Yōsai and the Transformation of Buddhist Precepts in Pre-modern Japan.

Shinya Mano

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD in Study of Religions

Year 2014

Department of Study of Religions
School of Oriental and African Studies
University of London

Declaration for PhD thesis

I have read and understood regulation 17.9 of the Regulations for students of the School of Oriental and African Studies concerning plagiarism. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.

Signed: _____Date: _____

Abstract

Yōsai has often been considered the founder of Japanese Zen. However, this received image is beset by at least two problems. Firstly, this received image of Yōsai was in fact created approximately a hundred years after his death. And secondly, his early career as an esoteric Buddhist is not being taken into account. The aim of this study is to revisit the received view taking these two problems into account and thus provide a historical repositioning of Yōsai. The dissertation is comprised of two parts; the first examines Yōsai's life, and the second analyses his role in the context of the development of Japanese Buddhist thought and practice.

These analyses succeed in presenting a new image of Yōsai and in identifying the interpretation of the esoteric precepts as Yōsai's central concern throughout his life. Further, the examination of the esoteric precepts suggests the need to reconsider our understanding of Japanese Buddhist precepts as a whole.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement

Introduction

State of the Field 12

The Received View (Previous Studies) 15

Plan of the Present Study 20

Methodology and A Note about Sources 23

Part One: Biography of Yōsai.

Chapter One. Life of Yōsai and Historical Background.

Biography of Yōsai and His Activities 30

Yōsai's Sponsors 36

Myōun, Yōsai and the Taira Clan 40

Yōsai's Activities in Northern Kyushu 43

1) Seigan Temple 44

2) Other Sites in Northern Kyushu 52

Travel to China 56

Return to Japan 60

His Death 64

Concluding Remarks 66

Chapter Two. Yōsai's Works and His Lineage.

Esoteric Works of Yōsai and Summaries of Major Works 67

1) *Shutten takō* (General Principle of Enlightenment) *Tai kuketsu* (Oral Transmission on the Practice of the Womb [Realm]) 71

2) *Tai kuketsu* (Oral Transmission on the Practice of the Womb [Realm]) 73

3) *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* (Revised Resolutions on the Preacher of Esoteric Buddhism) 74

4) *Imazu seiganji sōken engi*
(Origins of the Foundation of Imazu Seigan Temple) 75
5) *Kyōjigi kanmon* A.k.a. *Shingon kyōshu ketsu*
(Reflections on [Annen's] Meanings of Teachings and Times) 75
6) *Mumyō shū* (Collected Meanings of *Dharma*) 77
7) *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu*
(Resolutions on the Meanings of the Lotus Teachings in Esoteric Discourse) 79
8) *Urabon ipponkyō engi* (Origins of the Ullambana Ceremony) 84
9) *Bodaishin bekki* (Separate Records on *Bodhicitta*) 84
10) *Ingo shū* (Collection of Esoteric Idioms) 85

11) *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu*
(Oral Transmission of the Treatise on the Awaking of *Bodhicitta*) 88
12) *Shukke taikō* (An Outline of Becoming a Monk) 89
13) *Kōzen gokokuron* (Protection of Country by Rise of Zen) 90
14) *Kiccha yōjō ki* (Care of Health by Drinking Tea) 92

Yōsai and His Masters and Disciples 94
Yōsai's Disciples 100
Gyōyū 102
Eichō 105
Eicho's Pupils 108

Part Two: Esoteric Practice: Precepts, *Vinaya*, Consecration and Visualisation.

Chapter Three. Esoteric Practice 1. The *Putixin lun*.

The *Putixin lun* 111
The Great *Ācārya* 114
1) Kūkai 115
2) Enchin 117

3) Annen 118
Three Types of Practices 122
1) Practice of Vow 122
2) Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness 124
3) Practice of Visualisation 126
Annen's Interpretation of the Putixin lun 138
Concluding Remarks 145

Chapter Four. Esoteric Practice 2. Annen's Interpretation of Precepts.

Two Definitions of Esoteric Precepts 150
1] Seven Types of Precepts 150
1) *Dhāraṇī* Precepts or the Fifth *Samaya* 156
2) Fundamental Fourfold Precept for Esoteric Bodhisattva
Esoteric Precepts against the Four Grave Sins
Whispering of Fourfold Precept to Enter the World of Equality 162
3) The Precepts for the Three Activities of Identifying with the Buddha 166
4) Tenfold Precept for Esoteric Bodhisattva 170
5) [Esoteric] Five and Ten Good Precepts 171
2] The Fundamental Fourfold Precepts and the Tenfold Precepts for
the Esoteric Bodhisattva as *Samaya* Precepts 172
Coordination of Tendai Perfect Precepts with *Samaya* Precepts 175
Concluding Remarks 184

Chapter Five. Esoteric Practice 3. Yōsai's Thought.

Esoteric and Zen Precepts-/*Vinaya* in Yōsai's Doctrine 189
1) Yōsai's Interpretation of the Esoteric Precepts 190
2) The Essence of the Precepts in Yōsai's Thoughts 201
3) Zen Precepts and *Vinaya* in Yosai's Thought 206
Concluding Remarks 209

Chapter Six. Esoteric Practice 4. Influence of Yōsai and Precepts Group.

Precept Consecration and Yōsai 211
Precept Consecration 211

Transformation 213
Important Works 216
Logics in Precepts Consecration 221
Characteristic Concepts and Their Connections with Yōsai 227
1) The Combination of Principle as Cognitive Object with Wisdom 227
2) Yōsai's Interpretation of the Essence of the Precepts 228
3) Interpretation of the Combination of Principle and Wisdom in the Precepts Group 230
One Mind Precepts 234
Concluding Remarks 240

Conclusion 241

Bibliography 247

Acknowledgement

I never expected to study Buddhism. I still do not know why I came across Buddhism; neither am I from a religious family, nor did I grow up to be a spiritual sort of person. I arrived in England to study modern Chinese literatures at post-graduate level. Maybe I am bound by the *karma* of previous lives.

My interest in Yōsai, who is the primary concern of this dissertation, was aroused by my mentor, Dr Lucia Dolce when I was a student at SOAS, where I had intended to merely attend the foundation course. Dr. Dolce told me that Yōsai would be a good subject for research as his esoteric Buddhism had not yet been investigated at all. This very absence of previous studies provided significant attraction. I rushed into the SOAS library, and began reading Yōsai's esoteric works. Needless to say, I had no clue what he was talking about. His works were relatively short pieces, and misled me into believing that Yōsai would be an easy subject to deal with.

However, I soon came to realise that esoteric doctrines were among the most tiresome of topics to learn, and I almost gave up to focus on them. Nonetheless, I soon found myself at Waseda University, where my other mentor, Professor Okubo Ryōshun, taught a seminar on one of the most crucial esoteric doctrinal works by Annen. Without his training not only during the seminar, but also on many other occasions, I would have been unable to write this dissertation.

I believe that Dr Lucia Dolce and Professor Okubo Ryōshun who guided my first academic steps are truly indispensable mentors to me Their merciful patience to an insolent child is as if they were my parents not only in mind but also blood. Without doubt, special thanks must go to them.

Throughout my research I met many people who gave invaluable advice and suggestions. The conversations with Dr Mizukami Fumihiko of Tōhō Gakuin and Mr Iyanaga Nobumi of EFEO were always fruitful. Their words, based on a wide range of interdisciplinary knowledge, became a valuable admonition regarding my research method, which often tended to be too specific. In the final process of writing the dissertation, I had an opportunity to meet Professor Paul Groner of the University of Virginia, whose interests are most closely aligned with my own. Having a conversation with him on the way to an *onsen* was precious indeed. Although we only met few times, Professor Jacqueline Stone of Princeton University was also kindly interested in the progress of my research.

I thank Professor Sueki Fumihiko of Nichibunken and Professor Abe Yasurō of Nagoya University, who invited me to attend a *chōsa* at Ōsu kannon in Nagoya, where new works of Yōsai's were discovered. Ms Kobayashi Fujiko of SOAS Library always helped me to buy new books through the Library, which, through her efforts, became the richest library for Japanese esotericism in Europe. I also thank my fellows, Dr Kigensan Licha, Mr Matthew MacMullen and Mr Steven Evans who polished my English. Thanks should go to my friends at Waseda University, too. They always provided a rich and fertile mental environment. There are many who have helped and encouraged this reseach, and not all can be mentioned here. However, above all, I need to send my warmest gratitude to my parents, who are generous in all possible ways. This study is dedicated to them.

Introduction

This study is an attempt to offer a new image of Yōjōbō Yōsai 葉上房栄西, who may be better known as Myōan Eisai 明庵栄西 (1141 - 1215). Yōsai is generally considered today to be the founder of Japanese Zen Buddhism. Yōsai lived during the Kamakura period (1185 - 1333), a period in the history of Japanese religion that has been the subject of much scholarly debate. While other important figures in Japanese Buddhism of the Kamakura period, such as Hōnen 法然 (1133 - 1212), Shinran 親鸞 (1173 - 1262), Dōgen 道元 (1200 - 1253) Eizon 叡尊 (1201 – 1290) and Nichiren 日蓮 (1222 - 1282) have been studied and revised by both sectarian and non-sectarian scholars, Yōsai has not received nearly as much attention.

Much of the received image of Yōsai came from later evaluations. The most influential text was the *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釈書, the first collection of Japanese Buddhist biographies written by the Zen monk Kokan Shiren 虎関師錬 (1278 - 1346). It portrayed Yōsai as a Buddhist hero by classifying him among medieval figures, alongside preeminent Sino-Japanese monks who 'imported Buddhist wisdom' (*denchi* 伝智). Only a few monks, such as Ganjin 鑑真 (688 - 763) and Kūkai 空海 (774 - 835) are categorised as *denchi*, so, in this text, Yōsai is given a distinctively prestigious position in the history of Japanese Buddhism. It was Kokan who suggested that Yōsai should be considered the founder of Japanese Zen Buddhism.

The *Genkō shakusho* is one of the most significant sources to examine Yōsai, but its compilation served a distinct political agenda: to establish Zen as a central Buddhist tradition in Kyoto in the early fourteenth century. The depiction of Yōsai contributed to this political aim. Additionally, the *Genkō shakusho* changed the

notion of esoteric Buddhism (*mikkyō* 密教) in its institutional context. The terms, Tōmitsu 東密 and Taimitsu 台密, which are commonly used today to indicate Kūkai's esoteric lineages and the esoteric lineages transmitted within Tendai 天台, originated in the *Genkō shakusho*. In the *Kōzen gokokuron* 興禅護国論, the most famous work of Yōsai and a declaration of the revival of Zen, Yōsai's critical attitude towards this institutional division of esoteric Buddhism grows stronger. An aspect of the role of Zen in his view is to unify or totalise all Buddhist schools under this so-called "Zen."[1]

The other major text that shaped the received image of Yōsai is the preface of *Kōzen gokokuron*, written by an unknown author in the seventeenth century. This preface firmly posits Yōsai as the founder of Japanese Zen Buddhism. Because the most academically respected edition of the Buddhist canon today, the *Taishō shinshu daizōkyō* 大正新脩大蔵経, includes a version of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, accompanied by this preface, this late manuscript is the specific text that has determined the modern reading of Yōsai.[2]

It is clear that the received image of Yōsai as the Japanese Zen patriarch was constructed with institutional aims in mind, and from a centralised sectarian perspective that did not take into account the importance of the local developments of Buddhism. For example, Yōsai was once involved in northern Kyushu and its impact on the central religious and political establishment in his time. This centralisation developed from Kokan Shiren's political strategy, of which his most famous work, the *Genkō shakusho*, tries to contextualise Japanese Buddhist

[1] *Kōzen gokokuron* (T. 80 no. 2543 p. 5c).
[2] Ibid; p.1a – c.

history in a framework of Zen Buddhism. It is most likely that Kokan Shiren borrowed this Zen totalization or centralisation from Yōsai.

However, the biggest challenge for understanding Yōsai is the fact that his earlier career was as that of an esoteric Buddhist thinker. This contemporary material suggests that Yōsai may have been better known as an esoteric monk rather than Zen monk. Some important medieval texts, such as the *Keiran shūyō shū* 渓嵐拾葉集, composed in the fourteenth century, refers to Yōsai's esoteric lineage as "the transmission of the Yōjō Abbot" (*yōjō sōjō no den* 葉上僧正の伝).[3] Yōsai's esoteric thought was based on Tendai esoteric Buddhism or Taimitsu. His esoteric lineage, namely the Yōjō lineage (*yōjō ryū* 葉上流), had long been a respected Taimitsu lineage. The biggest problem for comprehensively understanding Yōsai is thus the fact that such aspects of his work have seldom been studied. Furthermore, the scholarly neglect of the Taimitsu tradition, in comparison with Tōmitsu, has also contributed to the gap in our knowledge of Yōsai. Yōsai was a complex figure because he was appropriated as a political figure, a tantric 'founder' and the first Zen patriarch of Japan. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to revise this incomplete understanding of Yōsai by addressing his various roles as a Buddhist thinker and present a more accurate view of him within the context of Japanese Buddhist history.

State of the Field

Kuroda Toshio's study of medieval Japanese Buddhism, the so-called *Kenmitsu* or exoteric-esoteric Buddhism 顕密仏教, and its relationship to politics has been recognised as the most authoritative analysis of medieval Buddhism in post-war

[3] T. 76 no. 2410 p. 572a

scholarship. Sueki Fumihiko summarises the features of *kenmitsu* Buddhism as "a higher category, with exo-esotericism and the *kenmitsu taisei* 顕密体制 forming subdivisions of it; exo-esotericism comprises the ideological or logical aspect (*kenmitsu shugi* 顕密主義), while the *kenmitsu taisei* comprises the institutional aspects." [4] In terms of this ideological dimension, Kuroda divided medieval Buddhism in two types; one is 'orthodox' Buddhism (*seitō bukkyō* 正統仏教), which consists of schools that used esoteric and exoteric Buddhism; the other is 'heterodox' Buddhism (*itan bukkyō* 異端仏教), which covers schools that attempted to eliminate the esoteric elements and the worship of *kami* from their teachings. While the 'orthodox' Buddhism had a tight relationship with political establishments, the 'heterodox' Buddhism kept a distance from central powers. Kuroda's idea contributed to revising the conventional image of medieval Buddhism, which centred on the Kamakura 'New' Buddhism (*Kamakura shin bukkyō* 鎌倉新仏教). If one follows Kuroda's classification of 'orthodoxy' and 'heterodoxy', and takes his examination of esotericism into account, Yōsai should be placed under the rubric of 'orthodox' Buddhism.

The institutional aspect of Kuroda's theory is also relevant for the topic of this study, because Yōsai was heavily involved in the creation of the ideology of the newly emerged establishment, namely, the Kamakura shōgunate (*Kamakura bakufu* 鎌倉幕府). Tsurugaoka hachiman shrine/temple (*Tsurugaoka hachiman jingūji* 鶴岡八幡宮寺) was the central institution to propagate the ideology of this new establishment, and Yōsai indeed was associated with this shrine/temple.[5] Sasaki Kaoru, one of the scholars who has endeavoured to develop Kuroda's

[4] Sueki Fumihiko (1996) p. 456
[5] See, chapter 2.

kenmitsu theory, argued that the Kamakura shōgunate was supported by a "zen-esoteric ideology" (*zenmitsu shugi* 禅密主義). The term *zenmitsu* was firstly introduced to explain a characteristic of Yōsai's doctrines by a modern sectarian scholar, Shishiō Enshin, whose research is problematic because he uses a writing of Yōsai that is nowadays considered a forgery.[6] Nevertheless, Yōsai played a significant role in *zenmitsu* propagation.[7] Although Kuroda and Sasaki's theories are fully applicable to Yōsai, one may note that Kuroda's theory, as well as that advanced by Sasaki, contains serious fundamental problems. That is, both Kuroda and Sasaki's theories do not examine the Buddhist doctrines - for example the meaning of 'esoteric' and 'exoteric/zen' - that comprise the ideologies of the establishment. This is particularly important for the *Kenmitsu* theory because Kuroda stressed that Taimitsu teachings crucially contributed to the development of *Kenmitsu* Buddhism. Modern Taimitsu specialists, such as Misaki Ryōshū, Lucia Dolce and Okubo Ryōshun, have often made this kind of criticism and urged scholars to reconsider the meaning of 'esoteric' in the Sino-Japanese Tendai doctrinal and practical contexts.[8]

Although, Yōsai's role in the context of the *Kenmitsu* system has been studied by modern scholars, his role in the framework of the *Kenmitsu* ideology has not yet been researched. Thus, this study suggests a new way of looking at Yōsai's doctrine by focusing on what, in the author's opinion, constitutes its core: esoteric precepts (*kai* 戒) and Zen *vinaya* (*ritsu* 律), both of which are the foundation of Buddhist monastic life. Soon after Yōsai's death, the revival of precepts and *vinaya*

[6] Shishiō Enshin (1975) pp. 189 – 198 A forged material attributed to Yōsai is the Shinzen yūshin gi. See also the next section concerning the received view.
[7] Sasaki Kaoru (1997) pp. 138 - 139
[8] Misaki Ryōshū (1988) pp. 27 – 76. Lucia Dolce (2006) pp. 130 – 171. Okubo Ryōshun (Forthcoming).

came to be a massive movement particularly in Nara circles, such as Saidai temple 西大寺. In fact, Yōsai had a close relationship with Nara temples, for he was appointed as the head promoter for the reconstruction of Tōdai temple (*tōdaiji daikanjin shiki* 東大寺大勧進職), a highly influential position.[9] Taking his important role in the Nara Buddhist circles into account, the material studied in this dissertation suggests that Yōsai triggered this religious movement, alongside Jippan 実範 (? - 1144), who wrote *Tōdaiji kaidan'in jukaishiki* 東大寺戒壇院受戒式.[10] Moreover, Yōsai's interpretation of esoteric precepts made a significant contribution to the emergence of Precepts Group (*kaike* 戒家), which Kuroda considers the perfect example of the exoteric-esoteric ideology.[11] This study helps decipher this important aspect of exoteric-esoteric Buddhism that prevailed in medieval Japan.

The Received View (Previous Studies)

The Conventional image of Yōsai, the first patriarch of Japanese Zen, has been deeply associated with Zen sectarianism since the late Kamakura period. Modern sectarian scholars find difficulty in positively assessing Yōsai, because some aspects of his life may be considered negative in the eyes of sectarian scholars, such as his self-nomination for the high rank priesthood and his close association with politics. The words of the prominent twentieth-century Zen scholar Yanagida Seizan epitomise the image of Yōsai: "He is not highly evaluated by modern people because his career cannot be separated from the pursuit of prestige that comes with fame in secular society…. Such image of Yōsai seems not suitable for the first

[9] Daigan Matsunaga (1976) pp. 190 – 192. Matsuo Kenji (2007) p.104
[10] T. 74 no. 2350 pp. 26 – 32.
[11] Kuroda Toshio (1994) p. 76

Zen patriarch of Japan."[12] Yanagida still sees Yōsai in the framework of the first patriarch or founder, and this is still a dominant image of Yōsai in most cases. Importantly, however, Yanagida suggested the need of further research on esoteric elements in Yōsai's thought, although he did not offer any actual analysis. It is most likely that here Yanagida was following the historian Taga Munehaya, perhaps the first modern scholar who paid attention to Yōsai's role as an esoteric monk. Taga's investigation acknowledges Yōsai's role as esoteric monk, and stresses that his esoteric lineage had become one of the major Tendai esoteric lineages throughout the pre-modern period. His biographical study of Yōsai was no doubt a landmark in the study of Yōsai, but some crucial problems remain.[13] First of all, Taga, as with Kuroda, neglects any issue concerning esoteric doctrine. For historians, esoteric doctrine, as maybe the name would indicate, is a difficult subject to deal with. While esoteric writings written by major esoteric scholar monks, such as Kūkai and Kakuban 覚鑁 (1095 - 1143), have been widely researched, Taimitsu works, especially those of medieval period, have been left untouched. Hence, Taga did not have reliable previous studies on medieval Taimitsu doctrine, which can be applicable to the study of Yōsai. Second, because Taga had no knowledge of esoteric doctrine, Taga's textual critique never touched upon the contents of Yōsai's esoteric works.

In 2005, another historian, Nakao Ryōshin, published a seminal book, *Nihon zenshū no densetsu to rekishi* 日本禅宗の伝説と歴史, in which he attempts to understand Yōsai within the context of the history of Japanese Zen since the Nara period. Nakao's primary interest is in early medieval Zen, when the majority of

[12] Ibid; p. 439
[13] Taga Munehaya (1965)

practitioners trained in Zen alongside esoteric Buddhism. For this reason, Nakao heavily uses the *Shinzen yūshin gi* 真禅融心義, attributed to Yōsai. However, this work was most likely forged in the mid-Kamakura period.[14] The *Shinzen yūshin gi* is thus not a useful material to investigate Yōsai's thought. Nevertheless, this writing is an invaluable document insofar as it sheds light on how esoteric-Zen ideology had become widespread after the death of Yōsai.

Nakao, as well as Taga, does not analyse the esoteric works that Yōsai authored before importing Zen from China. Recently, Yoneda Mariko has published a rich survey that reconstructs Yōsai's biography using a wealth of source materials concerning Yōsai's activities in local areas, such as northern Kyushu.[15] Yoneda's research uses materials, including Yōsai's short autobiography, recently discovered at the Shinpuku temple (*shinpuku ji* 真福寺) archive in modern day Aichi prefecture. Unfortunately, as with previous studies, Yoneda does not consider doctrinal issues. Sueki Fumihiko wrote synopses of Yōsai's newly discovered documents from Shinpuku temple.[16] Furthermore, Matsuo Kenji describes Yōsai's role as a promoter for fund raising to reconstruct Tōdai temple, which provides evidence of his close relation to Nara Buddhism.[17]

In western scholarship, while thorough research on Yōsai has not been offered, a few studies mention Yōsai. Albert Welter discusses Yōsai's Zen ideology as it relates to medieval politics.[18] Welter's article includes a translation of

[14] Takayanagi Satsuki (2004) suggests that the *Shinzen yūshin gi* was produced by someone who had been based on Mt. Kōya. On the basis of Takayanagi's survey, Tado Daichi (2010) arrives at the conclusion that this composition was written by one of Raiyu's successors. Shishiō Enshin (1975) is the only scholar considering the *Shinzen yūshin gi* to be Yōsai's authentic work.
[15] Yoneda Mariko (2010)
[16] Sueki Fumihiko (2006)
[17] Matsuo Kenji (2007) p. 104
[18] Albert Welter (1999)

extracted passages from the *Kōzen gokokuron*. Carl Bielefeldt's study, "Disarming the Superpowers: The abhijñā in Eisai and Dōgen" demonstrates a different approach to Zen. In this work, Bielfeldt points out that Yōsai's affirmative attitude towards the six *abhijñā* (*roku jinzū* 六神通) suggests there was a stronger esoteric influence on Yōsai's way of thinking than on that of Dōgen. However, needless to say, emphasis on the six *abhijñā* does not amount to evidence for identifying Yōsai's esoteric influence, because the six *abhijñā* is a concept which has been held since the emergence of Buddhism in India.[19] William Bodiford takes up Yōsai's role as a reformer of the Tendai tradition of precepts, which abandons the four-part *vinaya* (*sifen lu* 四分律).[20] Broadly speaking, Bodiford's point of view is similar to my research, however, Bodiford's interpretation of Japanese Tendai precepts (which is based on the study by Paul Groner) differs from my interpretation.[21] Among other studies, Daigan Matsunaga's biographical study of Yōsai well summarises Yōsai's life, including his combinatory practice of esoteric, Zen and Tendai.[22] In sum, previous research on Yōsai has been carried out from the historical point of view and has ignored the doctrinal perspective. It is my opinion that a doctrinal perspective is necessary to understand the significance and novelty of Yōsai's thought, which serves to draw an intellectual aspect of his biography.

A few words need be spent on previous studies regarding the material that constituted the doctrinal background of Yōsai (as we shall see in subsequent chapters of this research). For the *Putixin lun*, the most important esoteric treatise

[19] Carl Bielefeldt (2002) pp. 1018 - 1046
[20] William Bodiford (2005)
[21] For Paul Groner's study of the Tendai precepts, see the following paragraph.
[22] Daigan Matsunaga (1976) pp. 183 - 192

in Japan, there are many translations into modern Japanese, but only little research has been done. Tagami Taishū's study of the *bodhicitta* includes a chapter examining the *Putixin lun*.[23] However, his reading of the *Putixin lun* is problematic because he reads this important text only in the context of Kūkai's interpretation of esoteric Buddhism. In English, the latest study of the *Putixin lun* is the one by Kenneth White, but his research contains exactly the same issue that can be seen in Tagami's survey.[24] However, White's translation of the *Putixin lun* is no doubt a great contribution to Buddhist scholarship in western language.

The research on Japanese Buddhist precepts is very small, and for Japanese Tendai precepts, the number of researchers is particularly limited. Etani Ryūkai's comprehensive study of Tendai precepts would seem to be the most authoritative one.[25] His research seeks to draw the overall of transformation of the Tendai precepts from Zhiyi to the medieval scholar monks of Japan, such as Ninkū 仁空 (1309 - 1388) and Hōnen. The only problem of this study is the fact that Etani does not look at the interaction of esoteric Buddhism with the Tendai precepts, which is first advocated by Annen 安然 (841 - ?). In my opinion, Yōsai was heavily influenced by Annen's interpretation of the precepts, so this interaction between two types of precepts needs to be resolved. Paul Groner's seminal research of the Tendai precepts is another key previous study. His research on Saichō and Annen's interpretation of precepts is very useful to understand the tradition of Japanese Tendai precepts.[26] Especially, his book, "Saichō," is the best work, in both Japanese and English, to understand the foundation of Tendai precepts in historical terms.

[23] Tagami Taishū (1990)
[24] Kenneth White (2005)
[25] Etani Ryūkai (1978)
[26] Paul Groner (1984) and (1994)

He also wrote articles on Ninkū and Kōen 興円 (1262 - 1317).[27] However, because he is basically a historian, his articles only deal a little with the doctrinal side of precepts. Apart from those two giants, some scholars, such as Asai Endō and Teramoto Ryōshin conducted research on this topic.[28] Those scholars look at the importance of esoteric precepts in Japanese Tendai, but like Etani, they overlook the interaction of esoteric precepts with Tendai precepts.

Plan of the Present Study

This study has three aims. The first is to reconstruct the life and thought of Yōsai, drawing from existent research. The second is to find out what is original in his thought. The third is to contextualise his thought in the context of pre-modern Japanese Buddhist history. This study is divided in six chapters. In the first chapter, I offer a biography of Yōsai. To reconstruct his biography, I use a variety of source materials, including the ones that proffer a hagiographical image of Yōsai, depicting him as the founder of Japanese Zen. Most of the texts I have used in this chapter were written approximately within one hundred years of his death. I have also been able to draw on a new text discovered recently at the Osu Archives from Shinpuku temple 真福寺. This document, *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* 改変教主決 composed by Yōsai, has become the most important work to write his biography because it contains his autobiography. This has resulted in writing a new biography of Yōsai which differs from that of Taga. Moreover, I also pay attention to the significance of minor historical documents, such as Buddhist transmission certificates (*injin* 印信) and their postscripts. There are few *injin* documents

[27] Paul Groner (2003) and (2009)
[28] Asai Endō (1975), Teramoto Ryōshin (2010) and (2011). See, also chapter 4

preserved in the temples located in western Japan which record the name of Yōsai. By tracing them, his role as an esoteric monk can be clarified.

The second chapter consists of two parts. The first part explores how Yōsai's lineage, namely the Yōjō lineage, spread. Since few scholars have looked at his masters and disciples, exploring those figures serves to shed light on Yōsai's unknown activities, which in turn alters the received image of Yōsai. The characteristic of his lineage has been said to be the combinatory practice of esoteric and Zen Buddhism, but he never systematised this practice doctrinally. Eichō 栄朝 (1165 - 1247) and Gyōyū 行勇 (1163 - 1241), who were Yōsai's most trustworthy disciples, were important figures in propagating the Yōjō lineage. On behalf of Yōsai, Eichō took an active part in East Japan, while Gyōyū played a crucial role in West Japan. They also had many disciples who would later become famous Buddhist figures, such as Benen Enni 弁円円爾 (1202 - 1280). The second part of this chapter introduces Yōsai's works, including Zen writings. In this part, I consider the whole of Yōsai's corpus, including recently discovered documents. Yōsai left a great number of works, but few have ever been analysed. Thus, in this section I also offer summaries of Yōsai's writings.

Chapter Three and Four serve as a background survey of important doctrinal issues, which are relevant to Yōsai's central esoteric doctrine. The third chapter examines the *Putixin lun*, an important work in the formulation of esoteric doctrine in Japan. Since Kūkai, this has been the textual base for the claim that it is possible to attain Buddhahood within one's very body. Yōsai wrote a commentary on the *Putixin lun*, which is the pivotal text for deciphering his esoteric doctrine, because it emphasises three types of practices presented as the precepts of the esoteric practitioners. This chapter also analyses the *Putixin lun*'s three types of

practices, one of which had come to be treated as consecration, or *abhiṣeka* (*kanjō* 灌頂), probably first by Kūkai. Especially, I focus on analysing a visualisation or *samādhi* 三摩地 practice described in the *Putixin lun* in comparison with similar training prescribed in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*. This investigation eventually contributes to understanding the consecratory ritual employed by Taimitsu. Chapter Four takes up Annen's interpretation of the precepts. I emphasize Annen's role in the development of esoteric precepts, or *samaya* precepts (*samaya kai* 三昧耶戒). It was, in fact, Annen who first defined what esoteric precepts are based on the canonical esoteric scripture, the *Dari jing* 大日経. Annen's formulation of esoteric precepts became the most comprehensive and sophisticated interpretation of the precepts, which even later Tōmitsu scholar monks followed when debates about the precepts occurred. Furthermore, I also look at Annen's other achievements in the study of precepts, such as his discussion of attaining Buddhahood by receiving precepts (*jukai jōbutsu* 受戒成仏), and the argument over the agreement of esoteric and Tendai precepts (*enmitsu icchi* 円密一致). Annen's discussion of attaining Buddhahood by receiving precepts has been surveyed in the framework of Tendai teachings by Buddhist scholars, such as Etani Ryūkai and Paul Groner, but this study explores it from the esoteric Buddhist perspective.[29] The agreement of esoteric and Tendai precepts, which in fact suggests a reconsideration of the received view of the Tendai precepts, has not been studied at all. In addition, I should point out that Annen's discussion of attaining Buddhahood by receiving precepts strongly influenced Yōsai, whereas the

[29] Etani Ryūkai (1978) Paul Groner (1994)

argument for the combination of esoteric and Tendai precepts had much less of an effect on Yōsai's interpretation of the esoteric precepts.

Chapter Five is a study of Yōsai's thought, and attempts to assess how consistent his work was throughout his life. For this, an investigation into Yōsai's esoteric doctrine is necessary. The feature of Yōsai's esoteric doctrine is his emphasis on esoteric/*samaya* precepts founded on the *Putixin lun*. This is actually Yōsai's unique contribution to esoteric Buddhist history, the importance of which previous studies have ignored. His interpretation is quite unique as it is a hybrid of Kūkai's interpretation of esoteric precepts, based on the *Putixin lun*, and Annen's exegesis of Tendai precepts based on the theory of the attainment of Buddhahood by receiving precepts. Also, one can recognise that Yōsai was very likely influenced by works attributed to Enchin. I also consider Yōsai's interpretation of *vinaya* as it appears in his *Kōzen gokokuron*, Yōsai's best known "Zen" writing.

Finally, in Chapter Six, I examine his influence on later periods. His posthumous contribution, particularly to the emergence of the Precepts group, which was influential on Mt. Hiei throughout medieval period, is noteworthy. This chapter, therefore, considers from both ideological and political perspectives how later scholar monks appraised Yōsai and his thought, and why they embraced Yōsai into their tradition.

Methodology and A Note about Sources

Yōsai's thought has long been neglected since researchers must account for esoteric doctrines, a field that lags far behind other Buddhist research disciplines. For example, regarding even the *Kōzen gokokuron*, the most famous work of Yōsai which only scarcely argues doctrinal issues, the received scholarship has

disregarded the central doctrine of the text. As previously stated, the received image of Yōsai is a creation of Zen sectarian scholars and historians. The problem is that these sectarian scholars and historians are unaware of the esoteric perspective, or indeed of the methodology necessary to read esoteric texts. Therefore, to overcome the received image of Yōsai as the founder of Japanese Zen Buddhism, it is crucial to clarify the necessary background of esotericism that all previous studies have disregarded. Also, I have come to recognise that the traditional methodology of esoteric Buddhism alone seems inadequate to portray an appropriately vibrant image of Yōsai. In this respect, I shall first explain the status of recent methodologies, and then I would like to elucidate my own methodology in the next phase.

I have approached this study from a Buddhological point of view. Regarding Buddhology, it seems to me that there are two types in Japan; first is pre-modern Buddhology, and second is modern Buddhology, both of which I would like to use effectively. Pre-modern Buddhology can be paraphrased as sectarian studies (*shūgaku* 宗学), which offers original perspectives for interpreting texts. Unfortunately, this type of Buddhology is a highly exclusive research discipline, since sectarian scholars, who are preserving their religious traditions, still command an overwhelming majority. Non-sectarian scholars must learn the internal logics and languages that sectarian scholars uncritically utilise. Such an academic circumstance often denies non-sectarian scholars access to this field. The sectarian points of view are founded on sectarian polemics (*rongi* 論義), which is the collection of sectarian key concepts, compiled in order to educate trainees. [30] In

[30] The significance of sectarian polemics has been ignored even by Japanese Buddhologists. Sectarian polemics have usually been composed for two purposes; first is to educate trainees, and

esoteric Buddhism, among those key concepts, the theory of attainment of Buddhahood (*jōbutsu ron* 成仏論) and the theory of Buddha bodies (*busshin ron* 仏身論) centre on the sectarian polemics; especially the realisation of Buddhahood within this very body (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成仏), and the *dharmakāya* preaching (*hosshin seppō* 法身説法). This dual doctrinal structure is actually very practical for Buddhist trainees, because the theory of attainment of Buddhahood often connects to the methods of practice (*shudō ron* 修道論), while the theory of Buddha bodies directly links to Buddhahood itself, which is the goal of practitioners. Such a perspective is fully applicable not only to Yōsai, but also to pre-modern esoteric monks in general.

Modern Buddhology has often been considered synonymous with Philology, or textual criticism. The most remarkable achievement of modern Buddhology, in this sense, can be the completion of the *Tashō shinshu daizōkyō*, a critical edition of the Buddhist canon published in 1934. The task for succeeding Buddhologists was to translate Chinese/*kanbun* 漢文 into modern Japanese, which came to fruition as the *Kokuyaku issaikyō* 国訳一切経. The key person of modern Buddhology, after the publication of the *Tashō shinshu daizōkyō* and the *Kokuyaku issaikyō* had been published, may be Shimaji Daitō 島地大等 (1875 - 1927). Until Shimaji Daitō published the famous *Nihon bukkyō kyōgaku shi* 日本仏教教学史, modern Buddhology, especially Japanese Buddhism, had been no more than a minor subject.[31] When Shimaji published this book, it was the meeting of pre-modern and modern Buddhology.

---

second is to debate certain topics, often relevant to classification of teachings, with one's outer sectarian rivals.

[31] Shimaji Daitō (1933)

Pre-modern and modern Buddhologies alone does not suffice in modern academia for which critical approaches constitute its base, because sectarian scholars essentially cannot remove themselves from their doctrinal consensus established on the basis of the teachings declared by the founders and other preeminent patriarchs. At the same time, one needs to admit that without knowing their ways of understanding doctrines, or indeed the structure of the traditional sectarian polemics, one will be unable to decode the contents of doctrinal texts. Thus, in my opinion, to understand Yōsai, applying the perspective that Yōsai used seems to be the most sensible methodology. Modern scholars have long tended to make a chronology of Buddhist development, which I would like to call a vertical perspective. In this vertical perspective, only major texts that had massive leverage on the historical paradigm can contribute, so that great numbers of minor source materials have been left aside. Hence, I have also tackled minor source materials, written by Yōsai's contemporaries, in a positive manner in order to draw a more vivid image of him. This can be said to be a horizontal perspective.

Although quite a few number of Yōsai's esoteric works are accessible in the *Taishō shinshu daizōkyō* and the *Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大蔵経, decoding those texts is very difficult, because most of them take the form of *kuketsu* 口決, often written in a single short fascicle. The difficulty of reading *kuketsu* documents is due to the nature of texts that contain many scholastic arguments, which are often self-referential and highly abbreviated. Thus, it is hard to retrieve sources, and I had to read beyond these sources to uncover where those ideas came from. Some source materials I used in this study are not written by well-known monks. Analysing and

evaluating those texts also became an important task that was often trickier than investigating Yōsai's thought.

The way I have used source materials differs from most previous studies and this has contributed a new perspective on the topic. I have first chosen a single text that I regard to be central to unfold Yōsai's thought, That is, the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* 金剛頂宗菩提心論口決. I have discovered this fact for two reasons. First of all, the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* was completed right before his second study abroad to China, when he first trained in Zen Buddhism. This work was the final esoteric writing in his early career as an esoteric monk. I hypothesize that in the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu*, Yōsai draws his general conclusion regarding esoteric doctrines reflecting on his previous esoteric interpretation. Second, I have taken into account the position scholars, such as Hazama Jikō,[32] whose research underlines that in the medieval period, the authority of Taimitsu intellectual tradition declined, while ritual and ritual practice prospered (although, to be sure, I would like to stress that practice and doctrine are inseparable elements that always interact with each other).[33] Thus, I have read Yōsai's works while keeping in mind the revival of practices or rituals of this time, and I have come to recognise that the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* is the only composition associated with practice *and* ritual. The *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* also contains doctrinal issues which Yōsai discusses in other esoteric writings. Thereupon, I have presupposed that it is

[32] Hazama Jikō (1969) pp. 165 – 166. The downfall of intellectual activity does not mean that esoteric scholar monks lost their interest in doctrine. Like Yōsai, some esoteric monks wrote about esoteric doctrine, although, the quality of their doctrines was appallingly low.

[33] Interestingly, Lucia Dolce (2002) (2006) argues the reflection of ritual pattern to the medieval esoteric teachings. In her work on the Hokkehō, she discusses how some rituals, such as Hokkehō, were most likely created on the basis of canonical doctrines.

possible to contextualise Yōsai's writings by considering practical/liturgical elements manifested in the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu*, which seems to have become the central idea of Yōsai. To support my hypothesis, I have also taken into account some esoteric works written by Yōsai's contemporaries. While these are important texts because they serve as a window into the Buddhist trends of this particular time, they have never been appropriately assessed until now. From this point of view, I attempt to contextualise Yōsai in a horizontal way.

In order to put Yōsai's thought in the historical context of Japanese Buddhism, source materials, written by his predecessors and successors, have also been employed. This is the contextualisation of Yōsai in a vertical way. Here, the importance of Annen in order to investigate Yōsai's thought must be underlined. Annen is known as the most crucial figure for researching medieval esoteric Buddhism in both doctrinal and liturgical contexts, since Annen's standards had long been the most dominant interpretation of esoteric Buddhism. Because my argument is that Yōsai's core doctrine deeply links to the practice and ritual pattern (standardised by Annen) I have used not only Annen's doctrinal works, but also the liturgical writings. Other sources that I have used in this research are produced by members of the Precepts group, upon whom Yōsai may have had a great influence.

In this study, I try to present a new contextualisation, not only of Yōsai, but also of pre-modern Buddhism as a whole. The contribution of my study is to locate Yōsai's thought in the context of the transformation of Tendai ordination. Although the crucial role of Tendai ordination has already been studied by a few scholars, such as Etani Ryūkai and Paul Groner, their neglects of the importance of

esoteric influence calls for a renewed attention to the topic. In fact, ordination and esoteric consecratory ritual were combined by Annen, and Yōsai and members of the Precepts group conformed to Annen's system. Any discussion of pre-modern Tendai ordination, or even that of Japanese Pure Land (*jōdo* 浄土), cannot be considered to be comprehensive so long as it disregards esoteric Buddhism. Also, proper contextualisation of Yōsai's thought can only succeed if this exoteric-esoteric framework is taken into account. It is my hope that this way of reading Yōsai's writings will present a new, more complete image of Yōsai, and will elucidate a hitherto unexplored aspect of medieval esoteric Buddhism as a whole.

Part One: Biography of Yōsai

Chapter 1

Life of Yōsai and Historical Background

Biography of Yōsai and His Activities

There are two key works for understanding Yōsai's life; the *Genkō shakusho* and the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* 改変教主決, an invaluable source material recently discovered in the Shinpuku temple archive, also contains Yōsai's autobiography. Yōsai was born in 1141 as a child of someone from the Kaya family 賀陽氏, serving the Kibitsu-no-miya shrine 吉備津宮. According to the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu*, he was the seventeenth descendent of Emperor Kōrei 孝霊天皇.[34] His grandfather was Satsuma-no-kami Sadamasa 薩摩守貞政, but his parents are unknown. The biography of Yōsai compiled in the *Genkō shakusho* merely refers to his maternal family, namely the Den clan 田氏. [35]

The story of his birth has been mixed with hagiography which relates how his mother realised her pregnancy after a comet came into her body. He was born prematurely at eight months. [36] Neighbours slandered Yōsai and his mother because premature birth was thought to be an ill omen.[37] His mother, then, stopped feeding him for a couple of days until a vagrant monk, called Yōgon 陽厳, told her that his premature birth was actually an auspicious sign.[38]

[34] DNBZ. Vol 101 pp. 154b – 155a
[35] Ibid; p. 154b
[36] Ibid; p. 155a Incidentally, this would make him two months premature since, by the Japanese method of counting, pregnancy lasts 10 months.
[37] Ibid; p. 155a
[38] Ibid; p. 155a

The rest of the account in the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* seems to be based on real events. When he turned eight, he began studying the *Abhidarmakośa* 倶舎論, which almost all ordained Buddhists read in order to learn the most basic aspects of Buddhism.[39] His encounter with Buddhism was influenced by his father, who learnt Buddhism at Mii temple 三井寺.[40] As soon as Yōsai turned fourteen, he was officially ordained at the Mt. Hiei 比叡山 and became a Tendai monk.[41]

After the ordination, he spent most of his time at his birthplace, Bizen province (modern Okayama prefecture) a strategic station of the Sanyō arterial road since the Nara period.[42] There, Yōsai began fully devoting his life to Buddhist practices, which involved visiting many neighbour temples. Three temples, Anyō temple 安養寺, Kanayama temple 金山寺 and Nichiō temple 日応寺, are cited in the *Genkō shakusho* as places where he stayed.[43] These temples are relatively old, and the stories of their origins are often associated with Hōon Daishi 報恩大師 (? - 718 - ?),[44] a monk about whom little is know, but believed to have established forty eight temples in Bizen province 備前四十八ヶ寺. Alongside the above three temples in the province, Yōsai also mentions the name of an extinct temple,[45] which was called the Shōkō temple of Kojima 児島諸興寺, formerly located in Kurashiki city, Okayama prefecture. Few words need to be spent on this temple. According to the *Biyō*

[39] Ibid; p. 155a
[40] Ibid; p. 155a
[41] Ibid; p. 155a
[42] As for the importance of the Sanyō arterial road, it will be discussed later in the section of Yōsai's fund raising.
[43] DNBZ. Vol. 101 p. 155a
[44] Aka Haga bō or Maka shōnin. He is a highly mystical figure, and his biography is not known, apart from his birthplace, although there are two accounts of it; one is Yamato province (modern Nara prefecture) and the other is Bizen province. Shimoide Sekiyo (1976)
[45] Sueki Fumihiko (2007) p.111. Since the reason why Yōsai mentioned Shoko temple deeply links to his esoteric lineage, it will be studied in the part concerning Yōsai and his esoteric masters.

kokushi 備陽国史, a pre-Edo regional history, the temple was built to worship the *kami* of Kumano dispensed from the original Kumano shrines 熊野神社 in 761.[46] To resemble the original Kumano shrines, which consist of three shrines, two temples were established along with the Shōkō temple. Because the Kumano shrines were known as one of the capital *shugen* 修験 or *yamabushi* 山伏 sites, one can assume that these temples, too, were connected to *shugendō*.[47] In fact, one of the five disciples of En-no-ozunu 役小角 lived the temple called Yuga temple 瑜伽寺, which was once affiliated with Shōkō temple.[48] This linkage between Yuga temple and Shōkō temple suggests that Yōsai was most likely familiar with the *shugendō*. Additionally, Daisen temple 大山寺, which will be examined later, also contains an element of *shugen*.

Nichiō temple was erected as a temple belonging to the Sanron school (*sanron shū* 三論宗), and converted to the Tendai school in the early Heian period. This temple was again changed from the Tendai school to that of Nichiren in the late Muromachi period.[49] The history of this temple can be traced back to Hōon Daishi. Although there is no extant source material describing his specific activities at this temple, the preface of the *Gokokuron*, which was very likely written in the Edo period, states that Yōsai trained in the *samaya* practice (*samaya gyō* 三昧耶行) for years.[50] The "*samaya* practice" is an unusual term. Presumably, the term indicates esoteric practice in general. Nichiō temple was the place where

[46] Okano Kōji (2009) p. 21
[47] Ichikawa Shunsuke (1978) It seems to me that the use of the term, *yamabushi*, can be more appropriate rather than *shugendō*, but for the sake of convenience, the latter terminology will be applied.
[48] Ibid; These lineages are collectively known as the *Goryū* shugen.
[49] Okayama ken shi (1991) pp. 492 – 493. The temple was established in 718, and had been one of the most ancient temples in the Okayama prefecture.
[50] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 1a

Yōsai mainly lived, because in such text as the *Seiganji engi*,[51] he signed his name as 'Yōsai of Nichiō temple' 日応寺栄西. Yōsai had used this signature until he moved to Seigan temple in 1170 in the modern Fukuoka prefecture. Based at Nichiō temple, Yōsai travelled from temple to temple across the western region of Japan in order to develop his esoteric skills.

As for Kanayama temple, the temple is known for its enormous archive, which has been designated as a national cultural asset. According to the *Kanayama ji engi* 金山寺縁起, this temple belonged to the Hossō school 法相宗 until the late twelfth century and had come to be respected as the central temple among the forty eight temples established by Hōon Daishi.[52] The *Kanayama ji engi*, also states it was actually Yōsai who changed the temple from the Hossō school to the Tendai school.[53] Yōsai founded the *abhiṣeka* hall 灌頂堂 and the *homa* hall 護摩堂 of this complex. The *abhiṣeka* hall in particular is considered the first place where Yōsai conducted consecratory rituals in a manner which will later characterise his lineage.[54] However, it is impossible to ascertain whether he was involved in the establishment of these constructions either before or after his second study abroad to China. These buildings were reduced to ashes by monks of the Nichiren sect in the Muromachi period.

The relation of Yōsai to the Anyō temple is documented in the *Genkō shakusho*. As it reads, a friend of his father, Jōshin 静心, who taught Yōsai the basics of Buddhism, lived at an "Anyō temple." Yet, there were two Anyō temples in

[51] The text is available in Taga Munehaya (1965) p. 44
[52] Shinhan okayamaken no rekishi sanpo (1991) pp. 25 - 26
[53] Ibid; p. 43.
[54] Taga Munehaya (1965) pp. 41 – 42. Problematically, Yōsai's visit to Kanayama temple is barely referred to in the Japanese translation (*wage*) of the *Luocheng dongshan jianrenshansi kaishanshizu minganxigongshanshi taming*.

the same area. The first Anyō temple, also known as Gusesan temple 救世山, is situated nearby Kanayama temple.[55] Nowadays it belongs to the Rinzai school. On the upper part of the main gate hangs a wooden frame with the inscribed words 'Ancient Training Hall of Senkō 千光古道場. The name, Senkō (a thousand lights), indicates Yōsai. According to the *Genkō shakusho*, he was called by this name in China, because his body started to emit mysterious lights while he was performing a rain-making ritual requested by Chinese officials.[56] A stone monument, a pagoda for offerings and a temple bell in the Anyō temple are attributed to Yōsai, but were clearly built after Yōsai's death. Additionally, there are no artifacts relating to Yōsai left at this temple. This all indicates that Gusesan appears not to be the one mentioned in the *Genkō shakusho*. The second Anyō temple, known alternatively by the name of Asaharayama temple 朝原山, was believed to have been erected by Hōon Daishi as well.[57] According to folklore, Kūkai and Genshin 源信 (942 - 1017) resided at this temple,[58] and Genshin was the *de facto* founder of the Anyō temple complex. Another important monk, Bennen Enni 弁円円爾 (1202 - 1280), was also connected with the Asaharayama temple, and this seems crucial piece of information because this Anyō temple could have been the one where Yōsai supervised the construction, as is supported in the *Tōfuku kaizan Shōitsu kokushi nenpu* 東福開山聖一国師年譜. As will be noted later, Enni received the transmission of the Yōjō lineage from Yōsai's direct disciple. The *Shōitsu kokushi nenpu* also mentions that he paid a visit to Asaharayama to build the pagoda when he was

[55] Hereafter, the first Anyo temple will be refered to as Gusesan.
[56] DNBZ Vol. 95 p. 13a
[57] Ichikawa Shunsuke (1978)
[58] Maekawa Mitsuru (1997)

sixty-one years old.[59] The specific reason motivating him to visit the temple is unfortunately not stated, but it is likely Enni went to the Asaharayama temple largely because of Yōsai. Since Enni is closely related to this Anyō temple, it is more likely that the Asaharayama temple is what the *Genkō shakusho* refers to as "Anyō temple."

The fourth temple connected to Yōsai is Daisen temple (*daisen ji* 大山寺), situated at the border of modern Okayama and Tottori prefectures. The temple was established in the Nara period by an unknown priest from Izumo grand shrine. In 866, Ennin converted the temple into a Tendai temple. After its conversion, the Hall for Constantly Walking (*jōgyōsanmai dō* 常行三昧堂) was built. Since Ennin's conversion of this temple to Tendai, Daisen temple was a local centre for the *shugen* practitioners. Kikō 基好 (? - ?), who was known as the most important esoteric master of Yōsai, lived in one of the temple complexes of Daisen temple. The reason why Yōsai turned to Kikō for instruction is not known, but it is very likely that it was because the Daisen temple was a well-known centre with political influence. Actually, many armed monks (*shūto* 衆徒) had settled at Daisen temple, and they had political conflicts with Mt. Hiei and the political establishment in Kyoto,[60] some of which are reported in the *Tendai zasu ki* 天台座主記. Kikō was also famous as he trained Jien Jichin 慈円慈鎮 (1155 - 1225), who later would become the head abbot of Mt. Hiei on four occasions, and was a member of the Kujō regent family (*kujō sekkanke* 九条摂関家). The origin story of Daisen temple reads that "Jien, who deeply admired Ōhara Jōen 大原 長宴, the complier of an important Taimitsu ritual corpus the *Shijuū jō ketsu* 四十帖決, wished to inherit [Jōen's

[59] DNBZ. Vol. 95 p. 13b
[60] Okano Koji (2009) p. 10

esoteric] lineage. He looked for someone who was capable to train it to him, but Yakunin 薬仁 and Kenkei 兼慶[two famous figures in Jōen's lineage] had already passed away. So, [Jien] invited Kikō to Shōren temple （*shōren in* 青蓮院）. Kikō went up to Kyoto, and instructed Jien on the Combination offering ritual of the Tani lineage (*tani no gōgyō* 谷の合行) and the *abhiṣeka* of the secret altar (*himitsudan kanjō* 秘密壇灌頂). Since Kikō was busy, the monk, Kanshō of Seizan 西山観性, instructed Jien further on [Kikō's] behalf."[61] Therefore, Kikō was very likely someone who had not only political and military power, but also religious authority. For Yōsai, the master-disciple relation with Kikō was significant, and he met Kikō again even after his return from his second study abroad in China.

Yōsai's Sponsors

Since 894, when Sugawara-no-Michizane 菅原道真 (845 - 903) decided to abolish the official envoy to China, Japanese monks lost opportunities to absorb the Chinese repository of knowledge. Although there could have been various reasons, this abolishment may have partly been affected by one of the three persecutions of Buddhism that took place in Tang China (*eshō no haibutsu* 会昌の廃仏), which caused the decline of Buddhism. Nonetheless, civilian trade continued throughout the Heian period, particularly since the Song dynasty reunified China (960 - 1279). Alongside those merchants, some monks attempted to go to China, and a few succeeded in eluding the law. Famous figures before the time of Yōsai were Chōnen

[61] Okano Koji (2009) p. 11 As for these individuals and names of lineage, see Chapter 2.

奝然 (938 - 1016), Jakushō 寂照 (962 - 1034)[62] and Jōjin 成尋 (1011 - 1081); the latter two died in China. Chōnen, who has been best known as the founder of Seiryō temple 清涼寺, imported the canon compiled by the North Song dynasty.[63] Jōjin was appointed as a supervisor of the project for translating Buddhist scriptures in China, and sent five hundreds twenty seven volumes of Buddhist scriptures to Japan.[64] Under such circumstances, the expansion of trade between China and Japan seems to have furthered study abroad to China. Yōsai's motivation to go study abroad in China was also strongly affected by information obtained from Chinese merchants. Slightly before Yōsai's departure, it has been known that Kakua 覚阿 (1143 - ?) went to China and received a Song Zen transmission. [65] Although, nowadays, Kakua's transmission of Song Zen is considered as the first transmission to a Japanese monk, Kakua has never been regarded as the founder of Japanese Zen Buddhism. In addition, there was Kaikaku 戒覚 (? - ?), whose name has long been forgotten by history. The *Tosō ki* 渡宋記, a diary written down by Kaikaku, gives an account of his one year of living in China.[66] Those monks may have been rare examples whose names were actually recorded in historical documents, but there could have been other unknown monks who also went to China. Nevertheless, it was not an easy quest for medieval monks. One of the reasons that made the journey difficult was procuring the necessary funds.

[62] Jakushō is a mysterious figure. His name appears in the *Shijūjō ketsu*, which was composed by Kōgei and Jōen, associating with the origin of the combination *abhiṣeka,* although it is impossible to clarify its origin as a historical fact.
[63] DNBZ. Vol. 95 p. 53a
[64] DNBZ. Vol. 95 p. 97a
[65] Yanagida Seizan (1991) p. 245 Daigan Matsunaga (1976) p. 130
[66] ZTZ. Shiden II. pp. 320a – 325b He departed for China in 1082, and returned to Japan the following year.

