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CHAPTER V: THE EARLY PURE LAND FAITH
SOUTHERN CHINA

1. Hui-Yuan’s Disciples

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Hui-yuan established the Pai-lien she (the White Lotus Society) on Mt. Lu and, together with his followers, he cultivated the nien-fo san-mei, the meditation on the Buddha Amitābha and his Pure Land. Due to his reputation for diligent religious practice, his fame spread throughout the country.

After the death of Hui-yuan, his disciple Tao-ping became the abbot of the Tung-lin Monastery (Tung-ling ching-she). Others of his disciples, such as T’an-heng and T’an-hsien, also remained on Mt. Lu, and there spread Hui-yuan’s teachings, so it is not hard to imagine that Mt. Lu continued for a long time to be an important center of Pure Land activities.

At the same time, many of the monks and laity who had joined the White Lotus Association, among them many who were Hui-yuan’s disciples, traveled to various parts of China, converting others to the Pure Land faith. Due to their activities, the Pure Land faith spread throughout all parts of China and soon embraced a large portion of the population. The monks T’an-shun, T’an-yü, and Seng-ch’ê initially remained on Mt. Lu after the death of Hui-yuan, but after a while they moved to Chiang-ling (present-day Chiang-ling hsien, Hupei), and there began to preach. The layman Tsung Ping is also reported to have constructed a lodging in the San-hu (Three Lakes) region of Chiang-ling and lived there in seclusion.
Subsequent to this, the monk T’an-chien also moved to the same region, and began to preach there.

According to the seventh volume of the *Liang Kao-seng ch’uan*, T’an-chien was a disciple of Hui-yuan’s disciple, Tao-tsu; he was diligent in keeping all the rules of the *Vinaya*, and studied many of the scriptures. Subsequently, he went to Ch’ang-an where he studied with Kumārajīva, and then moved to Chiang-ling where he lived in the Hsin-ssu Monastery. Here he cultivated devotions to Amitābha, desiring to be reborn in the Pure Land. Based on these references then, we know that the Pure Land faith was at an early period spread throughout the Chiang-ling region of China.

The city of Ch’eng-tu (the present-day city of Ch’eng-tu, Szechwan) was the location where Hui-yuan’s younger brother, the monk Hui-chih, preached. According to the sixth volume of the *Liang Kao-seng ch’uan*, Hui-chih was a constant devotee of the Pure Land faith. He left his brother’s company in 399, and traveled west to the land of Shu (Szechwan). Here he lived in the Lung-yuan Monastery, and widely propagated the Buddhadharma. Many clerics and laity became his disciples, two early disciples being the monks Hui-yen and Seng-kung. Hui-chih died at the age of seventy-five in 412, and it is recorded that his chief disciples were the monks Tao-kung and T’an-lan.

The monk Tao-wang, one of the disciples of Hui-yuan, also taught in Szechwan. According to the seventh volume of the *Liang Kao-seng ch’uan*, and the *Ming-seng ch’uan chao*, Tao-wang became a disciple of Hui-yuan at an early age. He is described as having been widely versed in both the scriptures and the *Vinaya*, but specialized in the study of the *Nieh-p’an ching* (the Mahāyāna *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra*), and for several decades confined his diet to uncooked, vegetarian foods. Later in his life he moved to Ch’eng-tu, where he lived and taught in the Chih-yüan Monastery (“the Jetavana Monastery”), dying in the year 465. It is reported that, sometime during the Later Ch’i Dynasty (479–502), the monk Fa-lin also moved to Szechwan and there cultivated Pure Land devotions.

The city of Chien-k’ang (present-day Chiang-ning fu, Kiangsu), the capital city of southern China at this time, was also the scene for the preaching of the Pure Land faith by Hui-yuan’s disciples. Hui-yuan’s disciple, the monk Tao-yen, and two lay members of the White Lotus Association, Chou Hsü-chih and Lei Tz’u-tsung, moved to Chien-k’ang after the death of Hui-yuan. According to the seventh volume of the *Liang Kao-seng ch’uan*, the monk Tao-yen was a native of Ch’ao-na, in An-ting (present-day Ping-kuo hsien, Kansu). He moved to Mt. Lu and there became a student of Hui-yuan, later moving to Ch’ang-an where he studied with Kumārajīva. Sometime during the Yuan-chia period (424–453), he was living in the T’an-hsi ssu Monastery, in the city of Hsiang-yang (the present-day city of Hsiang-yang, Hupei). In the early years of the Hsiao chien period (454–456), he received an Imperial Order to become the abbot...
of the Chung-hsing ssu Monastery, in the capital city of Chien-k’ang. It was evidently here that he died in the early years of the Ch’in-shih period (466–471) at the age of sixty-eight.

The city of Yang-tu (present-day Chiang-tu hsien, Kiangsu) was the site of Buddhabhadra and Fa-yün’s new translation of the Wu-liang-shou ching (the Hsin Wu-liang-shou ching) in the year 421, and it was to this city that Hui-yuan’s disciple Fa-chuang moved. According to the twelfth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, the monk Fa-chuang was a native of Huai-nan (present-day Shou hsien, Anhwei) who, at the age of nine, left the householder’s life and became a disciple of Hui-yuan. Later in life he moved to north-central China (the Kuan-chung region) and studied with Seng-ying, a disciple of Kumārajña. In the early years of the Yuan-chia period (424–453), he moved to Yang-tu and there lived in the Tao-ch’ang ssu Monastery. It was here that he recited the Nieh-p’an ching, the Fa-hua ching (the Lotus Sūtra), and the Wei-mo ching (the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa), dying here in the early years of the Ta-ming period (457–464) at the age of seventy-five.

There also appears to have been considerable missionary activity in the Chekiang region. According to the fifth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, Hui-min, who at an early age had become a monk and lived on Mt. Lu, moved to the Chia-hsiang ssu Monastery in Shan-yin (present-day Shao-hsing hsien, Chekiang) in the early years of the Yi-hsi period (405–418). He later contracted a serious illness, and his thoughts turned to the Pure Land. He fervently prayed to Kuan-yin (the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara), and it is reported that, at the moment of his death, he was rewarded by the appearance of auspicious signs.

Hui-yuan’s disciple, the monk Tao-ching, left Mt. Lu and took up his residence on Mt. Jo-hsien (located in Shao-hsing hsien, Chekiang), where he preached the Buddhadharma. The monk T’an-i moved to Mt. Ch’in-wang (located in present-day Hang-chou, Chekiang), where he constructed a monastery (which has been mentioned above in Chapter III. 3 [Pacific World, Third Series, 3 (2001), p. 259]). It is also reported that the monk Tao-tsu moved to the state of Wu (present-day Wu hsien, Kiangsu) after the death of Hui-yuan.

