THE SAMAYA CODE

Esotericization of Buddhist Precepts in Japan

Klaus Leon Roger A. Pinte

© 2013

PhD.-dissertation presented to the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy of Ghent University,
Department of Languages and Cultures, for the degree of Doctor in Oriental Languages and Cultures
In memory of Pol Vanden Broucke (1957-2004)

Promotor Prof. dr. Andreas Niehaus

Decaan Prof. dr. Marc Boone

Rector Prof. dr. Anne De Paepe
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBJ</td>
<td>電子佛教辞典 (Jap. Denshi Bukkyō Jiten, see: online sources s.v. Muller).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHD</td>
<td>秘密曼荼羅教付法伝 (Jap. Himitsu mandarakyō fuhōden, cf. KDKZ II: 379ff.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heizei</td>
<td>平城天皇灌頂文 (Jap. Heizei-tennō kanjōbun, var. –mon, cf. KDZ II: 117ff. and T. LXXVIII, no. 2461)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBK</td>
<td>秘密三昧耶佛戒儀 (Jap. Himitsu sanmaiya bukkai gi, cf. T. LXXVIII, no. 2463)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHBK</td>
<td>授発菩提心戒文 (Jap. Ju热水hodaishin kaimon, cf. SS XX, 42b-52c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJSR</td>
<td>秘密曼荼羅十住心論 (Jap. Himitsu mandara jūjūshinron, cf. KDKZ I: 5ff.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kōnin 弘仁の御遺誡 (Jap. Kōnin no Goyuikai, cf. KDZ II: 861ff.)


MVS Māhāvairocanasūtra (i.e. 大日経 Jap. Dainichikyō, cf. T. XVIII, no. 848).


SBR 四分律 (Jap. Shibunritsu, cf. T. XXII, no. 1428)


SGR 三學録 (Jap. Sangakuroku, cf. KDZ I: 105-22)


Philological research in the field of Buddhist studies always implies a great deal of specific terminology that needs to be clarified, explained and interpreted. Buddhist terms and conceptions have therefore been clarified as the author’s best. The footnotes not only include such explanations, but also consist of bibliographical references. These are indicated according to the author-date system. In order to keep the text economical, a number of bibliographical abbreviations are used, cf. list supra. Although they are to consult there, this list does not include common abbreviations such as Chin., Jap. and Skt.

Given that our intended public is already quite familiar with general aspects of Buddhism, popular terms such as buddha, bodhisattva, dharma, mahāyāna, mantra, etc. will not be described any further, and are not italicized. Terms that may be less familiar, such as mudrā, dhāraṇī, adhiṣṭhāna, or do not belong to the English lexicon, as well as titles and transcriptions, are set in italics. Exceptions to this general rule are personal names and toponyms. Designations such as Buddha, Bodhisattva, Dharmakāya, or Tathāgata are capitalized when referring to divinities.

For readers proficient in Chinese, terms and titles are given with characters first. In order to facilitate the consultation of Japanese lexica, these are followed by the Japanese reading in the Hepburn transcription. In the bibliographies, however this is vice versa, and also when modern Japanese is quoted, transcription takes precedence. Only when indispensable for the argumentation, Pinyin transcription is added to indicate Chinese readings in modern pronunciation. Because Sanskrit is the lingua franca of Buddhist studies, however, Sanskrit equivalents are given for the reader’s convenience. For the Sanskrit transliterations, we will use the system as established during the 10th International Orientalist Conference in Geneva (1894).

For a comfortable reading, however, spacing may be added to transcriptions of long compounds and titles.

Except explicitly mentioned otherwise, quotations are given in the language of the original. This is not the case, however, when quoting Chinese and Japanese material, which is always translated in English. Unless clearly indicated, all translations are the author’s.
Elements that might be added for clarity's sake are put in square brackets. In chapter III, numbers in the left margin refer to the pagination in the T.-edition, and follow the tripartite of the pages that is commonly indicated with the letters a, b and c, followed by the line number. Because there are frequent problems with erroneous punctuations in the consulted edition (also see e.g. Chen 2011), except from Appendix A.1, citations form primary texts in classical Chinese are given without interpunition. Throughout this dissertation, bibliographical references are cited according to the author-date system. The citations in Appendix H are edited according to the Oxford Bibliography guidelines.
Kūkai (空海, 774-835) is commonly revered as the founder of the Shingon denomination of esoteric Buddhism in Japan.¹ He is regarded as one of the most prominent Japanese scholar-monks of the early Heian period (784/94-1185), and applied his remarkable diplomatic insights in his interaction both with the imperial court and the established Buddhist institutions. He is celebrated not only for his systematizing philosophical capacities, but also for his broad knowledge of Tang dynasty (618-907) Chinese culture.

Between 804 and 806, he studied esoteric Buddhism in China, from where he brought a vast array of texts, scroll paintings, and other ritual implements.² In Japan, Kūkai carried on the Zhenyan (真言) tradition of China as a fully systematic body of thought and practice, which he vested in the Shingon-shū (真言宗).³ The voluminous textual corpus attributed to Kūkai bears evidence of his envisioning a unity of Indian, Chinese and Japanese Buddhist denominations ultimately culminating in Shingon. Thus, the once fairly unstructured Zhenyan

¹ Lay name: Saeki [no] Mao (佐伯真魚), posthumous title: Kōbō Daishi (弘法大師), treasure name: Henjō Kongō (遍照金剛), popular references: Daishi (大師), Kōya Daishi (高野大師), and Odaishisama (お大師様). See Hinonishi 2002 for a recent source addressing the subject of Kūkai’s epithets. Kūkai’s disciple Shinzei (真済, 780-860) is believed to have been the first to compose a biography of Kūkai. Many Japanese introductions (入門 Jap. nyūmon) have been published on Kūkai’s life, but by far the best Japanese study is Katō 1989. Hakeda 1972: esp. 13-60 gives the most accessible overview on Kūkai’s life in English, and includes a useful chronological table on pp. 277-279. Abe 1999 includes very useful information on Kūkai’s date of birth, cf. p. 20 and p. 454 n.1; on Kūkai’s dissent, pp. 69-112. His biography is discussed on pp. 4-8, 22-23, 40-42, 46-47, 55-63, and 386-388. Abe’s analysis of Kūkai’s autobiographical writings is found on pp. 74-75, 84-85, and 89-90. Kūkai’s autobiographical writings are also discussed in Matsuda 2003: 12-35. However, a book-length work incorporating full English translations of Kūkai’s biographies and autobiographical writings is still lacking. Although as such not scholarly in scope, illustrated Kūkai biographies (弘法大師絵伝, Jap. Kōbō Daishi eden) are important material for the study of popular devotional views on his life. There are several Japanese articles on the subject, but most of them are outdated. Sekiguchi 1988, however, might be representative of the few more accessible accounts. On Kūkai and the development of Shingon Buddhism, see Abe 1999, and Tinsley 2011. On the term “esoteric Buddhism”, see postscript infra. For an annotated bibliography on Kūkai, see: appendix H.

² Borgen (1982) gives the most detailed English account of the Japanese embassy Kūkai joined when he went to China in order to study esoteric Buddhism. For his travel to China, see Abe 1999: 113-150; Hakeda 1972: 29-34.

³ His Catalogue of Sūtras, Vinayas, and Śāstras to be Studied in the Shingon School (真言宗所學經律論目録 Jap. Shingonshū-shogaku kyō-ritsu-ron mokuroku), often called Catalogue of the Three [Divisions of] Learning (三學録 Jap. Sangakuroku, further SGR) was perhaps the first systematic attempt to classify the Mikkyō texts, cf. Isaki 1988: 150. It can be found in the KDZ 1: 105-22. It was compiled in 823 as the curriculum for Shingon adepts, intended to be an addition to the standard works studied in the other Buddhist schools. Aside from a long list of tantras, there were only two treatises, i.e. the Bodhicitta-śāstra (cf. White 2005) and the Commentary on the Treatise on Mahāyāna (修摩訶衍論 Jap. Shaku makaen ron, T. XXXII, no. 1668), both attributed to Nāgārjuna (fl. 2nd century) and translated into Chinese by Amoghavajra (704-774) during the eighth century. On Amoghavajra, see Lehnert 2011: 351-359. The Catalogue also lists other materials for the study of Sanskrit and works on mantras. For Kūkai’s creation of the term Shingon-shū, cf. Abe 1999: 199ff.
teachings (Skt. dharma) that were nearly extinguished by the end of the Tang dynasty in China, soon became one of Japan’s most influential forms of Buddhism.

Also known as a famous calligrapher, Kūkai is a pan-Japanese cultural hero, who—amongst numerous other legendary accomplishments—has been attributed with the invention of the kana script. Until today devotees venerate him as a popular living saint who is remaining alive in eternal meditation on Mt. Kōya (Kōyasan 高野山), the inner sanctum (Oku-no-in 奥の院) of which is administered by Kongōbuji (金剛峰寺), the Shingon headquarters.

**Shingon Mikkyō**

Commonly referred to as Shingon Mikkyō (真言密教, lit. “mantra esotericism”, cf. Skt. mantrayāna), these teachings are considered to be “esoteric”, because their doctrine and ritual practice can be studied only after initiation, and are passed down in a lineage of master-disciple transmission. During the training period following the initiation, the master (阿闍梨 Jap. ajari, transliterating Skt. acārya) reveals to the disciple the “secret”, or “hidden” (密 Jap. mitsu) means for realizing Buddhahood.

Amongst these “mysteries” are mantras, rendered in Japanese as shingon (真言), the recitation of which forms a main constituent of esoteric Buddhist practice. Together with physical poses and manual signs (Skt. mudrā), as well as visualization techniques and meditative contemplation of divinities depicted in maṇḍalas, such expedients allow the ritual officiant, amongst others, to realize the perfection (Skt. siddhi) of man-Buddha integration (Skt. adhiṣṭhāna).

---

4 For more references, cf. annotated bibliography in appendix H.
5 Unless clearly indicated otherwise, all translations of terms, titles, and (exerpts from) texts are the author’s. For a study of mantrayāna in China, see e.g. Strickmann 1996, and Orzech 1989. See also postscript infra.
6 Lit. ‘true word’, but rather ‘word of truth’: “Die Wahrheit konstituiert sich sprechend, die Wahrheit spricht im mantra, weil ihr kein anderes Instrument als das der Sprache zur Verfügung steht.” (Lehnert 2001: 1000). On this term, also see chapter III, n. 267 infra s.v. furai shingon.
7 On visualization and contemplation, see e.g. Copp’s entry in Orzech 2011a: 141-145. For the relation between mudrā, mantra and maṇḍala, see: Orzech 2011b: 76 ff. For a detailed study of mudrā in Japan, see Saunders 1985. On the term maṇḍala, see: Wayman 1999.
Also called the “three esoterica” (三密 Jap. san mitsu, Skt. triguhya or trīṇi guhyāni), these means represent the body, speech/voice, and mind/thought of Mahāvairocana (大日 Jap. Dainichi, lit. ‘Great Sun’), the central divinity in the Shingon system. They are universal, because all beings—in whatever they do, say, and think—are considered nothing but individualized parts of the absolute reality as embodied by Mahāvairocana, but their originally enlightened (Skt. bodhi) nature is hidden from them by illusion.

Thus, contrary to what one might perhaps expect, the “esoteric” here does not entail that Shingon has some kind of numerous clausus for its neophytes. Just as the way to enlightenment is accessible for anyone, Shingon is open to all sentient beings. As it is the spiritual capacity of the candidate which is decisive for progress, the teacher has to make sure that the pupil receives suitable guidance. This is the main reason why certain aspects of Mikkyō are encrypted with for the uninitiated seemingly unfathomable terminology, that is veiled by drapes of symbolic ostentation, and needs oral explanation by an authorized master. Hence, Mikkyō texts are said to be written in “twilight language” (Skt. sāṃdhyābhāṣā).

**Abhiṣeka**

Tradition has it that the inception of Shingon esoteric Buddhism has been hallmarked by Kūkai receiving the twofold consecration into the vajradhātu and garbhadhātu-manḍalas from his master Huiguo (恵果, 746-806) at Qinglong Temple (青龍寺) in Chang’an in 804. After his return to Japan from his research stay in China (cf. supra: 1), Kūkai profiled himself as religious leader, an activity that was closely connected with his propagation of the consecration ritual, known as abhiṣeka (灌頂 Jap. kanjō).

---

8 English term according to the index in Orzech 2011a: 1192, s.v. “three mysteries”. For more information, also see chapter III, n. 446 below.
9 On Mahāvairocana, see e.g. Pinte K. 2009b. For the central divinities in the esoteric Buddhist pantheon, See Sørensen 2011.
10 See: NEBJ: 249b; BGD: 490b; DCBT: 63; Wayman 1992: 306, and 274, n. 82; and Abe 1999: 129-132, where a summary is given on Kūkai’s vision on the relation between the three mysteries and Mahāvairocana.
11 On the exclusion of women, cf. infra, chapter II: 13 n. 48.
12 This term was popularized by Bucknell & Stuart-Fox (1986).
13 For a study of these manḍalas, see: Snodgrass 1988. For the arrangement of the divinities in the two manḍalas, see MJ: appendix: 32-33; SJ: 292, 295.
14 According to Endō (1972: 2), he was the only one amongst thousands of Huiguo’s disciples who was transmitted the correct twofold lineage. On these manḍalas, see: e.g. Snodgrass 1988.
15 Abe 1999: 43. On abhiṣeka, see e.g. Davidson’s entry in Orzech 2011a: 71-75.
In general, there are three levels of abhiṣeka: the first is an introductory consecration, aimed at generating karmic affinity (結縁 Jap. kechien) with the maṇḍala divinities, establishing the candidate as a practitioner of esoteric Buddhism; the intermediate consecration enables the practitioner to study the rituals (学法 Jap. gakuhō) for the attainment of meditative union (Skt. yoga), or unio mystica, with a Buddha or bodhisattva in the maṇḍala; while the advanced consecration empowers the practitioner as a master of esoteric Buddhism who can preserve and transmit the tradition (伝教 Jap. denkyō kanjō) to other generations.\textsuperscript{16}

\textit{“Samaya precepts”: quid rei?}

Prior to the consecration ritual, there is a so-called “preliminary procedure” in which the recipient vows to uphold the “samaya-śīla* (Jap. sanmaiya-kai 三摩耶戒),”\textsuperscript{17} or the “esoteric precepts,” at the heart of which are, according to Abe, who paraphrases a note by Hakeda, the following four “vows”:

1. Never to abandon the True Dharma;
2. Never to negate bodhicitta, the seed of enlightenment said to be shared by all beings;
3. Never to be parsimonious in sharing Buddhist teachings with others; and
4. Never to cause any sentient beings harm.\textsuperscript{18}

Their contents and number appear to vary over time and according to denomination, but all practitioners of esoteric Buddhism, take “samaya precepts”, which are formally conferred prior to, or during the consecration ritual. In other words, they mark the entrance into esoteric

\textsuperscript{16} Abe 1999: 262, n. 93. Each of these rituals marks the beginning of intensive study, as pointed out in Orzech 2011b: 85, n. 38. For the processes of abhiṣeka as set out in the two major scriptures of Shingon, see Abe 1999: 133-149.

\textsuperscript{17} Var. Jap. sammaya-kai. Although Abe advances the aforementioned Sanskrit term as an equivalent for the Japanese term, no such an equivalent has yet been found in any Sanskrit source. Hence my addition of “*”, i.e. the common indication of reconstructed words. In Buddhist texts written in Chinese, the term is also attested as Jap. sanmaiya-kai 三摩耶戒, which actually is the most frequent term. A concordance survey of the T. canon (cf. appendix C) showed that the terms sanmaya-kai and sanmaiya-kai can also be abbreviated to sanma-kai and sanmai-kai, and are together attested in 202 texts spread over 28 different volumes, adding up to a total of 572 hits (text headings excluded). The abbreviated forms, however, are only used in 9% of the cases (52/572), one time of which it is written with the character 摩. The character 摩, both in full and abbreviated forms is used in only in 32% (182/272) of the cases, while the full form with the character 昧 is attested in 59% of the cases (339/572). At least in the T.-canon, 三摩耶戒, therefore, appears to be the most frequently used term. Strangely enough, although its correct Hepburn transcription is sanmaiya-kai, not a single source (also no Japanese studies) appears to use this reading. Future quantitative research might shed more light on this issue.

\textsuperscript{18} Abe 1999: 43-44, referring to Hakeda 1972: 95-96, and pointing out that these vows are called Jap. shi jūkin 四重禁, lit. the “four fundamental prohibitions”. For a brief discussion of the role of vows in esoteric Buddhism, see: Davidson 2011.
practice, and are in that sense core features of esoteric Buddhism. Therefore, it has been suggested that they are apt keys to determine whether in a certain period, on a certain location, or in a certain denomination, there was an institutionalized form of esoteric Buddhism. ¹⁹ However, regardless of a few studies on their history within Tibetan contexts, ²⁰ until today not a single Western language study exists on the inception and/or reception of the “samaya precepts” in China, Korea, or Japan.

Moreover, just like Abe (cf. supra), the handful of other scholars who mention them incidentally in their English publications on Chinese and Japanese esoteric traditions, such as Paul Groner, Richard Payne, and Charles Orzech, ²¹ all only paraphrase, or refer to the aforementioned aside in Hakeda’s work. ²² This immediately entails some questions, such as: What is this “preliminary procedure” about? What does the term “samaya precepts” mean? Why are they called “esoteric precepts”? Where do these “precepts” come from? How are they equated with being “vows”? What is meant by the “True Teaching” or “bodhicitta, the seed of enlightenment”? Etc.

For the ritual procedure followed in granting the “samaya precepts”, the reader is merely referred to two texts only, i.e. the Mahāvairocanaśūtra (大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經, Jap. Daibirushana jōbutsu jinhen kajikyō, further: MVS) ²³ and “Kūkai’s Himitsu sanmaiya bukkaigi 秘密三昧耶佛戒儀” (further: HSBK). ²⁴ While both the Tibetan and Chinese versions of the former have already been translated and studied extensively alongside their most important commentaries, ²⁵ the latter text has not yet been disclosed, translated or studied in any other language than Japanese (cf. infra).

Moreover, instead of calling them “esoteric precepts”, other scholars refer to them as “tantric” or “mantrayāna vows”. ²⁶ Is there a significant difference, then, between “esoteric” and “tantric” on the one hand, and between “precepts” and “vows” on the other? Are these merely

---

¹⁹ Payne 2006: 16
²³ T. XVIII, no. 848: 5c-6b, commented upon in 大毘盧遮那成佛經疏 (大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經通解, Jap. Daibirushana jōbutsu kyōsho), comp. Yixing (一行), i.e. T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 629c7-630a12, 661c3, 666c22, also referred to e.g. in Orzech 2011b: 85, n. 37. On Subhākarasimha, see Pinte K. 2011a. For Yixing, see: Keyworth 2011: 342-344.
²⁵ See e.g. the translation with Buddhaghuya’a commentary in Hodge 2003; the study of the Chinese text and translation of its first chapter by Tajima 1936; as well as the full translations by Yamamoto Y. 2001, and Giebel 2005 respectively. Hence, this text is not the main subject of the present research.
²⁶ Payne 2006: 16.
translations of the same concepts, or is there more to it? Therefore, the present dissertation aims at dealing with these questions concerning the “tantric vows” of “esoteric Buddhism”, and generally focusses on their representation in the HSBK, i.e. the ritual manual that has been put forward as a main source for the systematization of the aforementioned preliminary procedure.

*State of the field*

The Shingon teachings of Kūkai are undoubtedly amongst the most systematic and philosophic traditional Buddhist thought in Japan, but unfortunately they have been ignored for the most part in twentieth century English language scholarship. Aside from few exceptions, such as a basic work on Kūkai’s life and works by Hakeda (1972) and Yamasaki’s introduction to Shingon (1988), for a long time almost no substantial study on Kūkai, or Shingon, has been available to the non-Japanese versed reader.27

At the turn of the millenium, however, Abe’s seminal work (1999) appears to have paved the way for some very important publications, such as those by White (2005), Payne (2006), and Orzech (2011). They have proven uncontestably that academic inquiries into tantric or esoteric Buddhism deal with a highly philosophical, comprehensive body of thought and ritual synthesis, which until today lies at the heart of the daily religious practice of Shingon adepts around the world.

In comparison to the Buddhist rules in China,28 there is also not a lot of English language research on the history of the reception and approach of the Buddhist precepts on the Japanese archipelago. Exceptions are such groundbreaking works as those by Hankó (2003) and Unno (1994) that deal with Rishhū, and Groner’s extensive treatment of the Tendai precepts (e.g. Groner 1979, 1984, and 1990).

