

THE FORMATION OF EARLY ESOTERIC BUDDHISM IN JAPAN:
A STUDY OF THE THREE JAPANESE ESOTERIC APOCRYPHA

By

Jinhua Chen, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

Copyright by Jinhua Chen, May 1997

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1997)
(Religious Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Formation of Early Esoteric Buddhism in Japan: A Study of Three Japanese
Esoteric Apocrypha

AUTHOR: Jinhua Chen, B.A. (Beijing University)
M.A. (Beijing University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Koichi Shinohara

NUMBER OF PAGES: VII , 294

THIS DISSERTATION IS DEDICATED TO MY PARENTS

ABSTRACT

It is said that the Japanese monk Saichō (767-822), during his nine-month stay in China, was initiated by his chief Chinese Esoteric mentor Shunxiao (n.d.) into an illustrious esoteric lineage starting from a prestigious Indian Esoteric master Śubhākarasimha (637-735). It is also believed that Shunxiao, based on three Esoteric texts translated by Śubhākarasimha, transmitted to Saichō some particular forms of Esoteric Buddhist teachings, the core of which is preserved in one of the two "dharma-transmission documents" (*fuhōmon*) supposedly written by Shunxiao to certify the esoteric transmission conducted between himself and Saichō. This is the conventional view regarding the roots of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan.

This dissertation subjects this conventional view to a critical examination. It argues that the two *fuhōmons* ascribed to Shunxiao were not written by Shunxiao himself, but were prepared in Japan for re-interpreting the meaning, and strengthening the legitimacy, of the initiation Saichō received from China. The three *siddhi* texts attributed to Śubhākarsimha were also composed in Japan as the scriptural support for Saichō's esoteric transmission. The Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism in the name of Saichō was for the main part created not by Saichō himself but by his followers.

These negative conclusions can be turned into a positive agenda for future research of Japanese Tendai Buddhism. Scholars can turn from a fruitless search for the roots of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in China to look more closely in Japan. On the other hand, this study might invite more scholarly attention to a host of Buddhist apocrypha which, long regarded as Chinese, might have been actually produced in Japan or Korea.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My greatest debt is no doubt to my principal academic supervisor at McMaster University, Professor Koichi Shinohara, without whose guidance I would have never been able to write such a Ph. D dissertation. I am also extremely grateful to the other two members in my Supervisory Committee, Profs. Robert Sharf and Phyllis Granoff, for the patience and wisdom with which they have shepherded my study over the past five years. To Prof. Jan Yunhua, an emeritus professor at McMaster University, I owe many insightful suggestions.

A generous fellowship provided by the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai of Japan has enabled me to conduct my dissertation-research in Kyoto. It is my great pleasure to take this opportunity to thank the teachers, colleagues and friends I have met in Japan over the past two years. Their learning and kindness have made my study in Japan rather enjoyable. In particular, I must acknowledge my heartfelt thanks to Profs. Nagao Gadjin, Yanagida Seizan, Aramaki Noritoshi, Antonino Forte, Misaki Ryōshū and Sueki Fumihiko. Prof. Nagao, who kindly took the trouble of acting as my guarantor in Japan, helped me a lot in many ways both upon and after my arrival in Japan. Profs. Yanagida, Aramaki and Forte successively oversaw my study at Hanazono University (Dec., 1994 - Sept., 1995), Kyoto University (Oct., 1995 - May 1996) and the Italian school of East Asian studies (Jun., 1996 - Apr., 1997). Though extremely busy, they often went out of the way to guide my dissertation-writing. Prof. Misaki at Waseda University and Prof. Sueki at Tokyo University read some parts of my dissertation. Their encouragement, comments and criticism are greatly appreciated.

In addition, Prof. Victor Mair of the University of Pennsylvania, whom I met at the Italian

School of East Asian Studies in 1995, Prof. Paul Swanson of Nanzan University in Nagoya and Prof. Okubō Ryōjun of Waseda University also read the earlier draft of my dissertation and kindly gave me useful suggestions. I am grateful for their help and friendship.

Finally, I cannot end this without expressing my deepest gratitude and love to my parents and my wife Hua. Without their affection and support, it is doubtful that I would have ever been able to do anything successfully. It is to my parents that this dissertation is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PART ONE: THE POLEMICAL CONTEXT SURROUNDING THE COMPOSITION OF THREE JAPANESE ESOTERIC APOCRYPHA	
CHAPTER ONE The Transmission of Esoteric Buddhism to East Asia	8
CHAPTER TWO Saichō and Esoteric Buddhism	25
Section (A) Saichō's Contact with Esoteric Buddhism During His Stay in China	26
Section (B) Saichō's Esoteric Activities in Japan before Kūkai's Return from China	29
Section (C) Saichō and Kūkai: Saichō's Efforts to Create the Tendai Form of Esoteric Buddhism	35
Section (D) The <i>Kenkairon</i> and Saichō's Efforts to Redefine His Esoteric Transmission from China	42
Some Concluding Remarks	45
CHAPTER THREE Saichō's Disciples And the Legitimation of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism	55
Section (A) The <i>Denjutsu Isshinkaimon</i> and the Glorification of Saichō's Chinese Esoteric Mentor Shunxiao	62
(A.I) The <i>Denjutsu Isshinkaimon</i> Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission	63
(A.II) The Authenticity and Significance of the "Court Certificate" Included in the <i>Denjutsu Isshinkaimon</i>	64
(A.II.i) The Authenticity of This "Court Certificate"	65
(A.II.ii) The Significance of This "Court Certificate"	70
Section (B) The <i>Eizan Daishiden</i> and the Legitimation of Saichō's Esoteric Tradition	71
(B.I) The <i>Eizan Daishiden</i> Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission	71
(B.II) The Authenticity and Significance of the <i>Fuhōmon</i> 1	73
(B.II.i) The Bishamondō MS	73
(B.II.ii) The Authenticity of the <i>Fuhōmon</i> 1	78

(B.II.ii) The Significance of the <i>Fuhōmon</i> ¹	80
Section (C) The <i>Naishō Buppō Sōjō Kechimyakufu</i> and the Further Legitimation of Saichō's Esoteric Tradition	82
(C.I) The <i>Kechimyakufu</i> Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission	88
(C.II) The Significance of the <i>Kechimyakufu</i> Version of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission	92
Section (D) The <i>Kenkairon Engi</i> and Saichō's Esoteric Tradition: Appearance of the <i>FUHŌMON</i>	93
(D.I) The <i>Kenkairon Engi</i> Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission	96
(D.II) The Authenticity and Significance of the <i>FUHŌMON</i>	100
(D.II.i) The Authenticity of the <i>FUHŌMON</i>	100
(D.II.ii) The Polemical Agenda Underlying the Fabrication of the <i>Fuhōmon</i> ²	105
Some Concluding Remarks	108
THE CONCLUSIONS OF PART ONE	117
PART TWO CHINESE OR JAPANESE: THE PROVENANCE AND DATES OF THREE SIDDHI TEXTS ATTRIBUTED TO ŚUBHĀKARASIMHA (T#905, T#906, T#907)	
CHAPTER FOUR The Three <i>Siddhi</i> Texts: A General Survey	122
CHAPTER FIVE The Provenance and Date of T907	140
Section (A) Anne and T907	141
Section (B) Enchin and T907	150
(B.I) A Paragraph-by-paragraph Analysis of Enchin's KSSH	152
(B.II) A Further Analysis of KSSH: Did Enchin Know of T907 When Writing KSSH?	157
(B.III) The Dating of KSSH	162
(B.IV) Enchin's Association with Zhihuilun: His Ignorance of T907 Until 882	163
(B.V) Did Enchin ever Read T907?	165
(B.VI) Enchin and the T907 Author: Who Is the Borrower?	166
Section (C) Annen and the "Discovery" of T907	169
(C.I) The Date of Annen's Death, His <i>Taizōkai Daihō Taijuki</i> and A Preface in His <i>Hakke Hiroku</i> Bibliography	169

(C.II) The Identity of the Text Annen Called "Sonshō Hajikoku Hō" or "Sonshō Hajikoku Giki" 177	
(C.III) Annen and T907: Discoverer or Author? 180	
Section (D) The Textual Provenance of T907	181
Some Concluding Remarks	183
CHAPTER SIX The Provenance and Dates of T#906 and T#907	194
Section (A) A Textual Analysis of T905	194
Section (B) T905 and Enchin	201
(B.I) The Dates of KRHG, DKSM and ZSK 203	
(B.II) Two Pieces of Evidence for Supporting KRHG as the Original Text for the Textual Parallels between T905 and KRHG 206	
(B.III) The Contextual Inconsistencies of the Five Paragraphs in T905 208	
Section (C) The Date of T905 and the Polemical Agenda Underlying the Composition of T905 after T907	213
(C.I) Two Distinctive Features of T905 213	
(C.II) The Date of T905 216	
(C.III) The Polemical Agenda Underlying the Composition of T907 218	
Section (D) The Formation of T906	220
CHAPTER SEVEN The Transmission of the Three Texts in Japan and Their Impact on Tendai And Shingon	235
Section (A) The Transmission of the Three <i>Siddhi</i> Texts in Medieval Japan	236
Section (B) The Impact of the Three <i>Siddhi</i> Texts on the Japanese Esoteric Traditions: Their Incessant Appearances in the Medieval Japanese Exegeses and Treatises	239
(B.I) Tendai Authors and the Three <i>Siddhi</i> Texts 241	
(B.II) The Shingon Authors and the Three <i>Siddhi</i> Texts 243	
(a) The Twelfth-century Shingon Authors and the Three <i>Siddhi</i> Texts: Chōyo (n.d.) and Kakuban (1095-1143) 244	
(b) The Thirteenth-century Shingon Authors and the Three <i>Siddhi</i> texts: Jinken (?-1262) and Raiyu (1226-1304) 245	
(c) The Fourteenth-century Shingon Authors and the Three <i>Siddhi</i> Texts: Raihō (1279-1330), Yūban (1270-1352) and Gōhō (1306-1362) 247	
Some Concluding Remarks	251

	VII
THE CONCLUSIONS OF PART TWO	258
CONCLUSIONS	262
GLOSSARY	266
ABBREVIATIONS FOR PRIMARY SOURCES	283
WORKS CITED	284

阿彌陀佛如來母

上品卷地

阿彌陀佛

中品卷地

阿彌陀佛

下品卷地

阿彌陀佛

阿彌陀佛

阿彌陀佛

阿彌陀佛

阿彌陀佛

阿彌陀佛

阿彌陀佛

1 意淨任受 順晚阿彌契付法印信 四天王寺藏

因供奉沙門順晚
於越府峯山頂道
場付

因開元初大藏婆羅門國

王子法考善長是范仙國大都

南地寺傳大法輪至大唐國境

付為傳法弟子僧義林是

因師大阿闍梨二百三歲今在

新羅國傳法轉大法輪又付大

唐弟子僧順晚是鎮國道

場大德阿闍梨又付

子僧嚴澄持大法輪僧嚴澄

是弟四付為傳授唐貞元

二年四月九日書記今佛法

承不此阿闍梨沙門順

晚

2 同右 是沙門宣藏

INTRODUCTION

Saichō (767-822), the founder of the Japanese Tendai school, is remembered not only for having transplanted Chinese Tiantai Buddhism to Japan but also for his alleged role in obtaining an Esoteric Buddhist tradition from China. In Tendai Buddhism, the esoteric aspect sometime assumed such importance that the Tendai followers believed that the esoteric aspect of their school embodied a higher form of Buddhism than did its exoteric side, i.e., the traditional Tiantai doctrines that had been brought by their patriarch from China.

The legitimacy of Saichō's Esoteric tradition is mainly supported by two certificate documents (*fuhōmon*) reputedly left by Saichō's chief Chinese Esoteric mentor--Shunxiao. Two MSS are preserved at the Bishamondō Temple in Kyoto and the Shitennōji Temple in Osaka, and have been, respectively, designated as a "National Treasure" and "Important Cultural Property" by the Japanese government. They are regarded as the originals of these two *fuhōmons*.

The first *fuhōmon* (=Shitennōji MS), dated on the eighteenth day of the fourth month, Zhenyuan 21 (805) in the Tang Dynasty, is centred on the esoteric teachings Saichō is said to have received from Shunxiao. According to this *fuhōmon*, Shunxiao had initiated Saichō into some peculiar forms of esoteric teachings, the core of which consists in correlating three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs (i.e., A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham, A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham, A-Ra-Ba-Ca-Na) with three ranks of *siddhi* ("attainment"): higher, middle and lower.

The second *fuhōmon* (=Bishamondō MS) was supposedly written by the same Shunxiao one day after he is alleged to have written the first *fuhōmon*. It depicts an esoteric lineage in which

Saichō was counted as the fourth successor. This lineage is traced through Shunxiao, the third dharma-successor in the lineage, and his Korea-born but China-educated master Yilin (the second successor) back to the prestigious Śubhākarasimha, who was regarded as the first patriarch in this lineage.

According to several dharma-transmission documents which were obviously patterned on the two *fuhōmons* attributed to Shunxiao, some Post-Saichō Tendai leaders, like Kōchi (n.d.), Tokuen (n.d.), Enchin (814-891), Henjō (817-890), Annen (841-904?), etc., were also initiated into the same kind of esoteric ceremony centred around the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation. Thus, the esoteric lineage with which Saichō is said to have become affiliated in China was carried on by Saichō's followers in Japan, finally forming such an esoteric lineage involving Indian, Chinese, Korean and Japanese Esoteric Buddhists: (1) Śubhākarasimha --> (2) Yilin --> (3) Shunxiao --> (4) Saichō --> (5) Kōchi --> (6) Tokuen --> (7) Enchin --> (8) Henjō. Throughout the entire Tendai history, this lineage has become one main device employed to bolster the authenticity of the Tendai Esoteric tradition allegedly brought back to Japan by Saichō and systematized by Enchin and Annen.

The threefold classification of the category *siddhi* is by no means a new notion. It can be found in numerous esoteric texts translated into Chinese, for example, the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra*. In addition, the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs can be traced back to the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* and *Vajrasāekhara-sūtra*. Nonetheless, the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs were rarely listed together side by side; their correlations with the three ranks of attainment is even more unusual. As a matter of fact, the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation gets no scriptural support except in the three *siddhi* texts which, currently preserved in the *Taishō Tripiṭaka* under the number 905,

906 and 907, are attributed to Śubhākarasimha. Therefore, these three *siddhi* texts are generally taken as the fundamental texts on the basis of which Shunxiao initiated Saichō into his esoteric lineage.

To recapitulate, the following account has been given of Saichō's effort to transmit an esoteric tradition to Japan. In China Saichō was initiated into an illustrious lineage starting from Śubhākarasimha and culminating in Saichō's celebrated mentor Shunxiao, who, on the basis of three *siddhi* texts translated by Śubhākarasimha, transmitted to Saichō some esoteric teachings. The core of these teachings is also preserved in one of the two *fuhōmons* written by Shunxiao himself. This conventional view regarding the formation of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan is still uncritically accepted by almost all Tendai scholars.

In this dissertation, I will subject this conventional view to a critical examination. What has led me to question the historical validity of this conventional view is my understanding of the origin of the three *siddhi* texts that are said to form the scriptural basis of Saichō's Esoteric transmission.

Japanese scholars reject the traditional view of associating the three *siddhi* texts with Śubhākarasimha because they are so strongly coloured by Chinese *wuxing* ideas. Japanese scholars believe that they were written in China. They also stress the relative lateness of the three *siddhi* texts, which may have appeared in China later than the time of Śubhākarasimha. Finally, Japanese scholars also point out that of the three *siddhi* texts, T907 is the primary one on the basis of which the other two were written.

Despite the importance of their work on the three texts, Japanese scholars have ignored one possibility that must be taken into consideration: the three *siddhi* texts may have been composed

in Japan. It is here that my investigation begins.

I was first drawn to the close connection between T907 and a treatise by Enchin, the *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō* (KSSH). KSSH contains numerous ideas and sentences that can be found in T907. Evidence shows that these textual and intellectual parallels between T907 and KSSH could not have been derived from a third source. Further, KSSH was composed when Enchin had obviously no knowledge of T907 (KSSH was composed around 873, while some evidence shows that as late as 882 Enchin had known nothing of T907). Therefore, I tried to explain the textual and intellectual parallels between T907 and KSSH by the assumption that these ideas/sentences originally appeared in KSSH *before* they were moved to T907. Further, no evidence suggests that KSSH had ever circulated in an area outside Japan (e.g., China or Korea) where the Chinese language was also used. Therefore, T907, along with T905 and T906 (since they were both based on T907), must have been composed in Japan and on the basis of Enchin's KSSH.

I shall argue that the three *siddhi* texts were composed in Japan and by some Tendai followers (their Tendai origin can be shown by their extensive use of several works by the two Tendai patriarchs, Enchin and Annen). I shall also show that the three *siddhi* texts were used as the scriptural source for the esoteric teachings depicted in the second *fuhōmon*, which constitutes the certificate for the esoteric dharma-transmission putatively obtained by Saichō from China. This suggests that the three *siddhi* texts were prepared in Japan for the purpose of legitimating the Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism attributed to Saichō. From this new understanding of the origin of the three *siddhi* texts, what can we say about the two *fuhōmons* attributed to Shunxiao? Were they originally written by Shunxiao in China; or like the three texts, also forged in Japan for the same purpose (i.e., to legitimate Saichō's esoteric tradition)?

It seems difficult, if not impossible, to accept the two *fuhōmons* as documents written by Shunxiao for certifying the transmission between himself and Saichō. This conclusion is mainly based on the following fact: neither the *Esshūroku* (The Bibliography [Compiled] in Yuezhou) nor the *Kenkairon* (On Promoting the Precepts) mentions any document that can be identified as either of the two *fuhōmons*. Since in these two works Saichō was concerned with showing the religious value of his trip to China and the legitimacy of his Buddhist transmissions from China, had he really secured from China such important documents as the two *fuhōmons* he would have included, or at least mentioned, them in these two works.

However, it is the following fact that provides the strongest evidence against the conventional view that Saichō had obtained two *fuhōmons* from China. The *Esshūroku* contains a certificate signed by the Prefect of the Mingzhou, which describes Saichō's study in the area and confirms his religious attainment. At the end of the *Esshūroku*, Saichō also mentions a trifurcate *vajra*, which he says was given by his Esoteric master as a proof (*injin*) of the dharma-transmission (*fuhō*) between them. For certifying Saichō's religious activities in China, either of the two *fuhōmons* may have been as important as (if not more important than) this official document and this *vajra* used as *fohōinjin*. Furthermore, the two *fuhōmons* claim themselves to be written by Shunxiao on the eighteenth and nineteenth day of the fourth month of 805; *viz*, almost one month *before* the compilation of the *Esshūroku*, which was dated on the thirteenth day of the fifth month of 805. Therefore, if the two *fuhōmons* were authentic, Saichō would have certainly been in possession of them when he compiled the *Esshūroku*. Now that Saichō includes or mentions the official certificate and the *vajra* in the *Esshūroku*, we have reasons to assume that he would have also included or at least mentioned the two *fuhōmons* in the same bibliography had

he really possessed them at the time. Thus, the absence of these two *fuhōmons* in the *Esshūroku* strongly suggests that Saichō had, in fact, not secured these two *fuhōmons* from China. In other words, these two *fuhōmons* were forged in Japan and then attributed to Saichō.

In addition, it seems that the following point also casts doubt on the authenticity of the two *fuhōmons*: they present Shunxiao as calling himself a "*daitoku*" (*bhadanta*) at a "*chinkoku dōjō*" ("State-protecting Temple"), "*Acārya Śramaṇa*", "*naigubu*" ("Court Chaplain"). Few monks could be so presumptuous as to show off so many honorific titles in a document written for his disciple.

Finally, it is rather questionable that Saichō, albeit the shortness of his association with Shunxiao, secured from the same teacher two separate *fuhōmons* in two consecutive days respectively. We know that Saichō only made an extremely brief sojourn in Yuezhou. This left him very limited time to stay with Shunxiao (it appears that Saichō had stayed with Shunxiao for no more than several days). In Esoteric Buddhism, great significance is attached to oral master-to-disciple transmissions and the certificates confirming such esoteric transmissions (the so-called *fuhōmon*) must have been written with great care and importance. According to the two *fuhōmons* themselves, Shunxiao wrote one of the two documents on the eighteenth day of the fourth month of 805 and the other on the next. It is hard to imagine that Shunxiao had written a *fuhōmon* so easily (if not so recklessly) that he, barely one day after the issuance of one *fuhōmon* to a newly initiated student, deemed it necessary to write another one for the same person.

Thus, this dissertation has arrived at a conclusion which goes precisely contrary to the conventional view regarding the establishment of the Taimitsu school. The two *fuhōmons* ascribed to Shunxiao were not written by Shunxiao himself, but were prepared in Japan in order to re-interpret the meaning, and strengthen the legitimacy, of the esoteric initiation Saichō supposedly

received from China. The three *siddhi* texts also appeared in Japan, and were composed as the textual support for the Tendai re-interpretation of Saichō's initiation as embodied in the first *fuōmon*. Thus, the Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism which has been held as obtained by Saichō from China turns out to be, for the main part, created by his immediate and/or second-generation disciples. It is not justifiable to attribute this form of Esoteric Buddhism to Saichō, much less to attribute it to any esoteric tradition in China.

PART ONE

**THE POLEMICAL CONTEXT SURROUNDING THE COMPOSITION
OF THE THREE JAPANESE ESOTERIC APOCRYPHA**

CHAPTER ONE

THE TRANSMISSION OF ESOTERIC BUDDHISM TO EAST ASIA

Despite the repeated prohibition against the use of incantation and magic in a number of Buddhist texts, some Buddhist monks seem to have been fascinated with dhāraṇī incantations and other esoteric forms which have been included under the rubric "Tantrism". However, the formal rise of Esoterism in Indian Buddhism (a trend which can be called "Indian Esoteric Buddhism") still remains so elusive that no reliable conclusion has ever been reached on this problem.

Yet it may be safe to say that from around the third century AD onwards some esoteric cults seems to have originated inside the Buddhist movement in Eastern India and have been secretly transmitted between master and disciple. The oral transmission of these esoteric cults had been carried on until they began to be systematized and given a philosophical basis in India between the seventh and eighth centuries¹. This newly emerging religio-philosophical trend within Buddhism is generally referred to as "Esoteric Buddhism"².

Esoteric Buddhism has been characterized as a Buddhist tradition making extensive use of such "esoteric" (secret) forms as mantras/dhāraṇī ("spell", "incantation"), *mūdra* ("hand gestures") and *maṅḍala* ("sacred diagrams"). Therefore, the rise of Esoteric Buddhism is often equated with the appearance within Buddhism of these esoteric elements and forms. If this assumption is not too far from the truth, the origin of Esoteric Buddhism is traceable to the third century or even earlier through textual evidence, at least that accessible through Chinese translations.

The *Wuliangmen weimichijing* (Jpn., *Muryōmom mimitsuji kyō*; Skt.,

Anantamukha[sādhaka]dhāraṇī, T1011) translated by Zhiqian (d. 253 AD), is generally taken as the first Chinese-translated Esoteric Buddhist text. This is, of course, true in the sense that this text has a peculiarly "esoteric" title and one of its major parts is related to esoteric elements. This does not mean, however, that an earlier "proto-esoteric" buddhist text is not available. A good example is found in the *Modengjia jing* (Jpn., *Matōga kyō*; Skt., *Mātanga-sūtra*; T1300), which was translated as early as 230 AD by Zhu Luyan, a monk from central India who arrived in China in 224 AD. In this text, we find six dhāraṇīs, all of which begin with *om* and end with *svaha*. Moreover, we find in the same text a kind of rite strongly reminiscent of the *homa* procedure, a celebrated rite practised in later Esoteric Buddhism. In this ceremony as described in the *Modengjia jing*, a great fire is lighted and dhāraṇīs are recited as the ceremony begins; at the end of the recitation flowers are thrown into the fire³. Since it usually takes some time for ideas to be given textual form and still more time to get a text translated into a second language, we have reason to believe that the esoteric elements as presented in the *Mātanga-sūtra* had been practised in India sometime before 230 AD, when it was translated into Chinese. This means that some characteristically esoteric elements had already crept into Indian Buddhism at least at the beginning of the third century.

Since their incorporation into the Indian Buddhist movement, esoteric elements seem to have taken a steady hold on Mahayana. In contrast to their sporadic appearance in the Mahayana texts produced in the third century, esoteric elements had become so well accepted in fourth century Mahayanism that some Mahayana texts devote whole chapters to dhāraṇī. The *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*⁴, for instance, devotes an entire chapter exclusively to magic formulas of supposedly meaningless sound, which, when recited one hundred and eight times, are claimed to

ward off demons.

As witnessed by the Chinese translations, the esoteric-flavoured Buddhist texts, shortly after their appearance in India, were transmitted to China by Indian and Central Asian Buddhist missionaries, who were eager to use the newly imported esoteric forms to facilitate the acceptance of Buddhism by the Chinese people. Following the translation of these "proto-esoteric" texts like the *Modengjia jing* and *Wuliangmen weimichi jing* in the third century, the fourth century saw not only further esoteric-coloured scriptures translated in China, but also more Buddhist missionaries achieving their prestige by their reputed esoteric skills.

Dharmarakṣa (d. after 313 A.D.), a prolific translator, translated from Sanskrit a number of texts consisting of dhāraṇīs. Interestingly, he translated the dhāraṇīs according to their meaning rather than simply making a phonetic transcription⁵.

In this period there were also some Buddhist missionaries, who are mainly remembered not as translators, but for their magical talents. Fotucheng (231-348 AD) can be counted as the first and probably the most successful of those "Buddhist magicians", who made utmost use of their magical skills in their proselytizing activities. With his alleged supernatural abilities, Fotucheng succeeded in obtaining the full trust of the later Zhao (319-351 AD) ruler Shi Le (274-333 AD) and his nephew and successor Shi Hu (295-349 AD)⁶.

In the following three centuries (fifth to seventh), more Buddhists in China, both Chinese and foreign, were engaged in translating esoteric-flavoured scriptures into Chinese and promulgating various esoteric practices and teachings. Dhāraṇīs and the ways of reciting them remained the focus of the Esoteric Buddhist texts current in this period. In some Buddhist texts transmitted to China in this period, like the *Daji jing* translated by Dharmakṣema (d. 433 AD)⁷,

the dhāraṇī practice was even ranked side by side with *sīla* ("precept"), *samādhi* ("meditation") and *prajñā* ("wisdom"), the triad of the Buddhist *marga*. Zhitong in the early Tang dynasty, who demonstrated keen interest in Esoterism, is also credited with several Chinese translations dealing with dhāraṇīs. Among the Buddhist texts concerning dhāraṇīs in this period, the *Dakongque zhouwang jing* (T985)⁸ warrants particular attention for its tendency to deify dhāraṇī, which is referred to as *vidyārāja* (the "king of spells"). Furthermore, this sutra is followed by an appendix on methods for making altars (probably a kind of rudimentary mandala) and painting images.

The popularity of dhāraṇī practices in this period in China is not merely attested by the number of dhāraṇī-related Buddhist texts translated into Chinese, but is also illustrated by the fact that Emperor Yuan of the Liang Dynasty (r. 555 AD), son of Emperor Wu, perhaps the most fervent Buddhist patron China history has ever seen, confessed to have been so fascinated with dhāraṇīs that he himself managed to learn how to recite some of them⁹.

In addition to the further development of the dhāraṇī practice, there is evidence to show that some embryonic ideas of maṇḍala had already been introduced to China during this period through translated Buddhist texts. For instance, the *Dajiyi shenzhou jing* (Jpn., *Daikichiji shinju kyō*; T1335) translated in 462 AD by Tanyao, who was closely connected with the building of the stone cave-temple in Datong, describes the method of making an arena, in which images of Buddhist deities are arranged in a circle and various offerings are presented to the deities (T1335.21. 579b1). Chou Yiliang interprets this arena as a rudimentary maṇḍala¹⁰.

Some esoteric rites were also introduced to China during this period. A text called *Molizhitian tuoluoni zhoujing* (Jpn. *Marishiten darani jukyō*; T1256)¹¹, considered a translation of the Liang Dynasty (502-556 AD), specifies the method of cleaning the hall of the temple and

making offerings to the deity Marīci¹². Aṭigupta, who arrived in China in 652 AD, translated the *Tuoluoni jijing* (Jpn., *Darani jikkyō*; T901) which consists of many rites similar to those taught in sutras translated by Śubhākarasimha and Vajrabodhi.

Finally, Chinese people in this period, through the newly imported Buddhist esoteric texts, were also made familiar with some of the typically esoteric ideas, like the *siddhi* or magical powers. In the same *Dajiyi shenzhou jing* translated by Tangyao are taught a variety of *siddhis*, e.g., those to conquer the enemy, to forestall or stop a storm, to obtain rain, to conceal one's form, or to secure a wishing jewel, etc.

In the period between the third and seventh centuries latent esoteric elements were clearly visible in many Chinese-translated Buddhist texts. Chinese people in this period seem to have become entirely familiar with Esoteric forms and ideas such as dhāraṇīs, mandala and *siddhi*. However, esoteric forms known in this period seem mainly to have been resorted to as magical skills, and Esoteric Buddhism was far from being regarded as a kind of systematic teaching with an independent and peculiar world-view and soteriology. It is only during the seventh and eighth centuries that Esoteric Buddhism as a systematic teaching was officially introduced into China. This period is usually referred to as the beginning of the *junmitsu* ("Pure") form of Esoteric Buddhism, in contrast to the period from the third to the late seventh century when, it is assumed, the *zōmitsu* ("Miscellaneous") form of Esoteric Buddhism was transmitted to China¹³.

The establishment of Esoteric Buddhism as a "school" in China has been attributed to three Esoteric masters¹⁴, Śubhākarasimha, Vajrabodhi and Bukong (or Amoghavajra), who are conventionally referred to as the "Three *Mahāsattvas* of the Kaiyuan Period (713-741 AD)" (*Kaiyuan sandaishi*), though Bukong, perhaps the most important of them, extended his activities

far beyond the Kaiyuan period¹⁵.

Śubhākarasimha, who headed the "three *Mahāsattvas* of the Kaiyuan period", is remembered as the "first master" of the Esoteric "school"¹⁶ in China. He arrived in Chang'an in 716 and was warmly received by Emperor Xuanzong who was deeply impressed by his thaumaturgy. Śubhākarasimha's contribution to the spread of Esoteric Buddhism in China mainly consists in his role in translating into Chinese several basic esoteric texts, at least two of which were, presumably, written by himself in Sanskrit when he was still in India¹⁷. In 724 Śubhākarasimha, at the request of Emperor Xuanzong, accompanied the imperial cortege to Luoyang, where he, assisted by some Chinese monks¹⁸, translated the *Darijing* (Jpn., *Dainichi kyō*; Skt., *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*, six fascicles, T848). Supposedly based on the lectures Śubhākarasimha delivered during the course of translation, Yixing, one of Śubhākarasimha's Chinese students, has composed an authoritative commentary on the *Darijing*, which proved to be decisive in the formation of various Esoteric Buddhist traditions in China and Japan as well. One year later, Śubhākarasimha finished translating the one-fascicle esoteric manual, the *Gongyang fa* (Jpn., *Kuyō hō*; or *Gongyang cidi* [Jpn., *Kuyō shidai*]; the Methods for Making Offerings), which is now believed to be his own composition¹⁹. Shortly after the translation was done, the *Gongyang fa* was appended as the seventh fascicle to the originally six-fascicle *Darijing*. The year 726, two years after the translation of the *Darijing*, witnessed Śubhākarasimha's success in translating two other important esoteric texts, the *Supohutongzi qingwen jing*²⁰ and *Suxidijieluo jing*²¹. Attributed to Śubhākarasimha are, in total, twenty-one translations of esoteric texts, some of which have turned out to be, however, of dubious provenance²².

Following Śubhākarasimha, another Indian Esoteric monk, Vajrabodhi (Chinese name

Jingangzhi), came to China. Before arriving in Canton in 719 Vajrabodhi had spent one year in Sri Lanka, then a centre of Esoteric Buddhism²³. Two facts account for Vajrabodhi's pre-eminence in the East-Asian esoteric tradition. First of all is his translation in 723 of the *Jingangdingyujia zhong luechu niansong jing*²⁴, which represents the first Chinese translation of the *Vajrasékhara-sūtra* (known in China and Japan as *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō*, the Sutra of the Diamond-crown). In later Esoteric Buddhist traditions in East Asia, this sutra, along with the *Darijing*, or with the *Darijing* and *Suxidi jing*, were regarded as the two (Chin., *liangdabu*; Jpn., *ryōdaibu*) or three major esoteric scriptures (Chin., *sandabu*; Jpn., *sandaibu*)²⁵. In this sense, Vajrabodhi can be regarded as the person responsible for introducing the Diamond-realm line of Esoteric Buddhism into China. The other fact on which the importance of Vajrabodhi as an Esoteric master is based is his role as the *guru* of Bukong, who was destined to be the greatest and most successful Esoteric master in the history of China.

Bukong is also known by his Sanskrit religious name, Amoghavajra. In spite of his foreign blood²⁶, he must be primarily considered as a Chinese Buddhist priest since the whole of his seventy-year life, except for the nine years he spent in Central Asia as a child and a five-year period he spent in Sri Lanka, was lived in China²⁷. Shortly after Vajrabodhi's arrival in China in 719 Bukong, then fourteen years old, went to study with him. When Vajrabodhi died in 741, Bukong decided to visit India and Sri Lanka for further Esoteric training and to collect more Esoteric texts.

Upon his return to China from Sri Lanka in 746, Bukong found himself well received by the court, nobles and military elites. From then on, Bukong's prestige and popularity kept climbing as he skilfully lent his proficiency in thaumurgy, esoteric ceremonies, and political

strategy to the service of three successive Tang rulers²⁸, who were menaced by the difficult political situations leading up to and/or worsened by An Lushan Rebellion (756-763 AD).

Throughout the history of Chinese Buddhism, Bukong, by any standard, would have no rival in his success as a Buddhist priest, especially as an Esoteric master. Politically, no monk is comparable with him in the influence he achieved upon the court and local authorities and, in the number and rank of honorary titles he accumulated in and after his lifetime. As a translator, he is accredited with the translation of over one hundred Buddhist texts (most of which are, needless to say, esoteric). This puts him on a par with such great translators as Kumārajīva (344-413 AD), Paramārtha (499-569 AD) and Xuanzang (d.664 AD). It is mainly through his unremitting efforts that Esoteric Buddhism succeeded in surpassing any other Buddhist tradition and reached its pinnacle in the middle and late Tang periods.

Two aspects of the tremendous heritage left by Bukong proved to be of lasting impact on the later Esoteric (Taimitsu in particular) development in Japan and warrant particular attention here. Firstly, Bukong seems to have been in a position that enabled him to hold a syncretic attitude toward the two divisions of Esoteric tradition, i.e., the "Matrix Realm" (Chin., *taizangjie*; Jpn., *taizōkai*; Skt., *garbhakośadhātu*) and "Diamond Realm" (Chin., *jingangjie*; Jpn., *kongōkai*; Skt., *vajradhātu*), represented by the *Darijing/Dainichi kyō* and *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō* respectively. He was both a direct successor of Vajrabodhi, who is the first expounder of the Matrix-realm tradition, and an admirer of the tradition of Śubhākarasimha, from whom he was separated by one generation and who is the main promulgator of the Diamond-realm line²⁹.

Secondly, Bukong held the belief that the success of Esoteric Buddhism resided, for the most part, in its *huguo* (Jpn., *gokoku*, "state-protecting") function. The *huguo* idea so fervently

advocated by him proves to be influential on Saichō. Saichō was very appreciative of the *Bukong biaozi ji*, a collection of documents Bukong submitted to the court. He based many of his administrative reforms on Bukong's petitions preserved in this collection³⁰. What impressed Saichō most in the collection was, most likely, the *huguo* idea with which almost every document in the collection is replete.

Partly due to the far-reaching influence Bukong achieved during his lifetime and the efforts made by a number of his brilliant disciples, Esoteric Buddhism in Tang China did not decline immediately after the demise of Bukong. Led by those capable Esoteric masters like Hanguan, Huilang, Huichao and Huiguo (746-805), four of Bukong's "Six Greatest Disciples", Post-Bukong Esoteric tradition in China continued to enjoy prosperity well into the beginning of the ninth century; it was then that Kūkai and Saichō came from Japan to study Esoteric Buddhism, respectively in the capital Chang'an (then the centre of Esoteric Buddhism in East Asia) and the coastal region in modern Zhejiang Province, where the impact of Esoteric Buddhism was also palpable.

Mainly based on Chou and Weinstein³¹, I have given here a brief survey of the transmission and spread of Esoteric Buddhism in China before Saichō's arrival. Since this dissertation is focused on the esoteric aspect of Tendai Buddhism, a Japanese religious school considered to be inseparably associated with the Chinese Tiantai sect, I would like to turn now to a brief sketch of Tiantai's connection with Esoteric Buddhism. In this brief sketch, I will consider how the early Tiantai group headed by its founder Zhiyi treated the Esoteric form of Buddhism and how the Tiantai sect in the Tang Dynasty responded to Esoteric Buddhism when the latter exerted greater and greater impact on Chinese culture in general and a variety of Buddhist

traditions in particular.

Though bearing the same name as does its Chinese counterpart (Tendai is the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese Tiantai), the Japanese Tendai sect was much more than a Buddhist form transplanted from China intact. Rather, between Japanese Tendai and Chinese Tiantai there exist a number of differences, the most remarkable of which is demonstrated in their different attitudes toward esoteric Buddhism. Whereas the Japanese Tendai sect in general places equal emphasis on Tiantai teachings proper (represented by the *Lotus sutra*) and Esoteric Buddhism (crystallized in the *Darijing*), the Chinese Tiantai tradition seems to have advocated the superiority of the *Lotus* teaching over other forms of Buddhism, including the esoteric one.

However, it must also be admitted that Tiantai tradition, despite its emphasis on meditation and metaphysical speculations, was not altogether free from esoteric elements. On the contrary, Zhiyi (538-597 AD), the *de facto* founder of the Tiantai tradition, had already introduced a number of dhāraṇī practices and other esoteric elements into his four types of meditation³². As attested by his famous biography written by his heir Guangding (i.e., the *Sui Tiantai Zhize Dashi biezhuān*) and his lectures as well, not only did Zhiyi make much use of dhāraṇīs; he also encouraged his students to rely on some strongly esoteric-coloured ceremonies, e.g., those aimed at curing disease and expiating sins, etc.

However, the esoteric elements in Zhiyi's teachings were merely of marginal significance, far from serving as basic principles for his philosophy. This is not so surprising considering that the systematized form of Esoteric Buddhism was not introduced into China until over one century after Zhiyi's death. It is at the time of another Tiantai practitioner--Yixing, who lived in the mid-Tang period--that the so-called *junmitsu* Esoteric Buddhism began to prosper in China, and

Esoteric Buddhism came to occupy a central place.

Yixing (683-727) was celebrated as one of the most learned monks in China. He was particularly known for his expertise in astronomy, mathematics and the calendar. Steeped in Confucianist texts at an early age, he later shifted his interests to Taoism and finally settled on Buddhism, deciding to enter the Buddhist priesthood³³. Although mainly remembered in the history of Chinese Buddhism as the most prominent disciple of Śubhākarasimha³⁴ and the commentator of the *Darijing*, Yixing, before becoming an Esoteric Buddhist believer, had affiliated himself with some other Buddhist traditions, including Northern Chan, Vinaya and Tiantai.

As shown by his biographies, Yixing studied under such prestigious Tiantai masters as Hongqing and Huizhen³⁵. In addition, Yixing had lived for sometime on Mt. Tiantai where he no doubt acquired further knowledge of Tendai doctrines. As demonstrated by a number of passages in his commentary on the *Darijing*, Yixing, even after formally becoming Śubhākarasimha's student, still adhered to his belief that the *Lotus* represented the highest teaching of the Buddha. Yixing asserted the oneness between the Tiantai doctrines (*yuan/en*) and the Esoteric teaching (*mi/mitsu*). This idea, later known as the thesis of the *yuanmi yizhi (enmitsu icchi)*, may have profoundly influenced the thinking of Saichō, who used it to resist Kūkai's aggressive assertion that Esoteric Buddhism was the highest Buddhist teaching, standing above all forms of exoteric Buddhism (including Saichō's Tendai).

After Yixing, Esoteric Buddhism continued to exert its influence over Tiantai Buddhism. For example, Zhanran (711-782), the sixth Tiantai patriarch, who was believed to have brought about the revival of the Tiantai school at the late Tang, is said to have had contacts with one of

Bukong's chief disciples, Hanguang, and to have discussed some Buddhist issues with him. He is also said to have occasionally discussed esoteric practices³⁶. The extent to which the Tiantai monks had been attracted to Esoteric Buddhism by the end of the ninth century is demonstrated by the fact that the first esoteric initiation Saichō received in China was said to have been conferred by a Tiantai monk called Weixiang at the Guoqingsi Temple on Mt. Tiantai, then the headquarters of the Tiantai school³⁷.

Before finishing this chapter, some short remarks must be made about the transmission of Esoteric Buddhism to Japan by the end of the Nara period³⁸. Esoteric Buddhism has been generally taken as a post-Nara phenomenon. This is not far from the truth in the sense that the two systematic Esoteric Buddhist traditions were not brought to Japan until Saichō and Kūkai returned from China at the beginning of the ninth century. However, it must be noted that in the Nara period a number of important esoteric texts, among them the three major esoteric texts later taken as the textual bases for the "three esoteric traditions"³⁹, had already found their way to Japan. Besides the transmission of Esoteric texts to Japan, some esoteric ceremonies and rites seem to have attracted serious attention and were practised during the course of the Nara period, as Weinstein summarizes on the basis of his examination of Japanese scholarship:

By the Tempyō period (729-749) novices (*shamī*) were expected to be familiar with a variety of dhāraṇī, i.e., Esoteric incantations, as part of the regular Buddhist liturgy. The earliest collection of Buddhist folk tales, the *Nihon ryōki*, compiled c. 822, shows that by the Nara period dhāraṇī formed an important part of folk-Buddhism. Early sources record numerous instances during the Nara period of Esoteric rituals being performed to induce rainfall, cure illness or otherwise avert impending disasters. Little wonder then that more than forty of the 150-odd images that are thought to date from this period represent Esoteric divinities such as the thousand-armed Kannon and the Eleven-faced Kannon⁴⁰.

Notes,

1. Cf., B. Bhattacharyya 1932: 32-42.

2. Now more and more scholars have chosen the term "Esoteric Buddhism" to describe that form of Buddhism which, in its extensive use of religious practice such as *mantra/mūdra/mandala* and certain peculiar types of meditation, aims at a variety of goals, both material (e.g., "curing the sick," "conquering enemies," "finding treasures," etc.) and purely spiritual, like achieving some higher states of consciousness or even enlightenment. In this dissertation I follow this common usage. This decision is made not so much out of my satisfaction at the term chosen, as because of the more inadequacies the other terms (e.g., "Tantrism," "Mantrayana," "Vajrayana," "Mijiao/Mikkyō," "Buddhist Mysticism," etc.) might present in denoting the form of Buddhism under consideration here.

"Tantrism" is derived from "*Tantra*," which, used in contrast to "sutra," denotes a host of the "ritual texts." With such an etymological origin, "Tantrism" may be too narrow to denote the form of Buddhism under consideration. For similar reasons, I refrain from using "Mantrayana" (literally, the "vehicle of mantra") and "Vajrayana" (the "diamond-like vehicle").

In contrast to "Tantrism," "Mantrayana," "Vajrayana," "Mijiao/Mikkyō" and "Buddhist Mysticism" appear too loose in connotation to refer to the form of Buddhism in question. "Mijiao/Mikkyō" (Mikkyō being Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese term "Mijiao") is a term found in Chinese Buddhist texts, where it refers to the part of Buddhist teachings which appears more mystical and presumably, more advanced, than that which, directed to a larger audience, was preached by the Buddha in more straightforward way and therefore can be more easily understood. In this sense, "Mijiao/Mikkyō" covers a spectrum of Buddhist literature much broader than what the term proper, as it is understood now, indicates.

"Buddhist Mysticism" is a term recently preferred by some scholars to indicate the form of Buddhism we are here talking about (cf., Pandit 1987). In my opinion, this term is ambiguous and must be avoided (since not every mystical tradition within Buddhism can be relegated to the peculiar form of Buddhism under consideration).

3. T1300.21.400a27; cf., Chou 1945: 242.

4. The composition of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* is generally dated to the third century. There are three Chinese translations of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* preserved in the *Taishō Tripitaka*: (i) T#670, the *Lengjiaapoduoluobaojing* (tr. Guṇabhadra, in four fascicles); (ii) T#671, the *Ru Lengjia jing* (tr. Bodhiruci, in ten fascicles); (iii) T#672, the *Dacheng ru Lengjia jing* (tr. Śikṣānandra, in seven fascicles). The Guṇabhadra translation does not contain such a dhāraṇī chapter, while in the Śikṣānandra and Bodhiruci translations, the dhāraṇī chapter is found in the ninth and seventeenth chapter respectively (cf., T672.16.624c19; 625a20; T671.16.564c11-565b1).

Some scholars are of the opinion that the earlier version of the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* did not contain the dhāraṇī chapter, which may have been interpolated by some editor/translator (cf., BKD 11: 254-5).

5. See, e.g., the *Hailongwang jing* (Jpn., *Kairyūō kyō*; Skt., *Sāgaranāgarājaparipṛccha[sūtra]*), T598.15.141b6; 156c20; cf., Chou 1945: 242.

6. The thaumaturgic abilities Fotucheng was believed to possess include those to summon spirits as he likes, to tell one's fortune by listening to the sound of bells, and to see vividly what was happening one thousand *lis* away by applying oil to his palm, etc. (T50.383b18; cf., Chou 1945: 242-243).

Chou also gives other two examples of those who achieved and increased their prestige by their magical skills (cf., Chou 1945: 243). One is Śrīmitra, who died between 335 and 342 AD. He was said to

have practised the art of dhāraṇīs in a text now lost, called *Kongquewang jing*. The other is a monk from central Asia, Shegong (d. 380 A.D.), who came to China several decades later than Fochucheng. He won Fujian's (338-385 AD) favour by his ability to summon dragons and make rain.

7. Dharmakṣema was not merely a translator but was also versed in reciting dhāraṇī and demonstrating magic power, e.g., causing water to spring from a rock.

8. This sutra was translated by Yijing (635-713), one of the greatest translators in the history of China. Yijing travelled to India in 671 and stayed there until 692. He studied in Nālandā, which was the centre for Esoterism and where he was very likely to have been attracted to this form of Buddhism.

9. Chou 1945: 244.

10. Cf., Chou 1945: 243.

11. Two versions of the Chinese translation of a sutra, which appears close to the *Molizhitian tuoluoni zhoujing*, are preserved in the *Taishō Tripiṭaka* (T#1255, T#1256). They are attributed to Bukong (Amoghavajra).

12. Marīci is an Esoteric deity who was widely worshipped in the ancient Indian society.

13. Such bifurcations as *junmitsu vis-a-vis zōmitsu*, more often than not, turn out to be misleading. It seems dangerous to separate what is taken as the *junmitsu* from the *zōmitsu* and cut a sharp line between them. What is taken as the *junmitsu* type of Esoteric Buddhism can find its unmistakable inception in *zōmitsu* Esoteric Buddhism (cf., Misaki 1966).

14. As shown later, one of them (i.e., Bukong), despite his foreign origin, must be primarily regarded as Chinese. For a thorough study of the biographical sources related to these three Esoteric monks, see Chou's monograph-length paper (Chou 1945).

15. The Buddhist community was so deeply involved in Empress Wu's "usurpation" that Emperor Xuanzong, who reclaimed Family Li's control over the country from the hands of Empress Wu's successor, issued a number of decrees aimed at weakening the influence the Buddhist order had obtained by that time. However, Emperor Xuanzong gradually showed his tolerance and even favouritism toward a specific form of Buddhism--Esoterism. Weinstein interprets this apparently "paradoxical" phenomenon as a result of the similarity between Esoteric Buddhism and Taoism, with which the Tang rulers in general liked to associate, promoting the theory that they came from the same family as did Laozi, the patriarch of Taoism,

At first glance it might seem paradoxical that Hsun-tsung (Xuanzong), in spite of his antipathy toward traditional forms of Buddhist doctrine and practice, should have maintained close relations with a number of monks and provided support for the translation of Buddhist scriptures. When, however, we examine the background of those Chinese and Indian monks who enjoyed imperial favour during his reign, it becomes apparent that the Emperor's interest in them stemmed from the fact that they were all practitioners of Esoteric Buddhism (*mi-chiao* [*mijiao*]). Esoteric Buddhism had been trickling into China steadily since the fourth century, but it was only under the reign of Hsuen-tung that Esoteric Buddhism received active encouragement and official recognition. The reason for this emperor's enthusiasm for this new type of Buddhism is readily understandable if we bear in mind Hsuen-tung's fascination

with Taoism, which made use of ritual practices similar to those employed in Esoteric Buddhism such as astrology, incantation, mystical trances, and the like (Weinstein 1987: 54).

No doubt, the similarity between Esoteric Buddhism and Taoism was an important reason for the favour Esoteric Buddhism succeeded in winning from Xuanzong.

However, it seems that there are other reasons for this "paradoxical phenomenon". Xuanzong's suppression of Buddhism did not go without any resistance. The tension between Xuanzong's anti-Buddhist stance and the monastic order backed by some powerful nobles reached a balance when Xuanzong finally realized that Buddhism was an important force to which he could and must do something other than to suppress it. In other words, Xuanzong had enough wits to realize that he could and must effectively utilize Buddhism. Meanwhile, Xuanzong was also clear that the old Buddhist forms, too closely associated with the Empress Wu clan, could not be relied on any longer. Therefore, the new Tang ruler was in need of a new form of Buddhism, over which he was able to exercise full control.

At this point, the Esoteric Buddhist tradition was newly introduced into China. It was the right Buddhist form which perfectly met what Xuanzong was then seeking. Therefore, I suggest that Xuanzong's apparently "paradoxical" acceptance of Esoteric Buddhism must be understood in this broader political context.

16. "School" is a tricky and, in many cases when Chinese Buddhism is concerned, misleading term when applied to the Chinese Buddhist tradition in the pre-Sung periods (see, Weinstein 1987; and Sharf 1991).

17. These two texts are the *Gongyangfa* and the *Suxidi gongyangfa* (or, *Suxidi jieluo gongyangfa*). According to Yixing, the former was composed by Śubhākarasimha himself. The latter, not recorded in the two Tang state-sponsored Buddhist bibliographies (the *Kaiyuan lu* and *Zhenyuan lu*) in which most of Śubhākarasimha's officially supported translations were recorded, is unanimously held as Śubhākarasimha's translation by several Buddhist bibliographies compiled by some Japanese Buddhist pilgrims studying in Tang China. Its similarity in style with the *Gongyangfa* has led some scholars to believe that the *Suxidi gongyangfa* is also a manual composed by Śubhākarasimha himself (Lu 1995: 210-2).

18. As will be shown below, among Śubhākarasimha's Chinese students and assistants, the most capable and best known was the learned monk Yixing.

19. For the latest version of this view, see Lu 1995: 206-7.

20. Jpn., *Sobakodōji shomon gyō*; Skt., *Subāhupariṣṭhā*; The Sutra Delivered at the request of Bodhisattva Subahu; in three fascicles; T895.

21. Jpn., *Soshicchikara kyō*; Skt., *Susiddhikara sūtra*; The Sutra of "Wonderful Attainments" (*susiddhi*); in three fascicles; T893.

22. As I will argue in the second part of this dissertation, the three *siddhi* texts, which have been traditionally attributed to Śubhākarasimha, are not translations of a Sanskrit origin.

23. Weinstein 1987: 55.

24. Jpn., *Kongōchō yuga chu ryakushutsu nenju kyō*; The Recitation Sutra Extracted from the *Vajrasēkhara-yoga[-sūtra]*; T866.

25. From the standpoint of the later Sino-Japanese Esoteric traditions, the *Darijing* (Jpn., *Dainichikyō*), the *Jingangding jing* (Jpn., *Kongōchō gyō*) and the *Suxidi jing* (Jpn., *Soshicchi kyō*), were the three most important scriptures. In particular, Japanese Tendai school took them as the sources from which derived the three Esoteric traditions.

Otherwise, it is noteworthy that of the three fundamental texts, the *Jinganding jing/Kongōchō kyō* turned out to be the text that was first translated (Vajrabodhi translated it into Chinese in 723, one year earlier than the translation of the *Darijing/Dainichikyō*, which was done by Śubhākarasimha in 724; and three years earlier than that of the *Suxidi jing/Soshicchi kyō* done by the same Śubhākarasimha).

26. Bukong was born in Central Asia to an Indian father and a Sogdian mother.

27. It is for this reason that in this dissertation, while referring to Śubhākarasimha and Vajrabodhi, the other two of the "Three *Mahāsattvas* of the Kaiyuan period", by their Sanskrit names, I refer to Bukong by his Chinese, rather than Sanskrit, name.

28. The three successive emperors patronizing Bukong are Xuanzong (r.712-756), Suzong (r.756-762) and Daizong (r.762-779), the third of whom was the most fervent devotee of the Esoteric Buddhism promulgated by Bukong (in fact, of all the Tang rulers Daizong may have been the most enthusiastic supporter of Buddhism).

29. The so-called *ryōbufu'ni* (literally, the two divisions are not different") idea refers to the tendency to integrate the two esoteric traditions (i.e., "Matrix Realm" and "Diamond Realm") into a harmonious system in which neither was considered to be superior to the other. Scholars have long debated about when the *ryōbufu'ni* idea was formed. According to tradition, Śubhākarasimha and Vajrabodhi, the two principal representatives of the two esoteric traditions, initiated each other into their respective traditions. This story, known as "*kongzen goju*", had been uncritically accepted among Esoteric traditions in Japan until modern scholars revealed its lateness (it appeared no earlier than the middle of the ninth century, i.e., around a century after the death of the two Esoteric patriarchs involved).

Rejecting this conventional story, more and more modern scholars attribute the rise of the *ryōbufu'ni* idea to Vajrabodhi's main disciple Bukong. Matsunaga Yukei (1969: 146-47) is, however, sceptical of Bukong's alleged impartiality toward the two Esoteric traditions. He points out, Bukong seems to have valued the *Jingangding jing* teachings above *Darijing* teachings.

While it is debatable whether Bukong had maintained the unity and equality of the two Esoteric traditions, the *ryōbufu'ni* idea, as some modern scholars believe, seems to have been established in China by the time of Bukong's disciple and Kūkai's teacher, Huiguo (746-805) (cf., Groner 1984: 53). This understanding is apparently based on the following famous story related by Kūkai. It was said that Huiguo conferred only Diamond- or Matrix-realm initiation on most of his disciples, reserving the access to two initiations to only a few highly prized students, among whom was Kūkai.

However, we must be aware of the polemical agenda underlying the *ryōbufu'ni* ideology which might have been advanced by Kūkai and furthered by his followers. I tend to believe that the *ryōbufu'ni* idea was, most likely, not so much due to Kūkai's teachers in China as to Kūkai himself.

30. Groner 1984: 60-61.

31. Chou 1945; Weinstein 1987.

32. Misaki 1988: 92-97.

33. According to some sources, Yixing's decision to enter the monastic order was partly due to political reasons. It is said that Yixing decided to do so in order to prevent himself from being associated with Wu Sansi, a nephew of Empress Wu, who admired his learning and wanted to make a friend of him.

34. Despite this reputation Yixing did not assume his discipleship under Śubhākarasimha until he had studied with Vajrabodhi for several years, although Vajrabodhi arrived in Chang'an three years later than Śubhākarasimha. Further research is needed for the reasons Yixing chose to study with Vajrabodhi first.

35. Kūkai's *Ryaku fuhōden* (KZ1: 63-65) contains a stele inscription for Yixing, which is attributed to the Tang Emperor Xuanzong (685-762 AD). This inscription, if authentic, must be taken as the earliest and most reliable account of Yixing's life. In the same inscription is mentioned a monk named "Zhen", whom Tsukamoto Zenryū identifies as the Tiantai scholar Huizhen (see Tsukamoto 1933: 23). According to the *Shishi yaolu*, which was quoted in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* (cf., DZ1: 239-240), a work attributed to Saichō but actually compiled by Saichō's disciples (for the authorship of this work, see the relevant discussion in chapter three), Yixing also studied under Hongqing, another famed Tiantai scholar (cf., Weinstein 1974: 183).

36. Misaki 1988: 98-99.

37. As I will point out in chapter three, the historical truth of this saying could not be accepted without any reservation. It first appeared in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō Kechimyakufu* which, though conventionally taken as left by Saichō himself, was in fact prepared by Saichō's followers for some sectarian purposes.

38. Cf., Misaki 1968.

39. For the three fundamental esoteric texts, see note <25> in this chapter.

40. Weinstein 1974: 181.

CHAPTER TWO

SAICHŌ AND ESOTERIC BUDDHISM

Believed to be of Chinese descent, Saichō was born in 767¹ near Lake Biwa, which is located at the foot of Mt. Hiei. He began to study Buddhism at the age of twelve and was formally ordained as a Buddhist priest at nineteen at the Tōdaiji in Nara. Unsatisfied with the conservative and discursive style of the Nara schools, Saichō, barely three months after his ordination, retreated to the then deserted Mt. Hiei to practice meditation and austerities in a grass hut he built by himself. It was during his stay on Mt. Hiei that Saichō developed his interest in Zhiyi's Tiantai Buddhism².

Though living a secluded life, Saichō gradually succeeded in attracting the attention of court nobles. He was only thirty years old when he was appointed in 797 as one of the "ten monks serving at the court chapel" (*junaigubu*)³.

One important thing happened shortly after Saichō's appointment as a *naigubu*. Sponsored by the court, some of his wealthy relatives and lay followers, Saichō was engaged in the tremendous project of copying the Buddhist canon (*issaikyō*)⁴. This may have afforded him a chance to read some esoteric texts included in the canon⁵. It was probably during this project that Saichō gained access to Yixing's commentary on the *Darijing*⁶. What impressed him most in this commentary was perhaps Yixing's thesis about the "oneness of the Tendai (Chin., *yuan*; Jpn., *en*) and esoteric (Chin., *mi*; Jpn., *mitsu*) teachings", a thesis which was technically epitomized as *yuanmi yizhi* (Jpn., *enmitsu icchi*)⁷.

In 802 Saichō was invited to lecture on the *Lotus Sutra* at the Takaōsanji Temple. The

Takaōsanji lectures, which were Saichō's first lectures away from Mt. Hiei, turned out to be very successful. Even Emperor Kammu (737-809, r.781-806) was impressed by Saichō's performance and he is said to have sent Saichō complimentary messages. Encouraged by the emperor's interest in Tendai, Saichō requested permission to send two of his students (Enki and Myōchō) to China in order to secure accurate copies of Tendai texts and to receive instruction in Tendai doctrines directly from the Chinese masters. Saichō's request was soon approved. Unfortunately, Enki and Myōchō failed in their voyage to China⁸. Emperor Kammu then requested Saichō to travel to China in person. Saichō accepted it and in the seventh month of 804 he was aboard a Japanese envoy's ship heading for China.

Section (A) Saichō's Contacts with Esoteric Buddhism during His Stay in China

After a two month voyage, Saichō landed at the port of Mingzhou (in the northern part of present Zhejiang Province) on the first day of the ninth month of 804. About one month later, he reached Mt. Tiantai, the goal of his pilgrimage. During the tenth month of the same year Saichō allegedly received his first Esoteric initiation from a Tiantai monk named Weixiang who was then residing at the Guoqingsi Temple (Monastery for the Purification of the Empire) on Mt. Tiantai,

exactly the headquarters of the Tiantai school⁹.

Saichō spent about 20 weeks in the vicinity of Mt. Tiantai, studying with his Chinese Tiantai tutors Daosui¹⁰ and Xingman¹¹, in addition to collecting and copying Buddhist texts. During his sojourn on the Tiantai mountains he collected 120 texts, twelve of which are related to Esoteric Buddhism.

On the twenty-fifth day of the third month of 805, Saichō arrived at the port of Mingzhou to await the ship which would carry him back to Japan. No sooner had Saichō arrived in Mingzhou than he was informed that their previously scheduled return trip would be delayed for about one and a half month. This unexpected delay provided Saichō a chance to visit Longxinsi and Fahuasi, two local temples in Yuezhou, where Saichō had heard that a large quantity of Buddhist texts were stored.

Following Saichō's followers like the *Eizan Daishi den* author who states that Saichō was brought to Yuezhou in order to secure esoteric texts (DZ1: 19), some Tendai priest-scholars have tried to depict Saichō's Yuezhou trip as mainly aimed at seeking esoteric initiations and texts¹². The permission issued by the Mingzhou Prefect to allow Saichō to travel to Yuezhou, however, indicates that Saichō had applied to travel to Yuezhou merely because he heard that the Buddhist texts which he had failed to secure in Taizhou were stored at the two local temples in Yuezhou (i.e., the Longxingsi and Fahuasi)¹³. It is hard to conclude from the official document that the chief purpose of Saichō's Yuezhou trip was related to Esoteric Buddhism¹⁴.

In any case, Saichō did secure more Esoteric texts in Yuezhou than in the vicinity of Mt. Tiantai. According to the *Esshūroku* (The bibliography [compiled in] *Esshū* [Chin., Yuezhou])¹⁵, of the 102 texts that he obtained in Yuezhou 38 concern the esoteric tradition.

Yet what proves to be the most important aspect of Saichō's trip to Yuezhou was the esoteric initiation that he received with his disciple-interpreter Gishin (781-833) from Shunxiao, who was then affiliated with the Longxinsi Temple in Yuezhou. As Saichō himself states in the *Esshūroku* (DZ4: 381), Shunxiao initiated Saichō and Gishin into an esoteric initiation at a temple on Mt. Fengshan¹⁶, which is located east of Lake Jing:

[We] headed for the Longxingsi Temple in Yuezhou to visit the abode of Master Shunxiao. Gishin and I followed the master to the Fengshan Temple east of Lake Jing¹⁷. The master guided us to repair the temple and then led us into the "*mandala* altar of the five division *abhiṣeka*" (*gobu kanjō mandara danjō*). On the spot, he transmitted to us the methods of dhāraṇīs and sprinkled our heads with the water of dhāraṇī. Then, we copied the [texts about] the dharma-gates of recitation and the pictures regarding offering [ceremonies] as listed above. [Finally,] we had the texts collated (DZ4: 381).

Two points in this passage are important and warrant emphasis here. First of all, it seems that Saichō here merely presented his Chinese *guru* Shunxiao as an ordinary monk of the Longxingsi. Except for this simple remark, he says nothing about Shunxiao's titles, background or even the religious lineage to which he belonged. Here, we have to underscore the following fact: it is in the *Esshūroku* that Saichō described this monk responsible for the single important esoteric initiation Saichō received in China. Though the *Esshūroku* was written in China on the eve of his return to Japan, Saichō knew very well that he must submit it to the Japanese emperor, who had sponsored his travel to China and of whom he must convince the value of his study in China. Had Saichō at the time regarded Shunxiao as an eminent monk of distinguished lineage with honorific titles he would have described him as such in the *Esshūroku*. This would have been strong evidence for the importance of his study in China. Saichō's failure to do so suggests that either Shunxiao was indeed an ordinary monk or some reasons had prevented Saichō from learning that

Shunxiao was actually a distinguished priest. In either case, one thing is certain: Saichō, by the thirteenth day of the fifth month of 805 (the day he compiled the *Esshūroku*), had not seen Shunxiao as an especially pre-eminent monk. Serious attention must be paid to this fact. As will be seen in chapter three, this fact itself will prove very important in discrediting a "court certificate" allegedly issued by the Japanese government to certify Saichō's religious attainment as well as a "dharma-transmission certificate" (*fuhōmon*) which is said to have been written by Shunxiao for Saichō.

Secondly, the five division *mandala* mentioned in this *Esshūroku* passage seems to refer to the five divisions of a *kongōkai mandala*, i.e., the divisions of Buddha, Lotus, Vajra, Jewel, and Dharma. Therefore, although Saichō and later Tendai sources tried to redefine it as belonging to a dual esoteric tradition (*taizōkai* and *kongōkai*)¹⁸, the initiation from Shunxiao, as originally depicted in Saichō's own *Esshūroku*, was more likely of *kongōkai* origin.

Saichō was back in Mingzhou from Yuezhou by the thirteenth day of the fifth month of 805, the day he compiled the *Esshūroku*. He left for Japan on the nineteenth of the same month, arriving at his destination with the Japan mission either in the late sixth month or in the early seventh month, 805¹⁹.

Section (B) Saichō's Esoteric Activities in Japan before Kūkai's Return from China

Shortly after his return, i.e., on the fifteenth day of the seventh month of Enryaku 24 (805), Saichō submitted to the court a memorial²⁰ along with the *Taishūroku* and *Esshūroku*, the two bibliographies of Buddhist texts he had collected during his study in China. The court responded to his submission immediately. Edicts were issued, ordering the newly secured Tendai texts copied and distributed to the "Seven Great Temples" in Nara²¹. So warmly received by the court, Saichō had every reason to be optimistic about the future of his religious activities in Japan.

However, one thing probably slightly disturbed Saichō. Not long after his return he had come to the realization that Emperor Kammu, his chief supporter, was more interested in Esoteric Buddhism than in the Tendai teachings. It was in pursuit of the genuine Tendai dharma transmission that Saichō had gone to China and it was in Tendai doctrines that his expertise was believed to reside.

Emperor Kammu's favouring of Esoterism was due to both personal and political considerations. His attitude toward Esoteric Buddhism seems to have been crucial in inducing (if not forcing) Saichō to incorporate Esoteric Buddhism as part of the Hieizan curriculum shortly after his return from China. In this sense, Emperor Kammu's enthusiasm for Esoteric Buddhism was important for the initial formation of the Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism. Therefore, some speculation about Kammu's interest in Esoteric Buddhism may be necessary and helpful at this point.

At least two factors contributed to Emperor Kammu's interest in Esoteric Buddhism. First of all, his health was then rapidly deteriorating, a situation that believed to have been precipitated

by the vengeful spirit of Prince Sawara (d. 785), Emperor Kammu's half brother, who had fallen victim to a coup against Emperor Kammu²². In order to mollify Sawara's supposed malevolence against Emperor Kammu and facilitate the recovery of his health, many measures had been tried but unfortunately, they had got little effect by the time Saichō returned to Japan. The colourful esoteric rites newly brought back from China by Saichō appeared attractive and impressive, and were naturally resorted to as the last means of praying for the health of the ailing emperor²³.

