

Paul GRONER

## The *Lotus Sutra* and the Perfect-Sudden Precepts

Most accounts of Saichō's reforms of the ordination ceremony describe it as a substitution of the *Fanwang jing* precepts for those of the vinaya. However, the *Lotus Sutra* also served as a key element of Tendai views of the precepts and ordinations, frequently surpassing the *Fanwang jing* in importance. The *Lotus Sutra* included little that could be called precepts in the sense of rules that were to be followed. By investigating the manner in which a variety of Tendai traditions interpreted the role of the *Lotus Sutra*, I describe the diversity and vibrancy of the Tendai discussions of the precepts.

KEYWORDS: Perfect-Sudden precepts—Tendai—ordination—precepts—Ninkū—Annen

Paul GRONER is a professor of religious studies at the University of Virginia.

IN MANY accounts of Saichō's break with using the vinaya to ordain monks, he is described as substituting the precepts from the apocryphal *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 to ordain Tendai monks. Although this is an accurate view, it does not give sufficient weight to the role that the *Lotus Sutra* would increasingly play in Tendai descriptions of ordinations and precepts. Moreover, Tendai uses of the *Lotus Sutra* could be used to support a broad array of positions on the precepts, ranging from the careful observance of the precepts of the vinaya, to positions in which all precepts, including those of the *Fanwang jing*, could be ignored. The range of these views is explored in this article.

East Asian monks used selective quotations from the *Lotus Sutra* to arrive at a broad set of positions on the precepts. Passages could be cited that enabled monks to give a one-vehicle interpretation of the *Sifenlu* 四分律 precepts, thus enabling many Chinese Tiantai monks and Ganjin 鑑真 (Ch. Jianzhen, 668–763), the Chinese monk who brought both the Chinese Tiantai texts and orthodox vinaya ordinations to Japan, to seamlessly incorporate them into their practice. For example, the following passage, in which Śākyamuni speaks to śrāvakas 声聞, could be cited to support this incorporation: “That which you practice is the path of the bodhisattvas. Through gradual cultivation and study, you all shall become Buddhas” (T 9.20b23–24). Ganjin's supposed placement of Prabhūtaratna's pagoda (Jp. Tahōtō 多宝塔) on his ordination platform also indicates his view that the *Lotus Sutra* could be used to reveal the Mahāyāna significance of the *Sifenlu*.

In contrast, other passages such as the “Comfortable Practices” (*anrakugyō* 安樂行) prohibition on consorting with śrāvakas was cited as a rationale for rejecting the *Sifenlu* precepts. According to the *Eizan Daishi den* 叡山大師伝, the earliest biography of Saichō 最澄 (766/767–822), founder of the Japanese Tendai School, Saichō said:

From now on we will not follow śrāvaka ways. We will turn away forever from Hinayāna [strictures on maintaining] dignity. I vow that I shall forever abandon the two-hundred fifty [Hinayāna] precepts. The great teachers Nanyue [Huisi] and Tiantai [Zhiyi] both heard the *Lotus Sutra* preached on Vulture's Peak. Since then, these [bodhisattva] precepts have been transmitted from teacher to teacher. (DZ 5 *bekkan*: 32–33; GRONER 2000, 114)

However, many other early sources stressed the role of the precepts of the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經. Other sources were also introduced into the discussions.

In this article, I emphasize the role of the *Lotus Sutra* and its relation to the *Fanwang jing*.

During the Kamakura and Muromachi periods, many Tendai monks argued that the Perfect-Sudden Precepts were based on the *Lotus Sutra*. Such a claim left many questions. What passages in the *Lotus Sutra* could be interpreted as precepts? How should the precepts of the *Fanwang jing*, the text that Saichō had stated could be used as a substitute for the *Sifenlu* precepts, be understood, especially when it was interpreted in terms of the *Lotus Sutra*, which was cited as the source of his rejection of the vinaya in his earliest biography? Would *Lotus Sutra* precepts be available to all regardless of their social or religious status? What would a *Lotus Sutra* ordination look like? How would lay believers and monastics be distinguished? What would infractions of the precepts be like? How could they be expiated? These are some of the questions that will be examined in this article.<sup>1</sup>

The article begins with a survey of the background to these issues by briefly looking at Saichō, Annen 安然 (841–?), and the *Gakushōshiki mondō* 学生式問答. It then proceeds to explain how three medieval Tendai traditions—the Eshin-ryū 恵心流, Kurodani-ryū 黒谷流, and Jitsudō Ninkū's 実導仁空 (1307–1388) group of scholars—interpreted these issues. Finally, it concludes with a discussion of how lineages were constructed to elucidate the differences between the *Lotus Sutra* precepts and other sets. Because I have written about a number of these issues in the past, I will refer to my previous research in passing and focus on aspects of the thought of these figures that I have not mentioned before. Special attention is given to the position of Ninkū because it is particularly detailed and carefully nuanced.

### *The Background*

#### SAICHŌ

Saichō intended to use the *Fanwang* precepts to ordain monks. This is clearly stated in the *Shijō shiki* 四条式 (DZ 1: 17–18). The ordination manual compiled by Saichō concludes by asking newly-ordained monks whether they can observe the ten major precepts (*jūjūkai* 十重戒) of the *Fanwang jing* (DZ 1: 303–34). Most of the *Kenkairon* 顕戒論 (Treatise revealing the Precepts) can be understood as a defense of a claim that Saichō intended to use the *Fanwang* precepts to ordain monks. For example, note that Saichō divides his refutation of the position of his opponents in Nara into fifty-eight sections, a number that matches the number of precepts in the *Fanwang jing*, though the contents of the *Kenkairon* usually

1. Some of these questions have also been addressed in GRONER 2009b, 2013, and forthcoming.

are not concerned with the contents of the precepts. Saichō's lineage document, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* 内証仏法相承血脉譜, includes a bodhisattva precepts lineage that begins with Rushana (Vairocana) that is clearly a *Fanwang jing* lineage (DZ 1: 230–31; GRONER 2000, 255–61).

Few of the writings that modern scholars believe were written by Saichō can be cited to support the view that he intended to use the *Lotus Sutra* as precepts. Even so, references to the connection between Buddha-nature and the precepts scattered throughout Saichō's writings gave later monks sources that they could cite when arguing for the primacy of the *Lotus Sutra* over the *Fanwang jing* (SHIRATO 1987). The “Comfortable Practices” (*anrakugyō* 安楽行) are cited to indicate that a Mahāyāna practitioner should not go near a śrāvaka, but similar restrictions can be found in the *Fanwang* precepts (*Eizan Daishi den*, DZ 5 [*bekkan*]: 32–33; T 9.37a–b; T 24.1005c–1006b). Saichō also mentions a passage from the “Dharma Teacher” chapter of the *Lotus* that states that one should inhabit the Tathāgata's room, wear his robes, and use his seat—metaphors for being compassionate, having forbearance, and realizing emptiness (T 9.31c; DZ 1: 299; GRONER 2007a). But such mentions by themselves hardly constituted a convincing argument for the primacy of the *Lotus Sutra* as precepts.

#### ANNEN

The interpretation of the scriptural sources of the Perfect precepts changed dramatically with the composition of a detailed commentary on the ordination ceremony, the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒広釈 (Detailed explanation of the universal bodhisattva precepts ordination) by the influential systematizer of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism, Annen. Annen argued that the most basic precepts were the Esoteric precepts (*sanmayakai* 三昧耶戒) (T 74.764b). Because the basic Tendai position on Esoteric Buddhism was that the *Lotus Sutra* and Esoteric Buddhism had the same purport (*enmitsu itchi* 円密一致), this strengthened the position of the *Lotus Sutra*. The *Fanwang* precepts and the two hundred and fifty precepts of the vinaya were both simply expedients (GRONER 1990, 262–64). To support this position, Annen related a story in which Paramārtha loaded the bodhisattva vinaya on a ship to bring to China, but when the ship was about to sink, the texts had to be thrown overboard. As soon as they had been discarded, the ship was able to continue onwards to China. Paramārtha was said to have concluded that the bodhisattva vinaya did not have the proper karmic connections to flourish in China (T 74.757c).

In a variety of hierarchical schemes, Annen clearly subordinated the *Fanwang* precepts to the *Lotus Sutra*. For example, in a categorization of nine levels of Mahāyāna texts, the *Fanwang jing* was said to apply to those with the lowest religious faculties, but the *Lotus Sutra* was appropriate for those of the high-

est faculties. The precepts were considered in terms of the six levels of identity (*rokusoku* 六即), a system that combined the realization that advanced practitioners were essentially the same as worldlings with the necessity for practice. The *Fanwang jing* precepts corresponded to verbal identity (*myōji soku* 名字即), the level in which one had merely heard or read that one was identical to the Buddha, but had not yet begun to practice or gain any degree of realization. In contrast, the *Lotus Sutra* passage stated that when one heard the teaching of the *Lotus Sutra*, one immediately realized enlightenment was cited to demonstrate that the *Lotus Sutra* was the highest teaching, corresponding to the realization of wondrous enlightenment with one's very body (*sokushin myōkaku jōbutsu* 即身妙覺成仏; T 9.31a; T 74.765b). Finally, when the Diamond-realm (*kongōkai* 金剛界) *mandala* was considered, the *Fanwang* precepts corresponded to shallow and abbreviated (*senryakumon* 淺略門) teachings (T 74.764b, 769b). Annen's views were cited as authoritative by later Tendai scholars, both those who advocated a more lenient approach to the precepts and those who wished to revive them by advocating a stricter approach.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE RULES  
FOR MONKS IN TRAINING (*GAKUSHŌSHIKI MONDŌ* 学生式問答)

This text is traditionally attributed to Saichō, but in the last fifty years has been recognized to have been compiled by an unidentified medieval Tendai cleric (ISHIDA 1960; TAMAYAMA 1980). It took the form of a commentary on Saichō's *Rokujōshiki* 六条式 (Rules in six parts). The key question concerns the scriptural sources of the Perfect Precepts (DZ 1: 363). The *Lotus Sutra* is said to be superior to the *Fanwang jing*. The passages in the *Lotus Sutra* relevant to the precepts are then specified. First, the entire text can be called the precepts. This claim was based on a passage from the *Lotus Sutra* that equates holding the sutra—practices that include such activities as memorizing, chanting, copying, and disseminating the text—with holding the precepts (T 9.34b). Second, the passage in the “Dharma-teacher” chapter, which states that one should abide in the Tathāgata's room, wear the Tathāgata's robes, and sit in the Tathāgata's seat, is mentioned (T 9.31c). The third passage is from the “Comfortable Practices” chapter, and is typified by warnings that one should not go near śrāvakas (T 9.37a–b). Finally, the four precepts of Samantabhadra are mentioned. These sources from the *Lotus Sutra* were more extensively commented on by Sonshun 尊舜 (1451–1514), one of the great exponents of the Tendai Eshin lineage, in his commentary on Zhiyi's 智顛 *Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀, the *Makashikan kenmon tenchū* 摩訶止觀見聞添註 (BZ [Suzuki ed.] 37: 331c–332a).