English language academic inquiry into the precepts in esoteric Buddhism, however, is as yet virtually non-existing, let alone on Kūkai’s precepts view, or the origins, development, and institutionalization of the “samaya precepts” ritual in Japan. This implies that scholarship in

---

27 This neglect may have something to do with an intellectual’s prejudice against, and reluctance towards, the significance of esoteric ritual practice, in which symbols and images are used that are not so easily amenable to rational comprehension, and instead conjure up preconceptions of the “occult” and “magical”. Cf. Postscript below.

28 See e.g. de Groot 1967; Yifa 2002; Heirman 2007.
this field is largely dependent on primary sources that—given the time frame and cultural sphere under consideration—are mostly written in classical Chinese, and are discussed in highly specialized Japanese secondary studies.29

The first, if not the earliest, modern scholar to address Kūkai’s precepts view, and also his institutionalization of the “samaya precepts”, was Ueda Tenzui (1933), who laid out many of the conceptions that were followed by later scholars. The next noteworthy author in this context was Katsumata (1959), who discussed the textual development of different terms for “esoteric precepts” (密戒 Jap. mitsukai), and outlined the main textual sources for their conferral ritual.

In 1967 several publications were issued on the topic: Takagi dealt with the division between the so-called “exoteric” (Jap. 顕戒 kenkai) and “esoteric precepts”, with special focus on Kūkai’s view on, and his taking of the precepts, and also discussed the traditional lineage of transmission. Ueda R. published on the precepts view of the late 17th century monk Jōgon (浄嚴, 1639-1702),30 while Yamasaki issued an article on Kūkai’s view on the “samaya precepts”, addressing different designations for the term, alongside their occurrence in the MVS, as well as their relation to the Bodhicittaśāstra.31

In the 1970’s, the sanmaiya-kai of the Chinese MVS and its foremost commentary by Yixing (一行, 683-727)32 were discussed by Endō (1972), who also investigated how these ‘sanmaiya-kai’ were interpreted in some texts attributed to Kūkai. This was also the case in one of his later publications (Endō 1984), but there he focusses rather on dam-tshig, the Tibetan word for Skt. samaya. Tanaka (1977), however, analyzed the so-called Preface to the Samaya Precepts (三昧耶戒序 Sanmaiyaikaijo, further: SKJ),33 a primary source for Kūkai’s view on the (esoteric) precepts, and especially treats ten stages (十住心 Jap. jū jūshin) thought.34

---

29 Below is a very concise chronological survey of the most important Japanese literature related to the “samaya precepts” and their conferral ritual, covering studies from the 20th century up to today, but in no respect it intends to be comprehensive. For further references, see the annotation throughout, as well as the general and annotated bibliographies below.

30 cf. infra.

31 For an English study and translation, see: White 2005.

32 cf. p. 5, n. 23 above.

33 For an English study and translation, see White 2005: 357-372, and the discussion of excerpts in chapter IV below.

34 This is treated in chapter IV below.
In the early 1980’s, Shinada (1980 and 1981) studied Kūkai’s precepts view as seen from the "Text for the Initiatory Unction of Emperor Heizei" (平城天皇灌頂文 Heizei-tenno kanjōbun, var. –mon, further: Heizei)\textsuperscript{35} while Takada (1980) paid attention to the etymology of the term *samaya*, and –although focusing on *mantrayāna* in Tibet– pointed out some parallels with the Buddhist esotericisms in China and Japan, based on his reading of the MVS. Also in 1980, Takahashi explored the etymology of the Skt. compound *samaya-saṃvara*, and argued that ‘*sanmaiya-kai*’ is not Skt. *samaya-saṃvara*, but both *samaya* and *saṃvara* (cf. infra). Arai (1984) also explained the term ‘*sanmaiya-kai*’ as Skt. *samaya-saṃvara*, and discussed alternate designations from the MVS, with special focus on the idea that *bodhicitta* is a form of precepts.

In the beginning of the last decade of the past millenium, Satō (1991) focussed on the continuity of Kūkai’s precepts view in the esoteric lineage, while Murakami (1993) addressed Kūkai’s interpretation and his use of different terms for the ‘*samaya* precepts’, as well as the meaning of the *sanmaiya-kai* in Kūkai’s SKJ in relation to the *Bodhicittaśāstra* (cf. supra).

The most prominent specialist with regard to the present subject, however, is Tomabechi Sei’ichi (currently full professor in the Department of Buddhist Studies at Taishō University, Tōkyō). He published on the HSBK already in 1979, and the core of his research amounts to the text’s relation to two other text, namely the *Document on Conferring the Precepts on Arousing Bodhicitta*, i.e. the intent to attain awakening (授発菩提心戒文 Jap. *Ju hōtsu bodaishin kaimon*; further: JHBK) and the *Samaya Precept for the Abhiṣeka* (灌頂三昧耶戒 Jap. *Kanjō sanmaiya-kai*; further: KSK)\textsuperscript{36}

Publishing various articles on related issues, he proved himself a remarkably productive and unprecedented HSBK-scholar: Tomabechi (1988), for instance, classifies lineages according to their use of ritual manuals for the *samaya* precepts conferral ceremony, while his first 1990 article recognized the deficiencies of former studies (esp. the lack of accurate bibliographical references) and (re-)addressed the problematic division between exoteric and esoteric precepts, as well as questions concerning the interpretation and function of the *samaya* precepts according to Kūkai’s writings, alongside the latter’s precepts view. His other 1990 essays recalled the ritual procedure of the HSBK, and attempted to visually represent the formation process of the ‘*samaya* precepts’ in diagram form.

\textsuperscript{35} Text translated by Grapard (2000). For further information, see Chapter IV below.

\textsuperscript{36} For more information, see chapter IV: 73ff. below.
In 1991, he mainly investigated manuscripts of texts that relate to the HSBK, i.e. the *Samaya Precepts Ritual* (三昧耶戒儀 Jap. Sanmaiya-kai-gi) in the collection of the Ishiyamadera (石山寺) at Ōtsu in Shiga Prefecture (1991a), and the *Ritual on Authorizing the Samaya Precepts* (許可三昧耶戒作法 Jap. Kyoka sanmaiya-kai sahō) as well as the *Ritual Procedure for Admission* (許可作法次第 Jap. Kyoka sahō shidai, cf. Tomabechi 1991b), both part of the Kōzanji (高山寺, var. 梅尾山寺 Jap. Toga-no-oderā) collection in Kyōto. In his 1992 article, he addressed the major textual sources for so-called “precepts of the wisdom that is unimpeded with regard to the three periods” (三世無障礙智戒 Jap. sanze mushō gechi kai), one of the MVS designations of the “samaya precepts”. A publication that was distributed over two journals followed in 2005. The first (2005a), is aimed at answering the question how *samaya* precepts conferral ceremonies were performed in Japanese *mantrayāna* given the difficulties in deciding between such different interpretations as those given in the HSBK and KSK. Based on a wide variety of textual sources, it categorizes ritual procedures and ordination manuals according to Shingon subschool affiliation. His *Study of Heian Period Shingon Mikkyō* (平安期真言密教の研究 Jap. Heianki Shingon Mikkyō no kenkyū), appeared in 2008, but—as far as our topic is concerned— it largely encompasses his previous articles.

In sum, the available research is largely the work of Japanese scholars affiliated to Buddhist Universities. Amongst them, especially Tomabechi has argued Kūkai cannot be considered the genuine author of the HSBK, mostly because of its relation with principally two other texts: the first being either Kūkai’s own work, or of unknown authorship (JHBK), and the second (KSK) being allegedly composed by Ennin (圓仁, 794–864). Even though these texts and their relations will be further exemplified below (cf. chapter IV: 72ff.), when reading the HSBK within the framework of Kūkai’s precepts view—which at this point has not yet been done—there are many indications that adduce arguments in support of the hypothesis that it may have been precisely the opposite.

That is, at least in my opinion, it is highly likely that—in the same line of discussion on the *Hizōki*—the JHBK and KSK were separate texts that actually comprise Kūkai’s notes of oral instructions he received from Huiguō during his stay in China between 804-806. Upon his return to Japan these were later combined into one ritual manual, the HSBK, which has always circulated together with his SKJ, being its “preface” that contains the sprouts for the JJSR, his *magnum opus* compiled on imperial command around 830. Moreover, as already
suggested by e.g. Yamasaki (1967), the close relation of the HSBK with texts of which the authenticity has not been questioned, such as the SKJ, Kōnin and Heizei, may indicate that the former has been composed at the same time when Kukai wrote the latter texts, i.e. ca. 822. Of course, he incorporated the guidelines of other guidebooks (such as the MSZ and JBKG) into the HSBK ritual manual, but—as for instance Abe (1999) has shown—exactly this strategy was crucial in his construction of esoteric Buddhist discourse.

Scope

There is no doubt that by establishing the “samaya precepts” as the code for the esoteric initiation, Kūkai attempted to find a balance between the rectification and innovation of the orthodox Buddhist ordination procedures. In other words, his investment of the “samaya code” triggered a process of esotericization within contemporary ordination rituals, without radically demising them. Kūkai’s interpretation of the concept of ‘samaya’, and its implementation in the ordination system, therefore, forms an ideal foundation for any further investigation of the esotericization of Buddhism in Japan.

Although in a Buddhist context, this ‘esotericization’ can be described as “the process of increasing reception of occult ideas and magical practices,” it may also refer to the increasing isolation of its philosophy as the result of creating a terminology that is related to the exclusiveness of its intellectual and ritual domain. In contrast to the widely circulating assumption that an increasing degree of ‘esotericization’ would logically be inversely proportional to the degree of accessibility outsiders have to the tradition, an analytic reading of its texts offers insights into how esotericism as such is constructed and maintains itself. That is, texts offer access to the rationalization of so-called ‘strategies of esotericization’, i.e. “how do texts attain the status of esoteric teachings, and which role do they play in the maintenance, shaping, and legitimizing of cultural traditions”.

Later interpretations of, and polemics around Kūkai’s vision on the precepts have induced both very liberal and loose observance of ordination regulations –this is apparent, for instance, in the work of Annen (安然，841-889)– as well as conservative so-called ‘precepts

37 This has been suggested in Abe 1999: 53, and will further be substantiated in the below chapters.
38 This was the reaction of Saichô, cf. infra: chapter 2, s.v. bodhisattva-monks.
39 Strong 1979: 76.
40 Cook 1982: 534.
42 See Groner 1990.
restoration movements’ (戒律復興運動 Jap. kairitsu fukō undō) that would ultimately result in apologetic debates that catalyzed the establishment of Shingon subdivisions and branches (e.g. Kōya Shingon), and Shingon-affiliated schools, such as the Shingon Ritsu school (真言律宗 Jap. Shingon Risshū) during the Kamakura period (1185-1333).\footnote{On Shingon Ritsu, see: Pinte K. 2011b.}

The “samaya precepts” that were institutionalized by Kūkai, and triggered a mechanism of esotericization in the regulations for the ordination of priests in Shingon Risshū, have, in turn, influenced the manner of ordaining monks in other denominations, such as Zen, Tendai, and Jōdō Shinshū. They also influenced Jōgon (cf. supra), who promulgated that the “samaya precepts” are all-encompassing, i.e. they contain all precepts, both the exoteric and esoteric ones, as a result of which from 1776 onward, there is evidence that they were used no longer as a complement to, but instead of the monastic precepts of the vinaya.\footnote{Cf. Ueda R. 1967. On vinaya, see chapter II below, and chapter IV: passim.} Until today, they have kept playing a crucial role in the esoteric consecration ritual, in which they became a standard code for an increasing number of practitioners, not only in Japan, but also in the United States, and Europe.

As already briefly pointed out above, the HSBK is a ritual text that has been attributed to Kūkai, and is thus representative for the institutionalization period of esoteric Buddhism in Japan. Even though there are already some Japanese studies on this text, these are generally written by scholar-monks affiliated to private Buddhist Universities, whose vast knowledge of texts often results in a problematic verifiability of the data given in their work. A fully annotated translation of the HSBK, however, is still lacking, and more importantly, the HSBK has not yet been disclosed to the non-Japanese versed public.

Together with the above introduction (chapter I), this dissertation, therefore, comprises five chapters. The overall aim is to disclose the HSBK in two ways, the first being the presentation of its English translation, the first fully annotated one in any language (chapter III). Secondly, in reconsidering the text’s authenticity, the core of this text expounding the esoteric precepts is interpreted in the context of Shingon (chapter IV). This volume is rounded up with a general conclusion that summarizes my findings and future research plans (chapter V) and a postscript. However, first and foremost, the following paragraphs (chapter II) offer the reader a concise historical outline of the pre-Kūkai precept standards and introduces some basic concepts.
II. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Before addressing the main research theme that has been introduced in the preceding paragraphs, the reader should be offered an idea of the historical and religious background against which the “samaya precepts” were institutionalized in Japan. The present chapter, therefore, is a concise overview of the main turning points regarding the Japanese Buddhist community (僧伽 Jap. sōgya, transliterating Skt. samgha). It highlights some core concepts regarding the Buddhist precepts and their conferral in Japan up to Kūkai’s time, which are essential to understand their interpretation in the HSBK (cf. chapters III and IV below). In a nutshell, it briefly answers such preliminary questions as: How was the Buddhist community in Japan organized before Kūkai’s time? What was the pre-Heian period standard ordination procedure? What kind of precepts were conferred, and which texts were legitimizing this? What was the relationship between Buddhism and the state? Etc.

Establishing the samgha

Buddhism was officially introduced to Japan around 538, but undoubtedly Chinese practitioners, who were mainly living in Korean communities, had actually entered much earlier on a private basis. At the time, the imperial court was divided in three main factions: while the Soga (蘇我) family favoured Buddhism, both the Mononobe (蘇我) and Nakatomi (中臣) clans were against any religious innovation threatening indigenous Shintō (神道) patron deity (氏神 Jap. ujigami) beliefs.

Because the pro-Buddhist faction was eager to find a legitimate foundation on which to base its attempt of implementing Buddhism as the official state religion, there was an apparent need to establish a native Japanese monastic community, in which monks and nuns had

---

45 Between the 4th and 7th century, the Korean peninsula was divided in three kingdoms, of which Paekche (百済 Jap. Kudara) occupied the south-western tip, cf. Vandenberghe 2007: 277. It was Syŏngmyŏng, the then king of Paekche who called upon the support of Yamato in his military conflict with the neighboring state Silla (新羅 Jap. Shiragi), and sent an envoy bearing a gilded Buddhist statue and scriptures to the Japanese court. The traditional date for this event, which is regarded as the official introduction of Buddhism in Japan, is 552, but 538 is the currently accepted date, cf. Tamura 2000: 16; Eliot 2005: 197; Kamstra 1967: 241-245, and 265-283; Bingenheimer 2001: 19ff. For sources that suggest 522 as the beginning of Japanese Buddhism, cf. Kamstra 1967: 253-258.

received the precepts according to the procedures of the continental lineages.\textsuperscript{47} However, at the time there was no vinaya (cf. infra) in Japan, and a quorum of fully ordained monastics, who traditionally must preside over the officiating ceremony for it being legitimate, were still lacking.

Thus, the court started to send religious practitioners, and in first instance women,\textsuperscript{48} to the continent to improve their understanding of Buddhist doctrine and to train in accordance with the prescriptions in Buddhist monastic disciplinary codes. This is evident from the records of the Annals of Japan (日本書紀, Jap. Nihon Shoki; var. 日本紀, Jap. Nihongi),\textsuperscript{49} and those in the Outline of the Vinaya School (律宗綱要, Jap. Risshū kōyō),\textsuperscript{50} that trace the account on the origins of the Japanese samgha back to the early spring of 588, when Shimame (嶋女), Toyome (豊女), and Ishime (石女), three Japanese maidens of the then ruling Soga clan were

\textsuperscript{47} Hirakawa 1992: 150.

\textsuperscript{48} Although originally embracing the transcendent equality of men and women, on its journey beginning in the 5th century BCE from India through the deserts of Central Asia and the mountains of China, travelling through the Korean peninsula and crossing the sea to arrive in the 6th century CE in Japan, Buddhism had already assimilated a large number of doctrines that were dominating the patriarchal societies it encountered, such as Brahmanism and Confucianism, in which women were considered as the ‘second’ or ‘inferior sex’. Nevertheless, when encountering the indigenous animistic Shintō culture in Japan, where much importance was attached to the shamanistic power believed to be intrinsic to female nature, Buddhism seems to have been initially employed in Japan with its original policy of –at least a philosophical– gender equality intact. Beginning in the Nara period (710-784/94), androcentric Confucian standards entered Japanese society, and the important role that female shamans (巫女, also 神子 Jap. miko) had in political life of ancient times was gradually lost after the introduction of Chinese government structures, and from the Heian period (794-1185) onward, male ascetics who sojourned in secluded mountains took over the religious functions previously associated with female shamans. See e.g. Bodiford 1993: 92. Boyle and Sheen 1997: 217. The increasingly paternalistic society considered women more and more to be impure creatures that by nature distract and therefore hinder men, and so also monks, in their spiritual practice. Thus, from the 9th century onward, the Tendai and Shingon sects not only prohibited female ordination, but also banned them from their mountain temple precincts. See e.g. Boyle and Sheen 1997: 217 and Groner 1984: 159. However, the major shift away from traditional continental ordination practice by Saichō (767–822), who argued that the so-called bodhisattva precepts sufficed to enter priesthood (cf. infra, s.v. bodhisattva-monks), paved the way for women to re-enter the Buddhist clergy in later centuries. With the development of new schools of thought during the Kamakura period (1186/92-1333), all of which essentially were offshoots from Saichō’s Tendai, systematized by scholars such as Hōnen (法然, 1133-1212) and Nichiren (日蓮, 1222-1282) who founded the Jōdo (浄土) and Nichiren sects respectively, the creed that all people have an innate Buddha nature and are therefore inherently capable of attaining enlightenment in their current form and present lifetime, regardless of their sex, re-acknowledged women as legitimate candidates for Buddhist liberation. At present, Kōyasan Shingon Kongōbuji headquarters function as the headquarters of over 4,000 temples in Japan, and there are three schools for monks and nuns. Historically speaking, for over 1,000 years, women were prohibited to enter Kōyasan because this was a monastery for men. There was a monastery for women in Kudoyana, on the foot of Mt. Kōya. The prohibition was lifted in 1872, but in modern-day Japan, women who wish to become nuns are still initiated in the bodhisattva precepts without any preliminary ordination based on the prātimoksa. (These terms are further explained below).

\textsuperscript{49} Composed in 720 by Toneri Shinnō (舎人親王), these cover the history of early Japan until 697. For a list of Western language translations, see Hankó 2003: 383.

\textsuperscript{50} T. LXXIV, no. 2348, probably the most important work written by Gyōnen (凝然, 1240-1321). For an English translation, see Pruden 1995; for a partial German translation, see: Hankó 2003: 328-334. For a study on Gyōnen, cf. Blum 2002.
sent to the Korean kingdom of Paekche in search for the Law. \(^{51}\) After a successful period of training, they returned to Japan in 590 as fully ordained nuns, which could be suggested by their respective names \(^{52}\) Zenshin-ni (善信尼), \(^{53}\) Zenzō-ni (禅蔵尼), \(^{54}\) and Ezen-ni (惠善尼) \(^{55}\), they heard of six Korean resident monks who after their arrival in Yamato—as Japan was then called—had begun the construction works of the Hōkōji (法興寺; var. 飛鳥寺 Asukadera), the first Buddhist temple on the Japanese archipelago, which formed the foundation on which to build out the Buddhist community. \(^{56}\)

Even though this did not yet mean that they were able to establish a rightful samgha, their ordination formed a precedent for other Buddhists to take tonsure. \(^{57}\) From the turn of the 7th century on, the Korean immigrants in Japan established the first Buddhist monastic community on the Japanese archipelago. \(^{58}\)

**Self-ordinations**

Notwithstanding the fact that during the Asuka (飛鳥) period (550-710) several foreign fully-fledged monastics travelled to Japan, they were not able to confer a legitimate vinaya ordination, for which traditionally a commission of ten—and in remote areas five—monks, three learning masters, and seven, or exceptionally two, witnesses was required. \(^{59}\) Although very little is known about the first Japanese Buddhist communities, hieratical officiates seem to have been regulated by the state and primarily conducted for its welfare. The procedure had

---


\(^{52}\) In this context, the suffix -ni functions as a religious label that refers to 比丘尼 (Jap. bikuni), or the Japanese equivalent of the Sanskrit word for a full-fledged Buddhist nun, Skt. bhikṣunī. When used as a noun, the suffix -ni is pronounced as ama, though the latter was often used with respect to women who had simply decided to retire from public life. Thus the term ama does not always necessarily apply to an officially ordained female, and could moreover, refer to any rank within the female monastic order, as where it was used to distinguish female monastics from ubai or Buddhist laywomen (cf. Skt. upāsaka). Arai 1999: 33.

