

A Medieval Japanese Reading of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* Placing the *Kankō ruijū* in Historical Context

Paul GRONER

Although recent Japanese debates over hongaku thought have attracted considerable attention in the West, very few studies of actual Tendai hongaku texts have appeared in Western languages. In this study one text, the Kankō ruijū, is examined and placed in a historical context to demonstrate that it is a serious attempt by medieval Japanese scholars to interpret Chih-i's Mo-ho chih-kuan. Particular attention is paid to issues of how Zen models of lineage might have contributed to the text's formulation and how monastic debate allowed monks to select certain passages for intensive scrutiny. The use of the text in debates helps explain the appearance of new classification systems of doctrine, and the variety of positions on doctrine and practice advanced in the Kankō ruijū.

HONGAKU 本覚 THOUGHT has attracted considerable attention in the West recently, largely because of attacks on its place in Buddhism by such contemporary Japanese scholars as Hakamaya Noriaki 袴谷憲昭 and Matsumoto Shirō 松本史朗. Recent studies by Western authors like Peter GREGORY (1994) and Jacqueline STONE (1995) have critiqued the methodology of this modern Japanese scholarship in a sensitive and penetrating manner. In the present paper I hope to make a different type of contribution to our understanding of *hongaku* thought. Western scholarship on the subject has rarely focused on the medieval Japanese Tendai texts that provide much of the historical basis for *hongaku* thought. By examining one such work, the *Kankō ruijū*

* This paper is part of a joint research project conducted with Professor Ikeda Rosan 池田魯參 of Komazawa University. I am grateful to him for his many insightful comments. I had hoped to have parts of the research completed in time to participate in the recently published festschrifts for Professors Tada Kōryū 多田厚隆, Shioiri Ryōdō 塩入良道, and Ōkubo Ryōjun 大久保良順. I dedicate this paper to them with gratitude for the kindness they showed a young American graduate student many years ago.

漢光類聚, I hope to elucidate some of the roles of *hongaku* texts in the development of Japanese Buddhist thought and at the same time show that the doctrines in the text are more sophisticated than many modern scholars realize.

Hongaku texts include a variety of genres and doctrinal positions; since this paper examines only a single document, its conclusions do not necessarily apply to other *hongaku* works. The paper itself is divided into five parts. First, the *Kankō ruijū* and its probable compilers are briefly described. Second, the relationship between the text and the Tendai tradition of examination and debate (*rongi* 論議) is investigated in order to elucidate the institutional background of the text and thereby help clarify how *hongaku* thought might have been used by Tendai monks. Third, the fabrication of sources and historical traditions is examined, as the historical record is often so blatantly falsified in the *Kankō ruijū* that the author seems to have been signaling that he was inventing it. Fourth, the *Kankō ruijū*'s idiosyncratic interpretations of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 摩訶止觀 (Jpn. *Makashikan*), and the reasons for them, are explored. Fifth, various aspects of the *Kankō ruijū*—lineage, classification of doctrines, world-affirmation, and the role of practice—are surveyed in order to demonstrate the doctrinal complexity and subtlety of the text.

The Text and Its Compilers

The *Kankō ruijū* traces its origins back to a short text known as the *Shin'yō* 心要 (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 411–13). Although, as we shall discuss later, the *Shin'yō* was almost certainly fabricated by medieval Japanese Tendai scholars, the *Kankō ruijū* describes it as one of three short oral teachings that Nan-yueh Hui-ssu 南岳慧思 (515–577)—second T'ien-t'ai patriarch and teacher of T'ien t'ai's de facto founder, Chih-i 智顛 (538–597)—received in the stūpa of Prabhūtaratna (*tahōtō* 多宝塔). The *Kankō ruijū* claims that Hui-ssu transmitted these three teachings—the *Shin'yō*, the *Ryakugi* 略義, and the *Ryakumon* 略文—to Chih-i, who used them as the basis of his three major works, the *Shin'yō* becoming the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, the *Ryakugi* becoming the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* 法華玄義, and the *Ryakumon* becoming the *Fa-hua wen-chü* 法華文句. The *Kankō ruijū* itself is a commentary on the *Shin'yō*, and is also known under such titles as the *Tendai den Nangaku shin'yō shō* 天台伝南岳心要鈔 [Digest of the essentials transmitted from Hui-ssu to Chih-i] and *Tendai den Nangaku shin'yō kenmon* 天台伝南岳心要見聞 [Record of what has been seen and heard of the essentials of Hui-ssu as transmitted by Chih-i] (TADA et al. 1973, p. 188). Since the *Shin'yō*

was regarded as the source and essence of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, the *Kankō ruijū* was seen by the *hongaku* thinkers as a commentary on both works.

The *Kankō ruijū* is generally attributed to Chūjin 忠尋 (1065–1138), the forty-eighth *zasu* of the Japanese Tendai school (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 188, 240, 284), although, as we shall see below, there are reasons to doubt that he was in fact the author. Chūjin is also credited with commentaries on the other two synopses, the *Hokke ryakugi kenmon* 法華略義見聞 on the *Ryakugi* and the *Hokke mongu yōgi monsho* 法華文句要義聞書 on the *Ryakumon*.¹ Interestingly, although all three commentaries exist, of Hui-ssu's purported texts only the *Shin'yō* seems to have actually been written. The very existence of the other two was, apparently, the invention of medieval Tendai monks.²

Chūjin was the son of Minamoto no Tadasue 源忠季 (d.u.), a poet who served as governor of Tosa. Chūjin was a prolific author and is said to have written on Chih-i's major works as well as on various debate topics.³ Also skilled in political relationships, he was appointed head (*zasu* 座主) of the Tendai school in 1128 and awarded the rank of archbishop (*daisōjō* 大僧正) in 1135. As *zasu* Chūjin worked to revive the Tendai scholarly tradition of debate, examination, and lecture.

Chūjin's purported role in the naming of the *Kankō ruijū* is described in an afterword to the text. Chūjin was sequestered in the Jūzenji 十禪師 Shrine in the middle of the night of the last day of the seventh month of 1128. The deity of the shrine appeared to him while he was in a state between wakefulness and dreaming and granted him the text's teachings, saying:

Because you are saddened [by the possibility that the Dharma will be lost] in the future, you have recorded various essential teachings. You are certainly a messenger of the Buddha. The original teacher 本師 Śākyamuni employed a mysterious expedient to enter your mind and transmit this book. The work that you record will be a great teacher in the latter ages; it should be respected as if it had the characteristics of a Buddha. I, because of my vow to protect the Dharma, will follow the book and benefit humans and the Dharma. I originally am a

¹ The title *Kankō ruijū* is also found at the end of several fascicles of the *Hokke ryakugi kenmon*. This suggests that the title was used to refer collectively to all three of the commentaries attributed to Chūjin (BZ 40, pp. 14a, 26a). There are, in fact, two *Ryakugi* commentaries attributed to Chūjin; the relationship between them is not clear (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 570–71).

² ŌKUBO discusses the evidence that the texts were Japanese fabrications (1973, p. 572).

³ For a brief biography and list of works attributed to Chūjin, see TADA et al. 1973, pp. 574–76; TSUNODA 1994, vol. 2, p. 1630c–d.

being from Trāyatṛiṃśa heaven.⁴ Now that I am manifested 垂迹 my courtesy name is Zenkan 禅漢.⁵ I will cause the light of the Dharma from this book to increase wherever it is used. Thus you should name this book the *Kankō shō* [Digest of the light of Kan].

(TADA et al. 1973, pp. 285–86)⁶

Thus the *Kankō ruijū* employed a variety of strategies to legitimate itself, claiming not only that the text it was based upon—the *Shin'yō*—was conferred to Hui-ssu in Prabhūtaratna's stūpa, but also that Śākyamuni had entered Chūjin's mind and that the deity of Jūzenji Shrine had confirmed the transmission. Such dubious and extravagant claims have contributed to the critical attitude of modern scholars towards *hongaku* materials. However, these assertions are not so different from those made in many Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures and Chinese apocryphal works that profess to be the words of the Buddha, or that make historical claims on the basis of predictions and other devices.

⁴ The *honji* 本地 (the Buddhist divinity that manifested as a kami) of the Jūzenji deity was considered to be any of several Buddhist figures, including Jizō, Miroku, Benzaiten, and Kokūzo. Śākyamuni is said to have assigned Jizō the task of saving beings in the six realms when the two of them were in Trāyatṛiṃśa heaven.

⁵ The term *kan* 漢 often refers to China; thus the name Zenkan—which might be rendered as something like “meditating Chinese”—would seem to stress the Chinese origins claimed for the teachings of the *Kankō ruijū*. In this case the title could be translated “Categorizations of the Light from China.” However, the name Zenkan could also be translated as something like “meditating guy,” by using *kan* in the more vernacular sense found in some Ch'an texts (IRIYA 1991, p. 690). The title might then be translated “Categorizations from the Zen Fellow.” The story cited above was wellknown and was cited in a number of texts, including the *Honchō kōsoden* 本朝高僧伝, BZ 63, p. 85a. UESUGI Bunshū cites it as an example of the self-confidence of the authors of *hongaku* texts (1972, vol. 1, p. 438).

⁶ Jūzenji Shrine was one of the seven Sannō 山王 shrines. The term *jūzenji* 十禅師, which can be translated as “the ten meditation masters,” refers to a group of official posts awarded to monks so that they could use the powers accruing from their virtue to protect the state. Because most early Tendai *zasu* held one of these posts at a time when they had difficulty obtaining other official positions, the office was important in early Tendai history. Certain texts play on this meaning by claiming that the deity of Jūzenji Shrine was originally one of these masters, or that it was Emperor Kōnin, under whom the post of meditation master was established. By the time the *Kankō ruijū* was composed, the Jūzenji deity was seen as one of the manifestations (*gongen* 権現) of the kami Sannō, and through plays on words came to represent Sudden-Perfect meditation.

Belief in Jūzenji became popular in the late Heian period. In one story, the monk Myōson 明尊 (971–1063) received a teaching about the three truths, an event resembling Chūjin's experience in the *Kankō ruijū*. Jūzenji is said to have appeared in a dream to Hōchibō Shōshin 宝地房証真 (1136–1220 or 1131–1215); Jūzenji was disappointed when Shōshin requested worldly goods for his mother, but approved when he requested spiritual help for her. Thus, when Chūjin had his revelation from Jūzenji, he was part of a tradition of oracles, dreams, and word-plays typical of the type of teachings found in the *Kankō ruijū* (SUGAWARA 1992, pp. 130–33; ŌYAMA 1989, pp. 161–64, 338).