According to the sixth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, the monk Tao-tsu first left the householder’s life under the master Chih Fa-chi; later, with his companions, the monks Seng-ch’ien and Tao-liu, he moved to Mt. Lu and there received the full number of precepts. These three monks were favorites of Hui-yuan, but the monks Seng-ch’ien and Tao-liu both died at the early age of twenty-seven. Tao-tsu continued the literary work begun by his friend Tao-liu, and so put into final form a scriptural catalogue entitled the Chu-ching mu-lu. Tao-tsu later returned to the T’ai ssu Monastery in the state of Wu, dying there at the age of seventy-one in 419. According to the seventh volume of the Li-tai san-pao chi, the catalogue
compiled by Tao-tsu was in four Chinese volumes. The first volume, a
scriptural catalogue of those works translated during the Wei Dynasty,
was entitled the Wei-shih lu-mu. The second volume, recording those
scriptures that appeared during the Wu Dynasty, was entitled the Wu-shih
lu-mu. The third volume, recording those scriptures that appeared during
the Chin Dynasty, was entitled the Chin-shih tsa-lu. And the fourth
volume, recording those works that appeared “west of the river,” was
entitled the Ho-hsi lu-mu. It was reported that this four-volume catalogue
enjoyed a wide circulation at this time.

Indications have been preserved for us pointing to considerable Pure
Land activity at this time among monks and laymen who were not disciples
of Hui-yuan. According to the biography of the monk Seng-ch’uan, pre-
served in the seventh volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan and in the
Ming-seng ch’uan chao, he was a native of Hai-yang (located in present-
day Hsing-ch’eng hsien, Feng-t’ien, in Manchuria), in the western part of
the region of the Liao. He early began his studies in the regions of the states
of Yen and Ch’i, and a while later moved to Mt. Hu-ch’iu (present-day Wu
hsien, Kiangsu), where he constructed a golden image. Subsequently, he
moved to Yü-hang (present-day Ch’ien-t’ang, Chekiang), taking up resi-
dence in the Fang-hsien ssu Monastery. He is reported to have constantly
desired rebirth in Sukhåvat∆, and to have copied out by hand several
thousand copies of the O-mi-t’o ching.

According to the biography of T’an-hung, preserved in the twelfth
volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, this monk was a native of Huang-
lung (perhaps the present-day Chi-lin area of Manchuria). He devoted
himself to a study of various Vinaya works and, in the Yung-ch’u period
(420–422), traveled to the city of Fan-yü in the far south of China (in present-
day Kuang-tung province). In his later years, he moved to the region of
Chiao-chih (in the present-day Tongking region of Annam), taking up resi-
dence in the Hsien-shan ssu Monastery. Here he recited the Wu-liang-
shou ching and the Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching, desiring rebirth in Sukhåvat∆.
One day in 455, he gathered together a pile of firewood and immolated
himself, being perhaps the first person to commit “religious suicide” in the
history of the Pure Land faith (see below, Chapter XV). T’an-hung was also
perhaps the first propagator of the Pure Land faith in the area of Chiao-
chih. Sometime later, there was received from the land of Champa (south
of Tongking) a stone image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life, Amitåyus,
which may be in some way related to the early Pure Land preaching of T’an-hung.

The eleventh volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, as well as the Ming-
seng ch’uan chao, mentions the monk Hui-t’ung (var. Chih-t’ung), who lived
in the T’ai-hou ssu Monastery in Ch’ang-an, learning the practice of meditation
from the master Hui-chao. He was always devoted to the Pure Land faith, and
it is recorded that at his death he saw the light of the Buddha.
In volume seven of the *Liang Kao-seng ch’uan*, in the biography of the monk T’an-chien, it is reported that there were many others who, through their desire to be reborn in the Pure Land, experienced auspicious signs at the time of their deaths. Such events are recorded for Tao-hai (of Chiang-ling), Hui-k’an (of Pei-chou), Hui-kung (of Tung-chou), T’an-hung (of Huai-nan; present-day Shou hsien, Anhwei), Tao-kuang (of Tung-yuan shan), and Tao-kuang (of Hung-nung; present-day Ling-pao hsien, Honan). In addition to these names, the *Ming-seng ch’uan chao* also records that the monks Fa-i, Seng-hung, and Seng-ch’ang saw auspicious signs at their deaths. And the fifteenth volume of the *Fa-yuan chu-lin*, quoting the *Ming-hsiang chi*, records that in the Liu-Sung Dynasty, the upâsaka Ko Chi-chih, the bhikṣu Hui-mu, and the laymen Wei Shih-tzu and Ho T’an-yuan desired rebirth in the Pure Land, and were rewarded at their deaths by the appearance of auspicious signs.

2. The Pure Land Faith in the Ch’i and Liang Dynasties

There also appeared to be a considerable number of persons during the Ch’i (479–502) and the Liang (502–557) Dynasties who sought rebirth in the Pure Land. It was during this period that lectures on the *Wu-liang-shou ching* came to be especially popular, and the Pure Land teachings gradually came to be more and more studied. In perusing the various biographies of monks of this period, we find that in these dynasties a number of monks are recorded to have desired rebirth in the Pure Land: the monks Hui-chin, Seng-hsing, Ch’ao-pien, Fa-ming, Fa-ling, Seng-jou, Fa-tu, and Pao-liang.

According to the twelfth volume of the *Liang Kao-seng ch’uan*, the monk Hui-chin was a native of Wu-hsing (present-day Wu-hsing hsien, Chekiang), who lived in the Kao-tso ssu Monastery in the capital city of Chien-k’ang. He would always lecture on the text of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and caused over one hundred copies of this scripture to be made, transferring the merit from this pious deed to the attainment of his desire to be reborn in the Pure Land. He died at the age of eighty-four in 485.

According to his biography in the *Ming-seng ch’uan chao*, the monk Seng-hsing was a native of Wu-hsing (present-day Wu-hsing hsien, Chekiang), who lived in the Kao-tso ssu Monastery in the capital city of Chien-k’ang. He would always lecture on the text of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and caused over one hundred copies of this scripture to be made, transferring the merit from this pious deed to the attainment of his desire to be reborn in the Pure Land. He died at the age of eighty-four in 485.

According to his biography in the *Ming-seng ch’uan chao*, the monk Seng-hsing was a native of Wu-hsing (present-day Wu-hsing hsien, Chekiang), who lived in the Kao-tso ssu Monastery in the capital city of Chien-k’ang. He would always lecture on the text of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and caused over one hundred copies of this scripture to be made, transferring the merit from this pious deed to the attainment of his desire to be reborn in the Pure Land. He died at the age of eighty-four in 485.

According to his biography in the *Ming-seng ch’uan chao*, the monk Seng-hsing was a native of Wu-hsing (present-day Wu-hsing hsien, Chekiang), who lived in the Kao-tso ssu Monastery in the capital city of Chien-k’ang. He would always lecture on the text of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and caused over one hundred copies of this scripture to be made, transferring the merit from this pious deed to the attainment of his desire to be reborn in the Pure Land. He died at the age of eighty-four in 485.

The biography of Ch’ao-pien is found in the twelfth volume of the *Liang-sao-seng ch’uan*, and in the *Ming-seng ch’uan chao*. Here it is recorded that he lived in the Ting-lin shang ssu Monastery (the Upper
Ting-lin Monastery) in the city of Chien-k’ang, where he was earnest in his worship of the Lotus Sūtra and of the Buddha Amitābha. The monk Fa-ming lived in the Ling-chi ssu Monastery, where he always recited the Lotus Sūtra and the Wu-liang-shou ching.