\(^{53}\) According to Tamura (2000: 16), Zenshin “took the Buddhist vows in 584 […] and was the first person to be ordained in Japan”. His source, however, is the Fusō ryakki (扶桑略記), or the Abridged Annals of Japan, a 12th century work compiled by the Tendai monk Kōen (隆圓, 1119-1169), master to Hōnen’s (法然, 1133-1212), the founder of the Jōdo (浄土) or Japanese Pure Land School.

\(^{54}\) Hirakawa reads “Zenzo” instead of Zenzō, Hirakawa 1992: 150. The renderings given here, however, are based on e.g. Kamstra 1967: 249.


\(^{58}\) Kamstra 1967: 298-300.

\(^{59}\) The three masters are a preceptor, a professor, and an instructor, or master of liturgy, cf. n. 352 infra. Also see: Hankó 2003: 333, n. 786, and 329-333, where he points out that in some cases two witnesses could suffice. On this requirement, see also Heirman 2011: 610-611.
more to do, however, with evaluating a candidate’s diligence in chanting sūtras or performing nation-protection ceremonies, rather than with his/her vowing to uphold a certain set of disciplinary precepts.⁶⁰

These desperate straits, created both by the insufficient number of ordained members in the then still very small officially sanctioned Buddhist community, and the absence of thoroughly trained vinaya masters who could legitimize the ordinations they potentially conferred by means of disciplinary texts from the lawful scriptural lineage, drove the premature Japanese Buddhist clergy to the practice of self-ordination (自誓受戒 Jap. jisei jukai, lit. ‘pledging to uphold the precepts of one’s own accord’).⁶¹ This Chinese mahāyāna practice, was now conducted aside from the official sacerdotal examination system by priests(ses), who became known as “monastics who liberated themselves” (私度僧, Jap. jido sō).⁶²

This custom was justified, amongst others,⁶³ by the prescriptions expounded in the Divination Sūtra (占察經, Jap. Sensatsugyō; Chin. Chanzhajing),⁶⁴ presented as the Chinese translation of an Indian original by a certain Bodhidīpa during the Sui dynasty (581-618),⁶⁵ but is actually an apocryphon.⁶⁶ A crucial passage in this text starts with: “Taking [the precepts] by vowing [to uphold them] of your own accord, is also being granted the precepts [i.e. being ordained],”⁶⁷ adding that if one is unable to be ordained before the traditionally required quorum of full-fledged monastics, self-ordination before a Buddha statue is valid, even without the presence of the aforementioned masters and witnesses.

Nevertheless, by 624 –i.e. about thirty-five years after the first nuns were ordained– there is evidence that already 1,400 people who called themselves Buddhist monastics in Japan.⁶⁸ And five decades later, in 674, only the number of female monastics is said to have grown to approximately 2,400.⁶⁹

---

⁶⁰ Pinte 2011b: 845.
⁶¹ BGD: 556a; DCBT: 219; and Hankó 2003: 332-333 for specific evidence.
⁶² Groner 1984b: 5-6.
⁶³ For more information, see: Groner 2012: 221-222.
⁶⁶ See: BKD VI: 329b; and Hankó 2003: 333.
⁶⁷ T. XVII, no. 839: 904c12: 自受而亦得戒.
⁶⁸ Kamstra 1967: 315, pointing out that 41% of them were nuns.
⁶⁹ Arai 1999: 33-34.
**State sponsorship**

In the following decades, the number of monastics further increased under the sponsorship of such renowned figures as Shōtoku Taishi (聖徳太子, 574-622), who –amongst many other things– is attributed with having built seven temples, five being convents (尼寺 Jap. *amadera*), of which the Chūgūji (中宮寺) still stands in Nara today as a part of the Hōryūji (法隆寺).⁷⁰ However, since the Taika reforms (大化改新 Jap. *Taika kaishin*) of 646, which implied an acceleration and intensification of the influx of Confucian values that promoted patriarchy, the religious organizations became increasingly male dominated. Although knowledge of Confucianism had reached the Japanese islands well over a century before the first Buddhist *sūtras* were presented to the court, it was only in the 7th century that Confucianism first became institutionalized, in many ways taking precedence over Buddhism.⁷¹ Nevertheless, the fact that women were *treated* as inferior does not mean that actually they *were* inferior.⁷²

During the early Nara 奈良 period (710-784) most of the Buddhist doctrines were introduced into Japan directly from China.⁷³ A number of empresses and imperial consorts at the Nara court profoundly shaped the contours of Buddhism, which from that time on dominated life in ancient Japan. So was it due to the urging of empress Kōmyō (光明, 701-760)⁷⁴, for example, that emperor Shōmu (聖武, 701-756, r. 724-749) issued the 741 edict to establish national temples in each province for monks (国分寺 Jap. *kokubunji*) and nuns (国分尼寺 Jap. *kokubun-niji*), with the Tōdaiji (東大寺) in Nara as the head temple.⁷⁵ Although all provincial temples were to assist in insuring the welfare of the Japanese empire, while monks prayed for protection of the nation, nuns had the distinct responsibility both for the absolution of sins for the country as well as the purification of the nation.⁷⁶ These temples received economic support from the government, so it was no longer *per se* necessary for the monastics to gather alms.⁷⁷

---

⁷¹ Morris 1983: 108
⁷² Arai 1999: 35.
⁷³ Hirakawa 1992: 147.
⁷⁴ Also: Fujiwara no Asukabe-hime (藤原 安宿媛), she was tonsured at the ordination platform of Tōdaiji, Arai 1999: 35.
⁷⁵ Eliot 2005: 221. Some sources state that the nunneries were presided over by the Hokkeji. Arai 1999: 34.
⁷⁶ Ibid.: 34.
⁷⁷ Ibid.: 35.
**Introduction of the vinaya**

When speaking of Buddhist “precepts”, however, the first ideas that come to mind are issues related to *vinaya*. A lot of scholarly work has been invested in studying the Buddhist disciplinary codes in India, China, and Tibet, but due to widespread misconceptions surrounding phenomena such as clerical marriage, the question of the historical *vinaya* standards in Japan have often been disregarded by Western language scholarship.

Although there is very little known about the precept standards of the very early Buddhist community in Japan, the first Japanese monastics seem to have been largely dependent on the *vinaya* expertise of Korean immigrant monks. The precise conditions or textual basis for the ordination procedures and the content of the precepts that were then conferred, however, remain to be examined, ideally in an interdisciplinary project.

It remains a fact, though, that since the beginning of the 8th century, the *Dharmaguptakavinaya* (四分律 Jap. Shibunritsu further: SBR) was imposed by imperial decree as the exclusive scriptural authority for monastic ordinations in China. Therefore, it is not surprising that it was precisely this ecclesiastic codex which in 754 was the first *vinaya* to be transmitted to Japan. The person who has been credited for this accomplishment was *vinaya* master (Jap. risshi 律師) Jianzhen (Jap. Ganjin 廉真; var. 鑑真, 688-763), the celebrated third patriarch of the Nanshanlü (南山律) school, who accepted the request of the Japanese court asking for Chinese masters to come to Japan and perform legitimate ordinations according to the SBR. He introduced the SBR interpretation of Daoxuan (道宣, 596-667), and conferred the “full precepts” (具足戒, Jap. gusoku kai) of the continental tradition upon Japanese priests, who renounced their previous “unorthodox” initiations (cf. supra), and thus became the first full-fledged formally and properly ordained monastics on Japanese soil.

---

78 For an annotated bibliography on *vinaya*, see: Pinte K. 2009c.
79 See e.g. Jaffe 2001.
80 One of the few exceptions is Groner 1990.
81 i.e. between 705-710, cf. Heirman 2009: 2.
82 Chin. *Sifenlü* is the *Vinaya in Four Parts* that was translated between 410-412 in Chang’an by Buddhayaśas and Zhu Fonian, cf. T. XXII, no. 1428.
84 Although 753 was the year in which Jianzhen arrived in Kagoshima, the date given here is that of his arrival in the capital, cf. Ueda T. 1939: 120; Hankō 2003: 346. He had made several previous attempts to sail to Japan, but all were unsuccessful, see: ibid.: 345-347. On Jianzhen, see: Hankō 2003: 341-352.
85 南山律宗 Jap. Nanzan Risshū, named after the Zhongnanshan 终南山 mountains in southern Shaanxi province, see: ibid.: 13-14, n. 39-40, and 357-358 for genealogical tables.
86 Pinte 2011b: 845.
Ordination Platforms

In 755, the year following his arrival in Heijōkyō (平城京), as the capital of the Nara period was called, Jianzhen established the Ordination Platform Hall (戒壇院 Kaidan’in; var. 戒壇 堂 Kaidan-dō) at Tōdaiji (東大寺) in Nara, over which he presided as abbot and founder of the Japanese Vinaya school (Risshū 律宗). This became the center for all official ordinations, and was the first permanent ordination platform on Japanese soil, were ordinations were performed in accordance to the continental SBR tradition, implying that Japanese monks had to uphold 250 precepts, nuns abide by no less than 348 rules. In the same year, about four-hundred new ordinands, including women, took tonsure and others whose previous admission as monks or nuns was considered to be invalid, were re-ordained.

For six years the Tōdaiji Kaidan’in remained the only permanent ordination platform on Japanese soil, but it became known as the ‘central platform’ (中央戒壇, Jap. chūō kaidan) in 761, when empress Kōken (孝謙, r. 749-758, a.k.a. Shōtoku 称徳, r. 764-770) ordered the construction of two additional precept platforms: one at Yakushiji (薬師寺) in Shimotsuke (下野, in present 栃木県 Tochigi-ken), which became the ‘eastern platform’ (東戒壇, Jap. tōkaidan), and the other at Kannonji (観音寺) in Chikuzen (筑前, nowadays in 福岡県 Fukuoka-ken on Kyūshū 九州), being the ‘western platform’ (西戒壇, Jap. saikaidan).

Bodhisattva vows

Just as in China, where Mahāyanists took an additional set of precepts as a supplement to the SBR, however, also conferred as a “separate ordination” (別受 Jap. betsuju), the bodhisattva-śīla (菩薩戒 Jap. bosatsu-kai). These comprised the ‘ten grave and forty-eight minor commandments’ as espoused in the Brahmā Net Sūtra (梵網經, Chin. Fanwangjing; Jap. Bonmōkyō; further: BMK), which for more than thousand years had been

---

87 For a study, see: Hankó 2003. From 759 onwards, however, the Risshū headquarters were shifted to Tōshōdaiji (唐招提寺), cf. Ueda T. 1939: 120; Hankó 2003: 13-14, n. 39-40. For a brief discussion of the great temples of the state (大寺 daijī), see: Abe 1999: 34-35.
88 Abe 1999: 47.
91 Heirman 2007: 175, n. 51.
widely considered an authentic Chinese translation of an Indian original by Kumārajīva (344-413), but is now identified as an early 5th century Chinese forgery. By the end of the 5th century, the second fascicle of the BMK circulated as a so-called bodhisattva-prātimokṣa (菩萨戒本, Jap. bosatsu kaihon; Chin. pusa jieben), which formed the basis for the mahāyānist code in East Asia. Even though the words ‘mahāyāna’ and bodhisattvayāna, which are synonymous, only emerged in 6th century India, already from the 4th century onwards, practitioners of Buddhism who espoused the bodhisattva ideal had been both ordained (Skt. sākya-bhikṣus or -bhikṣunīs) and lay members (Skt. paramāpāsakas or -upāsikās) of the community. This is not surprising, for being a mahāyānist, implies that one is a bodhisattva, and both terms denote a religious condition, instead of a social role.

The list of precepts making up the disciplinary code for ordained monastics, the prātimokṣa, has also been called the “moral code of restraint” (Skt. samvara-śīla), but while this is “negative, a catalogue of things one undertakes not to do,” a bodhisattva is “not to rest content with being moral in this negative sense, but must also do positively moral things,” being called Skt. kuśala-dharma-samgrāhakam śīlaṃ, which—in the words of Richard Gombrich—is “whatever good, beyond the moral code of restraint, one accumulates with body or voice towards the great Enlightenment.” In other words, “it is what one does in addition to, not instead of, observing the prātimokṣa”.

This difference between a spiritual state and social status logically implies that ‘morality’ (Skt. śīla) is divergent from ‘discipline’ (Skt. vinaya), the former being rendered as 戒 (Jap. kai) and the latter as 律 (Jap. ritsu). When put together, these merge to 戒律 (Jap. kairitsu), the most common term used in Japanese studies when referring to the Buddhist precepts as a whole, thus both to ‘bodhisattva morality’ and ‘monastic discipline’.


95 On the term bodhisattva-prātimokṣa, see: Malalasekera 1972: 240-246.

96 Gombrich 1998: 47.


98 These are recited every fortnight in the posadha ceremony. On prātimokṣa, see e.g. Heirman 2011: 614.


100 For further explanation, see chapter IV below.
Threefold pure precepts

Interestingly, as the ‘full precepts’ (Skt. upasampadā; 具足戒 Jap. gusoku-kai)\(^{101}\) of the prātimokṣa are part of the so-called “threelfold” or lit. “three embracing categories of pure precepts” (三聚淨戒 Jap. sanju jōkai; var. sanshu jōkai),\(^ {102}\) the Divination Sūtra (cf. supra) also asserts that in receiving the latter, one also abides by the former set.\(^ {103}\)

First expounded in the Daśabhūmikāsūtra-śāstra,\(^ {104}\) said to have been composed by Vasubandu in the 4\(^{th}\) century, and outlined also in the fourth chapter of the Bodhisattvabhūmisūtra\(^ {105}\) translated between 414-426 by Dharmakṣema (385-433),\(^ {106}\) the first class of these ‘three groups of pure precepts’ indeed encompasses the so-called “precepts on morality and disciple” (撮律儀戒 Jap. shō ritsugi kai).\(^ {107}\)

This category, in turn, consists of two components: the prātimokṣa including behavioural prescriptions for all seven groups of the Buddhist community,\(^ {108}\) and the bodhisattvaśīla which mahāyāna practitioners were obliged to uphold, regardless of being monastic or layman (cf. infra). Aside from this, the mahāyāna Buddhists in Japan were also required to uphold the second and third categories of pure precepts, namely the “precepts for doing good deeds” (撮善法戒, Jap. shō zenhō kai), and the “precepts of benefiting all sentient beings” (Jap. 攝眾生戒 Jap. shō shujō kai).\(^ {109}\)

State controlled Buddhism

Opposing demeanours toward the new ‘barbaric religion’, as Buddhism was first perceived as within court circles following its introduction, have, however, restrained Buddhism for several decades to make headway. This culminated in the promulgation of an edict by empress Suiko (推古, r. 593-628) in the spring of 624, which instituted a board of clerical

\(^{101}\) This denotes the full set of the 250 precepts of the SBR, cf. supra.
\(^{103}\) T. XVII, no. 839: 904c12-20.
\(^{104}\)十地經論 Jap. Jūjikyōron. Translated into Chinese in 12 fasc. by Bodhirūci (exact date unknown) and others in the early sixth century, i.e. T. XXVI, no. 1522.
\(^{105}\)菩薩地持経 Jap. Bosatsujihikyō, i.e. T. XXX, no. 1581. Also see chapter IV: 86.
\(^{106}\) Hankō 2003: 106.
\(^{107}\) See: BGD: 1419, s.v. ritsuigikai.
\(^{108}\) These are: bhikṣus, bhikṣunīs, śrāmaṇeras, śrāmaṇerikās, śikṣamānas, upāsakas, and upāsikās. That is, monks, nuns, male novices, female novices, aspirant-nuns, devout laymen and laywomen respectively.
\(^{109}\) These categories are further discussed in chapter III, n. 429-432; For the esotericization of this category, also see chapter IV below.
administrators (僧剛 Jap. sōgō; var. 僧官 Jap. sōkan), lit. ‘samgha officials’, being high-ranked ‘monk-administrators’, who were entrusted with the inspection and supervision of the self-ordained Buddhist community. Originally, there were only three of these official posts: ‘Superintendent-monk’ (僧正 Jap. sōjō), ‘Director of Monks’ (僧都 Jap. sōzu), and ‘Chief of Buddhist Doctrine’ (Jap. 法頭 hōzu), but in the course of time these offices were widened or re-named, such as the latter post which would later be replaced by ‘Master of Discipline’ (律師 Jap. risshi).

However, instead of being preoccupied with the resolution of the by then already infamous immoral standards of monks and nuns, let alone with the implementation of a solid ordination system, the sōgō was designed as a means of state control. It was a useful apparatus for the government to screen and measure the growing number of Buddhist practitioners amongst the populace, which is evident, for instance, from the census held in autumn of the same year. Although the order kept growing steadily, and the lavish state patronage brought prosperity to the Buddhist order, this also meant that monks and nuns came under strict state control, that is, the state no longer functioned “as a patron, but as a religious police”.

Following the precedent in China, part of the court’s ‘penal codes and administrative statutes’ (律令 Jap. ritsuryō) was a set of regulations specifying state standards for the conduct of Buddhist monks and nuns (僧尼令 Jap. sōniryō). The extant version is included in the ritsuryō code of the Yōrō (養老) period (717-723), which was written in 718, but promulgated in 757, indeed, only three years after the introduction of the vinaya (cf. supra), and prohibited monks from staying in convents or nuns to stay in temples. Actually, quite of a few of the vinaya regulations were issued as official regulations, the violation of which was legally punishable. In this respect, we have to point out that throughout Japanese history the temporal political powers have, with varying degrees of success, always tried to use enforcement of the precepts to assert hegemony over the Buddhist community.

---

110 NEBJ: 335b, 339; BGD: 874c.
111 Abe (1999: 30) translates this term as ‘supreme priest’.
112 Bogel (2011: 955, n. 25) translates this as ‘priest general’.
113 Hankó 2003: 334, n. 790. For more information on this classification, see e.g. BGD: 873b; and Abe 1999: 30ff.
114 Cf. p. 15 supra.
115 These are the famous words of Nakamura, quoted in Kitagawa 1966: 34.
116 Jaffe 2001: 10. In all likelihood the sōniryō was already included in the Taihō code of 683, which is now lost. Adolphson 2007:167, n. 4.
117 See e.g. Abe 1999: 34. A discussion of this lies, however, beyond the scope of the present volume.
**Bodhisattva-monks**

Aside from the difficulties regarding the establishment of Tendai and what would in later times become known as the Shingon school, and their initially difficult relation to the so-called “six Nara schools” (南都六宗 Jap. *nanto rokushū*, lit. ‘six schools of the southern capital’)\(^{118}\) that had by that time developed, the government’s approach of the Buddhist community did not change drastically. That is, soon after their institutionalization in the middle of the 8th century, ordinations –and especially the adherence to the precepts– became purely *pro forma*,\(^ {119}\) for the on Chinese orthodoxy mirrored twofold ordination structure of separate SBR and BMK ordinations appears to have remained the standard system, at least until 822.

Despite the united opposition of the established monastic community, in that year, just some days after the death of Saichō (最澄, 767–822), the contemporary Tendai patriarch,\(^ {120}\) the court of emperor Saga (嵯峨, r. 809-823) approved the petition for Tendai (天台) priests to be legally permitted to ordain so-called ‘mahāyāna bodhisattva monks’ (大乘菩薩僧 Jap. *daijō bosatsu-sō*). Its procedure was exclusively based on the ‘perfect and sudden mahāyāna precepts’ (大乗圓頓戒, Jap. *daijō endonkai*) of the BMK, and was performed on a new Tendai-only precepts platform at Enryakuji (延暦寺) on Mt. Hiei (比叡).

Thus, within a century after the introduction of the *vinaya* into Japan, Tendai priests abandoned the continental ordination procedure and rejected the Tōdaiji ordination as *conditio sine qua non* to enter the monastic order.

---

\(^{118}\) Given that these are not directly related to the main topic under consideration, the reader is referred to Groner 1984 and Abe 1999 for the establishment of the Tendai and Shingon schools respectively, where also the bibliographies of Saichō and Kūkai are treated in extenso. An interesting table on major historical events regarding the relation between Saichō and Kūkai is in Watanabe 1986: 411-418. On Kūkai and Nara Buddhism, see e.g. Abe 1999: 34ff. For a concise survey of Japanese Buddhism during the Asuka and Nara period, see: Bingenheimer 2001: 48-62.