Other key sources are the *Guan Puxian jing* 觀普賢經, the capping sutra for the *Lotus Sutra*, which provided a format for the ordination ceremony, and the

*Yingluo jing* 瓔珞經, which discusses bodhisattva precepts. The *Yingluo jing*'s influence is particularly noteworthy because it supplied the formula for the three collections of pure precepts (*sanjujōkai* 三聚淨戒), used to confer the essence of the precepts in the ordination ceremony; this formula was significant because it excluded the precepts from the vinaya (T 24.1020b–c). This classification system differed from that found in the *Yuqie lun* 瑜伽論 (*Yogācārabhūmi*), which includes the precepts from the vinaya as the lowest of the three collections, the precepts prohibiting evil. In addition, the *Yingluo jing* included statements that the precepts could be conferred by virtually anyone, including husbands and wives, who might confer them on one another. A person who received the precepts and then broke them was said to be superior to one who had not received them but abided by them anyway; a person who received the precepts was at the very least a Buddhist. The bodhisattva precepts did not cease upon death, but lasted from lifetime to lifetime. One could receive them, but could not discard (*shakai* 捨戒) them. One might violate them, but could never lose them (T 24.1021b). Such statements were frequently cited in medieval Tendai texts on ordination and undoubtedly led to lax interpretations of the precepts.

Finally, the *Gakushōshiki mondō* specified that the lineage of the precepts originated in Prabhūtaratna's pagoda, a structure that appears in the *Lotus Sutra* in which Śākyamuni sits next to the Buddha Prabhūtaratna, thereby demonstrating that he is virtually eternal. Prabhūtaratna's Pagoda was conflated with Vulture's Peak (Ryōzen 靈山), the site where Śākyamuni is said to eternally preach the *Lotus Sutra*. Huisi 慧思 and Zhiyi 智顛, the two de facto founders of the Tiantai tradition, are said to have both heard the *Lotus Sutra* preached and to have received the precepts at this site (DZ 1: 369–70). The connection of the precepts with hearing the sutra preached is probably based on the passage in Zhiyi's biography that immediately follows Huisi's claim that they heard the *Lotus* preached; Huisi is then said to have explained the "Comfortable Practices" (*anrakugyō*) to Zhiyi (T 50.191c22–23). While Zhiyi's biography is probably referring to the teachings found in Huisi's work on the "Comfortable Practices," Saichō may well have understood this passage as supporting a claim that the "Comfortable Practices" could serve as precepts, the position maintained in the *Eizan Daishi den* passage cited above. Thus the Perfect precepts lineage is clearly identified with the *Lotus Sutra*.

Until recently, the *Gakushōshiki mondō* was widely accepted as Saichō's work, but recent scholarship has clearly shown that it was compiled later. Even so, it is repeatedly cited by medieval members of almost every Tendai lineage. After this work appeared, the *Lotus Sutra* almost always took precedence over the *Fanwang jing*. However, a number of problems remained. Which passages of the *Lotus Sutra* would be emphasized? How would the *Fanwang* precepts be used? How could passages from the *Lotus Sutra* be used as precepts when the sutra makes

no provision for the administration of the precepts or specifies penalties for infractions? How would an ordination with *Lotus Sutra* precepts be conducted? Below, the positions of three Tendai lineages—Eshin-ryū, Kurodani-ryū, and Jitsudō Ninkū's Seizan-ha and Tendai orders—are surveyed to demonstrate the range of positions held by monks affiliated with the Tendai tradition.

### *Eshin-ryū*

The Eshin-ryū 恵心流 lineage traced its origins through a legend that Ryōgen 良源 (912–985) had conferred original enlightenment (*hongaku* 本覚) teachings on his disciple Genshin 源信 (942–1017) (also known as Eshin *sōzu* or the Bishop Eshin). Eshin-ryū monks dominated a number of the institutions on Mt. Hiei. Perhaps because some of them were concerned with the administration and protection of large tracts of Tendai property, they may have supported a laxer approach to the precepts than lineages on the peripheries of power that focused on stricter and more ascetic practice.

Monks in the lineage often emphasized the connection of the precepts with Buddha-nature and identified the precepts (and Buddha-nature) with such positions as the realization of the true aspect (*jissō* 実相) of phenomena, a teaching fundamental to Tendai thought on enlightenment. Because the term *jissō* also appears in the *Lotus Sutra*, it was identified with realizing the essence of that text. Such interpretations placed little emphasis on actual rules and the treatment of violations, thereby leading to laxer interpretations of the precepts. Because I have discussed some of this material elsewhere, I focus on several documents and issues not treated in my earlier studies (GRONER 2007a).

The *Shuzenji ketsu* 修禪寺決 (Determinations from the Xiuchansi), an Eshin-ryū *hongaku* text attributed to Saichō, contains an ordination ceremony that rewrites part of the traditional *Fanwang* ordination ceremony used by both Zhanran 湛然 (711–782) and Saichō. Like the ordination manuals by Zhanran and Saichō, the precepts are conferred by Śākyamuni as preceptor, Mañjuśrī as master of the ceremony, Maitreya as teacher, the Buddhas of the ten directions as witnesses, and bodhisattvas as fellow students. The emptiness of all difficulties and disqualifying and restraining conditions (*shanan* 遮難) for ordination is announced and then the assembly is asked to assent to conferring the precepts. When the candidate is asked three times to accept the precepts, the essence of the precepts is compared to light and a moon-disk (*gachirin* 月輪) that steadily approaches and finally enters the candidate's heart, imagery that is reminiscent of Esoteric initiations. The candidate is then asked whether he can observe the actual precepts. In the manuals by Zhanran and Saichō, the ten major precepts of the *Fanwang jing* are specified, but in this ceremony, the candidate is asked whether he will maintain the Tathāgata's room, robes, and seat, a formula from

the *Lotus Sutra*. The ritual is said to be from the “Comfortable Practices” chapter of the *Lotus Sutra*, but it actually is from the “Dharma-teacher” chapter.<sup>2</sup> The ceremony ends by citing a passage from the *Fanwang jing* stating, “If sentient beings receive the precepts of the Buddha, they enter the ranks of the Buddhas, with the same rank as the great enlightened ones” (T 24.1004a20–21). This passage was cited often by monks from a number of different lineages; it is typical of a tendency to emphasize the spiritual benefits of receiving the precepts over any actual observance of specific rules. Note that the ten major precepts from the *Fanwang jing* are not mentioned.

A different interpretation of the ordination is taken by Sonshun, one of the great exponents of Eshin-ryū positions; he argued that holding the *Lotus Sutra* (*jikyō* 持經) was the equivalent of holding the precepts (*jikai* 持戒), a position based on a passage from the *Lotus Sutra* (*Nijōshō kenmon*, TZ 9: 225a; T 9.34b; GRONER 2007a). He also argued that with original enlightenment many of the issues traditionally applied to the precepts were obviated, including whether the precepts were upheld or broken and whether the path was cultivated or not. As part of his argument, he cited the *Pusajie yiji* 菩薩戒義記, the commentary on the *Fanwang* precepts attributed to Zhiyi that is frequently cited by those who argued for a stricter interpretation of the precepts. However, Sonshun, who argued for a laxer interpretation of the precepts, noted that the commentary only included three exegetical approaches (*sanjū gengi* 三重玄義) instead of the five usually found in Zhiyi’s works. He argued that this was because the approaches based on cause and effect did not apply to the Perfect-Sudden precepts (*Nijōshō kenmon*, TZ 9: 229b).

The Eshin-ryū position subordinated concrete rules to abstract principles, frequently emphasizing direct realization of the principle underlying our everyday existence as the goal. This position was sometimes called precepts of principle (*rikai* 理戒). In contrast, the following two lineages—Kurodani and Ninkū’s Seizan-ha—stressed adherence to concrete precepts, sometimes called the precepts of phenomena (*jikai* 事戒), as the primary way for practitioners to master the principle and gain realization.

### *Kurodani-ryū*

The Kurodani lineage was located on Mount Hiei, but at sites separate from the centers of economic and political power on the mountain (GRONER 2009a). In the beginning, its founders emphasized monastic discipline and a return to Saichō’s twelve-year seclusion on Mt. Hiei, so much so that the lineage was sometimes viewed as giving the *Fanwang* precepts precedence over the *Lotus* precepts.

2. See TADA et al. 1973, 78–79. The editors (TADA et al. 1973, 449) note that Zhiyi’s *Fahua wen-zhu* equates the Tathāgata’s room, robes, and seat with the “comfortable practices” (T 34.118a).



In fact, there are various reasons to argue for such a position, or for the position that the *Fanwang* precepts should at least be accorded a rank equal to that of the *Lotus Sutra*. Many of these arguments are made explicit in the *Ōwakizashi* 大謬請 (The large text tucked under one's arm), fascicle 14, part 6.<sup>3</sup> Texts such as Saichō's *Shijōshiki* 四条式, *Kenkairon*, and *Kechimyakufu* are cited to prove that he emphasized the *Fanwang jing*. The ordination manuals by Zhanran and Saichō transmit the *Fanwang* precepts. Zhanran's commentary on Zhiyi's *Fahua wenzhu* stated that for the Perfect precepts the *Fanwang jing* should be used (T 34.319b).

