

THE SADDHARMAPUNDARIKA AND ITS INFLUENCE

By *Senchū Murano*

The following paper is a summary of *Hokekyō no Shisō to Bunka*, edited by Yukio Sakamoto, Dean of the Faculty of Buddhism at Risshō University, Tokyo. (Kyoto, Heirakuji-shoten, 1965; 711 pp., Index 31 pp.; Yen 4,000.)

PART I: THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE *SADDHARMAPUNDARIKA*

Chapter I. The Formation of the Saddharmapundarika

A. The Saddharmapundarika and Indian Culture (Enshō Kanakura)

H. Kern holds that the character of the *Saddharmapundarika* is similar to that of Nārāyaṇa in the *Bhagavadgītā* and that the *Bhagavadgītā* had great influence on the *Saddharmapundarika*. Winternitz points out the influence of the *Purāṇas* on the sūtra, and Farquhar thinks that the *Vedāntas* influenced the sūtra. Kern shows us the materials for his opinion, but Winternitz and Farquhar do not.

On the other hand, Charles Eliot and H. von Glasenapp do speak of the influences of other religions on this sūtra. They try to find the sources of the philosophy of the *Saddharmapundarika* in the current thought of India of the time. This is more convincing.

It seems to be true to some extent that the *Saddharmapun-*

darika was influenced by the *Bhagavadgītā*. It is also true, however, that the monotheistic idea given in the *Bhagavadgītā* was already apparent in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, and that monotheism prevailed in India for some centuries around the beginning of the Christian Era. We can say that the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, the *Bhagavadgītā*, and other pieces of literature of a similar nature were produced from the common ground of the same age.

We can find an analogy between the wonderful scene shown by Nārāyaṇa in the *Bhagavadgītā* and the supernatural deeds done by Buddha Śākyamuni in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, but the scene described in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, especially in and after Chapter XV, is beyond human imagination, and has something special hardly recognizable as an influence of the *Bhagavadgītā*. We must notice here the characteristic of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* was not influenced directly by a particular religion outside Buddhism. We can say that new thoughts, which were introduced into Buddhism, developed as part of Buddhism in such a way that they showed some similarities to other religions.

B. The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka and Indian Society (Keishō Tsukamoto)

In Hīnayāna Buddhism, the preacher of the Law is called a *dharma-dhara* (one who knows the Law), or *dharma-kathika* (one who recites or preaches the Law). In Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially in Chapter X of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, he is called a *dharma-bhāṇaka*.

The world *dharma-bhāṇaka* is not foreign to Hīnayāna Bud-

dhism. In Hinayāna Buddhism, however, it means a reciter, and is regarded as a kind of *gandharvika* or musician, as is seen in the inscriptions of the Sānchī or Bhārhut stūpas. It seems that about the second century B.C. the *dharmabhāṇakas* were those who praised the Buddha, chanted the sūtras for lay visitors to the stūpas, and also preached to them. In those days the Law was preserved by the *Sthavīras*, and the role of the *bhāṇakas* was not important in the Buddhist Saṅgha. In the Mahāyāna sūtras, however, the *bhāṇakas* were called Bodhisattvas, and regarded as the bearers of the right teachings of the Buddha. They seem to have been low in their social status in the early days of Mahāyāna Buddhism, however. The fact that the virtue of perseverance was regarded as one of the six *pāramitās*, and also as one of the three requirements of the Bodhisattvas in Chapter X of the *Saddharmapundarika*, and that in many Mahāyāna sūtras, including the *Saddharmapundarika*, it says that the *bhāṇakas* should not be despised but respected, eloquently shows that the preachers of Mahāyāna Buddhism were generally despised and persecuted.

The *dharmadharas* or *dharmakathikas* of Hinayāna Buddhism were engaged in making commentaries on the *Āgamas* and giving a philosophical system to the *Abhidharmas*. They were eventually called the *Abhidharmikas*, that is, those who were well versed in the *Abhidharmas*. They became very scholastic and speculative in metaphysics. This dissatisfied Mahāyāna Buddhists. They called Bodhisattvas *dharmabhāṇakas*, and encouraged the propagation of the Law by regarding the propagation as a *pūjā* (oblation) or *dāna* (alms). Here the propagation of the Law was made the most important re-

ligious practice in Mahāyāna Buddhism.

C. *The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka and Hīnayāna Buddhism*
(*Kōgen Mizuno*)

Before we discuss the relation between the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* and Hīnayāna Buddhism, we must see :

1. Why Mahāyāna Buddhism in general rose against Hīnayāna Buddhism? or, What is the difference between Mahāyāna Buddhism and Hīnayāna Buddhism?

2. The conception of the Bodhisattva and the stages or degrees of Bodhisattva practices and the conception of the *pāramitās* are found not only in the *Mahāsāṃghikas* but also in the *Sthaviras*. Some teachings contained in the Mahāyāna sūtras are of *Sthavira* origin. What is the relation between Mahāyāna Buddhism and the *Mahāsāṃghikas* or the *Sthaviras*?

3. The *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*, the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*, the *Vajracchedikā*, the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, the *Avataṃsaka*, the *Sukhāvativyūha*, and others were composed before the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. These Mahāyāna sūtras are more or less connected with Hīnayāna Buddhism. The *Āgamas*, which express the fundamental teachings of the Buddha, were handed down through Hīnayāna Buddhism. Therefore, the Mahāyāna sūtras cannot be aloof from Hīnayāna Buddhism. What are the Hīnayānic elements in the Mahāyāna sūtras?