\(^{120}\) Posthumously: Dengyō Daishi (伝教大師)). The most important study in English on Saichō and the establishment of Tendai is Groner 1984. Abe 1995 is one of the few English studies on Kūkai’s relationship to Saichō (最澄, 767-822). A useful table of their contacts is in Watanabe 1986: 411-418. Tendai is the Japanese adaptation of Chinese Tiantai, a form of Buddhism of which the philosophical paradigm is centered on the *Lotus Sūtra* (Skt. *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*; Jap. Myōhō-renge-kyō 妙法蓮華経, cf. e.g. T. IX no. 262), and its esoteric line of approach is also referred to as Taimitsu (台密), whereas Shingon is called Tōmitsu (東密), the latter being a reference to Tōji (東寺), the temple where Kūkai was assigned as manager in 823, cf. Abe 1999: 37.

Also in 822, Kūkai, on the other hand, received imperial consent to erect an Abhiṣeka Hall (灌頂堂 Jap. Kanjōdō, also 真言院 Jap. Shingon’in) in a privileged position directly in front of the Great Buddha Hall (大仏殿 Jap. Daibutsuden) at the Tōdaiji precincts. Kūkai also had a consecration hall built at Takaosanji (高雄山寺, later renamed as Jingōji 神護寺) in 824, and also made plans for the erection of one at Tōji (東寺) in Kyōto, but the Tōdaiji Abhiṣeka Hall was the first state-approved Shingon initiation site.

Although Tōdaiji did not become a Shingon center, the hall’s foundation strengthened Kūkai’s alliance with, and induced serious interest of, the Nara samgha – this is evident, for instance, in Kūkai’s appointment as junior Director of Monks in 824 – not in the least because the consecrations inferred there included a new ritual, in which the aforementioned “samaya”, or “esoteric precepts” were conferred. Because strict observance of the precepts was considered essential to the efficacy of ecclesiastical services for the state and, perhaps even more important, the authority of the Sōgō derived from the successful implementation of the precepts, the management of precepts was of vital importance to the clerical establishment.

In contrast to Saichō (cf. supra), Kūkai promoted the introduction of a new set of precepts into the abhiṣeka, designed to meet the specific requirements lined out by the contemporary Nara monastic authorities, showing that Kūkai’s work of disseminating esoteric Buddhism was directly linked to issues surrounding the management of Buddhist precepts. As is apparent from the Kōnin Era Admonishments (弘仁の御遺誡 Jap. Kōnin no Goyuikai, further Kōnin), Kūkai instructed Shingon priests to “strictly adhere to both the exoteric and esoteric precepts (顯密二戒 Jap. ken-mitsu ni kai), and to purify themselves”.

He admonished them: “if you purposely violate [these precepts], you are not a disciple of the Buddha […] nor are you my disciple,” a watchword that will be further discussed in chapter IV below.

---

123 Abe 1999: 53.
125 Abe 1999: 46.
126 KDZ, II: 861; quoted in Ueda T. 1939: 141. Also see Abe 1999: 48, and chapter IV: 89 below.
Conclusion

The first monastic ordinations with the presupposed legal base of a scripture on discipline, appeared in Japan in the form of self-ordination, and shaped the current of Japanese ordination practice at least until the arrival of Jianzhen. Even when in China there had already been previous cases of self-ordinations, the specific situation of Mahāyānist self-ordination forming mainstream practise in Japan, rather than remaining confined to a periphery phenomenon, without the presence of an underlying legitimate framework based on vinaya lineages, meant a radical shift away from traditional continental ordination practise, and proved self-restrictive for it indirectly triggered the institution of the Sōgō, that put Buddhism under state control.

Thus, since prior to 754, there was no vinaya, and therefore no written pratimokṣa in Japan, it has been suggested that bodhisattvas “who were called bhikṣus […] were in fact pseudo-monks who were not ordained”, at least not according to the traditional upasampadā ordination. And yet, the historical records give evidence for the existence of a clerical community before that time. There is no other course, therefore, than to consider the self-ordained bodhisattva-monk as the keystone of the samgha in Japan, at least until the middle of the 8th century.

This changed only in 755, when the precepts platform was established at Tōdaiji, which for almost seven decades enabled monastics to be legitimately ordained in accordance with the continental SBR tradition. The erection of the Abхиṣeka Hall in 822, however, heralded the dawn of the officially sanctioned esoteric consecration rituals in Japan, being marked by the conferral of “samaya precepts”, the dexterous implementation of which within the already existing ordination framework, will be elucidated in the subsequent pages.

III. ANNOTATED TRANSLATION OF THE HSBK

As pointed out in the introduction (cf. chapter I), the samaya precepts ritual (三昧耶戒法 Jap. sanmaiya-kai-hō; also: 三昧耶戒式 Jap. sanmaiya-kai-shiki) is part both of the ritual procedure for the dharma transmission consecration (傳法灌頂三昧耶戒作法, Jap. denbō kanjō sanmaiya-kai sahō) and the ritual procedure for the karma bond consecration (結縁灌頂三昧耶戒作法 Jap. kechien kanjō sanmaiya-kai sahō).129

The HSBK ritual manual is commonly considered a postscript or supplement to Kūkai’s doctrinal guidebook SKJ,130 and both were compiled around 822.131 The text delineates the protocol for the ceremony of conferring the samaya precepts, which are usually conferred before entering the abhiṣeka platform. This chapter presents the first fully annotated translation of the HSBK. Before doing this, it may prove helpful to briefly call the readers’ attention to the text’s title, and clarify on what edition this translation is based.

**Title**

In the title 祕密三昧耶佛戒儀 (Jap. himitsu sanmaiya bukkaigi; var. ~butsu kaigi or ~butsukai gi), the constituent 祕密 (Jap. himitsu) means “secret”, “hidden”, or “esoteric”, but these connotations do not imply a certain privilege of a certain group, but –as already pointed out in the introduction– denote the teachings’ universal accessiblility, which is conditioned by the initiation from master to disciple.132

The term 儀 (Jap. gi), on the other hand, denotes a ceremony or ritual protocol. Thus, 戒儀 (Jap. kaigi) is a precepts ritual, or a protocol for a ceremony, in which precepts are conferred,

---

129 For more information, see e.g. MD: 835ff. s.v. sanmaiya-kaihō, see also: ibid. 835 s.v. sanmaiya-kai; 836 s.v. sanmaiya-kaijo, sanmaiya-kaidan, sanmaiya-kanjō, etc.
130 Kōda 1993: 381, where the possibility of it being an introductory discussion is also raised. The text is T. LXXVII, no. 2462, written by Kūkai, which according to White 2005: 35, “was originally written as a guidebook,” and was designed as a preface to the HSBK, expounding the “basis for the philosophy treating the various minds through which a practitioner passes as he progresses towards the highests […] ‘Secret, Sublime Mind.’” For a translation, see White 2005: 357-372. For the relation between those texts, see a chapter IV below.
131 Takagi 1993: 347, where also the extant manuscripts of the SKJ are discussed.
132 Also see e.g. BGD: 1128, s.v. himitsu.
i.e. a form of initiation, or ordination ritual. However, 佛戒 (Jap. butsukai/bukkai) can also be seen as a compound, meaning “Buddhist precepts”.

In other words, the title, lit. “esoteric samaya Buddha precepts ritual” could alternatively be read as the “secret ritual on the Buddhist precepts of samaya”, or “ritual on the secret samaya Buddhist precepts”. The latter is analogous with the translation of 秘密三昧耶佛戒 given by White in his reading of the final paragraph of the SKJ:

He who abides in this vehicle will come to know his body-mind by means of this precept, and will teach it to other sentient beings. It is this which is called the secret samaya Buddhist precept.\textsuperscript{133}

However, the title might also be interpreted as “ritual procedure [for the conferral] of the precepts of the secret samaya [with the Cosmic] Buddha”,\textsuperscript{134} for Skt. samaya can denote “unity”, “union”, alongside other meanings such as “pledge”, “seal”, “symbol”, or “mark”.\textsuperscript{135} And moreover, instead of “Buddhist precept”, 佛戒 may also be translated as “morality of Buddhas”, which may result in “ritual [for conferring] the mark of Buddha morality”. Tentatively, but more explanation will be given in the next chapter, HSBK is, nevertheless, translated as Ritual [for conferring] the esoteric precepts being the symbol of Buddhas.

Be that as it may, it is a fact that the HSBK is also known under its abbreviated title Samaya Precepts Ritual (三昧耶戒儀 Jap. Sanmaiyaikaigi).\textsuperscript{136} The title HSBK, however, accords only to a mid-13\textsuperscript{th} century manuscript preserved at Ninnaji (仁和寺)\textsuperscript{137} in Kyōto, and also emerges in Edo period (1603-1867) prints. Earlier manuscripts of the text, however, the oldest extant of which are dated 1094 and 1196, give the title Document for Conferring the Bodhicitta Vows (授菩提心戒文 Jap. Ju bodaishin-kai mon).\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{133} White 2005: 372.
\textsuperscript{134} Also see: MD: 635b: s.v. sammayabukkai, indicating it is synonymous, amongst others, to ‘Buddha precepts’ (佛戒 Jap. bukkai) or ‘Buddha morality’, i.e. Skt. buddha-śīla, and ‘Buddha-nature precepts’ (佛性戒 Jap. busshōkai). For 戒 denoting both ‘precepts’ as ‘morality’, see chapter IV below.
\textsuperscript{135} On the difficulty of translating the term samaya, see Snellgrove 1987: 165-166. A further discussion is in chapter IV below.
\textsuperscript{136} BKD I: 116d.
\textsuperscript{137} The head temple of the Omuro branch (Jap. Omuro-ha 御室派) of Shingon. Completed in 888, and named after the reign of emperor Kōkō (光孝. r. 884-887).
\textsuperscript{138} This is also the case in a document in the hand of a certain abbot Prajña (般若 Jap. Hannya), who in all likelihood was Kanken (観賢, 853-925), cf. Kōda 1993: 381 refers to manuscripts nos. 2, 4-7, and 9 listed in Takagi 1993: 347 ff. The provenance of the HSBK is further discussed in chapter IV below.
Source texts

The text that we have at hand is written in kanbun (漢文), i.e. Classical Chinese that was the contemporary lingua franca of the intellectual and administrative elite. It is collated as no. 2463 in the Continued Section on Various Schools (續諸宗部 Jap. Zoku-shokyō-bu, i.e. vol. 78: pp. 6-9) of the Revised Taishō Tripitaka (大正新脩大藏經 Jap. Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō, abbreviated as T.), 100 vols., edited by Takakusu Junjirō (高楠順次郎) and Watanabe Kaigyoku (渡邊海旭), which was first printed between 1924-1934 in Tōkyō by the Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai (大正一切経刊行会). This print (cf. appendix A.1), however, is based on the edition in Kūkai’s Collected Works (Jap. Kōbō Daishi Zenshū, 弘法大師全集, abbreviated to KDZ), first edited in 1910 by Hase Hōshū (長谷宝秀) of the Sōfū Sen’yō-kai (祖風宣揚会編纂) and published in Tōkyō by Yoshikawa Kōbunkan (吉川弘文館).

Since then, other editions have been published, the most authoritative amongst which was edited at Kōyasan between 1965-1968 by the Association for Editing Studies on Esoteric Buddhist Culture (Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Daishi chosaku kenkyūkai 密教文化研究所弘法大師著作研究会), that published a revised edition (i.e. 定本弘法大師全集 Jap. Teihon Kōbō Daishi Zenshū, further TKDZ) in 1993. The HSBK edition in the TKDZ (vol. 5: 165-176, cf. appendix A.2) is based on a Ninnaji manuscript dated 1250. It is a copy of a lost original in the hand of Hōjo (法助, 1227-1284), the fifth child of Fujiwara Michiie (藤原道家, 1192-1252).

There are two Japanese versions of the kanbun text: the first is a very concisely annotated yomikudashi (読下し) rendering in literary-style Japanese (文語 Jap. bungo) by Okada Keishō (岡田契昌), which can be found in the first volume of the Ritual Section (Jap. Jissō-bu 事相部) of the Japanese Translations of Esoteric Buddhism (國譯密教 Jap. Kokuyaku Mikkyō, pp. 9-21), edited by Tsukamoto Kengyō (塙本賢暁) and first published in Tōkyō by the Kokuyaku Mikkyō Kankō-kai (国譯密教刊行会) in 1921, but reprinted in 1976.

---

139 Cf. T. LXXVIII, no. 2463: 6, n. 6.
140 The HSBK is in vol. 5: 163-176. in Mikkyō bunka kenkyūjo Kōbō Daishi chosaku kenkyūkai (ed.), 1993
141 Kōda 1993: 381.
142 Takagi 1993: 348-349. The dates of Michiie are based on Dykstra 2008: 142, n. 153.
143 i.e. 9 notes on 12 pages of bungo text.
144 Lit. ‘breaking a text down for reading’, is “a strategy for reading Chinese texts by mentally rearranging the word order and adding grammatical particles to fit the syntactical and grammatical patterns of the Japanese language, often with the guidance of diacritics,” but as such is not considered a translation, cf. Haag 2011: 24.

Given that until today, the HSBK has not yet been disclosed to the non-Chinese and/or Japanese versed reader, the paragraphs below present its first annotated translation in any Western language. This English translation is based on the aforementioned print edition in Classical Chinese, and takes into account –and revises where needed– the interpretations of the Japanese versions.

Although the annotation may appear elaborate for specialists in the field of Esoteric Buddhist Studies, who are accustomed to the broad range of technical terms, it is a philologist’s duty to offer also the more general reader sufficient guidance and reference. In order to facilitate reference, the page and line references of the widely available T.-edition are presented in the left margin, instead of the TKDZ line numbers. Both editions are, however, appended below.

\[145\]^i.e. 39 notes on 23 pages of modern Japanese text.
ritual [for conferring] the esoteric precepts
being the symbol of buddhas

[T. 2463: 6b12]  [Master]  

To begin with, if you arouse the intent to attain supreme awakening, you should first of all contemplate [the following] in the depths of your mind, [visualizing] the ocean of the pure [enlightened] nature [of Dharmakāya Mahāvairocana within] all Buddhas in the ten directions.
being tranquil and perfectly bright, fundamentally free from production and annihilation. Being vast, unimpeded and omnipresent, formless, and constantly quiescent, it bears the marks of extinction.

[Oh, Buddhas], pity all worldlings, [because] their pure [and originally enlightened] mind is misled by defilement and delusion. They are mistaking [the imagined for the real], but are not aware of it! They are blind and unsatisfied. The poisons of greed, ill-will and delusion burn

Diamond Nature: all the various manifestations and transformations the Tathāgata produces to succour and liberate beings are eternal and immutable”.

Based on Endō’s addition (1987: 293) of “shobutsu wa 諸仏は”. In my opinion, the “contemplation” referred to above, is a mental address to, or invocation of the Buddhas.

Based on Endō’s addition (1987: 293) of “shobutsu wa 諸仏は”. In my opinion, the “contemplation” referred to above, is a mental address to, or invocation of the Buddhas.
and drown them day and night. [The pleasures of] the six sense organs\textsuperscript{169} attack and threaten them. The five desires\textsuperscript{170} tie them up and restrain them. Darkness and insanity has consumed them!

[Oh, Buddhas], pity the fact that they do not perceive the truth;\textsuperscript{171} pity\textsuperscript{172} these fellows\textsuperscript{173} with your great compassion!\textsuperscript{174}

Reveal\textsuperscript{175} your various shapes,\textsuperscript{176} by emerging from [the world where there is inherently] no arising,\textsuperscript{177} and take shape [from] the formless [world]!\textsuperscript{178}

[Oh, Buddhas], may you express\textsuperscript{179} [yourself in] language\textsuperscript{180} and instruct\textsuperscript{181} [them the teachings on the way of] birth and death [that depend on cause and effect]!\textsuperscript{182}

\textsuperscript{169} 六賊 (Jap. \textit{roku soku}), lit. 'six thieves', refers either to "the six faculties of eyes, ears, nose, tongue, skin and mind which engender affliction," They are "also likened to the six pleasures of the six sense organs. Prevention is by not acting with them, i.e. the eye avoiding beauty, the ear sound, nose scent, tongue flavors, body seductions, and mind uncontrolled thoughts," cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 六賊, referring e.g. DCBT: 138. Endō (1987: 316, n. 2) follows the latter interpretation, and adds that they are called the "six thieves" because they let diffuse the workings of the six cognitions".

\textsuperscript{170} 五欲 (Jap. \textit{go yoku}) are the five kinds of desire that arise from attachment to the first five of the aforementioned faculties (i.e. eyes, ears, nose, tongue, and body), which are also called the five objects (五境 Jap. \textit{go kyō}) of form, sound, fragrance, flavor, and tactility, i.e. Skt. \textit{pañca-kāma}, but can also be the five desires of wealth, sex, food, fame, and sleep, cf. Muller in DBJ; NEBJ: 91a; BDG: 376d; and DCBT: 121, s.v. 五欲. Also see: Endō 1987: 316, n. 3.

\textsuperscript{171} 覺知 (Jap. \textit{kakuchi}), cf. BGD: 177a.

\textsuperscript{172} 慍念 (Jap. \textit{minnen}), lit. 'thoughts of pity', cf. BGD: 1310d.

\textsuperscript{173} 此輩 (Jap. \textit{shihei}), with 輩 basically meaning 'fellows'.

\textsuperscript{174} 大悲 (Jap. \textit{dai hi}) refers to Skt. \textit{mahā-kāma}, see; BGD: 1310d.

\textsuperscript{175} 流演 (Jap. \textit{ruen}), lit. 'to spread broadly', cf. BGD: 1433d.

\textsuperscript{176} 化身 (Jap. \textit{keshin}), lit. 'transformation body', which is sometimes translated as 'avatar'. It is the so-called 'provisional form' (Skt. \textit{nirmāṇa-kāya}) of a Buddha, indicating "the transformation of the Buddha's body into the form of a sentient being in order to teach and save them. In order to teach sentient beings, this kind of buddha-manifestation utilizes superknowledges to appropriately discern and respond to their various capacities," cf. Muller in DBJ. See also: NEBJ: 172a; BDG: 292b; and DCBT: 142, s.v. 化身. The translation here is based on Endō’s reading (1987: 293) as: "samazama no sugata o arawasu さまざまなの姿かたを現わし". Also see n. 151 above.

\textsuperscript{177} 不生而生 (Jap. \textit{fushō ji shō}) is translated by Endō (1987: 293) as "honrai seiki-suru koto no nai sekai yori aete seikishi 本来生起することのない世界よりあえて生起し".

\textsuperscript{178} 無相現相 (Jap. \textit{mosō gensō}). 無相 is explained by Okada (1976: 9, n. 2) as "the absolute state of mind that eradicates all form". Here, Endō’s reading (1987: 293-294) is followed: "katachi no nai sekai yori tatte katachi o shimeshi 相のない世界より起って相を示し".

\textsuperscript{179} 假起 (Jap. \textit{keki}). Both Okada (1976: 9) and Endō (1987: 293) read 假 as "kari ni 仮に", which is an adverb, meaning "provisionally", "for example"., and is also used as an expression "granting that" (see e.g. SWED: 739b), and discern 起 as the following verb. However, 假, can also mean "an institution or establishment", i.e. "to establish a concept; the gathering of words and/or sentences", cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 假, implying that 假起 may also be translated as a single compound.

\textsuperscript{180} 言説 (Jap. \textit{gonzetsu}), lit. "linguistic expression", cf. BDG: 429b. According to Hodge in DBJ, s.v. 言説, it is also "a figurative designation (Skt. \textit{upacāra}); the usage of language to teach the dharma (Skt. \textit{deśānā}), which is in the final analysis, to be seen as a skillful means, and can never truly touch on reality."
[**DISCIPLES**]

Because of your compassion toward all sentient beings and [therefore also] towards us, [foolish commoners], every one of you, [Buddhas, please] display your knowledge of expediency, and bestow us with both the provisional and absolute teachings.

[**MASTER**]

[T. 2463: 6b20] Because you wish to guide [beings of] both sharp and dull religious faculties equally [into the Buddhist path], [we pray that you] set forth various sudden and gradual doctrines as entry [to enlightenment].