Secondly, Kammu's favouritism toward Esoteric Buddhism was perhaps, to a great extent, politically orientated. His attitude toward Esoteric Buddhism is strongly reminiscent of an precedent set by his Chinese counterpart, Emperor Xuanzong (r. 713-755). As observed above, Xuanzong had warmly responded to the newly introduced Esoteric Buddhism not merely for its apparent similarities with Taoism (the religious form favoured by him and other Tang rulers as well), but also out of his urgent need for a new type of Buddhism which had few political connections, and over which he was able to keep tight control²⁴. It was probably for a similar political reason that Emperor Kammu welcomed the Esoteric Buddhism Saichō brought back from China along with Tendai. One of the factors which had prompted Emperor Kammu to move his capital from Nara to Kyoto was his desire to reduce the influence that the Nara Buddhist order then exercised upon his government. He warmly embraced Esoteric Buddhism perhaps in the hope that this most recently imported Buddhist form could help counter-balance (or at least lessen) the pressure imposed on him and his government from the monastic institutions represented by the "Six Schools in Nara".

Although Emperor Kammu's favouritism toward Esoteric Buddhism over Tendai might have somewhat disappointed (if not frustrated) Saichō, evidence shows that he wasted no time in

adjusting the emphasis of his teachings to the new need of the emperor. He cleverly seized on every opportunity provided by Emperor Kammu and rapidly rose to prominence.

On the ninth day of the eighth month in 805, hardly one month after his return, Saichō was seen in the court practising sutra-reciting and esoteric rites for forestalling a recurrence of the earthquake which had ravaged the capital area several days earlier²⁵. Less than twenty days later, he was asked by the ailing emperor to conduct, for the purpose of hastening his recovery, a consecration ceremony²⁶ at the Takaōsanji Temple²⁷ under the auspices of the state. The court edict issued for this occasion demonstrated that Saichō had by that time achieved the emperor's complete trust for his role in introducing Esoteric Buddhism into Japan:

Esoteric Buddhism had not yet been transmitted to this land, but fortunately Saichō has obtained it. It will be fitting to select from among the clergymen in the great temples those who are endowed with both knowledge and virtue and to have them go through the *abhiṣeka* ritual ... All necessary funds for the performance of the ritual, regardless of amount, are to be provided as Saichō shall direct²⁸.

Attended by eight monks, two of whom, Shūen and Gonshō, acted as the stand-ins for the ill emperor²⁹, the ceremony was formally performed by Saichō on the first day of the ninth month of 806³⁰. The *sanmayakai* precept was conferred in this ceremony³¹. Also conducted in the ceremony were some esoteric procedures involving "Bucchō" (literally, the "top of the Buddha's head") and "Gobucchō" (the "tops of the heads of five buddhas"), which are among the three types of "Miscellaneous" esoteric (*zōmitsu*) rites into which Saichō was said to have been initiated while in Yuezhou³². Except for these two points almost nothing certain can be said of the content of this ceremony. It is, however, suggested that this ceremony might have been based on the initiation Saichō received in Yuezhou from Shunxiao, which was, most likely, a type of Diamond Realm (*kongōkai*) initiation³³. Finally, the esoteric implements which Saichō had brought from

Yuezhou were probably employed on this occasion³⁴. At any rate, if the description of this ceremony appearing in the *Eizan Daishiden*, *Kenkairon engi* and *Ruiju Kokushi* (completed 892)³⁵ is reliable, this esoteric ceremony represents the first *kanjō* ceremony ever conducted in Japan³⁶. Furthermore, it may have been the first Japanese esoteric ritual to use a *maṇḍala*, and one of the earliest ceremonies to use dhāraṇīs written in a Sanskrit script³⁷.

Despite the trust he had won from Emperor Kammu, Saichō was anxious to seek official recognition of his Tendai school. A memorial he submitted to the court on the third day of the first month of 806 was aimed at precisely this purpose³⁸. Saichō proposed in the memorial that the number of official yearly ordinands (*nenbun dōsha*) be fixed at twelve: two allocated to each of the Kegon, Tendai and Ritsu schools with the remaining six equally divided between Sanron and Hossō, the two most powerful schools at the time (each of which had been granted five yearly ordinands). Twenty-three days later, the court approved Saichō's proposal³⁹, but specified that one of the two ordinands allocated to Tendai must be devoted to the study of Esoteric Buddhism, i.e., the *Dainichikyō* (Chin., *Darijing*; Skt., *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*), the basic text on which the "Matrix Realm" line of Esoteric Buddhism was based.

It is notable that the division of the Tendai ordinands into two courses, *shanagō*⁴⁰ (the course of Esoteric Buddhism) and *shikangō*⁴¹ (the course of "meditation and contemplation" [i.e., Tendai teachings]), was not originally proposed by Saichō himself but required by the court. What warrants more attention is the following fact: in the court edict approving Saichō's proposal, the *shanagō* course was placed before the *shikangō* of esoteric study at all⁴². This sharp contrast between the absence of Esoteric Buddhism in Saichō's initial petition and the priority the court gave to it has led some scholars to believe that the formal introduction of Esoteric Buddhism into

Tendai was largely the result of Emperor Kammu's insistence⁴³.

On the other hand, Saichō's decision to concentrate his *shanagō* disciples on the *Dainichikyō* is notable. First of all, this reveals both his interest in the scripture and his confidence of his own mastery of it. As noted above, it is very likely that Saichō had already had access to Yixing's commentary on the *Dainichikyō* before his travel to China. Most likely, he had a chance to re-read the commentary during his sojourn on Mt. Tiantai, which was then, as noted in chapter one, an active site for esoteric studies and practice. The fame of the *Dainichikyō* as a fundamental esoteric text, as well as Saichō's own familiarity with an authoritative commentary on it, might naturally have led him to use the *Dainichikyō* as the sole text in his *shanagō* course. This exclusive concentration on the *Dainichikyō*, the basic text for the "Matrix Realm" line of Esoteric Buddhism, determined that the Tendai Esoteric Buddhism, from its inception, would lay particular stress on the "Matrix Realm" line. This tendency to stress the Matrix-Realm tradition seems to have persisted into Saichō's late years. In his 818 work, the *Kanshō Tendaishū nenbun gakushōshiki* (DZ1: 14), Saichō defined the *shanagō* course as a "curriculum in which students are trained in the meditative recitation of [the mantras for the deities in] the three divisions (*sanbu*)"⁴⁴. The term *sanbu* here refers to the three divisions in the Matrix *Mandala*, i.e., Buddha, Lotus and Vajra. Saichō made no mention of the Diamond *Maṇḍala*, which comprises five divisions (the two divisions of Jewel and dharma plus the three constituting the Matrix *Mandala*). In another work composed in 819, Saichō, in an even clearer way, redefined his *shanagō* course as *dainichi taizōkai*, i.e., the course of the "Matrix *Mandala* of the Great Compassion"⁴⁵.

Secondly, the exclusive use of the *Dainichikyō* in the *shanagō* curriculum meant that Saichō seemed to have been ignorant of the idea of *ryōbu goju* (which means, the "two esoteric

traditions interfusing with each other"), let alone that of *sanbu goju* (the "three esoteric traditions interfusing"). At the least it can be said that Saichō was not so interested in the *ryōbu goju* idea as later Tendai sources have led us to believe. In his later years, Saichō introduced into his *shanagō* program more esoteric texts⁴⁶, but not the *Kongōchō kyō* and *Soshicchi kyō*, two of the three most important works in the three traditions [*sanbu*] of later Tendai Esoteric Buddhism. Actually, it was not until Ennin's time that these two texts were added to the *shanagō* course and the *sanbu goju* idea became one of the hallmarks of Japanese Tendai Buddhism⁴⁷.

At any rate, the installation of the *Shanagō* curriculum on Mt. Hiei did prove significant for the initial establishment of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism. With the study of the *Dainichikyō* incorporated as its one subdivision, Saichō's new school was formally set up as the sole authoritative representative of the esoteric tradition at the time. It seems that in the early period after his return Saichō was respected as an Esoteric master as much as a Tendai patriarch.

Section (C) Saichō and Kūkai: Saichō's Effort to Create the Tendai Form of Esoteric Buddhism

Saichō's reputation as an authority on Esoteric Buddhism would have gone unchallenged

for much longer had the following two events not happened. The first is the untimely demise of Emperor Kammu in early 806. The following emperor, Heizei (774-824, r. 806-809), was indifferent to the Buddhist cause and seems to have been particularly unfriendly to the Tendai sect. The allotment of Tendai yearly ordinands was withheld during his three-year reign. What worsened Saichō's situation was the steady comeback of the Fujiwara clan, which was a strong backer of the Nara schools, especially the Hossō sect⁴⁸. Accordingly, Saichō's fledgling school was under considerable pressure from the conservative Nara schools headed by the Hossō, which was then regaining its power after a period of decline.

The second event which adversely affected Saichō's prestige as an Esoteric leader was the unexpected return of Kūkai, who had more solid mastery of Esoteric Buddhism than did Saichō⁴⁹. During his brief stay in China, Saichō was only occasionally initiated into some seemingly insignificant and obscure esoteric initiations from some little known masters living in remote regions like Yuezhou and Taizhou. By contrast, Kūkai had formally spent thirty months in the capital Chang'an, then the centre of Esoteric Buddhism, receiving from such prestigious Esoteric masters like Huiguo the dual esoteric transmission of "Matrix" and "Diamond" Realms. In the eyes of the knowledgeable, Saichō's comparatively limited esoteric knowledge was perhaps too easily outshone by Kūkai's thorough mastery of Esoteric Buddhism.

Although in general ignored in the two to three years following his return from China⁵⁰, Kūkai, with his brilliant literary talent and superior knowledge of Esoteric Buddhism, gradually succeeded in attracting attention from the royal and aristocratic families. He began to establish himself as a new authority in Esoteric Buddhism, potentially to the detriment of Saichō's prestige as an Esoteric expert. Saichō, however, did not merely see a threat in Kūkai at this period. There

is evidence to show that Saichō, at the early period of his association with Kūkai, viewed him more as a friend or even ally than as a rival. The subtle character of their relationship was to a large extent determined by their particular circumstances at the time.

Saichō was then facing a real crisis. The strong recovery of the Nara schools and the weaknesses inherent in his *shanagō* program were causing large-scale defection within his sect. The seriousness of the defection is confirmed by a record written by Saichō himself (cf., DZ1: 250-52). Between 807 and 812, there were in total twelve ordinands enrolled in the two curricula on Mt. Hiei. But all of them, except Kōjō (779-851) and Tokuzen, left Mt. Hiei, either defecting to the Hossō school or going to the Takaōsanji to study Esoteric Buddhism under Kūkai. It is easy to imagine how much damage these defections had done to the institutional foundation of Saichō's new school. In order to stem the defections within the Tendai order, among other things, Saichō needed to make his *shanagō* curriculum more attractive. And here, he urgently needed assistance from Kūkai, who, Saichō himself admitted, had superior knowledge of Esoteric Buddhism⁵¹.

In a letter of the second month of 811, Saichō formally requested Kūkai's instruction in Esoteric Buddhism and an esoteric consecration (*abhiṣeka*) he called in the letter *henjō isson kanjō* (the "*abhiṣeka* for the single deity of Vairocana")⁵². To this request from Saichō, Kūkai sent back a very positive response.

Considering Kūkai's situation at the time, his reaction is not surprising either. Having just risen from the obscurity of the three years following his return from China, Kūkai was then eagerly seeking broad recognition for his expertise in Esoterism. He may have taken Saichō's request as a rare opportunity to secure the seat of the Esoteric leader from Saichō, who had been recognized as the greatest Esoteric master in Japan. For Kūkai, there was perhaps no better way

to claim his paramount authority on Esoteric Buddhism than to help Saichō solve the difficulties he encountered in Esoteric activities. Thus, on the basis of their mutual needs, these two potential rivals formed a weak alliance.

One way Saichō tried to augment his esoteric knowledge was by reading the new esoteric texts brought back by Kūkai. Twenty-four of Saichō's extant letters, which number around forty, were addressed to Kūkai. Eleven of these letters to Kūkai were, in turn, written for the loan of the texts newly imported by Kūkai from China, most of which were, of course, esoteric. Saichō's surviving letters demonstrate that his borrowing of Kūkai's texts was both extensive and long lasting. It continued for several years, from 809 to 816. He managed to copy at least 214 fascicles, that is, nearly half of the entire 461 fascicles of Kūkai's imported texts⁵³.

In his letters to Kūkai, Saichō usually refers to himself humbly as, "your humble disciple [Sai]chō" (DZ5: 456), "Your disciple at the East Mountain [Hiei], Saichō" (DZ5: 456), "[Sai]chō who remains your disciple forever", etc. Considering that Saichō was senior (both in age and monastic rank) to Kūkai, his extraordinary esteem for and deference to Kūkai at this period were unusual⁵⁴. Without doubt, this testifies to Saichō's modesty. But it also shows how eager Saichō was then in his efforts to improve his esoteric expertise. Actually, by addressing himself in this way, Saichō not merely ceded the seat of Esoteric leader to Kūkai, but also openly accepted Kūkai's authority as a teacher in the matter of Esoteric Buddhism.

Saichō's earnestness in learning Esoteric Buddhism was further confirmed by the way he sought to receive esoteric initiations from Kūkai. On the twenty-seventh day of the tenth month of 812, Saichō, accompanied by his disciple Kōjō, went to visit Kūkai at the Otokunji Temple. This was, probably, the third occasion on which they saw each other⁵⁵. It seems that this meeting

between the two Buddhist leaders was quite amiable and constructive. Kūkai pleasantly promised to grant Saichō and his disciples a *taizōkai* initiation two months later. In order to fulfil this promise, Kūkai agreed to move to the Takaōsanji. In addition, Kūkai seems to have been quite pleased by Saichō's submission to his authority in Esoteric Buddhism. He volunteered an additional favour to Saichō and his disciples by conferring upon them a *kongōkai* initiation on the fifteenth day of the eleventh month (*viz*, after he moved to the Takaōsanji and before he conducted the *taizōkai* initiation as previously promised)⁵⁶. Thus on the exact spot where Saichō, seven years ago, had performed the first *kanjō* ceremony in Japan, he received from Kūkai the initiations into the dual esoteric transmission of the Diamond- and Matrix-realm⁵⁷.

But it seems that the initiations Saichō received from Kūkai were merely of intermediary rank, a far cry from the *dengyō kanjō* (or *denbō kanjō*, the *abhiṣeka* of dharma transmission) which qualifies the receiver to accept students and transmit to them esoteric dharma. It was really such an advanced initiation that Saichō was then seeking from Kūkai. A title of *dengyō ajari* would have helped Saichō considerably in rehabilitating his *shanagō* program. This would have made him a full-fledged Esoteric master and thereby enabled him to stem the tide of defections among his *shanagō* students (it appears that a majority of the defectors left Mt. Hieizan out of their dissatisfaction at the *shanagō* curriculum there).

Yet Kūkai insisted that Saichō study with him for three years before he would consider conferring on him the *dengyō kanjō* initiation, since the initiation required the mastery of some complicated rituals by both parties⁵⁸. Unfortunately, the monastic order on Mt. Hiei was then plunged into chaos. The disunion among Tendai monks and the problem of defections required Saichō's immediate return to Mt. Hiei and his sustained attention to the Hieizan monasteric

affairs. It was then out of the question for Saichō to stay with Kūkai for as long as Kūkai had requested. Both as a way to compensate for the regret caused by his untimely departure and more importantly, as a part of his plan to rehabilitate his *shanagō* course with Kūkai's help, Saichō decided to leave some of his most promising students to study Esoteric Buddhism under Kūkai at Takaō⁵⁹. Among these students were Enchō, Ken'ei and Taihan, the last of whom was Saichō's most beloved student.

Saichō's refusal to stay with Kūkai for a longer period probably caused Kūkai to question his sincerity in learning Esoteric Buddhism. Afterward, the way Saichō engaged himself in the esoteric study further exacerbated Kūkai. Saichō preferred to improve his esoteric expertise by reading, while Kūkai insisted on the irreplaceable importance of face-to-face transmissions between master and disciple (*menju*). Finally, Kūkai gave vent to his anger over the way Saichō pursued his esoteric studies in a letter in which he squarely refused Saichō's request to borrow the *Rishushakukyō*⁶⁰. The tone of this letter was so acrimonious that their friendship was believed to have been abruptly brought to a bitter end.

Their delicate relationship was further damaged by Taihan's announced defection to Kūkai. Taihan was considered by Saichō as the most capable student and as his future successor. Saichō's surviving letters to Taihan demonstrate his deep emotional dependence upon Taihan, whom he addressed as "my Dharma-colleague (*dōbō*)" (DZ5: 462-63). In some sense, Taihan had represented Saichō's hope of creating a Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism and promoting his *shanagō* curriculum. Taihan's defection may have been an emotional blow to Saichō, making his weak relationship with Kūkai absolutely irreparable.

However, the most damaging disagreement which had driven Saichō and Kūkai apart was

their conflicting opinion about the relationship between the Esoteric (*mikkyō*) and Exoteric (*kenkyō*) forms of Buddhism. Kūkai maintained that with regard to authority and validity Shingon stood head and shoulders above all other forms of Buddhism (including Tendai). By contrast, Saichō stuck to the *lotus* teaching as the paramount truth, which other Buddhist forms (including Shingon) could supplement but not surpass. He advocated that the Shingon and Tendai teachings were not contradictory to each other, but mutually supplementary. Both were of equal authority and validity and neither should be preferred over the other. For example, in the very letter to Kūkai dated the nineteenth day of the eighth month of 812, in which Saichō asked Kūkai to train him and his students in Esoteric Buddhism, Saichō declared,

But the Vairocana school (i.e., Shingon) and Tendai interfuse with each other. They all share the same commentary⁶¹ ... There should be no such thing as preferring one to the other. The *Lotus* and the *Golden Light* are those texts to which the previous emperor [Kammu] devoted himself, and there exists no difference between the One Unifying Vehicle [of Tendai] and Shingon (DZ5: 456; Abé's translation [1995: 112-13]).

In a letter four years later to Taihan, then studying with Kūkai at the Takaōsanji Temple, Saichō states, "The One Unifying Vehicle of the Lotus (*hokke ichijō*), the One Unifying Vehicle of Shingon (*shingon ichijō*)--what difference in excellence could there be?" (DZ5: 469). This indicates that Saichō, throughout his sustained association with (and occasional study under) Kūkai, adhered to the oneness of Tendai Perfect Teaching and Mikkyō (*enmitsu icchi*).

Moreover, for Kūkai, what was most intolerable about Saichō was his "questionable" understanding and "exploitation" of Esoteric Buddhism. As noted above, Saichō was bent on "grafting" Esoteric Buddhism to his Tendai teaching as a response to the crisis facing him and his fledgling school. Saichō had tried to use Esoteric Buddhism as a pillar to bolster and strengthen

the whole edifice of his Tendai teachings. For Kūkai, Esoteric Buddhism is different in nature from any exoteric form of Buddhism. No combination of them was allowed. Any attempt to subject Esoteric Buddhism to the service of any exoteric form of Buddhism was, for Kūkai, an unpardonable offence. This totally irreconcilable opinion about the nature, function of and inter-relationship between, Esoteric and Exoteric forms of Buddhism turned out to be another principal source of discord that seriously soured their relationship and finally turned Saichō and Kūkai from friends into antagonists.

In summary, the following remarks can be made about Saichō's relation with Kūkai. Apart from the crisis within the Tendai sect which necessitated his sustained presence on Mt. Hiei, Saichō's conviction that the *Lotus* teaching was the unsurpassed truth had prevented him from studying Esoteric Buddhism in the way Kūkai expected him to. This gulf between them increasingly evaporated Saichō's hope of developing a Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism by himself. Instead, he left some of his brilliant students with Kūkai to study Esoteric Buddhism. However, his plan to enlist Kūkai's assistance in training his students was also frustrated by the precipitous end of their co-operative relation and Taihan's defection to Kūkai. Given the irreconcilable nature of the two different ways in which Saichō and Kūkai viewed Esoteric Buddhism and its relation with other types of Buddhist forms (including Tendai), Saichō's prospect of achieving a Tendai-Mikkyō syncretism by grafting some Esoteric Buddhist forms to the Tendai teachings became more and more bleak.

Section (D) The *Kenkairon* and Saichō's Efforts to Redefine His Esoteric Transmission from Shunxiao

Taihan's defection formally announced the end of Saichō's friendship with Kūkai and his attempt to develop an Esoteric system in terms of Tendai doctrines. This marked a watershed in the life of Saichō. He seems to have been invigorated, rather than overwhelmed, by this event. Not long after his rupture with Kūkai, Saichō was seen on the way to the eastern provinces of Shinano, Kozuke, and Shimotsuke, where he engaged in proselytizing activities (Sonoda 1952: 49). This sojourn in the eastern provinces, though brief, proved to be of great importance for Saichō and the later development of his school. Some of his leading disciples, who were active after his death, came from the eastern area.

Saichō returned from the eastern provinces to Mt. Hiei in the eighth month of 817. From then on until his death in the sixth month of 822, the focus of his interest had shifted from Esoteric Buddhism to the (i) defence of the Tendai teachings against the Hossō criticisms, (ii) administering the Tendai order, and finally (iii) establishing an exclusively Mahayanist "precept platform" (*kaidan*) on Mt. Hiei. This last task, which is known in Japanese Buddhist history as *Daijō kaidan undō* (the movement advocating the establishment of a "Mahayanist precept platform"), proved to be the most ambitious and important achievement in the life of Saichō.

Saichō advanced the *daijō kaidan* movement in order to ordain Tendai monks in

accordance with the Mahayanist precepts as stipulated in the Chinese Buddhist apocryphon *Fanwang jing* (Jpn., *Bonmō kyō*; T1484). The *Fanwang jing* precepts are much less strict than the Hinayana precepts. Saichō's efforts to establish Mahayana *kaidan* incurred staunch resistance from the Nara schools. The Nara monks were afraid that the Tendai school, after gaining the privilege to ordain Buddhist priests by itself, would become more independent and uncontrollable. Therefore, they attacked the orthodoxy of Saichō's school through the accusation that his dharma transmissions were obtained from provinces, instead of the capital, in China⁶². Saichō felt the necessity of defending the legitimacy of his lineages.

Consequently, in the second month of Kōnin 11 (820), Saichō submitted the *Kenkairon* to the court in order to counter the criticisms advanced by the conservative monks against his petition to establish a Mahayana precept-platform on Mt. Hiei.

To the charge that Saichō, who never travelled to the Tang Capital but limiting himself to the coastal regions, failed to get orthodox and reliable dharma transmissions from China, Saichō responded by showing that his transmissions from China were all from reliable sources. First of all, he related in the *Kenkairon* his Tendai lineage:

At the end of the Enryaku period [we] Saichō and Gishin, *et al.*, under imperial order, went to the Great Tang to pursue the Way on Mt. Tiantai. Thanks to the virtues of our country, we reached Taizhou [safely]. Immediately, the governor of the prefecture, moved by our sincerity in seeking the dharma, introduced us to Master Daosui on Mt. Tiantai. With his love and compassion, the master, in one word, transmitted to us the teaching of "three contemplations in one mind" (Chin., *yixinsanguan*; Jpn., *isshinsankan*). The perfect bodhisattva precepts were also conferred on us, who are the most devoted. Thus, we completely obtained the teachings exclusively belonging to the Tendai school.

Then Saichō described his esoteric initiation from Shunxiao in a way different from that in which he had depicted the same initiation in the *Esshūroku* bibliography,

Moreover, the governor of Mingzhou Prefecture, Zhen Shenze, had us escorted to Yuezhou Prefecture to receive the *abhiṣeka*. Fortunately, we met Master Shunxiao from the Lingyansi Temple on Mt. Taiyue (i.e., Taishan). At a temple on Mt. Fengshan which situated east of Lake Jing, Master [Shunxiao] conferred [upon us] a *abhiṣeka* of a dual transmission. He also offered us a variety of instruments during the initiation. After receiving the initiation, we immediately returned to the place where the return ships were waiting (T74.2376.590c7-15; my emphasis).

Read in close comparison with the *Esshūroku* passage in which the initial description of the Shunxiao initiation was made fifteen years earlier, this *Kenkairon* passage is found to have differed from the earlier text in two important points. First of all, while it was merely observed in the *Esshūroku* passage that Shunxiao was a Longxingsi monk, the *Kenkairon* passage gives some further information about Shunxiao's background by indicating that he originally came from a temple called Lingyansi on Mt. Taishan (in present-day Taian City, Shandong Province).

Secondly, the *Kenkairon* passage defines the initiation from Shunxiao differently. The *Esshūroku* passage describes this initiation as an *abhiṣeka* conducted on a five-division *mandala*, impressing the reader that the initiation may have been of *kongōkai* origin. By contrast, in this *Kenkairon* passage, Saichō refrains from associating the Shunxiao initiation exclusively with a sort of *kongōkai abhiṣeka*; rather, he claims in the same passage that the initiation he received from Shunxiao belongs to a dual esoteric transmission (*ryōbu*).

On the basis of these two points, I conclude that some effort was made in the *Kenkairon* passage to clarify the obscurity surrounding Shunxiao and on the other, to redefine the initiation from Shunxiao as a dual esoteric transmission. This change was made, as suggested by Kiuchi, probably after Saichō associated with and studied under Kūkai, from whom he had received the *kongōkai* and *taizōkai* initiations (Kiuchi 1964: 164-65).

Some Concluding Remarks

Without doubt, throughout his lifetime Saichō's main interest resided in the Tendai teachings. What had brought him to China was, first and foremost, the objective of collecting those Tiantai texts either unavailable in Japan or available there in poorly transcribed copies. Yet, upon his return from China Saichō found, to his surprise (if not disappointment), that Emperor Kammu was more interested in Esoteric Buddhism than in the Tendai teachings, of which Saichō was an unchallenged authority.

However, all was not lost to Saichō, since one fourth of the texts he had secured in China were related to Esoteric Buddhism. Saichō devoted one of the two integral parts of his new religion to Esoteric Buddhism, which was indicated as the *shanagō* curriculum. Before Kūkai's return, Tendai was regarded in Japan as the sole officially recognized representative of Esoteric Buddhism and Saichō had been respected as the paramount authority of this new form of Buddhism.

As for Saichō's relationship with Esoteric Buddhism, it is worthwhile to stress the following points:

First of all, it seems that for Saichō Esoteric Buddhism had been important for merely a brief period. Initially, Esoteric Buddhism had been incorporated into the Hieizan curricula mainly at the strong insistence of Emperor Kammu. From 811 to 813, Saichō voluntarily went to study

Esoteric Buddhism under Kūkai, mainly as a strategy to stem the defections within his sect. After his relationship with Kūkai deteriorated and his attempt to obtain a Tendai-Mikkyō synthesis was frustrated, his concern was focused on Tendai teachings and the administrative affairs within the monastic order on Mt. Hiei. In his late years, he was pre-occupied with the movement aimed at the establishment of the *daijō kaidan* on Mt. Hiei. This movement gave rise to such strong opposition from the conservative Nara schools that Saichō was forced into a protracted debate with Nara monks, the learned Hossō leader Tokuichi in particular. So much of the future of his school had been tied to the *daijō kaidan* movement and the debate was so intense and far-reaching that Saichō, most likely, was left little time to take care of his other interests, including Esoteric Buddhism.

Secondly, after the death of Kammu, who had been fascinated with the esoteric forms brought back to Japan by Saichō, Saichō seems to have become more and more willing to define his school in terms of the Tendai *lotus* teaching, rather than its esoteric part. In particular, the more steadily Kūkai rose to eminence as an esoteric authority, the less Saichō became confident in the esoteric side of his school. We find that as early as the year 812 Saichō had openly admitted his deficiency in Esoteric Buddhism, while acknowledging Kūkai's proficiency in the same area. He had even gone so far as to seek, as student, instruction and initiations from Kūkai. Both by word and action, he had ceded the seat of Esoteric leadership to Kūkai.

Thirdly, with regard to the two esoteric traditions, Matrix- and Diamond-realm, which are respectively represented by the *Dainichikyō* and *Kongōchō gyō*, Saichō seems to have advocated the superiority of the former over the latter. This partiality toward the Matrix-realm tradition is confirmed by his insistence on basing the *shanagō* course exclusively on the *Dainichikyō*, to the exclusion of the

Kongōchō gyō. The exclusion of the *Kongōchō gyō* from the *shanagō* curriculum persisted even after Saichō's association with and study under Kūkai, which had, presumably, sufficiently familiarized him with the scripture and awakened him to its importance. We have evidence to believe that later in life Saichō's knowledge of the *kongōchō gyō* had become ample since he had obtained a copy of the *Kongōchō gyō* from Kūkai and kept it for several years. Therefore, Saichō's refusal to include the *Kongōchō gyō* in his *shanagō* course reveals not so much his lack of familiarity with the text as the weakness of his interest in it. It seems that Saichō himself was not so interested in the *kongōkai* line, much less in the *ryōbu goju* (the syncretism of the dual esoteric traditions), as he has been assumed to be. It was only in his late years when he was severely criticised by Nara monks for the parochial nature of his dharma transmissions that Saichō in the *Kenkairon* began to re-interpret his esoteric transmission from Shunxiao as of a dual transmission.

Notes,

1. Tradition as supported by the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, two works by Saichō's immediate disciples, has set the year of Saichō's birth in 767. However, around two decades ago, a controversy regarding the year of Saichō's birth erupted among Japanese Tendai scholars, with some scholars (e.g., Fukui 1973; Tsugunaga 1973) arguing that Saichō's birth must be dated to 766, as confirmed by Saichō's initiation and ordination certificates (DZ 5: 101-3) as well as the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* attributed to him (for an English summary of this bitter controversy, see Groner 1984: 19-21; Groner believes that the traditional date of 767 has not yet been decisively discredited).
2. Groner 1984: 17-38.
3. According to Groner, Saichō's success in this period was partly owing to his association with Jukō, who was himself one of the *junaigubu* monks (Groner 1984: 31).
4. Given the difficulties involved in copying the canon and the fact that Saichō was then a considerably young priest without too much influence, Ushiba doubts the historical truth of this saying (Ushiba 1971).
5. A large number of Chinese-translated esoteric texts had already been brought to Japan by the early Heian period (Kushida 1964: 9; Misaki 1968; Weinstein 1974). Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that not a few esoteric texts were included in a complete *issaikyō* collection circulating in Japan at the time of Saichō.
6. This dating of Saichō's first reading of Yixing's commentary is suggested by Ōyama (1973: 160). The early record regarding Saichō's access to Yixing's commentary was made by Enchin in his *Dainichikyō gishaku mokuroku engi*, which was written in 884 (cf., BZ26: 701).
7. Weinstein 1974: 186; Groner 1984: 51-52. However, Ōsabe Kazuō, who has contributed the only available monograph to the study of Yixing, argues that Yixing was not, in fact, so interested in the Tendai-Mikkyō syncretism (1963: 50-65, 181-96). On the other hand, some Japanese scholars question the conventional view that Saichō was eager to assume a "syncretic" position between the Tendai and Esoteric traditions (Ikeda 1969).
8. It is said that an eye ailment had prevented Enki from travelling to China (Groner 1984: 38).
9. This saying is based on the *Naishō Buppō sōjō Kechimyakufu* (DZ1: 246). No biography of Weixiang survives. Later Tendai monks made an attempt to identify this Weixiang with one of Bukong's disciples called Weishang (cf., the *Sōjō kechimyakufu* [BZ125: 160] and the *Taikon kechimyakuzu* [BZ65: 207] attributed to Kōjō and Enchin respectively; see Groner 1984: 61; Mizukami 1975: 153-55). This identification claims little historical reliability and failed to meet with widespread acceptance within the Tendai school.
10. Though counted as the seventh Tiantai patriarch, little is known about Daosui. The only source about him, a short biography written by his student Ganshu, contains little useful information about his life and teachings (it even fails to give the dates of his birth and death).

As shown by later Chinese sources, the importance of Daosui's position in the history of Chinese Buddhism seems to have exclusively rested on his dharma transmission to Saichō. I will suggest in next chapter that the position of Daosui as the seventh Tiantai patriarch was most likely established by Japanese Tendai monks (Saichō's disciples) rather than their Chinese "dharma-brothers". The glorification of Daosui was advanced as a part of the effort made by Saichō's followers to legitimate Saichō's dharma transmissions from

China (cf., Section [A], chapter three).

11. For some information about Xingman, see the *Naishō Buppō sōjō Kechimyakufu* (DZ1: 229).

12. See, for example, Shimizutani 1973: 591.

13. This official permission is included in the *Kenkairon engi* (DZ1: 277-8).

14. Kiuchi 1984: 167-70.

15. The *Esshūroku* is one of the two bibliographies attributed to Saichō (the other being *Taishūroku*, the Bibliography compiled in Prefecture Taishu [Chin., Taizhou]). In these two bibliographies Saichō recorded the Buddhist sutras, manuals, diagrams and instruments he had secured in Prefectures Taizhou and Yuezhou, the two main places where he had studied in China. The *Esshūroku*, in particular, records the Esoteric Buddhist texts, paraphernalia that Saichō had obtained during his brief sojourn in Yuezhou. The *Esshūroku* is dated on the thirteenth day of the fifth month of 805. This bibliography can be found in both *Taishō Tripitaka* (vol. 55) and *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* (Vol. 4).

Ushiba has pointed out some questions in a manuscript named "Jōdoin text" (Jōdoin being the temple in Taizhou, China, at which Saichō is said to have received some precepts and ordinations from Daosui). This text has been taken as the original of the *Esshūroku* left by Saichō himself. For examples, in the Jōdoin manuscript, the Chinese term *ershi* (twenty) was transcribed as *nian*, Lake Jing (Jinghu) was mis-written as Hujing, etc (Ushiba 1970).

Ushiba has indeed found some important problems in the Jōdoin text, which warrant further research. However, most of the evidence he has raised to argue against the authenticity of the *Esshūroku* seems weak. For instance, it is hard to deny the existence of Mt. Fengshan (see next note). It seems that Saichō has mis-written *Fengshan as Fengshan. Given the (i) shortness of his Yuezhou trip (which lasted no more than five days) and the (ii) hurry with which Saichō, as a foreigner, received the initiation from Shunxiao, this kind of mistake is nothing but understandable. In my opinion, what one can say from the evidence Ushiba has raised is no more than that the Jōdoin manuscript most likely represents a flawed copy of the original text. It is believable that Saichō had indeed written such a bibliography like the *Esshūroku* circulated to us.

16. Ushiba fails to identify the location of Mt. Fengshan where Saichō's initiation from Shunxiao is said to have occurred (1972: 88). This constitutes one reason he suspects the authenticity of the *Esshūroku* as a bibliography compiled by Saichō. However, Nomoto has recently identified this mountain as Mt. *Fengshan, a small hill in Village Lianggang, Town Baiguan, City Shangyu in Zhejiang Province. Nomoto also tries to identify Lake Jing as Lake Jian (the Chinese characters *jing* and *jian* both mean "mirror"), a man-made lake which, dug in Yonghe 5 of Eastern Han (140 AD), dried up at the beginning of the Southern Sung (1127-) (Nomoto 1996).

The recent investigation Nomoto makes reveals that Mt. Fengshan/*Fengshan is located east of the place where Lake Jian/Jing was dug. It seems that this conclusion agrees with the *Esshūroku* description of the relationship between Lake Jing and Mt. Fengshan.

17. The original text reads as *kokyō* (Chin., *hujing*, *ko/hu* = lake, *jing/kyō* = mirror). Here the correct reading may have been *kyoku* (Chin., *hujing* [the Lake of Jing]), as testified by the *Kenkairon* passage in which Saichō related, for the second time as far as we know, his encounter with and initiation from Shunxiao (cf., T74.2376.590c).

18. For Saichō's own re-interpretation of the initiation from Shunxiao as of a dual transmission, see the first chapter of his *Kenkairon* (my relevant discussion is made at the end of this chapter). For the effort Saichō's disciples made to redefine Saichō's initiation from Shunxiao as of a dual transmission, see the *Naishō Buppō sōjō Kechimyakufu* in particular (cf., Section [C] of chapter three).
19. On the fifth day of the sixth month of 805, the Japanese return ships took Saichō and the Japan mission back to the island of Tsushima, and later to Nagato in the northern part of present day Yamaguchi-ken, Honshu (Groner 1984: 63).
20. Saichō's memorial is preserved in the *Kenkairon engi* (DZ1: 282-83).
21. Groner 1984: 65.
22. NRDJ5: 168.
23. Groner 1984: 63-64.
24. Cf., note <15> in chapter one.
25. *Nihon kiryaku*, fasc. 13 (KT 10: 283) (cf., Groner 1984: 65).
26. Jpn., *kanjō*; Chin., *guangding*; Skt., *abhiṣeka*. This esoteric consecration involves a symbolic sprinkling of water on the head of the initiate.
27. The Takaōsanji was then the clan temple of Wake family, one of Saichō's most influential patrons. This temple might have been strongly pro-Tendai at the time. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the court must have negotiated with Saichō and gained his acquiescence before the edict was issued that Kūkai and his disciples be allowed to dwell in the temple (Groner 1984: 102-3).
28. DZ5: 92-93; tr. Hakeda (1972: 36-37).
29. The eight monks receiving the initiation in this ceremony included: Dōshō, Shūen, Gonsō, Shōnō, Shōshū, kōen, Enchō, and Kōi (*Eizan Daishiden*, DZ5: 21).
30. Shortly after this first *kanjō* ceremony, Saichō, at the request of Emperor Kammu, repeated the same *kanjō* ceremony at Nodera (aka Tendai-in, present-day Joju-ji) (DZ 1: 639). Some Japanese scholars argue that the *kanjō* ceremony was conducted and repeated not mainly for the dharma-transmission but for the healing of Kammu's illness (cf., Groner 1984: 66-81).
31. The *sanmayakai* indicates a set of precepts to be conferred on a candidate for initiation before he entered the platform where the ceremony was to be performed. It is important to note that the term "*sanmayakai*" appears in a "dharma-transmission certificate" (*fuhōmon*) attributed to Saichō (cf., Section [D], chapter three).
32. It is in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, a Tendai source compiled after Saichō's death, that Saichō is said to have received some miscellaneous esoteric initiations during his brief sojourn in Yuezhou. I suggest in chapter three that this saying is quite dubious.
33. Cf., Ono 1970: 22-23.

34. Saichō records in his *Esshūroku* the esoteric implements he secured in Yuezhou (cf., DZ4: 381).
35. As regards the description of this ceremony, the *Eizan Daishiden* version is found in DZ5: 21, the *Kenkairon engi* version in DZ1: 283-84, the KT version in KT6: 228. Of the three versions, that found in the *Eizan Daishiden*, on which the other two versions were probably based, proves to be the one with greatest details.
36. *Ruiju kokushi* (completed 892), fasc. 178 (KT6: 228).
37. For the use of maṇḍalas and Indian script during the Nara period, see Misaki 1968: 66, 72.
38. For this memorial, see *Kenkairon engi* (DZ1: 292-93).
39. This edict approving Saichō's petition is also collected in the *Kenkairon engi* (DZ1: 294-96).
40. The title of the course, *shanagō*, was taken from one of the Japanese readings of this sutra's title, the *Daibirushanakyō*.
41. The name of this course, *shikangō*, came from the title of the *Mohe zhiguan* (Japanese pronunciation, *Maka shikan*), lectures by Zhiyi that were compiled by his main disciple Guangding after his death. This text was used in Tiantai/Tendai school as the most authoritative source on meditation techniques. The content of this course was also stipulated on the basis of the same treatise. Besides the meditation techniques taught in the *Mohe zhiguan*, students affiliated with this course were also asked to study other exoteric doctrines.
42. This order was kept unchanged in all documents until 818 when Saichō wrote the *Rokujōshiki* (cf., Groner 1984: 71).
43. Nakao 1973: 163-80.
44. The translation is made by Abé (1995: 115). Some slight changes were made in my quotation.
45. Cf., Abé 1995: 115.
46. The esoteric works later introduced into the *shanagō* course include (1) *Mahāmāyūrī sūtra* (*Butsumo daikujaku myōō kyō*, T982), (2) the *Amogapāśa Sūtra* (*Fukū kenjaku jinpen shingon gyō*, T1092), (3) the *[Sarvadurgatiparīśodhana]uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī-sūtra* (*Bucchō sonshō darani kyō*, T967) (see Saichō's *Tendai hokke nenbun gakushōshiki* [*Rokujōshiki*, DZ1: 21, submitted to the court in 818]; see also his *Hiei-zan Tendai Hokke-in tokugō gakushōshiki* [DZ1: 12], also of 818).
47. For the polemical agenda of the *sanbu goju* ideology which emerged at the time of Ennin, see my discussion in section (D), chapter three.
48. Groner 1984: 72.
49. Kūkai was expected to study in China for a period as long as twenty years. However, the death of his Chinese teacher Huiguo might have drastically changed his initial plan of study in China. Kūkai returned to Japan around the tenth month of 606 after thirty month study in China.

50. Kūkai was back in Kyushu on the twenty-second day of the tenth month of 806. He waited there for at least a year before he was allowed to proceed to Kyoto to submit to the court the report of the results of his study in China. No reply was made from the court to his submission until three years after he had returned from China (i.e., in 809). In his late years Kūkai talked about the hardship of this three-year period: "For many years after I returned from China, I was unable to propagate the teachings widely, for the time was not yet opportune" (KZ3: 529, Hakeda's translation [1972: 37]).

51. In this period, Saichō, despite the potential threat Kūkai posed to him, did not hesitate to acknowledge Kūkai's proficiency in Esoteric Buddhism. In a letter dated the nineteenth day of the eleventh month of 812, which was believed to be addressed to his patron Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu (775-826), Saichō openly admitted Kūkai's superior knowledge of Esoteric Buddhism,

Although I had undertaken the long journey to China, willingly risking my life for the sake of dharma, I am still deficient in the way of Esoteric Buddhism (*shingondō*). The Master Kūkai was able to study this after reaching Ch'ang-an (Letter no. 23 in the *Rankei yuionshu*, KZ 5: 353-386; tr. Weinstein [1974: 186]).

52. DZ5: 456. For an English translation of this letter, see Abé 1995: 111.

53. Takagi 1990: 152.

54. Some Japanese scholars underscore the sectarian background against which the collection of these letters attributed to Saichō (which was titled *Dengyō Daishi shōsoku*) was edited and compiled. Currently included in the *Dengyō Daishi zenshū*, the *Dengyō Daishi shōsoku* underwent a long history of copying and editing, in which at least three persons affiliated with two conflicting sects were involved. Initially collected and copied in 1381 by Dōkai of Tōji, the headquarters of Shingon school, these letters were recopied and checked for errors by Sonkan of Ishiyama-dera. They were edited once again as late as 1819 by a monk from Mt. Hiei, Jōshō. In the light of the rivalry existing between Shingon and Tendai at the time when these letters were first copied and edited by a Shingon monk, scholars alert us to the possibility that these letters were edited or even altered for some sectarian and polemical purposes. In view of this, the extremely self-abasing manner in some of Saichō's letters may have been the result of intentional distortions made when these letters were copied and compiled.

It is almost certain that these letters had been edited in a way unfavourable to the interest and reputation of Tendai sect. However, in view of Saichō's character, I am still inclined to believe that these references to himself under examination were made by Saichō himself, rather than added by the Shingon copyist/editor.

55. Saichō and Kūkai probably first encountered each other when they were waiting in Kyushu for the ships which would carry them to the same destination--China. According to the *Tendai Kahyō* [compiled in 1771 and expanded in 1867], fasc. 2A, BZ41: 246), they renewed their acquaintance in 809 when Kūkai, as a junior, visited Saichō on Mount Hiei and sought the latter's instruction in Tendai teachings. However, the historical truth of this story related in the *Tendai Kahyō* has been seriously doubted (cf., Groner 1984: 78).

56. Cf., Abé 1995: 113-15.

57. Later, when one of Saichō's students described Saichō's lineages in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, he chose to omit any mention of the initiations Saichō had ever received from Kūkai. Scholars interpret this as evidence of the bitter rivalry existing then between Shingon and Tendai.

58. In a letter to Kūkai, which was dated the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month of 831, Saichō's student Enchō suggested that Saichō left Kūkai so abruptly since he could not afford to stay with Kūkai as long as the latter asked him to do (i.e., for three years),

Our master (Saichō) then asked: "How many months would it take for us to master the ritual manuals on the grand meditative methods (*taihō giki*)?" You replied: "It will be complete in three years." In grief, [our master] said: "I originally expected it to be complete in three months (*ikka*). If it requires years of training, I have no choice but to return to my abode, deal with the affairs of my own school and, thereafter, come back and resume my study." (KZ5: 385; tr. Abé [1995: 119])

59. Saichō's decision to leave his students with Kūkai for esoteric training was part of his plan to rebuild the *shanagō* program on Mt. Hiei (cf., his letter dated the eighteenth day of the fourth month [year unspecified, DZ5: 459], in which he entrusted his disciple Tokurei to Kūkai for the study of Esoteric Buddhism).

60. This letter is a reply to Saichō's repeated demand to borrow the *Rishushakukyō* (full title, "Tairaku kongō fukū shinjitsu samayakyō hannya haramita rishushaku" [Chin., "Dalejingang bukong zhenshisanmeiyajing poluomituo lichushi"], T1003), a commentary on the *Dairaku kongō fukū shinjitsu sanmayakyō* (Chin., *Dalejingang bukong zhenshisanmeiyajing*; Skt., *Prajñā pāramitā naya satapañcaśatika*, aka *Adhyardhasatika prajñā pāramitā*; the "Path to Truth Sutra"; T243). Containing some esoteric metaphors involving the images of violence and sexual desire, this commentary, Kūkai believed, would be dangerous for a student to read without personal guidance from a trained teacher. This is the apparent reason for Kūkai's refusal to lend Saichō this commentary. But actually as Kiuchi (1984: 162-3) and Takagi (1990: 182) point out, there was much more underlying Kūkai's letter. It is, in the final analysis, none other than an ultimatum urging the immediate and drastic change of the way Saichō had until that point been pursuing the study of Esoteric Buddhism; i.e., relying on the written texts, instead of oral transmissions, to study the esoteric teachings. For Kūkai, Saichō's manner amounted to transgressing the *sanmayakai*, an offense punishable by excommunication. The tone in the letter is as strong as that of a teacher chiding an errant student. This had, without doubt, seriously hurt Saichō (cf., Abé 1995).

Since this letter from Kūkai was apparently concerned with the loan of the *Rishushakukyō* and one of Saichō's letters to Kūkai, in which he made the request to borrow this commentary, was dated the twenty-third day of the eleventh month of 813, it is believed that Kūkai delivered his refusal letter shortly after that. This interpretation, however, causes some difficulties. The terms in which Kūkai's letter was written were so humiliating that no survival of friendship between them is conceivable. But the correspondence between Saichō and Kūkai continued until 816.

Recently a theory has been proposed by Abé to explain this contradiction. Abé suggests that perhaps Saichō asked for the loan of the *Rishushakukyō* many times, one of which was recorded in the letter dated the twenty-third day of the eleventh month of 813. Saichō made the same request in 816, which finally made Kūkai express his anger in this refusal letter, thus abruptly ending his friendship with Saichō. According to this theory, the refusal letter was delivered in 816, rather than 813 and the relationship between Saichō and Kūkai was ended by the letter abruptly and bitterly (Abé 1995). I find Abé's theory plausible.

61. This refers to Yixing's definitive commentary on the *Darijing* (*Dainichikyō sho*).

62. The criticisms the Nara monks had raised against Saichō were reflected in Saichō's own works; cf., the *Kenkairon* (On Promoting the [Mahayana] Precepts) (DZ1: 106) and the *Jō Kenkairon hyō* (On Submitting the *Kenkairon*) (DZ5: 36-38).

CHAPTER THREE

SAICHŌ'S DISCIPLES AND THE LEGITIMATION OF TENDAI ESOTERIC BUDDHISM

As noted in the last chapter, in his late years Saichō, while more and more pre-occupied with the *Daijō kaidan* movement, had actually relegated Esoteric Buddhism to a quite marginal place in his interests. After Saichō's death in 822 his immediate students debated with each other on how important a role esoteric teachings should play in Tendai school. It seems that the controversy was bitter, which was one of the elements that contributed to divide Saichō's immediate disciples into two sides, one headed by Gishin (781-833) and the other by Enchō (771-837).

For his linguistic talent, Gishin was chosen as the interpreter to accompany Saichō to China¹. Though Gishin has been usually taken as one of Saichō's leading disciples, Saichō sometimes regarded him as a fellow student, since he received esoteric initiations and ordination with the bodhisattva precepts along with Saichō. Probably because of his close association with Saichō, Gishin was appointed in 822 by Saichō as his successor. This appointment, however, planted seeds of internecine strife in the Tendai school, since another disciple Enchō had been appointed successor ten years earlier. Some Tendai monks objected to the appointment of Gishin on the grounds that Gishin, though senior to Enchō, had spent less time on Mt. Hiei and that his esoteric learning was insufficient for him to effectively administer the *shanagō* curriculum.

Nonetheless, with Saichō's strong insistence Gishin was finally accepted as Saichō's successor. During his tenure as the head of the Tendai sect (*zasu*), Gishin busied himself presiding

over the *fanwang* (Jpn., *bonmō*) ordination on Mt. Hiei and constructing the "precept platform" (*kaidan*) there. He seems to have had little interest in Esoteric Buddhism.

Gishin's challenger Enchō, however, proved to be more interested in Esoteric Buddhism. Among Saichō's disciples Enchō appeared to be one of the most serious and accomplished students of Esoteric Buddhism. It is even possible to trace Enchō's interest in Esoteric Buddhism back to sometime before Saichō's voyage to China². Enchō was among the few of Saichō's prized disciples who received with Saichō the Takaōsanji *abhiṣeka* from Kūkai. He was one of the students whom Saichō entrusted to Kūkai for esoteric training. Around a decade after Saichō's death Enchō succeeded in renewing his discipleship under Kūkai. In a letter which, dated the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month of 831, was also co-signed by other Tendai monks and the lay administrators, Enchō asked Kūkai to teach them Esoteric Buddhism³. It seems that Kūkai soon approved Enchō's request, as attested by the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, according to which Enchō studied with Kūkai at this time⁴. However, Kūkai's illness and subsequent death in 835 prevented Enchō from studying Esoteric Buddhism with him as long as he had wished.

After Gishin's death in 833, Enchō succeeded in deposing Gishin's designated successor Enshū, and became the third Tendai *zasu* in 834.

Kōjō, another of Saichō's prized disciples, was Enchō's most powerful ally in the struggle of Tendai leadership after Gishin's death. Kōjō wrote the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* mainly to advocate Enchō's right to the *zasu* position after Gishin's death. Kōjō was one of Saichō's most trusted disciples and for a long time he acted as Saichō's faithful liaison to the court. After Saichō's death, he became the most important person in facilitating the institution of the *fanwang* precept platform on Mt. Hiei. Like Enchō, Kōjō also demonstrated a deep interest in Esoteric

Buddhism, trying in his *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* to combine Tendai, Esoteric and Zen elements with the precepts. Kōjō's attempt to interpret the precepts in terms of Esoteric Buddhism proved to have influenced over Annen (814-?)⁵.

The strong interest in Esoteric Buddhism within the Tendai sect shortly after Saichō's death seems to have been stimulated by the success of Shingon as an esoteric tradition. Another reason may have been Kūkai's death in 835, which brought a real crisis to his school since it failed to find a capable successor to Kūkai. This may have kindled the confidence of Saichō's immediate disciples in competing with Shingon for the leadership of the esoteric tradition. Nonetheless, before formally engaging themselves in the competition to represent the orthodoxy of the esoteric tradition, Saichō's disciples had to deal with some serious weaknesses inherent in the Esoteric Buddhist tradition allegedly brought back to Japan by Saichō. These weaknesses, when compared with Kūkai's esoteric tradition, may have made the legitimacy of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism more vulnerable.

First of all, like Saichō, Kūkai, after his return from China, also presented to the court a memorial, in which he reported the result of his thirty-month study in China, and a bibliography of the texts and implements he secured from China. As confirmed by his memorial and bibliography, Kūkai's travel to China was almost totally esoteric-oriented and his subsequent study in China was mainly, if not exclusively, directed toward Esoteric Buddhism. But the avowed purpose of Saichō's visit to China was to study the Tendai teachings. To seek esoteric transmissions was merely of secondary importance for Saichō. Since Saichō's real concern during his stay in China did not reside in Esoteric Buddhism, people tended to doubt how earnest he was in pursuing Esoteric Buddhism in China and whether the esoteric tradition he had acquired there

was orthodox.

Secondly, Kūkai had spent at least 30 months in China, while Saichō's stay in China had lasted no more than nine months. This means that Kūkai had had much more time than Saichō to learn Esoteric Buddhism. Further, Saichō's agenda in China was focused on discussing Tendai issues with monks on Mt. Tiantai, receiving Tendai initiation and precept ordinations from them, collecting and copying Tendai texts. This might lead one to suspect how much time Saichō, during his brief stay in China, could indeed spare on the esoteric teachings and how far he could improve his expertise in the area.

Thirdly, according to his own account, Kūkai was among Huiguo's several outstanding students who were allowed to receive a dual Esoteric transmission. But as witnessed by Saichō's own accounts in the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon*, the only significant esoteric initiation Saichō received from China was that conferred by Shunxiao. Since the time at Saichō's disposal in Yuezhou was extremely limited, this initiation may have been conducted in great hurry. It was done in Chinese, now and then referring to some dhāraṇīs pronounced in Sanskrit. Though Saichō was able to read and write Chinese, his spoken Chinese remained unworkable during his brief but extremely busy stay in China. These facts, especially the hurry of the whole *abhiṣeka* procedure, may have prevented Saichō from understanding Shunxiao's esoteric teachings properly and completely. After returning to Japan, Saichō repeatedly changed his interpretations of the Shunxiao initiation, once suggesting its *kongōkai* nature (i.e., in the *Esshūroku*) and then clearly associating it with a dual transmission (i.e., in the *Kenkairon*). Obviously, Saichō had adjusted his interpretations in accordance with, among others, the improved understanding he achieved after his association with and occasional study under Kūkai. In any case, the discrepancies found

in his interpretations seem to confirm the ambiguity of the Shunxiao initiation on the one hand and his imperfect understanding of it on the other.

Fourthly, Kūkai had directly travelled to the capital Chang'an, then the centre of Esoteric Buddhism. His subsequent study of Esoteric Buddhism was also concentrated in the capital. In this sense, Kūkai's followers seemed to be justified in claiming that Kūkai had been able to receive the orthodox transmission of Esoteric Buddhism from China. In the case of Saichō, his trip to China, being Tendai-oriented, was from beginning to end confined to the coastal areas in Zhejiang Province, where Mt. Tiantai, the headquarters of the Chinese Tiantai school, was situated. Saichō had never been in Chang'an. Indeed, as was made clear in chapter one, by the time Saichō arrived in China Esoteric Buddhism had already spread to some areas remote from the capital, including those inland regions (like Jingzhou) and coastal provinces (like Yuezhou and Taizhou), where it succeeded in attracting a steadily growing following from all walks of life. The first-rate Esoteric masters were then, nonetheless, still flocking to the capital, steadily making Chang'an the esoteric centre. Therefore, Saichō's activities in China had been characterized as parochial; and this parochiality had proven to be one of the most vulnerable points in Saichō's Buddhist tradition (including, of course, its Esoteric aspect)⁶.

Finally, Saichō's principal Esoteric teacher in China, Shunxiao, as described by Saichō himself in the *Esshūroku* and the *Kenkairon*, was extremely obscure. Nothing is told about the dates of Shunxiao's birth and death, his native place, his religious background, etc. Saichō even failed to specify the esoteric lineage to which Shunxiao belonged. What was in striking contrast to the obscurity of Shunxiao⁷ was Huiguo's pre-eminence. Huiguo was celebrated as the seventh patriarch in an esoteric lineage which, beginning with Mahavairocana Buddha, culminated in

Bukong. In Esoteric Buddhism extreme importance was attached to the oral transmission from master to disciple. For this reason, the obscurity of Saichō's most important Chinese Esoteric mentor only served to tarnish the lustre of Saichō's esoteric tradition.

Therefore, for Saichō's followers, in order to glorify the esoteric tradition brought back to Japan by Saichō the following tasks had to be accomplished. The nature of the esoteric initiations Saichō received in China had first of all to be clarified. Secondly, the identity of Saichō's major Esoteric teacher in China must be made clearer and his status was to be promoted to the same level of Kūkai's teacher Huiguo. We will see below that these tasks were done step by step by Saichō's successors, who, more and more drawn to the esoteric side of their teacher's teachings, were eager to legitimate Saichō's esoteric tradition. The obscurity and ambiguity of Saichō's esoteric transmission proved to be of much help for Saichō's student in redefining them in a way favourable to their cause.

The endeavour of Saichō's students to legitimate Saichō's Esoteric tradition are documented in two categories of literature. Firstly, there are the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, *Kenkairon engi*, which, though originally composed by Saichō, have been seriously altered and extensively expanded by Saichō's immediate disciples an/or later Tendai editors. Secondly, a biography of Saichō (the *Eizan Daishiden*) and a collection of documents related to Saichō and the early Hieizan order (the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*), both of which were written/compiled by Saichō's immediate students after Saichō died in 822. The documents in these four works have been used as the primary sources for studying Saichō's life and the formation of the early Hieizan order. But, as I will show in this chapter, large sections of these documents were made and added to the four original works after their initial completion.

To specify the time when these four works achieved their present form requires much more research. Fortunately, what directly concerns us here is mainly the kind of documents in these four works that are related to Saichō's Esoteric transmission. In the following pages, we will discuss the various accounts provided by these four works regarding Saichō's Esoteric transmission. By doing that, we want to show how Saichō's Esoteric tradition was repeatedly redefined by his students.

In the discussion that follows, I will treat the four works in the following order: (i) the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, (ii) *Eizan Daishiden*, (iii) *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* and (iv) *Kenkairon engi*. This order was arranged in accordance with my understanding of the relationship between the varying accounts of Saichō's esoteric transmission. With regard to the different accounts of the esoteric transmission that was supposed to have taken place between Shunxiao and Saichō, while it seems reasonable to assume that a more elaborate one develops later by expansion, the following two possibilities must also be taken into consideration: (i) that these different accounts co-existed randomly and (ii) that a simpler account may have resulted from abbreviation of a more elaborate one. However, in chapter two and at the beginning of this chapter, I have underscored the following two points. On the one hand, Shunxiao and the initiation he was said to have conferred on Saichō were depicted with very few details in those early texts by Saichō, like the *Esshūroku* and the *Kenkairon*. On the other, shortly after Saichō's death, more and more of his disciples were attracted to Esoteric Buddhism and the Tendai sect paid more and more importance to its esoteric side. In order to make the Esoteric tradition in the name of Saichō comparable with the Shingon school initiated by Kūkai, the Tendai followers after Saichō should have had to glorify Saichō's Chinese Esoteric master Shunxiao and to redefine

Saichō's esoteric transmission from Shunxiao. Therefore, the simplest account of Saichō's esoteric transmission appears in the earliest datable source, while more elaborate accounts clearly show influence from Shingon (or efforts to combat and compete with it). Given these two points, it seems quite likely that the more enhanced accounts of Shunxiao and his initiation came later.

Each of the following four sections is to be devoted to the relevant documents contained in one of these four works. I will first describe how Saichō's dharma-transmission is presented; then discuss the authenticity of the document(s) concerned and the significance of each account of Saichō's transmission.

Section (A) The *Denjutsu Isshinkaimon* and the Glorification of Saichō's Chinese Esoteric Mentor Shunxiao

The *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* (Articles Related to the Transmission of the "One-mind Precepts", in three fascicles; DZ1: 523-648; T2379.74.634b-659a) was compiled by Kōjō around 833-34⁸. A majority of this collection is composed of documents related to the Hieizan community before or shortly after Saichō's death. It has proven to be an invaluable source for understanding the formation of the early Tendai order on Mt. Hiei⁹. In particular, it contains some documents which afford insights into the efforts that Saichō's immediate disciples made to legitimate the

esoteric tradition Saichō is said to have brought from China.

(A.I) The *Denjutsu Isshinkaimon* Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission

The *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* contains a certificate which is said to have been issued by the Kammu court to certify Saichō's religious achievement. The main body of this "court certificate" reads,

Dwelling on Mt. Hiei, the Eastern Mountain in the city of Heian, [Saichō] has been assiduously practising for fifteen years. **He has searched for the mysterious methods of recitation, and admired the exalted traces of Mt. Tiantai.** In the fourth month of Enryaku 23 (804), commissioned by imperial order, he crossed the sea to seek the Way. Arriving at the abode of Master Daosui, who is **the seventh generation disciple after Master Zhizhe** (*Chisha Daishi daishichideshi*; Chin., *Zhizhe Dashi diqidizi*¹⁰) at the Guoqingsi Temple in Taizhou, he obtained over two hundred fascicles of texts regarding the Tiantai teachings. Moreover, at the Longxingsi Temple in Yuezhou Prefecture he encountered Master Shunxiao who, as **the third-generation disciple after Trepitaka**¹¹ Śubhākarasimha from India, was the "Great Virtue" (*daitoku*; Chin., *dade*; Skt., *bhadanta*) of a "State-protecting Temple" (*chinkoku dōjō*; Chin., *zhenguo daochang*)¹², a "monk serving at the court chapel" (*naigubu*; Chin., *neigongfeng*). Entering the *abhiṣeka* altar, he received the "Procedures of Attainment (*siddhi*) for the 'Three Divisions' (*sanbu*; Chin., *sanbu*)". In addition, he obtained more than thirty fascicles of texts about the teachings [about reciting the] dhāraṇīs, over ten pieces of pictures and samples of various *maṇḍalas*, some implements for recitations, and so forth. Having obtained the official certificates from the Administrative Assistant (*hanri*; Chin., *panli*)¹³ of Taizhou Prefecture Lu Chu⁴ and the Prefect of the Mingzhou Prefecture, he returned [to Japan] to report on his mission in the sixth month of Enryaku 24 (805) (DZ1: 573; T2379.74.643c15-25).

Several important points are implied in this "court certificate". First of all, it represents Saichō's chief Chinese Esoteric mentor Shunxiao as an extremely prestigious master: he is (i) the third generation disciple of Śubhākarasimha, who was perhaps the first patriarch of the Matrix-realm (*taizōkai*) tradition of Esoteric Buddhism; (ii) a "Great Virtue" at a government-sponsored temple

which was established for the protection of the country (the so-called "*chinkoku dōjō*"), and (iii) a "monk serving at the court chapel" (*naigubu*), i.e., a "court chaplain", a status reserved for only a few monks who were highly respected both in virtue and learning.

Secondly, according to this document, Shunxiao transmitted to Saichō some "Procedures for the Attainment of Three Divisions" (*sanbushicchi hō*, Chin., *sanbu xidifa*), which reminds one of the term *sanshushicchi hō* (Chin., *sanzhongxidi fa*; the "procedure for the three kinds of attainment"). As we will see below, the *sanshushicchi hō* is a key notion in a later version of the *fuhōmon* attributed to Shunxiao (i.e., *fuhōmon*²; cf., section [D]) and in the three *siddhi* texts (to be discussed in Part Two below).

Thirdly, in describing Saichō's fifteen-year religious career before his voyage to China, this "court certificate" says, "He has searched for the mysterious methods of recitation, admired the exalted traces of Mt. Tiantai". It is noteworthy that here this "court certificate" describes Saichō's practices in Esoteric Buddhism before his relation to the Tendai doctrines. It seems that this "court-certificate" has given priority to Saichō's esoteric study rather than to his training in Tendai teachings. This is remarkable because both before and after his study in China Saichō had been primarily respected as a Tendai master.

Finally, it warrants serious attention that this "court certificate" refers to Daosui, Saichō's teacher on Mt. Tiantai, as the seventh generation disciple of Zhiyi. It is implied here that Daosui was recognized as the seventh generation patriarch of the Tiantai school.

(A.II) The Authenticity and Significance of This "Court Certificate"

(A.II.i) The Authenticity of This "Court Certificate"

Can this "court certificate" be accepted as authentic? First of all, it must be noted that this "court certificate" is said to have been issued by Emperor Kammu in the year 806¹⁵; i.e., shortly after Saichō returned from China¹⁶.

As noted above, this "court certificate" represents Shunxiao as a prestigious monk. This forms a striking contrast to Saichō's allusion to the same Shunxiao in the *Esshūroku* bibliography, in which Shunxiao was simply described as a Longxingsi monk in Yuezhou (cf., section [A], chapter two). How should we understand Saichō's failure in his *Esshūroku* to depict Shunxiao as such a highly respectable monk as presented in this "court certificate"?

Generally speaking, it is naturally expected of a monk that when he referred to his master in a public occasion it was both a matter of courtesy and a way to achieve respect for himself to list his master's honorific titles and prestigious background as exhaustively as possible. On such an important occasion as the submission of memorial and bibliographies to the court, Saichō had every reason to abide by this commonly observed practice. Furthermore, we know that Saichō presented his *Taishūroku* and *Esshūroku* bibliographies to the court in order to convince the emperor of the religious value of his study in China. Therefore the more respectable his teachers in China were, the more easily he would have succeeded in doing so. Had Saichō really had a teacher so eminent as the Shunxiao represented in this "court certificate", he would not have failed to describe Shunxiao as such in his bibliographies sent to the court. But Saichō merely referred to Shunxiao as an ordinary monk in his *Esshūroku*. This suggests that according to Saichō's own understanding at the time he composed the *Esshūroku*, Shunxiao was not so prestigious as this

"court certificate" claims him to be.

The simple terms in which Saichō described his *guru* Shunxiao in the *Esshūroku* also present an interesting and telling contrast to the way Kūkai described his master Huiguo in his bibliography sent to the court. In his bibliography Kūkai described the background of his *guru* Huiguo with great pride,

By chance, I fortunately encountered the master at the Dongtayuan Monastery in the Qinglongsi Temple, whose name is Acārya Huiguo. The *bhadanta* ("Great Virtue") is the dharma-transmission disciple (*denbōdeshi*; Chin., *chuanfadizi*) of [Master] Daguanzhi (the "Master who possesses great and broad wisdom"; i.e., Bukong) of the Daxingshansi Temple. In virtue, he was respected by his contemporaries; by his Way, he was esteemed as the "Teacher of the Emperor" (*teishi*; Chin., *dishi*). [The emperors of] three successive [Tang] dynasties respected him and received *abhiṣeka* from him; four kinds of Buddhist devotees relied on him and learnt from him the Esoteric Treasures (T55.2161.1065a17-21).

Kūkai's tone was full of pride. Here, both Saichō and Kūkai were in the same situation: referring their Chinese master to the court. Saichō's silence on the identity and background of Shunxiao is remarkable in comparison with the enthusiasm with which Kūkai talked about his Esoteric mentor in China. It is difficult to explain this remarkable distinction by the differences in their personalities¹⁷. Instead, this strongly suggests that Saichō, until the compilation of his *Esshūroku* in the fifth month of 805, had not yet considered Shunxiao as an extraordinarily eminent monk associated with a celebrated lineage and highly respected within the Buddhist order in his time.