In this respect, the question arises as to who provided funds for Yōsai. In fact, Yōsai's activities in China, for which he obviously needed a great amount of money, are mentioned in his biographical writings. For example, after his first visit to China, Yōsai brought back the Tiantai commentaries, written by Song scholar monks (*daisōkoku tendaishū shinshōsho* 大宋国天台宗新章疏).[67] Moreover, according to the *Ribenguo qianguangfashi citang ji* 日本国千光法師祠堂記, on the second occasion travelling to China, Yōsai donated three million to rebuild the main gate and cloisters of the Wannian temple 万年寺, Guanyin hall 観音院, Daci temple 大慈寺 and Zhizheta hall 智者塔院, all of which had been established on Mt. Tiantai 天台山.[68] It is also known that Yōsai was also involved in the reconstruction of the Jingde temple 景徳寺 on Mt. Tiantong 天童山.[69] These stories suggest that a great deal of money was spent by Yōsai. This begs the question of how he went about acquiring such a great deal funds. To investigate this question, one should give attention to his family background.

At the time when Yōsai decided to visit China, Japanese social and political circumstances were very chaotic due to the power struggles between Taira and Minamoto clans. Under such conditions, seeking patrons was unlikely to have been easy. Yet, Yōsai seems to have had a stroke of luck, as stated by the *Genkō shakusho*. The *Genkō shakusho* specifies that Taira-no-Yorimori 平頼盛 (1132 -

[67] *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* in Sueki (2007) p. 109b . The bibliography of the books he imported is extinct.

[68] ZGR. Vol. 9a. p. 273. A monetary unit for his donation is unknown. It is very likely that Yōsai used the currency of Southern Song, which was illegally circulated throughout late Heian Japan; in 1230, Song currency was legalised in Japan. According to the *Hyakuren shō*, it is said that a trade ship, owned by Saionji Kintsune, imported ten million *guan*. Moreover, the *Genkō shakusho* mentions Yōsai's importation of Japanese timbers to China. For this, Lin Ruihan addresses the appreciation of Japanese pine trees in the Song period. See: Lin (1989) p.351. The currency Yōsai used is not mentioned.

[69] Ibid; p. 273

1186), a brother of Taira-no-Kiyomori 平清盛 (1118 - 1181), sponsored Yōsai.[70] A brief outline will suffice for explaining this interesting link between Yōsai, the Taira clan and Myōun 明雲 (1115 - 1184), who was a head abbot of Mt. Hiei. For Yōsai's first journey in 1168, the Taira clan was still predominant or indeed at its apogee. Since Taira-no-Tadamori (1096 - 1153) expanded his territory towards northern Kyushu, he began to trade privately with Chinese merchants.[71] Due to the benefits from his private trade, the Taira clan gained massive supremacy in the area. [72] The Taira clan's colonisation eventually resulted in expanding the migration of Chinese merchants, which had deeply affected Yōsai's motivation for the voyage mentioned in the *Mirai ki* 未来記.[73] The region of what is now Okayama prefecture was also one of the most pivotal places for the Taira clan. Since Okayama prefecture had a station located between Kyoto and what is now Hiroshima prefecture, where the Taira clan established the Itsukushima shrine 厳島神社, this prefecture grew to become a major station under the control of the Taira clan.[74] The Kibitsu shrine, the nucleus shrine of this region, where Yōsai was born as a son of priest family, also took an initiative in regional development.[75] All of these historical facts explain that Yōsai's close relationship with the Taira clan did help him, financially speaking, to accomplish many construction projects.

[70] ZNBZ Vol. 101 p. 155b
[71] Gomi Fumihiko (1998) p. 67
[72] Ibid; p. 67
[73] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 17b
[74] Okayamashi shi p. 255
[75] Okayamashi shi p. 106

Myōun, Yōsai and the Taira Clan

Myōun, to whom Yōsai submitted the Tiantai commentarial works composed by Song scholar monks, is a key figure for clarifying how Yōsai raised funds. To begin with, it is worth describing Myōun, because, as has been mentioned, the *Genkō shakusho* states that Yōsai donated Tiantai commentaries to him. According to the *Tendai zasu ki* 天台座主記, Myōun of the Enyū bō 円融房 was born the second son of Minamoto-no-Akimichi 源顕通 (1081 - 1122).[76] Like most non-heirs, he entered Buddhist monkhood under the instruction of the ordained prince Saiun 最雲法親王 (1104 - 1162), who became the first prince-monk appointed as the head abbot of the Mt. Hiei.[77] Myōun was also trained by Sōjitsu 相実 (1081 - 1165), a well-known monk who is considered the founder of the Homan lineage 法曼流 of Taimitsu. Myōun was chosen to take the position of the head abbot of Mt. Hiei twice. The multiple appointments suggest Myōun was involved in politics. His first installation was rather bloody. The *Gukan shō* tells us that Myōun took over the abbotship from his predecessor Kaishū 快修 (1100 – 1172 aka Myōhō'in 妙法院) in 1167, a year before Yōsai went on his first study abroad to China.[78] The *Teiō hennen ki* 帝王編年記[79] also relates this event. Ten years on, Myōun might have been the most powerful monk in Japan. In such circumstances, it is noteworthy that Yōsai offered the invaluable volumes to Myōun.

Once Myōun became the abbot of Mt. Hiei he ordained Goshirakawa, the retired emperor, and Taira-no-Kiyomori.[80] Furthermore, emperor Takakura 高倉天

[76] ZGR. Vol. 4b p. 607b
[77] ZGR. Vol. 4b p. 607b
[78] NST. Vol. 86 p. 260 (1967) Nihon koten bungaku taikei vol. 86
[79] *Teiō hennen ki* p. 353 (1965) Shintei zōho kokushitaikei vol.12
[80] ZGR. Vol. 4b p. 609

皇 (1161 - 1181) employed him as his privy protection monk 護持僧.[81] Up until that point, Myōun's career had gone most favourably. However, one incident destroyed his career in 1176. According to the *Hyakuren shō*, a diary written in the thirteenth century by unknown author, this incident stemmed from the conflict between armed monks 大衆[82] and Fujiwara-no-Morotaka 藤原師高 (? - 1177) and his son Moromitsu 師光 (? – 1177 aka. Saikō 西光).[83] Bearing part of the responsibility for this incident, Myōun was stripped of the abbotship, and exiled to the Izu peninsula (in modern Shizuoka prefecture). However, his surrounders and supporters rescued him from captivity on the way to the eastern Japan, and returned him to Mt Hiei.[84] The *coup d'Etat* against the Taira clan plotted by Fujiwara-no-Morotaka and his son Moromitsu triggered the decline of the Taira government. Myōun, who had been hostile to them, was eventually acquitted by the retired emperor monk Goshirakawa, an ally of the Taira clan.[85] When the relationship between the Taira clan and Goshirakawa fell into discord, Myōun sided with the Taira clan.[86] Thanks to the victory of the Taira clan, he again became the head abbot of Mt. Hiei, and concurrently became the privy monk of the clan until the downfall of the Taira clan five years hence.[87] Additionally, Jien, who came from the Fujiwara regent family and wrote the *Gukan shō*, spoke harshly of

[81] *Tendai zasu ki* KT. 12 p. 611
[82] The term is also known as the *sōhei*. The role of the armed monks had been changed from classic to the medieval Japan. Particularly for the Tendai armed monks of the medieval Japan, Kinugawa Satoshi characterises them as the monks who were not consecrated and served to assist in performing series of major rituals conducted on Mt. Hiei. See: Kinugawa Satoshi (2004) pp. 38 - 57
[83] KT. Vol. 14 pp. 609 - 610
[84] KT. Vol. 12 pp. 343 – 344.
[85] KT. Vol. 12 p. 344
[86] KT. Vol. 12 p. 343
[87] KT. Vol. 12 p. 344

Myōun.[88] Since Yōsai acted closely with Myōun, who stood by the Taira clan, Jien depicted Yōsai in harsh terms as well in the *Gukan shō*, which is the basis from which the currently dominant views of Yōsai have been formed.

Regarding Yōsai's first study abroad, it is therefore sensible to attribute his success in fundraising to the patronage of the Taira clan. However, when Yōsai went for his second study abroad to China, the Taira clan had already been destroyed by the Minamoto clan. This significant power shift took place in 1185. Nevertheless, Taira-no-Yorimori survived the war, and the relationship between Yōsai and Yorimori endured even after the clan's downfall, as stated by the *Genkō shakusho*.[89] Additionally, according to the *Genkō shakusho*, Yōsai discussed with Yorimori that he once again wanted to go to China.[90] Although it cannot be concluded if it was a result of the Taira clan's downfall or not, Yorimori has not been supportive on this occasion.

Yōsai spent five years in China for his second study abroad, during which time he took part in reconstructing a number of temples, so much greater funds would be needed than for his first visit. It is likely that the Chinese merchants who migrated to northern Kyushu, particularly Hakata, played an important role in his fundraising. It is, therefore, necessary to be aware of his activities in northern Kyushu, where he spent almost one third of his life. The following section traces his footprints in northern Kyushu.

[88] NST. Vol. 86 p. 308
[89] DNBZ. Vol. 101. P.155b
[90] Ibid; p. 155b

Yōsai's Activities in Northern Kyushu

Yōsai had resided in northern Kyushu for nineteen years before his second journey to China. During this period, he concentrated on his writing activities. Some of his works reveal that he often had doctrinal disputes with other monks in northern Kyushu.[91] One of the key elements that caused Yōsai to concentrate on writing activities may be attributed to the erection of a temple, namely the Seigan temple. However, Yōsai did not have a hermit life in this temple, but travelled around northern Kyushu. According to the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu*, Yōsai visited other shrines and temples, such as Hakozaki-no-miya shrine 筥崎宮, Seburisen 背振山 temple and Harayama 原山 temple to exchange esoteric knowledge.[92] Among these shrines and temples, the Hakozaki-no-miya shrine was actually the place where he found his new sponsor for his second study abroad to China.

The importance of Chinese merchants should be mentioned in order to understand the circumstance of northern Kyushu in the late Heian period. As has been said, the political establishment in Kyoto stopped official trade, although private trade continued. There might have been many Chinese merchants who came to Japan during this period. Among them, Yōsai's relationship with the Zhang family 張氏 is important, because Yōsai was informed about the rise of Zen by Zhang Guoan 張国安.[93] A stone monument discovered in the modern Ningbo province is the earliest record of the Zhang family.[94] The monument states that

[91] For the actual contents of these debates, see the chapter on Yōsai's doctrine.
[92] The Hakozaki-no-miya shrine was known as it the Hachiman jin, which is the most popular figure of *kami* combined with Buddhism. It was recognised as a one of branch temple-shrines of the Iwashimizu Hachiman. See: *Tendai zasuki* p. 630
[93] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 17a
[94] http://www.japanology.cn/japanese/magazine/03lunji20/03lunwenji02.html. In this article, Wang Yong attempts to decipher three stone monuments which have been preserved too poorly to be readable .

Zhang Nin 張寧 and Zhang Gongyi 張公意 went there in 1167 to hold a memorial service for their parents. This inscription provides evidence that the Zhang family immigrated to Japan before 1167, the year Yōsai went to his first study abroad. The monument also describes the Zhang family as devoted to Buddhism. Furthermore, concerning Zhang family's devotion to Buddhism, the monument reads that the Zhang family (Zhang Xing 張興 and Zhang Ying 張英) became enthusiastic supporters of the Hakozaki-no-miya shrine in the mid-thirteenth century.[95] The close relationship between Yōsai's group and the Zhang family is recognisable in the *Shōitsu kokushi nenpu* 聖一国師年譜, which asserts that Bennen Enni, who belongs to Yōsai's lineage, was asked to write an inscription on his portrait by Zhang Sugang 張四綱, who may have also been a member of the Zhang family.[96]

According to the above investigations, Yōsai was sponsored by the Taira clan and the Zhang family in order study abroad to China. It can be said that without those sponsors, his activities, such as the importation of the Tiantai commentaries to Japan and all of the temple reconstructions in China, would not have been successful. Indeed, Yōsai might have been unable to import so-called Zen Buddhism to Japan, either.

1) Seigan Temple

As has been mentioned, Yōsai had lived at Seigan temple for nineteen years. Thus, this temple was like his home. Because of his long stay in Seigan temple, this temple has stored two invaluable manuscripts, *Seiganji urabon engi* 誓願寺盂蘭盆

[95] *Hakozaki no miya shiryo* (1970)
[96] DNBZ. 95 p. 66

縁起 and *Seiganji sōken engi* 誓願寺創建縁起, the former of which was signed by Yōsai.[97] To understand the origin of Seigan temple, the *Seiganji sōken engi* is indispensable. The author of the *Seiganji sōken engi* is unknown, but the *Nihon kotenseki sōgō mokuroku* 日本古典籍総合目録 considers the composer to be Kanchi 寛智, the monk who erected the temple. As we shall see, however, the authorship of the *Seiganji sōken engi* can be attributed to Yōsai. In order to ascertain the author of the *Seiganji sōken engi*, I have translated all of the passages, which are as follows.

The Origin of Imazu Seigan temple

There is no beginning of earth and heaven until [Buddha] creates the law. Mind has no substance, until [Buddha] realises the Principle. Sentient beings, who have neither beginning nor substance, still talk about the materiality. Nevertheless, I think that the origin of temples, which have places and shapes, are worthy to mention.

What is called the Seigan temple was proposed by a woman from Nakahara clan, and erected by Kanchi, who is a fellow of the woman. Since the woman turned thirty four years old, she has deeply regretted being a woman, who has five unattainable figures[98]; [she] has always wished to be with Buddha;

[97] These manuscripts have been kept at Kyushu rekishi shiryokan since 1977. Taga Munehaya asserts that extant copy of the *Seiganji sōken engi* is the signature of Yōsai, but it is very obvious that the copy was made much later than the contemporary of Yōsai in comparison with the *Seiganji urabom engi*.

[98] Famously, the *Lotus sūtra* addresses the five figures women cannot attain. The five figures are *Brahmma*, *Indra*, *Deva*, *Cakravartiraajan* and *Buddha*. However, at the same, the *Lotus sūtra* advocates that women can attain to enlightenment by referring to the Daughter of the Dragon King.

[she] has always admired the Lotus [pedestal] of nine grades[99]. At this point, [her] spirit connects with millions of Amida's incarnations; [she] arouses the vow to engrave the statue of a life-sized Shakyamuni[100]; [her] mind contemplates on [making] a Buddha land, which is purified and bounded by the golden rope[101]. Because [she] "made a vow" to establish a small temple, the temple is, thus, named the temple of Making a Vow, Seigan temple (*seigan ji* 誓願寺). On the first day of the fifth month of the second year of Kao, the year of 1170, [she] aroused the vow, and wrote down three wishes for the first time. First is to make the statue of life-sized Shakyamuni. Second is to copy six hundred volumes of the *Prajñā sūtra*. Third is to collect one thousand monks who believe in the *Fahua jing*.

After that, in the tenth month of the first year of Jōan, the year of 1171, [she] summoned a timber merchant from Suō prefecture 周州[102] to prepare for making the statue. [She] allotted thirteen stones of rice. However, [she] was unable to obtain appropriate wood the first two times; at the third time, [she] received a divine revelation and spotted the suitable wood. That was indeed a sign from Amida.

[99] This may indicate the Pure Land of nine grades. According to the *Guan muliangshou jing*, it is said that once one succeeds to rebirth in the outside of six worlds, on will rebirth on one of nine grades of Pure Land. The Lotus pedestal is an illustration of Pure Land. (T. 12 no. 365 pp. 344c – 346a) This text was translated in Song China. Alternatively, the term can be traced back to the *Dezangpusa yigui*. In this text, the nine grades means the central level of the Womb *maṇḍala*. (T.20 no. 1158 p. 652).

[100] Buddha's height has been believed approximately sixteen feet. When the statue is in seating position, it is often made into approximately six feet.

[101] The temple is likened to the space, which is sacred with golden ropes. The golden ropes to indicate sacred space is still seen in shrines.

[102] This corresponds to the modern Yamaguchi prefecture. The Suō prefecture is often abbreviated to the Bō prefecture.

During the autumn in the second year of [Jōan], ninety one pieces of timber arrived; in the eighteenth of the third month of the same year, the year of 1173, the ceremony, which celebrated the start of carving the statue about the time of the dragon[103]. In the third day of the fifth month of the same year, promoters[104] inscribed their names on the halo of the statue. For seventy days until its completion, sculptor and the promoters made great efforts; there was no hindrance. In the twenty eight day of the same month, work began; in the twenty third of the tenth month of the fifth year [of Jōan], years of labour were accomplished. Yōsai, a monk of Mt. Nichiō of Bizen province, who went to China, was anxious about it, so that [Yōsai] humbly offered to hold the combinatory 合行 *maṇḍala* offering ritual. Although the weather of this year was exceptionally stormy even after the first day of winter, on that particular day, it was like a spring day with clear sky. So, many monks and lay believers, whether wise or foolish, gathered around. This was indeed a result of Amida's miraculous power, because promoters kept worshipping Amida. Additionally, [they] borrowed the *Panruo jing* 般若経 in six hundred volumes from Chinese people, and [someone] lectured [on this canonical scripture] on the day. The numbers of the Lotus practitioners (*jikyō sha* 持経者) had not yet reached to one thousand.

The lay people of the temple land bode well; a mountain located to the north side of the temple, which protects from misfortunes that come from the ominous direction. The bay, located to the south, is filled with the water with

[103] From 8 to 10 AM.
[104] A woman from the Nakahara clan and Kanchi

eight attributes of Mt. Sumeru (*hachi kudoku* 八功徳).[105] Mountains, where [one] can pray for Venus, which arises from the east [of the temple]. Shore located to the west of this temple; it is the path to the Pure Land of Unending Delight. In front of the temple, a small town has been built up; this may be for the sake of sentient beings saved from suffering (*geke shujō* 下化衆生). There is nothing at the behind of [the temple]; this may be for the sake of [one's] will to attain enlightenment (*jōgu bodai* 上求菩提). [This temple] becomes a [Japanese] Qinglong [temple] of eastern China (*tōkan* 東漢)[106], and manifests the white lotus of the Western Land. Because of a vow made in the past and the completion of sermons in this life, [one's] ten thousand of shames has been extinguished.

Now, Kanchi is fifty five years old; a woman of the Nakahara clan is thirty nine years old, they have had four boys and four girls. Now, to make known to the posterity, [I] wrote down the origin of [this temple].

In the twenty fifth day of the tenth month of the first year of Angen.[107]

(*Chikuzen imazu seiganji*. pp. 12 - 13)

Although this is an anonymous manuscript, it has been long considered as the work of Kanchi (*Nihon kotenseki sōgō mokuroku*), as was said. On the contrary,

[105] The eight attributes of the Lotusis described in the Pure Land. The eight attributes are: sweetness, freshness, softness, lightness, purity, scentlessness, cleansing and nourishing.
[106] Alternatively, this could indicate the blue dragon, which is one of the four heavenly protectors of four directions(the blue dragon protects the east).
[107] 1175

Taga Munehaya attributed it to Yōsai.[108] Taga has not provided any evidence of Yōsai's authenticity, but it seems to me his assumptions are sound. Firstly, it reads '[M]any monks and lay believers, whether wise or foolish, gathered around. This was indeed a result of Amida's miraculous power, because the promoters kept worshipping Amida.' These passages pay homage to promoters' deep devotion and piety to Buddhism. Because the promoters, whom are spoken of highly, indicate Kanchi and a woman of the Nakahara clan, it is most unlikely that Kanchi was the composer of the text of the *Seiganji konryu engi*. Secondly, the passages, which state 'Yōsai, who went to China, a monk of Mt. Nichiō of Bizen province, was anxious about it, so that [Yōsai] humbly offered to hold the combinatory *maṇḍala* offering ritual' proves that the text was composed by Yōsai, because a honorific word expressing humility was used. From this, it is easily recognisable that the author of the *Seiganji konryū engi*, who is most likely Yōsai, has used a humble-term when depicting the scene Yōsai offered performing the ritual. In addition, referring to or indeed advertising the combinatory *maṇḍala* offering ritual, which is a crucial concept of Yōsai's idea of esotericism, strongly suggests that Yōsai was the writer of this document.

A question also arises why the discourses of the Pure Land Buddhism appear so often in those passages. This could have been a reason why editor of the *Nihon kotenseki sōgō mokuroku* doubted Yōsai as the genuine author. However, one should be aware that combinatory practice of various forms of Buddhism was performed throughout classic and medieval Japan. This seems a reflection of real circumstances of Buddhism at the time. Actually, the *Shaseki shū* by Mujū 無住 (1226 - 1312) written about a hundred years after Yōsai explains his

[108] Taga Munehaya (1965) pp. 56 - 57

comprehensive attitude towards practice. Moreover, according to the postscript of the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu*, Yōsai himself stated that he practiced *nenbutsu* in order to decide whether he needed to write this text.[109] This *nenbutsu* refers not to a chanting *nenbutsu* (*kushō nenbutsu* 口称念仏), but a visualisation *nenbutsu* (*kansō nenbutsu* 観想念仏), which was popularised by Genshin (944 - 1017), retrospectively seen as the founder of Tendai Pure Land teachings. Thus, frequent mentions of the Pure Land Buddhism in the *Seiganji sōken engi* should not be misconstrued as evidence that this work is an inauthentic writing attributed to Yōsai. Although modern scholars, such as Taga, posited that the temple had been erected by Yōsai, the temple was in fact founded by Kanchi and a woman of the Nakahara clan. Such conflation seems to arise due to Yōsai's long stay at Seigan temple.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that here the Taira clan's help was also involved in erecting Seigan temple. The temple was established in the Ito manor (*ito no shō* 怡土荘), which was governed by the Hōkongō hall 法金剛院 of the Ninna temple (*ninna ji* 仁和寺). The administrator of the Ito manor was a monk Nōsei(ren) 能盛(蓮)法師 (? - 1180 - ?), whose name before being ordained was Taira Yoshimori 平頼盛.[110] Thus, he was a member of the Taira clan. Nōsei was also known as Suō Nyūdō 周防入道, which leads us to presume that he was the reason why the promoters of Seigan temple offered the job of collecting timber to Suō province. Additionally, Yōsai had a close connection with Suō province even after

[109] T. 70 no. 2293 p.32a.

[110] Masaki Kisaburo (1978) p. 10 Specifically, he came from the Kanmu branch of the Taira clan, whose surname was converted from Fujiwara. *Ito no shō no Nosei hosshi nitsuite* in the Tōkai daigaku kiyō, bungakubu

his second study abroad, at which time he played role of the Chief solicitor of Tōdai temple. Chōgen 重源 (1121 - 1206) also collected timber from this province.

To conclude, attention also should be paid to the uniqueness of Seigan temple. That is to say, the temple treasures include a nine-pronged *vajra* 九鈷杵.[111] A nine-pronged *vajra* is unusual in the context of Japanese esotericism as it is merely mentioned in passing in the *Jingangding jing* 金剛頂経, one of the major texts of esoteric Buddhism, translated by Sino-Indian scholar monk, Dānapāna (? – 1045 - ? Shihu 施護), and the *Foshuo dabeikongzhi jingangdajiaowang yi* 仏説大悲空智金剛大教王儀 by Dharmarakşa (963 – 1058 Fahu 法護).[112] In particular, the *Foshuo dabeikongzhi jingangdajiaowang yi* is nowadays categorised as falling within *Anuttarayoga tantra*, or Unexcelled tantra.[113] The *Mikkyō daijiten* also considers the nine-pronged *vajra* as it shows Tibetan influence on Song esotericism.[114] These suggestions in fact imply the possibility that *Annuttara tantra* developed in late Tibetan tantrism, and as similar discourses are also seen in Yōsai's thought, meaning they could have been transmitted to medieval Japan. However, since the two esoteric scriptures mentioned above do not contain explanations of the meanings of the nine-pronged *vajra*, one can hardly resolve this issue.[115] The reason why such a rare ritual instrument was preserved at Seigan temple may be attributed to the fact that is situated in northern Kyushu, Japan's most active trade area throughout classical and medieval Japan.

[111] Chikuzen imazu Seiganji (1977) p.8
[112] T. 18 no. 885 p. 473a and T. 18 no. 892 p. 601b.
[113] Matunaga Yūkei (2006) pp. 91 - 92
[114] *Mikkyō daijiten*. p. 332a
[115] The former scripture presents the *vajra* as an object for visualisation practice, whereas the latter scripture introduces the *vajra* symbolising anger.

2) Other Sites in Northern Kyushu

According to the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* and the *Jūshū kyōshu ketsu*, while Yōsai was engrossed in his writing based at Seigan temple, he also travelled around northern Kyushu. As far as Yōsai notes, he paid visits to Hakozaki-no-miya shrine, Hōon hall of Kashii-no-miya shrine 香椎宮報恩院, Harayama temple 原山, Yanaisaka temple 楊(柳)坂寺 and Seburisen temple 背振山.[116] Among these temples/shrines, Seburisen is a distinctively important site in terms of Yōsai's activities.

Seburisen temple (nowadays known as Ryōsen temple 霊仙寺) has been prosperous as one of the most famous sacred places for mountain practice of Buddhism in northern Kyushu since the eighth century. Yōsai saw this temple as a special spiritual site, because famous esoteric monks, such as Kōgei 皇慶 (977 - 1049) and Shōkū 性空 (910 - 1007), visited this temple, before their attempts at traveling to China. The name of the temple has been referred to in many invaluable historical documents, which are mostly biographies of highly significant monks, such as *Tani ajari den* 谷阿闍梨伝 (Aka *Kōgei den* 皇慶伝) and *Shitsuji den* 悉地伝 (Aka *Shōkū den* 性空伝). Kōgei has been recognised as the founder of the Tani lineage 谷流, which, competing with the Kawa lineage 川流, later formed the mainstream Taimitsu lineage. The *Tani ajari den* states that Kōgei sojourned during his summer at Seburisen temple when he attempted to make a journey to China. While he was staying there, Kōgei met En'in 延印.[117] Although En'in's name

[116] The Kashii-no-miya shrine still exists, but the Hōon hall has dissappeared. There is no extant document which refers to Harayama temple apart from that of Yōsai.
[117] ZTZ. Shiden 2. p. 316b

has not appeared in any lineage charts representing Kōgei's master-disciple relationship, according to the *Tani ajari den*, Kōgei was instructed by En'in, and En'in certificated his realisation of Buddhahood.[118]

Hence, Seburisen temple could have been a religious and spiritual place of the utmost importance for Yōsai. As the matter of fact, Yōsai expressed his sincere respect to Kōgei and En'in in the *Gokokuron*.[119] Moreover, it has been told that Shōkū 性空 (910 - 1007), a relative of Kōgei[120] and the de facto founder of Enkyō temple on Mt. Shosha 書写山・円教寺, stayed and strove to train at Seburisen temple. As well as the *Tani ajari den*, the *Shitsuji den* 悉地伝, a biography of Shōku, reveals to what extent Seburisen temple has been acclaimed to be a miraculous religious spot. As it reads:

> [Shōkū] settled in Mt. Seburi in the Chikuzen prefecture when he was thirty nine years old. [He always] chanted the *Fahua jing* 法華経 in a calm environment of the mountain without any disturbance of people. When [he] felt relaxed in such surroundings, two teenagers came and sat on both sides. [They] sat together [with him], and uttered the *Fahua jing*. [Their] appearances were good-looking, and [their] voices were elegant. At that moment, a monk, who was not so familiar [to him], and was obviously not an ordinary being, [appeared] and gave him a single sheet of paper. He held it in his left hand, and made a gesture of a set of obeisance and an utterance. [Because of this,] recompense of good fortune extended all over places; and the fascicles of the *Fahua jing* started to shine. [Shōkū] was about to attain

[118] Ibid; p. 317a
[119] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 16b
[120] Both Kōgei and Shōkū came from the Tachibana clan.

Buddhahood. He thought that this was an extraordinary [experience] so that [he] departed to find the right place to complete his training…

(ZTZ. Shiden 2. p. 156a)

Taking the episodes of Kōgei and Shōkū into consideration, it appears that Seburisen temple had already become a famous historic site even in the time of Yōsai. Thus, his visit to Seburisen temple was a sort of pilgrimage to follow in his predecessors footprints.

Yanaisaka temple is now known as Eishō temple, which belongs to the Soto school at present. Yōsai writes, in the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu*, that there was an opponent in a debate who lived in this temple. Not far from Yanaisaka temple is Senkō temple 千光寺, which was established by Yōsai in 1193 once he came back from his second study abroad to China.[121] Most source materials in relation with Yanaisaka temple have been lost, but the *Kan'enki* 寛延記, states that the temple was built by the order of Emperor Tenmu 天武天皇 (? - 686) in order to protect the country.[122] The temple, in its early period, consisted of thirty six small halls that belonged to the Tendai school. While this temple has since been absorbed into the Sōtō school it is nevertheless not possible to assert that it is one of the oldest Zen temples in Japan, alongside those erected in northern Kyushu. The promoter of the temple has been said to be a certain Kusano tayū Nagahira 草野太夫永平 about whom nothing is known. The temple consisted of seven buildings 七堂伽藍 which indicate that it should have been recognised as an appropriate temple. Harayama

[121] The *Kanenki* is a book of local history, written by a community leader (*shōya*) in the late Edo period. This book is accessible in *Kurume shiryō sōsho*, 3.
[122] *Fukuokaken no chimei* (2004) p.35

temple was situated in what is now Nagasaki prefecture, but neither the temple buildings nor any other structures still exist. Further information of this temple is unknown due to the lack of source materials. As will be discussed later, Gonrin 厳琳 (? - ?), who had been appointed as the sixth abbot of Kennin temple (*kennin ji* 建仁寺), used to live in Yanaisaka temple.[123]

To sum up the major characteristics of Yōsai's activities in northern Kyushu, it is said that his nineteen-year stay was not only to wait for the opportunity of going to China, but also to propagate his esoteric teachings. While he based at Seigan temple for writing downs his ideas on esotericism, he travelled around all over northern Kyushu, visiting historical Buddhist sites where his predecessors had spent time. Furthermore, the importance of northern Kyushu in the context of the development of Japanese Buddhist culture is worthy to note. As we have seen in records from temples in northern Kyushu, Yōsai had frequent communications with immigrant Chinese merchants, who introduced contemporary trends of Chinese Buddhism. As the matter of fact, almost all of the foremost Buddhist monks who went to China, such as Saichō, Kūkai, Ennin, Enchin and so on, embarked from northern. Hence, for Yōsai, whose desire to travel overseas was to make pilgrimage, these contributing factors reveal that making the decision to move to northern Kyushu was practically a foregone conclusion..

[123] See: the part of Yōsai and his disciples.

Travel to China

Yōsai went to China twice, which was indeed a rare example at the time.[124] His first journey to China was a short one, approximately six months. As has been mentioned, Yōsai's motive to study abroad to China was not to learn the Zen/Chan Buddhism which was popular in Song China at the time. However, according to the *Kōzen gokoku ron*, written after his return from China, Yōsai declares that he had already been aware of the rise of Zen in China even before his first travel.[125] Assessing this statement is very difficult because of two reasons. The first reason is the nature of the *Kōzen gokoku ron*. The aim of this work was to demonstrate the authenticity and importance of what he imported from China. Hence, although he had been unfamiliar with Zen at the time, he may have wanted to stress his long time interest in it in order to hint at his own prescience. The second reason is in fact that Yōsai's previous knowledge of the rise of Zen in China could be true, since, as has been discussed before, it is very likely he was able to meet some Chinese immigrants, who could speak about the contemporary Chinese situation. In my opinion, Yōsai indeed knew that Zen was gaining popularity in China, even before his first journey. However, the study of Zen was not the primary purpose for him, according to the other chapter of the *Kōzen gokoku ron*. That is to say, he mentions that the purpose of his second study abroad was to make a pilgrimage to India.

Unfortunately, he did not write down a travel diary like Ennin's *Nittō guhō junrei kōki* 入唐求法巡礼行記.[126] The only extant source describing Yōsai's motive

[124] According to the *Gyokuyō*, Chōgen went to China three times, but a modern scholar, Saeki Kōji, asserted that this was Chōgen's own claim. See Saeki Kōji (2004) p. 66. For the *Gyoku yō*, see the next paragraph.
[125] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 1a
[126] There are many books on this work. See for instance, Reischauer Edwin (1955), Mibu Taishun (1967) and Anami Virginia (2007).

for this trip is the *Genkō shakusho*.[127] According to the *Genkō shakusho*, he disembarked to Ningbo 寧波 on the fourth month of 1168. He headed southwest, to the location of Mt. Tiantai. On the way to Mt. Tiantai, he met Chōgen 重源 (1121 - 1206), who accompanied Yōsai during this trip. They stayed together at the Wannian temple 万年寺, which was one of the temple complexes of the mountain. The *Genkō shakusho* recounts a story that praises Yōsai's success in crossing over a stone bridge in which it was believed that people having defilements were unable to cross. Once he got to the opposite bank, he met over five hundred *arahat* (*aluohan* 阿羅漢) and offered them tea. These anecdotes referred to in the *Genkō shakusho* seem highly hagiographical. Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149 - 1207), a close friend of Chōgen, wrote down a very similar story told by Chōgen, in his diary, *Gyoku yō* 玉葉.[128] Moreover, as was noted, according to the *Genkō shakusho* and Yōsai's brief autobiography, written in the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu*, Yōsai imported sixty fascicles of commentarial works composed by Song Tiantai masters. However, Yōsai compiled neither a catalogue nor bibliography.

To explore his second journey to China is difficult because, unfortunately, Yōsai's activities, such as what kind of practices he was trained in when he received certified Zen transmission, have not been documented. For this, the *Genkō shakusho* and the *Kōzen gokoku ron* are merely reliable as source materials to investigate.

[127] DNBZ. Vol. 101 p. 156b

Yōsai writes in the *Kōzen gokoku ron*, which read that 'To make a pilgrimage to India, I left Japan on the third month of 1187. I arrived in China with *Datang xiyu ji* 大唐西域記 and Buddhist certificates…"[129] Although the *Kōzen gokoku ron* claims that he has a sound aim, to import Zen Buddhism, on this occasion, this suggests that Yōsai's purpose of the second trip was actually to make pilgrimage to India. The *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* 金剛頂宗菩提心論口決, completed just two months before his departure, referred to his motive as it was exactly the same as what was expressed in the *Kōzen gokoku ron*.[130] However, Chinese officials declined his written application. Ironically, this failure gave Yōsai an opportunity to learn Zen Buddhism during his five year stay. Once his demand was declined, Yōsai moved to Mt. Tiantai where he was stayed about twenty years earlier with Chōgen. In this occasion, by his good fortune, Xu'an Huaichang 虚庵懷敞, who would become Zen mentor of Yōsai, temporary resided at the Wannian temple. In the relation of Yōsai with Xuan Huaichang, three episodes are mentioned in the *Genkō shakusho*. The first is about Yōsai's transmission of esoteric Buddhism to Xuan Huaichang. This is highly questionable since there is no historical evidence. It seems to me that Kokan Shiren, who created the first hagiographical image of Yōsai, very likely aimed at elevating Yōsai's evaluation in a sectarian sense, such as when Kokan Shiren praised him as the first patriarch of Japanese Zen.[131] By using such rhetoric, Kokan Shiren equated Yōsai's position to Xuan Huaichang. The second is his service for the temple reconstructions on Mt. Tiantai. As has been discussed, Yōsai built or rebuild many temples while he was

[129] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 5a and 16a. In the *Kōzen gokoku ron,* Yōsai presents this work as the *Xuanzhuang ji,* the record of Xuanzhuang.
[130] T. 70 no. 2293 p. 32a.
[131] Yōsai's image was composed differently by many sectarian ideologues. It actually reveals that he was a more respected figure in the medieval time.

staying in China. The third seems the most crucial one as it is about Yōsai's Zen transmission. According to the *Kōzen gokoku ron*, he always followed from place to place where Xuan Huaichang visited. Yōsai first met Xuan Huaiching at the Jingde temple 景徳寺, and there, Yōsai began to participate in Xuan Huaichang's Zen group. The Zen lineage Yōsai transmitted was one of Linji 臨済 lineages, namely the Huanglong lineage 黄竜派. Among many Japanese monks who received transmitted Zen lineage transmissions in China, Yōsai was the only one who belonged to the Huanglong lineage. Moreover, it is noteworthy that Yōsai was bestowed the Bodhisattva precepts by Xuan Huaichang. The *Genkō shakusho* states that Xuan Huaichang told Yōsai about the importance of adhering precepts and *vinaya* for Zen training. This is deeply reflected in the *Kōzen gokoku ron*, in which Yōsai advocated that the confusion of the country occurred from violation of precepts and renunciation of *vinaya*.[132] Furthermore, although Yōsai seems to have spent most of his time joining in Zen training, he kept his interest in esoteric Buddhism during his stay in China. In fact, at the same time, he recompiled the *Ingoshū* 隠語集, in which he explained the mind state of enlightenment in esoteric terms by using metaphors.[133] He also started writing a draft of the *Shukke taikō* 出家大綱 asserting that *vinaya*, or monastic rules, need to be strictly observed.[134]

Yōsai came back from China on the seventh month of 1191. However, Yōsai's road to success, propagating what he had learnt in China, was not very smooth because he needed to face a group of people who were threaten by him and his importation of Zen.

[132] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 5b Here, he cited passages from the *Niepan jing* (T. 12 no. 374 p. 381b).
[133] See the next chapter.
[134] See the chapter for examining Yōsai's esoteric works.

Return to Japan

Once Yōsai returned from China, the court forbade him to come up to Kyoto. He had to stay in northern Kyushu almost for three years until he arrived at Kyoto in 1194. The *Genkō shakusho* states that Yōsai at first introduced Bodhisattva precepts he inherited in China, on the occasion of *posadha* (*fusatsu* 布薩) conducted at Hōon temple 報恩寺.[135] Apart from this story, his activities after the return are unknown. Presumably, he resided most of the time in Seigan temple, and was deeply involved in its foundation, as the temple preserved some manuscripts of the *Fahua jing*, transcribed in 1192. According to the *Genkō shakusho*, in 1198, Yōsai was bequeathed the certificate of the Eight-Five secrets (*hachigo fuzoku injin* 八五付属印信), which had been considered as the most profound secret teaching in Japanese esotericism, from Kikō.[136] As well as Yōsai, Jien had also received transmission of this teaching from Kikō. Additionally, it is noteworthy that the core doctrine of Jien consists of the Eight-Five secrets representing the non-duality/identity of two mandalic worlds, namely the ultimate reality.[137]

The first reference to Yōsai in Kamakura documents was the *Hyakuren shō* 百錬抄, compiled in the late thirteenth century.[138] As it reads, "There was a rumour that Yōsai and Nōnin tried to establish the Daruma school… Monks of Mt. Hiei submitted the petition to the Imperial court to ban their activities."[139] Concerning the citation, Nōnin indicates Dainichibō Nōnin 大日房能忍 (? - ?) who has been

[135] DNBZ. Vol. 101 p. 157a
[136] However, one of recently discovered documents of Yōsai reveal that similar discourse connecting to the Eight-Five secrets can be found in it.
[137] See also the introductory part of this chapter. The Eight-Five secrets are exactly same as the *Secret abhişeka*.
[138] The *Hyakuren shō* was compiled by unknown editor who may have been close to aristocracies in Kyoto. This work has often been compared with the *Azuma kagami*.
[139] KT. Vol. 14 p. 164

considered as the founder of the Daruma school 達磨宗. Although some manuscripts, written by members of Japanese Daruma school, have been discovered recently, only a little is known about this group.[140] According to the *Genkō shakusho*, Nōnin was ordained at Mt. Hiei, and held an interest in Zen, which he might have known because of Kakua, who received Zen certificate transmission from Fohai Huiyuan 仏海慧遠 (? - 1135 – 1174 - ?) of the Lingyin temple 霊隠寺 a decade prior to Yōsai.[141] However, Nōnin had neither been to China nor been given certified Zen transmission from a Chinese master. That is to say, Nōnin was essentially self-trained. The author of the *Hyakuren shō* has not really distinguished Yōsai's Zen from that of Nōnin. Importantly, such random awareness of Zen may have triggered Yōsai's composition of the *Kōzen gokoku ron* in order to manifest the legitimacy of his Zen lineal transmission, or indeed of his Zen school. Furthermore, soon after he arrived in Kyoto, Yōsai was accused by the Tendai school of propagating Zen, which the Tendai school deemed to be a cause social confusion. In order to defend himself from the accusation, the *Kōzen gokoku ron*'s overall tone is adjusted to the Tendai school by means of its terminologies, canons and formulations.

Newly emerged political power, namely the Kamakura bakufu 鎌倉幕府, invited Yōsai, and placed him as their religious ideologue. This religious ideology of the bakufu was, as Sasaki Kaoru calls, a "zen-soteric ideology".[142] Obviously, their interests mutually agreed in the sense of religio-politico interdependence. Nonetheless, the Kamakura bakufu demanded Yōsai to perform esoteric rituals in

[140] See for instance, Sueki Fumihiko (2008).
[141] Kakua's Zen may have been too eccentric to be understood by then Japanese. An episode that Kakua, who summoned by Emperor Takakura inquiring what Zen is, whistled in response to the emperor's question, is well known.
[142] Sasaki Kaoru (1997) p. 138.

most cases. Yōsai's activities connecting with the Kamakura bakufu are referred to in the *Azuma kagami* 吾妻鑑. Interestingly, according to the *Azuma kagami*, Yōsai's roles were mostly performing series of offering rituals (*kuyō hō* 供養法).[143] Moreover, it should be emphasised that Yōsai was considered as an esoteric monk at this time. Alongside the *Azuma kagami*, the *Shaseki shū*, the *Keiran shūyō shū* depicted Yōsai as he practiced Zen together with esoteric Buddhism. In the *Keiran shūyō shū*, interestingly, a passage even asserted that Yōsai considered esoteric Buddhism to be superior to Zen.[144]

In 1200, Yōsai erected Jufuku temple 寿福寺 under the patronage of the Kamakura bakufu. This was a turning point in the way in which Yōsai was seen by his contemporaries.[145] Two years after the establishment of Jufuku temple, in 1202, he was finally allowed to construct a temple in Kyoto. That was Kennin temple, completed in 1204. The early complex of Kennin temple consisted of three buildings, which were Zen, esoteric and Tendai meditation (*shikan* 止観) halls. The reason for establishing a threefold temple complex can be attributed to Yōsai's idea of comprehensive training, but it is impossible to ascertain.[146]

As well as Yōsai's attempt to erect the Zen school, Yōsai is known for his role as the Chief temple solicitor of the Tōdai temple, the post that supervises temple reconstructions, from 1206 until his death.[147] Yōsai's predecessor was Chōgen, who accompanied Yōsai during his first study abroad. So, one can presume

[143] For example, offering ritual of sixteen *arahat* heavily implies a Zen element, while *Acala* (fudō) offering rite denotes an esoteric element.
[144] T. 76 no. 2410 p. 760b and c
[145] See, for instance, the *Tōji tendai kechimyaku fu*.
[146] Taga Munehaya (1965) pp. 126 - 127
[147] Matsuo Kenji (2007) p. 104

that Chōgen may have had a hand in Yōsai's appointment to the chief solicitor. The actual activities of Yōsai throughout this period are not clear, but some fragmented documents that can shed the light on it have been discovered at the Shinpuku temple archive with Yōsai's unknown works. They are letters written by Yōsai while he was acting as the Chief solicitor.[148] The contents of these letters concern administrative issues occurred in the reconstruction project. According to the letters, Yōsai made a great effort not only to raise funds of the Tōdai temple, but also to deal with crime prevention, such as timber thieves. Furthermore, Yōsai's autography links him to Tōdai temple. This autography was written and submitted to its temple for his dedication of a priceless Chinese ink stick and writing brush when the repairing of one of towers had been completed.[149] These facts reveal how heavily Yōsai took part in Nara Buddhist society in his last years.

Yōsai also embarked on the reconstruction of the Hōshō temple 法勝寺 in Kyoto, which had suffered from the civil war between Minamoto and Taira clans. This temple later became one of headquarters for Precept group (*kaike* 戒家), which displays Yōsai's doctrinal influence.[150] Reflecting on his success at rebuilding these temples, Yōsai submitted a petition to the court to acquire the title of Most venerable (*daishi* 大師). Because the title was usually given after deaths of venerable monks, many criticised his action. For instance, as stated in the *Gukanshō* 愚管抄 and *Gyokuyō* 玉葉, written by people who were close to the Kyoto

[148] Inaba Nobumichi (2003) pp. 136 – 147. These letters are found from series of manuscripts relating to *hetuvidya* (inmyo). The reverses of letters have been recycled by *hetuvidya* scholar monks (probably someone called Rōnnen bō) of Tōnan'in temple, which had a strong linkage to Shinpuku temple since the founder of its temple, Nōshin (? - ?), used to study at Tōnan'in temple. Thus, majority of old documents connect to Nara Buddhism of the time.
[149] Taga Munehaya (1965) p. 94.
[150] For details, see the part of the Precept Consecration.

establishment, spoke of Yōsai in harsh terms.[151] Consequently, his plan went wrong, and he was instead offered the title of *gon sōjō* 権僧正. In contrast, the author of the *Shaseki shū* 沙石集, Mujū Ichien 無住一円 whose esoteric lineage can be traced back to Yōsai, set a high value on his obtainment of this title.[152]

His Death

There have been two accounts concerning the date of Yōsai's death. The first account is based on the *Azuma kagami*, which records it as the fifth day of the sixth month of 1215 at Jufuku temple. The second account is derived from the *Shaseki shū*, the *Daijō'in guchu ryaku nikki* 大乗院具中暦日記 and the *Genkō shakusho*, which state that he died in Kyoto on the fifth day of the seventh month of 1215 at Kennin temple. The controversy over the date of his death has long been maintained, and most previous studies endorse the former account. Those surveys arrived at this conclusion because the *Azuma kagami* was the only document written contemporaneously with Yōsai's, whereas the rest of works were composed about a hundred years after his death.[153] In contrast, Tachi Takashi has recently proposed the coherence of the second account by introducing the *Daijō'in guchu ryaku nikki*, which he discovered in Isseido shoten 一誠堂書店 in Tokyo.[154] However, Tachi's survey is problematic. First, although he keeps claiming the importance of this text, he does not demonstrate why it has such a significant meaning. Second, Tachi cites the passages from the *Daijō'in guchu ryaku nikki* only a couple of times,

[151] NST. Vol. 86. p. 297
[152] KBT. Vol. 85. p. 108
[153] Taga Munehaya (1965) p. 122.
[154] Tachi Takashi (2009) p. 76

and he provides key evidence mostly through use of other historical documents, such as the ones noted above. Thus, Tachi's discussion is not successful.

Attention thus needs to be given to the *Azuma kagami*. The *Azuma kagami* has been considered as the official chronicle edited by the Kamakura bakufu in the early fourteenth century, the time when the Hōjō clan 北条氏 held actual power. Gomi Fumihiko 五味文彦 argues that the reason for compiling the *Azuma kagami* was to declare the legitimacy of the Hōjō family, and to revise the identity of the Kamakura bakufu.[155] Additionally, Gomi points out the trait of the *Azuma kagami* as it has been produced on the basis of a combination of fact and fiction in order to insist on the authenticity of the latter.[156] With an awareness of the Hōjō family's strategy in compiling the *Azuma kagami*, the same may have applied to the entry of Yōsai's death, since he has been one of the earliest key ideologues of the Kamakura establishment. However, we are unable to find a specific reason why Hōjō family would be compelled to change the date of his death, and rather, reportorial tone of the *Azuma kagami* renders us to regard that the *Azuma kagami* provides accurate information. In fact, the *Azuma kagami* reports that he suffered from diarrhoea, whereas the rest of source materials draw a much more hagiographical scene of his death, such as he had a glorious manner of death while sitting and meditating in peace. Therefore, we can conclude that the date of Yōsai's death was very likely the sixth month of 1215.

[155] Gomi Fumihiko (2000) pp. 310 - 311
[156] Ibid; p. 2

Concluding Remarks

This chapter has attempted to draw Yōsai's biography, which includes detailed analysis of his early life as an esoteric monk. The examinations have revealed three crucial points. Firstly, the examination of Yōsai's activities in northern Kyushu served to picture an aspect of local development of Buddhism in the late Heian period. Although, modern scholars, such as Kushida Ryōkō, surveyed local Buddhism, they only focused on East Japan.[157] However, newly discovered sources significantly contributed to exploration showing that northern Kyushu was also the place where many ambitious monks tried to propagate their own teachings.[158] Secondly, the importance of Taira clan and Zhang family as Yōsai's sponsors reframes the way he travelled to China twice. According to the scale of temple reconstructions he worked in China, and the importation of the volumes of Tiantai commentaries, he was unlikely to attain success without taking the recourse obtaining support from Taira clan and Zhang family. Finally, Yōsai's image we have seen here differs significantly from the modern view. Many source materials, such as the *Shaseki shū*, the *Azuma kagami* and the *Keiran shūyō shū*, portray Yōsai as an esoteric expert rather than a Zen master. Even the *Genkō shakusho*, which constitutes the modern image of Yōsai, shows his continuous interest in esotericism even after the importation of Zen.

[157] Kushida Ryōkō (1964) p. 190.
[158] For the contents of their debates, see the next chapter.

Chapter 2

Yōsai's Works and His Lineage.

Esoteric Works of Yōsai and Summaries of Major Works

Yōsai has left a large number of esoteric writings. They are mostly short works in a single fascicle. His writings take the form of *kuketsu* 口訣, which literally means "oral transmission." The *kuketsu* style is typical for medieval Buddhist discourse, freely mingling ritual and doctrinal concerns. The origins of the *kuketsu* style have been attributed to Saichō's voyage to China, where he was taught the most profound teaching of Tendai Perfect Buddhism, the doctrine of "three truths in one mind" (*isshin sangan* 一心三観), by means of oral transmission. In parallel with Saichō's transmission, esotericism utilised oral transmission in order to maintain the secrecy of esoteric doctrines and rituals. Although the term "oral transmission" suggests an entirely orally communicated tradition, series of transmissions have been recorded in written form since early on, soon after the formation of Buddhist doctrines and rites in the early Heian period. The practice of oral transmissions affected that the contents of transmission, which gradually underwent a change. One's religious experience seems to have enforced the understanding of teachings, which thus lost their close connection to their scriptural bodies.

Yōsai wrote over twenty works throughout his life. Because most of his writings other than the *Kōzen gokokuron*, are not well known, I shall list all works and touch on the summaries thereof. Yōsai started to write down his interpretations of esoteric teachings immediately after his return from his first trip

to China in 1175.[159] He produced three works in a year. *Shutten taikō* 出纏大綱 (General Principle of Enlightenment), *Tai kuketsu* 胎口決 (Oral Transmission on the Practice of Womb [Realm]) and *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* 改変教主決 (Revised Oral Transmission on the Preacher of Esoteric Buddhism) were all completed in 1175. By 1177, Yōsai had finished writing *Kyōjigi kanmon* 教時義勘文 (Interpretation on [Annen's] Meanings of Teachings and Times) and *Mumyō shū* 無名集 (Collected Meanings of *Dharma*). In 1178 he published *Hokke*(*kyō*) *nyū shingonmon ketsu* 法華[経]入真言門決 (Oral Transmission on the Meanings of Lotus Teachings in the Esoteric Discourse) and *Urabon ipponkyō engi* 盂蘭盆一品経縁起 (Origins of the *Ullambana* Ceremony). In the following year *Bodaishin bekki* 菩提心別記 (Separate Records on *Bodhicitta*) was compiled. In 1180, *Kechien ippen shū* 結縁一遍集 (Abbreviated Collection of Initiatory Rites) and *Shohi kuketsu* 諸秘口決 (Secret Oral Transmissions) were produced. In 1181 he began writing *Ingo shū* 隠語集 (Collection of Esoteric Idioms), which was completed in 1190. From 1181 to 1186, Yōsai temporarily stopped writing, as if he predicted the decline of the Taira clan, which had been his important sponsor. In 1187, just before he departed for his second and final trip to China, Yōsai completed *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* 金剛頂宗菩提心論口決 (Oral Transmission of the Treatise on Awaking of *Bodhicitta*) and *Jūhen kyōshu ketsu* 重編教主決 (Re-Revised Version of the Oral Transmission on the Preacher of Esoteric Buddhism). During his second stay abroad in China (1187 to 1191), Yōsai drew up the first draft of *Shukke taikō* 出家大綱, which was

[159] A chronological table of Yōsai, which includes recently discovered materials, is available in Sueki Fumihiko (2006) pp. 573-575.

completed in 1200. He re-drafted the *Ingo shū* in China, and renamed it *Hishu ingo shū* 秘宗隠語集.

In addition to the esoteric works listed above, *Enton isshinkai wage* 円頓一心戒和解 (Interpretation on Perfect-Sudden One-Mind Precepts), *Juzenkai sahō* 受禅戒作法 (Manual of Zen Ordination), *Shaka hassō* 釈迦八相 (Eight Aspects of Shakyamuni) and *Shinzen yūshingi* 真禅融心義 (Meaning of Perfect Zen Mind) have been attributed to Yōsai.[160] Furthermore, the *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* lists three more works attributed to Yōsai: *Sanbukyō kaidai* 三部経解題 (Explanatory Notes on Threefold Canonical Scriptures), *Jizō den* 地蔵伝 (Of Kṣitigarbha), *Funimon ron* 不二門論 (Treatise on Non-Dual Teachings).

As has been noted, Yōsai's esoteric thought has long been neglected. The reason why he has not been studied seems related to two factors. The first is that Yōsai's thought is not easily understood from a Zen sectarian perspective. In other words, it contains teachings of other Buddhist schools, particularly the Jimon lineage of Tendai Buddhism, which was competing with the Sanmon lineage, based on esoteric teachings of Mt. Hiei. The second factor is the question of how to contextualise Yōsai's thought against the backdrop the transformation of Japanese Buddhism. This difficulty might have been aggravated by the general atmosphere of late Heian Buddhism, which tended to specialise in ritual performance rather than attempting to transmit the doctrinal systems established by its founders. This preference for ritual performance over doctrinal studies led to Buddhist monks' decreasing comprehension of the more subtle philosophical points of the teachings.

[160] The reason will be discussed in the end of this chapter. For *Enton isshinkai wage,* see the chapter for Yōsai's influence to the Precepts Group.