In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* we find some teachings of Hīnayāna Buddhism, some terminologies proper to Hīnayāna Buddhism, and some personalities associated with Hīnayāna Buddhism. But these Hīnayānic elements are found mostly in the

first fourteen chapters of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*, very few in the rest of it. In the first fourteen chapters of this sūtra, the Hīnayāna teachings are recognized as the teachings suitable to the persons of lower intelligence to give them a standing in Buddhism. The authors of this sūtra were tolerant towards the Hīnayānists. They were different from the authors of the earlier Mahāyāna sūtras, such as the *Prajñāpāramitā*, *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, or *Avataṃsaka*. In these sūtras Hīnayāna Buddhism is criticized. The tolerant attitude is found everywhere in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*. In the parables and stories of the sūtra the important teachings are expounded skillfully and interestingly, always keeping tolerance towards others. Here lies the reason for the popularity of this sūtra.

Chapter II. The Saddharmapuṇḍarika and Chinese Culture
(*Yōshō Nomura*)

Not a few frescoes in the Mo-kaō Cave in Tun-huang are connected with the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*, and these are regarded as very important frescoes. This shows that the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* was treasured in the days of the making of the cave. The depicting was limited, however, to the dramatical descriptions or fables in the sūtra. In those days the philosophy contained in the sūtra was not yet studied or developed, therefore it is natural that these frescoes do not reflect the philosophical side of the sūtra.

The caves at Lung-men, Ta-t'ung, and Hsiang-t'ang-shan should also be investigated in connection with the propagation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*.

Chapter III. The Japanese Sects Based on the Saddharmapundarika

A. The Tendai Sect (Yutaka Takagi)

It is generally held that the Tendai Sect of Japan started in 806 when Saichō was permitted by the government to have two *Nembundosha* monks. A *Nembundosha* monk was a monk who had been initiated into monkhood for the study of the tenets of a particular sect for a certain number of years by government order. A certain number of such monks were allotted to various sects annually. This meant that the sects which were allotted *Nembundosha* monks were regarded as the sects officially recognized by the government.

Saichō tried to establish a Buddhist Order independent of the established sects in Nara. He petitioned the government for the realization of this, which was granted in 823. Therefore, it is more reasonable to say that the Tendai Sect started in this year.

The establishment of the independence of the Tendai Sect from Nara Buddhism meant that the Tendai priests were excluded from the governmental positions to be given to priests with regard to the control of the priesthood of Japan. Some priest-officers had been installed in Japan already in 624 in order to control the priesthood. They became more powerful year after year. There were some ranks in these offices, which became the origins of the nominal priest-ranks in later times. The Shingon Sect, which started at about the same time as the Tendai Sect, did not ask for its independence from the Nara

sects, therefore the Shingon priests were given the chance to be appointed priest-officers from the outset. The Tendai priests were at first proud of themselves in that they were aloof from the secular business of the hierarchy, but in the course of time they had to recognize the necessity of being appointed priest-officers in order to gain prestige among the priesthood of Japan. So they appealed for the grant of the appointment of some priest-officers. This was granted as late as the latter part of the ninth century.

As regards the appointment of *Kōdokushi*, however, the Tendai Sect was given the chance soon after the founding of the sect. A *Kōdokushi* was a monk despatched by the government to a provincial temple for preaching. Many Tendai priests who were appointed *Kōdokushi* went to the provinces for the preaching of the tenets of the Tendai Sect. In this way, the Tendai Sect was expanded to local districts.

B. The Nichiren Sect (Gyōyū Kageyama)

1. The Nichiren Sect during the lifetime of Nichiren

Nichiren (1222-1282) founded the Nichiren Sect in 1253 at Kamakura with a few followers. Seeing his fellow countrymen suffering from false religions he launched his religious campaign. He criticized all the Buddhist sects of the time, and was consequently persecuted by monks and laymen of those sects as well as by some government officials who were the votaries of those sects. In 1260, he submitted his thesis, *Risshō Ankoku-ron*, to the government in order to establish the right religion and by so doing to save Japan from looming internal disturbances and foreign invasions. As a result, his hermit-

age was destroyed by the army of one of the government officials. He fled to Shimōsa. After a while he returned to Kamakura, but was soon arrested and exiled to Izu. When he was pardoned, he visited his home country, where he was attacked by the Landlord Kagenobu Tōjō. One of his disciples was killed, two were wounded. He was also wounded. In 1271, he was arrested again and narrowly escaped from beheading at Tatsu-no-kuchi. Then he was banished to Sado Island. In 1274, he was pardoned and went to Mt. Minobu. In his later years he had some groups of followers in the Provinces of Kai, Suruga, Sagami, Musashi, Shimōsa, Kazusa, Awa and Sado.

2. The Nichiren Sect from the death of Nichiren to the Yoshino Period

During five or six decades after the death of Nichiren, the Nichiren Sect was propagated to some places in Tōhoku, Hokkaidō, Kyoto, Chūgoku, Shikoku, and Kyūshū.

In the Yoshino Period, the Nichiren Sect succeeded in making contact with the Imperial family, the Shogunate, and the public, through the *Kokka Kangyō* movement, preaching, and the practice of exorcism. *Kokka Kangyō* means to advise the government for the conversion of the whole nation to the right religion. Nichiren advised the government for this purpose by presenting his treatise, *Risshō Ankoku-ron* ("Establish the right teachings and save our country"). His followers in this period did the same by presenting similar treatises to the government.

3. The Nichiren Sect in the Muromachi Period.

In this period the Nichiren Sect was strengthened and ex-

panded. It became powerful enough to catch the attention of the monk army of Hieizan.

4. The Nichiren Sect in the Civil War Period.

The Nichiren Sect flourished most in this period. Many priests of the nobility became chief abbots of head temples of the Nichiren Sect in Kyoto. During this period syncretism of the Nichiren Sect with Shintoism was carried out through the worship of *Sanjūbanjin*, that is, the thirty Shinto tutelary gods, each on one or another of the days of the month.