Then, the "court certificate", at least the part glorifying Shunxiao, can be regarded as authentic only if the following two assumptions can be shown to be true: not only must it be supposed that during the several months between the submission of his bibliographies and the issuance of this "court certificate" Saichō had decided to glorify Shunxiao to the degree as

described in the "court certificate"; it must also be supposed that this glorification met with such success that the extraordinary prestige of Shunxiao was accepted by the court. Unfortunately, these suppositions prove to be ill-founded, since there is evidence to show that at least as late as 820 (i.e., fourteen years after this "court certificate" is said to have been issued) Saichō's understanding of Shunxiao's status had not yet significantly changed.

In his 820 *Kenkairon* Saichō mentions his Chinese *guru* once again. This time he does furnish some more information about Shunxiao. Shunxiao, he says, originally came from a temple called Lingyansi Temple on Mt. Taishan¹⁸. But except for that, Saichō says nothing new about Shunxiao. Thus, whereas the "court certificate" acclaims Shunxiao as one of the "court chaplains" and the dharma-successor of a distinguished esoteric tradition traceable to Śubhākarasimha, no similar words can be found in the *Kenkairon* passage to glorify Shunxiao in this way. However, in deciding the authenticity of the "court certificate", what was *not* said in the *Kenkairon* passage turns out to be of greater importance than what was said there.

As we know, before writing the *Kenkairon*, Saichō had been accused of having studied under obscure and unimportant teachers in China and having transmitted to Japan unorthodox dharmas (the *Kenkairon* was, in fact, written to prove that he had studied in China with qualified teachers and that the transmissions he received there were orthodox). Consequently, if Shunxiao had been recognized--whether by Saichō himself or by others--as such a prestigious monk as portrayed in this "court certificate", Saichō would not have failed to describe Shunxiao so in such a strongly polemic work like the *Kenkairon*. Saichō's failure to do so would then indicate that he had up to that point believed that Shunxiao was not so prestigious. Without assurance by Saichō that his Chinese Esoteric teacher was such an eminent monk, the court obviously would not have

issued such a certificate that describes Shunxiao as so great a monk. Thus, it is extremely hard to take the whole of this "court certificate" as authentic.

If we suppose that this "court certificate" were authentic, then given the unquestionable authority of this government-sanctioned document, by 819 (i.e., thirteen years after the issuance of this "court certificate") it would have been widely accepted within Japanese Buddhist institutions that Saichō had studied with an extremely respectable Esoteric master in China. In that case, no one would have raised any doubts about the orthodoxy of Saichō's dharma transmissions from China. But in fact we have seen that Saichō's transmissions were under serious attack at that time. Thus, this also confirms that not every part of this "court certificate" should be accepted as authentic.

This "court certificate" describes Daosui as Zhiyi's seventh-generation disciple, suggesting that Daosui was the seventh Tendai patriarch after Zhiyi ([1] Zhiyi --> [2] Guanding --> [3] Zhiwei --> [4] Huiwei --> [5] Xuanlang --> [6] Zhanran --> [7] Daosui). This is contrary to the usual way in which Saichō refers to Daosui in, for examples, the *Taishūroku* bibliography and the *Kenkairon*. In the *Taishūroku*, Saichō merely referred to Daosui as "Master Daosui of the Western Capital [i.e., Chang'an], the head of the Perfect school on Mt. Tiantai, Great Tang" (*Daitō Tendaisan enshū zasu seikyo Oshō Dōzui*; Chin., *Datang Tiantaishan yuanzong zuozhu xijing Heshang Daosui*; T55.2159.1058a3-4), while in the *Kenkairon* Daosui was simply called "Master Daosui on Mt. Tiantai" (*Tendai Dōzui Oshō*; Chin., *Tiantai Daosui Heshang*; T74.2376.590c8). Needless to say, having a teacher in the capacity of the Tendai seventh patriarch would have greatly strengthened the legitimacy of Saichō's dharma transmissions from China. Therefore, Saichō would surely have called Daosui the Tendai seventh patriarch had he really

regarded Daosui as such in his 805 *Taishūroku* and 820 *Kenkairon*, in both of which Saichō was, as noted above, concerned with showing the importance and orthodoxy of his Chinese dharma lineages. Therefore, Saichō did not call Daosui the seventh patriarch in both 805 and 820 very likely because he did not regard Daosui so.

Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that Saichō may have regarded a Tiantai monk *other than* Daosui as the seventh Tendai patriarch. Saichō's *Taishūroku* records a biography of the "Tendai seventh patriarch Master Zhidu¹⁹" (the *Tiantai diqizhu Zhiduheshang luezhuan* [A Brief Biography of Master Zhidu, the Seventh Tiantai Patriarch], compiled by Śramaṇa Zhiming²⁰; T55.2160.1059a5). Thus, this biography indicates that at least one Tiantai tradition held Zhidu, rather than Daosui, as its seventh patriarch. It seems that Saichō had no objection to accepting this Zhidu as the seventh Tiantai patriarch. Otherwise, he would have excluded this biography from his bibliography. Consequently, it is hard to imagine that Saichō, shortly after submitting his bibliographies to the court, could recognize Daosui as the seventh Tiantai patriarch, for such a claim precisely contradicts what is indicated in a biography whose title is included in one of his bibliographies.

Based on these points, I conclude that this "court certificate" as included in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, or at least in the form known to us, should not be accepted as authentic. Here we face two possibilities about the source of this "court certificate": (i) it may have been forged in its entirety by some Tendai monk; or (ii) it may have resulted from some alterations made by a later Tendai monk who added to the original certificate some lines aimed at legitimating Saichō's Esoteric tradition and particularly, at glorifying Shunxiao (if this were true, the lines I underscored would be exactly those lines added by some later Tendai monk, most likely one of Saichō's

immediate disciples).

(A.II.ii) The Significance of This "Court Certificate"

This "court certificate" is significant for its glorification of Saichō's Chinese *guru* Shunxiao. Glorified in this way, Shunxiao now became comparable with Kūkai's principal *guru* Huiguo, who was Bukong's prized disciple and was respected, according to Kūkai, by three successive Tang emperors. Tendai Esoteric Buddhism was thus represented as a credible rival of Shingon in the sense that it had a Chinese patriarch as respectable as that of Shingon.

On the other hand, the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* is noteworthy for one thing that it did *not* do. In the following three sections, we will discuss two "dharma-transmission certificates" (*fuhōmon*) allegedly written by Shunxiao for Saichō. It warrants our attentions that the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* does not mention either of these two *fuhōmons*. Given the values these two *fuhōmons* would have had for authenticating Saichō's Buddhist transmission, we have reasons to believe that Kōjō would *not* have excluded them from his collection had he known of such important documents. For this reason, the absence of the two *fuhōmons* in this collection compiled by Kōjō implies Kōjō's ignorance of them. This fact makes it questionable that Saichō had ever obtained from Shunxiao these two certificates as left to us today. Had Saichō obtained and possessed such important documents, he would not have hidden them from such a prized disciple like Kōjō.

Section (B) The *Eizan Daishiden* and the Legitimation of Saichō's Esoteric Tradition

The *Eizan Daishiden* (Biography of the Great Teacher of Mt. Hiei, one fascicle; DZ5: 1-48) has been traditionally attributed to one of Saichō's disciples called Ichijō Chū, who has been generally taken as Saichō's prized disciple Ninchū (n.d.). However, some compelling evidence has emerged to disprove this conventional identification of Ichijō Chū. Most likely, the true biographer was another disciple of Saichō called Shinchū²¹.

As might be expected of a biography/hagiography of a religious leader, the *Eizan Daishiden* was composed for glorifying the life of its subject--Saichō. It is natural that in this biography we see some traces of the endeavour Saichō's students made to glorify Saichō's dharma transmissions from China, including his esoteric transmissions.

(B.I) The *Eizan Daishiden* Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission

What is of particular interest for us in this biography is the following three documents it includes: (i) the same "court certificate" that was just discussed above in Section (A), (ii) another court edict called *Naishisen* and (iii) a document called *Jungyō [A]jari fuhōmon* which is said to have been given to Saichō by Shunxiao as the certificate of the dharma transmission conducted between them.

The second court edict called "Naishisen"²² is noteworthy for two reasons. First of all, it associates Saichō's esoteric tradition with Śubhākarasimha ("receiving the instruction left by Śubhākarasimha", DZ5: 22). Secondly, this court edict, if authentic, represents the earliest source for the legend that Śubhākarasimha (referred to as "Tenjiku jorin [Chin., *shangren*; Skt., *puruṣarṣabha*] [the superior man from India]") once visited Japan and finally left there after being disappointed by the difficulty of proselytizing there (DZ5: 22).

The third document, the *Jungyō Ajari fuhōmon* (hereafter abbreviated as *fuhōmon1*), proves to be of greater interest to us. Before quoting the *fuhōmon1*, the author of the *Eizan Daishiden* narrates the dharma-transmission between Shunxiao and Saichō. It is said there that in the early fourth month of Zhenyuan 21 (805), Saichō headed for the Longxingsi Temple in Yuezhou Prefecture, where he fortunately ran into Master Shunxiao from the Lingyansi Temple on Mt. Taishan, who was the "Great Virtue" at a "State-protecting Temple", a "monk serving at the court chapel". Moved by Saichō's desire to seek the dharma, Shunxiao conferred the *abhiṣeka* on him and transmitted to him the *samayas* for "three divisions", pictures, samples, seals, the certificate of dharma-transmission, and Esoteric implements, etc. (DZ5: 19).

This general description of the Shunxiao initiation is followed by the full quotation of the dharma-transmission certificate which is said to have been written by Shunxiao and issued to Saichō after Shunxiao initiated him into Esoteric Buddhism:

During the Kaiyuan period of the Great Tang there was a great Trepitaka, a prince of an Indian Kingdom, whose dharma-name is Zenmui (Chin., Shanwuwei [Śubhākarasimha]). He transmitted (turned?)²³ the great dharma-wheel from the Great Nālandā Temple to the Great Tang. He transmitted the dharma to his "dharma-transmitting disciple" Yilin, who was also a "state-master" (*kokushi*; Chin., *guoshi*) and a great *acārya*. One hundred and three years old, [Yilin] is now in the Kingdom of Silla, transmitting the dharma and turning the great dharma-

wheel. He transmitted the dharma to his disciple the monk Shunxiao of the Great Tang, who was a "Great Virtue" and Acārya at a "State-protecting Temple". [Shunxiao] transmitted the dharma to his disciple the monk Saichō from Japan, a "Great Virtue" who "serves at the court chapel", and asked [Saichō] to turn the great dharma-wheel [in Japan]. The monk Saichō is the fourth [generation disciple] entrusted with the dharma and its transmission. Written and recorded on the nineteenth day of the fourth month of Zhenyuan 21 (805). [Efforts must be made] to keep the Buddha-dharma from dying. Acārya and Śramaṇa Shunxiao writes this [certificate] and entrusts it to Saichō (DZ5: 19).

This *fuhōmon*¹ represents Saichō's esoteric lineage as being of orthodox and respectable origin.

In particular, the *fuhōmon*¹ depicts Saichō's Esoteric transmission as coming from an extremely prestigious monk. If the authenticity of this document were acceptable, the orthodoxy of Saichō's esoteric tradition would be substantially established. However, evidence from various sources shows that the *fuhōmon*¹ was not written by Saichō's Chinese *guru*, but was forged in Japan.

(B.II) The Authenticity and Significance of the *Fuhōmon*¹

Before formally discussing the *fuhōmon*¹ proper, I find it necessary to discuss a manuscript currently preserved at the Bishamondō Temple in Kyoto (to be referred to as Bishamondō MS hereafter)²⁴, since this text is believed to be the original of the *fuhōmon*¹. A term in the Bishamondō text, however, unambiguously betrays its true provenance--Japan.

(B.II.i) The Bishamondō MS

The Bishamondō text differs from the *fuhōmon*¹ as contained in the *Eizan Daishiden* in one important point. According to the *Eizan daishiden* version of the *fuhōmon*¹ Shunxiao refers to Saichō as "[My] disciple the monk Saichō, who is a 'Great Virtue', a 'monk serving at the court chapel' in *JAPAN* (Chin., *Ribenguo*; Jpn., *Nihonkoku*)" (Chin., *Ribenguo [nei]gongfeng dade*

dizi Seng Zuicheng; Jpn., *Nihonkoku [nai]gubu daitoku deshi Sō Saichō*). In the Bishamondō MS Saichō was addressed as "[my] disciple the monk Saichō of **THIS COUNTRY** (Chin., *benguo*; Jpn., *honkoku*; i.e., China)" (Chin., *benguo dizi Seng Zuicheng*; Jpn., *honkoku deshi sō Saichō*)²⁵.

Since this sentence in the Bishamondō MS implies that Shunxiao regarded Saichō as a Chinese monk, this MS can be taken as written by Shunxiao only either of the following two assumptions is proved to be true:

Assumption (i): Shunxiao here regarded Japan as a part of China and accordingly took Saichō as a Chinese;

Assumption (ii): Shunxiao had mis-written *Ribenguo/Nihonkoku* (Japan) as *benguo/honkoku* (this country); viz., he missed one character *ri/ni* in the MS.

Is either of these two assumptions tenable? Let us first turn to assumption (i).

Indeed, there were some cases in which some "hegemonic" Tang Chinese considered Japan or Korea as a part of China. Is it possible that Shunxiao, in this document, considered Japan as a part of China and consequently, that he regarded Saichō a Chinese monk? After further inspection, we have to conclude that as long as the Bishamondō MS is concerned, this assumption does not hold true, since it conflicts with messages contained in the other parts of this MS.

First of all, in the Bishamondō MS Shunxiao referred to China thrice²⁶. Every time he used *Datang* (Jpn., *Daitō*, the Great Tang) or *Datangguo* (Jpn., *Daitōkoku*; the country of Great Tang), never the term *benguo/honkoku*.

Secondly, in the Bishamondō MS, Silla (a part of Korea) is called the "Kingdom of Silla", rather than "this country". This indicates that at least in this document Shunxiao, its alleged author, considered Silla an independent country rather than a part of China. However, as we know, for geographical and cultural reasons, Korea had been much more likely than Japan to be

regarded as a part of China in Tang and Song China. Obviously, in this document had Shunxiao indeed regarded Japan belonging to this country--China, he would have also taken Silla as a part of China and therefore would not have referred to it as "Kingdom of Silla".

Finally, the Bishamondō MS seems to relate a story of a country-to-country dharma transmission: having turned the dharma-wheel in (i) the "country of the Buddha" (Chin., *foguo*; Jpn., *bukkoku*; i.e., India), Śubhākarasimha brought the dharma to (ii) Tang China, where he transmitted it to Yilin who brought it back to (iii) Silla before transmitting it to the Tang monk Shunxiao, who, in turn, transmitted the dharma to Saichō from (iv) China or Japan (depending on whether the text here gives *benguo/honkoku* ["this country" = China] as in the Bishamondō MS, or *Ribenguo/Nihonkoku* (Japan) as in the *Eizan Daishi den* version of the *fuhōmon*¹). In accordance with the logic implied in the Bishamondō MS, here Shunxiao, were he its true author, must have used the word *Ribenguo/Nihonkoku* (Japan) rather than *benguo/honkoku* (China). Only with the word *Ribenguo/Nihonkoku* does the document present a complete country-to-country dharma-transmission, running as follows:

(i) India (Śubhākarasimha) --> (ii) China (Yilin) --> (iii) Korea (?) --> (iv) Japan (Saichō)

This conforms to the inner logic of the Bishamondō MS perfectly. On the contrary, if we read instead the word *honkoku*, we are left with the following jumbled "international" dharma-transmission:

(I) India (Śubhākarasimha) --> (ii) China (Yilin) --> (iii) Korea (?) --> (iv) China (Saichō).

This is apparently illogical.

On the basis of these considerations, we conclude that this text can be taken as written by Shunxiao only on the assumption that the term *Ribenguo/Nihonkoku* (Japan) was mis-written as

benguo/honkoku (this country) in the text. This leads us to assumption (ii).

Then, is it possible that Shunxiao had missed one character (*ri/ni*) in writing the *fuhōmon* for Saichō, leaving a text in which Saichō was *mis-presented* as coming from "this country" (China) although what Shunxiao had originally meant to say was that Saichō was a monk from Japan (*Ribenguo/Nihonkoku*)? This possibility can not be categorically excluded, but is extremely unlikely. Had this document really been written by Shunxiao, given its importance for both himself and Saichō, Shunxiao would have written it very carefully. Furthermore, in the eyes of Shunxiao and Saichō, the mistake would have been too obvious *not* to have been noted and corrected²⁷.

Apparently, a more likely interpretation must be that the true author of this MS was not Shunxiao but a Japanese monk, from whose perspective Saichō was, of course, a monk of "this country" (i.e., Japan). Thus, the Bishamondō MS was either forged as a dharma-transmission certificate (*fuhōmon*) in the name of Shunxiao or copied from an original text (identical with the *Eizan Daishiden* version of the *fuhōmon*¹ which addresses Saichō as "my disciple from Japan") by a Japanese scribe who had inadvertently mis-copied the term *Ribenguo/Nihonkoku* (Japan) as *benguo/honkoku* (this country). This leads us to the problem of Bishamondō MS' relationship with the *Eizan Daishiden* version of the *fuhōmon*¹. Was the *Eizan Daishiden* version of the *fuhōmon*¹ based on the Bishamondō MS; or was the Bishamondō MS forged on the basis of the *Eizan Daishiden* version²⁸?

From the viewpoint of Shunxiao, to address Saichō as a monk from Japan would be correct, while to call him a monk of "this country" (i.e., Tang China) is wrong (judging from the Bishamondō MS itself, we could *not* conclude that Shunxiao himself regarded Japan a part of

China and Saichō a monk belonging to this country--China). As long as a dharma-transmission document (*fuhōmon*) was forged, then it seems more likely that a MS which claims to be the original of the *fuhōmon* was prepared *before* it was incorporated into a second text. In view of this, it appears more likely that the *Eizan Daishiden* document, which represents the "correct" version of the *fuhōmon*¹, was based on the Bishamondō MS which is flawed by one serious mistake. Therefore, it seems reasonable for us to assume that a later Tendai editor who included the Bishamondō MS in the *Eizan Daishiden* noticed this serious error and changed the term *honkoku* to *Nihonkoku* by adding a character "ni" to the original text. Besides, the deliberate attempt of the Bishamondō MS author to produce it as a *fuhōmon* of Saichō²⁹ also suggests that it was forged as, rather than copied from, an original document. The Japanese author of this MS wanted to forge a *fuhōmon* in the name of Shunxiao, but he was too careless to avoid such an error which implicitly mis-presents Saichō as a Chinese monk. With all the evidence considered, I conclude that the Bishamondō MS, which is regarded as the original of a *fuhōmon* written by Shunxiao for Saichō, was not written by Shunxiao in China but made in Japan³⁰.

Anyway, it is still categorically possible that there existed a manuscript of the *fuhōmon*¹ (although I am inclined to believe that this very possibility is extremely slight), which was earlier than both the Bishamondō MS and the *Eizan Daishiden* version of the *fuhōmon*¹ and in which Saichō was "correctly" addressed as a disciple from "Japan". While the Bishamondō MS represents a "wrong" copy of this earlier manuscript, the *Eizan Daishiden* reproduced it correctly.

Even if there did exist such a "correct" document as produced in the *Eizan Daishiden* as the *fuhōmon* attributed to Shunxiao (*fuhōmon*¹), it is still extremely hard to accept such a document as authentic (i.e., written by Shunxiao). It is to this problem that we are now returning.

(B.II.ii) The Authenticity of the *Fuhōmon*¹

Our conclusion regarding the authenticity of the *fuhōmon*¹ as concluded in the *Eizan Daishi den* is negative. The main reasons for believing so are as follows:

First of all, as argued in Section (A), at least as late as 820 it is unlikely that Saichō regarded Shunxiao as such a prestigious monk as (i) the third-generation disciple of Śubhākarasimha, (ii) a "Great virtue" at a "state-protecting Temple", (iii) a "monk serving at the court chapel", etc. Thus, the appearance of these terms in the *fuhōmon*¹ casts a shadow on the authenticity of this document, which claims itself to have been written by Shunxiao in 805, fifteen years earlier than the year 820.

Secondly, the absence of the *fuhōmon*¹ in Saichō's two bibliographies, especially in the *Esshūroku*, the bibliography of Buddhist texts and Esoteric implements Saichō is thought to have secured in Yuezhou where the Shunxiao initiation is said to have taken place, strongly argues against its authenticity.

As we know, Saichō submitted the two bibliographies to the court precisely to show the religious value of his travels in China. The inclusion of such a document like the *fuhōmon*¹ in his bibliographies would, without doubt, have enormously strengthened his implicit claim that his study in China was of unusual significance. Therefore, had such a document like the *fuhōmon*¹ been available to Saichō at the time he composed the two bibliographies he would not have hesitated to include it in them. Yet, we find that the *fuhōmon*¹ is not mentioned in his bibliographies.

Instead, his bibliographies contain two certificates signed by the governors of Taizhou and Mingzhou Prefecture, which certify that Saichō had travelled to the two areas and that he had been

engaged in seeking Buddhist teachings there³¹. Saichō also mentions in the *Esshūroku* an esoteric instrument (i.e., a trifurcate *vajra*) which was given by his Esoteric master (most likely, Shunxiao) as the "dharma transmitting certificate" (*shingon oshō fuhōinjin sanko bazara ichiko*³², T55.2160.1059c8). It is worth stressing that the "*fuhōinjin*" mentioned here does not refer to any *written* certificate but only to an Esoteric instrument; *viz.*, a trifurcate *vajra*³³.

Saichō failed to include in his bibliographies any *written* certificate from any of his Chinese teachers regarding his study under them and the lineages transmitted from them, while he *did* append two official documents issued by local authorities to the two bibliographies and *did* mention an object of *fuhōinjin* in them. Thus, the inclusion of the two official documents of secular sources strikingly contrasts with the absence of any written certificate sanctioned by any religious authority. Saichō must have fully understood the irreplaceable importance of such a document like the *fuhōmon1* for validating the orthodoxy of his dharma transmissions from China. Therefore, we have reason to believe that he did not include any dharma-transmission certificate in his bibliographies because either (i) the disclosure of such a certificate to the public would incur him so much trouble (or even a disaster) that Saichō had decided to conceal it despite the tremendous value it would have had for his school; or (ii) Saichō just *had not* secured such a certificate from his Chinese teachers. Since it is hard to imagine what trouble the *fuhōmon1* could have caused for Saichō and his school if it had been presented to the court³⁴, we have to resort to the other assumption for interpreting Saichō's failure to include, or even mention, a document like the *fuhōmon1* in his bibliography. This leads us to believe that Saichō actually did not secure such a document like the *fuhōmon1* from China. Consequently, this *fuhōmon* might have been forged either by Saichō himself or some later Tendai monk, who was eager to establish the legitimacy

of the esoteric tradition in the name of Saichō.

It is *not* likely that the *fuhōmon*¹ was composed by Saichō himself. This view is supported by the following two reasons. First of all, as we noted above, the *fuhōmon*¹ is not included in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, which was collected around one decade after Saichō's death. Had the *fuhōmon*¹ been made by Saichō himself, it would have been included in this Tendai collection compiled mainly for supporting the legitimacy of Saichō's Buddhist transmissions, including esoteric ones.

Secondly, if Saichō were the author of the *fuhōmon*¹, he would have done it after the submission of the *Kenkairon* in 820 and before his death in 822 (since in that work no trace is left of glorifying Shunxiao and connecting Saichō himself with Śubhākarasimha). During this period, the most likely occasion for him to forge such a document like the *fuhōmon*¹ would have been the time when he collected the documents for the *Kenkairon engi*, which was completed in the third month of 821. However, the tremendous risk accompanying the presentation of a false document like the *fuhōmon*¹ to the court may have sufficiently deterred any scrupulous person like Saichō from doing so. Therefore, I am inclined to believe that the *fuhōmon*¹ was not forged by Saichō himself, but by a certain Tendai monk after his death.

Given its inclusion in the *Eizan Dashi den* which was prepared by one of Saichō's direct disciples, I assume that this document was forged not too long after Saichō's death and most likely forged by Shinchū or another of Saichō's immediate disciples.

(B.II.iii) The Significance of the *Fuhōmon*¹

We noticed that the "court certificate" attributed to Saichō had already connected him with Śubhākarasimha by stating that his teacher Shunxiao was a third-generation disciple of the great

Esoteric master. But the same "court certificate" says nothing about why Shunxiao was taken as the third generation disciple of Śubhākarasimha. The *fuhōmon*1 as found in the *Eizan Daishiden* goes one step further by connecting Shunxiao to Śubhākarasimha through a Silla monk called Yilin. Thus, Saichō was closely associated with the renowned Esoteric patriarch Śubhākarasimha through the following lineage: (1) Śubhākarasimha --> (2) Yilin (one hundred and three years old, living in Silla [a part of the present-day Korea]) --> (3) Shunxiao --> (4) Saichō. By incorporating Saichō into such a distinguished Esoteric tradition initiated by Śubhākarasimha, the *fuhōmon*1 wants to prove the orthodoxy of Saichō's Esoteric tradition on the one hand and specify Saichō's esoteric tradition as of *taizōkai* origin on the other.

Since the *fuhōmon*1 was forged in Japan and nothing certain is known about Yilin (Saichō does not mention such a monk in either of the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon*), I am inclined to doubt the historical existence of this so-called Silla monk. An 834 Chinese source mentions Yixing and Xuanchao³⁵, a monk from Silla, as the only two dharma-transmission disciples of Śubhākarasimha³⁶. It seems therefore likely that when a fictitious figure was made to substitute for Xuanchao as the second dharma-transmission disciple of Śubhākarasimha, he was presented as coming from Silla, making him a compatriot of Xuanchao. Moreover, it is more difficult to disapprove the existence of a Korean monk than a Chinese monk. Finally, the name of Yilin may have been suggested by that of Yixing, the two names being probably quite similar in their Chinese pronunciation.

Section (C) The *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* and the Further Legitimation of Saichō's Esoteric Tradition

The *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* (An Diagrammatic Description of the Secretly Certified Blood-lineages of the Buddha-dharma; in one fascicle; DZ1: 199-248) is another important source attesting to the efforts later Tendai followers made to legitimate Saichō's Esoteric tradition. This work is generally regarded as the text Saichō referred to in his 819 *Jō Kenkairon hyō* (The Memorial regarding the Submission of the *Kenkairon*) as *Buppō kechimyaku* (the Blood-lineage of the Buddha-dharma), which he submitted to the court along with the *Kenkairon* in the year 820.

Judged by its currently available version, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* is a work primarily concerned with proving the orthodoxy of the various transmissions Saichō received from China. This text aims at proving that Saichō's original teachings were of four sources which were respectively called (i) *zen* (the Northern Chan school); (ii) *mitsu* (Esoteric Buddhism, including a dual esoteric transmission [i.e., *taizōkai* and *kongōkai*] and the *zomitsu* ["Miscellaneous"] tradition); (iii) *en* (Tendai school) and (iv) *kai* (the Vinaya school). It has therefore been highly prized within the Tendai tradition. However, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, particularly the parts regarding Saichō's Northern Chan and esoteric lineages, has been subjected to serious criticisms by modern scholars³⁷. Scholars have also been debating the authorship of this work since Gishin first questioned its authenticity in his bibliography³⁸.

Sasaki Kentoku is the first scholar who attempted a comprehensive study of the authenticity of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*³⁹. Sasaki's examination of the work was based on his understanding of the relation between the currently circulated *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* and the text indicated as the *Buppō kechimyaku* in the *Jō Kenkairon hyō*. Sasaki suggested that they may *not* be identical. In his *Jō Kenkairon hyō* Saichō referred to the *Kenkairon* (which was listed side by side with the *Buppō kechimyaku*) by its full name. Therefore, the title "Buppō Kechimyaku" as appearing in the *Jō Kenkairon hyō* may also have been the full name of the other text known to its author. Consequently, Sasaki argues, the current *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, with a different full name, is probably either a different work or more likely, an emended, expanded, and altered version of the *Buppō kechimyaku* (Sasaki believes that the original *Buppō kechimyakufu* may have been quite short, while the currently available *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* appears extraordinarily lengthy as an one-fascicle text).

Another observation point Sasaki raises to discredit the authenticity of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* is the peculiar manner in which it was composed. According to a colophon at its end Saichō's disciple Shinchū wrote down this work which Saichō dictated. This is contradictory to the usual way Saichō's other works were written (Saichō dictated no other works to a disciple). Furthermore, the appearance of the name Shinchū in this text is noteworthy, since no other early Heian period document mentions this disciple of Saichō.

Finally, Sasaki compares the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* with the *Jōshūron* (A Treatise on Glorifying the [Tendai] School), a work written by Renkō (815?-880?) to defend the Tendai School against the Nara schools. This comparison reveals that Renkō's representation of the Tendai lineages, which was mainly based on Zhiyi's *Mohe zhiguan*, was at variance with that

delineated in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*. Had Renkō really read the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* by the time he wrote the *Jōshuron*, he could not have failed to follow this authoritative work regarding Saichō's lineages in a work aimed at defending the legitimacy of those lineages. Therefore, Sasaki argues, Renkō appears to have been ignorant of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* when he wrote the *Jōshūron*. Had the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* been indeed written by the Tendai founder himself, it is also hard to imagine that a zealous Tendai apologist like Renkō would have failed to read it by the time he composed the *Jōshūron*, i.e., several decades after Saichō's death. Consequently, Sasaki reaches the conclusion that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* can not be attributed to Saichō. It was written by a later Tendai monk.

After rejecting the conventional ascription of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* to Saichō, Sasaki suggests that the ninth century Tendai monk Annen may be taken as the person responsible for expanding and emending the *Buppō kechimyaku* by Saichō into the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* which is in circulation today. Annen has significantly altered Saichō's Esoteric lineages as originally described in Saichō's *Buppō Kechimyaku* in order to make the Tendai School more competitive in gaining the leadership of the Esoteric tradition in Japan. Sasaki has also identified the passages in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* that came from some Chan texts, some of which were brought to Japan after Saichō, and therefore were inaccessible to Saichō. Sasaki believes these passages from Chan texts were not added to the *Naishō Buppō sojō kechimyaku* by Saichō but by Annen.

Sasaki's research sheds some light on the sources of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*. Some aspects of his hypothesis concerning the formation of the text have been confirmed by recent research. For example, Fukui Kōjun has addressed some compelling evidence to prove that the

Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu and the *Buppō Kechimyaku* are indeed two different texts⁴⁰. But Sasaki is not well grounded when he directly attributes the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* to Annen.

In his attempt to identify the true author of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, Fukui refers us to an important record found in the *Tendaishū shanagō haja benshōki* (Records of the Esoteric Course of the Tendai School Criticizing the Heterodox and Defending the Orthodox) compiled in 1109 by the Tendai monk Yakushun,

Let it be noted here formally: My late teacher (i.e., Saichō) made the following instruction in his *Kechimyaku*, "My future dharma-grandsons can add the names [of Tendai successors] to [this text] for the purpose of continuing the dharma". I, the disciple Kōjō, added something to the text of the three-generation lineage in order that the dharma could survive.

Let it be noted here too: Our master's [text about] the miscellaneous *mandala* mentions the name of Acārya Weixiang. This master is one of the five "dharma-transmitting *acāryas*" (*denbō ajari*) [designated by Master] Qinglong (i.e., Huiguo). When I Kōjō, the little monk, received in the room of the late Acārya Kūkai the "*Mandala* of the One-deity of the Lotus Flower" (*Renka isson mandara*), I heard by my own ears the name of Master Weixiang. Though he was not included in the transmission lineage, I, in order to preserve the traces of the Mountain (i.e., Tendai), inserted the name of Master Weixiang into the list of Trepiṭaka Bukong's dharma-sons and placed it before [the name of] Acārya Shunxiao. I thus composed the text about lineage. I sincerely wish that the *sange* order (Tendai sect) not bitterly blame me [for doing that]. The future [Tendai] practitioners must also carefully inspect the dharma of later generations and add the names [of Tendai monks to this *Kechimyaku*] according to the rule (TZ7: 199a16-b7).

On the basis of this record Fukui concludes that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* was compiled by Kōjō.

Unfortunately, Fukui's conclusion is not completely plausible either. First of all, as the author of the *Tendai kahyō* believes, Kōjō's work mentioned here is the *Sōjō kechimyakufu* (BZ125: 160a). According to Yakushun, the text in question is titled *Eizan kechimyakufu*.

Yakushun also warned the reader not to take this text by Kōjō as that by Saichō (TZ7: 199a6). Obviously, the text quoted here by Yakushun is different from the *Buppō Kechimyakufu* attributed to Saichō. Secondly, according to the above-quoted remarks by Kōjō, in Kōjō's work the name of Weixiang was put before that of Shunxiao. This can not, however, be seen in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* in circulation today. Finally, if the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* had indeed been compiled by Kōjō himself, it would be difficult to explain why it was said at the end of the text that the text was dictated by Saichō to Shinchu, who was apparently less prestigious than Kōjō.

In any case, I agree with Japanese scholars (including Sasaki and Fukui) in thinking that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* resulted from the emendation and expansion of the *Buppō kechimyaku*, which was originally written by Saichō himself. In other words, I agree that at least some parts of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* were not directly composed by Saichō himself. Here, I would like to provide two more pieces of evidence to support this view. One is the inclusion in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* of the *fuhōmon*¹, which was, I argued in Section (B), forged by a Tendai monk after Saichō's death. The other is that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* author, most probably, had used a work by a Chinese monk which was compiled in 834, twelve years after Saichō's death (see below).

At the same time, for the effort some Japanese scholars made to attribute the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* to Annen or Kōjō, I have to admit that it remains difficult, if not impossible, to identify the true compiler of this text on the basis of currently available evidence. However, since the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* tells us that it was written by Shinchū at Saichō's dictation, it seems more probable to attribute it to a certain Tendai monk in the line of Shinchū.

As for the date of the text in question, something more certain can be said. First of all, since a 927 manuscript of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* has been discovered⁴¹, it seems safe to say that it was compiled before the end of the ninth century. Moreover, since the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* only contains the *fuhōmon1* but not the *fuhōmon2*⁴², which appeared no later than 873 (Enchin referred to *fuhōmon2* in his *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō* which was composed around 873)⁴³, it was probably compiled before the appearance of the *fuhōmon2*, i.e., before 873⁴⁴. Finally, because the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* author used an 834 work by a Chinese monk called Haiyun (see below), I believe that it was compiled after 834 (most likely after 840 since it took time for the Chinese text to be imported into Japan).

Consequently, with regard to the formation of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, the following tentative conclusion seems plausible: this text was compiled between 840 and 870 by a Tendai monk who was, very likely, either Shinchū himself or one of his immediate disciples.

Having dealt with the formation of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, we now turn to a discussion of how Saichō's Esoteric tradition was re-depicted and legitimated in this work. Before doing that, a brief remark regarding the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*'s relation with the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden* appears appropriate. Whereas both the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden* depict the Shunxiao initiation as merely of Matrix-realm origin, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* defines it as of a dual esoteric transmission. Therefore, in view of the relative complexity of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* definition of the Shunxiao initiation, I am inclined to believe that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* was later than both the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden*. Or, at least, it can be said that these *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* documents aimed at legitimating Saichō's Esoteric lineages

were composed later than those which, found in the other two works, were composed for the same purpose.

(C.I) The *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmissions

The *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* classifies Saichō's esoteric tradition into two categories, one is the "transmission of the dual *mandalas*, Matrix-realm and Diamond-realm" (*taizō kongō ryōmandara sōjō*) and the other the "transmission of the Miscellaneous *Mandalas*" (*zōmandara sōjō*). The former refers to the Shunxiao initiation, the only transmission of the "pure" (*jun*) Esoteric Buddhism Saichō received from China. As noted above, according to Saichō's own description in the *Esshūroku* and the nature of the esoteric texts and implements he brought back from China, the Shunxiao initiation was most likely of Diamond-realm origin. But in the *Kenkairon*, Saichō redefined the Shunxiao initiation as a transmission of the dual *mandalas* of the Matrix and Diamond-realm, the *taizō kongō ryōbu mandara sōjō*. This tendency to redefine the Shunxiao initiation as of a dual esoteric transmission was continued in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, in which the Shunxiao initiation is identified with the "transmission of the dual *mandala*, the Matrix- and Diamond-realm".

Not only did the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* author try to re-depict the Shunxiao initiation as of a dual transmission, he also claims that Saichō's Chinese *guru* Shunxiao was in a lineage deriving from Śubhākarasimha (the greatest expounder of the Matrix-realm tradition) and Bukong (the chief advocator of the Diamond-realm tradition) as well. The *Naishō Buppō sōjō*

kechimyakufu contains a document called "Taizōkai kongōkai Ryōmandara sōjō shishi kechimyakufu" (A diagrammatical illustration of the blood-lineage transmitted between the [Esoteric] masters regarding the two *mandalas* of Matrix- and Diamond-realm). This document draws two esoteric lineages respectively belonging to the Matrix- (*Taizōkai*) and Diamond-realm (*kongōkai*) traditions, with which Saichō, along with Shunxiao, was affiliated,

The Lineage of Diamond-realm: (1) the Vairocana-tathagata in the Diamond-realm (Kongōkai Birushana Nyorai) -- (2) Vajrasattva -- (3) Nagarjuna -- (4) Nagarbodhi -- (5) Vajrabodhi -- (6) Bukong -- (7) Shunxiao -- (8) Saichō

The Lineage of Matrix-realm: (1) the Vairocana-tathagata in the Matrix-realm (Taizōkai Birushana Nyorai) -- (2) Śubhākarasimha -- (3) Yixing and Yilin -- (4) Shunxiao -- (5) Saichō (DZ1: 237-244)

In the second lineage, Yilin is conspicuously represented as one of Yixing's co-disciples (*hōtei*, "younger dharma-brother"). Obviously, the fame of Yixing as the greatest disciple of Śubhākarasimha and the commentator of a fundamental scripture for any Esoteric Buddhist tradition (the *Darijing/Dainichikyō*) was here emphasized to compensate for the obscurity of Yilin, Saichō's "dharma grand-father".

A Chinese Esoteric monk named Haiyun (Jpn., Kaiun) also gives a more detailed description of the dual Esoteric lineages in his *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji* (Jpn., *Ryōbu daihō sōjō shishi fuhō ki*; The Record of Master-to-Disciple Transmissions of the Two-divisioned Great Dharma; T2081, compiled in Taihe 8 [834]). It is striking to note the similarities between the two versions of the dual Esoteric lineage as found in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* and Haiyun's Record respectively. Let us first summarize Haiyun's version in the following diagrams:

Kongōkai : (1) the Vairocana-tathagata in the Diamond-realm (Kongōkai

Birushana Nyorai) -- (2) Vajrasattva **Samantabhadra** -- (3) **Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī** -- (4) Nagarjuna -- (5) Nagarbodhi -- (6) Vajrabodhi -- (7) Bukong -- (8) **Huiguo** -- (9) **Kūkai** (T51.2081.783c19-784b2);

Taizōkai : (1) the Vairocana-tathagata in the Matrix-realm (Taizōkai Birushana Nyorai) -- (2) **Bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi** (3) **Dharmagupta** -- (4) Śubhākarasimha -- (5) Yixing and **Xuanchao** -- (6) **Huiguo** -- (7) **Kūkai** (T51.2081.786b6-787a3).

As for the Diamond-realm lineage, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version is almost identical with the Haiyun version except for the following three points. First, the third successor in the Haiyun version (Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī) is absent in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version. Second, Haiyun's Record and the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* identify the second successor as Vajrasattva Samantabhadra and Vajrasattva respectively. Third, the last two successors in the lineages are indicated as Huiguo-Kūkai (Haiyun) and Shunxiao-Saichō (the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*) respectively.

As for the Matrix-realm lineage, the two versions also appear identical except for several slight differences. The second successor in the Haiyun version (Dharmagupta) was omitted in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version, while in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version Yilin, rather than Xuanchao (as in the Haiyun version), is presented as one of the two successors of Śubhākarasimha. Moreover, the last two successors are also different in the two versions: Huiguo-Kūkai (Haiyun) in one, and Shunxiao-Saichō (the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*) in the other.

In the main, these two versions are so close that I believe that one is based on the other. Since there is no evidence to show that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* had circulated in China by 834 when Haiyun wrote his Record, it seems plausible to assume that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version was based on Haiyun's Record. If this is true, it could also be used as

evidence against the traditional view that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* was composed by Saichō himself, since by the time Haiyun wrote his Record Saichō had already been dead for twelve years.

Besides re-depicting the Shunxiao initiation and placing Shunxiao and Saichō in two Esoteric lineages, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* also attributes several initiations of "miscellaneous" *mandalas* to Saichō. It is said in the work that in China Saichō and Gishin received an additional four Esoteric rites from monks and a layman:

- (1) the *gobucchō hō* and *myōdō mushasai* from the monk Dasu;
- (2) The *fushuedan* and *nyoirindan* from the layman Jiangbi;
- (3) The *Gundari hō* from the monk Lingguang;
- (4) The *Daibucchō mandara* from the Guoqingsi monk Weixiang (DZ1: 245-6)

The historical truth of the fourth *zōmitsu* transmission (i.e., that from Weixiang) appears supported by a certain relatively reliable source⁴⁵. However, it is striking to note that while the fourth esoteric rite was represented as conducted in the tenth month of 805, the former three were all dated on the same day, i.e., the fifth day of the fifth month of 805, a mere two weeks before Saichō's departure for Japan. Misaki tries to explain this apparently unlikely coincidence by the following assumption. Saichō, Misaki gathers, had failed to record the specific date for each of these initiations when they were conferred on him. Therefore, fifteen years later when he described these "Miscellaneous" esoteric rites in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* he was left with no choice but to attribute them to the same date⁴⁶. Moreover, it is suggested that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* date may have been taken from the colophon of a text or *mandala* which Saichō brought back⁴⁷.

However, it seems to me questionable that these three esoteric rites ever took place.

Neither the *Esshūroku* nor the *Kenkairon*, the only two documents by Saichō in which he discussed his Esoteric initiations in China, says anything about these three Esoteric rites. Rather, it is hinted in the *Kenkairon* that the Shunxiao initiation was the only Esoteric initiation Saichō received during his sojourn in Yuezhou, "after receiving the Shunxiao initiation, [we, Saichō and Gishin] *immediately* returned to the Port of Mingzhou where the ships were waiting for us" (T74.2376.590c).

Finally, it should be noted that a "dharma-transmission certificate" (*fuhōmon*) attributed to Shunxiao (the *Jungyō Ajari fuhōmon*) is included in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*. Comparing the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version of the *fuhōmon* with the *Eizan Daishiden* version, we find that they are almost identical except for several slight differences⁴⁸. Therefore, the two versions of the *fuhōmon* as found in the two texts can be regarded as based on one and the same source.

(C.II) The Significance of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* Version of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmissions

In both the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan daishiden*, Saichō's esoteric transmission is depicted as originating from the Matrix-realm tradition. In the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* Saichō was reported to have received the *dual* transmission from Shunxiao, who was not only a third generation disciple after Śubhākarasimha but also a direct disciple of Bukong. Śubhākarasimha and Bukong were respectively recognized as the most important expounders of the two esoteric traditions, Matrix- and Diamond-realm. Thus, in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō*

kechimyakufu Saichō's teacher Shunxiao was glorified as even more distinguished than Kūkai's teacher Huiguo, who was Bukong's most promising disciple. The Shingon ideology presented Huiguo as the ardent advocator of the *ryōbu goju* idea (the idea that the two esoteric traditions are inter-penetrating).

On the other hand, it is remarkable that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, while including some obviously insignificant *zōmitsu* initiations Saichō allegedly received from China, omits the Takaōsanji *abhiṣeka* Saichō received from Kūkai, which concerned a dual transmission. By doing that, the author of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* tries to minimize the significance of the initiations Kūkai conferred upon Saichō and some of his leading disciples.

Also, it is important to note that the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* stresses the importance of some "Miscellaneous" esoteric rites in Saichō's esoteric tradition. It may well be that because of the precedent set by the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, the "Miscellaneous" esoteric rites have always played a more important part in Tendai Esoteric Buddhism than in Shingon.

Section (D) The *Kenkairon Engi* and Saichō's Esoteric Tradition: Appearance of the Second Version of the Dharma-transmission Document (*Fuhōmon2*)

In the third month of 821, Saichō collected 33 documents and edited them into a work titled the *Kenkairon engi* (Materials Concerning the *Kenkairon*; in two fascicles; DZ1: 263-98). Saichō submitted this document collection to the secretary of the State Council (Dajokan)⁴⁹. Since some of the monks in Nara had questioned the orthodoxy of Saichō's teachings, much of the *Kenkairon engi* was devoted to proving that Saichō had studied under qualified teachers in China.

The *Kenkairon engi* was in two fascicles. The first primarily contains official documents concerning Saichō's studies in China and a request for early ordinands for the Tendai School. The second fascicle, which has unfortunately been lost (or destroyed?), contained documents concerning the controversy over the bodhisattva precepts, including petitions by Saichō's opponents.

Although it is highly probable that Saichō did compile a work called the *Kenkairon engi*, the *Kenkairon engi* that has come down to us can not be regarded as compiled by Saichō himself. Rather, I am of the opinion that the currently available version of the *Kenkairon engi* represents the result of repeated alteration and expansion made by later Tendai editors on the original text that was probably left by Saichō himself. Some documents originally included into the text were excluded and destroyed since they were against the Tendai interests. For example, the whole second fascicle, which contained petitions from Saichō's opponents, may have been destroyed purposefully. As I will show below, some documents forged after Saichō's death were added into the *Kenkairon engi* as the textual supports for the legitimacy of Saichō's dharma-transmissions (especially the esoteric ones).

In comparison with the three Tendai sources discussed in the three preceding sections (the *Denjutsu issinkaimon*, *Eizan Daishiden*, and the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*), the *Kenkairon*

engi achieved its present form at a relatively late date. A so-called "court certificate" proving Saichō's religious expertise is found in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden*. As quoted in both works, the "court certificate" presented Shunxiao as the third generation disciple of Śubhākarasimha (*[Zen]mui sanzō daisan deshī*). But when quoted in the *Kenkairon engi*, the same "court certificate" describes Shunxiao as *Fukū sanzō daisandeshi*⁵⁰, which could mean (i) the "third disciple of Trepitaka Bukong" or the "third-generation disciple of Trepitaka Bukong". Obviously, the editor of the *Kenkairon engi* did not understand this phrase as the "third-generation disciple of Trepitaka Bukong", which would mean that Saichō's teacher Shunxiao was one generation junior to Kūkai's teacher Huiguo who was one of Bukong's disciples. Therefore, the editor understood the phrases as the "third disciple of Trepitaka Bukong", which means that Shunxiao was a fellow student of and therefore comparable with Huiguo.

However, the editor forgot that the phrase "*daisandeshi*" in this context could only be understood as the "third generation disciple", since in the same document Saichō's Tiantai teacher Daosui was referred to as the *Chishadaishi daishichideshi*, which can only be understood as the "seventh generation (and not the seventh) disciple of Zhiyi" because Daosui was almost two centuries later than Zhiyi (538-597) and his discipleship under Zhiyi is absolutely impossible. Therefore, in this context, the phrases "*daisandeshi*" or "*daishichideshi*" must be understood as the "third/seventh generation disciple", rather than the "third/seventh disciple". In other words, the editor of the *Kenkairon engi*, in including the "court certificate" into the *Kenkairon engi*, substituted "Bukong" for "[Zen]mui" (Śubhākarasimha) and was ignorant of the problem caused by this change. This change was obviously made for the purpose of associating Shunxiao with Bukong and thereby showing that Saichō's esoteric tradition can be traced to the *kongōkai* tradition

as well as to the *taizōkai* one.

As demonstrated by the *fuhōmon*¹, at the outset Saichō's disciples were pre-occupied with connecting Saichō with the *taizōkai* lineage initiated by Śubhākarasimha. Neither the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* nor the *Eizan Daishiden* makes any effort to connect Saichō with the *kongōkai* tradition. It was only in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* that Saichō's esoteric tradition was depicted as belonging to a dual transmission. Therefore, given the eagerness with which the editor of the *Kenkairon engi* tried to connect Saichō with Bukong, I feel that the currently available version of the *Kenkairon engi* took form later than either of the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden*.

On the other hand, since the *Kenkairon engi* contains a more elaborate version of the *fuhōmon* than the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version of the same certificate, it was probably also later than the latter. Consequently, of the four sources discussed in this chapter, the *Kenkairon engi* contains some of the latest documents which represent the latest stage of the effort Saichō's followers made to legitimate Saichō's Esoteric tradition. Now, let us turn to the text of the *Kenkairon engi* proper and try to see what the *Kenkairon engi* documents can tell us about how Saichō's Esoteric tradition was re-interpreted by later Tendai monks.

(D.I) The *Kenkairon engi* Presentation of Saichō's Esoteric Dharma-transmission

Preserved in the *Kenkairon engi* are at least five documents which are of great relevance to understanding how Saichō's followers had changed their ideas of Saichō's esoteric tradition. These five documents are:

(1) The *Daitō Taigaku Reiganji Jungyō Ajari fuhōmon* (Chin., *Datang Taiyue Linyansi Shunxiao Asheri fufawen*; The dharma-transmission certificate from Acārya Shunxiao of the Linyansi Temple on Mt. Taiyue [=Taishan], the Great Tang, DZ1: 279-280);

(2) *Dainihonkoku shoken kanjōdōjō juhōdesi naishisen* (The edict delivered by the Inner Court Envoy (*naishisen*), about selecting disciples to be initiated in the first *abhiṣeka* platform ever established in the Great Japan, DZ1: 283-4);

(3) *Shi kyotōguhō Saichō denbō kugen* (An official certificate for dharma-transmission issued to Saichō who went to China to seek the dharma, DZ1: 284-6);

(4) *Shi kyotōguhō yakugosō Gishin denbō kugen* (An official certificate for dharma-transmission issued to Interpreter-monk Gishin who went to China to seek the dharma, DZ1: 289-90);

(5) *Den sanbusamaya kugen* (An official certificate for transmitting the *samayas* of "three divisions", DZ1: 290-1).

Of these five *Kenkairon engi* documents, the first one is of greatest relevance to our present study.

We will consider in-depth the first document (hereafter referred to as *FUHŌMON*) before discussing the other four documents.

Indeed, the so-called "dharma-transmission certificate" (*fuhōmon*) attributed to Shunxiao is by no means unfamiliar to us. We have found such a "certificate" (i.e., *fuhōmon1*) included in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō Buppō sējō kechimyakufu* as well. After comparing it with the *fuhōmon1*, we find that the *FUHŌMON* is composed of two parts. The second part, which is identical with the *fuhōmon1*, is preceded by the first part which reads as follows,

In a room of *mandala* comprising "Thirty-seven Deities" (Chin., *sanshiqizun*; Jpn., *sanjushichison*)⁵⁰ headed by Vairocana-Tathagata,

A-Vam-Ram-hum-Khum -- the higher rank of attainment;
 A-Vi-Ra-hum-Kham -- the intermediate rank of attainment;
 A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na -- the lower rank of attainment.

Through the *abhiṣeka* (*kanjō*), the *samayas* for the "three divisions" (*sanbu*) were

conferred [by] Acārya Śramaṇa Shunxiao. The methods for drawing pictures, samples and mudras [were also transmitted]. On the eighteenth day of the fourth month of Zhenyuan 21 (805). Śramaṇa Shunxiao of the Lingyansi Temple on Mt. Taishan, who was the "Great Virtue" at a "State-protecting Temple" and one "monk serving at the court chapel", transmitted the *samayas* for the "Three Divisions" and [issued] this certificate to his disciple Saichō (DZ1: 279).

Thus we see that we have two versions of certificate for Saichō's esoteric initiation from Shunxiao: the *fuhōmon1* and *FUHŌMON*. The authenticity of the *fuhōmon1* has been rejected. Is the same conclusion applicable to the *FUHŌMON*? Before dealing with the authenticity of the *FUHŌMON*, I think it is helpful to make a close comparison between the *FUHŌMON*, the *fuhōmon1*, the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon* passages relevant to Saichō's Esoteric transmission in China.

We find that the *FUHŌMON* differs from the other three sources in several important points. First of all, the *FUHŌMON* is much more specific as to the content of the Shunxiao initiation. In the *Esshūroku* Saichō was satisfied with observing that he obtained from Shunxiao a kind of five-division *abhiṣeka*. The *Kenkairon* passage merely says that the Shunxiao initiation was about a dual transmission. As for the *fuhōmon1*, it says nothing about the content of the Shunxiao initiation. By contrast, the *FUHŌMON* describes the content of the Shunxiao initiation in much greater detail. According to the *FUHŌMON*, the core of the Shunxiao initiation resides in a threefold correlation between a triplet of five-syllabled dhāraṇīs and three ranks of attainment. Besides that, the *Fuhōmon* tells us that Saichō receives an *abhiṣeka*, through which the *samayas* of "three divisions" were transmitted to him. After that *abhiṣeka*, Saichō was also offered some diagrams and seals, which were used, presumably, to certify the authenticity of his initiation.

Secondly, both the *Esshūroku* and the *Kenkairon* are not clear about the date of the

Shunxiao initiation. Only by referring to the context of the two relevant passages in the *Esshūroku* and the *Kenkairon* is one able to infer that the initiation occurred in the fourth month of 805. The *fuhōmon*¹ indicates that it was written by Shunxiao and entrusted to Saichō on the nineteenth day of the fourth month of Zhenyuan 21 (805), without saying when the initiation happened. The *FUHŌMON*, by contrast, unambiguously dates the initiation to the eighteenth day of the fourth month of Zhenyuan 21 (805).

Thirdly, the *FUHŌMON* is meticulous in describing the place of the initiation: it occurred in a place where a *mandala* comprising "Thirty-seven Deities" [headed by] the Vairocana-tathagata has been drawn, at the Fengshan[ding] Temple in Yuezhou Prefecture. This also forms a striking contrast to the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon* passages, both of which only briefly observed that the initiation was conducted at the Fengshan Temple east of Lake Jing, and the *fuhōmon*¹ as well, which remains silent on the initiation location.

Fourthly, in the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon* passages almost no mention is made of Shunxiao's titles, background, and his lineage. In the *fuhōmon*¹, Shunxiao was presented as a "Great Virtue" at a "State-protecting Temple", a Great Acārya . In the *FUHŌMON*, one more honorific title is attributed to Shunxiao: he was not merely a "Great Virtue" at a "State-Protecting Temple", but also a "monk serving at the court chapel".

Therefore, of all the materials which have concerned us so far, the *FUHŌMON* presents the most detailed description of the Shunxiao initiation. However, the problem which follows this general conclusion is whether this *FUHŌMON* can be regarded as authentic; i.e., written by Saichō's Chinese *guru* Shunxiao.

(D.II) The Authenticity and Significance of the *FUHŌMON*

(D.II.i) The Authenticity of the *FUHŌMON*

First of all, it is clear that the whole of the *FUHŌMON* can not be accepted as authentic since its second part (= *fuhōmon1*) was, as I have argued in Section (B) above, written by a certain Tendai monk rather than by Shunxiao as it claims. Then, what can we say about the authenticity of the first part of the *FUHŌMON*?

In fact, the first part of the *FUHŌMON* itself originally existed as a separate *fuhōmon* attributed to Shunxiao. On sixth December, 1965 a major national newspaper in Japan, *Asahi Shinbun*, reported that a manuscript, whose text is identical with the first part of the *FUHŌMON*, was stored at the Shitennōji Temple in Osaka⁵². This manuscript claims to be a dharma-transmission certificate issued by Shunxiao to Saichō. The experts who investigated the Shitennōji manuscripts agreed on the authenticity of this *fuhōmon*. Regarded as important written evidence for the cultural communication between ancient China and Japan, this manuscript was designated as an "Important Cultural Property of Japan" (*juyō bunkazai*) shortly after its discovery in 1965. Japanese calligraphy scholars are generally of the opinion that this manuscript was written in the typical Tang calligraphical style and must be taken as of Chinese provenance. To my knowledge, no Japanese scholar has so far expressed any doubt about the authenticity of this manuscript and all Tendai scholars use it as one of the primary sources for studying the appearance of the Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan and its relationship with Chinese Esoteric Buddhism⁵³.

However, for the same reasons that have led me to reject the authenticity of the *fuhōmon1*, I find it extremely difficult to accept this *fuhōmon* stored in the Shitennōji Temple (hereafter

fuhōmon2) as authentic. These reasons include the (i) absence of this "dharma-transmission certificate" in Saichō's two bibliographies, in which he would have had every reason to mention such a document had it really been in his possession at the time he wrote the bibliographies; the (ii) appearance of the terms aimed at glorifying Shunxiao in the manuscript⁵⁴.

In addition to these two major points, one minor, but by no means insignificant, point also casts doubt on the authenticity of the *fuhōmon1* and *fuhōmon2* as well. Shunxiao is presented by the two *fuhōmons* to address himself as a "*daitoku*" at a "*chinkoku dōjō*", "*Acārya Śramaṇa*", "*naigubu*", etc. It is really a rarely witnessed practice that a monk would be so presumptuous as to show off so many prestigious titles he assumed.

Fourthly, I find it extremely unbelievable that Saichō, during his several-day stay with Shunxiao⁵⁵, received two separate *fuhōmons* (i.e., *fuhōmon1* and *fuhōmon2*) from the same Esoteric master. As a rule, a *fuhōmon* is meant, on the one hand, to officially establish the discipleship of its holder under the master signing it; and on the other, to confirm that such and such an esoteric transmission had indeed occurred between the master and disciple as specified therein. In view of the unparalleled importance the esoteric tradition has attached to a face-to-face oral transmission from the master to disciple, it seems justifiable for us to assume that an Esoteric master must have written and issued a *fuhōmon* with great care and importance. In the case of Shunxiao and Saichō, if the two *fuhōmons* could be accepted as authentic, Saichō had in fact received a second *fuhōmon* from Shunxiao only one day after obtaining his first *fuhōmon* from the same Esoteric master. This would lead to such a conclusion: Shunxiao had issued *fuhōmons* in such an easy way, and/or he had written *fuhōmons* so carelessly (if not recklessly), that barely *one day* after the issuance of a *fuhōmon* to a newly initiated student it suddenly occurred to him that

he had to write a new *fuhōmon* for the same foreign student. Obviously, this conclusion directly contradicts our belief that in Esoteric Buddhism the composition and issuance of *fuhōmons* was a matter of great importance. This conclusion is therefore extremely unlikely. Consequently, the co-existence in Japan of two *fuhōmons* attributed to the same Shunxiao does not reinforce the authenticity of each of them, but, on the contrary, suggests that at least one of the two *fuhōmons* (presumably the one which appeared later, i.e., the *fuhōmon2*) is of dubious source.

Besides these four pieces of evidence against the authenticity of the *fuhōmon2*, one peculiar aspect of its content also betrays its lateness in appearance. The *fuhōmon2* seems to try to depict the Shunxiao initiation in terms of "three divisions" (*sanbu*), the three esoteric traditions represented by the three basic Esoteric sutras (the *Dainichikyō*, *Kongōchōgyō* and *Shoshicchi gyō*).

As noted above, the *fuhōmon2* represents the core of the Shunxiao initiation as the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation. The former two dhāraṇīs, which are correlated with the higher and intermediate ranks of attainment respectively, are found in the *Darijing* (T848.18.20a19; 52b12-28), while the third one in correlation with the lower rank of attainment is traceable to a text closely related to the *Jin'gangding jing* (T1173.20.710b)⁵⁶. Therefore the author of the *fuhōmon2* seems to have used the three five-syllabled dhāraṇīs to represent the *Darijing* and the *Jin'gangding jing*, two basic texts for the dual esoteric transmission. Furthermore, according to the *fuhōmon2*, the three dhāraṇīs were correlated with the three ranks of attainment (higher, intermediate and lower). The *locus classicus* for this threefold classification of the Indian notion "*siddhi*" (attainment) is found in the *Suxidi jing*⁵⁷, the text representing the third Esoteric tradition in the *sanbu* system. Thus, it seems that the *fuhōmon2* implicitly advocates a kind of *sanbu goju* idea (the idea that the three Esoteric traditions are mutually supplementing

and inter-penetrating). According to Matsunaga, in China the *Suxidi jing* was placed on a par with the *Darijing* and the *Jingangding jing* around the 830s⁵⁶. The *Suxidi jing* was not included into the Hieizan *shanagō* curriculum until the return of Ennin (794-864) from China in 847. Ennin may have been drawn to the importance of the *Suxidi jing* during his study in Chang'an between 840 to 847, exactly the time when the *Suxidi jing* was steadily gaining popularity within the Chinese Esoteric Buddhism.

Therefore, the *sanbu goju* implication in the *fuhōmon2* makes it difficult if not impossible to regard it as written by Shunxiao in 805, when the *Suxidi jing* probably had not yet been elevated to a position as one of the three fundamental texts in the Chinese Esoteric Buddhism.

On the other hand, the *fuhōmon2* author's probable knowledge of the *sanbu goju* idea makes it possible to give a rough period in which the *fuhōmon2* was prepared in Japan. Since Ennin is the person responsible for introducing the Japanese Tendai sect to the *sanbu* idea, it seems safe to date the appearance of the *fuhōmon2* to sometime after 847, the year Ennin returned to Japan.

Moreover, as noted above, Enchin mentions the *fuhōmon2* in one of his treatises, the *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō*; which was completed around 873⁵⁷. Therefore the appearance of the *fuhōmon2* could be tentatively dated between 847 and 873.

At this point it is necessary to discuss the relationship between the two "dharma-transmission certificates" attributed to Shunxiao, the *fuhōmon1* and the *fuhōmon2*, which are represented by the Bishamondō MS and Shitennōji text respectively. The two texts were written in different sizes of characters (the characters in the Shitennōji text are larger than those in the Bishamondō MS). Furthermore, in comparison with the Bishamondō MS, the Shitennōji text

appears to have been written in deeper color. Nonetheless, Japanese scholars, who believe in the authenticity of both documents, have assumed that the writings in the two manuscripts are of the same style and are therefore from one and the same person, i.e., Shunxiao.

However, I find it insufficient to claim that two manuscripts were written by the same author merely on the grounds that their writing styles are close. In ancient China and Japan, to copy another writer's handwriting was one kind of basic training any calligraphy practitioner had to undergo. This training enabled a qualified calligrapher to produce a copy of any original writing which may look so close to its original that people other than calligraphy experts are unable to tell them apart. There are countless examples to show how closely a copy made by a later calligrapher could match the original writing. Since, as we have shown above, neither of these two documents was authored by Shunxiao, we have no reason to cling to the conventional idea that they were composed by the same hand, that of Shunxiao. Rather, we must explore the possibility that the two documents were written by two Japanese authors.

The *fuhōmon*₁ (=Bishamondō MS) had already been included in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, in both of which the *fuhōmon*₂ (=Shitennōji text) was not found. The *fuhōmon*₂ is only found in the *Kenkairon engi*, where it is incorporated as a part of the *FUHŌMON*. The absence of the *FUHŌMON*₂ in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* implies that the *fuhōmon*₂ may have appeared later than the *fuhōmon*₁. In other words, the *fuhōmon*₂ appeared at such a late date that the author or editor of the *Eizan Daishiden* and the editor of Saichō's *Buppō kechimyaku* (i.e., the author of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*), who did include the *fuhōmon*₁ in the two works, had no chance to see the *fuhōmon*₂ and were therefore unable to include it in the works under their redaction. This

assumption is further corroborated by the relative lateness of the final formation of the *Kenkairon engi*⁶⁰.

(D.II.ii) The Polemical Agenda Underlying the Fabrication of the *Fuhōmon2*

But, one problem remains: why, after the appearance of the *fuhōmon1*, was the forging of the *Fuhōmon2* necessary? Indeed, the agenda underlying the forgery of the *fuhōmon2* appears to have been very complicated. Here I can only make some brief comments. First of all, we have shown that the *fuhōmon1* was flawed by a serious mistake (i.e., Saichō was wrongly addressed as a monk coming from "this" [=Chinese] country), a mistake which may have been later noticed by Tendai editors of the text, who corrected it by changing "this country" to "the Country Japan" (or the "eastern country", which also means Japan). In view of this, we might assume that the author of the *fuhōmon2* may have made the document because he was not satisfied with this defect of the *fuhōmon1* and wanted to provide a better version of Saichō's "dharma-transmission certificate".

However, besides this somewhat practical reason, I would suggest that the *fuhōmon2* may have been forged for some deeper polemical agenda. As we know, the most important part of the *fuhōmon2* appears to consist in identifying the core of the Shunxiao initiation as the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation. This new definition of the Shunxiao initiation seems to have aimed at re-depicting the Shunxiao initiation as of "three traditions" (*sanbu*). Also, as shown in his 820 *Kenkairon*, Saichō, in his later years, tended to reinterpret the Shunxiao initiation as of a dual transmission. It is very likely that this new interpretation of Saichō's may have been stimulated by his association with and study under Kūkai, who may have awakened Saichō to the (i) importance of the Diamond-realm tradition and the (ii) *ryōbu goju* idea. Since Shingon followers

prized Kūkai's tradition as the sole orthodox esoteric lineage incorporating the dual transmission, it would have been natural for the Tendai monks after Saichō to try to outshine Shingon by redefining Saichō's esoteric initiation as belonging to the *three* traditions (the two plus a third represented by the *Suxidi jing/Soshicchi kyō*).

Now that the Chinese origin of the *fuhōmon2* has been rejected, we will try to see if it is possible to identify its true Japanese author. In answer to this question, one will be naturally drawn to Enchin (814-91), whose *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō*, according to my research to date, represents the earliest textual source referring to the *fuhōmon2*. Furthermore, this treatise of Enchin was exclusively dedicated to the scriptural source of the "procedure of three ranks of attainment", the core of the *fuhōmon2*. Enchin's close connection with the *fuhōmon2* leads one to consider the possibility that he was the real author of the *fuhōmon2*. However, one fact makes this possibility unlikely. Enchin in 882 prepared some questions which he sent to his previous teachers in Chang'an for answers. Among these questions is one regarding the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation which is found in the *fuhōmon2*⁶¹. This means that the *fuhōmon2* was, very likely, not made by Enchin himself. Otherwise, it would be difficult to explain why he had asked such a question so seriously.

With Enchin excluded as the likely author of the *fuhōmon2*, Ennin (794-864) (or a Tendai monk in his line) immediately emerges as the most likely person who had composed the *fuhōmon2* in the name of Shunxiao. We know that the *fuhōmon2* advocates, albeit implicitly, the *sanbu goju* idea. It is Ennin who first introduced this idea into the Tendai school. The two decades between 847 and 873, to which I have dated the formation of the *fuhōmon2*, was exactly the time when Ennin, as the chief Tendai representative, was actively fighting with Shingon over the orthodoxy

of their respective Esoteric traditions. Without doubt, the Tendai sect may have benefited greatly from a "dharma-transmission certificate" like the *fuhōmon*², which not only supports the orthodoxy of the Esoteric tradition Saichō was said to have secured from China but also suggests that Saichō's Esoteric tradition was inherently superior to Kūkai's since Saichō's tradition was of "three divisions" (*sanbu*) while Kūkai's was merely of "two divisions" (*ryōbu*).