According to the eleventh volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, the monk Fa-lin lived in the P’ei ssu Monastery in Shu chün (present-day Ch’eng-tu hsien, Szechwan), where he was renowned for his adherence to the Vinaya rules. He subsequently accompanied the monk Seng-yin to the province of Shensi, returning eventually to the Ling-chien ssu Monastery in Shu (Szechwan). He was always concerned with the Pure Land faith, and recited both the Wu-liang shou ching and the Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching. He died at an unknown age in 495.

According to the eighth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, the monk Seng-jou was a native of Tan-yang (present-day Tan-yang chen, Ch’ang-t’u hsien, Anhwei). He early became proficient in the scriptures and began lecturing on them, subsequently moving to Shan-yin where he studied with the master Hui-chi. He then moved to the Ting-lin shang ssu Monastery (see above) in Chien-k’ang. Here his fame reached the attention of the emperor, and he was richly rewarded for his scholastic abilities by the Emperors Wen-hui and Wen-hsüan, gaining great fame during his lifetime. He constantly vowed to be reborn in Sukhāvatī and, at every sunset, he would stand in a formal position, facing west with his palms together in reverence. He died at the age of sixty-three in 494.

The monk Fa-tu was also a native of Huang-lung. Early in his life, he traveled to the north for study and, towards the latter years of the Liu-Sung Dynasty, he moved to the city of Chien-k’ang and took up residence in the Chi-hsia ssu Monastery on Mt. She (located in present-day Chiang-ning fu, Kiangsu). He was held in esteem by the Emperor Wen-hsüan, and always desired to be reborn in the Pure Land, often lecturing on the Wu-liang-shou ching. He died at the age of sixty-three in 500.

The monastery in which Fa-tu lived, the Chi-hsia ssu, was founded sometime during the T’ai-shih period (465–471) of the Liu-Sung Dynasty. It seems that a retired scholar from Chi-chou by the name of Ming Seng-shao moved to Mt. She and there built himself a rude hut. Subsequently the monk Fa-tu, who was “a companion in the Way” of Ming Seng-shao, also moved to Mt. She, and there, in a small mountain temple, he began to lecture on the Wu-liang-shou ching. Once, during the night, Ming Seng-shao saw a bright light coming from this temple. Moved by this miracle he converted his hut into a Buddhist monastery in 489. After his death, his son Ming Chung-chang constructed a more permanent dwelling against the face of a cliff at the western base of the mountain. Here, together with the monk Fa-tu, he carved a seated image of the Buddha Amitābha, over thirty feet in height, with a backdrop forty feet high, and seated figures of two bodhisattvas, over thirty feet in height. Chung-chang and the monk Fa-tu
were aided in their construction work by the various emperors of this dynasty, the Emperors Wen-hui, Wen-hsien, Wen-hsüan, and Shih-an. The wife of the Liu-Sung Prime Minister, the Lady Tsui, and, later, the Ch’i Dynasty military governor of Yung-chou, one T’ien Hsiung, contributed money for the completion of this work. With their contributions, the workmen were able to carve onto the face of these massive rocks “hundreds of millions” of forms of the nirmāṇakāya Buddha, Śākyamuni. These figures were later decorated through gifts made by a Liang Dynasty king, King Ching-hui of Lin-ch’uan. (This information is based on a memorial inscription, the She shan chi-hsia ssu p’ei-ming, which was composed by the Ch’ien Dynasty official, Chiang Tsung-chih, and preserved in volume four of the Chin-ling fan-she chih [A Monograph of the Buddhist Monasteries in the Chin-lin area]). These carvings became famous, and were known as the She-shan Ch’ien-Fo yen, “The Grotto of the One Thousand Buddhas on Mt. She.” However, another account differs considerably in its account of the origins of these carved images. This is the one preserved in a memorial inscription erected in honor of one Lord Ming-cheng, a stele written in the hand of the T’ang Dynasty Emperor Kao-tsung and erected within the precincts of the Chi-hsia ssu Monastery. This memorial inscription is also preserved in the fifty-ninth volume of the Chin-shih ts’ui-pien. This latter account records that the monk Fa-tu had over ten new carved images. It also records that in 516 (not in 511 as given above) the King of Lin-ch’uan had constructed one image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life (Amitābha) which measured (from base to tip of halo) some fifty feet in height! It is not certain which of these accounts is the correct one.

According to the account preserved in the eighth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, the monk Pao-liang initially lived in the Chung-hsing ssu Monastery, in the city of Chien-k’ang. Later, he moved to the Ling-wei ssu Monastery, and here would often lecture on the Nieh-p’an ching, the Sheng-man ching (the Śrīmālādevī Sūtra), the Wei-mo ching, and the Fa-hua ching. In 509, upon an order from the Emperor Wu, he composed a seventy-one-volume commentary on the Nieh-p’an ching, the Nieh-p’an ching chi-chieh, in which he gathered together all the theories propounded by the various masters who had previously commented upon this scripture. His biography also records that he lectured on the Wu-liang-shou ching close to ten times.

Based on these accounts, then, we can see that lectures on the Wu-liang-shou ching were gradually becoming more popular at that time in southern China, but it would seem, too, that there were no written works as yet composed by these lecturers.

The monk Fa-yün was a disciple of the master Pao-liang. He lived in the Kuang-che ssu Monastery in Chin-ling (one of the names of the city of Chien-k’ang). There he lectured often on the Ch’eng-shih lun (the Tattva-siddhi) and the Fa-hua ching. Together with the scholar-monks Seng-min and
Chih-tsang, Fa-yün was counted as one of the “Three Great Dharma Masters of the Liang Dynasty” (Liang san ta-fa-shih). It is not recorded that he sought rebirth in the Pure Land. However, in the fifth volume of his work on the Lotus Sūtra, the Fa-hua ching i-chi, in the section where he elucidates the fourth chapter, “On Faith and Understanding,” the wealthy man in the scripture is likened to the Buddha Amitābha. Similarly, in the eighth volume of this same commentary, Fa-yün discusses the passage from the sixteenth chapter, “On Length of His Life,” where the text says, “he manifests his own body, or the body of another.” Fa-yün explains that “his own body” refers to the form of the Buddha Śākyamuni, while “the body of another” refers to the body of Amitābha. Based on these fragmentary passages, it would appear that Fa-yün held that the Buddha Amitābha (here identical to the Buddha Amitāyu) is the basic underlying form (pen shen) of the Buddha Śākyamuni, which, if true, is profoundly significant for later thought.

In his Ching Kuan-yin ching shu, Chih-i (founder of the T’ien-t’ai tradition) discusses the ideas of the Master An-lin of the Ch’i-an ssu Monastery, whom Chih-i considered to be one of the “Seven Masters of the North.” According to Chih-i, An-lin held that Śākyamuni was the “response body, the trace body,” whereas Amitābha was “the true body, the underlying body.” “The response body” (nirmāṇakāya) was unable to conquer the effects of poison, but the “true body” (dharmakāya or sambhogakāya) was able to remove all types of poisons. This theory of An-lin is clearly the teaching that there are two aspects to the Buddha’s manifestation, a basic ground whence the manifestation arises, and the manifestation, “the trace body” itself, and that these bodies were the Buddha Amitābha and Śākyamuni respectively. This theory was perhaps borrowed by An-lin from the teachings of the master Fa-yün. We know that in 509, a nineteen-foot high golden image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life was cast and enshrined in this same Kuang-che ssu Monastery. Based upon these accounts, then, we can see that this Kuang-che ssu was the primary center for the Pure Land faith in this region.