---

183 示現 (Jap. jigen), cf. BGD: 549b.
185 慈念 (Jap. rennen), cf. BGD: 1441d, and DCBT: 432, s.v. 慈念.
186 Here, I follow Endō (1987: 294), reading: “ware-ra bonku no hito-bito 我ら凡愚の入びと”, i.e. unenlightened beings. This alludes to the term 凡夫 (Jap. bonbu), Skt. prthagjana, a simple foolish person, i.e. a normal human being, the state in which a ritual practitioner enters the practice hall, see: Payne 2012: 288.
187 方便智 (Jap. hōben-chi) is “the wisdom or knowledge of using skillful means (for saving others); Skt. upāya-jñāna.” Muller in DBJ, referring to NEBJ: 107b, DCBT: 154, and BGD: 1226c. Endō (1987: 294) explains this as “wisdom of provisional help”. For more on 智, cf. NEBJ: 29b and BGD: 950b, s.v. chie. On 方便, see e.g. Reeves’s entry in DBJ; BGD: 1225; and DCBT: 154, s.v. 方便.
188 權實教 (Jap. gonjitsu [no nikiyo], i.e. the provisional and the absolute teaching. “Tiantai philosophy characterizes the single vehicle (Skt. ekayāna) teaching to be true, and the three vehicle teaching to be expedient”, Muller in DBJ. Also see: NEBJ: 86a, and BGD: 433c, s.v. 權實. While the One Vehicle (Jap. ichijō 一乗) teaching, offers one vehicle for all beings, the Three Vehicles (Jap. sanjō 三乗) teaching perceives one separate vehicle “for each of the three categories of (1) śrāvaka disciples, i.e. the so-called Hinayāna, leading to arhatship; (b) pratyekabuddha or ‘solitary realizer’, i.e. the Madhyamayāna, leading after longer periods to a Buddhahood that is ascetically attained and for one’s self; and (c) bodhisattva, called Mahāyāna, leading after countless ages of self-sacrifice in saving others and progressive enlightenment to ultimate Buddhahood.”, cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 三乗. Endō (1987: 294) explains 權實教 respectively as “the teaching corresponding to one’s constitutional/potential abilities/capacities” and “the teaching of ultimate reality/truth”. Okada (1976: 9, n. 3) defines 權實の教 as “the provisional teaching of the final expedient expounded for those with low capacities” and “the absolute teaching, preaching the profound truth of the One Vehicle”.
189 利钝 (Jap. ridon), i.e. practitioners of sharp faculties and dull faculties (Skt. parāpara), cf. BCSD: 192; also see: BGD: 1411a.
190 根性 (Jap. konjō) is the potential for attaining liberation, i.e. one’s “inborn nature”, “basic spiritual proclivities; ability to grasp religious principle”, cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 根性; also DCBT: 327; BGD: 425a.
191 Endō’s addition (1987: 294) of “Jap. hitoshiku 等しく” is followed here.
192 引導 (Jap. indō), cf. DCBT: 1; and BGD: 68a.
193 施設 (Jap. sesetsu), cf. BGD: 821b; and DCBT: 303.
194 種種 (Jap. shuju), see BGD: 634b.
195 顿漸 (Jap. ton zen) refers to “the two fundamentally differing explanations as to how practice”. That is, “the gradual approach (漸教, Jap. zenkyō) understands practice toward enlightenment as a gradual process of spiritual purification and advancement, while the sudden teaching (頓教, Jap. tonyō) maintains that the very idea of attainment of enlightenment as a goal of one’s efforts is based on an illusory, dualistic subject/object model that cannot be sustained according to the implications of the Buddhist doctrine of emptiness,” cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 頓漸, referring to e.g. BGD: 1026c and DCBT: 419. Endō (1987: 294) translates this as “the teachings which
[DISCIPLES]

Thus, we [feel sincere]\(^{195}\) compunction!\(^{196}\)

[MASTER]

Lest all Buddhas have mercy\(^{197}\), offer [their thereupon based] provisional help\(^{198}\), and sympathize with [you], wordlings, who are submerged\(^{199}\) in limitless suffering,\(^{200}\) you must arouse a vast mind\(^{201}\), [in the following manner,\(^{202}\) saying]:

[DISCIPLES]

I vow\(^{203}\) to eliminate the whole of myriad evils;

I vow to master\(^{204}\) [the teachings of] the supreme doctrines;

[T. 2463: 6b25] I vow to liberate\(^{205}\) the entire realm of living beings;\(^{206}\)

---

enable one to immediately enter the realm of enlightenment” as opposed to “those for which many years of practice is needed”.

\(^{194}\)法門 (Jap. hōmon), lit. ‘gate of the teaching (Skt. dharma)’, i.e. Skt. dhammaparyāya. According to Mahāyāna teachings, there are endless methods or ‘gates’ to gain insight, cf. BGD: 1237, s.v. 法門.

\(^{195}\) Here, I follow Endō’s translation (1987: 294), which has “fukaku 深く”, lit. ‘deep’, before the insertion “kokoro of okoshi 心を起こし.”

\(^{196}\) 慚愧 (Jap. zanki), cf. BGD: 499c. Translated as “conscience and a sense of shame”, see: Muller in DBJ, s.v. 慚愧.

\(^{197}\) 慈悲 (Jap. jihī) denotes the altruistic compassion aimed at the salvation of all beings, cf. NEBJ: 135a; BGD: 573b; and Muller in DBJ, s.v. 慈悲.


\(^{199}\) 沈淪 (Jap. chinrin), lit. ‘to sink’, i.e. in the sea of samsāra. See: BGD: 968c.

\(^{200}\) 苦海 (Jap. kukai/kugai), lit. ‘ocean of suffering’, See: BGD: 266a and DCBT: 313.

\(^{201}\) 廣大之心 (Jap. kōdai no shin) is ‘an excellent mind’, being “a reference to the possession of the four boundless minds,” i.e. 四無量心 (Jap. shi muryōshin) or the “four immeasurable states of mind”, explained both as the “four kinds of meditation to give bliss to, and to take away the suffering of sentient beings” and as the “four minds of immeasurable concern for others”, including the “immeasurable minds of (1) kindness (慈 Jap. ji, Skt. maitrī), or bestowing of joy or happiness; (2) pity (悲 Jap. hi, Skt. karuṇā), to save from suffering; (3) joy (喜 Jap. ki, Skt. muditā) on seeing others freed from suffering; and (3) impartiality (捨 Jap. sha, Skt. upekṣa), i.e. rising above these emotions, or giving up all things, e.g., distinctions of friend and enemy, love and hate, etc. They are also called the four equalities (四等 Jap. shi dō), cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 廣大心.

\(^{202}\) Here, Endō’s addition (1987: 294) is inserted: “masa ni tsugi no yō ni まさにつぎのように”.

\(^{203}\) 誓願 (Jap. seig prenatal, i.e. promises that bodhisattvas must keep without fail when they are aspirants to Buddhahood, cf. NEBJ: 262a, BGD: 825a, DCBT: 428, s.v. 誓願. Generally there are four so-called “broad” or “universal vows” (四弘誓願, Jap. shi guzeigan) for bodhisattvas: (1) saving all beings without discrimination; (2) ending all kinds of desires and defilements; (3) continuously studying all methods and expedients; and (4) realizing the supreme path to Buddhahood, cf. BGD: 511, s.v. 四弘誓願.

\(^{204}\) 修習 (Jap. shūjū, var. shūjū), lit. ‘repeated practice’, or ‘to cultivate’, cf. BGD: 625a, s.v. 修習.

\(^{205}\) 度脱 (Jap. dodatsu), i.e. “to save, to convey (someone) to deliverance”, cf. Muller in DBJ, and BGD: 998a.
Lest all beings\(^{207}\) vow to seek prompt realization\(^{208}\) of supreme awakening,\(^{209}\) the excellent fruition\(^{210}\) of all Buddhas, I arouse the intent to attain awakening!

[MASTER]

That what is called “the intent to attain awakening”, is the pure Dharmakāya\(^{211}\) within all Buddhas, but also is [the origin of]\(^{212}\) all beings’ mental status of [perceiving the non-duality of] defilement and purity.\(^{213}\)

If you would look for its origin\(^{214}\), because it is fundamentally\(^{215}\) not arising, nor ceasing, you may search in the ten directions, in the end you will not find it, [because the intent to attain awakening]\(^{216}\) is not expressed by\(^{217}\) using speech,\(^{218}\) written terminology,\(^{219}\) or mental cognition.\(^{220}\)
Continuing to transmigrate\(^{221}\) in delusion\(^{222}\) is called the “defiled body\(^{223}\) of all sentient beings”, while manifesting\(^{224}\) enlightenment\(^{225}\) is precisely called “the pure Dhammakāya within all Buddhas”.\(^{226}\)

Therefore, the *Sūtra on neither Increasing nor Decreasing*\(^{227}\) says:

> Dharmakāya [Mahāvairocana] is not separate from the realm of worldlings; the realm of worldlings is not separate from the Dhammakāya. The realm of worldlings is precisely the Dhammakāya; and the Dhammakāya is the realm of worldlings!\(^{228}\)

---


\(^{221}\) 流轉 (Jap. *ruten*) is ‘continuity’, and refers to the deluded transmigration through life and death. Synonymous to 輪廻 (Jap. *rinne*), i.e. Skt. *samsāra*, cf. NEBJ: 242b, referring to NEBJ: 234a, s.v. 輪廻. See also BGD: 1433d, s.v. 流轉.

\(^{222}\) 安心 (Jap. *mōshin*, also: *mōjin*) is a defiled mind, or deluded and attached thought; the mind incapable of apprehending the original essence of things, cf. BGD: 1363c, s.v. 母心.

\(^{223}\) 染汚之身 (Jap. *zenma no shin*). 染汚 means ‘to contaminate the pure mind with defilements’, referring to ‘all contaminated factors that impede the attainment of *nirvāṇa*’, cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 染汚. See also BGD: 846d, s.v. 染汚; NEBJ: 335a, s.v. *zenma*, where it is explained as ‘connected with pain and suffering’, also “a term denoting evils, and deeds neither good nor bad but barring enlightenment.”

\(^{224}\) 開発 (Jap. *kaihatsu*) is ‘one who has been awakened’, but “in the True Word Esoteric Sect, to unfold and manifest the Buddha-nature”, cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 開発. See also BGD: 171d, s.v. 開発, which defines its meaning within Shingon Mikkyō as ‘the establishment of the Buddha nature within us, and making it public’.

\(^{225}\) 照悟 (Jap. *shōgo*), in which the first character means ‘illumination’, also ‘to understand completely’, but also ‘proof’, ‘verification’, cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 照; while the second denotes ‘enlightenment’, ‘realization’, as distinguished from delusion, cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 照. See also BGD: 725a, s.v. 照, and NEBJ: 261b, s.v. 照.

\(^{226}\) Endō’s modern rendering (1987: 295) of this passage is: “When the hesitating mind continues to lose control, it is ultimately called the body of the people who are wrapped in worldly desires (i.e. Skt. *klesa*), [while the] evidently realizing the insight (leading to enlightenment) of the Buddhas who establish enlightenment (i.e. Skt. *bodhi*), is in fact called the pure and true body of all Buddhas.”

\(^{227}\) 不増不減經 (Jap. *Fuzō fugen-gyō*; Chin. *Buzeng bujian-jing*), being the *Anunatvāpūrṇatvānirdesaparivarta* (i.e. T. XVI, no. 668), translated by Bodhiruci between 519–524 , who arrived in Luoyang in 508 , and worked there until 534/538. See Demiéville 1978: 67, s.v. *Fuzōfugen-gyō*; 237, s.v. Bodairushi I; and Nanjio 1975: 121, no. 524, where the title translation is borrowed from. According to Lancaster (1979: 166, no. 490), referring to T. LV, no. 2157: 839b6, i.e. the 貞元新定釋教目録 (Jap. *Jōgen shinjō shakkyō mokuroku*; Chin. *Zhengyuan xinding yijiao mulu*) compiled by Yuan Zhao 圓照 (fl. 778 ) in 800. However, the text was translated in 525 (i.e. Zhengguang 正光 6), this is confirmed by BKD IX: 192b, s.v. *Fuzō gugengyō*, where the text is discussed in more detail. On the 貞元新定釋教目録, see BKD VI: 48c, s.v. *Jōgen shinjō shakkyō mokuroku*. The *Anunatvāpūrṇatvānirdesaparivarta* is “a short but influential *tathāgatagarbha* text that discusses the relationship between sentient beings and the dharmakāya (or dharmadhātu) as being one of equivalence within the medium of the *tathāgatagarbha*. The sermon begins with a question by Śāriputra as to whether the total number of sentient beings who transmigrate through the three realms and six destinies ever increases or decreases. The Buddha responds by explaining how views of increase and decrease are equivalent to the mistaken extremes of eternalism and nihilism. He then goes into depth (sic) explaining the nature of the *tathāgatagarbha* in relation to the dharma body and sentient beings,” cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 不増不減経. NEBJ: 66b, s.v. *Fuzō-fugen-gyō*, translates its title as *Sūtra on That Which Neither Increases nor Decreases*, adding that the text “proclaims the identity between the hosshin [i.e. Dhammakāya Mahāvairocan] and all sentient beings. It also declares that all beings will attain Buddhahood.”

\(^{228}\) Indeed, T. XVI, no. 668: 467b16-18 reads identically the same: 不離衆生界有法身不離法身有衆生界衆生界即法身法身即衆生界. Endō (1987: 295) renders this as: “It is not the case that there is another true body
Further, it is said [in the *Mahāyāna-dharmadhātu-nirviśeṣa-śāstra*]:

> You should know that the purity of the realm of worldlings precisely is the Dharmakāya. The Dharmakāya is *nirvāṇa*, and *nirvāṇa* is Tathāgata [Mahāvairocana].

When looking at it in this way, there is essentially no distinction between the body of all Buddhas and the naturally pure Dharmakāya [Mahāvairocana within] all sentient beings.

**[DISCIPLES]**

[T. 2463: 6c10] Thus, I [who now still may have doubts], am no different from all buddha-tathāgatas, who –whilst once [still] residing in the stage of practice—[also] lost track of the[ir] original dharmakāya [nature].

**[MASTER]**

So, arousing great effort and vigorously endeavoring in correct practices, already is having accomplished the state of Buddhahood.

---

separate from the world of humans, and further, it is also not the case that there is a world of humans separate from the true body. The human world is no other than the true body, because the true body is de human world.” For further reference on this passage, see: Guang 2005: 88.

229 Strangely, even though the text does not mention any shift in the source from which it quotes, there is no reference found in the aforementioned T. XVI no. 668. However, the following lines are an almost exact match to a passage in the 大乘法界無差別論 (Jap. Daijō hokkai mushabetsu ron; Chin. Dacheng fajie wu chabie lun), composed by Sthiramati and translated by Devaprajña et al. in 691: 眾生界得清淨時應知即是法身法身即是涅槃界涅槃即是如來, cf. T. XXXI, no. 1626: 896a20-22. Also see Nanjio 1975: 275-276, no. 1258; and Lancaster 1979: 210, no. 640, referring to the 大周刊定衆經目録 (Jap. Daishū kanjō shukyō mokuroku; Chin. Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu) compiled by Mingquan (明佺, n.d.) in 695, i.e. T. LV, no. 2153: 408b6. For this catalogue, see: Lancaster 1979: 367, no. 1058; Nanjio 1975: 354, no. 1610; and for more information, BKD VII: 256c. On *bodhicitta* thought in T. XVI, no. 668, see: Tagami 1986.

230 *nirvāṇa* (Jap. nehan), cf. NEBJ 211b; BGD: 1076b, s.v. *nirvāṇa*.

231 *nyorai* (Jap. nyorai), cf. NEBJ: 224b; BGD: 1063c; DCBT: 210, where it is pointed out that this concerns “the Buddha in his nirmāṇakāya, i.e. his ‘transformation’ or corporeal manifestation descended on earth”. The passage under consideration is explained by Endō (1987: 295) as: “You should know that the reason why the human world is pure, exactly is because it is de body of truth. In other words, the body of truth is enlightenment; enlightenment, in other words, is Buddha.”


233 諸佛如來 (Jap. sho butsu nyorai), cf. BGD: 690c

234 又地 (Jap. inchi; var. inji). Okada (1976: 10, n. 2) notes that this is “the stage of practicing Buddhism”, Indeed, the term refers to “the causal stage of the practice of becoming enlightened”, the state of practicing Buddhism which leads to the stage of attainment of Buddhahood, being 果地 (Jap. kaji). See: BGD: 71a, s.v. 又地 and 149b, s.v. 果地; Also: DCBT: 264.
That being the case, I must ask, how can you possibly hanker after swimming in mud, and not manifest correct practice?!

[DISCIPLES]
Therefore, I arouse this intent of attaining supreme awakening!

[MASTER]
Further, observe that the worldlings are sinking in the ocean of suffering and are submerged in the river of birth and death, ignoring the source of their own naturally enlightened mind and losing the life power of wisdom that nourishes the Dharmakāya.

[DISCIPLES]
When I pity them, they and the Dharmakāya in me are equal and non-dual!

---

235 大精進 (Jap. dai shōjin), i.e. Skt. mahā-vīrya denotes ‘inexhaustible effort’, or ‘stamina’, cf. BGD: 920c.
236 勤修 (Jap. gonshū), cf. BGD: 432b.
237 正行 (Jap. shōgyō), cf. DCBT: 193; BGD: 698b.
238 正覚 (Jap. shōgaku), lit. ‘correct awakening’ (Skt. sambodhi), but also refers to a person who has awakened to reality, i.e. a Buddha or tathāgata, cf. BGD: 697d, s.v. 正覚.
239 The text reads 今 (Jap. ima), but Endō (1987: 296) interprets this as “then” (Jap. kono toki ni oite このときに).
240 云何 (Jap. ikan [ga]) is usually not translated, because it often implies a rhetorical question. In my opinion, though, it reinforces the ritual discourse, in which master and disciple take turns.
241 According to Endō (1987: 296), this is “the mud of the defilements that pollute our body” (Jap. mi o osen-suru bonnō no nukarumi 身を汚染する煩悩のむかるみ).
242 畏心 (Jap. zeshin), being interpreted by Endō (1987: 296) as “kono satori o motomeru kokoro この菩提を求める心”.
243 Note that 観 (Jap. kan) in the kanbun text, is nowhere attested in the renderings neither of Okada (1976), nor Endō (1987).
244 自心 (Jap. jishin), cf. BGD: 555c.
245 惠命 (Jap. emyō) is synonymous to 慧命 (Jap. emyō), i.e. while the physical body lives nourished by food, the dharma-body is nourished by wisdom, cf. BGD: 106d, s.v. 慧命. Also see the additional phrase in Endō 1987: 296.
246 我法身 (Jap. wa ga hoshin) is explained by Endō (1987: 296) as “watashi no yū-suru shinri-to shite no shintai わたしの有する真理としての身体”, lit. ‘the true body that I am endowed with’.
247 平等 (Jap. byōdō), cf. DCBT: 187; BGD: 1146d, s.v. 平等, i.e. Skt. sama(ya) or samatā, cf. SJ: 196, no. 1601; and DCBT, p. 187, s.v. 平. This ‘equality’ means the lack of making distinctions amongst things, BGD: 488, s.v. samama yā and 1146, s.v. byōdō. ‘Equality’, however, also refers to the “non-duality of concrete existence and abstract principle”, “one-ness of matter and mind”, in other words, “all concrete things or phenomena are identical with the truth, or that which appears is as such the path”, cf. Toganō 1970: 105-110, and
How can you have faith, and endurance,\textsuperscript{249} when you are not offering help?\textsuperscript{250}

That is why [you should]\textsuperscript{251}, vigorously\textsuperscript{252} arouse great compassion, liberate\textsuperscript{253} all sentient beings, and destroy Māra,\textsuperscript{254} the enemy [of the dharma]!\textsuperscript{255}

Therefore, I arouse the intent to attain awakening!

Now, you must summon\textsuperscript{256} all Buddhas!

I, disciple X, bow my head to the ground and prostrate\textsuperscript{257} before the assembly of all Bodhisattva-mahāsattvas\textsuperscript{258} and numerous Tathāgatas, who are fully

---

\textsuperscript{248}無二 (Jap. \textit{mu ni}), cf. BGD: 1342c.

\textsuperscript{249} Both Okada (1976: 10) and Endō (1987: 296) take \textit{信任} (Jap. \textit{shinin}) as a compound, but this is as yet not attested in any of the consulted dictionaries, neither general nor specialized. Therefore, both terms have been translated separately. On \textit{信} (Jap. \textit{shin}), see: e.g. BGD: 774c; and for \textit{任} (Jap. \textit{nin}), e.g. DCB: 200.

\textsuperscript{250} 救拔 (Jap. \textit{kyūbachi}; var. \textit{kubatsu}), see e.g. DCBT: 351.

\textsuperscript{251} 勇猛 (Jap. \textit{yumyō}; var. \textit{yūmyō}), also means ‘to be courageous’, cf. BGD: 1386c.

\textsuperscript{252} 度 (Jap. \textit{do}), cf. BGD: 997b; NEBJ: 45b.