5. The Nichiren Sect in the Azuchi and Momoyama Periods

The representatives of the Nichiren Sect had a debate with those of the Jōdo Sect by permission of the then ruler Nobunaga Oda in 1579. The judge, who had previously been ordered secretly by the ruler to persecute the Nichiren debaters, announced that the delegates of the Nichiren Sect had been argued down. The Nichiren priests had to submit a written apology. Three of the debaters were beheaded.

Hideyoshi Toyotomi was tolerant towards the Nichiren Sect, but punished a Nichiren priest who had refused to attend an intersectarian Buddhist ceremony.

6. The Nichiren Sect in the Edo Period

The Tokugawa government patronized Buddhism, irrespective of sectarian differences. Many excellent priests were produced, many temples built and many Buddhist educational institutions established. But the founding of new sects was prohibited by the government. As for the Nichiren Sect, the preaching of the doctrine of *Fujufuse* was prohibited. This

discouraged the followers of the Nichiren Sect. *Fujufuse* means literally "not receive, not give." It means that the followers of the Nichiren Sect should not receive any alms from the followers of the other sects, or give anything to them. Judging from the doctrine of *Fujufuse*, government patronage given to the Nichiren Sect could not be regarded as offering to the Buddha as conceived by the sect, because the head of the government was not a follower of the Nichiren Sect. It follows that a Nichiren priest should not accept an invitation by the government to a Buddhist gathering in which the priests of other sects took part.

In the latter half of the Edo Period, the Nichiren Sect obtained its votaries among the public. Many annual functions were held in Nichiren temples. Dramas in connection with the life of Nichiren became popular.

7. The Nichiren Sect in the Modern Age

At the beginning of the Meiji Era, propagation of the Nichiren teachings became very active, and the sect had many supporters among the public and young people. The title *Daishi* was given to Nichiren by the Emperor, also an Imperial tablet was given to the Nichiren Sect. During the last war the sect was cooperative with military men. After the end of the war many new sects have been produced on the basis of the teachings of Nichiren.

Chapter IV. The Persecutions of Nichiren Priests (Eishū Miyazaki)

From the time of Nichiren till the middle of the Muromachi

Period, Nichiren priests were persecuted because they submitted written advices to the central or local governments, saying that the ruler of Japan or the governor of the province concerned should become a convert to Nichiren's religion and then issue an edict to convert the whole population in order to establish the peace of the country or the province.

From the beginning of the Muromachi Period to the beginning of the Tokugawa Period, Nichiren priests were persecuted because they failed to argue down in public debates the priests of other sects patronized by the government. These public debates had been held because of the wishes of Nichiren priests who tried to prove the truth of Nichiren's religion.

In the Tokugawa Period, Nichiren priests were persecuted because they refused government orders which they deemed to be against the doctrine of *Fujufuse*.

The above-mentioned three kinds of persecutions of Nichiren priests were found more or less in any period.

The most noticeable persecutions because of *Fujufuse* took place :

1. in 1595, when Nichiō refused the invitation of Hideyoshi Toyotomi ;
2. in 1630, when Ikegami priests stood against Minobu priests in the controversy over the doctrine of *Fujufuse* ;
3. and in 1665 and 1666, when the doctrine of *Fujufuse* was regarded as illegal by the government and the *Fujufuse* priests were banished to remote islands.

In the last case, lay followers committed suicide by *seppuku*, fasting or drowning.

PART II. THE LITERATURE ON THE SADDHAR-
MAPUNDARIKA

Chapter I. The Translations of the Saddharmapūṇḍarika
(*Shōken Yazaki*)

The *Saddharmapūṇḍarika* was translated in many languages:

1. The Chinese versions are the *Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching*, *T'ien-p'in-fa-hua-ching*, and *Cheng-fa-hua-ching*. There are some other Chinese texts associated with the *Saddharmapūṇḍarika*.

2. The Tibetan version is almost equivalent to the Nepalese text and the *T'ien-p'in-fa-hua-ching* as to the contents. In Tibet the *Saddharmapūṇḍarika* is not regarded as important as in China and Japan, but treated just as one of the Mahāyānā sūtras. In connection with the worship of Avalokiteśvara, however, the *Saddharmapūṇḍarika* is given much importance.

3. There are some other versions in French, English, Japanese, Hsi-Hsia, Turkish, Manchurian, Annamese, Mongolian, and others.

Investigation of these various versions of this sūtra shows that it is popular among the Buddhists all over the world, and not to be confined to one or a few sects as their canonical sūtra.

Chapter II. Commentaries on the Saddharmapūṇḍarika

A. *The Conception of Vyākaraṇa in the Saddharmapūṇḍarika*
(*Ryūgen Taga*)

The word *vyākaraṇa* or *veyyākaraṇa* is used in various

meanings in the texts of Early Buddhism. Of these meanings, that of "prophecy" or "record" has a special connection with Mahāyāna sūtras.

In the *Āgamas*, *vyākaraṇa* is used as the record of the re-birth of a dead person, or of the enlightenment of Buddha Śākyamuni, or of the enlightenment of oneself. The records of the enlightenment of the Buddha gave birth to the conception of a Bodhisattva as a Buddha-to-be in the *Jātakas*, and also to that of a Buddha whose duty is to assure others of the attainment of future Buddhahood as in the case of Buddha Dipaṅkara. The conception of the past Buddhas produced that of the future Buddhas, and accordingly more Bodhisattvas were conceived. It follows that the existence of many Buddhas was conceived not only in time but also in space. Accordingly, there appeared many instances of prophecies about future Buddhahood. The conception of the Buddha-nature or the *Tathāgata-garbha* was given a theoretical basis through the theory that mind is primarily pure. Before the birth of the theory that everybody has the Buddha-nature or the *Tathāgata-garbha*, the only way of giving Buddhahood to the *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* was to foretell their future Buddhahood by the Buddha himself. This makes one of the important teachings of the *Saddharmapūṇḍarika*.

