhicitta* the basis for *ōjō* (Genshin and the *Hongaku* group), but previously I had abandoned acts of charity (*dāna*, first of the six *pāramitās*, most basic act of monk and lay Mahayanists), precept-keeping (*vinaya*, monastic precepts of the Tendai school) and even filial upkeep of parents (the practice of the sixth grade in the Nine Grades of Man, the type Amida

actually said he would deliver from this world). I have chosen to take up the praising of the Buddha's name (nembutsu, practicable for even the last three of the Nine Grades)."⁸¹ This passage, I think, reflected the subjective choice made by Hōnen in 1175. He saw himself as an evil, common man in a degenerate age (criminal in body, evil in heart⁸²) and chose nembutsu as "the best of all means for *ōjō*." Such selectivity was personal, and the choice was instrumental (means-end).

The Pure Land tenet-classification (*kyōhan*) had always been selective. It did not list a continuous hierarchy of "lower to higher" teachings. Since Tan-luan, it had been a matter of "Either/Or," it was "the Easy versus the Difficult Path" (Tan-luan), "the Pure Land Path versus the Sage Path" (Tao-cho), or "The Major Path versus the Auxiliary Path." In terms of Amida-directed practices, the choice had always been a matter of narrowing down the choices until Shan-tao established "praising the name of the Buddha" to be the Proper Path while the rest of the paths were only supportive. However, only with Hōnen was *selectivity* totally exclusive.⁸³ And only in Shinran that the instrumentality of the act was totally reversed (end to means, or *tariki*; it is Amida who empowers nembutsu).

Reflections on the "meanings" of *Senjaku* by Hōnen since 1175 must have become deeper as time went on. Usually, Hōnen is said to have made a threefold choice. The choice was first Pure Land as goal; second, nembutsu as means; and third the choice was of *Hongan nembutsu*—nembutsu based on the Original Vow of Amida. We can see that the first choice was comparable to Genshin's longing for Pure Land; that the second choice was indebted to Shan-tao's notion of the Proper Path, and that the third was Hōnen's interpretative focus on the 18th vow. The third then points ahead to Shinran's *tariki* idea.

The *Amida Sutra* had used the term *senjaku* to describe Bodhisattva Dharmakara's choice of the Pure Land. Dharmakara, the future Amida

among many available Pure Lands in the Mahayana spiritual universe. Amida also *selected* his various vows and made, according to Hōnen's exegesis, the 18th vow *selectively* the *Hongan*. That Hōnen could choose the nembutsu path to gain rebirth in the Pure Land was by virtue of the *Hongan* of Amida — not by virtue of Shan-tao's interpretation. It is therefore significant that Hōnen never said he "selected" Shan-tao's philosophy; he only used the term "rely" (*yoru*).⁸⁴

The Japanese title of the *Senjaku* retains precisely this ambivalence, namely, that the Choice was both subjective (Hōnen's) and objective (Amida's).

Senjaku Hongan Nembutsushū: On Choosing to Recite the Buddha-name according to the Original Vow of Amida Buddha (the early reading), or On the Practice of Nembutsu Inspired by the Chosen Original Vow of Amida Buddha⁸⁵ (the orthodox reading).

Hōnen's three-stepped choice (for Pure Land, Nembutsu, and *Hongan*) was objectively based on the *Longer Amida Sutra*. The following précis of a passage devoted to the nuance of *senjaku* from the last chapter of the *Senjaku* will show how the final shift towards a *cosmicized senjaku* took place:

The *Longer Amida Sutra* has three successive *senjaku*: the choice of the Pure land, the choice of the nembutsu practice, and the choice of the *Hongan*. The *Kuan-ching* has also three successive *senjaku*: the selectivity of the light of Amida's grace shining solely upon the nembutsu fellowship and not upon others, the selective act of Amida to appear and welcome those men of "upper birth of the lowest grade" for their having been chosen (or, their having chosen) to practice nembutsu in preference over listening to sutras, and the selective, additional encouragement to pursue nembutsu. The *Shorter Amida Sutra* has one *senjaku*: nembutsu as the proof of sincerity.