Despite the robust defense of the place of the *Fanwang jing* in the *Ōwakizashi*, the authors of that text would eventually come down on the side of the *Lotus Sutra* as taking precedence. For example, according to one position mentioned in the *Ōwakizashi*, there existed a mythical untranslated 120- (or 112-) fascicle version of the *Fanwang jing* that could be classified as a mix of Separate and Perfect teachings, but the chapter on the mind-ground (Shinjibon 心地品) that Kumarājīva had actually translated was a Perfect teaching.<sup>4</sup> A shorter version of the *Naishō Buppō kechimyakufu* (that in fact probably never existed) was said to have represented Saichō's ultimate position. The ordination platform, following the *Guan Puxian jing*, the capping sutra for the *Lotus Sutra*, had Śākyamuni as its main image, indicating that the *Lotus Sutra* took precedence over the *Fanwang jing*.

One of the clearest statements of the Kurodani-ryū position on the relation between the *Fanwang jing* and the *Lotus Sutra* is found in a text by one of the founders of the lineage, Kōen 興円 (1262 or 1263–1317), *Bosatsukaigiki chicken besshi shō* 菩薩戒義記知見別紙抄 (A compendium of additional notes of knowledge of the *Pusajie yiji*), which enumerates a threefold categorization of the precepts:

In the first, the text and its meaning both are concerned with the *Fanwang* precepts; these are a mix of Distinct and Perfect precepts. They are related from the perspective of before the *Lotus Sutra* was preached. In the second level, the

3. The provenance of this text is not clear to me, but SHIMAJI Daitō (1977, 439) suggests that it is an Eshin-ryū document from the Sengoku period or after. It seems to present debate arguments from several perspectives. In this study, I use two sections discussing the sources for the precepts. The first section (14.5) seems to be more consistent with Eshin-ryū arguments while the second (14.6) seems more consistent with the Kurodani-ryū. I thank Nomoto Kakujō and the members of the Tendaishū Seiten Hensanjo for making this text available to me, in an edition probably printed in 1657.

4. In the traditional Tendai system of four levels of content in Śākyamuni's teachings, the two highest are the Distinct and Perfect teachings. The Distinct teaching is usually associated with texts such as the *Huayan jing* and *Fanwang jing*. One use of the term "distinct" is that the stages on the path to Buddhahood are distinct. Although Tendai recognized the teachings as being profound, it criticized them for being applicable for a distinct group of advanced bodhisattvas and not readily available for those of lesser abilities. In contrast, Perfect teachings were available to all and were not characterized by a long path with distinct stages. The mixture of Distinct and Perfect teachings indicated that the Perfect aspects of the Buddha's teaching were still not easily available to all.

text is based on the *Fanwang jing*, but the meaning is based on the *Lotus Sutra*. It thus follows the basic meaning of the *Lotus Sutra*. Although it explains how a bodhisattva studies and practices according to the *Lotus Sutra*, because the text [of the *Lotus Sutra*] is abbreviated [when the precepts are considered], it must rely on the *Fanwang jing* to explain the behavior of the bodhisattva. Thus the bodhisattva precepts rely secondarily on the *Fanwang jing*. In the third level, both the text and meaning are from the *Lotus Sutra*. At that point, they are solely Purely Perfect bodhisattva precepts.

(ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 5b; also see ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 11b)

The *Bosatsukaigiki chicken besshi shō* passage goes on to note the difference between explicating the text from the perspective of one of the four teachings in the Tendai exegetical system (*tōbun* 当分) and from the perspective of the entirety of the Buddha's life (*ichidai* 一代) and his overall purpose, an approach that opens up the Perfect meaning of the other teachings (*kasetsu* 跨節). In the former case, the *Fanwang* precepts are interpreted as a mix of Distinct and Perfect teachings (*betsuenkyō* 別円教); in the latter, they are referred to as bodhisattva precepts and are called Purely Perfect (*jun'en* 純円).

According to Kurodani documents, the title of Zhiyi's commentary did not include the term *Fanwang jing*, but took the title *Pusajie yiji* (A record of the meaning of the Bodhisattva Precepts) because this indicated that it described the Perfect Precepts and surpassed the Distinct and Perfect teaching mix that characterized the *Fanwang jing* and *Huayan jing* (ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 25a). Thus although Zhiyi's commentary would seem to analyze the *Fanwang jing*, the underlying meaning was said to reside in the *Lotus Sutra*.

The primacy of the *Lotus Sutra* over the *Fanwang jing* is also reflected in the Kurodani-ryū "consecrated ordination" (*kaikanjō* 戒灌頂), originally performed after the completion of a twelve-year retreat, but later after a significant, but unspecified period of practice during which one was to uphold the precepts. Early in the ritual, a consecration (*kanjō* 灌頂) is performed and the following passages from the *Lotus Sutra* chanted:

By virtue of conditions is the Buddha-seed realized. For this reason, [the Buddhas] preach the One-vehicle. The enduring abiding of the dharmas, the secure position of the dharmas in the world is ever-abiding. (T 9.9b)

Each time having this thought: How may I cause the beings to contrive to enter the Unexcelled Path and quickly to perfect the Buddha-body? (T 9.44a)

These quotations reflect the Buddha's intention in appearing in the world, the identification of conventional truth with ultimate truth, the valorization of this world, and the quick realization of Buddhahood.

The ritual then continues on two platforms: an outer platform (also called platform of conferral, *denjudan* 伝受壇) and an inner platform (or platform of

realization, *shōkakudan* 正覺壇). The heart of the ritual is a series of four types of *gasshō* performed by the teacher and the student. The four *gasshō* on the outer platform are accompanied by the recitation of four phrases from the *Fanwang jing*:

The four types of *gasshō*: The teacher and student each perform a *gasshō* (this is a normal *gasshō*). “Sentient beings receive the Buddha’s precepts.” The teacher’s left hand and the student’s right hands are joined. Both chant together, “One immediately enters the ranks of the Buddhas.” The teacher’s right hand and the student’s left hand are joined. Together they chant, “Our ranks are the same as the great enlightened ones.” The teacher’s left and right palms are joined to those of the student. Together they chant, “Truly we are offspring of the Buddhas.” (*Kaikan denju shidai*, ZTZ *Enkai* 1: 20a; *Fanwang jing*, T 24.1004a).<sup>5</sup>

Although the passage from the *Fanwang jing* reflects the view that realization occurs with ordination, the long practice of the precepts that preceded this ritual indicates that the concrete rules were vital. In later centuries, as the period of practice preceding the ritual was shortened, the emphasis on adherence to the precepts lessened.

The teacher and student then move to the inner platform. Again, a set of four types of *gasshō* is performed, with a passage from the *Lotus Sutra* chanted after each one. The passages recited are usually not doctrinally significant, but passages that refer to *gasshō* or holding up one hand (for example, see *Kaikan denju shidai*, ZTZ *Enkai* 1: 21–23; *Miaofa lianhua jing*, T 9.9c12, 6c6, 59c14, 60a2). The significance of the ritual is brought out by the explanation that compares the teacher and student with Śākyamuni and Prabhūtaratna (Tahō Nyorai 多宝如来). The agenda to stress the Tendai view of enlightenment is then carried out by explaining that the ten fingers meeting in the *gasshō* represent the interpenetration of the ten realms (*jikkai gogu* 十界互具), an element of the three thousand realms in a single thought-moment (*ichinen sanzen* 一念三千). In addition, the six degrees of identity (*rokusoku*) of worldlings with Buddha are arrayed with the four *gasshō* in the following manner:

First <i>gasshō</i>	identity in principle ( <i>ri soku</i> 理即)
Second <i>gasshō</i>	verbal identity ( <i>myōji soku</i> 名字即)
Third <i>gasshō</i>	identities of practice, seeming realization, partial realization ( <i>kangyō soku</i> 觀行即, <i>sōji soku</i> 相似即, <i>bunshō soku</i> 分証即)
Fourth <i>gasshō</i>	identity of ultimate realization ( <i>kugyō soku</i> 究竟即)

An explanation follows each *gasshō*; the explanation of the second *gasshō* includes the same four lines from the *Fanwang jing* used in the outer platform,

5. I rely on the *Kaikan denju shidai* 戒灌伝授次第, a ritual manual compiled in 1741 by Gōe 豪慧. Although it is a later compilation, it is well constructed and organized.

indicating that the *Fanwang jing* was clearly secondary to the *Lotus Sutra* and was only considered to apply to the level of verbal identity.

The atmosphere of the *kaikanjō* can be seen in the following passage, in which the culmination of the ritual with the fourth *gasshō* is described:

The fourth *gasshō* is the *gasshō* of ultimate identity. The oral explanation is that the teacher raises his right palm, the student his left palm. Without discussing whether they join or are apart, the one hand reveals the mysterious identity [*myōgō* 冥合]. According to the sutra, “Others who do no more than raise one hand have already realized the Buddha’s path.”

(*Miaofa lianhua jing*, T 9.9a20, 25) (Chanted only by the teacher)

(The following is not read.) At the time of the ordination, the teacher and student perform *gasshō*. Through these *gasshō*, the six degrees of identity and realization of Buddhahood [occur]. Through the *gasshō*, the essence of the precepts is revealed. The essence of the worldling and the sage is one; meditation and wisdom are replete only in the *gasshō*. The five elements are replete.... If one grasps this, then attaining enlightenment is like turning one’s hand over.

(*Kaikan denju shidai*, ZTZ *Enkai* 1: 23b)

The Kurodani lineage clearly gave the *Lotus Sutra* the most important place in its treatment of the precepts. At the same time, the precepts of the *Fanwang jing* played a crucial role in giving concrete expression to practice, an aspect of the path that was not spelled out in the *Lotus Sutra*. As time passed, the critical balance between the *Lotus Sutra* and the *Fanwang jing* in the Kurodani lineage would increasingly shift towards the abstract, with growing emphasis being placed on the *Lotus Sutra* and the *kaikanjō* as a ritual to confer or call forth Buddhahood in this very body (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成仏).

