

*Jōkei sen “Yuishikiron jinshishō” no kenkyū: Butsudō hen* 貞慶撰『唯識論尋思鈔』の研究：仏道篇 (Study of the “Yuishikiron” *Jinshishō* Compiled by Jōkei: Volume on the Buddha Way). By Kusunoki Junshō 楠淳證. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2019. xvi + 735 pages. Hardcover: ISBN 978-4-8318-6377-5.

ROBERT F. RHODES

Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1213), who lived from the end of the Heian 平安 period (794–1185) to the early years of the Kamakura 鎌倉 period (1192–1333), was one of the most renowned monks of the Japanese Hossō 法相 school. Although he is famous as the author of the *Kōfukuji sōjō* 興福寺奏状 (Kōfukuji Petition), calling for the suppression of the *senju nenbutsu* 専修念仏 (exclusive *nenbutsu*) movement of Hōnen (1133–1212), Jōkei was actually an extremely serious Buddhist practitioner who immersed himself in the study of Buddhist doctrines, convinced that the way of scholarship provides an authentic path to buddhahood. In this important study, Kusunoki Junshō focuses on Jōkei’s “*Yuishikiron*” *jinshishō* 唯識論尋思鈔 (Extracts of Investigations into the *Treatise on Consciousness Only*; hereafter, *Jinshishō*), to examine this monk’s complex Buddhist thought.

The *Jinshishō* is a ten-fascicle-long compendium of Hossō doctrinal issues taken up during debates (*rongi* 論議) held in conjunction with Buddhist ceremonies. Doctrinal debates were central to the life of scholar-monks, since appointment to high ecclesiastical positions depended on their ability to excel themselves at these debates. To educate their monks and prepare them for these events, the Japanese Buddhist schools incorporated debates into their own ceremonies. The Hossō school was no different in this regard, and their annual ritual cycle included a number of debate-centered ceremonies. These debates were serious affairs; the participant prepared for them assiduously, and creative new interpretations of Hossō doctrines were frequently proposed and defended during such events.

During the late Heian and early Kamakura periods, many notable collections of Hossō debate topics and their interpretations were compiled. Besides the *Jinshishō*, they included the *Bodai’in shō* 菩提院抄 (Bodai’in Extracts) by Zōshun 藏俊 (1104–1180) and the famous “*Jōyuishikiron*” *dōgakushō* 成唯識論同学鈔 (Extracts for Fellow Students of the *Treatise on the Accomplishment of Consciousness Only*; hereafter, *Dōgakushō*) by Jōkei’s disciple Ryōsan 良算 (d.u.). Just one fascicle of the former work, saved only because it was incorporated into the *Dōgakushō* to replace a lost fascicle, is extant. The *Dōgakushō* is extant and consists of over a thousand topics. It is a monumental compilation of Japanese Hossō doctrines, taking up nearly six hundred pages (sixty-eight fascicles) in the Taishō canon (T no. 2263, 66: 1–595b). In addition to these lengthy compendiums, shorter *tanzaku* 短釈 documents treating individual debate topics were

also composed, nearly two thousand five hundred of which Kusunoki has identified (pp. 54–55).

According to the postscript found at the end of the *Jinshishō*'s first fascicle, Jōkei began plans to compile this work in 1197 but was unable to begin working on it for nearly four years. During these years, however, he discussed the structure and general content of the text with Ryōsan and even had the latter compose the *Manishō* 摩尼抄 (Maṇi Jewel Extracts) in thirty-two fascicles to serve as a draft for the *Jinshishō*. Then, for about fifty days from the end of 1200 to the beginning of the next year, Jōkei debated a number of Hossō doctrines with several of his disciples and on that basis composed a draft of the *Jinshishō* consisting of over seventy topics. Later in the year he made additions to it and finally completed the work in the ninth month of 1201 (pp. 64–65). Despite its importance, however, the text of the *Jinshishō* is presently unpublished and even the most complete manuscripts (those held by the libraries of Minobusan and Otani universities) are both missing fascicles 5 and 9 (pp. 68–69).

Although there can be no question that doctrinal debates served as a major arena for developing and transmitting Buddhist thought in medieval Japan, research into this topic was long neglected by scholars of Japanese Buddhism. Fortunately, the importance of these debates has been recognized in recent years and scholars have gradually begun to analyze them at length. Kusunoki has been at the forefront of this renewed interest in doctrinal debates and this hefty (over seven hundred pages) monograph, the culmination of a lifetime of study dedicated to Hossō debate texts, is a significant contribution to this still nascent field of research.