Now, we can go back to the other four *Kenkairon engi* documents and see if they can tell us anything new about the way Saichō's Esoteric tradition was legitimated. The second and third documents (one about the establishment of the Vairocana *mandala* at the Takaōsanji Temple, the other regarded as the "court certificate" issued to Saichō) are identical to those included in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden* except that the term "Mui" (Śubhākarasimha) in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden* documents was changed into "Fuku" (Bukong) in the *Kenkairon engi* documents. This change indicates that by the time the *Kenkairon engi* was compiled Saichō's followers were more eager to associate their master with Bukong than with Śubhākarasimha.

As for the third document, which is regarded as the "court certificate" issued to Saichō's main disciple Gishin, the head of the Tendai sect after Saichō, I have not found strong evidence against its authenticity. Yet this document is remarkable for referring to the "procedure of attainment for 'three divisions'" (*sanbu shicchi hō*).

The fifth document, which concerns the transmission of the *samayas* for the "three

divisions", must be regarded as spurious for its incorporation of the whole *FUHŌMON* (= *fuhōmon1* + *fuhōmon2*), whose sources are dubious. The *fuhōmon* as reproduced in the fifth document differs from the *FUHŌMON* included as a separate *Kenkairon engi* document at several points, the most remarkable of which is that the Shunxiao initiation is indicated in this document to have occurred on the sixteenth day of the fourth month of Zhenyuan 21 (805), not the eighteenth day of the same month and year as in the *FUHŌMON*.

Some Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, we discussed the effort Saichō's followers had made to re-interpret and legitimate the Esoteric transmissions ascribed to Saichō. In doing so, we investigated the following four major Tendai works, the (i) *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, (ii) *Eizan Daishi den*, (iii) *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* and (iv) *Kenkairon engi*.

The *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* contains a so-called "court certificate" which claims itself to be an official document issued by the Kammu authority to certify Saichō's religious attainment. Though this "certificate" proves to be of dubious source, it was noteworthy for glorifying Saichō's

main Chinese Esoteric mentor Shunxiao as an extremely prestigious monk who was a third generation disciple of the great Indian Esoteric master Śubhākarasimha.

We find in the *Eizan Daishi den a fuhōmon* allegedly written by Shunxiao for Saichō. This *fuhōmon* was also forged in Japan in order to incorporate Saichō into a celebrated lineage supposedly initiated by Śubhākarasimha and continued by (i) Yilin, a Korean monk who, this *fuhōmon* says, had transmitted esoteric teachings to Shunxiao, (ii) Shunxiao himself and (iii) Saichō. The appearance of this *fuhōmon* marks the formal formation of the Tendai idea of its Esoteric lineage, which, according to this *fuhōmon*, could be traced back to Korea, China and eventually India.

Further effort is seen in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* to authenticate the esoteric tradition attributed to Saichō. We find that the obscure Korean monk Yilin, the “dharama-grandfather” of Saichō, was identified in this Tendai work as a co-disciple of Yixing, who was perhaps Śubhākarasimha’s most renowned disciple in China. The author of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* also attempted to connect Saichō with Bukong by affiliating Saichō with the *kongōkai* esoteric lineage in which Bukong has been respected as a patriarch. Here, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō Kechimyakufu* author tried to equate Saichō’s esoteric tradition with a dual transmission that includes Bukong as well as Śubhākarasimha. Saichō’s esoteric tradition was thus represented as comparable with the Shingon school created by Kūkai, who is believed to have secured the two esoteric transmissions from China.

Finally, we find a second version of Shunxiao’s *fuhōmon* in the *Kenkairon engi*, another work originally left by Saichō himself but seriously altered and expanded by later Tendai monks. This version of *fuhōmon* proved to be essential for the formation of some central ideologies

supporting early Tendai Buddhism. It re-interprets the esoteric transmission Saichō received from Shunxiao as the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation, in which is implied the *sanbu goju* idea. The esoteric tradition Saichō received from Shunxiao was thus characterized as the integration of three esoteric transmissions (i.e., the *kongōkai*, *taizōkai* and *Soshitsu*). Obviously, this ideology was advocated for the purpose of outshining the Shingon tradition, which claimed itself to represent the combination of two esoteric transmissions known as *kongōkai* and *taizōkai*.

Notes,

1. In the twentieth day of the tenth month, Enryaku 21 (802), Saichō sent to the court a memorial in which he suggested that Gishin be nominated as the interpreter who was to accompany him to China. This memorial is currently preserved in the *Kenkairon engi* (DZ1: 267-8).
2. According to the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* (DZ1: 638), Saichō, sometime before he was sent to China, entrusted Enchō to perform an esoteric ceremony called *gobucchō hō* for Emperor Kammu.
3. *Rankei ionshū*, the KZ5: 383-85. Since in this letter from Enchō Saichō was presented as having openly admitted his deficiency in Esoteric Buddhism, some Tendai scholars suspected that it was probably forged for sectarian purposes. However, there is sufficient evidence to show that this letter was authentic (cf., Groner 1984: 82; Abé 1995: 119).
4. ZD1: 639; cf., Groner 1984: 288.
5. Cf., Groner 1984: 298.
6. As a matter of fact, the parochiality of Saichō's study in China was used by the Nara monks as a major proof to accuse him of receiving illegitimate transmissions from China (see section [D], chapter two).
7. Two passages in the *Goyuigō* (T2431) attributed to Kūkai refer to Shunxiao as a disciple of Bukong. But it seems that this work was composed sometime after Kūkai's death (Sasaki 1939: 127-139). Sasaki has also revealed the purpose of representing Shunxiao as one of Bukong's disciples. On the one hand, it was made in order to ease the tensions between the Shingon and Tendai schools. But more importantly, this reference was made to blunt Tendai criticisms of use of alcoholic beverages by Shingon monks by recording that both Huiguo and Shunxiao stated that drinking for medical purposes was acceptable (Groner 1984: 60).
8. Scholars have noticed the bitter intro-sectarian background against which this work was prepared. The Tendai order was then facing a serious crisis caused by the death of its head Gishin. Though Gishin designated his student Enshū as his successor, many Tendai monks supported Enchō on the grounds that Enchō was more qualified than Enshū. One important aspect of the agenda underlying the preparation of Kōjō's *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* was precisely to advocate for Enchō's right to the post of the second Tendai head (*zasu*) after Gishin. Finally the successor dispute was resolved with the success of Enchō. After that, Kōjō seems to have lost interest in the work; and no more efforts were made to write the remaining parts or polish the parts drafted, leaving a poorly edited and a quite unreadable text (Groner 1984: 17-18).
9. Only a short but extremely obscure passage (of around 2,100 characters) at the end of this work is believed to have been composed by Kōjō himself. However, a Japanese scholar has revealed that this part was also a kind of "scissors-and-paste" work, composed largely of quotations from a number of Chinese Buddhist texts (Ishida 1963: 371-82). For an English summary of the main ideas in this passage, see Groner 1984: 293-95.
10. The term *daishichideshi* usually means the "seventh disciple". But here, it is obvious that the term could not be understood in this way since Zhiyi and Daosui were separated by time too far to have been teacher and student. Rather, the term here is read as "the seventh generation disciple", which means that Daosui is regarded as the seventh generation [Tiantai] disciple *after* Zhiyi, strongly suggesting that Daosui was considered the seventh Tendai patriarch after Zhiyi (i.e., [1] Zhiyi --> [2] Guangding --> [3] Zhiwei --> [4] Huiwei --> [5] Xuanlang --> [6] Zhanran --> [7] Daosui).

A similar expression in the same document, *daisandeshi*, is also to be read in the same way, meaning that Shunxiao is counted as the third generation disciple after Śubhākarasimha (i.e., [1] Śubhākarasimha --> [2] ? --> [3] Shunxiao).

11. In this dissertation, I follow Forte in rendering the Chinese term *sanzang* (Jpn., *sanzō*) as *Trepitaka* (*Trepitakā* in feminine gender), rather than *Tripitaka*, which has been generally taken as the Sanskrit equivalent of this Chinese term (Forte 1990: 247-8).

12. Full name, *zhenhu guojia daochang*. The idea of establishing temples for the purpose of protecting the country was based on the *Renwang jing* (Jpn., *Ninnō kyō*, T#245, 246), *Jinguangming jing* (Jpn., *Konkōmyō kyō*; T#663) and the *Shouhuguojie jing* (Jpn., *Shugo kokkai kyō*, T#997).

13. Here the *panguan/hangan* (Administrative Assistant) may have been mis-written as *panli/hanri*, which has been rarely used to refer to an official title.

14. In the *Esshūroku* bibliography Lu Chun is represented as the Prefect, rather than an Administrative Assistant, of Taizhou Prefecture.

15. Kōjō, the author of the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, failed to specify the date when this "court certificate" was issued. It is noted in Kōjō's collection that this certificate was issued to Saichō on the insistence of Emperor Kammu (T2379.74.643c12). Furthermore, this certificate indicates that Saichō was then forty years old. According to the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, Saichō died in 822 at the age of 56, which implies that he was born in 767 (cf., Groner 1984: 19). Therefore, Saichō reached forty in 806. In other words, this certificate, if authentic, must have been issued in the year 806 (Enryaku 25).

Furthermore, Emperor Kammu died in the early 806. This also implies that this "court certificate", if indeed granted to Saichō with Kammu's consent as the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* claims, must not have been later than 806.

16. Saichō returned to Japan in 805, very likely at the end of the sixth month of the year (cf., Groner 1984: 65).

17. Scholars have noticed the personality differences between Saichō and Kūkai. Saichō has been regarded as a modest and virtuous person who concealed "loftiness and purity" in "virtue and humility" (Abé's translation of Tsuji's comment; see Abé 1995: 134; Tsuji 1944: 283-84). By contrast, Kūkai has been depicted by the historians of Japanese Buddhism as a "multi-talented operator", a politically minded strategist who "particularly excelled in manipulating people" (Abé 1995: 134; Tsuji 1944: 311).

18. For Saichō's new understanding of Shunxiao's identity in his *Kenkairon*, see Section (D), chapter two.

19. I have found no other source mentioning this monk.

20. Otherwise unknown. Probably a student of Zhidu.

21. See, Fukui 1986-87. The most recent study of this biography is provided by Saeki 1992.

22. The "Naishisen" refers to a court official in charge of transmitting the imperial orders.

23. The Chinese character *zhuān* (Jpn., *ten*; "turn") is close to *chuan* (Jpn., *den*; "transmit") in form. Since the expression "to *turn* the dharma-wheel" is more natural than that "to *transmit* the dharma-wheel", I guess that the character "*zhuān/ten*" was mis-written here as "*chuan/den*".

24. This manuscript is held as the "National Treasure" (*kokuhō*) by the Japanese government. It is photocopied in the *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* (The Complete Works of Dengyō Daishi [Saichō]).

25. The character *hon* in the Bishamondō MS appears obscure and is hard to recognize. It seems that a certain editor of the Bishamondō MS tried to rewrite the character *hon* as *tō* ("eastern"); viz., to change the word *honkoku* to *tōkoku* (the "Eastern Country"; i.e., Japan, which is located east of China) (Ōyama 1974). I think it unlikely that someone had changed *tōkoku* to *honkoku*, since the term *tōkoku* produces a correct context, while the *honkoku* does a wrong one. Apparently, it is less likely that an editor may have been so reckless as to change a correct context to a wrong one. The case must have been precisely to the opposite: *honkoku* was changed to *tōkoku*. Therefore, it is the character *hon*, rather than *tō*, that appeared in the original text.

There are more reasons for believing so. Firstly, the character in question, though appearing obscure in the Bishamondō MS, looks closer to *hon* than to *tō*. Secondly, the *Eizan Daishiden* version of the *fuōmon*1 is identical to the Bishamondō MS except that it *does* contain the character "*ni*" which is missing from the Bishamondō MS. As noted above, the *Eizan Daishiden* version of the *fuōmon*1 was, most likely, copied from the Bishamondō MS. The term *fu?koku* ("?" indicates the character which appears as *to* or *hon*) in the Bishamondō MS corresponds to the *fu'nihonkoku* in the *fuōmon*1 as produced in the *Eizan Daishiden*. A comparison of these two documents suggests that the obscure character appearing between *fu* ("transmit") and *koku* ("country") in the Bishamondō MS must be *hon* (because obviously it could not be *ni*).

26. (1) in the Kaiyuan period of the "country of the Great Tang" (*Datanguo/Daitōkoku*); (2) [Śubhākarasimha] transmitted the dharma-wheel to the "country of the Great Tang" and (3) Disciple Monk Shunxiao of the "Great Tang" (*Datang/Daitō*).

27. We must bear in mind that Saichō was very nationalistic. He is credited with the invention of the "national title" (*gokugo*) of Japan, *Dainihon* (The Great Nippon) (c.f., Sakamoto 1973). Therefore, the saying of the *honkoku Sō Saichō*, which means Monk Saichō of this country (China), may have been too objectionable for Saichō to have been ignored by him.

28. In either case, it seems certain to conclude that the Bishamondō MS could not be accepted as the original text left by Shunxiao. The status of this dubious MS needs reconsideration.

29. The efforts of the author of the Bishamondō MS to make it appear to be an original one could be read in the following facts. For example, the text was stamped at the top, middle and bottom; no acknowledgement was made to the effect that the document was copied from an original text.

30. Another fabricated Tendai document of similar nature provides circumstantial evidence for the spuriousness of the *fuōmon*1. A manuscript called *Dōzui Oshō fuōmon* (a dharma-transmission certificate from Master Daosui) claims to be a *fuōmon* Saichō received from his Tiantai teacher Daosui. Though also designated as "National Treasure" of Japan, this manuscript is of dubious provenance (cf., Nomoto 1991).

First of all, the existence of such a "dharma-transmission certificate" was first reported in the *Tendai Kahyō*, which was first compiled in 1771 and then expanded in 1867, both times with strong sectarian agenda. It contains not a few documents of dubious sources.

Secondly, the document contains a legend that the Chinese Tiantai founder Zhiyi, as he himself predicted before he breathed his last, was to be reborn in Japan two hundred years after his death in China.

The legend that Zhiyi was reborn as Saichō was obviously modelled on another legend that Prince Shōtoku (Shōtoku Taishi, 574-622) was the reincarnation of Huisi (Zhiyi's teacher). These legends could only have originated in Japan. Daosui, as a Chinese monk, would have had little chance of knowing it. Furthermore, this prediction concerning Saichō is not found in Chinese sources about Zhiyi, particularly the *Sui Tiantai Zhizhe dashi biezhuàn* (A Special Biography of Master Zhizhe [i.e., Zhiyi] on Mt. Tiantai of the Sui Dynasty, T2050), a biography written by Zhiyi's heir Guanding shortly after Zhiyi's death. This has made it more shaky that by the time of Daosui this prediction had been so widely accepted in China that Daosui had come to regard Saichō as the reincarnate Zhiyi and had decided to write such a "dharma-transmission certificate" for Saichō.

Given the similar nature of the two *fuhōmons* attributed to Saichō's Tiantai and Esoteric teachers, the suspiciousness of one casts doubt on the source of the other.

31. The two governors who signed these two certificate for Saichō were Lu Chun and Zhen Shenze, who respectively governed Taizhou and Mingzhou when Saichō visited the two prefectures. The two certificates are appended to the *Taishūroku* and *Esshūroku* respectively (cf., T55.2159.1058a5-11, T55.2160.1060a2-12).

32. This phrase literally reads, "one trifurcate vajra [given by] the Shingon master as the proof of the dharma-transmission".

33. The term "*injin*" does not necessarily mean a written certificate. In some cases, it refers to a certification *article(s)* instead. Another example is found in a passage from Kūkai's bibliography, in which Kūkai, after listing eight kinds of Buddhist articles and esoteric instruments, like five-treasure, *samaya vajra*, etc., makes the following remarks,

The eight articles as listed on the right were originally brought from Southern India by Acārya Vajrabodhi. He transmitted them to Acārya Daguānzhi (i.e., Bukong), who, in turn, transmitted them to Acārya Qinglong (i.e., Huiguo). Master Qinglong transmitted them to me Kū[kai]. These are the certification articles for the dharma transmission, and are what the myriad sentient beings rely on and take refuge in (T55.2161.1064c20-1065a4).

34. In a casual talk with me, Prof. Forte raised an interesting assumption, according to which Saichō had chosen not to submit to the court his *fuhōmon* (with the Bishamondō MS as its original) just in fear that a copying error therein, which implies that Japan is a part of China, might infuriate the emperor. I cannot help but admire the ingenuity with which Prof. Forte has proposed such an assumption. Were the Bishamondō MS authentic, this assumption would be, without doubt, a perfectly sound explanation for Saichō's perplexing silence on so important a document like the *fuhōmon*1. Unfortunately, as we have just shown, it is hard to accept the Bishamondō MS as genuine.

In addition to the extremely unlikelihood that Shunxiao or Saichō had made or ignored such an apparent and serious mistake in so important a document, the ways Saichō refers to Shunxiao in both the *Esshūroku* and the *Kenkairon* also argue against the assumption that Saichō had ever received from Shunxiao a document like the Bishamondō MS. Whereas the copying error in the Bishamondō MS might have deterred Saichō from presenting it to the court, such a *fuhōmon*, albeit the serious flaw, would have sufficiently convinced Saichō of Shunxiao's unusual prestige. However, this assumption inevitably contradicts the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon engi* passages mentioning Shunxiao, which demonstrate that Saichō, both shortly after returning from China and during his late years, did not regard Shunxiao as an extraordinarily prominent monk.

35. It is said that Xuanchao transmitted the Matrix-womb line of esoteric teachings to Huiguo, Kūkai's teacher (MD: 481-2). That may have been one of the reasons the Tendai monk who created this esoteric lineage for

Saichō decided to replace Xuanchao with a some Yilin.

36. See the next section of this chapter about Haiyun's Record.

37. Ushiba Shingen even goes so far as to claim that the true author of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* was the *Kōzen gokokuron* author Eisai (1141-1215) who wrote it in order to prove that Zen practices had already been incorporated in Saichō's teachings and practised by Tendai monks. Ushiba's conclusion is apparently untenable since a 927 manuscript of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* is still extant.

38. DZ5: 158. Gishin questioned if the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* was indeed written by Saichō himself. He listed the text at the end of his bibliography (Groner 1984: 251).

39. A large space of Sasaki's huge monograph, *Sange gakushoshiki shinshaku*, is devoted to discussing the authorship of the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* (pp. 46-60; 611-74).

40. Fukui 1986-87.

41. Tsuji 1944(1): 262-63; Fukui 1993.

42. For the content of the *fuhōmon2*, see my discussion in Section [D] of this chapter.

43. Cf., Section (B), chapter five.

44. Given the importance the *fuhōmon2* may have had for authenticating Saichō's esoteric tradition, here I assume that had the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* author known this document, he would have included it in his work. Therefore, the absence of the *fuhōmon2* in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* attests to the author's ignorance of this important document. This, in turns, suggests that the *fuhōmon2* had not yet appeared in Japan by the time the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* was compiled.

45. In this section we have just discussed a passage from Yakusun's *Tendai shanagō haja benshoki* (cf., p.85). According to this passage, Kōjō once made the following comment, "Our master's [text about] the miscellaneous *manala* mentions the name of Acārya Weixiang". This text was, presumably, the *Buppō kechimyaku* that Saichō mentions in his *Jō Kenkairon hyō*. As noted above, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* available to us today is proved to be written on the expansion of Saichō's *Buppō kechimyaku* either by Shinchū himself or a Tendai monk in his line. Moreover, Shinchū was apparently a senior of Kōjō. So, very likely, the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyaku* appeared after Kōjō. Therefore, the text Kōjō was talking about here was Saichō's *Buppō kechimyaku*, rather than the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*. This means that the name of Weixiang had already appeared in Saichō's *Buppō kechimyaku*, in which he was associated with Saichō's transmission of the "miscellaneous *mandala*" from China. This confirms that Saichō's miscellaneous initiation from Weixiang is more believable.

46. Misaki 1988: 177.

47. Groner 1984: 61.

48. These slight differences between the two versions of Saichō's dharma-transmission certificate (*fuhōmon*) include: firstly, in the *Eizan Daishiden* the certificate is referred to as the *Jungyō Ajari fuhōsho*, while it is indicated in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* as the *Jungyō Ajari fuhōmon*; secondly, whereas in the *Eizan*

Daishiden version Saichō is addressed as "[My] disciple the monk Saichō, who is the 'monk serving at the court chapel' and a 'Great Virtue' from Japan" (*Nihonkoku kubu daitoku deshi Sō Saichō*), Saichō was simply called "[My] disciple the monk Saichō from Japan" (*Nihonkoku deshi Sō Saichō*) in the *Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version.

49. Although the exact date of the presentation is not known, Groner suggests that it was probably submitted to coincide with the anniversary of Kammu's death (Groner 1984: 157).

50. Cf., Kiuchi 1972(a).

51. Saichō's *Esshūroku* bibliography includes four texts which, judged by their titles, are related to the "thirty-seven deities" (*sanjushichison*) (cf., T2160.55.1058b23-24, 1058c9-10).

52. Ōyama 1974. Kiuchi 1984.

53. Ōyama 1974.

54. These terms include "*chinkokudōjō daitoku*" (A "'Great Virtue' at a 'State-protecting' Temple") and "*naigubu*" (A "monk serving at the court temple"), etc. As I argued elsewhere, Saichō had never associated these terms with Shunxiao at least as late as 820 (see my relevant discussion in Section [B]).

55. On the twenty-fifth day of the third month of 805, Saichō arrived at the port of Mingzhou just to be told that their previously scheduled return trip would be delayed for about one and a half month. Saichō thus decided to visit Longxinsi and Fahuasi in Yuezhou, where Saichō had heard that a large quantity of Buddhist texts were stored (Weinstein 1974). Consequently, Saichō applied to the Mingzhou Prefect for a permit to continue his travels. The permit, which is still preserved in the *Kenkairon engi* (DZ 1: 277-78), was issued on the sixth day of the fourth month. This means that Saichō did not leave Mingzhou for Yuezhou before the sixth day of the fourth month. Considering the time Saichō spent on the trip from Mingzhou to Yuezhou, we have to admit that up to the nineteenth day of the fourth month of 805, to which the *fuhōmon2* (allegedly issued one day after the *fuhōmon1*) dated, Saichō had stayed with Shunxiao for no more than several days.

56. Enchin discusses the source of these three five-syllable dhāraṇī in his *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō* (See my relevant discussion in section [B], chapter five).

57. Though the notion of "the three ranks of attainment" (Chin., *sanping xidi*; Jpn., *sanhon shicchi*) was also mentioned in other esoteric texts (e.g., the *Darijing*), the most extensive and authoritative discussion of this notion is found in the *Suxidi jing*, which devotes a whole chapter (Chapter Sixteen) to the notion (T18.891.614a21-c13; see also the relevant passages in 603c3-7).

58. Matsunaga 1969: 147-48. The date is based on a passage in Haiyun's Record (see above), which was completed in 834.

59. See chapter five.

60. For the lateness of the *Kenkairon engi*, see my discussion at the beginning of this section.

61. See Section (B), chapter five.

THE CONCLUSIONS OF PART ONE

In this part we have seen how Saichō's immediate and second generation disciples had repeatedly re-interpreted Saichō's esoteric traditions. By the time of Ennin, Saichō's esoteric tradition had been interpreted as not merely belonging to a dual, but to a triple, esoteric transmission. In this respect, the appearance of the *fuhōmon2* is remarkable since it represents the first step in promulgating this position.

Thanks to the sustained efforts made by Saichō's students like Enchō, Kōjō, Shinchū, and his second generation disciples (with Ennin as their brilliant representative), by the middle of the ninth century Saichō's esoteric tradition had been gradually established. By this time the Esoteric Buddhism had assumed such importance in the Tendai school that some of its leaders, like Enchin and Annen, were ready to claim openly that the esoteric aspect of their school embodied a higher form of Buddhism than did its exoteric side, i.e., the traditional doctrines of Chinese Tiantai.

However, the attack on the orthodoxy of Saichō's Esoteric Buddhism never ceased. Shingon monks never stopped pressing their Tendai rivals for the scriptural support of the esoteric transmission of Saichō as represented in Tendai sources, the most basic of which was, needless to say, Saichō's "dharma-transmission certificates" like the *fuhōmon1* and *fuhōmon2*. As shown in section (D) of chapter three, the core of the initiation Saichō received from Shunxiao was gradually fixed on the threefold correlation between the three five-syllabled dhāraṇīs and the three ranks of attainment. Despite the enormous help the Tendai monks could have drawn from the *fuhōmon2*, they may have been always embarrassed that the threefold correlation stipulated in the

"dharma-transmission certificate" had no scriptural support. It is exactly the urgent need of supporting the threefold correlation (i.e., the core of the initiation Saichō is said to have received from Shunxiao) that had directly prompted the forgery of a *siddhi* text (i.e., T907), which was to be used as the scriptural support for the esoteric transmission which, according to the *fuhōmon2*, Saichō received from Shunxiao.

As I will show in part two, one primary source for the composition of T907 is the *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō* by Enchin. It is also noted that Enchin wrote this treatise for clarifying the scriptural source for the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs and the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation. At the beginning of this treatise, Enchin cited the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation as recorded in Saichō's "dharma-transmission certificate" (i.e., the *fuhōmon2*). After that, Enchin quoted a number of sources related to the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs, especially the five-syllable dhāraṇī, A-Vam-Ram-Ham-Kham, which is assigned in the *fuhōmon2* to the higher rank of attainment. In the *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō*, Enchin made the following statement concerning the authenticity of the Tendai esoteric teachings as crystallized in the five-syllable dhāraṇī,

This fact is recorded in the "official certificate" (*kanchō*) [which authorized the conferment of the title of] Acārya in the thirteenth year of the Jōgan period (872). Those who, out of their ignorance, slander my master will be guilty of a crime punishable by death. Driven by a deep pity on them, I hereby offer the irrefutable evidence [for the authenticity of the teachings related to the three dhāraṇīs]. I hope my purpose [of writing this treatise] can be understood by those who have a sense of shame (BZ27.986a3-5).

This statement suggests that at the time Enchin wrote this treatise Saichō was accused of having transmitted some esoteric teachings which lacked scriptural support, although according to the two *fuhōmons* attributed to Shunxiao, Saichō had received these teachings in person from a prestigious

teacher. As Enchin himself confessed, the incentive which had prompted him to write this treatise was precisely to convince those who slandered Saichō that Saichō's esoteric transmission is of canonical support.

In another treatise (the *Kyōji ryōbu hiyōgi*) which is closely connected with the *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō*, Enchin also made efforts to justify the Taimitsu lineage as depicted in Saichō's *fuhōmon*,

Śubhākarasimha from India transmitted it, Master Yilin in China gave it, Dharmamaster Shunxiao taught it to [Master] Eizan (i.e., Saichō). Thus, although the three countries (India, China and Japan) are geographically separated, the essence of the "One-vehicle" is nonetheless communicable. The sutras and teachings, transmitted from masters to disciples, become illustrious. [The transmission of teachings] is clearly recorded in the official certificates. But there are some persons who insist that these syllables, not found in the *Kongōchō gyō*, do not have scriptural support. They are exactly like those who, regarding themselves as infallible while always blaming others, end up by incurring losses to themselves. Why? The two sutras do contain some paragraphs which unambiguously [support the authenticity of these dhāraṇīs]. Unable to reach the truth, one has no right to blame others (BZ28.1087b3-8).

The lineage under discussion here is precisely identical with that as described in the *fuhōmon1*.

It is clear that the legitimacy of this Taimitsu lineage, along with the esoteric teachings of the three dhāraṇīs and the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation (both contained in the *fuhōmon2*), had been seriously attacked by some Japanese Buddhists. The main attackers were, I believe, Shingon monks. They doubted the existence of any scriptural support for the esoteric teachings contained in the *fuhōmon2*. Like the *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō*, this treatise was also written by Enchin for establishing the scriptural sources for Saichō's esoteric teachings and lineage. By doing that, Enchin hoped that he could succeed in justifying the legitimacy of his patriarch's esoteric tradition.

Likewise, Annen, in announcing his "discovery" of T907 and quoting from the text, was obviously concerned with the same issue about the scriptural source for Saichō's esoteric lineage and doctrines,

In addition, during Konpon Daishi from Mt. Hiei (i.e., Saichō) stayed in the Tang China, Acārya Jungyō/Shunxiao transmitted to him the procedure of "three kinds of attainment", the seal and document of which are preserved in the *Kenkairon engi*. [The "dharma-transmission certificate] says, Am-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham (the higher rank of attainment), A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham (the middle rank of attainment), A-Ra-Ba-Sa-Na (the lower rank of attainment). The *mūdra* for the cultivation [of the procedure] is not included [in the certificate however].

Acārya Chin (i.e., Enchin) said, "The great Master transmitted [the procedure of "three kinds of attainment"] to Kōchi, who transmitted it to Tokuen; Tokuen transmitted it to [me,] Enchin." Enchin transmitted it to the Great Acārya, i.e., the Gonsōjō (i.e., Henjō), who often doubted the existence of the methods [for securing the "three ranks of attainments"]. **Recently, I discovered a copy of the text called *Sonshō hajigokuhō* (=T907) containing the three groups of dhāraṇīs for the three kinds of attainment, which are close to those taught by Acārya Shunxiao (T2390.75.98b; my emphasis; cf., my relevant discussion in chapter five).**

This clearly demonstrates that it is the same concern (i.e., to legitimate the orthodoxy of Saichō's esoteric tradition) that had stimulated Annen to compose T907.

Therefore, the text on the basis of which T907 was written (very likely, by Annen) as well as the occasion on which Annen declared his "discovery" of T907 were both closely connected with the issues of whether Saichō's esoteric teachings and lineage were canonically founded. Consequently, we have reason to believe that the forgery of T907 was attempted and accomplished in a context in which the Tendai monks were pre-occupied with defending Saichō's esoteric tradition which they had repeatedly redefined and developed as it was severely criticized by Japanese monks affiliated with Shingon and other sects.

In a word, our final conclusion is that the efforts of Saichō's followers to legitimate his

esoteric tradition culminated in the composition of T907, which was prepared as a scriptural support for the esoteric teachings and lineages contained in a series of documents, with the *fuhōmon*² as the latest and most important one. These documents were either deliberately forged by Saichō's followers or formed by altering some texts originally left by Saichō himself.

PART TWO

**CHINESE OR JAPANESE: THE PROVENANCE AND
DATES OF THREE *SIDDHI* TEXTS ATTRIBUTED
TO ŚUBHĀKARASIMHA (T#905, T#906 AND T#907)**

CHAPTER FOUR

THE THREE *SIDDHI* TEXTS: A GENERAL SURVEY

The *Taishō Tripiṭaka* contains three texts (T#905-7) which, said to be translated by Śubhākarasimha¹, bear similar titles:

(1) T905.18.909b-912b: "Sanzhongxidi podiyu zhuanyezhang chusanjie mimi tuoluoni fa" (Jpn., "Sanshushicchi hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani hō"; The Esoteric dhāraṇīs Related to the Three Kinds of Attainment [Which Lead to] Destroying Hell, Transforming the Karma and Transcending the Three-realms"; hereafter T905);

(2) T906.18.912b-914c: "Foding zunshengxin podiyu zhuanyezhang chusanjie mimi sanshenfoguo sanzhongxidi zhenyan yigui" (Jpn., "Bucchō sonshoshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu sanjim bukka sanshushicchi shingon giki"; The Manual of Dhāraṇīs Related to the Three Ranks of Attainment [Which, Belonging to] the Supreme Heart of the *Tathāgata-uṣṇīṣa*, [Lead to] Destroying Hell, Transforming the Karma and Transcending the Three-realms"; hereafter T906);

(3) T907.18.914c-915c: "Foding zunshengxin podiyu zhuanyezhang chusanjie mimi tuoluoni" (Jpn., "Bucchō sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani"; The Esoteric Dhāraṇīs [Which, Belonging to] the *Tathāgata-uṣṇīṣa*'s Supreme Heart, [Lead to] Destroying Hell, Transforming the Karma and Transcending the Three Realms"; hereafter T907).

As suggested by their titles, these three texts (hereafter referred to as the "three *siddhi* texts" for all of them talk about the esoteric notion of *siddhi* [Chin., *xidi*; Jpn., *shicchi*; "perfection" or "attainment"]) are interrelated with each other. In fact, T907 is wholly reproduced in both T905 and T906. As for content, the three *siddhi* texts have also much in common.

T907 begins with a detailed description of the various worldly benefits and efficacy which the author believes the five Sanskrit syllables (A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham), if recited appropriately,

will produce. Then, the five syllables are correlated with "five viscera", five kinds of natural and social phenomena, five buddhas in the five directions, five sections associated with the five elements (earth, water, fire, wind, and space). Subsequently, T907 classifies the Esoteric category *siddhi* ("attainment") into three ranks (lower, middle and higher) before correlating the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇī (A-Ra-Ba-Ca-Na; A-Vi-Ra-Ha-Kha; A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham) with the three kinds of attainment (that of "emerging", that of "entering" and that of "mystery") respectively. Finally, T907 ends with a twenty-two line *gāthā*.

A major part of T905 consists in correlating further Buddhist and Esoteric fivefold categories, among which is the five Sanskrit syllables, with a number of Chinese indigenous fivefold categories that have been grouped together through the *wuxing* pattern in the Chinese traditional thought.

T906, except for the parts which can also be found in T907, has the idea of *podiyu/hajigoku* (i.e., "destroying the hell") as its key theme.

These three *siddhi* texts have been taken as fundamental scriptures for the Japanese Tendai Buddhism, since they represent the only textual source for Esoteric teachings contained in a "dharma-transmission" (*fuhōmon*) that was allegedly written for Saichō by his Chinese Esoteric master Shunxiao. As we know, the core of this *fuhomōn* resides in the unusual practice of correlating the three ranks of *siddhi* with the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs; and it is precisely this threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation that forms the central theme for all of our three *siddhi* texts.

Because no text except for these three *siddhi* texts talks about the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation, it appears that, in transmitting the Esoteric teachings to Saichō, Shunxiao

would have had to base himself on these three *siddhi* texts. This is the conventional opinion held by most Japanese scholars with regard to the textual source for the Esoteric dharma-transmission conducted between Shunxiao and Saichō. But some scholars have also noted that the *Esshūroku* and *Taishūroku*, Saichō's two bibliographies of the works he brought back from China, do not mention any works on the themes of "destroying hell" (*hajigoku*) or "three kinds of attainment" (*sanshushicchi*)². This fact per se suggests that the content of Saichō's Esoteric initiation would not have been based on the three *siddhi* texts or any one of them. Otherwise, Saichō would have managed to get a copy of such a text that is of particular importance for the main esoteric initiation he received from China; and he would not have failed to record the text in his bibliographies.

Now that Shunxiao, in initiating Saichō into his Esoteric tradition, was very unlikely to have based himself on any of the three *siddhi* texts, some Japanese scholars point to another text as the textual source for the contents of Saichō's initiation. This text is entitled, "Qingjing fashen Biluzhe'na xindi famen chengjiu yiqie tuoluoni sanzongxidi" (Jpn., "Shōjō hosshin Birushana shinji hōmon jōju issai darani sanshushicchi"; The [Sutra on] the Three Kinds of Attainment [Representing] All the Dhāraṇīs, [Which Are] Attained through the Teachings of the "Mind-ground" [Related to] Vairocana[-buddha] with Pure Dharma-body; T899.18.776c-781c; hereafter T899)³. This text is noteworthy for being one of the only two (the other being T905) already known esoteric texts said to have been translated in Chinese, whose titles include the term *sanzhongxidi/sanshu shicchi*. Furthermore, in contrast to the absence of the three *siddhi* texts in the bibliographies of works brought back by Saichō and other *nittō hakke*⁴ authors, T899 is recorded in the bibliography compiled by Jōgyō (d. 866), one of the *nittō hakke* authors. Tajima

Tokunon (BKD 9: 148), for example, argues that it is T899, rather than any of the three *siddhi* texts, which was used when Shunxiao initiated Saichō into his Esoteric lineage.

Unfortunately, this view incurs some difficulties too. T899, though mainly devoted to the theme of "threefold attainment" (*sanzhongxidi/sanshushicchi*), says nothing of the three groups of the five-syllable dhāraṇīs, let alone the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation. Nasu Seiryū has presented other evidence highlighting the difficulties of believing T899's tenable connection with Saichō's initiation (Nasu 1973). While a number of elements as represented by T905 and the other two related texts had been included in the initiatory ceremony, Nasu points out, none of these elements, except for the threefold classification of *siddhi*, is contained in T899.

The difficulties that accompany these hypotheses about the scriptural source for Saichō's Esoteric initiation underscore that we fall short of appropriately understanding the true provenance, nature and historical transmission of the three *siddhi* texts. Much more research is needed before we reach a more reliable understanding of these problems surrounding the three *siddhi* texts.

First of all, since Japanese scholars have done a lot of work on the three *siddhi* texts, a review of the relevant Japanese work is not only necessary but helpful.

Given their importance for the entire Tendai tradition, the three *siddhi* texts have attracted a great deal of scholarly attention and been subjected to extensive critical examinations. A number of Japanese scholars, including Ōmura Seigai (1918), Nasu Zenryū (1954), Kanbayashi Ryūjō (1931), Yoshioka Yoshitoyo (1964), Ōsabe Kazuō (1971), Matsunaga Yuken (1929), Matsunaga Yukei (1976), Misaki Ryōshū (1988), Kiuchi Hiroshi (1987), and finally Mizukami Fumiyo (1986), have made important contributions to our understanding of these three *siddhi* texts. Not

only have Japanese scholars demonstrated sustained interest in the three *siddhi* texts, their relevant studies are also multi-faceted, covering those problems regarding the provenance of the three *siddhi* texts, their inter-relationship, their relationship with Saichō's *fuhōmon*, their connections with the two genres of Esoteric texts (i.e., *podīyu/hajigoku* and *foding/bussho*), their assimilation of indigenous Chinese concepts like *wuxing* theory, Taoist ideas, especially those on the "art of life-cultivation" (Chin., *yangsheng*; Jpn., *yōjō*), etc.

The fundamental issue facing a scholar interested in the three *siddhi* texts is, of course, regarding their real provenance. Though the three *siddhi* texts have been conventionally taken as translated by Śubhākarasimha, all the Japanese scholars working on them reject this conventional authorship-attribution. Their consensus on this problem is mainly based on the following three considerations.

Firstly, since his arrival in China in 716 Śubhākarasimha had immediately attracted patronage from Emperor Xuanzong. Almost all of his translations, being officially sponsored, were recorded in two major Chinese Buddhist bibliographies compiled in the middle and later Tang periods⁵. These three *siddhi* texts do not appear in either of these two bibliographies, which casts doubt on the traditional view that associates them with the renowned Tantric master.

Secondly, the three *siddhi* texts appear too Chinese in style to have had a corresponding Sanskrit texts. What is particularly remarkable is the appearance of such peculiarly indigenous Chinese ideas as *wuzang* (Jpn., *gozō*; "five viscera") in the three *siddhi* texts.

According to the indigenous Chinese thought (especially the Taoist-coloured medical sciences), the "five viscera" (*wuzang*) inside the human body serve as the main internal organs for "storing" (*zang/zō*) the vital energies essential to the human existence. In all of the three *siddhi*

texts, the five Sanskrit syllables A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham are viewed as dominated (Chin., *zhu*; Jpn., *shū*) by the "five viscera", a purely indigenous Chinese fivefold category. T905, in particular, formulates an elaborate correlation between several other generally Buddhist and particularly Buddhist Esoteric fivefold categories with fivefold categories which are incontrovertibly Chinese in origin. These originally Chinese categories include the *wuxing* (the "five-phases": metal, wood, water, fire, earth), the *wuwe* (the "five-tastes": sweet, sour, bitter, pungent and salty), the *wuji* (the "five-seasons": the four seasons plus a fifth called *jixia*, "middle summer") and *wuqi* (the "five qis": *hun, po, zhi, shen, yi*)⁶. These fivefold categories have been so closely correlated with one another in the distinctively Chinese *wuxing* scheme that their appearance in a text would immediately disapprove its claim of Indian origin.

Thirdly, the three *siddhi* texts are too synthetic in content and therefore too late in time to have been translated by Śubhākarasimha, who apparently had no knowledge of some synthetical ideas contained in them. The three *siddhi* texts, for instance, define the *wubu* (Jpn., *gobu*; the "five-sections of a Diamond-realm mandala") as (i) *vajra*-, (ii) *lotus*-, (iii) *karma*-, (iv) *treasure*-, and (v) *emptiness*-sections. This kind of *wubu/gobu*⁷ classification is akin to the five-section notion that became prevalent with the further development of some new-style esoteric teachings which have been generally called the Diamond-realm (Chin., *jingangjie*; Jpn., *Kongōkai*; Skt., *vajradhatu*) line of Esoteric Buddhism. Some initial forms of this Esoteric Buddhist tradition had already been introduced to Tang China by Vajrabodhi. However, it is until the time of Bukong that it began to get its full-fledged form⁸; and Bukong did not independently carry out his religious activities until several decades after the death of Śubhākarasimha. Consequently, it seems anachronistic to connect Śubhākarasimha with any complete and mature version of five-section

idea. This makes it hard to credit Śubhākarasimha with the translation of the three *siddhi* texts in which the five-section idea looms so large.

In the same vein, the concept of the "five-buddhas" as found in the three *siddhi* texts also renders problematic the ascription of the three *siddhi* texts to Śubhākarasimha. In all the known esoteric texts translated by Śubhākarasimha, the "five buddhas" are generally listed as Vairocana, Ratnaketu, Sarendraraja, Dundubhi-ghośa and Amitābha. It is only with the rise of Bukong's new-style Esoteric Buddhism that the five-buddhas were re-defined as Vairocana, Aksobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi (or Śākyamuni). The notion of five-buddhas in the three *siddhi* texts (i.e., Vairocana, Aksobhya, Amitābha, Ratnasambhava, Amoghasiddhi) is identical with this re-definition advanced in the Diamond-realm tradition. More surprisingly, T905 makes an effort to harmonize the two kinds of "five-buddhas" ideas by identifying three buddhas in the "five-buddhas" notion proposed in Śubhākarasimha's translations (i.e., Ratnaketu, Sarendraraja and Dundubhighośa) with the three ones in Bukong's redefined notion of the five-buddhas (i.e., Aksobhya, Ratnasambhava and Śākyamuni [=Amoghasiddhi]). In short, the "five-buddhas" notion as manifested in the three *siddhi* texts demonstrates that they were composed with, if not after, the formal establishment of the Diamond-realm line of Esoteric Buddhism in China, which happened after the death of Śubhākarasimha.

Furthermore, T905 tries to defend the oneness of Vairocana-buddha's two aspects which are known as (i) the "dharmakaya-as-the-principle" (Chin., *lifashen*; Jpn., *Rihosshin*) and (ii) "dharmakaya-as-the-wisdom" (Chin., *zhifashen*; Jpn., *chihosshin*)⁹ respectively. Such a synthetic effort is hard to imagine before the rise of Diamond-realm line of Esoteric Buddhism, which identified itself with one of the two aspects of Vairocana-buddha--wisdom, while

associating the Matrix-realm Esoteric Buddhism introduced by Śubhākarasimha with the other aspect of Vairocana-buddha, i.e., principle.

For all these factors, Japanese scholars reject the conventional view that the three *siddhi* texts were translated by Śubhākarasimha. Instead, the strong indigenous Chinese colour of the three *siddhi* texts convinces Japanese scholars of their Chinese origin.

The consensus among Japanese scholars, however, does not go beyond this point. They disagree not only on the date of the three *siddhi* texts but also on their inter-relationship.

Ōmura, the first modern Japanese scholar questioning the Indian origin of the three *siddhi* texts, takes them as products of the Middle Tang Dynasty¹⁰. Matsunaga Yuken with whom Nasu agrees, tries to date the three *siddhi* texts at the time of Huiguo (746-806), Kūkai's Chinese master. He argues that some learned priest at the time of Huiguo might have been responsible for the composition of these three *siddhi* texts¹¹. Ōsabe, disagreeing with Ōmura, contends that the three *siddhi* texts were written in the late period of Tang Dynasty¹². Matsunaga Yukei, on the other hand, takes it most likely that the three *siddhi* texts were composed between 805 and 830 AD. Matsunaga Yukei arrives at this dating by the following two considerations. First, it is unlikely that the three *siddhi* texts appeared in China prior to the beginning of the ninth century¹³. Second, the idea of "three kinds of attainment", appearing so prominent in the three *siddhi* texts, was first introduced in the *Susidhikāra Sūtra* which, though already translated by Śubhākarasimha, until 830s¹⁴ did not begin to achieve the same importance as that long attached to the *Darījīng/Dainichi kyō* and the *Jingangding jīng/Kongōchō gyō*.

Besides the dates of the three *siddhi* texts, their inter-relationship also becomes a central point about which Japanese scholars working on the three texts have debated for long. It is widely

accepted by Japanese scholars that T906, along with T905 which is a different version of T906, is enlarged on the basis of T907 (see, for example, Ōsabe 1982: 124). Despite this commonly agreed "congeniality" of the three texts, Japanese scholars, in figuring out the sequence in which the three *siddhi* texts were made, contradict each other. Kanbayashi, for instance, maintains that T907 is the basic text, which is the earliest in composition and on the basis of which were composed T905 and T906. Furthermore, T905, in comparison with T906, was later in composition, in the opinion of Kanbayashi, for "its more apparent Chinese tone" and "its more undisguised manner of courting the ruling classes"¹⁵. Ōsabe, however, believes that T906 was later than T905 as well as T907¹⁶.

In conclusion, most of Japanese scholars working on the three *siddhi* texts believe that the three texts, of which T907 is the basic text for the other two, were written in China sometime in the middle or late period of the Tang Dynasty (766-906).

Although Japanese scholars made important observations, I am afraid that they may have been misled by some misguided assumptions, which have, unfortunately, prevented them from investigating the provenance of the three *siddhi* texts in a less prejudiced way.

Firstly, Japanese scholars seem to have been misled by the tacit assumption that all Chinese texts were composed in China. Generally, it is well known that the Chinese language used to be an "international language" (*lingua franca*) which remained for several centuries as an official language in a number of East-Asian countries. Yet, in dealing with a specific Chinese text, scholars tend to forget and/or ignore this simple fact.

Another tacit, but likewise unfounded, assumption misleading Japanese scholars is that a text strongly coloured by some ideas undoubtedly originating from China was necessarily written

in China. Indeed, the *wuxing* idea, among others, originally grew from the indigenous Chinese soil. Nonetheless, some indigenous Chinese ideas like *wuxing* had also been well accepted and practised in other East Asian (including Korean and Japanese) societies. Consequently, the incorporation of some indigenous Chinese ideas (with the *wuxing* as the example *par excellence*) into a text *does not* necessarily mean that it was composed in China. The failure to realize this apparently simple fact has prevented Japanese scholars from considering the possibility that these three *siddhi* texts might have been composed somewhere in East Asia but aside of China.

In our opinion, the Japanese origin of the three *siddhi* text is not only probable, it is also supported by a lot of textual evidence. Before formally examining the Japanese origin of the three texts, it seems proper to prove one assumption that will form a departure point for our reexamination of the three *siddhi* texts. This assumption is about the primacy of T907 over T905 and T906; *viz.*, out of the three *siddhi* texts T907 is the oldest one which was wholly reproduced in T905 and T906. The remaining part of this introductory chapter will be therefore devoted to this problem.

As noted above, almost all Japanese scholars working on the three *siddhi* texts have accepted the primacy of T907 over its two affiliated texts, though none of them has ever put forward any persuasive argument for it¹⁷.

The strategy I will employ for deciding T907's primacy over T905 and T906 is to compare the five *gāthas* that appear in the three *siddhi* texts, in order to ascertain whether the four *gāthas* in T905 and T906 originated from the single *gātha* in T907¹⁸.

Let us start with comparing the two *gāthas* in T905 with the single *gātha* in T907 (hereafter referred to as G907). It is in G907 that the whole text of T907 ends. G907, composed of 22 lines,

turns out to be the longest of the five *gāthas* we are going to examine. The whole *gātha* runs as follows,

- (1) Prostrate myself before Vairocana-buddha
- (2) whose pure eyes open like the lotus flowers.
- (3) Controlling the "three realms", he is the teacher for the human and the celestial beings as well.
- (4) With great enlightened mind he is the saviour of this world.
- (5) The profound and wonderful dhāraṇīs [constituting] the empowering methods
- (6) flow into the "gate of syllable A" [representing] the non-production.
- (7) The white curl which is formless possesses the true and universal wisdom,
- (8) perfect and permanent like the sun and the moon.
- (9) Akṣobhya and Ratnasambhava, as the saviour of the world,
- (10) Amitābha, Amoghasiddhiraja,
- (11) all residing in the propitious wheel of attainment,
- (12) transmit this wonderful dharma and proselytise all the sentient beings.
- (13) The compassionate and self-existent Trailokya-vijaya-rajā¹⁹
- (14) and the Vajrasattva Āryacalanātha,
- (15) never breaking their vows, always come [to rescue the sentient beings] on time.
- (16) After accomplishing the *vajra*-like feats, they return to the *vajra*-fields.
- (17) I, relying on Vairocana-buddha,
- (18) open the "wisdom-*mūdra*" of the mind and set up the goal.
- (19) Universally embellished by the countless merits,
- (20) [let us] enter together into the dhāraṇīs [leading to] all the Sugatas.
- (21) May those who have the opportunities to study and cultivate together [these Esoteric teachings]
- (22) peacefully dwell in the supreme, pure sea! (T907.18.915c1-11)

G907 sounds like a standard *gātha* which is used to consummate a sutra: in its first part (lines 1-12) the merits of the five-buddhas²⁰ are praised (of these twelve lines eight [lines 1-8] are devoted to Vairocana-buddha and the remaining four to the four other buddhas); then, in the second part (lines 13-16) the two *rajās*, Trailokya-vijaya-rajā and Āryacalanātha, are lauded; finally, in the third part (lines 17-22) the author pronounces his vow that he would follow Mahāvairocana-buddha until he succeeds in getting his own mind enlightened and being reborn in the pure-land; in the same part the wish is also made that all practitioners would peacefully reside in the

paramount "Sea of Purity". So, G907 reads like a very self-consistent *gāthā* from beginning to end.

Now, let us turn to the two *gāthas* in T905 and see how they are related to G907. In T905, the first *gāthā* (hereafter G905/1) is found near the beginning of the text (T905.18.909b26-c6):

- [(1)]Prostrate myself before Vairocana-buddha
 [(2)]whose pure eyes open like the lotus flowers.
 [(3)]Controlling the "three realms", he is the teacher for the human and the celestial beings as well.
 [(4)]With great enlightened mind he is the saviour of this world.
 [(5)]The profound and wonderful dhāraṇīs [constituting] the empowering methods
 [(6)]flow into the "gate of syllable A" [representing] the non-production.
 [(7)]The white curl which is formless possesses the true and universal wisdom,
 [(8)]perfect and permanent like the sun and the moon.
 [(9)]**The body, mouth, and mind constitute the three mysteries**
 [(10)]**which form the transformation-body;**
 [(11)]**Five wheels and five kinds of wisdom are of five parts**
 [(12)]**which completely cover the wheel of dharma-field.**
 [(13)](9)Akṣobhya and Ratnasambhava, as the saviour of the world,
 [(14)](10)Amitābha, Amoghasiddhi-rajā,
 [(15)](11)all residing in the propitious wheel of attainment,
 [(16)](12)transmit this wonderful dharma and proselytise all the sentient beings.
 [(17)](13)The compassionate and self-existent Trailokya-vijaya-rajā
 [(18)](14)and the Vajrasattva Āryaacalanātha,
 [(19)](15)never breaking their vows, always come [to rescue the sentient beings] on time.
 [(20)](16)After accomplishing the *vajra*-like feats, they return to the *vajra*-fields. (The numbers in the square and round brackets indicate the numerical orders of the lines in G905/1 and G907 respectively)

Even a cursory comparison of G905/1 with G907 is sufficient to reveal that all the lines of G905/1, except for lines 9-12²¹, are identical with lines 1-16 of G907 (T907.18.915c1-8).

The second *gāthā* in T905 (hereafter G905/2), which was appended to the text proper (T905.18.912a28-b1), is comparatively short. It is composed of merely six lines, which are precisely identical with lines 17-22 (T907.18.915c9-11) of G907:

- [1](17)I, relying on Vairocana-buddha,

[2](18) open the "wisdom-*mūdra*" of the mind and set up the goal.

[3](19) Universally embellished by the countless merits,

[4](20) [let us] enter together into the *dhāraṇīs* [leading to] all the *sugatas*.

[5](21) May those who have the opportunities to study and cultivate together [these Esoteric teachings]

[6](22) peacefully dwell in the supreme, pure sea! (The numbers in the square and round brackets indicate the numerical orders of the lines in G905/2 and G907 respectively)

In summary, with regard to the relationship between the two *gāthas* in T905 and the *gāthā* in T907, the following conclusion can be made: of the lines of which the two *gāthas* in T905 are composed, all, except for four lines in G905/1, are exactly identical with the lines of G907.

With the close affinities between G905/1, G905/2 and G907 explained, let us look at the ways they work in their corresponding contexts. As stated above, G907 is very consistent by itself. Such a consistency is, however, missing in the two *gāthas* in T905.

Let us turn to G905/1 first. As I have already pointed out, G905/1 is composed of three groups of lines: between the two groups (both being of eight lines), which are found at the beginning and end of G905/1 respectively, is a third group (of four lines) taken from an esoteric tract attributed to Śubhākarasimha (T1141). The two groups of eight lines (i.e., lines 1-8 [devoted to Mahāvairocana-buddha] and lines 13-20 [talking about the four Buddhas plus two *rajās*]) are connected with each other very well (Mahāvairocana-buddha plus the other four buddhas form the famous "five buddhas", while the two *rajās* are usually represented as two companions of the five buddhas, especially Vairocana). Yet these two groups of lines do not appear directly related to the third group of four lines which is concerned with the "three mysteries" and "five wheels". So, in G905/1, two thematically related parts are separated by a third one which is without relevance to either of the former two. It is very unlikely that an author, while having written two groups of lines thematically associated with each other so well, had also written in between them a third

group of lines which are related to neither of them in meaning. Thus, the whole of G905/1 was very unlikely composed by one and the same author. Rather, this *gāṭha* may have been constructed through the following process: first, the two groups of eight lines were moved from a second source to T905; then, the T905 author, falling short of understanding the connection between the two groups of lines, inserted between them four lines totally irrelevant to either of them²². Since G907 reads so consistently, I suspect that T907 must be taken as the original text from which the T905 author had taken the two groups of lines. This would suggest that the other parts of T905 that parallel T907 were also taken from T907, thence T907's primacy over T905.

I have argued for the primacy of T907 over T905 through comparing G907 with the two *gāṭhas* in T905. By the same strategy, the same conclusion can be reached concerning the relationship between G907 and the two *gāṭhas* in T906, as well as that between T907 and T906.

First of all, let us examine how the two *gāṭhas* in T906 are connected with the sole *gāṭha* in T907 (i.e., G907). The reader can not help but notice the close connection between G907 and the two *gāṭhas* in T906. In T906, the first *gāṭha* (hereafter G906/1) appears in the middle of the text (T906.18.913c4-6), while the second (hereafter G906/2) is attached to the text (T906.18.914b12-19). In contrast with T905 in which a longer *gāṭha* (G905/1) is followed by a shorter one (G905/2), T906 contains two *gāṭhas* the longer of which (i.e., G906/2) is preceded by the shorter one (i.e., G906/1). G906/1 is only composed of six lines:

- [(1)]Prostrate myself before Vairocana-buddha
- [(2)]whose pure eyes open like the lotus flowers.
- [(3)]Controlling the "three realms", he is the teacher for the human and the celestial beings as well.
- [(4)]With great enlightened mind he is the saviour of this world.
- [(5)]The profound and wonderful dhāraṇīs [constituting] the empowering methods
- [(6)]flow into the "gate of syllable A" [representing] the non-production (T906.18.913c4-

6).

G906/2 is relatively lengthy, composed of sixteen lines,

- [1](7)The white curl which is formless possesses the true and universal wisdom,
 [2](8)perfect and permanent like the sun and the moon.
 [3](9)Akṣobhya and Ratnasambhava, as the saviour of the world,
 [4](10)Amitābha, Amoghasiddhirajā,
 [5](11)all residing in the propitious wheel of attainment,
 [6](12)transmit this wonderful dharma and proselytise all the sentient beings.
 [7](13)The compassionate and self-existent Trailokya-vijaya-rajā
 [8](14)and the Vajrasattva Āryaacalanātha,
 [9](15)never breaking their vows, always come on time [to rescue the sentient beings].
 [10](16)After accomplishing the *vajra*-like feats, they return to the *vajra*-fields.
 [11](17)I, relying on Vairocana-buddha,
 [12](18)open the "wisdom-*mūdra*" of the mind and set up the goal.
 [13](19)Universally embellished by the countless merits,
 [14](20)[let us] enter together into the dhāraṇīs [leading to] all the Sugatas.
 [15](21)May those who have the opportunities to study and cultivate together [these
 Esoteric teachings]
 [16](22)peacefully dwell in the supreme, pure sea! (T906.18.915c4-11) (The numbers in
 the square and round brackets indicate the numerical orders of the lines in G906/2 and
 G907 respectively)

The six component lines of G906/1 parallel the six ones at the beginning of G907 (T907.18.915c1-3). As for G906/2, its sixteen component lines are identical with lines 7-22 of G907 (915c4-11). In other words, of the 22 lines of G907, the six lines at its beginning (lines 1-6) and its remaining 16 lines (lines 7-22) are precisely the same lines respectively forming the two *gāthas* in T906.

Through comparing the two *gāthas* in T906 with G907, we are also able to establish the primacy of G907 over the two *gāthas* in T906. I pointed out above that the six and 16 lines, which constitute G906/1 and G906/2 respectively, correspond with G907's lines 1-6 and lines 7-22. In G907, lines 1-8 and lines 9-16 are devoted to (i) Vairocana-buddha and the (ii) other four of the five-buddhas plus two *rajās* serving the five buddhas. Therefore, in G907 lines 1-8 form an

inseparable whole, which is devoted to Vairocana-buddha. G906/1 is composed of the first six lines in G907. G906/2 begins with the two lines²³ in praise of several remarkable features attributed to Vairocana-buddha. These two lines should have originally followed the six lines in G906/1, all of which are dedicated to Vairocana-buddha. So, the two *gāthas* in T906 could not have been originally written as separate parts of T906, but was formed by *wrongly* breaking one originally consistent *gātha* (i.e., G907) into two. This means that the two *gāthas* in T906, like other parts in the same text which find their parallels in T907, were borrowed from T907, which served as the basic text for T906 and T905 as well. It would also mean that T906 could not have been based directly on T905.

Notes,

1. Cf., T905.18. 909b16; T906.18.912b11; T907.18.914c25.
2. For the two Buddhist bibliographies attributed to Saichō, see chapter two.
3. T899 is also known for its three alternate titles, (i) "Biluzhe'na biexing jing" (Jpn., "Birushana betsyūgyō kyō"; The Sutra Transmitted through Special Lines [from] Vairocana[-buddha]), (ii) "Da Biluzhe'na sanzongxidi fa" (Jpn., Dai Birushana sanshushicchi hō"; The Procedures of the Three Kinds of *Siddhis* [Preached by] Māhavairocana[-buddha]) and (iii) "Qingjing Biluzhe'na sanzongxidi fa" (Jpn., "Shōjō Birushana sanshushicchi hō"; The Procedures of the Three Kinds of Attainments [Preached by] Pure Vairocana[-buddha]).
4. The *nittō hakke* refers to the eight Japanese Esoteric monks who went to study in Tang China (cf., note < 64 > in chapter five).
5. They are (i) the *Kaiyuan shijiaolu* (The Buddhist Bibliography [Compiled] in the Kaiyuan Period) completed in 730 by Zhisheng and (ii) the *Zhenyuan shijiao lu* (The Buddhist Bibliography [Compiled] in the Zhenyuan Period") in 799 by Yuanzhao.
6. For the "Chinese" traits of these fivefold categories and how they have been correlated with each other in the traditional Chinese thought, see Needham 1985.
7. In the Diamond-realm Esoteric Buddhism a mandala is conceived in terms of the following five sections: (i) *vajra*-, (ii) lotus-, (iii) buddha-, (iv) karma-, and (v) treasure-section.
8. It seems reasonable to believe that the notion of "five-sections" in the Diamond-realm Esoteric Buddhism was in fact based on, and therefore temporally posterior to, the notion of "three sections" as propounded in the esoteric teachings brought to China by Śubhākarasimha, which was referred to as the Womb-realm line of Esoteric Buddhism in contrast to the Diamond-realm line.
9. For how the East-Asian Esoteric Buddhism understood the inter-relationship between the two aspects of Māhavairocana-buddha indicated by "principle" and "wisdom", see Matsunaga Yukei: 1977.
10. Ōmura 1918: 432-433.
11. Matsunaga Yūken: 1929.
12. Ōsabe 1971: 119-130.
13. Here Matsunaga follows Misaki who, from the absence of the three *siddhi* texts in the bibliographies of Kūkai and Saichō, infers that the three *siddhi* texts had not yet appeared in China by the time of their return to Japan from China, i.e., at the beginning of the ninth century since Saichō and Kūkai returned to Japan in 805 and 806 respectively (cf., Misaki 1984).
14. This date is based on a passage in Haiyun's *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufaji* (T2081.51. 786a).
15. Kanbayashi 1933.

16. Ōsabe 1972.

17. The only evidence Japanese scholars use to argue for the primacy of T907 is its relatively short length. This is obviously insufficient. While it is, indeed, more natural that a shorter version might be the basic text for a more lengthy one, a shorter text, in some cases, may be an abbreviated version of and therefore later than, a more lengthy one.

18. While both T905 and T906 contain two *gāthas* separately, T907 has only a single one.

19. Trailokya-vijaya-rajā (the "Deity-descending-from-the-three-worlds") and Āryaacalanātha (the "Immovable Deity") are the renowned two *rajās* that accompany and serve Mahāvairocana-buddha.

20. In this *gātha*, the five buddhas are specified as Vairocana, Akṣokya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi, which exactly coincides with the Diamond-realm version of the *wufo/gobu* notion.

21. Lines 9-12 in G905/1 turn out to be identical with four lines in a *gātha* at the beginning of an esoteric tract attributed to Śubhākarasimha, the *Cishipusa luexiu yujia niansongfa* (Jpn., *Jishibosatsu ryakushu yuga nenjuhō*, "The Contemplation and Recitation Methods for A Simplified Form of Yoga-practice, as Preached by Bodhisattva Maitreya", T1141). The four lines in this tract that also appear in T905 are found in T1141.20.590a16-18.

22. Though irrelevant with the two groups of lines in G905/1, these four lines, about the "three mysteries" and "five wheels" respectively, are connected with some paragraphs in T905. This might have been the main reason why the author took the trouble of inserting these four lines between the two groups of lines taken from G907.

23. Cf., "the white curl is formless, the true and universal wisdom/is as perfect and permanent as the sun and the moon" (T906.18.914b12).

CHAPTER FIVE

THE PROVENANCE AND DATE OF T907

With regard to the provenance of the three *siddhi* texts, I will begin with a re-examination of T907. This decision is not made arbitrarily but in accordance with the understanding that T907 is the primary text on which the other two (T905 and T906) were based.

First of all, I will discuss in section (A) the fact that Anne, one of Ennin's main disciples, is said to have mentioned in a bibliography attributed to him a text called "Sonshō hajigoku giki", exactly one of the titles for which the three *siddhi* texts have been known in Japan.

After questioning the credibility of this bibliography attributed to Anne, I will turn to Enchin, who in one of his treatises referred to a text that, at first glance, may be identified as one of the three *siddhi* texts. I will discuss in detail in this section about Enchin (section [B]) whether or not Enchin has indeed in this treatise displayed any knowledge of T907. My conclusion is negative. In all likelihood, Enchin was ignorant of T907 by the time he wrote this treatise, which, significantly, shares with T907 a number of textual parallels. This suggests that T907 was actually written on the basis of this treatise of Enchin's (before reaching this conclusion I will rule out the possibility that the textual parallels between Enchin's treatise and T907 may have been due to a third source). In other words, T907 was written in Japan, rather than in China as Japanese scholars have had us believe.

Now that neither Anne nor Enchin is the first person who had mentioned T907, one is naturally attracted to Annen, who claimed to have "discovered" in his works a text which I will identify as T907. Therefore, in Section (C), I will see how the "discovery" of T907 was

announced in Annen's works. After analyzing Annen's connection with T907, I will come to the conclusion that Annen is more than a pure "discoverer" of T907. He is, most likely, the real author of T907.

Finally, in the last section of this chapter (Section [D]), I will investigate the textual provenances of T907.

Section (A) Anne And T907

As argued in the last chapter, of the three *siddhi* texts T907 proves to be the earliest one which was wholly reproduced in both T905 and T906. Therefore, a sound understanding of the provenance of T907 will contribute to a successful solution of the problems related to the provenance of its two derivative texts, i.e., T905 and T906.

As far as the provenance of T907 is concerned, one will naturally ask such a question, "when and where was the text mentioned for the first time"? As stated above, so far no evidence has ever emerged to show that any of the three *siddhi* texts was mentioned in any Chinese Buddhist bibliography or in any other Buddhist source circulating in China. Furthermore, it seems very unlikely that Saichō himself had any knowledge of the three *siddhi* texts¹. Then, in which source was T907 mentioned for the first time?

As regards this problem, one is immediately attracted to a bibliography, called *Kenbo mokuroku* (A Bibliography Carefully Sealed) attributed to Anne (794-868). This bibliography is included in an exegesis of the *Biexing jing* (Jpn., *Betsugyō kyō*, T899; most likely an Esoteric Buddhist apocrypha composed in China)², the *Hi sōjōshū* (A Compilation [of the Sayings Regarding] the Secret Transmission) compiled after 1217³ by a certain Tendai monk belonging to the lineage of Master Jichin (i.e., Jien, 1152-1225), who attached particular importance to the *Betsugyō kyō*⁴. According to the *Hi sōjōshū*, this *Kenbo mokuroku*, prepared in 843, mentions a text called *Shoshō hajigoku giki* (Tendaishūten hensankai 1990: 32), exactly one of the titles by which the three *siddhi* texts, T906 and T907 in particular, have been known in Japan. If the authenticity of this bibliography can be confirmed, and if the *Shoshō hajigoku giki* mentioned in the bibliography can be identified as one of the three *siddhi* texts, then this bibliography must be taken as the earliest source to have mentioned T907⁵. Unfortunately, some evidence has presented difficulties in either accepting this bibliography as left by Anne or identifying the *Shoshō hajigoku giki* mentioned in the bibliography as any of the three *siddhi* texts.