Although the *Kankō ruijū* presents itself as a text by Chūjin, internal evidence—such as the fact that many of its doctrines do not appear in other *hongaku* works from Chūjin's time—indicates that it was composed at a later date, probably by someone in Chūjin's lineage. Several scholars suggest that the compiler or editor was Jōmyō 静明 (d. 1286), whose opinions are cited in the *Hokke ryakugi kenmon* (HAZAMA 1948, vol. 2, p. 358; ŌKUBO 1973; TAMURA 1966; and BZ 97, pp. 338–39).⁷ This argument is partly based on the fact that Jōmyō is the latest identifiable figure in the *Kankō ruijū* and the *Hokke ryakugi kenmon* (a fact that also suggests the text may have been compiled by a disciple in his lineage).

Much about Jōmyō's biography is not clear. According to the *Honchō kōsōden*, he is said to have been the son of Fujiwara no Sukeyoshi 藤原資能 (d.u.) and a descendant of Fujiwara no Saneyoshi 実能 (1096–1157), Minister of the Left. A student of Hangen 範源 and Shunpan 俊範 (d. 1262), Jōmyō was skilled at debate and was the author of the *Hyakudai* 百題, a text consisting of a hundred topics for debate (KOUDA 1972, pp. 1–5).⁸ Jōmyō also studied Zen under the eminent master Enni 円爾 (Ben'en 弁円; 1202–1280) of Tōfuku-ji 東福寺, realizing enlightenment when asked a question about the profound meaning of the character *myō* 妙 (wondrous) from the Japanese title of the *Lotus Sūtra*. Jōmyō became a prominent monk and lectured on Tendai topics to Emperor Go-Saga and retired Emperor Kameyama (*Honchō kōsōden*, BZ 63, pp. 101c–102a).

Some Tendai sources give a different genealogy for Jōmyō, listing him as part of a lineage of married priests who designated their sons as their religious successors (*shintei* 真弟): Kōkaku 皇覚—Hangen—Shunpan—Jōmyō.⁹ By this account, Jōmyō's teachers, Hangen and Shunpan, were also his grandfather and father. The two versions of Jōmyō's lineage have not been reconciled by modern scholars.¹⁰

Jōmyō's Zen teacher, Enni (Ben'en), was ordained at the Tendai temple Onjō-ji 園城寺 and practiced Zen at Kennin-ji 建仁寺, the temple founded by Eisai 荣西 (1141–1215). From 1235 to 1241 he studied

⁷ Jōmyō is cited under the name of Awataguchi 粟田□, a place in Sakyō-ku, Kyoto, where he spent much of his time; Awataguchi is famous for its sword makers and artists surnamed Awataguchi. Dates for Jōmyō, Shunpan, and Seikai in this paper are based on ŌKUBO 1986.

⁸ Kouda notes that Jōmyō's name is not mentioned in the *Hyakudai*, but seems to accept the book as being compiled by him.

⁹ Kōkaku (fl. Late Heian period) was the son of Fujiwara no Mototoshi 藤原基俊 and is said to have been the author of the *Sanjū-shi ka no kotogaki* 三十四箇事書.

¹⁰ UESUGI Bunshū follows the hereditary account of Jōmyō's lineage (1972, 1, p. 438). By the Late Heian period hereditary lineages of monks were not unusual in Japan; Jōmyō's monastic lineage was only one of many hereditary monastic lineages connected with the Fujiwaras (NISHIGUCHI 1987, p. 191; *Sonpi bunmyaku*, KUROITA 1929–66, 1, p. 273).

Ch'an in China. After he returned to Japan he was appointed abbot of the great Zen temple Tōfuku-ji, then being built in Kyoto. The relation between Ben'en and Jōmyō is described in the Buddhist historical text *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釈書:

Jōmyō of Mt Hiei heard that Ben'en had mastered Tendai doctrine, and asked Ben'en about the four types of concentration 四種三昧. At the same time he inquired about the essence of the separate transmission (*betsuden* 別伝). Because Jōmyō had never heard an explanation like that of Ben'en, he listened closely. Ben'en said, "You have not yet mastered the teachings and discernments. How then could you know the true tenets of our singular transmission (*tanden* 単伝) of the Buddhas and patriarchs? How could your academic study (*gigaku* 義学) of Buddhism compare with it?" Jōmyō was struck by those words. From that time on, he ceaselessly traveled [between his temple and that of Ben'en]. Sometimes he discussed the differences between relative and absolute (*sōzetsu nitai* 相絶二待). In order to teach Jōmyō, Ben'en used the school's teachings so that Jōmyō's doubt suddenly vanished. Jōmyō stood up and paid obeisance to Ben'en. With tears flowing, he said, "If I had not come to see the master, then how would I have plumbed the depths of the mysterious workings (*gensū* 玄樞) of the Buddhas and patriarchs. From now on I vow not to waste this rare chance of being born in the world."

(BZ 62, p. 103b-c)¹¹

Like Eisai, Zen master Ben'en was also interested in Tendai and esoteric Buddhism. Even the architecture of Tōfuku-ji reflected this mixture of interests: though modeled on Chinese Ch'an temples, it had a number of buildings devoted to esoteric Buddhism. Among Ben'en's disciples were monks from a number of Buddhist traditions (COLLCUTT 1981, pp. 41-48). In addition to texts on Zen, Ben'en wrote esoteric Buddhist works like the twelve-fascicle *Dainichikyō kenmon* 大日經見聞, a discussion of the *Ta-jih ching* (*Mahāvairocana-sūtra*) and the two commentaries on it by I-hsing 一行 and Śubhakarasiṃha; he also wrote the three-fascicle *Yugikyō kenmon* 瑜祇經見聞. The *Dainichikyō kenmon* is based on lectures delivered by Ben'en in 1272, towards the end of his life. Although the text includes citations from a variety of texts, including those by Kūkai, Ben'en stated that interpretations of the *Ta-jih ching* should be based on the *Lotus Sūtra*, and he often followed doctrines advanced by Ennin 円仁 (794-864). The text

¹¹ The *Genkō shakusho* biography of Ben'en is long, occupying the entire seventh fascicle, and mentions monks from a number of different schools, indicating Ben'en's openness.

thus demonstrates the syncretism between Zen, Tendai, and esoteric Buddhism that characterized Ben'en's life.¹²

One of Jōmyō's Tendai teachers was a priest named Shunpan 俊範. According to TAKAGI Yūta (1991), neither Shunpan's family background nor dates are known. In 1221 Shunpan was appointed lesser bishop (*shōsōzu* 少僧都) and judge of examinations (*tandai* 探題). He instructed students in the town of Sakamoto at the foot of Mt Hiei and eventually became head of studies (*sōgakutō* 総学頭) on Mt Hiei itself. Shunpan was the author of a number of texts that focused on lineage and the transmission of teachings (*Honchō kōsōden*, BZ 63, p. 98; NBJJ, p. 339).

The lineage of monks that produced the *Kankō ruijū* was thus composed of highly educated scholars, many of whom were from the Fujiwara family. Nearly all had a serious interest in the scholarship connected with the debate and examination tradition, a tradition that, as we shall see, influenced the format of the *Kankō ruijū*. Thus, rather than being dismissed as a part of a degenerate class of literature, the *Kankō ruijū* should be considered in its historical context as a reflection of one of the scholarly currents of its day.

The Tendai Examination System

The Tendai debate system is said to date back to the time of Saichō 最澄 (766–822); it was revived and systematized by Ryōgen 良源 (912–985) shortly after he became Tendai *zasu*. To advance in the monastic hierarchy a Tendai monk was expected to master a variety of exoteric doctrines, usually focusing on Chih-i's three major works. He would train for the major examination on Mt Hiei by participating in a series of lesser debates and tests. Although the examinations had a variety of forms, a common pattern had the monk take several seemingly contradictory passages from the scriptures and commentaries and reconcile the discrepancies so that a consistent doctrinal interpretation could be presented (GRONER, forthcoming). A similar format appears repeatedly in the *Kankō ruijū*. Passages or problems are presented, and a yes-or-no question is asked about how the issues are to be understood. The reasons why either an affirmative or a negative answer are inadequate are then presented. Finally, the seeming discrepancy is accounted for by noting that the answers refer to different

¹² The text, the authenticity of which has not been questioned, cites Tendai thinkers extensively. It includes a number of unique teachings, including a distinction between teachings 教学 and their essence 宗旨 (ONO 1967, vol. 7, p. 392; Takagi Shingen in ND 97, pp. 206–209). The *Yugikyō kenmon* has not been published in a modern edition.

levels of attainment or interpretation. A variety of classifications of doctrine are thus presented in the *Kankō ruijū*; these classifications do not always agree with each other, and sometimes several answers by different thinkers are presented to a single question.

The examination system played an important role in the evolution of Tendai thought. Instead of reading Chinese T'ien-t'ai texts as wholes and writing commentaries on the entire text, Japanese Tendai thinkers would often take Chinese T'ien-t'ai doctrines out of context and juxtapose them with passages from other texts, or consider them from the perspective of a particular problem that interested them. Texts by Chih-i and Chan-jan 湛然 (711-782), for example, were used in arguments on topics that were seldom or never discussed in China. New doctrinal interpretations arose. For example, *sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成佛 (the realization of Buddhahood with this very body) and *sōmoku jōbutsu* 草木成佛 (the realization of Buddhahood by trees and grasses) were not major topics in Chinese T'ien-t'ai doctrine, but became so in the Japanese Tendai examination system.

Although *hongaku* thought did not arise directly out of the debate system, some connection between the two clearly existed and deserves further investigation. Perhaps the biggest difference between the two was the emphasis on lineage and secrecy in the *hongaku* tradition. The opinions cited in the *Kankō ruijū*, for example, are primarily from scholars in its own lineage; representatives of other schools or Tendai lineages are rarely cited. The *Kankō ruijū* repeatedly characterizes the *Shin'yō* as a *kuden* 口伝 ([secret] oral transmission). After it was "expanded upon" by Chih-i and written down by Kuan-ting 灌頂 (561-632) as the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, the supposed oral transmission became available to most people, but even then the *Shin'yō* continued to be regarded as secret (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 191, 195). In contrast, the examination and debate system was public, and monks could gain higher rank or fame if they performed ably in the forum that the system provided.