According to the fourth volume of the Pi-ch’iu-ni ch’uan (Biographies of Nuns), the nun Tao-kuei of the Ting shan ssu Monastery recited the Sheng-man ching and the Wu-liang-shou ching continually both day and night, dying at the age of eighty-five in 516.

According to the sixteenth volume of the Hsü Kao-seng ch’uan, the monk Tao-ch’in lived on Mt. Lu in the early years of the Liang Dynasty, constantly cultivating Pure Land devotions. One night in a dream he saw a ship about to set sail in the direction of the Buddha land of Amitābha. Although he asked to board the ship, he was not permitted to do so. This was because he did not recite the O-mi-t’o ching, and he had not paid for the construction of a bathhouse on the grounds of the monastery! From this time onward, we are told, Tao-ch’in recited the O-mi-t’o ching, and he was
eventually reborn into the Pure Land, his death being accompanied by auspicious signs.

The account of Tao-ch’in is preserved also in the O-mi-t’o ching pu-su-i shen-li ch’uan (Accounts of the Miraculous Power of the O-mi-t’o ching), and in a Postface (hou chi) to the O-mi-t’o ching, dated 728 (K’ai-yuan 16), which was discovered at Tun-huang. In these accounts, the monk in question is referred to simply as “the Meditation Master Ch’in” (Ch’in ch’an-shih), and his dream occurred sometime during the T’ien-chia period (560–565) of the Ch’en Dynasty. Ennin’s catalogue of scriptures, the Nittö-guhō mokuroku (dated 838), lists among other works a one-volume nien-fo san-mei chih kuei (Instruction in the Nien-fo Samādhi), composed by the Sui Dynasty monk Hui-ch’in, of the I-ai ssu Monastery, on Mt. Lu. Now if this Hui-ch’in is the above-mentioned Meditation Master Ch’in, he could not have lived in the early years of the Liang Dynasty, but sometime during the years of the Ch’en Dynasty and the Sui Dynasty instead.

3. Early Images of Amitābha

From the end of the Chin Dynasty onwards, the construction of images of the Buddha Amitābha continued apace with the gradual growth of the Pure Land faith. Most of the images in north China were carved out of rock, while those in the south were metal.

According to an account given in the thirteenth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, as well as in the Ming-seng ch’uan chao, the monk Seng-hung lived in the Wa-kuan ssu Monastery, in the city of Chien-k’ang (present-day Chiang-ning fu, Kiangsu). At this time, at the end of the Chin Dynasty, the prohibition on the use of copper was very strictly enforced, but notwithstanding, Seng-hung solicited donations from believers and was able to have cast a sixteen-foot-high image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life. He was arrested and thrown into prison for this deed, but he began to recite the Kuan-shih-yin ching (the scripture of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, the twenty-fifth chapter of the Lotus Sūtra), while fervently worshiping an image of the Buddha. Suddenly, he perceived a miraculous vision, and was able to escape from the prison.

According to an account preserved in the thirteenth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan, as well as in the Ming-seng ch’uan chao, the monk Seng-liang lived in Chiang-ling. He wished to cast a sixteen-foot golden image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life. However, since the copper necessary for the casting was insufficient in that region, he hired one hundred craftsmen and rented some ten large vessels, and sailed with the craftsmen to the border of Hsiang-chou (present-day Ch’ang-sha hsien, Hunan). He arrived at the shrine of Wu-tzu Hsü, located in Tung-hsi, “Copper Canyon.” Here they mined some copper and cast the image. However, there was not enough copper for the casting of the halo surrounding the image,
so the Liu-Sung Emperor Wen constructed a gold-plated halo and presented it to the image. The finished image was enshrined in the P‘eng-ch‘eng ssu Monastery. Subsequently, during the T’ai-shih period (465–471), the image was moved to the Hsiang-kung ssu Monastery by the Emperor Ming.

There is preserved in the Fa-yuan tsa-yuan yuan-shih chi mu-lu (quoted in the twelfth volume of the Ch‘u san-tsang chi-chi) an account of the construction of a golden image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life that was sixteen feet tall by the monk Seng-liang. This account is entitled the Ching-chou sha-men Shih Seng-liang tsao Wu-liang-shou chang-liu chin-hsiang chi.

Volume two of the Liang Dynasty monk Pao-ch‘ang’s composition, the Pi-ch‘iu-ni ch‘uan, records that the nun Tao-ch‘iung (of the Chien-fu ssu Monastery, Chin-ling) had constructed a golden image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life in 438.

The Ming-seng ch‘uan chao records two additional instances. The Liu-Sung Dynasty monk Tao-ch‘ing, of the An-lo ssu Monastery (the Sukhāvatī Monastery), had a five-foot gilded image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life cast. Also, the monk Hui-ch‘ing (of the Chih-yuan ssu Monastery, see above) constructed a sixteen foot-high image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life.

The twenty-eighth volume of the Fo-tsu t‘ung-chi records that the Liu-Sung Dynasty nun Tao-yüan had constructed some seven large images, which she placed in various monasteries, and further records that she had a copper and gold alloy image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life cast.

The above-mentioned Fa-yuan tsa-yuan yuan-shih chi mu-lu also contains two further inscriptions. One is a record of the Liu-Sung Emperor Hsiao-wu constructing a golden image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life (the Sung Hsiao-wu Hsiao-wu Huang-ti tsao Wu-liang shou shih-hsiang chi). The other is an inscription on the cast metal image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life sent as tribute from the country of Champa (the Lin-i kuo hsien Wu-liang-shou t‘ou shih hsiang chi).

The Japanese Buddhist scholar Seigai Ômura, in his Shina Bijutsu-shi: Chōsō-hen (History of Chinese Art: Sculpture) records a slightly defaced stone inscription, dated 448, from a border region of China. The inscription reads: “For the benefit of my father and mother, as well as for my mate of the Hsiung clan, and our children, I have made the vow to be born in the land of the Buddha □-liang-shou□” (為父母并熊身兒子、起願□亮壽□国生[square boxes represent illegible or missing characters in the original]). The character liang 亮 is an error for liang 量, and so the image was clearly an image of the Buddha Amitābha. We can see from these above accounts that the construction of images of the Buddha Amitābha continued apace throughout the Liu-Sung Dynasty.

There are a considerable number of references to the construction of such images during the Ch‘i and Liang Dynasties as well. The sixteenth volume of the Kuang Hung-ming chi preserves for us an inscription on an
embroidered hanging of the Buddha of Unlimited Life, which was crafted by a certain Madame Ch’en in company with the bhikṣu Pao-yuan of the Yueh-lin ssu Monastery, and dated 486. The thirteenth volume of the Liang Kao-seng ch’uan records that the monk Fa-yüeh of the Ch’eng-ch’ueh ssu Monastery in Chien-k’ang, together with the monk Chih-ching of the Pai-ma ssu Monastery, made a solicitation for donations in order to construct an eighteen foot-high image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life. In the early years of the Liang Dynasty, they received imperial permission for the construction of this image, and in 909 work was begun on it within the Hsiao Chuang-yen ssu Monastery. The amount of copper available for the construction was insufficient, so additional copper was presented by the Imperial Court, and eventually a nineteen foot-high image of the Buddha was completed, which was enshrined in the Kuang-che ssu Monastery. The account concludes by saying that this image was the largest golden image existing anywhere east of the Kunlun Mountains (i.e., in all China!). The account of the casting of this image is given in the Kuang-che ssu chang-chiu Wu-liang-shou chin-hsiang chi, preserved in the Fa-yuan tsa-yuan yuan-shih chi mu-lu (which in turn is preserved in the twelfth volume of the Ch’u san-tsang chi-chi).