\textsuperscript{253} 魔 (Jap. \textit{ma}) is an abbreviation of 魔羅 (Jap. \textit{mara}), i.e. Skt. Māra, the demon king of the realm of desire, but the term also refers to defilement, or hindrances to enlightenment. See e.g. BGD: 1282a, s.v. 魔羅 and 1280-1281, s.v. 魔.

\textsuperscript{254} 怨敵 (Jap. \textit{onteki}), cf. BGD: 136c.

\textsuperscript{255} 啓請 (Jap. \textit{keishō}) is requesting the attendance of buddhas and bodhisattvas, mostly prior to sūtra chanting, cf. BGD: 312a.

\textsuperscript{256} 稽首和南 (Jap. \textit{keishu wanan}), i.e. Skt. \textit{vandana}, cf. NEBJ: 328b, BGD: 1467b, s.v. 稽首; And NEBJ: 169a, BGD: 313a, s.v. 和南, which in Zen also is read as ona, cf. BGD: 124a, s.v. 和南. Endō 1987: 317, n. 8, points out that 稽首 is the translation of the meaning of Skt. \textit{vandana}, while 和南 is its transliteration.

\textsuperscript{257} 摩訶薩 (Jap. \textit{makasatsu}), Skt. \textit{mahāsattva}, lit. ‘great being’ especially denotes a bodhisattva who is mainly engaged in liberating sentient beings, cf. BGD: 1277, s.v. \textit{makasatsu}. In this context, it is crucial to note that the exoteric and esoteric concepts of ‘bodhisattva’ differ. ‘The Sanskrit term ‘bodhisattva’ comprises the two words \textit{bodhi} and \textit{sattva}. Bodhi means ‘awakening’ and ‘path’, and ‘sattva’, according to the Buddhist perception of the term, is ‘sentient being’ and ‘hero’. The original exoteric translation of ‘bodhisattva’, therefore, was ‘a being with the mind of the great Way’ and ‘being of Awakening’; and hence ‘seeker of Awakening’ and ‘a being who heroically seeks the Way’. For exoteric Mahāyāna the ‘Bodhisattva’ is one who diligently seeks Awakening and is thus destined to become a Buddha, one who seeks Awakening not only for himself but for all other beings, and whose aspiration has a twofold modality, ascending by means of Knowledge (Awakening for self) and
endowed with the myriad virtues of the transformation body, reward body\(^{259}\), and pure Dharmakāya of [Mahā]vairocana,\(^{260}\) and of all Buddhas in the ten directions!

[\text{T. 2463: 6c20}] [Oh, may they] descend to the consecration platform\(^{261}\) and rescue us by means of their great compassion, and enlighten us with their great wisdom!

Arousing the great intent to attain awakening, I now aspire to abandon [the cycle of] birth and death, destroy the multitude of hindrances,\(^{262}\) overpower the non-Buddhist paths,\(^{263}\) surpass the two [Buddhist] vehicles [of śrāvakas and pratīkabuddhas],\(^{264}\) and solemnly vow to practice the great compassion of all Buddhas!

\(^{259}\) \text{報身} (Jap. \text{hōshin}), Skt. \text{sambhogakāya} is the “reward body”, or “ideal body of a Buddha which is produced upon entering Buddhahood as the result of vows undertaken during the practices in the bodhisattva path. The body of the Buddha with which the blissful reward of enlightenment is enjoyed,” cf. Paul Swanson in DBJ, s.v. \text{報身}. Also see: NEBJ: 108b; BGD: 1242a.

\(^{260}\) \text{毘盧遮那} (Jap. \text{Birushana}) Mahāvairocana, cf. BGD 1136b. Also known as \text{大日如來} (Jap. Dainichi nyorai), cf. NEBJ: 41b; BGD: 926a; and more details in SJ: 477; and MD: 1522, s.v. \text{大日如來}. For more info, see: Pinte K. 2009b.

\(^{261}\) \text{道場} (Jap. \text{dōjō}) is explained as “truth-plot; bodhi-maṇḍala; circle; or place of enlightenment […] for attaining to Buddha-truth. An object of or place for religious offerings. A place for teaching, learning, or practicing religion”, cf. DCBT: 416, s.v. \text{道場}, where it is also pointed out that it can also refer to the ordination platform. Originally, \text{道場} was a translation of the \text{bodhimāṇḍa, i.e. the place where the historical Buddha attained enlightenment. Later the term was used to designate a place where Buddhist ceremonies were held. In 613, Yangdi of the Sui dynasty is accounted to have changed the name for all Chinese temples from \text{寺} (Chin. \text{si}) to \text{道場} (Chin. \text{duochang}), cf. Chou 1945: 310. It may be interesting to note the following double meaning: “the two semantic levels of the \text{bodhi-maṇḍala}, the Buddha’s seat of enlightenment: first, as the eternal realm of enlightenment, the ‘assembly of all the Tathāgatas forming the great maṇḍala’ […], into which Śākyamuni Buddha occasionally returns by means of his own \text{samādhi}; and second, as the sacred site of enlightenment under the bodhi tree on the bank of the Nairātījan in the kingdom of Magadha where the Buddha addresses his assembly”, cf. Abe 1999: 265-266. Although the word \text{maṇḍala} originally meant “circle”, in esoteric texts it designated pictures and symbols of groups of buddhas and bodhisattvas painted on a certain surface and in which every deity has its own space, cf. Chou 1945: 311: “Maṇḍala means a gathering place of the saints. It refers to an altar where recitation takes place. In China however, the maṇḍalas on the earthen platform came to be reproduced on cloth or paper”. In this sense, ‘entering the maṇḍala’ refers to the \text{abhiṣeka} ceremony in the esoteric initiation ritual. ‘Sitting in the maṇḍala’ can also be taken literally, i.e. the tantrist sits in the midst of the buddhas displayed in a drawn or visualized maṇḍala and makes offerings, repents, etc. in order to ultimately participate in the illuminated state of his fellow buddhas. Hence, its translation as “consecration platform”.

\(^{262}\) \text{魔業} (Jap. \text{ma shū}), lit. Māras, cf. n. 255 supra.

\(^{263}\) \text{外道} (Jap. \text{gedō}) is explained by Endō (1987: 297) as “\text{bukkyō igai no oschie 佛教以外の教え}”, i.e. Skt. \text{tirţhika}, cf. BGD: 305, s.v. \text{外道}. For different categories, see: DCBT: 184, s.v. \text{外}.

\(^{264}\) \text{二乗} (Jap. \text{nī jō}, cf. Endō (1987: 297) reading: “\text{shōmon engaku no futatsu no oschie 声聞,経覚の二つの教え}”. Also see BGD: 1047, s.v. \text{二乗}.
Therefore, I now prostrate by bowing at your feet\textsuperscript{265} in absolute trust!\textsuperscript{266}

[MASTER]

[Now,] recite the mantra of universal obedience!\textsuperscript{267}

\textbf{[DISCIPLES]}

\textit{Oṃ sarva-tathāgata pāda-vandanāṃ karoti!}\textsuperscript{268}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{265} 頂禮 (Jap. chōrai), cf. NEBJ: 33a; BGD: 964c, s.v. 頂禮.

\textsuperscript{266} 師依 (Jap. kie) generally refers to taking refuges (esp. in the three treasures), but this is doubtful in this context. For other meanings, see: NEBJ: 173b; BGD: 215, s.v. 師依.

\textsuperscript{267} 菩提真言 (Jap. jūrei shingon). 菩提 means to worship all buddhas, cf. DCBT: 374; BGD: 1181d. According to Renou (1985: 565), “Tout l’enseignement tantrique se résume […] en une mise en efficacité du mantra. Le mantra non seulement est divin, il est la divinité même, la forme matérielle du dieu à un degré bien plus haut que l’image. Chaque divinité a son mantra particulier: celui d’une divinité femelle est lui-même féminin, on l’appelle une vidhāy « science », comme les çakti dont il est l’exact représentant. Le choix et la remise du mantra à l’élève forment l’essentiel de l’initiation tantrique.” Asi de from the terms mantra and vidhyā, dhāraṇī belong to the domain of magical formulas as well. These designations are used to refer to the different aspects of the formulas. According to Toganō (1970: 32), they can be translated as “secret spell”, “knowledge-spell” and “holding-spell” respectively. He advances that mantras are Hinduist and pan-Indian, that vidhāy is a Hindu-Buddhist term and that dhāraṇīs are typical of Buddhism. A historical survey of the introduction of these designations in China and Japan can be found in idem, 38 ff. In China, Skt. mantra was initially translated as 咒 (Chin. zhou), i.e. ‘spell’, 密咒 (Chin. mizhou), ‘secret spell’, 神咒 (Chin. shenzhou), ‘divine spell’, and from the second half of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century onwards, it was translated as 真言 (Chin. zhenyan), lit. ‘true word’. While the term mantra had a strong influence in India given its connection with the authority of Vedas, in China, the Vedas had no power whatsoever. Therefore, Toganō (1970: 41) argues that the translated terms themselves show, to some extent, a denial of that which is Hindu. He further states that the term dhāraṇī, on the contrary, was translated as 陀羅尼 (Chin. toloni) and that the translation 總持 (Chin. zongzi), lit. ‘entire support’, was used only when asking what dhāraṇī actually meant in Chinese. The notable fact that the Chinese translations, on one hand, expunged the term mantra, and on the other hand, retained the term dhāraṇī, he considers the reason for the term dhāraṇī becoming a particular Buddhist term. Dhāraṇīs are a kind of summarizing miniatures of the sūtras and as Chou (1944: 258) puts it: “the dhāraṇīs are used to epitomize sūtra, vinaya, and āstrā; they are the short-cut to enlightenment […] A bodhisattva, having epitomized all the meditations in one string (i.e. dhāraṇī), would suddenly be elevated in rank and approach supreme enlightenment”. The general difference between dhāraṇī and mantra (i.e. 真言 Jap. shingon) is that a dhāraṇī is longer than a mantra. Moreover, a dhāraṇī is used as a substitute for a certain sūtra and is generally for exclusive use by priests, something that does not hold true for a mantra, cf. Toganō 1970: 50ff. where he further divides mantras in two main categories: (1) ‘Hinduist shingon’ which are exclusively used by monks and nuns; and (2) ‘Sino-Japanese shingon’ which are used by laity as well. The latter are of two kinds. The first are the kōmyō-shingon 光明真言, or ‘light-shingon’. They began to circulate ca. 880 and were originally described in the 不空菩薩神變真言經 (Jap. Fukū kēnja jūpen shingongyō, i.e. T. XX, no. 1092) by Bodhiruci (693-713) and in the 不空菩薩毘盧遮那佛大灌頂光真言 (Jap. Fukū kēnka Būshun-butsu daikanjō kōshingō, cf. T. XIX, no. 1002) attributed to Amoghavajra (705-774). Secondly, there are the jūsan-butsu-shingon 十三仏真言 or ‘the shingon of the thirteen Enlightened Ones’; cf. Toganō (1970: 51-54). Further information on these thirteen deities, cf. MJ: 340, s.v. jūsō. Depending on the school in which they occur, dhāraṇīs are divided in several categories as well. Here we mention the relevant classification that has been contributed to Amoghavajra. A first category is the varja-dhara-dhāraṇī, which Toganō calls the “dhāraṇī of holding letters”, given that the fact with these ‘letters’ one refers to all sūtras. He argues that “holding the letters” has to be understood as holding on to what one hears, which directly explains the fact that these kinds of formulas are said to enhance memory. A second class consists of so-called artha-dhāraṇīs, which encompass formulas containing the essence of the practice and teachings of the sūtras. Thirdly, there are dharmā-dhara-dhāraṇīs, which trigger the realization of the pure Dharma. The last group consists of samādhi-dhara-dhāraṇīs. They are used for the perfection of concentration, as a result of which the practitioner is not disturbed during his meditation, cf. Toganō 1970: 22-29.

\end{footnotesize}
Hail to Buddha Akṣobhya of the east, up to Buddha [Mahāvairocana], the pure Dharmakāya!  

[MASTER]  
[T. 2463: 6c27] Next, you should make offerings!  

[DISCIPLES]  
I, disciple X, with purified and exquisite incense, flowers, banners, ritual canopies, drinks and food, lamps and candles, I beseech to constantly bring offerings to all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, as well as all Nobles and Sages.
[T. 2463: 7a02] [Therefore, I say]:

With the power of my individual merit,
With the power of the support of the Tathāgatas,
And with the power of the Dharma realm,
I abide in universal worship!

[MASTER]

[Recite] the mantra of universal worship!  

[DISCIPLES]

Om gagana-sambhava-vajra hoḥ!

---

277 我功德力 (Jap. ga kudoku riki), lit. ‘the power of individual merit’ is one of the so-called three powers (三力, Jap. san riki) that are expounded in the MVS (cf. T. XVIII, no. 848: 19a2), alongside the ‘power of the Tathāgata’s support (如来加持力, Jap. nyorai kaji riki), and the ‘power of the dharma-dhātu’ (法界力, Jap. hōkai riki), i.e. of innate Buddha-nature, cf. BGD: 492c, s.v. 功徳 (Jap. kudoku), which denotes Skt. guṇa referring to “the merits of one’s pious acts or religious practice”, cf. NEBJ: 184a, s.v. 功徳.

278 The term 加持 (Jap. kaji) rendered as ‘support’ in the second power (cf. n. 277 supra), conforms to Skt. adhīṣṭhāna, which in precepts rituals, means to ask for the support of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas in keeping the vows. According to Orzech: “The term adhīṣṭhāna has its roots in the Pāli scriptures, where adhitthana iddhi is the power of the Buddha’s self-multiplication. It is found throughout the Mahāyāna and has a range of meanings. These include decision, resolution, self-determination, to stand on or insist on, basis, to oversee, a residence or abode, and a benediction. Its basic meaning seems to be to take a stand, or position, in its metaphorical and literal senses, as well as to provide a basis for, as in benediction. This ‘basis’ is the foundation for transcendent wisdom’s existence in the world. It indicates, to borrow a convenient phrase, ‘a place on which to stand’, as well as the stand taken.” In esoteric Buddhism, “this also signifies establishing a stable link with a deity. In the meditations on the stūpa of the five cakras (五輪塔 Jap. gorintō), in which one initially focuses on the earth element in oneself and in the deity, and then the water element, and so on, the adhīṣṭhāna signifies the identification with the deity has been achieved. Kūkai’s explanation: kaji 加持 refers to the Great Compassion of the Tathāgata and the mind of faith of sentient beings. Ka means the reflection of the Buddha Sun in the water of the minds of sentient beings, and ji means the sādhaka’s mind that ‘retains’ the Buddha Sun”, cf. Snodgrass, 1988: 35. Also see: NEBJ: 157b/174; BGD: 146a, and MD: 234a, s.v. 加持.

279 普供養眞言 (Jap. fu kuyō shingon).

280 唵誐誐嚢三婆嚩嚩日羅斛 (Jap. On gyagya nā sanbanbaba zara koku), i.e. “Om, Vajra[-like Treasures] that emerges from emptiness, hoḥ!”, denoting a formula for the emergence of the vastness of various treasures such as clothing, palaces, drinks, offerings, etc. from the storehouse of emptiness, but ultimately it is a formula that beseeches the arousal of infinite and true treasures that are indestructible as a vajra and surpass worldly treasures, cf. SJ: 35, no. 179, where the corresponding mudrā is found, alongside other attestations, the most interesting amongst which are (1) 受提心戒儀 (Jap. ju badaishin kaigi, further: JBKG), i.e. T. XVIII, no. 915: 940b28, attributed to Amoghavajra; (2) the 十八契印 (Jap. Jūhachikaiin), lit. ‘Mudrās of the Eighteen Paths’, referring to two times nine deities for each of the two maṇḍalas, i.e. T. XVIII, no. 900: 782c10-11, i.e. composed by Kūkai’s teacher Huigu (cf. introduction: 3 supra), cf. BKD V: 191b; and (3) Amoghavajra’s 阿閦如來念誦供養法 (Jap. Akushu-nyorai nenju kuyō hoḥ), lit. ‘Worship and Recitation Ritual for Akṣobhya Buddha’, i.e. T. XIX, no. 921: 17c03-0017c03. For Akṣobhya, see n. 271 above. A further discussion of the JBKG is in chapter IV below.
[M]ASTER

[Next, you must] sincerely\textsuperscript{281} repent!\textsuperscript{282}

[DISCIPLES]

Since the past without beginning, until this existence and up to this very day, I, disciple X, have been misled and obscured by ignorance!\textsuperscript{283}

I have been disregarding and faulting\textsuperscript{284} my pure [i.e. originally enlightened] mind, and have been attached\textsuperscript{285} to false conceptualizations;\textsuperscript{286}

I have given rise to various discriminations,\textsuperscript{287} uncountable [fundamental] defilements, such as greed, ill-will, and delusion, as well as subsidiary afflictions,\textsuperscript{288} such as anger, jealousy and avarice;

I have been self-proud\textsuperscript{289} and have slandered the [three jewels of] Buddha, Dharma and Saṃgha;

I have disseized\textsuperscript{290} and stolen\textsuperscript{291} all kinds of possessions;\textsuperscript{292}

I have killed\textsuperscript{293} intentionally as well as inavertently,\textsuperscript{294} and I have hurt\textsuperscript{295} sentient beings;

\textsuperscript{281} 至心 (Jap. shishin), cf. BGD: 536, s.v. 至心.
\textsuperscript{282} 懺悔 (Jap. sange), cf. NEBJ: 334b; BGD: 497, s.v. 懺悔.
\textsuperscript{283} 無明 (Jap. mumyō). Although translated as ‘ignorance’, it is a fundamental misconception which prohibits one to see the real nature of things, rather than a real shortage of knowledge, which is the basis of all defilements, cf. BGD: 1346, s.v. 無明.
\textsuperscript{284} 違失 (Jap. ishitsu), lit. ‘excess and shortcoming’. Hence, also denoting ‘mistake’.
\textsuperscript{285} 攀縁 (Jap. han’en), lit. ‘to clamber upon conditions (or objects)’. Refers to the arising of consciousness due to its contact with the external world. The mental function of cognizing objects; or, the cognized objects themselves. Here, the connotations of 縁 as ‘object’ and ‘condition’ tend to overlap, as the objects of one’s experience are also the conditions by which one is influenced, and through which one must operate, cf. Muller in DBJ, and BGD: 1116d, s.v. 攀縁.
\textsuperscript{286} 妄想, also translated as ‘delusion’, cf. n. 165 supra.
\textsuperscript{287} 分別 (Jap. funbetsu) is usually used with a negative connotation, referring to the mental action of partial and limiting rationality, which hinders the function of the originally enlightened mind, cf. Hodge in DBJ; NEBJ: 63b; BGD: 1199b, s.v. 分別.
\textsuperscript{288} 隨煩惱 (Jap. zui bonno). For a detailed list, see: Muller in DBJ; NEBJ 340a; BGD: 812b, s.v. 随煩惱.
\textsuperscript{289} 我慢 (Jap. gaman) is described as ‘pride in the belief that the aggregates are self and are possessed by self’, cf. NEBJ: 68b. While the term is later commonly understood in the negative sense of ‘pride’, or ‘conceit’, Schmithausen (1977: 149-150) understands the Skt. equivalent for 我慢, i.e. Skt. asmi-māna simply as a “feeling of identity of self”.
\textsuperscript{290} 侵奪 (Jap. shindatsu), cf. BGD: 778d.
\textsuperscript{291} 盜竊 (Jap. tosetsu), cf. BGD: 1002b.
\textsuperscript{292} 財物 (Jap. zaimotsu), cf. BGD: 450d.
Selfishly and uncaringly, I have been greedy;\(^{296}\)

I have drunk wine and have eaten meat;

With the pungent vegetables\(^{297}\) I have polluted the temple grounds,\(^{298}\) and even damaged\(^{299}\) monastic items for daily use.\(^{300}\)

My sins are uncountable and boundless, [for they include] lying,\(^{301}\) flattery,\(^{302}\) insulting\(^{303}\), and backbiting\(^{304}\), as well as transgressions of the rules on conduct\(^{305}\) and eating\(^{306}\), the five heinous crimes\(^{307}\) and the ten evils.\(^{308}\)

Now, I confess them and repent\(^{309}\) in perfect sincerity,\(^{310}\) only praying that my sins be extinguished!\(^{311}\)

\(^{293}\) Okada 1976: 12 and Endō 1987: 298, as well as TKDZ: 167 have 而代替 of 而 in the T.-edition, but both characters denote ‘to kill’.

\(^{294}\) 死殺 (Jap. gosetsu), cf. BGD: 385a.

\(^{295}\) 侵害 (Jap. songai), cf. BGD: 893b.