Although the relation between the debate system and *hongaku* thought is still unclear, the growing importance of exclusive lineages within the Tendai school might well have contributed to the development of secret oral traditions connected with success in the examinations at various Tendai institutions. Thus the possible role of a hereditary line of monks from the Fujiwara clan in the production of the *Kankō ruijū* indicates, perhaps, their mastery of secret doctrines used in the debates.

The link between the examination system and *hongaku* texts provides interesting clues as to how the texts might have been used.

Examination manuals, for example, were not designed as guides for religious praxis, though they sometimes did have practical implications. A manual on a topic like *sokushin jōbutsu* would address, say, the issues surrounding the passage in the *Lotus Sūtra* where the eight-year-old daughter of a Nāga king suddenly realized Buddhahood. Although *sokushin jōbutsu* was a fascinating issue for many monks, the manuals rarely gave any information about the practices (or lack of practices) that might lead to this goal—they were primarily guides for successfully answering intellectual questions (see GRONER 1989 and 1992). The *Kankō ruijū*, therefore, should be seen as a guide to interpreting the *Shin'yō* (and thus the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*), and not as a work that concerned itself about whether or not a person should practice.

Debate manuals were often called *shiki* 私記 (private compilations [concerning a topic]). The very name of the genre suggests that a doctrinal problem might have several answers depending upon the person analyzing it. The *Kankō ruijū* may have had a single compiler, such as Jōmyō, but it contained oral and written traditions from a number of sources. As a result it does not reflect a single position: at times the interpretation is close to the traditional interpretations of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* advanced by figures such as Chan-jan, but at other times teachings are offered that have little or no precedent in Chinese sources. This lack of uniformity may indicate that lineage was more important in the *hongaku* tradition than a particular doctrinal orientation.

A similar lack of doctrinal conformity can be seen between different *hongaku* texts associated with the same lineage. For example, Seikai 政海, one of Jōmyō's four most able disciples, wrote the text entitled *Tendai den Nangaku shin'yō shō* that, although clearly based on the *Shin'yō*, never mentions the *Kankō ruijū*.¹³ Nor is the *Kankō ruijū* mentioned in a text of the same lineage compiled several generations later, the *Tōkai kudenshō* 等海口伝抄 [Digest of the oral transmissions compiled by Tōkai].

This might also indicate that the *Kankō ruijū* was kept as a secret text for some time, a secrecy that might have been due to a controversy among Tendai monks over the authenticity of the *Shin'yō* (ŌKUBO 1991, pp. 178–87). This controversy is reflected in three commen-

¹³ The same is true of the *Seikai shin'yō shō*, an unpublished manuscript cited in ŌKUBO 1991 (pp. 185–86). In addition, Seikai seems to adopt a position skeptical of Hui-ssu's connection with the *Shin'yō*. Seikai's biography is found in the *Honchō kōsōden*, BZ 63, p. 102a; other biographical information is collected in ŌKUBO 1986, pp. 13–15. Among the works attributed to him was a ninety-two fascicle text on debate topics, the *Shūyō ruijū shō* 宗要類聚抄 (NBJJ, p. 348a). Seikai was credited with the establishment of a new lineage, the Tsuchimikado 土御門 (UESUGI 1972, p. 438).

taries on Chih-i's major works composed by monks at the Ojō-in 往生院 in Iga Province. The monks, principally Ryōi 良意 and his disciple Yūchō 祐朝, attended lectures by Jōmyō and his disciples for some forty years. The commentaries they compiled between 1330 and 1350, referred to collectively as the *Iga shō* 伊賀抄, adopted the question-and-answer format of debate texts and cited some fifty scholars.¹⁴ The works indicate that their compilers rejected Jōmyō's use of the *Shin'yō* and oral traditions. Instead, they closely follow the Chinese commentary by Chan-jan. There was also a difference in approach: the *Kankō ruijū*, as we shall discuss in more detail later, treated only those parts of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* directly related to the *Shin'yō*, while the *Iga shō* took up the entire text. The same approach is seen in the *shiki* written by Hōchibō Shōshin, a text often cited by the authors.

All of this indicates the wide variety in the ways that Tendai monks used texts like the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and the *Shin'yō* in the context of Tendai debate and exegesis. Thus in some circles, such as the group that produced the *Iga shō*, adhering to the position of a teacher like Jōmyō does not seem to have been extremely important, though the fact of having studied under him might have been. The exchange of doctrinal opinion among such monks was probably quite free. In other circles, however, texts and opinions were jealously guarded, perhaps in order to avoid criticism or to make special claims for a lineage. Yet even in the latter cases a variety of doctrinal opinions was expressed, much as in the more open debate and examination system.

The Falsification of Sources

As we have seen, the *Kankō ruijū* is a curious hybrid: a commentary influenced by the format or style of an examination manual. Despite the *Kankō ruijū*'s extravagant claims for the text it was commenting upon, there are many clear indications that the *Shin'yō* was in fact the work of medieval Japanese scholars. It was apparently written after a careful consideration of those authentic Chinese and Japanese sources that suggest the existence of such a text. For example, the lists of works Saichō brought back from China mention a certain *Mo-ho chih-kuan shin'yō* in eight pages (DZ 4, p. 353); no author is given, but it may have been written by Chan-jan (HIBI 1966, p. 459). The term *shin'yō* also appears in the *Eizan Daishi den* 叡山大師傳 (a biography of Saichō compiled several years after his death) in a passage concerning the Dharma transmission from Tao-sui 道邃 (n.d.) to Saichō.

¹⁴ Only one of the three commentaries has been published, that on the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*; see ZTZ, *Kengyō* vols. 1-2. For studies of the texts, see OKUBO 1990 and NOMOTO 1990.

At that time the Prefect Lu Ch'un 陸淳 [d. 805] invited Tao-sui, abbot of the Hsiu-ch'an 修禪 monastery on Mt T'ien-t'ai to the Lung-hsing 龍興 monastery in T'ai-chou, where Tao-sui clarified Tendai doctrines and the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*. When the prefect saw Saichō's desire to seek the Dharma, he encouraged Saichō saying, "It is man who enlarges the Way; it is man who maintains the way. Our way will now flourish." Then he entrusted Tao-sui with the copying of scriptures; the few that were completed are listed elsewhere. The preceptor Tao-sui personally opened the essentials (*shin'yō*) and determined all the meanings and principles. It was like pouring water from one vase to another [without spilling a drop] or obtaining the wish-fulfilling gem.

(DZ 5 [*furoku*], p. 17)

The word *shin'yō* here could certainly be interpreted as referring to a book, although it is more natural to read it as a reference to the essentials of doctrine. The author of the *Kankō ruijū* did not in fact cite this passage to support his claim, possibly because the transmission did not occur at the right time. However, the passage might well have been one of several that suggested a special transmission from Tao-sui to Saichō.

According to the *Kankō ruijū*, the actual transmission of the *Shin'yō* occurred several months later on the night before Saichō returned to Japan:

When Saichō was in China, he had not received the twofold transmissions (of the teaching and practice), namely the secret texts *Ryakugi*, *Ryakumon*, and *Shin'yō*. The evening before he was to return to Japan, on the twenty-fourth day of the sixth month of 805, Tao-sui gave these teachings to Saichō in the Pure Land Hall (Gokuraku Jōdo-in) by the western eaves of the Lung-hsing monastery. Tao-sui's words are recorded as follows in the *Zuijin roku* 隨身録: "The *Ryakugi*, *Ryakumon*, and *Shin'yō* are all Hui-ssu's teachings that were recorded by Kuan-ting. They are the most secret of the secret [teachings] 秘中深秘. You should hold them in your mind and propagate the Tendai teachings.

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 191)¹⁵

15. The *Zuijin roku* is a fictitious text. Many of the Tendai *hongaku* claims of oral transmissions involve Tao-sui and Saichō. There are several possible reasons for the prevalence of oral transmissions traced to Saichō, including his prominence as founder of the Tendai school and the brevity of his stay in China. In addition, the polemical nature of Saichō's written works and his early death at the age of fifty-five left room for speculation about the nature of some of his transmissions. Ennin and Enchin, in contrast, were more careful in

What is particularly interesting here is the date given for the meeting between Saichō and Tao-sui. This date conflicts with that of Saichō's return to Japan, a major event in Tendai history and one that is clearly dated in a number of readily available texts, including the *Eizan Daishi den* (SAEKI 1992, pp. 346–47). These texts all agree that Saichō had already left China by the time of this supposed meeting. By placing the transmission after the generally acknowledged date of Saichō's departure, the compiler of the *Kankō ruijū* was either being very careless or leaving a clear signal that the tradition was unusual in some way.

Nor is this the only example of the *Kankō ruijū*'s compiler leaving clear traces that his sources had been fabricated. Although certain of the inconsistencies could be accounted for by citing secret oral teachings, some, like the above-mentioned conflict of dates, were so obvious that they could not be ignored. Another disparity relates to the very title *Shin'yō* and the central meaning of the work. A text or tradition called the *Hsin-yao* (Jpn. *Shin'yō*) is mentioned by Chan-jan in his commentary on the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, when he explains Kuan-ting's statement, "[The *Mo-ho chih-kuan*] expounds the practice that [Chih-i] used within his own mind" (TDZ 1, p. 60; T 46.1b; TADA et al. 1973, p. 191). Because this passage plays an important role in both the *Kankō ruijū* and the Tendai school as a source for the authenticity of the Tendai tradition, traditional scholars would almost certainly have consulted Chan-jan's commentary. They would thus have been familiar with the following comments:

[Kuan-ting's statement] is also intended to prevent later generations from practicing in ways that go against [what has been taught], for this one text [the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*] is thereby established as containing all the basic features of practice. Some say that there is a special transmission of the essentials of mind (*Shin'yō*) apart from the three [basic treatises and systems of calming and contemplation, namely the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, *Tz'u-ti ch'an-men*, and *Liu-miao fa-men*] and that these three works are therefore useless. But even if there were an oral transmission given face to face, it could not amount to anything more than a verification before the master of one's own private realization. The techniques for contemplating and

specifying the nature of the teachings they received. Hence, while clear lineages for Ennin's esoteric teachings existed, Saichō's quickly slipped into obscurity. Finally, an unclear reference to a transmission of "the three views in an instant" that Saichō received from Tao-sui may have suggested that other transmissions occurred (*Kenkairon* 顯戒論, DZ 1, p. 35).

