
Review

Reviewed Work(s): *The Origins and Development of Pure Land Buddhism: A Study and Translation of Gyōnen's Jōdo Hōmon Genrushō* by Mark L. Blum

Review by: Jérôme Ducor

Source: *The Journal of Japanese Studies*, Summer, 2003, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Summer, 2003), pp. 393-397

Published by: The Society for Japanese Studies

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25064416>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Japanese Studies*

JSTOR

explained. And while the wide range of topics appealed to this reader, there are by the same token a number of issues that may seem only marginally relevant to Ryōgen or even his times at best. Still, these tendencies should not be allowed to distract from the significant contributions of Groner's study, which also includes an extensive section with eight appendices that are useful for both research and teaching. The complete translations of a record of the Ōwa Debates (963), Ryōgen's will, and his 26 stipulations are particularly reflective of monastic and courtier life in the late tenth century. They are also noteworthy inclusions since they are quoted almost verbatim from the dissertation of Eishō Nasu in a rare but laudable effort of cooperation between two scholars.⁶ It is perhaps this inclusiveness that best characterizes *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei* in general. It goes well beyond the confines of a traditional biography and might therefore more appropriately be described as a work about the political and ideological framework within which aristocrats and educated monks of the tenth century lived and interacted in the Kyoto area.

The Origins and Development of Pure Land Buddhism: A Study and Translation of Gyōnen's Jōdo Hōmon Genrushō. By Mark L. Blum. Oxford University Press, New York, 2002. xxi, 470 pages. \$55.00.

Reviewed by
JÉRÔME DUCOR
Lausanne University/Ethnographic Museum of Geneva

This book is to be welcomed as a tremendous contribution to our knowledge of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism. Sino-Japanese Buddhism and especially Pure Land Buddhism have been neglected during the first century of Buddhist studies in the West.¹ Blum's translation of Gyōnen provides an essential survey of Pure Land transmission before Hōnen and immediately following his death. A monk belonging to the Kegon school, Gyōnen (1240–1321) was not only one of the most outstanding scholars of his time but also an unusually eclectic character. He is credited with over 180 works in 1,200 fascicles, most of them devoted to Kegon, Vinaya, and Buddhist history.² Still, Gyōnen's most famous work is his first and rather short monograph, the "Essentials of the Eight Schools" (*Hasshū kōyō*), written in 1268: this be-

6. Eishō Nasu, "Doctrine and Institution in Japanese Tendai Buddhism: A Study of Jie Daishi Ryōgen (912–985)" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1996).

1. For recent bibliographic data, see www.pitaka.ch/genchi.htm and www.pitaka.ch/shin-bib.htm.

2. Some 48 works in 150 fascicles are extant today according to the original list provided by Blum, pp. 389–94.

came a kind of normative definition of Japanese Buddhism during the Meiji era (p. 102). Amazingly enough, this book was translated into French as early as 1892 by a whimsical Swiss figure, Alfred Millioud, and more recently into English by the late Leo Pruden.³

The complete works of Gyōnen included 23 writings on the Pure Land, of which the *Genrushō*, written in 1311, is the only one to have survived. This text lists almost all the Pure Land masters from India to Japan and their works, not only from Shandao's tradition (*Zendō-ryū*) inherited by Hōnen, but also from the various other trends. Together with the *Chōsai-roku* catalogue by Kakumyō-bō Chōsai, Hōnen's disciple and Gyōnen's teacher, the *Genrushō* constitutes nothing less than the most valuable record on the sources of Sino-Japanese Pure Land Buddhism. In some instances, it is even the sole locus for quotations of otherwise lost works (p. 215).