Anne is among the eight leading disciples of Ennin, who, as the most important Tendai leader of the Post-Saichō Tendai order, was responsible for introducing the "three-section" (*sanbu*) notion into Tendai Esoteric Buddhism⁶. He is also said to have received in 863 the extraordinary honour of being chosen as one of the only two candidates to be initiated to the "Three Divisions" of Esoteric Buddhism, those of the Diamond-realm, Womb-realm and the *Soshicchi* (i.e., *susiddhi*). In 864, i.e., one year after he was conferred the "Rank of the Great Acārya of the Three-divisions" (*sanbu daiajari i*), he succeeded Ennin (who died in the first month of 864) as the head (*zasu*) of the Tendai school⁷. Is it possible to connect this so-called *Kenbo mokuroku* with

such a prestigious Tendai patriarch?

Before trying to answer this question, let us first look at how this bibliography was compiled.

The following is a full translation of the text of the *Kenbo mokuroku*, which is very short.

The *Kenbo Mokuroku*:

(I) *Rikai* (Chin., *lijie*): The Realm of Principle -- The Division of Womb-realm⁸:

(1) The *Dainichikyō* (Chin., *Darijing*; the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*, one fascicle⁹; T848);

(2) *Shō daikanjō giki* (Chin., *She daguangding yigui*, the Procedure for the Great Consecration; i.e., *She Dabiluzhe'na chengfō shenbian jiachi jing ru lianhuataizang haihui beishengmantuoluo guangda niansong yigui gongyangfangbianhui* [Jpn., *Shō Daibirushana jōbutsu jinben kajikyō nyurenge taizokaie hishō mandara kodai nenju giki kuyōhōbenne*]; tr. by Śubhākarasimha, T850);

(3) *Sōjō denbō shidai ki* (Chin., *Xiangcheng chuanfa cidi ji*, The Record of the Dharma Transmitted from Generation to Generation; i.e., *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufaji* [Jpn., *Ryōbu daihō sōjō shishi fuhōki*]; one fascicle¹⁰; by Haiyun, T2081)

Division (II): *Chikai* (Chin., *zhijie*, The Realm of Wisdom) -- The Division of Diamond-realm¹¹

(1) *Kongōbu rokaku yugikyō* (Chin., *Jingangfeng louge yuzhijing*, The Yogin Sūtra [Preached in] the Mansion on the Vajra-peak; i.e., *Jingangfeng louge yiqie yujia yuzhijing* [Jpn., *Kongōbu rokaku issai yuga yugikyō*]; tr. by Bukong, T867)

(2) *Issai jishō jōbutsu giki* (Chin., *Yiqie shichu chengfō yigui*, The Procedure for Attaining the Buddhahood Anytime and Anywhere; i.e., *Jingangdingjing yizidinglunwang yuga yiqieshichu niansong chengfō yigui* [Jpn., *Kongōchōgyō ichijichōrinnō yuga issaijishō nenju jōbutsu giki*]; tr. by Bukong, T957);

(3) *Gohimitsu giki* (Chin., *Wumimi yigui*, The Procedure for the Five Secrets; i.e., *Jingangding yujia jingangshacui wumimi xiuxing niansong yigui* [Jpn., *Kongōchō yuga kongōsatta gohimitsu shugyō nenju giki*]; in one fascicle; tr. by Bukong, T1125);

(4) *Sōjō den* (Chin., *Xiangchuan zhuan*, the Record of the Generation-by-generation [Dharma-]transmission; one fascicle; perhaps the Record by Haiyun, T2081)¹²;

Division (III): *Enmankai* (Chin., *Yuanmanjie*, The Perfect Realm) -- The Division of *Soshicchi* (*Susiddhi*)¹³

(1) *Myōjōju giki* (Chin., *Miaochengjiu yigui*, the Procedure for the Wonderful attainment [*susiddhi*]; probably referring to the *Suxidi jieluo gongyangfa* [Jpn., *Soshicchi kara kuyōhō*]; tr. by Śubhākarasimha, T894);

(2) *Shōjō Birushana Betsugyō kyō* (Chin., *Qingjing Biluzhe'na biexing jing*, The Sūtra Transmitted through Special Lines, [Preached by] the Pure Vairocana-buddha; i.e., *Qingjingfashen Biluzhe'na xindi famen chengjiu yiqie tuoluoni sanzongxidi* [Jpn., *Shōjōhōsshin Birushana shinji hōmon jōju issai darani sanshushicchi*, T899);

(3) *Sonshō hajigoku giki* (Chin., *Zunsheng podiyu yigui*, The Procedure [Preached by the Ultimate Buddha] about Destroying the Hell; one fascicle; seemingly referring to T906 or T907);

(4) *Sōjō myōken hō* (Chin., *Xiangcheng miaojian fa*, The Generation-to-generation Transmitted Procedure about Bodhisattva Miaojian [Jpn., Myōken; Skt., Sudristih, Wonderful Sights]; one fascicle)¹⁴.

Division (IV): *Shakuke* (Chin., *Shijia*, The Division about the General Buddhist Teaching)

(1) *Shōki* (Chin., *Chaoji*, The Scribed Record; one fascicle)¹⁵;

(2) *Rishu shaku* (Chin., *Liqu shi*, the Commentary on the *Rishu* [*kyō*], i.e., *Dale Jingang zhenshi sanmeiye jing boluomituo lichujing shi* [Jpn., *Dairyaku kongō fukū shinjitsu sanmayakyō hannya haramita rishushaku*, tr. by Bukong, T1003) (Tendaishūten hensankai 1990: 32)

The way the *Kenbo mokuroku* was compiled makes it hard to associate the bibliography with Anne. For example, it is striking to find that the *Rishu shaku*, i.e., the *Rishukyō gishaku*¹⁶, is included in this bibliography. It is well known that the relationship between Saichō and Kūkai rapidly deteriorated when Kūkai wrote Saichō an extremely acrid letter in which he not only

squarely refused to lend Saichō the *Rishukyō gishaku*, but also chided Saichō for having deviated from, in the eyes of Kūkai, the true way of pursuing the Esoteric studies¹⁷. Since this accident, which had apparently incurred a galling shame and humiliation in Saichō and the whole Tendai order headed by him, was precipitated by the loan of the *Rishukyō gishaku*, this Esoteric text later became extraordinarily unpopular among Tendai monks. This fact is attested by the scarcity of sub-commentaries the Tendai scholars have written on it. Of the only three Tendai exegeses on the *Rishukyō gishaku*, one is extant, one partly extant and the third totally lost¹⁸. This presents a sharp contrast to the fervent attitude Shingon monks assumed toward the same Esoteric commentary. Shingon monks had contributed over sixty sub-commentaries to the *Rishukyō gishaku*¹⁹.

Given that the *Kenbo mokuroku* lists the troublesome (for Tendai followers) *Rishukyō gishaku* as one of the twelve most important Esoteric texts, it is hard to ascribe this bibliography to Anne who lived in a time when the wound caused by the Saichō-Kūkai strife had not yet healed and Tendai was combating Shingon for the leadership of the Japanese Esoteric tradition. Therefore, I am inclined to believe that this *Kenbo mokuroku* was out of the hand of a certain Tendai monk later than Anne, who lived in a time when the Tendai practitioners became less sensitive to the Saichō-Kūkai strife and meanwhile less cautious about the *Rishukyō gishaku* than Anne and his Tendai colleagues. It is probably inspired by the popularity the *Rishukyō gishaku* had achieved in Shingon circles that this Tendai author of the *Kenbo mokuroku* decided to include it into the bibliography.

On the other hand, even if it were possible to attribute this *Kenbo mokuroku* to Anne, I still find it difficult to identify the *Sonshō hajigoku giki* mentioned therein as any of the three *siddhi*

texts. First of all, as I will demonstrate in Section (C), at least as late as 882 Enchin, another major Tendai leader after Saichō and Ennin, was still ignorant of the existence of any of the three *siddhi* texts. This fact *per se* makes it extremely unlikely that Anne could have known of any of the three *siddhi* texts by the year 863 when Anne was said to have compiled a bibliography including the *Sonshō hajigoku giki*. Let us try to establish this proposition by a *reductio ad absurdum*.

We suppose that this bibliography had been indeed prepared by Anne in 863 and the *Sonshō hajigoku giki* found therein had been indeed one of the three *siddhi* texts. This would mean that Anne had already known of one of the three *siddhi* texts by 863. As we know now, any of the three *siddhi* texts would serve as a good scriptural support for the Esoteric teachings which, according to a *fuho-mon* document, was transmitted to Saichō from his Chinese teacher Shunxiao. Therefore, had Anne had access to such a text, he, as a major Tendai leader, would have known very well the value of such a text for the religious community to which he belonged and therefore he would not have hesitated to have the text circulated as widely as possible. Given that Anne was elevated to the position of the Tendai head (*zasu*) in 864, we have reason to believe that he would not have had any difficulty in circulating among the Tendai circle a text so important for his school. In that case, this text called *Sonshō hajigoku giki* would have been circulated widely among the Tendai circle for almost two decades by the year 882. During the two decades of circulation, this text would have become well known to any Tendai monk who was interested in it. Thus, such an eminent and erudite Tendai scholar like Enchin would certainly have been very familiar with the text by 882.

On the other hand, in 882 Enchin wrote to Zhihuilun in China to ask for the scriptural

source for the threefold dhāraṇī-*siddhi* correlation. This fact strongly suggests that Enchin did not know of any of the three *siddhi* texts at that time, since any of the three *siddhi* texts, as noted above, would have served as a good scriptural support for the threefold dhāraṇī-*siddhi* correlation.

Thus, the supposition that the *Sonshō hajigoku giki* included in the 863 *Kenbo mokuroku* was one of the three *siddhi* texts contradicts the conclusion that as late as 882 Enchin had been still ignorant of any of the three *siddhi* texts.

As I will show in Section (C), this conclusion regarding Enchin's relationship with any of the three *siddhi* texts is drawn from such relatively reliable textual sources as *Kimon* and *Shō Chierin sanzō sho*, whose connection with Enchin has been firmly established by early bibliographies²⁰. In contrast, the supposition regarding Anne's knowledge of a text which can be identified as one of the three *siddhi* texts is based on a bibliography contained in a Japanese exegesis that was relatively late in date (no earlier than 1217, three and half centuries after Anne's death). Obviously, the conclusion has sounder grounds than the supposition does. Now that the supposition contradicts this conclusion, it is the supposition, rather than the conclusion, that must be rejected. In other words, the *Sonshō hajigoku giki* as mentioned in the *Kenbo mokuroku* can not be taken as one of the three *siddhi* texts.

Besides this piece of evidence, we have another one to argue against the possibility that the *Kenbo mokuroku*, if indeed prepared by Anne in 843, included a text which can be taken as one of the three *siddhi* texts. As discussed in Section (D), Annen in one of his works, which was probably completed after 902, claimed that he had "recently obtained" a text called "Sonshō hajigoku hō". The tone in which Annen declared this "discovery", as well as other pieces of evidence, suggest that Annen is the first person who "discovered" this text called *Sonshō hajigoku*

hō which, as I will argue, turns out to be T907. If the bibliography attributed to Anne can be regarded as reliable and the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* included therein refers to T907, this text would have already been circulated among the Tendai circle for at least four decades before Annen announced its "discovery" in around 902. It is almost unimaginable that such an important (at least for the Tendai school) text as the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*, after four decades of circulation, had still remained so rarely known that it had to be "recently discovered" by such a knowledgeable and prestigious Tendai master as Annen.

On the basis of these two pieces of evidence, I conclude that even if the ascription of the *Kenbo mokuroku* to Anne were tenable, the *Sonshō hajigoku giki* indicated in the bibliography could not be identified as any of the three *siddhi* texts. To put it more clearly, the *Kenbo mokuroku* does not indicate that any of the three *siddhi* texts was known to Anne.

Before finishing this section, let me make a brief speculation on how such a bibliography was written in the name of Anne. A remark in the *Hi sōjōshū* tells us something about the true agenda underlying the compilation of the *Kenbo mokuroku*.

Then, Sannōin (i.e., Enchin) left no comment regarding the transmission of this sūtra (i.e., the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra*). This fact required no further comment. As for the important procedure for the transmission of the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra*, this sutra must be transmitted secretly. Though Konpon Daishi (Saichō) received from Shunxiao the dual division [of Esoteric Buddhism], he based his own teachings mainly on the "Matrix-realm Division" (*taizōkai*). Furthermore, though Kōbō Daishi (Kūkai) also got the transmission of the Dual Division, he took the "Diamond-realm Division" (*kongōkai*) as principle. The transmission of the Womb-realm [Division] is not so clear. Huiguo transmitted to Acārya Yichao the "secret box" containing the Three Divisions. Acārya [Yichao] transmitted it to Farun. Farun transmitted it to Faquan. Faquan transmitted it to Jikaku Daishi (Ennin). All these transmissions were handed down in a direct line [from master to disciple]. No transmission to the branch line had ever been made. After [Ji]kaku Daishi returned to Japan [from China], he applied [to the court] for the seals of the "Great Acārya of Three Division" (*sanbu dai Ajari*) and got them. Out of the eight

dharma-transmission [disciples] he chose Anne and Eryō (791-859) to receive the "Rank of the Great Acārya of Three Divisions". The remaining six disciples only received the [rank of] the Dual Division. The prosperity of Esoteric Buddhism in the capital was totally due to the effort of Jikaku Daishi (Tendaishūten hensankai 1990: 33).

According to this theory, both Saichō and Kūkai merely obtained from China the dual division of the Esoteric teaching, i.e., those of the Womb-realm and Diamond-realm. It is not until Ennin came back from China that the Three Divisions were transmitted to Japan.

It is notable that in this passage the Three Divisions of the Esoteric teachings were said to be kept by Huiguo in a "secret box". As noted in chapter two, it may be possible to associate the notion of the dual division with Huiguo. The notion of "Three-divisions" (*sanbu*) would have originated in China at a time considerably later than Huiguo. Furthermore, it is Ennin who must be credited with introducing the *sanbu* idea into Japan. Accordingly, that Huiguo kept the "three divisions" of Esoteric teachings in a "secret box" must be taken as a legend which, though possibly traceable to the late Tang, was mainly fuelled by Tendai followers in Japan. In order to combat and compete with Shingon which prizes the dual Esoteric transmission as its hallmark, the Tendai leader Ennin advanced the ideology that the Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism was of "three divisions" (*sanbu*) and therefore superior to the Shingon form of Esoteric Buddhism, which was only composed of "two divisions" (*ryōbu*)²¹.

The title of the *Kenbo mokuroku*, which means the "bibliography to be carefully sealed [and preserved?]", is strongly reminiscent of the legend that Huiguo got the "Three Divisions" of Esoteric teachings stored in a "secret box" and transmitted them to his trusted disciple. Furthermore, this bibliography categorizes twelve texts into four categories: the (i) *Rikai* (the Realm of Principle; i.e., the Womb-realm Division); (ii) *Chikai* (the Realm of Wisdom; the

Diamond-realm Division), (iii) *Enmankai* (the Perfect Realm; the *Soshicchi* Division), and finally (iv) *Shakuke* (the division of the general Buddhist teachings). Therefore, both the title of this *Kenbo mokuroku* and the way it categorizes the Esoteric texts echo the Tendai ideology that Tendai represents the triple and, therefore the most advanced, form of the Esoteric Buddhism.

Finally, I suspect that the inclusion of the *Sonshō hajigoku giki* in the division of Perfect Realm, which indicates the *soshicchi* division of the Three Divisions, may have been patterned after Annen's renowned bibliography, the *Hakke hiroku*, which subjects the same text to the Esoteric teachings represented by the *Soshicchi kyō* (i.e., *Susiddhikāra-sūtra*), i.e., the *soshicchi* Division²².

Section (B) Enchin and T907

A short treatise attributed to Enchin, i.e., the *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō* (A Decisive Explanation of the Procedure Related to the Three Kinds of Attainment, hereafter referred to as KSSH; BZ27.985-86), *seems* to have been the first textual source referring to T907. KSSH is Enchin's only work exclusively devoted to the "threefold attainment", exactly the same theme dominating T907. Not only do a number of sentences and ideas in KSSH find their parallels in

T907, Enchin seems to have also in the same treatise referred, at least thrice, to a text which, at first appearance, looks like T907. In the following pages, we must try to determine if this initial impression of KSSH stands the test after we closely examine this treatise by Enchin.

However, before formally treating KSSH, let one point be made clear: Enchin would have referred in KSSH to T907 had he known of T907 when he wrote KSSH. As Japanese scholars have already pointed out, Enchin wrote KSSH in order to remove the serious doubts--both inside and outside the Tendai circle--on the scriptural support for the practice of correlating the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs with the three ranks of attainment²³. For this reason, I assume that Enchin would not have set aside and failed to include in KSSH any important textual source about the triple dhāraṇīs, in particular their correlation with the three kinds/ranks of attainment. In the light of this, T907 is exactly the textual source that Enchin would have referred to in KSSH had he read it by the time, since T907 not merely contains the same triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs as used in one of Saichō's *fuhōmons*, but also correlates the triple dhāraṇīs with the three kinds of attainment (i.e., "emerging", "entering" and "accomplishment"). Furthermore, T907 was attributed to the celebrated Esoteric patriarch--Śubhākarasimha. Consequently, T907 stands as the ideal scriptural source which would have served Enchin very well, who was then eagerly seeking the scriptural source for the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs and its correlation with the threefold attainment. Thus, had Enchin known anything about T907 as an independent text by the time he wrote KSSH he would not have failed in KSSH to refer his readers to it.

On the basis of this understanding, we assume that if Enchin failed to quote from or at least refer to T907 in his KSSH, he did not know T907 while writing KSSH. Then, does Enchin refer to the content of T907 in KSSH? In order to answer this question, we must closely read this short

treatise paragraph by paragraph.

(B.I) A Paragraph-by-paragraph Reading of KSSH

For the sake of convenience, I will break KSSH into ten paragraphs in accordance with the different themes.

Paragraph (1) (BZ27.985a1-8) refers to the celebrated Esoteric transmission Saichō is said to have received from his Chinese Esoteric master Shunxiao. In this initiatory ceremony, Shunxiao had allegedly transmitted to Saichō three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs ([i] A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham, [ii] A-Vi-Ra-Hum-kham, and [iii] A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na), which were taken as representing the three ranks of attainment (higher, middle and lower). Though it is also recorded in the three *siddhi* texts (either in the text proper or in the interlinear notes), in KSSH Enchin bases this threefold dhāraṇī-*siddhi* correlation on the *fuhōmon* document attributed to Saichō and not on any of the three *siddhi* texts.

Then, in the second paragraph (BZ27.985a9-12), Enchin reports that the same three five-syllable dhāraṇīs, respectively representing the "three-bodies" of the buddha²⁴ this time, were carved on the pillars at the Shuinansi and Tiangongsi Temples²⁵ in the "Eastern Capital of the Tang Dynasty" (i.e., Luoyang). This story is of interest to us not merely for its mention of the same triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs which looms so large in both Saichō's *fuhōmon* and the three *siddhi* texts, but also for the correlation it draws between the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs and the "three buddha-bodies" (i.e., dharma-, transformation- and retribution-body). T907 and its two derivative texts, though correlating the "three bodies" with the three ranks of attainment, do not

associate the "three bodies" with the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs²⁶. Like the previous paragraph, this paragraph provides no evidence for suggesting that Enchin has referred here to any of the three *siddhi* texts.

Paragraphs (3) (BZ27.985a13-18) traces back the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs to their separate canonical sources, i.e., two chapters in the *Darijing/Dainichi kyō* and one chapter in a concise scripture which, as suggested by its title "Jingangdingjing Manshushili wuzi xintuoluoni pin" (Jpn., *Kongōchōgyō Manjushiri Bosatsu goji shindarani hon*; the Chapter in the *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō* about the Five-syllable Heart-dhāraṇī of Mañjuśrī)²⁷, most likely belongs to the genre of *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō*. It is noteworthy that Enchin, in discussing the textual sources of the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs, says nothing of T907. I will discuss later the significance of Enchin's remarkable reticence on T907 in this occasion.

In paragraph (4) (BZ27.985b2-12), the longest paragraph in this short treatise, Enchin reports some instructions he once received in Tang China from his Chinese teacher Faquan²⁸, who was quoted to have made the following observations,

The five-syllable dhāraṇī, extracted by Brahmācārīn Prabhūtaratna (Jpn., Tahō; Chin., Duobao) from the *Dainichi kyō* and *Kongōchō gyō*, is capable of bringing about immeasurable merits if they were recited appropriately.

In T907 as well as its two derivative texts we find a sentence which, except for its failure to mention Prabhūtaratna's role in extracting the five-syllable dhāraṇī from the two sūtras, matches the above-quoted sentence closely²⁹.

Then, Faquan, as related by Enchin, went on to identify this powerful five-syllable dhāraṇī as A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham. The merit of reciting this five-syllable dhāraṇī once is said to be comparable with that of reciting the whole *tripiṭaka* a million times. Such a comment regarding

the amazing merits implied in this five-syllable dhāraṇī is also found in T907 and its two derivative texts³⁰.

After this comment, the five syllables of this five-syllable dhāraṇī are taken as seeds for the "five buddhas situated in the five directions" (Jpn., *gohōbutsu*; Chin., *wufangfo*). The same correlation is also attempted in T907 and its two derivative texts, in which the five syllables (A, Vam, Ram, Kum, Kham) are associated with the five buddhas in the five directions in the following way³¹,

BUDDHAS	AKṢOBHYA	AMITĀBHA	RATNASAMBHAVA	AMOGHASIDDHI	VAIROCANA
DIRECTIONS	EAST	WEST	SOUTH	NORTH	CENTRE
SYLLABLES	A	VAM	RAM	HUM	KHAM

This fivefold correlation is followed by another one which is made between the five syllables and five kinds of natural and social phenomena. Such a correlation is also made in T907 and its two affiliated texts³².

Subsequently, Faquan was also reported to have identified the five syllables as the "dhāraṇī for the dharma-body" (Jpn., *hōshin shingon*; Chin., *fashen zhenyan*). In T907 and its two affiliated texts, the five syllables are also identified as "dhāraṇī for the dharma-body"³³.

Finally, Faquan, according to Enchin, observed that he chose not to say anything about other "two buddhas", i.e., the two buddhas assuming the bodies of "retribution" and "transformation"³⁴, since they, Faquan believed, had been fully discussed in the sūtras belonging to the "Two Divisions" (Jpn., *ryōbu*; Chin., *liangbu*)³⁵. The readers can, Faquan assumed, consult these relevant sutras for further information about the two buddhas in the retribution- and transformation-body respectively.

In summary, in this paragraph Faquan is said to have made the following six points to his

Japanese disciple Enchin: (i) the source of the five-syllable *dhāraṇī*, (ii) the five component syllables of this five-syllable *dhāraṇī* and their inconceivable merits, (iii) the correlation between the five syllables and the five cardinal directions and five buddhas, (iv) the correlation between the five syllables and five kinds of natural/social phenomena, (v) the identification of this five-syllable *dhāraṇī* as the *dhāraṇī* for the dharma-body, (vi) the reason of not talking about the *dhāraṇīs* for the buddhas of retribution- and transformation-body. Of all these six points, five (from [i] to [v]) can be found in T907 and its two affiliated texts. Coincidences between T907 and Enchin's report of the instruction from Faquan are so numerous that one may be led to suspect if Faquan and/or Enchin had consulted T907 before making/reporting these points.

Enchin begins paragraph (5) (BZ27.985b13-17) with a piece of important information: Ninchū (?-824 AD), one of Saichō's best trusted disciples, secretly kept a "Collection of Essentials" (*yōshō*). According to Enchin, this *yōshō* collection contains a couple of sentences virtually identical with two sentences in paragraph (4) about the source of the five-syllable *dhāraṇīs*. These two sentences in paragraph (4), in turn, find their parallels in T907 and its two affiliated texts. What warrants particular attention is that in this couple of sentences as appearing in this paragraph no mention is made about Prabhūtaratna either, which coincides with T907 and its two affiliated texts. According to Enchin, the same *yōshō* collection also talks about (i) three kinds of attainment: "emerging", "entering" and "accomplishment", and (ii) the *dhāraṇīs* for the "three bodies", which most likely indicate the threefold correlation between the triple five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* and the "three bodies" of the buddha (transformation-, retribution- and dharma-body). All these suggest that this collection treasured by Ninchū seems to be T907, or one of its two affiliated texts (T905 and T906), because apart from the couple of sentences mentioned above, the

classification of *siddhi* in terms of "emerging", "entering" and "accomplishment" is also attempted in the three *siddhi* texts³⁶.

Paragraph (6) (BZ27.986a1-5) does not speak of anything which can be considered related, either directly or indirectly, to T907 and its two derivative texts. This paragraph is, however, noteworthy for the strong polemical sentiment with which Enchin defended the existence of the scriptural support for the threefold dhāraṇī-*siddhi* correlation. As demonstrated elsewhere in this dissertation³⁷, the strong polemical tones expressed in this treatise provide an important clue for us to unravel the polemical agenda underlying the composition of T907.

Paragraph (7) (986a6-7) presents itself as another piece of evidence for determining whether or not Enchin had referred to T907 (and/or its two derivative texts) in his KSSH. This paragraph warrants serious attention for its unambiguous reference to a text entitled "Sanshu shicchi hō" (the "Procedure for the Three kinds of Attainment"). According to Enchin, this text is in one fascicle and its translator is unidentified. Enchin also acknowledges that the teachings as preached in this tract are different from that he spelt out in the present treatise. Nevertheless, he was reluctant to devalue this tract for the reason and warned Buddhist practitioners not to do so either. T905 is also known for the same title (i.e., "Sanshu shicchi hō"). Furthermore, T907 and T906 as well were also referred to by the same title in some cases³⁸. All this leads one to suppose that this tract Enchin here mentions by the name of "Sanshu shicchi hō" might be either T907 or one of its two derivative texts.

Paragraph (8) (BZ27.986a7-8) is actually the last paragraph of KSSH, since KSSH seems to have originally ended with this paragraph, whereas Paragraphs (9) and (10) were actually added by some editor(s) of KSSH³⁹. In this paragraph, Enchin concluded his treatise by explaining why

he had taken the trouble to prepare such an outline of the procedure for the threefold attainment. He confessed that he did this since he was afraid that all the scriptures related to the procedure of threefold attainment, being scattered here and there, might be ignored by the later practitioners.

Paragraph (9) (BZ27.987a10-11) talks about the "transforma-tion body" and its relationship with the Buddhist "three treasures". It is believed that the "transformation-body" is exactly the source from which all the "Twelve Divisions of the Mahāyana Canons" (Jpn., *junibukyō*; Chin., *Shierbujing*) as well as the Buddha, dharma and *sangha*, the so-called "three treasures" of Buddhism, were established. This paragraph may have been added to Enchin's original text by a later editor, who felt such a note about the "transformation-body" relevant to the present treatise in which the three "buddha-bodies" are correlated with the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs.

In comparison with the preceding paragraph (i.e., [9]), Paragraph (10) (987a12-b2) turns out to be more interesting in that it contains some quotations from an Esoteric scripture, which are also found in one of T907's two derivative texts--T905. As indicated in this paragraph, the Esoteric scripture from which these quotations were made is the *Kongōchō[gyō] Manjushiri gozi [shin]darani hon* (Chin., *Jingangding Manshushiri wuzi [xin]tuoluoni pin*), exactly the same Esoteric scripture (i.e., T1173) to which Enchin had attributed the source of the third group of the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs (i.e., A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na).

(B.II) A Further Analysis of KSSH: Did Enchin Know of T907 When Writing KSSH?

It is very unlikely that a reader of KSSH fails to be impressed by the frequency the passages and ideas in T907 seem to have echoed throughout Enchin's KSSH. In this concise

treatise, which is of no more than one thousand characters, Enchin appears to have directly referred to, or indirectly hinted, T907 many times.

First of all, in his report of the instruction he received from Faquan, Enchin wrote six points, five of which find their parallels in T907:

- (i) a couple of sentences describing Prabhūtaratna's role in selecting from the *Dainichi kyō* and *Kongōchō gyō* five Sanskrit syllables, are believed to be capable of bringing about immeasurable, indescribable merits (BZ27.985b2-5; T907.915a17-20);
- (ii) a sentence to the effect that reciting the five syllables (A, Vam, Ram, Hum, Kham) once equals reciting the whole *tripiṭaka* million times (BZ27.985b6-7; T907.915b24);
- (iii) a correlation between the same five syllables with the five buddhas in the five directions (BZ27.985b7; T907.915a12-15);
- (iv) a correlation between the same five syllables with five kinds of social/natural phenomena (BZ27.985b7-10; T907.915a8-12);
- (v) the identification of the five syllables as the "dhāraṇī for dharma-body" (BZ27.985b11; T907.915c29-b1);

Therefore the main points of Enchin's report of Faquan's instructions find their parallels in T907. This fact leads the reader to assume that Faquan, in giving these instructions to Enchin, may have based himself on some textual source which is either T907 itself or extremely close to it.

The second occasion in which Enchin seems to have referred to T907 in KSSH is found in his description of a *yāshō* collection possessed by Ninchū. Enchin's description strongly suggests that this *yāshō* collection in question may have been T907 or one of its two derivative texts. According to Enchin, this collection not only contains a couple of sentences virtually identical with those found in T907, it also defines the Indian notion of "attainment" (*siddhi*) in

terms of "emerging", "entering" and "accomplishment", which coincides with T907.

Finally, in the same KSSH Enchin definitely referred to a text called "Sanshu shicchi hō". Since the three *siddhi* texts (in particular T905) are sometime known by the same name, i.e., "Sanshu shicchi hō", one is tempted to take this text as T907 or one of its two derivative texts (especially T905).

However, after further analysis, I have to concede that in none of these three occasions had Enchin actually referred to T907 or its two derivative texts. Let us begin with Enchin's report of the instruction he received from Faquan. As stated above, the coincidences found between some T907 passages and five of the six instructions Faquan gave to Enchin produce the impression that T907 or a text close to it may have been taken as the textual basis for the instructions attributed to Faquan. But this impression turns out to be ill-founded. It seems much more likely that Faquan did not have such a text in his mind when offering Enchin these five points of instruction; otherwise, he would have referred Enchin to such a text, just as he did when he talked about the "two buddhas", which form the subject of the sixth point of his instruction⁴⁰. Furthermore, according to Enchin's own understanding, these points must be attributed to Faquan, rather than to any textual source. Otherwise, he would have directly referred the readers to the textual source, instead of observing that these points were heard by himself (from Faquan) (cf., BZ27.985b12).

As for the second occasion in which Enchin mentioned a *yōshō* collection treasured by Ninchū, one point defies the effort to identify this *yōshō* as T907 or either of its two derivative texts. According to Enchin, Ninchū's collection also includes the *dhāraṇīs* corresponding to the "three-bodies". This probably refers to the threefold correlation between the "three buddha-bodies" and the three five-syllable *dhāraṇīs*, a kind of threefold correlation Enchin once found

carved on a pillar of a temple in Luoyang (cf., paragraph [2]). But, as noted above, T907 and its two derivative texts just do not correlate the "three buddha-bodies" with the triple five-syllable *dhāraṇīs*⁴¹. For this reason, I have to conclude that this *yōshō* collection allegedly in the possession of Ninchū should not be identified as T907 nor as either of its two derivative texts.

Finally, the text Enchin mentioned in KSSH as "sanshu shicchi hō" is, very probably, T899, rather than T907 or either of T907's derivative texts. This conclusion is made on the basis of the following considerations. First of all, T905, like T906 and T907, has been unambiguously attributed to Śubhākarasimha while the text mentioned in KSSH is said to have been translated by an anonymous person. Secondly, as Enchin himself confessed, the teaching of this tract does not agree with his ideas of "threefold attainment" that he has expounded in KSSH. But a comparison of KSSH with T905, T906 and T907 reveals general agreement. Therefore, I am convinced that the tract in question could not be taken as any of the three *siddhi* texts.

Instead, I suggest that this text in question is T899. As it is preserved in the *Taishō Tripitaka*, T899 is also in one fascicle and its translator is unidentified too. More importantly, "Sanshu shicchi hō" is also one alternate name under which T899 has been known⁴². Furthermore, it is true that except for its threefold classification of the notion "attainment", T899 almost bears nothing in common with the three *siddhi* texts and KSSH as well. Finally, T899 is contained in the bibliography attributed to Jōgyō (?-866), one of the eight *nittō hakke* pilgrims (cf., T2163.55.1070a3). This text could easily have been accessible to Enchin when he wrote KSSH, which was written no earlier than 871⁴³.

In summary, KSSH *does* contain several elements which are also found in T907. However, after further analysis, all these elements were attributed by Enchin himself to (i) an occasion in

which one of his Chinese teachers gave some oral instructions to him and to (ii) a *yōshō* collection treasured by Ninchū, which apparently can not be identified as T907. As for the text which Enchin mentions in KSSH by the title "Sanshu shicchi hō", it turns out to be T899 rather than T907 or either of its two derivative texts. None of these three sources can be taken as referring to T907 and therefore as a token of Enchin's possible knowledge of T907.

On the contrary, KSSH provides some evidence in proof of Enchin's ignorance of T907 when he wrote KSSH. In KSSH Enchin tried to identify the canonical sources for the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs corresponding to the three ranks of attainment (BZ27.985a13-18). Enchin traced back the first two groups of the triple dhāraṇīs (correlated with, respectively, higher and middle ranks of attainment) to two chapters in the *Dainichikyō/Darijing*, the third to a chapter in the *Kongōchō gyō/Jingangding jing*, referred to as the *Jingandingjing Manshushili wuzi xintuoluoni pin* (T1173) in KSSH. Here, in speaking of the canonical sources for the three dhāraṇīs, Enchin remained remarkably silent on T907, which appears to be a much better canonical source for the three dhāraṇīs than the two chapters in the *Dainichi kyō/Darijing* and one chapter in the *Kongōchō gyō/Jingangding jing* as well.

T907, reputedly translated by Śubhākarasimha, stands almost as authoritative as the *Darijing/Dainichi kyō* and *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō*, which Enchin *did* cite in KSSH as canonical sources for the three dhāraṇīs. Either of the latter two sūtras only contains one or two of the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs, while all the three dhāraṇīs are included in T907. In this sense, T907, in comparison with both *Dainichi kyō/Darijing* and *Kongōchō gyō/Jingangding jing*, appears to be a "better" canonical source for the three dhāraṇīs and their correlations with the three kinds of attainment. For every reason, Enchin would have referred in KSSH to T907 had

he really known this text allegedly translated by Śubhākarasimha. Thus, we conclude that his failure to mention T907 in the treatise implies his ignorance of T907 at the time.

Furthermore, Enchin's ignorance of T907 at the time of writing KSSH is corroborated not only by an analysis of the text of KSSH itself but also by evidence outside the text. On the one hand, it is very likely that Enchin wrote KSSH sometime around 873 in order to resolve Henjō's question about the canonical source for the "procedure of the threefold attainment". On the other, there is evidence to show that at least as late as 882 (nine years before his death and nine years after his KSSH was probably written) Enchin had not yet seen any of the three *siddhi* texts. On the basis of these two points, it can be ascertained that by the time he wrote KSSH Enchin had not had a chance to read, let alone to quote from, T907.

Since these two points prove to be very important for furthering the argument that by the time he wrote KSSH Enchin had known nothing of T907, I will discuss them in more details in the following two sub-sections (i.e., [B.III] and [B.IV]).

(B.III) The Dating of KSSH

Though Enchin himself failed to date KSSH, it is very likely that it was written in or a bit later than 873. According to the *Yohō hennen zatsushū* (BZ28.1290-1352; A Miscellany of the "Remaining Flowers": Compiled in Temporal Order), Enchin submitted a petition to the court on the fourteen day of the second month, Jōgan 15 (873), proposing that the title of *ajari* (Skt., *Acārya*) be awarded to Henjō (817-890)⁴⁴. His petition was soon approved. Moreover, according to the *Chishō Daishi nenpu* (The Chronicle of Chishō Daishi [Enchin], hereafter referred to as the

"Enchin Chronicle")⁴⁵, on the ceremony of awarding the title of *Acārya* on Henjō, which was held on the ninth day of the ninth month in Jōgan 15 (873), Enchin also transmitted to Henjō the "procedure for three kinds of attainment" (*sanshu shicchi hō*)⁴⁶.

Annen also reported that Henjō, after receiving from Enchin the "procedure for the threefold attainment", kept questioning the existence of any scriptural source for the procedure⁴⁷. For this reason, some Japanese scholars suggest that KSSH may have been written by Enchin in response to Henjō's request concerning the scriptural source for the practice of three ranks of attainment (c.f., BKD3: 136). If this speculation is not far from the truth, as I believe, the composition of KSSH can be dated around 873, the year Henjō received his *ajari* title and was initiated to the "procedure for the threefold attainment".

(B.IV) Enchin's Association with Zhihuilun: His Ignorance of T907 until 882

According to Enchin's Chronicle as well a letter⁴⁸ which is said to have been written by Enchin to Zhihuilun (Jpn., Chierin; Skt., Prajñācakra)⁴⁹, one of his Esoteric teachers in Tang China, in the seventh month of Genkei 6 (882) Enchin wrote to Zhihuilun for his advice on the problems that had long perplexed him. Along with this letter, Enchin sent to Zhihuilun a separate collection (the *Kishū* ["A Collection of Questions"] as he called it in the letter) into which he had collected his questions. The *Kishū* is identified as a collection called "Kimon" (Questions) preserved in the *Chishō Daishi zenshū*. Another collection, under the title "Sasa gimon" ([A Collection of] A Variety of Questions), has also been ascribed to Enchin. The *Kimon*, though almost identical with the *Sasa gimon* in content, appears more refined in form than the *Sasa*

gimon. For this reason, it seems that the *Kimon* is a revised version of the *Sasa gimon*.

Among the questions which, collected in these two documents, were addressed to Zhihuilun, one is of particular relevance to our investigation of Enchin's relationship with the three *siddhi* texts. This question is about the scriptural support for the practice of correlating the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs with the "three ranks of attainment" or "three bodies" of the buddha. The question *per se* implies that when preparing these two documents Enchin was still wondering about the existence of any scriptural support for this kind of threefold correlation. Let us first turn to the *Kimon* to see how the question was posed there,

A Vi Ra Hum Kham (the body of dharma⁵⁰)
 A Vam Ram Hum Kham (the body of retribution⁵¹)
 A Ra Pa Ca Na (the body of transformation⁵²)

On the wall of the Tiangongsi Temple in the Eastern Capital [of China] was carved [the statement to the effect that these three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs] are the dhāraṇīs for the [buddha's] "three bodies" (*trikāya*). **On which scripture is this saying based?** It is also said that [these three groups of] dhāraṇīs correspond to the three ranks of attainment. Is that of any [canonical] support? **If there is any unmistakable [scriptural] support, please show its source in detail and take the trouble to teach me** (BZ27.1033a5-8; my emphasis)⁵³.

Enchin himself and his followers as well kept silent on the result of this letter addressed to Zhihuilun. As I believe, no answer had come back to Enchin from Zhihuilun, who may have already been dead for almost a decade by the time Enchin had this letter delivered in 882⁵⁴. However, here we are not so much interested in whether Enchin got an answer from Zhihuilun as in the question he asked Zhihuilun and the time this question was asked. Since this question is centred around the threefold dhāraṇī-body (or dhāraṇī-*siddhi*) correlation and Enchin himself dated the letter to 882, it can be ascertained that by 882 Enchin was still all at sea as to the scriptural support for the threefold correlation between the three dhāraṇīs and attainments/bodies. This

means that at least by 882 Enchin had not read T907 and its two derivative texts. Otherwise, he would not have taken the trouble to include in his "question collection" the problem regarding the scriptural source for the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs and their correlation with the three kinds of *siddhi*, since any of the three *siddhi* texts covers the three dhāraṇīs and *siddhis* and therefore can be taken as the very scriptural source Enchin was then searching for.

On the basis of the evidence at our disposal, we are able to conclude that Enchin was very unlikely to have known of T907 when writing his KSSH. This unlikelihood becomes strengthened when the following two points are taken into account: (i) KSSH was, in all likelihood, written around 873 and (ii) at least until 882 Enchin had still been ignorant of T907.

(B.V) Did Enchin ever Read T907?

Furthermore, there is evidence to show that Enchin had known nothing of T905 not only as late as 882 but even at his death in 891.

As is discussed in the next section, Annen declared in one of his works (TDT) that he "recently" discovered a copy of a text, which I will identify as T907⁵⁵. This means that T907 was discovered by Annen shortly before he wrote the work, which was completed not too long after 902⁵⁶. On the other hand, Annen here seems to hint that so far as he knew he was the first person to "discover" T907. In other words, T907 was *FIRST* discovered by Annen around 902, more than ten years after Enchin's death.

The manner Annen declared his "discovery" of T907 strongly suggests that Enchin had no knowledge of T907 throughout his lifetime. If Enchin had read T907 before his death in 891, then

given the extreme importance this text had for the dharma-transmission ascribed to Saichō, he would have had it widely circulated within Tendai circles before his death in 891. In the case, T907 would have circulated within the Taimitsu circle for at least one decade when Annen declared its "discovery" in his TDT which was completed after 902. By the time, T907 would have been well known within Tendai circles for long. This contradicts Annen's claim that T907 was "recently discovered" by him.

For the reason, I am inclined to believe that T907 had not been known to Enchin before his death in 891.

(B.VI) Enchin and the T907 Author: Who Is the Borrower?

Now that Enchin had not had the chance to read, let alone quote from, T907 by the time of writing KSSH (or even before his death in 891), how should we interpret the textual parallels between his KSSH and T907? This requires a new understanding of the inter-relationship between Enchin's KSSH and T907. The evidence raised here forces us to question the assumption that T907, as a translation attributed to Śubhākarasimha or a text produced in China earlier than the time of Enchin, must be taken as the text to which Enchin was indebted for all the textual parallels between his KSSH and T907. Rather, we must seriously explore the possibility that the textual parallels between KSSH and T907 resulted from the borrowing from KSSH by the T907 author and not the contrary.

As a rule, the textual parallels between two texts can only be explained by two hypotheses: first, both texts borrow from a third source; second, one text borrows from the other. Obviously,

the textual parallels between T907 and KSSH can not be explained by the first hypothesis. As noted above, a majority of the textual parallels between T907 and KSSH is found in Enchin's report of Faquan's oral instructions, which were, most likely, made by Faquan himself independently, without consulting a scripture or other kind of source. Therefore, the textual parallels between T907 and KSSH should be explained by the second hypothesis only; viz., one of them borrowed from the other.

Then, the problem is between Enchin and the T907 author who is the textual borrower? Since it has been excluded that Enchin had obtained a chance to read T907 by the time he wrote KSSH, all the sentences and ideas in his KSSH which find their parallels in T907 can not be regarded as borrowed from T907. On the contrary, these sentences and ideas were taken from KSSH to T907. In other words, those T907 parts which find their parallels in KSSH were composed on the basis of KSSH. Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that Enchin's KSSH was ever transmitted to a country outside Japan where Chinese was also used (like China and Korea). It can be established that T907 was written in Japan on the basis of Enchin's KSSH.

Here, I would like to draw into consideration one more proof for the Japanese origin of T907. As will be noted in Section (D) of this chapter, T907 contains several sentences, which are identical with several lines in the *Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon* attributed to Kūkai. As we know, it is very unlikely that both Saichō and Kūkai knew anything of T907 throughout their lives⁵⁷. Therefore, the appearance in T907 of these sentences, which are so close to the several lines in one of Kūkai's text, strongly suggests that these T907 sentences were made on the basis of Kūkai's text. In other words, T907 was written in Japan.

Now that T907 was written in Japan rather than in China, it could be composed by (i)

either Enchin himself or (ii) somebody else who had not only felt the incentive to create a text like T907 but also had the chance to read Enchin's KSSH. Given that Enchin did not know of T907 at his life time, the later assumption must be accepted as true.

Here, further evidence must be considered for supporting the view that Enchin was not likely the author of T907.

As a matter of fact, Enchin's innocence of the forgery of T907 can also be corroborated by the following consideration. Indeed, Enchin was once in great need of a text like T907 which can be used as a decisive rebuttal to the challenge that the procedure for the "three ranks of attainment" as depicted in one of Saichō's *fuho-mon* documents was canonically unfounded. However, this assumption concerning Enchin's supposed forgery of T905 is irreconcilable with the existence of his KSSH and therefore must be rejected. Let us put the reasoning in the following way. Had T907 been written by Enchin, then he would have written it either before or after the composition of KSSH. Suppose the text had been finished before KSSH, it would have no longer been necessary for Enchin to write such a piece of work like KSSH, now that T907 had already presented a kind of scriptural support for the threefold dhāraṇī-*siddhi* correlation. Had he created T905 after the composition of KSSH, he would not have done so *unless and until* he had succeeded in keeping KSSH from circulation (the best way is, of course, to get it destroyed), since it was to his tremendous disadvantage that he left behind him such a work so close to a text forged by himself in the name of Śubhākarasimha. Therefore, the very existence of KSSH tends to deny Enchin of any role in the forgery of T907.

Section (C) Annen And the "Discovery" of T907

I have suggested in the last section that T907 was composed by some Japanese monk after Enchin's death in 891, which implies that Enchin was not the person responsible for the forgery of T907. Then, in the decade from 891 and 902, who is the most likely candidate for the authorship of T907? At this point, one naturally turns attention to Annen (841-?), who was born approximately 30 years after Enchin. It is thanks to him that a text which can be identified as T907 was "discovered" and made known to the world for the first time.

However, before formally treating Annen's "discovery" of T907, let us briefly discuss the (i) date of Annen's death, (ii) authorship of a preface found in a bibliography compiled by Annen, and (iii) date of one of Annen's major works, *Taizōkai daihō taijuki* (T2390, "A Record of the Face-to-face Transmission of the *Garbhadhatu* Great Procedures", hereafter TDT). All of these three problems are, to a certain extent, interlinked together; and our dating of T907 will rest, in part, on them.

(C.I) Annen's Death, His *Taizōkai Daihō Taijuki* and A Preface in His *Hakke Hiroku* Bibliography

Annen is considered one of the most creative Japanese Buddhist scholars, whose influences have not been limited to Tendai school, but have reached to other cultural forms in Medieval Japan. Despite his pre-eminence in the history of Japanese Buddhism, some aspects of Annen's life still remain obscure. He is generally believed to have been born in 841, but scholars debate on the place of his birth. His blood relationship with Saichō has been suggested but never proved. Though first studying with Ennin, Annen seems to have been initiated to the Tendai school by Henjō, succeeding whom he became the head of Genkeji Temple in 880. No reliable source tells us when and under what circumstances Annen died.

The date of Annen's death is a problem that has been extensively discussed by Japanese Tendai scholars. Yet, so far no consensus has ever emerged about this controversial problem. At least four different dating have been suggested for his death: (i) before 889, (ii) between 889 and 897, (iii) after 902 and (iv) 915.

The first dating, proposed by Japanese scholars like Ōyama (1979: 505), is based on the fact that virtually nothing is known about Annen after 889, which, given the fame and importance Annen had achieved by the time, suggests that he may have died not long after the time. According to this dating, Annen was forty-nine years old when he died (the date of his birth is generally set in 841). Such a life-span appears too short to be associated with so productive and mature author like Annen⁵⁸. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that Annen may have lived longer⁵⁹.

One theory has been raised for explaining the sudden disappearance of Annen's name from record since 889. Terada (1936: 176-78) suggests that this may have been due to the death of Annen's chief teacher and patron Henjō in 890 and the dramatic rise of Annen's fellow student

Yuishu after Henjō's death. The particular attention and favouritism Annen won from Henjō⁶⁰ may have aroused jealousy from Yuishu who was appointed to be the head of Onjoji and then as *zasu* on Mount Hiei. The triumph of Yuishu may have forced Annen into religious retreat until his death. This assumption, however, has never been proved by any solid evidence.

The fourth dating is based on later legendary sources⁶¹, which advocate the tradition that Annen in 915 entered a cave to meditate indefinitely, which means that he died in the year. This legend was obviously modelled on similar stories about Kūkai, according to which Kūkai entered a cave to meditate until Maitreya's appearance on earth⁶². The credibility of this dating can be easily rejected due to the legendary nature and the lateness of the sources it is based.

The second dating seems to have met with the widest acceptance. Unfortunately, it is not unassailable either. This dating was proposed by Hashimoto Shinkichi, perhaps the scholar who has contributed the most to our present understanding of Annen's life⁶³. Hashimoto's dating is mainly based on the following saying. It is said that one of Annen's student Genjō was once conferred the *denbō ajari* title from Annen; unfortunately, due to Annen's unexpected death he failed to receive from him a formal certificate (*injin*) for the title. Through investigating the various documents concerning initiations Genjō had ever received, Hashimoto concludes that he must have received the *denbō ajari* title by 897; *viz.*, Annen must have died before the year.

This dating is problematic for the following two reasons. First of all, the authenticity of this lineage of Genjō is questionable. Though not categorically impossible, it is extremely unlikely that one was able to get such an important initiation as that of the *denbō ajari* without receiving an official *injin* from his *guru*. The history of Chinese Buddhism (the Chan tradition in particular) abounds in the examples that some monks claimed to have been initiated by a prestigious master

though he regretted that his initiation did not, for one reason or another, get officially certified. The claims made by those monks must be examined carefully (more often than not, they turn out to be ill-founded). This may also hold for Japanese monks with similar claims.

Secondly, my study of a preface in Annen's *Hakke hiroku* bibliography⁶⁴ indicates that Annen was still alive in 902.

First of all, let us try to date this preface, to which two different dates have been given: (i) the eleventh day of the fifth month, Engi 2 (i.e., 902) as given by the edition the *Taishō* editors of the *Hakke hiroku* used as the master copy (T2176.55.114a16); (ii) the third day of the third month, Ninna 1 (885) on the basis of another edition of the *Hakke hiroku* (footnote [1], T2176.55.1114). I accept the first date as the more likely one.

The "reign title" (Jpn., *nengō*; Chin., *nianhao*) Genkei ended on the twenty-first day of the second month, Genkei 9, when a new reign title Ninna was adopted⁶⁵. Thus, between the twentieth day of the first month of Genkei 9 (the day Annen finished the initial version of his bibliography [T2176.55.1113c]) and the third day of the third month of Ninna 1 (the second dating of the preface), there is only a time-span of barely four months. In other words, according to the second date, Annen would have finished a revised version of his bibliography merely four months after it was initially compiled. The size of this bibliography convinces me that the whole work of revision would have cost Annen at least a couple of months, which means that Annen would have begun to revise his bibliography merely *two months* after the initial version was completed. Given the importance Annen has attached to the *Hakke hiroku*, this bibliography might have resulted from a long period of elaborate preparations. It is therefore quite unlikely that Annen, less than two months after the completion of the first version of his bibliography, had

become so unsatisfied with it that he deemed a revised version indispensable.

Furthermore, the bibliography refers to a text, the *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki*, which I will identify as T907 in the next sub-section. But as I argue in the section dealing with Enchin's relationship with T907, T907 was very likely composed after 891. Therefore, when Annen's bibliography was initially compiled in 885, T907 had not yet appeared in Japan and therefore could not be included in the bibliography. Rather, T907 was included in the revised version of bibliography, which might have been prepared later than 891. Consequently, I believe that the first dating (902) is more acceptable than the second one (885).

Therefore, if this preface can be taken as written by Annen, Annen actually lived at least until 902. Since this 902 preface contradicts the Genjō lineage according to which Annen died before 897, Hashimoto maintains that it was not necessarily written by Annen himself. Rather, the preface was, he believes, written by an editor of the bibliography. Hashimoto does not sound so persuasive on this point. A close analysis of the content and the style of this preface suggests that this preface was very likely written by Annen himself.

This preface begins with a comment on the way each of the "Eight Esoteric Bibliographies" attributed to the eight Japanese masters of Esoteric Buddhism was formed. All of them, the preface says, were compiled by selecting the [Esoteric] sūtras and manuals newly included in the *Zhenyuan lu* (Jpn., *Jōgen roku*, completed in 800). This work formed the textual basis for each of the [eight] Esoteric traditions (T2176.55.1113c17-18). According to the author, the way in which the "Eight Esoteric Bibliographies" were prepared has decided their common defects: "They omit all the dhāraṇī manuals belonging to the 'old translations', leaving the dhāraṇī practitioners ignorant of the sources from which the Esoteric texts were selected. Thus, [the eight

bibliographies] fail to live up to the standard that [a bibliography] must make the reader informed as much as possible" (T2176.55.1113c18-20).

After this criticism, the author explains the method by which the present bibliography is prepared:

On the basis of the "Eight Esoteric Bibliographies", this bibliography classifies [the Esoteric texts] into twenty categories, each of which is further divided into different classes of [Esoteric] manuals. Under every class are also included the Esoteric texts belonging to the "old translations"⁶⁶. The vows and histories related to the texts, though some of which may not be dhāraṇī-texts, are also to be provided. Furthermore, in the [Eight Esoteric] Bibliographies, some texts, in accordance with the bibliographies they originally appear, are quoted with their abbreviated titles; in contrast, some Esoteric masters give in their bibliographies the full titles for their favourite texts. This has prevented the readers of later generations from seeing the true identities of the texts. Now, in this bibliography I will record the original as well as derivative titles of the Esoteric texts, the differences between the full and abbreviated titles are also observed. In addition, the eight masters, for the sake of secrecy, [sometimes] chose not to include in their bibliographies some Esoteric texts. I have, however, included in my bibliography these texts insofar as they came to my attention (T2176.55.1113c20-25).

Subsequently, the author enumerates in his preface the (i) "Eight Esoteric Bibliographies" on which the bibliography is based; and the (ii) twenty categories into which the Esoteric texts are classified in the bibliography (T2176.55.1113c26-1114a12). Finally, the preface talks about how the Esoteric texts which were newly transmitted to Japan are dealt with in the bibliography,

As for the sutras and manuals which have been newly transmitted [to Japan], I will indicate the names of the persons responsible for transmitting them to Japan. Only one character in the name [of each of the eight masters] is noted so that the present text would not run too long. As for the [sutras related to the] Esoteric teachings transmitted in different times, the names of the temples in which these sūtras were copied will also be noted. If these texts were not copied in any temple in Japan, no such information is possible (T2176.55.1113c17-1114a13).

Therefore, this preface was written to explain the peculiar methods the author of this new bibliography has adopted in compiling his work. The tone of this preface suggests that the author

of this preface is very likely the author of this new bibliography. It is remarkable that the name of Annen is not mentioned in the preface. This seems to confirm the view that it is Annen himself who has written this preface. What is most telling in this preface is, however, the manner in which the preface speaks of the general method used in this new bibliography to classify all the Esoteric texts into twenty categories. As we know, in the first version of Annen's bibliography, the Esoteric texts were assorted into sixteen categories. The classification in terms of "twenty categories" is a new one that expanded the classification of "sixteen categories"⁶⁷. This also reveals the identity of the author of this preface, since the author of the preface, if not Annen himself, would have acknowledged that the new classification was based on an old one that was used in Annen's manuscript and so on.

Finally, Annen is credited with two other bibliographies, the *Jōgen shinnyū mokuroku shingonkyō narabini shingon ichiko* (The Esoteric Teachings and One Dhāraṇī Newly Included in the *Jōgen roku* Bibliography) and the *Jōgenroku zen yaku daranīho churoku* (A Selected Bibliography of the Dhāraṇī Manuals Translated before the *Jōgenroku*)⁶⁸. These two bibliographies are not extant now. But judging from their titles, we can still know that Annen was indeed once engaged in studying the *Jōgen roku* (Chin., *Zhenyuan lu*) in order to (i) specify the Esoteric texts and dhāraṇīs newly included in the bibliography and (ii) select from the bibliography the dhāraṇī manuals translated prior to the compilation of the *Zhenyuan lu*. Presumably, these two bibliographies reflect the two kinds of work done by Annen. All this corroborates the statement in this 902 preface, according to which the *Hakke hiroku* bibliography included under every category the Esoteric texts belonging to the "old translations" (i.e., translated before the *Zhenyuan lu*).

From all these considerations, I am inclined to believe that the 902 preface was composed by Annen himself. In other words, Annen was still alive until 902.

Thus, the third dating (i.e., after 902)⁶⁹ is left as the most likely one for the date of Annen's death. For the validity of this dating, we have some further evidence. In his TDT Annen mentions a text which I will also identify below as T907⁷⁰. As I believe, T907 was written on the basis of Enchin's KSSH, but after the death of Enchin in 891. Therefore, Annen must have lived long enough to "discover", if not "forge", T907. In other words, Annen must have outlived Enchin, who died in 891⁷¹. Furthermore, Annen's *Hakke hiroku* bibliography, which was initially compiled in 885, contains the title of T907 which was composed, most likely, after 891. This suggests that Annen's bibliography was revised after 891 and it was in the revised version that T907 was included in it.

It is, however, the dating of the TDT that leads me to conclude that Annen must have lived several years beyond 902. As for the dating of the TDT, it was most probably composed after 891 since it quotes T907, which was composed after Enchin's death (891).

Secondly, in his renowned bibliography Annen recorded some of his own major works in addition to those Esoteric sutras, commentaries and manuals brought back to Japan by the eight *nittō hakke* pilgrims. Annen did not, needless to say, include every work of his in the bibliography. However, since the TDT is, by any standard, among the most important works Annen has ever written, we have reason to believe that he would have included it into the bibliography had it been finished either when the bibliography was initially compiled in 885 or when the bibliography was revised in 902⁷². The current *Taishō* edition represents the revised version of the bibliography in which TDT is not found. The absence of the TDT in the

bibliography suggests that TDT was finished after 902.

Since TDT appeared to have been finished after 902 and since the composition of such a voluminous book (TDT is in seven fascicles) may have cost him several years, I am of the opinion that Annen died some time after 902.

(C.II) The Identity of the Text Annen Called "Sonshō Hajigoku Hō" or "Sonshō Hajigoku Giki"

Recorded in Annen's *Hakke hiroku* bibliography is a text called "Sonshō hajigoku darani giki" (Chin., "Zunsheng podiyu tuoluoni yigui", "The Procedure of the Utmost Wonderful Dhāraṇīs for Destroying the Hell"). As presented by Annen's bibliography, this text is in one fascicle and belongs to the *soshicchi bu* ("Division of *Susiddhi*"), which is one of the Three Divisions of the Esoteric teachings. Furthermore, according to an interlinear note, this text is also called *Sanshu shicchi hō* (Chin., *Sanzhongxidi fa*, the "Procedure of the Threefold Attainments") (T2176.55.1117a17). Finally, what warrants particular attention is that in Annen's bibliography this *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki* is followed by another one-fascicle text entitled "Sanshu shicchi fuhō" (The Dharma-transmission of the Threefold Attainment; see, T2176.55. 1117a18), which is identified in the interlinear note as the dharma-transmission document (*fuhōmon*) attributed to Saichō, recorded in the third fascicle of the *Kenkairon engi*⁷³ (T2176.55. 1117a18).

This bibliography by Annen is the first textual source that mentions a text that can be identified as T907, though not as T905 nor T906⁷⁴.

Why should this text, recorded in Annen's bibliography, be taken as T907, rather than T905 or T906? This is indeed a debatable issue⁷⁵. First of all, what we can say with some certainty

is that this text in Annen's bibliography is unlikely to be T905, since of the three *siddhi* texts T905 is the only one whose title does not contain the term "Sonshō" (*vikīrṇoṣṇīṣa*), one of the two core components of the title by which Annen refers to his text. Secondly, T906 and T907 are both alternatively known as "Bucchō *Sonshōshin hajigokuhō*" (Chin., "Foding zunshengxin podiyu fa")⁷⁶, which is close to Annen's "Sonshō hajigoku hō" (Chin., "Zunsheng podiyufa"). In contrast, the alternative title for T905 is "Sanshushicchi himitsu shingon hō" (Chin., "Sanzhong xidi mimi zhenyanfa"), which is totally different from "Sonshō hajigoku hō".

Consequently, this *hajigoku* text as recorded in Annen's bibliography may be T906 or T907. T906 appears a more likely candidate than T907 for the following two reasons. Firstly, T906 bears a title closer to that of the text listed in Annen's bibliography⁷⁷. Secondly, it is only in T906 that the theme of *hajigoku* ("destroying the hell") gets fully treated. Nevertheless, this first impression, after further analysis, is proved to be misleading.

In his bibliography Annen merely gives the title of the text called "Sonshō hajigoku darani giki", without a single word concerning the content of the text proper. Indeed, without any information regarding the general purport of this text, it is difficult to reach a definite decision on its true identity. Fortunately, not only did Annen record the title of this text in his bibliography, he, in his other works, also made references to a text which turns out to be the text he recorded as *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki* in the bibliography.

In the sixth fascicle of his seven-fascicle TDT, Annen referred to a text with the title of "Sonshō hajigoku hō":

In addition, during the time Konpon Daishi from Mt. Hiei (i.e., Saichō) stayed in Tang China, Acārya Jungyō (Chin., Shunxiao) transmitted to him the procedure of "three kinds of attainment", the seal and document of which are preserved in the

Kenkairon engi. [The document] says, Am-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham (the higher rank of attainment)⁷⁸, A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham (the middle rank of attainment)⁷⁹, A-Ra-Pa-Sa-Na (the lower rank of attainment)⁸⁰. The *mūdra* for the cultivation [of the procedure] is not included [in the document nonetheless]. Acārya Chin (i.e., Enchin) said, "The great Master transmitted [the procedure] to Kōchi, who transmitted [it] to Tokuen; Tokuen transmitted [it] to [me,] Enchin." Enchin transmitted it to the Great Acārya, i.e., the Gonsōjō⁸¹, who often doubted the existence of the methods [for securing the "three ranks of attainment"]. Recently, I discovered a copy of the text called *Sonshō hajigoku hō* containing the three groups of dhāraṇī corresponding to the three kinds of attainment, which are close to those taught by Acārya Jungyō.

The text reads, "A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na (which is called the "attainment of Emerging")⁸², A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham (which is called the "attainment of Entering")⁸³, A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham (which is called the "attainment of Mystery", also called "the attainment of accomplishment" and "wonderful attainment" [Skt., *susiddhi*])⁸⁴. A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham, which are illustrated as the five sections, five buddhas, five wheels, the contemplations of earth, lotus, sun, moon and space, are also called the "dhāraṇī for the dharma-body" (T2390.75.98b1-12).

This *Sonshō hajigoku hō* appears to be very likely the same text as that recorded in Annen's bibliography as the *Sonshō hajigoku darani hō*. As noted above, judged by its title, this *Sonshō hajigoku hō* (i.e., *Sonshō hajigoku darani hō*) is either T906 or T907, and very unlikely to be T905. The quotation Annen here made from this text provides us evidence for believing that the text in question is none other than T907.

According to the quotation Annen made here, in this *Sonshō hajigoku hō* the five Sanskrit syllables are correlated with the "five sections", "five buddhas", "five wheels" and the five contemplations centring on the earth, lotus, sun, moon and space; besides, the "five syllables" are also named the "dhāraṇīs for the dharma-body". In T907 the "five syllables" are first correlated with the "five buddhas" (915a12-15), and then aligned with the "five sections/wheels"⁸⁵ and "five contemplations" (c.f., 912a23-26). In T906, the "five syllables" are correlated not only with the "five Buddhas" (912b21-24), "five sections", "five wheels", and "five contemplations" (912c17-

21), but also with "five shapes"⁸⁶ (square, full-moon-like [=round], triangular, half-moon-like [i.e., semi-circular], full-moon) and "five colours" (yellow, white, red, black, and colour of all colours [=green]) (912c17-21).

Furthermore, as reported by Annen, in the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* the five syllables were further identified as the "dhāraṇī for the dharma-body" *after* they had been correlated with the "five sections", "five wheels" and "five contemplations". This is completely consistent with T907 but not T906. In T907, it is only *after* those fivefold correlations are made that the five syllables are further identified as the "dhāraṇī for dharma-body" (912a29-b1). In the case of T906, the identification of the "five syllables" as the "dhāraṇī for dharma-body" is made, however, some ten lines *before* those correlations are introduced (912c7-8).

On the basis of these two reasons, I argue that the text reported by Annen as the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* in the TDT or *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki* in his bibliography refers to T907, not T906 nor T905.

(C.III) Discoverer or Author: Annen and T907

To recapitulate, it was during the revision of the *Hakke hiroku* bibliography in 902, rather than its initial compilation in 885, that the title of the *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki* (=T907) was included in the bibliography. On the other hand, Annen announced his "discovery" of T907 in his TDT, which, though undated, was very probably written after 902. So, in comparison with TDT, the *Hakke hiroku* bibliography represents the earlier textual source to have mentioned T907. Therefore, it can be affirmed that Annen knew of T907 no later than 902. Consequently, T907

was written in Japan between 891 and 902.

In this decade between 891 and 902, who wrote this Japanese Esoteric Buddhist apocryphon? At this juncture, I am inclined to believe that the author of T907 was Annen. We know that Annen is the first person to have reported the existence of T907. More importantly, Annen was the most prominent Taimitsu representative after Enchin and Henjō. He, like Enchin, may have been motivated to substantiate the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation with some authoritative textual sources. Therefore, he obviously had the motive to forge such a text like T907, which provides the scriptural support for the practice of correlating the triple five-syllable dhāraṇīs with the three kinds/ranks of attainment. Finally, Annen had the chance to gain access to Enchin's KSSH, which includes the oral instructions from Faquan to Enchin. It would have been quite easy for him to write a text which contains the main points of Faquan's instruction and then make public the "discovery" of the text.

Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that T907 was, most probably, written by Annen between 891 and 902 on the basis of, besides other sources, Enchin's KSSH.

Section (D) The Textual Provenance of T907

We are now left with the last task in this chapter, i.e., to investigate the textual provenance

of T907. Besides Enchin's KSSH, what kinds of textual sources were used in T907?

The *Dainichi kyō/Darijing* and Yixing's commentary on the sūtra are, first and foremost, two important textual sources on the basis of which some basic ideas in T905 were formed and some T907 passages were written. From the chapter of "Xidi" (Skt., *siddhi*; Jpn., *shicchi*; "attainment) in the *Dainichi kyō* the T907 author directly quoted one passage. This *Dainichikyō* passage identifies the five syllables of A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham as the "vajra-syllables" (Jpn., *kongō jiku*; Chin., *jinggang ziju*) which are believed to be capable of subduing the four kinds of Maras, freeing sentient beings from the "six realms of reincarnation" (Skt., *ṣaḍ-gati*; Chin., *liuqu*; Jpn., *nokushu*), making the "wisdom of 'all wisdoms' (Skt., *sarvajna*)" complete⁸⁷. In addition, two lines in a *gatha* of the *Dainichikyō*, "Prostrate myself before Vairocana-buddha/whose pure eyes open like the lotus flowers"⁸⁸, were also quoted in T907 and used as the first two lines of the *gatha* in which T907 ends.