B. *Chi-ts'ang's View on the Saddharmapūṇḍarika* (*Taion Satomi*)

Fa-yün (467-529) thinks that the Buddha's life is finite because it is said in Chapter XVI of the *Saddharmapūṇḍarika*, " The duration of my life is twice as long as the number of *kalpas*

stated above." Chi-ts'ang (549-623) contends that the Buddha's life is infinite because it says in the same chapter, "The Buddha is always staying here, never extinct." Fa-yün believes that the Buddha's life is finite because it says in Chapter V of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* that everything returns to the Void. Chi-ts'ang again says that this Void should be interpreted as the non-existence of illusions in the mind of the Buddha, not as the expression of the final condition of all things including the Buddha himself.

According to Fa-yün, there are two kinds of Bodhisattvas: the Bodhisattvas who devote themselves to practising the six *pāramitās*, and those who practise the six *pāramitās* only arbitrarily. He holds that the former will become Buddhas while the latter hardly will. He finds the ground of his views through changing the ordinal numbers into cardinals in the sentence of Chapter II of the sūtra: "There is only one vehicle in the Buddha-lands of the ten quarters; not the second or the third." According to him, it reads: "There is only one vehicle in the Buddha-lands of the ten quarters. There are no two vehicles, nor three vehicles." He says that the two vehicles are the *Śrāvaka*-vehicle and the *Pratyekabuddha*-vehicle, while the three vehicles are the two vehicles and the Bodhisattva-vehicle. In the same way he reads the numbers in the following sentence in the same chapter: "The *Tathāgata* expounds the law to all living beings for the sake of the One-Buddha-vehicle, not for the other vehicles, that is, the second or the third." He also says that his view is right because there are two kinds of bullock-carts in the parable given in Chapter III. According to him, the great white bullock-cart represents the Buddha-

vehicle, and the bullock-cart without any adjective represents the Bodhisattva-vehicle.

Chi-ts'ang says that there are not three vehicles besides the Buddha-vehicle. He holds that numbers should be interpreted as ordinal numbers, and that there are no such Bodhisattvas who practise the six *pāramitās* only arbitrarily. He says that the great white bullock-cart is nothing else than the bullock-cart without any adjective.

C. *Chan-jan's Works on the Saddharmapundarika*
(*Nobumasa Hibi*)

Chan-jan (711-782) wrote many commentaries on the *Saddharmapundarika*. Among these, the *Fa-hua-hsüan-i-shih-ch'ien*, *Fa-hua-wen-chü-chi*, and *Chih-kuan-fu-hsing* are his main works.

The *Fa-hua-hsüan-i-shih-ch'ien* was completed first of these three. Chan-jan lectured on Chih-i's *Fa-hua-hsüan-i* from about 742 to 755. He recorded his answers to the questions asked by his disciples during that time. He put these records in order and made them into a book during the years 758 and 761, and completed it in 764.

The *Chih-kuan-fu-hsing* was prepared already from about 742 to 755. This was given a book form earlier than the *Fa-hua-hsüan-i-shih-ch'ien*, and completed later than the latter.

The *Fa-hua-wen-chü-chi* was completed last. This was based on his lectures given from about 758 to 761. In or after 766 it was given a book form, and completed between 774 and 777. This was the last of the main works of Chan-jan, in which his philosophy was expressed in its full ripeness.

Chapter III. The Copying of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka
(*Shōkō Kabutogi*)

The extant oldest handwritten copy of Kumārajīva's version of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is fragmentary. It is the last part of Volume I written in 411, that is, five years later than the date of the translation by Kumārajīva. Fragments of the copies of the sūtra written thereafter are existing. The oldest extant complete copy was written at the end of the Sui Period. In Japan, the oldest extant copy of the sūtra was written in the Nara Period.

The statement that the number of Chinese characters used in this sūtra is 69,384, is found in a document written as early as the Sui Period. This number is different from that of the letters included in the present edition. The text which the Nichiren Sect is now using includes 69,942. This shows that there were some different texts of Kumārajīva's version in early periods. The insertion of Chapter XII and the verses of Chapter XXV may also have altered the number to some extent.

The extant wood-block printed copies in China, Korea, and Japan are different from each other. This was caused by the difference of the original texts.

The present edition of this sūtra used by Japanese Buddhists is similar to one of the Kasuga editions published in the Kamakura Period. The Kasuga editions were edited by Shinjo. It is said that he revised his edition as often as fifteen times. It is evident that there were two other editions than that published by Shinjo. It seems that these two editions were not popularized.

Wood-block printing of sūtras started in Japan in the Kama-

kura Period. Nevertheless, handwriting of sūtras was not stopped. The handwriting was regarded as a religious practice. A handwritten copy of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* was called *Nyohōkyō*. The word *Nyohōkyō* literally means a sūtra copied without mistakes, but meant specifically the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* copied without mistakes.

The first practice of *Nyohōkyō* writing was done in 752 when the Great Buddha of Nara was consecrated. In 1031, Kakuchō of Hieizan buried the *Nyohōkyō* written by Ennin (792-862) for the purpose of keeping this sūtra undestroyed until Buddha Maitreya would appear in this world. In those days it was believed that the world would soon come to an end and that the next world would come, in which Buddha Maitreya would be the Savior. Buddha Maitreya was believed to save people by preaching the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*. That is to say, Kakuchō intended to keep the sūtra underground for the use of the coming Buddha. From that time on, the burying of copies of the *Nyohōkyō* was popular until the end of the Heian Period.