The *Pan-chou San-mei Sutra* also *senjaku* (selected) the name of AmidaAll the above works are taught selectively (*senjaku*) by Śākyamuni. All the Buddhas of the universe also choose (*senjaku*) the act of nembutsu in praising Amida.⁸⁶

The particularity of an existential choice made by Hōnen during his first conversion and "reliance" on Shan-tao had now been projected into a Cosmic Act, into something akin to a Calvinistic notion of Election.⁸⁷ Men do not choose God; God choose men. This reversal of values is common in religious experience. Hōnen recognized that his choice of a path was made possible only by Amida's previous Choice of this path for him. The passage cited above also shows another element in mature Jōdo thought: the tendency toward *henotheism*, that is, the lavishing of all divine attributes onto Amida Buddha, the Pure Land, the *Hongan*, the nembutsu. As all the Buddhas honor Amida Buddha by choosing to praise his name, the whole universe was orchestrated to render one act of devotion to this Supreme Buddha.⁸⁸

SUMMING UP

The above essay has looked into the ideological formation of the Jōdo school. The emergence of the independent Japanese Mahayana schools in Kamakura was a historic event that began with Hōnen's conscious detachment of his own form of piety from the Heian orthodoxy. A personal existential choice of a "means" in 1175 became by 1198 fully the banner of a popular movement. In its equilateral simplicity, the Jōdo faith evoked a response from people of very divergent background, from lords to peasants, from warriors to prostitutes. By combining the *ōjō* zeal with a sophisticated critique of the *Hongaku* tradition, Hōnen's movement even went beyond the Chinese counterparts.

There were, of course, other more mundane factors in the formation of the Jōdo institution.

Recent famines and droughts around the capital, peasant unrest, political turnovers and intrigues, old Heian hierocrats meddling into politics and so on. Often the ruling powers were more concerned with the possibility of riots in the capital than with Buddhological debates. However, small incidents could touch off grand events. The conversion of two lady attendants by two allegedly charming disciples of Hōnen is usually given as the immediate reasons for the banning of the sect and the exile of the master. And Buddhological debates could be of great significance since in Heian the old assumption about a theocratic state was still alive, such that any challenge to the orthodox schools of Heian was a challenge against the ruling class. In the same way too, the rising *samurai* turned a sympathetic ear to the new sects for reasons of spiritual refuge, or political legitimation, or the refinement of a new lifestyle—more simple, spartan—in a new era. The end result was the Kamakura Reformation.

The surviving historical records are, of course, far from being representative of the period. Critical, social historians can wonder if Hōnen and the other saints were really that significant in their times, and whether or not the survival of sectarian histories have not distorted their roles. Despite all these reservations, the paradigm of a Kamakura Reformation is not out of keeping with its founding spirit. Ideas do change history. And Hōnen's personal choice did epitomize one man's choice that changed the religious history of Japan.

NOTES

1. Tamura Enchō, "Hōnen" in *Rekishi Jinbutsu* series (Tokyo, 1959).
2. Collected in the *Taishō Daizōkyō*, vol. 37, pp. 245-278.
3. Basic texts of Hōnen are in Ōhashi Shun'ō, ed., "Hōnen, Ippen" in *Nihon Shisō Taikō* series, vol. 10 (Tokyo, 1971); henceforth referred to as *Genbun* for any citation from Hōnen's

original treatise in Classical Chinese-Japanese.

4. Basic text is Isida Mizumaro, ed., "Genshin" in series cited, vol. 6 (Tokyo, 1970).

5. *Genbun*, pp. 283-84.

6. In English, see the translation of the sect's biography of Hōnen by Harper Havelock Coates and Ryūgaku Ishizuka, *Hōnen, The Buddhist Saint: His Life and Teaching* (Kyoto, 1925). See Katsuki Jōki, ed., *Jōdo-shū kaisōki no kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1957) for detailed discussion on the founding of the sect; see p. 289 for matters concerning the charge.

7. See the modernist argument of Shigematsu Akihisa, *Nihon Jōdokyō seiritsu katei no kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1964), pp. 475-99. This is the most thoroughly historical study I know. See also the appendix where he responds to the traditionalists' criticism; especially pp. 655-56. See Review/Criticism in Katsuki, *op. cit.*, pp. 171-220.

8. On the history of Jōdokyō scholarship with essential bibliographical notes, see Katsuki Jōko, *op. cit.*, appendix 1 and 2, pp. 303-46.

9. The line "For forty years (Hōnen remained) a Tendai monk" is taken by the traditionalists to mean "up to age forty," but interpreted by modernists as "forty years or more after Hōnen's entry into the order at seventeen;" see note 7 above.

10. Ōhashi in *op. cit.*, *Kaisetsu* section, pp. 389-453, describes a "middle period" between Hōnen's early Tendai-nembutsu phase and his mature Hongan-nembutsu faith in 1198. The middle period saw Hōnen's response to early criticism in his exegesis of the *Sanbukyō* in 1190; see p. 405.