Some Tōmitsu scholar monks began to make great efforts to revisit their predecessors' thought and revive the tradition of doctrinal studies. This trend was less developed for Taimitsu lineages. The majority of materials linked to Taimitsu composed by Yōsai's contemporaries concerned themselves solely with ritual performances. Additionally, in inverse to the decline of the Taimitsu doctrinal transformation, some Tendai scholar monks at the time came to show great interest in Tendai perfect teachings, and the most important doctrinal principle of Japanese Tendai – the integration of esotericism and Tendai Perfect teachings – were retained. One famous figure in this context was Shōshin, who composed commentaries on Zhiyi's three major writings, which were the foundation of Tiantai Buddhism[161]

Yōsai's writings themselves provide a great example for understanding in the way in which medieval monks studied Buddhism. In his writings, his discussions address two major concerns. The first concern is for the path to attain Buddhahood, and the second one is about the nature of Buddhahood itself. The former concern is commonly referred to as the theory of attaining Buddhahood (*jōbutsu ron* 成仏論). The discussions over the nature of the Buddha, which, Hirakawa Akira argued, are a feature typical of Mahayana Buddhism, were mainly dealt together with the practitioner's own goal, Buddhahood.[162] In other words, the practitioners' own aspiration became apparent in the discussion on the nature of Buddhahood. In Mahayana, the importance of the eternal Buddha *dharmakāya* (*hosshin* 法身) arose after Shakyamuni's death, because even after he died, clarifying the essence of Shakyamuni's enlightenment, or the eternal Buddhahood, was vital to his followers.

[161] Those three compositions, *Hokke gengi shki*, *Hokkeshō shiki* and *Shikan shiki*, are collectively known as *Sandaibu shiki*.
[162] Hirakawa Akira (1974) p. 330

The need of the eternity of Buddhahood resulted in the theory on the bodies of Buddha (*busshin ron* 仏身論). Once Buddhism was imported to Japan, the theory of the bodies of the Buddha became deeply connected to the discussion over which body actually preaches the Law (*kyōshu ron* 教主論/義) or indeed the esoteric Buddhist notion of the *dharmakāya* preaching (*hosshin seppō* 法身説法).

1) *Shutten taikō* (General Principle of Enlightenment)

Yōsai's very first work, *Shutten taikō* was written in 1175, when he returned from his first visit to China. As the title indicates, this work comprehensively describes the method to attain Buddhahood. The method of practice which Yōsai referred to in this work is the Visualising Practice for Obtaining the Buddha Body in Five Phases (*gosō jōjin kan* 五相成身観), originating from scriptures and treaties belonging to the *Jingangding jing* lineage, such as the *Putixin lun*. The *Shutten taikō* also discusses the question of the preacher of esoteric Buddhism (*shingonshū kyōshu gi* 真言宗教主義) in which Yōsai was interested throughout his life and is pivotal in his thought. I shall discuss later in the examination of the *Kyōjigi kanmon*.

Let us carefully consider a number of the salient points made by Yōsai in the *Shutten taikō*. Firstly, Yōsai, as well as other esoteric monks, considered the esoteric practitioner to be identical to *Mahāvairocana* or the eternal Buddha, referring to the famous verse in the *Putixin lun*: "If a person seeks the wisdom of the Buddha and realises Bodhicitta in the very body given by father and mother he

will instantly attain the stage of great enlightenment."[163] Not only in Yōsai but also in many other esoteric writings, this citation is used to demonstrate the possibility of attaining Buddhahood with the flesh body, a process known as *sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成仏. Secondly, Yōsai spent the latter half of the *Shutten taikō* discussing the preacher of esoteric Buddhism. For Yōsai, the preacher of esoteric Buddhism is the *ācārya* (*ajari* 阿闍梨), the esoteric master.[164] As has been noted, most of his esoteric compositions include this topic. In this work, Yōsai argues against someone called "a monk of Harayama temple" (Harayama no sō 原山の僧), whose interpretation asserted that the preacher was the *parasaṃbhoga kāya* or the recompense body of Buddha for the beings in the world (*tajuyū shin* 他受用身), while Yōsai consistently claimed it to be the *svābhāvika kāya* or the body of the Buddha's own nature (*jijuyū shin* 自受用身). The background as to why the argument between Yōsai and a monk of the Harayama temple began is unknown. According to Yōsai, the *svabhavika kāya* is the *Mahāvairocana* of the Womb realm (*taizō kai* 胎蔵界) and that of the Diamond realm (*kongō kai* 金剛界). Yōsai's account considering the *svābhāvika kaya* as the preacher of esotericism is not his original idea, but taught by his master, Kikō. Yōsai's doctrinal animosity towards the position forwarded by the monk of the Harayama temple was very persistent, and he maintained this attitude until his second departure for China. However, it should be underlined that to interpret the *parasaṃbhoga kāya* as the preacher might have been the orthodox interpretation, as Kōgei, whose esoteric studies had been the standard to

[163] White (2002) p. 235. Originally, T. 32 no. 1665 p. 574c

[164] I shall argue Yōsai's interpretation of the preacher of esotericism in the chapter of Yōsai's esoteric thoughts.

almost all medieval esoteric practitioners, declared exactly the same view as did the monk of the Harayama temple.

The sources Yōsai used in the composition of the *Shutten taikō* reveals his wide range of reading. Although the main theme of the *Shutten taikō* is the esoteric Buddhist teaching, one can also notice that many non-esoteric scriptures and treatises are cited. Yōsai quoted from scriptures that were well esteemed by Tiantai/Tendai Buddhism, such as the *Fahua jing*, *Guanpuxian jing* 観普賢経, *Huayen jing* and *Niepan jing*, which are the central sources of Tiantai doctrine. For the treatises, he referred to the *Weimo jing lueshu* 維摩経略疏 and *Fahua xuanyi* 法華玄義 by Zhiyi, and the *Zhiguan fuxingzhuan hongjue* 止観輔行伝弘決 and *Fahua wengou ji* 法華文句記, composed by Zhiyi and Zhanran.

2) *Tai kuketsu* (Oral Transmission on the Practice of the Womb [Realm])

Yōsai completed the *Tai kuketsu* a day after he finished writing the *Shutten taikō*. Although the title of the work suggests its topic to be the esoteric practices of the Womb realm, it actually consists of three chapters. These chapters deal with the practices of Womb, Diamond and Combination, respectively. Thus, the *Tai kuketsu* does not deal with doctrinal issues but it is a guideline for ritual performance.

Yōsai's interpretation of these is based on Kōgei's *Ryōgyō birei shidai* 両行毘麗次第, which may be the first ritual manual for combinatory consecration in Taimitsu. The term *birei* often indicates consecrations, but the contents actually bear resemblance to modern *kegyō* 加行, preparation practices performed prior to consecratory rituals.

3) *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* (Revised Resolutions on the Preacher of Esoteric Buddhism)

The *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* in five fascicles was written in northern Kyushu. The lost manuscript by Yōsai was discovered in 2006 in the Shinpuku temple archive in modern Nagoya city.[165] This manuscript is invaluable also because it contains Yōsai's autobiography, as I have noted earlier. The contents of the autobiographical section are identical to Yōsai's biographical entry in the *Genkō shakusho*. Hence, Kokan Shiren most likely perused the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* when he wrote Yōsai's biography.

As the title indicates, the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* concerns itself with the preacher of esotericism. As in the *Shutten taikō*, Yōsai argues against the account of the esoteric preacher given by the monk of Harayama temple. He also denounced another anonymous monk who, according to Yōsai, considered the *svasaṃbhogakāya* that body of the Buddha that preaches the esoteric teachings.

Furthermore, the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* indicates the esoteric lineage Yōsai received from his master, and he proudly proclaims the legitimacy of his esoteric line. The *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* also makes reference to the history of this lineage, relying on the *Tani ajari den*, Kōgei's biography composed by Oe-no-Masafusa. In this context, Yōsai recorded a question about the difference between the combinatory *abhiṣeka* and the secret *abhiṣeka* (*himitsu kanjō* 秘密灌頂), posed by someone who lived in northern Kyushu, which doubts the legitimacy of the combinatory consecration that was transmitted to Yōsai. To respond to this

[165] This text is now perusable in Sueki Fumihiko (2013) pp.

question, Yōsai, at first, attempted to demonstrate the authenticity of the combinatory *abhiṣeka* by referring to his lineage chart, given from Kikō. As for the difference between the two types of *abhiṣeka*, Yōsai confesses that he himself was not entirely sure of the difference. Still, Yōsai's emphasis on the fact that he received the combinatory *abhiṣeka* is noteworthy.

When Yōsai put the above issues in writing, he was living in northern Kyushu. It seems to me that, among the many esoteric practitioners in this region, Yōsai might have been one of few monks who had the appropriate training under a renowned instructor. Thus, he may have proudly announced his transmission.

4) *Imazu seiganji sōken engi* (Origins of the Foundation of Imazu Seigan Temple)

The *Imazu seiganji sōken engi* reveals the purpose of Yōsai's second journey to the continent. According to this text, the purpose of his trip was to make a pilgrimage for Indian Buddhist relics. It also describes the background to the completion of Imazu Seigan temple. The extant manuscript written in Yōsai's own hand has been preserved at the Kyūshū rekishi minzoku hakubutsukan 九州歴史民俗博物館.

5) *Kyōjigi kanmon* (Reflections on [Annen's] Meanings of Teachings and Times) A.k.a. *Shingon kyōshu ketsu* (Oral Transmission on the Preacher of Esotericism)

The *Kyōjigi kanmon* is a kind of commentarial work on Annen's *Kyōjigi* 教時義 (a.k.a. *Kyōji mondō* 教時問答) in four fascicles. Annen's text, alongside his *Bodaishin gishō,* established the fundamentals of Taimitsu doctrine. Because of its

complexity, only a few scholar monks attempted to comment on the *Kyōjigi*. The *Kyōjigi kanmon* could be considered an attempt of this sort, but it is not a comprehensive study. Rather, Yōsai just extracted those paragraphs from the *Kyōjigi* in which Annen dealt with the question of who preaches the doctrines of esoteric Buddhism and with the theory of the bodies of Buddha, and tried to give an interpretation of those passages. Yōsai's esteem for Annen is obvious from the preface of this work. At the same time, his respectful attitude towards his esoteric master, Kikō, is manifest in the text. Yōsai consequently attempted to legitimise his master's teachings, which he took as his principal guide, by means of Annen's text. However, it appears that he soon realised that the two differ significantly, thus complicating his interpretive task.

Annen's systematisation of doctrines and rituals was a great achievement, yet his thoughts were open to interpretation. In the case of the theory of Buddha bodies, although Annen established a famous classification of Buddha bodies, namely the One Buddha theory (*ichibutsu ron* 一仏論), he spoke of the Buddha as assuming many different aspects at the same time. Such a complication stems from his hermeneutic strategy, according to which all Buddhist deities, or the innumerable Buddhas, were identical with the One Buddha.

Judging from the *Kyōjigi kanmon*, Annen's theories posed a conundrum for Yōsai. Eventually, in the concluding remarks of this text, he stressed how important it is to follow one's own master's teachings. That is to say, he failed to provide evidence for the legitimacy of his master's transmission, which was criticised by a monk of Harayama temple, by borrowing Annen's authority.

We cannot know whether or not Yōsai lost his confidence by failing to tackle Annen's ideas on the Buddha, but he finally stopped the debate with the

monk of Harayama temple, who no longer appears in later lists, such as the *Mumyō shū*, which Yōsai published in the following year. Nevertheless, Yōsai still exhibited his interest in the esoteric preacher.

Such long-time interest in arguing the esoteric preacher seems not to have been Yōsai's aim. In fact, he comprehended series of arguments in the *Kongōchōshū bodaoshiron kuketsu*, his very last esoteric composition completed right before he went to the second study abroad to China. However, without comparing other esoteric writings written in his contemporary, Yōsai's ideas hidden within the *Kongōchōshū bodaishiron kuketsu* cannot be deciphered.

6) *Mumyō shū* (Collected Meanings of *Dharma*)

The *Mumyō shū* was discovered in the Shinpuku temple archive in 2009 along with the *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* and some fragments of a text entitled *Jūshū kyōshu ketsu* 重修教主決. The *Mumyō shū* was copied in 1180, when Yōsai lived in northern Kyushu. According to the postscript of the *Mumyō shū*, Yōsai completed it in 1177 at Seigan temple.

Although it is very likely that the *Mumyō shū* was composed by Yōsai, the manuscript does not contain the name of author.[166] Furthermore, even the *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten*, which is the most comprehensive modern Buddhist catalogue, does not provide the *Mumyō shū*. In the light of the authority of the *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten*, the authenticity of this writing should be examined by analysing its contents. The *Mumyō shū* mainly concerns the difference between the preacher of Tendai teachings and that of esoteric teachings, in which once again Yōsai

[166] *Chūsei sentoku chosaku shū*. p. 442a

claims the superiority of esotericism. The *Mumyō shū* interprets the preacher of esotericism as the *svabhavakāya*, as we have seen in other works by Yōsai. The most decisive evidence affirming the authenticity of the *Mumyō shū* can be found in the concluding paragraph. It states that "because the *Mumyō shū* deals with the most profound esoteric teaching, this work should not be disclosed to the public, and should be circulated merely within the community consisting of Yōsai's disciples."[167]

The term *mumyō* 無名, the central subject of the *Mumyō shū* is a synonym of "formless" (*musō* 無相), which often denotes one of the characteristics of the *dharmakāya* Buddha. Thus, both *mumyō* and *musō* were associated with the idea of emptiness.[168] Yōsai acknowledged that the *dharmakāya* in esoteric discourse and the one found in Tendai discourse are different. However, as will be examined later, he regarded that those two types of *dharmakāya* are at the same time identical in ultimate perspective. In this respect, Yōsai asserted that the esoteric *dharmakāya* was able to preach, although such a view is very much contrary to the interpretation of the *dharmakāya* given in canonical scriptures, such as the *Dari jing* and *Jingangding jing*. Moreover, attention needs to be paid to Yōsai's single statement that esoteric and Tendai *dharmakāya* are identical on the most profound level. Although the correlation of the Tendai teachings with esoteric Buddhism represented Taimitsu core doctrine, many early scholar monks, such as Ennin and Annen, classified esotericism as superior to the rest of the Buddhist teachings. Particularly, Annen's doctrinal formulisation presented in the *Kyōjigi* and the

[167] Yōsai often calls himself as "Yōsai" rather than the first person singular 'I' in some of his works. See: *Chūsei sentoku chosaku shū*. p. 442a

[168] For example, the chapter of Non-duality in the *Weimo jin* (T. 14 no. 475 p. 550c), See chapter three, which concerns Annen's interpretation on the author of the *Putixin lun*.

Bodaishingi shō became the dominant view of Buddhism until the late Heian era. A similar classification is also found in Yōsai's *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu*, which was composed right after the *Mumyō shū*. It is evident that there is continuity both in the contents and the year of composition, and therefore, it is most likely the *Mumyō shū* is the authentic writing of Yōsai.

7) *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu* (Resolutions on the Meanings of the Lotus Teachings in Esoteric Discourse)

As the title indicates, the *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu* was written in order to argue for the integration of esoteric Buddhism and Tendai perfect teachings. Just like the *Mumyō shū*, the *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu*, discussed the similarities and differences between the two forms of Buddhist teachings. Thus, one can recognise the similarity to *Kōen hokke gi* 講演法華儀 (Full title: *Nyū shingonmon nyū nyojitsuken kōen hokke ryaku gi* 入真言門入如実見法華略儀), attributed to Enchin.[169] In the *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu*, Yōsai interprets the *Fahua jing*, using esoteric terminologies. Considering the above examination of the *Mumyō shū*, which declared the integration of esotericism and Tendai Buddhism to be the ultimate interpretation of the Buddhist Law, one can assume that to Yōsai's mind the *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu* reveals the most profound esoteric discourse.

The *Hokke(kyō) nyū shingonmon ketsu* was composed in 1178,[170] and it has never been published. There are two manuscripts extant; one is stored at Otani

[169] T. 56 no. 2192 pp. 189 – 203.
[170] See also, the part of the Hokke hō mentioned in the *Ingoshū*.

University and the other is in the Eizan archive. The Eizan manuscript was transcribed in 1789, and the Otani manuscript was copied from the Kōdaiji version 高台寺版 in 1907 so that both are in reasonably good condition. While the Eizan manuscript contains only the latter fourteen chapters, also known as the chapters of original ground (*honmon* 本門) of the *Fahua jing*, the Otani version, which includes a short preface, covers the whole scripture. Because the contents of the latter fourteen chapters are exactly the same in both manuscripts, using the Otani version seems the best course of action.

It seems to me that the *Hokke*(*kyō*) *nyū shingonmon ketsu* is one of the most interesting works of Yōsai for two reasons. The title suggests that there might have been an interpretative connection with the *Kōen hokke gi*, but Yōsai does not cite any passage from this work.[171] In fact, the ways of demonstrating the identification of the Tendai perfect teaching and that of esotericism presented in those two compositions are different. That is, while the *Kōen hokke gi* demonstrates this correspondence by interpreting the title, *Myōhō renge kyō*, in an esoteric perspective, the *Hokke*(*kyō*) *nyū shingonmon ketsu* interprets each chapter of the *Lotus sūtra* by means of esoteric doctrine. Nonetheless, the principal concern of the *Kōen hokke gi* resembles the *Hokke*(*kyō*) *nyū shingonmon ketsu* in a broader perspective in that both discuss the sameness of esoteric and Tendai Buddhism.

[171] The full title is *Nyūshingonmon jū nyojitsuken kōen hokke ryakugi*. Not only modern scholars, but also those of pre-modernity have argued whether or not this work is authentic or spurious. The majority of them concluded that it is the result of comparison with Enchin's other work. The *Kōen hokke gi* contains the verse of original enlightenment (hongaku shisō), which gave shape for the core of the original enlightenment thought that became common in the mid or late Heian period. For the most comprehensive survey on the *Kōen hokke gi,* see Mizukami (2008).

Moreover, some discussions conducted in the *Hokke*(*kyō*) *nyū shingonmon ketsu* bear resemblance to the *Shijūjō ketsu* 四十帖決 by Kōgei,[172] which can be regarded as a doctrinal and liturgical "database" of Taimitsu, although Tōmitsu writers utilised it throughout the classical and the medieval time as well. Let me give one example in which Yōsai's concerns are shown to dovetail the *Shijūjō ketsu*.

One can recognise the interests Yōsai and the *Shijūjō ketsu* held in common in their respective views on the original teaching 本門 (The latter fourteen chapters of the *Fahua jing*) and that of the manifestation 迹門 (The former fourteen chapters of the *Fahua jing*). In the interpretation of the two classification of the Lotus teachings, the teaching of manifestation has manifested Buddha's teaching in the phenomenal or actual world 事 because the chapters were believed to be preached by the historical Shakyamuni, who was about to attain enlightenment (*gayagonjō no hotoke* 伽耶近成の仏).[173] The original teaching based on the latter fourteen chapters, which was preached by another form of Shakyamuni, that represents the long ago awakened Buddha (*kuon honji/jitsujō no hotoke* 久遠本地(実成)の仏), who abides in the world of principle 理.[174] Although the *Hokke*(*kyō*) *nyū shingonmon ketsu* and *Shijūjō ketsu* both treat the very same issue, they arrived at different conclusions. That is to say, while the *Shijūjō ketsu* associates the Original ground (*honji* 本地) as the Diamond mandalic world, and the Manifestation ground as the Womb world, Yōsai presents a novel opinion:

[172] T. 75 no. 2408 pp.825 - 960
[173] T. 34 no. 1719 p. 326b. Zhanran was the first scholar monk, who used the term *gaya gonjō* or *gaye jincheng* in the *Fahua wenju ji*.
[174] Ibid: 328a.

This [Lotus] scripture is about the Womb realm, namely, the eastern *maṇḍala*. [One] should be aware of it. Question: Some say that the ground of manifestation corresponds to the Womb realm, and the original ground correlates to the Diamond realm.[175] Does the Shingon school allow such interpretation?[176] Answer: [In the case that one sees] the two grounds separately, it is unacceptable; [In the case that one sees that] the two grounds are combined, it is acceptable. The first case is the incorrect one; the Womb realm corresponds to the Manifestation ground. The Manifestation ground does not reveal the non-separation of the three bodies of Buddha, while the Womb realm indicates the original and eternal *dharmakāya*, which consists of three classes. It is the mandalic world that the *dhamakāya* freely comes and goes between the cause and result. Thus, [the Manifestation ground and the Womb realm] are different. [One] says that the Diamond realm corresponds to the Original ground, where it is evinced by the innate and eternal Buddha. [The Diamond realm is] beyond any discourse, and contains the [practice of] obtaining the Buddha's perfect body in five phases. [The Diamond realm also] manifests physical actions 羯磨身… It is the realm of the *dharmakāya* of Wisdom so that [the Diamond realm and the Original ground] are different. The second case is the acceptable interpretation; as [the Tiantai teachings say], although the Original ground and that of Manifestation are basically different, they are identical and inconceivable.

(Otani University version 16a)

[175] 'Someone' here may indicate the author of the *Kōen hokke gi*.
[176] In this context, the Shingon school indicates esoteric Buddhism in general.

The first account that Yōsai criticised bears resemblance to the Separate teachings (*bekkyō* 別教), in Tendai Buddhism, according to which the truth was understood from three separates aspects – emptiness, phenomenal world and middle way – unlike the Perfect teaching in which the three aspects are immediately identified. That is, both mandalic views of the world and that of two grounds where the *Fahua jing* were preached are separately understood. This interpretation is exactly the same as the one given in the *Shijūjō ketsu*. Although Yōsai esteemed the *Shijūjō ketsu* and its author, Kōgei, he was sceptical of Kōgei's interpretation in this case. The second account, which was Yōsai's own argument, reminds us of the Tendai perfect teachings in which dualistic views are denied. In this light, he further claimed that the identification of the mandalic worlds and the two grounds of the *Fahua jing* were admissible only if one was aware of the non-duality behind this correspondence. In addition, Yōsai effectively used the famous phrase from two of the three Tiantai commentaries (*tiantai sanda bu* 天台三大部) on the *Fahua jing*, *Fahua xuanyi* 法華玄義 and *Fahua wenju* 法華文句, reading "although the original ground and that of manifestation are different, they are identical and inconceivable (*honjaku kotonari to iedomo fushigi itsu nari* 本迹雖殊不思議一也)" in order to justify the non-duality in the non-esoteric discourses.[177] Esoteric Buddhism too, applied the non-duality of Wisdom and Principle to explain the ultimate Buddha. In this light, Yōsai constructs the identification of esotericism and Tendai perfect teaching; however, he does not demonstrate this identification in further detail.

[177] T. 33 no. 1705 p. 282a (*Xuanyi*) and T. 34 no. 1718 p.129b (*Wengou*)

8) *Urabon ipponkyō engi* (Origins of the Ullambana Ceremony)

The *Urabon ipponkyō engi* may be considered one of Yōsai's minor works. A manuscript version of the text, written in Yōsai's own handwriting, is published in the *Dainihon shiryō* 大日本資料. The manuscript was written to commemorate an offering of the *Lotus sūtra* on the occasion of *Ullambana* rite held at the Seigan temple. Just like the *Imazu seiganji sōken engi*, this text contains some passages shedding light on Yōsai's motives for making a second journey to the continent. The two texts are in agreement that the original motivation for undertaking the journey had been to make a pilgrimage to India. Thus, Yōsai obviously was neither expecting to stay in China for five years, nor to import Zen to Japan before actually setting out on his travels from northern Kyushu.

9) *Bodaishin bekki* (Separate Records on *Bodhicitta*)

The *Bodaishin bekki* describes the merits of worshiping Jizō 地蔵 (*Kṣitigarbha*) and Fudō 不動 (*Acala*). In this work, Yōsai discusses Jizō as the Bodhisattva who helps sentient beings attain enlightenment. Jizō is presented as symbolising compassion, and Fudō symbolises wrath. Relying solely on the contents of the *Bodaishin bekki*, it is almost impossible to ascertain in what context Yōsai wrote this work. The Buddhist deities Jizō and Fudō had been venerated by lay people throughout the Heian and Kamakura periods, and stories that might help to decode the context of the *Bodaishin bekki* can be found in medieval narrative literature. Among these, the *Shasekishū*, composed by Mujū Ichien, contains some suggestive passages. For instance, it mentions a teaching connecting Jizō and Fudō, namely the *Jifu no*

ketsu 地不の決, which "*Jifu"* is very likely an abbreviation of Jizō and Fudō. It seems to have been transmitted within Yōsai's esoteric group, because, for instance, areas where Yōsai's disciples propagated "zen-esoteric teachings," there still remains the custom of worshipping Jizō and Fudō together.[178] The content of Jizō *and* Fudō combinatory worship depicted in the *Shaseki shū* bears a strong resemblance to that described in the *Bodaishin bekki* in that Mujū Ichien considered Jizō as the manifestation (*suijaku* 垂迹) of the Buddha's skillful means of compassion, and Fudō as that of wrath and wisdom. Moreover, Mujū described how the combinatory prayer of those two deities was considered crucial for attaining enlightenment by his contemporaries.[179]

10) *Ingo shū* (Collection of Esoteric Idioms)

I discussed already that a manuscript of the *Ingo shū* has been recently discovered at Shinpuku temple. There is also a reedited version of the *Ingo shū*, entitled *Hisu ingo shū* 秘宗隠語集, which is kept at Daitōkyū Memorial Library 大東急記念文庫 in Tokyo.[180] The *Ingo shū* mainly treats the inner world of the *ācārya* (*ajari* 阿闍梨), who, in the context of Yōsai's thought, is identical with the eternal Buddha.[181] In order to illustrate this inner world, the text makes free use of metaphors connected to sexual intercourse, for example taking the foetus as the result of a sexual

[178] Shaseki shu (1966) p. 105. See also Sasaki Kaoru (1997). For Kṣtigarbha worship in medieval Japan, see Hayami Tasuku (1996).
[179] Ibid; p.114
[180] Unfortunately, I have never had an opportunity to peruse the revised version. In a private conversation with Sueki Fumihiko, he told me that the library plans to publish a book including the *Hisu ingo shū*.
[181] For this, see the section for Yōsai's central thoughts.

intercourse to represent enlightenment. This imagery has caused the text to be mistakenly associated with the alleged "heresies" of the so-called Tachikawa ryū.[182]

In this section, the appendix of the *Ingo shū* will be analysed. The appendix consists of thirteen oral transmissions on specific esoteric rituals, *Fudō hō* 不動法, *Nōen rokugatsu hō* 能延六月法, *Senju hō* 千手法, *Aizenō hō* 愛染王法, *Kokūzō hō* 虚空蔵法, *Jizō hō, Hokke hō* 法華法, *Soshijji hō* 蘇悉地法, *Yugi hō* 瑜祇法, *Monju hō* 文殊法, *Jūhachidō* 十八道, *Kenkyō richimyōgō* 顕教理智冥合 and *Busshari* 仏舎利. Because the oral transmissions on the *Senju hō, Aizenō hō, Kokūzō hō* and *Jizō hō* consist of a couple of passages, describing secret skills to perform these rites, their details cannot be explored.

The oral transmission on the *Hisu ingo,* the "secret meanings in the esoteric school," discusses the meaning of the Sanskrit syllable *A*, a topic first raised in the *Putixin lun.* This exploration links the content of the *Ingo shū* with the *Mumyō shū*, for both further analyse the meaning of this syllable. As the discussion in this text unfolds, we learn that '"Non-aspect" or "formless" is the meaning of the syllable *A* because the syllable *A* is a negative prefix. Therefore, "Non-aspect" can be paraphrased as "Aspect of *A*"…' Since the notion of Non-aspect is used synonymously with that of Non-duality, Yōsai concludes that "[I]n terms of esoteric idioms, the syllable *A* is explained in the Non-duality of man and woman (*nannyo wagō* 男女和合)," an expression, which indicated sexual intercourse.

Next, the *Oral Transmission of Fudō* also debates the senses of esoteric idioms, stating the same as the above *Hisu ingo*. As was the case in the *Bodaishin bekki*, the role of Fudō in this work is unclear. Interestingly, according to Yōsai,

[182] Iyanaga Nobumi has worked on the question of how the Tachikawa lineage had come to be considered a heresy. See Iyanaga (2011) pp. 803 - 811

there were two traditions of Fudō rituals; one was performed by Tōji temple monks and the other was practiced by Tendai monks.

The next transmission, the *Nōen rokugatsu hō,* in medieval Japan was strongly associated with the *Dakini* ritual 荼吉尼法.[183] Although it is unclear from which of the two it originated, the ritual might have derived from the *Dari jing* or *Shengwudongzun daweifennuwang niansong* 聖無動尊大威忿怒王念誦, and had been performed for either predicting one's death or defeating enemies.[184] This entry is very short and just describes the merits of Fudō that protect the practitioner from the effects of black magic caused by *Dakini*'s thaumaturgic power.

As for the *Hokke hō*, it states that its oral transmission has been referred to in another work. This 'other work' may be the *Hokke (kyō) nyū shingon monketsu*, which, as has been noted, gives an esoteric interpretation of the Tendai perfect teachings in terms of esotericism. The textual basis of *Hokke hō* was *Guagzhi yigui* 觀智儀軌 (Full title: *Chengjiu miaofalianhua jingwang yugaguanzhi yigui* 成就妙法蓮華経王瑜伽觀智儀軌. a.k.a. *Fahua yugui* 法華儀軌), probably translated by Bukong 不空.[185] The *Guangzhi yigui* was imported by Kūkai, whose catalogue of esoteric scriptures brought from China, contains the title of this text.[186] Ennin and Enchin imported this scripture as well.[187] The scripture describes how to chant Lotus mantra, how to delineate the Lotus *maṇḍala*, and how

[183] *Chusei sentoku chosaku shu* (2006) p. 4452b For the relation of this ritual performance with the *Dakini*, see Iyanaga Nobumi ibid.
[184] T. 21 no. 1199.
[185] T. 19 no. 1000 pp. 594 – 602. Another version is named *Fahuamanchaluo weiyixingsefa jing* (T. 19 no. 1001) translated by Jingangzhi.
[186] T. 55 no. 2161 p. 1061c.
[187] T. 55 no. 2167 p. 1079b. Enchin's catalogue does not state this text, but Annen's catalogue asserts that Enchin imported this. (T. 55 no. 2176 p. 1119c).

to construct an altar for the performance of Lotus ritual. It was utilized in a ritual context rather than in terms of doctrine.[188]

11) *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* (Oral Transmission of the Treatise on the Awaking of *Bodhicitta*)

The last esoteric writing Yōsai composed before he began to propagate Zen was the *Kongōchōshū bodaishiron kuketsu*, a brief commentarial composition on the *Treatise on the Awakening of Bodhicitta*. As has been mentioned, the *Kongōchōshū bodaishiron kuketsu* is deeply connected with the *Ingo shū,* in that both works include many discourses used by the Tachikawa lineage. Typically, the Womb *maṇḍala* symbolises femininity, while the Diamond *maṇḍala* and wisdom represents masculinity. Like the *Ingo shū*, the combination of the two *maṇḍala*s or two sexes represents ultimate enlightenment. In addition, the *Mahāvairocana* of the Diamond *maṇḍala* is usually denoted by the Sanskrit syllable *Vam*, but in the *Kongōchōshū bodaoshiron kuketsu* Yōsai considered the syllable of Diamond *Mahāvairocana* to be *A,* which normally indicated the *Mahāvairocana* of the Womb *maṇḍala*. This use of the syllable *A* to designate the Diamond *Mahāvairocana* seems very likely borrowed from the *Putixin lun*.[189] Yōsai's aim was the combination of the two mandalic worlds. Interestingly, in the *Ingo shū* Yōsai used

[188] Lucia Dolce suggests that the esotericised Lotus teachings have been respected to cement the Accomplishment class, one of the threefold classes characterising Taimitsu discourse. In particular, she claims the possibility that because there exists no *maṇḍala* linked to the Accomplishment class, the Lotus *maṇḍala*, depicted on the basis of the *Guazhi yigui* was considered to compensate for its lack. See Dolce (2007) pp. 13 – 25.

[189] T. 32 no. 1665 p. 574 a and b

the syllable *Vam* to indicate the Diamond *Mahāvairocana*, which had been the orthodox understanding.

The above is the brief summary of the *Kongōchōshū bodaoshiron kuketsu*. Although the work, at first glance, appears to repeat the same issues, it should be underlined that this text contains Yōsai's most pivotal insights. With an awareness of its importance, the following section will decipher the central ideas of Yōsai's doctrine.

12) *Shukke taikō* (An Outline of Becoming a Monk)

The *Shukke taikō*, in one fascicle, is an independent writing compiled in China, but, according to Yōsai's claim manifested in this work, it can be considered that the *Shukke taikō* plays the role of preface of the *Kōzen gokokuron*. In fact, Yōsai discussed Saichō's interpretation of ordination, which he did not deem entirely appropriate. This is the first work he discussed Saichō's interpretation of Fanwang precepts (*binmō kai* 梵網戒), namely Tendai perfect precepts (*enkai* 円戒). He criticised Saichō's declaration of separate ordination (*betsuju* 別受), a system of ordination, which only a set of precepts (*shōritsugi* 摂律儀) in three collections of pure precepts (*sanju jōkai* 三聚浄戒) were given. However, according to Saichō's authentic writings, such as *Kenkai ron* 顕戒論, Saichō never advocated separate ordination, but stressed on the importance of comprehensive ordination (*tsūju* 通受), in which all three collections of pure precepts were bestowed.[190] Yōsai did not mention which of Saichō's texts he referred to. Parenthetically, some medieval

[190] For Saichō's comprehensive ordination, see Paul Groner (2003).

vinaya scholar monks, such as Shunjō 俊芿 (1166 - 1227) and Kakujō 覚盛 (1194 - 1249), started studying the comprehensive and separate ordinations.[191]

13) *Kōzen gokokuron* (Protection of Country by Rise of Zen)

Kōzen gokokuron is the first writing that introduced Song Zen to Japan. As the title indicates, the *Kōzen gokokuron* is the first and only work in which Yōsai is conscious of politics. The reason Yōsai composed this work was to protect himself from accusations provided by Imperial and Buddhist establishments in Kyoto, both of which did not have specific knowledge about Song Zen. According to the *Genkō shakusho*, a monk called Rōben 良弁 (? - ?), who lived in northern Kyushu, submitted a petition to the court that in which he admonished the central establishments as many people started to follow Zen, and warned Kyoto establishments that this could threaten the balance between Imperial and Buddhist establishments.[192] Their reaction was prompt. In 1195, the imperial court summoned Yōsai to Kyoto, and commended Shirakawa Nakasuke 白河仲資 (1157 - 1222) and Hamuro Muneyori 葉室宗頼 (1154 - 1203) to conduct an interview to evaluate him.[193] Their reaction seems to be a repercussion of Nōnin's propagation of Daruma teachings that Yōsai's contemporaries misleadingly considered to be one and the same with Zen teachings. Therefore, the *Kōzen gokokuron* mainly tries to legitimise his teachings, and to distinguish them from those of Nōnin, which Chapter Three, the chapter for answering people's questions about Zen (*senin ketsugi mon* 世人決疑門) deals with.

[191] The development of vinaya studies in the medieval time has comprehensively studied by MInowa Kenryō (1999)
[192] DNBZ. Vol. 101 p. 157b
[193] Hanuki Masai (1985) p. 419

Chapter One is an introductory part of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, which is entitled as the chapter concerning the role of Zen serving to maintain Buddhist law (*reihō kujū mon* 令法久住門). In this chapter, Yōsai explained that Zen had to be practiced on the basis of adhering *vinaya* (*jiritsu* 持律), which had long been neglected on Mt. Hiei.[194] Yōsai advocated the importance of adhering to *vinaya* throughout the *Kōzen gokokuron*. In Chapter Two, the chapter of the protection of the country (*chingo kokka mon* 鎮護国家門), he addressed the actual merit of keeping the *vinaya*, as it was the best solution for reconstructing Japan, which had suffered from series of domestic problems in the late Heian, or Insei 院政, period.[195] As I shall discuss in the chapter five of this study, it is my hypothesis that he centred this avocation in this writing, and this comprised his core doctrine, alongside his esoteric interpretation of precepts. Yōsai also discussed the relation between Zen and adhering to the *vinaya* in Chapter Seven, the chapter on general principles and the recommendation of participation in Zen practices (*daikō kanzan mon* 大綱勧参門) and Chapter Eight, the chapter of establishing regulations for monastic life (*konryū/zenshū shimoku mon* 建立/禅宗支目門). In Chapter Seven, Yōsai credited Zen with best preserving the legitimate teaching of the Buddha (*buppō no sōfu* 仏法の総府).[196] In Chapter Eight, he argued how monks should observe monastic rule, or *vinaya*, based on the *Chanyuan qinggui* 禅苑清規, composed by Zongze 宗賾 (? - ?).

Yōsai demonstrated the authenticity of Zen by juxtaposing Saichō's lineage chart of Zen, stated in *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyaku fu* 内証仏法相承血脈譜, with

[194] Negrection of *vinaya* and lax attitude towards precepts in Japanese Tendai has been discussed by Paul Groner (1984) and (2007). See, also Chapter four and five of this dissertation.
[195] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 5c.
[196] Welter Albert (1999) p. 65

that of his own, both of which traced back to Bodhidhāma 菩提達磨 (? – ?), who was the twenty eighth patriarch since Mahākāśyapa.[197] This provided evidence that Zen had pre-existed even before Yōsai's importation of Zen by Saichō, and thus, defended his position from the accusations levelled at him by Mt. Hiei. At the same time, Yōsai criticised Saichō's affirmative position to violate precepts, or abandonment of precepts (*mukai* 無戒) discussed in *Mappō tōmyō ki* 末法灯明記, which modern scholars, such as Sakaino Kōyō and Ishida Mizumaro, argued is a forgery compiled by a certain Tendai monk in later period.[198] Yet, many medieval monks, such as Yōsai, Hōnen and Shinran considered the *Mappō tōmyō ki* to be Saichō's genuine work.[199] One may deem that Yōsai wrote the *Kōzen gokokuron* only to protect himself from Mt. Hiei, but it is evident that his criticism on the *Mappō tōmyō ki* is a challenge to Mt. Hiei.

14) *Kiccha yōjō ki* (Care of Health by Drinking Tea)

The *Kiccha yōjō ki* 喫茶養生記 is known for first introducing the custom of drinking tea in daily life.[200] The *Kiccha yōjō ki* was compiled for Minamoto-no-Sanetomo, the third shōgun of Kamakura *bakufu*. This work consists of two major parts; first is about medical effects of tea, and the second is about those of mulberry. To explain the medical use of tea, Yōsai used esoteric texts, which proves that his interests in esoteric Buddhism, even after he published the *Kōzen gokokuron*. The texts Yōsai employed in the *Kiccha yōjō ki*, were the *Commentary on* the *Zunsheng tuoluoni podeyu fa* (*sonshō darani hajigoku hō hishō* 尊勝陀羅尼破地獄法秘鈔) and the

[197] T. 80 no. 2543 (For original text DZ. Vol. II pp. 513 - 563) p. 5c and p. 10a.
[198] Sakaino Kōyō (1915) p. 32, Ishida Mizumaro (1962) pp. 148 – 151.
[199] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 6c
[200] Usually called *Kissa yōjō ki*, but I used the pronouceation of Wu dynasty, which was commonly used in medieval Japan.

Commentary on the Gozō mandara giki (*gōzō mandara giki shō* 五臟曼荼羅儀軌鈔), both of which were extinct ritual manuals. Both the original ritual manuals of these texts interpret correspondences of natural phenomena, which include five organs of human beings (*wuzang* 五臟), five colours (*wuse* 五色) and five senses (*wugen* 五根). The *Commentary on the Gozō mandara giki* adds five Buddhas of the Diamond *maṇḍala* (*wufa* 五仏), five syllables (*wuzi* 五字).[201] Yōsai highlighted the five organs, and stressed that tea was most effectively for promoting a healthy heart. As will be discussed in the chapter three of this study, the heart plays the most significant role for esoteric visualisation practices, to which visualising heart constitutes the foundation of Becoming Buddha within This Very Body.

It is indeed true that drinking tea has taken a firm hold on the Japanese lifestyle since Yōsai's introduction, and it is also true that tea had already been familiar even to pre-medieval esoteric monks. In fact, some source materials, concerning liturgical manual, describe usages of tea during conducting rituals. The oldest example of using tea in esoteric ritual is seen in *Hishō* 秘鈔 by Shukaku hosshinnō 守覚法親王 (1150 - 1202), who compiled oral transmissions inherited from his esoteric master, Shōken 勝賢 (1138 - 1196).[202] In the *Hishō*, tea is used for *Hokuto hō* 北斗法, worshipping the Plough in order to avert misfortunes.[203] The *Hishō* reads that ritual performer offers three cups of tea on altar alongside silver

[201] Five Buddhas are Mahāvairocana, Akşobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitayus and Shakyamuni. The five syllables are usually *A, Vi, Ra, Hūm* and *Kham*, but in this text, it reads *Trāḥ, Hum, Hriih, Amh* and *Vam*.
[202] Takahashi Shūei (2005) p. 6
[203] T. 78 no. 2489 pp. 578a – 583b

pieces and dried jujubes (similar to dates).[204] The tea used in this ritual was decocted, rather than simply infused, tea.

However, the use of tea in the above case is not indigenously Japanese, but it is mentioned in the Chinese Apocrypha *Qiyaoxingchen biexing fa* 七曜星辰別行法 and *Fantian huoluo jiuyao* 梵天火羅九曜, attributed to Yixing 一行 (683 - 727). Both scriptures display Daoist influence, because the *Hokuto hō*, or the B*eidou fa*, is named the *Gexiangong li beidou fa* 葛仙公礼北斗法. Gexiangong, or better known as Gexuan 葛玄 (? - ?), was a Daoist master whose mastery of inner alchemy (*neidan* 内丹) is mentioned in *Shenxian zhuan* 神仙伝, a collection of hagiographies of Daoist masters attributed to Ge Hong 葛洪 (283 - 343). Although the hagiography of Gexuan does not mention the role of tea as an alchemic medicine (*danyao* 丹薬), the title of ritual, the *Gexiangong li beidou fa*, suggests that the composers of the above two scriptures boar Daoist alchemy in mind.

Yōsai and His Masters and Disciples

Yōsai's lineage is called the Yōjō lineage. Since the early Edo period, this lineage has been counted as one of the thirteen lineages of Taimitsu 台密十三流. The earliest reference to it can be found in the *Keiran shūyo shū*, written in the mid-fourteenth century. In this text, Yōsai is mentioned as the Yōjō *sōjō* of Kennin temple.

Yōsai is known to have learnt esoteric Buddhism from Ken'i 顯意 (? - ?) and Kiko 基好 (? - ?), with the latter effectively serving as Yōsai's mentor. Kikō's lineage can be traced back to a monk called Yakunin 薬仁, who lived on Mt. Hiei, but

[204] T. 78 no. 2489 p. 579a

otherwise little is known about Kikō's life. According to various lineage charts, he received esoteric teachings from Nenkaku 念覚 (? - ?) of the Tani line 谷流 established by Kōgei 皇慶, Kengei 兼慶, a pupil of Yakunin and Seishō 聖昭, who founded the Anō lineage 穴太流.[205] The latter two lineages are collectively been known as the Kawa lineage 川流. Kakuchō 覚超 (960 - 1034) has retrospectively been considered the founder. Together, the Kawa and the Tani lineages were considered the two main Taimitsu lines. Kikō mastered both lineages, and under his tutelage Yōsai acquired a comprehensive knowledge of Taimitsu doctrines and practices.

Not many medieval monks attempted to clarify the history of their own lineage as Yōsai did. His motive for recording this history of his esoteric lineage in detail was to refute a monk from the Harayama temple who denounced Yōsai's lineage as not being mainstream Tani lineage.[206] Yōsai defended the legitimacy of his own lineage as follows.

> That monk [from Harayama temple] said that the combinatory consecration 合行灌頂 pointed to the secret consecration 秘密灌頂… He also said that [my] understanding of the combinatory consecration of the Tani was an inappropriate one; he claimed that the *mudrā* used for this consecration was, at first, devised by Jakushō 寂照 (aka. Kato jōsen 賀登上仙), and passed down to Kakukū of Sekisen 石泉覚空. Eventually, the priest of Ohara 大原僧都 (aka. Chōen 長宴) was transmitted [this teaching], and composed the ritual manual, which firstly referred to the name of the combinatory consecration of Tani 谷

[205] *Mikkyō daijiten* Appendix p. 32
[206] *Kaihen kyōshu ketsu* in Sueki Fumihiko (2010) p. 111b.

の合行. Thus, he said that [I,] who respected Yakunin's teaching, should not proclaim myself a descendant of the Tani lineage.

(*Kaihen kyōshu ketsu*. p. 111b)

To sum up, Yōsai's opponent criticised the lack of Kōgei's presence in Yōsai's line. For the monk from Harayama temple, Yōsai's line should not be considered part of the Tani lineage. In order to defend the authenticity of his own lineage, Yōsai referred to his transmission certificate, which reads as follows.

[My] certificate of esoteric lineage, [goes from] Mahāvairocana… [to] Jōshin 静真 (Amida bō 阿弥陀房), Kōgei (Tani ajari 谷阿闍梨), Chōen (*sōzu* of Ohara 大原僧都), Raishō 頼昭 (Sōgon bō 荘厳房), Yakunin (Chōju bō 長寿房), Kengei (Sōji bō 惣持房), Kikō (Shōzen bō 祥禅房), Yōsai (Yōjō bō of Mt. Nichiō 日応山 葉上房). Another certificate reads: Mahāvairocana… Jakushō (Mikawa Nyūdō 三河入道), Kōgei, Chōen, Raishō, Kakuhan 覚範 (Chisen bō 智泉房), Yakunin, Kenkei, Kikō to Yōsai.

Now, this combinatory consecration stems from Ennin. The combinatory consecration transmitted from Kōgei is known that of Tani 谷之合行, while the combinatory consecration transmitted from Kakuchō 覚超 is generally called that of Yokawa 横川之合行, abbreviated to Kawa. Hence, when [one] says the combinatory consecration of Tani, it indicates Ennin's lineage. Although [that monk] said what I used for consecratory performance was not an authentic Tani manner, Yakunin learnt the Tani method. Thus, what I have been instructed in is based on Kōgei's Tani lineage.

(*Kaihen kyōshu ketsu*. p. 111a)

Unfortunately, biographies of those monks, apart from Jakushō, Kōgei and Chōen, are not known. Little time need to be spent on the origin story of the 'combinatory practice' stated by Yōsai. According to Yōsai, the "combinatory practice" was created by Jakushō, who also went to China. Kōgei accompanied him to northern Kyushu.[207] According to the *Fozu tongji* 仏祖統記, a book of Buddhist history by Zhipan 志磐 (? - ?), Jakushō is introduced for his submission of the collection of questions concerning Tendai doctrines (*Tendaishū gimon nijūshichi jō* 天台宗疑問二十七条), compiled by Genshin, to Siming Zhili 四明知礼 (960 - 1028).[208] He was also welcomed by Emperor Zhenzong 真宗 (997 - 1022), and was appointed as minister for temple administrative affair (*senglu si* 僧録司). Furthermore, Emperor Zhenzong entitled Jakushō to use the title of Most Venerable (*Dashi* 大師), along with a purple robe (*ziyi* 紫衣). The permission to use a purple robe represents that the emperor placed his reliance on Jakushō. Although he tried to return to Japan, he ended up staying in China at the request of Vice Prime Minister Dingwei 丁謂 (966 - 1037), Hi until his death in 1034.[209] Naturally, a question arises as to how Jakushō transmitted the "combinatory practice" to Kakukū of Sekisen. Since there are no extant documents providing evidence that Kakukū went to China, and he was given transmission of the "combinatory practice" from Jakushō, the above story may be a fiction.

[207] ZTZ. Shiden II. p. 316b.
[208] T. 49 no. 2035 p. 191. Tiantai scholar monk in Southern Song China. The *Fozu tongji* was completed in 1269.
[209] DNBZ. Vol. 101

Moreover, Yōsai referred to a short biography of Yakunin, who had been a key figure in the above debate.

> After [Yakunin] left Mt. Hiei, he lived nearby Yae no iwaya 八重石崛 in Hōki province, and often visited Mt. Dai. Because he was a venerable master, he transmitted the combinatory consecration to Sōjibo Kengei of Daisen temple by following [the manual] he edited. He also propagated it at Kojima temple of the Bizen province, where this consecration had not been transmitted before his visit.
>
> (Ibid; p. 111b)

Only little was known about Yakunin until Okano Kōji researched the expansion of Yakunin's lineage throughout the late Heian period.[210] His survey revealed how Yakunin could be seen as a crucial figure in the context of the medieval Tendai esoteric community in western Japan. Okano introduced the postscripts of three Taimitsu documents linked to practices based on the *Yuqi jing* 瑜祇経, preserved at Shōren'in temple 青蓮院. The three documents are entitled *Yugi kyō bonara* 瑜祇経母捺羅,[211] *Yugi kyō shiki* 瑜祇経私記, and *Yugi kyō saiketsu* 瑜祇経西決. All were composed by Yakunin while he was travelling in West Japan. These postscripts contain the names of Kikō and Yōsai, which gives evidence that they certainly perused these documents.

In the late Insei period, Yakunin and a second-generation pupil of Yakunin, Kikō, seemed to be known for their mastery of esoteric practices relating to the

[210] Okano Koji (2009) pp. 18 - 33
[211] The term '*bonara*' denotes *mudrā*.

Yuqi jing, such as the *buddhalocanì* ritual (*butsugen butsumo hō* 仏眼仏母法) and the eight-syllable ritual representing the realisation of the Womb *Maṇḍala* (*daihi taizō hachiji shingon* 大悲胎蔵八字真言).[212] Those two rites resemble each other, and they are also known as 'Eight-Five rite' (*hachigo hō* 八五法), "Seal of pale ink" (*usuzumi injin* 薄墨印信) and "combinatory practice," highly respected in Taimitsu, which deeply connects to their esoteric transmission in China.[213] All these rituals deny duality from all possible perspectives, and instead point to the Buddha's ultimate point of view: non-duality. Because these rites were performed to confirm the practitioner's understanding of ultimate esoteric teaching, the transmission was very limited. Among that limited number of monks, Yōsai's rival, Jien, another major disciple of Kikō had received transmission of these teachings relevant to the *buddhalocanì* ritual through Kanshō 観性 (? – 1182 - ?). Jien's famous *Musō ki* 夢想記, which is included in *Bisei betsu* 毘麗別, gives a variant interpretation of the *buddhalocanì* ritual, symbolising the empress and her pregnancy.[214] Both Yōsai and Jien used sexual metaphor in order to explain the Buddha's ultimate point of view. As Mizukami has claimed, sexual metaphor for explicating the ultimate truth was commonly employed by medieval monks, and its use, which is misleadingly related to the heretical Tachikawa ryū 立川流, should be reassessed.

[212] Mizukami Fumiyoshi (2008) p. 453
[213] Mizukami Fumiyoshi (2008) p. 470.
[214] ZTZ. Mikkyo III. pp. 32 - 45

Yōsai's Disciples

For some modern scholars, such as Nakao Ryōshin, the characteristic of Yōsai's lineage is said to be the combinatory practice of esotericism and Zen, although Yōsai himself hardly ever demonstrated such a combination on the doctrinal level. Yet, it appear as though he recommended training in multiple forms of Buddhism, as can be deduced from both his own and his disciples' activities. His role in esoteric prayers for the Kamakura *bakufu* has already been noted by many modern scholars, such as Yanagida Seizan and Sasaki Kaoru.[215] Among Yōsai's many disciples, Taikō Gyōyu 退耕行勇 (1163 - 1241) and Shakuenbō Eichō 釈円房栄朝 (? - 1247) are the most prominent figures, and I shall devote more space to them. They are direct disciples of Yōsai, who propagated Yōsai's teachings to several monks, and later become recognized as historically significant figures.

Other than Gyōyu and Eichō, there may have been almost thirty monks who were instructed by Yōsai. The most trustworthy lineage chart for this is the *Tōji tendai daikechimyaku zu* 東寺天台大血脈図 (Lineage Chart of Tendai Teaching, preserved at Tōji temple), composed by Bennen Enni 弁円円爾 (1202 - 1280), a pupil of Eichō.[216] This lineage chart, preserved at Tōfuku temple 東福寺, lists Raigon 頼厳, Kyōgon 教厳, Kakuson 覚尊, Genyu 源祐, Ben'ō 弁応, Gonsai 厳西, Kinsai 欣西, Rinchi 琳智, Henkei 遍慶, Rinkai 琳海, Anin 阿忍 and Gonyō 厳耀. Among these, few words need to be said about Rinkai, Anin and Gonyō. Rinkai seems to be the one who transcribed two versions of Yōsai's *Ingoshū* 隠語集. Next, Anin is more widely known than Rinkai because he has retrospectively come to be regarded as the founder of the so-called Anin lineage 阿忍流. Okonogi Teruyuki's

[215] Yanagida Seizan (1972) p.439. Sasaki Kaoru (1997) pp. 77 – 78.
[216] DNK. Iewake 20. *Tofukuji monjo*. pp. 71 - 74.

survey of the documents preserved at the Mitsugon'in 密厳院 archive in modern Aichi prefecture suggests that Anin might be one of Enni's esoteric masters.[217] Finally, Gonyō appears to be Eichō's first esoteric master before Eichō met Yōsai. Gonyō was a fairly well-known monk as his name is mentioned in the *Azuma kagami*; this work mentions his role as an esoteric priest. He was asked to perform an esoteric ritual for defeating enemies in 1189 by Minamoto-no-Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147 - 1199), the first shogun of the Kamakura *bakufu*. Furthermore, he served as abbot of Jikō temple 慈光寺, erected by Dōchu 道忠 (? - ?), who was a student of Jianzhen (688 - 763) 鑑真, and propagated Buddhism in eastern Japan along with Saichō 最澄 (766 - 822). Jikō temple is as historically important as Midono temple 緑野寺, where Saichō offered his transcriptions of the *Lotus sūtra*. Because Jikō temple had been so highly esteemed, its chief monk, Gonyō, ought to have held a privileged position. However, his detailed biography is not known.