The sixteenth volume of the Kuang Hung-ming-chi contains an inscription to an image of the Buddha Amitābha, composed by the Liang Dynasty literati Shen Yueh.

The thirty-ninth volume of the Nan-shih (Standard History of the Southern Dynasties) preserves the inscription from a stele erected within the Chin-hsiang ssu Monastery (the Monastery of the Golden Image) in Yung-chou (the Yung-chou Chin-hsiang ssu Wu-liang-shou Fo-hsiang p’ei) composed by the Liang Dynasty layman Liu Ch’ien.

The ninetieth volume of the Ku-chin t’u-shu chi-ch’eng, in the Monograph on Spirits and Prodigies (Shen-i tien), records an inscription to an image of the Buddha Amitābha composed by the Liang Dynasty Emperor Chien-wen.

In his O-mi-t’o ching shu, the Sung Dynasty scholar-monk Yuan-chao (see below Chapter XXVIII) records that the layman Ch’en Jen-leng raised a stele within the precincts of the Lung-hsing ssu Monastery, Hsiang-chou (present-day Hsiang-yang, Hupei), with the text of the O-mi-t’o ching on it. The text had some twenty-one additional characters in it: following the words “one-pointedness of mind, undisturbed,” the text continued with the words: “exclusively hold to the Name . . . with many good roots and various meritorious and virtuous causes and conditions.”

Yuan-chao himself had this inscription copied and carved on another stele, and erected it on the grounds of his own monastery, the Ch’ung-fu ssu Monastery in the Hsi-hu (the Western Lakes) region of Hang-chou, in present-day Chekiang province. Eventually, this latter inscription was again copied and brought to Japan, and raised on a stele presently in the precincts of the Shuzo-jinja, in the province of Echizen. This stele has been declared a National Treasure.
CHAPTER VI: THE EARLY PURE LAND FAITH
NORTHERN CHINA

1. The Northern Wei Dynasty

Under the influence of Hui-yuan of Mt. Lu, coupled with the translation by Pao-yün and Kalayaśas of Pure Land texts, the Pure Land faith spread to all parts of south China. In the north, however, there were no major spokesmen for the Pure Land teachings. Civil wars and insurrections continually ravaged the area, and in 446 the Northern Wei Emperor Wu began a systematic destruction of Buddhism. Texts were burned, and monasteries and stupa-s were laid waste. Thus, for a while Buddhism was effectively destroyed in the regions under the effective control of the Northern Wei Dynasty.

When the Emperor Wen-ch'eng took the throne, Buddhism underwent a revival. In 454, the monk T'an-yüeh was given an Imperial Command to construct five shrines out of caves and grottos carved into the north face of the mountains facing the Sai-shan ku Valley, in Wu-chou, to the northwest of the Wei capital, Heng-an (present-day Ta-t'ung, Shansi). Later, T'an-yüeh constructed over ten stone chapels and temples in the vicinity of these caves, and images of the Buddhas were enshrined in all of them. This was the beginning of the famous Ta-t'ung Caves.

In 494, the Emperor Hsiao-wen moved the capital of the Wei Dynasty to the city of Loyang, and soon thereafter work was begun on the Lung-men caves (located in present-day Lo-yang hsien, Honan). Over the years, a large number of both caves and temples came to be constructed in this area, and images of the Buddhas were enshrined in them. The largest number of images were those of the Buddha Maitreya, followed in number by images of Sākyamuni and Avalokiteśvara. There were comparatively few images of the Buddha Amitābha, and those that exist are of a somewhat later date.

According to Seigai Ōmura’s Shina Bitjutsu-shi: Chōsō-hen, the first image of the Buddha Amitābha to be constructed at Lung-men was one raised by a pious laywoman, one Madame Chiang, in the year 518. This image was followed at Lung-men by images raised in 519, 522, 523, 526, 527, 533, and 545.

Nevertheless, at this early date, concepts of the Pure Land were still in the elementary stage, and in most cases the faith in the Pure Land of Amitābha was identified or confused with a faith in the appearance of the future Buddha Maitreya and his Pure Land, Tuśita. This is shown with great clarity by one inscription, dated 499, preserved in the Ku-yang Cave in Lung-men. This inscription was composed by the bhiksu
Seng-hsin on a stone image of the Buddha Maitreya constructed by him. The inscription says:

I have raised this one stone image of Maitreya for the benefit of the rebirth of my father and mother, and for all of the masters and members of the Sangha related to me. I desire that they all be born in the Western Land of the Buddha of Unlimited Life, that they may hear the Three Teachings of the Dharma under the Nāga Flower Tree. May they all be reborn in their human state as the sons and grandsons of lords and kings, and may they be born together with the Great Bodhisattvas in the dwelling of Tusita Heaven.

An inscription on an image of Maitreya raised by the bhikṣuṇī Fa-ching in 501 states that she desired to be born in the Western Land of Sublime Bliss (Sukhāvatī), and that she be born as a duke, a king, or a millionaire. We find a similar sentiment in an inscription on an image of the Buddha Šakyamuni raised in this same year by the bhikṣuṇī Hui-chih. She also desires to be born in this same Western Land of Sublime Bliss as a duke, a king, or a millionaire, and she desires to hear the Three Teachings of Maitreya given under the Nāga Flower Tree.

These inscriptions show that the belief in a future Pure Land involved both belief in the future appearance of Maitreya, and belief in the Pure Land of Amitābha, Sukhāvatī. These devotees wished to be reborn in Sukhāvatī by virtue of the merits accruing from the construction of an image of Maitreya. Then, when the Buddha Maitreya appears in the world, they wish to be born as human beings, the sons of feudal lords or kings, and to hear the Three Teachings given by the Buddha Maitreya under the Nāga Flower Tree.

Many devotees desired to be born in Heaven, among the deva-s, through the merits acquired by raising an image of the Buddha Amitābha. In one inscription, dated 526, on an image of the Buddha Amitābha raised by the upāsikā (laywoman) Huang Fa-seng, she desires that her deceased relatives be born in Heaven, where “they will cast off suffering, and obtain pleasure.” In an inscription on an image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life, raised in 545 by (the monk?) Hui-chien, the donor says: “For the benefit of my deceased father and mother, I have constructed an image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life [here: Wu-shou Fo], desiring that they may be born in the Heavenly Land.” Another inscription dated 549 on a stone image says that the donor has constructed four Buddha and four Bodhisattva images, by the merits of which the deceased may ascend to Heaven, and there be born in the Western Land of the Buddha of Unlimited Life. An inscription on a stone image of Amitābha carved in 597 records that the donor desires to cast off his present defiled form, and meet Maitreya face to face, and that he may be born in the Western Land (of Amitābha).
What specifically do these donors mean by Heaven, t’ien? We can, of course, regard this Heaven in the Confucian sense of the word. However, these are not Confucian inscriptions, but inscriptions at the base of Buddha images, so the Heaven referred to must be one of the Pure Lands of Buddhism. From this very early period, however, the belief in the Pure Land of Maitreya, Tusita Heaven, was bound up with the belief in the Pure Land of Amitābha, Sukhāvatti. So these inscriptions doubtlessly refer to the one Pure Land which is commonly called a “heaven” (t’ien), in Buddhist writings, the Tusita Heaven of Maitreya. If this is the case, these inscriptions must be read and understood as evidence of this confusion of beliefs, on the one hand a belief in “birth in Tusita” (tou-shuai shang-sheng), and on the other, “rebirth in the West” (hsi-fang wang-sheng). The later result of this confusion of beliefs led to Sukhāvatī coming to be called the t’ien-shou kuo, the “Heavenly Land of Long Life.”