In comparison to the *Dainichi kyō*, Yixing's commentary on the sūtra was more extensively used in T907. One whole paragraph in T907 can be traced back to the third fascicle of Yixing's commentary. In this passage, the Buddha who conceals the Esoteric teachings from the ordinary people is likened to a king who hides the precious swords from his most beloved son for fear that his son, not knowing how to use the swords, might get hurt⁸⁹. More importantly, there is evidence to believe that one central idea pronounced in T907 is also indebted to Yixing's commentary. This idea underlies the correlation between several Esoteric and indigenous Chinese fivefold categories in general⁹⁰, and that between the five syllables (A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham) and the "five divisions" in particular⁹¹.

Besides Enchin's KSSH, the *Dainichi kyō* and Yixing's commentary, the fourth textual

source which was crucial for the formation of T907 is an Esoteric scripture, *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* (Jpn., *Bucchō Sonshō darani kyō*; Skt., *Tathāgata-uṣṇīṣa-vikīrṇa-dhāraṇī-sūtra*; The Sutra of the Dhāraṇīs of the Buddha's Head which Is the Utmost Honourable"). This sutra has been fervently worshipped not merely in China but also in Japan, not only by Esoteric practitioners but also by Buddhist followers affiliated with some non-Esoteric sects (like Chan/Zen schools)⁹². The importance as well as popularity of this Esoteric scripture is attested by the fact that at least thirteen different Chinese translations of the same scripture are still extant and preserved in Chinese Buddhist *Tripitaka* (T#968-T#974[e]). T907 is indebted to this Esoteric scripture not merely for its title⁹³ but also for the structure of its first paragraph and the main idea underlying it.

T907 begins with the promise that this sūtra will lead to the destroying of hell, the eradication of the "sevenfold misfortune"⁹⁴. It is also promised that the five Sanskrit syllables, whether carried by the rulers or the governors, or painted on the flags and carved on the drums and bugles, will bring about a variety of merits and miracles. This also strongly reminds one of the relevant passage in the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* about the merits that are expected of the reciting and copying of this sūtra. Prince Suppatitṭha, the subject of the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing*, is also mentioned at the beginning of T907. All these can be understood as the impact from the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing*⁹⁵.

Finally, what may appear ironical is that several lines from a text attributed to Kūkai were incorporated into T907, an Esoteric Buddhist apocryphon of Tendai origin which was written for the interest of the Tendai school, a school antagonistic against that established by Kūkai. The *Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon* (An Explanation of the Principle and Contemplation of the

Dhāraṇī-reciting) by Kūkai contains the following eight lines,

All of the Tathāgatas
 [possess] the wisdom-water like the sweet dew;
 All the Buddhas of the "three times"
 [have] the wonderful medicines like the finest cream.
 With one syllable entering into the [five] viscera,
 one becomes immune to every kind of illness.
 [He can also] immediately attain
 the empty and tranquil buddha-body (KZ5: 95).

It is striking to find that these eight lines from Kūkai's text were re-written into T907 in this prose form,

The dhāraṇīs for the five-section as listed in the right are the pearl-liquid made of *the sweet dew* of non-production (Jpn., *fushō*; Chin., *busheng*; Skt., *anutpādatva*) which comes from *all the Tathāgatas, the wonderful medicines of the finest cream* of the buddha-nature. *With one syllable entering into the five viscera, [the practitioner] will become immune to any kind of illness* (T907.18.915a26-28; the underlines corresponding to the lines in Kūkai's text).

As shown above, T907 was aimed at defending the interest of Taimitsu, an Esoteric tradition opposed to that initiated by Kūkai. Considering the polemic and sectarian propaganda underlying the composition of T907 and the intensity of the Tendai-Shingon conflict at the time T907 was composed, the utilization of one of Kūkai's works in such a polemic-oriented text like T907 is very interesting and deserves serious attention.

Some Concluding Remarks

After investigating a variety of evidence related to T907, I suggest that T907 was written in Japan on the basis of a treatise attributed to Enchin. My study of Annen's connection with T907 leads to a tentative conclusion about the authorship of this Japanese Esoteric Buddhist apocryphon: Annen was, in all likelihood, more than a discoverer of T907; rather, as the present state of our knowledge stands, he is the most likely candidate for the authorship of T907.

In this chapter, I have also examined the textual sources on the basis of which T907 was composed. They include (i) a short treatise by Enchin (KSSH), (ii) the *Darijing/Dainichi kyō* (T848), (iii) *Darijing shu/Dainichi kyō sho* (A Commentary on the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*; T1796) by Yixing, (iv) the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing/Bucchō Sonshō darani kyō* (T967) and finally (v) a text attributed to Kūkai, *Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon*.

Notes,

1. See chapter four.
2. For this sutra and its Chinese origin, see my discussion in chapter four.
3. This *Hi sōjōshū* includes a statement of a monk called Kōyō (about whom nothing else is known) in the fifth year of Kenbō period (1217) (Tendaishūten hensankai 1990: 33). Therefore, we assume that this text was composed after 1217.
4. Jien wrote a commentary on the *Betsugyō kyō*, which is entitled *Birushana betsugyōkyō shiki* (A Private Record Concerning the *Birushana betsugyōkyō*). Another commentary on the same sutra is attributed to a monk from his lineage (cf., Misaki 1993: 283).
5. Since T907 was almost word by word reproduced in T905 and T906, the discovery of either of T905 and T906 amounts to that of T907 itself.
6. Cf., section (D) of chapter three.
7. Misaki 1993: 286.
8. The “Realm of Principle” refers to the Division of the Womb-realm which, along with the Division of the Diamond-realm (known as the “Realm of Wisdom”), forms the two divisions into which the Esoteric teachings were generally divided in East-Asian Esoteric Buddhist traditions.
9. The *Darijing* was originally translated by Śubhākarasimha and Yixing as a six-fascicle sutra. After the *Gongyang cidi* was attached to it as the seventh fascicle, the *Darijing* began to circulate in seven fascicles. The *Kenbo mokuroku* author was wrong here in observing that the *Dainichi kyō/Darijing* is in one fascicle.
10. The Haiyun Record is composed of two fascicles. Here the *Kenbo mokuroku* author may have referred to its second fascicle, which is regarding the transmission of the Womb-realm Esoteric Buddhism.
11. Cf., Note (13).
12. This may have referred to the first fascicle of the Haiyun Record, which relates the transmission of the Diamond-realm Esoteric teachings.
13. Misaki identifies this Enmankai Division as the *Soshicchi* Division, the third of the Three Divisions (*sanbu*) into which the Tendai school, most likely beginning from Ennin, divided the Esoteric teachings (Misaki 1993: 287).
14. I fail to identify this text.
15. Ibid.
16. The *Rishukyō gishaku* is a commentary on the *Rishukyō* which, though said to have been translated by Bukong, was very likely to be written by himself. For this influential esoteric commentary and how this text became related to the Saichō-Kūkai strife, see section (D), chapter two.

17. See chapter two.
18. Nomoto 1988.
19. Nomoto 1988.
20. Cf., BZ28: 1400b, 1402b, 1406b, etc.
21. Cf., chapter three.
22. Cf., Section (C) of this chapter.
23. I will return to this problem when dealing with the dating of KSSH.
24. The *trikāya* (Chin., *sanshen*; Jpn., *sanshin*) denotes the three kinds of body (substance) a buddha is believed to assume under different circumstances: (i) the body of dharma (Skt., *dharmakāya*; Chin., *fashen*; Jpn., *hoshin*), (ii) that of retribution (Skt., *sambhogakāya*; Chin., *baoshen*; Jpn., *hoshin*), and (iii) that of transformation (Skt., *nirmāṇakāya*; Chin., *huashen*; Jpn., *keshin*).
25. In Zhenguan 5 [631] Emperor Taizong ordered that one of his old residences in Luoyang be donated to the monastic order and be used as a temple, which was called the Tiangongsi. For its royal connection, the Tiangongsi Temple had become famous in the Tang dynasty, particularly for its close ties with some eminent Esoteric monks. In Chanshou 2 (693), the Tantric master Maṇicintana (Chinese name Baosiwei, ?-721; see Forte 1984) from Kashmir was ordered to take residence at this temple. It is at this temple that he translated several important Esoteric texts. Under the reign of Emperor Xuanzong, Daoyin from the Qinglongsi Temple, the Esoteric headquarters in Tang China, also lived at this temple and translated into Chinese the *Jingyezhang jing* (Jpn., *Jōgosshō kyō*; The Karma-purifying Sutra; T1494) (cf., BD4: 3782).
- Thus, for its Tantric background, it is not surprising to read Enchin's report that the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs, in correlation with the three buddha-bodies, were carved on the pillars of this temples.
- I am grateful to Prof. Antonino Forte of the Italian School of East Asian Studies in Kyōto for referring me to the importance of the Tiangongsi Temple in the history of Chinese Esoteric Buddhism and its connection with Maṇicintana in particular.
26. The threefold dhāraṇī-body correlation is, however, derivable from the combination of the dhāraṇī-attainment correlation and body-attainment correlation, both of which are made in the three *siddhi* texts. For this reason, the threefold body-dhāraṇī correlation can be regarded as implied in the three *siddhi* texts, though not clearly established there.
27. This sutra is now collected in the *Taishō Tripitaka* (T#1173). Claiming to be one fascicle in the *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō*, it is devoted to a five-syllable dhāraṇī ascribed to Mañjuśrī, viz, a dhāraṇī composed of the five syllables, A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na (i.e., the third of the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs which are correlated with the three ranks of attainment in Saichō's *fuhōmon* as well as the three *siddhi* texts).
28. Faquan (Jpn., Hōsen, or Hassen, ?-?) is said to be the author of two Esoteric manuals which are currently preserved in the *Taishō Tripitaka* under the numbers 852 and 853 respectively. For Enchin's association with and study under Faquan, see BZ28.1310b13-1311b1. Ennin also used to study with this Chinese Esoteric master.

29. Cf., T905.18.910b28-c2, T906.18.912b27-c1, T907.18.915a17-20.

30. Cf., T905.18.911a21, T906.18.913c23-24, T907.18.915b24.

31. Cf., T905.18.910b22-25, T906.18.912b21-24, T907.18.915a12-15.

32. Cf., T905.18.910b18-22, T906.18.911b21-17, T907.18.915a8-12.

33. T905.18.910c20-21, T906.18.912c7-8, T907.18.915c29-b1.

34. The two buddhas mentioned here by Faquan may have referred to two of the "three buddha-bodies". Now that the dharma-body had already been treated by Faquan himself (he identified the five syllables as the "dhāraṇī for the dharma-body"), the "two-buddhas" may have referred to the *hoshinbutsu* (Chin., *baoshenfo*) and *keshinbutsu* (Chin., *huashenfo*), i.e., two kinds of buddhas manifested in the bodies of "retribution-body" (*sambhoga-kāya*) and "transformation-body" (*nirmāṇa-kāya*) respectively.

35. The term *ryōbu* (Chin., *liangbu*) here refers to the Esoteric traditions attributed to the *Darijing/Dainichi kyō* and *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō*, two fundamental texts for various East Asian Esoteric traditions.

36. For the threefold classification of the category of *siddhi* (attainment) in terms of "emerging", "entering" and "mystery", see T905 (911a5-17), T906 (913c10-18), T907 (91512-21).

37. Cf., the conclusion of part one.

38. See chapter seven.

39. It seems that KSSH originally ended at the two-character term, *yuner* (Jpn., *unji*), which is a standard term with which an article written in classic Chinese usually ends. If this is true, the interlinear note and two paragraphs ([9] and [10]) that follow the term *unji* were not written by Enchin himself but added by a certain KSSH editor.

40. With regard to the "two buddhas", Faquan is said to have told Enchin,

As for the two buddhas, they are completely discussed in the various sutras belonging to the "Two Divisions". For the reason, I would say nothing about them. You can understand them by yourself (BZ27.985b11-12).

Here, Faquan did not speak of anything about the "two buddhas", as he assumed that if one needs to know anything about the "two buddhas" he can consult various sūtras belonging to the "Two Divisions" (referring to the Esoteric texts affiliated with the *Darijing/Dainichi kyō* and the *Jingangding jing/Kongōchō gyō*), in which the "two buddhas" are, as Faquan believed, fully treated.

41. I discussed this question when discussing paragraph (2).

42. T899 has a full title which is as long as "Qingjing fashen Biluzhe'na xindi famen chengjiu yiqie tuoluoni sanzongxidi" (Jpn., "Shōjōhōsshin Birushana shinjihōmon jōju issai darani sanshu shicchi). It is also known for three other titles: (i) "Biluzhe'na biexingjing" (Jpn., "Birushana Betsugyō kyō"), (ii) "Da Biluzhe'na sanzongxidi fa" (Daibirushana sanshushicchi hō"), and (iii) "Qingjing Biluzhe'na sanzongxidi fa" (Jpn.,

"Shōjō Birushana sanshushicchi hō") (cf., T899.18.781b), two of which are close to the title "Sanzhongxidi fa" (Jpn., "Sanshushicchi hō").

43. We know this since in KSSH Enchin mentioned an official document which was dated to Jōgan 13 (871) (BZ27.986a3).

44. BZ28.1326b4-1327a3.

45. The *Chishō Daishi nenpu* was compiled by Sontsu in 1467 (BKD8: 8).

46. BZ28.1291a13-14; c.f., BZ28.1327c.

47. For Annen's report of Henjō's attitude toward the threefold attainment, see the next section in this chapter.

48. This letter is now preserved in the *Chishō Daishi zensho* (BZ28.1336-9) under the title "Shō Chierin sanzō sho" ("A letter to Trepīṭaka Prajñācakra"). The same letter is also found in BZ113. 297-300. For a detailed study and a Japanese translation of this letter, see Ono 1978.

49. Zhihuilun's brief biography is found in the *Song gaosengzhuan* (Biographies of Eminent Monks [Compiled in] the Song Dynasty, T2061.50.723a4-12). He is praised for his gift for languages and his full mastery of dhāraṇī. He is said to have written a work called "Shijiao zhigui" ("A guide to the teachings"). Though his specific date is unknown, his death preceded, most likely, the year 873 since his biography reports that his disciple Shaoming erected a stele in commemoration of him during the Xiantong period (860-873). Enchin was introduced to Zhihuilun in Daizhong 9 (855) (cf., BZ28.1311b2-4).

50. This word appears in the text as an interlinear note.

51. *Ibid.*

52. *Ibid.*

53. A similar, but briefer question is collected in the *Sasa gimon*, which represents, as noted above, a different version of the *kimon*:

A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham -- the higher rank [of attainment],
 A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham -- the middle rank [of attainment],
 A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na -- the lower rank [of attainment].

From which scripture does this [correlation] come? I used to see this [correlation] carved on many doors of temples in Luoyang. What is its main purport? (BZ27. 1039b 11-13)

54. As noted above, according to his biography in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*, Zhihuilun died no later than 873, i.e., almost a decade before Enchin delivered his letter in 882. Considering the transportational difficulties existing between China and Japan at the time, it seems understandable that Enchin remained oblivious to Zhihuilun's death around one decade after it happened. As acknowledged by Enchin himself, the latest reply he got from Zhihuilun was that dated to the fifth day of the eleventh month of Xiantong 2 (861), i.e., twenty-one years before he was preparing in 882 to renew his association with his former teacher. Enchin in the same letter also said that on the fourth day of the eighth month, 863, he asked a person called Zhan Jingchuan (who

was probably a Chinese merchant trading between China and Japan) to send a letter to Zhihuilun. Zhan returned to Japan a year later to report that the road to Chang'an was blocked and he was unable to visit Zhihuilun there.

The envoy for Enchin in 882 was a person called Li Da (Jpn., Ri Da), who survived a wreckage which, occurring in 865, killed Zhan and a Japanese monk called Ensai who had been notorious for his misconduct in Tang China (cf., BZ28.1336a15-b7).

55. My reason for making such an identification will be discussed in the next section.

56. For the dating of this important work of Annen, see my relevant discussion in the next section.

57. Cf., chapter four. Neither Saichō nor Kūkai mentions T907 in his bibliographies of the texts brought back to Japan from China.

58. Over one hundred books, most of which works on Esoteric Buddhism, have been attributed to Annen. Some of these books may have been actually wrongly attributed to Annen, while others may have been quite short. Nonetheless, Annen still stands as an impressively prolific author (Hashimoto 1912, 4/11: 13; Etani 1976: 313; Groner 1987: 150).

59. The evidence includes (i) a preface dated 902 found in the bibliography attributed to Annen and (ii) a lineage claiming that Annen conferred the *denbo ajari* title on a student around 897 (see hereinbelow).

60. Henjō conferred special initiations on Annen without giving them to Yuishu (*Kongōkai daihō taijuki*, ND 82: 251-52).

61. *Tendai kakyō*, which was compiled in 1771 and expanded in 1867; BZ41: 380c-381a.

62. Cf., Hakeda 1972: 60.

63. Hashimoto 1918.

64. Better known as *Hakke hiroku* (The Bibliography Compiled on the Basis of the Eight Bibliographies by the Eight Esoteric Masters), this bibliography by Annen has a full title called "Shō Ajari shingon mikkyō burui soroku" ("A Complete Bibliography of Various Sorts of Dhāraṇī Esoteric [Works Brought Back from China by] the [Japanese] Ācaryas"; T2176). This bibliography was widely circulated in later Esoteric circles in Japan, both Shingon and Tendai as well (exclusively to the *Hakke hiroku* Misaki has contributed a paper, which remains the only available exhaustive study of this important bibliography by Annen [Misaki 1968]).

The *Hakke hiroku* was initially compiled in 885. The "eight esoteric bibliographies" which Annen was based in compiling his own bibliography were left by the following eight Japanese Esoteric masters who went to study in Tang China (known as the *nittō hakke*):

- (i) Saichō (766-822), stay in China: 804-805;
- (ii) Kūkai (774-835), stay in China: 804-806;
- (iii) Jōgyō (?-864), stay in China: 838-839;
- (iv) Engyō (799-852), stay in China: 838-839;
- (v) Ennin (794-864), stay in China: 838-847;
- (vi) Eun (798-869), stay in China: 842-847;
- (vii) Enchin (814-891), stay in China: 853-858;

(viii) Shūei (809-884), stay in China: 862-865.

Whereas the 885 version of Annen's bibliography classified the Esoteric texts into sixteen categories, the 902 revised version used a new method in accordance with which the Esoteric texts were classified into twenty, rather than sixteen, categories.

65. Cf., NRDJ7: 582.

66. The *jiufan* (Jpn., *kyūhon*), or *jiuyi* (Jpn., *kyūbyaku*), literally "old translations", refers to the Chinese translations of the Buddhist texts made before the Tang Dynasty.

67. For the names of these "sixteen categories", cf., T2176.55.1113c1-6.

68. See, for instances, the *Mitsujō senjutsu mokuroku* (A Bibliography of the Esoteric Writings) (BZ2.253b10-11); the *Enryakuji mitsujō ryaku mokuroku* (A Brief Bibliography of [the Works Belonging to] the Esoteric Vehicle [Compiled at] the Enryakuji Temple) (BZ1.145a4-5); the *Honchō taisō senjutsu mikkyō shomoku* (A Bibliography of the Esoteric Works Composed by the Tendai Patriarchs of this Country) (BZ2.205a13-14), etc.

69. For this dating, see Kiuchi 1986: 360. Kiuchi says nothing about how he reached such a dating.

70. See (C.II) in this section.

71. This affirms once more that the first dating, which sets the death of Annen in 889, is unacceptable.

72. Cf., BKD7: 182-3.

73. The current edition of the *Kenkairon engi* is in two fascicles. The author of this interliner note (either Annen himself or a *Hakke hiroku* editor), if not here referring to an edition other than the current one, may have mistaken the *Kenkairon*, which is in three fascicles, as the *Kenkairon engi*.

74. Anne is said to have prepared a bibliography which includes a text called "Sonshō hajigoku giki", exactly one of the names for which the three *siddhi* texts (T906 and T907 in particular) have been known in Japan. Nonetheless, the authenticity of this bibliography is questionable; and we have evidence to doubt that any of the three *siddhi* texts was known to Anne (see section [A]).

On the other hand, Enchin's KSSH mentions two texts, one in the possession of Ninchū and the other known under the name "Sanshu shicchi hō". Either of these two texts is likely to be taken as one of the three *siddhi* texts. But actually, as I just argued, neither of them can be identified as any of the three *siddhi* texts.

75. Although a colophon attached to T905 by an editor of T907 identified T907 as the *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki* in Annen's bibliography (see, T907.18.915c21-23), Ōmura identifies this *hajigoku* text recorded by Annen as T906 (Ōmura 1918: *funoku* 34).

76. See T906.18.914b20, T907.18.915c12.

77. The title of the tract in Annen's text is of four components: (1) *Sonshō*, (2) *hajigoku*, (3) *darani*, and (4) *[gi]ki*. Three of them ([1], [2] and [4]) can be found in T906's title, which also has a term ("shingon") identical in meaning with the fourth component ([3] *darani*) not found in T906's title. In comparison, three components

([1], [2], [3]) are found in T907's title which does not, however, contain a term corresponding to the fourth component ([gi]ki).

78. The statement bracketed here appears in the text as an interlinear note.

79. *Ibid.*

80. *Ibid.*

81. The *gonsōjō*, a high-rank monastic post secondary to the *sōjō* (the highest monastic official supervising the Buddhist order), here refers to Henjō, who was promoted to the position in 868.

82. The sentence bracketed appears in the text as an interlinear note.

83. *Ibid.*

84. *Ibid.*

85. Five wheels are mentioned in neither T906 nor T907. But both of them mention the "five elements" (earth, water, fire, wind, space) which are also named as "five wheels" in some well known Esoteric texts, such as Yixing's commentary on the *Darijing/Dainichi kyō*.

86. Actually only four shapes are used in the text, since the shape of "full moon" is associated with Syllables A and Kham as well.

87. In the *Dainichi kyō/Darijing*, this passage is found in T848.18.20a17-19, while its quotation in T907 is found in T907.18.915b14-16.

88. In the *Dainichi kyō/Darijing*, these two lines of *gathas* are found in T848.18.45a8. For the corresponding quotation of these two lines in T907, see T907.18.915b18.

89. In Yixing's commentary, this passage is found in T1796.39.609c8-9. The corresponding passage in T907 is found in T907.18.915b7-8.

90. In his *Darijing* commentary Yixing has used some indigenous Chinese thinking patterns, like *wuxing* and *jiugong*, to re-interpret some Esoteric teachings and practices as expounded in the *Darijing*. In particular, Yixing has tried to correlate a number of Esoteric fivefold categories together on the basis of *wuxing* pattern.

91. The "five divisions" which are correlated in T907 with the five Sanskrit syllables A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham are the (1) division of vajra-earth, (2) that of vajra-water, (3) that of vajra-fire, (4) that of vajra-wind, and (5) that of vajra-space. This correlation between five syllables and five divisions of "five elements" is traceable to Yixing's commentary too, where the same five Sanskrit syllables are correlated with the "five elements" (cf., T1796.39.586b11-13; 727c8-23).

92. Cf., Liu 1995.

93. The title of T907, which reads, "Bucchō Sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsu sangai himitsu darani", is apparently copied from that of the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* (Jpn., *Bucchō Sonshō darani kyō*).

94. The term "sevenfold misfortune" comes from the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* (cf., T967. 19.350a-b).

95. Cf., T967.19.351b9-18.

CHAPTER SIX

THE PROVENANCE AND DATES OF T#905 AND T#906

In the last chapter we argued for the Japanese origin of T907. Therefore, T905 and T906, both written on the basis of T907, must also be taken as composed in Japan. In this chapter we will show that even without resorting to this conclusion we reached on the provenance of T907, there is still sufficient evidence to show that T905 was also composed in Japan, with several works by Enchin used as its sources (some passages and ideas in Enchin's KSSH were, as shown in the last chapter, incorporated into T907). In this chapter I will also discuss the provenance and date of T906. Furthermore, some hypotheses will be proposed on the polemical agenda underlying the composition of T905 after the appearance of T907.

Section (A) A Textual Analysis of T905

T905 begins with a section (909b17-25) which is also found in T907; we can assume that this section was taken from T907¹. This section is followed by a *gathā* which, as noted in chapter four, consists in the first sixteen lines of the *gathā* in T907 in addition to four lines from a *gathā* in an Esoteric text (T1141) attributed to Śubhākarasimha.

Then, we find a long part (T905.18.909c7-910b18) which, though based on a section in T907 (T907.18.915a6-15), was perhaps mainly written by the author of T905 himself². This part of T905 correlates the five Sanskrit syllables (A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham) with a variety of fivefold categories, both Buddhist Esoteric and indigenous Chinese. Five sentences in this section identify the five Sanskrit syllables as the seeds for the five elements (*pañca-mahā-bhūta*, i.e., "earth", "water", "fire", "wind", "emptiness" or "space") respectively:

- (i) Syllable A, identical with the "dharmakāya-as-the-principle" of Mahāvairocana-Tathāgata, ... , is the seed of the wheel of the vajra-ground (T905.18.909c7-9);
- (ii) Syllable Vam, ... , is the seed of the wheel of water in the wisdom-sea of Mahāvairocana-tathāgata (T905.18.909c24-27);
- (iii) Syllable Ram, ... , is the seed of fire [planted] in the "mind-ground" of Mahāvairocana-tathāgata (T905.18.910a8-9);
- (iv) Syllable Hum, ... , is the seed of wind, [which indicates] the permanent life of Mahāvairocana-tathāgata (T905.18.910a19-21);
- (v) Syllable Kham, ... , is the "invisible protuberance" (Skt., *uṣṇīṣa-siraskata*; Jpn., *muken chōsō*; Chin., *wujian dingxiang*) on the top of the head of Mahāvairocana-tathāgata, [the seed in] the place for the wisdom of the "great emptiness" (Jpn., *daikūchi sho*; Chin., *dakongzhi chu*), to which the five Buddhas are enlightened (T905.18.910b6).

These five sentences find their parallels in a treatise attributed to Enchin, the *Kyōji ryōbu hiyōgi* (An Explanation of the Esoteric, Fundamental Teachings Related to the Dual Division, hereafter KRHG; BZ28.1087-8):

- (i) Syllable A is the seed of the *vajra*-wheel of Mahāvairocana[-tathāgata]'s *dharmakāya* (BZ28.1087a8-9);
- (ii) Syllable Vam is the perfect seed of the wheel of water in the wisdom-sea of Mahāvairocana-tathāgata (BZ28.1087a10-11);
- (iii) Syllable Ram is the seed of fire [planted] in the "mind-ground" of

Mahāvairocana-tathāgata (BZ28.1087a12);

(iv) Syllable Hum is the seed of wind, [which indicates] the permanent life of Mahāvairocana-tathāgata (BZ28.1087a13-14);

(v) Syllable Kham is the "invisible protuberance" on the top of the head of Mahāvairocana-tathāgata, [the seed in] the place for the wisdom of the "great emptiness", to which the five Buddhas are enlightened (BZ28.1087a13-14).

Following this major part in T905 which was not directly copied from T907 but mainly written by the author himself, we find a big section (T905.18.910b26-911a27), which was, as a whole, based on T907. However, this section also includes some sentences and paragraphs that can not be traced back to T907. First of all, two sentences in this part find their parallels in the same KRHG³. Besides these two sentences, three paragraphs from textual sources other than T907 (i.e., the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra* and two other Esoteric scriptures [T#1172 and T#1173]) were also included in this section of T905 mainly based on T907⁴.

Finally, we come to the concluding section of T905 (T911a27-912a27) which is the other major part in T905 that is not found in T907. This long section, except for one paragraph (in 911b4-6)⁵, can be divided into two classes of paragraphs: one is related to Yixing's commentary and the other to Enchin's works. We will first discuss the five paragraphs in this section which are connected with three works attributed to Enchin: (i) KRHG, the (ii) *Zashiki* (The Miscellaneous, Personal Notes; hereafter ZSK; BZ27.977-984), the (iii) *Daibirusharajōdōkyō shinmoku* (The Heart and Eyes of the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*; hereafter DKSM; BZ26.648-655).

Such a T905 paragraph is found in T905.18.911a27-b1:

Right now, the eight gates comprehensively cover ten thousand dharmas. These three groups of five-syllables, forming fifteen syllables [in total], are fifteen kinds of *Vajra-samādhī*. One syllable is fifteen syllables and fifteen syllables are one syllable. One syllable is five syllables and five syllables are one syllable. [The syllables,] which are turned either by or against the syllable sequence, are not different from beginning to end.

This T905 paragraph in the concluding section is closely paralleled by a KRHG paragraph:

These three groups of five-syllables, forming fifteen syllables [in total], are fifteen kinds of *Vajra-samādhī*. One syllable is fifteen syllables and fifteen syllables are one syllable. One syllable is five syllables and five syllables are one syllable. [The syllables,] which are turned either by or against the syllable sequence, are not different from beginning to end. *Right now, the eight gates comprehensively cover ten thousand dharmas*⁶ (BZ28.1087a17-b2).

The second paragraph in the concluding section of T905 with parallel in Enchin's works is found in 911c26-912a3:

Consequently, "Mahāvairocana-buddha as the central deity" is the *dharmakāya*; the mystery-lord who holds the *mūdra* of vajra-wisdom is Prajñā; Avalokiteśvara who holds the *mūdra* of lotus is the delivery. So, the "mystery of body" is the virtue of *dharmakāya*; the "mystery of mouth" the virtue of *prajñā*; the "mystery of mind" the virtue of delivery. By means of *prajñā* the delivery is attained: the delivery is based on the *prajñā*. Both of them depend on the substance of *dharmakāya*. [Three of them] are neither identical nor different; without any one of the three, the other two would not work. They are like the three dots in the Sanskrit syllable I (ॄ). The "bodhi-mind" is the Vajra-section; the "great Compassion (*mahākaruṇā*)" the lotus section; the *upāya* this "transformation-body" (*nirmāṇa-kāya*).

Its parallel is found in Enchin's work ZSK:

The Central Deity in the *garbhadhatu*-[mandala] is the *dharmakāya*; the Vajrasattva is *prajñā*; Avalokiteśvara is the delivery. By means of *prajñā* the delivery is attained: the delivery is based on the *prajñā*. Both of them depend on the substance of *dharmakāya*. [Three of them] are neither identical nor different; without any one of the three, the other two would not work. The "bodhi-mind" is the Vajra-section; the "great Compassion (*mahākaruṇā*)" the lotus section; the *upāya* this "transformation-body" (*nirmāṇa-kāya*) (BZ27.980a10-13).

Then, the three component sentences of a paragraph in T905.18.911a3-5 are all found in Enchin's

DKSM. This paragraph in T905 reads,

So, syllable A, denoting the "internal womb" (Jpn., *naitai*), represents the rank prior to the "equal enlightenment" (*sambodhi*). Syllable Sa, denoting the "external womb" (Jpn., *gaitai*), represents the "wonderful enlightenment". Syllable Ba denotes the function. All dharma-wheels depend on this gate, which freely pervades all over the fields of "two transformations" and is capable of delivering all the sentient beings in the "ten realms" (T905.18.912a3-5).

The three sentences in DKSM corresponding to the three sentences in this T905 paragraph are:

(1) So, Syllable A, denoting the "internal womb" (Jpn., *naitai*), represents the rank prior to the "equal enlightenment" (*sambodhi*) (BZ26.652b8);

(2) Syllable Sa, denoting the "external womb" (*gaitai*), represents the "wonderful enlightenment" (BZ26.653a4);

(3) Syllable Ba denotes the function. All dharma-wheels depend on this gate, which freely pervades all over the fields of "two transformations" and is capable of delivering all the sentient beings in the "ten realms" (BZ26.653a8).

The fourth paragraph in the concluding section of T905 which is connected with Enchin's work is found in 912a18-21:

But as for Vairocana[-buddha]'s body and field, **his "secondary retribution" and "principal retribution"⁷ are inter-penetrating, the nature and appearance are identical.** The Thusness pervades the "Great I" in the dharma-field; **the "body", "words" and "thoughts" are equal and resemble the great, empty space.** Take the empty space as one's truth-plot (Jpn., *dōjō*; Chin., *daochang*; Skt., *bodhi-mandala*), the dharma-field as one's bed.

These two sentences (as produced in bold type in the quotation) in this T905 paragraph also find their parallels in Enchin's DKSM:

(1) The Buddha's three "mysteries" [body, mouth and mind] embrace the saintly and lay as well, and by smelting the [distinctions between] the "secondary retribution" and the "principal retribution", making both of them inter-penetrate each other (BZ26.652a15).

(2) The body, words and thoughts, i.e., the "three mysteries", [which constitute] the Tathāgata's body of equality, are equal and resemble the empty space (BZ26.

650a5-6).

The fifth paragraph in the concluding section of T905, paralleled in KRHG, is found in 912a21.5-

26:

Mahāvairocana-Tathāgata, in order to reveal this Way, manifests himself through the two bodies. The "Buddha-as-the-dharmakāya-of-the-wisdom" (Jpn., *chihōshinbutsu*; Chin., *zhifashenfo*), residing in the principle of reality, reveals the "Thirty-seven deities" (Jpn., *sanjushichison*; Chin., *sanshiqizun*) for the sake of enjoying himself. By doing that he succeeds in making all [the sentient beings] enter into the Way of the non-duality. The "Buddha-as-the-dharmakāya-of-the-principle" (Jpn., *rihōshinbutsu*; Chin., *lifashenfo*), residing in the "extinct illumination" of thusness, exists to perpetuity along with the dharma. [Originally] motionless, he becomes activated and thereby manifests himself on the eight petals. In order to enjoy himself and others, he reveals the three-layered *mandala*, making [the sentient beings] in the "ten realms" enlightened to the "Great Emptiness" (Jpn., *daikū*; Chin., *dakong*). Although divided into principle and wisdom and different from each other with regard to fullness and incompleteness, [these two aspects of the *dharmakāya*] originally belong to one and the same dharma and [in the final analysis] no difference exists between them. Ten thousand dharmas are included in the single syllable A and the "five sections" belong to one and the same Vairocana[-buddha].

The KRHG parallel for this paragraph is found in BZ28.1087b8-1088a4,

Mahāvairocana-Tathāgata, in order to reveal this Way to all [the sentient beings], manifests himself through the two bodies; i.e., the "Buddha-as-the-dharmakāya-of-the-wisdom" and the "Buddha-as-the-dharmakāya-of-the-principle". The "Buddha-as-the-dharmakāya-of-the-wisdom", residing in the principle of reality, reveals the "Thirty-seven deities" for the sake of enjoying himself and others⁸. By doing that he succeeds in making all [the sentient beings] enter into the Way of the non-duality. The "Buddha-as-the-dharmakāya-of-the-principle", residing in the "extinct illumination" of thusness, exists to perpetuity along with the dharma. [Originally] motionless, he becomes activated and thereby manifests himself on the eight petals. In order to enjoy himself⁹, he reveals the three-layered *mandala*, making [the sentient beings] in the "ten realms" enlightened to the principle of the "Great Emptiness". The principle and wisdom, like two opening gates which are seemingly different, are actually not different from each other. They originally belong to one and the same dharma and [in the final analysis] no difference exists between them ... Now let the following judgment be made: they are merely divided into principle and wisdom and become different from each other [only] with regard to fullness and incompleteness. It must be understood that originally

no appearance of oneness and difference exists.

Having shown how T905's concluding section is connected with these works by Enchin, we are now in a position to examine the relationship between the same T905 section with Yixing's commentary. We find that, except for the five paragraphs whose parallels are found in Enchin's several works and the single paragraph included in T907 as an interlinear note, all of the remaining paragraphs in the concluding section are paralleled in Yixing's commentary.

As observed in chapter four, all of the three *siddhi* texts contain a number of Esoteric ideas which had not become popular for a long time after the death of Śubhākarasimha and Yixing¹⁰. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the fourteen paragraphs shared by Yixing's commentary and T905 could have been taken from a third source¹¹. For these two reasons, I assume that the textual parallels between T905 and Yixing's commentary imply that these paragraphs were moved to T905 from Yixing's commentary.

In accordance with the ways they are related to Yixing's commentary, those T905 paragraphs based on Yixing's commentary can be divided into the following four groups:

(i) seven paragraphs (found in [1] 911b1-4, [2] 911b7-11, [3] 911b14-18, [4] 911b20-22, [5] 911b22-23, [6] 911c5-6, [7] 912a8-18), which were directly taken from the following seven paragraphs in Yixing's commentary respectively: (1) T1796.39.656a17-20, (2) 623a6-10, (3) 653b1-6, (4) 705c27-29, (5) 706b13-15, (6) 706a7-11, and (7) 647b2-14;

(ii) two paragraphs (911b18-21, 911c24-26) which are almost directly quoted from Yixing's commentary except for some slight adaptations (cf., 750a15-18; 788a12-15);

(iii) four paragraphs which resulted from the combination of two or more paragraphs/sentences in Yixing's commentary: (1) the T905 paragraph in 911b10-13 was based on two paragraphs in the commentary (cf., 746a4 and 666b16-19); (2) the T905 paragraph in 911b23-c5 was based on the following three paragraphs in the commentary: 666b19-25, 631b2-5 and 789a27-b3; (3) the T905 paragraph

in 911c10-24 was written on the basis of the following two long paragraphs in Yixing's commentary: 788a25-b14 and 788b14-23; (4) the T905 paragraph in 912a5-7 was based on the following five sentences from the commentary: 586b21, 586c23, 587b7, 586c18-19, and 586b15-16.

(iv) one paragraph (911c6-10) which can be regarded a summary of a long paragraph in Yixing's commentary (cf., 787c25-788a12).

The following conclusions can be drawn on the basis of this textual analysis of T905. First of all, besides T907 several other textual sources were also used in the composition of T905. These textual sources include three Esoteric sūtras (T1141, T1172, T1173) attributed to Śubhākarasimha and Bukong, the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra* and Yixing's commentary.

Secondly, as for the two major parts in T905 which are not found in T907, this textual analysis reveals that the first one, though expanded on the basis of one section in T907, was probably written by the T905 author independently, and that the second part consists of two kinds of paragraphs: (i) those either directly taken from or written on the basis of Yixing's commentary; (ii) those whose parallels are found in Enchin's works.

Finally, with regard to T905's relationship with Enchin, it can be said that T905 has in total five paragraphs, seven sentences which find their parallels in the following three works by Enchin: (i) KRHG (two paragraphs, seven sentences), (ii) DKSM (two paragraphs) and (iii) ZSK (one paragraph).

Section (B) T905 and Enchin

We have attributed all the textual parallels found between T905 and other textual sources, except for those between T905 and Enchin's works, to the possibility that T905 has borrowed some paragraphs/sentences from those textual sources. This possibility can be corroborated since we know that T905 was written long after these textual sources began to circulate in China and Japan. Can we say the same thing for a certainty about the textual parallels between T905 and Enchin's works?

In the last chapter, we have argued for the Japanese origin of T907 which was composed in Japan on the basis of Enchin's KSSH and probably after Enchin's death. In the light of this argument and of the assumption that T905 was written on the basis of T907, it is possible to conclude that all the T905 paragraphs with parallels in Enchin's works must have been quotations from Enchin's works. But, without resorting to the conclusion we reached on the provenance of T907, is it still possible for us independently to determine the nature of T905's relationship with the three works by Enchin?

It is clear that there are two (and only two) possible explanations for the textual parallels between T905 and Enchin's works: either both Enchin and the T905 author used a third source, or one of them copied from the other. Therefore, T905 will not be proved to have borrowed from Enchin's texts *unless and until* the following two possibilities are excluded: (i) both Enchin and T905 borrowed these paragraphs/sentences from a third source, and (ii) Enchin took these paragraphs/sentences from T905.

We can rule out the first possibility relatively easily. The T905 author, in writing/compiling the concluding section, has made frequent references to Yixing's commentary.

Consequently, had he quoted these five paragraphs from a third source, the most likely candidate might also have been Yixing's commentary. But as a matter of fact, these five paragraphs are not included in Yixing's commentary¹². Furthermore, neither Enchin nor T905 acknowledged that these paragraphs/sentences were taken from a third source. However, it is the following fact that makes extremely unlikely the existence of such a third source for these paragraphs/ sentences: T905 and KRHG share two paragraphs, seven sentences. In view of the small size¹³ of both T905 and KRHG, it is very unlikely that the two texts, without one consulting the other, happened to quote from a third source so many virtually identical paragraphs/sentences¹⁴. The only reasonable explanation must be that one of them copied these paragraphs/sentences from the other. In the same vein, the remaining three paragraphs shared by T905 and Enchin's works must also be explained by this hypothesis. Thus, the problem is, who borrowed from whom, Enchin or the author of T905?

As demonstrated in the last section, a majority of T905's concluding section is composed of paragraphs either directly taken from, or re-written on the basis of, Yixing's commentary. This fact may encourage one to view the five paragraphs in the same section, whose parallels are found in Enchin's works, as of the same nature: they were, too, either directly quoted from, or rewritten on the basis of, some other source; *viz*, Enchin's works (now that a third source for these paragraphs has been excluded). Is this impression well founded? Some evidence lends support for this impression.

(B.I) The Dates of KRHG, DKSM And ZSK

The textual parallels between T905 and Enchin's works must be interpreted by one of the following two possibilities: either Enchin quoted from T905 or the T905 author used Enchin's works. Thus, we can determine their true relationship if we can rule out the possibility that Enchin knew anything of T905 when he wrote the three works in which several paragraphs/sentences, also found in T905, appear. Since we have evidence to show that as late as 882 Enchin had known nothing of the three *siddhi* texts (among which is T905), one strategy we can use in order to determine if Enchin had quoted from T905 is to date the three works. If the three works (or even one of them) can be shown to have been composed before 882, then we can conclude that Enchin could not have used T905 in writing the works in question.

The ZSK paragraph whose parallel is found in T905 bears the date given by Enchin himself of the twenty-fourth day of the twelfth month, Jōgan 14 (872) (BZ27.981a7). In other words, this ZSK paragraph was written precisely one decade before 882.

The dating of DKSM turns out to be more complicated. DKSM is also known as the *Dainichikyō ryakushaku* (A Short Explanation of the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*). According to the Enchin Chronicle, Enchin wrote this work on the twenty-fourth day of the fifth month, Jinjū 1 (851) (BZ28.1385a15-17). The postscript at the end of DKSM, however, puts its composition at a time when he stayed at the Monastery of Shitennōji on Mt. Jōzan in the Prefecture of Chinzai, after his visit to Mt. Tiantai.

According to the *Enryakuji zasu Enchin den* (A Biography of the Head of the Enryakuji Temple, Enchin; composed in 902 by Miyoshi Kiyoyuki [847-918]), Enchin made his first visit to Mt. Tiantai in China on the first day of the twelfth month of 853, around four months after he arrived in the prefecture of Fuzhou, China, in the eighth month of the year. Enchin's first visit

to Mt. Tiantai, which lasted for over half a year, kept him there until the seventh day of the ninth month of the next year (BZ28. 1367a-1368a). Obviously, the postscript does not refer to this visit Enchin paid to Mt. Tiantai (because instead of immediately returning to Japan after this visit to Mt. Tiantai he went ahead to Chang'an), but to another one he made between the fourth day of the sixth month of 856 and second month of 858, on the eve of his return to Japan. Enchin left China for Japan on the eighth day of the sixth month of 858. Fourteen days later, he reached the prefecture of Taizai (i.e., Chinzai). This short work was finished after he reached Taizai and before he got an imperial edict on the fourteen day of the eighth month, which asked him to go to the capital.

This postscript reads, "Śramaṇa Enchin, who is the Dhāraṇī practitioner, Court Chaplain (*naigubu*) from the Enryakuji Temple on Mt. Hieizan in the Upper Capital (i.e., Kyoto), Japan, made the above comments on the basis of the fundamental sūtra (i.e., the *Dainichi kyō*) at the Shitennōin Monastery on Mt. Jōzan in the Prefecture of Chinzai after his travel to Mt. Tiantai [in China]" (*Nihonkoku Jōzo Hieizan Enryakuji Shingon shōgo naigubu Shamon Enchin yu Tendai ji, kai o Chinzaifu Jōzan Shitennoin, an honkyō sanjutsu shi*; BZ26.654-5). It sounds like it was written by Enchin himself. On the other hand, the Enchin Chronicle was finished by Sontsu (1427-1516) as late as 1467. Because of the tone of this postscript and the lateness of the Enchin Chronicle, the postscript appears to be more reliable than the Enchin Chronicle in dating DKSM. I am therefore inclined to believe that DKSM was composed in 858, rather than 851 as the Enchin Chronicle claims (cf., BKD 3: 445). Thus, DKSM was composed almost a quarter of century before 882.

As for KRHG which Enchin himself failed to date, we have no reliable evidence to date

it. Nonetheless, this treatise is closely related to one of Enchin's other treatises, KSSH. It seems that it was also written around the time KSSH was done (i.e., around 873)¹⁵.

Thus, at least two of Enchin's works, ZSK and DKSM, were composed before 882. Therefore, we can say with confidence that the three paragraphs in T905 whose parallels were found in these two works by Enchin were either directly taken from, or re-written on the basis of, these two works by Enchin.

(B.II) Two Pieces of Evidence for Supporting KRHG as the Original Text for the Textual Parallels between T905 and KRHG

Of the three works by Enchin which share some paragraphs/sentences with T905, KRHG is the only one undated. Nevertheless, even though it is difficult, if not impossible, to date KRHG, there are still two pieces of evidence to support the view that in comparison with T905, KRHG is more likely to be the original source for the two paragraphs shared by it and T905.

The first piece of evidence is provided by the fact that the T905 paragraph 912a21-27, which parallels the KRHG paragraph BZ28. 1087b8-1088a4, was also included in one of the other works by Enchin--the *Zakki* ("The Miscellany", BZ28.1113-6), which was probably edited by Enchin's disciples after his death. Presumably, this *Zakki* includes Enchin's occasional remarks, lectures, comments. In this short collection, the paragraph was marked as Enchin's (who was called *sannō*, the "mountain-king"¹⁶). This means that at least at the time of editing this posthumous work of Enchin, his disciples were still oblivious to T905. Otherwise, they may have hesitated to collect in their master's *Zakki* a paragraph which could also be found in a sūtra

putatively translated by Śubhākarasimha. At least, they would have noted that this paragraph is also found in T905.

This is another piece of evidence to support the view that Enchin had not read T905 before his death in 891¹⁷. Otherwise, for the importance of this text, it is extremely unlikely that Enchin would have failed to refer his students to it.

The second piece of evidence is elicited from a comparative reading of a sentence appearing in T905 and KRHG. At the end of the paragraph immediately preceding T905's concluding section, the following paragraph is found,

Among these three kinds of attainments, the attainment of "emerging" is the achievement of the transformation-body, the attainment of "entering" that of retribution-body, the attainment of "mystery" that of dharma-body. They are indeed three kinds of "permanent bodies", the store of true dharma. *[They are] indeed the complete substance of the Vairocana-buddha-as-the-dharmakāya, the true source for the "five-sections" and "three-sections!"* Therefore, prostrate oneself and make obeisance to the Vairocana-buddha ... (my emphasis, T905.18.911a23-25)

The eulogy (italicized in the quotation) does not appear in the corresponding paragraph in T907 (915b26-29), nor in T906 (913c1-3). The whole paragraph in T905, except for this eulogy, is found in T907. As noted in chapter four, of the three *siddhi* texts T907 is the earliest one. It was reproduced almost wholly and word for word in both T905 and T906. From these two reasons, I believe that this eulogy was added by the T905 author. Then, this eulogy was either composed, or copied from a third source, by the T905 author. If this eulogy had been originally written into T905 by the T905 author, its parallel in KRHG might have come from T905. If it was copied from another source, then this source might well have been KRHG. I have shown above that T905 owes KRHG the paragraph 912a21-27. This leads one to assume that this eulogy shared by T905

and KRHG might also have been quoted from KRHG to T905. A comparative reading of the T905 and KRHG contexts for this eulogy lends support for this assumption. This eulogy, while causing contextual inconsistency in T905, helps form a considerably consistent context in KRHG¹⁸.

In T905, this eulogy identifies the three kinds of attainment as the "complete substance of the Vairocana-buddha-as-the dharmakāya". This conflicts with the general idea of this T905 paragraph in which this eulogy appears. According to this T905 paragraph, the three kinds of attainment correspond with the three buddha-bodies respectively, rather than exclusively with the *dharmakāya*. In contrast to the T905 paragraph where this contradiction appears, the KRHG paragraph in which the same eulogy is found reads more naturally and consistently.

In the light of these considerations, I tend to believe that KRHG, rather than T905, was the original source for this eulogy. In the same vein, the other paragraph and seven sentences in KRHG which are also found in T905 were originally written by Enchin and then incorporated into T905¹⁹. Thus, we can conclude that all the textual parallels between T905 and the three works by Enchin were borrowed by the author of T905 from Enchin's works. In other words, just like the T907 author who has relied on Enchin's KSSH as one basic textual source for writing T907, the T905 author has used three other works by Enchin in writing his text.

(B.III) The Contextual Inconsistencies of the Five Paragraphs in T905

Finally, through comparing the different contexts in T905 and Enchin's treatises, where the textual parallels are found, we can also arrive at the same conclusion regarding the relationship between T905 and Enchin's three treatises.

As noted above, between T905 and Enchin's three treatises we find five paragraphs in common. Through comparing the ways these five paragraphs work in their respective contexts, we find that the five paragraphs fit in with their contexts in Enchin's treatises much better than they do in with their T905 contexts. As far as some textual parallels are concerned, the textual sources providing more consistent contexts for these textual parallels are more likely to be the primary sources in which these textual parallels originally appeared. In the light of this, it can be said that Enchin's treatises, in comparison with T905, are more likely the original sources into which the five paragraphs were written.

(a) The T905 Paragraph 911a27-b1

The T905 paragraph 911a27-b1 parallels the KRHG paragraph BZ28.1087a17-b2, which discusses the "non-duality" (Jpn. *fu'ni*; Chin., *buer*) of (i) the "one-syllable" and "fifteen-syllables" on the one hand, and (ii) the "one-syllable" and "five-syllables" on the other. This KRHG paragraph is followed by an eulogy:

[They (i.e., the three groups of five-syllables) are] indeed the complete substance of "Vairocana as the *dharmakāya*", and the true source for the "five-sections" and "three-section" (BZ28.1087b2-3).

This eulogy appears quite natural in this KRHG paragraph, since the "three-sections" and "five-sections" in this eulogy echo the "*three groups of five-syllables*", exactly the topic of this KRHG paragraph.

In comparison, the T905 parallel of this KRHG paragraph, paragraph 911a27-b1, looks quite unnatural in its context. In T905, this paragraph is followed by a paragraph (911b1-4), which, directly taken from Yixing's commentary, talks about the inter-relationship between "one-syllable" and "all-syllables" in terms of four categories: (i) *sho* (Chin, *she*; "attract"), (ii) *shaku*

(Chin., *shi*; "interpret"), (iii) *sei* (Chin., *cheng*; "accomplish") and (iv) *ha* (Chin., *po*; "destroy").

These two T905 paragraphs 911a27-b1 and b1-4 do not appear to bear any relationship.

It is noteworthy that the T905 paragraph 911a27-b1, while without significant connection with the paragraph next to it (i.e., 911b1-4), appears closely related to the paragraph 911b4-6²⁰, which treats the five different ways of "turning" (Jpn., *ten*; Chin., *zhuan*) the syllables. Both paragraphs 911a27-b1 and b1-6 concern themselves with the problem of the two-way syllable-turnings. The five-syllables in paragraph 911a27-b1 can be interpreted as resulting from the fivefold syllable-turnings that are treated in paragraph 911b4-6. Therefore, with regard to these three T905 paragraphs, we find that two thematically related paragraphs (i.e., 911a27-b1 and 911b4-6) are separated by a third one (i.e., 911b1-4) which seems to have no connection with either of the former two.

(b) The T905 Paragraph 912a21-27

Similarly, T905 paragraph 912a21-27 is also conspicuously unnatural as appearing in its context. This T905 paragraph is focused on the unity between the "two *dharmakāyas*" of Vairocana-buddha, i.e., the "*dharmkāya*-as-the-wisdom" and "*dharmakāya*-as-the-principle". The T905 paragraph preceding it (i.e., 912a18-21) is devoted, in contrast, to two subjects: (i) the absolute "non-duality" of Vairocana's "personality" and "field", (ii) the omnipresence of the same buddha's three mysteries. No necessary connection can be read between these two T905 paragraphs.

In contrast, the KRHG paragraph found in BZ28.1087b8-12, which parallels the T905 paragraph 912a21-27 appears more natural in its context. This KRHG paragraph is supplemented by a paragraph (BZ28.1087b12-1088a4) which is concentrated on the same topic--the "non-

duality" of Vairocana-buddha's two aspects; i.e., the two *dharmakāyas* denoted by principle and wisdom. Furthermore, the KRHG paragraph BZ28.1087b8-12 fits natural into the general theme of the whole treatise, which is, as indicated by the title, about the "mysterious teaching of the two sections (aspects) [of Vairocana-buddha]." This again suggests that KRHG may have been the text into which this paragraph was originally written.

(c) The Three T905 Paragraphs 911c26-912a3, 912a3-5 and 912a18-21

The three component sentences of the T905 paragraph 912a3-5, along with two of the three component sentences of the T905 paragraph 912a18-21, are all found in Enchin's DKSM. The T905 paragraph 911c26-912a3, which finds its parallel in Enchin's another work--ZSK, is followed by the T905 paragraph 911a3-5. For these two reasons, these three T905 paragraphs are to be examined here side by side.

First, we will examine how the parallels for these three T905 paragraphs work in two of Enchin's treatises. As for the ZSK parallel for the T905 paragraph 911c26-912a3, found in BZ27.980a10-13, appears in a collection of notes left by Enchin as a separate and independent entry. DKSM contains five sentences, three of which are included in the T905 paragraph 912a3-5, while the remaining two included in the T905 paragraph 912a18-21. DKSM is a self-consistent work in which Enchin follows one and the same interpreting pattern in terms of three Sanskrit syllables (i.e., A-Sa-Va). In DKSM, these five sentences are quite natural.

Whereas in Enchin's two treatises the paragraphs/sentences paralleling the three T905 paragraphs are natural, the three T905 paragraphs are quite unnatural in T905. In discussing the T905 paragraph 912a21-27, I noted the incompatibility between this paragraph and that 912a18-21, one of the three T905 paragraphs discussed here. As for the relationship between the T905

paragraph 912a18-21 and paragraph preceding it (i.e., 912a8-18, quoted from Yixing's commentary), they appear quite disconnected in meaning. The T905 paragraph 912a8-18, talking about the reason why sentient beings should worship a person who has mastered the bodhi-*mūdra* as reverently as they worship a *stūpa*, seems to have nothing to do with the T905 paragraph 912a18-21 which is about the *e-shin*²¹ unity and the universal presence of Vairocana-buddha's "three mysteries".

The remaining two T905 paragraphs (i.e., 911c26-912a3 and 912a3-5), next to each other in T905, appear consistent with each other. A series of threefold correlation are proposed in paragraph 912a3-5: the three syllables A, Va, Ra are identified with, respectively, the "equal enlightenment", "wonderful enlightenment" and "function". In this sense, this paragraph harmonizes with paragraph in 911c26-912a3, in which several groups of threefold correlation are also proffered forward²². But one problem emerges as soon as we turn to the T905 paragraph immediately following 912a3-5. One focus of this T905 paragraph in 912a5-7 exactly consists in the "three clauses", which are drawn into correlation with the three sections *at the end of* paragraph 911c26-912a3. Therefore, in fact, the two T905 paragraphs 911c26-912a3 and 912a5-7 are connected with each other more closely than with the paragraph placed between them, i.e., paragraph 912a3-5.

In conclusion, these five T905 paragraphs appear unnatural and inconsistent with their respective contexts. In contrast, their parallels in Enchin's texts are much more natural as they appear in their respective contexts. This also suggests that T905 is probably not the original source of the five paragraphs in question²³. In other words, the five paragraphs originally appeared in

Enchin's works *before* they were moved to T905, thence the Japanese origin of T905.

Section (C) The Date of T905 and the Polemical Agenda Underlying the Composition of T905 after T907

Before formally treating these two problems, we will underscore two distinctive features of T905 in comparison with its two affiliated texts.

(C.I) Two Distinctive Features of T905

The first feature is obvious. It becomes evident even by a hasty comparison of the titles of the three *siddhi* texts: of the three *siddhi* texts, only the title of T905 is headed by the term "three ranks of attainment" (Jpn., *shanshushicchi*; Chin., *sanzhongxidi*)²⁴.

The second feature is more complicated; it is about T905's direct reference to the "three ranks of attainment". As we know, the dharma-transmission document (*fuhōmon*) attributed to Saicho correlates the three groups of five-syllable dhāraṇīs with the "three *ranks* of attainment" (higher, middle and lower), rather than with "three *kinds* of attainment" ("merging", "entering" and "mystery"). In T905 the three dhāraṇīs are correlated with three ranks (and not merely with

three kinds) of attainment in the text proper. However, in its two affiliated texts, T906 and T907, the saying of "three ranks of attainment" is merely put forward (either partly or wholly) in the form of interlinear notes.

In T906, the discussion of "three ranks of attainment" is not complete. Only two ranks of attainment (i.e., lower and middle) are included in the text proper while the term *jōhon shicchi* (the "higher rank of attainment") merely appears in an interlinear note.

The text of T907 proper merely includes the discussion of "three kinds of attainment", and does not mention the "three ranks of attainment". This concept is only found in T907's three interlinear notes. These interlinear notes might have been interpolated into T907 by its editor on the basis of T905. This assumption is confirmed by Annen's quotation of T907 in his TDT. As quoted by Annen, the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* (=T907) correlated the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs with the three *kinds* ("emerging", "entering" and "mystery"), but not the three *ranks* (lower, middle and higher), of attainment.

Besides, another comparatively early edition of T907 cited in a Taimitsu work attests to the absence of the saying of the "three ranks of attainment" in the text of T907 proper. This Taimitsu work is the one-hundred-fascicle *Gyōrin shō* (T2409), which was completed in 1154 by Shinnen (?-?)²⁵. In fascicle seven, Shinnen made a lengthy quotation from a text called "Bucchō Sonshōnshin hajigoku dengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani" by Śubhākarasimha (T2409.76.73c26-74a18). Judged by both the title²⁶ and the quotation²⁷, the text referred to by Shinnen here is none other than T907²⁸.

What is particularly remarkable in this quotation is that none of the three interlinear notes, that appear in the *Taishō* edition of T907 mentioning the three ranks of attainment, is found in

Shinnen's quotation. Did Shinnen fail to quote the interlinear notes, which were actually present in the text he was quoting from? Or does the version of T907 Shinnen used here simply lack the interlinear notes? The second assumption appears to be closer to the truth, as verified by Shinnen's own comment following this quotation,

My personal comment: there exists a different version [of this text], whose general purport is identical with that in the text [as quoted] above. The length of this different version is a bit larger. It takes syllables A, Vam, etc., as the higher rank of attainment; it takes syllables A, Vi, etc., as the middle rank of attainment, which is called the "*vajra*-words" capable of subduing the four kinds of Maras and six realms, of satisfying the wisdom of "all-wisdoms"; it takes syllables A, Ra, etc., as the lower rank of attainment ... (T2409.76.74a19-23).

In his comment, Shinnen especially emphasizes that this different version of T907 (most likely T905) associates the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs with the three ranks of attainment. From this it is clear that this correlation of three dhāraṇīs with the three ranks of attainment must have conspicuously distinguished this text (=T905) from Shinnen's version of T907. Otherwise, Shinnen would not have felt the necessity of commenting on it. From this we can also infer that this threefold correlation between three dhāraṇīs and three ranks of attainment was not included in the text Shinnen just quoted (i.e., T907), neither as a part of the text proper nor as interlinear notes. So, I conclude that originally T907 did not contain (i) the classification of attainment in terms of three ranks and (ii) the correlation between the three dhāraṇīs and three ranks of attainment.

This feature of T905, along with the fact that of the three *siddhi* texts T905 is the only one with a title headed by the term *sanshushicchi*, will be proved crucial for determining the date of T905 and deciphering the polemical agenda underlying its formation after T907.

(C.II) The Date of T905

Let us first discuss the date of T905. It is remarkable that Annen did not mention T905 in his *Hakke hiroku* bibliography and TDT, although he *did* mention in both of them a text which I have identified as T907²⁹. As we know, when Annen in TDT referred to and quoted from T907, he used this text as the canonical support for the "procedure of the threefold attainment" (*sanshushicchi hō*) in Saicho's *fuhōmon*. On the other hand, the two distinctive features of T905 as stressed above present T905, in comparison with its two affiliated texts (T906 and T907), as a better scriptural source not only for the "procedure of the threefold attainment" but also for the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation--the core of Saicho's *fuhōmon*. Therefore, as far as the canonical source for the legitimacy of Saicho's dharma-transmission is concerned, Annen would not have failed to quote (or at least to mention) T905 had he read the text by that time. However, the fact is that Annen did not include T905 in his *Hakke hiroku* bibliography which was revised in 902. This suggests that as late as 902 Annen had not yet had a chance to see T905.

Considering Annen's rarely paralleled erudition and the likelihood that he would have warmly welcomed T905 had it come to his attention, Annen's ignorance of T905 by the year 902 suggests that T905 did not exist at the time. For this reason, the year 902 can be set as the *terminus post quem* for the composition of T905. At this point in my research I set the *terminus ante quem* for T905 in 1047, when a Tendai master called Kōgei was reported to have made reference to a text which can be identified as T905.

Kōgei (977-1049) is a Tendai leader who opened a major Taimitsu branch, i.e., the *taniryū* branch, in opposition to the *gawaryū* branch. The *taniryū* branch was once prosperous. A number

of Taimitsu sects influential in Medieval Japan were derived from it. In his later years, Kōgei dedicated himself to lecturing and commenting on Esoteric sūtras. Some of his lectures and comments were recorded by his student Choen (1016-1081) in a book called "Shijūjū ketsu" (T2408, "Forty chapters of Instructions").

In the *Shijūjū ketsu*, Choen reported that on the twenty-third day of the seventh month of the year 1047 Kōgei mentioned in his lecture a different version of the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*,

A different version of the *Sonshō hajigoku* says, "The 'dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom' is also called the body of retribution" (so on and so on). This passage is consistent [with what I said here]. It calls the "dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom" as the "principal [retribution]" (Jpn., *sho[ho]*; Chin., *zheng[bao]*), implying that the object (Jpn., *kyō*; Chin., *jing*) and wisdom (Jpn., *chi*; Chin., *zhi*) correspond with each other in a mysterious way (T2408.75.871c29-872a2).

In the next section I will identify the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* Kōgei is discussing here as T906. Then, the "different version of the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*" mentioned in the quoted passage may be T905 or T907. The sentence quoted by Kōgei here, *viz.*, "the dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom is also called the body of retribution", is only found in T905 (c.f., T905.18.909c27-28). Thus, this "different version" appears to have been T905.

In addition, in T905 the "dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom" is associated with the "body-for-self-enjoyment" (Jpn., *jijuyōshin*; Chin., *zhishouyongshen*), exactly one of the two aspects of the "retribution-body" (the other aspect being the "body-for-other's-enjoyment" [Jpn., *tajuyōshin*; Chin., *tashouyongshen*]) (912a21-23). Out of the three *siddhi* texts T905 is the only one in which the two concepts "dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom" and "principal retribution", contrasted with "dharmakāya-as-the-principle" and "secondary retribution" (Jpn., *ehō*; Chin., *yibao*) respectively, are successively discussed (912a18-27).

Finally, according to Chōen, it is only after discussing the relationship between the two aspects of both the "retribution-body" and dharmakāya³⁰ that the reference to this "different version" was made by Kōgei (T2408.75.870c21-871c29). It is striking that the bifurcations of both "retribution-body" and dharma-body are also formulated in the T905 paragraph in 912a21-27, in which the inter-relationship between the two aspects of the two bodies are further expounded (c.f., 912a21-27).

From these parallels between T905 and this "different version of the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*", I conclude that this "different version" mentioned by Kōgei in 1047 is no other than T905. Therefore, the year 1047 can be established as the *terminus ante quem* for the composition of T905.

In conclusion, it can be said that T905 was composed in Japan between 902 and 1047.

(C.III) The Polemical Agenda Underlying the Composition of T905

Let us now turn to the second question in this section: given that T907 had already existed as the canonical support for the dharma-transmission attributed to Saichō, what prompted the forgery of T905 after T907? Before trying to answer this question, I will first briefly observe Annen's connection with T905.

In chapter four, I proposed that Annen be taken as the most likely author of T907. We have now determined that T905 was composed on the basis of T907 and furthermore that T905 was also based on Enchin's works. It would now be necessary to investigate the possibility that T905 was also composed by Annen.

Indeed, in the sense that T907 only mentions the three *kinds* of attainment not that of three *ranks* of attainment (the latter being one central category in Saichō's *fuhōmon*), T907 may not have been the perfect text for supporting the authenticity of Saichō's *fuhōmon*. But Annen seems to have been content with this "imperfect" text, congratulating himself for "having recently discovered" such a text. This suggests that he, at least at that time, lacked the impulse to create a new and "better" text, such as T905.

Furthermore, as I argued in chapter four, the way in which the twenty-two line *gathā* in T907 was broken into two in T905 suggests that the T905 author had failed to understand the connection between several lines of this twenty-two line *gathā*. This would mean that the author of T905 was not the author of this *gathā*. Thus, Annen, if taken as the most likely author of T907, could not have been the author of T905.

For these two reasons, I believe that Annen is unlikely to have overseen the fabrication of T905. The absence of reference to this text in his bibliography revised in 902 is further evidence.

Thus, in view of the fact that several works by Enchin as well as Yixing's definitive commentary on the *Darijing* were used in T905, I believe that T905 was composed in Japan after Annen by some Tendai monk who respected not only Yixing but also Enchin. What had prompted the composition of T905 after T907?

One unique feature of T905, i.e., it contains in the text proper (rather than interlinear notes) the classification of the three *ranks* attainment (not merely that of three *kinds* of attainment), seems to provide an important clue for answering this question. This peculiar feature of T905 leads me to speculate that after Annen died some Tendai monk must have become discontent with T907 as a scriptural support for the Esoteric dharma-transmission portrayed in

Saichō's *fuhōmon* and tried to write a "better" text than T907. His efforts finally resulted in the formation of T905. The peculiar feature of T905 has made it a "better" scriptural source than T907 for supporting the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation as depicted in Saichō's *fuhōmon*. Consequently, I suggest that the search for a better scriptural source than T907 for supporting Saichō's *fuhōmon* might have been the most important sectarian incentive that had prompted the forgery of T905 after the appearance of T907 in Japan³¹.