Besides the translation itself, Blum provides a long introduction on "Gyōnen and Kamakura Pure Land Buddhism" and offers interesting perspectives. One is Gyōnen's effort to construct his own Pure Land transmission. As a scholar of the Kegon school and abbot of the Kaidan'in of the Vinaya school (Risshū), Gyōnen belonged to the so-called "Ancient Buddhism of Kamakura" (*Kamakura kyū-bukkyō*), that is, to those Buddhist schools prior to the Kamakura period that were revived during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As such, Gyōnen was uneasy about the claim by Hōnen that his lineage was drawn from Shandao (613–81), as this did not entail a face-to-face historical transmission.

Shrewdly enough, Gyōnen then advocates a parallel lineage going back to the Chinese master Lingzhi Yuanzhao (J. Reishi Ganjō, 1048–1116). An eclectic scholar related to both the Vinaya and Tiantai schools, Yuanzhao also adhered to the Pure Land teaching.⁴ His uninterrupted lineage was eventually introduced to Japan by Shunjō (1166–1227), who traveled in China from 1199 to 1211 and later founded the Sennyūji temple in Kyoto.⁵

3. Alfred Millioud (1864–1929), "Esquisse des huit sectes bouddhistes du Japon par Gyau-nen," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 13e année (Paris, 1892), tome XXV, pp. 219–43, 337–60; XXVI, pp. 201–19, 279–315; Leo Pruden, *The Essentials of the Eight Traditions*, BDK English Tripitaka, 107-I (Berkeley: Numata Center, 1994), previously published in *The Pacific World*, New Series, No. 7–9 (Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies, 1991–93). Pruden also translated Gyōnen's *Risshū kōyō: The Essentials of the Vinaya Tradition*, BDK English Tripitaka, 97-I (Berkeley: Numata Center, 1995).

4. Yuanzhao was converted to Pure Land after reading Zhiyi's *Jingtu shiyi lun* and Shandao's *Wangsheng lizhan jie*. See Zongxiao's *Lebang wenlei (Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō)* [Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35], Vol. 47, text no. 1969, p. 170ab).

5. Yuanzhao is counted as the fifteenth patriarch in the succession of the Daoxuan (J. Dōsen) Vinaya School. His transmission down to Shunjō is as follows: Yuanzhao, Daobiao (J. Dōhyō), seventeenth patr. Zhunyi (Jun'ichi), eighteenth patr. Fazheng (Hosshō), nineteenth patr. Fajiu (Hōkyū), Liaohong (Ryōkō) and Shunjō, who met Liaohong in 1201. Cf. Gyōnen's *Risshū kōyō*, Vol. 2 (*Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō*, Vol. 74, pp. 17a13–28, 20b16–17); Pruden, *Risshū kōyō*, pp. 120–21, 139. See Shunjō's biography: *Sennyūji Fukaki hosshi den* by Shinzui

This transmission was further strengthened by Shunjō's disciple Chikyō (n.d.), who left for China in 1238 and later became the abbot of Sennyūji.⁶ Gyōnen defines the Chinese Pure Land lineage in his "Development of the Transmission of Buddhism through the Three Countries" (*Sangoku buppō denzū engi*, Vol. 1), in which he describes three periods: first, "upper antiquity" (*jōko*), represented by Huiyuan of Lushan; second, "middle antiquity" (*chūko*), which covers Shandao's tradition; and third, a "later time" (*godai*), in which he mentions Zunshi and Yuanzhao, the latter receiving this final comment: "In the Empire, all the Pure Land teachings were resumed into his interpretation and were made uniform through his manners and doctrine." Then Gyōnen proceeds to explain how Yuanzhao's teaching was conveyed to Japan. The related passage is quoted by Blum (pp. 111–12), but I would revise it as follows:

Dharma master Shunjō Fukaki of Sennyūji entered the Song [China] to study the Dharma. He received mainly [*shō*] the Tendai teaching and the Vinaya School, and secondarily [*ken*] received the Pure Land Teaching of Lingzhi [Yuanzhao]. This is the structure [*kibo*] of the continuous transmission [*sōden*] of the Pure Land teaching.