### *Ninkū’s Treatment of the Fanwang Precepts*

Ninkū was a skilled administrator, serving as the abbot of both the Tendai temple Rozanji 廬山寺 in Kyoto and the Seizan headquarters at Sangoji 三鈷寺 in the western foothills outside of Kyoto. Sangoji was the headquarters of the Seizan-ha 西山派, a branch of Jōdoshū that was close to Tendai. Rozanji was an important center of Tendai in Kyoto. Ninkū was also one of the most prolific authors of his time. As the leader of two temples that engaged in lecturing and debate, he and the monks surrounding him were vitally interested in educational and administrative issues, including the rules for monastic discipline; they compiled texts on a variety of topics including the precepts (GRONER 2003a; 2003b).

Ninkū rarely cited the sort of apocryphal sources favored by Eshin-ryū advocates in his discussions of the precepts. In fact, he was keenly aware of the history of Tendai discussions of the precepts and cited them with accuracy and a sense

of their historical value and practical consequences. One of the few exceptions to this was the *Gakushōshiki mondō*, a text that Ninkū, like virtually everyone else of his age, believed was by Saichō. The text did not have many of the *hon-gaku* elements that marked many works as clearly being later productions, but reflected later preoccupations with placing the *Fanwang jing* at a level subordinate to the *Lotus Sutra*. The importance of the text as an object of Ninkū's attention is indicated by his placement of its explanation of the precepts at both the beginning of the *Bosatsukai giki kikigaki* 菩薩戒義記聞書 (Writings about lectures on the *Pusajie yiji*, hereafter cited as *Kikigaki*; SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, 3: 3a), his extensive commentary on Zhiyi's *Pusajie yiji*, and at the beginning of a debate text, the *Endonkai gyōjishō* 円頓戒曉示抄 (Compilation on understanding the Perfect-Sudden precepts, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 364a).

Ninkū could not state that the traditional claim that the *Fanwang jing* was a mixed Perfect and Distinct teaching, which was suggested in both Chinese Tiantai texts and the *Gakushōshiki mondō*, was incorrect because he would be going against the views that had been used by the most eminent Tiantai and Tendai scholars. Instead, he had to come up with a way to recognize their positions, but then advance a position that both explained and superceded their views. Restoring the precepts to a place of prominence was a key factor in his efforts.

Ninkū chose to base his views on Zhiyi's *Pusajie yiji*, a text that gave the *Fanwang* precepts a more pronounced Tendai perspective and placed more importance on the precepts themselves. In addition, by emphasizing it, Ninkū could ignore commentaries by scholars from other traditions. Although this text was occasionally mentioned by Eshin-ryū scholars such as Sonshun, it did not play a major role in their thought. It came to play a more important role in Kurodani scholarship, but was central to Ninkū's interest in the precepts.

The authenticity of the *Pusajie yiji* has been questioned by Satō Tetsuei (1902–1984) because it relies on a threefold exegetical structure rather than the fivefold structure found in most of Zhiyi's works. Moreover, it interprets the essence of the precepts (*kaitai* 戒体) as being at least partially physical, even though in other works by Zhiyi, the essence of the precepts is interpreted as being mental (SATŌ 1960, 412–15; GRONER 2000, 225–27, 232). The points that Satō raised also played a crucial role in Ninkū's interpretation of the *Pusajie yiji*. In this article I follow Ninkū's traditional view and regard the *Pusajie yiji* as Zhiyi's work.<sup>6</sup>

6. For an argument that the differences between the *Pusajie yiji* and *Mohe zhiguan* on the essence of the precepts can be reconciled, see HIRAKAWA 1991. Recently MURAKAMI (2009) has used a different set of arguments to suggest that the *Pusaji yishu* was compiled well after Zhiyi's death, but was in existence by the time of Zhanran and his disciple Mingguang 明暎 (fl. 777).

At least three reasons for Ninkū's decision to focus on the commentary can be suggested. First, the *Fanwang jing* was a terse text. By using Zhiyi's commentary, Ninkū was able to develop his views more extensively. Second, Ninkū was concerned with how to classify the *Fanwang jing* precepts. Were they merely expedient teachings? Or could they be classified as something more authoritative? Zhiyi's text offered possibilities to resolve these issues, particularly if it could be shown to differ from other commentarial traditions. Third, by basing his views on Zhiyi's commentary, Ninkū clearly based his views on Tendai teachings and could ignore the numerous commentaries on the *Fanwang jing* by scholars from other schools.

Ninkū's major work on the precepts, the *Bosatsukai giki kikigaki*, was a subcommentary based on Zhiyi's commentary on the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing*. The *Kikigaki* is the longest commentary on Zhiyi's text. Other texts by Ninkū and those around him, such as the *Endonkai gyōjishō* and *Kaijushō* 戒珠抄 (Compilation on the pearl of the precepts), were lecture and debate texts that focused on issues that arose in reading and interpreting the *Pusajie yiji*. Thus Zhiyi's commentary played a central role in Ninkū's views on the precepts. The *Bonmōkyō jikidanshō* 梵網經直談抄, a set of popular lectures on the *Fanwang jing* probably given by Ninkū, was also based on *Pusajie yiji*. While the *Fanwang jing* was cited to prove points, the *Pusajie yiji* served as the focal point of Ninkū's doctrinal views of the precepts.

In choosing to focus on this work, Ninkū departed from a number of other medieval texts on the precepts. For example, an Eshin-ryū text by Prince Ryōjo 良助 (1268–1302), the *Endonkai myakufu kuketsu* 円頓戒脈譜口決 (Oral determinations of Perfect-sudden precept lineages), was primarily based on Annen's *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* and a number of oral transmissions. Ryōjo does, however, add two new lineages to those already mentioned: the lineage from Vairocana and the lineage from Śākyamuni in Prabhūtaratna's pagoda (Tahōtō). The first of these additional lineages was called the direct conferral on Mount Dasu (*Daiso jikiju* 大蘇直授), and referred to Zhiyi's enlightenment on Mount Dasu when he practiced the Lotus samādhi under Huisi. The second lineage was called the direct conferral that is appropriate to the recipient's religious faculties (*tōki jikiju* 當機直授); this was based on the conferral by Śākyamuni and bodhisattvas described in the capping sutra of the *Lotus Sutra* (Ryōjo 1476, 64–66 [section 55]). Thus the two new lineages added other dimensions to the emphasis on the *Lotus Sutra*. The *Pusajie yiji* is largely ignored in the *Gakushōshiki mondō* and Eshin-ryū materials.

#### THE BODHISATTVA PRECEPTS AS AN INDEPENDENT TEXT

In this section, Ninkū's efforts to raise the *Fanwang* precepts to the level of the *Lotus Sutra* are examined. Ninkū's sense of the importance of the precepts can

be seen in his citations of Chinese views of the *Fanwang jing*. He noted Zhiyi's claim that the *Fanwang jing* was the last text translated by Kumārajīva. Because Kumārajīva wished to give it a special place, he had memorized the text, translated it, and then urged his disciples to propagate it, all acts that indicated the high respect he had for its teachings (*Kaijushō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2; 231a; *Kikigaki*, *Seizan zensho*, *bekkan* 3: 19b–20a; *Fanwang jing*, T 24.997a9; *Pusajie yiji*, T 40.563a16–18). In addition, Ninkū noted that Zhanran had stated, “If one wishes to establish the Perfect precepts, one should indicate the *Fanwang* precepts; they are complete” (*Kaijushō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2; 231a; *Fahua wenzhu ji*, T 34.319b4). These were both strong arguments. The first cited the respect that the supposed translator of the *Fanwang jing*, a figure who had translated the authoritative version of the *Lotus Sutra* and who played a key role in Tiantai lineages, had for the bodhisattva precepts. The second identified the Perfect precepts with the *Fanwang jing*. However, such statements alone would not have enabled Ninkū to supersede the views of the *Fanwang jing* from other schools, not to mention Chinese Tiantai and Japanese Tendai scholars that described it as a mix of Perfect and Distinct teachings.

According to Ninkū's interpretation of the *Pusajie yiji*, Zhiyi was not simply commenting on the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing*, the traditional view found in most commentaries on the *Pusajie yiji*, but rather on the second fascicle as an independent text. The first fascicle of the *Fanwang jing* included an influential description of bodhisattva stages of the Buddhist path, which many East Asian exegetes had associated with those in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (*Dilun* 地論).<sup>7</sup> As a result the *Fanwang jing* had been closely associated with the *Avatamsaka* (*Huayan jing* 華嚴經) as a capping sutra (*kekkyō* 結經). Moreover, both were narrated by Vairocana Buddha. The *Fanwang jing* was thus classified as the same type of teaching as the *Huayan jing*, a mixture of Distinct and Perfect teachings (*betsuenkyō*); moreover, it was said to be inferior to the Purely Perfect teachings (*jun'enkyō* 純円教) of the *Lotus Sutra* (Mingguang, *Tiantai pusajie su*, T 40.581c14; Zhiyi, *Fahua wenzhu*, T 34.128a23; Zhanran, *Fahua wenzhu ji*, T 34.330c1; Yuancui 元粹, *Sijiaoyi beishi* 天台四教儀備釋, z 57: 636c18). Such arguments weakened the authority of the precepts in the second fascicle.

For example, when the two-fascicle text of the *Fanwang jing* was viewed in terms of the three trainings (*sangaku* 三学), the stages enumerated in the first fascicle referred to meditation and wisdom and the second fascicle referred to morality (*Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, 88; ISHIGAKI 1956, 210–11). The two-fascicle text consisted of “distinct” expositions of the three trainings, thus meriting its classification as a Distinct teaching. When the fascicle with the precepts was read first and followed by the fascicle on stages, the precepts seemed to

7. FUNAYAMA (2011) has demonstrated that the two fascicles are different both stylistically and in content.

be preliminary to the meditation and wisdom of the first fascicle. When the two-fascicle text is considered in terms of stages on the path, the stages enumerated in the first fascicle are those of bodhisattvas. An exegete could thus easily argue that the precepts were not applicable to people on the lower stages of the path.