PART III. THE PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION INVOLVED IN THE SADDHARMA- PUNDARIKA

Chapter I. The Philosophical and Sociological Bases of the Saddharmapuṇḍarika

A. The Saddharmapuṇḍarika and the Philosophy of Bud- dhism (Shōson Miyamoto)

Buddhism is against the *ekamṣa-vāda* or one-sided opinions.

The *Madhyamāpratīpad* and the *Vibhajya-vāda* in early Buddhism were theories opposed to the *ekamṣa-vāda*. These theories encouraged infallible observations and Bodhisattva practices as true human activities. Study and practice are the two ingredients of Buddhism. Both of them are based on the Middle Way. In the studies of *Abhidharmas*, both the *lakṣaṇa* and the *svabhāva* were investigated in the right way, because the Middle Way, which had been influenced by the *Vibhajya-vāda*, directed the *Abhidharma* studies to the right direction, and fostered man's wish for cooperation. The theories of the Void and the Middle Way, which were made the basic principles of Mahāyāna Buddhism by Nāgārjuna, had been much influenced by the ideas of *avyākata* and *vibhajya* of Early Buddhism. There are some pairs of ideas which are seemingly opposed to each other : for instance, *vibhajya* vs. *bodhi*, *viññāna* vs. *prajñā*, *abhidharma* vs. *prajñā-pāramitā*. These ideas seem to have developed separately, but there is always underlying the conception that "we can get *prajñā* by transforming *viññāna*." That is why *abhidharma-vibhajya* developed into *madhyamāpratīpad-vibhajya* of the *Yogācāras* and the *Vijñānavādins*, through the influence of the theories of the Void and the Middle Way advocated by Nāgārjuna.

It is generally held that the philosophies of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, and the *Mādhyamikas* are essentially the *Niḥsvabhāva-vāda*, because they stand on the theory of the Void, while the *Sarvāstivādins* advocate the *Svabhāva-vāda*, which is the *Vibhajya-vāda* of Hīnayāna Buddhism. It seems that the *Sarvāstivādins* are criticized in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, but it must be noticed that the *svabhāva*

is mentioned as one of the five things in the *Upāya-kauśalya-parivarta* of the *Saddharmapundarika*. This *parivarta* aims at seeing that all beings shall be entered into the One Vehicle, that is, the truth that anything and everything is Reality by itself.

B. The Saddharmapundarika as Viewed from the Standpoint of the Philosophy of Religion (Teruji Ishizu)

A cultural religion is different from primitive religions in that it has a founder, an organization of followers, and a set of doctrines. On the one hand, the doctrines, which are set forth by the founder and developed by his followers, make up the form of worship and the thought of the followers, and on the other, the authorities of the religious organization defend the doctrines. The science of the doctrines of a particular religion is established under these circumstances.

In the case of Buddhism, the most important subject of the science of doctrines is *Kyōsō-hanjaku* which serves to classify the various teachings of Buddhism into categories and give the highest value to the teachings of the sect concerned by putting them into the category which is deemed the most excellent. In other words, a sect establishes first the philosophy of its religion, and then criticizes all the other sects from the principles of its philosophy. Generally speaking, a sect chooses a sūtra or sūtras as its Canon.

According to the Tendai Sect, the Buddha expounded first the true teaching, then some provisional teachings, and finally the true teaching again. According to Tendai, in the final teaching, that is, in the *Saddharmapundarika*, the Buddha gives

each of the provisional teachings a standing in the course of Buddhist education. To give a standing to any provisional teaching and not give up any of the provisional teachings as meaningless is called *Kaiken*. According to Tendai, the conception of *Kaiken* is proper to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*.

To teach people with provisional teachings is justified by the theory of the four *siddhāntas* or ways of teaching: We can teach people 1. according to worldly ideas, 2. by pleasing them, 3. by blaming them, and 4. by telling them the truth straightforwardly. According to Tendai, the Buddha taught in four ways: abruptly, gradually, secretly, or indefinitely. The Buddha taught at one time Hinayāna only, at another time Hinayāna-cum-Mahāyāna, special Mahāyāna, or perfect Mahāyāna, because, Tendai says, the Buddha intended to save all the people of various dispositions. Tendai's dividing of the time of the teaching of the Buddha into five periods bears the appearance of a historical fact, but is in reality a product of his own philosophy by which he arranged various sūtras into the order of the categories of his *Kyōsō-hanjaku*. Here we see the principles of Tendai's philosophy of religion.

C. *A Sociological Study of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*
(*Shōbun Kubota*)

It is generally assumed that Buddhism denies worldliness. One of the characteristics of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is, however, that in this sūtra the truthfulness of worldly human life is approved under certain conditions. In this sūtra *upāsakas* and *upāsikas* are given the same status as that of monks and nuns. It is true that everywhere in this sūtra the *Śrāvakas*

and the *Pratyekabuddhas* are criticized and that unenlightened persons and ordinary people are encouraged to realize that human life is of little value. But this is done only as a device of the Buddha for the purpose of leading them to enlightenment or *Nirvāṇa*. A device is a means, not a purpose. The purpose of the Buddha in this sūtra is to let them know that they are in reality the Bodhisattvas, who have compassion in their hearts and also aspire for the Buddha's enlightenment.

There are two kinds of Bodhisattvas in this sūtra. The first are the Bodhisattvas who have not yet known the eternity of the Buddha. The second are the Bodhisattvas who see that the historical Buddha Śākyamuni is in reality the Buddha who attained enlightenment in time immemorial, that is, the Buddha-without-a-beginning, the Eternal Buddha. In the *Bodhisattva-pr̥thivī-vivara-samudgama-parivarta* of this sūtra many Bodhisattvas spring up from underground and greet the Buddha, expressing their regret for the lapse in seeing him. The Bodhisattvas who are the disciples of the historical Buddha are surprised at this scene. In the next chapter, *Tathāgatāyus-pramāṇa-parivarta*, the Buddha announces his eternity, and it is realized that these Bodhisattvas who have sprung up from underground are the disciples of the Eternal Buddha. The Bodhisattvas of this second kind are the pattern of people which this sūtra aims to accomplish.