11. Compared with the *Senjakushū*, Hōnen's 1190 exegesis seems "academic" and too imitative of Shan-tao.

12. This is subscribing to the old magical Buddhism of Heian; see Tsuboi Shun'ei, "Hōnen Kyōgaku ni okeru kai no mondai," *Bukkyō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō*, 39, 213-27.

13. Persecution, however, had the usual effect of radicalizing the persecuted for indirectly it affirmed the eschatological crisis and degeneration of the out-group. See Ōhashi, pp. 411-13.

14. This is clear when the *Senjakushū* ("not for public eyes," it says in the end) is compared with Hōnen's correspondences.

15. Following the exegetical style of his commentary on the *Amida Sutra*; see Ōhashi, pp.405-6.

16. *Genbun*, pp. 257b-258a.

17. See interesting short article by Inoue Mitsusada, "Chūkō Tendai to Mappō Tōmyōki" in *Nihon Shisō Taikō Geppō* 30 (1973). Inoue dated this work, attributed to Saichō, to the Sesshō period in Heian.

18. On the Chinese Pure Land tradition, see Mochizuki Shingo, *Jōdokyōrishi* (Tokyo, 1930): I have taken out the Chinese Pure Land section that was in an earlier draft of this paper. On Shan-tao's opinion on *Fa* and *chi* (Jpn: *Hō*, *ki*) see Li Hsiao-pen, "Chung-kuo Ching-t'u-tung shih" in Chang Chia compiled *Chung-kuo Fo-chiao-shih lun chi* (Taipei, 1956), vol.2, pp. 579-80. The *Fa* (*Dharma*) of faith is Amida, the recipient counterpoint is (man's) evilness. Later in Jōdo-Shinshū, Rennyo developed this correspondence into the idea of *kihō-ittai*.

19. *Genbun*, p. 28a; a loose translation.

20. *Genbun*, p. 258ab; the choice of the three was already made in 1190.

21. *Genbun*, p. 259ab.

22. See Tamura Yoshirō, et al., ed., *Tendai Hongaku Ron* in *Nihon Shisō Taikō*, vol. 9 (Tokyo, 1973), Tamura, *Kaisetsu* section, pp. 519-21; also Ōhashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 409-11.

23. *Genbun*, p. 281ab.

24. The *samādhi* might seem incongruous with Hōnen's rejection of the traditional *śīla*, *samādhi*, *prajñā* (precepts, trance-meditation, wisdom), but it was a standard Jōdo term even in China. See Itō Yuishin's essay in Katsuki, ed., *op. cit.*, 245-75. Enchō had a *nembutsu sammai* prior to Hōnen!

25. See my "The Emerge of Sinitic Mahayana: T'ien-t'ai," paper written for the AAS conference at Toronto, 1975.

26. That Hōnen's dream might be modelled

upon precedences had been noted by Sakai Shun'ei in an essay cited by Ōhashi, p. 435.

27. *Genbun*, p. 257b.

28. Genshin's line was "Among the works leading to *ōjō*, the most superior is *nembutsu*," cited by *Ōjōden no Kenkyū*, compiled by Kōden Isan no Kai (Tokyo, 1968) p. 84.

29. Scholars generally refer to Hōnen's faith as "*nembutsu ihon*" over against Shinran's "*shinjin ihon*." I think the difference between "priority" (among options) and "basis" (of all) should be kept.

30. *Ōjōden no Kenkyū*, pp. 251-52.

31. *Ibid.*, pp. 253ff.

32. Chia-ts'ai (fl. 627-49) meditated Tao-cho (562-645) and Shan-tao (613-681).

33. The doctrine is known as "commoners entering the land of recompense."

34. See Inoue Mitsusada, ed., *Ōjōden. Hokke Kenki* in *Nihon Shisō Taikō*, vol. 7 (Tokyo, 1974). The *Ōjōyōshū* itself does not include *Ōjō*-legends.

35. *Ōjōden no Kenkyū*, pp. 30-48. "Akunin *Ōjō Hanashi*."

36. The Welcome is related to vow no. 19 of Amida's 48 vows; see also Ōhashi, pp. 427-432.

37. See Ienaga Saburō, *Jōdai Bukkyō Shisōshi Kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1966). A significant shift in Pure Land art occurred between Heian and Kamakura.

38. See Kobayashi Yasuji, "Ōjōden no Kyōju to sono Kōzō ni suite," *Ōjōden no Kenkyū*, pp. 107-8. Concern for deathbed *nembutsu* also increased.