In a Postface (hou-chi) to the forty-sixth volume of a copy of the Hua-yen ching, found in Tun-huang and dated 583, we find what is perhaps the first occurrence of the phrase t’ien-shou kuo. This is in the phrase: “I desire that my deceased father and mother are born in the Western Heavenly Land of Long Life.” Also, an inscription on an image of Amitābha in the Mo-ai Cliffs in the Ling-yen ssu Monastery, located in the Ch’ien-fo Mountains of present-day Li-shan hsien, Shantung province, and dated sometime in the Sui Dynasty, states: “I have respectfully constructed this one image of the Buddha Amitābha, with the desire that I, together with all sentient beings, may ascend to □□□□□□, there to maintain our heavenly long lives” (敬造阿弥陀佛像一軀，願供一切衆生同登岐□□□□□□保天壽).

In Japan, in 622, the Empress Suiko had constructed an embroidered hanging, entitled the “Tenjūkoku Embroidered Hanging,” as an offering upon the death of Prince Shōtoku. Such a hanging clearly reflected the north Chinese belief of the two previous centuries. Prince Shōtoku was, it was thought, reborn in Amitābha’s Pure Land, and this embroidered hanging is thought to represent this Pure Land, Sukhāvatti.

In any case we can see that, although confused with Tusita Heaven in the minds of some monks, nuns, and laity, belief in the Pure Land of Amitābha came to be more and more widespread in north China.

2. Bodhiruci and the “Six Great Worthies of the Pure Land Teachings.”

The monk Bodhiruci was a native of north India who came to China, arriving at the capital city of Loyang in 508, during the reign of the Emperor Hsuan-wu of the Northern Wei Dynasty. Bodhiruci was the famous translator of such important texts as the Shih-ti ching lun (the Daśa-bhūmi vyākhyāna) and the Ju-Leng-chia ching (the Lankāvatāra Sūtra). Impor-
tant for the Pure Land teachings, however, was his translation of the Wu-
liaṃg-shou ching Yū-p’o-ti-she Yuan-sheng chieh (An Upādea [Instruction]
on the Amitāyus Sūtra: A Gāthā on Desiring Rebirth), traditionally
ascribed to Vasubandhu. This work is also known by a variety of shorter
titles, either the Wu-liang shou ching lun (A Commentary on the Amitāyus
Sūtra), the Wang-sheng lun (A Commentary on Rebirth), or simply the
Ching-t’u lun (A Commentary on the Pure Land). It was an important work
to later Pure Land thinkers for its teaching of attaining rebirth by the five-
fold practice of the nien-fo (wu nien-fo wang-sheng).

According to the ninth volume of the Li-tai San-pao chi, this work was
translated in 530 during the Northern Wei Dynasty; the sixth volume of the
K’ai-yuan Shih-chiao lu gives the date of this translation as 529. However,
there is nothing in the biography of Bodhiruci (preserved in the first
volume of the Hsū Kao-seng ch’u’an) that would attribute a belief in the
Pure Land to him. Rather, the first reference to him in a Pure Land context
is a master-disciple lineage recorded in the second volume of the An-lo chi
(A Collection of Works on Sukhāvatī), composed in the T’ang Dynasty by
the monk Tao-ch’o (see below, Chapter XII). In this work, Tao-ch’o gives
a lineage of six masters who, in their profound investigations of the
Mahāyāna, came to believe that the most essential teachings of the
Mahāyāna were the Pure Land teachings. These six masters are Bodhiruci,
Hui-ch’ung, Tao-ch’ang, T’an-luan, Ta-hai, and Fa-shang. Thus, ac-
cording to Tao-ch’o, Bodhiruci is the first Patriarchal Master of the Pure
Land teachings in China.

In the biography of T’an-luan, preserved in the sixth volume of the Hsū
Kao-seng ch’u’an, the story is told that when T’an-luan was traveling in
south China, he passed through Loyang and there met the master Bodhiruci.
T’an-luan asked Bodhiruci whether there was in the Buddhadharmarma any
art or technique that equaled the Taoist techniques for attaining perpetual
life. Bodhiruci responded to this by spitting on the ground and berating
him. Handing T’an-luan a copy of the Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching, Bodhiruci
said that this was the technique of the Great Sage, Śākyamuni, and that if
he were to cultivate its teachings, he would obtain liberation from the
round of birth and death, and hence attain the deathless state.

If this account is true, then Bodhiruci must be regarded as a believer in
the Pure Land teachings. However, it is not recorded in either the An-lo chi,
nor in Chia-ts’ai’s Ching-t’u lun. Perhaps this account is no more than a
pious legend appended to account for Bodhiruci’s translation of a major
Pure Land text, the Wu-liang-shou ching lun. In any case, it is hard to credit
this account with any basis in historical fact.

The name Hui-ch’ung is perhaps a misprint for the name Tao-
ch’ung. According to the seventh volume of the Hsū Kao-seng ch’u’an,
the master Tao-ch’ung studied the Shih-ti ching lun with Bodhiruci. In his
day he was as famous a master as his contemporary, Hui-kuang (see

below), for Tao-ch’üng came to be counted as one of the patriarchal masters of the northern Ti-lun tradition. The northern Ti-lun tradition was a major academic tradition in Chinese Buddhism which centered on the study of Bodhiruci’s translation of the Daśa-bhūmi-vyākhyāna. The study of this text prepared the way for the eventual development of the Hua-yen tradition of Buddhism. In any case, there is no evidence in the biography of the master Tao-ch’üng that he was especially interested in the Pure Land faith.

According to the twenty-fourth volume of the Ta-chih-tu lun shu (composed by the Northern Chou Dynasty scholar-monk Hui-ying), the master Tao-ch’ang 道場 (also written Tao-chang 道長) was a disciple of Hui-kuang. Subsequently he attended Bodhiruci’s lectures, but became the object of the jealousy of Bodhiruci’s other students, and moved to Ch’ung-kao shan (located in present-day Teng-feng hsien, Honan), where he lived for ten years, studying the Ta-chih-tu lun. He eventually left the mountain and returned to the city, where he began to lecture on this work, and the subsequent popularity of the Ta-chih tu lun is said to be based on Tao-ch’ang’s lectures on the text.