Section (D) The Formation of T906

As in the case of T905, a textual analysis of T906 is indispensable for an appropriate understanding of the provenance of T906. For this reason, we will begin the formal examination of the provenance and date of T906 with a close investigation of the textual sources on which T906 is based.

Like T905, T906 was also written on the basis of T907. In T906, a large part which extends from its beginning to T906.18. 912c21 must have been taken from T907. A close comparison of this part of T906 with T907 reveals that its component sentences were re-arranged when they were put into the text of T906.

This part of T906 is followed by another large part (912c23-913b25) that describes a mandala-like picture, in which several syllables are transformed into a number of unique images characterizing a buddha-field in which Mahāvairocana-buddha and his companions are said to have dwelt. This part of T906 constitutes one of the two major parts in T906 which, not found in T907, may have been added by the author of T906 himself. It is composed of the following four kinds of textual sources:

- (i) one small section that was taken from Yixing's commentary³²;
- (ii) two paragraphs which are found in Annen's *Kongōkai daihō taijuki*³³ as well as in a *kongōkai* sūtra (T1056) translated by Bukong³⁴;
- (iii) one big paragraph which can be divided into three sections: (a) exclusively found in *Kongōkai daihō taijuki*; (b) taken from a *kongōkai* text (i.e., T878; also translated by Bukong)³⁵; and (c) found in 913b4-8 which was probably composed by the T906 author himself;
- (iv) two paragraphs in 913b1-20 and 913b20-25 respectively, which are not found elsewhere and therefore might have been written by the T906 author himself.

Let us examine in more detail how the component paragraphs in this major part of T906 are related to Annen's *Kongōkai daihō taijuki* and the two *kongōkai* texts.

We will first turn to the paragraph (912c25-913a2) which, immediately following the small section taken from Yixing's commentary, is also found in T1056³⁶ as well as Annen's *Kongōkai daihō taijuki*. Since T1056 is earlier than both *Kongōkai daihō taijuki* and T906, this textual parallel between the three texts suggests that (i) either T906 or the *Kongōkai daihō taijuki* borrowed this paragraph from the other, which, in turn, had borrowed it from T1056; or that (ii) both of them borrowed this paragraph from T1056, no textual borrowing having taken place between them.

The other paragraph, found in 913a2-12³⁷, though also found in both T1056 and Annen's

Kongōkai daihōtaijuki, is closer to its parallel in the *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki* than to the parallel in T1056³⁸. Therefore, I assume that either Annen or the author of T906 borrowed this paragraph from the other.

While the two T906 paragraphs treated above are both found in T1056 and Annen's *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki*, the three-sectioned 913a12-b7 paragraph, immediately after the paragraph in 913a2-12, contains a section that is only found in Annen's *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki*:

This syllable Vam changes into a *stūpa* which, in form, can be square, round, triangular, curved and sphere-like, since it is made of the "five elements": earth, water, fire, wind and space. This *stūpa* is transformed into Mahāvairocana-tathāgata whose body is [as bright as] the moon and who, with the "crown of five-buddhas" on the head, embellishes his own body with a celestial dress made of fine silk and with a necklace of precious stones. The lights emanating from him illumine all over the dharma-fields in the ten directions. **All lean on a moon-wheel.** The "Four Buddhas", "Four *Pāramitā* [-bodhisattvas]", "Sixteen [bodhisattvas]", "Eight Serving [bodhisattvas]" and "Four Embracing [bodhisattvas]", one thousand buddhas in the *bhadrakalpa* and twenty kinds of *devas*, along with countless bodhisattvas, are surrounding him and serving as his companions (T906.18.913a12-18)³⁹.

The second section of this T906 paragraph lists the "thirty-seven deities"⁴⁰, which constitute a group of Esoteric deities often cited in a variety of Esoteric Buddhist texts. Nonetheless, this T906 section appears to have been quoted from T878⁴¹.

Following the first major part that was added by the T905 author is a part whose component paragraphs, except for two small ones, are all found in T907⁴². One of these two T906 paragraphs not found in T907 identifies Syllable A with the *amalāvijñāna*, the four Chinese character *bi-ru-sha-na* (Chin., *bi-lu-zhe-na*) with the "four teachings" (*sikyōgi*; Chin., *sijiaoyi*) advocated in the Chinese Tiantai school⁴³:

Syllable A is like the *amalāvijñāna*, whose substance is the *ālayavijñāna*. Ten thousand dharmas are stored in syllable A, just like all the dharmas are stored in

the "store *viññāna* " (i.e., *ālayaviññāna*). For the reason, in the four characters, *bi-ru-sha-na* (Vairocana), are included the "four teachings". The nine-layered moon-wheel represents the "nine deities on the eight petals"⁴⁴ (T906.18.913c7-9).

The other small paragraph in 913c24-914a1, which was written on the basis of one of Zhiyi's commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*, correlates the *amalā viññāna* with the "wheel of the nine-layered heart-moon",

These dhāraṇīs of the three kinds of attainment, though being the dhāraṇīs for *buddhoṣṇīṣa*'s supreme mind, are actually the dhāraṇīs for Mahāvairocana-tathāgata's "three bodies" [respectively]. From this, it must be understood that the *buddhoṣṇīṣa* is exactly Vairocana-tathāgata's body, exactly the three-sectioned *buddhoṣṇīṣa* -body. As for the three kinds of *viññānas*, the first is the *avadāna-viññāna* , i.e., the six *viññānas*; the second the *adāna-viññāna* , i.e., the seventh *viññāna* ; the third the *ālaya-viññāna* , i.e., the eighth *viññāna* ⁴⁵. Now, a fourth one called *amalāviññāna* is added [to the three *viññāna* s], constituting the teaching [as implied] in the "wheel of the nine-layered heart-moon".

T906 continues with the second of the two major parts in T906 which, not found elsewhere, might have been written by the T906 author himself. In this part, the tri-chiliocosm is classified into three ranks and some *hajigoku* ("destroying hell") ideas were propounded (T906.18.914a1-b11).

Finally, T906 ends with a *gathā* which is, as illustrated in chapter four, composed of the sixteen lines from the *gathā* in T907.

Through this textual analysis, we find that T906 is composed of the following seven kinds of textual sources: the first is, needless to say, T907; the second is two paragraphs in Yixing's commentary; the third is several paragraphs that can be found in an Esoteric text (T1046) and a

work by Annen (i.e., the *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki*) as well; the fourth is two paragraphs that are exclusively found in the *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki*; the fifth is a paragraph that is probably taken from another Kongōkai text--T878; the sixth is several sentences from one of Zhiyi's commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*; the seventh is several paragraphs written by the T906 author himself independently.

Compared with T907 and T905, T906 is particularly remarkable for the following several reasons. First of all, it places the emphasis on Kongōkai thought. This is testified by T906's close connection with those well known Kongōkai sūtras like T1056 and T878, as well as Annen's important work exclusively devoted to the Kongōkai transmissions in the Tendai school.

Secondly, it is noteworthy that T906 has assimilated some characteristic *yogacara* ideas. The two paragraphs found in T906.18.913c7-9 and 913c24-914a1, refers to the "ninth consciousness" (i.e., *amalāvijñāna*) as advocated in some branches of the Chinese Yogacara traditions⁴⁶.

Thirdly, T906 distinguishes itself from T905 and T907 by its full treatment of the *hajigoku* ideas. As noted above, the second of the two major parts in T906 that were added by the T906 author himself is mainly devoted to *hajigoku* thought. This presents a sharp contrast to both T905 and T907, which, though headed by a title including the term *hajigoku*, say nothing about the notion of *hajigoku*.

Now let us try to determine the provenance and date of T906. First of all, one point is

clear: T906 was, like T905 and T907, composed in Japan. Secondly, it warrants particular note that two T906 paragraphs find their parallels in Annen's *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki*. Therefore, it is possible (i) that the *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki* has used these two paragraphs from T906 or (ii) that these two paragraphs in the *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki* were incorporated into T906. The second assumption is, as I tend to believe, closer to the truth for the following three reasons: first, T906 was written on the basis of T907; second, T907 was very probably written by Annen and third, it is very unlikely that Annen is the author of T906. Since the former two reasons have already been discussed in this and the last chapters, I will here confine myself to discussing the third reason.

As already noted in chapter four, the author of T906, in breaking the single *gathā* originally found in T907 into two in T906, separated several lines of this *gathā* which are devoted to the same theme and can not be read separately. This would mean that the author of T906 is unlikely to have been the original author of this *gathā* in T907, who probably was Annen. In other words, T906 was very unlikely to have been written by Annen. Furthermore, T906 was prepared on the basis of T907. Therefore, I think that T906 was written in Japan after Annen. The textual parallels between the text and Annen's *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki* must have resulted when the author of T906 copied them from the *Kongōkai daihōtaijuki* into T906.

As for the date of T906, we must recall again that T906, like T905, was not included in Annen's bibliography which *does* refer to T907. In dealing with the date of T905, I noted that the absence of T905 in Annen's bibliography implies that Annen had known nothing of T905 as late as the year 902 when the bibliography was subjected to revision. Considering Annen's broad learning and the great interest T905 would have had for him, I concluded that T905 had not yet

appeared in Japan by 902. By the same reason, I believe that T906 was composed in Japan later than 902. The year 902, therefore, can be set up as the *terminus post quem* for the composition of T906.

On the other hand, according to the *Shijūjū ketsu* (the same work providing a proof enabling us to put the *terminus ante quem* for T905 in the year 1047), Kōgei is said to have mentioned in the fourth month of Chōkyū 3 (i.e., 1042) a text under the title "Sonshō hajigoku hō",

The master (i.e., Kōgei) says, "The five wheels are exactly the five wisdoms and five buddhas, just as [it is discussed] in the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*" (so on and so on, said in the fourth month of Chōkyū 3) (T2408.75.827a18-19).

The title of this text, "Sonshō hajigoku hō", suggests that it might have been either T906 or T907; it is not likely to have been T905 whose title does not have the key term *Sonshō*. In fact, this text turns out to be T906, since of the three *siddhi* texts only T906 correlates the five wheels with five wisdoms (T906.18.912c17-21). This ascertains that T906 was known to a Tendai monk by 1042. Thus, the year 1042 can be given as the *terminus ante quem* for the composition of T906. Consequently, T906 was composed in Japan between 902 and 1042.

Notes,

1. In chapter four I argued that of the three *siddhi* texts T907 is the oldest one which was almost wholly reproduced in both T905 and T906. For this reason, I assume that all the T905 parts which are also found in T907 were taken from T907.

2. Five sentences from T907 and five sentences from Enchin's KRHG were, as I show below, were reproduced in this long paragraph of T905.

Furthermore, the BZ edition of the *Chishō Daishi zenshu* includes a fragmentary record of a lecture which is said to have been delivered by Enchin on the *Lotus Sūtra*. This fragmentary record includes a series of fivefold correlations which remind the reader of the main ideas implied in this T905 paragraph,

Liver, green in colour, is likened to a seven-leaf lotus; heart, red in colour, to an eight-leaf lotus; spleens, yellow in colour, to a yellow flower which is of one angular leaf; lungs, white in colour, to an eight-leaf lotus; kidney, black colour, to a black flower with eight leaves. The chapter of *upāya* [in the *Lotus Sūtra*] is aligned with the yellow lotus; that of the "precious pagoda" with the red flower; that of "herbs" with the green flower; that of *abhijñāna* with the black flower. My mother Ratnaketu in the east, correlated with the air of spring, exists by sucking the essence in the green flower in my liver; my mother Ratnarasi-Buddha (Ratnasambhava-buddha?) in the south, correlated with the air of summer, exists by sucking the essence in the red flower in my heart; my mother Amitabha in the west, correlated with the air of autumn, exists by sucking the essence in the white flower in my lungs' [my mother Amoghasiddhi-buddha in the north, correlated with winter, exists by sucking the essence in the black flower in my kidney;] my mother Vairocana-buddha at the centre, [correlated with the air of mid-summer,] exists by sucking the essence in the yellow flower in my spleens (BZ28.1199b5-11).

At the beginning, Enchin correlated the five viscera with five colours and five kinds of flower; then, five chapters in the *Lotus Sūtra* were associated with five-coloured flowers. Further, Enchin went on to correlate the five buddhas in the five directions with the five seasons, five kinds of flowers in five colours and five viscera.

According to the BZ edition of this fragmentary record, Enchin here merely correlates four buddhas with four seasons, four flowers of four colours and four viscera. I doubt that the MS was damaged here, since at the beginning of this passage Enchin has already put forward a couple of fivefold correlations which involve five viscera, five colours, etc. The *gohōbutsu* notion (i.e., five buddhas in five directions), which was initiated in Yixing's *Darijing* commentary (cf., chapter nine), had already been well accepted by the time of Enchin. I have no reason to believe that in this context involving so many fivefold categories Enchin had fallen short of completely enumerating the five buddhas in five directions.

Finally, it is remarkable that several passages in the famous Chinese Buddhist apocryphon, the *Tiweipoli jing*, were also used in this long paragraph in T905. The following sentences, for instances, are found in the *Tiweipoli jing* (for the corresponding *Tiweipoli jing* passages, see Makita 1977: 178):

Liver, corresponding with the external organ eye, dominates the muscles which end at the nails (T905.18.909c15-16).

Heart, corresponding with the external organ tongue, dominates the blood which ends at the milk. Moreover, heart dominates the helix, nose, throat, bridge of the nose, forehead and cheeks (T905.18.910a15-16).

Kidney is born from the black breath and lungs. Dominating ears, kidney corresponds with bones and dominates the marrow. The marrow ends at the ear-hole, while the bones at the teeth (T905.18.910a29-b2).

3. The first sentence is found in 911a2:

The *dharmadhātu* [the "realm of dharma"] refers to the substance of the Tathāgata in the *dharmakāya*.

Its KRHG parallel is found in BZ28.1087a4.

The second sentence is found in 911a25-26 (its KRHG parallel is found in BZ28.1087b2-3):

[They] are the complete body of the Vairocana-buddha-as-the-*dharmakāya*, and the true source for the 'five sections' and 'three sections'.

4. Two of the three paragraphs are identifiable, while the third one is not (which means it may have been written by the T905 author himself). The paragraph whose source I fail to identify is found in T905.18.910c4-9, which attributes a lot of merits to the five Sanskrit syllables. A paragraph in T905.18.911a2-4 is quoted from the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra*:

From the armpit to the top of the head is the higher [rank of attainment]; from the navel to the armpit the middle [rank of attainment]; from the feet to the navel the lower [rank of attainment]. With regard to the dharanis [related to the attainment], three kinds of attainment must be distinguished.

The parallel passage in the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra* is found in T893.18.603c6-7.

The other T905 paragraph found in T905.18.911a5-11 was written on the basis of two Esoteric sūtras, the *Jingangding chaosheng sanjie jing shuo Wenshu wuzi zhenyan shengxiang* (Jpn., *Kongōchō chōshōsangai kyō setsu Monju goji shingon shōsō*, The Excellent Appearances of Mañjuśrī's Five-syllable Dharani Which Is Preached in the *Vajra-crown Sūtra on Transcending the Three Realms*; T1172) and the *Jingangding jing Manshushili Pusa wuzi xintuoluonipin* (Jpn., *Kongōchōgyō Monjushiri Bosatsu goji shindarani hon*; The Chapter about Mañjuśrī's Five-syllable Heart-dhāraṇī Preached in the *Kongōchōgyō*; T1173, which Enchin regards as the scriptural source for the third of the three five-syllable dhāraṇīs [i.e., A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na]):

Reciting this dharani once is like reciting eighty-four thousands and twelve *tripitakas* of *Vedas*. That is sufficient in ridding the practitioner of all calamities. He will enter into the Tathāgata[-state] where all dharmas become equal and so do all the wordings; the *mahā-prajñā* ("great wisdom") will be obtained rapidly. After reciting this dharani twice, he will remove the grave sins [culminated] in one hundred million *kalpas*, which determine his birth and death. Manjusri and Samantabhadra, followed by the "Four Congregations", surround him to give him empowerment, while Maitri-abhaya and all the benevolent deities make their presence before him. After reciting this dhāraṇī thrice, he will immediately enter into the *samādhi*. After reciting this dhāraṇī four times, he will get full control [of good and evil passions], never forgetful [of the Buddhist teachings]. After reciting this dhāraṇī five times,

one will rapidly accomplish the supreme bodhi.

For the sources of these sentences in T1172 and T1173, see T1172.20.709a18, 709a19-21, 709b27-28, 709b28-29, 709b29-c1; T1173.20.710a17-19.

The sentences from T1173 which were moved to T905 are also found in Enchin's KSSH. Therefore, probably it is after reading KSSH that the T905 author decided to incorporate into his text these sentences from T1172 and T1173.

5. This paragraph appears in T907 as an interlinear note (T907. 915b18-19). It is possible that the paragraph was taken from T907 into T905. But since the paragraph appears in T907 as an interlinear note, it is more likely that the paragraph was interpolated into T907 by an editor after he read T905 (as I will show later, this is true at least for some of the interlines notes in T907; cf., my discussion of one version of T907 used by Shinnen [section (C) of this chapter]).

6. In the T905 paragraph in 911a27-b1 this italicized sentence appears at the beginning, rather than the end, of the paragraph.

7. The pair of categories, *e-shin* (Chin., *yi-zheng*), is equal to the *ehō-shinhō* (Chin., *yibao-zhengbao*), both of which mean the "secondary retribution" and the "principal retribution". The *e[ho]* denotes the kind of retribution resulting from one's karmas in his previous lives, manifesting in the form of the living condition one is born into, e.g., the country, family, possession, etc. The *shin[ho]*, on the other hand, refers to the personality deriving from one's previous karmas (cf., Soothill 1968: 249). Here, I choose to use the tentative English translations for these two categories, *e[hō]*--secondary [retribution], *shin[hō]*--principal [retribution], although I am aware of the considerable inadequacy of the translations, which I have to tolerate before more appropriate translations are found.

8. The T905 paralleling sentence reads this as "reveals the thirty-seven deities" for the sake of enjoying himself.

9. In the T905 paralleling paragraph, this sentence reads as "in order to enjoy himself and others".

10. Śubhākarasimha, allegedly enjoying an extraordinarily long life (99 years), outlived his disciple Yixing, who is 46 years younger than his teacher, by eight years.

11. Yixing's commentary was composed on the basis of Śubhākarasimha's lectures on the *Darijing*. With regard to these fourteen paragraphs, no acknowledgement has been made in Yixing's commentary to the effect that any of the fourteen paragraphs was based on another source.

12. I first resorted to the Index Series for the *Taishō Tripitaka*. Then, I checked this twenty-volume commentary page by page. In both cases, I failed to identify any of these five paragraphs in Yixing's commentary.

13. T905 is of no more than 4,400 characters, while the KRHG is barely of 800 characters.

14. That is possible only under the circumstance that these paragraphs/sentences are in an extremely short article (as short as composed of virtually nothing more than these paragraphs/ sentences). That is almost impossible for the thematic varieties these paragraphs/sentences display.

15. For the dating of KSSH, see section (B) in chapter five. For the connection between KSSH and KRHG, see BKD 3: 136.

16. This title is based on the fact that Enchin once served as the abbot of a so-called Sannōin Temple.

17. In chapter five we discussed some other evidence to show Enchin's ignorance of all of the three *siddhi* texts (including T905) until his death in 891.

18. As I noted above, the concluding section of T905, mainly composed of paragraphs from other sources, appears contextually inconsistent. For this reason, the contextual inconsistencies found in the whole concluding section of T905 can not be *exclusively* ascribed to the five T905 paragraphs which are also found in Enchin's three texts.

However, the T905 paragraph under investigation here is not in the same situation and therefore the eulogy is to be taken as the sole cause for the contextual inconsistency regarding this T905 paragraph (the parallel paragraph of this T905 paragraph in both T906 and T907, lacking this eulogy, appears consistent).

19. This conclusion is also corroborated by the remarkable positions two paragraphs and one sentence in KRHG are found in T905. In KRHG, the eulogy is found next to the paragraph in BZ28.1087a17-b3. In T905, the paragraph containing this eulogy is also next to the paragraph which parallels the same KRHG paragraph. What proves particularly telling is that the two KRHG paragraphs are found at the beginning and end of the concluding section of T905, which is one of the two major parts prepared by the T905 author himself.

20. This paragraph may have been taken from T907 in which the paragraph serves as an interlinear note.

21. For the meaning of this pair of Buddhist terms, see note <7> .

22. The threefold correlation formulated in the T905 paragraph in 911c26-912a3 includes the following four threefold categories: (1) "three-sections" (buddha-, lotus-, and vajra-section), (2) "three-virtues" (*dharmakāya*, *prajñā*, and delivery), (3) "three-mysteries" (body, mouth, and mind), and finally (4) "three clauses" (bodhi-mind, compassion and *upāya*) (T905.18.911c26-912a3).

23. Nevertheless, we would have to take another fact into consideration. In T905 the whole concluding section, excluding these five paragraphs and one other paragraph (911b4-6), is, as shown before, composed of paragraphs either directly taken from, or carefully constructed on the basis of, Yixing's commentary. This peculiar situation might have determined to a great extent the inconsistencies in T905's concluding section as a whole. In view of this, it is possible that the inconsistencies in this section are caused not so much by the five paragraphs as by the paragraphs based on Yixing's commentary. For this reason, the inconsistencies regarding the five T905 paragraphs can be counted as no more than *circumstantial* evidence for disqualifying T905 as the original source for the five paragraphs. The *decisive* proofs for the view that Enchin's treatises are the primary sources to which T905 was indebted for the five paragraphs must be sought, therefore, in the evidence discussed in (B.I) and (B.II).

24. Of the three *siddhi* texts, T907 has a title ("Bucchō sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani") which does not contain the term of *shanshushicchi*; the title of T906 does contain the term which appears, however, near the end of the title ("Bucchō sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu sanjim bukka *sanshushicchi* shingon giki"). T905 is the only text whose title is headed by the term ("*Sanshushicchi* hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani hō").

25. Some fascicles were finished earlier. Fascicle forty-two was finished, for example, as early as 1144, one decade before the completion of the whole work. In the *Gyōrin shō*, the *Bucchō Sonshōshin hajigoku dengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani* and its different version are mentioned in fascicle seven, which might have been finished even earlier than 1144.

26. The title referred to by Shinnen here is exactly identical with that by which T907 is currently included in the *Taishō Tripitaka* (cf., T907.18.914c), and different from those of T905 and T906 in the same *Taishō Tripitaka* (cf., T905.18.909b; T906.18.912b).

27. This quotation is only found in T907, not in T905 or T906.

28. The corresponding paragraphs in T907 is found in T907.915b12-28.

29. Cf., section (C) in chapter five. Annen referred to T907 as the *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki* in his *Hakke hiroku* bibliography and as the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* in his TDT, in which Annen also made quotation from T907.

30. The two aspects of the "retribution-body" are the "body-for-self-enjoyment" and "body-for-other's-enjoyment", while in T905 the *dharmakāya* is bifurcated into the "*dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom*" and "*dharmakāya-as-the-principle*".

31. Of course, there were other reasons for the formation of T905, such as the desire to weave some basic Esoteric fivefold categories with a number of indigenous Chinese fivefold categories inspired by the *wuxing* pattern, etc.

32. This small section (912c23-25), in which this large part of T906 begins, was taken from Yixing's commentary (for its connection with Yixing's commentary, see T1796.39.586b11-13; 727c8-23).

33. As noted about, in this work Annen records the *Kongōkai*-related teachings transmitted in Tendai tradition (cf., chapter five).

34. *Jingangding yujia qianshou qianyan Guanzizai Pusa xiuxing yigui jing* (Jpn., *Kongōchō yuga senju sengen kanjizai Bosatsu shugyō gikikyō*), the Sūtra about the Practice Manual [Preached by] the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara Who, [Wearing] the Vajra-crown, Is One-thousand-armed and One-thousand-eyed.

35. *Jingandingjing jingangjie dadaochang Biluzhe'na Rulai zishouyongshen neizhengzhi juanshu foshenyimingfo zuishangcheng mimi sanmodi lizanwen* (Jpn., *Kongōchō gyō kongōkai daidōjō Birushana Nyorai jiyuyushin naishōchi kenzoku hosshin imyōbutsu saijōjō himitsu sammaji raisammon*), An Eulogy of the Highest Vehicled and Mysterious Samādhi Related to the Vairocana-Tathāgata, i.e., the Buddha Who has a Self-enjoying Body, Who Is Surrounded by Companions with Inner-enlightened Wisdom, Who Has Some Extraordinary Titles And Who Lives in the Great Truth-plot of Diamond-realms As Preached in the *Jinganding Jing/Kongōchō Gyō*.

36. This T906 section reads,

In the space-wheel is visualized syllable Hum, which, deep black in colour, expands gradually into a wind-wheel. On the wind-wheel is visualized syllable Vam, which is transformed into a water-wheel. On the water-wheel is visualized syllable Pra, which, golden in colour, is transformed into a "gold tortoise". On the back of "gold tortoise" is visualized syllable Su,

which is transformed into Mt. Sumeru that is made of four kinds of treasures. In addition, there is syllable Kam which is transformed into a "gold mountain" that is surrounded by seven layers [of mountains]. To visualize that fragrant milk is flowing from the pores of the Mahāvairocana-buddha who is [visualized] in the air. [The fragrant milk] pour like rains over the seven "gold-mountains", forming a fragrant milk-sea of eight kinds of merits.

Its parallel in T1056 is as follows,

Then, in the space-wheel below is visualized syllable Hum, which, deep black in colour, expands gradually into a great wind-wheel. On the wind-wheel is visualized syllable Vam, which is white in colour. It is gradually expanded until as large as the wind-wheel which is transformed into a water-wheel. On the water-wheel is visualized syllable Pra, which, golden in colour, is expanded as large as the water-wheel and then transformed into a "gold tortoise". On the back of the "gold tortoise" is visualized syllable Su, which is transformed into Mt. Sumeru that is made of four kinds of treasures. In addition, there is syllable Kam which is transformed into a "gold mountain" that is surrounded by seven layers [of mountains]. To visualize that fragrant milk is flowing from the pores of the Mahāvairocana-buddha who is [visualized] in the air at the top of the Mt. Sumeru. [The fragrant milk] pour like rains over the seven "gold-mountains", forming a fragrant milk-sea of eight kinds of merits (T1056.20.75a11-19; the parts produced in bold type are also found in T906).

37. Paragraph (4.3) is based on (i) Annen's KDT and (ii) T1056.

38. This point becomes clear when this T906 paragraph is compared with its parallels in T1056 and KDT. This T906 paragraph reads,

[The practitioner] must visualize in mind Mt. Sumeru, on the top of which is visualized syllable Sri that is transformed into an eight-petalled lotus flower permeating all over the dharma-field. On the lotus flower there is syllable A which is transformed into an eight-peaked and eight-pillared treasure-pavilion. This pavilion is so high and wide that it seems to be without centre and edges. It is embellished in various ways by all sorts of large and wonderful treasures; it is surrounded by Tathāgatas, the "*devas, nagas* and others of the eight classes", and the inner and outer bodhisattvas who serve [the buddhas], all of whom are as many as the *koṭis* of the sands in sixty River Ganges. In this palace of dharma-field there is syllable Sri which is transformed into a big lotus flower on the leaves of which is [visualized] a *mandala*. On the mandala there is a "lion throne" (*simhāsāṭha*), on which sits a lotus-king. On the top of the lotus-king is a pure and full moon-wheel. On the full moon-wheel is [visualized] syllable Sri that is transformed into a large lotus flower like the fine moon. On the lotus flower is [visualized] syllable Vam from which are emanating strong lights illuminating all over the dharma-field. On touch of the lights, all the sentient beings tortured in the "three realms" and "six directions", in the "four forms of birth" and "eight conditions", will be [immediately] delivered.

Only a part of this T906 paragraph is found in T1056:

On the top of Mt. Sumeru is visualized an eight-petalled lotus-flower. On the lotus flower is visualized an eight-vajra-pillared treasure-pavilion. At the womb of lotus flower is visualized

syllable Sri, from which is emanating strong lights illuminating all over the buddha-worlds. On touch of the lights, all the sentient beings tortured will be [immediately] delivered (T1056.20.75a19-22).

The KDT parallel for this T906 paragraph is found in T2391.75.139c24-29,

[The practitioner] must visualize in mind Mt. Sumeru, on the top of which is visualized syllable Sri that is transformed into an eight-petalled lotus flower permeating all over the dharma-field. On the lotus flower there is syllable AA which is transformed into an eight-peaked and eight-pillared treasure-pavilion. In this palace of dharma-field there is syllable Sri that is transformed into a big lotus flower on which is [visualized] a mandala. On the mandala there is a "lion throne" (*simhaśāṣṭha*), on which sits a lotus-king. On the top of the lotus-king is a pure and full moon-wheel. On the full moon-wheel is [visualized] syllable Sri that is transformed into a fine and large lotus flower (*this lotus flower has a stalk*). On the lotus flower is [visualized] syllable Vam from which are emanating strong lights illuminating all over the dharma-fields.

We find that this KDT paragraph, except for one interlinear note (underscored in the quotation), is wholly found in its T906 parallel.

39. The KDT parallel for this T906 paragraph is found in T2391.20.139c29-140a8,

This syllable Vam changes into a *stūpa* which, in form, can be square, round, triangular, curved and sphere-like, since it is made of the "five elements": earth, water, fire, wind and space. This *stūpa* is transformed into the Mahāvairocana-tathāgata whose body is [as bright as] the moon and who, with the "crown of five-buddhas" on the head, embellishes his own body with a celestial dress made of fine silk and with a necklace of precious stones. The lights emanating from him illumine all over the dharma-fields in the ten directions. The "Four Buddhas", "[Four] *Pāramitā* [-bodhisattvas]", "Sixteen [bodhisattvas]", "Eight Serving [bodhisattvas]" and "Four Embracing [bodhisattvas]", the sixteen deities in the *bhadrakalpa*, twenty [kinds of] *devas*, along with countless Mahā-bodhisattvas, are surrounding him and serving as his companions. After performing the visualization in this way, empower seven locations [on the body].

40. The "thirty-seven deities" include, firstly, the central deity and "four secondary buddhas", which form the "five buddhas": (1) Mahāvairocana, (2) Akṣobhya, (3) Ratna-sambhava, (4) Amitābha, and (5) Śākyamuni; secondly, the "four [pāramitā]-bodhisattvas": (6) Vajra-pāramitā -bodhisattva, (7) Ratna-pāramitā -bodhisattva, (8) Dharma-pāramitā -bodhisattva, and (9) Karma-pāramitā -bodhisattva; thirdly, the "sixteen bodhisattvas": (10) Vajra-sattva-bodhisattva, (11) Vajra-rajā-bodhisattva, (12) Vajra-rāga-bodhisattva, (13) Vajra-sādhu-bodhisattva, (14) Vajra-ratna-bodhisattva, (15) Vajra-tejas-bodhisattva, (16) Vajra-ketu-bodhisattva, (17) Vajra-hasa-bodhisattva, (18) Vajra-dharma-bodhisattva, (19) Vajra-tiksna-bodhisattva, (20) Vajra-hetu-bodhisattva, (21) Vajra-bhāṣa-bodhisattva, (22) Vajra-karma-bodhisattva, (23) Vajra-rakṣa-bodhisattva, (24) Vajra-yakṣa-bodhisattva, and (25) Vajra-samādhi-bodhisattva; fourthly, the "eight serving bodhisattvas": (26) Vajra-lāsi-bodhisattva, (27) Vajra-mala-bodhisattva, (28) Vajra-gītā-bodhisattva, (29) Vajra-nṛta-bodhisattva, (30) Vajra-dhūpā-bodhisattva, (31) Vajra-puṣpā-bodhisattva, (32) Vajra-loka-bodhisattva, and (33) Vajra-gandha-bodhisattva; and finally, the "four embracing bodhisattvas": (34) Vajrāhkusa-bodhisattva, (35) Vajra-pāsa-bodhisattva, (36) vajra-sphoṭa-bodhisattva, and (37) vajra-vesa-bodhisattva.

41. Cf., T878.18.336a3-c12.
42. Although mainly based on T907, this T906 part, with so many changes in re-arranging the component paragraphs/sentences taken from T907, becomes quite unreadable.
43. A seven-fascicle work called "Sijiao yi" is attributed to the Chinese Tiantai leader Zhiyi (cf., T1929).
44. Jpn., *hachikuson*, Chin., *bayejiuzun*. In the Matrix-realm line of Esoteric Buddhist tradition, the first layer of the three-layered Matrix-realm-mandala is likened to and often visualized as an eight-petalled lotus flower. At the lotus flower's centre and on its four petals are seated the five buddhas, while the four bodhisattvas sit on its other four petals. The five Buddhas are Vairocana, Ratnaketu, Sarendraraja, Amitābha and Akṣobhya. The four bodhisattvas are Samantabhadra, Mañjuśrī, Avalokiteśvara and Maitreya. The five buddhas and the four bodhisattvas are therefore called "nine deities on the eight petals".
45. These sentences produced in bold type in the quotation were, according to a Shingon monk Ekō (an editor of Gōhō's sub-commentary on Yixing's *Dainichikyōsho* [*Dainichikyōsho ennāshō*]), quoted from Zhiyi's commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* (cf., chapter seven, the part about Gōhō's relation with the three *siddhi* texts). Ekō does not specify which commentary he was talking about here (at least two commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* have been attributed to Zhiyi). Misaki successfully identifies the textual source (i.e., the *Weimojing xuanshu* [Jpn., *Yuimakikyō gensho*; A Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*: Focusing on Its Mysterious Teachings; T1777]) which was used by the T906 author here (Misaki 1988: 506). Misaki says nothing about Ekō's comment. Therefore, he has probably arrived at this identification independently.
46. The notion of *amalāvijñāna* (literally, "immaculate consciousness"), as the ninth mode of consciousness, was first proposed by the prolific Indian translator Paramārtha (499-569), who oversaw the Chinese translation of many Yogacara and Tathāgata-garbha texts. Shortly after the time of Paramārtha, this notion became one of the most important categories for the Shelun school which was based on Paramārtha's translation of Asanga's *Mahāyanasamgraha* (Chin., *She Dacheng lun*) (cf., Gimello 1976: 212-8, 313-28; Paul 1984: 46-71; Buswell 1989: 92-104).

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE THREE *SIDDHI* TEXTS IN JAPAN AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE TENDAI AND SHINGON SCHOOLS

In the last two chapters, I presented the reasons for believing that the three *siddhi* texts were composed in Japan. Moreover, I have touched on the polemical agenda underlying the three *siddhi* texts (especially T907 and T905). Not merely do the three *siddhi* texts turn out to be Japanese products, the process by which they were composed was also imbued with Tendai propaganda.

It seems that Annen, the Tendai leader who was, in all likelihood, responsible for the fabrication of T907, and the other two Tendai monks who wrote T905 and T906 on the basis of T907, had been very successful in covering up the polemical purposes prompting the composition of the three *siddhi* texts. There is evidence to believe that all of the three *siddhi* texts, despite their Tendai origin, had been gradually accepted by various Esoteric branches affiliated with the Shingon school (especially its *shingi* sect). Very successful in attracting audiences from two Japanese antagonistic Esoteric traditions, the three *siddhi* texts became widely circulated among various Esoteric Buddhist circles in Japan.

The first goal of this chapter is to offer a historical review of the transmission of the three *siddhi* texts in Japan. This discussion will mainly rely on two colophons found in the *Taishō* edition of the three *siddhi* texts. Following this historical review, I will focus on the problem of how the three *siddhi* texts have exerted their influence on the two Esoteric traditions in Japan. For this purpose, I will investigate the Esoteric exegeses and treatises which made references to and/or

quotations from one, two, or all three of the texts.

Section (A) The Transmission of the Three *Siddhi* Texts in Medieval Japan

In the *Taishō Tripitaka*, the three *siddhi* texts are printed together. A colophon¹ appears at the end of T906, while another, separate colophon follows T907². These two colophons are of immense importance in providing a glimpse of the transmission of the three *siddhi* texts in medieval Japan. However, to my knowledge, no serious scholarly attention has been paid to the two colophons to date. For this reason, I will here make a detailed analysis of these two colophons, trying to draw from them any information relevant to the transmission of the three *siddhi* texts in Japan.

The two colophons were both written by Kaidō (1751-1810)³, the editor of the manuscripts of the three *siddhi* texts on which the *Taishō* edition of the three *siddhi* texts were based. According to the colophon attached to T906, on the reverse side of T906's manuscript used for Kaidō's edition, there were two notes made by the two scribes/redactors of the manuscript, Chōnen⁴ and Ji'nin⁵. Chōnen's note indicates that he transcribed the manuscript in the second month of Enpō 2 (1674). According to the note left by Ji'nin, on the tenth day of the eighth month

of Tenmyō 5 (1785), he made a copy of the manuscript on the basis of the one left by Chōnen. After reproducing these two notes at the end of the copy he made of the manuscript, Kaidō describes how he and his colleagues found this manuscript and discusses the relationship between the manuscripts of T905 and T906:

In the autumn (the seventh month) of Kyōwa 1 (1801), the year corresponding with the "circular year" (Jpn., *sai*; Chin., *sui*) *shinshu* (Chin., *xinqiu*), I searched for manuscripts in the Chishakuin Monastery⁶ in Kyto. Daisei⁷, from the Aizenin Chapel on Mt. Tozan, along with others, were responsible for copying, collating and editing the manuscripts. Among the two texts related to the [theme of] "Sonshō hajigoku", the *Sonshō hajigoku*, not mentioned in the Buddhist bibliographies, was printed first. The *Sanshushicchi ki*, a different version [of the *Sonshō hajigoku*] devoted to the same theme, is to be subjected to further edition--before putting into print, it will be collated with a better edition (T906.18.914b25 -29).

From the two notes left by Chōnen and Ji'nin, it is clear that at least since 1674 T906 had been successively copied. As for Kaidō's own comment, it is interesting for three points. First, it is noteworthy that according to Kaidō, T906, which he refers to as "Sonshō hajigoku gi", had not been mentioned in the Buddhist bibliographies by the time he began to edit the manuscripts in 1801. Secondly, Kaidō seems to have been reluctant to put the manuscript of another text, possibly T905 (referred to as "Sanshushicchi ki") into print. He confessed that he was searching for a better manuscript of T905 since the quality of the manuscript of the text available for him at the time was not so satisfactory. Finally, it was Kaidō's belief that T905 is a different version of T906 and is devoted to the same theme.

Like the colophon attached to T906, the colophon appended to T907 is also composed of two sections. The first consists of three notes separately left by three transcribers/editors of the manuscript of T907 on which Kaidō's edition was based. The second is a short comment made by Kaidō himself about the identity of the manuscript he was editing.

These three notes delineate a continuous history of transcription and edition made on the manuscript of T907--a history lasting as long as eight centuries. Jōsen's⁸ note records that on the first day of the sixth month of Jireki 2 (1066), Jōsen himself made a copy of the text on the basis of the Hijiri Gyōbō (library) edition that was then preserved by the Tanseki family⁹. According to the second note left by Monkai¹⁰, the copy made by Jōsen was later kept at the Sōjō¹¹ library in the Kongō'ōin Monastery. Monkai reported that on the eighteenth day of the seventh month of Shinwa 2 (1346), the Sōjō library in the Kongō'ōin Monastery bestowed upon him this copy when he was fifty-four years old, serving as the Gonshōjōto¹². Finally, as shown by the note made by Ji'nin, this copy once bestowed to Monkai was in storage at the Eishinin Monastery in Uji. Ji'nin reported that his copy was based on the manuscript stored in the Eishinin Monastery (T907.18.915c19-20).

After these three notes, Kaidō comments,

The *Hakke hiroku* contains the following entry, "The *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki*, one fascicle (this is identical to the *Sanshushicchi hō* ["The Procedures for the Three Kinds of Attainment"])¹³." It can be inferred from this that the procedures expounded in the text are not clearly indicated in the title, necessitating such an interlinear note¹⁴. The present text may have been the text [to which the *Hakke hiroku* refers] (T907.18.915c20-22).

Here, Kaidō proposed that the text called "Sonshō hajigoku darani giki", as is recorded in Annen's well known *Hakke hiroku* bibliography, can be identified with the manuscript he was editing here. Kaidō's proposal agrees with a conclusion reached above, i.e., the *Sonshōhajigoku darani giki* whose title is included in Annen's bibliography and the *Sonshō hojigoku hō* which is quoted in Annen's TDT are none other than T907. We should note that Kaidō edited all of the three *siddhi* texts, which provided him an opportunity to compare them. He might have had reasons to identify

the text recorded in Annen's bibliography as T907 rather than with T905 or T906.

Having reviewed these two colophons in some details, I will now see what conclusions can be drawn from them. We should first note that the earliest datable edition of T907 (1066) is over six centuries earlier than that of T906, which is dated 1674. In chapter three, I argued that of the three *siddhi* texts T907 is the earliest one. This conclusion is corroborated by these two colophons¹⁵. Second, Kaidō's identification of a text recorded in Annen's bibliography is of great interest to us. The following fact is of the greatest relevance to our discussion in this chapter. Not only is the editor of the three *siddhi* texts, Kaidō, a well respected monk coming from one *shingi* branch of Shingon school, but also the three *siddhi* texts were collected at some renowned *shingi* headquarters like Chishakuin and Kongō'ōin. This would mean that despite their Tendai origin, T906 and T907 had also been appreciated by some Shingon monks, especially those affiliated with the *shingi* Shingon sects. This fact will become more obvious in our discussion in the following section.

Section (B) The Three *Siddhi* Texts and the Medieval Japanese Esoteric Exegeses and Treatises

According to a colophon we discussed above, a Japanese monk called Jōsen transcribed

a manuscript of T907 in 1066. This is the first traceable appearance of T907 after its forgery around 902. The same colophon also indicates that the copy of T907 made by Jōsen was later preserved at a library at a *shingi* Shingon monastery.

As for T905 and T906, they were mentioned for the first time in 1042 and 1037-39 respectively by a Taimitsu monk named Kōgei. Like T907, some copies of T905 and T906 had also been preserved in several Shingon monasteries. As described by a colophon appended to T906, the manuscripts on which the Taishō edition of T905 and T906 are based were found by Kaidō, a *shingi* Shingon master, at a *shingi* Shingon monastery in Kyōto. All this shows that albeit their Tendai source, the three texts had also attracted appreciators from outside Tendai circles.

As evidenced by their repeated appearances in both Tendai and Shingon works, the three *siddhi* texts succeeded in attracting attention and respect from the two opposite Esoteric Buddhist traditions in Japan. A number of Japanese Esoteric authors, despite their sectarian opposition, agreed in using the three *siddhi* texts as a kind of canonical source--although for varying purposes.

In this section I will investigate the extent to which the three *siddhi* texts were used in the exegeses and treatises written by both Tendai and Shingon masters. This descriptive review will be made in the temporal order, with priority given to the author who is earlier rather than to one who is more influential. In view of the Tendai origin of the three *siddhi* texts, I will begin with Tendai authors although my research to date has found more Shingon authors connected with the three *siddhi* texts.

At this point, I feel obliged to acknowledge the incomplete-ness of the strategy I employ for making this descriptive review. For this preliminary review I adopted the following method: By using the Index Series for the *Taishō Tripitaka*, I will investigate how the Esoteric texts in

the *Taishō Tripitaka* refer to any of the *siddhi* texts. This provisional method is marred by two problems of the *Taishō Tripitaka* : first, it excludes a quantity of Japanese Esoteric texts, both Tendai and Shingon; second, it covers more Shingon texts than Tendai. For these reasons, the descriptive review to be made in this section is incomplete. It might also have been due to the bias of the Taishō collection that we have found in the *Taishō Tripitaka* more Tomitsu works than Taimitsu's that make references to the three *siddhi* texts.

(B.I) Tendai Authors and the Three *Siddhi* Texts

The first Tendai monk who made reference to two of the three *siddhi* texts (i.e., T905 and T906) is Kōgei. According to the record his student Chōen makes in the *Shijūshō ketsu*, Kōgei had definitely referred to T905 twice (in 1042 and 1047 respectively), while to T906 once (in 1042). Elsewhere, Kōgei mentioned a text called "Sonshō hojigoku hō" twice: sometime between 1037 and 1039, and in 1042 respectively. Both T906 and T907 have been conventionally known by the same title, "Sonshō hojigoku hō". Consequently, it is difficult to determine which of the two texts Kōgei was actually referring to. However, in Chōen's work Kōgei is said to have twice referred to T906 by the title "Sonshō hojigoku hō". Therefore, I am inclined to believe that when Kōgei mentioned a text by the same title on the two other occasions (i.e., sometime between 1037 and 1039, and in 1042 respectively), the text was also T906. These relevant records made by Chōen in the *Shijūshō ketsu* are the textual evidence to determine the earliest possible *terminus ante quem* for both T905 and T906¹⁶.

Shinnen is the second Tendai scholar who had a knowledge of the three *siddhi* texts. All

of the three *siddhi* texts were mentioned in Shinnen's *Gyōrin shō*, which was completed in 1154. In the seventh fascicle of the *Gyōrin shō*, Shinnen referred to a text titled "Bucchō Sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani", from which he made a long quotation. In chapter six I have identified this text as T906. Immediately following the quotation, Shinnen went on to compare this text (=T906) with one of its "different versions" which I identified as T905. Thus, it is my conclusion that Shinnen knew both T905 and T906.

In the ninth fascicle of the aforementioned *Gyōrin shō*, Shinnen also referred to a text called "Sonshō hajigoku", from which he made a long quotation (T2409.76.83a18-25). This quotation itself ascertains that this text Shinnen here referred to as "Sonshō hajigoku" is none other than T907¹⁷. Therefore, all of the three *siddhi* texts are used in Shinnen's *Gyōrin shō*.

Finally, on the impact of the three *siddhi* texts on the exegeses and treatises by Post-Annen Tendai authors, Kōshū's (1276-1350) *Keiran shūyōshū*¹⁸ provides some interesting information deserving serious attention. In the *Keiran shūyōshō*, one of the three *siddhi* texts was referred to several times when Kōshū is said to have talked with one guest about the Tendai transmission centring around the controversial "procedures of the threefold attainment" (*Sanshushicchi hō*). First, one of Kōshū's guests is reported to have mentioned a text called "Sonshō hajigoku ki", which he says Tendai masters in general and Saichō in particular have taken as the scriptural support for the threefold attainment (T2410.76.881c8-10). Then, in his reply Kōshū quotes from the same *Sonshō hajigoku ki*,

Just like the *Sonshō hajigoku ki* says, "These five syllables are also called the *susiddhi* ('wonderful attainment')." (T2410.76.882b7-8)

Strictly speaking, this quotation is found in none of the three *siddhi* texts. However, Kōshū here

seems to have referred to the following paragraph which was originally written into T907 and then reproduced in T905 and T906,

A, Bam, Ram, Hum, Kham, ..., are called the mysterious attainment, are also called the "attainment of accomplishment", **also called the susiddhi** ("wonderful attainment") ... (my emphasis, T907.18.915,b19-21; 905.18.911a17-18; T906.18.913c18-19)

Therefore, a kind of rephrasing, rather than a literal quotation, was made here by Kōshū. Finally, several lines after this rephrasing, Kōshū relates that Annen subjected this *giki* (manual) to the category of the *susiddhi* division of the three-division Esoteric Buddhist tradition (*sanbu*). Then, Kōshū quotes from Annen's TDT a paragraph in which Annen excitedly reported his "discovery" of T907, a paragraph we have extensively discussed elsewhere in this dissertation¹⁹. Indeed, it is difficult to reach a certain decision on which of the three *siddhi* texts Kōshū and his guest were talking about in this occasion. However, the text's title ("Sonshō hajigoku ki") as well as Kōgei's reference to a paragraph in Annen's TDT²⁰ intimate that the text in question might have been T907.

(B.II) The Shingon Authors and the Three *Siddhi* Texts

In the *Taishō Tripitaka* I have found seven Shingon masters who have, in their works, used the three *siddhi* texts. Each of them has left one to five works which are connected with one, two, or all three of the *siddhi* texts. Each of these seven Shingon masters occupies a prominent position in Shingon history in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteen centuries. Commensurate with these authors' historical prominence are the irreplaceable roles their works played in the formation

and transformation of the Shingon Buddhism. In the following discussion, for the sake of convenience, I will divide those seven Shingon authors into three groups (from [a] to [c]) in accordance with the different centuries to which their works connected to our three *siddhi* texts belong.

(a) The Twelfth-century Shingon Authors and the Three *Siddhi* Texts

As far as my research to date goes, Chōyo (n.d.) is the first Shingon scholar who made reference to one of the three *siddhi* texts. In his important work, the *Hishū kyōsō shō*²¹ (completed in 1139), Chōyo quotes a paragraph (T2441.77.645b19-24) from a text called "Sonshō hojigoku hō". The paragraph quoted is found in all of the three texts²². So, from the quotation itself it is impossible to decide which of the three *siddhi* texts Chōyo was here referring to. Nevertheless, the title of this text quoted by Chōyo on this occasion suggests that the text is possibly T906 or T907, since of the three *siddhi* texts T905 is the only one whose title does not contain the term *Sonshō*.

Besides Chōyo, there is another twelfth century Shingon master who made much use of T905 in his work. This master is none other than Kakuban (1095-1143), a towering figure not only in Shingon Buddhism but also in the whole of Japanese religious history. Kakuban's work, the *Gorin kujimyō himitsushaku*²³, has been generally held to be a good analysis of the type of Jōdo-Shingon syncretism he attempted. This important work by Kakuban is closely connected with T905. Apart from several paragraphs and sentences, a major section of the *Gorin kujimyō himitsushaku* finds its parallel in T905²⁴.

quoted by Raiyu here is T906.

Raiyu had also resorted to T905 in one of his best known exegeses. To Yixing's commentary on the *Dainichi kyō/Darijing* Raiyu contributed a sub-commentary, the *Dainichikyōsho shishinshō*²⁸, which is among one of the authoritative sources for Japanese Esoteric followers to understand Yixing's commentary. In this sub-commentary Raiyu refers to a text by Śubhākarasimha under the title "Hajigoku ki" (The Manual for "Destroying Hell"). From this Esoteric manual ascribed to Śubhākarasimha Raiyu quotes a paragraph (T2217.59.597c12-17), which is identical to the T905 paragraph in 912a21-27. In the interlinear note attached to this quotation Raiyu makes the following comment,

My personal comment: the "principle of reality" is exactly the "principle of suchness". The "extinct illumination of suchness", according to [Yixing's] commentary, is the "wisdom of reality", namely, the "wisdom of suchness". Therefore the *Jinguanming jing* (Jpn., *Konkōmyō kyō*; Skt., *Suvarṇaprabhāsa[uttamarāja]-sūtra*) says, "Only the suchness and the 'wisdom of suchness' are called the *dharmakāya*" (quotation). The *kon[gō]kai* line speaks of the "enjoyment-by-oneself" and "enjoyment-for-others", while the *taizō[kai]* line merely speaking of "enjoyment-by-oneself". The "buddha of enjoyment-by-himself" and his companions respectively lecture on the gates of the "three mysteries", enjoying each other with the dharma, hence the "enjoyment-by-oneself" and "enjoyment-for-others". [Irrespective "enjoyment-by-oneself" or "enjoyment-for-others",] the practices should be carried out one by one, hence the "enjoyment-for-oneself". There is indeed no contradiction between the two lines. Says the "Explanation" by the Great Master (*Daishi*)²⁹, "The self-nature is the 'body of principle' said in the *taizō[kai]* line; the 'buddha of enjoyment' is the 'buddha of wisdom' said in the *kon[gō]kai* line. In order to enjoy the dharma-pleasure, the buddha and his companions lecture on the gates of 'three mysteries' respectively" (quotation) (T2217.59.597c18-20).

This comment is directed to the inter-relation between the "enjoyment-by-oneself" and "enjoyment-for-others". These are the two aspects of the "retribution-body", which is one of the "three bodies" (*trikāya*) a buddha is expected to assume. The T905 paragraph in 912a21-27 is

devoted to the same topic. Here, it is interesting to note that the classification of the two aspects of the "retribution-body" is, according to Raiyu, only made in the *kongōkai* line and that the *taizōkai* line only speaks of the "enjoyment-for-oneself".

Finally, Raiyu also mentions in his work, the *Hishō mondō*³⁰, a text entitled "Sonshō hajigoku ki"³¹, which is, as suggested by its title, either T906 or T907.

(c) The Fourteenth Century Shingon Authors and the Three *Siddhi* Texts

We find three major Shingon scholars in the fourteenth century who were familiar with our three *siddhi* texts. One of them is Raihō (1279-1330?)³², who in his *Shohō fumbetsushō*³³ refers to a text called "Hajigoku ki". He reports that this text correlates water to the direction of west and the virtue of "wisdom of Wonderful contemplation" (T2448.77.721a15), which means that this text is T906 (of the three texts T906 is the only one correlating the "five elements" [among which is water] with "five wisdoms" [among which is the "wisdom of the wonderful Contemplation"]) (cf., 912c17-21).

In addition, Raihō in the same *Shohō fumbetsushō* also refers to a text called "Sanshushicchi giki" as a canonical source for the "dhāraṇīs for the three bodies" (T2448.77.729b28-c1). The "Sanshu shicchi giki" is the title for which T905 has been generally known, and therefore the text mentioned by Raihō here might have been T905.

The second fourteenth century Shingon master making use of the three *siddhi* texts is Yūban (1270-1352). In the history of Shingon Buddhism, Yūban is famous for his sub-commentary to Yixing's commentary, i.e., the *Dainichikyōsho myōinshō*³⁴, in which Yūban not

only frequently referred to T905, but also quoted a lot from it. Throughout the *Dainichikyōsho myōnshō*, Yūban quoted seven times in total from a text he refers to as "Sanshicchi" ("three kinds of attainment"). Since these quotations are found in T905 only, not in T906 nor T907, it can be ascertained that the text mentioned by Yūban as "Sanshicchi" is T905. The following diagram indicates the seven occasions in which T905 is quoted by Yūban in his sub-commentary to Yixing's commentary³⁵.

- (i) Yūban: 264b3-5 = T905: 911a2-4
- (ii) Yūban: 264b5-10 = T905: 911b25-29
- (iii) Yūban: 321b13-14 = T905: 911b11-12
- (iv) Yūban: 544c2-19 = T905: 911c5-6, 911c6-10, 91110-22
- (v) Yūban: 545a15-16 = T905: 911b17-18
- (vi) Yūban: 545a15-17 = T905: 911b26-29
- (vii) Yūban: 545a29-b1 = T905: 911b28-29.

Besides these seven direct quotations from T905, Yūhan in the same sub-commentary also refers several times to a text called "Sanshicchi giki"³⁶. Most likely, this *Sanshicchi giki* is the same T905.

Apart from this voluminous sub-commentary, Yūban has left a shorter work, the *Dainichikyōsho myōnshō kuden*, which, judging from both its title and content, might have been compiled on the basis of the *Dainichikyōsho myōnshō*. Like the *Dainichikyōsho myōnshō*, the *Dainichikyōsho myōnshō kuden* frequently quotes from T905, which it refers to as "Sanshicchi", "Sanccchi giki" or simply "Giki". From the following diagram one gets a clear idea of how heavily the *Dainichikyōsho myōnshō kuden* has relied on T905.

- (i) Yūban: 642c1-4 = T905: 912a28-b1³⁷
- (ii) Yūban: 649a18-b1 = T905: 912a11-18
- (iii) Yūban: 649b4-8 = T905: 912a18-21
- (iv) Yūban: 649b19-c2 = T905: 912a21-27
- (v) Yūban: 649c5-7 = T905: 912a28-29

- (vi) Yūban: 673a18-24 = T905: 911c24-26, 911c26-912a1
- (vii) Yūban: 673a29-b8 = T905: 912a18-21, 912a21-27
- (viii) Yūban: 673c4-9 = T905: 911b7-11
- (ix) Yūban: 678a16-b27 = T905: 911b17-c27.

Gōhō (1306-1362), a disciple of Raihō, is the third fourteenth century Shingon scholar who has also made numerous quotations from two of the three *siddhi* texts. In comparison with his teacher, Gōhō seems to have been much more appreciative of two of the three *siddhi* texts. Evidence shows that at least two of them have been used extensively in at least four of his works. It seems that Gōhō's favouring of the three texts is focused on T905 as well, as is illustrated by the frequency to which he quoted from the text. From the text he calls "Sanshushicchi giki", Gōhō in his *Kongōchōshū kogai*³⁸ quotes a paragraph (T2451.77.766c14-18), which is identical to a part of the T905 paragraph in 912a21-27. In the same treatise Gōhō also quoted a sentence from the same paragraph in the same *Sanshushicchi giki* (=T905) (c.f., T2451.77.769c23-24). As noted above, this T905 paragraph in 912a21-27 elucidates the inter-relationship between the two aspects of the *dharmakāya*, i.e., two dharmakāyas in terms of principle and wisdom, called "*dharmakāya-as-the-principle*" and "*dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom*" respectively. It seems that Gōhō is particularly fascinated with this T905 paragraph, from which he, in writing his other works, also repeatedly quoted. For example, in the *Dainichikyō kyōshū honji kaji fumbetsu*³⁹ which is the same size of the *Kongōchōshū kogai*, Gōhō quoted this T905 paragraph word by word (cf., T2452.77.777b27-c7).

On the other hand, it seems that "Sanshushicchi giki" is not the only name by which Gōhō refers to T905. In some cases, he refers to the same T905 by the title "Sonshō hajigoku giki" which is, elsewhere, almost always associated with T906 or T907. In his *Tokuichi mikettōshaku*⁴⁰,

for instant, Gōhō quotes from a text titled "Sonshō hajigoku giki" a paragraph (T2460.77.875c 11-15) which, identical with a part of the T905 paragraph in 911a21-27, is not found in T906 nor T907. This quotation is particularly remarkable since here with a title usually associated with T906 or T907 but never with T905, Gōhō refers to a text which is explicitly T905. I gather that in this case Gōhō might have got the title wrong. The same might have been true when he, in the same *Tokuichi mikettōshaku*, refers to a text called "Hajigoku giki". He states that this text is an explanation of the way the two buddhas of principle and wisdom deliver their teachings (T2460.77.876b8-9). According to this reference, this *Hajigoku giki* is also none other than T905. The reason for believing so is also simple: of the three *siddhi* texts T905 is the only one which speaks of the buddha in terms of "principle" and "wisdom"⁴¹.

Gōhō's unusual enthusiasm for T905 is, however, fully demonstrated in his sub-commentary on Yixing's commentary, the *Dainichikyōsho ennōshō*, in which a text called "Sanshushicchi giki" is quoted seven times:

- (i) Gōhō: 4c21-24 = T905: 910c27-911a1
- (ii) Gōhō: 113b16-18 = T905: 910c17-18
- (iii) Gōhō: 187b27-c3 = T905: 911c26-9121
- (iv) Gōhō: 201b4-6 = T905: 909c21-22
- (v) Gōhō: 243b26-c8 = T905: 911a29-b6
- (vi) Gōhō: 333a16-20 = T905: 912a2-3, 912a3-5
- (vii) Gōhō: 420a17-18 = T905: 909c20-25⁴².

Since most of the quotations made from this text so-called "Sanshucchi giki" are found in T905 alone⁴³, it seems safe to assume that this text is in fact T905.

In the same sub-commentary, Gōhō also refers to a text called *Hajigoku giki*, from which he quotes the following paragraph,

Says the *Hajigoku giki*: "The nine-layered moon-wheel represents the 'nine deities

situated in the eight petals". It also says, "As for the three *jñānas*: the first is the *avadāna-vijñāna*, i.e., the six *vijñānas*; the second the *ādāna-vijñāna*, i.e., the seventh *vijñāna*; the third the *ālaya-vijñāna*, i.e., the eighth *vijñāna* (so on and so on) (Says [E]kō, the above quotation is from Tiantai's [i.e., Zhiyi] commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*)⁴⁴. Now, a fourth *vijñāna* called *amālavijñā* is added [to the three kinds of *vijñānas*], making the teaching of the "nine-layered moon-wheel" complete (T2216.59.415c22-26).

Since the two quotations Gōhō here quoted from a text called "Hajigoku giki" are found in T906 alone, this *Hajigoku giki* can be identified as T906. What is of particular interest in the paragraph quoted above is that the Shingon monk Ekō attributes these two quotations from T906 to one of Zhiyi's commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, which turns out to be the *Weimojing xuanshu* (Jpn., *Yuimakyō gensho*; T1777). As suggested in section (D) of chapter six, these two T906 paragraphs, not found in T907, might have been prepared by the T906 author himself, who was very likely a Tendai monk. By thus unravelling the textual source for this T906 passage, Ekō's comment will help strengthen the validity of the view regarding the Tendai origin of T906.

Some Concluding Remarks

Although it is far from exhaustive, the descriptive review made in this chapter is sufficient

as an illustration of the large degree to which the three *siddhi* texts were accepted and used by a number of Japanese Esoteric Buddhist authors belonging to both Tendai and Shingon traditions. Given the Tendai origin of the three *siddhi* texts and the polemic agenda underlying their formation, it is striking to find that they have been also so warmly embraced by so many prestigious Shingon masters.

This extraordinary phenomenon suggests either (i) that Annen, the most likely author of T907, and the other two Tendai authors of T905 and T906 had been quite successful in covering up the true origins of the three *siddhi* texts, or (ii) that those Shingon masters, even though aware of the Tendai origins of the *siddhi* three texts, had been so fascinated with their content that they chose to ignore their Tendai background. Since there has been no questioning of the authenticity of the three *siddhi* texts throughout the course of Japanese Esoteric Buddhist history, I am inclined to take the first assumption as more plausible.

I would like to further point out that from this descriptive review it becomes clear that of the three *siddhi* texts T905 is most respected and most frequently cited by the Shingon authors. In section (B), we have treated seven Shingon authors, who have quoted from and/or referred to one of the three *siddhi* texts for a total of thirty-nine times. Of the thirty-nine references, there are thirty references to, or quotations from, T905. For the large part, most of the Shingon authors who were attracted to T905, their interest in the text seems to have been aroused by and focused on its two major sections which, not found in T907, were most likely written/compiled by the T905 author himself. In particular, the T905 paragraph 912a21-27, which was taken from one of Enchin's treatises (KRHG), is referred to with most frequency by these Shingon scholars discussed in this section. This T905 paragraph has been cited, in part or wholly, for a total of six times.

On the other hand, other Shingon authors have been often drawn to the other major part of T905 prepared by the author himself, in which several fivefold Esoteric Buddhist categories were correlated with a variety of fivefold categories of indigenous Chinese origin (e.g., formed around the *wuxing* pattern). For instance, Kakuban, one of the greatest philosophers the Shingon school has ever produced, has appreciated this part of T905 to the extent that he incorporated it into his important work--the *Gorin kujimyō himitsushaku*.

Notes,

1. This colophon is found in T906.18.914b22-c1.
2. This colophon is found in T907.18.915c14-25.
3. Kaidō is a learned Shingon scholar affiliated with the Hasedera (or Busan) branch, an important *shingi* ("New Teaching") Shingon sect. For Kaidō's life and his contribution to the *shingi* Shingon, see MD 366.
4. Nothing is known about this Chōnen. For his interest in T906, very likely he is a Shingon or Tendai monk. Since he is here said to have transcribed T906 in 1674, this Chōnen apparently can not be the Jōdo monk who, bearing the same name, was active in the middle of the nineteenth century.
5. Nothing is known about him. Another Shingon monk is also known by the same name, but he died in 1675. As indicated by this note, this Ji'nin made a copy of T906 in 1785. Thus, this Ji'nin can not be identified with the Shingon monk who died in 1675.
6. Located in present-day Kyoto City, the Chishakuin Monastery is the headquarters for the Chizan sect, a *shingi* Shingon branch.
7. Unidentified.
8. *Ibid.*
9. T907.18.915c14-15.
10. Monkai's note is found in T907.18.915c16-18.
11. The Sōjō represents the highest-ranked monastic title sanctioned by the court.
12. The Gonshōsōto is a kind of monastic official.
13. This bracketed statement appears in the colophon as an interlinear note, which is consistent with the original in Annen's text (cf., T2176.55.1117a17).
14. This interlinear note reads, "This is exactly the *Sanshushicchi hō*".
15. Of course, this must be treated with caution. It is also probable that the manuscripts under Kaidō's edition are not the earliest circulated editions of the three *siddhi* texts.
16. See chapter six.
17. In the quotation Shinnen identifies Bodhisattva Kikyō as Prince Suppatiṭṭha. Of the three *siddhi* texts T907 is the only one in which such an identification is found (T907.18.914c28) (in the *Taishō* edition of T907 this identification is made in an interlinear note). For this reason we identify Shinnen's text as T907.
18. T2410 (The Collection of Leaves Gleaned by Keiran). The *Keiran shūyōshū* is an astoundingly massive work, originally composed of as many as 300 fascicles. Unfortunately, only one hundred and thirteen fascicles are extant. For the impressive length of the work, it seems reasonable to assume that it is Kōshū's lifetime

work, taking him three to four decades (1312-1347) to write (cf., NBDD 139).

19. Here, Kōshū does not make a literal quotation from Annen's text either (cf., T2410.76. 882b13-24).

20. I identified this text whose "discovery" was publicized in this paragraph of Annen's TDT as T907 (see chapter five).

21. T2441 (The Collected Writings Related to the Teachings and Forms of the Esoteric School); cf., NBDD 441. In this work Chōyo discusses forty-eight issues that were at the time regarded as crucial for the Shingon-advocated teachings.

22. This paragraph quoted by the *Hishū kyōsō shō* is found in T907 (915b5-9), in T906 (912c12-16), and in T905 (910c24-911a1).

23. T2514 (An Esoteric Explanation of the Five-wheels and Nine-syllable Dhāraṇī), which is also known as the *Tongo ōjō hikan* (A Mysterious Contemplation on the Rebirth on the Pure-land by the Sudden Enlightenment).

24. Yoshioka has prepared a chart in which he presents seventy-six sentences shared by T905 and this work of Kakuban's (Yoshioka 1964: 82-88). In T905 most of these sentences are found in the first major section probably written by the T905 author himself, in which a series of fivefold correlations are carried out between some Esoteric fivefold categories and those indigenous Chinese fivefold categories related to the *wuxing* pattern.

25. In the Shingon history Jinken is remembered for his active role in founding the Jizōin Monastery inside the Daigoji Temple in Kyōto. Later on, the Jizoin Monastery became the headquarters for the *jizōinryū* branch, one of the six branches of the *daigo* sect of Shingon school. In the history of Japan, Jinken is also known as an ardent bibliophile (cf., MD 1257-8).