Later master of this temple [Sennyūji], Venerable Chikyō entered the Song to receive the Vinaya while also learning the Pure Land teaching. He eventually returned to his temple of origin and spread brilliantly what he had studied. Thus as far as the transmission of the Pure Land teaching is concerned, the Sennyūji is the source [*hon*]; however, everything that has been disseminated in Japan adopts Shandao [because of Hōnen and his disciples]. Originally Master Chikyō had also studied Shandao,⁷ so that [his teaching] either combined both [Yuanzhao and Shandao] or emphasized [one of] them according to his opinion.

Thereafter both Master Shiin [disciple of Shunjō] and Master Kakua [disciple of Chikyō]⁸ combined the two ways [*ni-zu*] of Shandao and Yuanzhao together with the two methods [*ryō-mon*]⁸—that is, the secondary one [*ken*] [Pure Land Teaching] and the main one [*shō*] [Tendai and Vinaya]—according to their opinions.

The *Genrushō*'s section on China also classifies Yuanzhao as belonging to the "later time" (*godai*), with the comment that he became the standard

(*Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho*, new ed. [Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1969–73], Vol. 72, p. 52a). Charlotte Von Versucher, "Le moine Shunjō: sa jeunesse et son voyage en Chine," *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*, Vol. 88 (2001), pp. 161–89.

6. See Gyōnen's *Risshū kōyō*, Vol. 2 (*Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō*, Vol. 74, pp. 20c1–2); Pruden, *Risshū kōyō*, p. 140.

7. Chikyō had been a close friend of Hōnen's disciple Shōkū (1177–1247), according to the former's biography in the *Honchō kōsō den*, Vol. 58 (*Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho*, new ed., Vol. 63, p. 339c).

8. On Shiin and Kakua, see Gyōnen's *Risshū kōyō*, Vol. 2 (*Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō*, Vol. 74, pp. 20c5–18); Pruden, *Risshū kōyō*, pp. 140–41.

(*kiku*) of Pure Land teaching in China. Moreover, Gyōnen mentions also 18 Chinese and Korean authors who commented on Pure Land scriptures although they were not considered patriarchs as such (pp. 190–95). Gyōnen's definition of the number of patriarchs in China is translated by Blum as follows: "Although there may be thirty patriarchs [within the Pure Land Tradition] with which people are usually concerned [today], if we were to make a selection among them we should focus on just nine patriarchs" (p. 195). It should read: "Although the common use is to refer to five or six patriarchs,⁹ if one resorts to eclecticism [*setchū*] one should refer to nine patriarchs."

The nine patriarchs defined by Gyōnen are Bodhiruci, Tanluan, Daochuo, Qiacai, Shandao, Huaigan, Fazhao, Shaokang, and Yuanzhao, a list quite different from the tradition advocated by Hōnen. But the Yuanzhao-Sennyūji transmission allows Gyōnen to consider himself an heir to this uninterrupted Pure Land lineage because Shunjō's transmission had been carried over to him by Hōnen's disciple Chōsai (pp. 58–59, 373–75). In his comments on "Gyōnen's Pure Land Beliefs," Blum notes the influence of Yuanzhao (p. 376) whose teaching he described earlier as "idealistic Pure Land" (*yuishin Jōdo*) (p. 189, note 28). Such a doctrine had been strongly rejected by the Shandao tradition inherited by Hōnen. However, it did form part of the teaching that Shunjō conveyed during his final illness to the ex-regent Kujō Michiie.¹⁰ Once again, this idealistic interpretation can be traced back in Gyōnen's subcommentary to the "Commentary on the Vimalakīrti-Sūtra," attributed to Shōtoku Taishi.¹¹

The *Genrushō* also divided the history of Japanese Pure Land into three periods including six patriarchs: "ancient times" (*shaku*) with Chikō, Chōkai, and Genshin; "middle antiquity" (*chūko*) with Yōkan and Jippan; and "recent times" (*kindai*) with Hōnen who "established the Pure Land School." Gyōnen then explains in detail the lineages and doctrines of Hōnen's six main disciples: Kōsai, Ryūkan, Shōkū, Shōkō, Gyōkū, and Chōsai, together with their own disciples and subdisciples, amounting to more than 70 masters (pp. 211–86). These six chapters constitute half the text of the *Genrushō*. Gyōnen then adds a chapter covering four masters outside Hōnen's direct lineage: Jūshin, Ryōhen, Shinkū, and Goa (pp. 286–91).