In the biography of one Chih-nien, preserved in the eleventh volume of the Hsü Kao-seng ch’uan, there is mention of the Dharma Master Tao-ch’ang 處 (also written Tao-chang 達長) who lived in Yeh-tu (located in present-day Lin-chang hsien, Honan). He was well-versed in the Ta-chih-tu lun, and was a major scholar of this tradition. In the biography of the monk Ming-chan, in the twenty-fourth volume of this same Hsü Kao-seng ch’uan, mention is also made of the Dharma Master Tao-ch’ang, who lived in the Ta-chi ssu Monastery, in Yeh. It states that his exclusive topic of study was the Ta-chih-tu lun. Thus, we can see from these accounts that he lived in the Ta-chi ssu Monastery in the capital city of Yeh, and that his lectures on the Ta-chih-tu lun were popular and well-attended.

According to accounts preserved in the second volume of Tao-hsian’s Chi Shen-chou San-pao kan-t’ung lu, and in the fifteenth volume of the Fa-yuan chu-lin, sometime during the reign of the Sui Dynasty Emperor Wen, the śrāmane Ming-hsien visited the monastery of the master Tao-ch’ang. While there he saw a picture of the Buddha Amitābha surrounded by some fifty attendant bodhisattvas. This picture was supposedly based on an Indian model preserved in the Kuquta Vihāra in Magadha, showing the Five Bodhisattvas of Supernormal Powers (rddhi). Tao-ch’ang copied this picture and caused it to be circulated. Since this Tao-ch’ang is, without doubt, the same Tao-ch’ang mentioned above, and if this account is historically true, then he was a believer in the Buddha Amitābha, and the work that he obtained was the so-called “Mandala of the Five Supernormal Powers.”

According to the third volume of Fa-lin’s Pien-ch’eng lun, the Northern Wei Emperor Hsiao-wen constructed the An-yang ssu Monastery (the
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Sukhāvati Monastery) in the capital city of Yeh in memory of his deceased mother. It is clear then, that the Pure Land faith enjoyed a great prosperity in the capital city of Yeh.

The fifth of the “Six Pure Land Worthies” listed by Tao-ch’o is the monk Ta-hai, which is perhaps a variant name for the monk Hui-hai. According to the twelfth volume of the Hsü Kao-seng ch’üan, the monk Hui-hai first studied with the Dharma Master Chiuang who lived in the Kuang-kuo ssu Monastery, in the capital city of Yeh, and here studied the Nieh-p’an ching and the Leng-chia ching. Later Hui-hai constructed the An-lo ssu Monastery (the Sukhāvati Monastery) in Chiang-tu (present-day Chiang-tu hsien, Kiangsu), and lived there until his death at the age of sixty-eight in 609. Throughout his life he desired rebirth in the Pure Land. On one occasion he received from the monk Seng-ch’üan (of Ch’i-chou, located in present-day Li-ch’eng hsien, Shantung) an image of the Buddha of Unlimited Life copied from the above-mentioned picture of the Bodhisattvas of the Five Supernormal Powers. He in turn caused this picture to be copied, recording on it that viewing it only deepened his desire for rebirth in the Pure Land. From this account, it is clear that the master Hui-hai was also a believer and a worshiper of the “Mandala of the Five Supernormal Powers.”

The reputed history of this mandala is given in the second volume of Tao-hsüan’s Chi Shen-chou San-pao kan-t’ung lu. In the Kukku†åråma Monastery, in Magadha, there were five Bodhisattvas who possessed supernormal powers (rddhi). They went to Sukhāvati heaven and there they met Amitābha, requesting him to descend to this sahā world in order to benefit the living beings here. At that time, the Buddha was seated with fifty of his attendant bodhisattvas, each one on his lotus throne. The Buddha then appeared in this world, together with these fifty attendant bodhisattvas, and they manifested themselves on the top of a tree. The five bodhisattvas took the leaves of this tree and drew pictures of this scene on them, and distributed these leaves far and wide.

During the reign of the Han Emperor Ming, a śramaṇa, the nephew of Kaśyapa-mātāṅga, brought a copy of this mandala to China. Tao-hsüan continues that time of the Wei and Chin Dynasties is distant from the time of the Buddha, and the world has entered into the period of the Extinction of the Dharma. For these reasons both scriptures and religious pictures are on the verge of extinction, and this mandala too was almost lost.

During the reign of the Sui Emperor Wen, there was a śramaṇa by the name of Ming-hsien. He obtained a copy of this mandala from the Dharma Master Tao-ch’ang, and Tao-ch’ang in turn told him the circumstances of its composition in India, and of its transmission to China. From the time of Tao-ch’ang onward, copies of this picture spread widely throughout China. The Northern Ch’i Dynasty painter, Ts’ao Chung-ta, was especially good at mixing colors, and he drew facsimilie of this mandala on the walls of monasteries all over the country.
As we have seen from the above, this *mandala* is reputed to trace its origins to the Later Han Dynasty, but this tale is obviously not based on historical fact. Previously we have referred to the second volume of the *Wang-sheng ch’uan*, which was composed by one Chieh-chu, and is now preserved in the library of the Shimpukuji Monastery, Tokyo. This text records that the Indian monk Jinadharma was a firm believer in the Pure Land teachings, and that in India he drew a picture of Amitābha surrounded by twenty-five attendant bodhisattvas. He brought this picture with him to China, and composed a *gāthā* expressing his devotion to the *mandala*. The *gāthā* says, “If you desire the Pure Land, you should make images and pictures. At the moment of your death, they will appear before you, and shall point out the Path to you . . . .”

These twenty-five attendant bodhisattvas perhaps have some relationship with the twenty-five bodhisattvas mentioned in the *Shih wang-sheng O-mi-t‘o Fo-kuo ching*, and since this *mandala* is a picture of Amitābha and his attendants, the figure twenty-five is perhaps also a scribal error for the figure fifty-two. If this is the case, then perhaps it was the Indian master Jinadharma who first brought this *mandala* to China, sometime during the Northern Ch‘i Dynasty (479–502).

According to volume X:4 of the *Yuishiki-ron Dōgaku-shō*, the master Chih-chou of P‘u-yang (present-day P‘u-yang hsiien, Hopei), constructed images of Amitābha, Avalokiteśvara, Mahāsthāmaprāpta, and the fifty-two bodhisattvas within the Hsi-fang Ching-t‘u yuan (the Western Pure Land Chapel). His mind was solely concerned with the Pure Land, and suddenly some miraculous signs appeared to him. According to this account, the representation of these fifty-two bodhisattvas continued to be produced well into the T‘ang Dynasty.

The representation of Amitābha and his fifty-two attendant bodhisattvas was introduced into Japan as well. The volume *Amida* of the *Kakuzen-shō* (*Kakuzen-shō: Amida-no-kan*) gives pictures of these bodhisattvas.

3. Hui-kuang

The scholar-monk Hui-kuang was as famous in his day as was the monk Tao-ch‘ung, the disciple of Bodhiruci. He was counted as the founder of the southern branch of the Ti-lun tradition that centered on the study of the *Daśa-bhūmi* scripture. According to the twenty-first volume of the *Hsü Kao-seng ch‘uan*, Hui-kuang was initially the Monastic Supervisor (*kuo-seng-t‘u*) in the capital city of Loyang. Later he was sent by Imperial Order to Yeh, where he became the Monastic Supervisor for the whole kingdom (*kuo-t‘ung*). During his whole life, he desired rebirth in the Pure Land. However, it is not certain which
Pure Land it was that he was so devoted to (the Sukhāvatī of Amitābha, or the Tusita of Maitreya). His biography does state that when he was about to die, he desired to be reborn in Sukhāvatī.