*Chapter II. The Relation between Indian and Chinese
Thoughts and the Saddharmapundarika*

*A. The Saddharmapundarika and Indian Buddhism
(Shinjō Suguro)*

In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* the Buddha is described as the Absolute One. This conception of the Buddha is closely connected with the worship of the past Buddhas. Judging from text critic and archaeological surveys, the idea that there appeared many Buddhas in the past was established at a very early date, possibly at the time of the Buddha. It is generally held that the conception of the Buddha as the Saviour comes from the deification of the Buddha and that this conception is of later development, but in reality the past Buddhas were conceived as saviours already in the period of Early Buddhism. It can be said that the Buddha Śākyamuni was believed to be the Saviour in this period in the same way as the past Buddhas. The eternity of the *Dharmakāya* was established at the time of the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha. The idea that Bodhisattvas save others possibly derived from the conception of the past Buddhas regarded as saviours. These conceptions, that is, the eternity of the *Dharmakāya* and the capacity of Bodhisattvas, are already seen in Early Buddhism, and became apparent in Mahāyāna sūtras. In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, these conceptions lead to produce the conception of the Eternal Buddha. The Buddha in this sūtra is regarded as the Buddha of whom all the other Buddhas are manifestations. The past Buddha Prabhūtaratna sits with Buddha Śākyamuni side by side in the *stūpa* of treasures. This means that the worship of the past Buddhas as saviours, represented here by Prabhūtaratna, still exists with the worship of Buddha Śākyamuni. It is held that this sūtra will be propagated in the future by the Bodhisattvas who are the disciples of the Eternal Buddha. This also means that the *Dharma* in the future and the eternity

of the Buddha are connected with the Buddhas in the past.

B. The Saddharmapundarika and Chinese Philosophy
(*Kōjun Fukui*)

It seems that the first record showing the connection of the *Saddharmapundarika* with Chinese philosophy was the *Chen-kaō*, written probably in the sixth century, in which the *Saddharmapundarika* was compared with the *Chuang-tzu* and *Hsiang-ch'ing-ching*.

The words *miao* and *hsüan* were given special meanings in the first chapter of the *Tao-te-ching*. The scholars of the T'ien-t'ai Sect further developed the meanings of these words, but their interpretations went too far beyond their original meanings.

It is generally accepted that the canonical texts of religious Taoism are in most cases imitations of the Buddhist sūtras. It should be noticed that many phrases or ideas of the *Saddharmapundarika* were imitated there. Fa-lin (572–640) already pointed out in his *Pien-cheng-lun* that many phrases or ideas of the *Saddharmapundarika* were accepted in the Taoist texts. The most important Taoist text, *Tung-hsüan-ling-pao-yüan-shih-wu-liang-tu-jen-shang-p'in-miao-ching*, in 61 volumes, involves many elements of the *Saddharmapundarika*.

It seems that from the outset Chinese scholars regarded Buddhism as containing many exaggerations and fictions. In the *Saddharmapundarika* there are many parables and big numbers beyond human comprehension. These are characteristics of this sūtra, and these characteristics have much to do with the Chinese conception of Buddhism. Judging from this

fact, it can be said that the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* has little connection with Chinese philosophy itself.

C. *The Saddharmapūṇḍarīka and Chinese Buddhism*
(*Yukio Sakamoto*)

During the Liang, T'ang, Sung, and Ming Periods, about 90 priest wrote commentaries on the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka*; more than two hundred people were recorded as experts in lecturing on the sūtra or chanting it. Not a few minors or females are found in the list of these lecturers or chanters. During these periods some priests burned themselves for the purpose of dedicating their lives and bodies to the sūtra as oblations, following the example shown by the Medicine-King Bodhisattva related in Chapter XXIII of this sūtra.

In this sūtra the three vehicles are united into one. The three vehicles are the Śrāvaka-vehicle, the Pratyekabuddha-vehicle, and the Bodhisattva-vehicle. Together they are the Buddha-vehicle. A teaching by which one can reach a particular goal is likened to a vehicle. For instance, the Śrāvaka-vehicle means the teaching by which one can reach Arhatship. According to this sūtra, the three vehicles are only devices to lead people to the one vehicle. This view is found also in other Mahāyāna sūtras. But the truth that all people have the possibility of attaining Buddhahood is revealed only in the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka*. According to this sutra, there is no essential difference between the Śrāvakas, Prātyekabuddhas, and Bodhisattvas.

The ordinal number in Chinese is made by putting the ordinal prefix to the cardinal number. But this prefix is sometimes omitted, making no distinction between ordinals and

cardinals. Moreover, the plural ending is in most cases omitted. These grammatical ambiguities cause controversies. The *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* speaks of the "Two Vehicles" and "Three Vehicles." These may be read as "the Second Vehicle" and "the Third Vehicle." Tao-sheng, Chi-ts'ang, K'uei-chi read these numerals as ordinal numbers and said that the second vehicle and the third vehicle are the Pratyekabuddha-vehicle and the Śrāvaka-vehicle respectively. According to them, the first vehicle is the Bodhisattva-vehicle, which is nothing but the Buddha-vehicle. But Fa-yüan, Chih-i, Fa-ts'ang read the numerals as cardinal numbers.

According to Fa-yün and Hui-yüan, the third vehicle is the Bodhisattva-vehicle of Provisional Mahāyāna.