Another source is the *Fusō gozan ki* 扶桑五山記, which states that the second through the seventh abbot of Kennin temple were Yōsai's direct disciples. Their names are as follows; Zenkei 禅慶, Dōshō 道聖, Genchin 玄珍, Zenkō 禅興, Gonrin and Enrin 円琳 (1190 - ?).[218] Apart from Gonrin and Enrin, none of these names are mentioned in any other sources. As has been mentioned briefly, Gonrin once lived in Eishō temple, where Yōsai had stayed in his youth.[219] Gonrin is also known to be a master of Jinshi Eison 神子栄尊 (1195 - 1272), who entered the Buddhist priesthood at Eishō temple. In addition, Eison's biography, the *Minakamisen manjukaizan jinshizenji gyōjitsu* 水上山万寿開山神子禅師行実, makes

[217] Okonogi Teruyuki (2002) p. 112
[218] Tamamura Takeji (1983) p. 37
[219] See the section on Eishō temple in the chapter of Yōsai's biography.

reference to Gonrin as a senior disciple of Yōsai.[220] Enrin was the author of the *Bosatsukai gishō sho* 菩薩戒義疏鈔, a commentary on the *Pusajie yishu* 菩薩戒義疏, attributed to Zhiyi.[221] In addition, Hōjibō Shōshin 宝地房 証真 (1131/1136 – 1215/1220) was also a teacher of Enrin.[222]

Yōsai apparently had quite a few disciples, although the majority of them are not very well known. Bennen Enni and Shinshi Eison, however, still have to be recognised as influential historical figures. Among the many disciples connected to Yōsai's lineage, Gyōyū and Eichō were his most trustworthy disciples.[223] The next section, in this respect, will explore Gyōyū, Eichō and their eminent apprentices.

Gyōyū

Only three extant works, the *Azuma kagami*, the *Enpō dentō roku* 延宝伝灯録 and the *Honchō kōsō den* 本朝高僧伝, mention Gyōyū.[224] The *Genkō shakusho*, an invaluable material to understand Yōsai's biography, does not refer to him. Drawing on these sources, we can establish that Gyōyū was born in 1163 and died in 1241. He used to call himself Genshin 玄信 until he was ordained at Tōdai temple. During this period, he was instructed by Ningaku 任覚 (1109 - 1180) of Tōji temple. In 1192, he moved to Kamakura, since he had been chosen to be an administrative monk 供僧 of Tsurugaoka Hachiman shrine temple 鶴岡八幡宮寺, where Yōsai performed esoteric rituals a number of times. He met Yōsai once he

[220] ZGR. 9-2. p. 297a
[221] DNBZ. Vol. 71 pp. 1 – 148. As for the issue on the authenticity of the *Pusajie yishu*, see the chapter of Annen's interpretation of the esoteric precepts.
[222] Takigawa Zenkai (1982) pp. 1 -35.
[223] Enrin, too has been assessed by modern scholars as a key scholar monk in the context of the emergence of the Precepts Group 戒家. Kubota Tesshō (1977) pp. 162 – 163 INBUDS
[224] In modern language, there is a comprehensive survey on Gyōyū by Nakao Ryōshun. See Nakao (2005).

had started serving at Tsurugaoka Hachimangūji, but the exact time of their encounter is not known. Gyōyu succeeded him as abbot of Jufuku temple and Kennin temple, and also acceded to the chief solicitor of the Tōji temple reconstruction project after Yōsai. Moreover, at Yōsai's suggestion, he was employed by Hōjō Masako 北条政子 (1157 - 1225), widow of Minamoto-no-Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147 - 1199), to supervise the building of the Kongōsanmai hall 金剛三昧院 on Mt. Kōya 高野山 in 1211. Eventually, he became the first abbot of this hall in 1234, and retired in 1237.[225] His activities between 1237 and 1241 were not recorded.

A brief outline is sufficient to explain the role of the Kongōsanmai hall, a major centre advocating Zen-Esoteric practice, and its community, Gyōyū's introduction of Zen-Esoteric combinatory practice had a massive impact on Mt. Kōya. A recent study by Tado Taichi demonstrates how such a combinatory practice spread. Tado particularly gives attention to Dōhan 道範 (1178 - 1252) and Shinkū 真空 (1204 – 1268 a.k.a. Kohata no Shinkū 木幡の真空) who became the fifth abbot of the Kongōsanmai hall. Dōhan was Shinkū's master. Shinkū was also lectured the *Zongjing lu* 宗鏡録 by Yongming Yanshou 永明延寿 (904 - 975) from Benen Enni. Although those two distinguished scholar monks had a critical attitude towards Zen, Tado has highlighted that the Zen, which they criticised, was that of the Daruma school.[226] A useful text should be used in order to examine the combinatory practice of esoteric and Zen, widely popularised within Mt. Kōya. The *Shinzen yūshin gi* 真禅融心義 in one fascicle, attributed to Yōsai, serves to explain how Zen was introduced and adopted at Mt. Kōya. The authenticity of this work,

[225] *Kongosanmai'in monjo* 1. pp. 449 - 454
[226] Tado Taichi (2008) pp. 18 – 22.

however, has long been doubted by modern scholars, such as Nakao, Takayanagi and Tado, because the contents reveals in this suggest that it was written down on the basis of Dōhan's classification of esotericism and Zen.[227] As the previous studies also suggest, the *Shinzen yūshin gi* was most likely composed by a disciple of Dōhan who lived on Mt. Kōya.

A biography of Gyōyu, entitled *Kaizan gyōjō narabini ashikaga reifu* 開山行状並足利霊符, by an unknown author, is preserved in the archive of Jōmyō temple 浄妙寺 in Kamakura and is an invaluable document for understanding his life. Most of the contents are based on the *Azuma kagami* and the Jōmyō temple's records of deceased (*tōji dai kakochō* 当寺大過去牒).[228] An interesting entry in the *Kaizan gyojo narabini ashikaga reifu* is the account of Gyōyū being dispatched to China by Minamoto-no-Yoritomo in 1184 and returning to Kamakura in 1188. If this entry were true, his stay in China could have partly overlapped with Yōsai's stay in China from 1187 to 1191. If this were the case, it could explain the reason why Yōsai made Gyōyū one of his two senior successors alongside Eichō.

Taking the above short biography of Gyōyū into account, it is obvious that Gyōyū closely worked with Yōsai. In my opinion, he may have served as Yōsai's right-hand man of sorts, particularly in the sphere of politics. As a matter of fact, one can perceive Yōsai's political strategy in which his disciples take possession of the abbotships of prestigious temples, in order to expand his influence. In this case, he succeeded in putting Mt. Kōya under his influence by means of Gyōyū.

[227] Takeyanagi Satsuki (2002) pp. 608 – 610.
[228] Nakao Ryōshin (1987) pp. 39 – 50. He is sceptical this document because some references from the *Azuma kagami* differ from the standard edition. The document can now be consulted in *Sōtōshū kenkyūin kenkyū kiyō Vol. 19*, as documented by Nakao, who relies on this text to compose Gyōyu's biography.

Eichō

Eichō was another senior disciple of Yōsai. By contrast, Eichō's lineage soon declined. The only extant source material to investigate his life is a lineage chart of the Renge temple (*Renge'in ryū kechimyaku* 蓮華院流血脈), which reads as follows.[229]

> Shakuenbō Eihō, who erected Chōraku temple of Mt. Serata 世良田山 長楽寺, was born in Nawa District of Kōzuke County. [He] entered the Buddhist priesthood and [he was] consecrated by the abbot Gonyō of Mt. Jikō. [Eichō was also] known as a great donation collector. Later, [he] followed the bishop Yōsai, who established Kennin temple. Eichō was transmitted the bowl and the Precepts of a Zen monk, and at the same time, received a consecratory ritual that was based on [the manuals of the] Anō lineage.
>
> (*Gunmaken shi.* V. p. 687a)

According to this document, Eichō came from the region of modern Gunma prefecture. He was ordained at Jikō temple under the supervision of Gonyō, and furthermore, he received an esoteric consecration from Gonyō, one of Yōsai's first-generation disciples. Later, he became Yōsai's pupil. Eichō seems to have been a talented disciple, as he was given the robe that Yōsai had been presented by Xuan Huaichang while studying in China. Moreover, Eichō inherited the Renge'in lineage of Taimitsu from Sokujōbō Shōgō 即成房聖豪 (? - ?). Late in his life, he was appointed abbot of Jikō temple, a position from which he retired a couple of years

[229] *Gunmaken shi* (1978) shiryo hen 5. P. 687. Renge'in ryū is also known as Renge ryū, which was established by Yōi (? - ?) See, *Mikkyō daijiten* p. 2303c

before his death. However, the *Renge'in ryū kechimyaku* does not give the years of his birth and death. Instead, the *Zensatsu juji seki* 禅刹住持籍 (Records for Abbots of Zen Temple) states that Eicho died in 1247 aged 83. Hence, the year of his birth is probably 1165.

Furthermore, even before Yōsai came to Kamakura in 1199 Eichō might already have been a famous monk in eastern Japan, as he had established some major temples, such as Fusai temple 普済寺, Daimai temple 大梅寺, Renge temple 蓮華寺 and Kezō temple 華蔵寺.[230] Among these temples established by Eichō, Ryōsen temple 霊山院 and Chōraku temple 長楽寺 are significant for the central roles they played in the process of broadening Yōsai's lineage. Ryōsen temple was built in the domain of Jikō temple 慈光寺, one of the most ancient temples in Japan established by Dōchū 道忠 (? - ?), where Eichō was ordained in his youth, also, by one account, he may have held the abbotship of Ryōsen temple.[231] Additionally, since the area where Jikō temple was located was referred to as *bessho* 別所, the place where many *kanjin hijiri* 勧進聖, monks who collect donation for temple reconstructions, gathered.[232]

Nitta Yoshisue's 新田義季 encouragement and sponsorship were crucial to the establishment of Chōraku temple. Because of the Nitta family's devotion to Eichō, he was appointed as the first abbot as soon as construction was finished. The temple was regarded as one of the ten distinctive Rinzai Zen temples 十刹 in the early Muromachi period. The temple declined in the late Muromachi period and was later revived by Tenkai (1536-1643 天海) who converted Chōraku temple to the

[230] Yamamoto Seiki (2003) p. 21
[231] For the history of the Ryōsen temple, see Sugawara Shoei (1981) *Zenshu chihoshi chosakai nenpo* vol.3 pp. 195 - 228
[232] Ibid; p. 198

Tendai school in 1642. The reason for this conversion was the importance that the Nitta clan held for the Tokugawa family, which proclaimed itself to be descendent from the Nitta clan. Since this conversion, the temple has been known as Tōshogu 東照宮, indicating the clan temple/shrine (*ujidera* 氏寺) of Tokugawa.[233]

Chōraku temple is said to have been only temple that taught Zen together with esotericism. While there are actually a great number of esoteric Buddhist writings in the temple archive, no source material relevant to Zen can be found. Thus, the documents, stored in this temple archive, do not provide evidence for the combined practice of Zen and esotericism. Accordingly, one needs to investigate this issue from a different perspective. Some famous and invaluable medieval literary works can shed light on this question. Among these works, the *Shaseki shū* 沙石集, which was written by Mujū Ichien, one of Eichō's disciples, tells of Eichō and his teaching. A passage from the *Shaseki shū* clarifies what sorts of practices were taught at Chōraku temple and how Eichō instructed his disciples.

> Eichō of the Shakuenbō was compassionate and wise. [He] learnt both esoteric and exoteric Buddhism and he delivered sermons. People of the Kōzuke region wanted to listen to his teaching […] To enter the Buddhist priesthood under his instruction, [one was asked to] hold just three [types of] shabby robes and one bowl, and observe the precepts strictly. Additionally, [one was taught to] practice contemplation and learned the teachings of Exoteric, Esoteric and Zen Buddhism…
>
> (*Shaseki shū*. p. 237)

[233] Okonogi Teruyuki (2002) p. 13

Nevertheless, the image of Eichō emerging from the *Shaseki shū* also strongly indicates that the combinatory practice of esotericism and Zen had been practiced at Chōraku temple since its establishment. Although the above passages demonstrate the importance of combinatory practice, what Zen practice in this context actually remains unclear, as no source materials related to Zen are preserved at Chōraku temple. While the nature of the "combinatory practice" performed in Eichō's lineage cannot ascertain, this combinatory characteristic was passed on to Eichō's disciples.

Eicho's Pupils

Many monks visited Chōraku temple to be instructed by Eichō.[234] In 1223, Bennen Enni called on the temple in order to receive esoteric consecration alongside Jinshi Eison, who founded Manju temple 万寿寺 in Hizen province.[235] According to the *Genkō shakusho*, Bennen Enni, in his early career, studied at Mii temple. Because he was not satisfied with what he learnt from his master there, he shifted his interest to Zen Buddhism, which came to be popular at the time. He then travelled to Chōraku temple, which many deemed to be the best place for training Zen. The reason he did not choose Kennin temple is not known for sure, but for Enni, Kennin temple, being situated right in the middle of the capital city, might have been too secular to learn Zen properly, i.e., for very intense training required. In Chōraku temple, he received the Taimitsu lineage from Eichō. After Eichō died, he moved to Kamakura to study Zen further under Gyōyu. At this point, Enni had been trained by the two most senior disciples of Yōsai. However, these masters

[234] Yamamoto Seiki lists up Eichō's disciples and successive abbot of this temple. See Yamamoto Seiki (2003)
[235] ZGR. Vol. 9 p. 297a

were obviously unable to satisfy his aspiration. Eventually, he decided to make a journey to China, and stayed there from 1235 to 1241. His master was Wuzhun Shifan 無準師範 (1178 - 1249), known as the most influential figure for the Kamakura Zen community. Once Enni returned to Japan, he built Jōten temple 承天寺 with sponsorship by Chinese immigrants who lived in northern Kyushu. His most noteworthy achievement was the foundation of Tōfuku temple 東福寺 in Kyoto in 1255. Since Tōfuku temple had been sponsored by the Kujō family 九条家, a regent family of the time, considerable religio-political power was concentrated in this temple. Kokan Shiren, the author of the *Genkō shakusho*, was ordained at this temple. Of the most significance was Enni's appointment to the post of Chief solicitor of Tōdai temple, a position that Yōsai and Gyōyu had held before him.

Jinshi Eison could have been Enni's closest friend, since they studied at Chōraku temple and made the journey to China together.[236] He was trained in Zen by Wuzhun Shifan alongside Enni. However, Eison has not won the same fame as Enni, whose was centred in Kyoto. Nevertheless, his roles in broadening Zen and invigorating the religious environment in northern Kyushu, the biggest international trade region of Japan at the time, should not be overlooked.[237] He constructed Entsū temple 円通寺, one of the temples built in Usa Hachiman shrine 宇佐八幡宮, which had been considered as the headquarter of all Hachiman shrines since the Nara period. Eison took advantage of the prestige of this shrine to propagate the teachings he had learnt from Eichō and Wuzhun Shifan. He also

[236] ZGR. Vol. 9 p. 299a

[237] For the importance of northern Kyushu throughout the pre-modern era, see the chapter on Yōsai's biography.

made great efforts to build Manju temple 万寿寺 in what is now Saga prefecture. Manju temple was dubbed 'the temple for imperial prayer' (*chokugan ji* 勅願寺).

Part Two: Esoteric Practices: Precepts, Vinaya, Consecration and Visualisation

Chapter 3

Esoteric Practice 1. The *Putixin lun*

The *Putixin lun*

Among many esoteric scriptures and treatises, *Jinggangding yuqiezhong faanouduoluo sanmosanputixin lun* (*Treatise on the Realisation of Bodhi in Diamond Yogic Tradition*) 金剛頂瑜伽中発阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心論 (hereafter: *Putixin lun* 菩提心論), has been considered as one of the most significant works for Japanese esoteric Buddhism, alongside the two major scriptures, the *Dapiluzhe chengfo shenbian jiachi jing* 大毘盧遮那成仏神変加持経 (hereafter: *Dari jing* 大日経) and the *Jingangding jing* 金剛頂経. Although the title is often abbreviated as *Putixin lun*, this abbreviation may mislead readers. In a Sino-Japanese esoteric Buddhist context, the term *putixin* or *bodaishin* 菩提心 has two meanings; one is the awakening of faith to attain Buddhahood (*bodhicitta utpāda*), the other is the mind of Buddhahood (*bodhicitta* or *sambodhicitta*). The *Putixin lun* mainly discusses the methods to realise Buddhahood, but not that for the awakening of faith. Moreover, the *Putixin lun* puts emphasis on the bodily practice for obtaining the Buddha's perfect body (Ch. *foshen yuanman* Jp. *busshin enman* 仏身円満). As will be discussed in the later section, since a practitioner is required to visualise his own heart, or *hṛdaya* (Ch. *rouxin* Jp. *nikushin* 肉心) in the first step of this bodily practice, *xin* in the context of the *Putixin lun*, indicates not only cognitive mind or *citta* (Ch. *shixin* Jp. *shikishin* 識心), but also flesh heart. Thus, I have translated the title simply as the *Treatise on the Realisation of Bodhi in Diamond Yogic Tradition*.

As its full title indicates, the *Putixin lun* belongs to the Diamond (Ch. *jingang* Jp *kongō* 金剛) scriptual lineage, constituting the dual mandalic (Ch. *liangbu* Jp. *ryōbu* 両部) lineages, alongside the Womb (Ch. *taizang* Jp. *taizō* 胎蔵) scriptual lineage, based on the *Dari jing*. Transmission of the dual mandalic lineages is the foundation of Japanese esoteric Buddhism. Nonetheless, the *Putixin lun* also contains many elements of the Womb textual lineage drown from the *Dari jing* and its commentaries.[238] Such types of combinatory element of the two mandalic lineages in esoteric Buddhist texts are called *gōnyū* 合揉, a unique term invented by Misaki Ryōshū.[239] This term *gōnyū* is often used in the doctrinal context, while in the context of rituals, the combinatory practices are traditionally named as *gōgyō* 合行. For these esoteric texts, Misaki gave the name, *uṣnīṣa* scriptural lineage (*bucchō kei kyōten* 仏頂系経典).[240] Although the *Putixin lun* is a treatise, one can consider that the *Putixin lun* is closely linked to the *uṣnīṣa* scriptural lineage.

The *Putixin lun* is a small treatise compiled in one fascicle, but its impact on Japanese Buddhist history has been massive. The *Putixin lun* was first introduced by Kūkai in his *Goshōrai mokuroku* (Catalogue of the Imported Scriptures and Treatises) 御請来目録. Kūkai's use of this treatise settled the position of this work in the context of the development of esotericism in Japan. He cited the *Putixin lun* to claim the superiority of esoteric Buddhism among many pre-existing forms of teachings, because the treatise states a peculiar method of practice, namely the Practice of Visualisation. Since then, quite scholar monks, particularly from Tōmitsu lineages, have written commentaries on this treatise. In this chapter, I

[238] There are two commentaries on the *Dari jing*; one is the *Dari jing yishi*, the other is the *Dari jing shu*. The *Yishi* is preferably used in the Tendai esoteric Buddhism, while the *Shu* is utilised in Kūkai's esoteric lineage. See, for instance, Osabe Kazuo (1963) p. 12 and Okubo Ryōshun (2001) p. 5.
[239] Misaki Ryōshū (1988) p. 417
[240] Ibid; p. 484

also deal with Taimitsu interpretations of the *Putixin lun*. I focus on Annen, who composed a voluminous work on this treatise, which immensely influenced later esoteric doctrines and practices, regardless of sectarian difference.

Identifying the composer of the *Putixin lun* was an important task for early Japanese esoteric scholar monks. In Japan, the *Putixin lun* was attributed to either Nāgārjuna or Mañjuśrī. However, it is very likely that it was composed by a Chinese esoteric monk who could have been one of the pupils of Bukong. The critical edition of the *Putixin lun* included in the Taishō canon was produced comparing the texts included in two Chinese editionss and two Japanese manuscripts.[241] The underlying problem is that the two Chinese canons contain the term "the great *ācārya* of Dajiansi 大鑑寺大阿闍梨," whereas Japanese manuscripts do not mention it. According to modern scholarship, the "Dajiansi" very likely indicates one of Bukong's disciples, who lived at this temple.[242] Even if a version of the *Putixin lun* containing the term "Dajiansi" was imported from China in the early Heian period, debates on the "great *ācārya*" would not have occurred in later Japanese era. In this light, esoteric scholar monks attempted to indicate who the "great *ācārya*" actually is. Among them, Kūkai, Enchin and Annen devoted much attention on this issue, because it was relevant to the formation of both Taimitsu and Tōmitsu sectarian identities. Taking into account the significance of identifying the composer of the *Putixin lun*, I shall first conduct the analysis of their interpretations on the "great *ācārya*."

[241] The two Chinese canons are Song canon and that of Ming. The three manuscripts preserved in Japan are Ninna temple manuscript and Kunaichō manuscript.
[242] Katō Yūyū (1941) pp. 1 – 22.

The *Putixin lun* contains many important elements for the development of esoteric Buddhist thought and practice. The first characteristic is to the formulation of three types of practices, consisting of Vow (Ch. *xingyuan* Jp. *gyōgan* 行願), Realisation of Supreme Emptiness (Ch. *shengyi* Jp. *shōgi* 勝義) and Visualisations (Ch. *sanmode* Jp. *samaji* 三摩地). Such formulation is unique to the *Putixin lun*. Further attention needs to be given to two points. Firstly, the Practice of Visualisations is deeply linked to *abhiṣeka* (Ch. *guanding* Jp. *kanjō* 灌頂), or esoteric consecration. Secondly, the above three practices as a whole have been regarded as the precepts. The first point is discussed in the outset of Chapter 5. This chapter mainly deals with the second point.

In Japan, these three practices have been known comprehensively as the threefold *bodhicitta* practice (*sanshu bodaishin gyō* 三種菩提心行), an expression often used by medieval monks, but the *Putixin lun* does not mention the three practices in terms of *bodhicitta* practice. In the treatise, the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness and that of Visualisation denote *bodhicitta* practices. It was Annen's idea to interpret the three practices as the threefold *bodhicitta* practice by applying the Tiantai threefold pattern.

The Great *Ācārya*

As was indicated in the introductory part, mentioning who the "great *ācārya"* was because a concern only in Japan. The manuscripts of the *Putixin lun* imported in the early Heian era very likely did not explain who this "great *ācārya*" is. This made the "great *ācārya*" open to interpretation, and Heian scholar monks provided various answers. It is noteworthy that both Kūkai and Annen used the *Jingangding jing yujue* 金剛頂経義訣 (Commentary on the *Jingangding jing* in four

or six fascicles, Full title: *Jingangding jing dayuga bimixinde famen* 金剛頂経大瑜伽秘密心地法門), composed by Vajrabodhi (Jingangzhi 金剛智 671? – 741), and written down by Bukong. This commentary recounts how the *Jingangding jing* was transmitted from Mahāvairocana Buddha to Nāgārjuna, and the plot of this story was interpreted by Kūkai and Annen each in their own way. The following passages will explore how the above two scholar monks dealt with the issue.

1) Kūkai

Kūkai considered the composer of the *Putixin lun* to be Nāgārjuna. He argued this he advocated in four texts. First is the *Himitsu mandara jūjusshin ron* (Discussion on the Ten Stages of Mind in Secret *Maṇḍala* Teachings 秘密曼荼羅十住心論), the most popular work of Kūkai.[243] In the *Benkenmitsu nikkyōron* as well, Kūkai wrote that "this treatise, composed by Nāgārjuna, is the most pivotal treatise of esotericism among a thousand of treatises. [The treatise] compares the difference between esoteric Buddhism and exoteric Buddhism in their depths, and the different speed they allow to attain enlightenment."[244] This quotation makes clear Kūkai's understanding that the composer of the *Putixin lun* is Nāgārjuna, despite differing from the versions in the Chinese canons.

The reason why Kūkai emphasises Nāgārjuna very likely connects to the legitimacy of his lineage. To demonstrate this, the *Himitsumandarakyō fuhōden* 秘密曼荼羅教付法伝 (a.k.a. *Kō fuhō den* 広付法伝), which recounts the seven patriarchs from Mahāvairocana to Huiguo 恵果 (746 - 805), is a useful source

[243] T. 77 no. 2425 p. 336b. The *Goshorai mokuroku* states neither the name of translator nor that of composer.
[244] T. 77 no. 2427 p. 378b.

material. The *Himitsumandarakyō fuhōden* in two fascicles is a collection of short biographies of the seven patriarchs of the Shingon Buddhism, which begins with Mahāvairocana and ends with Huiguo.[245] The entries for Mahāvairocana and Vajrasattva, who belong to the super-mundane realm, are short. Thus, the biographies virtually begin with that of Nāgārjuna. In the entry for Nāgārjuna, Kūkai referred to Nāgārjuna's distinctive role in the myth of transmission of esoteric Buddhism depicted in the *Jingangding jing yujue*. As it reads: "[Nāgārjuna] learnt countless numbers of Buddhist teachings. Consequently, [he] entered into the Iron Tower of the South India, and was given the consecratory rite from Vajrasattva; He learnt the teachings of the most profound esoteric *maṇḍala*, and propagated it to people."[246] This famous scene of Nāgārjuna's transmission of the Diamond consecration has been known as the Transmission in the Iron Tower of South India 南天鉄塔相承説.

Kūkai also used another interpretation. In the *Kyōōkyō kaidai* 教王経開題, a short commentary on the most popular version of the *Jingangding jing* translated by Bukong, Kūkai explained that "this scripture (*Kyōōkyō*) and the *Dari jing* were the fundamental scriptures, which were both transmitted by Nāgārjuna in the Iron Tower of the South India. Those two [esoteric] scriptures indeed differ from the [exoteric] scriptures, which were preached by the manifestation body of Buddha."[247] Regardless of which interpretation of Nāgārjuna was accepted, these passages reveals that Kūkai indeed considered Nāgārjuna the *de facto* first patriarch of

[245] KDZ. Vol. 1 pp. 5 - 8
[246] KZ. 1. p. 6
[247] T. 61 no. 2222 p. 7a

esoteric Buddhism.[248] Therefore, one can assume that Kūkai identified the "great *ācārya*" with Nāgārjuna.

2) Enchin

Enchin dealt with the issue of the "great *ācārya*," but unlike Kūkai, Enchin did not connect it with sectarian identity. His concern was simply his academic interest. In the *Sasa gimon* 些些疑文, which is a collection of various questions that Enchin wanted to ask to Chinese esoteric masters,[249] one reads that "the *Putixin lun* was composed by Nāgārjuna. Another says: [the *Putixin lun*] was selected by Bukong. This has not been clarified. In my opinion, the second account seems the correct." Another manuscript, attributed to Enchin, called *Zōmon zōki* 雑問雑記, is also a useful source material to understand his opinion. The *Zōmon zōki* no longer exists, but it is cited in the *Bodaishinron kenmon* 菩提心論見聞, by unknown author, and the *Hōsakushō* 宝冊鈔 by Gōho 杲宝 (1306 - 1362) as the authentic work of Enchin.[250] The *Bodaishinron kenmon* reads: "The *Zengyuan lu* 貞元録 states that the *Putixin lun* was selected by Bukong. Thus, Bukong is most likely the author of it." The *Zengyuan lu* is the official catalogue of Buddhist scriptures, which was submitted to emperor Dezong 徳宗 (742 - 805) in 800 by Yuanzhao 円照 (? - ?). This catalogue was compiled on the basis of the *Kaiyuanlu* 開元録, a private catalogue completed in 730 by Zhizhao 智昇 (? - ?). Enchin's reference to this catalogue is

[248] In the Kamakura period, these two views on Nāgārjuna's transmission would be discussed by many Tōmitsu scholar monks as topics of sectarian polemics.
[249] NBZ. Vol. 27 pp. 1037a – 1069b. The *Sasa gimon* is interesting material to see Enchin's striving to understand the commentaries on the *Dari jing*. Although this is a small work, decoding this text is very difficult, as it requires vast knowledge of its commentaries in comparison with very little number of his authentic works, such as the *Bodaijokyo ryakugishaku* on which the *Putichang jing* is commentated on by means of the *Dari jing* commentary.
[250] T. 70 no. 2294 p. 34b. T. 77 no. 2453 p. 817c

most appropriate, as the *Putixin lun* was indeed first catalogued by Yuanzhao.At the same time, a famous work attributed to Enchin, *Dainichi kyō shiki* 大日経指帰 reads that the *Putixin lun* was written by Nāgārjuna.[251] Threfore, he may have provided two conclusions.

3) Annen

Annen dealt with the "great *ācārya*" having understood that the *Putixin lun* contains the elements of two scriptural lineages. Therefore, for him, the "great *ācārya*" had to be someone who could combine the two, or it had to be something which fulfils the role of the myth of the Iron Tower of South India.[252] In the *Shingonshū kyōji mondō* 真言宗教時問答 (hereafter *Kyōji mondō* 教時問答), his best-known workAnnen offered a new interpretation of the "great *ācārya*," who was Mañjuśrī 文殊.[253] He draws from four texts: the *Commentary on the seventh fascicle of the Dari jing* (*Dari jing gongyangcidifa shu* 大日経供養次第法疏), the *Commentary on the Jingangding jing in four or six fascicles* (*Jingangding jing yujue* 金剛頂経義訣), the *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji* 両部大法相承師資付法記 and the *Vimalakirti sūtra* (*Weimojie suoshou jing* 維摩詰所説経). This argument is constructed by passages of these texts in the following way.

The *Dari jing gongyangcidifa shu*, composed by a Korean scholar monk, Bukesiyi 不可思議 (? - ?). In the context of arguing his interpretation, Bukesiyi writes:

[251] T. 58 no. 2212 p. 20c
[252] T. 75 no. 2397 p. 451c Annen was aware of Enchin's opinion, but deemed that "[Enchin] ignored the fundamental issue despite his realistic approach."
[253] T. 75 no. 2397 p. 451c

> […] there was a town called Gandhara. The king of its [city] invited a priest and begged him to transmit the offering ritual. Because the scripture was long and its meaning was deep and [the king] was unable to understand the way of offering, the king implored the priest to explicate it. [The king] encouraged [the priest] to explore the area where there was the tower established by Kaniska; [Around the tower, he] sought out holy empowerment 加持. Soon after, the words were projected in the sky, and they were shining like gold. The priest read them once and wrote them down. [The priest] looked up to the sky and said "Who has received the revelation of these!?" [A voice] responded, "I did." [The priest] asked again, "Who are you?" [Someone] said, "I am Mañjuśrī!" [...] This priest was indeed Shanwuwei.
>
> (*Gongyangcidifa shu* T. 39 no. 1797 p. 790b)

The above passage depicts the scene of the origin of the *Dari jing gongyangcidifa* in which Mañjuśrī projected each single word of the seventh fascicle of the *Dari jing* into the sky, and Śubhakarasiṃha (637 - 735 Ch. Shanwuwei 善無畏) transcribed them at the tower of Kaniska (*jinsuwangta* 金粟王塔). Shanwuwei is the translator of the *Dari jing*, alongside Yixing 一行 (683 - 727). This transmission of the offering ritual manual of the *Dari jing* (*Dari jing gongyangcidifa* 大日経供養次第法. a.k.a. the seventh Fascicle of the *Dari jing*) from Mañjuśrī to Shanwuwei is the first key point to understand Annen's interpretation of the "great *ācārya*." Next, Annen has accurately quoted the passages from the *Jingangding jing yujue*. As it reads:

After the death of Shakyamuni, for hundreds of years, nobody could open the door [of the Iron Tower]. The door had been chained up. When the teachings of Buddha had decayed, there was a great venerable [, whose name was Nāgārjuna,] who acquired the mantra of Mahāvairocana. [He chanted this mantra, and] succeeded in meeting Mahāvairocana Buddha, whose single figure changes into those innumerable. [Mahāvairocana Buddha's transformed body projected words in the sky, and Nāgārjuna carefully wrote them down. This writing is, namely the *Piluzhena niansong fayao*. Nāgārjuna wished to open the door according to the merits acquired in transcribing [the scripture]. He recited the *Piluzhena niansong fayao* for seven days. Seven days after, he hurled seven poppy seeds at the door. The door, then, opened.

(*Jingangding jing yujue* T. 39 no. 1798 p. 808a-b)

What Annen had done by quoting the above two passages from the *Jingangding jing yujue* and the *Dari jing gongyang cidifa shu* was to combine the two mythical stories of transmission of esoteric scriptures. For this combination, Annen considers the *Piluzhena niansong fayao* 毘盧遮那念誦法要 as differing from the mantra of Mahāvairocana, and identified the mantra of Mahāvairocana with the *Dari jing gongyangcidifa*.[254] This connection is explained in the next quotation from the *Kyōji mondō*. As it reads:

This bodhisattva (Nāgārjuna) had already obtained the mantra of Mahāvairocana in order to summon Mahāvairocana, who, after appeared,

[254] The *Piluzhena niansong fayao* is considered to be the *Dapiluzhenafo shuo yaolue niansong jing* (T. 18 no. 849 pp. 55 - 64). However, Onozuka Kicho (200) suggests, their origins are slightly different.

> taught him the *Piluzhena niansong fayao* prior to enter the Iron Tower of South India. The mantra of Mahāvairocana was the same as the *Dari jing gongyangcidifa,* which Mañjuśrī transmitted to Shanwuwei. Thus, Nāgārjuna acquired the mantra from Mañjuśrī. [Therefore, Haiyun's] lineage chart of the Diamond realm reads Mahāvairocana – Vajrasattva – Mañjuśrī - Nāgārjuna etc… What it points to is that [Nāgārjuna] was transmitted the mantra of Mahāvairocana by Mañjuśrī in advance of acquiring the *Piluzhena niansong fayao*.
>
> (*Kyōji mondō* T. 75 no. 2396 p. 430c)

Annen slightly manipulated the passage from the *Jingangding jing yujue* where the mantra of Mahāvairocana and the *Piluzhena niansong fayao* are regarded as identical. Instead, he separated this mantra from the *Piluzhena niansong fayao*, and considered the same text as the *Dari jing gongyangcidifa*, mentioned in the *Dari jing gongyangcidifa shu*. By doing this, Annen can introduce Mañjuśrī in the Iron Tower myth. Although Annen does not clearly state this in the *Kyōji mondō*, by bringing Mañjuśrī into story, Annen implies that Mañjuśrī the one who united the two esoteric scriptural lineages. Annen created a new esoteric lineage. Since Annen sought to clarify the "great *ācārya*" within this unification, he attributed the composition of the *Putixin lun* to Mañjuśrī. Moreover, to reinforce his own opinion, Annen cited a lineage chart, included in Haiyun's 海雲 (? – 834 - 874) *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji* 両部大法相承師資付法記.[255] The authenticity of the *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji* has been placed in doubt by Amanda Goodman, who

[255] For detailed account see, Chen Jinhua (2010) pp. 94 – 109.

suggests that this text may have been forged by Annen.[256] However, recent survey provided by Jinhua Chen has reversed her account.

There was a deeper meaning for employing Mañjuśrī to combine the two scriptural lineages. It should not be forgotten that Annen, as a Taimitsu scholar monk, always had the combination of the Tiantai and esoteric Buddhism in mind. In Tiantai Buddhism, the *Vimalakirti sūtra* (*Weimojie suoshou jing* 維摩詰所説経) is an important scripture, for which Zhiyi wrote a commentary, the *Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩経文疏, and submitted it to Yangdi 煬帝 (569 - 618).[257] The most famous chapter of this scripture is the Chapter for Entering the Gate of Non-duality (*rubuerfamen pin* 入不二法門品),[258] where Mañjuśrī is depicted as the representation of non-duality. Annen's estimation of this chapter has been pointed out by Okubo Ryōshun.[259] Annen obviously knew that Mañjuśrī had long been the representation of the non-duality in the Tiantai teachings since Zhiyi, and thus, he might have reconfirmed the importance of Mañjuśrī. Such an interpretation can be considered as his attempt at creating a Taimitsu sectarian identity, competing with that of Tōmitsu, but founded on the myth of the Iron Tower of South India.

Three Types of Practices

1) Practice of Vow

The *Putixin lun* begins with the explanation of the Practice of Vow. According to the *Putixin lun*, it is explained that "by striving to benefit others, and bringing comfort without remind to the world of sentient beings, [one] shall view sentient

[256] Unpublished. Ibid; p. 94.
[257] X. 18 no. 0388 p. 462.
[258] T. 14 no. 475 pp. 550b – 551c.
[259] Okubo Ryoshun (2004) pp. 156 – 157.

beings everywhere just as though they were [oneself]."[260] In order to benefit others, one needs to begin with a compassionate mind. The *Putixin lun* continues, "[…] through the teachings of great compassion, one most effectively saves sentient beings, according to what they seek, forsaking even his own life in affording them peaceful life and joyful bliss."[261] Benefitting others by having compassionate attitude is thus advocated in the *Putixin lun*. The reason for having such rules is founded in Chapter Thirty-seven of the *Huayan jing* 華厳経 in sixty fascicles, the *Revelation of the Tathāgata* (*Rulai chuxian pin* 如来出現品) and Chapter Twenty of the *Lotus sūtra*, "Sadāparibhūta" (*Changbuqingpusa pin* 常不軽菩薩品).[262] The citations from these chapters are closely connected to the idea of *tathāgata garbha* (*rulaizang sixiang* 如来蔵思想), a thought which holds the ideal that all sentient beings have intrinsic Buddha nature. Hence, in other words, practitioners are instructed to make the vow to save sentient beings, all of whom are innately endowed with Buddha nature, through compassion.

Having a compassionate attitude is the key factor in the Practice of Vow. Interestingly, the *Commentary on the Dari jing* also discusses compassion in association with *bodhicitta*. It is comprehensively known as the three principles of the *Dari jing* (*sanju famen* 三句法門), which promotes esoteric practitioners to the attainment of enlightenment. For this, the commentary reads: "*bodhicitta* is the cause; great compassion is the essence; skilful means are the ultimate."[263] This reference is cited repeatedly in the sources I have examined. It is evident that the practice of vow referred to in the *Putixin lun* is supposed to be distinct from the

[260] Kenneth White (2005) p. 213. My translation of the *Putixin lun* is based on Kenneth White's translation. I have modified some parts.
[261] Ibid; p. 213.
[262] T. 9 no. 279 p. 272c and T. 9 no. 262 p. 50c
[263] ZTZ Mikkyo 1. p.45b.

bodhicitta. Thereupon, the next question that arises from this is what *bodhicitta* actually is in the context of the *Putixin lun*.

2) Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness

As explained above, the *Putixin lun* relies heavily on the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, although the full title indicates that the *Putixin lun* primarily belongs to the *Jingangding jing* lineage of scripture.[264] It is, in fact, clear that the passages where the *Putixin lun* explains the Practice of Realisation of Emptiness, were written on the basis of the *Dari jing*. The *Putixin lun* sums up the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness as it reads:

> It consists of insight into the absence of self-nature of all beings, [namely emptiness]. What is the "absence of self-nature"? It is as follows: Ordinary beings cling to fame, profit, and those items necessary for daily life, striving for materialistic pleasure and selfishly indulging in the three poisons and the five desires. The esoteric practitioners should truly detest and abandon these. As stated by the *Dari jing*, "the phenomenal world has no form that is the emptiness." To realise such emptiness is namely the "supreme *bodhicitta.*" Be aware of emptiness in all phenomenal factors as the non-arising in phenomenal factors, in which there is no distinction even between mind and body. [That means to] realise the wisdom of silence, equality and truth; once acquired, one will never lose it.

[264] For the difference between the *Yishi* and the *Shu*, see the next section, discussing the Practice of Visualisation.

(T. 32 no. 1665 p. 573a and b)

These quotations are remarkable because the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness is so clearly defined. Since the definition of *bodhicitta* in the *Putixin lun* draws from the *Dari jing*, it seems significant to go back to the related lines of its commentary:

> The [*Dari*] *jing* reads: "*Bodhicitta* and teaching of the Secret lord are too sophisticated or minute to acquire." As was explained before, [*bodhicitta*] means the supreme wisdom of Buddha. "Minute" is *anuttara* in Sanskrit, which consists of seven most minute elements, being occurred by indirect cause. Thus, there is no single teaching apart from the *bodhicitta*, which has no aspect.
>
> (ZTD. Mikkyo 1 p. 24a)

Importantly, the *Commentary on the Dari jing* declares the formless *bodhicitta* (*wuxiang putixin* 無相菩提心). Here, the term "formless" indicates something that indeed exists, and yet, cannot be recognised by the cognitive feeling of sentient beings (*bukede* 不可得); it is called emptiness (*kong* 空).

Since the *Putixin lun*, as remarked at the beginning of this chapter, asserts the superiority of esotericism because of the Practice of Visualisation, one may presume that the Practice of Visualisation is the practice of *bodhicitta*. However, given the definition of *bodhicitta* that the *Putixin lun* introduces, it is most likely that the author of the *Putixin lun* understood the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness to be *bodhicitta*. Therefore, the Practice of Realisation of

Supreme Emptiness appears to be a crucial practice. In fact, some Japanese esoteric scholar monks debated on this practice in the context of a discussion on the Realisation of Buddhahood within [One's] Own Mind (*zixin chengfo* 自心成仏).[265] Although the realisation of Buddhahood within [one's] body is known as the characteristic of the esoteric Buddhism, the importance of mind is also mentioned. This mode of the realisation of Buddhahood is also advocated in the *Commentary on* the *Dari jing* as it is equated with the supreme wisdom, or indeed emptiness.[266] Nonetheless, the *Putixin lun* asserts the superiority of the Practice of Visualisation over that of the Vow or the Realisation of Supreme Emptiness, because those two kinds of training are based on visual practices.[267]

3) Practice of Visualisation

While the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness is the training on the basis of the mind connecting to formlessness/emptiness (*wuxiang xing* 無相行), the Practice of Visualisation, as the name indicates, advocates both metaphysical and physical training on the foundation of concrete form (*youxiang xing* 有相行). Therefore, the *bodhicitta* in the latter context is given a form. The importance of visualising practice is a characteristic of esotericism, which advocates a form of practice in which the practitioner identifies his three activities with those of Buddha (*sanmi xing* 三密行). Visualising the practitioner's body as that of Buddha

[265] See, Okubo Ryōshun (2011)
[266] ZTZ. Mikkyo 1. p. 16b This state of mind is called *nyojitsu chi jishin*, the Realisation of One's mind as it is. For this, see the fifth fascicle of the *Commentary to Dairi jing* (ZTZ. Mikkyo 1. p. 172c).
[267] See the next part of the Practice of Visualisation

(*guan benzun* 観本尊) is emphasised in both the *Dari jing* and *Jingangding jing* traditions.[268]

The first passage of the section on the Practice of Visualisation summarises the merit of this visualising training. It states: "To visualise practice visualisation is to attain the ultimate Buddhahood performed by esoteric practitioners. Be aware that [trainees] will obtain the mind of Samantabhadra, which is innate in all sentient beings."[269] Samantabhadra, who is identical to Vajrasattva, is known as the second patriarch of esoteric Buddhism, which means that Samantabhadra received transmission of the esoteric lineage from Mahāvairocana. This implies that, through visualisation, all esoteric practitioners can be direct disciples of Mahāvairocana. The Practice of Visualisation consists of two major types of training that relate to mind, and yet for the sake of convenience, the practitioner is advised to visualise his flesh heart instead. The first is the practice by which practitioners visualise a moon disk that waxes and wanes in sixteen degrees (*yuelun guan* 月輪観). This training is also associated with a minor practice, which is the visual performance of the syllable *A* (*azi guan* 阿字観). In the visualising practice of the moon disk, the trainee is to envisage their mind as the full moon, which symbolises *bodhi* or enlightenment. *Bodhicitta* in this context is the moon, only one sixteenth as bright.[270] This is an aspect in *bodhicitta* that is in contrast with that described in the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness, because the latter practice is conducted on the basis of form. Nevertheless, it can also be said that the first phase of the visualising moon disk is identical with the attainment resulting from the previous training since both are evidently named

[268] See Okubo Ryoshun (2004) pp. 78 - 79
[269] T. 32 no. 1665 p. 573c
[270] T. 32 no. 1665 p. 574a

bodhicitta. One point is that while the previous practice ends up with realisation of *bodhicitta* based on the cognitive mind, the Practice of Visualisation manifests further performances to acquire the actual body of Buddha.[271] The *Putixin lun*, thus, proclaims the superiority of the visualision of practice. In the *Putixin lun*, this performance is explained in a stanza, which is as follows:

> Visualise the eight petals of white Lotus reaching a size of the lower arm; imagine the syllable *A* sparkling in white upon those petals. [Make] the Diamond *vajra* first, and conceal two thumbs. [In this way, you will] enter the wisdom in which the Buddha is always in bliss.
>
> (T. 32 no. 1665 p. 574a)

This stanza merely describes the visualisation, but it does not explain how the syllable *A* makes the practitioner acquire the wisdom of Buddha. The visualisation of the syllable *A* is a practice which is also introduced in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*. To clarifying this, the *Putixin lun* makes recourse to the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, in this case, the *Yishi* version.[272] According to the *Commentary on the Dari jing*:

---

[271] This issue concerns the notion of *hosshin sokuto* (awakening *bodhicitta* is immediately enlightenment) resembling to the notion of *shohosshin ji benjo shogaku* (the moment awakening *bodhicitta* is immediately the true enlightenment) referred to in the *Huayen jing*. The former is often argued in the Tomitsu sectarian polemic, and the latter is used in the Taimitsu doctrine. However, if the Tomitsu scholar monks emphasise too much thenotion of *hosshin sokuto* - which those of medieval time did - it may happen that their opinions criticise Kūkai's claim, which underlines the importance of the Practice of Visualisation.

[272] There are two versions, *Yishi* and *Shu*. The doctrinal contents are the same, but contents regarding various rituals differ from each other. It is noteworthy that, of the two versions of the *Commentary*, the *Yishi* contains passages, that are not mentioned in the *Shu*. Thus, the commentary refers to the *Yishi*.

> The syllable *A* has five meanings. First is *A* indicating *awakening of faith* (*putixin* 菩提心). Second is *Â* indicating the practice of *bodhicitta* (*putixing* 菩提行). Third is *Am* indicating attainment of *bodhi* (*zhengputi* 証菩提). Fourth is *Ah* indicating *parinirvāna* (*banniepan* 般涅槃). Fifth is *Âh* indicating obtainment of wisdom of skilful means (*juzu fangbianzhi* 具足方便智).
>
> (T. 32 no. 1665 p. 574a)

Additionally, the commentary correlates the four transformed *A* syllables with the fourfold process of the ultimate truth within this phenomenal world originated in the *Fahua jing*.

> [First] is to open (*kai* 開) Buddha's wisdom (*fozhijian* 仏知見), which corresponds to the syllable *A* that means *bodhicitta*. [Second] is to indicate (*shi* 示) Buddha's wisdom, which corresponds to the syllable *Â* that means to develop *bodhicitta*. [Third] is to realise (*wu* 悟) Buddha's wisdom, which corresponds to the syllable *Am* that means *bodhi*. [Fourth] is to enter (*ru* 入) Buddha's wisdom which corresponds to the syllable *Ah* that means achievement of *nirvāna*. When [one] comprehends the meaning of the previous four altogether, one has the syllable *Âh*, which means the perfection acquiring marvellous skilful means.
>
> (T. 32 no. 1665 p. 574a - b)

The above quotation describes how to develop *bodhicitta*, by visualising the syllable *A*, which embodies the perfection of Buddha, represented by the syllable *Âh*. Those

five aspects of transformation have been collectively known as the "fivefold syllable *A*" (*wuzi ming* 五字明), and particularly, *Âh* is named the "syllable *A* which comprehends the previous four phases" (*goten gusoku no aji* 五転具足の阿字). This fivefold pattern actually resembles the Visualisation Practice for Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases (*wuxiangchengshen guan* 五相成身観), the second major visualisation practice mentioned in the third section of the *Putixin lun*, but there is a pivotal distinction between these two. Namely, the visualisation training focused on syllable *A* is the practice performed merely to attain enlightenment on a metaphysical level; on the other hand, that of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases is exercised to realise Buddhahood on both metaphysical and physical levels. The following passages will examine the Practice of Visualisation in association with bodily enlightenment.

The Visualisation Practice of Obtaining Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases is advocated not only in the *Putixin lun*, but also in some scriptures and in manuals of ritual belonging to the *Jingangding jing* tradition, such as the *Jingangding jing yuqie shibahui zhigui* 金剛頂経瑜伽十八会指帰 and the *Jingangding jing lianhuabu xinniansong yigui* 金剛頂経蓮花部心念誦儀軌.[273] Among many related texts, the terminology mentioned in the *Jingangding jing yuqie shibahui zhigui* was utilised most commonly. It consists of five terms: awakening of faith (*tondabenxin* 通達本心), training for obtaining *bodhicitta* (*xiuputixin* 修菩提心), obtaining the Diamond mind (*chengjingangxin* 成金剛心), realising Diamond body (*zhengjingangshen* 証金剛身) and perfecting Buddha body (*foshenyuanman* 仏

[273] T. 18 no. 869 pp. 284c – 287c. T. 18 no. 873 pp. 299b – 310a

身円満).[274] Moreover, these five phases are briefly correlated to the five wisdoms (*wuzhi* 五智) and the nine consciousness (*jiushi* 九識), and the correspondences between these became much more sophisticated in Japan, especially with Annen.[275]

The actual methods to accomplish the five phases are very obscure, and they do not go further than transmitting five sets of *dhāraṇī*, however, the *Putixin lun* and the foregoing ritual manuals do not provide any information. In particular, as to the perfecting Buddha body, an absence of actual visualisation procedure, which is the reason upon which the *Putixin lun* proclaims the superiority of esoteric Buddhism, becomes a significant problem.[276] The *Commentary on the Dari jing*, however, provides a clue. One of the most significant practices referred to in the *Commentary on the Dari jing* is the Visual Performance by Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body (*wuzi yanshen guan* 五字厳身観). This specific term is merely mentioned in *Dari jing chisong cidi yigui* 大日経持誦次第儀軌[277] but the same practice is explained in detail in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*. Here this type of visualisation practice is deeply linked to the most important phase in the

[274] T. 18 no. 869 p. 284c. There have been many different sets of terminologies pointing to the five phases. Kakuchō (960 - 1034) has overviewed and organised these in his *Gosōjōjin shiki*. (T. 75 no. 2403 p. 785a - b). As shall be explored in the next section of Annen's interpretation of three types of practices, Kūkai, and maybe his master Huiguo too, considered bestowing the five sets of *dhāraṇī*, corresponding to the five phases, as *abhiṣeka*. (Abe Ryuichi (1999) pp. 142 - 143) However, the *Jingangding jing* states those mantras in the chapter of preparation training (Ch. *jiaxing*. Jp. *kegyō*), but not in that of *abhiṣeka*.

[275] Tado Taichi (2008) pp. 83 – 99. In this survey, Tado underlines the importance of *Zunsheng yigui* in the shape of Annen's formulisation of this practice. Furthermore, he discusses how his formulisation affected to later development of Tōmitsu doctrine on this issue, concerning whether the *bodhicitta* is awakened by the eighth consciousness or that of ninth.

[276] Among the five phases of this practice, the awakening *bodhicitta*, the training *bodhicitta* and the obtaining Diamond mind have visualisation practice. The visualisation of moon disk has been used for the first two, and the visualisation of *vajra* has been employed for the obtaining Diamond mind.

[277] T. 18 no. 860 pp. 181a – 188a. A similar practice is also mentioned in ritual manuals, such as the *Xuanfa si yigui*, *Qinglong si yugui* and *Shedasheng yugui*. The practice referred to in those manuals began to be called the practice of four syllables on four parts of practitioner's body comprehensively by Annen.

abhiṣeka ritual. The following citation is from the eleventh fascicle of the commentary (*bimimantuluo juyuan pin* 秘密曼荼羅品) describing the Visual Performance by Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body.

> When the *ācārya* establishes the Womb [*maṇḍala*], or creates [it] on [the body of his] disciple, [he,] to begin with, stays in contemplation to visualise his own body. [In this visualisation,] the lower half of the body is visualised as the *Vajra* wheel, which is solid and yellow coloured. Next, the body part between navel and breast is visualised as the Water wheel, which is white coloured. Next, the body part between breast and throat is visualised as the Fire wheel, which the colour is red. Next the body part between throat and head is visualised as the Air wheel, which is black. Furthermore, the Earth wheel (= *Vajra* wheel) is envisioned as a tetrahedron; the Water wheel is envisioned as a sphere; the Fire wheel is envisioned as a triangular pyramid; the Air wheel is envisioned as a hemisphere. Emptiness is symbolised by a waterdrop containing various colours. [A waterdrop] is visualised as vertex… The tetrahedron corresponds to the syllable *A*; the sphere corresponds to the syllable *Vam*; the triangular pyramid corresponds to the syllable *Ram*; the hemisphere corresponds to the syllable *Kham*; the dot corresponds to the syllable *Kem*… Once this visualisation is accomplished, [the body] becomes a manifestation of the Womb *maṇḍala*, which empowers [the *dharma dhātu*] alongside with innumerable Buddhas. These innumerable Buddhas empower the *ācārya* to establish the *maṇḍala* on the body of his disciple.
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyo 1. P. 499a and b)

The above quotation describes the visualisation performed by a master before he conducts a consecration for a disciple. However, this preparatory performance itself does not suffice to complete the Visual Performance by Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body. That is, as the last passages of the above citation state, a master needs to visualise his disciple's body in order to consecrate him to be an *ācārya*. This also means that, without being visualised or consecrated by a master, to perform the above visualisation violates the vow of maintaining secrecy (*yuesanmeiye* 越三昧耶). Accordingly, therefore, how a master visualises *maṇḍala* on a disciple's body needs to be examined. This training is referred to in the sixth and twelfth fascicles of the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, the Chapter on Fulfilment of Secret *Maṇḍala*, and the Chapter on the Entering *Maṇḍala* (*rumantuluo pin* 入曼荼羅品). These passages begin with burning the disciple's body by means of the syllable *Ra*, which represents the element of fire. The following citation comes from the sixth fascicle:

> To perform the *abhiṣeka* ritual… the master comes closer to his disciple, and burns the disciple's body by visualising the syllable *Ra* to transform the body into ashes. [Next,] he pours the water of four jars on the burnt body, and after that, visualises the syllable *Vam* in white colour. From this, the five syllables, *A, Vam, Ram, Ham* and *Kham*, emerge, and they become the five wheels. Next, visualise the syllable *Am*, and put it on the top of the disciple's head. [The syllable *Am*] eventually transforms into the central level of the Womb [*maṇḍala*]. From this syllable, a threefold flame emerges. The first flame comes down to the disciple's throat, and creates a second *maṇḍala*. The first *maṇḍala* brightens more and reaches to the navel. Many deities emerge, and

constitute a third *maṇḍala*. At tat time, the whole body of the disciple becomes the body of *maṇḍala*. In a profound sense, this is the body of *dhārma dhātu*.

(ZTZ. Mikkyo 1. pp.223b – 224a)

In the above quotation, we find the origin of the word "*abhiṣeka*," which is "to pour the water bottled in four jars." Thus, this passage is very much the description of the climax of the *abhiṣeka* rite. The rite symbolises death and rebirth. What a master burns is his disciple's physical and metaphysical defilements. This act represents the purified Buddha nature (*foxing* 仏性), which is formless.[278] To reincarnate this Buddha nature as the *maṇḍala* means that the practitioner who lost form then transforms into the perfect body of Buddha (*foshen* 仏身). In order to do so, water is poured on ashes. This water symbolises wisdom, because it is a metaphor for the syllable *Vam*, which embodies wisdom. It needs to be underlined that the *maṇḍala* introduced in the passage above consists of three classes, while the iconographical Womb *maṇḍala* (*taizō genzu mandara* 胎蔵現図曼荼羅), as it has been commonly known in Japan, consists of four classes.[279] The three class Womb *maṇḍala* is the one depicted on the basis of *ācārya*'s transmission. Nonetheless, both types of Womb *maṇḍala* indicate the mind and body of Buddha.