Fa-shang, the last of the Tao-ch’o’s “Six Pure Land Worthies,” was a disciple of Hui-kuang. According to the eighth volume of the *Hsū Kao-seng ch’uan*, he was as famous in his day as Tao-ch’ang. Throughout his life he worshiped Maitreya, and thus desired to be reborn in Tusita Heaven, dying at the age of eighty-five in 580. According to this, he was not a devotee of the Sukhāvatī Pure Land faith. The reason Tao-ch’o included him among the “Six Pure Land [here: Sukhāvatī] Worthies” was perhaps that the meaning of the term “Pure Land” as employed by Tao-ch’o was the broad meaning of this term. In this usage it would have also included the idea of Tusita Heaven as a Pure Land, on an equal footing with Sukhāvatī.

Furthermore, Hui-kuang’s disciple, the monk Tao-p’ing, was noted for being a devotee of Sukhāvatī and, according to the eighth volume of the *Hsū Kao-seng ch’uan*, at the time of his death saw the light of the Buddha. According to the ninth volume of the *Hsū Kao-seng ch’uan*, Tao-p’ing’s disciple was the monk Ling-yü, who composed three commentaries. One was on the *O-mi-t’o ching* (the *O-mi-t’o ching shu*), one on the *Kuan Wu-liang shou ching* (the *Kuan Wu-Liang-shou ching shu*), and one on the *Upadeśa* of Vasubandhu (the *Wang-sheng lún shu*) in which he elucidated and clarified the Pure Land teachings. Based on this, then, we can clearly see that Pure Land faith and devotion was highly regarded in both the Northern and the Southern branches of the Ti-lun tradition.

It was approximately at this period, too, that the *Ta-ch’eng ch’ih-sin lún* (*The Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*) first came to be noticed in Chinese Buddhist circles. It was traditionally taught that this work was composed in India by Aśvaghosa, and was translated into Chinese by the monk Paramārtha. This work teaches origination from out of the Tathāgata-garbha, and that the absolute (tathatā, chen-ju) constitutes the basis and the support of all the dharmas, a position which tallied with the contemporary teachings of the Southern branch of the Ti-lun tradition.

In volume five of the *Chung-ching mu-lu* (compiled in the Sui Dynasty by the monk Fa-ching), the *Ta-ch’eng ch’ih-sin lún* is listed within the section “Doubtful Works” (*I-huo lu*). The notation indicates that the work does not appear in any list of Paramārtha’s translations, and so the compiler relegated it to the “doubtful” category. Volume ten of the *Ssu-lun hsüan-i* by the T’ang Dynasty monk Hui-chun is preserved in the second volume of Chinkai’s *Sanron-gensho Mongiyō*. Here it states that the masters of the Northern branch of the Ti-lun tradition held that this work was not composed by Aśvaghosa, but that it was forged (i.e., written in China and ascribed to an Indian master) by some master of the Ti-lun tradition.
The Ta-ch’eng ch‘i-hsin lun itself says in one passage at the end of the section “Cultivation and Faith”:

If one desires to cultivate stilling and insight (śamatha and vipaśyanā), and to search out correct faith, because one lives in this Sahā world, it is not possible to ever personally encounter the Buddhas, and to make pūja offerings to them. It is very difficult to generate faith. So, if someone fears regressing, he should with one-pointedness of mind concentrate on the Buddha of the West, Amitābha, and be reborn in his Pure Land, and abide in the number of those truly assured.

This passage borrows heavily from the teaching of the two paths, the difficult and the easy path, attributed to Nāgārjuna. Furthermore, it is also closely related to T’an-luan’s teachings that divide these paths into two: the difficult path is the path of practice in this world, whereas the easy path is the path of rebirth. We can see, then, that many of the masters of the Ti-lun tradition were believers in the Pure Land faith, and, as Hui-chün points out, this work was probably composed by a master of the Southern branch of this Ti-lun tradition.

Another work whose first appearance dates from this period is the two-volume Chan-ts‘a shan-o Yeh-pao ching. The text itself, which is included in the present-day canon of Buddhist scriptures, bears the name of the Indian Tripiṭaka Master Bodhidharma as its translator. Bodhidharma, however, is totally unknown. According to the twelfth volume of the Li-tai San-pao chi, the scholar-monk Fa-ching (the compiler of the Chung-ching mu-lu) was asked to examine this work in 593 in order to determine its authenticity. Fa-ching declared that it was a forgery, and as a result, it was officially prohibited from circulating. Fa-ching, in both the second volume of his Chung-ching mu-lu and the fourth volume of Yen-tsung’s Chung-ching mu-lu, relegates this scripture to the section “Doubtful Works,” so we can confidently say that this work is not the translation of an Indian original.

The last volume of the Yeh-pao ching states that it teaches the “true significance” of the Mahāyāna but, in fact, its teaching in this section is almost identical to the teachings of the Ta-ch’eng ch‘i-hsin lun. Furthermore, the Yeh-pao ching praises the Pure Land teachings in terms that are very close to those used in the Ta-ch’eng ch‘i-hsin lun. The Yeh-pao ching says, towards the end of its last volume, that even if one were to practice adhimokṣa (one’s resolutions, lit: one’s faith and understanding), because his roots of good are still shallow, he will be unable to progress in his spiritual cultivations. However, anyone who fears regressing should meditate on the name of the Buddha and visualize the dharmakāya of the Buddha. Should he thus cultivate the practice of faith, he will be born, in
accordance with his vows, in that Pure Land which is even now in that other direction. There his good roots will grow and increase, and he will be able to speedily attain the state of non-regression.

The monk Jin’go of Silla wrote the *Tamhyŏn-gi Jesam-sagi* (*Private Notes on the Third Volume of the T’an-hsüan chi*), which is in turn quoted in the eighth volume of Kembô’s *Hōsatsu-shō*. There, Jin’go states that the *Ta-ch’eng ch’i-hsin lun* was composed based on another forged text, the *Chien-ch’a ching*. Thus, it would naturally follow that the *Ta-ch’eng ch’i-hsin lun* would be a forgery. The words *chien-ch’a* appear to be a transliteration of the words *chan-ts’a* so it would appear that Jin’go is saying that the *Ta-ch’eng ch’i-hsin lun* was written based on the *Chan-ts’a shan-o Pao-yeh ching*.

Whatever the case may be, it is clear that from the very earliest days, both the *Ta-ch’eng ch’i-hsin lun* and the *Pao-yeh ching* were regarded as similar texts. Now, if we were to assume that the *Ta-ch’eng ch’i-hsin lun* was the composition of one of the masters in the Southern branch of the Ti-lun tradition, then we would be obliged to acknowledge that the *Chan-ts’a shan-o Pao-yeh ching* is from the hand of a master from this same school. These problems have already been discussed in detail in my work, the *Daijō-kishin-ron no kenkyū* (*A Study of the Ta-ch’eng ch’i-hsin lun*). If this above conclusion is accepted, then it is clear that the Pure Land faith came to be viewed with increasing importance among the masters of the Ti-lun tradition.