Ninkū's new interpretation of the text led to a number of innovative views about the bodhisattva precepts. Instead of treating the precepts as only one of the three trainings, all three are included in the putative independent text. Thus the precepts encompass meditation and wisdom, thereby raising their status from that of a preliminary practice (*Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, 88; ISHIGAKI 1956, 210–11). When stages were considered in Ninkū's reading of the text, they were the six degrees of identity (*rokusoku*), a formulation that stressed the essential identity between worldlings and Buddhas, but still allowed for the importance of practice (*Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, 63b). Thus Ninkū rejected the view that the precepts were only for bodhisattvas, not for worldlings or Buddhas. The emphasis on practice found in the six degrees of identity was vital. In giving the precepts such a high status, Ninkū did not want to allow the lax interpretations followed by some Tendai exegetes, particularly those in the Eshin lineage.

Ninkū believed that the precepts in the *Fanwang jing* could be considered Perfect teachings applicable to everyone. But to make his case, he had to rid them of the label of being a mixture of Distinct and Perfect teachings and argue that they were actually a purely Perfect teaching. To do this, Ninkū raised the status of the fascicle on precepts to the same level as the *Lotus Sutra*.

According to Ninkū, after Zhiyi explained the title of the *Fanwang jing* (T 40.563a16–21), he began referring to the text as the *Pusajie jing* 菩薩戒經 (Sutra on the bodhisattva precepts), not as the *Fanwang jing*. In fact, the very title of Zhiyi's commentary used this appellation. In this way, Ninkū could claim that Zhiyi had indicated that he was commenting on the precepts as an independent work, not as part of a larger *Fanwang jing*. On the basis of a passage in Zhiyi's commentary, Ninkū argued that the text on which Zhiyi had based his commentary was a "one-chapter one-fascicle" (*ippon ikkan* 一品一卷) text that existed independently of the two-fascicle translated *Fanwang jing* and the mythical 112- or 120-fascicle version of the *Fanwang jing* that had never been translated (*Gyōjishō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 366–67; *Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, 4). In fact, the term *ippon ikkan* does occur in the *Pusajie yiji* (T 40.580a17), but is used in a different sense than the way Ninkū used it. As evidence for his position, Ninkū cited a passage in the *Pusajie yiji* that indicated that when the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing* was "excerpted" from the text, it was called the *Bodhisattva Precepts Sutra* (T 40.569c4–5). Ninkū read the term that I have translated as "excerpted" (外) in the previous sentence as meaning "outside of the *Fanwang jing*" (or perhaps the *Huayan jing*), suggesting that a separate inde-



pendent text existed (*Kaijushō*, *ZTZ Enkai* 2: 292–94). If the *Bodhisattva Precepts Sutra* were simply a single chapter in a larger text, it would not have had an introduction (*jo* 序) and a concluding section urging that it be spread to others (*rutsū* 流通). Together with a main exposition (*shōshū* 正宗), these were the three essential parts of a complete scripture that were traditionally identified in East Asian Buddhist exegesis. On the basis of a passage in Zhiyi's *Pusajie yiji*, Ninkū identified these parts in the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing* and argued that they proved it was an independent text (T 40.569c5; *Kaijushō*, *ZTZ Enkai* 2: 294–97).

Zhiyi's use of these terms in his commentary, which Ninkū used to argue that the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing* represented an independent text, were usually taken by other Tiantai and Tendai commentators as conventions that Zhiyi had employed to analyze the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing*, not as part of a proof to establish the second fascicle as an independent text. For example, the term *rutsū* in Zhiyi's commentary simply referred to spreading the precepts, not to the propagation of an independent text (*Pusajie yiji*, T 40.579c25–27).

Ninkū recognized that serious objections could be raised against his claim and presented those criticisms in the *Kaijushō*. The contents of the supposed independent text were the same as the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing*. No other commentary on the *Fanwang jing* treated the second fascicle as an independent work, though many commented only on the second fascicle of the *Fanwang jing*. In addition, Ninkū's interpretation of the *Pusajie yiji* differed from traditional views, which frequently identified it with the *Huayanjing*. Ninkū noted that three subcommentaries on Zhiyi's commentary by Chinese monks of the Song dynasty—Daoxi 道熙 (n.d.), Yunqi 蘊齋 (1054–1130), and Yuxian 與咸 (d. 1163)—did not follow his interpretation.<sup>8</sup> By arguing that Zhiyi had treated the second fascicle as an independent text with the title *Pusajie jing* (*Bodhisattva Precepts Sutra*), Ninkū could argue that the positions in which the *Fanwang* precepts were viewed as a mixture of Perfect and Distinct teachings, or the *Gakushōshiki mondō*'s argument that the *Fanwang* precepts were subsidiary to the *Lotus Sutra*, reflected the two-fascicle *Fanwang jing*, but not the one-fascicle *Bodhisattva Precepts Sutra*. With this forced interpretation, he tried to account for the differences between his own interpretation and those found in the earlier works by Chinese and Japanese exegetes.

As was noted above, the authenticity of the *Pusajie yiji* has been questioned by Satō Tetsuei because it used a threefold exegesis (*sanjū gengi*): 1. explaining the title; 2. setting forth the essence; and 3. analysis of the text. In contrast, in many of his other commentaries, Zhiyi had employed a fivefold analysis (*gojū*

8. Although Ninkū cited approximately ten commentaries on the *Pusajie yiji*, he cites these three the most often, usually in a critical manner. Only Yuxian's commentary survives (TERAI 2000, 100).

*genji* 五重玄義): 1. explanation of the title; 2. definition of the essence; 3. elucidation of the tenets; 4. discussion of the function or application; and 5. classification of doctrine. The threefold exegetical style seemed inferior because it was not as complete as the fivefold exegesis. This issue had troubled other Tiantai commentators. In fact, Chinese commentators such as Daoxi and Yunqi had argued that the threefold and fivefold interpretations were the same and had tried to reconcile the two systems. In contrast, Yuxian had argued that they were different. Zhanran's disciple Mingguang, the author of the earliest Tiantai commentary on the *Fanwang jing* precepts after that attributed to Zhiyi, had also been concerned with rectifying the threefold exegetical approach; however, he had followed Fazang's commentary on the *Fanwang jing* and had thus used Huayan interpretations in some of his work. Ninkū argued that none of these Chinese commentators had understood the profound and subtle meaning of Zhiyi's use of the threefold exegesis. For Ninkū, the threefold exegesis was Zhiyi's way of indicating how special the *Bodhisattva Precepts Sutra* was (*Kaijushō*, *ZTZ Enkai* 2: 227–32, 235–38).

### Lineages

Tendai exegetes were aware of the differences between the various presentations of the precepts and frequently discussed them in hierarchical terms, dividing them into such categories as Buddha's precepts (*bukkai* 仏戒) and bodhisattva precepts (*bosatsukai* 菩薩戒), precepts in principle (*rikai*) and precepts in phenomena (*jikai*). These dichotomies were often analyzed in terms of whether the precepts could be lost or not, or whether they were based on the *Lotus Sutra*, *Fanwang jing*, or more abstract principles that transcended these texts. In this section, however, I examine several examples of how lineages were used to discuss the relation between the precepts of the *Lotus Sutra* and the *Fanwang jing*.

The *Ōwakizashi* presents arguments for taking either the *Lotus Sutra* or the *Fanwang jing* as the primary source for the Perfect-Sudden precepts, and it was probably intended to train monks in debate. It accounts for the origin of the two positions in the way in which Saichō conferred the precepts. In section five of the fourteenth fascicle of the *Ōwakizashi*, Saichō is said to have conferred the bodhisattva precepts on two of his major disciples—Kōjō 光定 (779–858) and Ennin (794–864)—on separate occasions.<sup>9</sup> When he bestowed them on Kōjō, he conferred the *Fanwang* precepts, but for Ennin, the *Lotus Sutra* precepts were bestowed. According to the *Ōwakizashi*, the lineage of *Fanwang* precepts was continued by such monks as Ryōnin 良忍 (1073–1132) out of a compassion-

9. The text actually notes that he conferred the precepts first on Jakkō Daishi 寂光大師 (the honorific title of Saichō's student Enchō 円澄), but then seems to confuse him with another of Saichō's students, Kōjō, perhaps because of the character 光 that the two names had in common.

ate feeling that it should not be abandoned, but Tendai monks are said to have always realized that the Perfect-Sudden precepts primarily relied on the *Lotus Sutra* and only secondarily on the *Fanwang jing*. Both the *Fanwang jing* and *Lotus Sutra* precept lineages were eventually conferred on Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212).<sup>10</sup> However, Hōnen conferred the *Fanwang jing* lineage only on Shōkū 証空 (1177–1247), the de facto founder of the Seizan-ha. This account thus explained how both the Kurodani lineage and Shōkū received the precepts from Hōnen and stressed the *Pusajie yiji*, but radically differed from each in interpreting it, with Shōkū's lineage clearly interpreted as inferior or incomplete because of its supposed emphasis of the *Fanwang* precepts.