An interesting fact is recognisable in the use of the syllable *Am*. Although the above reference omits a detailed explanation of the transformation of the syllable *A* in four degrees, there is a related visualisation practice consisting of twelve syllables (*shier zhenyan* 十二真言) which is an advanced contemplation

[278] ZTZ. Mikkyo 1. p. 564b
[279] Such as the Womb *maṇḍala* preserved at Tōji temple.

performed after the accomplishment of the above process in order to ensure the disciple's achievement of Buddhahood. At the same time, the *Commentary on the Dari jing* suggests a practice that can be alternated with this twelve syllables practice, namely the Visualisation Practice of Radiating Lights from Hundred Syllables (*baiguangzi bianzhao* 百光字遍照).[280] The twelfth fascicle of the *Commentary on the Dari jing* explains it as follows:

> To ensure [the disciple's] Buddhahood, there is an additional skilful means by using [the method of] the twelve syllables… Visualise those syllables on the entire body [of your disciple]. These syllables are the king among all syllables. Firstly, there are four syllables visualised on [disciple's] head. One syllable, representing emptiness, is on the top of the head; two syllables are on both ears; one syllable is on the nape. [Secondly,] there are four syllables visualised on middle part of [disciple's] body. Two syllables are visualised on both shoulders; [the other] two syllables are visualised on the throat and the heart. Next, there are four syllables visualised on lower part of [disciple's] body. Each is [envisioned] on navel, hip, thigh and feet. [We have] two thighs and the feet, but visualising one thigh and foot suffices…
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyo 1. pp. 546b – 547a)

It is fascinating to try and understand why the *Commentary on the Dari jing* explains this practice by making a crucial link between perfecting the Buddha body,

[280] Although the *Commentary on the Dari jing* considers this practice as an alternative practice of the Visualisation of Twelve Syllables, it went on to become a separate method of practice in Japan. See, Annen's interpretation of Visualisation Practice. The *Jingangding jing* also mentions a Reciting Practice of Hundred Syllables. The name shows a resemblance to the Visualisation Practice of Hundred Syllables, but this reciting practice is linked to the realisation of emptiness.

namely the Visualisation Practice for Obtaining Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases described in the scriptures belonging to the *Jingangding jing* lineage, and the Visual Performance by Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body advocated in the *Dari jing* and its commentaries. Importantly, the commentary says that,

> The Kings of Twelve Syllables are the same as the Diamond contemplation, which equals to that Bodhisattva seats under the Bodhi tree where [Shakyamuni] was initiated into entering the Diamond realm. Thus, many Buddhas from ten directions come and consecrate [the Bodhisattva, i.e. Shakyamuni], while they are empowering each other, to enter Buddhahood. Now, this means exactly the same as the accomplishment of the Womb *maṇḍala*.[281]
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyo 1. p. 509b)

The description resembles the Practice of Visualisation advocated not only in the ritual manuals of the *Jingangding jing* tradition, but also in the *Putixin lun*, which state:

> Bodhisattva/Shakyamuni who understood all words [of Mahāvairocana Buddha] firstly sat on the Diamond seat, and realised ultimate Buddhahood. Then many Buddhas transmitted this teaching [of the Practice of Visualisation]… After that, [he] finally acquired the perfect body of Buddha.
>
> (T. 32 no. 1665 p. 574c)

[281] A similar image of the five wheels practice is available in Helmut Brinker (1997/1998) p. 45.

These passages drown from the *Commentary on the Dari jing* provide evidence to clarify the Training for Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases and the above two visualisation practices. It is evident that the composer of the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, Yixing, had already been aware of the Practice of Visualisation, referred to in the series of scriptures and ritual manuals belonging to the *Jingangding jing*. As the matter of fact, Yixing knew the Visualisation Practice of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases through an essential text for esoteric precepts and meditation, the *Wuweisanzang chanyao* 無畏三藏禅要 (Full title: *Wuweisanzang shoujiechanhuiwen ji chanmen* 無畏三藏受戒懺悔文及禅門), which was written by Yixing's master Shanwuwei.[282] The *Wuweisanzang chanyao* does not cite the exact term of this practice of the five phases, a set of *mantra*, but it gives four *dhāraṇī*, exactly corresponding to the four out of the five *dhāraṇī* connected to the Visualisation Practice of Obtaining Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases.[283] Therefore, it can be said that Yixing bore the combination of two major esoteric traditions in mind when writing the commentary, even before Japanese esoteric scholar monks strived to combine the two major esoteric traditions.

Now, we have noted earlier that the Practice of Visualisation lacks actual instructions on how to perform the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases. It is problematic that the *Putixin lun* does not mention this practice despite the fact that holds visualisation practice in such high esteem. No one can ascertain the reason why the *Putixin lun* does not refer to the advanced envisioning practice. Since the *Putixin lun* is a very short treatise, it looks like a simple piece of work at

[282] T. 18 no. 917 pp. 942 - 946
[283] Ibid; p. 944a and b

a glance. However, when juxtaposed with the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, which this treatise frequently cites, many hidden meanings can be read between the lines. Such sophisticated contents of this treatise were studied extensively by the esoteric scholar monks of Japan, like Annen, Saisen, Kakuban, Dōhan and Yūkai. Hence, this current survey is obviously not enough to comprehend all of the various issues in the *Putixin lun*. I have focused on the central problems, the composer of the treatise and the three types of practices. However, it goes without saying that much more work remains to be done.

Annen's Interpretation of the *Putixin lun*

Annen compiled a commentary on the *Putixin lun* in five fascicles, namely the *Bodaishin gi shō* 菩提心義抄 (Full title: *Taizōkongō bodaishingi ryaku mondō shō* 胎蔵金剛菩提心義略問答抄), to which I have already referred in the foregoing sections. The *Bodaishin gi shō* is considered to be the first commentary on the *Putixin lun* in the esoteric tradition.[284] It was read critically or uncritically by almost all esoteric scholar monks as the most authoritative commentarial work on this important treatise. The *Bodaishin gi shō* examines the meanings of *bodhicitta*, mentioned in both the *Dari jing* and the *Jingangding jing* scriptural traditions, by re-formulating the three types of practices introduced in the *Putixin lun*. Annen provided a peculiar interpretation of the three types of practices. While the term *bodhicitta* merely indicates the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness in the context of the *Putixin lun*, Annen transformed all three practices in *bodhicitta*

[284] There is only one commentary on the *Putixin lun* prior to the *Bodaishin gi shō*. The commentary is is a small fascicle, entitled the *Putixin yi* (T. 46 no. 1953), attributed to Qianzhen, about whom very little is known. A characteristic of this work is that Qianzhen commentated on the *Putixin lun* in terms of non-esoteric teachings, such as Huayen teachings. For this part of study, I owe to Misaki's study (1988).

practices. Annen is not explicit on the reason for this claim, but it is most likely that it was meant to counter Kūkai's position, according to which the Practice of Visualisation only can be the *bodhicitta* as esoteric practice.[285] Annen additionally construed the three practical phases of the process of the realisation of Buddhahood (*bodhicitta*, compassion and skilful means), advocated in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, by connecting all three phases to the *bodhicitta* practices of the *Putixin lun*.[286] That is, Annen associated the three practices described in the *Commentary on the Dari jing* with the threefold *bodhicitta* practices of the *Putixin lun*. By doing so, he integrated the training systems (*gōgyō* 合行) with the doctrinal interpretation (*gōnyū* 合揉) of these *maṇḍala*s.

To establish the combinatory practices of Womb and Diamond realms was one of the primal reasons why Annen composed the *Bodaishin gi shō*. Annen systematically argued for combining the two different visualisation practices, which were prescribed in canonical texts, the Visualising Practice of Obtaining Buddha Body in Five Phases referred to in the *Jingangding jing* scriptures and the Visualisation Performance by Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body elaborated on in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*.

Annen's interpretation was heavily influenced by Ennin's understanding of another type of meditation, the *ānāpāna-smṛti* (*Contemplation by Counting Breathing*, Jp. *asahanaka samaji* 阿娑頗那伽三摩地).[287] This is also known in Japanese as *mushiki shin sanmai* 無識身三昧 (Contemplation on Body without

[285] See the citation presented in the chapter on Yōsai's doctrine.
[286] T. 75 no. 2397 pp. 461c - 462a.
[287] Hereafter, I draw from Misaki's survey of Ennin's interpretation of meditation. See, Misaki (1981) pp. 31 – 37, and (1996) pp. 449 – 470.

Consciousness) and *susoku kan* 数息観 (Counting Breath Meditation).[288] This most basic method of meditation, which is one of four meditations on body, feeling, mind and principle, namely *smṛtyupasthāna* (*sinianchu* 四念処), has existed since the emergence of Buddhism. The *ānāpāna-smṛti* had been categorised as the gradual Mahayana contemplation (*zengaku daijō* 漸学大乗). Ennin discussed it into two categories, called "gradual in sudden" (*ton no zen* 頓の漸), and "gradual in gradual" (*zen no zen* 漸の漸), both of which are inferior categories than "sudden in sudden," which was the category the esoteric visualisation practices discussed above belong to. His categorisation of this contemplation draws from the *Jingangding jing yijue*, where the author, Vajrabodhi (Ch. Jingangzhi 金剛智 669 – 741), describes it as a lesser method of contemplation. In so doing, Ennin argued that one can attain a "gradual in sudden" type of enlightenment by performing the *ānāpāna-smṛti*. Because this contemplation was mentioned in both esoteric (sudden) and non-esoteric (gradual) scriptures, Vajrabodhi and Ennin might have categorised the contemplation into the "gradual in sudden." Annen's evaluation of the *ānāpāna-smṛti* differed from that of Ennin in that he combined this contemplation with an esoteric visualisation practice. This uniqueness was that he deemed this contemplation to be the contemplation of *Garuḍa* 迦楼羅観 (aka, *mimyō kan* 微妙観), mentioned in *Shouhu guojiezhu tuoluoni jing* 守護国界主陀羅尼経.[289] According to the *Shouhu guojiezhu tuoluoni jing*, the contemplation of Garuda consists of five phases, which correspond to the five elements. By accomplishing this contemplation, the defilements of all beings can be purified. In this respect, Annen presumably recognised the resemblance between this contemplation and the

[288] T. 61 no. 2223 p. 34b and c.
[289] T. 75 no. 2397 p. 467a

Visualisation Performance of Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body, with which he eventually identified the Visualisation Training of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases. This may be the reason why Annen argued that also the Visualisation Training of Obtaining Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases needed to be performed on the basis of the *ānāpāna-smṛti*, or indeed the contemplation of Garuda. As Annen discussed in the *Bodaishin gi shō*:

> Question: What does it mean to visualise *bodhicitta* while [one] is in the *ānāpāna-smṛti*?
>
> Answer: When [one] is in this contemplation, all tathāgata appear in the sky and told one "the mind you just attained is Buddhahood. Yet, you still do not understand either the greatest *samādhi* nor the ultimate wisdom… Adore all Buddhas while you are in this contemplation, which [your] mind and body standstill." This means that [one] performs the Practice of Obtaining Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases, while [one] is in the *ānāpāna-smṛti*.
>
> (T. 75 no. 2397 p. 467a)

Such combination of mandalic practices can be recognised in other perspectives. However, before examining this combination, a few words need to be spent on Annen's opinion concerning the Womb practice, namely the Visualisation Performance by Five syllables on Practitioner's Body, in the *Bodaishin gi shō*.

Annen declared that there were three types of Womb practice. First was the Contemplation of Great Emptiness (*daikū sanmai* 大空三昧), mentioned in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*. The following quotation from the *Commentary on*

the Dari jing, was cited by Annen to demonstrate the difference between the Practice of Emptiness and that of "Great Emptiness."

> According to the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, the contemplation in which the practitioner visualises all Buddhas, is named the worldly contemplation (*seken zanmai* 世間三昧). The worldly contemplation is practiced by contemplating ten illusions in order to purify all defilements. By purifying all illusions and defilements, [one] realises emptiness; this is why it is named the contemplation of sentient beings. Yet, because the practitioner still attaches to emptiness, this contemplation does not suffice to be the Contemplation of Great Emptiness… The Contemplation of Great Emptiness takes place when [one's] mind is empty, and at the same time it also contains all aspects of this universe.
>
> (T. 75 no. 2397 p. 463a)

This Contemplation of Great Emptiness is not a visualisation practice, where a practitioner actively sees visual images, but a contemplation on all interdependencies in this phenomenal world, i.e. the so-called emptiness. Importantly, he considered this practice as preparation for performing the second type of practice, Visualising the Creation of Womb *Maṇḍala* of Great Compassion (*daihitaizō hosshō samaji* 大悲胎蔵発生三摩地). He explained:

Question: What is it meant with "the space of Buddha" (*busshitsu* 仏室) when you say that [the practitioner/*ācārya*] embodies the Womb *Maṇḍala* of Great Compassion, while he abides in the stage of the Buddha (*butsuji* 仏地)?

Answer: … The stage of the Buddha, in which the practitioner stays, is called "the space of Buddha"… According to the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, when [*ācārya*] performs this visualisation practice, he visualises the five syllables on [his] body to begin with. [He] visualises, beforehand, his own heart to be the eight petaled Lotus… [He] visualises this Lotus, and makes this Lotus to be the pedestal. On this pedestal, [he] visualises [himself as] the syllable *A*. [Once he accomplishes the five syllable visualisation, he] visualises the one hundred syllables, from his throat, by means of purified eyes. Accordingly, [he] acquires the body of Mahāvairocana, seating between two Vidyārāja; this space [between two Vidyārāja] is namely the space of Buddha.

(*Bodaishingi shō* T. 75 no. 2397 p. 463c)

The passage above seems to summarise well in the understanding of the performative process for Visualising the Creation of Womb *Maṇḍala* of Great Compassion, which consists of the Visualisation Performance by Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body and the Visualisation of Hundred Syllables on the Practioner's Body. Note that Annen, in the following passage, mentions the Visualisation of Kings of Twelve Syllables, which is performed in between the above two visualisation performances. I have already noted the similarity between the Visualisation of Hundred Syllables and that of Kings of Twelve syllables. Annen presents the same interpretation in the *Gushi kanjō* 具支灌頂 (Full title: *Kanchūin senjō jigōkanjō gusokushibun* 観中院撰定事業灌頂具足支分), which is a liturgical

manual for consecration. Yet, here, Annen provided a different interpretation. In the *Bodaishin gi shō*, he classified the visualising practice of twelve syllables as a performance to protect the purified body acquired from performing the Visualisation Performance by Five Syllables on Practitioner's Body, and presented the Visualisation Practice of the Hundred Syllables for perfecting the Buddha body.[290]

As I mentioned earlier, the *Commentary on the Dari jing* equates the visualising practice of twelve syllables with the perfecting of the Buddha body described in the *Jingangding jing* tradition.[291] However, Annen did not make reference to the crucial passage from the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, which provided the most firm evidence for legitimising the non-duality of the two mandalic worlds. This notion of non-duality is connected to the Accomplishment class (*soshitsuji bu* 蘇悉地部), which unifies the Womb and Diamond mandalic world views. The Accomplishment class characterises Taimitsu in both institutional and doctrinal senses. Instead of discussing the non-duality of two mandalic worlds on the basis of the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, Annen began to study the *Jingangfenlouge yiqieyuqieyuzhi jing* 金剛峯楼閣一切瑜伽瑜祇経 (hereafter *Yuzhi jing* 瑜祇経) to solve this issue, and composed an instruction manual, the *Kongōburōkaku issaiyugi kyō shugyōbō* 金剛峯楼閣一切瑜祇経修行法 (Aka. *Yugikyō sho* 瑜祇経疏) in three fascicles.[292] Annen classified a certain teaching and practice mentioned in the *Yuzhi jing* as the Accomplishment class in terms of the *Jingangding jing* lineage (*kongōchō no soshitsuji* 金剛頂の蘇悉地).

[290] Full title is the *Kanchūin senjō jigōkanjō gusokushibun*. T. 75 no. 2393 p. 272b.
[291] See the chapter for the *Putixin lun*.
[292] T. 61 no. 2228 pp. 485 - 504

Interestingly, he effectively employed the Visualisation Practice of Hundred Syllables in a practice based on the *Yugi kyō*.[293]

Concluding Remarks

Japanese esoteric Buddhist doctrine and practices centre on the *Putixin lun*, alongside the *Dari jing* and the *Jingangding jing*. Importantly, the *Putixin lun* contains teachings and practices from the above two canonical scriptures. This study, therefore, has taken such characteristic of the *Putixin lun* into consideration. From such a standpoint, this chapter has focused on two main issues, the authorship of this work and the three practices.

As for the first issue, the discussion on identifying the composer of the *Putixin lun*, or the "great *ācārya*," occurred in Japan in the early Heian period. Circumstantial evidence suggests that the versions of the *Putixin lun* perused by the early Heian scholar monks lacked the crucial proper noun identifying to the composer. Otherwise, there would have been no necessity for those scholar monks to discuss who this "great *ācārya*" might have been. In this respect, Kūkai, Enchin and Annen provided different interpretations.

In the *Himitsu mandara jūjusshin ron* 秘密曼荼羅十住心論, Kūkai attributed the composition to Nāgārjuna. This interpretation was made on the textual basis of the *Jingangding jing yujue*, making reference to the myth of the Iron Tower of South India. In his *Himitsumandarakyō fuhōden*, he claimed the legitimacy of his esoteric transmission by refering to a lineage, where Nāgārjuna was considered the *de facto* first patriarch of esoteric Buddhism. Annen's interpretation differs from Kūkai. He considered Mañjuśrī corresponding to be the

[293] Ibid; p. 496a See, Mizukami Fumiyoshi (2010)

"great *ācārya*," and by involving Mañjuśrī, he combined esoteric Buddhism and the Tiantai perfect teachings. However Annen's demonstration is speculative, and he did not provide enough evidence demonstrating that Mañjuśrī is the "great *ācārya*." Annen employed the *Jingangding jing yujue* and the *Dari jing gongyangcidifa shu* (which is the *Commentary on the seventh fascicle of the Dari jing*) preached by Mañjuśrī. On the basis of those two texts, Annen attempted to combine the two mythical transmission stories from the *Jingangding jing yujue* and the *Gongyangcidifa shu* to determine Nāgārjuna's inheritance of the *Dari jing* tradition from Mañjuśrī. Nevertheless, Annen did provide a sensible basis for concluding that Mañjuśrī composed the *Putixin lun*. Mañjuśrī symbolised the non-duality in the early Tiantai commentaries connected to the *Weimo jing*. Hence, Annen very likely applied Mañjuśrī's symbolism to the question of the identity of the composer of the *Putixin lun*.

The three practices presented in the *Putixin lun* are the second issue dealt with in this chapter. In particular, the Practice of Visualisation has long been considered as the advanced practice distinguishing esotericism from the other forms of Buddhism, since it specifies the method of training based on visualisation. Nevertheless, the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness, one of other *Putixin lun*'s practices, is as significant as the Practice of Visualisation because the supreme emptiness is *bodhicitta*, the Attainment of the Buddha Mind. This *bodhicitta* is referred to as the "formless *bodhicitta*." The Practice of Visualisation also describes *bodhicitta*, but to the contrary, it gives it a form as the Sanskrit syllable *A*, or the moon disk. This method is the Visualisation Practice of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases, which begins with visualising the moon disk. Problematically, however, neither the *Putixin lun* nor the ritual manuals

belonging to the *Jingangding jing* lineage contain any actual visualisation method for the final phase, the practice of perfecting the Buddha body. It is indeed a fundamental problem of the entire *Jingangding jing* tradition. To shed light on it, therefore, this study has introduced a similar practice referred to in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, namely the Visualisation Training of Five Syllables on Body, which is performed during the *abhiṣeka* rite. The *Commentary on the Dari jing* notes an important point of the merit of this visualisation practice by associating it with the Visualisation of Twelve Syllables on Practitioner's Body, performed to ensure the practitioner's Buddhahood after he accomplishes of the Buddha body as the result of the *abhiṣeka* rite. That is, the commentary declares the sameness of the Visualisation Practice of Kings of Twelve Syllables and the visualisation performance, introduced in the *Jingangding jing* tradition. Hence, the lack of actual visualisation to perfect the Buddha body as one of the Training of Obtaining Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases could be compensated by those two visual-based practices preached in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*.

The *Putixin lun*, compiled in one small fascicle, has played a crucial role in the context of the transformation of Japanese esoteric Buddhism, mainly in Tōmitsu. Tōmitsu and Taimitsu monks wrote commentaries on this text, and discussed it in their sectarian polemics. It should also be stressed that, throughout the medieval Japan, various types of new ritual practices were created on the basis of the three practices manifested in the *Putixin lun*.

Chapter 4

Esoteric Practice 2. Annen's Interpretation of Esoteric Precepts

An examination of Annen's interpretation of the esoteric precepts sheds light on two crucial issues in the transformation of the interpretation of the precepts in Japan. The first is the meaning and role of esoteric precepts as understood by prominent pre-Annen esoteric scholar monks, such as Ennin and Enchin, neither of whom has left any texts relevant to esoteric precepts. Exceptionally, Kūkai wrote a single work, *Sanmayakai jo*, which, as the title indicates, is linked to esoteric precepts. However, Kūkai's interpretation of esoteric precepts as manifested in this work differs from the ordinary interpretation, because while esoteric precepts often have a tight linkage with esoteric consecratory ritual, he does not discuss the precepts in conjunction with consecration. The second issue is the development of Tendai Perfect precepts, to which Annen made a significant contribution, and which later became the most standard interpretation of the precepts in Japanese Tendai. Thus, without an understanding of the esoteric doctrines formulated by Annen, the full implications of Tendai Perfect precepts cannot be properly grasped. Nevertheless, these two issues have not been investigated by modern scholars because surveys on Taimitsu have long been neglected. As it is Annen who holds the key to deciphering these issues, he is a uniquely important figure, not only in the history of Tendai Buddhism but also in that of Japanese Buddhism as a whole.

Annen's interpretation of esoteric precepts, or of precepts in general, is unique. In dealing with Annen's uniqueness, a traditional approach, *i.e.* an approach based on Buddhist studies on precepts and *vinaya*, is not only unhelpful, but rather become an obstacle to understanding. For example, according to

Daoxuan 道宣 (596 - 667), the term "forms of precepts" (*kaisō* 戒相) usually refers to entries of precepts (*kaijō* 戒条, or *gakusho* 学処) that embodies or actualises on practitioners three (bodily, verbal and mental) activities.[294] In the context of Annen's esoteric interpretation of precepts, the "forms of precepts" is more freely interpreted. That is, for Annen, *dhāraṇī* and visualisation practices are also regarded as "forms of precepts." As has been discussed in the chapter on the *Putixin lun*, transmitting and performing those practices is the most advanced and most rapid method for attaining enlightenment. In this context, Annen demonstrated that *dhāraṇī* and visualisation practices themselves are immediately Buddhahood. For Annen, therefore, the term *kaisō* implied that having received the precepts was equivalent to having attained enlightenment (*bukka* 仏果). This may be a new way looking at the Realisation of Buddhahood by Receiving Precepts. Moreover, another novel interpretation of the precepts presented by Annen is that he combined esoteric ordination rituals and esoteric consecratory rites. Annen demonstrates this only a little, but such an interpretation of esoteric precepts exerted a massive influence to his successors, such as the Precepts group of Tendai, which emphasised the precept consecration or the consecrated ordination (*kai kanjō* 戒灌頂).

Another fundamental problem in Annen's study of esoteric precepts, namely that he provided two definitions of the esoteric precepts, also known as *samaya* precepts. The first definition is composed of seven precepts from the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, and these seven precepts were named "seven types of precepts" (*shichishu kai* 七種戒) by Annen. The second definition consists of two sets of

[294] T. 40 no. 1804 p. 4b and c.

precepts, the fourfold precepts (*shijū gonkai* 四重禁戒) and the tenfold precepts (*jūjū gonkai* 十重禁戒). Problematically, those two definitions appear in the same writing. My hypothesis is that the seven types of precepts are discussed in the framework of ordination ritual, while the two sets of precepts are argued in the context of classification of teachings, particularly along with Tendai Perfect precepts.

Two Definitions of Esoteric Precepts

1] Seven Types of Precepts

The seven types of precepts consist of 1) [Esoteric] Five and Ten Good Precepts (*go kai jū zenpō kai* 五戒十善法戒), 2) Precepts for the Three Activities of Identifying with Buddha (*sanbyōdō kai* 三平等戒, a.k.a. *sanze mushōgechi kai* 三世無障碍智戒), 3) Fundamental Fourfold Precepts for the Esoteric Bodhisattva (*shingonmongyō bosatsu konpon shijū gonkai* 真言門行菩薩根本四重禁戒), 4) Tenfold Precepts for the Esoteric Bodhisattva (*shingonmongyō bosatsu juju gonkai* 真言門行菩薩十重禁戒), 5) Whispering of Fourfold Precepts to Enter the World of Equality (*nyūsamaya nigo ichige kai* 入三昧耶耳語一偈戒), 6) Esoteric Precepts against Four Grave Sins (*shiharai samaya kai* 四波羅夷三昧耶戒) and 7) *Dhāraṇī* Precepts (*jimyō gonkai* 持明禁戒). These sevens groups of precepts are mentioned in the *Gushi kanjō* (具支灌頂), a composition describing ritual manners of consecratory rites.[295] Consequently, the seven types of precepts have been discussed by most modern scholars as *samaya* precepts, although I am not sure whether they were aware that this definition was provided by Annen in the context of ritual.[296] To examine these seven types of precepts as *samaya* precepts, we need to compare them with the

[295] T. 75 no. 2393 p. 235a

[296] Asai Endō (1975), Kubota Tesshō (1986), (1989), Teramoto Ryōshin (2010), (2011)

Commentary on the Dari jing, since Annen originally referred to this commentary. In order to clarify this process, first a few words need to be spent on the meaning of the term *samaya*. According to the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, the term has four meanings (*samaya shigi* 三昧耶四義), which are 1) Equality (*byōdō* 平等), 2) Fundamental Vow (*honzei* 本誓), 3) Astonishment and Awakening (*kyōgaku* 驚覚) and 4) Removing Obstructions (*joshō* 除障).[297] For these, as the *Commentary on the Dari jing* states:

> [It is said in the *Dari jing* that] "[the *Tathāgata*] finally preached the meaning of *samaya*"; which is that all Buddha laws are meant to be equal; *samaya* is that a great vow makes all beings to attain to [Buddhahood] like [the Buddha] himself; and *samaya* means to remove all sentient beings' obstructions in order for them to acquire pure wisdom; and *samaya* is astonishment at [all beings and all Buddhas] in order to cultivate them. Therefore, *samaya* is named to be all *Tathāgata*'s precepts, which are as solid as Diamond (*issainyorai kongō seikai* 一切如来金剛誓戒).
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyō 1. P. 244a)

The most important point is that all four meanings of *samaya* carry the connotation of being precepts, namely the precepts of all *Tathāgatas*. Taking this significant point into consideration, the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, further formulates five degrees of the *samaya* precepts, which at the same time correlate to five types of consecrations. The following citation from fascicle eleven of the

[297] According to Sam Van Schaik, the etymology of the term *samaya* closely relates to its root meaning in Sanskrit as a conjunction or meeting place. Thus, in the Indo-Tibetian Buddhist tradition, the term signifies the place where wisdom becomes embodied. In accordance with an accomplishment of practice, the wisdom being becomes embodied in the *samaya* body, or the representation or visualised form of the Buddha. See, Sam Van Schaik (2010) p. 62.

Commentary on the Dari jing (*Mimimandaluo pin* 秘密曼荼羅品) plays a crucial role in decoding Annen's interpretation and definition of esoteric precepts.

> There are three types of consecratory rites (*kanjō* 灌頂). First is the consecration which abbreviates performances (*li suozuoye* 離所作業)… Second is the consecration which is actualised in performances (*zuo shiye* 作事業)… Third is the consecration performed on the basis of mind (*yixin* 以心)… [*S*]*amaya* therefore means [vows] which [one] cannot violate (*bukeweiyue* 不可違越). In short, it means precepts. [As for] the five types [of *samaya*] described [in the *Dari jing*], the first is just to see the [iconographical] *maṇḍala* from afar (*yaojian mantuluo* 遥見曼荼羅). That is, when [one sees an *ācārya*] making a *maṇḍala*, [one's intrinsically] acquired *maṇḍala* is cultivated by [iconographical *maṇḍala*]. In an instant, [the *maṇḍala*] makes all people there to be in bliss, and leads them to worship [the *maṇḍala*]. The *ācārya*, who notices their laudable attitude], leads them to a nearby altar, and allows them to offer votive [items]; and to scatter flower petals and incense onto the altar. By seeing those services, inestimable bad deeds will be removed. Nonetheless, [one] is yet not permitted to be taught mantra and *mudrā*. This is the first [*samaya*]. Second is to see the [iconographical] *maṇḍala* [laid onto] the altar (*jian mantuluo zuowei* 見曼荼羅坐位). That is, the *ācārya* invites the practitioner into the altar in order for him to scatter flower petals and incense onto the altar. The *ācārya* informs the disciple that "a certain deity on the *maṇḍala* where your flower petal dropped will become your [individual] object of worship." In addition to this, [one] is able to face the altar, and is able to

see the entire layout of the altar from afar. For permitting [this level of *samaya*], it is the so called the second *samaya*. Even if [one] asks to be taught mantra and *mudrā* [by an *ācārya*,] [an *ācārya*] can give them by considering [one's] capability. The third *samaya* is to visualise the *maṇḍala* and to bestow *mudrā,* and to perform various rites (*jian mantuluo ji yinwei bing zhushi* 見曼荼羅及印位並諸事). That is, the *ācārya* visualises one's entire body to be a *maṇḍala*. Concurrently, [an *ācārya*] explains the characteristics of deities, and gives other esoteric *mudrā* to [the practitioner], and teaches how to perform each single ritual. This is what the third *samaya* is. The fourth [*samaya*] is to perform esoteric practices by following the Buddha law; to understand the meanings of all laws; to acquire all required skilful means; to please an esoteric master[,*ācārya*]; all of which makes an *ācārya* pleased. An *ācārya* establishes a "transmission *maṇḍala*" (*yunjiao mantuluo* 伝教曼荼羅) for the practitioner, and tells [one] that "you from now on create *maṇḍala* exactly the same as I did, and initiate other disciples in order not to exterminate the Buddha lineage." This is the fourth [*samaya*]. The fifth is the esoteric *samaya* (*bimi sanmeiye* 秘密三昧耶). Although [one] sees the entire layout of the altar, and is taught *mudrā*, one's esoteric wisdom will not awaken if one does not enter this altar. Therefore, at this esoteric altar (*bimi tan* 秘密壇), [one] undergoes a consecratory rite by following Buddha's laws as it is. This is the fifth *samaya*.

(ZTZ. Mikkyō I. pp. 522b – 523a)

According to this quotation from the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, the five types of *samaya*, or *samaya* precepts, have a deep connection with consecratory rituals. On the basis of the above passages, Annen clarified this correspondence alongside the three types of consecration mentioned in *Ruilingye jing* 蕤泗耶経. As the *Gushi kanjō* states:

> [*S*]*amaya* means that there are three consecrations within the five types of *samaya*. The three consecrations consist of the consecration of bestowing mantra and *mudrā* (*jubō kanjō* 受法灌頂), the consecration of inheriting Buddha laws (*denbō kanjō* 伝法灌頂) and the esoteric consecration (*himitsu kanjō* 秘密灌頂); all of these are described in fascicle eleven of the *Commentary on the Dari jing*. Next, to answer [the question of] how many types of *samaya* exist, there are five types.
>
> *Samaya* is [something] that kings and nobles among many peoples in many countries esteem; [as] Nobles make a great vow [for their sovereigns] at privy councils. One[, who is neither king nor noble,] must never make such vow by oneself; rather [one] should make a vow by following [one's *ācārya*'s] instruction. In case that one violate [one's] sincere vow, made in front of a trustworthy man [=*ācārya*], one commits a grave sin. Hence, *samaya* immediately means to adhere to [a vow].
>
> (T. 75 no. 2393 p. 214b)

The above is Annen's summary of the passage from fascicle eleven on three types of consecrations. Definitions of *samaya* and consecrations were mentioned here and there throughout the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, and they were not

systematically presented. Therefore, it can be said that the novelty of Annen is his choice of the definitions of *samaya* and consecrations described in the fascicle eleven of the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, among the other fascicles, which also mention them. The correspondence between the three types of consecrations and the five *samaya* was explained in the third fascicle of *Kōshō fudōmyōō hiyōketsu* 広摂不動明王秘要決 (a.k.a. *Kōshō fudō* 広摂不動) attributed to Annen.[298] In this text, Annen regarded the fifth esoteric *samaya* to be the third consecration; the fourth *samaya* to be the consecration of inheriting Buddha laws; the third *samaya* to be the consecration of bestowing mantra and *mudrā*. The esoteric consecration was also named as Esoteric Altar (*himitsu dan* 秘密壇), or Mind-to-mind consecration (*ishin kanjō* 以心灌頂) in medieval time.[299] The third and fourth *samaya* were collectively named as Consecration for Obtaining the Buddha Body (*gushi kanjō* 具支灌頂), which are also called Altar of All Good Laws (*kae dan* 嘉会壇), and Altar of Great Compassion of the Womb Realm (*daihi taizō dan* 大悲胎蔵壇), which are terms often referred to in medieval consecration ritual manuals. Importantly, in Annen's doctrinal context, the original meaning of the third *samaya* has been lost and it came to signify the Visualisation Practice of Five Syllables on the Practitioner's Body. Along with the fourth *samaya*, this five-syllable based practices is labelled by Annen "Visualisation for Creation of the Compassionate Womb *Maṇḍala*", in which an esoteric master visualises his disciple's body as a four-wheeled syllable *maṇḍala*.[300] The second *samaya* corresponds to the initiation in which one is bound to a Buddhist deity (*kechien kanjō* 結縁灌頂). The *Kechien*

[298] NDZ. 43 pp.136b – 141b
[299] T. 75. no. 2393 p. 215b.
[300] For the Visualisation Practice of Creation of Compassionate Womb *Maṇḍala*, see the chapter examining the *Putixin lun*.

kanjō is conducted at the very beginning of all consecratory rites, and it is also performed on lay believers. Annen considered the *kechien kanjō* as the first *samaya* because it is for all sentient beings. This is an interesting point which can be explored further by referencing the interpretation of seven types of precepts to their linkage with his interpretation of the five types of *samaya*. In fact, juxtaposing those two can shed light on the meanings of the seven types of precepts, as will be seen in the following section.

1) *Dhāraṇī* Precepts or the Fifth *Samaya*

Having noted he contents of the seven precepts at the beginning of this section, let us now examine their meanings in the context of consecratory rites. For the sake of clarity, this study begins with an analysis the *Dhāraṇī* Precepts. The *Dhāraṇī* Precepts are a unique set of precepts as they are composed of *dhāraṇī* and visualisation practices. Its components seem to resemble the Practice of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases, which appears in scriptures belonging to *Jingangding jing*, or Diamond esoteric tradition. The *Dari jing* and its commentary contain a chapter mentioning these precepts, the "Chapter on *Dhāraṇī* Precepts" (*Chiming jinjie pin* 持明禁戒品). One of the most pertinent points is its description of a visualisation practice, called the Practice of Adhering *Dhāraṇī* or Sanskrit Syllables for Six Months (*Liuyue chisong fa* 六月持誦法).

> The *Tathāgata* again helped [disciples] by means of a method different from ordinary practices of skilful means. Therefore, [the *Tathāgata*] preached the Practice of Adhering *Dhāraṇī* for Six Months. This [practice] is as esoteric as the forthcoming practice [on the three activities]. For the first month, [one]

needs to visualise a Diamond [wheel], which corresponds to the yellow coloured cubic *maṇḍala*. Visualise it as if one seats oneself on this [cubic *maṇḍala*], and then, visualise oneself to be the syllable *A*. This yellow coloured cubic *maṇḍala* that is identical with the syllable *A* fills one's body, and the body becomes this syllable itself. Make the Five-Clawed Diamond *mudrā* […] For the second month, [one] abides within the Water wheel. This wheel is [a] globular shaped [*maṇḍala*] which is coloured white. Visualise it as if [one] exists within [this spherical *maṇḍala*]. Like the above skilful means, make the Lotus *mudrā* […] which is the same as that of *Avalokiteśvara*. Visualise one*'s* body to be the syllable *Vam* […] For the third month, [one] abides within the Fire wheel, indicated by a red coloured conic *maṇḍala*. Visualise [oneself] within this [*maṇḍala*], and [one] becomes the syllable *Ra*. Make the Sword *mudrā* […] For the fourth month, [one] abides within the Air wheel, which is given the shape of an inverted hemisphere. Its colour is black. [Visualise] one's body by means of the syllable *Ha*… Make the Preaching *mudrā* […] For the fifth month, [one] abides within both the Diamond and Water wheels. That is, [one] visualises the white coloured spherical *maṇḍala* within the yellow coloured cubic *maṇḍala*, and abides within it. Then, [one's] lower body becomes yellow, and the upper half becomes white. Visualise also the syllables *A* and *Vam* at once… For the sixth month, [one] abides within the Air and Fire wheels, both of which remove all hindrances. The Fire wheel is allocated within the Air wheel, resembling [the practice for the fifth month]. Like the former month, [one's] lower body corresponds to the Air [wheel], and the upper half becomes the Fire [wheel]. [Visualise] the syllables *A* and *Ha* at the same time.

(*ZTZ. Mikkyō* I. pp. 565a – 566b)

This practice in six phases resembles the Visualising Practice of Five Syllables on the Practitioner's Body given in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, which prescribes Visualising Five Syllables on the Practitioner's Body. This is a form of visualised consecration, or *abhiṣeka*, as has already been mentioned in the chapter on the *Putixin lun*. Actually, Annen considered the two practices as identical methods of training, a view he asserted without any demonstration of the reason. The work in which he expounds this identity is the *Bodaishingi shō*.

> Question: What is the meaning of which [one] obtains the five syllables on [one's] body?
>
> Answer: [I] do not explain this in detail because this is the profound esoteric practice[…] The methods of practice explained in Xidichengjiu pin 悉持成就品, Xidichuxian pin 悉持出現品, Xizhang pin 息障品 and the chapter for *Dhāraṇī* Precepts employ the Visualisation Practice of Five Wheeled [Syllable *Maṇḍala*] on the Practitioner's Body.
>
> (T. 75 no. 2397 p. 464a)

Another work by Annen, the *Yugikyō sho*, a commentary on the *Yuqi jing* 瑜祇経, discusses on what occasion the Practice of Adhering *Dhāraṇī* / Sanskrit Syllables for Six Months is performed in the framework of the series of consecratory rituals. Annen asserted that the practice was to be performed while an *ācārya* was conducting the esoteric consecration that Annen coordinated with the fifth

samaya.[301] That was the visualisation when an *ācārya* visualised his own body as the *maṇḍala* composed of five syllables and wheels, called "self-consecration" (*ji kanjō* 自灌頂). The *ācārya* had to perform it in advance of his disciple's consecration, in order to sanctify himself. Therefore, one can assume the Practice of Adhering *Dhāraṇī* / Sanskrit Syllables for Six Months, or the *Dhāraṇī* Precepts, to be the most advanced precepts among the seven types of precepts.

Next, we will consider the Precepts of the True Law (*shinbō kai* 真法戒). While the *Dhāraṇī* Precepts are the most advanced precepts based on the *Dari jing*, or the Womb Realm, the Precepts of the True Law are the most profound precepts of the Diamond realm. However, the *Jingangding jing* scriptures, on which the Diamond realm is based, do not mention these precepts at all. Only a single ritual manual, composed prior to the emergence of the dual mandalic tradition, treats the Precepts of the True Law. This crucial ritual manual is the *Wuweisanzang chanyao*, which was composed in Chinese by Shanwuwei, the Central Asian monk considered the pioneer of the Womb esoteric tradition in East Asia. The Precepts of the True Law are composed of four *dhāraṇī*, resembling the five *dhāraṇī* corresponding to the five phases practice for obtaining Buddha's perfect body, the consecration of Diamond realm.[302] According to the *Wuweisanzang chanyao*, the Precepts of the True Law are bestowed after being ordained with the Tenfold precepts (*jūjū kai* 十重戒).[303] As the result of receiving the Precepts of True Law, or

[301] T. 61 no. 2228 p. 496a

[302] The four *dhāraṇī* are stated in T. 18 no. 917 p. 944a and b. As to the relation between the five *dhāraṇī* and the consecratory rite of Diamond realm, see Abe Ryuichi (1999 pp. 141 – 149) and also the chapter for analysing the *Putixin lun* in this study.

[303] T. 18 no. 917 p. 943c. Although this is hypothetical, in the late Kamakura period, thinkers of the Precepts Group might have borrowed this double ordination system from Annen's work quoted in the next paragraph. They might have considered the Tenfold precepts, described in the *Muweisanzang chanyao*, as identical to the Ten good precepts from the *Fanwang jing*. With an

the four *dhāraṇī*, recipients attain the so called "stage of all consecrated *maṇḍala*" (*yiqie guanding mantuluo wei* 一切灌頂曼荼羅位), also known as the stage of *bodhisattva* consecration (*pusaguanding zhi wei* 菩薩灌頂之位).[304]

Annen deemed the Precepts of the True Law highly useful because of their similarity to the Practice of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases. Annen discussed these precepts in the *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒広釈 (a.k.a. *Futsū kōshaku* 普通広釈), which is the most distinctive and important of his texts when trying to understand the transformation of Japanese Tendai precepts.

> [W]hen transmitting these *Tathāgata*'s Diamond Treasure Precepts (*nyorai no kongō hōkai* 如来金剛宝戒), all recipients become Buddha […] Therefore, the *Fanwang jing* says that, "if you, King, Prince, Nobles, *bhikṣu*, *bhikṣuṃī* […] slaves and animals understood the preceptor's words, and observed the precepts, all of you will be called the purest of beings. As the *Yingluo jing* 瓔楽経 says, [in the case that one] understands the preceptor's words, [one] will never violate the precepts after [one's] acquirement. It is what is said to be the Precepts of the True Law.
>
> (T. 61 no. 2381 p. 758b)

awareness of this, the citation in the next paragraph shows the identification of the *Fanwang jing* precepts and the Precepts of the True Law, which came to mean that recipients received the *Fanwang jing* precepts twice. Since Annen considered ordination and consecration the same, thinkers of Precepts group might have followed Annen's idea. See the chapter six of this study, concerning the Precepts Group.

[304] Ibid; p. 944b.

The *Tathāgata*'s Diamond Treasure Precepts indicates the Tendai perfect precepts as based on the *Fanwang jing* 梵網経, which constitutes the foundation of Japanese Tendai ordination since Saichō. Here, Annen's argument is made interesting because he asserts that the Tendai perfect precepts will be subsumed into the Precepts of the True Law, a set of esoteric precepts. This citation can actually provide evidence that Annen discussed the coordination of esotericism with Tendai Perfect teachings even in the framework of the precepts, as we shall investigate later.

Moreover, exactly the same *dhāraṇī* mentioned in the *Wuweisanzang chanyao* is also used in a ritual manual called *Niansongjiehufa putongzhubu* 念誦結護法普通諸部, which is attributed to Vajrabodhi, and which may be considered as an alternative translation of the *Wuweisanzang chanyao*.[305] Although Annen did not provide any assessment of the *Wuweisanzang chanyao*, he did discuss the *Niansongjiehufa putongzhubu* instead, in his seventh fascicle of the *Kongōkai daihō taijuki* 金剛界大法対受記 (a.k.a. *Kon taiju ki* 金対受記), a collection of ritual knowledge connecting to the Diamond realm. In this work, the *Niansongjiehufa putongzhubu* is classified in the category of combinatory practice of Diamond realm (*kongōchō nihō gōgyō* 金剛頂二法合行).[306] "Combinatory practice" was seen as *Soshitsuji* consecration 蘇悉地灌頂 in the pre-medieval Tendai.[307] The term "*soshitsuji*" means "to accomplish," which in the Taimitsu context points to perfection, or the realisation of Buddhahood at the most profound level. Thus, the

[305] T. 18 no. 904 pp. 900 – 909.
[306] T. 75 no. 2391 p. 186a
[307] Dolce (2011) p. 759. Briefly speaking, sectarian position of *Soshitsuji* consecration and Yogic consecration can be considered to be the same. The former often associates with Womb esotericism, and the latter relates to Diamond esoteric tradition. Meanwhile, Yogic consecration is sometimes called *Soshitsuji* consecration on the basis of Diamond realm.

Niansongjiehufa putongzhubu is a very crucial ritual manual in Annen's thought. I would also suggest that the *Wuweisanzang chanyao* can also be considered as a liturgical manual demonstrating combinatory practice. Although this text was written by the pioneer of Womb esoteric tradition, Śubhakarasiṃha, it also contains an important practice relevant to Diamond esotericism, namely the Practice of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases. Nonetheless, I think that Annen's high estimation of the *Niansongjiehufa putongzhubu* suggests that he also considered the *Wuweisanzang chanyao* as a significant liturgical manual for the combinatory practice as the *Niansongjiehufa putongzhubu*. It is, thus, possible to establish a correspondence between the four sets of *dhāraṇī* or Precepts of the True Law described in the *Wuweisanzang chanyao* and the *Dhāraṇī* Precepts mentioned in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*. Indeed, while Precepts of True Law links to the Practice of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases, the *Dhāraṇī* precepts connects to the Visualising Practice of Five Syllables on the Practitioner's Body. As has been discussed, those two practices are identical with the foremost consecration of Diamond and Womb realms. Therefore, the *Dhāraṇī* precepts can also be regarded as being for the most advanced practitioners.

2) Fundamental Fourfold Precept for Esoteric Bodhisattva

Esoteric Precepts against the Four Grave Sins

Whispering of Fourfold Precept to Enter the World of Equality

These three sets of precepts, the Fundamental Fourfold Precept for the Esoteric Bodhisattva, the Esoteric Precepts against the Four Grave Sins and the Whispering of the Fourfold Precept to Enter the World of Equality share the same

contents, which are comprised of four entries.[308] Those three sets of precepts originally appear in different chapters of the *Commentary on the Dari jing*,[309] and this differentiation was taken up as a crucial issue by Annen. This issue will be explored in the part analysing Annen's second definition of *samaya* precepts, for which this issue will be the vital. Here, it will suffice to look at the quotation the entries which clarify the fourfold precepts in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*.

> The first precept is not to violate the *dharma*. Follow the right teaching of the all *tathāgatas*. All recipients of [these esoteric precepts] must maintain them. […] Do not bring the mind to violate the *dharma*, in case all non-esoteric believers entice you into converting to their vehicles. There was a *śrāvaka*, who was capable of understanding [the esoteric teachings], and always kept violating the *dharma* [, because he did not follow esoteric Buddhism.] Even if [this *śrāvaka*] violated the *śrāvaka* precepts, that would not become a violation of precepts in esoteric perspective. Once he converted to esoteric Buddhism, he would be unable to slander the *dhārma*. However, the esoteric precepts must be adhered to.
>
> The second precept is not to abandon pursuing *bodhi*. The mind of *bodhi* is like the banners of a general in *bodhisattva* practices. When the general loses the banner, the army surrenders. That is to commit the most serious misdeed (*boluoyi* 波羅夷). Even a *śrāvaka*, who is incapable of training in *Mahāyāna* practices and who attempts to attain *Hīnayāna* enlightenment, pursues *bodhi*.

[308] T. 75 no. 2393 p. 234c

[309] Fundamental Fourfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva (ZTZ. Mikkyō I. p. 577a), Esoteric Precepts against the Four Grave Sins (ibid; pp. 235a – 236a), Whispering of Fourfold Precepts to Enter the World of Equality (ibid; p. 234b).

Someone says that “I kept performing good deeds and devoted myself to the three treasures in order to acquire blessings in the world of human and heaven. [But, as has often been said,] the greatest *bodhi* can be attained only by someone with great capability, such as Śubhakarasiṃha and Mañjuśrī. So, how could I acquire this [greatest *bodhi*]?” Such [excuses] bring [one] step aside from the vow of *bodhi* […] Additionally, it is impossible for the mind of *bodhi* to disappear.

The third precept is not to begrudge the *dharma*. If one holds the right *dharma*, and keeps pursuing *bodhi*, yet begrudges the *dharma*, that is to commit the most serious misdeed. The reason is that the Buddha created the *dharma* after he attained enlightenment. And the Buddha made a great effort to make each single word and verse. This is like the heritage from parents, and must not to be monopolised by a single sentient being. This is, in esoteric Buddhism, like violating the Three Treasures […]. Although it says that begrudging the *dharma* is prohibited, preceptors do need to consider the capabilities of the recipients. After that, [one] can impart this [precept] to [the disciple]. If [one] exposes the most profound secret in public, and [one] incites someone to doubt others, the good deed will disappear.

The fourth is not to disturb the practices of all sentient beings. This differs from the four ways of propagation, which are the four foundations of the *bodhisattva* precepts. When [the master] gives the precepts, [the master] has to observe [the disciple’s] capability. When [one] makes a vow to follow Buddhist teachings, [the master] is going to give the precept. [If one] does not make a vow to follow Buddhist teachings, [one] will be unable to receive the precept. Thus, one will be unable to become an esoteric *bodhisattva*. The

> reason is that the esoteric *bodhisattva* arouses his mind of wisdom in order to save all sentient beings, and in order to convert the three vehicles… To ruin the good deeds of all sentient beings, and make [one] to dismiss the practice of benefitting others, this is to commit the most serious misdeed.
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyō I. pp. 235a – 236a)

The above passage is from the fourth section of chapter two of the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, which explains the Esoteric Precepts against the Four Grave Sins. It is a comprehensive explanation of the four entries of the three sets of precepts.

In Annen's thought, the three sets of the precepts consisting of four entries were arranged to be performed in third and fourth *samaya*, namely the consecration of obtaining Buddha body.[310] However, unlike the *Dhāraṇī* Precepts, corresponding to the fifth *samaya*, the above three sets of fourfold precepts are not identical with visualisation practices for obtaining the Buddha body, such as Visualising Practice of Five Syllables on the Practitioner's Body. Nevertheless, when one pays careful attention to the identity of ordination and consecration, examined earlier, one can decode Annen's aim. To consider ordination as consecration makes ordination a purely formal act that does not require the consequent practice of keeping the precepts. Annen might have connected this with the notion of "affirming the violation of precepts," prescribed in the *Fanwang jing* regarding to which to violate the precepts is seen in a positive light.[311] In fact, Annen dedicated very little space to the discussion of esoteric ordination or precepts, only about half of a single fascicle out of the ten fascicles of the *Gushi*

[310] T. 75 no. 2393 p. 284b
[311] Paul Groner (1990)

kanjō, whereas the rest of the fascicles are mostly allotted to visualisation practices. Thus, Annen's less strict attitude towards precepts can also be applicable to the above three sets of precepts consisting of four entries.

Even after Annen's death, many esoteric liturgical documents, such as the *Shijūjō ketsu* and the *Keiran shūyō shū*, merely discuss how ordination ritual and visualisation practices should be performed while giving little consideration to the precepts themselves. As we shall see, the same tendency can be observed in Annen's discussion of the precepts for the Three Activities of Identifying with the Buddha.

3) The Precepts for the Three Activities of Identifying with the Buddha

The three activities (*sangō* 三業), consisting of body, speech and mind, are the basic karmic activities of sentient being in Buddhism. Not only in East Asian esoteric Buddhism, but also in Chinese Tiantai, scholar monks tried to demonstrate that the *dharmakāya*/*tathāgata* also performed the three activities, namely the three secret activities (*sanmitsu* 三密).[312] Additionally, a form of training in which the practitioner identifies his three activities with those of *dharmakāya* (*sanmitsu gyō* 三密行) came to be one of the most pivotal practices in Japanese esoteric Buddhism since Ennin. As its name indicates, the precepts for the Three Activities of

[312] *Dharmakāya* and *tathāgata* are ultimately identical, however the usage of these terms is different in Taimitsu and Tōmitsu. Needless to say, this problem is related to the discussion of the *dharmakāya* preaching. In the context of Tōmitsu of the Kamakura period and the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, the term "*tathāgata*'s three secret activities" is more suitable, since they neither demonstrated nor mentioned the *dharmakāya* preaching. On the other hand, in the context of Taimitsu, since Annen succeeded to prove the *dharmakāya* preaching by applying the Chinese Tientai theory of Buddha bodies, the term "*dharmakāya*'s three secret activities" seems more coherent. As this part of the present study focuses on Annen, I shall use "*dharmakāya*'s three secret activities."

Identifying with the Buddha are connected to the above identification practice. The *Commentary on the Dari jing* describes the characteristic of this type of precept.

> The scripture says, "in case ordinary beings obtain this precept, [their] mind, speech and bodily activities will become identical to those of Buddha." This precept [for Three Activities of Identifying with Buddha] is known as *saṃvara* (*sanfuluo* 三縛羅) in Sanskrit, which means causation and accomplishment of this precept. We call it the result of the skilful means [based on] Wisdom. *Śīla* (*shiluo* 尸羅) simply means purity. *Saṃvara* means equality. The identification of the three activities, indicates an initiation into the gate of the equality of the three activities (*sanpingden* 三平等) [, namely the Buddha's three secret activities]. Thus, [the precept] can also be called the "Precept of Wisdom of No Hindrances in the Three Aeons".
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyō I. P. 133a)

Thus, the *Commentary on the Dari jing* we learn that the precept for the Three Activities of Identifying with the Buddha has two meanings; *saṃvara* and the *śīla*. Although the original meanings of those terms are "destruction of karma" and "ethical code/precepts," the *Commentary on the Dari jing* describes the former term as indicating equality, and the latter as designating purity. These definitions seem to be based on the idea of this precept empowering the practitioner through interaction with *dharmakāya*, and its three activities which are pure and equal.