The volume is divided into three sections. The first section, “Jōkei no butsudōron” 貞慶の仏道論 (Jōkei's Theory of the Buddhist Path), discusses various issues related to this monk's understanding of, and involvement with, Buddhist practice. Along with topics like the reasons behind Jōkei's retirement to the mountain confines of Kasagidera 笠置寺 north of Nara 奈良 in 1193, Kusunoki here provides basic information about Hossō debates, debate texts, and the *Jinshishō*. In this section, Kusunoki also notes that Jōkei wrote a number of liturgical texts called *kōshiki* 講式 addressed to various buddhas, bodhisattvas, *kami* 神, and the Buddha's relics, and notes that the main Buddhist figures worshipped by Jōkei included Amida 阿弥陀, Śākyamuni, Maitreya, and Kannon 觀音. Kusunoki argues that Jōkei first sought birth in Amida's Pure Land but turned to Śākyamuni's Pure Land of Vulture Peak after realizing how difficult it would be for an ordinary being (*bonpu* 凡夫) to attain birth in Amida's exalted realm. At the same time, Jōkei became attracted to Maitreya's Tuṣita Heaven since it too was believed easy to reach for ordinary beings. However, by 1201, Jōkei's devotion gravitated towards Kannon. As Kusunoki notes, this indicates that the land in which Jōkei sought to be reborn changed over the course of his life.

The second section, “Jōkei kyōgaku (rongi) to butsudō” 貞慶教学(論義) と仏道 (Jōkei’s Doctrines [Debate] and the Buddhist Path), constitutes the core of this volume. This section is composed of three chapters of around a hundred pages each and in each chapter Kusunoki discusses in meticulous detail one central issue of Hossō doctrine that was frequently taken up in the debates. The first of these three issues concerns the distinctive Hossō teaching of the five lineages (*goshō* 五姓). It is well known that the Hossō school maintains that all beings are by nature divided into five distinct “lineages” or classes of beings: (1) the *śrāvaka* lineage; (2) the *pratyekabuddha* lineage; (3) the bodhisattva lineage; (4) the indeterminate lineage, or those who possess the potential to attain more than one of the spiritual attainments above; and (5) lineage-less beings or *icchantikas*—beings who forever lack the capacity to escape from the cycle of transmigration. This is in marked contrast to the Tendai 天台, Kegon 華嚴, and Sanron 三論 schools, all of which held to the teaching of the one vehicle that maintains that all beings will attain buddhahood. The question of whether the five lineages or the one vehicle represents the true Buddhist position was bitterly debated by the Hossō monk Tokuitsu 徳一 (d.u.) and the founder of the Japanese Tendai school, Saichō 最澄 (766 [or 767]–822), in the early years of the Heian period. Jōkei was committed to upholding his school’s position, but Kusunoki emphasizes that for Jōkei, this was not just an academic problem: the monk was firmly convinced of the truth of the five lineages teaching and that he himself did indeed belong to the bodhisattva lineage.

After a succinct survey of the scriptural sources for the Hossō position, Kusunoki discusses several topics in the *Jinshishō* related to the doctrine of the five lineages. The first concerns the interpretation of the one vehicle teaching. Here Jōkei argues that if one is attached to either the teaching of one vehicle or the five lineages, seeing them as two different things, they will inevitably be understood as being contradictory to each other. However, Jōkei continues, if they are seen from a higher and more inclusive point of view, which he calls the standpoint of the “uncreated single principle” (*mui no ichiri* 無為の一理, p. 182), there is no contradiction between them.