According to Chih-i, the Buddha first preached the *Avataṃsaka* to Bodhisattvas, then the Hinayāna teachings, then the Hinayāna-cum-Mahāyāna teachings, and lastly the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*. He says that the third vehicle is for the Bodhisattvas in the *Avataṃsaka* and the Hinayāna-cum-Mahāyāna teachings.

According to K'uei-chi, the view that the three vehicles are devices to lead people to the one vehicle is a tentative teaching to lead people of indefinite nature. He held that, according to the *Samdhi-nirmocana-sūtra*, the teaching of the one vehicle is a device to lead people to the three vehicles. Fa-ts'ang criticized him, pointing out the difference between the device used in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* and that given in other sūtras.

According to Hui-yüan, there are four kinds of devices: a device as a means to proceed farther, a device to produce infinite wisdom, a device shown in the skilful composition of the

universe, and a device to give fictitious teachings in order to prepare for the realization of the truth. He said that the devices given in the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* are of the last kind.

According to Chih-i, there are three kinds of devices : 1. a teaching made suitable for the various dispositions of the hearers, 2. a teaching by which the truth is revealed, and 3. various teachings which are in essence nothing but the truth itself. He said that the devices mentioned in Chapter II of the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* are of the last kind.

Chapter III. The Philosophy Involved in the Saddharmapūṇḍarīka.

A. The Philosophical Significance of Chapter XXV of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīka (Shinjō Kamimura)

It is generally held that the *Samanta-mukha-parivarta* of the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* has nothing to do with the other chapters of the sūtra except the mentioning of the Buddha Śākyamuni and Buddha Prabhūtaratna in the prose section of the chapter. I think this assumption is wrong because the calling of the name of Avalokiteśvara repeated in the *gāthas* of this chapter is based on the “faithful understanding in a single thought”, which is one of the characteristics of the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka*. The expression “*tat-kṣanam*” (at that moment) denotes that the calling of his name transcends time and space. This immediateness cannot be found in any other sūtra. This calling, that is, this deed or *karma*, is regarded as the cause of the cessation of suffering in this chapter, which is not so foreign to the fundamental principles of the *Sad-*

darmapuṇḍarīka as is generally supposed.

B. Dengyō's View on the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka (Endō Asai)

We can say that the philosophy of T'ien-t'ai is based on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, although we find many elements of other sūtras in his philosophy. We are more certain that Nichiren established his religion solely on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, because he refused to accept any other sūtras as canonical. As regards Dengyō, it is doubtful whether he recognized the supremacy of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* or not.

As far as his conception of the Pure Mahāyāna Order is concerned, it is clear that this conception cannot be established without the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. The reasons for this are the following :

1. It is true that the Mahāyāna precepts entirely independent of the Hīnayāna precepts are given in the *Brahmajāla*, but the words of the *Brahmajāla* are not clear. These Mahāyāna precepts are clearly given only in the fourteenth chapter of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*.

2. He wished to establish the Pure Mahāyāna Order in order to protect the State. He said that he wished to bring up "treasures of the State" for that purpose. The expression "treasures of the State", meaning Bodhisattvas, is found in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*.

3. According to Dengyō, the initiation into the Pure Mahāyāna Order, that is, the transmission of the Mahāyāna precepts, was regarded as the immediate attainment of Buddhahood. This immediateness or abruptness of enlightenment is not found in any other Mahāyāna sūtras besides the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*.

rika.

4. It is an established idea that Buddhism is composed of study, meditation, and discipline. Dengyō thought that T'ien-t'ai's philosophy dealt only with study and meditation. He wished to make the T'ien-t'ai Sect perfect by adding to it discipline in the form of the Mahāyāna precepts.

5. As a matter of fact, he used the *Brahmajāla* as the material for the Mahāyāna precepts, but only subsidiary to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. He wished to enshrine the Buddha revealed in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* in the hall where the Mahāyāna precepts were to be given to the aspirants. He used the *Kan-fugen-gyō*, a supplementary sūtra to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, as the source of the ritual of the initiation.

It must be noticed, however, that some monastic rules he stipulated came from other sources beside the sūtras mentioned above. For instance, the rule that one should stay in Mt. Hiei for twelve years comes from the *Soshijikyō*.

C. *The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka and the Medieval Tendai Philosophy (Kaishū Shigyō)*

After Dengyō's death, the Tendai Sect of Japan made a special development in order to cope with Shingon mysticism, and a set of doctrines was created to make a special type of Tendai Buddhism. This new type of Buddhism is usually called *Chūko Tendai* or the Medieval Tendai Philosophy.

According to the Medieval Tendai Philosophy, the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is not satisfactory as far as the presentation of the way of introspecting our minds is concerned. The way of introspecting our minds was given by T'ien-t'ai. That was to

see the truth that the three thousand things exist in a single thought of our minds. This is the fundamental truth, which expresses the true teachings of the Eternal Buddha. Thus, by the Medieval Tendai philosophers, the truth of the three thousand things in a thought, which T'ien-t'ai established as a complementary theory to the teachings in the *Saddharmapundarika*, was regarded as superior to the latter. These philosophers intended to say that the sūtra is inferior because of its exoterism, and that this fundamental truth is superior because of its esoterism. They could not say this, however, because the words exoteric and esoteric were the terms of Shingon mysticism. So they used the words *Hommon* and *Shakumon*, which were primarily used to divide the sūtra into two parts. According to the Medieval Tendai philosophers, *Hommon* means the teachings of the Eternal Buddha, and *Shakumon*, the teachings of the Historical Buddha. They said that the sūtra is *Shakumon*, because it contains only the temporary teachings of the Buddha, and that the Fundamental Truth is *Hommon*, because it is the true teaching of the Buddha.