As for Annen's interpretation of the precept for the Three Activities of Identifying with Buddha, as he did not specifically discuss the meaning of this

precept, it seems very likely that he accepted the interpretation elaborated on in the commentary cited above. Annen underlined that the function of skilful means is founded on the precepts for the Three Activities of Identifying with Buddha. Although skilful means are often considered as expedient wisdom (*gonchi* 権智), esotericism regards them as exquisite expedient wisdom (*myōgon chi* 妙権智), an appellation which may be based on the *Fahua xuanyi* by Zhiyi.[313] According to the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, exquisite expedient wisdom is actualised in the identification of the practitioner's three activities with those of *dharmakāya*.[314] Annen elevated the position of expedient wisdom in order to establish the soteriological scheme extending the possibility of liberation to ordinary beings or lay believers, and by stressing its exquisiteness, he argued that exquisite temporal wisdom was also beneficial to holy beings, *i.e.* those who had attained the stage of the first abode (*shojū i* 初住位), the most important stage in Tiantai and Tendai Buddhism.[315] Annen argued in the *Kyōji mondō*:

> Although the practice of identifying the practitioner's three activities with those of *dharmakāya* is common in both ordinary and holy beings, ordinary beings are unable to understand the Buddha's three secret activities which the three activities interact each other equally (*sanbyōdō* 三平等). When [one] attains the stage of holy beings, [one] is able to understand the Buddha's three secret activities.
>
> (T. 75 no. 2396 p. 449b)

[313] For exquisite temporal wisdom, see T. 39 no. 1796 p. 581c. For Zhiyi's *Fahua xuanyi*, see T. 33 no. 1716 p. 713b and c.
[314] T. 33 no. 1796 pp. 581c – 582a
[315] See, Paul Groner (1989) pp. 63 -67.

Annen made a connection between the Precepts for the Three Activities of Identifying with Buddha and the second, third and fourth *samaya*. A brief explanation is needed of the initiation, which establishes a practitioner's ties with a Buddhist deity, the so-called *kechien kanjō*. Here, initiation means a ceremony of the entrance or acceptance into esoteric monkhood. This initiation is basically relevant to the second *samaya*, and at the same time, it is also performed on three different occasions. The first occasion is during the second *samaya*. As has been quoted earlier, the *Commentary on the Dari jing* interpreted this step as an invitation to the *maṇḍala* altar, where the disciple forms a tie with a certain Buddhist deity.[316] Annen argued in his *Bodaishingi shō* that lay believers who are "good men and good women" (*zennan zennyo* 善男善女) can be initiated into esoteric Buddhist lay community through performing the initiation that binds them with a Buddhist deity. [317] However, this initiatory rite is also performed in the consecratory ritual for obtaining the Buddha body, related to the third and fourth *samaya*. In other words, the Precepts for the Three Activities of Identifying with Buddha are also transmitted on these occasions. Annen clarified this in his *Gushi kanjō*.

> Now, [an *ācārya*] invites a disciple into this altar [of Great Compassion of Womb Realm, corresponding to the fourth *samaya*]. Like on the former altar [of Inviting All Laws, corresponding to the third *samaya*], [the *ācārya*] visualises the syllable *A* on the disciple's heart, the syllable *Am* on top of the

[316] ZTZ. Mikkyō 1. p. 522b
[317] T. 75 no. 2393 p. 235c

disciple's head and the syllable *Ram* on the disciple's eyes. [After this, the *ācārya* allows the disciple to perform] the initiation that binds ties with a Buddhist deity. Then, [the *ācārya*] begins to visualise the disciple's body to be the Womb *Maṇḍala*, composed of four wheels.

(T. 75 no. 2393 p. 272a)

Thus, the initiation that Binds Ties with Buddhist Deity is also conducted right before the climax of esoteric consecration, in which the master pours water on the head of the disciple. To sum up, although the second *samaya* basically corresponds to the *Kechien kanjō*, in which the ritual is conducted in order to initiate one into the sacred space, *maṇḍala* altar, and which is also performed in the third and fourth *samaya*, namely the consecratory rites.

4) Tenfold Precept for Esoteric Bodhisattva

The Tenfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva are referred to in Chapter Eighteen of the *Dari jing*, the chapter for Receiving Precepts as Skilful Means (*shoufangbianxuechu pin* 受方便学処品), and the corresponding chapter of its commentary, alongside Esoteric Precepts against the Four Grave Sins. The Tenfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva consist of ten entries. The first four entries are almost the same as the three types of Fourfold precepts discussed above. The remaining of six entries are characteristic of this precept. Those are: 1) Abstention from defaming any Buddhist scriptures, 2) Abstention from not preaching Buddhist teachings, 3) Abstention from having wrong views, 4) Abstention from obstructing people who have awoken *bodhicitta*, 5) Abstention from preaching *Hīnayāna* teachings to *Mahāyāna* believers, and from preaching *Mahāyāna* teachings to

Hīnayāna believers and 6) Abstention from being ungenerous with esoteric teachings.[318] Annen was the first scholar monk to advocate using the Tenfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva. Before Annen, a different type of Tenfold precepts were used for esoteric ordination, and this type of Tenfold precepts was based on the *Wuwei sanzang chanyao*, which was the liturgical manual. Annen classified the *Wuwei sanzang chanyao* into a lower position than the *Dari jing* and its commentary, since the *Wuwei sanzang chanyao* was not the scripture preached by Buddha. Nevertheless, the Tenfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva played an important role in his second definition of the *samaya* precepts, alongside Fundamental Fourfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva. In the second definition, as Fundamental Fourfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva correlates to the third and fourth *samaya*, Tenfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva also corresponds to these. This issue shall be explored in the next section concerning Annen's second definition of *samaya* precepts on the basis of the esoteric fourfold and tenfold prohibitive precepts.

5) [Esoteric] Five and Ten Good Precepts

The [Esoteric] Five and Ten Good Precepts are referred to in the thirteenth fascicle of the *Commentary on the Dari jing.* Annen touched on these precepts only briefly; perhaps because both of these precepts were traditionally designed for lay believers. He argued that the [Esoteric] Five and Ten Good Precepts resembled the non-esoteric precepts of the same name. For him, the only difference was that the esoteric precepts stressed skilful means, and thus recipients were expected to serve

[318] ZTZ. Mikkyō 1. p. 578a and b

others on the foundation of these precepts.[319] Unfortunately, Annen did not discuss on which occasion(s) esoteric masters were supposed to transmit these precepts to recipients. Early Heian era texts concerning esoteric precepts, such as the *Genjō kai gi* 玄静戒儀 (Full title: *nyūmandara jubosatsukai gyōgi* 入曼荼羅受菩薩戒行儀) by Genjō 玄静 (? – 890 - 904 – ?) a disciple of Annen, do not contain any discussion of the [Esoteric] Five and Ten Good Precepts.[320]

2] The Fundamental Fourfold Precepts and the Tenfold Precepts for the Esoteric Bodhisattva as *Samaya* Precepts

While Annen elaborated the first definition of *samaya* precepts in the context of consecratory rituals, he formulated the second definition in the context of doctrine, particularly arguments on the classification of teachings. Therefore, Annen basically established the second definition of *samaya* precepts in order to demonstrate the agreement of esotericism and Tendai Perfect teachings in the framework of his study of the precepts.

The second definition of *samaya* precepts is seen in his *Futsū kōshaku* and *Kyōji mondō*. In the *Futsū kōshaku*, the Precepts of the Four Grave Sins (*shiharai* 四波羅夷), the Tenfold Precepts for Bodhisattva (*juju gonkai* 十重禁戒), the Precepts for the Four Profound Sins (*shidai shōzai* 四大性罪) and the Tenfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva (*jū hōben gakusho* 十方便学処) are considered as *samaya* precepts, while in the *Kyōji mondō*, the Fundamental Fourfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva (*shi konpon* 四根本) and the Esoteric Tenfold Precepts

[319] T. 75 no. 2393 p. 236b
[320] SZ. 27 p. 20

(*himitsu jūjū* 秘密十重) are asserted to be the *samaya* precepts.[321] In both works, fourfold and tenfold precepts were regarded as *samaya* precepts. However, the names of the set of precepts used in these works apparently differ from those discussed in the framework of the seven types of precepts in the *Gushi kanjō*. To understand Annen's second definition *of samaya* precepts, we may benefit from a highly relevant passages found in the *Gushi kanjō*.

> In many [esoteric] ordination manuals, the Fourfold precept stated in this scripture [*i.e.* the *Dari jing*] has been neglected. [Those ordination manuals] regard the Fundamental Fourfold Precept for the Esoteric Bodhisattva and the Whispering of the Fourfold Precepts to Enter the World of Equality as the Fourfold precept. Likewise, for the Tenfold precept, [the manuals] do not use this scripture; for example, [those manuals] use the Tenfold precept referred to in the *Wuweisanzang chanyao* (*zenyō bosatu jūjū* 禅要菩薩十重), but do not use the Tenfold precept described in chapter eighteen of the *Dari jing* (*jusshu hōbengakusho* 十種方便学処). Now, [we] must use Tenfold Precepts for Esoteric Bodhisattva proclaimed in the eighteenth chapter of the *Dari jing* for the Fourfold precept for esoteric practitioners.
>
> (T. 75 no. 2393 p. 234c)

According to this passage, Annen declared the seven types of precepts as the *samaya* precepts, and underlined the significance of the fourfold and tenfold precepts referred to in chapter eighteen of the *Dari jing*, which are the Esoteric

[321] For the *Futsū kōshaku*, see T. 74 no. 2381 p. 764b, and for the *Kyōji mondō*, see T. 75 no. 2396 p. 400a.

Precepts against the Four Grave Sins (*shiharai samaya kai* 四波羅夷三昧耶戒) and the Tenfold Precepts for the Esoteric Bodhisattva (*shingonmongyō bosatsu jūjū gonkai* 真言門行菩薩十重禁戒). However, one can find some problems, concerning the relation between Annen's definition of the seven types of precepts and that of the above. Firstly, ascertaining whether Annen established a correspondence between the fourfold precepts based on the chapter eighteenth of the *Dari jing*, which he claimed in the *Gushi kanjō*, with the Precepts for the Four Grave Sins or that with the Precepts for the Four Profound Sins, as both stated in the *Futsū kōshaku*, seems impossible because he omitted any explanation of them. Secondly, there is a discrepancy in the sources. The account of the fourfold precepts given in the *Kyōji mondō* is more problematic because it considers the Fundamental Fourfold Precepts for the Esoteric Bodhisattva as *samaya* precepts, and therefore it contradicts the above citation, which prohibits the use of the Fundamental Fourfold Precepts for the Esoteric Bodhisattva. Finally, it is not clear on which occasions those two sets of precepts were given to recipients.

Nevertheless, those difficulties provide us a great hint as to how we should approach Annen's study of the precepts. That is, it seems that the concrete contents of the *samaya* precepts were not so important to Annen. Rather, Annen may have conceptualised the term *samaya* precepts to signify the general esoteric elements of precepts in order to contextualise them in the classification of teachings, especially in light of the relation between esotericism and Tendai Perfect teachings.

Coordination of Tendai Perfect Precepts with *Samaya* Precepts

Many modern scholars who have dealt with Annen's interpretation of precepts have neglected to address the fact that he managed to combine esoteric/*samaya* precepts with Tendai Perfect precepts. In this, Annen followed Saichō's and Ennin's attempts to demonstrate the equality of these two forms of Buddhism, although he eventually declared the superiority of esoteric/*samaya* precepts to Tendai Perfect precepts in the ultimate or esoteric perspective.[322] In this light, Annen presented three discussions of the equality of Tendai Perfect and esoteric precepts, and each of these showed a characteristic approach. The first argument was made on the basis of the Womb *Maṇḍala*. This *maṇḍala* consisted of four classes. Annen used the four classes as a hermeneutical tool according to which the central class of the *maṇḍala* (*chūdai* 中台) indicates the highest meanings, and the second to fourth levels in turn became expressions of inferior meanings. This argument was presented in the second fascicle of Annen's *Kyōji mondō*, and reads as follows:

> According to the *Jingangding jing yijue* 金剛頂経義決, "the *Fanwang jing prātimokṣa* is taken from the elementary level of the *Jingangding jing*." Each of the deities of the four-part *maṇḍala* has precepts that he maintains. Those of the first level, the central class, observe the four basic secrets and the tenfold [esoteric] precepts. Those in the second level observe the ten major and forty-eight minor precepts [of *Fanwang jing*], the four or six major precepts, and the twenty-eight minor precepts. Those in the third level

[322] Modern scholars are Asai Endō (1975), Kubota Tesshō (1986), (1989), Teramoto Ryōshin (2010) and Paul Groner (1990)

observe the two-hundred fifty precepts for monks, the five-hundred precepts for nuns, the five lay precepts of men and gods, or the ten good precepts.

(Groner (1990) p. 263; T. 75 no. 2396 p. 400a and b)

Scholars, without exception, have cited the above passages in order to discuss how Annen determined the superiority of *samaya* precepts over the Tendai perfects or *Fanwang* precepts. However, right after these lines, Annen makes a very interesting statement, which reads:

In the same manner, all exoteric precepts can be correlated with the four-part *maṇḍala*. The *Fanwang* precepts of Tendai are observed by those who are capable of learning the Perfect teachings. The *Yingluo* precepts 瓔珞戒 are observed by those who are capable of learning the Separate teachings… [Therefore,] those of the first level, the central class, observe the *Fanwang* precepts of the Perfect teachings. Those on the second level observe the [*Yingluo*] precepts of the Separate teachings etc…

(T. 75 no. 2396 p. 400b)

The importance of this passage lies in its claim that the Tendai Perfect precepts can be matched with the central class of the *maṇḍala*, as well as with the fourfold and tenfold esoteric precepts, or the so-called *samaya* precepts. Thus, one can regard the Tendai Perfect precepts as identical to the precepts of esotericism, because both are interpretatively classified into the central class of the Womb *Maṇḍala*. Annen's exegesis demonstrates the superiority of esotericism, and yet, at the same time, declares the equality of esotericism and Tendai Perfect teachings.

This position can be understood as two standpoints associated with the notions of absoluteness and of relativity (literally mean "to give" and "to deprive") (*yodatsu nigi* 与奪二義).[323] The archetype of this exegesis can be found in Zhiyi's composition, *Fahua wenju*.[324] For Annen, on the basis of the absolute stand point, *samaya* precepts are superior to Tendai Perfect precepts, while, on the ground of the relative perspective, those two forms of precepts can be treated as equal.

The second argument is doctrinally more sophisticated than the first one. In fact, this argument of Annen is a ground-breaking achievement not only in the context of the transformation of Tendai/Taimitsu doctrines, but also in that of Japanese Buddhism as a whole. Annen's great achievement is to be the first to suggest the existence of a set of Lotus/*Hokke* precepts (*hokke kai* 法華戒) based on the *Fahua jing*.[325] Until now, scholars have traced the origin of the Lotus precepts to medieval Tendai, especially to the Precepts group, and thus Annen's fundamental role in their formulation has long been overlooked.

To investigate the emergence of the Lotus precepts, it needs to be stressed that Annen was the first scholar monk who combined the Lotus precepts and the *samaya* precepts. As has been discussed above, Annen's use of the term "*samaya* precepts" was quite unique in that it was conceptual. Annen's highly conceptualised *samaya* precepts might also be considered the origin of what would

[323] See, for instance, T. 75 no. 2397 p. 490c.
[324] T. 34 no. 1718 p. 41a. Zhiyi uses this dual exegesis in the discussion of which the idea that the ultimate teaching of the Buddha is that there is one vehicle leading to Buddhahood, and the doctrine of the three vehicles is merely a provisional teaching to lead unenlightened beings. Annen may have paraphrased one vehicle as the absoluteness, and three vehicles as the relativity.
[325] Note that Annen does not use the actual term *Hokke kai* in his writings. This terminology is seen in some texts composed by members of the Precepts group, which emerged approximately three hundred years after Annen.

come be known as conceptual precepts or *rikai* 理戒 among members of the Precepts Group.[326] These conceptual precepts were entirely emptied of any behavioural prescription or concrete content and considered to function on a purely abstract level.[327]

Taking the above points into consideration, we will now analyse the passages from Annen's *Kyōji mondō* in which he concerns himself with the coordination of *samaya* and Tendai Perfect precepts on the basis of the *Fahua jing*. Firstly, we need to turn our attention to the meaning of the *samaya* precepts as elaborated on in fascicle four of the *Kyōji mondō.* This fascicle is concerned with the meaning of the term "engagement" (*sei* 制), which itself is an abbreviation of "engagement with precepts" (*seikai* 制戒).

> Question: If one asked to obtain *samaya*, how would [an *ācārya*] be supposed to answer?
>
> Answer: He is to say: "insofar as you become my disciple by performing consecratory rites, you make a great vow in front of all Buddha, uttering "from now on I believe and follow *samaya* practice, and never violate this vow.""
>
> (T. 75 no. 2396 p. 448c)

Although in the above quote, the term "*samaya*" simply indicates esoteric Buddhism, or the esoteric practice for identifying with the Buddha, we can also

[326] In the Precepts group, the *Hokke kai* was interpreted as the precepts of phenomenal world (*jikai*), which practitioner's physical practice was emphasised.

[327] The term *rikai* originated from Zhiyi's *Moho zhiguan*, and this term is often linked to the contemplation on three truths.

recognise another meaning of the term "*samaya*" in those lines. This second meaning refers to a 'great vow' or 'this vow,' which is, as has been noted at the beginning of this chapter, one of the four meanings of *samaya* mentioned in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*.

> [It is said in the *Dari jing* that] "[the *Tathāgata*] finally preached the meaning of *samaya*"; which is that all Buddha laws are meant to be equal; *samaya* is that a great vow makes all beings to attain to [Buddhahood] like [the Buddha] himself; and *samaya* means to remove all sentient beings' obstructions in order for them to acquire pure wisdom; and *samaya* is astonishment at [all beings and all Buddhas] in order to awaken them. Therefore, *samaya* is named to be all *Tathāgata*'s precepts, which are as solid as Diamond (*issainyorai kongō seikai* 一切如来金剛誓戒).
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyō 1. P. 244a)

In the same discussion, Annen suddenly began to refer to passages from chapter twenty of the *Fahua jing*, the chapter of Sadāparibhūta (*Changbuqingpusa pin* 常不軽菩薩品), without any explanation.

> According to the *Fahua jing*, "whenever Sadāparibhūta saw any monk, nun, layman, or laywoman, he would praise and pay homage to them, saying: I deeply respect you. I dare not belittle you. Why is this? Because all of you practice the bodhisattva path, you will thus become Buddha. Whenever he spoke these words, people would assail him with sticks or stones; he fled from the fourfold extremely proud assembly yet still proclaimed loudly at a

distance. Thus he attained purity of the natural eye and purity of the ear, nose, tongue, body, and mind, and taught the Dharma to the fourfold assembly without fear. They suffered greatly in *Avīci* Hell for a thousand *kalpas*. After having been freed from the consequences of their errors they finally met Bodhisattva Sadāparibhūta, who led and inspired them to highest, complete enlightenment."

[…] [F]or considering a preservation of skilful means, Sadāparibhūta's merit should not be taught to the one who does not believe the merit. For considering a benefit for the truth [of the *Fahua jing*], Sadāparibhūta's merit should be taught to the one, who even though does not believe the merit.

(BDK English Tripiṭaka Series: The *Lotus Sūtra* p. 266 T. 75 no. 2396 p. 448a and b)

Because Annen omitted any explanation for this quotation it is unclear how to decode its meaning in the context of the precepts. However, it would seem that to juxtapose the above citation with Zhiyi's *Commentary on the Fahua jing* (*Miaofalianhua jing wenju* 妙法蓮華経文句) may serve to contextualise the above lines in relation to the precepts. As Zhiyi's *Commentary* explains:

All beings intrinsically acquire three types of Buddha-nature. Reading and reciting [the Lotus] scripture indicates the Buddha-nature of wisdom (*leyinfoxing* 了因仏性); Practicing the Bodhisattva path indicates the Buddha-nature of good deeds and merits (*yuanyinfoxing* 縁因仏性); Not to belittle but to deeply respect others [like Sadāparibhūta] indicates the Buddha-nature of suchness (*zhengyinfoxing* 正因仏性). 'I deeply respect you. I dare not belittle

you' implies the seat (*zuo* 座) of the *Tathāgata*; 'Bearing up under assailant with sticks and stones' implies the robe (*yi* 衣) of the *Tathāgata*; 'Yet [Sadāparibhūta] still proclaimed loudly at a distance' implies the space (*shi* 室) of the *Tathāgata*. Moreover, 'I deeply respect you' correlates with mind activities; Sadāparibhūta's speech correlates with oral activities; 'He fled from fourfold extremely proud assembly yet still proclaimed loudly at a distance' correlates with bodily activities. Those three, along with compassionate activity are collectively known as "vow for serene and pleasing activities" (*shiyuan anlexing* 誓願安楽行).

(T. 34 no. 1718 p. 141a)

The explanations that Annen gives of Sadāparibhūta's propagation of the *Fahua jing* in the *Kyōji mondō* and *Miaofalianhua jing wenju* highlight two important points. Firstly, by reading the *Kyōji mondō* alongside the *Miaofalianhua jing wenju*, we become aware that Sadāparibhūta's activities depicted in the *Kyōji mondō* are deeply connected to a vow for serene and pleasing activities, which is a practice based on chapter fourteen of the *Fahua jing*, the chapter of Soothing Conduct (*anlexing pin* 安楽行品). Because Zhiyi combined the idea of Sadāparibhūta's practice with a vow for serene and pleasing activities, Sadāparibhūta's practice became equated with a type of vow in Tiantai/Tendai doctrines. Annen seems to be the first scholar monk who highlighted the significance of this combination in order to provide evidence for the identification of *samaya* precepts with the Tendai Perfect precepts based on the *Fahua jing*. Returning now to Annen's discussion of "engagement with precepts," we have noted that he emphasised the meaning of

"vow" in regard to the *samaya* precepts. Now, since Zhiyi made a connection between Sadāparibhūta's practice and a vow for serene and pleasing activities, Annen could proceed to prove the agreement of *samaya* precepts and Sadāparibhūta's practice, using the term "vow" as a point of contact.

The second point we need to understand is that Annen's discussion actually does constitute the earliest argument on *Fahua* precepts in Japanese Tendai doctrinal history. To be sure, Saichō had referred to the *Fahua jing* in his *Kenkai ron*, however, as Paul Groner argues, Saichō's uses of the *Fahua jing* stemmed from the central role the scripture played in Tendai thought, not because it was directly applicable to the problem concerning the propagation of the *Mahāyāna* precepts on the basis of the *Fanwang jing*.[328] Groner further suggests that it was only medieval Tendai scholar monks such as Jitsudō Ninkū 実導 仁空 (1309 – 1388) who tackled the *Hokke* precepts in earnest.[329] However, according to my analysis, it is not simply likely that Annen had already considered the *Hokke* precepts prior to medieval Tendai scholar monks, but as a matter of fact, some archetypes of medieval interpretations of the *Hokke* precepts can already be recognised in Annen's discussion. For instance, medieval monks elaborated four chapters concerning precepts on the basis of the *Fahua jing* (*hokke shiko no kaihon* 法華四箇の戒品). These are first mentioned in the *Tendai hokkeshū gakushōshiki mondō* 天台法華宗学生式問答,[330] an important sectarian document traditionally attributed to

[328] Paul Groner (1984) p. 206
[329] Ibid; p. 208
[330] DZ. I. p. 363. *Endonkai kikigaki* in 1263 by Ejin may be the first work that referenced this work. See, ZTZ Enkai I. p. 205a

Saichō, although its authenticity has long been doubted.[331] The four chapters were the chapter of Skilful Means (*Fangbian pin* 方便品), the chapter of Dhārma teachers (*Fashi pin* 法師品), the chapter of Soothing Conduct and the chapter of Contemplation on Samantabhadra Bodhisattva (*Puxianpusa quanfa pin* 普賢菩薩勧発品). It is very likely that those four categories originated from the *Miaofalianhua jing wenju*, which has been quoted before. Firstly, the chapter that Zhiyi commentated on the chapter of Dhārma Teachers of the *Fahua jing* mentioned the propagation of the *Fahua jing* in three ways, in the expression of "seat," "robe" and "space" (*gukyō no sanki* 弘経の三軌); secondly, for the chapter of Soothing Conduct, he described the characteristic of this chapter by means of the practice on "three activities of sentient beings" alongside the adhering "vow." Finally, in the commentary for the chapter of Contemplation on Samantabhadra Bodhisattva, Zhiyi emphasised the significance of "vow" as it is made for salvation of sentient beings, which was a cardinal idea of *Mahāyāna* Buddhism.[332] However, note that Zhiyi did not consider the above gist of three chapters as they played roles of precepts. Thereupon, I would like to suggest that the so-called medieval *Hokke* precepts might have not emerged without the interpretative juxtaposition of Sadāparibhūta's practice with the *samaya* precepts, which occurred in Annen's *Kyōji mondō*, alongside Zhiyi's interpretation of Sadāparibhūta's practice.

[331] Ishida Mizumaro (1963) pp. 87 – 91. INBUDS. As far as I have seen, *Endonkai kikigaki*, by Gudō Ejin (? – 1268 - ?)(ZTZ. Enkai I pp. 204 - 253), is apparently the first work referring to the *Tendai hokkeshū gakushō shiki mondō*.

[332] See, the above citation referred from Zhiyi's *Commentary on the Fahua jing*.

Concluding Remarks

In the first half of this section, we have investigated Annen's two definitions of the *samaya* precepts, the first of which was related to consecratory rituals, and the second to doctrine. As for the first definition, it is noteworthy that Annen advocated combining the *samaya* precepts, consisting of the seven types of precepts, with the three degrees of consecratory rites. Annen most clearly actualised such a new system of ordination or consecration in the fifth or most advanced *samaya* (*Dhāraṇī* precepts) in which visualisation practice simultaneously functioned as ordination and consecration. Furthermore, we have understood that, in Annen's thought, the fifth *samaya* corresponds to the Practice of Obtaining the Buddha's Perfect Body in Five Phases (Consecration of Diamond realm), associated with four or five *dhāraṇī*, or indeed with the Precepts of the True Law, referred to in the *Muweisanzang chanyao*, the ritual manual composed by Śubhakarasiṃha, retrospectively seen as the founder of the Womb esoteric tradition. It appears to me that Annen's use of the Precepts of the True Law is due to his doctrinal strategy in which he considered the combination of Womb and Diamond realms as representing the most advanced aspect of esotericism. In this regard, it will also be important to underline that the ordination system mentioned in the *Muweisanzang chanyao*, which prescribed the bestowing of the Tenfold precepts to be given to the recipient prior to the Precepts of the True Law, could have been the archetype of Double consecratory ordination (*jūju kanjō* 重授灌頂) or Precept consecration (*kai kanjō* 戒灌頂). For this later development, Annen seems to play a key role in that he asserted that the Tendai Perfect or *Fanwang* precepts, consisting of ten precepts assimilated into the Precepts of the True Law in the ultimate or esoteric perspective. Moreover, we have studied the three sets of fourfold precepts, all of

which are connected to the Consecration for Obtaining the Buddha Body, which in turn corresponds to the third and fourth *samaya*. According to our examination, the ordination ritual, by means of the above three sets of precepts, was absorbed into the consecratory rite following Annen's understanding of ordination and consecration as identical. In other words, visualisation practices, which are the hallmark of consecratory rites, would appear to be much more esteemed than ordination by Annen and medieval esoteric practitioners. This neglect or dismissal of ordination, in my opinion, may have had its own roots in Annen's lenient attitude toward the precepts. A similar aspect was recognised in his second definition of the *samaya* precepts. That is, in this definition, Annen did not clearly indicate the contents of the *samaya* precepts, but he merely stated two sets of precepts which were Fourfold and Tenfold precepts.

The second half of this chapter has investigated Annen's discussion of the coordination of esoteric and Tendai Perfect precepts, which has not been analysed in any substantial way by scholars. I would suggest that Annen's effort to combine esotericism and Tendai Perfect teachings was a necessary consequence of Japanese Tendai Buddhism, for this combination had been the pivotal principle of its doctrines. Therefore, the influence of his achievement cannot be overestimated. For example, the *Hi sōjō shū* 秘相承集, which presumably was composed in the thirteenth century by an unknown author, argued the combination of esoteric and Tendai Perfect precepts on the basis of Kōjō and Annen's interpretations of the precepts.[333] Misaki Ryōshū, who has surveyed this work, judges that the *Hi sōjō shū* was written in order to confirm the sectarian identity of its unknown author as a monk of Jimon lineage (*jimon ha* 寺門派), competing with Mt. Hiei, in the context

[333] ZTZ. Mikkyō III. I analyse this work alongside Yōsai's interpretation of esoteric precepts.

of the ever greater importance given to precepts and monastic codes since the early Kamakura period by famous Buddhist figures such as Yōsai and Eizon.[334] Moreover, Annen's interpretation of the precepts is also reflected in the contents of the *Onjōji kaidan kitsunan dō* 園城寺戒壇詰難答, a document submitted to the imperial court by a monk of Onjō/Mii temple (*Onjōji*/*Miidera* 園城寺・三井寺) to counter Mt. Hiei's persistent criticism of the independence of the *samaya* ordination platform (*samaya kaidan* 三昧耶戒壇) of Onjō temple.[335] This invaluable document describes the views on the precepts taken by Onjō temple and Mt. Hiei. Whereas monks from Onjō temple argued the absolute superiority of *samaya* precepts, scholars from Mt. Hiei considered the equality of *samaya* precepts and Tendai Perfect precepts. Of course, these two opinions mentioned in the *Onjōji kaidan kitsunan dō* were merely reinterpretations of Annen's exegesis of the precepts on the basis of his own classification of the teachings.

[334] Misaki Ryōshū (1994) pp. 184 – 213.
[335] Tsuji Zennosuke (1944) p. 835. Ishida MIzumaro (1986) pp. 145 – 196. Kubota Tesshō (1990) pp. 40 – 57, and (2002) pp. 93 – 114.

Chapter 5

Esoteric Practice 3. Yōsai's Thought

First, a few words need to be said about the historical background of Yōsai's thought in the context of the transformation of esoteric doctrine, which took place between the late Heian and the early Kamakura periods, a movement in which Yōsai played an active part. Since the mid-Heian period (from the eleventh century), the development of esoteric doctrine had been at a standstill. The reasons remain unexplained, but one can presume that such stagnation was due to Annen's formulation of esoteric doctrine, which became dominant from the early Heian onward. Additionally, the rise of Tendai Pure Land Buddhism, propelled by Genshin, might have been a factor that contributed to the decline of esoteric doctrine. Heian scholar monks had been at a loss for overcoming this crisis. It was for the great reformer of the Tōmitsu school, Kakuban, to break through this deadlock and create a new wave of doctrinal innovation that, soon after, Jōhen 静遍 (1166 - 1224) and Dōhan, contemporaries of Yōsai, would ride. These three esoteric scholar monks all belonged to the Tōmitsu branch of Esoteric Buddhism. It is noteworthy that these elite scholar monks were heavily influenced by Genshin and his followers. Such reform movements offered the opportunity to revise traditional esoteric thought, and reconsider the esoteric canonical scriptures and treatises.

On the other hand, the scholarly circumstances in Taimitsu circles during this period remain largely unknown. Yōsai and Jien were the only well-known monks who composed writings relevant to doctrine, but their primary interests lay with esoteric practice. In the late Heian period, someone Taimitsu monks like Yōsai and Jien began reconsidering doctrines. Before that, the majority of Taimitsu

monks were rather keen to perform esoteric rituals, and the formation of Taimitsu esoteric factions based on alternative ritual methods accelerated. On the basis of such development of alternative ritual methods, some esoteric monks, such as Yōsai and Jien, created new interpretations of doctrine constituted on the foundation of liturgies. The reason why Yōsai and Jien, both of whom were fairly prolific writers, composed doctrinal works may be found in the encouragement they received from the contemporary revival of Tōmitsu.

Another factor that cannot be ignored is the Jimon lineage's competition with the Sanmon lineage of Mt. Hiei. The government authorised Jimon ordination platform, which made the Sanmon lineage fear for their own position. Especially for Jien, who was appointed head abbot of Mt. Hiei four times, the Jimon school seems to have been a problem of vital importance. The activities of the Jimon school had a massive impact on Yōsai as well, but, Yōsai most likely took advantage of the rise of the Jimon school to mark out his own esoteric thought. Overall, the impact of the Jimon school's winning independence for their own ordination platform should be given more attention than modern scholars have hitherto paid it, as it affected not only Taimitsu lineages but medieval Buddhism as a whole. Its impact on a series of reform movements, such as those of Nara Buddhism and the Precepts Group (*kaike* 戒家), which sought to revive the importance of precepts and the *vinaya* (*ritsu* 律), is particularly noteworthy. Revisiting the precepts and the *vinaya* has usually been considered a repercussion of the demoralisation of the Buddhist community. However, in my opinion, in this case there were more complex religio-political reasons, including the Jimon school, underlying the emergence of the trend of revisiting the precepts and the *vinaya*.

Taking the historical backgrounds mentioned above into account, one can contextualise Yōsai's reconsideration of the canonical scriptures and treatises. In order to reconsider traditional reading of canonical scriptures and treatises, he reread the *Putixin lun*, the most important treatise of esotericism. To deal with the problem raised by the Jimon lineage, Yōsai re-examined the meaning of ordination, or indeed of precepts. Considering Yōsai's rereading of the *Putixin lun* and the reinterpretation of the meaning of precepts in a comprehensive way, one can become aware of the core of Yōsai's doctrine, that is, the esoteric precepts based on the *Putixin lun*. Importantly, his interest in esoteric precepts, or precepts in general, remains at the heart of his concerns well into his later career, even after he imported Zen Buddhism from China.

Esoteric and Zen Precepts-/*Vinaya* in Yōsai's Doctrine

Some of Yōsai's esoteric ideas have briefly been presented in the chapter on his works and their summaries. The present section will focus specifically on Yōsai's cardinal thought. At the centre of his doctrine are the precepts and the monastic codes, the *vinaya*. Yōsai discussed the precepts in his earlier career, when his main interest had been in esoteric Buddhism, and he began to concern himself mainly with the *vinaya* once he returned from his second study abroad in China. After his return from China, he argued for the adoption of the Zen precepts together with the *vinaya*, but spent only a few words discussing the precepts. This study will first investigate his interpretation of esoteric precepts. As Yōsai did not explicitly discuss his understanding of this subject in his works, we are forced to read between the lines, a task we can only achieve by juxtaposing his texts with the esoteric works of those of his contemporaries who discussed similar issues. Next, I

shall explore Yōsai's exegesis of the precepts and the *vinaya* within the framework of Zen Buddhism.

1) Yōsai's Interpretation of the Esoteric Precepts

As we have seen in the chapter concerning the *Putixin lun*, the three practices–Vow, Realisation of Supreme Emptiness and Visualisations–are themselves regarded as precepts.[336] The *Putixin lun* states that

> When innumerable Buddhas and Bodhisattvas were still training, they practiced the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness, the Practice of Vow and the Practice of Visualisation to be the precepts. Soon after the three practices were given by *Mahāvairocana*, all attained Buddhahood at once. [They had] always borne [these three practices] in mind.
>
> (T. 32 no. 1665 p. 572c)

Yōsai formulated his ideas of the esoteric precepts based on these lines. Viewing the three types of practice as the precepts has a long history in Japan, dating back to the early Heian period. The first esoteric scholar monk to stress the passage of the *Putixin lun* quoted above was Kūkai. In his *Sanmayakai jo* 三昧耶戒序 (Introduction of *Samaya* Precepts) he employed this text in order to demonstrate the difference between pre-existing interpretations of the precepts and those of the newly imported esotericism.[337] The relevant passages of the *Sanmayakai jo* read:

[336] For the three practices, see the chapter for the *Putixin lun*.
[337] The *Sanmayakai jo* may have been a draft of the *Heizei tenno kanjo mon*, which was a petition submitted to the imperial court.

The Buddha's *samaya* precepts are the precepts of the mandalic teachings of the *dharmakāya Mahāvairocana*. When one wants to follow this vehicle, one awakens the four types of mind: the first is faith; the second is compassion; the third is supreme truth; the forth is great *bodhicitta*. Firstly, faith means not to withdraw [oneself from one's pledge] […] Secondly, compassion, that is the practice of vow, means not to give rise to the mind of the *śrāvaka* and *pratyeka* [, which neglects benefiting other sentient beings]. *Mahāyāna* practitioners merely awaken this mind […] Thirdly, supreme truth is the mind of profound wisdom […] As yet, this mind is not good enough to be named the supreme *bodhicitta* […] Finally, there are two types of *bodhicitta*; one is the *bodhicitta,* which practitioner pursues; the other one is the *bodhicitta* which is pursued. The first type of [*bodhicitta*] is as if people make decision in [one's] mind in advance of acting. The second type of [*bodhicitta*] is the Diamond mandalic world, which is represented by the four types of *maṇḍala*s […] When all Buddhas contemplate [these four *maṇḍala*s], it is called the secret visualisation practice. When innumerable Buddhas and Bodhisattvas were still training, they had observed the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness, the Practice of Vow and the Practice of Visualisation to be the precepts: Soon after the three practices were granted, all attained Buddhahood at once. [Buddhas and Bodhisattvas had] always borne [these three practices] in mind.

(*Sanmayakai jo* T. 78 no. 2426 pp. 5a – 6a)

What the above quotation reveals is that Kūkai considered the *Putixin lun* precepts to be comprised of the practice of Vow, Realisation of Supreme Emptiness and Visualisation practice, as *samaya* precepts (*sa[n]maya kai* 三昧耶戒), and used *samaya* as a general term indicating esoteric precepts. It is not known whether Kūkai was granted the *Putixin lun* precepts by his esoteric master Huike 恵可 (746 - 805). It seems most likely that Kūkai's definition of *samaya* precepts on the basis of the *Putixin lun* was his original idea since no evidence of similar information can be found in Chinese ordination manuals.

Whether or not Yōsai was familiar with the *Sanmayakai jo* cannot be determined, as he never cited even a single line from it. Perhaps the notion that the three types of practice play the role of the precepts, presented in the *Putixin lun*, was considered basic knowledge for medieval esoteric monks. If it was so, Yōsai's take on the esoteric precepts was not entirely original. However, I would like to suggest that his application of esoteric doctrine that emerged in the Jimon lineage made Yōsai's interpretation of esoteric precepts original.

The writing of Yōsai which mainly focuses on the esoteric precepts is the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu*, in one fascicle. In this work in particular, Yōsai examines the essence of the precepts, and how this essence could be embodied within practitioners. The discussion on the Preacher of esoteric Buddhism, which most of his esoteric works deal with, is deeply connected with the issue of the esoteric precepts, although scholars have treated those two issues separately. Medieval scholar monks discussed the doctrine of the Preacher of Esotericism alongside the theory of Buddha bodies. The discussion of the Preacher of Esotericism is an exegetical argument, which had two aspects in medieval Japan. First is the Preacher of Esotericism as it indicates the preacher of esoteric

scriptures. The preacher of esoteric scriptures, in this sense, is *Mahāvairocana*. The second exegesis arrives at the conclusion that an esoteric practitioner, who maintains the teachings and practices written in esoteric scriptures in the phenomenal world on the behalf of *Mahāvairocana*, is the Preacher of Esotericism. Here, esoteric practitioner, or the role of Preacher, points to an esoteric master, an *ācārya* or *ajari*. Yōsai discussed the Preacher of Esotericism in the second sense, that is, the preacher signified an *ācārya*. He also called the *ācārya* as Body of Equal Wisdom (*byōdō chishin* 平等智身), the term which is originally found in the *Commentary on the Dari jing*.[338] In fact, Yōsai was influenced by different factors, such as the *Commentary on the Dari jing* and Enchin's works.

In the closing remark of the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu,* Yōsai asserted that "in the time when Shakyamuni no longer exists, *ācārya* who have transmitted appropriate Buddhist teachings [or have been consecrated] are named Buddha."[339] The aim of Yōsai's discussion of the theory of the bodies of the Buddha was to explain the *ācārya*'s metaphysical and physical world, both of which were closely related to his idea of the essence of esoteric precepts and its actualisation in the body of the practitioner, or indeed that of the *ācārya*. Yōsai employed two different types of Buddha body theory, consisting of three and four bodies, respectively. His esteem for the *svabhāvakāya* or the Body of Buddha's Own Nature, one of the four bodies, is characteristic of his interpretation of the preacher. He considered the *svabhāvakāya* to be the *ācārya*, and thus, his major concern is to define the *svabhāvakāya*. Such characterisations can be seen throughout his writings, but the most succinct expression is in the *Kyōjigi kanmon*.

[338] ZTZ. Mikky ō 1. P. 19 a.
[339] T. 70 no. 2293 p. 31c

> The preacher of esoteric Buddhism is the *svabhāvakāya*, which intrinsically acquires the Principle 理 and the Wisdom 智, and which extends his existence across the phenomenal world.
>
> (NDZ. Tendai mikkyo shosho 5 p. 409a)

A few words need to be spent in order to understand the "Principle" and "Wisdom" in question. Generally speaking, Principle and Wisdom correspond to the *dharmakāya* and the *samboghakāya* of the three Buddha bodies theory. Principle always indicates a feature of the eternal Buddha, who is formless, *i.e. dharmakāya*, while Wisdom often points to a type of Buddha who attained Buddhahood as the result of practicing good deeds, in other words the *samboghakāya*.[340] By means of this Wisdom, the Principle/the eternal Buddha can be realised, and that means to attain to enlightenment. In addition, from enlightened point of view, where Wisdom and Principle coexist, the *samboghakāya*, particularly the *sva samboghakāya*, Buddha's enjoyment body for his own sake (*jijuyū shin* 自受用身), is considered to be the *dharmakāya*. Thus, the *sva samboghakāya* is often classified as both the *dharmakāya* and *samboghakāya*. Also, the *nirmāṇakāya* indicates the historical Buddha Shakyamuni.

However, Yōsai had always been sceptical about the above account that the *para samboghakāya* correlates to *dharmakāya*;[341] for him, the *dharmakāya* intrinsically includes Wisdom. This interpretation of *nirmāṇakāya* was shared by other medieval thinkers. In the context of Yōsai's thought and some medieval

[340] T. 38 no. 1778 p. 564a
[341] See the part of the Summaries of Yōsai's esoteric works.

Japanese esoteric doctrine, the *nirmāṇakāya* indicates enlightened beings, which, from the perspective of esoteric Buddhism, means *ācārya*. Taking Yōsai's interpretation of the three Buddha bodies theory into consideration, the combination of Principle and Wisdom (*richi myōgō* 理智冥合) signifies the enlightened mind of an *ācārya*. Moreover, Yōsai connected the *svabhāvakāya* with the *nirmāṇakāya*, which denotes both Shakyamuni and enlightened beings.

> Question: How can the three types of *bodhicitta* be interpreted by using the four degrees of interpretation?
>
> Answer: In the narrow interpretation, the Practice of Vow corresponds to the vows described in four verses; the Practice of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness corresponds to the supreme wisdom; the Practice of Visualisation corresponds to the thirty seven deities [of the Diamond *maṇḍala*]. In the secret interpretation, the transformation of the syllable *A* in three phases, *A, Ah, Am*, correlates to the three [types of] *bodhicitta* [practices] in sense that Buddha nature is originally purified and perfected. In the profound secret interpretation, the *hō maṇḍala* (*hō mandara* 法曼荼羅), *samaya maṇḍala* (*samaya mandara* 三昧[342]耶曼荼羅) and *dai maṇḍala* (*dai mandara* 大曼荼羅) correspond to the three types of practices. In the most profound and secret interpretation, the innate combination of Principle, Wisdom and Function (*yū* 用) means the combination of the three [types of] *bodhicitta* [practices]. Wise men need to consider [the above] well.
>
> (*Bodaishinron kuketsu* T. 70 no. 2293 p. 31b)

342

The underlined passage seems to shed light on the foregoing quotation from the *Kyōjigi kanmon*. Having already covered the meaning of Principle and Wisdom, we now need to clarify the concept of Function. In spite of its importance, Yōsai did not discuss this concept in his works, apart from the above citation. Therefore, it seems necessary to decode the meaning of Function taking into account the writings of Yōsai's contemporaries, such as Jōhen and Dōhan, who advocated an opinion similar to his.[343] Interestingly, Jōhen and Dōhan provided interpretations of the three bodies of the Buddha, known as the account of three standpoints (*santen setsu* 三点説). Modern scholars, such as Nakamura Masafumi, assert that this was first argued by Jōhen in his *Hishū mongi yō* 秘宗文義要, composed in 1216, and his *Kenmitsunikyōron tekagami shō* 顕密二教論手鏡鈔, composed in 1224.[344] According to Jōhen, the account of three standpoints was originated in the *Dainichikyō shinmoku* 大日経心目 attributed to Enchin. Interestingly, although Yōsai did not quote any passages from the *Dainichikyō shinmoku*, two of his works, the *Mumyō shu*, written in 1177, and *Bodaishinron kuketsu*, written in 1187, which have been cited above, reveal the account of three standpoints that precedes Jōhen. It is possible that Yōsai was in fact the first esoteric scholar monk who used this

[343] Jōhen's activities had mainly been based on Zenrin temple. He had been trained at Daigo temple and Ninna temple in his youth. His interests included Pure Land Buddhism, and he even wrote a commentary on Hōnen's *Senjaku hongan nenbutsu shū*, the *Zoku senjaku mongi yōshō*. A Pure Land *maṇḍala*, composed under the supervision of Jōhen, depicting the scene where Amida appears from the summit of mountains, is well known. Dōhan was one of Jōhen's pupils. He learnt esotericism at Daigo temple in his early career, and later moved to Mt. Kōya, where he spent time to develop his thoughts. He attempted to develop esotericism further by including his master's Pure Land teachings. Dōhan was a very prolific writer, as well, and he left more than seventeen writings. Among those works are *Dainichikyō sho henmyō shō*, Dōhan's comments on the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, and *Himitsu nenbutsu shō*, in which he interpreted the Pure Land teachings in the light of esoteric discourse.

[344] See, Nakamura Honnen (1991) pp. 31 – 72.

important account. In any case, the three standpoints had come to be popular in Kamakura period.

It is true that the archetypical formulation of this theory can be found in the *Dainichikyō shinmoku*. Hence the attribution of this work to Enchin is questionable, as this work was not cited in any esoteric or non-esoteric composition before Jōhen. Just like the *Dainichi kyō shiki* when I have mentioned in the chapter concerning the *Putixin lun*, the *Dainichikyō shinmoku* may have been written by a scholar monk belonging to the Jimon lineage. Let us consider the following passage:

> There are three ways to interpret the title of the [*Dari*] *jing* […] 'Da' is a Chinese translation of '*Mahā*' in Sanskrit, that is to say, the whole essence of *dharmadhātu*, and the most profound meaning of the three classes [of Womb mandalic world]. '*Mahā*' also has three meanings, which are "greatness", "superiority" and ""triumph." [Those three meanings] correlate to the three classes, too. The syllable *A* [, the syllable indicating the Buddha class,] symbolising eternity, is the great and profound Principle. The syllable *Sa* [, the syllable indicating the Lotus class,] symbolising Non-Defilement, is the spacious Wisdom. The syllable *Va* [, the syllable indicating the Diamond class,] symbolising Non-Decline, is the Function, that is distinguished and superior. All [those three] are contained within a single mind, and no more or less than the one mind. Therefore, the syllable *A* signifies the phase of nature; the syllable *Sa* signifies the form; the syllable *Va* signifies the phase of function… Thus, '*Mahā*' means to encompass nature, form and function;

this comprehensiveness is the secrecy of three standpoints, and the abyss of five wisdoms.

(*Dainichikyō shinmoku* T. 58 no. 2212 p. 21a)

The passages explore the meaning of the *dharmadhātu*, consisting of three aspects, which are Principle, Wisdom and Function. Furthermore, it makes a correlation between those three and the nature of Buddha (*taidai* 体大), the form of Buddha (*sōdai* 相大) and the function of Buddha (*yūdai* 用大) that are based on the *Dasheng qixin lun* 大乗起信論.[345] On this point, Enchin's *Bodaijō kyō ryaku gishaku* 菩提場経略義釈 should also be considered. As the title indicates, this text is Enchin's commentary on the *Putichang suoshuo yizidinglunwang jing* 菩提場所説一字頂輪王経, which belongs to the Bucchō scriptural lineage (*bucchō kei kyōten* 仏頂系経典),[346] which advocates merits of the syllable *Bhrūṃ*. Sugawara Shinkai points out that Enchin's motive in writing this commentary was to formulate protecting deities of Mt, Hiei, namely Sannō *shin*/*kami* 山王神.[347]

[345] T. 32 no. 1666 p. 575c. In the *Dasheng qixin lun*, the aspect of nature indicates eternity, equality and nature of human mind. The aspect of form signifies all merits acquired under the process of developing Wisdom. The aspect of function denotes functions of eternity acknowledged through the aspect of form.

[346] The term Bucchō scriptural lineage was invented by Misaki Ryōshu in order to classify esoteric scriptures containing mixed elements of Womb and Diamond realms. For Misaki, this term points to early esoteric texts, which were written before the emergence of dual idea of Womb and Diamond realms. Although Misaki's classification is very useful, some awkward problems remained. Namely, Misaki did not consider the development of Bucchō scriptural lineage in its own tradition. In other word, some scriptures, belonging to Bucchō tradition, were composed after dual scriptural lineage, so that the contents of new Bucchō texts are better organised (or non-duality is well represented) than the ones produced before the establishment of the dual lineage.

[347] Sugawara Shinkai (1992) pp. 57 – 58. Enchin struggled with the question of how the *kami* of Sannō shrine could be treated in the context of Japanese Tendai doctrine. He applied the theory of Buddha bodies to identify the *kami* of Mt. Hiei, which had been considered as Buddha's manifestation/trace body, or *nirmāṇakāya*. In this relation, furthermore, putting emphasis on *nirmāṇakāya* along with *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra* (*Ichiji kinrin bucch*ō ō) is what I consider Enchin's great achievement in Japanese Buddhist history.

Enchin interpreted the three Buddha bodies focusing on the syllable *Bhrūṃ*, pronounced *Boron* in Japan. This syllable symbolises *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra*, a form of the Buddha composed of *Mahāvairocana* / *dharmakāya* and Shakyamuni / *nirmāṇakāya*.

> *Nāmaḥ samanta buddhānāṃ bhrūṃ*; as stated by the *Commentary on the Dari jing*, the first line means devotion for all Buddhas, in accordance with the three bodies of *Mahāvairocana* extending across the universe… Additionally, a [Zhanran's] commentary on [the *Fahua xuanyi*] says that the three bodies of Shakyamuni extend across the universe, as well as those of *Mahāvairocana*. The chapter of the *Lotus sūtra* on *Samantabhadra*, too reads that Shakyamuni is namely *Mahāvairocana*… The syllable *Bo* (*Bh*) belongs to the syllabic group of *Va*, meaning the ultimate teaching which is impossible to recognise… The syllable *Ro* (*Ru*) belongs to the syllabic group of *Ra*, meaning the ultimate teaching which is detached from all defilements… The syllable *N* (*Huṃ*) belongs to the syllabic group of *A*, which means the non-arising, and which contains all other syllables […]When the three bodies adapted to the three syllables, the syllable *A* points to the *dharmakāya*; the syllable *Ra* points to the *sambhogakāya*; the syllable *Va* points to the *nirmāṇakāya*. By applying the characteristics of *Mahāvairocana*, whose single body consists of the three bodies, it can be said that the single syllable [*Bhrūṃ* /*Boron*] too consists of the three syllables.
>
> (*Bodaijōkyō ryaku gishaku* T. 61 no. 2230 pp. 535b ~ 536b)

Enchin, in order to provide evidence for the identification of the historical Buddha Shakyamuni/*nirmāṇakāya* with the eternal Buddha *Mahāvairocana*/*dharmakāya*, divided the syllable *Bhrūṃ* into three syllabic components, and made those correspond with the three bodies of Buddha. Or, to put it the other way around, he asserted that the single Buddha *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra*, like the syllable *Bhrūṃ*, encompasses three bodies. But how did this interpretation influence Yōsai's view of *ācārya*, which he called Body of Equal Wisdom? It is conceivable that Yōsai read Enchin's interpretation of the three bodies of the Buddha, and reached the conclusion that *nirmāṇakāya* and *svabhāvakāya* were the same form of Buddha, and both of those indicated the *ācārya* or esoteric practitioner himself in the phenomenal world. A similar interpretation had been provided by Jōhen and Dōhan.[348]

The above is the account of three standpoints, which was popularised in the Insei era, approximately from 1086 to 1185. In addition, *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra* was further characterised by late Kamakura scholar monks in two ways; the first is *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra Mahāvairocana* (*dainichi kinrin* 大日金輪) and the second is *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra* Shakyamuni (*shaka kinron* 釈迦金輪).[349] The following section will analyse the essence of precepts Yōsai has declared, and its actualisation or embodiment in the practitioner's body.

[348] Nakamura Masafumi (1991) pp. 31 – 67.

[349] Ascertaining the reason that *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra* was characteries in two ways seems impossible. A Chinese or Korean text entitled *Qingse dajingangyaocha piguimo fa* (T. 21 no. 1221 pp. 99 - 102), first introduces the *Ekākṣara uṣṇīṣa cakra Mahāvairocana* and Shakyamuni.

2) The Essence of the Precepts in Yōsai's Thoughts

This section will deal with Yōsai's interpretation of the essence of precepts (*kaitai* 戒体). The essence of precepts is a very difficult concept to understand. In short, the essence of precepts is the good effects of precepts, which remains with recipients after they undergo the ordination ritual. In other words, entries of the precepts are actualised in the recipient's body, or mind, as good effects, and these good effects protect one from wrongdoings. Annen developed this basic notion of the essence of precepts. In his *Futsū kōshaku*, he defined the Tendai Perfect precepts as the precepts that represent Buddha nature (*busshō* 仏性), so that after ordained, Buddha nature actualises in the recipient. What this means is that by the act of receiving the precepts, the recipient attains Buddhahood (*jukai jōbutsu* 受戒成仏).[350]

It is even difficult to acknowledge that Yōsai discusses the esoteric precepts, because he does not argue them explicitly. However, this basic understanding clearly underpins his core doctrine. Evidence showing that he was interested in the esoteric precepts can be found in the *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu*. Yōsai writes:

> Question: A master said that the three types of *bodhicitta* [practices] are identical with the three collections of pure precepts 三聚浄戒.[351] Is this true or not?

[350] For *jukai jōbutsu*, see Paul Groner (1990) pp.266 – 268.