Claims about oral transmissions from China through Ennin are not as common as for Saichō, although he is mentioned in the *Kankō ruijū*. See ŌKUBO 1980, pp. 74–82.

settling the mind presented in this text would still stand as sufficient unto themselves. How much more so if later practitioners do not have a personal transmission to rely on. Apart from this text what is there to speak of? Thus one should have faith in the fact that this [teaching itself] represents the [patriarchal] transmission.

(TDZ 1, p. 60; T 46.147b19–29;

DONNER and STEVENSON 1993, pp. 47–48 [with minor changes])

Dan Stevenson, in the introduction to his translation of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, views the above-mentioned “special transmission of the essentials of mind” as a movement within T’ien-t’ai; it might also indicate the influence of Hua-yen or of incipient Ch’an traditions (DONNER and STEVENSON 1993, pp. 31–61). In any case, Chan-jan clearly rejects such a tradition. Because his statement appears as a comment to a *Mo-ho chih-kuan* passage emphasized in the *Kankō ruijū*, Chan-jan, a scholar cited often in medieval Tendai sources, appears to be rejecting the very tradition that the *Kankō ruijū* compiler is commenting upon. This too might be a deliberate signal that his basic text, the *Shin’yō*, is a fabrication.

Other examples of the *Kankō ruijū*’s tendency to fabricate texts and events are its repeated reference to nonexistent passages from the *Nieh-p’an ching* 涅槃經 (*Nirvāna-sūtra*) (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 205, 216, 217, 225) and its frequent citation of such fictitious texts as the *Naishō denbōketsu* 内証伝法決 (attributed to Saichō) and the *Keppu* 決附 (attributed to Ennin) (TADA et al. 1973, p. 190).¹⁶ Dates and events are also referred to incorrectly, as when the following passage confuses a key event in Tendai history: “During the Ōwa period, the retired emperor Ichijō 一條 asked the best scholars of Tendai to assemble at his palace in Kitayama to read [the treatise on] calm-abiding and insight meditation” (TADA et al. 1973, p. 236). The Ōwa era corresponds to 961–64, however, while Ichijō ruled from 986 to 1011.¹⁷

Certain modern scholars attribute such mistakes to a simple lack of scholarship (HAZAMA 1948, vol. 2, p. 41). Indeed, spurious references

¹⁶ The title *Naishō denbōketsu* is apparently based on that of an authentic text by Saichō, the *Naishō Bupphō sōjō kechimyaku* 内証仏法相承血脈, DZ 1, pp. 199–248).

¹⁷ The discrepancy may have been due to a confusion between two events in Tendai history. The Ōwa era was when Ryōgen held the debates at court that launched his career and began the rise of the Tendai school to its position of preeminence in Japanese Buddhism; the topics discussed at the Ōwa debates also influenced the development of the Tendai examination system. However, Ichijō did indeed extend an invitation to Tendai scholars, as confirmed by a passage in the *Gonki* 権記 recording Ichijō’s request to Kakuun during the Kankō era (1004–1011) to read Chih-i’s three major works to him. The significance of the Ōwa debates is discussed in my forthcoming book on Ryōgen.

might have been repeated so often over the years that they came to be accepted even by knowledgeable monks. However, as noted above, some of the mistakes are so blatant that the author seems almost to have been signaling that the text was not really what he was representing it to be. Perhaps the author could not bring himself to make a distinction between texts he respected as authentic and the work he himself was fabricating. Or he may have felt that he was beyond concern with distinctions between authentic and inauthentic. In the latter case he might have used his own views as the ultimate authority, following a subjective *kanjin* 觀心 approach (HANANO 1992, p. 133).

An example of such a free *kanjin* interpretation occurs at the beginning of the *Kankō ruijū* in a passage asking about the meaning of the expression *Tendai den Nangaku shin'yō*, usually interpreted to mean “Chih-i transmitted Hui-ssu’s essentials.” The compiler cites an argument for reading it as “Chih-i transmitted the essentials to Hui-ssu,” reversing the historically acknowledged sequence. While recognizing the validity of the traditional reading, the argument claims that the revised meaning reveals the profound meaning (*genji* 玄義), in which both Chih-i and Hui-ssu receive the teachings directly from Śākyamuni in Prabhūtaratna’s stūpa, but Chih-i’s superior proselytizing abilities better enable him to elaborate upon them. Thus the traditional order of Hui-ssu transmitting the teaching to Chih-i reflects a “manifestation and harmonization of the light” (of Buddhas and bodhisattvas) to the level of convention wisdom (*suijaku wakō* 垂迹和光), while the new order of Chih-i transmitting the teaching to Hui-ssu expresses a more profound primordial stance (*honji* 本地) in which no difference exists between the two men (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 188–89).

Discussions such as this suggest that the fabricated traditions should not simply be dismissed as sloppy scholarship, especially in a tradition like Buddhism where apocryphal works and traditions are common. Instead, these developments should be viewed as part of the ongoing evolution of Buddhist doctrine, in which informed efforts are sometimes made to interpret concepts in new ways.

The Kankō ruijū: An Idiosyncratic Reading of the Mo-ho Chih-kuan

As we have seen, the *Kankō ruijū* claims that the *Shin'yō* was the basic text of Hui-ssu and the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* was Chih-i’s expanded version of it. At the same time, both teachings are said to have been conferred by Śākyamuni in Prabhūtaratna’s stūpa. In fact, an examination of the *Shin'yō* shows that it consists of a portion of Kuan-ting’s introduction to the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and parts of the sixth fascicle of the *Mo-ho chih-*

kuan itself. The *Shin'yō* gave Jōmyō and other Japanese Tendai scholars the opportunity to read the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* in their own idiosyncratic fashion: passages that gave detailed practical explanations of meditation could be skipped, while those that stressed the immanence of Suchness in phenomena could be stressed. In addition, portions of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* that did not have an established commentarial tradition, in particular the portions of the sixth fascicle included in the *Shin'yō*, could be adopted without fear of opponents citing contradictory passages from Chinese commentaries. The justification for this approach to the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* is given early in the *Kankō ruijū*:

Realization when one hears the words “Perfect-sudden calm-abiding and insight” is, of course, one type of faculty. Those who realize the path through the Introduction to the *Chih-kuan* have the most superior 上上 faculties. There should be ten chapters in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*.¹⁸ Those who realize the way through the (first chapter on the) Broad Meaning 大意 have superior 上 faculties. Those who realize the way when they are between the third and seventh chapters have middling 中 faculties. Those who require all ten chapters have the lowest 下 faculties. In the *Shin'yō* that we are now looking at, the term “Brief Calm-abiding and Insight” (*ryaku shikan* 略止觀) refers to the introduction to the Broad Calm-abiding and Insight (*kō shikan* 広止觀). Both the Brief and Broad have the same meaning and both were orally transmitted in Pra-bhūtaratna’s pagoda. When Chih-i clarified calm-abiding and insight, he only explained the Broad Calm-abiding and Insight, not the Brief Calm-abiding and Insight. Because those with immature 生 faculties were among the audience, he secretly conferred (the Brief Calm-abiding and Insight) on Kuan-ting. When Kuan-ting later recorded it, he wrote down the Brief Calm-abiding and Insight and called it the Introduction. The term “brief” means to avoid complexity and relate the basic idea. Its meaning is the same as “introduction.”

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 209)

In this way the *Kankō ruijū* presents a rationale for ignoring most of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*. When coupled with Saichō’s assertion that the Japanese all possess “perfect” faculties (*enki* 円機), the above passage

¹⁸ There were supposed to be ten major chapters in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, but only seven were written. The passage would make better sense if it referred to the ten fascicles of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, but it clearly does refer to chapters. A similar passage is found in works by both Chih-i and Chan-jan, but refers to the ten modes of meditation 十乘; see IKEDA 1986, p. 231. For an English-language discussion of the ten modes of meditation, see DONNER and STEVENSON 1993, pp. 20–21; and STEVENSON, unpublished manuscript.

suggests that most Tendai monks need not concern themselves with the complexity of the full *Mo-ho chih-kuan*.¹⁹

This stress on selected aspects of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* might well have been part of an attempt to emphasize Tendai's similarities with the new Zen traditions by eliminating ritual and liturgical requirements specific to Tendai. The passages from the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* included in the *Shin'yō* concern Perfect-Sudden meditation (*endon shikan* 円頓止觀) and the immanence of Suchness in everything, while those not included describe the necessity for practice and explain the actual procedures, liturgies, and rituals used in meditation. The compilers of the *Shin'yō* thus seem to be suggesting that the essence of Chih-i's *Mo-ho chih-kuan* can be reduced to the presence of Suchness in all phenomena and that little actual practice may be required for those with superior faculties.

The *Shin'yō*'s use of selected passages fits in well with the tendency to take subjects out of context already found in the examination tradition. At the same time it reflects a tension found in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and the Chinese commentarial tradition concerning whether the rituals and liturgies for meditation are essential for realization or not (DONNER and STEVENSON 1993, pp. 62-96). By downplaying the importance of the ritual aspect, the compiler of the *Shin'yō* seems to adopt an approach similar to that of *zui-jū zanmai* 隨自意三昧 (cultivating meditation wherever the mind is directed), the last of the four major types of samādhi described in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*. The *Shin'yō* can thus be viewed as a strategy for dealing with an old debate over the reading of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*.²⁰

Some Doctrinal Characteristics of the Kankō Ruijū

A confusing variety of doctrines is presented in the *Kankō ruijū*. Here I examine only some of the most important for investigating the connections between Tendai and Zen. Particular attention is paid to issues associated with lineage, the classification of teachings, and practice.

TEACHINGS, IMPORT, AND LINEAGE

According to a passage near the end of the *Kankō ruijū*, Saichō

¹⁹ Although Saichō's teaching on perfect faculties is not specifically referred to in the *Kankō ruijū*, most of the systems of religious faculties mentioned in the text assume that nearly everyone possessed some degree of higher faculties.