39. For Shan-tao, the issue of the *Sambhoga* (*Hō*) states of the Pure Land was crucial and metaphysical, but Hōnen did not seem to sustain a consistent view on the nature of Amida's *kāya* or land. I suspect that the Pure Land tradition as a whole in Japan had a more naive, naturalistic and immediate perception of Pure Land that had its roots in the old *Taka-no-hara* in Shinto myth, the ancient mountain worship (cf. *Yamaokoshi Mida*), paradises in mountains or in islands or on the sea (cf. Heian *yamazato* tradition). For more technical

discussion on Hōnen's view on Amida's body and land, see Asai Jōkai, "Hōnen no Busshinkan" and "Hōnen no Buddōkan," *Shinshūgaku*, vol. 43, pp. 22-42 and vol. 45-46, pp. 137-58.

40. An implicit periodization scheme of my own is being used here with psychological correlations: Early (high) Medieval thought is *clerical* with a *realistic optimism* (Shan-tao); High Medieval or Heian thought is *theocratic* with an *extravagant optimism* out of proportion to reality; Late Medieval (Reform) Kamakura thought is *lay-oriented* with a *renewed pessimism* (Hōnen) that can go to extremes unknown before (Shinran). I cannot defend this thesis in the present essay.

41. See Tamura's *Kaisetsu* essay in *Tendai Hongaku Ron* and (in English) special volume of *Acta Asiatica*, vol. 20 (1971) devoted to Kamakura Buddhism, essay by Tamura Yoshirō, "The New Buddhism and Nichiren," pp. 45-57 and his "The New Buddhism of Kamakura and the Concepts of Original Enlightenment," *Tōyō University Asian Studies-I*, 61, pp. 73-91.

42. Chih-i (in one debatable text) held the idea that man's nature was evil and therefore elimination of evil leading to (incipient) enlightenment would be his position. Saichō was in that tradition in *Kokugaisho* but moved towards Hongaku in his *Hokke Shoku*. See Hisasita Noboru, "Hōnen shōnin ni okeru Hongaku shisō," in Bukkyō Daigaku, compiled, 300th year memorial volume of the founding of the Jōdo-shū, *Hōnen Shōnin Kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1975).

43. Cited in *Tendai Hongaku Ron*, p. 519.

44. Thus Genshin regarded "meditative recall to be superior, buddha-name recitation to be inferior," see Katsuki, "Hōnen Shōnin no Jōdo Kaishū ni okeru Bukkyō no tankan," *Jōdo-shū Kaisōki no Kenkyū*; Tōdō Kyūjun, "Jōdo Kaishū no ichirekitei," *ibid*.

45. Genshin regarded the Trikāya to be present in the one body of Amida, and Hōnen took the three words "A-mi-da" to incorporate the Trikaya; see "Hōnen no Busshinkan" cited; Takahashi Kōji, "Hōnen Shōnin no Busshinkan no

Tokuisei," *ibid*.

46. This dynamic quality is derived from Hua-yen's appropriation of Yogācāra; T'ien t'ai is more "static" because of its dependence on non-causative Mādhyamika.

47. See *Tendai Hongaku Ron*, pp. 483-504.

48. Cited from above work, p. 517. This is the only incidence in the *Ōjōyōshū* (understandably the least "Hongaku" work of Genshin) where the term *Hongaku* actually appeared. *Engakukyō* is translated by Charles Luk, *Ch'en and Zen Teachings*, III.

49. Cited by Katsuki from Genshin's *Kanjinrakuyōshū*, in Katsuki, *op. cit.*, in his *Jōdo-shū Kaizokuki no Kenkyū*, p. 10. See Chih-i, *op. cit.* (T. 46, 4a).

50. Three such works attributed to Genshin are included in *Tendai Hongaku Ron*.

51. The nuance of relative radicalism within Hongaku thought is hard to translate into English; the issue is somewhat like the relative shades of theological Realism in medieval Europe (not an inappropriate parallel, since the issue for both was "How much of the Universal is present in the particular?") See *ibid.*, pp. 514, 516-17. Shinran appropriated the term "From Result to Cause" to describe the Power of Amida's *Hongan* to "lift" man out of his total fallenness. In this case, *Hongaku* thought merged into *Hongan* thought.

52. I think *power* is an inalienable category in *Hongaku* thought; the *aśūnya tathāgatagarbha* is with infinite *gunas*, and power came into play in Shingon thought through the mysterious power of *adhiṣṭhāna* (*kaji*).