In creating the two lineages, Saichō was said to have had two different objectives. The *Fanwang jing* lineage and the teachings associated with it reflected his efforts to counter criticisms from the Nara schools; they served as teachings (*kyōmon* 教門) that were tailored to the recipient. In contrast, the *Lotus Sutra* lineage consisted of the ultimate meaning (*jitsugi* 実義) of the precepts. These precepts consisted of the manner in which matters of dignity and propriety (*igi* 威儀) of sentient beings (in other words, the ordinary behavior of plants, animals, humans, and other sentient beings) were to be maintained as they passed through the six realms of rebirth.<sup>11</sup>

At times, the *Ōwakizashi* account is sloppy. In its account of lineages, although Kōjō is said to have received the *Fanwang* precepts lineage from Saichō, a close reading of his *Denjutsu isshin kaimon* 伝述一心戒文 (Narrative of the document on the one-mind precepts) reveals that he was primarily interested in using Yixing's 一行 commentary on the *Darijing* 大日經 (*Mahāvairocana-sūtra*) to interpret the precepts, a factor that is not mentioned. The emphasis on the *Fanwang* precepts is said to have been found in a number of texts associated with Saichō, including the *Kechimyakufu*, *Kenkairon*, and the *Ken'yō daikairon* 顯揚大戒論 (Treatise clarifying and extolling the Mahāyāna precepts); however, the last work is by Ennin. All of these texts are said to reflect arguments designed to counter

10. According to section 14.5 of the *Ōwakizashi*, Ninkū's Rozanji lineage argued that the *Fanwang* precepts were primary, a characterization that is refuted in Ninkū's writings. Most lineages for the bodhisattva precepts included Ennin and Hōnen in the same lineage. For an example, see TAMAYAMA 1980, 758–60. Other Tendai groups made similar claims about secret transmissions. For example, Ninkū argued that Shōkū, founder of the Seizan-ha, had heard Hōnen's explanation of Zhiyi's *Pusajie yiji* three times, but that other monks had heard only a line or two (*Seizan shōnin engi*, in WASHIO 1925–1933, 1.5: 339). Of course this view of Hōnen runs counter to Pure Land views of him as rejecting the precepts for the exclusive practice of the nenbutsu, but Tendai and the Seizan tradition of the Jōdoshū consistently trace precept lineages through Hōnen.

11. *Ōwakizashi*, fasc. 14, section 5. A similar point about the practice and realization of trees and grasses is made in the *Sōmoku hosshin shugyō jōbutsuki* 草木発心修行成仏記 (BZ [Suzuki ed.] 41: 141b–142a), a text attributed to Ryōgen but actually dating from the twelfth century.

the arguments of the Nara schools rather than to have revealed Saichō's ultimate position on the precepts, the primacy of the *Lotus Sutra*.

A slightly different view is found in a Tendai Kurodani document, *Endon kaitai shikishin no koto* 円頓戒体色心事 (On whether the essence of the precepts is physical or mental). This text explained how the *Lotus Sutra* lineage, which is primary, merged with the *Fanwang jing* lineage, which is secondary, during the time of Huisi (ZTZ *Enkai* 1: 398b–399a). The *Lotus Sutra* lineage was said to be primary and to reflect Zhiyi's true views; the *Fanwang* lineage is described as secondary and a mere expedient to refute other interpretations. The two lineages were then conferred separately by Eikū's 叡空 (d. 1179) students. The Seizan 西山 lineage transmitted the *Fanwang* lineage while Hōnen (through the Nison'in 二尊院 lineage) conferred the *Lotus Sutra* lineage. These lineages are said to reflect the differences in the emphasis placed on the *Fanwang* precepts by the two lineages.

Ninkū was critical of the Kurodani's view of lineage. In the *Kikigaki*, he mentioned two initial lineages that developed after Saichō's death.<sup>12</sup> The first was called the Ōhara 大原 lineage and had its origins with Kōjō 光定 (779–858). The lineage was eventually passed on to Ryōnin 良忍 (1073–1132) who conferred the precepts on Hongaku Shōnin 本覚上人 (n.d.).<sup>13</sup> However, Ninkū noted that by his time, this lineage had weakened and had very few adherents.

Did an Ōhara lineage going through Ryōnin exist? Unpublished documents from Saikyōji 西教寺, head temple of the Shinsei branch 真盛宗 of Tendai, indicate that several ordination lineages with significantly different interpretations, including the Kurodani lineage described above, also traced themselves from Ryōnin, but an analysis of these will have to wait for another opportunity (KODERA 1981; SHIRATO 1981; SUGIZAKI 1981). Because Ninkū was ordained at the Raigōin in Ōhara, a site associated with Ryōnin, he probably was familiar with many of the lineages that existed during his time.

Ninkū referred to the lineage that he wished to emphasize in the *Kikigaki* as the Kurodani 黒谷 (perhaps indicating that he wished to challenge Kōen's use of the term "Kurodani lineage"); Ninkū claimed that it had its origins in

12. Other views of lineage existed. For a significantly different perspective, Eson's 惠尊 *Tendai Engyō bosatsukai sōjō kechimyakufu* 天台円教菩薩戒相承血脈譜, compiled in 1272, lists two major lineages: Kōjō and Enchin, with Ryōnin participating in both; see SHIRATO 1981, 92. Other exegetical approaches to the precepts that traced their origins to such early Tendai figures as Eryō 惠亮 (802?–860) and Chōi 長意 (836–906) are known, but little detail about them remains (FUKUDA 1954, 662).

13. See *Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, *bekkan* 3: 28b. Hongaku Shōnin, also known as Ennin 縁忍 (not to be confused with the Tendai patriarch Ennin 円仁, famous for his travel diary of his journeys in China), was the second abbot (*chōrō* 長老) of Raigōin 来迎院 at Ōhara 大原. Little is known about Hongaku Shōnin, but Yoshida Tsunefusa 吉田経房 (1143–1200) reported meeting him and being impressed (SUGIZAKI 1981, 155–56; TSUNODA 1994, 2: 2674d).

Ennin, just as Kōen's lineage had done, but Ninkū's interpretation of Ennin's lineage was different from the *Ōwakizashi* lineage described above. Ennin had cited a variety of exoteric texts in his *Ken'yō daikairon*, but had died before he could complete the work by adding his own comments; Ennin's student Anne 安慧 (805–868) asked Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845–903) to compose an introduction to the text. The *Ken'yō daikairon* had not been cited often in early Tendai works, probably because Ennin had not lived long enough to provide a guide as to how to interpret the voluminous quotations in it. For Ninkū, Ennin's position coincided with a position that Ninkū himself sometimes articulated, that the precepts should be emphasized and not be mixed with other traditions that might undermine them.<sup>14</sup> Evidence for the high regard that the Seizan lineage had for Ennin is found in a list of texts published (*inban* 印板) by Shōkū, the founder of the Seizan lineage. Among them was Ennin's *Ken'yō daikairon* (*Jōdo sōkeizu*, TŌKYŌ DAIGAKU SHIRYŌ HENSANJO 5.23: 178). At one point, Ninkū cited a passage from the *Yuanjuejing* 円覺經 (Perfect enlightenment sutra) and noted that it had also been cited by Ennin in the *Ken'yō daikairon* (*Dayuanjuejing*, T 17.921a24; Ennin, *Ken'yō daikairon*, T 74.712a; Ninkū, *Shingaku bosatsu gyōyōshō*, T 74.782a). Finally, one of Ninkū's last works, composed in 1386, was the *Daikai shinanshō* 大戒指南抄 (A compass for the Mahāyāna precepts) in one fascicle. This text is a detailed interpretation of the introduction to Ennin's *Ken'yō daikairon*.<sup>15</sup> This is quite different from the treatment of the *Ken'yō daikairon* found in the *Ōwakizashi* that relegated it to a secondary role as a refutation of Nara School positions, sometimes wrongly attributing it to Saichō.

According to Ninkū, Ennin's lineage was passed down to Eikū 叡空 (d. 1179), who in turned conferred the teachings on Hōnen. However, Eikū and Hōnen had a fundamental disagreement about the concept of the essence of the precepts. Eikū argued that it should be identified with the mind of true aspect (*jissōshin* 実相心), basing his view on Mingguang's commentary, which is close to the interpretation found in the *Mohe zhiguan* (*Tiantai pusajie shu*, T 40.581a23–24, 587b3; *Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, *bekkan*, 3: 28b). Hōnen argued that this term was not found in the *Pusajie yiji* and that Eikū's views did not correspond with those of Zhiyi. The impasse was finally resolved when Eikū went to Hōnen

14. *Kōin gakuō tsūki*, T 83.534c. However, elsewhere Ninkū sees the precepts as initiating people into Buddhism and Pure Land teachings as leading them to their final goal (*Bonmōkyō jikidanshō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 167b, relying on a mention of the Pure Land in the *Pusajie yiji*, T 40.563b11).

15. The *Daikai shinanshō* has not been published, but I was able to obtain a copy of a manuscript from Kitano Tenmangū 北野天満宮 with the help of Wakazono Zensō 若園善聰 of Ryūkyō University. He hopes to publish an annotated version of the text.

and praised his views, suggesting that they make a pact that they would be each other's teachers (*Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, 28b).

In the *Gyōjishō*, Ninkū suggested that Hōnen gave these teachings to Shōkū as a secret teaching, and that they were unknown to Hōnen's other students, in particular to Hōnenbō Shinkū 法蓮房信空 (1146–1228) and the other members of the Nison'in 二尊院 lineage (*Gyōjishō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 424; *Bonmōkyō jikidanshō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 158b–159a). As Ninkū wrote in his biography of Shōkū:

The precepts of the Saint, Hōnen, are divided into two traditions: the Nison'in of Saga and the Seizan lineage, which has been transmitted since Shōkū. Shōkū is widely known to have been Hōnen's prized disciple and to have received his true teaching. When Hōnen lectured on the *Pusajie yiji*, others might only hear one chapter or one section; Shōkū heard him lecture on the entire text two or three times.

(*Zen'e shōnin e*, TŌKYŌ DAIGAKU SHIRYŌ HENSANJO 5.23: 227)

This account is strengthened by Ryōe's 了慧 (1251–1330) *Tendai bosatsukai-gisho kenmon* 天台菩薩戒義疏見聞. Ryōe had received the precepts from a lineage including Hōnen's disciple Tankū 湛空 (1176–1253), who belonged to Shinkū's lineage. According to a passage close to the beginning of the text:

Shin[kū] answered, "Our teacher Gen[kū, also known as Hōnen] primarily studied the Pure Land teachings and did not study the commentary on the precepts.... But he [Hōnen] would say that there were precepts of phenomena [*jikai*] and precepts of principle [*rikai*]. When precepts of phenomena were considered, adherence and breaking of the precepts existed. When precepts in principle were considered, only adherence existed, but breaking the precepts did not. When the precepts were received, one had them forever and could not lose them. When he conducted ordinations, [Hōnen] would say in the introduction, these precepts eternally abide through the three time periods. Although one can receive them, one cannot abandon them. Although one breaks them, one does not lose them. They abide through the future.