²⁰ ASAI analyzes the tendency in Japanese Tendai to emphasize insight over the actual performance of the four types of meditation (1977). Although he cites substantial evidence, he does not take sufficient account of how the textual genres he employs affect his analysis. If, for example, he had considered ritual manuals his conclusions might have been different.

received two transmissions in China: the *shūkyō* 宗教 (teachings of the lineage) and the *shūshi* 宗旨 (essential import of the lineage, i.e., the Buddha's realization and basic intent [*butsui* 仏意]). The teachings (*shūkyō*) are based on the scriptures and on the "revealed Lotus teaching" (*kensetsu Hokke* 顯說法華), while the essential import (*shūshi*) is based on the mind and on the "fundamental Lotus teaching" (*konpon Hokke* 根本法華) (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 279–80).²¹ The teachings drew from the *Fa-hua hsüan-i* and the *Fa-hua wen-chü* for doctrines like the four teachings, the five time periods, and the division of the *Lotus Sūtra* into "roots" and "traces"; the essential import turned to the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* for teachings on innate nature and clarity (*tenshin dokurō* 天真独朗),²² the three truths, and the three thousand realms.

The distinction between these two categories is reflected in the manner in which they are said to have been transmitted. Saichō is said to have passed them to Ennin, after which they reached Ryōgen. Ryōgen transmitted both the teachings and essential import to Genshin 源信 (942–1017), but only the teachings to Kakuun 覺運 (d. 1007). The distinction between the two transmissions in this account is similar to that found in the chronicles of the Ch'an tradition, in which only one person in each generation is designated as patriarch. Though a master may give two types of transmission to his disciples, one will be clearly superior. Mahākāśyapa, the first patriarch after Śākyamuni, is said to have conferred the teachings upon many disciples, but the Buddha's enlightenment only upon Ānanda. The difference between the transmissions to Shen-hsiu 神秀 (606?–706) of the Northern school and Hui-neng 慧能 (638–713) of the Southern school is explained in similar terms by Tsung-mi 宗密 (780–841). Later Ch'an retained this distinction between mind-to-mind transmission and transmission of the teachings.

The claim in Ch'an that only one person in each generation of the

²¹ The terms "teaching" and "essential import" are also used in the *Hokke ryakugi kenmon* (BZ 40, p. 3b). TAMURA suggests that use of the two terms may originate with the *Kankō ruijū* (1990a, p. 172). The expressions "revealed Lotus teaching" and "fundamental Lotus teaching" are part of a threefold classification system devised by Saichō (*Shugo kokkaishō*, T 74.140a). "Hidden Lotus teachings" refers to the teachings of scriptures other than the *Lotus Sūtra* (since all teachings are included in the One-vehicle of the *Lotus Sūtra*); "revealed Lotus teachings" refers to those of the *Lotus Sūtra* itself; "fundamental Lotus teachings" refers to the Buddha's realization, which forms the basis of the *Lotus's* teaching. This classification was often used in medieval Tendai texts.

²² *Tenshin dokurō* refers to the transmission of the three views in an instant with a single word, a transmission that Saichō is said to have received from Tao-sui (*Kenkairon*, DZ 1, p. 35). *Tenshin* indicates the innate nature of things in which each thought encompasses Suchness. *Dokurō* refers to the brightness and clarity resulting from the realization that no difference exists between worldlings and Buddhas and between samsāra and nirvāṇa.

early tradition could receive the ultimate transmission was a myth designed to add legitimacy to certain teachers.²³ This was also true in medieval Tendai, as evidenced by the claims made in the *Kankō ruijū* concerning the destiny of the special transmissions that Saichō is said to have received from Tao-sui. Although the *Naishō Buppō kechimiyaku fu* 内証仏法血脈譜, an authentic text by Saichō, clearly indicates that Gishin 義真 (781–833) received most of Saichō's teachings (DZ 1, pp. 230, 236, 244), his position is ignored in the *Kankō ruijū* (in part because he was seen as the founder of the rival Jimon 寺門 faction). Jōmyō's view of Tendai lineage may have been influenced by his study of Ch'an. The *Kankō ruijū*, in fact, refers to the transmission to Mahākaśyapa and the teachings of Bodhidharma (TADA et al. 1973, p. 280).

The importance of lineage is also reflected in the conflict that arose over Jōmyō's successor. Because Jōmyō's eldest child was a daughter, he conferred his teachings on his son-in-law, Shinga 心賀 (fl. 1329). A son, Jōhan 静範 (fl. 1347), was later born to Jōmyō, but Jōhan was only seven years old when his father died. Nevertheless, the possibility of two successors to Jōmyō's teachings led to a bitter debate between the lineage centering on Shinga and that centering on Jōhan. Because of Jōhan's extreme youth when his father died, his followers had to claim that the transmission of lineage had nothing to do with age or practice. In contrast, Shinga's followers argued that a seven-year-old boy could not be a proper receptacle for the teaching. Shinga's lineage eventually prevailed, while Jōhan's slipped into obscurity (*Nijō goshō kenmon*, TZ 9, p. 165).²⁴ Once the arguments between the two sides had declined, the possibility of two monks receiving the transmission in a single generation came to be accepted.

Jōmyō's lineage eventually developed an elaborate ceremony to indicate the succession of a patriarch. A place of enlightenment (*dōjō* 道場 [lit., site where the Way is realized]) was prepared at a secret location. Pictures were hung of Śākyamuni, the twenty-three Indian patriarchs of T'ien-t'ai, the eight Chinese T'ien-t'ai patriarchs, and such Japanese patriarchs as Saichō and Ennin. Incense, flowers, and lamps were offered to each. The site was said to be patterned after the

²³ For an analysis of Ch'an lineage myths that also demonstrates their importance during the Sung, see FOULK, unpublished manuscript. Tsung-mi's use of the terms *shūkyō* and *shūshi* is discussed on pages 36 and 136–37; there is also an extensive discussion of the development of the legends concerning the transmissions to Mahākaśyapa. Because these topics were matters of concern for Sung dynasty Ch'an, they might well have been stressed by the monks who introduced the tradition to Japan.

²⁴ The *Asabashō* gives a lineage for Shinga that clearly demonstrates the political successes of his ancestors and the father-son lineage of his descendants T (*zuzō*) 9.946b. Little subsequent information exists about Jōhan, but he is credited with a text on debate topics, the *Shūyōshū kiki-gaki* 宗要集問書.

Chinese T'ien-t'ai monastery Kuo-ch'ing ssu 國清寺, though pictures of the gods of the Sannō cult were also displayed. Among the ritual objects used in the ceremony were a copy of the *Lotus Sūtra* and the third and fifth fascicles from the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*. These fascicles include the explanations of the three views and the three thousand realms in an instant, the teachings that were transmitted in the ceremony. The platform for the ceremony also displayed two mirrors, which symbolized some of the key doctrines conferred during the ceremony (ŌKUBO 1980, pp. 82–89). The teacher and student invited the various Buddhas and deities to attend and paid obeisance to them. The high point of the ceremony was a performance of the *Lotus* repentance ceremony 法華懺法. The ceremony was thus a symbolic reenactment of the enlightenment that Chih-i attained through *Lotus* repentance (*Nijō goshō kenmon*, TZ 9, pp. 160b–61a).

The transmission ritual was recorded by the second generation of Jōmyō's followers. However, it may well have been based on traditions, perhaps simpler than that described here, that existed during Jōmyō's time. The description of the transmission ceremony is followed by an enumeration of three types of lineage (*kechimyaku* 血脈) that is attributed to Jōmyō. The first begins with Śākyamuni's transmission to Mahākāśyapa and continues through the sequence of teachers. This transmission, consisting of the teachings (*kyōgaku* 教学), is identified with the lineage of the treasury of the Dharma (*fuhōzō* 付法藏) mentioned at the beginning of the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*.

The second lineage originates with the transmission of the teaching from Śākyamuni to Hui-ssu in Prabhūtaratna's stūpa, and consists of a transmission of the "mind-ground" 心地. Whereas the first transmission could probably occur through written texts, the second transmission is oral (*kuden*). This transmission is compared to the transmission of the "current teachers" mentioned in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, but in fact it is quite different. The *Mo-ho chih-kuan* lineage is based on the realization that Hui-wen gained from reading Nāgārjuna. Such a literary link would not have served the purposes of the more mystical transmission being advocated by this particular text. Attempts to find more direct forms of explanation can be found in Saichō, who argued that Hui-ssu and Chih-i received the teaching from Śākyamuni when he preached the *Lotus Sūtra* on Vulture's Peak (DZ 1, p. 124; GRONER 1984, pp. 257–59).

The third type of lineage, which seems to have been peculiar to Jōmyō, is the *inka* 印可 (seal of the Dharma) lineage (Sonshun, *Nijō goshō kenmon*, TZ 9, p. 161a). Although the term *inka* is identified with wondrous enlightenment 妙悟 in other texts, it is not specifically linked to the Zen tradition in this text. Perhaps the growing sectarian

competition between Tendai and Zen made such syncretism impossible. The *inka* lineage could be received in two ways: as the culmination of a progression through the three-lineage system, or independently, without first going through the two lower lineages.²⁵

According to the *Kankō ruijū*, Hossō and Kegon focus on the teachings (*kyōgaku*) and Zen focuses on the essence (*shūshi*). Tendai, however, includes both. The third fascicle of the text claims that Saichō received a fivefold teaching in China: 1) the three views in an instant, 2) the three thousand realms in an instant, 3) the beginning and end of meditation, 4) the profound meaning of the *Lotus*, and 5) the school of Bodhidharma. Bodhidharma's teachings were characterized as resembling the Tendai teachings of the quiescence of phenomena: "The teachings of Bodhidharma's school cut off the characteristics of both defilements and enlightenment; they do not inquire about the traces of saṃsāra and nirvāṇa. All in the dharma-realm is quiescent" (T 74.404a).

As in the Zen tradition, the claim that the essence transcended verbal expression resulted in the creation of new meanings for words and of new genres of literature. In the words of the *Kankō ruijū*: "If scriptures cannot be relied upon to translate the essential import (*shūshi*), how are teachers to propagate Buddhism? Through the doctrines of oral transmissions" (TADA et al. 1973, p. 280). Oral transmissions must have suited the needs of the compilers of texts such as the *Kankō ruijū*, since they served as sources of teachings not found in the scriptures. Another "source," as mentioned above, was the spurious scriptures or passages the compilers invented, as when they cited a spurious ten-fascicle version of the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* to corroborate the three-part lineage classification outlined above (TADA et al. 1973, p. 280).²⁶

In China, Ch'an monks had argued for a distinction between teachings and essential import, a separate transmission outside of the teachings, and the presence of an unbroken line of patriarchs back to Śākyamuni in order to demonstrate the superiority of their tradition over schools such as T'ien-t'ai. Little, if any of that sense of rivalry is found in the *Kankō ruijū*, probably because the Zen tradition had not yet developed as a threat to Tendai when the text was compiled. The very fact that Jōmyō could study under Enni (Ben'en) demonstrates the contemporary spirit of cooperation.²⁷

²⁵ This description is based on the *Seikai shin'yō shō* and *Tōkai kudensho* 等海口伝抄, TZ 9: 391b.. Not all of Jōmyō's disciples followed this version of the threefold transmission; some equated it with teaching, practice, and realization (UESUGI 1972, p. 600).