53. *Hongaku* thought degenerated by the Genroku era when its original metaphysical sublimity was finally corrupted by plebeian superstition.

54. Spiritual crisis had often produced both: wishful optimism and acute pessimism.

55. The fault of Luther, from the point of view of a "catholic" mind, was his single-mindedness in emphasizing—not the word faith, *fide*—but the word alone, *sola*.

56. The meditation on the True Body of the Buddha was regarded to be the key *vipāśyanā* taught in the *Kuan-ching* (*Amida-Meditation Sutra*).

57. The mystic always regards the man of faith to be a mystic *mangue* (failure as a mystic).

58. See Shigematsu, *op. cit.*, pp. 288-89, or Ōbayashi's review of it, included in *Ōjōden no Kenkyū*, pp. 229-32.

59. A section of the original draft of this essay has been taken out here, and I will also be brief here on bibliographic details concerning Shan-tao studies.

60. *Taishō* vol. 37, p. 278.

61. Hōnen did echo Shan-tao's basic opinions, especially around 1190. For example, Hōnen had to reclaim Shan-tao's thesis that the Pure Land was no "low" *nirmanakāya* illusion (as held by Japan's Hossō school which denied it). However, I do not think these were crucial issues as Muraoka Tsunetsugu seems to think in his *Nihon Shisōshi Gaisetsu* IV (Tokyo, 1961), p. 358.

62. *Genbun*, p. 263b.

63. Shan-tao's *Kuan-ching Hsüan-i*, when taken as a whole, acknowledged the different "recipient" (*chi*) mode of the Sage and the Commoner. By regarding the Nine Grades to be describing Commoners, Shan-tao actually prevented himself from taking Huiyuan's position that the *chi* for Sage and Commoners (in the nine grades) was continuous and only quantitatively different. Hōnen did talk about the Nine Grades (*Genbun*, pp. 264-266) briefly, but according to Kishi Kakuyū's tabulation in his *Zokuzoku Zendō Kyōgaku no Kenkyū* (Yamaguchi, 1967), Hōnen regarded the Nine Grades to be *myōsetsu*, and expedient division of no great classificatory significance: both good and evil men will be equally saved.

64. Ōhashi, pp. 421-26.

65. This is generally the opinion of Kishi Kakuyū, *op. cit.*, and essay on "Hōnen no Zendō Kyōgaku Shuyō to so no Hihan." *Jōdokyō no Shisō to Bunka*, volume dedicated to Prof. Etani (Kyoto, 1972), pp. 209-26.

66. See Muraoka's history cited, pp. 262-

63: *Hongan soku betsugan*. Similarly, nembutsu (response to Hongan) also subsumed all deeds within itself.

67. The abbreviated list here is constructed from *Zoku* and *Zokuzoku Zendō kyōgaku no Kenkyū* (Yamaguchi, 1966, 1967), a basic source plus other readings.

68. Or rather: the desiring mind will become the bodhicitta. A possible basis of this is the *Śrīmālā devī sūtra*'s idea that the tathāgatagarbha is that which loathes suffering and desires bliss.

69. *Ibid.* The *Hongaku* optimism returned with Shinran, especially in his *Shō* section of *Kyōgyōshinshō*. See Murakami, "Zendōtaishi kigonron," *Shinshūgaku* 17-18, pp. 158176.

70. See "Hōnen Shōnin ni okeru Hongaku Shisō" cited earlier; I do not associate this theory of "the arousal of nembutsu from the deluded mind" with the doctrine of Suchness perfumation (in the *Awakening of Faith*) as one Japanese scholar would. There is also an identification of the *Hongan* (the Mind of Hongan) with the *Ganjōshin* (the Mind desiring ōjō) in Hōnen which anticipated Shinran's idea that the mind of faith itself was generated by the Hongan.

71. Consistency should not be expected of Hōnen at all times. His *Senjakushū* began with Tao-cho's query about why men were unenlightened if they were said to have Buddha-nature; *Genbun*, p. 257b.