[351] A few words need to be spent on the three collections of pure precepts, which are often known as hermeneutical classification of precepts. As a matter of fact, Yōsai's understanding of the three collections of pure precepts is unique. The three collections or categories are the precepts to save

Answer: This is truly against the real meaning [of the three types of *bodhicitta* practice]. So, do not think [as such]. The three collections of pure precepts are the seeds of the three bodies of the Buddha, namely the Buddha nature, which is the cause [to attain to enlightenment]…etc. For the three types of *bodhicitta* [practices], each one of the three is the manifestation of the skilful means of the three and four bodies of Buddha.

(*Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* T. 70 no. 2293 p. 31a)

As was underlined at the beginning of this chapter, the esoteric precepts in the framework of Yōsai's doctrine are comprised of the three practices referred to in the *Putixin lun*. The above quotation is actually the only statement, which he talks about precepts.

In order to elucidate Yōsai's interpretation of the esoteric precepts, the doctrinal paradigms of the time needs to be examines. A useful point of reference is the *Hi sōjō shū* 秘相承集 in 1217, composed by someone called *bhikṣu* Kōyū 公用比丘, whose biography is unknown. In fact, the *Hi sōjō shū* contains many terminologies bearing resemblance to those of Yōsai, and serves to clarify his exegesis, since the *Hi sōjō shū* considered the three practices presented in the *Putixin lun* as the esoteric precepts as well.[352]

---

sentient beings, the precepts to discipline the observer himself, and the precepts to advocate good deeds. Although Yōsai regarded the three collections of pure precepts to be as used merely by non-esoteric Buddhists, actually, they were also employed in esoteric ritual manuals, such as the *Muweisanzang chanyao* and *Jingangding yuqie lueshu sanshiqizun xinyao*, to interpret the precepts. (T. 18 no. 917 pp. 943a – 944a. T. 18 no. 871 p. 296b).

[352] ZTZ. Mikkyō III. p. 40a

The most authoritative survey of the *Hi sōjō shū* has been conducted by Misaki Ryōshū in his *Taimitsu no riron to jissen* 台密の理論と実践.[353] Therefore, the next few paragraphs heavily rely on the results of his research on the *Hi sōjō shū*. Moreover, the *Hi sōjō shū* identifies the *Putixin lun* based esoteric precepts with the precepts of the Buddha's Own Nature (*jishō kai* 自性戒), consisting of the inborn perfection of the three Buddhist basic practices, Precepts, Contemplation and Wisdom (*jishō shōjō no sangaku* 自性清浄の三学).[354] This is a highly scholastic argument understandable only in an exegetical context because it draws from a succession of quotations. The *Hi sōjō shū* identifies the two forms of esoteric precepts calling upon the notion of one mind.

> Question: Are the precepts of Own Nature and the esoteric precepts advocated on the foundation of the *Putixin lun* different or the same?
>
> Answer: Although the contents of the two set of precepts are different, the essence of the precepts, which is the One Mind, is the same.
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyo 3. p. 40a)

This specific use of the term "One Mind" most likely originates in Kōjō's *Denjutsu issinkai mon* 伝述一心戒文, describing the circumstances of Saichō's advocacy of the Mahāyāna precepts and their meaning in Japan. In the *Denjutsu issin kai mon*, Kōjō linked the One Mind with the practices of the three activities, mental, verbal and bodily activities.[355] The One Mind differs from the mind within three activities since the One Mind transcends those three activities, and comprehends them all.

[353] Misaki Ryōshū (1994) pp. 184 - 208
[354] Ibid; p. 40a
[355] T. 74 no. 2379 p. 655c

The *Hi sōjō shū* gave an additional denotation to the One Mind; it is the essence of the precepts. Actually, the One Mind explained in the *Hi sōjō shū* is the key to decode Yōsai's interpretation of the essence of the precepts. The *Hi sōjō shū*, in fact, explained the One Mind by means of a theory that resembled the theory of three bodies of the Buddha, formulated in the shape of the three standpoints, I have analysed before. The following is the part of the *Hi sōjō shū* which discusses the essence of precepts.

> … [T]he pure *dharmakāya* is the *dharmakāya* of Principle, namely the Buddha of the Womb *Maṇḍala*; Mahāvairocana is the *dharmakāya* of Wisdom, namely the Buddha of the Diamond *Maṇḍala*; the mind ground [or the true mind] 心地 is the non-dual *dharmakāya*, namely the Buddha of the Accomplishment *Maṇḍala*.
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyō III. p. 34b)

The "mind ground," the "true mind" and the "One mind" are synonyms, and are all indicate the essence of the precepts. Additionally, concerning this feature of the true mind, the *Hi sōjō shū* states that "the non-dual *dharmakāya*, comprehending Principle and Wisdom, always abides in the true mind of all sentient beings." From this, the *Hi sōjō shū* claims that the non-duality or the combination of Principle and Wisdom equates to the essence of the precepts. Because this notion of the essence of precepts is based on the activity of the mind, it has been known as the theory of the essence of the precepts based on the mind (*shinbō kaitai setsu* 心法戒体説). Exactly the same interpretation is applicable to Yōsai's view of the essence of the precepts. In this light, it is easier to understand Yōsai's *Kongōchōshū*

bodaishinron kuketsu, which could be said to be an expression of his idea of the essence of the precepts.

Thus, in the context of the *Hi sōjō shū*, the three types of *bodhicitta* practices were considered to be the precepts, and the essence of those was the One mind composed of the combination of the above three practices. Here, the Principle and the Wisdom are features of the essence of the *Putixin lun* precepts. In my opinion, the same interpretation can be applied to Yōsai's interpretation of the esoteric precepts, in which the Practice of Vow and that of Realisation of Supreme Emptiness become the essence of the precepts. Moreover, Function signifies the empowerment of the non-duality of Principle and Wisdom, or that of *dharmakāya*, which embodies the three activities of the *ācārya* or *nirmāṇakāya*. This means that the essence of the precepts can be actualised in the practitioner's body. The *Hi sōjō shū* speaks in a similar way of such actualisation of the essence of precepts:

> By practicing the three activities, [a practitioner] acquires the precepts. The three activities are integrated into the One Mind of Buddha, which is the essence of precepts.
>
> (ZTZ. Mikkyō III. p. 40b)

Within the context of both the *Hi sōjō shū* and *Bodaishinron kuketsu*, the actualisation of the essence of the precepts means becoming a Buddha in this very body, or *sokushin jōbutsu*. The attainment of Buddhahood by receiving the precepts was first exposed by Annen, but he demonstrated it on the basis of the Tendai perfect precepts, consisting of ten good precepts and forty eight trivial precepts

grounded on the *Fanwang jing*.[356] Although it is almost impossible to ascertain the link, it seems very likely that Yōsai applied Annen's interpretation on the Tendai perfect precepts to esoteric precepts, as he was the first scholar monk who paid attention to the attainment of Buddhahood by receiving precepts. A similar view would be inherited by the Precepts group (*kaike* 戒家), which emerged on Mt. Hiei in the late Kamakura period.[357] As a matter of fact, Yōsai, even after his death, had the role of the Precepts group's ideologue. His presence within the emergence and transformation of the Precepts group will be investigated in the next chapter.

3) Zen Precepts and Vinaya in Yosai's Thought

This section, will move on to examine the roles of the precepts and the *vinaya* advocated in Yōsai's best known work, the *Kōzen gokoku ron*. Yōsai's motives for composing the *Kōzen gokoku ron* were multiple. The first was to promote the revival of Zen in order to protect the country, as the title indicates. The second was to respond to the indictment issued by Mt. Hiei which regarded Yōsai's declaration of the revival of Zen as a threat to the Tendai institution. The third was to demonstrate how Zen served to improve one's inner world, consequently bringing peace not only to one's mind, but also to society.

Yōsai's interpretation of Zen has often been characterised as advocating the importance of observing the *vinaya* as the foundation of Zen practice (*buritsu zen* 扶律禅).[358] According to Yōsai's own words, it can possibly be said that his idea of Zen is to adhere to the *vinaya*. The term *buritsu* 扶律 was created by Zhiyi to characterise the *Niepan jing* 涅槃経, which he deemed to be the scripture which

[356] For the Tendai Perfect precepts, see the chapter for Annen's interpretation of esoteric precepts.
[357] For Precepts group, see the chapter for the influence of Yōsai's though in Precepts group.
[358] Yanagida Seizan (1991) p. 460

had broadened (扶) *vinaya* practices in the age of the end of the *Dharma*/Buddhist teachings (*mappō* 末法).[359] Although the character 扶 means "to broaden" something, the connotation Yōsai added to it is different. In his interpretation, the character means "to observe", in this case, *vinaya*.[360] The reason why Yōsai advocated the importance of observing the *vinaya* is deeply connected to the notion of the age of the end of the *Dharma*. In Japan, it was believed that the age of the end of the *Dharma* had started in 1052. Since then, this notion furthered pessimistic views of the world for hundreds of years to come. Yōsai's awareness of contemporary social circumstances and his plan for restoring Buddhism are contained in the *Kōzen gokoku ron*, which states: "practicing Zen on the foundation of *vinaya* makes the *Dharma* remain in the world."[361] This citation sums up Yōsai's Zen thought very well. In other words, he claimed that the *Dharma*, which delivered peace, could be maintained by observing *vinaya*. Yōsai describes the conditions for attaining individual peace of mind:

> [O]bserving the precepts and the *vinaya*, [one's] mind becomes clear like water, and [one] comes to realise the [true] mind. [Observing the precepts and *vinaya*] immediately equates to the practices of perfect wisdom. Even for people whose capabilities are low, observing the precepts and *vinaya* removes defilements out of their minds; and their minds becomes like the full moon. This is the true meaning of observing the precepts and monastic disciplines mentioned in the *Niepan jing*.

[359] As well as broadening *vinaya* practice, the *Niepan jing* was said to be the scripture which advocated the eternal presence of Buddha law by Zhiyi.
[360] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 8b
[361] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 7a

(*Kōzen gokoku ron* T. 80 no. 2542 p. 13a)

For Yōsai, without the inner peace brought about by adhering to the *vinaya* on an individual level, social strength could not be restored. The *vinaya*, or the monastic code Yōsai recommended following was the *Sifen lu* 四分律. The *Sifen lu* began to be categorised as *Mahāyāna* teaching by Chinese monks such as Daoxuan 道宣 (596 - 667), who is considered the founder of the *Vinaya* school (*risshū* 律宗). Nonetheless, many Japanese scholar monks, particularly those of the Tendai school, saw the *Sifen lu* as a lesser teaching.[362] Yōsai's interpretation of the *Sifen lu* was the same as those Tendai predecessors. In addition, Yōsai also advocated the Bodhisattva and Zen precepts (*bosatsu kai* 菩薩戒, *zen kai* 禅戒), but he did not elaborate on them. Instead, he declared the importance of the adherence of the precepts alongside the *vinaya*. It seems most likely that the Bodhisattva precepts were basically the same as the *Fanwang* precepts, which the Tendai school had long employed in their ordination system. Not only in the Chinese Chan/Zen tradition, but in Chinese Buddhism in general, the simultaneous transmission of the *Fanwang* precepts and the *Sifen lu* had been the regular ordination system.[363] In this sense, Yōsai's idea was not so novel.

Yōsai was accused by monks of Mt. Hiei for his promotion of observing the *vinaya*, because this bore too close a resemblance to the teaching of the Vinaya school, based on the *Sifen lu*. In order to respond to Mt. Hiei's accusation, Yōsai stated, in the *Kōzen gokoku ron*, that "there has been no distinction between Mahayanist precepts and the *vinaya* of the Hinayanists. *Mahāyāna* precepts

[362] Paul Groner (2000) p.9
[363] Ishida Mizumaro (1985) p. 9

constitute the compassion in one's mind, while one observes the *vinaya* to purify the body in order to support the growing of the compassionate mind."[364] To substantiate his position, he referred to passages from works composed by Daoxuan and Zhanran 湛然, who was known as the sixth patriarch of the Tiantai school. For instance, he cited Zhanran's commentary on Zhiyi's *Mohezhiguan* 摩訶止観, namely the *Mohezhiguan fuxing chuan hongjue* 摩訶止観輔行伝弘決, emphasising the importance of the *vinaya* alongside the precepts.

Concluding Remarks

The reason why Yōsai stressed the significance of observing the *vinaya* after coming back from China may be found in his esoteric knowledge, according to which he considered receiving the esoteric precepts as the method to attain Buddhahood. Although Yōsai never discussed a combinatory thought or practice of esotericism and Zen in his writings, we can deem that observing esoteric precepts and *vinaya*, both of which were linked to monastic principles and discipline, manifest as Yōsai's cardinal thought throughout his life. Previous scholarship has been unable to arrive at this conclusion, because they did not read and examine Yōsai's esoteric works. Yet, my conclusion can be easily contextualised in the development of medieval Buddhism. Other medieval monks, such as Eizon 叡尊 (1201 - 1290) and his disciples, started a movement based on ideas resembling those of Yōsai. Eizon is retrospectively known as the *de facto* founder of Esoteric-Vinaya school (Shingonritsu shū 真言律宗). As the name of the school indicates, this school advocates the importance of adhering esoteric precepts and *vinaya*. Like

[364] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 13b

Yōsai, monks who belonged to this school did not write doctrinal works that demonstrated the combination of esotericism and *vinaya* study, but rather tended to concentrate on practice. In this connection, one may presume Jippan's influence to Yōsai's interpretation of the *vinaya*, which is a topic to investigate in future. Moreover, if one looks at Yōsai's predecessors, the Precepts group, which belonged to the Tendai school, produced many doctrinal writings, which interestingly mention Yōsai quite often. In this respect, the next chapter will examine the Precepts group and its relation to Yōsai.

Chapter 6

Esoteric Practice 4. Influence of Yōsai and Precepts Group

Precept Consecration and Yōsai

The aim of this chapter is to investigate the relationship between Yōsai's thought and Precept Consecration (*kai kanjō* 戒灌頂). This was a popular form of ritual in medieval Tendai school. A particular group that esteemed this consecratory ritual has been known as Precepts group (*kaike* 戒家). Since several works written by monks of this group frequently mention Yōsai, one can assume that the influence of Yōsai's thoughts on the Precept Consecration was profound. Thus, this chapter will examine how Yōsai's esoteric ideas affected it. Scholars admit a certain degree of esoteric influence, but they assert that this influence is limited. Scholars have rather stressed the influence of Tendai Perfect Buddhism on the Precepts Consecration as being more relevant. However, when key terminologies used in texts related to Precept consecration are taken into account, one can note that some of these terminologies are closely related to those of esoteric Buddhism. Moreover, it is remarkable that Yōsai has been referred to in texts advocating the Precept Consecration, such as the *Keiran shūyō shū*. These factors suggest that Yōsai has significantly contributed to the emergence and transformation of this tradition.

Precept Consecration

Before we begin our examination with the above factors in mind, the history (including previous studies) and characteristics of the Precept Consecration will have to be briefly introduced. This is even more necessary for the fact that there

are no studies of this important tradition available in English, with the sole exception of Paul Groner's pioneering contribution.

The Precepts Consecration thrived in the Kurodani area of Mt. Hiei and specialised in the study of the precepts, they are collectively known as the Kurodani lineage (*kurodani ryū* 黒谷流) or the Precepts group (*kaike* 戒家).[365] Precept Consecration was conducted under conditions of strict secrecy until after the Second World War. The Precept Consecration has been maintained into the present only at the Saikyō temple (*Saikyōji* 西教寺) in Otsu city, Shiga prefecture. This temple has been the headquarters of the Tendai Shinzei school 天台真盛宗, established by Shinzei Shōnin (1443 - 1495), since the early sixteenth century. Former Saikyō temple head abbot Shikii Shūjo 色井秀譲 made the secret ritual manuals and their meanings available to the public. He has conducted a series of surveys on the emergence and the development of the Precepts Consecration in which he analysed the role and significance of the Precept Consecration systematically. The results were complied and published in 1989 as *Kaikanjō no nyumonteki kenkyū* 戒灌頂の入門的研究.[366] This book has been considered as the most comprehensive study of the subject. Other modern scholars (such as Hazama Jiko 硲慈弘, Okubo Ryōjun 大久保良順, Nomoto Kakujō 野本覚成, Terai Ryōsen 寺井良宣, Fujimoto Ryotai 藤本了泰, Etani Ryūkai 恵谷隆戒, Uesugi Bunshū 上杉文秀, Kubota Tesshō 窪田哲正, and Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿) have studied the Precepts Consecration and related topics. In the West, Paul Groner surveyed Kōen, the most

[365] Shiki Shujō (1989) However, Kōshu should not be categorised singularly in the Kai group, as the most characteristic of Kōshu's lineage is to learn Tendai, esotericism, precepts and records of oral transmission combinatory.
[366] Shikii Shunjō (1989)

important ideologue within the tradition of the Precepts Group, and his role in the development of the Precepts Consecration.

Transformation

The Precept Consecration is also known as the Double Conferment Consecration (*juju kanjō* 重授灌頂), because this ritual is usually conducted twelve years after one's first ordination, a tradition which continues to this day. The idea that one is conferred precepts twice is itself quite unique, because double conferment of precepts had long been contrary to the standards of the official ordination system, namely the full ordination (*gusoku kai* 具足戒), legislated by the Japanese state in Nara period. The idea of double conferment can actually be traced back to Annen's interpretation of the esoteric precepts, which was discussed above.. Furthermore, the resemblance between the Precept Consecration and the so-called consecration of five phials (*gobyō kanjō* 五瓶灌頂), which indicates the esoteric consecration of Diamond realm, at also has been pointed out by Shikii.[367] The latter form of consecratory ritual is the same as that of the Mind-to-Mind (*ishin kanjō* 以心灌頂), Secret (*himitsu kanjō* 秘密灌頂) and Yogic (*yugi kanjō* 瑜祇灌頂) consecrations, which indicate the most advanced consecration rituals in terms of esoteric Buddhism. Yet, quite a number of source materials relating to Precept Consecration proclaim that the consecratory rites are based on non-esoteric scriptures and Tiantai commentaries. The precepts conferred throughout the rites are based on the *Fahua jing* and the *Fanwang jing*; both of these have been

[367] Ibid; p. i

employed theoretically in the Tendai ordination since Annen.[368] Although the Precepts group claimed their attempt for overcoming esoteric Buddhism, the Precept Consecration still remained one of its elements. This is indeed the core idea of the Japanese Tendai tradition, the coordination of esoteric Buddhism with the Tendai Perfect teachings.

The details of the emergence of the Precept Consecration are almost impossible to ascertain. Shikii argues that the Pure Land school established by Hōnen 法然 (1133 - 1212) may have contributed to its development. According to his survey, the archetype was constituted by Eikū 叡空 (? - 1179), who was known as a master of Hōnen. Hōnen then inherited it from Eikū, and handed it down to Shinkū 信空 (1146 - 1228). Tankū 湛空 (1176 - 1253) was succeeded by Shinkū, and the ritual was given its basic form by the time of Ejin 恵尋 (? - 1289?). Ejin's disciple, Egi 恵顗, (? - 1288 - ?) and Egi's disciple, Kōen 興円 (1261/2 - 1317), who had brought the ritual of Precepts Consecration to its completion. Kōen's pupil Echin 恵鎮 (1281 - 1356) was sponsored by Emperor Godaigo 後醍醐天皇 (1288 - 1339). Echin rebuilt Hosshō temple (*Hosshōji* 法勝寺) and Gannō temple (*Gannōji* 元応寺), and established altars for Precepts Consecration there. As its result, two branches of Precepts Consecration emerged from these two temples. The lineage of Hōshō temple was continued by Yuiken 惟賢 (1289 - 1378), and the inheritor of the Gannō lineage was Kōshū 光宗 (1276 - 1350), who composed the *Keiran shūyō shū*. By the mid-sixteenth century, the lineage of Hōshō temple merged into the Gannō lineage. Because many key terms used in Kurodani lineage sources are derived from the Danna lineage (*danna ryū* 檀那流), some have considered the Precepts

[368] For the interpretation of the *Fahua jing* in Tendai ordination, see the chapter four.

group as a branch of the Danna lineage in the context of lineal transmission.[369] Although there might be Pure Land elements in this tradition, this study is not concerned with the issue of the relationship between the Precepts group and Hōnen's Pure Land teachings. The above account summarises the lineal development of the Precept Consecration, according to the commonly accepted version of their history.

There has been a controversy over determining the *de facto* founder. Because identifying the "founder" seems to be a purely sectarian pursuit, I will merely give a brief account of the controversy. According to the previous studies provided by the above modern scholars, Tankū, Ejin and Egi played crucial roles in terms of the foundation of the Precept Consecration. In the context of Precepts group, two perspectives can be employed in determining the "founder." Most modern scholars believe that Precepts Consecration began with Ejin. Ishida Mizumaro, who has been known as the giant of Japanese Precepts studies, surveyed the emergence of the Precepts group. Ishida's approach is quite unique as he sees the biography of Kōen (*denshin kashō den* 伝信和尚伝) as a key document, which depicts an interesting scene that Kōen dreamt, hinting at the significance of Ejin. The dream was that Ejin advised Egi to confer the consecration to Kōen.[370] Pointing to the significance of this dream, Ishida Mizumaro arrives at the conclusion that Ejin ought to be regarded as the "founder" of the Precept Consecration.[371] However, Ishida's account is not really persuasive because the biographies of key religious figure often tend to contain hagiographical elements.

[369] Hazama Jikō (1948) p. 68. Shikii Shujō (1988) p. 143. The Danna lineage and the Eshin lineage are collectively known as the Edan lineage, which has heavily contributed to the teachings of the oral transmission.
[370] Shikii Shujo (1988) pp. 9 - 10
[371] Ishida Mizumaro (1963) p. 483 - 487

Additionally, Ishida suggests that Kōen's master, Tankū, can also be regarded as the "founder" of Precepts Consecration. On the basis of Ishida's account, Ōkubo Ryōjun, who also concedes the difficulty of asserting the founder of the lineage, further suggests that some ideas of *genshi-kimyō dan* 玄旨帰命壇 may have affected Ejin's doctrine.[372] The Genshi-kimyō dan is known as the ritual, which has been performed in Danna lineage in order to transmit the most profound teaching, *isshin sangan* 一心三観. Ōkubo arrives at such a conclusion by tracing back Ejin's lineage tree referred to in the *Isshin myōkai shō* 一心妙戒鈔, which was written by Ejin. He presumes that the monk who introduced the doctrine and ritual of the *genshi-kimyō dan* to Ejin might have been Sonne 尊恵 (? - ?).[373]

Whether the foundation of the Precept Consecration can attribute to Ejin's deed or not, he seems to be the key figure to explore the forming of this unique consecratory tradition.

Important Works

There are many source materials related to the Precept Consecration. These documents are now consultable in three volumes in the *Tendaishū zensho* 天台宗全書 and two volumes entitled Tendai Perfect Precepts (enkai 円戒) 1 and 2 of the *Zoku tendaishū zensho* 続天台宗全書. Before examining source materials composed

[372] The Genshi-kimyō dan was created in order to compete with esotericism. Its "profound teachings" (*genshi*) were often taught in concrete form, namely as rituals. In this competition, monks, who deemed Tendai perfect teachings more important than those of esoteric Buddhism, ritualised the ultimate of the Tendai perfect teachings, namely the One Mind-Three Aspects. Because some Genshi-kimyō dan manuscripts contain sexual terms, this tradition was considered a heresy. See Okubo Ryōjun (1985) Nihon bukkyō shisōshi ronshū 3. pp. 308 - 329

[373] The lineage chart, showing the relationship between those two monks, is available in Okubo's survey (ibid; p. 7). Sonne's years of birth and death are unknown, but he is pretty much a cotemporary of Yōsai. Additionally, his name is mentioned often in the volume six of the *Heike Monogatari*.

by the members of the Precepts group, we must first touch upon the three liturgical scriptures, which constitute the core of the Precept Consecration. The first is the *Pusajie yishu* 菩薩戒義疏, which has been attributed to Zhiyi.[374] The second is the *Guanxin* (*song*) *shierbu jing yi* 觀心(誦)十二部経義.[375] This document is not indexed in any of Saichō's catalogues, but Ennin and Enchin refer to it in their catalogues. The *Guanxin shierbu jing yi* is a controversial work the author of which has not been determined, but it has often been attributed to Zhiyi. As a matter of fact, not only modern scholars, but also Japanese scholar monks of the past doubted the authenticity of this attribution. Ennin, Enchin and Eichō 永超 (- 1094 -), for instance, considered the *Guanxin shierbu jing yi* to have been composed by Zhangan Guanding 章安灌頂 (561 - 632), Zhiyi's most faithful disciple.[376] Hōjibō Shōshin and Enchū 淵冲 (- 1723 -) doubt even Guanding's authorship of this work; at the same time, they admitted that its genuine author was impossible to ascertain. As for modern scholarship, Uesugi Bunshū 上杉文秀[377] Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英 and Ōno Hideto 大野秀人 each forward their own theories as to the proper attribution of this text. Uesugi argues that the *Guanxin shierbu jing yi* was produced by one of the members of the Precepts group, because the Chinese in which the text is written is not sophisticated enough to be by a Chinese author. Needless to say, a theory based on stylistic analysis does not suffice. Satō's discussion, which I partly support, demonstrates that the work had gradually come to be brought to completion in both China and Japan. Satō attributes a part of the

[374] See: Chi (2008), see also the later footnote.
[375] There is also a version entitled as the *Shierbu fa*, which may have been an existing edition, contained in the *Zoku tendai shu zensho*. Since the ZTZ designates it as the *Shierbu jing yi*, I hereafter call all versions collectively as the *Shierbu jing yi*.
[376] In the above respect, Ennin's version may have been the *Shierbu jing yi*, but not the *Shierbu fa*.
[377] Incidentally, Uesugi was a practitioner of the Precept Consecration.

first section of the *Guanxin shierbu jing yi*, to Guanding. In fact, Satō's account resembles that of Enchū. However, as happens frequently, any author could have imitated or paraphrased Guanding's ideas without references.[378] The work was completed in the Song period, which corresponds to late Insei Japan.

The third liturgical text is the *Tonchō himitsu kōyō* 頓超秘密綱要 (a.k.a. *Tendai chisha zenkan* 天台智者全肝), which has been attributed to Zhiyi. This work presents the basic structure of the Precept consecration. Again, however, the authenticity of the composition is doubted and it is very likely a Japanese pseudo-epigraphy as some passages of the *Gozu hōmon yōsan* 牛頭法門要纂, a famous medieval text linked to the tradition of oral transmission, are cited in the text.[379] The term "*Gozu*" (Ox-head) indicates the Zen lineage that Saichō has transmitted from China. This reveals that the author of this text was keenly concerned with Zen Buddhism, which widely spread throughout the Kamakura period. Furthermore, interestingly, the preface of a copy of the *Tonchō himitsu kōyō* states that Yōsai has imported this writing from China.[380] However, whether he was actually the first man who introduced this text cannot be ascertained because he did not make a catalogue of the Buddhist texts he imported. Nonetheless, this can be regarded as a single piece of evidence that Yōsai made a contribution to the development of the Precept Consecration. Additionally, as will be discussed later, Yōsai and the characteristics of his doctrines are called to attention in the *Keiran shūyō shū*, which was composed by a Kōshū, member of the Precepts group. Thus,

[378]Ono's study is rather forcibly done. Although he provides many invaluable counterarguments, which point out the inauthenticity of Chii's composition, he eventually arrives at the conclusion that Chii is the genuine author. In other words, it appears his conclusion had already been fixed prior to his argument.
[379] Nomoto Kakujo (1986) Kaidai p. 10
[380] ZTZ. Enkai 1. p. 317

it seems fair to presume that the tradition of the Precept Consecration as a whole tried to embrace Yōsai and his doctrine one way or another.[381]

On the basis of the above three works comprising the foundation of the ideology of the Precepts group, the members of Precepts group produced a great number of texts. Among the great number of these, the *Enkai jūroku jō* 円戒十六帖 (a.k.a. *Jūroku jō ketsu* 十六帖決) by Kōen has been considered as the most pivotal work.[382] The work consists of sixteen articles, each article interpreting oral transmissions connected to the Precepts Consecration. These articles comprehend the totality of the doctrine and rituals of the Precept Consecration and thus can be understood as a guideline to understand all aspects of this tradition. Doctrinally, the *Enkai jūroku jō* can be characterised by saying that esoteric Buddhism is coordinated with Tendai Perfect teachings. Such a doctrinal structure is the standard of Japanese Tendai. The ideas advanced in the *Enkai jūroku jō* are rooted in the *Endon kai kikigaki* 円頓戒聞書, which was written on the basis of Ejin's lectures on Annen's *Futsū kōshaku*, the most significant works concerning Japanese Tendai perfect precepts[383] To interpret the *Futsū kōshaku*, Ejin heavily quoted Annen's esoteric *oeuvre*. However, at some point, the Precepts Group had come to shift its focus to a *Fahua jing* based interpretation, which meant that the majority of thinkers within the Precepts Group tried to lessen the esoteric elements

[381] Nonetheless, the discourses that remind us of Yōsai's thought are not mentioned in the *Tonchō himitsu kōyō*.
[382] ZTZ. Enkai 1. pp. 76 - 115
[383] The *Futsū kōshaku* is known as the only and highly systematic work which shows the meaning of the *Fanwang jing* based on Tendai perfect precepts. However, the *Endon kai kikigaki* often cites Annen's pivotal esoteric writings, such as the *Kyōji mondō* and *Bodaishin gi shō*, to explain the denotations of Perfect precepts in the Precepts group. For previous study, Kubota Tesshō is one a scholar who dealt with the *Endon kai kikigaki*. However, his point of view is founded solely on the Tendai Perfect teachings, so he makes no effort to examine esoteric influence on this work.

in their thought, although some esoteric elements still remained. Interestingly, Yakunin, a contemporary of Kōen, showed more positive understanding of esoteric teachings.

Yuiken's *Bosatsu endon jukaikanjō ki* 菩薩円頓授戒灌頂記 in one fascicle is an interesting text which goes against the trend of lessening esoteric elements.[384] The sole esoteric element which can be recognised in the *Bosatsu endon jukaikanjō ki* is its interpretation of becoming Buddha within this very body. For this, Yuiken refers to one of the alternative versions of the *Sokushin jōbutsu gi* (*Ihon Sokushinjōbutsu gi* 異本即身成仏義), often attributing to Kūkai or Annen, alongside with Annen's *Futsū kōshaku*. In the corresponding passages, Yuiken argues that the three kinds of the becoming Buddha in this very body (*sanshu sokushin jōbutsu* 三種即身成仏), consisting of innateness (*rigu* 理具), empowerment (*kaji* 加持) and practice (*kentoku* 顕得), and the three kinds of receiving precepts (*sanshu jukai* 三種受戒), namely intrinsic nature (*shōtoku* 性得), transmission (*denju* 伝受) and acquirement (*hottoku* 発得), which Annen formulated in his *Futsū kōshaku*, are basically identical.[385] According to the characteristic of Yuiken's *Bosatsu endon jukaikanjō ki*, it can be said that Yakunin's positive understanding of esoteric teachings, which differed from Kōen's diminution of esoteric elements, and may have brought about division in the Precepts group. Therefore, Yuiken is regarded as the pioneer of the so-called Hōshō temple lineage.

Besides these works, many works relating to the Precept Consecration, such as the *Bosatsu kai shō kikigaki* 菩薩戒疏聞書 by Echin, the *Bosatsu kai giki kikigaki sho* 菩薩戒義記聞書 (a.k.a. *Eitoku ki* 永徳記) in thirteen fascicles and

[384] T. 74 no. 2383 pp. 787 - 798
[385] T. 74 no. 2382 p. 795a

Endon kai gyōji shō 円頓戒暁示抄 by Ninkū 仁空 (1309 - 1388) remain. Ninkū's interpretation of Tendai Perfect precepts have been researched by Paul Groner.[386]

Logics in Precepts Consecration

The concept of *igyō* 意楽 originally connoting "to vow in mind," played an important role throughout classic and medieval Japan in the context of visualising practices. Since esoteric Buddhism was imported to Japan, the term *igyō* came to signify "tips" given by the master to his disciple by means of oral communication. The "tips" became crucial in order to characterise teaching of certain lineages. Additionally, *igyō* was used to clarify methods of practice for which the original source was too ambiguous to stand alone. Thus, series of *igyō* are not based on canonical or scriptural materials. Such free interpretation of practices spilled over into the doctrinal dimension and led to its broadening. On the doctrinal level, many monks tended to play associative games with equivalent numbers and similar concepts. Although such a tendency is seen in Chinese Buddhism as well, Japanese examples are more developed. In this regard, the following passages examine the world of *igyō* in the tradition of the Precept Consecration to reveal the circumstance surrounding its early transformation.[387]

Buddhist numerology (*hossū* 法数) was distinctively employed by the Precepts Group. In fact, their use of the numerology exerted an influence over the later development of Japanese Zen. The heavy use of numerological symbolism in Zen Buddhism has come to be well understood following Bernard Faure's survey

[386] Paul Groner investigated Ninkū's systematisation of monastic training,see: Paul Groner (2011) pp. 233 - 261

[387] This part of study owes to Shikii's survey that underlined three characteristics. However, examinations themselves are fully original.

published in 2003. While Faure's investigation on this topic constitutes a great achievement in terms of elucidating an aspect of medieval intellectual activities, his way of demonstration is highly problematic. The problem lies on his contextualisation of numerological symbolism in Sino-Japanese Zen history. My hypothesis is that there could have been an external influence, such as the Tendai teachings, on medieval Sōtō Zen. To investigate the various issues surrounding Buddhist numerology, this study will take up the symbolic elements of *kaṣāya* (*kesa* 袈裟) in China and Japan, which Faure has also researched.

Faure uses Sōtō *kirigami* 切紙 documents, documents secretly transmitted in Zen, mostly produced in the late Muromachi period. Faure's survey tries to illustrate the continuity of the symbolic function of the *kaṣāya* from Chinese Chan to Japanese Sōtō Zen. However, one might note that Faure's perspective, which seeks continuity in terms of the Zen tradition alone, cannot be maintained, as the question of why Sōtō monks suddenly began to take up the symbolism of the *kaṣāya* around the late Muromachi period arises.[388] It is the Tiantai doctrine and the teaching of the Precepts group that sheds the light on this problem.

Zhiyi's interpretation on the *kaṣāya* is presented in fascicle four of the *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止観, one of the three most pivotal Tiantai/Tendai works. The corresponding passages argue the symbolic meanings of the *kaṣāya* in light of its role as garment.

[388] Bernard Faure (2003) He also examines numerological games on the bases of textile patterns. However, he does not pay attention to Kōen and the Precepts Group - he merely mentions the *Keiran shūyō shu* – in his examination. He considers this game as typical of Zen Buddhism, but it is most likely that this religio-philosophical notion has been influenced by the Precepts Group. As a matter of fact, Faure uses *kirigami* documents to provide evidence for this phenomenon to be original to Zen. Yet, most *kirigami* material dates to the post-Kamakura period, and thus, introduces the danger of anachronism into Faure's argument.

> The three types of *kaṣāya* identify with the three contemplations.[389] The three truths veil ugliness [of human mind]; the three truths protect [people] from the attachments, which are like various sickness; the three realisations whisk mosquitoes and tabanids [Horse flies].[390] Because [the three truths] adorn the three bodies of Buddha, the three contemplations symbolise [three] *kaṣāya*.
>
> (T. 46 no. 1911 p. 42a)

To sum up the above citation, the three *kaṣāya* symbolise not only the three contemplations, but also the three truths and the bodies of the Buddha. However, more specific symbolism, such as which *kaṣāya* represents which contemplation, is not elaborated upon. Zhiyi's brief examination implies that the symbolism of the *kaṣāya* was not an important matter for him, as it tends towards being a futile numerological game. Faure ignores the above numerological symbolism in the Tiantai / Tendai tradition, and rather he cites the *Nianfo jing* 念仏経 which reads, "The *kaṣāya* is exactly the same as the Buddha. All the representations of the Buddha are like that, because they are identical to the Buddha."[391] Faure might have cited these passages to make a link between the *Nianfo jing*, which contains a slight Zen influence, and Sōtō Zen *kirigami* documents. However, the original text of the *Nianfo jing* does not mention the *kaṣāya* specifically but simply states "cloth

[389] The three *kaṣāya* indicate fivefold, sevenfold and ninefold patterned textiles. Each one is used on different occasion, such as the one for overalls, one for daily life and one for ceremonies. The three contemplations consist of the contemplation of emptiness, temporality and middle-way. The objects of these contemplations are the three truths, which are that of emptiness, temporality and middle way.

[390] The three realisations signify the Buddha's own enlightenment. The three realisations are enlightenment for one's own interest, enlightenment encouraging others and ultimate enlightenment. The Buddha comprehends all these three kinds of enlightenments, as his own realisation. "To whisk mosquitoes and tabanids" means various calamities.

[391] Bernard Faure (2003) p. 232 The *Nianfo jing* is attributed to Shandao (613 - 681). The influence of Zen on Shandao's thoughts is studied by Ibuki Atsushi (2002) pp. 71 - 78

衣." Although the Chinese character "cloth" can often signify the *kaṣāya*, it plainly indicates "cloth" in general according to the context of the *Nianfo jing*.[392] Therefore, the *Mohe zhiguan* could be one of the earliest examples containing the numerological symbolism of the *kaṣāya*. In my opinion, the Sōtō Zen interpretation of the symbolism of the *kaṣāya* may be a corollary of that of Chinese Tiantai through the interpretations of the Precepts Group, which will be the next subject of the discussion.

The Precept Group took numerology more seriously, and furthered its symbolic function. Consequently, numerological symbolism became one of its conspicuous doctrines. In this respect, Kōen's *Enkai jūroku jō* 円戒十六帖 made the account of the *Mohe zhiguan* more sophisticated.

> Question: Are there any differences between fivefold, sevenfold and ninefold patterned *kaṣāya*?
>
> [Answer:] The fivefold patterned [*kaṣāya*] indicates equality and compassion, which puts your own benefit aside, and benefits sentient beings. Thus, [the fivefold patterned *kaṣāya*] is the representation of the skilful means of the five vehicles, which adorn the *nirmāṇakāya tathāgata*.[393] The sevenfold patterned [*kaṣāya*] is the true wisdom, which has no aspects; so that wicked heart does not arise. Thus, it is the temporal gate of the seven skilful means,

[392] T. 47 no. 1966 p. 127b. Incidentally, the commensurate chapter should be understood in the context of the roles and denotations of Buddha statues.

[393] In the context of Japanese Buddhism, the five vehicles usually signify *bodhisattva*, *śrāvaka*, *pratyeka*, undetermined and no-nature. The five vehicles often points out the characteristic of the Hossō school.

which adorn the wisdom of the *Para samboghakāya tathāgata*.[394] The ninefold patterned [*kaṣāya*] indicates the perpetual abidance of *dharmakāya*'s own enlightenment that is beyond duality. Thus, [the ninefold patterned *kaṣāya*] is the representation of the temporal vehicle of the nine *dharmadhātu*, of which becomes the robe of endurance to veil the embarrassment of defilements.

Furthermore, the fivefold patterned [*kaṣāya*] symbolises the five phases of consciousness, which consist of the *nirmāṇakāya*'s flesh and dermis. The sevenfold patterned [*kaṣāya*] represents the seventh consciousness, which composes the *samboghakāya*'s flesh and dermis. The ninefold patterned [*kaṣāya*] embodies the ninth consciousness, which [is] the *dharmakāy*a's flesh and dermis.

(ZTZ. Enkai 1. p. 100b)

Here, the levels of consciousness and bodies of the Buddha are symbolised by the three kinds of *kaṣāya*. This symbolism was derived from the *Mohe zhiguan*, developed by Kōen. In addition, a text of Mingkuang 明曠 (- 777 -), the *Tiantai pusajie shu* 天台菩薩戒疏, seems to tie the *Mohe zhiguan* to the *Enkai jūroku jō*. That is, his formulation of the perfect three collections (*ensanju* 円三聚), in which

[394] The seven skilful means denotes the seven sages, which *Mahāyāna* doctrine usually considers the teachings of the Lesser vehicle. In Tendai doctrine, however, the seven skilful means point to human, heaven, *śrāvaka*, *pratyeka*, bodhisattva of the common teaching, bodhisattva of the separate teaching and that of the perfect teaching. Incidentally, the mention of the *para samboghakāya* here is interesting. Although, as the name indicates, it is a type of *samboghakāya*, the *para samboghakāya* is also given a feature of *dhāmakāya*, because *para* means to "go beyond." So, in other words, the *para samboghakāya* can be "beyond- *samboghakāya*." The significance of the *para samboghakāya* will be discussed in its relation of the affect of Yosai's thoughts on the Precepts Group.

all threefold patterns are put together under the three kinds of truth 三諦,[395] is also applied in the above citation from the *Enkai jūroku jō*. This formulisation is, as well, founded on Zhiyi's account cited above, and consequently it is much more thoroughly clarified by Mingkuang.

As well as the symbolism of the *kaṣāya*, Kōen presents other numerological symbolisms, such as the five treasures symbolising the five Buddhas of esoteric Buddhism, which also represents the five patriarchs of Buddhism. Many writings composed by members of the Precepts group actually followed Kōen's unique interpretation. The numerological play and symbolism, hence, constitutes the elemental doctrine of the Precept consecration. In addition, the heavy use of numerological symbolism within the Precepts group also demands reconsideration of the interpretation of the symbolism of the *kaṣāya* in the late medieval Sōtō Zen.

In the medieval Sōtō Zen, the symbolism of *kaṣāya* became more complicated. Ishikawa Rikizan 石川力山 (1943 - 1997) introduced two *kaṣāya*, with their images, in his surveys on *kirigami*. The first *kirigami* describes the meaning of ninefold patterned *kaṣāya* in terms of nine grades (*kuhon* 九品) of Pure Land. The second *kirigami* interprets the ninefold patterned *kaṣāya* by means of Womb and Diamond *Maṇḍala* of esotericism.[396]

It seems to me that the interpretation of *kaṣāya* in the Sōtō Zen was heavily influenced by the Precepts group. As the matter of fact, the majority of early Sōtō Zen *kirigami* documents relating to the interpretation of the *kaṣāya* have been composed in the late Muromachi period, long after the peak of the Precepts group's peak authority.

[395] T. 40 no. 1812 pp. 580a and b

[396] Ishikawa Rikizan (2001) pp. 319 – 322. For the second *kirigami* document, see also Bernard Faure (2003) pp. 230 - 232.

Characteristic Concepts and Their Connections with Yōsai

As has been discussed, because the coordination of Tendai Perfect teachings with esoteric Buddhism represents the main principle of Japanese Tendai doctrine, the thinkers of the Precepts group have often employed conceptual terminologies from both forms of Buddhism. The following passages examine the discourses of the combination of the principle as cognitive object (principle itself) with wisdom (*kyōchi*/*richi myōgō* 境[理]智冥合) in the shape of Yōsai's interpretation of precepts. Furthermore, the question, of which precepts are actualised within the One Mind (*isshinkai zō* 一心戒蔵), should also be examined, as it relates closely to Yōsai's thought. Interestingly, Yōsai mentions those unfamiliar terminologies of his time not only in his early esoteric writings, but also in the later writings as well. In this respect, I shall examine the terminology used by the Precepts group and compare it with those used by Yōsai, in order to demonstrate that Yōsai had a significant influence on the Precepts group.

1) The Combination of Principle as Cognitive Object with Wisdom

The term "the combination of the principle with wisdom," has been used in two ways since the early importation of Buddhism to China. One meaning denotes the innateness of their combination, which at the same time links to the eternity of Buddha *Mahāvairocana*. In the other connotation, the principle is still acknowledged by the practitioner's cognitive activity that is wisdom. Therefore, its combination with wisdom leads the practitioner to attain Buddhahood within this very body. In summary, the former indicates the enlightenment of *dharmakāya* and the latter signifies that of *nirmāṇakāya*. However, because these terms explain the unfathomable depths of Buddhist inner world, many scholar monks,

particularly those of Japanese origin, misunderstood or purposely manipulated their meanings. Furthermore, one needs to be aware that combinatory doctrines of this kind are often connected to the theory of the bodies of the Buddha. Taking this basic knowledge into consideration, this part of the study examines the combination of the principle with the wisdom in Yōsai's esoteric discourse. Next, the discussion will shift focus on the combination pattern in the Precepts group.

2) Yōsai's Interpretation of the Essence of the Precepts

Yōsai's exegesis of the combination of principle and wisdom is based on the symbolism of *Mahāvairocana* in the Womb and Diamond *Maṇḍala*s. Both are represented by the Sanskrit syllables *A* in Yōsai's *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu*, which is an unusual interpretation in the Tōmitsu and Taimitsu orthodox or traditional doctrines, in which the *Mahāvairocana* of the Diamond realm is usually symbolised by the syllable *Vam*. Moreover, as has been discussed in the section of Yōsai's central doctrine, Yōsai added the Buddha's functions in the phenomenal world (*yū* 用), which points to the *nirmāṇakāya*, to the combination of Principle and Wisdom. Yōsai regarded the threefold combination as the true meaning of the threefold *bodhicitta*, namely making a vow, realisation of emptiness and visualisation, referred to as the precepts in the *Putixin lun*. In his thought, the *Putixin lun* precepts correlated to the three bodies of the Buddha, and this correlation between two was considered as the essence of the precepts. According to other esoteric text of Yōsai, the *Ingo shū*, the essence of the precepts is most fittingly represented by new life, *Śarīra* and *cittamani* (*nyoi hōju* 如意宝珠).[397] All

[397] Sueki Fumihiko (2006) pp. 450b and 455a

these three terms can be associated with the combination of Principle with Wisdom, although Yōsai's discussion is not entirely clear.

As was noted in chapter five, the structure in which threefold combination is employed bears resemblance to Enchin's interpretation of three bodies of the Buddha, symbolised by the syllable *Bhrūṃ*, as stated in his *Bodaijōkyō ryaku gishaku* 菩提場経略義釈. In fact, many contemporaries of Yōsai, such as Jien and Nichiren, characteristically made use of this syllable, but what it actually meant was unclear. Most significantly, one newly discovered text of Yōsai, the *Jūshū kyōshu ketsu*, explains the meaning of the syllable *Bhrūṃ*. Yōsai claimed that visualising the syllable *Bhrūṃ* was the direct path to attain to enlightenment.[398] In addition, the *Dainichikyō shinmoku* 大日経心目, attributed to Enchin, seems to have been one of highly influential compositions for medieval scholar monks in the context of the threefold combination. Although the authenticity of the *Dainichikyō shinmoku* is quite dubious when viewed under the lens of modern scholarship, Shōshin 証真 (? - 1165 - 1207 - ?), Raiyu 頼瑜 (1226 - 1304) and Gōhō 杲宝 (1306 - 1362) considered it to be Enchin's composition.[399] In medieval Tōmitsu, as argued by Yōsai, the idea of the threefold combination exposed in the *Dainichikyō shinmoku* was developed by scholar monks, and came to be known as the theory of three standpoints.[400]

It is clear that Yōsai was interested the precepts on the basis of the *Putixin lun*, and his view on the essence of precepts also links to his heavy studies on the theory on the bodies of Buddha, associating with the combination of the Principle

[398] See, Misaki Ryoshu (1994) pp. 128 - 147
[399] T. 58 no. 2212 p. 21a and b, T. 59 no. 2217 pp. 572c – 573a, T. 59 no. 2916 p. 334a
[400] For this, see the chapter for examining Yōsai's central thought.

with the Wisdom (and with the Buddha's activities in phenomenal world, alternatively).

3) Interpretation of the Combination of Principle and Wisdom in the Precepts Group

There are two exegeses of the combination of principle with wisdom in the Precepts group. Firstly, their combination symbolises the bodies of the Buddha, just like in Yōsai's interpretation. Secondly, it also represents the highly ontological notion of the "self and other relationship" or indeed the principle of participation. Interestingly, these interpretations are largely associated with ritual gestures, particularly two hands placed palms together in *añjali* (*gasshō* 合掌), which is, in fact, the climax of the Precept Consecration. The usage of *añjali* in the Precepts group is quite unique. Here, what the *añjali* gesture designates is the spiritual unity between masters and disciples. Like Masonic handshakes, etc., *añjali* is interpreted symbolically in this tradition. As Paul Groner points out, there are four types or degrees of *añjali* used during the ritual of the Precept Consecration.[401] Among those four degrees, the discussion associated with the combination of Principle and Wisdom is presented in the third one. The following quote from Kōen's *Enkai jūroku jō* discusses this association in detail:

> The *añjali* points to Shakyamuni and Prabhūtaratna, seated in the tower of Prabhūtaratna, where the Buddha acquired the combination of principle as a cognitive object with wisdom. The seal of ultimate reality (*jissō in* 実相印) was given from Prabhūtaratna to Shakyamuni in the tower [of Prabhūtaratna].

[401] Paul Groner (2010) p. 198

That is why *añjali* is said to be the tower [of *Prabhūtaratna*]. Thus, *añjali* is also said to be Shakyamuni and Prabhūtaratna seated in a line… The *nirmāṇakāya tathāgata* is the body resulting from the combination of principle as a cognitive object with wisdom. The left [hand] indicates the *dharmakāya*; the right [hand] indicates the *samboghakāya*; the combination [of left hand and right hand] indicates the *nirmāṇakāya tathāgata*… According to an oral transmission, The Prabhūtaratna is the *dharmakāya*'s combination of principle itself with wisdom; Shakyamuni is that of the *samboghakāya*; the combination of a disciple with a master (*shishi myōgō* 師資冥合) is that of the *nirmāṇakāya*… When the spirit of the disciple is united with a master, the three bodies of Buddha are identified. Thus, [it is] one Buddha.

(ZTZ. Enkai 1 pp. 76a – 77a)

A short explanation is required of the terminology and contents of this quotation. First of all, Shakyamuni and Prabhūtaratna are a reference to the eleventh chapter of the *Fahua jing*, the *Xianbaota pin* 見宝塔品. This chapter has been highly esteemed in Japanese Tendai to support the coordination of the Tendai Perfect teachings with esoteric Buddhism. In this chapter, as well as in the above passages Prabhūtaratna corresponds to *dharmakāya*, which esoteric Buddhism considers to be *Mahāvairocana,* or Dainichi 大日 in Japanese. The content of this chapter was for the composition of the *Fahua guanzhi yigui* 法華観智儀軌,

translated by Fukong, an esoteric manual on a ritual centred on the *Fahua jing*, the *hokke hō*.

Moreover, the *Enkai jūroku jō* considers the *stupa* of Prabhūtaratna representing the *añjali* to be the same as the Iron Tower in South India, the root meaning of which relates to the famous myth of the origin of two esoteric texts.[402] Secondly, the combination of Principle with Wisdom is applied to each one of the three bodies of the Buddha; Principle indicates the *dharmakāya*, Wisdom points to the *samboghakāya* and their combination signifies the *nirmāṇakāya*. The role of the *nirmāṇakāya*, which points to the historical Shakyamuni Buddha, or the function of *dharmakāya* in phenomenal world, seems particularly noteworthy, as this interpretation is intimately linked to that of Yōsai.[403] On the physical level, this unity is symbolised by means of a characteristic way of shaking hands, that master and disciple join their hands to form *añjali*. On the metaphysical level, the unity of principle and wisdom indicates enlightened beings, namely the *nirmāṇakāya*. Last of all, the *Enkai jūroku jō* states that "when a disciple combines with a master, three bodies of Buddha are identified. Thus, [it is] one Buddha." Decoding this passage will serve to clarify the link between Yōsai's interpretation of the combination of principle and wisdom and that of the Precepts group.

As has been noted, in Yōsai's thought, the essence of the precept is associated with *Śarīra* and the *cittamani*, In fact, a very similar idea is referred to in the *Enkai jūroku jō* as well.

[402] ZTZ. Enkai 1. p. 76a and b. For the Iron Tower of the South India, see; Abe Ryūichi (1999) pp. 131-133.
[403] See the chapter for Yōsai's thought.

> For the substance of the precepts as the *cittamani*, it is the *mudrā* of Sarasvatī (*Benzai ten* 弁才天). For us of the Precepts Group, the *cittamani* which the Dragon keeps is what it is… This [*cittamani*] is the *Śarīra* of the Buddha in the former *kalpas*; the *Śarīra* is the substance of the precepts; this substance transforms into Sarasvatī to protect the substance of the precepts itself.
>
> (ZTZ. Enkai 1 p. 88a)

Kōen's *Enkai jūroku jō* explains that the *Śarīra* has a symbolic meaning indicating the combination of three bodies of Buddha, where a single body of the Buddha comprehends the three. Furthermore, the *Enkai jūroku jō* asserts that the embodiment of the perfection of the three bodies is equivalent to obtaining the substance of the precepts in this very phenomenal world, or indeed this flesh body.[404] Taking this into account, the following citation is highly evocative of Yōsai's notable contribution to the development of the Precepts Group.

> The [syllable] *Bhrūṃ* is the seed [of the perfection of the three bodies], namely the [*uṣṇīṣa* Buddha of] the Golden wheel (*kinrin bucchō* 金輪[仏頂]) or the *uṣṇīṣa* [Buddha] of the flames (*shijōkō bucchō* 熾盛光仏頂). In addition, the Shakyamuni, whose body shines the colour of red crystal, is identical with the [*uṣṇīṣa* Buddha of the] Golden wheel. The [syllable] *Bhrūṃ* is the secret [meaning] of the *Śarīra*; that is, the whole body is the *Śarīra* equal to the perfection of the three bodies [of Buddha].

[404] ZTZ. Enkai 1 p. 100a

(ZTZ. Enkai 1 p. 102a and b)

Kōen's way of using the syllable *Bhrūṃ*, *i.e., Śarīra*, as the substance of the precepts is exactly the same as in Yōsai, as has been examined before. The rest of examples of Yōsai's influence on the Precepts Group are not as clear cut as the above case, but they are suggestive nonetheless. Among these examples, the notion of the One Mind precept seems closely linked to Yōsai.

One Mind Precepts

The term One Mind Precepts, at first, reminds us of Kōjō 光定 (779 - 858) and his *Denjutsu isshinkai mon* 伝述一心戒文. However, not many Tendai scholar monks had employed the term until the emergence of the Precepts Group. Presumably, Jien, a contemporary of Yōsai, may have been the first scholar monk who referred to this terminology prior to the emergence of the Precepts group. It is noteworthy that Jien's idea of the One Mind precepts, in the context of Precepts Group, closely resembles Yōsai's ideas concerning esoteric precepts, which developed on the basis of the *Putixin lun*.[405]

Let us look at the *Endon sanju isshin kai* 円頓三聚一心戒, which is attributed to Yōsai. The colophon of this work does not reveal the year of composition. According to my analysis of the *Endon sanju isshin kai*, there is no apparent connection between this text and Yōsai's other works; for example, Yōsai hardly ever argued about the precepts based on the *Fahua jing*, while the *Endon sanju isshin kai* contains such an argument. It is thus likely that the *Endon sanju isshin kai* is an apocryphal work purposely presented in Yōsai's name. In my

[405] Misaki Ryōshu (1994) pp.192 - 194

opinion, the text's anonymous author was most likely a member belonging of the Precepts Group, whose sectarian strategy may have required presence of Yōsai's reputation for one reason or another. In this respect, firstly, this part of the present study will inquire after the meaning of the One Mind Precept in the *Endon sanju isshin kai*. Secondly, the discourse of the One Mind Precept in the Precepts Group, and its relation with the *Endon sanju isshin kai* will be surveyed. This will demonstrate the ways in which Yōsai has contributed to the tradition of Precept Consecration.