9. In his *Senchakushū* (Vol. 1) Hōnen defines three traditions of the Chinese Pure Land: Huiyuan, Cimin, and Daochuo-Shandao. For the last tradition, he offers two explanations: one by Daochuo and one by himself which includes six patriarchs: Bodhiruci, Tanluan, Daochuo, Shandao, Huaigan, and Shaokang. Eventually, Hōnen dropped Bodhiruci to keep only the five Chinese patriarchs. See my "Shandao et Hōnen, à propos du livre de Julian F. Pas 'Visions of Sukhāvati,'" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (1999), p. 145.

10. See Shunjō's biography: *Sennyūji Fukaki hosshi den (Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho, new ed., Vol. 72, p. 56c)*.

11. Gyōnen, *Yuimagyō-sho anraki*, Vol. 10 (*Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho, new ed., Vol. 13, pp. 115c, 116b*).

Surprisingly, Gyōnen concludes by adding his own main master Enshō, although his ties with Pure Land teachings are unclear (p. 291).

Blum's work is what it should be. All the Pure Land teachers and their works he mentions are provided with bio-bibliographical references to original sources. Had Blum also provided the related translations and studies published in Western languages, his book would be an almost exhaustive encyclopedia of Pure Land Buddhism. "Almost" because Gyōnen ignored, for reasons unknown, certain famous figures such as Shinran, Seikaku, and Ippen (pp. 40–45). We should be grateful to Blum that numerous footnotes are given at the bottom of the page and that *kanji* are included in the text itself. Some carelessness has occurred during the editing of the work: a few names and titles are missing from the index, such as Seikaku and *Hasshū kōyō*. Occasional words have been omitted, for example, "one commentary each on the and the *Kuan-ching*" (p. 193, note 43). Mention should be made besides that Ryōe did not complete the *Kurodani Shōnin gotōroku* in 1198 (p. 203, note 19) but in 1275, and this was not the first attempt to compile and edit Hōnen's writings (p. 36, note 21): Shinran had already completed a similar collection in 1257, the *Saihō shinan shō*.¹² The reference related to the introduction of Shandao's *Kuan-ching shu* in Japan is not *Shinran Shōnin kechimyaku monjū* (p. 206, note 27), but *Shinshū kechimyaku denrai-shō*, attributed to Zonkaku.¹³

Finally, some comments should be subject to caution, such as when Blum asserts that for Shinran "practice is a prerequisite to true faith" (p. 250, note 18). Also, while Gyōnen was the first Japanese historian of Buddhism, one may wonder whether he was really "the first proper Buddhist historian in Japan" (p. ix) in comparison to Jien (1155–1225) and his *Gukan-shō*. Blum almost never refers to Western sources other than those in English, while contributions such as Paul Demiéville's "Sur la pensée unique" and Henri de Lubac's *Amida* would have been worthy of mention.¹⁴

Nevertheless, Blum's work is definitely a must for those concerned with a scholarly approach to both Pure Land teaching and Far Eastern Buddhism.

12. *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō*, Vol. 83, text no. 2674.

13. *Shinshū shōgyō zensho* (Kyoto: Oyagi Kōbundō, 1972), Vol. 5, p. 124.

14. Paul Demiéville, "Sur la pensée unique," *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*, Vol. XXIV (1924), pp. 231–46; Henri de Lubac, *Amida: Aspects du Bouddhisme*, Vol. II (Paris: Seuil, 1955). A new edition is to be published in 2003 as de Lubac's *Œuvres complètes*, t. XXI (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).