(BZ [Suzuki ed.] 16: 66a; see *Yingluo jing*, T 24.1021b)

Thus Ninkū's view that significant differences existed between the positions of Shinkū and Shōkū on the precepts was shared by monks from rival lineages, even if they did not agree on their evaluations of those interpretations.

Did Ninkū's view that the bodhisattva precepts were a Perfect teaching actually reflect Shōkū's position? Shōkū was so vitally concerned with the precepts that when he was on his deathbed he told a visitor that the path to rebirth in the Pure Land consisted of the four precepts and three encouragements (discussed below) and the visualization of the Buddha (*kanbutsu* 觀仏) and recitation of the Buddha's name (*nenbutsu* 念佛) according to the *Guan wuliangshou jing* 觀無量壽經 (Contemplation Sutra). Thus Shōkū was portrayed in Ninkū's biography of

him as closely associating the observance of the precepts and Pure Land practice. Two days later, Shōkū discussed the interpretation of passages in Zhiyi's *Pusa-jiejing yiji* concerning the stages and the four teachings, a topic that was vital to the classification of the *Bodhisattva Precepts Sutra* as a Purely Perfect teaching. Shōkū's conversation partner was Myōkan 明観 (n.d.), abbot of Sennyūji 泉涌寺 (*Honchō kōsōden*, BZ 63: 99a, 339c; *Kikigaki*, SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 1975, 68). Myōkan, also known as Chikyō 智鏡, had studied under Shunjō 俊苾 (1166–1127), a Tendai monk who had studied the precepts in China. Myōkan also traveled to China in 1238 to study the precepts, Chan and Pure Land. Upon his return, he was named the fourth abbot of Sennyūji. Because Myōkan would probably have adhered to a more traditional Chinese interpretation of the *Pusajie yiji*, the two monks probably would have disagreed on many points; even so, the two men seem to have been good friends. Despite such evidence that Shōkū was concerned with the precepts and how the bodhisattva precepts should be classified, he did not write much about them; in contrast, Ninkū was involved in the composition of numerous texts on the precepts. Significant differences between the positions of Shōkū and Ninkū on the precepts may have existed, but Shōkū's stance is not clear enough to delineate this issue in detail (Asai 1981, 123).

Ninkū considered still another interpretation of precepts lineage, a continuous and unbroken lineage from the Buddha to a series of patriarchs, comparing it with Zen and Tendai views of lineages. With the exception of Zen and some Esoteric practitioners, no other school argued for such an unbroken lineage. Earlier Chinese Tiantai and Japanese Tendai monks had argued that such a lineage had been broken with the death of Śiṃha (Shishi 師子), last in a putative line of Indian patriarchs accepted by the Tiantai School. Ninkū did not accept the Zen tradition's interpretation of its unbroken lineage, but also was critical of traditional Tendai critiques of it. Instead, he developed his own argument for a continuous lineage (*fuḥōzō sojō* 付法藏祖承). He began by suggesting that the traditional Tiantai view of a lineage that was interrupted by Śiṃha's death was a provisional and Hīnayāna view, and then offered a new interpretation of a patriarchal lineage:

The twenty-three patriarchs [up to Śiṃha] all lived during the thousand years of the True Dharma [*shōbō* 正法] and were all sages. But when the Period of the True Dharma turned into the Periods of the Simulated and End of the Dharma, then the proselytization by teachers who are worldlings [*bonshi* 凡師] changed its spiritual means. After Śiṃha's death, the True Dharma was hidden, but this did not mean that there were no men who transmitted it; the transmission continued. (*Kaijushō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 283b)

Ninkū added that Zen too clung to a Hīnayāna and provisional conception of lineage and then confused it with their teachings of "a separate transmission outside of the teachings."

Instead of the unbroken Zen lineage, Ninkū suggested that the unbroken transmission of the Buddhist teachings could be found in the bodhisattva precepts lineage, which went from Vairocana to Śākyamuni in Prabhūtaratna's pagoda and then to more than twenty bodhisattvas. The vague expression "more than twenty bodhisattvas" included Mahākāśyapa and Ānanda, two figures at the beginning of the Zen lineage. For Ninkū, the key figure was Kumārājīva, who supposedly translated the *Fanwang jing* and then spread it, resulting in an unbroken transmission of the Buddhist teachings.

The doctrinal basis for Ninkū's lineage lay in two teachings mentioned in both the *Pusajie yiji* and Mingguang's commentary; these were called "the four precepts and the three encouragements" (*shikai sangon* 四戒三勸) (T 40.569c8 and 584b21). The teaching of the four precepts refers to how the precepts have been transmitted from 1. Vairocana, to 2. Śākyamuni, to 3. bodhisattvas, to 4. sentient beings in an unbroken lineage (*Kaijushō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 283a). Although the precepts when transmitted from Vairocana to Śākyamuni were at such a high level that only a Buddha could understand them, by taking those same precepts and conferring them on bodhisattvas and then on sentient beings, they were made accessible even to worldlings (*bonbu* 凡夫) in an obscure country (Japan) during the decline of the Dharma (*mappō* 末法) (*Gyōjishō*, ZTZ *Enkai* 2: 400a–402b). The three encouragements refer to how sentient beings are urged to receive the precepts, observe them, and chant them. The power of the Perfect precepts is such that it can affect the faculties of the ignorant during the decline of the Dharma (*Bonmōkyō jikidanshō*, ZTZ *Enkai*, 2: 165b). Moreover, the distinction between bodhisattva precepts and the precepts of the Buddha, a position used by some Tendai scholars to argue for a hierarchical difference between the *Fanwang* precepts and *Lotus Sutra* precepts, was overcome.

What were the practical consequences of this unbroken lineage for worldlings? If the precepts were Perfect, then they should apply to everyone, just as the teachings of the *Lotus Sutra* were universal. Ninkū's approach to such issues can be seen in a discussion in the *Kaijushō* concerning whether people whose capacities were suited to any of the four teachings could receive the bodhisattva precepts. Ninkū argued if the precepts were classified as a mix of Distinct and Perfect teachings, they could not be received and observed by everyone. The *Huayan jing*, the scripture traditionally associated with the mix of Distinct and Perfect teachings, had been criticized by Tiantai scholars as being too difficult to understand for all but advanced practitioners. In a similar manner, one might argue that the *Fanwang* precepts were suitable for advanced practitioners, whereas the Hīnayāna precepts were more suited for those of lesser ability.<sup>16</sup>

16. The argument contains abstruse discussions about the stages on the path involving descriptions from the first fascicle of the *Fanwang jing*, but these will not be discussed in detail here.



Although Saichō had argued that Japanese religious faculties had matured and were Perfect, heightened awareness of the advent of the period of decline of the Dharma (*mappō*) might have called this into question. Ninkū adamantly argued that anyone could hold the bodhisattva precepts; all that was required was the ability to understand the teacher's words. Moreover, the ordination ceremony could be conducted by worldlings. The teacher conducting the ceremony need not be a sage or free of defilements. Ultimately, the Buddhas and bodhisattvas conferred the actual precepts while worldlings conducted the ceremony.

### Conclusion

Saichō's early death, before he could clarify his proposals to use a new set of precepts to ordain monks, left Tendai monks in a quandary in which they were uncertain which sources of the precepts to use or how to organize them into a set of coherent precepts and ordinations. The result is that significant differences are found within the Tendai School on monastic discipline and the interpretation of ordinations. The wide disparity in treatments of the relation between the precepts and the *Lotus Sutra* was further complicated by the use of the *Fanwang jing* for ordinations by some in the Japanese Tendai School. In contrast, exegetes of the Eshin-ryū, on the basis of the apocryphal *Gakushōshiki mondō*, identified passages from the *Lotus Sutra* with the precepts, and gave the *Fanwang jing* little, if any, role in the precepts. The result was an emphasis on vague and abstract principles with little or no consideration of concrete rules and their enforcement.

The monks from other Tendai lineages stressed the importance of concrete rules from the *Fanwang jing*, even as they argued that the *Fanwang* precepts should be interpreted through the *Lotus Sutra* or subordinated to it. By organizing precepts and texts into hierarchies or devising lineages, they were able to integrate the *Lotus Sutra* and *Fanwang jing* precepts. The Kurodani lineage's exegetical hierarchy in interpreting Zhiyi's *Pusajie yiji* and its "consecrated ordination" ritual exhibited this position. In the Rozanji lineage, Ninkū and his students reconciled these scriptures in a series of lectures and debates based on the *Pusajie yiji* by arguing that the precepts from the *Fanwang jing* should be considered an independent text equal to the *Lotus Sutra*. For both of these lineages, the importance of observing concrete rules was emphasized as an essential step in mastering the principles (*ri* 理) of Buddhism.

Doctrinally, all of these lineages emphasized the universality of Buddhahood. Passages from the *Fanwang jing* promising realization of Buddhahood with the ordination were cited more than any other passage from that text. These were combined with the ever-present predictions and promises of Buddhahood for all found in the *Lotus Sutra*, resulting in the use of ordinations to call forth the realization of Buddhahood with this very body (*sokushin jōbutsu*). The empha-

sis on the *Lotus Sutra* as the ultimate teaching is found in most Tendai texts on the precepts, giving the precepts a universal or authoritative quality, sometimes encompassing a variety of specific precepts and at other times excluding them. Thus, Tendai treatments of the precepts of the *Sifenlu* and the *Fanwang jing* differed according to which lineage discussed them. Passages from the *Lotus Sutra*, often cited out of context, were frequently used to justify positions, but contradictory passages could easily be cited.