\(^{296}\) 賊 (Jap. tonzen), lit. ‘polluted by desires’, cf. BGD: 1025b.

\(^{297}\) 薫辛 (Jap. kunshin), lit. ‘perfumed and bitter’. Endō (1987: 298) interprets this as “vegetables with a strong smell like the five pungent roots”, i.e. 五辛 (Jap. goshin). Although there are many variant lists, they generally include leeks, scallions, garlic, onions, ginger, and chives. If eaten raw they are said to cause irritability of temper, and if eaten cooked, to act as an aphrodisiac; moreover, the breath of the eater, if reading the sūtras, will drive away the good spirits. Also called 五辛菜 (Jap. goshin), cf. DCBT: 128; BGD: 369d.

\(^{298}\) 伽藍 (Jap. garan) refers to Skt. saṃgha-ārāma, which originally designated a Buddhist monastery or convent, but later was used to refer to the whole precinct, cf. NEBJ: 70a; BGD: 161a. Also named 僧伽藍 (Jap. sōgyaran), cf. BGD: 874b. Endō (1987: 317, n. 14) defines it both as a monastery (寺院 華), and as a a park or garden for enjoyment of monks (園林 華).

\(^{299}\) The T.-edition gives 浸 (Jap. shin), meaning e.g. ‘to moisten’, whereas Okada 1976: 12 and Endō 1987: 298, as well as TKDZ: 168 have 浸 (Jap. shin), i.e. ‘to violate’ as the first character in the compound 侵損 (Jap. shinson), ‘to damage’.

\(^{300}\) According to Endō (1987: 317, n. 15), 常住 (Jap. jōjū) is an abbreviation of 常住僧物 (Jap. jōjū sōmotu), lit. ‘items for continual daily use’ being one of the four kinds of property of the Buddhist community (四種僧物 華), next to e.g. a monastic’s personal belongings such as clothing, medicine, etc. See: BGD: 518a. Endō (1987: 317, n. 15) also points out that the term refers both to the things monastics jointly use in a monastery, as well as to the buildings of the temple grounds itself, and even to the clothing and food they receive from laypeople.

\(^{301}\) 妄言 (Jap. mōgon), cf. BGD: 1363b.

\(^{302}\) 綺語 (Jap. kigo), cf. NEBJ: 173b; BGD: 212c.

\(^{303}\) 嫌口 (Jap. akaku), cf. BGD: 22a; DCBT: 372.

\(^{304}\) 不舌 (Jap. rōzetsu), cf. BGD: 1426b.

\(^{305}\) 破戒 (Jap. hakai), cf. NEBJ: 97a; BGD: 1094a; DCBT: 334.

\(^{306}\) 破齋 (Jap. hasai), cf. BGD: 1094c.

\(^{307}\) 五逆 (Jap. gogyaku), i.e. killing one’s mother, father or teacher, causing blood to flow from the Buddha body, and destroying the harmony of the saṃgha, cf. DCBT: 128; BGD: 357a; Endō 317, n. 16.

\(^{308}\) 十惡 (Jap. jūaku) are the ten unwholesome activities carried out through the three modes of bodily action, speech, and thought: killing, stealing, debauchery, lying or deception, ornate speech or flattery, insult, treachery or slander, coveting, becoming angry, and delusion, cf. Endō 317, n. 17. See also: BGD: 65; NEBJ146a. Also called the 十惡業 (Jap. jūaku gō), cf. BGD: 651c.

\(^{309}\) 發露懺悔 (Jap. hotsuro sange), cf. BGD: 1257d.

\(^{310}\) 至誠 (Jap. jijō), cf. BGD: 536c.

\(^{311}\) 消滅 (Jap. shōmetsu), lit. ‘to cause to cease’, cf. BGD: 716c.
[MASTER]

Therefore, recite] the mantra for erasing [the karmic seeds of] crimes!

[DISCIPLES]

Om sarva-pāpa-sphuṭa dahana vajrāya svāhā

[MASTER]

Next, I should confer the precepts.

[FORMAL NOTICE]

Suppose you previously took full ordination, you must again take the three refuges, because this other [ordination of yours] is limited!

---

312 滅罪 (Jap. metisuzai), cf. BGD: 1357c.
313 善薩婆波拏捺摩伽羅 (Jap. On saraba hanba taka nāba zaraya hanba) is translated by Endō (1987: 299) as “Om, I take refuge in the vajra that erases all sins. May it be realized!” However, SJ: 214, no. 1717 does not mention ‘taking refuge’. T.-edition has 代替 instead of 吾. Interestingly, this formula is also attested in JBKG (T. XVIII, no. 915: 940c22), cf. text discussion in chapter IV below. For other attestations, see SJ: 214, no. 1717. Endō (1987: 317, n. 18) also points out that a similar formula, i.e. the 出罪方便真言 (Jap. Shutsumai hōhen shingon), namely 善薩婆波拏摩伽羅囊伐折羅莎莎莎 is attested in the MVS, i.e. T. XVIII no. 848: 46b3-4. This is called ‘the mantra of the expedient means for expiating sins’ and is translated by Giebel (2005: 236-237) as “Om, for you who like a vajra, burst asunder and burn all sins, svāhā!”
314 授戒 (Jap. jukkai), lit. ‘receiving the precepts’. See: NEBJ: 150; BGD: 637b; DCBT: 251, s.v. 受戒; and BGD: 641a, s.v. 授戒.
315 具戒 (Jap. gusoku kai), i.e. the full set of precept for full-fledged monastics, cf. BGD: 276b, s.v. 具足戒. See also chapter II, s.v. introduction of the vinaya supra and more information about Kūkai’s ideas on the precepts in chapter IV below.
316 三歸 (Jap. sanki). According to Endō (1987: 299) this denotes the ‘[taking] the three refuges’ in the three treasures (三寶, Jap. sanbō), namely, Buddha, Dharma and Saṃgha. Here, however, the three treasures (Skt. triratna) are (1) the trikāya of the Tathāgata, (2) the vaipulya-mahāyāna-dharma, and (3) the avaivartika-samgha. For trikāya, see n. 153 above. The vaipulya-mahāyāna-dharma (方廣大乘法藏, Jap. hōkō daijō hōjō), lit. is the Storehouse of the Doctrine of the Universal Realm of the Great Vehicle, cf. BGD, p. 1224, s.v. 方廣 and ibid.: 922, s.v. 大乗. Soothill defines 法藏 as “the absolute, unitary storehouse of the universe, the primal source of all things”, cf. DCBT, p. 272, s.v. 法藏. Also Nakamura gives such a description, BGD: 1234, s.v. 法蔵.
317 In general, this appellation is a reference to the canonical texts of Mahāyāna: “Les mahāyānasūtra sont appelés vaipulyasūtra quand ils ont pris une grande étendue par suite d’amplification des données traditionnelles, amplification de style et d’affabulation”, cf. Renou 2001: 366. In esoteric Buddhism, this term alludes especially to the MVS and the STTS (For more on these fundamental texts, see: chapter IV below). The third treasure, i.e. the community of avaivartikas, refers to the avaivartika-bodhisattva-samgha (不退菩薩僧, Jap. futai no bosatsu sō), consisting of “never receding bodhisattvas, who aim at perfect enlightenment”, cf. DCBT: 109, s.v. 不退; BGD: 1169, s.v. futai no bosatsu. Interestingly, these three refuges are attested only in seven texts of the entire T.-canon, but occur merely in three texts other that the one under consideration in the same phrasing, namely: (1) T. XVIII, no. 894: 941b8-13 of the 蘇悉地羯羅供養法 (Jap. Soshicchikara kuyō hō), a pūjāvīdhi ritual text attributed to Šubhakararēṇa (善無畏, Jap. Zenmui 637-735) based on the Susiddhi-tantra (蘇悉地羯羅經, Jap. Soshicchikara kyō, i.e. T. XVIII, no. 893), cf. BKD VII: 14c; (2) in JBKG (T. XVIII, no. 915: 717c24-a01); and
It is not necessary to demarcate a location [for the ordination],\textsuperscript{318} for [the ritual space] equals the dharma realm. Do not request to transfer your attendance to someone else, because you will have no other occasion!\textsuperscript{319}

**[DISCIPLES]**

[T. 2463: 7a20] I, disciple X, eternally\textsuperscript{320} take refuge in all Buddhas [who partake in] the unsurpassed three bodies [of Mahāvairocana].\textsuperscript{321}

I take refuge in the treasury of the universal mahāyāna dharma.\textsuperscript{322}

I take refuge in the community of all non-retrogressing bodhisattvas.\textsuperscript{323}

---

\textsuperscript{317} 有限 (Jap. ugen) means “finite”, but both Okada (1976: 12) reads “limited” (Jap. ka-giri aru 限りある), which Endō (1987: 299) interprets as “ka-gen ga aru 期間がある”, i.e. ‘limited in time’; ‘set for a due time’, implying that it expires. Here, however, 有限 could perhaps be better understood as ‘limited’, in the sense that even though one is already ordained, the full precepts for monastic ordination are excelled by precepts that are now to be conferred.

\textsuperscript{318} 結界 (Jap. kekkai) refers to Skt. sīmābandha, i.e. the demarcation of ritual space, cf. NEBJ: 169b; BGD: 317c. The translator has already encountered other cases, however, e.g. T. XVIII, no. 917: 942, n. 14, where the editors of the T.-edition have confused 界 (Jap. kai), with 戒 (Jap. kai). 結戒, by contrast, designates the systematization of the rules of moral conduct, to receive and observe the precepts, or to be bound by the precepts, cf. BGD, p. 317c. As Endō’s translation (1987: 299) suggests, however, this does not seem to be the case here. Snodgrass (1988 vol. 1: 60) adds that 結界 denotes the rituals for defining the boundaries of the maṇḍala and expelling “demonic influences that might hinder the performance of the ritual or harm the ritualist.” See ibid. for more information, and for an example of a mudrā and formulas used such a ritual.

\textsuperscript{319} The at first glance strange sentence 不欲説欲無異處故 is left out by Okada (1976: 12). Endō (1987: 299) gives the following bungo reading: “yoku ni arazu shite yoku o toku, idokoro naki ga yu e ni 欲にあらずして欲を説く、異処なきが故に”, and interpreting this as youkubō o toite mo towareru koto ga nai, subete shinri no sekai ni hoka-naranai kara 欲望を説いても執われることがない、すべて真理の世界に他ならないから”, tentatively meaning something as “Even if I preach about desires, you will not be obsessed, because they are all none other than the realm of truth.” However, 不欲 (Jap. fuyoku) simply means ‘do not desire’ or ‘wish to’; and according to BGD: 831c, 説欲 (Jap. setsuyoku) is the same as 欲法 (Jap. yokuhō), i.e. the basic sexual attraction between male and female, but in vinaya texts, the term usually refers to ‘desire for the dharma’. In other words, “when various kinds of precepts-related gatherings are run, it is clearly decided who will attend at a given location. However, when one monk cannot attend due to a conflict, but wants to attend, this is called ‘desire’ (欲, Jap. yoku). When this wish to attend is transferred to another monk, it is called ‘offering the desire’ (與欲, Jap. yo yoku). When this transfer is accepted by another monk, it is called ‘accepting the desire’ (受欲, Jap. ju yoku). When this process is explained at the assembly, it is called the ‘explanation of the desire’ (説欲, Jap. setsu yoku),” cf. BGD:1398d, s.v. 欲法. The clause 無異處故 means lit. ‘it is because it is not a different location’, i.e. the location is the same as the dharma realm, but 處 (Jap. sho) also denotes ‘a situation’, cf. BGD: 687c. Hence the translation ‘because there will be no other occasion’.\textsuperscript{320} 盡未來際 (Jap. jin mirai sai), lit. ‘to the end of all time’, cf. BGD: 799a.

\textsuperscript{321} 無上三身諸佛 is read as Jap. mujō sanjin no shobutsu, cf. Endō 1987: 299.

\textsuperscript{322} Cf. n. 317 above.

\textsuperscript{323} Ibid.
[MASTER]
Disciple X, you have thus taken refuge in the Buddha!
You have taken refuge in the Dharma!
You have taken refuge in the Saṃgha!
In harmony with all bodhisattvas, you have now aroused the intent [to attain awakening].
This is eternal, permanent, and there is no turning back!

[DISCIPLES]
[T. 2463: 7a25] Oh, may the Honourable One[s] acknowledge that I am a bodhisattva!
(Repeat this three times).

[MASTER]
Proclaim the mantra of the three refuges!

[DISCIPLES]
Oṃ, bhūḥ khaṃ!

---

324 The text reads 弟子某甲等, which usually is a first person self-address, but it is logical that the master addresses his disciples.
325 Endō (1987: 299-300) explains ‘Buddha’ as “the embodiment of the truth”, ‘Dharma’ as “the teachings of the truth”, and ‘Saṃgha’ as “the ideal community”.
326 和合 (Jap. wagō) means ‘unified’, i.e. the combination of various elements in the formation of a single entity, cf. BGD: 1466a; NEBJ: 328a. Endō (1987: 300) compares this with the mixing of milk and water.
327 In contrast to Endō’s reading (1987: 300) as “I have….” (cf. Jap. warera wa 我は…), again, it is more likely that the disciple is addressed. See also n. 325 above.
328 無退轉 (Jap. maitōten), cf. 不退 (Jap. futai) in n. 317 supra.
329 尊 (Jap. son). In this case in all likelihood referring to Mahāvairocana, but it might also be the divinities to be invoked, or even the master, being ‘a venerable’ who has completed practice, cf. BGD: 892a.
330 證知 (Jap. shōchi) also means ‘to prove’, ‘to witness’, cf. BGD: 737.
331 It can also be that the above passage has to be repeated three times either by both the master and the disciple(s), or by both parties separately, cf. n. 325 and 328 above.
332 三歸真言 (Jap. sanki shingon): 朧懐欠 (Jap. On botsu ken), which according to Endō (1987: 300 and 317, n. 19) means “Oṃ, earth and sky!”, but he gives no further explanation. Hatta (SJ: 96, no. 640), by contrast, explains Skt. bhūḥ as 大地 (Jap. daijī), which next to ‘the whole earth’ may also refer to the ‘great bhūmi’, i.e. the level of the bodhisattvas who are in dārśana-mārga (見道 Jap. kendō) or above, cf. BGD: 322d, s.v. 見道. Hatta further equals khaṃ to ‘void’ 虚空 (Jap. kokū), and states that this formula is contemplating the pure manda (道場 Jap. dōjō) in one’s own mind, and means “May my mind ground (心地 Jap. shinjī) be like the void!” For 道場, see n. 262 above. 心地, on the other hand, can be interpreted according to Soothill as ‘mental stage’, in the sense of “the mental base from which all emerges”, DCBT: 150; and also BGD: 766, s.v. 心地. It may be interesting to note that in India, gods, kings and also Buddhas took earth and sky as witnesses for their oaths. Also this formula appears in JBKG (T. XVIII, no. 915: 941a3), although with 步 as the character for bhūḥ,
From this day forward, I, disciple X, arouse the intent to attain awakening!

I vow to destroy all evil!

I vow to cultivate the unsurpassed dharma gate!

I vow to liberate all sentient beings!

I vow to pursue the excellent fruition of all tathāgatas!

[T. 2463: 7b01] Until I reside in bodhimaṇḍa,333 I will never fall back!

Now, in harmony with all bodhisattvas, I arouse the intent to attain awakening!

Oh, may the honourable one be my witness!

(Proclaim this three times)

[MASTER]

Recite the mantra of arousing the intent to attain awakening!334

[DISCIPLES]

Oṃ bodhicittam utpādayāmi!

but denoting the same, cf. list in SJ: 68 (from right), no. 640. For a discussion of the relation of the HSBK with the JBKG, see chapter IV below.

333 菩提道場 Jap. bodai dōjō, Skt. bodhimaṇḍala, cf. BGD: 1223, s.v. bodai dōjō. It is the place where a bodhisattva, in following Śākyamuni’s example, attains supreme awakening, cf. DCBT: 389, s.v. 菩提道場. Macdonell describes it as “the seat of wisdom, which is said to have risen from the earth in the shadow of the tree under which Buddha obtained complete enlightenment”, cf. PSD: 198. Also Monier-Williams confirms this, cf. SED: 734. For 蕭場 (Jap. dōjō), cf. n. 262 supra. The term 菩提道場 refers to the vajradhātu- and garbhadhātumandala, that are based on the MVS and STTS respectively. In the present Japanese version, the vajradhātumandala consists of nine spaces where 1461 reside, and the garbhadhātumandala comprises thirteen areas for 405 deities, see e.g. Chou 1945: 312. For an encompassing study, see: Snodgrass 1988. On the aforementioned texts, see: chapter IV infra.

334 發菩提心真言 (Jap. hotsu bodaishin shingon): 喃呪地啞多母怛波那野彌 (Jap. On bōzishitta bodahadayamii), meaning “Oṃ, I arouse the mind of pursuing enlightenment!”, cf. Endō 317, n. 20. This formula is also attested in the STTS (cf. Abe 1999: 143) as well as in the MVS (T. XVIII, no. 848: 46b21-22), where it is called: 發菩提心方便真言 (Jap. hotsu bodaishin hōben shingon), lit. ‘mantra of the expedient means for generating the bodhi mind’, and translated as “Oṃ, I generate the mind of awakening”, cf. Giebel 2005: 237. However, it occurs also in many other texts, including both JBKG (T. XVIII, no. 915: 941a18), and in MSZ (T. XVIII, no. 917: 944b4-7), which are discussed in chapter IV below. Hatta (SJ: 93, no. 622), on the other hand, translates it as “Oṃ, I intend to arouse the Bodhi mind”. This dhāraṇī –as it is termed in the MSZ (T. XVIII, no. 917: 944b3)– is used in various rituals, and is variously called the ‘formula for receiving the precept regarding the mind of enlightenment’ (発菩提心戒真言 Jap. hotsu bodaishin kai [no] shingon), which is e.g. the case in the JBKG (T. XVIII, no. 915: 941a17). The Skt. utpādayāmi is a causative praesens in the first person singular, implying that the formula can be translated more literally as “I cause the mind of enlightenment to be born”, and thus as “I manifest the mind of enlightenment”.

48
The Nirvāṇasūtra\textsuperscript{335} says:

The initial determination to seek awakening\textsuperscript{336} [marks you as a Buddha, who is] the master of humans and deities,\textsuperscript{337} and excels [both] śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas.

Arousing the intent to attain awakening goes beyond the three realms.\textsuperscript{338}

Therefore it can be called ‘unsurpassed’.

\textsuperscript{335} Nirvāṇasūtra (Jap. Nehangyō), Skt. Nirvāṇasūtra. According to Radich, this is “a generic name for a group of sūtras entitled Mahāpārīnīvānasūtra, depicting events at the end of Buddha’s life”. These sūtras can be divided into two main groups: Nikāyāgama texts, and the Mahāyāna version of the Mahāpārīnīvānasūtra, which “while bearing some discernable relations to the Nikāyāgama version and containing some similar material, is vastly expanded, and also devote the bulk of its vast scope to the exposition of a large number of radical new doctrines. Three Chinese versions […] have come down to us, i.e. two translations and a revision: (1) The Dabannihuan jing 大般泥洹經 [Jap. Daihatsuniojangyō], 6 fasc.; translated in 416-418 […] by Buddhabhadra and Faxian, T. XII, no. 376. This translation was based upon a manuscript obtained by Faxian in Pātaliputra, reportedly from the house of a lay family; (2) The Dubanniepan jing 大般涅槃經 [Jap. Daihatsunehangyō], T. XII, no. 374, 40 fasc. translated in Guzang under the Northern Liang by Dharmakṣema. […] This translation was begun [in…] 421. This version was translated from a second Indian manuscript, obtained […] from a descendant of the same layperson who was the source of Faxian’s text. […] Various dates are given by various scholars for the translation of this text, ranging from about 414 to 423 […] This is also called the “Northern Edition”; (3) Da banniepan jing 大般涅槃經 (same title as above), 36 fasc.; produced under the Liu Song by Huiyan, Huiguan, Xie Lingyun et al., i.e. T. XII, no. 375. This ‘translation’ was actually a revision, based upon the Dharmakṣema version. It is known as the ‘Southern’ version of the text. […] Dharmakṣema’s version of the text (T. XII, no. 374) is ostensibly the basis of the only complete English translation to date, by Yamamoto [i.e. Yamamoto K. 1974]. However, […] Yamamoto’s translation is in fact a translation from Shimaji’s Kokuyaku issai kyō 國譯一切經 classical Japanese translation of the text, rather than a direct translation from the Chinese. […] Shimaji translated the Southern version, i.e. the ‘revision of Dharmakṣema’ by Huiyan/Jñānabhadrā et al. (T XII, no. 375). Thus, Yamamoto’s claim that he translates the Chinese of Dharmakṣema is doubly a misnomer. Readers should also be warned that Yamamoto’s translation is very often inaccurate.”; cf. Radich in DBJ, s.v. 涅槃經, with altered T.-references. This inaccurateness may also be evident from the quote below, cf. n. 340 infra.