Chapter IV. The Religion Involved in the Saddharmapundarika

A. Nichiren's View on the Saddharmapundarika (Kankō Mochizuki)

There are two attitudes which the propagator of Buddhism should have towards the hearers. One is a tolerant attitude in which he approves first the opinions of the hearers and then gradually leads them to the truth by persuasion. The other is

an intolerant attitude in which he never admits wrong views of others, criticizes them bitterly and thoroughly. It is generally held that the persuasive method leads to enlightenment, while the aggressive method has no direct connection with enlightenment. According to Nichiren, however, the radical method is the direct and immediate way of presenting the true teachings of the Buddha, while the persuasive method is only an indirect device of compromise. Furthermore, to Nichiren, the radical method is not an alternative but an indispensable one, because it comes from his consciousness of the sin that he had slandered the true teachings of the Buddha for a long time in his previous existences. To him, to teach others meant a compensation for his sin.

As far as these two attitudes are concerned, the first fourteen chapters of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* are different from the following fourteen chapters as follows :

1. In Chapter XVI of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, to which Chapter XV serves as a prelude, the Buddha declares his eternity. In the first fourteen chapters, devices are admitted to lead others, but in the following chapters there is a strong tendency to deny devices.

2. In the first fourteen chapters those who slander the *keepers of this sūtra* are blamed, but in the following chapters those who slander *the true teachings* are attacked.

3. In the first fourteen chapters the age in which the slanderers would appear is expressed as vaguely as “after the death of the Buddha” or “in the degenerate age”, but in the following chapters it is more definitely expressed as “in the five hundred years”.

4. In the first fourteen chapters the area in which this sūtra should be propagated is not limited to this world, but in the following chapters it is said that this sūtra should be propagated in this world we live in.

5. In the first fourteen chapters the propagators of this sūtra are persons of higher rank such as the Bodhisattvas as described in Chapter XIII or XIV, but in the following chapters they are persons of lower rank such as a *bhikṣu* who has purified his six sense-organs for the first time at the end of his life in this world as described in Chapter XX, or the four kinds of devotees as described in Chapter XXVIII.

B. Developments of Nichiren's Teachings in the Modern Age (Kyōkō Motai)

The philosophy and religion of Nichiren were given a systematic presentation by Ichinyoin Nichijū (1549-1623). His achievements were made in two fields: commentation on Nichiren's works and philosophical exposition of Nichiren's thought. His philosophical exposition was developed by Kenjuin Nichikan (1666-1789), and others, and his commentation was succeeded by Ankokuin Nikkō (1626-1698), Zenchiin Nikkō (1655-1734), and others.

Sōzan Gensei (1623-1668) was, however, not among the followers of Nichijū in the pursuit of Nichiren's religion. He intended to approach Nichiren more intuitively through the media of literature and arts. He was a poet, and created a new field of Nichiren Buddhism. His spiritual movement enriched with literary achievements was inherited by Emyō Nittō (1642-1717), Kannyoin Nittō (1653-1717), Hommyō Nichirin

(1793-1823), and others.

These two currents of Nichiren Buddhism, that is, the scholarly approach and the spiritual approach, were harmoniously combined and made into a philosophical as well as beautiful system of doctrines by Udanain Nichiki (1800-1859).

Chapter V. A History of the Studies on the Saddharmapūṇḍarīka by Nichiren Priests (Hōyō Watanabe)

The doctrines of the Nichiren Sect are based on Nichiren's interpretation of the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka*, which was much influenced by the philosophy of the Tendai Sect. Therefore, it was made a rule for the Nichiren Buddhists to study the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka*, the writings of T'ien-t'ai and his followers, and the writings of Nichiren. But, for some reasons, political, educational, and so on, all these three items were not studied or propagated with equal weight; at one time one of them was emphasized and at another time another:

1. For about two centuries after Nichiren, the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* was mainly used for propagation.
2. In and around the Muromachi Period the doctrines of Nichiren were chiefly taught.
3. After that until recently the texts of the philosophy of T'ien-t'ai were more studied and lectured than the sūtra or Nichiren's writings.

These changes of subjects of study in the Nichiren Sect reveal the social background of the respective periods.

The Saddharmapundarika and its Influence

Note: The positions of the writers who have contributed in this work are as follows: (The names are given in alphabetical order.)

Asai, Endō: Asst. Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Fukui, Kōjun: D. Litt., Prof. of Waseda Univ.

Hibi, Nobumasa: D. Litt., Asst. Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Ishizu, Teruji: D. Litt., Prof. of Tōhoku Univ.

Kabutogi, Shōkō: Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Kageyama, Gyōyū: D. Litt., Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Kamimura, Shinjō: D. Litt., Prof. of Taishō Univ.

Kanakura, Enshō: D. Litt., Prof. of Risshō Univ., Prof. Emeritus of Tōhoku Univ., Member of the Japanese Academy.

Kubota, Shōbun: D. Litt., Vice-President of Risshō Univ.

Miyamoto, Shōson: D. Litt., Prof. of Komazawa Univ., Prof. Emeritus of Tokyo Univ.

Miyazaki, Eishū: Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Mizuno, Kōgen: D. Litt., Prof. of Komazawa Univ.

Mochizuki, Kankō: D. Litt., Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Motai, Kyōkō: Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Murano, Senchū: Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Nomura, Yōshō: Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Sakamoto, Yukio: D. Litt., Dean of the Faculty of Buddhism, Risshō Univ.

Satomi, Taion: Prof. of Minobusan College.

Shigyō, Kaishū: Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Suguro, Shinjō: Asst. Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Taga, Ryūgen: Asst. Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Takagi, Yutaka: Asst. Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Tsukamoto, Keishō: D. Litt., Asst. Prof. of Risshō Univ.

Watanabe, Hōyō: Lecturer of Risshō Univ.

Yazaki, Shōken: Lecturer of Risshō Univ.