The commentary on the *Fanwang jing*, Zhiyi's *Pusajie yiji*, was used to give the precepts a Tendai interpretation. But in this case, too, the text was cited in a variety of ways to support both lax and strict interpretations of the precepts. The great variety of positions should not be seen as resulting from a lack of attention to the precepts, but rather reveals the urgency that at least some Tendai monks felt in interpreting them and understanding what it meant to be a practicing Buddhist.

## REFERENCES

### ABBREVIATIONS

- BZ *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書. Ed. Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団. Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1970–1973.
- DZ *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 伝教大師全集. Ed. Hieizan Senshuin Fuzoku Eizan Gakuin 比叡山專修院附属叡山学院. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1975.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. 85 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭, eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1932.
- TZ *Tendaishū zensho* 天台宗全書. Ed. Tendaishūten Kankōkai 天台宗典刊行会. Tokyo: Dai'ichi Shobō, 1973–1974.
- Z *Wan xuzangjing* 卍續藏經. 1983. Ed. Xinwenfeng bianjibu 新文豐編審部. Taipei: Xinwenfeng Chuban.
- ZTZ *Zoku Tendaishū zensho* 續天台宗全書. Ed. Tendaishūten Hensanjo 天台宗典編纂所. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1987–present.

### SECONDARY SOURCES

#### ASAI Jōkai 浅井成海

- 1981 Seizan Shōkū shi no shōgai ni tsuite 西山証空師の生涯について. In *Kimura Takeo kyōju koki kinen: Sōden no kenkyū* 木村武夫教授古稀記念—僧伝の研究, ed. Kimura Kyōju Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Henshū Kakari 木村教授古稀記念論文集編集係, 105–28. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō.

FUKUDA Gyōei 福田堯穎

1954 *Tendaigaku gairon* 天台学概論. Tokyo: Bun'ichi Sōgō Shuppan.

FUNAYAMA Tōru 船山 徹

2011 *Bonmōkyō gekan senkōsetsu no saikentō* 梵網經下卷先行説の再検討. In *Sankyō kōshō ron zokuhen* 三教交渉論叢續編, ed. Mugitani Kunio 麥谷邦夫, 127–56. Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo.

GRONER, Paul

1990 *The Fan-wang ching and monastic discipline in Japanese Tendai: A study of Annen's Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*. In *Buddhist Apocryphal Literature*, ed. Robert Buswell, 251–90. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

2000 *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. (Originally published 1984, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley and the Institute of Buddhist Studies, Berkeley.)

2001 Ninkū Jitsudō's view of the Hinayāna Precepts. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 50: 6–10 (left).

2003a Jitsudō Ninkū on ordinations. *Japan Review* 15: 51–75.

2003b The revival and transformation of monastic discipline. In *Buddhism in Global Perspective, vol.2*, Kalpakam Sankarnarayan, Ravindra Path, and Ichijō Ogawa, eds., 205–22. Mumbai: Somaiya Publications.

2007a Rationales for the lax adherence to the Precepts: Some Tendai interpretations of the Precepts based on the *Lotus Sutra*. In *Contribution of Buddhism to World Culture, vol.2*, Ichijō Ogawa, Kalpakam Sankarnarayan, and Ravindra Panth, eds., 310–30. Mumbai: Somaiya Publications.

2007b Can the Precepts be lost? Can the Precepts be violated? The role of the *Pusajie yiji* in medieval Tendai discussions of the Precepts. In *Essays from the International Tendai Conference, Tendai gakuho* (Journal of Tendai Buddhist Studies), 165–200.

2009a Kōen and the “consecrated ordination” within Japanese Tendai. In *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, James Alexander Benn, Lori R. Meeks, and James Robson, eds., 178–207. New York: Routledge.

2009b “Hokkekyō” to endonkai 『法華經』と円頓戒. *Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō* 26: 1–29. Trans. Matsumoto Tomomi.

2013 *The Lotus Sūtra and Tendai Perfect-Sudden Precept ordinations*. In *Universal and International Nature of the Lotus Sutra: Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on the Lotus Sutra*, 13–28. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

Forthcoming *Nihon Tendai ni okeru kaikan* 日本天台における戒観. In Ōkubo Ryōshun 大久保良峻, ed., *Tendaigaku* 天台学. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

HIRAKAWA Akira 平川 彰

1991 *Chigi no kaitairon ni tsuite* 智顛の戒体論について. *Hirakawa Akira*

*chosakushū: Nihon Bukkyō to Chūgoku Bukkyō* 平川彰著作集—日本仏教と中国仏教, 121–36. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

ISHIDA Mizumaro 石田瑞磨

1960 “Gakushōshiki mondō” no gisen ni tsuite 『学生式問答』の偽撰について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 8: 87–91.

ISHIGAKI Gensen 石垣源瞻

1956 Jōdokyō no endonkai juyō ni tsuite 浄土教の円頓戒受容について. *Nihon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 21: 201–18.

KODERA Bun'ei 小寺文穎

1981 Ryōnin Shōnin saku “Ryaku fusatsu shida” no kenkyū 良忍上人作「略布薩次第」. In *Ryōnin Shōnin no kenkyū* 良忍上人の研究, ed. Yūzū Nenbutsushū Kyōgaku Kenkyūjo 融通念仏教学研究, 58–89. Osaka: Dainenbutsuji.

MURAKAMI Akiya 村上明也

2009 “Bosatsukai gisho” no Tendai Daishi setsu o utagau 「菩薩戒義疏」の天台大師説を疑う. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 119: 218–221.

Ōwakizashi 大謬請

1657 No other publishing information available.

RYŌJO 良助

1476 *Endonkai myakufu kuketsu* 円頓戒脈譜口決. No other publishing information available.

SATŌ Tetsuei 佐藤哲英

1960 *Tendai Daishi no kenkyū* 天台大師の研究. Kyoto: Hyakkaen.

SEIZAN ZENSHŪ KANKŌKAI 西山全集刊行会

1975 *Seizan zensho* 西山全書, *bekkan* 別卷 3. Kyoto: Bun'eidō Shoten.

SHIMAJI Daitō 島地大等

1977 *Tendai kyōgaku shi* 天台教学史. Tokyo: Ryūbunkan.

SHIRATO Waka 白土わか

1981 Ryōnin Shōnin to Manshūin-hon “Shukke sahō” 良忍上人と曼殊院本『出家作法』. In *Ryōnin Shōnin no kenkyū* 良忍上人の研究, ed. Yūzū Nenbutsushū Kyōgaku Kenkyūjo, 90–101. Osaka: Dainenbutsuji.

1987 Inherent enlightenment (*hongaku shisō*) and Saichō's acceptance of the Bodhisattva precepts. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14: 113–27.

SUGIZAKI Daie 杉崎大慧

1981 Yūzū nenbutsushū no kechimiyaku 融通念仏宗の血脉. In *Ryōnin Shōnin no kenkyū* 良忍上人の研究, ed. Yūzū Nenbutsushū Kyōgaku Kenkyūjo, 146–60. Osaka, Dainenbutsuji.

TADA Kōryū 多田厚隆, ŌKUBO Ryōjun 大久保良順, TAMURA Yoshirō 田村芳朗, ASAI Endō 浅井円道, eds.

1973 *Tendai hongakuron* 天台本覚論. *Nihon Shisō Taikei* 9. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

TAMAYAMA Jōgen 玉山成元

- 1980 “Tendai hokkeshū gakushōshiki mondō” (Tōji-hon) no shiteki kachi  
『天台法華宗学生式問答』(東寺本)の史的価値. In *Dengyō Daishi kenkyū*  
伝教大師研究, ed. Tendai Gakkai 天台学会, 739–64. Tokyo: Waseda  
Daigaku Shuppanbu.

TERAI Ryōsen 寺井良宣

- 2000 “Bosatsukai giki kikigaki” 『菩薩戒義記聞書』. In *Shōzoku Tendai-shū zen-  
sho mokuroku kaidai* 正統天台宗全書目錄解題, ed. Tendai Shūten Hensanjo  
天台宗典編纂所, 99–101. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TŌKYŌ DAIGAKU SHIRYŌ HENSANJO 東京大学史料編纂所

- 1901–present *Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本史料. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

TSUNODA Bun'ei 角田文衛

- 1994 *Heian jidaishi jiten* 平安時代史事典. 3 vols. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.

WASHIO Junkei 鷺尾順敬, ed.

- 1925–1933 *Kokubun Tōhō Bukkyō sōsho* 國文東方佛教叢書. Tokyo: Kokubun  
Tōhō Bukkyō Sōsho Kankōkai.

# Journal of Korean Religions

The **Journal of Korean Religions (JKR)**, the only English-language academic journal dedicated to the study of Korean religions, was launched in the autumn of 2010. It aims to stimulate interest in and discuss the study of Korean religions in various academic disciplines within the humanities and social sciences. A peer-reviewed journal, **JKR** is published twice a year, in April and October, by the Institute for the Study of Religion at Sogang University in Korea. The digital version is available online via the Project MUSE database.



## Call for Articles

**JKR** invites contributions from senior and junior scholars researching on any aspects of Korean religions from a wide range of perspectives, including religious studies, philosophy, theology, literature, folklore, art, anthropology, history, sociology, political science, and cultural studies. Articles submitted for consideration should be under 10,000 words in length including endnotes (bibliographies and appendices are additional) and should not have appeared or be under review for publication elsewhere. **JKR** also welcomes book reviews (up to 1,000 words) and review articles (up to 3,000 words).

## All contributions or inquiries should be sent to the Managing Editor

Email: [journalkr@sogang.ac.kr](mailto:journalkr@sogang.ac.kr)  
Tel & Fax: (82)2-705-8096  
[jkr.sogang.ac.kr/](http://jkr.sogang.ac.kr/)  
[muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal\\_of\\_korean\\_religions](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_korean_religions)  
[www.facebook.com/JournalofKoreanReligions](http://www.facebook.com/JournalofKoreanReligions)

Postal Address:  
*Journal of Korean Religions*  
Institute for the Study of Religion  
Sogang University, 35 Baekbeom-ro, Mapo-gu  
Seoul, 121-742, SOUTH KOREA

**Institute for the Study of Religion, Sogang University, Seoul, Korea**