72. See Ishida Jushi, "Nihon Jōdokyō no Tokusitsu to Jōdo Shinshū," *Shinshūgaku* vol. 41-42 (1070). Whereas Chinese Pure Land leaned towards a harmonization of Pure Land piety (faith in form) and Zen mysticism (wisdom with the Formless) (p. 22), Shinran's *Hongaku* thought identified the nembutsu path with "*paramārtha*, the One Tao, Reality, Buddha-nature, Dharma, Mind, Wisdom, and the Incomprehensible Ultimate Virtue" all fused in the *Ekayāna* Sea. This *Hongan Ichijō Sea* is "round, perfect, full, sudden, unobstructed, nondual"—in other words, it is the Formless (Zen) Wisdom. From the *Gyō* section of *Kyōgyōshinshō*: "This Sea from time immemorial

has transformed the rivers of the various deeds and merits of the commoner or the sage, as well as the streams of the Mahayana-defaming infidels and of infinite ignorance itself, into the Great Treasured Sea Water of the Compassion, Wisdom, Truth, Infinite Virtue of the Hongan."

73. Myōe is a Kegan master requested by the same Lord Hōjō Kujo to refute Hōnen's treatise. (Hōnen had died and could not reply, but Shinran's work was possibly a reply to Myōe; the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, however, absorbed some of Myōe's *Hongaku* thought.) See Bandō Shōjun trans., "Myōe's Criticism of Hōnen's Doctrines," *The Eastern Buddhist* (new series: vol. 7-1, 1954), pp. 37-54. See Takachiho Tetsuzō, *Hōnen Kyōgaku no Tokusitsu to Dōkō* (Kyoto, 1954), pp. 46-50; this study focused on the bodhicitta issue and its re-emergence in Shinran. Also, see "Zaijarin to Shinran Kyōgaku to no Taiō," in *Shinshūgaku*, vol. 38, pp. 47-64.

74. From a *Seishū* (*seishanba*) recorded cited by Ōhashi, p. 406: this might be a later insertion.

75. *Genbun*, p. 259b.

76. Ōhashi, p. 406, traced it to the 1190 commentary on the *Amida Sutra*. The personalistic interpretation has been given by Matsutani Bun'ō, "Hōnen Shōnin to Senjaku Hongan Nembutsushū," Matsutani and Hanayama, ed., *Nihon Bukkyō Shi to Shisō* (Tokyo, 1959), pp. 127-152: subjective choice was contrasted with the old schools' objective tenet-classification. A somewhat philosophical interpretation of the irrational side (the existentialism) of Hōnen is given by Takahashi, "Senjaku no seikaku ni tsuite," *Jōdokyō no Shisō to Bunka*, pp. 187ff.

77. *Hsin-hsin-ming* (Essay on Trusting the Mind).

78. Reform faiths are, in my words, characterized by "single-mindedness," "eschatological impatience," and "formula minimalism."

79. *Genbun*, p. 283

80. Kierkegaard's use of Subjectivity was

within a different context; he was against the easy-going, bourgeois Christian piety that he saw around him.

81. *Genbun*, p. 263a; I work on the assumption that this reflects an earlier phase.

82. This body/mind division of *tsumi* and *aku* is supposedly Hōnen's; see Yata Ryōshō, "Hōnen ni okeru no Mondai," *Shinshūgaku* vol. 45-46, pp. 181-200. Hōnen did not care for the distinctions of the Nine Grades for all men, either sinful or good, to attain *Ōjō* through nembutsu.

83. Yang Wen-hui was against this *Senjaku* notion; see Ishii Kyōdō, *Senjakushū no Kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1951), I, p. 32. See also Etani work cited below in 88.

84. See *Genbun*, pp. 259a, 281a. But Japanese scholars repeatedly confuse *yori* and *senjaku*.

85. The official reading among Jōdo-shū scholars is the second one: Anthology on the Thought of the Buddha in the Selected Main Vow.

86. *Genbun*, pp. 280b-281a.

87. In a footnote on p. 181, Masaharu Anesaki in his *History of Japanese Religion* compared the *Hongan* motif in Jōdo faith with "the Christian doctrine of Predestination;" see *op. cit.* (London, 1930).

88. On the increasing henotheistic tendencies, see Ōhashi, pp. 426-27. This is a natural consequence of the heightened Selectivity; see Etani Ryūkai, "Jōdokyō no hihanseishinshijo ni okeru Senjakushū no kachi," *Bukkyō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō*, vol. 38 (Special issue no. 1 dedicated to Hōnen studies), pp. 37-56. Myōe also criticized Hōnen for going beyond Shan-tao: "Had Hōnen followed Shan-tao (without establishing a sect of his own on one element in Shan-tao), there would be no complaint against him." See Myōe's *Zaijarin* cited earlier and "Zendō to Hōnen," *Shinshūgaku*, vol. 17-18 (special issue dedicated to Zendō Kyōgaku), pp. 177-187, especially p. 183.