²⁶ A number of traditions connected with the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* were linked to Ch'an stories about the transmission to Mahākāśyapa.

²⁷ The supposed persecution of Dōgen around this time could be cited as evidence to

A FOURFOLD CLASSIFICATION OF BUDDHISM: THE *SHIJŪ KŌHAI*

The *Kankō ruijū* was compiled during the period when oral transmissions were being systematized. One of the important new doctrinal systems advanced around that time was the *shijū kōhai* 四重興廢, a four-fold classification of the teachings in which each teaching superseded and canceled those that came before (TADA et al. 1973, p. 225).²⁸ The system as it appears in the *Kankō ruijū* consists of:

1. teachings prior to the *Lotus* (*nizen* 爾前),
2. the *Shakumon* 迹門 section of the *Lotus*,
3. the *Honmon* 本門 section of the *Lotus*, and
4. discernment of mind, or *kanjin* 觀心.

This system reflects the outlook of Saichō, who tended to exclude doctrines unnecessary for the Japanese with their perfect faculties. He thus exalted the Perfect Teachings of the *Lotus Sūtra* above Hinayāna and other Mahāyāna teachings (GRONER 1984, pp. 180–83). These other teachings were not simply regarded as inferior—they were unnecessary for the advanced practitioner and so could be completely rejected. The fourth category of the *shijū kōhai*, the discernment of mind, is sufficiently vague to allow for a number of interpretations. Although Tendai monks like Annen 安然 (b. 841) argued for the supremacy of *kanjin* as part of their program to fully integrate esoteric

the contrary. However, William BODIFORD has noted that no contemporary evidence for such persecution exists. Criticisms of Nōnin 能仁 were directed against a seemingly antinomian movement rather than against the Zen tradition (1993, pp. 28–30).

²⁸ TAMURA notes that the *shijū kōhai* system is first seen in the *Kankō ruijū* and *Hokke ryakugi kenmon* (1990b, p. 350). The latter says, “When the *Shakumon* is established, the teachings prior to the *Lotus Sūtra* are superseded. When the *Honmon* is established, the *Shakumon* is superseded. When the discernment of mind is established, the *Honmon* is superseded” (BZ 40, p. 4b). However, Ishida Mizumaro demonstrates that the system appears earlier in the *Jigyō nenbutsu mondō* 自行念仏問答 (BZ 39, pp. 63c, 64c), and in a manner that suggests it had already been formulated for some time. ISHIDA dates this text to approximately 1170–80 (1967a, pp. 245–47; 1967b). HANANO Michiaki arrives at a similar date, arguing that the *shijū kōhai* developed around the time of Kōkaku (1973, pp. 44–45). Thus Ishida and Hanano would place the development of the system several decades before Jōmyō’s time.

TAKE Kakuchō analyzes the material in a different manner, however, looking not only at the four elements in the *shijū kōhai* system but also at the relationship between the elements (1991, p. 416). He claims that a system in which *kanjin* clearly supersedes the *Shakumon* and the *Honmon* of the *Lotus Sūtra* does not develop until the early fourteenth century. According to Take, the first clearly dated example of the *shijū kōhai* system is found in Shinsō’s 心總 *Ichijōshō* 一帖抄, dated at 1329. Take does not accept the possibility of dating the *shijū kōhai* system on the basis of the *Kankō ruijū*, since he does not believe that the text can be dated as firmly to Jōmyō’s time as I have argued in this paper. He thus attributes the system to interaction between Tendai monks and Nichiren followers. However, to make his point more convincingly, Take needs to deal in a more comprehensive manner with the evidence in the *Kankō ruijū*.

Buddhism and Tendai,²⁹ *kanjin* was a term used in both Tendai and Zen sources. It thus served as a good concept to bring the two traditions together. In Tendai sources, *kanjin* could refer to elementary practices such as the observation of one's own mind, or to culminating practices such as the three truths in an instant. In Zen sources, it might refer to the discernment of the innate qualities of the mind.³⁰ The *Kankō ruijū's* usage of *kanjin* as part of a classificatory system differs from earlier usages. *Kanjin* could even be interpreted as superseding the teachings of the *Lotus Sūtra*,³¹ as when it was seen as a wordless truth incorporating the realization of Jōmyō and Ben'en. In addition, *kanjin* did not necessarily refer to practices specific to one school, and at times seemed to refer to the affirmation of one's own subjective views over those found in sectarian scriptures and teachings.

The emphasis on subjective views may have been a reflection of Ben'en's influence on Jōmyō. In fact, Ben'en used a similar approach in his commentary on the *Ta-jih ching*:

Question: The great purport of Tendai Lotus is classified into a threefold [hierarchy]: the *Shakumon*, *Honmon*, and *kanjin*. Among the three, which should be classified as identical to Esoteric Buddhism?

Answer: *Kanjin*.

Question: Does the essence of the teaching of *kanjin* lie outside of the teachings of the *Shakumon* and *Honmon*?

Answer: What sort of essence of teaching could lie outside of the teachings of the *Shakumon* and *Honmon*? And yet the

²⁹ Both HANANO 1973, pp. 39-42, and TAKE 1991 describe the early to mid-Heian Tendai teachings that forerun the *shijū kōhai* system.

³⁰ For a useful survey of the usages in both traditions, see ZGD, p. 182c-d; Tendai usages are discussed in MBD 1, pp. 792c-93c.

³¹ The *Kankō ruijū* refers to the ultimate principle or teaching using several similar terms: *kanjin*, *shin'yō* (essentials of mind), and *shikan* (calm-abiding and insight, but sometimes used in a sense close to *kanjin*). In the following passage *shikan* supersedes *Honmon* and *Shakumon*:

When Ryōgen was about to die, he conferred the following teaching about calm-abiding and insight on Genshin, "The words and meanings of teachings collected in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* should not be considered the same as *Honmon* or *Shakumon*, nor as provisional or ultimate. The words are the same, but the meanings are different."
(TADA et al. 1973, p. 202)

In other passages, the ultimate is more closely identified with the essence of *Shakumon* and *Honmon*, before any differentiation occurred:

The "essentials of mind" we speak about now is the enlightenment of the fundamental *Lotus* before *Honmon* and *Shakumon* were distinguished.

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 194)

Interpretations in which *kanjin* clearly superseded all teachings probably offered more scope for agreement between the Zen and Tendai traditions.

meaning [of *kanjin*] far exceeds them.

Question: What is the meaning of this?

Answer: The meaning of *Honmon* and *Shakumon* concerns whether the Buddha realized Buddhahood long ago or recently. *Kanjin* takes the teachings of *Honmon* and *Shakumon* and treats them as a discernment of an instant of functioning of one's own mind. Thus it transcends the consideration of realization of Buddhahood in terms of time. *Kanjin* resides only in the three thousand realms in an instant of one's own mind.

(*Dainichikyō kenmon*, ND 26, p. 335a–b)

According to the above quotation, *kanjin* would transcend the *Lotus Sūtra*. This position may have been linked to efforts to raise the status of esoteric Buddhism and Zen. However, Ben'en also treats *kanjin* as the essence of the *Lotus Sūtra*, a position that might have allowed syncretism with Tendai.

The *shijū kōhai* system was used in a variety of ways to analyze Buddhist doctrine. For example, the *Gakumon nikki* 学問日記, an apocryphal diary of Genshin's teachings, is cited in the *Kankō ruijū*:

According to the *shijū kōhai*, in the great [perfect] teachings prior to the *Lotus Sūtra* the defilements are not enlightenment. In the great teachings of the *Shakumon*, the defilements are identical to enlightenment. In the great teachings of the *Honmon*, the defilements are identical to enlightenment and enlightenment is identical to the defilements. In the great teachings of the *kanjin*, there are neither defilements nor enlightenment.

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 225)

ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICE

This emphasis on the free interpretation of doctrine and the transcendence of such distinctions as defilement and enlightenment threatened to obviate the need for practice and morality. A number of passages in the *Kankō ruijū* do indeed seem to support such a conclusion. However, as the following statement demonstrates, these passages usually, but not always, apply to the advanced practitioner.

Those with superior faculties will realize enlightenment with the words "All phenomena are originally Buddha-dharmas." Those who have dull faculties and are unable [to use this teaching] can definitely understand it through the scriptures. Thus, we answered that the teachings on meditation are established.

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 200)

The text goes on to argue that for those with the highest faculties, “understanding is practice and realization” (*ge soku gyōshō* 解即行證). A cursory reading of the *Kankō ruijū* indicates the value that the compilers placed on the mastery of the subtleties of Tendai doctrine. For them, study of and debate on the Tendai teachings comprised practice. Debate was thus not an ancillary practice, but a major activity that led to Buddhahood.³²

In contrast to these statements suggesting that the advanced practitioner need not cut off delusion nor realize enlightenment, other passages reflect Chih-i’s warnings that beginning practitioners should not misinterpret the meditation on evil.³³

As Tao-sui stated, “There are those who have just started on the path and those who are more advanced (*gokedō* 後化道). Evil is basically the deluded mind, and is different from innate nature and truth (*hōri* 法理). When a person has just started on the path, he should not be told that evil can be taken as the essence of calm-abiding and insight because wrong views would increase. But for the advanced practitioner, wrong views themselves can serve as calm-abiding and insight meditations.” When Kuan-ting wrote, “Teachings that equate opposites (*sōdaishu kaie* 相對種開會) should not be taught to evil people,” he did so with this intention.