26. T2535 (Oral Instructions on the *Usuzōshi*; completed 1262). The *Usuzōshi kuketsu* is Raiyu's commentary on the *Usuzōshi* by Segen (1162-1231).

27. T2534 (Some Notes about Entering the Principles of *Taizōkai* Esoteric Buddhism). Raiyu wrote this small thesis in 1300 at the request of a person who was either a disciple or a lay follower.

28. T2217 (The *Shishin* ["Heart-directing"] Sub-commentary on the *Dainichikyō Sho*). This sub-commentary is undated, it is believed to have been written between 1261 and 1280 (cf., NBDD 367).

29. Raiyu here may have referred to Kūkai, who has been posthumously known as "Kōbō Daishi".

30. T2536. The *Hishō mondō* (Questions and Answers Related to the Collected writings of Esoteric Buddhism) was written between 1297-1299.

31. T2536.79.339c13. Raiyu refers to this *Sonshō hajigoku ki* as a scriptural source for the "mysterious dhāraṇī" (*himyō*) of "A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham".

32. In the Japanese religious history, Raihō is famous for two reasons. First, it is alleged that in the presence of Emperor Gōdaigo (r. 1319-1330) he gave some brilliant lectures on Kūkai's *Sokushinjōbutsu ki* and the *Putixin lun* (a Chinese Buddhist apocryphon widely used in Japanese Esoteric Buddhism), which impressed

(b) The Thirteenth Century Shingon Author and the Three *Siddhi* Texts

One of the two thirteenth century Shingon authors who were attracted to the three *siddhi* texts is Jinken (?-1262)²⁵. In his *Jikki shō* (T2497, The Collected Writings of the "True Destination"; completed 1231), Jinken twice refers to a text called "Sonshō hajigoku ki". In his first reference, he cites the text as the scriptural source for the "dhāraṇīs of the threefold attainment" (*sanshushicchi shingon*, T2497.78.708a27). Then, he refers to the text as a canonical support for the "*mūdras* of three-bodies" (T2497.78.711a215). Judged by its title, the text called "Sonshō hajigoku ki" may be T906 or T907.

The other thirteen-century Shingon author interested in the three *siddhi* texts is Raiyu (1226-1304). His profound interest in the three *siddhi* texts is proven by a number of quotations he made from at least two of them (i.e., T905 and T906). In the history of Japanese Buddhism, Raiyu has been remembered not only as an active Shingon practitioner but also as a prolific author. In his *Usuzōshi kuketsu*²⁶, Raiyu records a text called "Bucchō Sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu sanjinbukka sanshushicchi shingon giki", which he ascribes to Śubhākarasimha (T2535.79.186c4-6). The title presented here is precisely identical to the one for which T906 is currently known. Raiyu did not limit himself merely to referring to T906 by title, in another of works he also quotes from this text. In the *Taizō nyūrishō*²⁷, Raiyu quotes from a text called "Sonshō hajigoku ki", which, judging by the title, is either T906 or T907:

The nine-layered moon-wheel indicates the teaching of the "nine-deities standing on the eight leaves" (Jpn., *hachōkuson*; Chin., *bayejiuzun*) (T2534.79.172c2-3).

This quotation proper, which is found in T906 only (c.f., T906.18.913c9), proves that this text

the emperor deeply. Secondly, he and his two disciples (Gōhō and Kenhō) all established themselves as illustrious Shingon masters, thereby winning for themselves a nickname "Tōji Sanhō" (The Three Treasures of the Tōji Temple [the headquarters of Shingon school]).

33. T2448 (Some Analytical Notes about Various [Esoteric] Teachings). This work is undated. But it was quite probably composed later than 1300. This one-fascicle work is recorded and edited by Nyuken on the basis of Raihō's lectures. This means that when the lectures were made Raihō might have been a senior monk whose lectures were regarded as worthy of being taken down. Raihō was only twenty at the beginning of the fourteen century. So, it is quite unlikely that at that time he could have been prestigious enough to have had his lectures recorded. For this reason I think that the *Shohō fumbetsushō* was lectured at his late years; viz., in the fourteen century.

34. T2213 (The *Myōin* ["Fine Seal"] Sub-commentary to the *Dainichikyō Sho*). Yūban's sub-commentary is dated 1330. Among the numerous Japanese sub-commentaries on Yixing's commentary, this one by Yūban has been well respected not so much for its unparalleled voluminousness (it is composed of eighty fascicles) as for the creativeness it displays.

35. The diagram indicates, firstly, where the quotation of T905 is found in the *Taishō* edition of the *Dainichikyōsho myōinshō*; then the parallel paragraph in T905. For example, in "Yūban: 264b3-5 = T905: 911a2-4", "264b3-5" means Yūban makes the quotation in T2213.58.264b3-5; and "911a2-4" indicates the *Taishō* source for this T905 paragraph that was quoted by Yūban.

36. In talking about how the practitioner, after "empowered" by the Tathāgata, becomes identified with the buddha's body, Yūban refers the reader to the chapter of "Mimi mantuoluo fa" (Jpn., "Himitsu mantara hō"; the "procedure for the mysterious mandala") in the *Darijing* and a text called "Sanshicchi". Since throughout his sub-commentary, Yūban repeatedly refers to T905 by the same title "Sanshicchi", I believe that this text called by this name is T905. This is corroborated by the fact that the T905 paragraph in 911b23-c5 discusses how the practitioner is to obtain his unity with the buddha.

In fascicle sixty-seven the same *Sanshicchi* is mentioned, but no quotation is made from it. In this case, Yūban is concerned with the correlation between a mandala's three layers and the practitioner's three bodily parts, a topic to which the T905 paragraph in 911b23-c5 is devoted. Therefore the title "Sanshicchi" referred to T905 as well.

In fascicle sixty-six Yūban also refers to a text titled "Sanshicchi giki" (T2213.58.544a9), which is probably the same T905.

37. Actually the quotation made here is found in all of the three *siddhi* texts. However, Yūban here indicates that the quotation is made from a text called "Sanshicchi giki". In the *Dainichikyōsho myōinsho kuden* Yūban, from a text he refers to as "Sanshicchi giki", quotes some paragraphs which could only be found in T905. Therefore, it is very likely that this text referred to as "Sanshicchi giki" is T905.

On the other hand, it must be noted that this quotation is made by Yūban with some adaptations.

38. T2451 (A Synopsis of the Kongōchō School, one fascicle). This short treatise is dated to 1349.

39. T2452 (A Discrimination on the *Honji* ["Original Ground"] and *Kaji* ["Empowerment"] of the Patriarch of the *Dainichi kyō*). This short treatise is an overall critique of the well known controversy within the Shingon school regarding the *honji-kaji* relationship (the *honji* and *kaji* are held as two forms of Mahāvairocana-buddha). This controversy contributed to split the Shingon school into two sects known as *shingi* ("new teaching") and *kōgi* ("old teaching").

40. T2460 (Answers to the Unsolved Questions Raised by Tokuichi). Gōhō wrote this work with the intent of offering answers to the questions asked by a well-known Heian Hossō monk, known as Tokuichi, who is famous as a rival of Saichō.
41. This saying is propounded in the T905 paragraph in 912a21-27 that was taken from Enchin's KRHG.
42. Here the quotation is apparently in odds with the original in T905, where syllable Vam is correlated with the section of lotus, rather than the section of dharma. However, this change made by Gōhō seems to have been based on the *Lichu jing* (Jpn., *Rishukyō*; Skt., *Adhyardhaṣatika-prajñāpāramitā*), in which the section of lotus, according to Gōhō, is called the "section of dharma" (T2216.59.420a18-19).
43. Some of these quotations, which are found in the parts of T905 that were taken from T907, can be found in T906 as well as T907.
44. The bracketed statement appears in the text as an interlinear note, which is added by Ekō (1666-1734), a Shingon monk in charge of editing Gōhō's sub-commentary.

THE CONCLUSIONS OF PART TWO

In part two, we investigated the origin of three Esoteric Buddhist texts that are preserved in the *Taishō Tripitaka* under the numbers 905, 906 and 907. With regard to the provenance of these three *siddhi* texts, Japanese scholars, rejecting the traditional view of ascribing all of them to Śubhākarasimha, have unanimously regarded them as composed in China. However, we have collected and examined some textual evidence which shows that the three *siddhi* texts were all composed in Japan. I have set the *terminus post quem* and *terminus ante quem* of the three *siddhi* texts as follows:

- (1) T907: 891--902;
- (2) T905: 902-1047,
- (3) T906: 902-1042.

As far as the textual materials currently at our disposal go, Annen is the most likely candidate for the authorship of T907, the earliest of the three *siddhi* texts.

In this part we have also tried to reveal the textual sources for these three *siddhi* texts. T907 was mainly based on Enchin's KSSH, which was written to legitimize the esoteric teachings and lineage as described in a dharma-transmission document (*fuhōmon*) attributed to Saichō. The T907 author (very probably Annen) availed himself of the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* (Jpn., *Bucchō sonshō darani kyō*; T967), *Darijing/Dainichi kyō* (T848), Yixing's commentary on the sutra (T1796) and most strikingly, a text attributed to Kūkai (*Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon*). The formation of T907 can be shown as follows:

Ketsu sanshushichi hō (Enchin) + *Bucchō sonshō darani kyō* (T967) + *Dainichi kyō* (T848) + *Dainichikyō sho* (Yixing) (T1796) + *Nenchi rikan Keibyakumon* (Kūkai) == > T907

In contrast to T907, the formation of T905 and T906, both composed on the basis of T907, proves to be relatively complicated. Apart from T907 which was wholly reproduced in T905, three treatises by Enchin, Yixing's commentary, several esoteric sutras (among which is the prestigious *Susidhikāra-sūtra* [T893]), and finally, an early Chinese Buddhist apocryphon, the *Tiweipoli jing* (The Book of Trapusa and Bhallika), which was of sustained influence in Chinese Buddhism, were also used in the composition of T905. The formation of T905 can be illustrated by the following diagram:

T907 + Enchin (*Kyōji ryōbu hiyogi, Dai Birushana jōdōkyō shinmoku, Zashiki*) + Yixing (*Dainichikyō sho*) + T1141 (*Jishibosatsu ryakushu yuga nenju hō*) + T1172 (*Kongōchō chōshōsangai kyō seitsu Monju goji shingon shōsō*) + T1173 (*Kongōchōgyō Manjushiri Bosatsu gojishin darani hon*) + T893 (*Soshicchi karakyō*) + *Tiweipoli jing* == > T905

Mainly based on several *kongōkai* texts, T906 appears strongly *kongōkai*-coloured. First of all, the T906 author has used at least two paragraphs from a work by Annen, which is about the *kongōkai*-line teachings and practices transmitted in the Tendai esoteric tradition. Incorporated into T906 were also several paragraphs from some *kongōkai*-related sutras, like T878 and T1056. Finally, it is remarkable that the T906 author also used some sentences from one of Zhiyi's commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, the *Weimojing xuanshu* (Jpn., *Yuimakyō gensho*; T1777). Thus, the formation of T906 can be diagrammatically indicated as follows:

T907 + Annen (*Kongōkai daihō taijuki*) + T878 (*Kongōchōgyō kongōkai daidōjō Birushana Nyorai jūyūshin naishōchi kenzo ku hosshin imyōbutsu saijōjō himitsu samaji raisammon*) + T1056 (*Kongōchō yuga senju sengen Kanjizai Bosatsu shugyō giki kyō*) + T1777 (*Weimojing xuanshu*) == > T906

In this part, we also investigated the polemical circumstances under which the three *siddhi* texts (especially T907 and T905) were composed. An "international" dharma-transmitting lineage, first proposed in the *fuhōmon* attributed to Saichō and then maintained by the whole Tendai

tradition, connects Saichō and other Tendai patriarchs with the celebrated Indian Esoteric Buddhist master Śubhākarasimha. According to this *fuhōmon*, Saichō was linked to Śubhākarasimha through a monk called Yilin (whom this *fuhōmon* describes as a leading disciple of Śubhākarasimha) and his disciple--Shunxiao, Saichō's putative Esoteric mentor in China. In the Post-Saichō Tendai school this "international" dharma-transmission was promoted to such a pre-eminent position that the legitimacy of the whole Tendai tradition became, mainly if not exclusively, staked to it.

However, what was unfortunate for the Tendai school was that the threefold dhāraṇī-attainment correlation (better known as the "procedure of the three ranks of attainment" [*sanshushicchi hō*]), central to this "international" Esoteric dharma-transmission, had no scriptural support. The existence of the canonical source for the "procedure of the three ranks of attainment" was once even doubted by some eminent Tendai leaders themselves. Some extra-Tendai monks directly accused Tendai of lacking any scriptural support for the fundamental Esoteric teachings attributed to the Tendai founding patriarch--Saichō. It is as a rebuttal to this allegation that T907 was forged between 891 and 902.

As for the composition of T905 after the appearance of T907, my research reveals that it was also prompted by the same polemical purpose. Between 902 and 1047, a certain Tendai apologist felt it necessary to prepare a better scripture than T907 to justify the dharma-transmission depicted in Saichō's *fuhōmon*.

Besides, it is notable that the three *siddhi* texts (especially T905), despite their Tendai origin, have also succeeded in attracting respect from various sects of its rival, the Shingon school. In particular, Kakuban (1095-1143), the founder of *shingi* sect of Shingon school, made much use of T905 when he tried to elaborate a peculiar contemplative form called "gozō

sanmajikan". By virtue of this *gozō sanmajikan* contemplation Kakuban wanted to substantialize the *sokushin jōbutsu* teaching, exactly the cornerstone laid down by Kūkai for Shingon Buddhism.

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation comprises a critical study of the formation of early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism (also known as "Taimitsu") in early Heian Japan. It focuses on one aspect of the sectarian and polemic environment in which Taimitsu was created and developed into a decisive player in the Japanese religious life. The polemic environment under discussion in this dissertation was characterized by a fierce and protracted sectarian controversy between Tendai and Shingon (the two major Esoteric Buddhist traditions in Japan) over the orthodoxy of the esoteric tradition allegedly brought back to Japan from China by Saichō, the founding patriarch of the Tendai/Taimitsu school.

The present dissertation began with an investigation of how Saichō and his followers responded to the challenge which was mainly posed by their rivals the Shingon monks. Shingon monks questioned the authenticity of the Tendai esoteric tradition. We find that at the outset Saichō suggested in his *Esshūroku* bibliography that the initiation he received from Shunxiao was close to a *kongokai* transmission. However, in his late years when he defended in the *Kenkairon* his Buddhist transmissions from China, Saichō re-interpreted his initiation from Shunxiao as composed of a dual transmission (i.e., *taizōkai* and *kongōkai*).

After Saichō died in 822, his immediate and/or second-generation disciples, who were eager to create a full-fledged Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism capable of competing with Shingon, engaged in legitimating and developing the esoteric tradition in the name of their master. Their effort in this regard is evidenced in a series of documents which were either left by Saichō

himself and seriously altered by them, or prepared by them independently within the two to four decades after their master's demise.

A so-called "court edict" was first forged, or altered, in order to glorify Shunxiao, Saichō's chief Esoteric mentor in China. Then, a "certificate for the dharma-transmission" (*fuhōmon*) was forged in order formally to establish the historical reality of the esoteric initiation Saichō received from Shunxiao on the one hand, and to incorporate Saichō into a prestigious lineage starting from Śubhākarasimha on the other. Meanwhile, a work originally left by Saichō, the *Buppō kechimyku*, was edited and changed, with some esoteric lineages added to show that Saichō was initiated into some Miscellaneous Esoteric teachings (*zōmitsu*) in addition to the dual esoteric transmission he supposedly received from China.

Subsequently, probably immediately after Ennin (one of the most capable of the Post-Saichō Tendai leaders) returned from China, a document was deliberately prepared within the Tendai circle as a second *fuhōmon* from Shunxiao. This new *fuhōmon* is of great significance not merely for its re-interpretation of Saichō's initiation from Shunxiao, but also for its implicit claim that Saichō was initiated to an esoteric tradition which was composed of a triple esoteric transmission (the *soshicchi* in addition to *taizōkai*, *kongōkai*) and therefore superior to the dual esoteric transmission Kūkai received from China.

Finally, as the scriptural support for the peculiar Esoteric teachings in terms of which Saichō's initiation was re-interpreted in this new *fuhōmon*, three *siddhi* texts (T#905-7) were composed successively by some Tendai monks. The great Tendai scholar-monk Annen was very likely the author of T907, which proves to be the earliest of the three *siddhi* texts.

The conclusions at which this dissertation has arrived question the historical validity of the

conventional opinion concerning the establishment of the Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism in Japan. However, it is our hope that these negative conclusions can be turned into a positive agenda for future research. Now that we know that most of the documents regarding Saichō's esoteric transmissions were composed sometime after Saichō's death and in the course of the evolution of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism, we can begin a more focused historical investigation of this process. Scholars can turn from a fruitless search for the roots of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in China to look more closely in Japan.

Finally, I hope that this study might invite more scholarly attention to a host of Buddhist apocrypha which, with their Indian origin denied, have long been regarded as Chinese but which might have been produced in Japan or Korea.

As I have shown in part two, there exists much evidence suggesting the Japanese origin of the three *siddhi* texts. Unfortunately, some tacit but unfounded assumptions have prevented Japanese scholars working on the three *siddhi* texts from carefully assessing the relevant evidence. They have accepted almost without hesitation that China is the sole possible source for any allegedly Buddhist scriptures whose Indian origin became, in one way or another, discredited. This seemingly unexceptionable practice has been recently challenged by Robert Buswell, who argues for the Korean origin of a Buddhist apocryphon, the *Jingang sanmei jing* (Kor., *Kumgang sammaë-kyōng*; Jpn., *Kongō sanmai kyō*; The *Vajrasamādhi Sūtra*), which, he argues, was written in Korea but also circulated in China, had exerted an enormous influence on Chinese Buddhism, particularly the formation of Chan ideology (Buswell 1989).

Buswell's research underscores, on the one hand, the necessity of reevaluating the "international" role the Chinese language had played for a long period in the evolution of East

Asian civilization. On the other, by re-identifying as Korean a Buddhist apocryphon which has been long accepted as Chinese, Buswell's work calls for a re-appraisal of the contributions the non-Chinese East Asian people (who once used Chinese) made to East Asian civilization. It reminds us that not all the textual sources in Chinese were necessarily written by Chinese and in China. I hope that my dissertation will further contribute to this important reevaluation.

GLOSSARY:

Aizenin	愛染院
ajari	阿耨黎
ajikan	阿字觀
an	安
An Lushan	安祿山
Anne	安惠
Annen	安然
Baiguan	百官
baoshen	報身
baoshenfo	報身佛
bayejiuzun	八葉九尊
benguo	本國
benguo dizi seng Zuicheng	本國弟子僧最澄
Betsugyō kyō	別行經
Bi-lu-zhe-na	毗盧遮那
Biluzhe'na biexing jing	毗盧遮那別行經
Biluzhe'na fo	毗盧遮那佛
Bi-ru-sha-na	毗盧遮那
Birushana betsugyō kyō	毗盧遮那別行經
Birushana betsugyō shiki	毗盧遮那別行私記
Bishamondō	毗沙門堂
bonmō	梵網
Bonmō kyō	梵網經
bucchō	佛頂
Bucchō sonshō darani	佛頂尊勝陀羅尼
Bucchō saishō darani kyō	佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經
Bucchō sonshōshin hajigoku hō	佛頂尊勝心破地獄法
Bucchō sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō	佛頂尊勝心破地獄轉業障
shutsusangai himitsu darani	出三界秘密陀羅尼
Bucchō sonshōshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai	佛頂尊勝心破地獄轉業障出三界
himitsu sanjim bukka sanshushicchi shingon giki	秘密三身佛果三種悉地真言儀軌
buer	不二
Bukong	不空
Bukong biao zhiji	不空表制集
Buppō kechimiyaku	佛法血脈
Busan	豐山
busheng	不生
Butsumo daikujaku myōō kyō	佛母大孔雀明王經

Chaoji	抄記
Chang'an	長安
cheng	成
chi	智
chihōshin	智法身
chihōshinbutsu	智法身佛
chikai	智界
chinkoku dōjō	鎮國道場
Chinzai	鎮西
Chisha Daishi daishichideshi	智者大師第七弟子
Chishakuin	智積院
Chishō Daishi nenpu	智證大師年譜
Chishō Daishi zenshū	智證大師集
Chōen	長冥
Chōkyū	長久
Chōnen	超然
chuan	傳
chuanfadizi	傳法弟子
Chūin	中院
Cishipusa luexiu yujia niansongfa	慈氏菩薩略修瑜伽念誦法
Da Biruzhe'na sanzongxidi fa	大毗盧遮那三種悉地法
Dacheng fayuan yilinzhang	大乘法苑叢林章
Dade	大德
Daguanzhi	大廣智
Dai Birushanajōdōkyō shinmoku	大毗盧遮那成道經心目
Dai Birushana sanshushicchi hō	大毗盧遮那三種悉地法
Daibucchō mandara	大佛頂曼陀羅
daigo	醍醐
Daigoji	醍醐寺
daijō kaidan undō	大乘戒壇運動
daiku	大空
daikuchishō	大空智處
Dainichi kyō	大日經
Dainichikyō gishaku mokuroku engi	大日經義釋目錄緣起
Dainichikyō ryakushaku	大日經略釋
Dainichikyō sho	大日經疏
Dainichikyōsho ennōshō	大日經疏演奧鈔
Dainichikyōsho myōinshō	大日經疏妙印鈔
Dainichikyōsho myōinshō kuden	大日經疏妙印鈔口傳
Dainichikyōsho shishinshō	大日經疏指心鈔
Dainichikyō kyōshū honji kaji fumbetsu	大日經疏教主本地加持分別
dainichi taizōkai	大日胎藏界

Dai Nihonkoku shoken kanjōdōjō juhōdesi naishisen	大日本國初建灌頂道場受法弟子內侍宣
Dairaku kongō fukū shinjitsu sammayakyō	大樂金剛不空眞實三昧耶經
Dairaku kongō fukū shinjitsusammayakyō	大樂金剛不空眞實三昧耶經
hanyaharamita rishushaku	般若波羅密多理趣釋
daisandeshi	第三弟子
Daisen	大宣
Daishi	大師
Daitō	大唐
daitoku	大德
Daitōkoku	大唐國
Daitō Taigaku Rengenji Jungyō Ajari fuhōmon	大唐秦嶽靈巖寺順曉阿奢黎付法文 ^a
Daitō Tendaisan enshūzasu saikyō oshō Dōzui	大唐天台山圓宗座主西京和尚道還
Daizong	代宗
Daji jing	大集經
dakong	大空
dakongzhichu	大空智處
Dale jingang bukong zhenshi sanmeiyejing	大樂金剛不空眞實三昧耶經
daochang	道場
Daosui	道還
Daosui heshangfufawen	道還和尚付法文
darani	陀羅尼
Darijing	大日經
Darijing chaoji	大日經抄記
Darijing shu	大日經疏
Datang	大唐
Datangguo	大唐國
Datang Taitue Linyansi Shunxiao Asheri fufawen	大唐秦嶽靈巖寺順曉阿奢黎付法文
Datang Tiantaishan yuanzongzuozhu xijing Heshang Daosui	大唐天台山圓宗座主西京和尚道還
denbō deshi	傳法弟子
denbō kanjō	傳法灌頂
dengyō ajari	傳教阿奢黎
Dengyō Daishi shōsoku	傳教大師消息
Dengyō daishi zenshū	傳教大師全集
dengyō kanjō	傳教灌頂
Denjutsu issinkaimon	傳述一心戒文
Den sanbusamaya kogen	傳三部三昧耶公驗
dobo	多寶
dōjō	道場
Dōzui	道還
Dōzui oshō fuhōmon	道還道還和尚付法文
Duobao	多寶
ehō	依報
ehō-shinhō	依報 - 正報

Eisai	榮西
Eishinin	慧心院
Eizan Daishi den	叡山大師傳
Ekō	惠光
en	圓
Enchin	圓珍
Enchō	圓澄
Engyō	圓曉
Enki	圓基
enmankai	圓滿界
enmitsu itchi	圓密一致
Ennin	圓仁
Enpō	延寶
Enryaku	延歷
Enryakuji	延歷寺
Enryakuji mitsujō ryaku mokuroku	延歷寺密乘略目錄
Enryakuji zasu Enchin den	延歷寺座主圓珍傳
Ensai	圓載
Enshū	圓脩
ershi	二十
Eryō	惠亮
e-shin	依-正
Esshūroku	越州錄
Fahuasi	法華寺
fanwang	梵網
Fanwang jing	梵網經
Faquan	法全
Farun	法潤
fashen	法身
fashen zhenyan	法身真言
Fengshan	峰山
*Fengshen	豐山
foding	佛頂
Foding zuisheng tuoluoni	佛頂尊勝陀羅尼
Foding zuisheng tuoluoni jing	佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經
Foding zunsheng tuoluoni niansong yigui fa	佛頂尊勝陀羅尼念誦儀軌法
Foding zunsheng tuoluoni zhuyi	佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義
Foding zunshengxin podiyu fa	佛頂尊勝心破地獄法
Foding zunshengxin podiyu zhuangyechang chusanjie	佛頂尊勝心破地獄轉業障出三界
mimi sanshen fोगuo sanzongxidi zhenyanyigui	秘密佛果三種悉地真言儀軌
Fotucheng	佛圖澄
fuhōinjin	付法印信
fuhōmon	付法文

Fujian	符堅
Fujiwara	藤原
Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu	藤原冬嗣
Fukū	不空
Fukū kenjaku jinpen shingon kyō	不空 索神變真言經
Fukū sanzō daisan deshi	不空三藏第三弟子
fu'ni	不二
funoku	附錄
fushō	不生
fushūedan	普集會壇
Ganshu	甘淑
Gawaryu	川流
Genjō	玄靜
Genkei	延喜
giki	儀軌
Gishin	義真
gobu	五部
gobucchō	五佛頂
gobucchō hō	五佛頂法
gohobutsu	五方佛
gobu kanjō mandara danjō	五部灌頂曼陀羅道場
Gohimitsu giki	五祕密儀軌
Gohō	杲實
gokoku	護國
Gongyang cidī	供養次第
Gongyang fa	供養法
gonsōjō	權僧正
Gorin kujimyō himitsushaku	五字九明祕密釋
goshojoto	權少僧都
Goyuigō	御遺告
gozō	五藏
gozō sanmajikan	五藏三摩地觀
Guanding	灌頂
Gundari hō	軍荼利法
Guoqingsi	國清寺
guoshi	國師
gyōbō	御房
Gyōrin shō	行林鈔
ha	破
hachōkuson	八葉九尊
Hailongwang jing	海龍王經
Haiyun	海雲

hajigoku	破地獄
Hajigoku ki	破地獄軌
Hakke hiroku	八家秘錄
Hanguang	含光
Hasedera	長谷寺
Hassen	法全
Heian	平安
Heizei	平城
Henjō	遍照
henjō isson kanjō	遍照一尊灌頂
Hieizan	比叡山
Hieizan Tendai hokkein tokugō gakushohiki	比叡山天台法華院得業式
hijiri	聖
Himitsu mantara hō	秘密陀羅尼法
himyō	秘明
Hishō mondō	秘相問答
Hishū kyōsō shō	祕宗教相抄
Hi sōjōshū	秘相承集
hokke ichijō	法華一乘
Honcho taisō senjutsu mikkyō shomoku	本朝台祖撰述密教諸目
Hongqin	宏欽
honji	本地
honkoku	本國
hongkoku deshi sō Saichō	本國弟子僧最澄
Honshu	本州
Hosen	法全
hoshin	法身
hoshinbutsu	法身佛
hoshin shingon	法身眞言
Hossō	法相
hōtei	法弟
Huashen	化身
Huashenfo	化身佛
huguo	護國
Huichao	惠超
Huiguoui	惠果
Huilang	惠明
Huisi	惠思
Huiwei	惠文
Huizhen	惠眞
hun	魂
Ichijō Chū	一乘忠
injin	印信

Issai jishō jōbutsu giki
 issaikyō
 isshinsankan

Jichin
 Jien
 Jijuyōshin
 Jikaku Daishi
 Jikki shō
 jing
 jingangjie
 Jingangding chaoshengsanjiejing shuo
 Wenshu wuzi zhenyan shenxian
 Jingangding jing
 Jingangdingjing jingangjiedadaochang Biluzhe'naRulai
 zishouyongshen neizhengzhi juanshu foshenyimingfo
 zuishangcheng mimi sanmodi lizanwen
 Jingangdingjing Manshushili wuzi xintuoluonipin
 Jingangdingjing yizidinglunwang yuga
 yiqieshichu niansong chengfo yigui
 Jingangding yujia jingangsachui
 wumimi xiuxing niansong yigui
 Jingangding yujia qianshou qianyan
 Guanzizaipusa xiuxing yigui jing
 Jingangdingyujia zhong luechu niansong jing
 Jingangfeng louge yiqie yujia yuzhijing
 Jingangfeng louge yuzhijing
 Jingangsanmei jing
 Jinguangming jing
 Jingzhou
 Jingangzhi
 Jinghu
 Jingyezhang jing
 Ji'nin
 Jinju
 Jinken
 Jireki
 jiufan
 jugong
 Jōgan
 Jōgan roku
 Jōgan roku zen yaku daranihō churoku
 Jōgan shinnyu mokuroku shingonkyo narabini shingon ichiko
 Jōgosshō kyō

一切時處成佛儀軌
 一切經
 一心三觀

慈鎮
 慈圓
 自受用身
 慈覺大師
 實歸抄
 經
 金剛界
 金剛頂超勝三界經
 說文殊五字真言勝相
 金剛頂經
 金剛頂經金剛界大道場毗盧遮那如來
 自受用身內證智眷屬佛身異名佛
 最上乘秘密三摩地禮贊文
 金剛頂經曼殊師利五字心陀羅尼品
 金剛頂經一字頂輪王瑜伽
 一切時處成佛儀軌
 金剛頂經瑜伽金剛薩陞
 五秘密修行念誦儀軌
 金剛頂經瑜伽千手千眼
 觀自在菩薩修行儀軌經
 金剛頂瑜伽中略出念誦經
 金剛頂峰樓閣一切瑜伽瑜祇經
 金剛頂峰樓閣瑜祇經
 金剛三昧經
 金光明經
 荊州
 金剛智
 鏡湖
 淨業障經
 慈忍
 仁壽
 深賢
 治歷
 舊翻
 九宮
 貞觀
 貞觀錄
 貞觀錄前譯陀羅尼選目
 貞觀新入目錄真言教并真言一箇
 淨業障經

Jōgyō	常曉
jōhon shicchi	上品悉地
Jō Kenkairon hyō	上顯戒論表
Jōsen	靜暹
Jōshūron	定宗論
Jōzan	上城
jun	純
junaigubu	內供奉
Jungyō ajari fuhōmon	順曉阿奢黎付法文
ju'nibukyō	十二部經
junmitsu	純密
Juyō bunkazai	重要文化財
kaidan	戒壇
Kaidō	快道
Kairyūō kyō	海龍王經
Kaiyuan lu	開元錄
Kaiyuan sandashi	開元三大士
Kaiyuan shijiao lu	開元釋教錄
kaji	加持
Kakuban	覺鑪
Kammu	桓武
kanjō	灌頂
Kanshō tendaishu nenbun gakushōshiki	獎勵天台宗年分學生式
kai	戒
kamma	羯摩
kanchō	官牒
Kechimyakufu	血脈譜
Keiran shūyōshu	溪嵐拾葉集
Kenbo mokuroku	堅封目錄
Kenkairon	顯戒論
Kenkairon engi	顯戒論緣起
Kenkyō	顯教
keshin	化身
keshinbutsu	化身佛
Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō	決示三種悉地法
Kikyō	起教
Kimon	疑問
Kishū	疑集
Kōbō Daishi	弘法大師
Kōbō Daishi zenshū	弘法大師全集
Kōchi	廣智
Kōen	廣圓
Kōgei	皇慶

Kōi	光意
Kōjō	光定
kōki	古義
Kokuhō	國寶
kokushi	國師
Kongōbu rokaku issai yuga yugikyō	金剛頂峰樓閣一切瑜珈瑜祇經
Kongōbu rokaku yugikyō	金剛頂峰樓閣瑜祇經
Kongōchōgyō ichijichōrinnō yuga issaijishō nenju jōbutsu giki	金剛頂經一字頂輪王瑜珈 一切時處成佛儀軌
Kongōchōgyō kongokai daidōjō Birushana Ryorai jijuyushin naishōchi kenzoku hosshin imyōbutsu saijōjō himitsu sammaji raisammon	金剛頂經金剛界大道場毗盧遮那如來 自受用身內證智眷屬佛身異名佛 最上乘秘密三摩地禮贊文
Kongōchōgyō Manjushiri Bosatsu goji shindarani hon	金剛頂經曼殊師利五字心陀羅尼品
Kongōchōshū kōgai	金剛頂宗綱概
Kongōchō yuga kongōsatta gohimitsu shūgyō nenju giki	金剛頂經瑜珈金剛薩陞 五秘密修行念誦儀軌
Kongōchō yuga senju sengen	金剛頂經瑜珈千手千眼
Kanjizaibosatsu shugyō gikikyō	觀自在菩薩修行儀軌經
kongō jiku	金剛字句
kongōkai	金剛界
Kongōmyō kyō	金光明經
Kongō'ōin	金剛王院
Kongō sanmai kyō	金剛三昧經
Kongquewang jing	孔雀王經
kongzen goju	金善互授
Konpon Daishi	根本大師
Kōshū	光宗
Kōzen gokokuron	興禪護國論
Kūkai	空海
kūkyō	空教
Kūmgang sammae-kyōng kyō	金剛三昧經 教
Kyōji ryōbu hiyōgi	教示兩部祕要義
Kyōwa	享和
kyūbyaku	舊譯
kyūhon	舊翻
Kyushu	九州
li	里
Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji	兩部大法相承師資付法記
liangdabu	兩大部
Lianggang	梁港
Li Da	李達
lijie	理界

Lingyansi	靈巖寺
Liqu shi	理趣釋
liuqu	六趣
Longxingsi	龍興寺
Luoyang	洛陽
Maka shikan	摩訶止觀
Matōga kyō	摩登迦經
menju	面授
Miaochengjiu yigui	妙成就儀軌
Mijiao	密教
Mikkyō	密教
Mimi mantuoluo fa	祕密曼陀羅法
Mingzhou	明州
Mitsujō senjutsu mokuroku	密乘撰述目錄
Miyoshi Kiyoyuki	三善清行
Modengjia jing	摩登迦經
Mohe zhiguan	摩訶止觀
Monkai	文海
Mui	無畏
muken chōsō	無見頂相
Muryōmon mimitsuji kyō	無量門微密持經
Myōchō	妙著
myodō mushasai	冥道無遮齋
myōin	妙印
Myōjōju giki	妙成就儀軌
Nagato	長門
naigubu	內供奉
Naishisen	內侍宣
Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu	內證佛法相承血脈譜
Neigongfeng	內供奉
nenbun dosha	年分度者
Nenchi shingon rikan kebyakumon	念誦真言理觀啓白文
nengo	年號
nianhao	年號
Nihonkoku	日本國
Nihonkoku [nai]gubu daitoku deshi Sō Saichō	日本國[內]供奉大德弟子僧最澄
Nihon ryōiki	日本靈異記
Ninchū	仁忠
Ninna	仁和
nokushu	六趣
nyoirindan	如意輪壇
nittō hakke	入唐八家

Onjōji	園城寺
panli	判吏
po	破
Podiyu	破地獄
Putixin lun	菩提心論
qi	氣
Qingjing Biluzhe'na sanzongxidi fa	清淨毘盧遮那三種悉地法
Qingjing fashen Biluzhe'na xindi famen	清淨法身毘盧遮那心地法門
chengjiu yichie tuoluoni sanzongxidi	成就一切陀羅尼三種悉地
Raihō	賴實
Raiyū	賴瑜
Rankei ionshū	蘭契遺韻集
Renka isson mandara	蓮華一尊曼陀羅
Renkō	蓮綱
Renwang jing	仁王經
Ribenguo	日本國
Ribenguo [nei]gongfeng dade dizi Seng Zuicheng	日本國[內]供奉大德弟子僧最澄
rihoshinbutsu	理法身佛
rikai	理界
Rishushaku kyō	理趣釋經
Rokujōshiki	六條式
Ru Lengjiajing	入楞迦經
Ryaku fuhōden	略付法傳
Ryōbu daihō sōjō shishi fuhō ki	兩部大法師資付法記
ryōbufuni	兩部不二
ryōbu goju	兩部互釋
ryōdaibu	兩大部
sai	歲
Saichō	最澄
sanbu	三部
sanbu dai ajari	三部大阿耨黎
sanbu daiajari i	三部大阿耨黎位
sanbu goju	三部互釋
sanbu sanmaya	三部三昧耶
sanbu sanmeiye	三部三昧耶
sanbu shicchi hō	三部悉地法
sanbuxidi fa	三部悉地法
sange	山家
sanjushichison	三十七尊
sanmaya	三昧耶

sanmayakai	三昧耶戒
sannō	山王
Sannōin	山王院
sanshen	三身
sanshin	三身
sanshicchi giki	三悉地儀軌
sanshiqizun	三十七尊
sanshushicchi	三種悉地
sanshushicchi giki	三種悉地儀軌
Sanshushicchi hajigoku	三種悉地破地獄
Sanshushicchi hajigoku tengosshō	三種悉地破地獄轉業障
shutsusangai himitsu daranhō	出三界祕密陀羅尼法
Sanshushicchi himitsu shingon hō	三種悉地祕密真言法
sanshushicchi hō	三種悉地法
sanshushicchi shingon	三種悉地真言
sanzhongxidi fa	三種悉地真言
Sanzhongxidi mimi zhenyanfa	三種悉地祕密真言法
Sanzhongxidi podiyu zhuanyezhang	三種悉地破地獄轉業障
chusanjie mimi tuoluonifa	出三界祕密陀羅尼法
Sasa gimon	些些疑文
Sawara	早良
sei	成
shaku	釋
Shakuke	釋家
shami	沙彌
Shangyu	上虞
Shanwuwei	善無畏
Shaoming	紹明
shanagō	遮那業
she	攝
She Dabiluzhe'na chengfo shenbian jiachi jing	攝大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經
ru lianhuataizang haihui beishengmantuoluo	入蓮華胎藏海會悲生曼陀羅
guangda niansong yigui gongyangfangbianhui	廣大念誦儀軌供養方便會
She dacheng lun	攝大乘論
She daguanding yigui	攝大灌頂儀軌
Shegong	涉公
shen	神
shi	志
shicchi	悉地
shierbujing	十二部經
Shi Hu	石虎
Shijia	釋家
Shijiao zhigui	釋教旨歸

shikangō	止觀業
Shijujō ketsu	四十帖決
Shi kyotō guhō Saichō denbōkogen	賜去唐求法最澄傳法公驗
Shi kyotō guhō yakugosō Gishin denbōkogen	賜去唐求法譯語僧義真傳法公驗
Shi Le	石勒
Shinchū	真忠
shingi	新義
Shingon	真言
shingon ichijō	真言一乘
shingon oshō fuhōinjin sanko bazara ichiko	真言和尚付法印信
Shinwa	貞和
Shishi yaolu	釋氏要錄
Sho ajari shingon mikkyō burui soroku	諸阿攝黎真言密教部類總錄
shō	攝
Shō Chierin sanzō shō	上智慧輪三藏書
Shō Daibirushana jōbutsu jinben kajikyō	攝大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經
nyurenge taizokaie hishō mandara	入蓮華胎藏海會悲生曼陀羅
kodai nenju giki kuyōhōbenne	廣大念誦儀軌供養方便會
Shō daikanjō giki	攝大灌頂儀軌
shō[hō]	正[法]
Shohō fumbestushō	諸法分別抄
Shōjō Birushana sanshushicchi hō	清淨毘盧遮那三種悉地法
Shōjō hosshin Birushana shinji homon	清淨法身毘盧遮那心地法門
jōjū issai darani sanshushicchi	成就一切陀羅尼三種悉地
Shōki	抄記
Shōnō	正能
Shōshū	正秀
Shouhu guojie jing	守護國界經
Shōtoku	聖德
Shōtoku Taishi	聖德太子
shū	主
Shūei	宗叡
Shūen	修圓
Sijiaoyi	四教儀
sikyōgi	四教儀
Sobakodōji shomon gyō	蘇婆呼童子請問經
sōjō	相承
Sōjō den	相承傳
Sōjō denbō shidai ki	相承傳法次第記
Sōjō myōken hō	相承妙見法
sokushin jōbutsu	即心成佛
Sokushin jōbutsu ki	即心成佛義
Song gaoseng zhuan	宋高僧傳

sonshō	尊勝
Sonshō buccō shuyugahō giki	尊勝佛頂修瑜珈法儀軌
Sonshō hajigoku darani giki	尊勝破地獄陀羅尼儀軌
Sonshō hajigoku giki	尊勝破地獄儀軌
Sonshō hajigoku hō	尊勝破地獄法
Sontsu	尊通
Soshicchi	蘇悉地
Soshicchikara kyō	蘇悉地羯羅經
Soshicchi kyō	蘇悉地經
sui	歲
Supohutongzi qingwen jing	蘇婆呼童子請問經
Suxidi gongyangfa	蘇悉地供養法
Suxidijieluo jing	蘇悉地羯羅經
Suxidi jieluo gongyang fa	蘇悉地羯羅供養法
Suzong	肅宗
Tahō	多寶
Taihan	泰範
Taihe	太和
taihō giki	大法儀軌
Taimitsu	台密
Taishan	泰山
Taishūroku	台州錄
taizangjie	胎藏界
Taizhou	台州
taizōkai	胎藏界
Taizōkai daihō taijuki	胎藏界大法對受記
taizō kongō ryōmandara sōjō	胎藏金剛兩曼陀羅相承
Taizong	太宗
Taizō nyurishō	胎藏入理鈔
Taiyue	泰嶽
tajuyōshin	自受用身
Takaō	高雄
Takaōsanji	高雄山寺
Taniryu	谷流
Tanseki	但石
Tashouyongshen	他受用身
teishi	帝師
ten	轉
Tendai	天台
Tendai Dōzui oshō	天台道邃和尚
Tendai hokke nenbun gakushokiki	天台法華年分學生式
Tendai kahyō	天台霞標
Tendaishu shanagō haja beshō ki	天台宗遮那業破邪顯正記

Tenmyō	天明
Tiangongsi	天宮寺
Tiantai	天台
Tiantai diqizu Zhiduheshang luezhuan	天台第七祖智度和 尚略傳
Tiantai Zhizhe Dashi biezhuān	天台智者大師別傳
Tiantai Dosui heshang	天台道邃和 尚
Tiweipoli jing	提謂波利經
tō	東
tōkoku	東國
Tōdaiji	東大寺
Tokuen	德圓
Tokuichi	德一
Tokuichi mikettōoshaku	德一未決釋
Tokuzen	德善
Tongo ōjō hikan	頓悟往生秘觀
Tōzan	當山
Tsushima	對馬
Ūji	宇治
unji	云爾
Usuzōshi	薄草子
Usuzōshi kuketsu	薄草子口訣
Weimojing xuanshu	維摩經玄疏
Weixiang	惟象
wubu	五部
Wu Che	武轍
wufangfo	五方佛
wuji	五季
wujian dingxiang	無見頂相
Wuliangmen weimichijing	無量門微密持經
Wumimi yigui	五祕密儀軌
Wu Shansi	武三思
wuqi	五氣
wuwei	五味
wuxiangchengshenguan	五字成身觀
Wuxing	五行
wuzi	五字
Xiangcheng chuanfa cidi ji	相承傳法次第記
Xiancheng Miaojian fa	相承妙見法
Xiancheng zhuan	相承傳
Xiantong	咸通
xidi	悉地

Xingman	行滿
xinqiu	辛酋
Xuanchao	玄超
Xuanlang	玄朗
Xuanzang	玄奘
Xuanzong	玄宗
Yakushun	藥鴿
yangsheng	養生
yi	依
yibao	依報
Yicao	義操
Yiling	義林
Yiqie shichu chengfo yigui	一切時處成佛儀軌
Yixing	一行
Yinxinsanguan	一心三觀
yi-zheng	依-正
Yohō hennen zatsushū	餘芳編年雜集
yōjō	養生
yōshō	要抄
yuanmanjie	圓滿界
Yuanmi yizhi	圓密一致
Yuanzhao	圓照
Yuezhou	越州
Yuimakyō genshō	維摩詰玄疏
Yuishu	惟首
yuner	云爾
Zakki	雜記
zang	藏
Zasiki	雜私記
zasu	座主
Zen	禪
Zenmui	善無畏
[Zen]mui sanzo daisan deshi	善無畏三藏第三弟子
Zhan Jingquan	詹景全
Zhanran	湛然
Zhejiang	浙江
zheng[bao]	正[報]
Zhenguan	貞觀
zhenguo daochang	鎮國道場
zhenhu guojie daochang	鎮護國界道場
Zhen Shenze	鄭審則
Zhenyuan	貞元

Zhenyuan shijiao lu	貞元釋教錄
Zhenyuan lu	貞元錄
zhi	志
zhi	智
Zhidu	智度
zhifashen	智法身
Zhifashenfo	智法身佛
Zhihuilun	智慧輪
zhijie	智界
Zhiqian	支謙
Zhisheng	智升
Zhiwei	智威
Zhiyi	智顛
Zhizhe Dashi diqidizi	智者大師第七弟子
zhu	主
zhuan	轉
zishouyongshen	自受用身
zō	雜
zōmandara sōjō	雜曼陀羅相承
zōmitsu	雜密
Zunsheng podiyu fa	尊勝破地獄法
Zunsheng podiyu tuoluoni yigui	尊勝破地獄陀羅尼儀軌

ABBREVIATIONS FOR PRIMARY SOURCES

BD *Bukkyō daijiten*. Mochizuki Shinkō, ed. 2nd ed., 10 vols. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1958-63.

BKD *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten*. Ono Genmyō, ed. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppanshu, 1964-78.

BZ *Dainihon Bukkyō zensho*. Takasu Junijo et al., eds. Tokyo: Yuseidō, 1913-22. Reprint Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan, ed. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1970-73. 100 vols.

DZ *Dengyō Daishi zenshū*. Hieizan senshuin-nai Eizan gakuin, ed., five volumes., second edition (Hieizan: Toshō kankokai, 1927-27); reprint edition (Tokyo: Nihon Bussho kankōkai, 1975).

IBK *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*. Nihon Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kai, ed., Tokyo.

KT *Shintei zoho Kokushi taikai* (Kuroita Katsuomi ed., 66 vols., Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunkan. 1929-66.

KZ *Kōbō Daishi zenshū*, 5 vols. Hase Hoshu et al., eds. Kyoto: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1910.

MD *Mikkyō Daijiten*, 6 vols., ed. and comp., Matsunaga Shodo. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1931; 3rd edition 1974.

NBDD *Nihon Bukkyō tenseki daijiten*. Kanaoka Hidetomo et al., eds. Tokyo: Yuzangaku.

ND *Nihon daizōkyō*. Nakano Tatsue, ed. Tokyo: Nihon Daizōkyō Hensankai (1919-21); Reprint, Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan (1976)

NBJJ *Nihon Bukkyō jinmei jiten*. Nihon Bukkyō Jinmei Jiten Hensan Inkai, ed. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1992.

NRDJ *Nihon Rekishi Daijiten*. ed., Nihon Rekishi Daijiten Henshu Inkai. Tokyo: Kawade, 1968.

T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, 85 vols. Takakusu Junjiro et al., eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924-32.

TG *Tendai gakuhō*. The Tendai Association of Buddhist Studies, ed.

TZ *Tendaishū zensho*, ed., Tendaishūten kankōkai, 26 vols. Hieizan: Tendaishūten kankōkai, 1935-37; reprinted Tokyo: Dainichi shobō, 1973-74.

WORKS CITED

Abé, Ryūichi

1995 Saichō and Kūkai: A conflict of Interpretations. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22/1-2: 103-37.

Akamatsu Toshihide

1973 Saichō to Kūkai. *Ōtani gakuhō* 53/2: 1-13.

Ando Toshio, Sonoda Koyu, eds.

1974 *Saichō*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Asai Endo

1973 *Joko Nihon Tendai honmon shisōshi*. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

Aseda Zensho

1970 Saichō Kenkyūshi no kentō. *IBK* 19/1: 160-1.

1980 *Heian Bukkyōshi Kenkyū*. Tokyo: Nagata bunshodō.

Battacharya, B.

1932 *An Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism*. London: Oxford University Press.

Bharati, Agehananda.

1965 *The Tantric Tradition*. London: Rider.

Bodde, Derk

1981 Types of Chinese Categorical Thinking. In his *Essays on Chinese Civilization*, ed. Charles Le Blanc and Dorothy Borei (Princeton). pp. 141-60.

Buswell, Robert

1989 *The Formation of Chan Ideology in China and Korea: Vajrasamādhi-sūtra, A Buddhist Apocryphon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1992 *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (ed.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

1992(a) Introduction: Prolegomenon to the Study of Buddhist Apocryphal Scriptures. Buswell ed., pp. 1-30.

Butler Lee A

1996 The way of Yin and Yang: A Tradition Revived, Sold, Adopted. *Monumenta Nipponica* 51/2:

189-219.

Chappell, David, ed.

1983 *T'ien-t'ai Buddhism: An outline of the Fourfold Teachings*. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō.

Chou Yi-liang

1945 Tantrism in China. *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies* 8: 241-332.

Das Gupta, S.B.

1950 *An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta Press.

de Visser, M. W.

1935 *Ancient Buddhism in Japan: Sutras and Ceremonies in Use in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries A.D. and Their Histories in Later Times*, 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Eizan Gakkai, ed.

1974 *Eizan Bukkyō Kenkyū*. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshodo

1979 *Annen oshō no Kenkyū*. Kyoto: Dohosha.

Eliade, Mircea, ed.

1987 *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: McMillan Publishing Company.

Forte, Antonino

1984 The Activities in China of the Tantric Master Mañicintana (Pao-ssu-wei: ?-721) from Kashmir and of his Northern Indian Collaborators. *East and West*. 301-45.

1987 Book Review of *Offerings of Jade and Silk: Ritual and Symbol in the Legitimation of the T'ang Dynasty* (by Wechsler. Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1995). *T'oung Pao*, LXXIII: 327-40.

1989 Book Review of the *Buddhism under the T'ang* (by Stanley Weinstein, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987). *T'oung Pao* LXXV: 317-24.

1990 The relativity of the Concept of Orthodoxy in Chinese Buddhism: Chih-sheng's Indictment of Shih-li and the Proscription of the *Dharma Mirror Sutra*. In Buswell, ed. 239-49.

Fukui Kojun

1968 Dengyō Daishi seinenkō shingi. IBK 17/1: 21-4.

1970 *Eizan Daishiden* no seikaku. IBK 18/2: 13-22.

1973 *Eizan Daishiden* o meguru ni san no mondai. TG 15: 1-10.

1980 *Dengyō Daishi Kenkyū: Bekkan*. ed. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu.

1983 *Dengyō Daishiden kenkyū yoryaku*. TG 26: 1-6.

1983(a) Shōki Taimitsushi ni tsuite no ishinon. TG 25.

1986-87 *Naishō Buppō sōjō Kechimyakufu shingi*. TG 29: 1-9; 30: 1-6.

1988 *Eizan Daishiden ni tsuite no kentō*. TG 31: 1-6.

Fung Yu-lan, [Eng. tr. by Derk Bodde]

1973 *History of Chinese Philosophy*, 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gimello, Robert M.

1976 *Chi-yen (602-668) and the Foundation of Hua-yen Buddhism*. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.

Groner, Paul

1984 *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 7.

1987 *Annen, Tankei, Henjō, and Monastic Discipline in the Tendai School: The Background of the Futsu jubosatsukai koshaku*. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14/2-3: 129-60.

Hakeda Yoshito

1972 *Kūkai: Major Works*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hashimoto Shinkichi

1918 *Annen oshō jiseki kō*. *Sange gakuhō* 3/10-4/11.

Hazama Jiko

1969 *Tendaishūshi gaisetsu*. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

Honda Koyu, tr.

1911 *Yakuchu Eizan Daishiden* (by Ninchū). Hieizan: Goonki jimukyoku.

Hoshimiya Chiko

1974 *Henjō no shukke*. In *Eizan gakkai*, ed., pp.298-309.

1975 *Henjō no Gangyō-ji keiei to sono igi*. *Mikkyō bunka* 112: 30-43.

Inaba Enjo

1953 *Tendai shikyōgi shinshaku*. Kyoto: Hozokan.

Inada Sogen

1936 Godai'in sentoku denkō. *Eizan gakuho* 11:8-24. Reprinted in Eizan Gakkai, ed. (1979), pp. 8-24.

Ishida Mizumaro

1963 *Nihon Bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Zaike Bukkyō kyōkai.

Kamimura Shinjo

1958 *Eizan Daishiden* ni okeru mondai. IBK 6/2: 552-5.

1962 *Eizan Daishiden* ni okeru mondai. IBK 10/2: 93-6.

Kanbayashi, Ryūjō

1931 Hajigoku sanshushicchi hō hyakutei. In *Kokuyaku issaikyō. Mikkyō bu*, vol.3. pp.80-94. Tokyo: Daitō.

Kato Seiichi

1993 Kōbō Daishi to Dengyō Daishi no Kankei saikō. IBK 42/1: 18-25.

Kawasaki Tsuneyuki

1961 Saga Tennō to Saichō Kūkai. In *Nihon jinbutsushi taikai*. 7 vols. Vol. 1: Kodai, pp. 136-69. Tokyo: Asakura Shoten.

Kimura Shusho

1992 *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* no taikō. TG 35: 48-53.

Kiuchi Gyōō (Hiroshi)

1965 Dengyō Daishi no taikon ryōbu ni tsuite. IBK 13/1: 164-65.

1967 Dengyō Daishi no montei to Mikkyō. TG 8: 59-62.

1968 Dengyō Daishi no mikkyō sōjō to Fukū sanzō. IBK 17: 247-9.

1972 Godai'in Annen sonja to mikkyō. IBK 20/2: 260-63.

1972(a) *Kenkairon engi* ni okeru ichi mondai. TG 14: 157-64.

1973 Henjō to mikkyō. IBK 21/2:758-63.

1976 *Dengyō Daishi no shōgai to shisō*. Tokyo: Daisan bunmeisha.

1977 *Taizō engi* ni tsuite. TG 12: 98-103.

1981 *Eizan Daishiden no yakuwari*. TG 24: 90-8.

1984 *Tendai mikkyō no keisei*. Tokyo: Keisuisha.

1985 *Annen sen sanbu taijuki no kendō*. IBK 33/2: 416-21.

Kohn, Livia

1989 *Taoist Meditation and Longevity Techniques* (ed.). Ann Arbor: Centre for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan.

Kōyasan daigaku, ed.

1965 *Mikkyōgaku Mikkyōshi ronbunshū* (*Studies of Esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism, in commemoration of the 1,150th anniversary of the founding of Kōyasan* [sic]). Kōyasan: Kōyasan University Press.

Liu Shufen

1996 *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing yu* Tangdai zunsheng jingzhuang de jiangli--jingzhuang yanjiu zi yi. *Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan Lishi Yuyan Yanjiusho jikan* 67/1: 145-93.

Lu Jiangfu

1995 *Zhongguo mijiao shi*. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui kexueyuan chubanshe.

Major, John S.

1978 *Myth, Cosmology, and the Origins of Chinese Sciences*. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 5: 1-20.

1987 *Yin-yang Wu-hsing*. In Eliade ed., vol. 15: 515-6.

Makita Tairyō

1976 *Gikyō Kenkyū*. Kyoto: Jimbun kagaku Kenkyūsho.

Matsunaga, Yūkei

1969 *Mikkyō no rekishi*. Sara sosho, no.19. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

1977 *Ri to chi*. *Mikkyōgaku* 13-14: 60-71.

1976 *Sanshushicchi to hajigoku*. *Mikkyō bunka* (121): 1-13.

Matsunaga, Yūken

1929 *Sanshushicchi hajigoku giki no kenkyū*. *Mikkyō kenkyū* (35): 1-18.

Misaki Ryōshū

1961 *Jichin oshō no mikkyō*. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 100.

- 1962 Taimitsu no soshicchi ni tsuite. IBK 10/1: 217-20.
- 1964 Ennin no mikkyō ni okeru ichi ni no mondai. IBK 12/2: 228-30.
- 1965 Jichin oshō no mikkyō shisō ni tsuite. *Bukkyōshigaku kenkyū* 12.
- 1965(a) Tōmitsu no mikkyō to soshicchi. Kōyasan daigaku, ed. pp. 255-81.
- 1966 Junmitsu to zōmitsu ni tsuite. IBK 15: 525-40.
- 1968 Nara jidai no mikkyō ni okeru shomondai. *Nantō Bukkyō* 22: 55-73.
- 1968(a) Annen no *Sho Ajari shingon mikkyō burui soroku* ni tsuite. IBK 16/2: 98-105.
- 1969 Dengyō Daishi no mikkyō shisō. *Firosōfia* 56: 41-66.
- 1980 Dengyō Daishi no mikkyō shisō ni okeru sho mondai. Fukui ed., pp. 477-96.
- 1982 Godai'in Annen to Taimitsu no keifu ni tsuite. IBK 31-1.
- 1985 Taimitsu no soshicchi o meguru sho mondai. *Mikkyō bunka* 149: 79-95.
- 1988 *Taimitsu no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Sobunsha.
- 1992 *Mikkyō to shingi shisō*. Tokyo: Sobunsha.

Miura Shuko

- 1921 *Dengyō Daishi den*. Hieizan: Tendai shumuchū.

Mizukami Fumiyoshi

- 1976 Dengyō Daishi no mikkyō shiryō ni kansuru ichi ni no kosatsu. TG 18: 151-6.
- 1981 Annen no *Taizōkai daiho tajuki* ni tsuite. TG 23: 117-120.
- 1982 Shōki taimitsu no soshicchi sōjō ni tsuite. TG 24: 163-66.
- 1984 Annen no mikkyō ni kanshinu ichi ni no kosatsu. IBK 32/2: 196-8.
- 1987 Taimitsu ni okeru sanshushicchi hō no densō. TG 30: 87-91.
- 1988 Sanshushicchi hō to sanshin shingon. IBK (73): 253-57.

Monowa Kenryō

1990 Kōjō to *Naishō Buppō sōjō ketsumyakufu*. IBK 38/2: 19-23.

Muranaka Yushō

1975 *Denjutsuisshin kaimon no senshu ni tsuite*. TG 18: 104-11.

Nakao Shunpaku

1973 *Nihon Shōki Tendai no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Nagata Bunshodō.

1987 *Dengyō Daishi Saichō no Kenkyū*. Tokyo: Nagata Bunshodō.

Nara Hiromoto

1974 Godai'in Annen no chosaku ni tsuite. *Seishin kagaku* 13: 32-46.

Nasu, Seiryū

1954 Sanshushicchi hajigoku giki no kenkyū. In *Miyamoto kyōju kinen Indogaku bukkyōgaku ronshū*. pp. 431-44.

1958 Chugoku mikkyō ni okeru Dokyō shisō no juyō. IBK 6/1: 84-93.

1975 Dengyō Daishi shoden no mikkyō. In Tendai Gakkai, ed., pp. 1009-1032.

Needham, Joseph

1985 *Science and Civilization in China*. vol. 2. Taipei: Caves Books, Ltd.

Nomoto Kakusei

1991 *Dengyō Daishi ju Dōzui oshō dendōmon no shingi*. TG 34: 74-81.

1994 *Dōzui ju Bosatsukaitei no nazo*. TG 37: 26-35.

1996 *Hozan dōjō no ichi*. TG 38: 34-41.

Ōkubo Ryōjun

1980 *Edan ryōryū homonchu no Dengyō Daishi*. In Fukui, ed., pp. 71-92.

Ōmura, Seigai

1918 *Mikkyō hattatsushi*, 5 vols., Tokyo.

Onjoji, ed.

1973 *Chishō Daishi*, Otsu.

Ono Katsutoshi

1970 *Saichō Kūkai kōyūkō. Ryūkoku daigaku ronshū* 394: 1-29.

- 1978 Enchin no *Shō Chierin sanzō sho* fu yakuchu. *Ryūkoku shidan* 73-74: 59-77.
- 1982 *Nittō guhō gyoreki no kenkyū: Chishō Daishi hen*. Kyoto: Hozokan.
- Orzech, Charles D.
1987 Chen-yen. In Eliade ed., vol. 3: 233-8.
- Ōsabe, Kazuō
1971 *Tōdai Mikkyōshi zatsukō*. Kobe: Kobe shoka daigaku gakujutsu kenkyūkai.
- Ōyama Kōjun
1960 Dengyō Daishi no mikkyōkan. IBK 8/1: 325-30.
- 1979 Godai'in Annen ni tsuite. In *Ōyama Kōjun chosaku zenshū*. Osaka: Pitaka, vol. 1, pp.497-515.
- Ōyama Ninkai
1974 Saichō denju Jungyō Ajari fuhōinshin. *Bukkyō geijutsu* 96: 80-95.
- Paul, Diana Y.
1984 *Philosophy of Mind in Sixth-Century China: Paramārtha's "Evolution of Consciousness"*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rhodes, Robert F.
1984 Annotated Translation of the *Ssu-chiao-i* (On the Four Teachings)". *Annual Memoirs of the Ōtani University Shin Buddhist Comprehensive Research Institute* 2: 53-91.
- Saeki Arikaio
1986 *Jikaku Daishiden no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan.
- 1992 *Dengyō Daishiden no kenkyū*. Tokyo; Yoshikawa Kobunkan.
- Sakamoto Tairyō
1973 Dengyō Daishi to Dainihon no kokugō. in Tendai gakkai ed., pp.485-500.
- Sasaki Kentoku
1938 *Sange gakushoshiki shinshaku*. Yamazaki: Hobundo.
- 1939 Kōbō Daishi no *Goyuigō* wo utagaute Jungyō Ajari no koto ni oyobu. *Nihon Bukkyōgaku kyōkai nenpō* 12: 91-140.
- Sawa Takaaki
1979 Kūkai shinpitsu soko goshōrai mokuroku jōhyō ni tsuite. *Bukkyō geijutsu* 126: 11-20.

Sekiguchi Shindai

1977 *Tendai shikyōgi*. Tokyo: Sankibo.

Sharf, Robert

1991 *The Treasure Store Treatise (Pao-tsang-lun)*: The Sinification of Buddhism in Eighth Century China. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.

Shibuya Jigai, ed.

1973 *Kōtei zoho Tendai zasuki*. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobo.

Shimizutani Kyōjun

1972 *Tendai mikkyō no seritsu ni kansuru kenkyū*. Tokyo: Bun'ichi Shuppan.

Shiori Ryōchū

1937 *Dengyō Daishi*. Tokyo: Nihon hyoronsha.

1963 *Dengyō kyōgaku ni okeru Hakke kyō to Dainichi kyō no mondai*. IBK 11/1: 103-9.

Shiori Ryōtatsu

1975 *Denjutsu isshinkaimon ni okeru ni san no mondai. Taishō daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 61: 553-66.

Shiori Ryōtatsu and Nakano Yoshiteru, eds.

1972 *Dengyō Daishi Kōbō Daishi shū*. Vol. 3, Bukkyō kyōiku hoten. Tokyo: Tamagawa daigaku shuppanbu.

Sonoda Kōyū

1952 *Saichō no togoku dendō ni tsuite. Bukkyō shigaku* 3/2: 49-63.

1956 *Eizan Daishiden no sakkan oyobi ryūden*. In *Umehara Shinryū kangaku hanreki kinen ronshū*, pp. 302-7. Edited by Kenshin gakkai. Kyoto: Kenshin gakkai.

1974 *Saichō to sono shisō*. In Ando Toshio and Sonoda Koyu, eds., pp. 439-515.

Soothill, William

1982 *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms*. Taipei: Xinwenfen (reprinted).

Sueki Fumihiko

1995 *Heian Shōki Bukkyō shisō no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Shunjusha.

Swanson, Paul L.

1986 *T'ien-t'ai Studies in Japan. Cahiers d'Extreme-Asie* 2: 219-32.

Takeuchi Kozen

1995 Goyuigō no seiritsu katei ni tsuite. IBK 43/2: 83-7.

Tamura Koyu, ed.

1979 *Saichō Jiten*. Tokyo: Tokyodō Shuppan.

Tendai Gakkai, ed.

1975 *Dengyō Daishi kenkyū*. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppansha.

Tendaishūten Hensankai, ed.

1990 *Zoku Tendaishū zensho: Mikkyō 3*. Tokyo: Shunjusha (reprinted, 1993).

Terada Shuncho

1936 Annen sonja jiseki tokugyō ryōzuihen. In *Eizan gakuho* 11: 153-78. Reprinted in Eizan Gakkai, ed.

Tsuji Zennosuke

1944 *Nihon Bukkyōshi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Uesugi Bunshu

1935 *Nihon Tendaishi*. 2 vols. Nagoya: Hajinkaku Shobō. (reprinted Tokyo: Kokusho Kankokai, 1972)

Ushiba Shingen

1967 *Dengyō Daishi no zenbō sōjō ni tsuite: Naishō Buppō sōjō kechimyakufu wo chushin to shite*. TG 10: 95-100.

1970-72 Jodoinhan *Dengyō Daishi shorai mokuroku* ni tsuite. TG 12: 84-92; 14: 60-7.

1971 *Eizan Daishiden* ni okeru ni san no mondai. *Nantō Bukkyō* 26: 59-77.

1971(a) Saichō no Jungyō yori no mikkyō denbō ni tsuite. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 44: 156-7.

1971(b) *Denjutsuisshin kaimon* no seiritsu ni tsuite no ki. *Nantō Bukkyō* 26.

1972 *Denjutsuisshinkaimon* ni tsuite no utagai. *Nantō Bukkyō* 30: 54-75.

1975 *Eizan Daishiden* no seirichi ni tsuite. Tendai Gakkai ed., pp. 65-92.

Watanabe Shoko

1969 *Saichō Kūkai shū*. Nihon no shisō, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chikuma shobo.

Watanabe Shujun

1977 *Dengyō Daishi Saichō no kokoro to Shōgai*. Tokyo: Yuzankaku.

Wechsler, Howard, J.

1985 *Offerings of Jade and Silk: Ritual and Symbol in the Legitimation of the T'ang Dynasty*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press (reviewed by Forte, 1987).

Weinstein, Stanley

1974 The Beginnings of Esoteric Buddhism in Japan. *Journal of Asian Studies* 34: 177-91.

1987 *Buddhism under the T'ang*. London: Cambridge University Press (reviewed by Forte, 1989).

1987(a) Chinese Buddhism. In Eliade ed., vol. 2: 482-7.

Yoshioka, Yoshitoyo

1964 *Korin kuji hishyaku* to Dōkyō gozōkan. *Mikkyō bunka* (69-70): 77-97.