Another related topic concerns the notion of the *icchantikas* of great compassion (*daihi sendai* 大悲闡提). They refer to bodhisattvas who have vowed never to attain buddhahood until all beings have been ferried over to liberation; since there is no end to the number of such beings, the *icchantikas* of great compassion are forever destined to remain in the realm of transmigration to work for the salvation of others without attaining buddhahood themselves. But Kusunoki explains that the position that these *icchantikas* can never attain buddhahood was contested during the Tang 唐 dynasty (619–907) by Chinese Faxiang (Hossō) scholars (p. 224). Ultimately, this led Jōkei to assert that *icchantikas* of great compassion may be said to both attain and not attain buddhahood, arguing that from the perspective of the gate of wisdom, they can be said to attain buddhahood, but from the perspective of the gate of great compassion, they

can be said not to attain buddhahood (p. 231). At the end of this chapter, Kusunoki also points out that Jōkei emphasized the importance of faith, inasmuch as faith in the Buddhist teachings was taken to be a sign that one was not an *icchāntika*. (The lack of faith in the Buddhist Dharma was considered to be a defining characteristic of an *icchāntika* that can never gain release from the cycle of rebirths.)

The next chapter focuses on the Hossō teaching that it takes three *asaṃkhyā kalpas* to attain buddhahood. The Hossō school holds that the path of bodhisattva practice consists of forty-one stages, consisting of the ten abodes (*jūjū* 十住), ten practices (*jūgyō* 十行), ten merit-transferences (*jūekō* 十回向), ten grounds (*jūji* 十地), and the stage of sublime awakening (*myōgaku* 妙覺). During the first *asaṃkhyā kalpa*, bodhisattvas ascend through the first thirty stages; during the second *asaṃkhyā kalpa*, they progress from the first ground to the seventh ground; and during the third *asaṃkhyā kalpa*, they start from the eighth ground and finally reach the stage of sublime awakening. However, in the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* by Asaṅga (ca. 320–ca. 390), an important Hossō text, there is a line that says, “(One must) vigorously and quickly take refuge in the shores of virtue” (T 1594, 31: 143c). In his comments on this line, Asvabhāva (450–530) asks why the term “quickly” is used here and replies that the length of time can be perceived as long or short depending on one’s mental discrimination. For example, one may experience having lived a long time in a dream but when one awakes, one realizes that only an instant has passed. In the same way, a long period of time can be encompassed in one moment (T 1598, 31: 419a). Since these words can be interpreted to mean that one can attain the fruit of buddhahood in just one moment, it became necessary to reconcile Asvabhāva’s words with the notion that it takes three *asaṃkhyā kalpas* to achieve buddhahood. This topic, known as “*shōzai ichisetsuna*” 撰在一刹那 (“[three *asaṃkhyā kalpas*] are encompassed within one moment”), was often taken up in Hossō debates. Jōkei reconciles these two positions by arguing that, since all dharmas are empty and devoid of self-natures (*jishō* 自性), concepts like “long” and “short” do not contradict each other and are mutually encompassing. This is why Asvabhāva stated that the three *asaṃkhyā kalpas* can be encompassed in one instant, and his words do not necessarily support the position that one can attain buddhahood instantaneously.

Another interesting topic that Kusunoki takes up in this chapter concerns the question as to whether one must study under many different buddhas during the course of one’s practice, or must continue to serve just one buddha until one attains buddhahood. Jōkei maintains that the former position is the correct one, arguing that since it takes bodhisattvas three *asaṃkhyā kalpas* to attain buddhahood, they must inevitably study under multiple buddhas during this extremely long period of time. Although this may seem like an arcane problem, Kusunoki holds that it is actually of great significance, since it is deeply related to Jōkei’s criticism of Hōnen’s exclusive

*nenbutsu* teaching. (As noted above, Jōkei attacked Hōnen's Pure Land movement and had written the *Kōfukuji sōjō* calling for its suppression.) It is well known that Hōnen rejected the need to rely on any other buddha besides Amida to be saved. According to Kusunoki, it was to counter this monk's emphasis on exclusive reliance on Amida that Jōkei adamantly upheld the need to worship many buddhas. As Kusunoki notes, the difference in opinion between the two monks on this matter highlights their conflicting approach to Buddhist practice. Hōnen famously held that anyone can attain birth in Amida's Pure Land just by reciting the *nenbutsu*. Since in Hōnen's view, Amida's Pure Land is a recompense land (*hōdo* 報土) that lies beyond the world of transmigration, this means that anyone, even someone who has not engaged in any Buddhist practice, can transcend the cycle of transmigration all at once by the simple act of reciting the *nenbutsu*. Such a view is, of course, totally incompatible with the Hossō position that three *asamkhyā kalpas* of rigorous practice is required to reach buddhahood. From Jōkei's perspective, because Hōnen's teaching downplays the importance of practice, it would bring about the demise of the Buddhist Dharma in Japan if left unchecked. It was for this reason that Jōkei was impelled to oppose Hōnen's *nenbutsu* movement.

The next chapter takes up Jōkei's interpretation of the Pure Land. Although his understanding of the pure lands of Śākyamuni, Maitreya, and Kannon are also analyzed in this chapter, the main focus is on Amida's Pure Land. According to the Hossō school, Amida's Pure Land is a recompense land that can only be perceived by bodhisattvas who have ascended to the ten grounds. In other words, this Pure Land is accessible only to extremely advanced bodhisattvas who have undertaken Buddhist practices for a long time. This naturally implies that ordinary beings still mired in delusion are incapable of being born in the Pure Land. In Hossō thought, the only kind of buddha land in which such beings can be reborn is a transformed land (*kedo* 化土), a less exalted type of buddha land. Jōkei, however, felt this was problematic since he was convinced that Amida created his Pure Land specifically as a place where such ordinary, delusion-ridden beings could be reborn and thus saved. If Amida's land was a recompense land, Jōkei reasoned, ordinary deluded beings like himself would not be able to be born there and this contradicts Amida's vow to save all beings. Jōkei's solution was to argue that Amida's Pure Land is both a recompense land and a transformed land, since these lands are ultimately one in their substance.

At the end of this chapter, Kusunoki discusses Jōkei's understanding of how one should mentally compose oneself when faced with death. This was an important issue since the right state of mind at the moment of death was believed to determine where one would be reborn in the next lifetime. Based on the major Hossō treatise *Yogācārabhūmi*, Jōkei first argues that one enters the state between rebirths (*antarābhava*) after one dies due to one's attachment to oneself (*jitai ai* 自体愛); simi-

larly, one is reborn in a new body after one's period in the state between rebirths is over due to attachment to things around oneself (*kyōgai ai* 境界愛, p. 450). However, he further states that by maintaining the correct state of mind at the moment of death, one can create wholesome karma and, assisted by the power of the Three Treasures, be reborn in a buddha realm (pp. 454–55).

Finally, in the last section of the volume entitled “*Yuishikiron' jinshishō no honkoku dokkai kenkyū*” 『唯識論尋思鈔』の翻刻読解研究 (Transcription and Reading of the “*Yuishikiron' Jinshishō*”), Kusunoki provides transcriptions, along with running commentaries, of four topics taken from the *Jinshishō*: (1) “*shōzai issetsuna*” related to the Hossō argument that it takes three *asaṃkhyā kalpas* to attain buddhahood; (2) “*ichibutsu keizoku*” 一仏繫属 ([Being in] the Retinue of One Buddha) concerning the question of whether one may or may not study under one buddha during the three *asaṃkhyā kalpas* it takes to attain buddhahood; (3) “*henge chōji jōdo umu*” 変化長時浄土有無 (The Existence or Nonexistence of the Pure Land Transformed for a Long Period of Time) concerning the nature of the Pure Land; and (4) “*myōjū shin'yō*” 命終心用 (Points to Keep in Mind at Death) on the proper state of mind of a person facing death.

In conclusion, it may be said that Kusunoki's monograph, the first sustained analysis of Hossō doctrinal debates, is a groundbreaking study that opens up a whole new field of research in Japanese Buddhism. At several places in the volume, Kusunoki announces that a sequel volume, to be entitled *Jōkei sen “Yuishikiron' jinshishō” no kenkyū: Kyōri hen* 貞慶撰『唯識論尋思鈔』の研究：教理篇 (Study of the “*Yuishikiron' Jinshishō*” Compiled by Jōkei: Volume on Doctrine), is being prepared for publication. Everyone interested in the development of Japanese Buddhist thought will look forward with anticipation to this volume as well.

*Shinra Myōjin and Buddhist Networks of the East Asian “Mediterranean.”* By Sujung Kim. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2020. xi + 180 pages. Hardcover: ISBN 978-0-8248-7799-6.

ANNA ANDREEVA

The study of medieval Japanese religions and Buddhism continues to yield new discoveries. If one were to seek complexity, vast terrains of imagination, and occasional (or more likely, continuously present) bursts of frustration, it is a field that never fails to disappoint. All of these aspects stem from the fact that medieval Japan's religiosity has survived to our times in forms and representations that can rarely be accessed or