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 196)

Some of the issues connected with practice can be sorted out by referring to the *Kankō ruijū*’s twofold classification of *kanjin*: 1) *kyōchi funimon* 境智不二門, the nonduality of object and subject, and 2) *gendō usōmon* 還同有相門, returning to and becoming the same as the phenomenal realm (TADA et al. 1973, p. 189).³⁴ The second aspect corresponds to many of the *Kankō ruijū*’s affirmations of the phenomenal realm just as it is. However, the wording “return to and become the same as” (*gendō*) suggests that the phenomenal world can in practice be affirmed only after the practitioner has realized the nonduality of subject and object. The term is thus the same as *gendō hongaku* 還同本覺 (return and become the same as *hongaku*), found in other *hongaku* works and in the writings of Annen.³⁵ This term, like *gendō usōmon*,

³² SATŌ characterizes such attitudes as “the realization of Buddhahood through debate (*rongi jōbutsu* 論議成仏)” (1979, pp. 59–60).

³³ For a discussion of Chih-i’s views on the use of evil in meditation, see DONNER 1987.

³⁴ The term *gendō usōmon* is found in other texts related to the *Kankō ruijū*. However, the term seems to disappear after the *Kankō ruijū*, perhaps indicating a shift in the position of *hongaku* texts (HIROUMI 1978, p. 707).

³⁵ For an example of Annen’s usage of the term *gendō hongaku*, see his *Bodaishingshō*

refers to the post-enlightenment realization that the enlightenment attained (*shikaku* 始覺) is the same as innate enlightenment (*hongaku*). The *Kankō ruijū* comments:

“Nonduality of object and subject” refers to the transcendence of characteristics that differentiate sentient beings and Buddhas, to the elimination of any trace of the teachings. It refers to the innate nature and clarity (*tenshin dokurō*) that is to be found in the essence of things, to not thinking of the difference between good and evil.

As for “returning and becoming the same as the phenomenal realm,” after the characteristics of subject and object have been eliminated and innate liberation (*honge* 本解) established, all practices and realizations are the correct transmission of meditation.

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 189)

Many such affirmations of this world are found in the *Kankō ruijū*. Among the topics that receive considerable space are the realization of Buddhahood by grasses and trees³⁶ and the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*'s contention that “each form and each smell is the middle way” (TADA et al. 1973, pp. 215–17; T 46.1c; DONNER and STEVENSON 1993, pp. 112–13). However, such statements do not necessarily indicate that practice was not required. Rather, they indicate that practice could be based on whatever was at hand.

Some of the problems that arise during discussions of practice in texts like the *Kankō ruijū* are thrown into relief by the issue of whether plants can realize Buddhahood. It can be claimed that both plants and people are capable of realizing Buddhahood since they possess a mind that is innately pure and characterized by Suchness. In a sense, everyone and everything is inherently Buddha. Instead of eliminating defilements, one need only realize that innate nature. If practice is intended as a means of eliminating defilements, then perhaps practice is not required to realize what is already present.

This issue is discussed in the *Kankō ruijū* and related texts in terms of the question of whether Buddhas practice. Because no distinction can be made in an ultimate sense between Buddhas and sentient

(ND 83, p. 246b). The derivation of the term from the *Ta-sheng ch'i-hsin lun* [Awakening of faith] is clear; for the relevant passage and a discussion, see HIRAKAWA 1973, pp. 106, 118.

³⁶ Medieval Tendai discussions of the realization of Buddhahood by the grasses and trees contain some unusual usages of terms like *hosshin* 発心 (the resolve to attain enlightenment) and *shugyō* 修行 (practice) as they attempt to explain how they might apply to plants. Such issues are beyond the subject matter of this paper. For a general discussion of world-affirmation in Japanese Tendai texts, see ŌKUBO 1994.

beings, the issue concerns worldlings as much as it does Buddhas. The following passage is typical of the discussions on the subject.

Question: Does the aspiration to enlightenment and practice occur in the Perfect stage of Buddhahood?

Answer: Such and such (云々).

Doubt: Either answer has ambiguities. If we say that it occurs, then the aspiration to enlightenment and practice is necessary for the realization of Buddhahood, but since we have already said that Buddhahood is Perfect, how could such practice be present? However, if we say that practice is not present, then when we consider the mind of Perfect-Sudden meditation, the myriad phenomena of the ten realms and three thousand realms are already replete in the innate, eternal Buddha essence. Meditation is established on the basis of the three thousand realms. How can we say then that it is not present?

(BZ 40, p. 81b-c)

After considering a variety of ways out of this seeming contradiction, the compilers turned to the six identities (*rokusoku* 六即), a set of stages devised by Chih-i. The stages are called “identities” because they describe the realization of a nature already possessed by the practitioner (BZ 40, pp. 83b-90b; for a traditional Chinese account, see DONNER and STEVENSON 1993, pp. 207-18). The six identities begin with the practitioner’s innate nature (identity in principle, *risoku* 理即), a quality of which he may not even be conscious. The practitioner then goes through four stages as he gradually becomes aware of his nature and finally realizes Buddhahood in the last stage, ultimate identity (*kukyōsoku* 究竟即).

The compilers of the *Kankō ruijū* warn of the danger of practicing specifically to attain what one already has. Practice and realization occur out of compassion for others, not because they are necessary (BZ 40, p. 83).³⁷ Another passage analyzes the difference between purposeful (*sai* 作意) discernment and natural (*nin’un* 任運) discernment. Purposeful discernment is based on the intent to stop extraneous thoughts from arising. Natural discernment is based on developing firm faith and not responding to thoughts by creating additional ones (BZ 40, p. 86c). Although such statements might be considered refutations of practice, they are more likely instructions about the attitudes one should have when practicing.

If the *Kankō ruijū* required such practices as meditation and the

³⁷ Although some of the rhetoric about practice seems reminiscent of Zen, the language employed is that of Tendai. The similarities would seem to arise from teachings on Buddha-nature common to both traditions.

copying and chanting of scriptures, then what sorts of ritual or liturgical settings were employed? The text supplies little concrete information about what monks might have done, a characteristic it shares with many of the debate manuals, including early texts on *sokushin jōbutsu* by Rinshō 麟昭 and Annen. This does not indicate a rejection of practice, however—these texts were not the appropriate place for a discussion of the subject, being of a different genre from ritual manuals.

In fact, a position that would seem supportive of practice is found in the *Kankō ruijū*'s discussion of *sokushin jōbutsu*. This teaching, with its emphasis on world-affirmation and enlightenment in this existence, would seem an excellent candidate for claims of a quick or easy realization of Buddhahood by almost anyone. Such claims would have been facilitated by early discussions of *sokushin jōbutsu*—which often focused on developing new views of the hierarchy of practitioners and new interpretations of the path—and by Saichō's declaration that all Japanese possess perfect faculties, implying that they need not follow provisional teachings. In the *Kankō ruijū*, however, a more conservative approach is suggested by Shōhan 勝範 (995–1077) in his discussion of perfect faculties and *sokushin jōbutsu*.

There are three types of people who have the perfect faculties that enable direct realization:

1. those with faculties enabling them to understand and practice (*gegyō gusoku* 解行具足);
2. those with faculties enabling them to have faith but not to engage in other practices (*yuishin muyō* 唯信無余);
3. those with faculties enabling them to listen but not to understand [or to have faith] (*yuimon fuge* 唯聞不解).³⁸
 - i. Those with faculties enabling them to understand and practice are able to discern phenomena in a profound manner; thus they will realize Buddhahood both physically and mentally in this life.
 - ii. Those with faculties enabling them to have faith but not to engage in other practices are able to attain the way through faith, but cannot practice correctly; thus they do not realize Buddhahood in this life either physically or mentally. However, because they have the seeds for the rapid realization of Buddhahood, in their next lives they will obtain a Dharma-body (*hosshōjin* 法性身). According to Ennin's *Hokke giki* 法華儀軌 [Procedures of the *Lotus*], "If one has a mind of faith and listens to a single verse or sen-

³⁸ Later passages in this section indicate that the text should read 唯聞不信.

tence of the *Lotus Sūtra*, then in his next life, there will be no reason for him to receive a samsāric body; instead he will clearly receive a Dharma-body.”

- iii. Those with faculties enabling them to listen but not to understand have no faith in the *Lotus Sūtra*, but [still] listen to it in a casual manner.³⁹ Because the karmic connections of listening to the Dharma are great, in their third life they will receive a Dharma-body. According to the *P'u-hsien ching* 普賢經, “Even the slowest person will not require more than three lifetimes.”

(TADA et al. 1973, p. 232; T 9.389c)⁴⁰

This passage indicates that even though realization can be rapid, practice is necessary for everyone. Moreover, those who have the highest faculties and who practice seriously attain the goal the fastest. Although Saichō too had suggested that some who realize *sokushin jōbutsu* might require three lifetimes, most of his successors had ignored this view. The *Kankō ruijū* thus returned to a more conservative position in this case.⁴¹

Conclusion

This investigation of the *Kankō ruijū* has touched on only a few of the possible points that might be explored. The object of the analysis was to demonstrate that a close reading of a so-called *hongaku* text can reveal significant aspects of the historical and doctrinal development of Japanese Buddhism that have been overlooked in recent polemical writings on *hongaku*. The *Kankō ruijū* reflects contacts between the emerging Zen tradition and the established Tendai school, contacts that fostered attempts to integrate Zen and Tendai practices, and that may have led to the increased influence of Zen concepts and Zen lineage myths in Tendai circles. The *Kankō ruijū* also displays a number

³⁹ In interpreting this sentence, I follow Ōkubo's emendation of reading 輕重 as 輕易 (TADA et al. 1973, p. 232).

⁴⁰ This marks the end of a lengthy quotation from Shōhan, who lived in the Renjitsu-bō 蓮実房 in Saitō on Mt Hiei. Originally a student of Kakukei 覚慶 and later Kakuchō 覚超, he received esoteric initiations from Kōkei 皇慶. In 1070 he was appointed *zasu*. Among his works are the *jigyō ryakukichū* 自行略記註, *Sanshūgi shiki* 三周義私記, *Sanshūgi shiki* 三身義私記, *Saihōshū* 西方集, and the *Jōbodai* 成菩提. A lineage in the *Makura no sōshi* 枕雙紙 includes the following: Kakuchō—Shōhan—Chōgō 長豪—Chūjin. As one of the founders of the lineage that includes Chūjin, Shōhan occupies a high place of authority in the *Kankō ruijū*.