The *Endon sanju isshin kai* mainly deals with the *Fahua jing* precepts and the ten good precepts based on the *Fanwang jing*. They were collectively known as the Perfect precepts since Annen, but they did not gain popularity among Tendai monks until the late Kamakura period. The *Endon sanju isshin kai* contains strong towards tendency affirming the relaxed attitudes towards precepts and *vinaya* / monastic codes that characterise Tendai Perfect precepts. Thus, the *Endon sanju isshin kai*, by advocating the importance of the Tendai Perfect precepts, in this sense contradicts to the contents of the *Kōzen gokoku ron*, the primary theme of which was to advance a strict observation of *vinaya*.[406] The following passage reveals the idea of the *Fahua jing* precepts disagrees with Yōsai's opinions of the precepts and *vinaya* as stated in his late career.

[406] The reason why Yōsai did not emphasise the precepts at this stage could have been that he knew that the precepts could easily be violated by following the major interpretation constructed by Annen. Needless to say, Yōsai himself was once interested in discerning the ultimate meaning of the precepts, as has been noted previously.

> The One Mind Precepts of the Diamond treasure are said to be that one's own mind is immediately and innately Buddha. Being aware of it as such is the *Fahua jing* precepts. The One Mind is the seed of innumerable [Buddha] laws. In the *Fahua* [*jing*], it is called the non-aspect… The *Mohe zhiguan* says that a thought-moment is the principle of the *tathāgata garbha*.[407]

While Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkai mon* regarded the ten good precepts as the One Mind precepts, the composer of the *Endon sanju isshin kai* considered the *Fahua jing* precepts to be those of the One Mind. As was noted, the *Fahua jing* precepts rose in prominence in the late Kamakura period. Furthermore, although the *Kōzen gokoku ron* promoted observation of the *vinaya*, and it had long been ignored by Japanese monks, the *Endon sanju isshin kai*, however, took quite different a stance by asserting that "one's own mind is immediately and innately Buddha"; thus showing characteristics of original enlightenment thought. Clearly, the authenticity of the *Endon sanju isshin kai* as a genuine work of Yōsai needs to be questioned.

Here, the issue as to who actually composed the *Endon sanju isshin kai* cannot be ignored. My hypothesis, which has already been hinted at above, is that one of the members of the Precepts group wrote this work under Yōsai's name. Unfortunately, to indicate a single individual is impossible. However, there is some circumstantial evidence in the texts of the Precepts group which lends weight to this conjuncture. I would also point out the frequent references to Yōsai contained in the works of the Precepts Group to draw our attention to support my hypothesis.

[407] Otani University manuscript.

As has been briefly mentioned, the *Tonchō himitsu kōyō* 頓超秘密綱要 (a.k.a. *Tendaichisha zenkan* 天台智者全肝), one of the three liturgical texts used by the Precepts group, is closely linked to Yōsai, as he was considered as its importer by some members of the Precepts group. Since Yōsai did not compile any catalogue of Buddhist scriptures, the veracity of this claim is impossible to ascertain. On the other hand, this claim does serve to further a kind of sectarian strategy in order to elevate the reason for the existence of the Precepts group. For example, the *Enkai jūroku jō* states:

> There is a document entitled *Tonchō himitsu kōyō* in one fascicle… This work was imported by Yōsai when he came back from his second study abroad in China. However, he did not leave any oral tips on the ordination ritual of the consecration. The colophon says that there are no oral tips, too. This means, there is no need for them for the ordination.
>
> (ZTZ. Enkai 1 p. 79a and b)

According to the above quotation, the authority of Yōsai in the Precepts group has clearly been manifested by Kōen. Kōen's motive for referring to Yōsai in his work is clear from the depiction of Yōsai in the *Keiran shūyō shū*.

The *Keiran shūyō shū* is well known for its crucial importance in exploring the medieval religious world of Japan. The work discusses many different religious phenomena, including Esotericism, Tendai perfect teachings, Shinto, Zen and the Precepts group. The composer of the *Keiran shūyō shū* is Kōshū, whose main lineage can be traced back to Kōen. Hence, Kōen was a member of the Precepts

Group. Apart from the *Keiran shūyō shū*, he produced the *Kaike chifukuro* 戒家智袋[408] in one fascicle, which was also a highly exhaustive composition, and mainly tackled doctrines from the standpoint of the Precepts group. Taking Kōshū's historical position and his thought into consideration, his reference to Yōsai in the *Keiran shūyō shū* is quite relevant. Among the many passages associated with Yōsai, the following two seem crucial to understand the sectarian strategy of the Precepts group.

> The master says that the laws of the two *maṇḍala*s 両部 are based on principle, which is the *dharmadhātu.* Thus, each function of the law is disconnected. This is named the phrase of non-function 死句 [in the Zen context]. The accomplishment class 蘇悉地 [constituting one of the threefold classes] enables the non-function to function; in terms of Zen, it is the phrase of function 活句… It is the oral transmission on the accomplishment class inherited from the abbot [Yōsai of] the Yōjō [lineage].
>
> (T. 76 no. 2410 p. 760b)

The next citation relates to the classification of teachings with respect to Esotericism and Zen.

> On the superiority of Esotericism to Zen:
> Kensai 見西, a disciple of the abbot Yōjō says that the fundamental point of Buddhism is to practice to improve [the stage of] mind… Shingon teachings

[408] ZTZ. Enkai 1 pp. 131 - 138

deal with something completely beyond the three studies. It is because of the merits of *dhāraṇī*; it is because of the becoming Buddha in this very body because the presence of Buddha is everywhere. Zen teachings are noble, but it is just a teaching preached by historical Buddha Shakyamuni.

(T. 76 no. 2410 p. 761a)

These two citations explain the interrelation between esoteric and Zen Buddhism, and eventually claim the superiority of Esotericism. This is precisely the sectarian strategy Yōsai was caught up in. This sectarian strategy consists of two factors. The first is that Yōsai actually has been much more esteemed by medieval monks than his image among contemporary scholarship would suggest. The involvement of significant figures in claiming the legitimacy of a certain group or institution has been a conventional way to elevate one's own group's economic, social, political and/or religious status. Exactly the same seems applicable to the relation of the Precepts group with Yōsai. Yōsai, closely associating with the newly emerged Kamakura bakufu, and a trailblazer of the Zen institution, was indeed an influential man in the politico-religious sphere of medieval Japan.[409]

The second factor is that the Precepts group manipulated the image of Yōsai skilfully. To begin with, it is hard to believe that Yōsai actually spoke as to the relative merits of esotericism and Zen Buddhism, because none of his works clearly states as such. Nonetheless, for the Precepts group, Yōsai must have been a Tendai/Taimitsu monk, who was supposed to claim the superiority of his own institution–which at the same time encompasses the Precepts group–over the Zen institution.

[409] See the part of Yōsai's biography.

Concluding Remarks

If we consider the historical background of the time when Precepts Group reached at its climax, we can point out that, in the early fourteenth century, state-sponsored Zen Buddhism attained its climax. Institutionally, the five mountains system (*gozan seido* 五山制度) was renewed under the supervision of the emperor Godaigo 後醍醐天皇 (1288 - 1339) whose appointment of Musō Soseki 夢窓疎石 (1275 - 1351) to the head abbotship of Nanzan temple 南山寺 is noteworthy. In addition, the emperor Godaigo's patronage of Buddhism in general was significant for the development of Buddhism. For this, many scholars have studied his close relation to Monkan, who has been known as the founder of the "heretical" Tachikawa lineage.[410] In such circumstances, it seems fair to say that the competition between Buddhist schools intensified as they vied to get more attention from the establishment. Taking this religious environment of the time into account, the Precepts Group would have been positioned as at least a rival against the Zen institution, and may have viewed them as their arch rival. Therefore, to compete with Zen, Yōsai, who has established its first official institution of Japan, and who also had Tendai/Taimitsu knowledge, was an empowering figure for the Precepts Group.[411] For this reason, the Taimitsu Buddhist side of Yōsai needed to be stressed. Moreover, the fact that Yōsai's interpretation of esoteric precepts heavily influenced the formulisation of that of the Precepts Group can also be seen as a pivotal contributing factor to explain the frequent references of Yōsai.

[410] For example, Kuroita Katsumi (1940), Moriyama Seishin (1965), and Amino Yoshihiko (1993)
[411] For the sponsorship of Emperor Godaigo, see Matuo Kenji (1995) pp. 167 – 194.

Conclusion

This study has sought to analyse Yōsai's thought, and contextualise it in the development of Buddhism in pre-modern Japan. To conduct this analysis, I have looked at Yōsai's doctrinal and practical issues together with his socio-political role, because I have hypothesised that one's social and political position can impact one's success at propagation of their thought.

This study has shed light on Yōsai's activities in early career, alongside his activities after his return from China. He had already been famous before his importation of Song Zen, because he closely served for a head abbot of Mt. Hiei, who permitted his study abroad. Eventually, he imported Song Tiantai commentaries, an invaluable set of texts at that time. However, Yōsai's such achievement was almost erased from the mainstream historical narrative, because he lost the religio-political power game, which was entwined with a series of civil wars between the Taira and Minamoto clans. Yōsai and the group of Mt. Hiei to which he belonged, declined in proportion to the downfall of their supporting clan, Taira clan. From this period to his second study abroad to China, Yōsai spent most of time in northern Kyushu, where a manor of the Taira clan was located. Yōsai's relationship with Taira clan lasted even after the fall of Taira establishment. He returned to political front again, and it was his "revival" as a key religio-political figure. Yōsai wrote the *Kōzen gokokuron*, Protection of Country by "Revival" of Zen, against such a background. "Revival" can be a key term to understand Yōsai, and, in fact, his idea of Buddhism was nothing new, indeed it was rather conservative. Kuroda Toshio dubbed this conservative or "orthodox" ideological paradigm as *kenmitsu* Buddhism. The characteristic of *kenmitsu* Buddhism was hold that

esoteric Buddhism comprehended all forms of religion, although esoteric foundation was sometimes hidden, either unconsciously or purposely. Since Yōsai wrote many esoteric writings, to overlook his esoteric thought would be to overlook the very core of his thought.

Therefore, this study paid attention to pre-modern Japanese esoteric Buddhism, particularly esoteric precepts. An analysis of esoteric precepts was necessitated by my hypothesis, that Yōsai's central thought was composed of esoteric precepts based on the *Putixin lun*, the most important esoteric treatise since Kūkai. However, Yōsai's interpretation of esoteric precepts has been impossible to contextualise in the transformation of esoteric precepts in pre-modern Japan without a new way of looking at esoteric source materials concerning the precepts.

The importance of esoteric precepts has been mentioned by modern scholars, but, because almost all were sectarian scholars, the way they saw esoteric precepts was limited to their own sectarian terms. The problems set forth in sectarian studies of precepts were attributable to their experiences through which they were ordained. Ordination constitutes sectarian identity, determining their standpoints to interpretations which they were actually transmitted. Furthermore, they often tended to conduct research only on key figures, such as Kūkai and Annen, who created the interpretative foundations of esoteric precepts, and then arrived at similar conclusions. However, Kūkai and Annen's interpretations have not been maintained purely as such research might lead one to believe, but rather, those interpretations came to be modified, abbreviated and sometimes misunderstood by later monks. Therefore, this study has carefully reread their original texts while

taking into account of the gap between pre-modern and modern/contemporary interpretations of esoteric precepts.

To contextualise Yōsai's core thought, which, in my hypothesis, consists of the interpretation of esoteric precepts, I have traced back to Chinese interpretations of the esoteric precepts. I have re-examined the most basic canonical texts, such as the *Dari jing*, the *Jingangding jing*, the *Putixin lun*, and their commentaries, all of which contain the sections concerning esoteric precepts. According to this examination, it has become evident that the esoteric precepts were not well formulated by Chinese esoteric scholar monks, neither in doctrinal nor liturgical senses. In other words, the definition of the precepts and the ordination procedure were not systematically studied, because of the fact that esoteric Buddhism had not been around long enough at that point. Thus, the task of systematisation remained, and it fell to the early prominent scholar monks of Japan to complete this crucial task.

Kūkai's composition of the *Sanmayakai jo*, composed on the basis of the *Putixin lun*, and Annen's production of liturgical commentaries for the *Dari jing*, shows their efforts towards systematisation. Eventually, Annen's definition of the precepts and ordination came to be the most accepted system, not only for Taimitsu, but also for post-Kūkai Tōmitsu. Yōsai's interpretation was founded on the above interpretation of the esoteric precepts. What I would like to emphasise particularly is his use of Enchin's thought in order to interpret the precepts. The rise of Enchin's lineage in the Insei period has been another key to decode Yōsai's interpretation, since the lineage had started to claim the independence of ordination platform from Mt. Hiei. Taking the above three Heian scholar monks, retrospectively considered as the founders of three major esoteric institutions, into

account of Yōsai's aim of dealing with the esoteric precepts, it is very likely that he tried to consolidate the claims provided by the above three establishments. Actually, Yōsai himself testified that he exhibited such an ambition in the *Kōzen gokokuron*, as he wrote "Zen is the foundation of all Buddhism, and the ultimate of Buddha's teachings."[412] Now, as we have seen, for him, "Zen" is the synonym of "*vinaya*." Therefore, unification of Buddhism by arguing precepts and *vinaya*, in institutional, liturgical and doctrinal terms, was his consistent assertion throughout his life.

The characteristic of Yōsai's interpretation of esoteric precepts can be recognised particularly in his opinion of the essence of precepts. Yōsai considered the essence of precepts as the *dharmakāya* Buddha, from which the preceptor bestowed it to recipient during the esoteric ordination rite. In other words, conducting ordination is a means to attain Buddhahood. Similar interpretation of the essence of precepts was seen in the *Hi sōjō shū*, composed in the early Kamakura period by unknown author. Unfortunately, it has been impossible to ascertain how esoteric ordination was performed by them. Some scholar monks in later periods, such as those who belonged to the Precepts Group, provide us with hints, because they employed the above interpretation, and established the ritual, namely *kai kanjō*, or the Precept Consecration.

The question arises as to why Yōsai was interested in the precepts and *vinaya*. It seems to me that it was an intellectual paradigm of medieval Buddhism, particularly Tendai school. Actually, quite a few numbers of works concerning the precepts were produced in this period. Contemporaneously with Yōsai, Jien wrote the *Bisei betsu* 毘麗別, in which he interpreted *abhiṣeka*, which was identical with

[412] T. 80 no. 2543 p. 5c.

ordination in Taimitsu exegesis. Other Tendai scholar monks, such as Ninkū, composed a commentary on the *Pusajie yishu*, a text attributed to Zhiyi. Although none of the above scholar monks mention their motives for writing these works connecting to the precepts, one can presume that they might have been attempting to reconsider Saichō and Annen's interpretations of the precepts, both of which showed loose attitude towards the precepts. Other likely factors triggering the reconsideration would be Nakagawa Jippan's reconstruction of the ordination procedure of Tōdai temple. However, their aims at revisiting precepts and *vinaya* came out of different interests. That is, the main concern of Nara scholar monks of this time was to downgrade the precepts so that novices could receive full ordination, whereas Tendai made the interpretation of the precepts or ordination more severe in both the doctrinal and liturgical sense.

How, then, should we read those revisions of precepts and *vinaya* in the context of medieval Japanese Buddhism? Matsuo Kenji's theory is that *vinaya* practitioners in black robes (*kokue* 黒衣), who often dropped out of bureaucratic system (*tonse* 遁世) and who played role of temple solicitors, dominated the religious reality of the medieval period, and this may explain the influence that it exerted on those scholar monks.[413] Yōsai can be considered as one of the innovators of this movement, because Matsuo's theory is almost fully applicable to him, although Yōsai was given a bureaucratic title, *sojō*, after he left Mt. Hiei. Indeed, while, Matsuo's theory offers an interesting perspective through which to observe medieval Buddhism, three issues remain. First is Matsuo's assessment of the Precepts Group, which he calls the New *Vinaya* school (*shingi risshū* 新義律宗). Matsuo invented the term "New *Vinaya* school," even though the *vinaya* was not

[413] Matsuo Kenji (1996)

their major concern in accordance with Japanese Tendai principle since Saichō. Second is that Matsuo does not clarify doctrinal aspect of medieval *Vinaya* school, consisting of *Zen-Ritu* 禅律 and *Shingon-Ritsu* 真言律 ideologies. This is not Matsuo's fault, because only little source materials remain, and it attributes most likely to their primary concern has been practices. In such circumstance, however, Yōsai can be an important representative of *Shingon-Ritsu* ideology, which has often considered that Eison 叡尊 (1201 - 1290) is the originator of this movement, since he argued comprehensively on the basis of esoteric precepts and *vinaya*. Third is that, according to Matsuo's theory, Saichō could have been categorised as a *tonse* monk, because he rejected the official ordination system of his time, after he ordained at the ordination platform of the Tōdai temple and studied abroad in China at government expense. It is well known that Saichō propagated the so-called, *Mahāyāna* precepts that he received in China, and attempted to establish an ordination platform on Mt. Hiei.[414] The second issue may show a possibility that Matsuo's theory can apply to Heian Buddhism, like Kuroda's *kenmitsu* theory.

Yōsai's position in Japanese Buddhist history is clear in both Kuroda and Matsuo's theories, as he was a dominant political figure as a *vinaya* monk, who also followed the "orthodox" Buddhism, the *kenmitsu* Buddhism; nevertheless modern scholarship has taken precious little notice of Yōsai and his role. As has been mentioned in the introduction, the reason for this neglect seems attributable to Taimitsu doctrines and practices, regarding which much study remains to be done. In order to paint a more accurate and vivid picture of medieval Japanese Buddhism, a more integrated doctrinal and liturgical understanding of the aspect of esoteric Buddhism in Heian period is necessary.

[414] Paul Groner (1984) pp. 109 - 116

Bibliography

Abbreviations

DNBZ. Dai nihon bukkyō zensho 大日本仏教全書. 151 vols. Ed. Nanjo Fumio. Bussho kanko kai, 1912-1922 Tokyo.

DNK. Dai nihon komonjo 大日本古文書. Ed. Tokyo daigaku 1901- Tokyo.

DNS. Dai nihon shiryō 大日本資料. Ed. Tokyo daigaku shuppan kai, 1901- Tokyo.

DZ. Dengyō daishi zenshū 伝教大師全集. Ed. Tendaishū shūten kankōkai. 1912. Shiga.

KDZ. Kōbōdaishi zenshū 弘法大師全集.Ed. Sofū senyō kai. 1909 – 1910 Tokyo.

KT. Kokushi taikei 国史大系. Ed. Keizai zasshi sha. 1897 – 1901 Tokyo.

NDZ. Nihon daizōkyō 日本大蔵経. 100 vols. Ed. Matsumoto Bunzaburo and Nakano Tatsue. Nihondaizokyo hensankai, 1914-1922 Tokyo.

NG. Nichirenshōnin goibun 日蓮聖人御遺文. Ed. Katō Fumimasa. 1904.

NKBT. Nihon kotenbungaku taikei 日本古典文学大系. Ed. Iwanami shoten. 1957-1966 Tokyo.

NST. Nihon shisō taikei 日本思想大系. Ed. Iwanami shoten. 1971-1982 Tokyo.

SSZ. Shōwa teihon nichiren ibun 昭和定本日蓮遺文. Ed. Risshōdaigaku Nichiren kyōgaku kenkyūjo. 1989 Minobu.

SZ. Shingonshū zensho 真言宗全書. Ed. Takaoka Ryūshin. Shingonsū zensho kankōkai. 1933 – 1939 Tokyo.

T. Taisho Shinsyu Daizokyō 大正新侑大蔵経. 100 vols. Ed. Takakusu Junjiro and Watanabe Kaikyoku. Daizokyo kai, 1924-1935 Tokyo

TZ. Tendaishū zensho 天台宗全書. Ed. Tendai shūten hensanjo. 1973 – 1974 Shiga.

ZGR. Zoku gunsho ruijū 続群書類従. 33vols. Ed. Hanawa Hokiichi. Zoku gunsho ruijū kanseikai 1923 – 1934 Tokyo.

ZSZ. Zoku shingonshū zensho 続真言宗全書. Ed. Nakamura Zenkyō. 1975-1988 Wakayama.

ZTZ. Zoku tendaishū zensho 続天台宗全書. Ed. Tendai shūten hensanjo. 1987 - Shiga.

Original Sources

Chengjiu miaofalianhua jingwang yugaguanzhi yigui 成就妙法蓮華経王瑜伽観智儀軌. T. 19 no. 1000, 594-602.

Dafangguangfo huayan jing 大方広仏華厳経. T. 9 no. 278, 395-788.

Dapiluzhenajing gongyang cidifashu 大毘盧遮那経供養次第法疏 T. 39 no. 1797, 790-807.

Dari jing chisong cidi yigui 大日経持誦次第儀軌. T. 18 no. 860, 181-188.

Dapiluzhena chengfo shenbian jiachi jing 大毘盧遮那成仏神変加持経. T. 18 no. 848, 1-55.

Dapiluzhena chengfo jing shu 大毘盧遮那成仏経疏. T. 39 no. 1796, 579-789.

Dapiluzhenafo shuo yaolue niansong jing 大毘盧遮那仏説要略念誦経. T. 19 no. 849, 55-64.

Dasheng qixin lun 大乗起信論. T. 32 no. 1666, 575-583.

Dezanpusa yigui 地蔵菩薩儀軌. T. 20 no. 1158, 652.

Fanwang jing lushena fashuo pusaxinde jiepin 梵網経盧舎那仏説菩薩心地戒品. T. 24 no. 1484, 997-1010

Fantian huoluo jiuyao 梵天火羅九曜. T. 21 no. 1311, 459-462.

Fodingzunshengxin podeyu zhuanyezhang chusanjie mimituoluoni 仏頂尊勝心破地獄転業障出三界秘密陀羅尼. T. 18 no. 907, 914-915.

Foshuo dabeikongzhi jingangdingdajiaowang yi 仏説大悲空智金剛大教王儀. T. 18 no. 892, 587-602.

Foshuo guan wuliangshoufo jing 仏説観無量寿仏経. T. 12 no. 365, 340-346.

Foshuo yiqierulai jingangsanye zuishangbimi dajiaowang jing 仏説一切如来金剛三業最上秘密大教王経. T. 18 no. 885, 469-511.

Jingangding jing xinniansong yigui 金剛頂経蓮華部心念誦儀軌. T. 18 no. 873, 299-310.

Jingangding jing yuqie shibahui zhigui 金剛頂経瑜伽十八会指帰. T. 18 no. 869, 284-287.

Jinggangding yuqie lueshu sanshiqizun xinyao 金剛頂瑜伽略述三十七尊心要. T. 18 no. 871, 291-297.

Jingangding yuqiezhong fa anouduolou sanmiao sanputixin lun 金剛頂瑜伽中発阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心論. T. 32 no. 1665, 572–574.

Jingangfenglouge yiqie yugayuzhi jing 金剛峯楼閣一切瑜伽瑜祇経 T. 18 no. 867 253-269.

Niansongjiehufa putongzhubu 念誦結護法普通諸部. T. 18 no. 904, 900-909.

Piluzhena chenfo shenbian jiachi jing yishi 毘盧遮那成仏神変加持経義釈. ZTZ. Mikkyō I.

Putichangshuo yijidinglunwang jing 菩提場所説一字頂輪王経. T. 19 no. 950, 193-224.

Qingse dajingangyaocha piguimofa. 青色大金剛薬叉辟鬼魔**法**. T. 21 no. 1221, 99-102.

Qiyaoxingchen biexing fa 七曜星辰別行法. T. 21 no. 1309, 452-457.

Shengmudongzun daweifennuwang niansong 聖無動尊大威忿怒王念誦. T. 21 no. 1199,

1-7.

Shouhu guojiezhu tuoluoni jing 守護国界主陀羅尼経. T. 19 no. 997, 525-577

Suxidijieluo jing 蘇悉地羯羅経 (Jpn. *Soshijjikyara kyō*) T. 18 no. 893, 603–33.

Weimojie suoshou jing 維摩詰所説経 (Jpn. *Yuimakitsu shosetsu kyō*) T. 14 no. 475, 537-557.

Zunshengtuoluoni podiyu yigui 尊勝陀羅尼破地獄儀軌 (Jpn. *Sonsho darani hajigoku giki*; full title: *Bucchoson shoshinhajigoku tengoshoshutsusankai himitsusanjin bukka sanjushitsuji shingongiki*) T. 18 no. 906, 912-914.

Annen 安然 (841-889, 915)

(882) *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒広釈. T. 74 no. 2381, 757-779.

(885?) *Taizōkongō bodaishingi ryaku mondōshō* 胎蔵金剛菩提心義略問答抄. T. 75 no. 2397, 451-560.

(?) *Shingonū kyōji gi* 真言宗教時義. T. 75 no. 2396, 374-450.

(?) *Kanchūin senjō jigōkanjō gusoku shibun* 観中院撰定事業具足支分. T. 75 no. 2393, 213-298.

(?) *Kongōburōkaku issaiyugi kyō shugyōbō* 金剛峯楼閣一切瑜祇経修行法. T. 61 no. 2228, 485-504.

(?) *Kōshō fudōmyōō hiyōketsu* 広摂不動明王秘要決. NDZ. 43, 136-141.

(?) *Kongōkai daihō taijuki* 金剛界大法対受記. T. 75 no. 2391, 116-199

Bukesiyi 不可思議 (?-?)

(?)*Dapiluzhenajing gongyang cidifashu* 大毘盧遮那経供養次第法疏. T. 39 no. 1797, 790-807

Bukong 不空 (705-774)

(?) *Jingangding jing yujue* 金剛頂経義訣. (Jpn. *Kongōchō kyō giketsu*, full title: *Jingangding jing dayuga bimixinde famen* 金剛頂経大瑜伽秘密心地法門) T. 39 no. 1798, 808-822.

Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667)

(626) *Sifenlu shanfanbuque cingshichao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔. T. 40 no. 1804, 1-156.

Echin 恵鎮 (1281-1356)

(1354) Bosatsukai sho kikigaki 菩薩戒疏聞書. ZTZ Enkai II,

Enchin 円珍 (814-891)

(882) *Sasa gimon* 些些疑文. NBZ. Vol. 27, 1037-1069.

(886 or 887) *Bodaijō kyō ryakugishaku* 菩提場経略義釈. T. 61 no. 2230, 513-564.

(?) *Zōmon zōki* 雑問雑記. (Extinct)

(?) *Dainichi kyō shiiki* 大日経指帰. T. 58 no. 2212, 12-21.

(?) *Dainichi kyō shinmoku* 大日経心目. T. 58 no. 2212, 21-24

Ennin 円仁 (794-864)

(851) *Kongōchō daikyōō kyō sho* 金剛頂大教王経疏. T. 61 no. 2223, 7-114.

Enrin 円琳 (1190-?)

(1237) *Bosatsukaigi shōsho* 菩薩戒義疏鈔. DNBZ. Vol. 71. 1-148.

Ejin 恵尋 (?-1268-1289-?)

(?) *Endonkai kikigaki* 円頓戒聞書. ZTZ. Enkai I.204-253.

Genjō 玄静 (?-890-904-?)

Nyūmandara jubosatsukai gyōgi 入曼荼羅受菩薩戒行儀. SZ. 27, 31-55.

Gōhō 杲宝 (1306-1362)

(1350) *Hōsaku shō* 宝冊鈔. T. 77 no. 2453, 786-836.

Guanding 灌頂 (561 - 632)

Guanxin (*song*) *shierbu jing yi* 観心(誦)十二部経義. ZTZ. Enkai I, 334-364.

Haiyun 海雲 (?-834-874)

(834) *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji* 両部大法相承師資付法記. T. 51 no. 2081, 783-787.

Jien 慈円 (1155 - 1225)

(1220?) *Gukanshō* 愚管抄. NST. Vol. 86.

Jōhen 静遍 (1166-1224)

(1216) *Hishū mongi yō* 秘宗文義要. SZ. 22, 71-77

(1224) *Benkenmitsu nikyōron tekagami shō* 辯顯密二教論手鏡鈔. ZSZ. 18.

Kakuchō 覚超 (960-1034)

(1013) *Gosōjōjin shiki* 五相成身私記. T. 75 no. 2403, 783-799.

Kakuban 覚鑁 (1095-1144)

(?) *Gorinkujimyō himitsu shaku* 五輪九字明秘密釈. T. 79 no. 2514, 11-22.

Kaikaku 戒覚 (?-?)

(1083) *Tosō ki* 渡宋記. ZTZ. Shiden II, 320-325.

Kōan Shūgen 亨菴宗元 (?-?)

Mizukamisen manjukaizan jinshizenji gyōjitsu 水上山万寿開山神子禅師行実. ZGR. Vol. 9-1. 292-296.

Kōen 興円 (1262-1317)

(1313) *Enkai jūroku jō* 円戒十六帖. ZTZ. Enkai I, 76-115.

Kōjō 光定 (779-858)

(?-838) *Denjutsu isshinkai mon* 伝述一心戒文. T. 74 no. 2379, 634-660.

Kokan Shiren 虎関師錬 (1278-1346)

(1322) *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釈書. DNBZ. Vol. 101. 133-512

Kūkai 空海 (774-835)

(807) *Jōshin shōraikyō tō mokurokuhyō* 上新請来経等目録表. (a.k.a. *Goshōrai mokuroku* 御請来目録)T. 55 no. 2161, 1060-1066.

(822) *Heizeitennō kanjō mon* 平城天皇灌頂文. T. 78 no. 2461, 1-3.

(822?) *Sanmayakai jo* 三昧耶戒序. T. 78 no. 2462, 4-6.

(830?) *Himitsumandara jūjusshin ron* 秘密曼荼羅十住心論. T. 77 no. 2425, 303-362.

(?) *Himitsumandara kyō fuhō den* 秘密曼荼羅教付法伝. KDZ. Vol. 1, 1-49.

(?) *Kyōō kyō kaidai* 教王経開題. T. 61 no. 2222, 5-7.

Mujū Ichien 無住 一円 (1226-1312)

(1307) *Shaseki shū* 沙石集. NKBT. 85.

Nichiren 日蓮 (1222-1282)

(1242) *Kaitai sokushin jōbutsu gi* 戒体即身成仏義. SSN. 1. 1-15

(1243) *Kaihōmon* 戒法門. NG. 16-28.

Ninkū 仁空 (1309-1388)

(1385) *Bosatsukai giki kikigaki* 菩薩戒義記聞書. TZ. 15, 1-598.

Oe no Masafusa 大江匡房 (1041-1111)

(1109) *Taniajari den* 谷阿闍梨伝. ZTZ. Shiden II. 316-319.

Qianzhen 潜真 (?-?)

(?) *Putixin yi* 菩提心義. T. 46 no. 1953, 987-988.

Saichō 最澄 (766 [767]-822)

(819) *Kenkai ron* 顕戒論. DZ I, 25-198.

(819) *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* 内証仏法相承血脈譜. DZ. Vol II. 513-563.

(?) *Tendaihokkeshū gakushōshiki mondō* 天台法華宗学生式問答. (Attributed to Saichō) DZ. I, 335-414.

Shanwuwei 善無畏 (637-735)

(?) *Wuweisanzang shoujiechanhuiwen ji chanmen yaofa* 無畏三蔵受戒懺悔文及禅門要**法**. (Abbr. *Wuweisanzang chanyao* 無畏三蔵禅要.) T. 75 no. 917, 942-946.

Shukaku hosshinnō 守覚法親王 (1150-1202)

(?) *Hishō* 秘鈔. T. 78 no. 2489, 483-583

Tetsugyū Enshin 鉄牛円心 (1254-1326)

Tōfuku kaizan Shōitsu kokushi nenpu 東福開山聖一国師年譜. DNBZ. Vol. 95 129-150.

Yōsai 栄西 (1141-1215)

(1175) *Shutten taikō* 出纏大綱. NDZ 45 (Tendaishu mikkyōbu shosō 天台宗密教部章疏 3): 648-655

——— *Tai kuketsu* 胎口決. Eizan bunko 叡山文庫, Shinnyozō 真如蔵.

——— *Kaihen kyoshu ketsu* 改変教主決. In Shinpukuji Osubunko shogyotenkan chusei shūkyō tekusuto no sekai, 25-38.

(1176) *Kyojigi kammon* 教時義勘文. NDZ 45 (Tendaishu mikkyōbu shosō 天台宗密教部章疏 3): 401-410.

(1177) *Mumyo shu* 無名集. In Abe and Yamasaki (2006), pp. 431-442.

(1178) *Urabon ipponkyo engi* 盂蘭盆一品経縁起. DNBZ. Vol. 115 503-504.

——— *Imazu seiganji sōken engi* 今津誓願寺創建縁起. DNBZ. Vol. 115 505.

——— *Hokekyō nyushingon monketsu* 法華経(入)真言門決. Eizan bunko 叡山文庫. Yokokawa Bettodai zosho 横川別当代蔵書. 1930 Kyoto.

(1181) *Ingoshū* 隠語集. In Abe and Yamasaki (2006), pp. 445-456.

(1187) *Kongōchōshū bodaishinron kuketsu* 金剛頂宗菩提心論口決. T. 70, no.2293 29-32.

(1195) *Shukke taikō* 出家大綱. DNS. Juntoku Tenno Kenpo sannen shichigatsu nanoka 順徳天皇建保三年七月五日, pp. 708-709 and 711.

(1198) *Kōzen gokoku ron* 興禅護国論. T. 80 no.2543, 1-17.

Miraiki 未来記. T. 80 no. 2543, 17.

(1204) *Nihon buppō chūkō gammon* 日本仏法中興願文. DNBZ. Vol. 125 371b-373a

(1211) *Kiccha yōjō ki* 喫茶養生記. DNBZ. Vol. 115 505-518.

Yuanzhao 円照 (?-?)

(800) *Zengyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釈教目録. T. 55 no. 2157, 771-1048.

Yuiken 惟賢 (?-?)

(1359) *Bosatsu endonjukai kanjō ki* 菩薩円頓授戒灌頂記. T. 74 no. 2383, 787-798.

Zhipan 志磐 (? - ?)

(1269) *Fozu tongji* 仏祖統記. T. 49 no. 2035, 129-476.

Zhisheng 智昇 (668-740)

(730) *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釈教録. T. 55 no. 2145, 477-723

Zhiyi 智顗 (538-597)

(593) *Miaofalianfa jing xuanyi* 妙法蓮華経玄義. T. 33 no. 1796, 681-814.

(?-597) *Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩経文疏. X. 18 no. 0388, 462-703.

(?-597) *Miaofalianfa jing wenju* 妙法蓮華経文句. T. 34 no. 1718, 1-150.

(?) *Pusajie yishu* 菩薩戒義疏.　T. 40 no. 1811, 563-580.

(Unknown Authors)

(1010) Shitsuji den 悉地伝. ZTZ. Shiden II. 155-159.

(1217) *Hisōjō shū* 秘相承集. ZTZ. Mikkyō III. 32-45.

(10th century) *Ihon sokushinjōbutsu gi* 異本即身成仏義. NDZ. 43, 228-236.

(12th centu) *Tendai hokkeshū gozuhōmon yōsan* 天台法華宗牛頭法門要纂. NST. Tendai hongaku ron 天台本覚論. 23-40.

(13th century)*Bodaishinron kenmon* 菩提心論見聞. T. 70 no. 2294, 33-116.

(13th century) *Denshin kashō den* 伝信和尚伝. ZTZ. Shiden II, 410-429

(Mid-Edo period) *Fusō gozan ki* 扶桑五山記. In Kamakurashi bunkazai shiryō Vol. 2.

(Other)

Hyakuren shō 百錬抄. KT. Vol. 14

Teiō hennen ki 帝王編年記. KT. Vol. 12.

Tendai zasu ki 天台座主記. ZGR. Vol. 4-2

Tōji tendai kechimyakuzu 東寺天台血脈図. DNK. Iewake 20 Tofukuji monjo I. 70-74

Tsurugaoka hachimangūji gusō shidai 鶴岡八幡宮寺供僧次第. ZGR. Vol.104

Secondary Sources

Abe Ryūichi (1999) *The Weaving of Mantra*. New York. Columbia University Press.

Abe Yasurō and Yamasaki Makoto (2006) *Chusei sentoku chosakushu* 中世先徳著作集. Kyoto: Rinsen shoten, pp. 521-536.

Anami Stibbs Virginia (2007) *Following the Tracks of Ennin's 9th C. Journey*. Beijin: China International Press.

Asai Endō (1975) *Jōko nihon tendai honmon shisō shi* 上古日本天台本門思想史. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten.

Bielefeldt Carl (2002) Disarming the Superpowers: The abhijñā in Eisai and Dōgen. In *Dōgen zenji kenkyū ronshū*, Ed. Daihonzan Eiheiji Daionki Kyoku, pp. 1018-1046. Fukui: Eiheiji.

Bodhiford William (2005) Bodhidharma's Precepts in Japan In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Brinker Helmt (1997/1998) Facing the Unseen: On the Interior Adornment of Eizon's Iconic Body. In *Archives of Asian Art*. Vol. 50. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Chen Jinhua (2010) *Crossfire Shingon-Tendai Strife as Seen in Two Twelfth-century, with Special References to Their Background in Tang China*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of The International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.

Chi Limei (2008) *Tōdai tendaibukkyō fukkōundō kenkyū josetsu: keikei tannnen to sono shikanbugyōden guketsu* 唐代天台仏教復興運動研究序説：荊渓湛燃とその止観輔行伝弘決. Daitō shuppan: Tokyo

Dolce Lucia (Forthcoming) *Esoteric Patterns in Nichiren's Interpretation of the Lotus Sūtra*. Leiden.

———— (2002) Between Duration and Eternity: Hermeneutics of the "Ancient Buddha" of the *Lotus Sūtra* in Chih-I and the Nichiren. In: *A Buddhist Kaleidoscope: Essays on the Lotus Sūtra.* pp. 223-239 Ed. Reeves G.Tokyo: Kōsei shuppan.

———— (2006) Reconsidering the Taxonomy of the Esoteric. Hermeneutical and Ritual Practices of the *Lotus Sūtra*. In: *The Culture of Secrecy in Japanese Religion.* pp. 130-171 Eds. Scheid, B. and Teeuwen, M. London: Routledge

Etani Ryūkai (1978) *Endonkai gairon* 円頓戒概論. Tokyo: Daitō shuppan sha.

Faure Bernard (2003) Quand l'habit fait le moine: the symbolism of the kasaya in Soto Zen in Chan Buddhism in Ritual Context. London: RoutledgeCurzon

Fukuda Gyōei (1954) *Tendaigaku gairon* 天台学概論. Tokyo: Seikosha.

Furuta Shōkin (1977) *Eisai* 栄西. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Girard Frederic (2007) *The stanza of the bell in the wind*: Zen and nenbutsu in the early Kamakura period. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies.

Gomi Fumihiko (1998) *Nihon no chūsei* 日本の中世. Tokyo: Nihon hōsō shuppan kyōkai.

Groner Paul (1984) *Saicho : the establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. California: University of California Berkley.

———— (1989) The Lotus sūtra and Saichō's Interpretation of the Realisation of Buddhahood with This Very Body. In *The Lotus sūtra in Japanese Culture*. Eds. Tanabe George and Tanabe Willa. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

———— (1990) The Fanwang ching and Monastic Discipline in Japanese tendai: A Study of Annen's Futsū kōshaku. In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Ed. Buswell, R. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

———— (2003) Jitsudō Ninkū on Ordinations. In *Japan Review* 15 pp. 51-75. Kyoto: Kokusai nihonbunka kenkyū sentā.

———— (2007) Can the precepts be lost? Can the precepts be violated?: The role of the Pusajie yiji in medieval Tendai discussion of the precepts. In *Kokusai tendai gakkai ronshū* 国際天台学論集. pp. 165-200. Shiga: Tendai gakkai.

———— (2009) Kōen and the 'Consecrated Ordination' within Japanese Tendai. In *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia*: *Places of Practice*. pp. 178-207. Eds. James Alexander Benn, Lori R. Meeks, James Robson. New York: Routledge.

Hanuki Masai (1985) Eisai no nissō kichō to kamakura gyōke. In Eisai zenji to rinzaishū 栄西禅師と臨済宗. Eds. Hirano Shūjō and Katō Masatoshi. Tokyo: Yoshikawakōbun kan.

Hazama Jikō (1948) *Nihonbukkyō no kaiten to sono kichō*, jō ge. 日本仏教の開展とその基調 上・下. Tokyo: Sanseidō shuppan.

Ibuki Atsushi (2002) Nenbutsukagami ni miru hasseiki kōhan no zen no dōkō. In *Tōyō gaku ronsō, Tōyōdaigaku bungakubu kiyō* 28 東洋学論叢 東洋大学文学部紀要 28. Tokyo: Tōyō daigaku

Ichikawa Shunsuke (1978) *Okayama no jinja bukkaku* 岡山の神社仏閣. Okayama. Nihon bunkyō shuppan

Inada Soken (1936) *Taimitsushoryu meigi ko*. In Eizan gakuho 叡山学報 VI. Kyoto: Dobo sha, pp. 2-38. 10

Ishida Mizumaro (1962) Mappōtōmyō ki nit suite. In *Indogaku bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 20 印度学仏教学研究 20. pp. 148-151.

———— (1963) *Nihonbukkyō niokeru kairitsu no kenkyū* 日本仏教における戒律の研究. Tokyo: Zaike bukkyō kyōkai.

———— (1986) *Kairitsu no kenkyū* 戒律の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Ishikawa Rikizan (2001) *Zenshū sōdden shiryō no kenkyū* 禅宗相伝資料の研究. Hōzōkan: Kyoto.

Iyanaga Nobumi (2011) Tachikawa-ryū. In *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*. Leiden ・Boston: Brill. pp. 803 – 814.

Katō Yūyū (1941) Kōraizō hon bodaishin ron nit suite. In *Mikkyō kenkyū* 78 密教研究 78. Kōyasan. pp. 1 – 22.

Kinugawa Satoshi (2004) Dōshū taisan to enryakuji no heiwa in *Enryakuji to ch ūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会. Kyoto. Hōzōkan. pp. 36 – 57.

Kubota Tesshō (1986) Annen no samayakai setsu ni tsuite. In *Indogaku bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 35 印度学仏教学研究 35. pp. 150-153.

———— (1990) Onjōji kaidan kitsunan tō nit suite. In *Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō* 7 東洋の思想と宗教 7. Tokyo: Waseda tōyō tetsugaku kai.

———— (1992) Annen no samayakai setsu nit suite 2. In *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 38 印度学仏教学研究 38. pp. 90-95

———— (2002) Eizan onjō kaidan ronsō. In *Bukkyō shisō to sono tenkai* 仏教思想とその展開. Ed. Misaki Ryōshū. Tokyo: Sankibō.

Kuroda Toshio (1994) Kenmitsu taisei ron. In *Kuroda toshio chosakushū* 2 黒田俊雄著作集 2. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Maekawa Mitsuru (1997) *Kurashikifukuyama to anyōji* 倉敷福山と安養寺. Okayama. Nihon bukyōshuppan.

Masaki Kisaburō (1978) Chikuzen koku itonoshō nitsuite in *Zoku shōensei to bukeshakai* 続荘園制と武家社会. Ed. Takeuchi rizō hakase kokikinen kai. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunsha.

Matsunaga Daigan and Alicia (1976) The *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*. Tokyo: Kenkyū sha.

Matsunaga Yūkei (2006) *Indo kōki mikkyō* インド後期密教. Tokyo: Shunjū sha.

Matsuo Kenji (1995) *Kanjin to hakai no chsūei shi* 勧進と破戒の中世史. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunsha.

———— (2007) *A history of Japanese Buddhism*. Folkestone: Global Oriental.

Mibu Taishun (1967) Eizan no shinpū, Sanke gakushōshiki, Nittō guhō junrei kōki. In *Nihon no bukkyō* 3 日本の仏教 3. Tokyo: Chikuma shobō.

Misaki Ryōshū (1978), Serata chorakuji shogyo rui. In *Gunmashi* 群馬県史: Shiryo hen

V. Chusei I. Ed. Gunmakenshi hensan iinkai. Gunma: Gunmaken, pp. 990-1020.

———— (1981) Jikakudaishi no kongōchōkyōsho no ichimondai. In Tendai gakuhō 24 天台学報 24. pp. 31-37. Shiga: Tendai gakkai.

———— (1994) *Taimitsu no riron to jissen* 台密の理論と実践. Tokyo: Sōbun sha.

———— (1996) Godaiin annen ni okeru samaji no shisō. In *Suguro Shinjo hakase kokikinen ronbunshū* 勝呂信静博士古希論文集. Tokyo: Sankibō

Minowa Kenryō (1999) *Chūsei shoki nanto kairitsu fukkō no kenkyū* 中世初期南都戒律復興の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan

Mizukami Fumiyoshi (2008) *Benen Enni no Yugikyo kaishaku*. In Tada Takamasa hakase kokikinen ronshu 多田孝正博士古希記念論集. Tokyo: Sankibo busshorin, pp. 639-656.

———— (2010) *Taimitsushisō keisei no kenkyū* 台密思想形成の研究. Tokyo: Shunjū sha.

Nakamura Honnen / Masafumi (1991) Jōhen no kyōgaku. In *Kōyasandaigaku ronsō* 26 高野山大学論叢 26. Wakayama: Kōyasan daigaku.

Nakao Ryōshin (1987) Taikō gyōyū no gyōjitsu. In *Sōtōshuū kenkyūin kenkyūkiyō* 19 曹洞宗研究員研究紀要 19. pp. 39 – 50.

———— (2005) *Nihonzenshu no densetsu to rekishi* 日本禅宗の伝説と歴史. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunkan.

Nomoto Kakujō (1986) *Tonchō himitsu kōyō kaidai* 頓超秘密綱要 解題. ZTZ. Mokuroku kaidai. pp. 224-225.

Okano Kōji (2009) *Heian makki ni okeru tendaisō no shugyō junrei*. In *Kurashiki no rekishi* 19 倉敷の歴史 19. Kurashiki. Kurashikishishi hensai shitsu.

Okonogi Teruyuki (2002) *Chūsei jiin to kantōbushi* 中世寺院と関東武士. Tokyo: Seishi shuppan.

Okubo Ryōjun (1985) Tendai genshi kimyō dan kanjō nit suite. In *Nihon bukkyō shisōshi ronshū* 3 日本仏教思想史論集 3. pp. 308-329. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōunan.

Okubo Ryōshun (2008) Tendai mikkyô no dentô. In *Kansei bunka kenkyūsho kiyō* 4, pp. 57-81. Tokyo: Kansei bunka kenkyū jo.

———— (2004) *Taimitsu kyōgaku no kenkyū* 台密教学の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

———— (2011) Hosshinsokutō to jishinbutsu. In *Tendai gakuhō* 35 天台学報 35.

pp. 13 – 20. Shiga: Tendai gakkai.

———— (2013) Tendai mikkyō no kenmitsu setsu 天台密教の顕密説. In *Buppōsō ronshū* 仏法僧論集. pp. 227 – 244. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Reischauer Edwin (1955) *Ennin's Travels in T'ang China, Ronald Press Company*. New York: Ronald Press Co.

Saeki Kōji (2004) Tairiku no jōdo shinkō. In *Tabi no kanjinhijiri Chōgen* 旅の勧進聖重源. pp. 61-79. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan.

Sakaino Kōyō (1915) Mappōtōmyō ki no shingi. In *Osaki gakuhō* 39 大崎学報 39. pp. 19-33. Ed. Mochizuki Kankō. Tokyo: Nichirenshū dōsōkai.

Sasaki Kaoru (1997) *Chusei bukkyo to kamakura bakufu* 中世仏教と鎌倉幕府. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunsha.

Schaik V. Sam (2010) The Limit of Transgression: The Samaya vows of Mahāyana. In *Esoteric Buddhism at Dunhuang: Rites and Teachings for this Life and Beyond*, pp. 61-84. Eds. Schaik V. Sam and Kapstein, M.. Leiden: Brill

Shimaji Daitō (1933) *Nihon bukkyō kyōgaku shi* 日本仏教教学史. Tokyo: Meiji shoin.

Shimoide Sekiyo (1976) *Nihonshi niokeru minshū to shūkyō* 日本史における民衆と宗教. Tokyo. Yamakawa shuppansha.

Shishō Enshin (1975) Taimitsu yōjōryūso yōsai no zenmitsu kan. In *Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 40 日本仏教学会年報 40. Nihon bukkyō gakkai, pp. 189 – 198.

Sueki Fumihiko (2006) Mumyō shu, Ingoshū kaidai. In Abe and Yamasaki (2006), pp. 556-576.

Sugawara Shinkai (1992) *Sannō shintō no kenkyū* 山王神道の研究. Tokyo: Shunjū sha.

Tado Taichi (2008) Gosōjōjinkan no nihonteki tenkai. In Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō 東洋の思想と宗教. 83 – 99. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku tōyō tetsugakkai.

———— (2008) Bodaishinron kenmonshō no kentō. In *Indogaku bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 58-2 印度学仏教学研究 58-2. pp. 18- 22.

Takayanagi Satsuki (2002) Den eisai shinzenyūgi no shingi mondai. In In *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 50-2 印度学仏教学研究 50-2. pp. 608 – 610.

Take Kakuchō (2008) *Hieizan bukkyō no kenkyū* 比叡山仏教の研究. Hōzōkan: Kyoto.

Taga Munehaya (1965) *Eisai* 栄西. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunsha.

———— (1985) Eisai no mikkyo ni tsuite. In *Eisai zenji to rinzaishu* 栄西禅師と臨済宗. Ed. Hirano Sojo and Kato Shoshun. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunsha, pp. 40-68.

Tagami Taishū (1990) *Bodaishin no kenkyū* 菩提心の研究. Tokyo: Tokyo shoseki.

Takahashi Shūei (2005) Kamakura jidai no mikkyōsho ni miru cha. In *Kanazawa bunko kenkyū* 315 金沢文庫研究 315. Kanagawa: Kanazawa bunko.

Takigawa Zenkai (1982) Hōjibō shōshin no seibotsunen nit suite. In *Tendai gakuhō* 24. 天台学報 24. pp. 1-10. Shiga: Tendai gakkai.

Tamamura Takeji (1963) Fusō gozan ki. In *Kamakurashi bunkazai shiryō* Vol.2 鎌倉市文化財資料 第２集. Kamakura: Kamakurashi kyōikuiinkai.

———— (1983) *Gozan zensō denki shūsei* 五山禅僧伝記集成. Tokyo: Kōdan sha.

Terai Ryōsen (2000) Hieizan kurodani niokeru kairitsufukkō to sono shisō. In *Indogaku bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 46 印度学仏教学研究 46. pp. 281-288.

Teramoto Ryōshin (2010) Taimitsu no samayakai to sono gaikan. In *Tendai gakuhō* 53 天台学報 53. pp. 105-113. Shiga: Tendai gakkai.

———— (2011) Annen to samayakai: shichishukai wo chūshin ni. *In Indogaku bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 60 印度学仏教学研究 60. pp. 102-105.

Tsuji Zennosuke (1944) *Nihonbukkyō shi* 日本仏教史. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Wang Yong (2000) Ninpō ni genzonsuru hakatazaijū sōjin no sekihi. In *Chūgoku no nihonnkenkyū* Vol. 3. 中国の日本研究 第三号. http://www.japanology.cn/japanese/magazine/03lunji20/03lunwenji02.html

Welter Albert (1999) Eisai's Promotion of Zen for the Protection of the Country. In *Religions of Japan in Practice*. Ed. Tanabe George. Princeton University Press: New Jersey.

White Kenneth (2005) *The Role of Bodhicitta in Buddhist Enlightenment Including A Translation Into English of Bodhicitta-Sasta, Benkemmitsu-Nikyoron, And Sammaya-Kaijo*. New York: Edwin Mellen

Yamamoto Seiki (2003) *Kozuke no kuni niokeru zenbukkyo no ryunyu to tenkai* 上野国における禅仏教の流入と展開. Tokyo: Tosui shobo.

Yanagida Seizan (1991) Yōsai to Kozen gokokuron no kadai. In NST. 10. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, pp. 439-486.

Yoneda Mariko (2009) Yōsai no nisso: Yosaiden ni okeru zen to mitsu. In *Umi o wataru Tendai bunka* 海を渡る天台文化. Eds. Yoshihara Hiroto and Wang Yong. Tokyo: Bensei shuppan.

Reference Works and Collections

Chikugo shi 筑後志. Eds. Sugiyama Masanaka and Ogawa Seikaku. Kurume: Honjō

chishindō

Chikuzen imazu seiganji. In *Kyūshū no jisha siriizu*. 九州の寺社シリーズ (1977) Fukuoka: Kyūshū rekishi shiryō kan.

Chūsonji ōgon hihō ten 中尊寺黄金秘宝展. Ed. Chūsonji ōgon hihōten jikkō iinkai. Iwate: Chūsonji ōgon hihōten jikkō iinkai.

Gunma ken shi shiryōhen 5, *chūsei* 1 群馬県史資料編５,中世１. (1978). Ed. Gunmaken shi hensan iinkai. Gunma: Gunma ken.

Kurume shiryō sōsho 3 久留米資料叢書 3. (1976) Ed. Koga Yukio. Kurume: Kurume kyōdo kenkyūkai.

The *Lotus Sūtra*. BDK PDF Version. (2007) Ed. Numata Centre for Buddhist Translation Research. Berkley: California.

Mikkyō daijiten 密教大辞典 6 Vols. (1970) Ed. Mikkyō jiten hensan kai. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Nichirenshōnin ibun jiten: Rekishi hen 日蓮聖人遺文辞典 歴史篇. (1985) Ed. Risshōdaigaku Nichiren kyōgaku kenkyūjo.

Okayama ken shi shūkyō kyōiku hen 岡山市史 宗教教育編 (1991). Ed. Okayamashi shi henshū iinkai. Okayama: Okayamashi.

Shinhan okayama no rekishisanpo 新版岡山の歴史散歩. Ed. Okayamaken kōtōgakkō kyōiku kenkyū kai shakaika bukai rekishi bunka kai. Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppan.