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Abstract

In 1978 with the publication of the Letters of Shinran: A translation of the Mattôshô, translators working at the Hongwanji International Center sparked a debate that continues at present regarding the translation or transliteration of the term shinjin. That this debate continues into the present day is not surprising when we consider that shinjin is the cornerstone of Shin Buddhist paths of awakening. This paper begins by analyzing shinjin within Shinran’s writings and the Shin Buddhist tradition. Second, it examines arguments for and against either the transliteration or translation of shinjin. This paper then concludes by arguing that depending on context it is necessary to employ both strategies in order to properly communicate Shin Buddhism in English.
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Introduction

In 1978 with the publication of the *Letters of Shinran: A translation of the Mattōshō*, the Hongwanji International Center sparked a debate that continues at present regarding the translation or transliteration of the term shinjin (信心). At that time the translation committee decided to transliterate rather than translate shinjin as faith which a number of previous translators of Shinran’s works had done. The International Center’s policy of transliteration continued until 2000 with the publication of the *Letters of Rennyo: A Translation of Rennyo’s Gobunshō* in which the phrase “entrusting heart” was introduced as a translation for shinjin. The translation committee did not explain this change until 2005 with the publication of the second edition of *A Record in Lament of Divergences: A Translation of the Tannishō*. In this paper I first examine what shinjin means both in the context of Shinran’s religious thought and the Shin Buddhist or Jodo Shin-shu tradition. The second part of this paper examines the arguments for the differing translations of shinjin. Finally, this paper concludes by examining how the various approaches can all be of use when presenting Jodo Shin-shu in English.

Before exploring the meaning of shinjin in Shinran’s writing, we must first pause to note that the shinjin Shinran describes is different from how shinjin is understood in contemporary Japanese. In its contemporary usage, shinjin is used to describe a sense of religious faith, belief, and/or devotion or even a sense of piety.

Shinjin as Presented in Shinran’s Writings

Shinran, like his teacher Hōnen (1133–1212) based his understanding of shinjin on the concept of the threefold mind (sanshin 三心) discussed in the *Sutra on the Meditation of the Buddha of Immeasurable Life* (Jpn. *Kammuryōju kyo* Chn. *Guān wúliángshòu jīng* 觀無量壽經) and explained by Shandao (Jpn. Zendo 613–681) as being necessary for birth in the Pure Land in his *Commentary on the Sutra on the Meditation of the Buddha of Immeasurable Life* (Jpn. *Kammuryōju kyo sho* Chn. *Guān wúliángshòu jīng shu* 觀無量壽經疏). The extent to which Shandao’s writings influenced Shinran can be found in one of the *Hymn’s of the Pure Land Masters* (kōsō wasan 高僧和讚), where Shinran states that Shandao’s teachings “fulfilled the Buddha’s fundamental intent.”

The three minds identified by Shandao include the sincere mind (shishin 至心), mind of deep faith (shingyō 信心), and the mind of aspiration for birth in the Pure Land (yokushō gakoku 欲生我國). Shinran in Chapter 3 of *The True Teaching, Practice, and Realization of the Pure Land Way* (*Ken jōdo shinjitsu kyōgyōshō monrui* 頂浄土真実教行証文類) quotes Shandao’s explication of the three minds and great length, before offering his own view “that
the three minds should be taken as one and that this mind one is the mind mentioned in Amida Buddha’s “Primal Vow” (hongan). Shinran goes even further to explain that Amida Buddha gives this mind to sentient beings. Shinran writes:

reflecting on this [threefold] mind for myself alone; I find that all beings, an ocean of multitudes, have since the beginningless past down to this day, this very moment, been evil and defiled, completely lacking the mind of purity. They have been false and deceitful, completely lacking the mind of truth and reality. Thus, when the Tathāgata, in profound compassion for the ocean of all sentient beings in pain and affliction, performed bodhisattva practice for inconceivable millions of measureless kalpas there was not a moment, not an instant, when his practice in the three modes of action was not pure, or lacked this true mind. With this pure, true mind, the Tathāgata brought to fulfillment the perfect, unhindered, inconceivable, indescribable, and inexplicable supreme virtues. The Tathāgata gives this sincere mind to all living things, an ocean of beings possessed of blind passions, karmic evil, and false wisdom. This mind manifests the true mind of benefiting others. For this reason, it is completely untainted by the hindrance of doubt. This sincere mind takes as its essence the revered Name of supreme virtues.

Shinran begins this quote by stating his view that sentient beings existence is characterized by their vile selfish nature. Thus, sentient beings cannot undertake the bodhisattva vows necessary to save themselves, nor for that matter others. Shinjin thus represents a transformational moment when Amida Buddha’s mind is given to practicers of the Pure Land Buddhist path. Based on the above quote we can understand shinjin as the transformative experience when that which is pure and good becomes one with that which is vile, evil, and impure. This union is transformative in that which is vile and evil is turned into that which is pure and good.

Through this transformative experience one experiences what it means to know that birth in the Pure Land is assured and is therefore free from doubt—even if only for one moment. This does not mean however that the Pure Land practicer is now free from the delusions that characterize sentient beings existence. Rather, the transformative experience of shinjin ensures that one’s birth in the Pure Land and subsequent enlightenment (Buddhahood) is assured. Thus Shinran explains that those who have realized shinjin are equal to the Tathāgata-s (shobutsu to hitoshi). Shinjin is not the final goal of the Shin Buddhist path, but rather the goal of this worldly existence. Finally, shinjin is simultaneously the means by which sentient beings are saved and the assured of salvation; in spite of the fact that the Pure Land practicer remains evil and defiled.
Shinjin in Tradition of Jōdo Shin-shū

While Shinran is revered as the founder of the Jōdo Shin-shū school(s) of Buddhism, it is Rennyo 蓮如 (1415–1499), the eighth head priest of the Hongwanji, who is responsible for transforming Jōdo Shin-shū into one of—if not the—largest and most influential Buddhist traditions in Japan. James Dobbins, explaining Rennyo’s role in the spread of Shin Buddhism states, “[w]ithout him it is questionable whether Shinran’s religious message would ever have become the widespread and enduring creed that it has.” The key to Shin Buddhism’s growth during Rennyo’s tenure is found in Rennyo’s ability “to render Shinran’s doctrinal abstractions into simple religious formulas accessible to the humblest believer and to explain them in the context of daily devotional practices.” Some of the devotional practices instituted by Rennyo include chanting the Hymn of True Shinjin (Shōshinge 正信偈) and other hymns composed by Shinran, as well as yearly observances of Shinran’s memorial (hōonkō 報恩講). Practices that still continue at present.

We noted above that it was under Rennyo that Shin Buddhism began to spread and that it was under his care that the Hongwanji became a powerful institution. The key to Rennyo’s successful propagation of Shin Buddhism was Rennyo’s letters. There are currently 266 letters in existence, written over a span of thirty-seven years, eighty letters of which were compiled into five fascicles by Ennyo, one of Rennyo’s grandsons. Later this five-fascicle collection was distributed to lay Shin Buddhists, who ideally would read them as part of a daily devotion. The lasting significance of Rennyo’s letters can be seen in that they often read, as scripture, at Shin Buddhist services today.

Rennyo’s life goal, according to many commentators, was to disseminate the essence of Shinran’s teaching in a manner that could be understood by all. In doing so, Rennyo modified Shinran’s teachings. One of the most noticeable differences is that Rennyo very rarely uses shinjin, but rather uses anjin (案心) to describe the transformational experience of Shin Buddhism. Scholars involved in sectarian Shin Buddhist studies, according to Rogers and Rogers, have considered anjin as being homogeneous with shinjin; whilst scholars working outside of the tradition have tended to see these two terms as different, given the political, economic, and psychological conditions of Rennyo’s time. So that we may more fully understand the transformational experience of shinjin/anjin, we now turn our attention to Rennyo’s letters and his explication of Shin Buddhist paths of awakening.

Rennyo explains his interpretation of shinjin as anjin as follows:

Shinjin is [a matter of] clearly discerning the significance of Amida Buddha’s Primal Vow and single-heartedly taking refuge in Amida; this we call decisive settlement of anjin. Therefore full realization of the significance of the six characters “na-mu-a-mi-da-butsu”
[南無阿弥陀仏] is the substance of decisively settled faith. That is, the two characters “na-mu” indicate the receptive attitude of sentient beings who entrust themselves to Amida Buddha. Next, the four characters “a-mi-da-butsu” signify the dharma through which Amida Tathāgata saves sentient beings. This is expressed as ‘the oneness in namu-amida-butsu’ of the person and dharma [ki-hō ittai no namu-amida-butsu 機法一体の南無阿弥陀仏]. Thus the three acts of sentient beings and the three acts of Amida Buddha become one. Referring to this Master Shandao wrote in his commentary: “The three acts of the Buddha and of sentient beings are inseparable.”

In this quote Rennyo, not only redefines shinjin as anjin, but also introduces the concept of the oneness of the religious practitioner and the dharma. Regarding the former, we can see that anjin has a more emotional aspect to it then shinjin did in Shinran’s writings. In Shinran’s thought, shinjin represents the mind of Amida Buddha given to religious practitioners, so that they can accept without doubt Amida Buddha’s salvific action. Anjin speaks to the idea that ones faith is settled and that ones mind should be at ease. On this point Dobbins explains, “Anjin, meaning literally ‘a mind at peace,’ conveys better the sense of tranquility and assurance that emerges from faith than does shinjin, meaning simply ‘a mind of faith.’”

That anjin would have better conveyed a sense of tranquility and assurance than shinjin may also have aided in the growth of the Shin Buddhist community, given the dire situation Rennyo and the whole of Japan faced. Kakehashi vividly describes the situation in 1461 when Rennyo wrote his first letter:

Bodies of those who had died of starvation were piled on each other in the main thorough-fares of Kyoto, and over 82,000 corpses were dumped into the Kamo River. The waters of the Kamo River were clogged with bodies and Kyoto was filled with the stench of death.

Given this situation, one can see how Rennyo’s use of anjin may have aided in the rapid spread of Shin Buddhism that occurred during Rennyo’s life. The hope that tranquility would be possible may have provided some relief from the constant reminders of suffering and death.

Rennyo’s reformulation of the Shin Buddhist path, was not only influential in forming both Shin Buddhist teachings but also Shin Buddhism as an institution. As regards shinjin and anjin we have seen that Rennyo transformed Shinran’s teaching to one that appeals more directly to ones emotional state. As a result of anjin the practitioner is put into a state of unity with the dharma. It is these two similar, yet different streams of thought that have been influential in forming how the Shin Buddhist tradition conceives of the dynamics of the relationship between religious practitioners and Amida Buddha. In order to probe how this
relationship has been conceptualized within the tradition, we now turn our attention to the issue of how to best present the transformative of experience of shinjin/anjin in English.

**Presenting Shin Buddhism in English**

As noted at the outset of this paper, for the last thirty years scholars, practitioners, and others have been engaged in a debate how to best communicate shinjin/anjin in English. Translators and reviewers have had pages and pages of debates regarding issues of translation and transliteration. In the paragraphs that follow, I seek to review some of these debates and then offer my own thoughts on the issue. The purpose of this section is not to suggest the definitive way to communicate Shin Buddhism in English, but rather to explore various methods and their successes and failures. Doing so, not only provides insight into the process of how Shin Buddhism has been introduced to English speakers, but also helps us to understand the broader issues of expressing religious experiences cross-culturally.

Before examining the specific project of presenting Shin Buddhism in English, it is necessary to reflect on general issues in the translation of religious texts. Paul L. Swanson, director of the Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture and translator of *The Great Cessation-and-Contemplation* (Jpn. *Maka shikan*, Chn. *Móh zhīguàn* 摩 止 観) offers two rules for translating words and ideas from one language to another: (1) “there is no one-to-one correspondence between words of different languages;” and (2) “there is never only one correct translation.” 25 Regarding the first, issue Swanson notes that each individual word has a connotation that is found outside of dictionaries. Swanson explains that given this we need to avoid rigidly insisting that each word match another word in the name of consistency in translation. On the second point, Swanson notes that given the nuances we find in religious discourse it is possible “that different translation could all be ‘right’ in different ways.” 26 With these two rules in mind, we can now turn our attention to various presentations of Shin Buddhism in English.

Before 1978, most translations of Shinran and Rennyo’s works used the word “faith” to intelligibly render shinjin/anjin in English. However, these texts were heavily annotated in order to differentiate faith as understood in the context of Jodo Shin-shu from that found in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Realizing this situation was less than ideal for the general reader, the Shin Buddhist translation committee decided to transliterate shinjin. In the glossary to *The Letters of Shinran*, the editors explain their decision:

Shinjin has commonly been translated as “faith,” but we have felt that the term, so strongly variously colored by its usage in the Judeo-Christian tradition, would only blur the precision of the meaning of the original. 27
In order to support their claim that faith is an often misunderstood term, the committee then offers a quote from Paul Tillich where Tillich explains that misunderstandings of faith are quite common in English. Thomas Kasulis in his review of this early work, supports the decision to transliterate shinjin as it may help to deemphasize “the theistic appearance of Shinshū doctrine.” The logic expressed by the translation committee and supported by Kasulis among others, is that given the multiple meanings of the word faith, combined with Shinran’s careful attention to detail in explaining shinjin it would be better to take transliterate shinjin. Readers would be forced to discover what the terms means through their own course of study rather then relying on their own understandings of faith.

Luis O. Gomez, however disagreed with this decision, reviewing a later work by the translation committee, he writes:

It is true, and certainly quite obvious, that shinjin does not simply mean ‘faith;’ it is the ‘believing mind’ or the ‘mind of faith.’ But it seems to me that shinjin is an instance of the general concept of faith, and that Shin Buddhism stands to gain in clarity of exposition if the fact is accepted broadly and explicitly. One need not fear such an acceptance will blur the distinction that should be made between Shinshū and Protestant notions of faith. For faith can operate in more than one conceptual and experiential context. No religious tradition has an exclusive claim on the concept and definition.

Gomez goes on, to argue that the translators had taken Shinran’s voice away by not allowing the reader to grapple with the meaning of faith in his writings. Further, Gomez takes the committee to task for “mystifying” Shinran’s writings. From the perspective of this paper, Gomez’s concerns are valid in that Shinran, with the exception of his works in Chinese, was often trying to explain his religious thought to people with little or no education. We have already seen that Shinran, used shinjin to explain the doctrine of the threefold mind. If I understand Gomez correctly, he seems to be arguing that the translation committee could have used faith in a similar manner.

In the thirty years that have passed since the initial decision to transliterate shinjin was taken, a number of English works have been published which probe Shin Buddhist doctrine and history as well as a number of works, which reflect on the meaning of Shin Buddhism at present. In exploring how to best communicate shinjin to speakers of English it is telling to note that even in works written by members of the translation committee, one often finds that shinjin is explained in English using the word faith. As a result, we are left to wonder if readers are thus equating shinjin with faith, in spite of the translation committee’s efforts.

In 2000 as noted in the introduction the translation committee’s policy changed, when the translation committee made the decision to translate shinjin as entrusting heart, a decision not
explained until 2005. The committee explains:

In Japanese, *shinjin* is widely used to indicate religious piety in general, but in Shinran’s teaching, it has a specific meaning that makes it difficult to render into English. For if we were to translate it as “faith” or “belief” this would lead to a serious misunderstanding of what Shinran intended. A key element in Shinran’s usage is that *shinjin* is Amida’s true heart bestowed on the practicer. . . . Such an awakening frees oneself of all self-centered calculation in seeking to attain birth in the Pure Land and naturally leads one to totally entrust oneself to Amida’s saving work.  

In this explanation, we see that not only has the committee decided to translate *shinjin* but also that rather than explaining it as being Amida’s mind given to the practitioner, they now use heart. Which may introduce a more emotional sense into understandings of the Shin Buddhist path that are usually characterized as being found more in Rennyo’s thought, due to his use of *anjin*, as explained above.

**Conclusions**

And so, we find ourselves over thirty years after the initial efforts of the translation committee still trying to find a way to explain Shinjin in English. Do we translate *shinjin* as faith, entrusting heart (mind), or simply transliterate *shinjin*? As someone who has learned a great deal from all the translations mentioned here, at present it is perhaps best to proceed with a variety of translations and the continue to transliterate as well. Depending on context, it may be beneficial to translate *shinjin* as faith, to build bridges with people from a variety of faiths. If readability is the most desired trait, one may wish to use various translations for *shinjin*, depending on context. In scholarly studies, one can see that either approach may be useful. As understandings of Shin Buddhism in English grow deeper and more nuanced, we may find ourselves revisiting the issue. Perhaps one day, translators and others will find themselves contemplating a different English word to use, one that is easily understood while being ambiguous enough to encourage readers of Shinran to look further in order to fully understand what is meant. For now, however, it seems prudent to continue to present Shin Buddhism in English using as a number of different methods. Readers who want to more fully understand the nuances of the Shin Buddhist path and its transformative dimensions will thus be able to see various shades of meaning, and discover anew what it means to experience *shinjin*/faith/entrusting.
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