⁴¹ For a discussion of *sokushin jōbutsu* being spread over three lifetimes, see GRONER 1992, pp. 448–49. This article considers some of the usages to which Tendai monks put the concept of *sokushin jōbutsu* (see especially pp. 463–64).

of approaches that a text might take to legitimate its claims, such as focusing on selected portions of a basic text like the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*, mentioning revelations from kami, alluding to oral transmissions, and quoting fictitious texts. The use of fictitious texts is particularly common, but the reasons for this are not clear—the compiler knew of authentic texts that supported his positions, and often insured that the careful reader would be aware of the fictitious nature of some of the sources he was citing. At any rate, in a tradition such as Buddhism that has relied upon apocryphal texts for so long, it is hardly appropriate to dismiss the use of such fabrications as a sign of degeneration or declining scholarship.

When the *Kankō ruijū* is read against the background of the Tendai debate manuals, it reveals an attitude towards practice different from that often attributed to *hongaku* texts. Like many of the debate manuals, the *Kankō ruijū* does not promote specific practices but does not reject them either. And at least several of the authorities cited in the text held that some form of practice was necessary before Suchness could be realized in things just as they are. Indeed, the trouble taken by the text's compiler to develop elaborate systems explaining his position suggests that he felt it important to remain conversant with classical Tendai teachings, a position that hardly seems consistent with recent accusations of decadence.

ABBREVIATIONS

- BZ *Dainippon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書. Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木學術財団, ed. Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972–1975.
- DZ *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集. Hiei-zan Senshu-in Fuzoku Eizan Gakuin 比叡山專修院附屬叡山學院, ed. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.
- MBD *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典. Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, ed. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1932–1967.
- NBJJ *Nihon Bukkyō jinmei jiten* 日本仏教人名辞典. Nihon Bukkyō Jinmei Jiten Hensan Inkai 日本仏教人名辞典編纂委員会, ed. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1992.
- ND *Kaitei zōhō Nihon daizōkyō* 改訂増補日本大藏經. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1973–78.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, 100 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 et al., eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai and Daizō Shuppan, 1924–32.

- TDZ *Tendai Daishi zenshū: Makashikan* 天台大師全集一摩訶止觀. Tokyo: Nihon Bussho Kankōkai.
- TZ *Tendaishū zensho* 天台宗全書. Tendai Shūten Kankōkai 天台宗典刊行会, ed. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1972.
- ZGD *Zengaku daijiten* 禪学大辞典, new ed., Zengaku Daijiten Hensansho 禪学大辞典編纂所, ed. Tokyo: Daishūkan Shoten, 1985.
- ZTZ *Zoku Tendaishū zensho* 続天台宗全書. Tendaishūten Hensansho 天台宗典編纂所, ed. Kengyō 顯教, vols. 1-2. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1990-91.

REFERENCES

ASAI Endō 浅井円道

- 1977 Nihon Tendai ni okeru shikan chōkoku shichō no tenkai 日本天台における止觀超克思潮の展開. In *Bukkyō no jissen genri* 仏教の実践原理, Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大, ed., pp. 619-36. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

BODIFORD, William

- 1993 *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

COLLCUTT, Martin

- 1981 *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

DONNER, Neal

- 1987 Chih-i's meditation on evil. In *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society*, David Chappell, ed., pp. 49-64. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

DONNER, Neal and Daniel B. STEVENSON

- 1993 *The Great Calming and Contemplation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

GREGORY, Peter

- 1994 Tsung-mi and the problem of *hongaku shisō*. *Komazawa daigaku Zen kenkyūjo nenpō* 5: 200-151 (left pagination).

FOULK, T. Griffith

- n.d. Ch'an myths and realities in medieval Chinese Buddhism. Unpublished manuscript.

GRONER, Paul

- 1984 *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series.
- 1989 The *Lotus Sūtra* and Saichō's interpretation of the realization of Buddhahood with this very body (*sokushin jōbutsu*). In *The Lotus Sūtra in Japanese Culture*, George and Willa Tanabe, eds., pp. 53-74. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- 1992 Shortening the path: The interpretation of the realization of Buddhahood in this very existence in the early Tendai school. In *Paths to Liberation: The Mārga and Its Transformations in Buddhist Thought*, Robert Buswell and Robert Gimello, eds., pp. 439–74. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- forthcoming *Ryōgen: The Restoration and Transformation of the Tendai School*.
- HANANO Michiaki 花野充昭
- 1973 Shijū kōhai no seiritsuki ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu 四重興廢の成立期に関する一考察. *Bukkyōgaku ronshū* 10: 34–53.
- 1992 Nichiren no shōdai shisō to Danna-ryū no kanjō genshi kuden 日蓮の唱題思想と檀那流の灌頂玄旨口伝. In *Nihon Chūgoku Bukkyō shisō to sono tenkai* 日本中国仏教思想とその展開, Misaki Ryōshū 三崎良周, ed., pp. 115–58. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- HAZAMA Jikō 裕慈弘
- 1948 *Nihon Bukkyō no kaiten to sono kichō* 日本仏教の開展とその基調. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- HIBI Nobutada 日比宣正
- 1966 *Tōdai Tendaigaku josetsu* 唐代天台学序説. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- HIRAKAWA Akira 平川彰
- 1973 *Daijō kishinron* 大乘起信論. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.
- HIROUMI Kōken 弘海高顕
- 1978 Tendai kuden hōmon ni okeru gendō usō ni tsuite 天台口伝法門における還同有相について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 26: 707–708.
- IKEDA Rosan 池田魯参
- 1986 *Maka shikan kenkyū josetsu* 摩訶止観研究序説. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.
- IRIYA Yoshitaka 入矢義高 and KOGA Hidehiko 古賀英彦
- 1991 *Zengo jiten* 禅語辞典. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan.
- ISHIDA Mizumaro 石田瑞麿
- 1967a *Jōdokyō no tenkai* 浄土教の展開. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- 1967b Kuden hōmon ni okeru shijū kōhai no seiritsu 口伝法門における四重興廢の成立. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 15: 298–301.
- KOUDA Ryōsen 古宇田亮宣, ed.
- 1972 *Wayaku Tendaishū rongi hyakudai jizaibō* 和訳天台宗論義百題自在房. Tokyo: Rinkōin.
- KUROITA Katsumi 黒板勝美, ed.
- 1929–66 *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai* 新訂増補国史大系. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

- NISHIGUCHI Junko 西□順子
1987 *Onna no chikara* 女の力. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- NOMOTO Kakujiō 野本覚成
1990 Iga-ryū (Eshin-ryū) Tendaigaku no keifu 伊賀流 (慧心流) 天台学の系譜. *Tendai gakuho* 32: 75-80.
1991 Kaidai: Makashikan igashō 2 解題—摩訶止観伊賀抄2. *Zoku Tendai shū zensho*, Kengyō 2. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- ŌKUBO Ryōjun 大久保良順
1973 *Kankō ruijū* 漢光類聚. In TADA et al. 1973, pp. 569-83.
1980 Edan ryōryū hōmonchū no Dengyō Daishi 惠檀兩流法門中の傳教大師. In *Dengyō Daishi kenkyū: Bekkan* 傳教大師研究—別卷, Fukui Kōjun 福井庚順, ed., pp. 71-92. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu.
1986 Honri taikōshū tō to Seikai: Oboegaki 本理大綱集等と政海—覚え書. *Tendai gakuho* 28: 10-16.
1990 Kaidai: Makashikan igashō 1. *Zoku Tendai shū zensho*, Kengyō 1. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
1991 Tendai kuden hōmon no seiritsu to bunkenka 天台□伝法門の成立と文献化. In *Hongaku shisō no genryū to tenkai* 本覚思想の源流と展開, Asai Endō, ed., pp. 177-222. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- ŌKUBO Ryōshun 大久保良俊
1994 Genjitsu kōtei shisō: Hongaku shisō to Taimitsu kyōgaku 現実肯定思想—本覚思想と台密教学. In *Nihon no Bukkyō: Bukkyōshi o minaosu* 日本の仏教—仏教史を見なおす, Nihon Bukkyō Kenkyūkai 日本仏教研究会, ed. 47-70. Tokyo: Hōzōkan.
- ONO Genmyō 小野玄妙, ed.
1967 *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.
- ŌYAMA Kōjun 大山公淳
1989 *Shinbutsu kōshōshi* 神仏交渉史. Osaka: Tōhō Shuppan.
- SAERI Arikaio 佐伯有清
1992 *Dengyō Daishi den no kenkyū* 伝教大師伝の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan.
- SATŌ Tetsuei 佐藤哲英
1979 *Eizan jōdokyō no kenkyū* 叡山浄土教の研究. Kyoto: Hyakkaen.
- STEVENSON, Daniel B.
n.d. Selections from Zhiyi's *Great Calming and Contemplation*. Unpublished manuscript.
- STONE, Jacqueline
1995 Medieval Tendai *hongaku* thought and the new Kamakura Buddhism. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22: 17-48.

SUGAWARA Shinkai 菅原信海

1992 *Sannō Shintō no kenkyū* 山王神道の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TADA Kōryū 多田厚隆, ŌKUBO Ryōjun, TAMURA Yoshirō 田村芳朗, and ASAI Endō, eds.

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

TAKAGI Yutaka 高木 豊

1991 Shunpan no hongaku shisō 俊範の本覚思想. In *Hongaku shisō no genryū to tenkai*, Asai Endō, ed., pp. 173–76. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

TAKE Kakuchō 武 覚超

1991 Eizan Mii to Nichiren monka to no kōryū: Shijū kōhai no seiritsu o megutte 叡山三井と日蓮門下との交流—四重興廢の成立をめぐって. In *Hongaku shisō no genryū to tenkai*, Asai Endō, ed., pp. 397–423. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

TAMURA Yoshirō 田村芳朗

1966 *Kankō ruijū* 漢光類聚. In *Shin Butten kaidai jiten* 新仏典解題事典. Nakamura Hajime 中村 元 et al., eds., 261–62. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

1990a *Hongaku shisō ni okeru jissen no genri* 本覚思想における実践の原理. In *Hongaku shisōron* 本覚思想論, Tamura Yoshirō Bukkyōgaku Ronshū 田村芳朗仏教学論集 1, pp. 159–84. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

1990b *Nihon Tendai hongaku shisō no keisei katei: Toku ni Sōchō Zen to no kanren ni tsuite* 日本天台本覚思想の形成過程—とくに宋朝禪との関連について. In *Hongaku shisōron*, pp. 347–64.

TSUNODA Bun'ei 角田文衛, ed.

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

UESUGI Bunshū 上杉文秀

1972 *Nihon Tendaishi* 日本天台史. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai. (originally published Nagoya: Hajinkaku Shobō, 1935)