\textsuperscript{336} Sho hosshin, cf. BGD: 680b.

\textsuperscript{337} Tenshō (Jap. tenshi), is an epithet of a Buddha, cf. BGD: 981b; DCBT: 145. Okada (1976: 13), however, takes tenshō (Jap.inden shi) as one phrase, meaning ‘teacher of humans and gods’. See also BGD: 1070c, s.v. 天人. Also Endō (1987: 301) has a similar reading, namely: “the teacher of the human world and the realm of heaven”.

\textsuperscript{338} 三界 (Jap. sangai) generally refers to the three realms of saṃsāra, i.e. the desire realm (欲界 Jap. yokukai, Skt. kāmadhātu), form realm (色界 Jap. shikikai, Skt. rūpadhātu), and the formless realm (無色界 Jap. mushikikai, Skt. ārūpya-dhātu), cf. DCBT: 70; NEBJ: 252a: BGD: 456d, s.v. 三界. However, in the esoteric sense, the term may also denote lotus, Buddha, and vajra, cf. MD: 777, s.v. 三界.

\textsuperscript{339} This quote matches with T. XII, no. 375: 838a4-7, which Yamamoto (1974, vol. III: 942) translates as “[The mind that first aspires to and the end attained are not separate. Such minds are hard to say which comes first. The end not yet attained, one saves others first. That is why I pay homage to the first aspiration.] From the first is he the teacher of man and heaven and is he far above śrāmanas (sic.) and pratyekabuddhas. Such an aspiration goes above the three realms. That is why he is the most superior.”
The Avatāṃsakasūtra\textsuperscript{340} says:

Practioner,\textsuperscript{341} when you first arouse this wonderful jewelled intent [to attain awakening], you surpass the stage of commoners,\textsuperscript{342} and enter the realm where the Buddhas practice.\textsuperscript{343}

Next,\textsuperscript{344} I ask: Kind sirs,\textsuperscript{345} are you, or are you not, able to uphold the great, supreme and unsurpassed precepts\textsuperscript{346} of all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas?

[**DISCIPLES**]

[Yes], I am able [to do so].\textsuperscript{347}

\textsuperscript{340} 華嚴經 (Jap. Kegongyō, Chin. Huayan jing) is Skt. Avatamsaka-sūtra, or Flower Adornment Sutra, one of the most influential sūtras in East Asian Buddhism, of which three Chinese translations exist, all with the full title 大方廣佛華嚴經 (Jap. Dainihōbutsu kegonkyō, Chin. Dajinbanguang fo huayan jing). This text “describes a cosmos of infinite realms upon realms which mutually contain each other. The vision expressed in this work was the foundation for the creation of Huayan (華嚴) Buddhism, which was characterized by a philosophy of interpenetration (圓融)”. The sūtra is well known for its detailed description of the course of the bodhisattva’s practice through fifty-two stages. Fragmentary translation of this text probably began in the second century, and the famous ‘Ten Stages’ book (十地經 Jap. Jūji kyō, Skt. Daśabhūmikā-sūtra), often treated as an individual scripture, was first translated in the third century. Much of the content of the Huayan jing, including such portions as its Book of the Ten Stages, has roots in Yogācāra discourse, but the text’s basic stance advocating innate enlightenment leads to a greater affinity with East Asian tathāgatagarbha and buddha-nature-oriented works such as the Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith, Nirvāṇa Sūtra, Lotus Sūtra, etc. Thus the Huayan jing comes to be valued in Tiantai’s doctrinal system,” cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 華嚴經. There are three major full-length translations of the sūtra: (1) Buddhahadra’s translation, completed around 420 (Avatamsaka-sūtra; 60 fasc.; T. IX, no. 278); (2) Śīksānanda’s translation (80 fascicles Avatamsaka-sūtra; T. X, no. 279) completed around 699; and (3) the translation of Prajñā dated around 798 (40 fasc.; Gaṇḍavyūha; T. X, no. 293). For more information, see: BKD III: 10d-11b, s.v. 華嚴經.

341 観音 (Jap. bōsō), lit. ‘son of Buddha’ refers to a bodhisattva, or even to any practitioner, for according to esoteric discourse, all possess the same Buddha-nature, cf. NEBJ: 23b; BGD: 1192.

342 凡夫位 (Jap. bombu i) is the level of unenlightened beings. Syn. 異生位 (Jap. ishō i), cf. BGD: 36d, s.v. 異生位. See also 凡夫 in n.185 above.

343 行處 (Jap. butsugyō sho), Skt. buddha-gocara, see: BKBD: 116. Skt. gocara, or 行處 (Jap. gyōsho), however, can also designate “the area within which exchange or intercourse is conducted”, cf. BGD: 243d-244a, s.v. 行處. This quotation is identical to T. X, no. 279: 184a8-9, cf. supra n. 341.

344 As indicated by Kōda (1993: 381-382), this point marks a shift in the contents of the HSBK. Up to this point, text is remarkably close to the JHBK, and now shifts to the KSK. For more information, see the discussion on the HSBK’s authenticity in chapter IV infra.

345 仁者 (Jap. jinjō), cf. BGD: 792c.

346 律儀 (Jap. ritsugi kai), Skt. saṃvara-sūla refers to the pratimokṣa of the seven groups, i.e. bhikṣus, bhikṣunīs, śīkṣamānas, śrāmaṇerīs, śrāmaṇeras, upāsakas, and upāsikās, who each receive the precepts according to their position, cf. BGD: 1419, s.v. ritsugi kai. Soothill interprets 律儀 (Jap. ritsugi) as “rules and ceremonies”, cf. DCBT: 301, s.v. 律.

347 The Chinese text reads “[You should] answer” in smaller font, but for readability’s sake this has been left out.
[MASTER]

Next, [you should] summon\(^{348}\) the worthies and sages\(^{349}\)

(Summon them three times)\(^{350}\)

[DISCIPLES]

I, disciple X, summon all Buddhas of the ten directions to be my great reverend witnesses.\(^{351}\) Most Virtuous Ones,\(^{352}\) please\(^{353}\) be my clear witnesses!\(^{354}\)

I, disciple X, invoke\(^{355}\) Akṣobhya,\(^{356}\) Ratnaketu,\(^{357}\) Amitāyus\(^{358}\) and Divyadundubhi-mega-nirghoṣa\(^{359}\) to be my preceptors.\(^{360}\)

\(^{348}\) 請 (Jap. shō), lit. ‘to request’ or ‘invite’, can also be translated as ‘to summon’, cf. 招請 (Jap. shōsei) in Endō 1987: 301. Also see: DCBT: 443, s.v. 請.

\(^{349}\) Cf. 賛聖 in n. 277 above.

\(^{350}\) 三請 (Jap. san shō), cf. BGD: 475d. See also "san tabi 三たび" in Endō 1987: 301.

\(^{351}\) 尊譚 (Jap. sonshō) generally refers to the seven witnessing अचार्यas or members of the clergy who are present at an ordination ceremony, and are also called 七證師 (Jap. shichi shoṣhi), or 七證 (Jap. shichi shoṣ). See 三師七證 (Jap. san shi shichi shoṣ) in BGD: 585a, denoting the ‘three masters’ (三師), or superior monks, and a minimum of seven witnesses (七證) required for an ordination ceremony to be valid. Also see n. 60 supra. The ‘three masters’ (Skt. अचार्य) are: (1) the ‘preceptor’ (戒和尚 Jap. kai oṣhō), i.e. a teacher who is responsible for instructing the postulant and granting the precepts (Skt. upadhyācyārya, cf. BGD: 166, s.v. kai oṣhō); (2) the ‘professor’, or ‘master [in charge] of the act [of professing the precepts]’ (羯摩師, Skt. karmācārya), who recites the announcement and the text of the precepts (cf. BGD: 182, s.v. kamma ajari); (3) and the ‘instructor’ (教授師 Jap. kyōushi), who functions as judge of qualifications (Skt. anuśāsanācārya), but is also called ‘master of liturgy’ because he teaches ritual to the receiver of the precepts (cf. BGD: 231c, s.v. 教授師). See also NEBJ: 259a; BGD: 465a, s.v. 三師七證. In Mahāyana texts and in tantric ritual manuals however, these masters are usually (1) Śākyamuni; (2) Mañjuśrī; and (3) all bodhisattva-mahāsattvas, whom are invited to be the disciple’s respective upādyāya, karmācārya, and fellow postulants (同學 Jap. dōgaku hōryō, cf. e.g. DCBT: 204, s.v. 同). According to Abe (1999: 50 and 465, n. 122) this originated in the Samantabhadra-sūtra, translated by Dharmanimitra (356-442) as 觀普賢菩薩行法經 (Jap. Kanfugenbosatsugyōbōkyō), i.e. T. vol. IX, no. 277. On Dharmanimitra, see: MD: 1692, s.v. 奉無常多 (Jap. Danmanmitta).

\(^{352}\) 大德 (Jap. daitoku), cf. NEBJ: 43a; BGD: 925c.

\(^{353}\) Based on “dō kai どうか” in Endō 1987: 301.

\(^{354}\) 證明 (Jap. shōmyō) is translated as ‘to have the clear witness within’, or ‘to prove clearly’, cf. DCBT: 473, s.v. 證; BGD: 738a, s.v. shōmyō.

\(^{355}\) 奉請 (Jap. bujō, var. bushō), cf. BGD: 1183c.

\(^{356}\) According to Shingon doctrine, of the six elements (i.e. earth, water, fire, wind or air, ether or space, and conciousness), the first five form the phenomenal world or the garbhadhātu (胎藏界 Jap. taizōkai), which is the ‘womb’ of all things, while the sixth element forms the realms of wisdom or consciousness, i.e. the vajradhātu (金剛界 Jap. kongōkai) or the Diamond Realm. The sixth element, Skt. vijñāna, is further divided in the so-called pañca-vijñāna (五智 Jap. gochī), or the five wisdoms: (1) dharmadhātu-svabhāva-vijñāna (法界體性智 Jap. hokkai taishō-chi) or the wisdom lying in the nature of the dharmadhātu itself (also translated as ‘Dharma World Knowledge’, and called the ‘Fundamental Knowledge’, 根本智 Jap. kompon-chi) which is associated with Mahāvairocanā’s samādhi and the element of ether; (2) adarśāsāna-vijñāna (大圓鏡智 Jap. daienkyō-chi) or the wisdom of the ‘great round mirror’ that reflects all (also called ‘Diamond Knowledge’, 金刚智 Jap. kongō-chi), and is associated with the element of water, the east, and thus also Buddha Akṣobhya; (3) samatā-vijñāna (平等性智 Jap. byōdōshōchī) is the wisdom of equality and universality of all things, (also translated as ‘knowledge of
identity’, and called Initiation Knowledge,灌頂智 (Jap. kanjō-chi), corresponding to the element of fire and Buddha Ratnasambhava of the south; (4) pratyaveksanā-jñāna (妙觀察智 (Jap. myōkan-zatchi), the wisdom of the correct and profound insight (also translated as ‘Knowledge of Wondrous Perception’, and called ‘Lotus Knowledge’,蓮華智 (Jap. renge-chi), associated with water and Amitābha of the west; and (5) kṛtyānushāna-jñāna (成所作智 (Jap. jōshosa-chi) or the wisdom denoting the perfection of the beneficial acts (also translated as ‘Knowledge of the Perfection of Action’), and is associated with air and Amoghasiddhi of the north. These five Buddhas are also called the five dhīyāṃ Buddhas. The five wisdoms are the latter four kinds that are attributed to each Buddha, to which esotericism adds a first universal and encompassing one. See: DCBT: 119-120; BGD: 372; MD: 620; MJ: 220, s.v. gochi; Hakeda 1972: 83-84; and Yamasaki 1988: 61-63; and MD: 633, s.v. go butsu. These five knowledges are discussed in Amoghavajra’s translation of the Bodhicittasūtra, quoted in BD: 1246, s.v. gochi. For an English translation of this text, cf. White 2005. See Snodgrass 1988, vol. 2: 590, and ibid: 589-592 for a the iconographic representation of these Buddhas in the vajradhātu-mañḍala. ‘This being said,無動 (Jap. Mudō), cf. BGD: 1342a; Syn. 不動 (Jap. Budō), can be an abbreviation for 不動明王 (Jap. go myōō), i.e. Acala, the messenger of the Buddhas; and the chief of the five luminous kings (五明王 (Jap. go myōō)). See e.g. NEBJ 59b; BGD: 1170d, s.v. 不動明王. However, 不動 may also denote 不動佛 (Jap. Budō-butsu), an appellation for Akṣobhya, one of the aforementioned five dhīyāṃ Buddhas 五智如來 (Jap. go chi nyorai) depicted in the vajradhātu-mañḍala. Endō (1987: 302), however, states that the Buddhas evoked here are those from the garbhadhātu-mañḍala, but in the present iconography Akṣobhya is not part of the central lotus of this diagram. He is portrayed in the north of the so-called ‘old iconography of the garbha-mañḍala’, cf. Yamamoto 1980: fig. 4, no. 4. Another possibility is that it may be Acala depicted in an older edition of the concerning diagram, but this manḍala has not been identified yet. Or, maybe, Endō is mistaking, and not the garbhadhātu, but the vajradhātu Buddhas are invoked, in which case Akṣobhya perfectly fits the picture as Buddha of the east. For the relation between Acala and Akṣobhya, also see Snodgrass 1988: 236. At this point the reader is referred to a basic sketch of the divinities’ place in the manḍalas, i.e. appendix B infra.

357 寶生 (Jap. Hōshō), syn. 窮生佛 (Jap. Hōshō-butsu), lit. the ‘Jewel-born Buddha’, is Ratnasambhava, the central figure of the south in the vajradhātu-mañḍala, cf. BGD: 1245b; and for more details, see: MD: 2017-2018, s.v. Hōshō butsu. If Endō’s statement (1987: 302) is correct, and the Buddhas invoked here are part of the garbhadhātu-mañḍala, then it is highly unlikely that Ratnasambhava is intended here. It could be that he refers to Ratnaketu, for 寶生佛 is an attested other name for Ratnaketu, who is usually called 寶幢佛 (Jap. Hōsū-butsu), 寶勝 (Jap. Hōshō), or 寶生佛 (Jap. Hōshō-butsu), and is the Buddha of the east in the garbhadhātu, while its Buddha of the south is Saṃkusumitarājā (開敷華王, Jap. Kaifukeō), cf. MD: 209a, s.v. Kaifukeō-butsu. Again, in case Endō is mistaking, it would be only logical that the text, parallel to the aforementioned Akṣobhya (cf. n. 357 above), intends to evoke Ratnasambhava of the south in the vajradhātu.

358 阿彌陀 (Jap. Amida) usually denotes Amitābha, cf. NEBJ: 7a; BGD: 9c; MD: 37-39, s.v. Amida-butsu. However, he is normally called Amitāyus in the garbhamañḍala, and Amitābha in the vajra-mañḍala, cf. Snodgrass 1988: 232 and 611 respectively. When –as Endō suggests (cf. n. 357-358 supra)– indeed the garbhadhātu is intended, then 阿彌陀 would have to be a transliteration for Amitāyus (無量壽 菩提). See e.g. MD: 2148b, s.v. Muryōju-butsu. Amitāyus also appears as Buddha of the west in the “Old iconography” of the garbhadhātu, cf. Yamamoto 1980: fig. 4, no. 5.

359 天鼓雷音[佛] (Jap. Tenkorai[on]-butsu) translates Skt. Divyadundubhi-mega-nirghoṣa, one of the Buddhas depicted in the garbhadhātu-mañḍala, residing in the region to the north of the eight-petaled dais. As he energizes the people in the world to awaken to the wisdom of nirvāṇa, his name is ‘Thunderous Rumble of the Heavenly Drum’, cf. BGD: 980a, DCBT: 148. For more information, see Snodgrass 1988: 236. He accords to Amoghasiddhi in the vajradhātu-mañḍala, cf. MD: 1905, s.v. 不空成就仏 (Jap. Fukan jōju butsu). In contrast to Endō (1987: 302), who clearly adds that these four Buddhas are the four tathāgatas of the garbhadhātu-mañḍala, the other Buddhas quoted here are definitely also names of Buddhas residing in the vajradhātu-mañḍala (cf. supra n. 357-359). Their respective correspondences are (listed in the order garbhadhātu/vajradhātu): Ratnaketu/Akṣobhya (east), Saṃkusumita-rāja/Ratnasambhava (south), Amitāyus/Amitābha (west), and Divyadundubhi-mega-nirghoṣa/Amoghasiddhi (north). In the garbhadhātu-mañḍala these Buddhas embody the so-called ‘five conversions,’ but because these realms are non-dual, they also represent the five knowledges that are embodied in the vajradhātu-mañḍala, cf. Snodgrass 1988, vol. 2: 590 vs. ibid.: vol. 1: 220. On the five knowledges, see n. 257 supra. On the five conversions, see: Snodgrass 1988, vol. 1: 215ff. Divyadundubhi-mega-nirghoṣa is the only Buddha of the four who is addressed with a specific name that clearly indicates the realm of his manifestation. Its reason remains an object for further investigation, but it might, perhaps, be that names from the other diagram are deliberately used in order to stress the manḍalas’ interrelation and non-duality. However, given that in the subsequent passage, the Buddhas are clearly listed in the order east, south, west, and north, and there bear names that are typical to the vajradhātu-mañḍala, the text is probably corrupt here, or the
I am depending on you, preceptors [of the garbhadhātumāṇḍala] to receive the full precepts being the symbol of Bodhisattva purity.\(^{361}\)

Oh, please be my preceptors! Oh, may you be compassionate\(^{362}\) towards me!

I sincerely invite Akṣobhya\(^{363}\) the Mighty,\(^{364}\) Ratnasambhava the Supreme Venerable,\(^{365}\) Amitābha\(^{366}\) the Great Compassionate, and Amoghasiddhi the Active One!\(^{367}\)

By sincerely prostrating before them, I summon these unsurpassed Venerables [who are residing the vajradhātumāṇḍala]!

---

**Author/compiler confusion:** The author/compiler confused the names of the first two Buddhas. Then, in accordance to the order in the next passage, Akṣobhya should be Ratnaketu, while Ratnaketu should be replaced with the Saṃkusumita-rāja. On these latter two Buddhas, see Snodgrass 1988: 227 and 230ff.

**和尚 (Jap. ōshō), Skt. upadhyāya,** see n. 352 above.

**具足菩薩清浄三昧耶戒 (Jap. gusoku bosatsu shōjō sammaya kai).** Endō (1987: 302) translates具足 as ‘flawless’, ‘absolute perfection’ (cf.完全無欠 Jap. kanzen muketsu), an interpretation which is also found in BGD: 276a, s.v.具足, and adds that the whole phrase denotes “the precepts on pure equality” (Jap. kiyoraka na byōdo no kai 清らかな平等の戒) that are expounded in the Shingon school. However, as explained under the ‘Title’ section (cf. p. 25 above), samaya may also be translated as ‘symbol’. For a further discussion, and for Skt. samaya denoting e.g. ‘equality’, see chapter IV below. On具足 also see chapter II: 17 and 20, n. 102; p. 45, n. 316 supra.

**慈愍 (Jap. jimin), NEBJ: 136a; BGD: 574a.**

**阿閦鞞 (Jap. Ashukubi),** here, in contrast to the previous passage (cf. n. 357 above), clearly indicates Akṣobhya, who resides in the east of the vajradhātumāṇḍala, cf. MD: 24b, s.v. Ashuku-butsu; Snodgrass 1988: 604ff.

**雄猛 (Jap. yūmyō), BGD: 1386c.**

**Here called 宝生尊 (Jap. Hōshō-son),** residing in the south of the vajradhātū, cf. Snodgrass 1988: 607ff. Also see n. 358 above.


**成就不空業 (Jap. jōjū fukū gō),** a lit. transliteration of Skt. siddhi amogha karman. For成就 denoting siddhi, cf. MD: 1157c, s.v. jōjū; for 不空 being amogha, see: BKBD: 46, s.v. 不空; and for 業 as karma(n), ibid.: 660. On the meanings of 業, see Muller in DBJ, s.v. 業. For obscure reasons the parts of the name seem to be inverted, because this Buddha is generally referred to as 不空成就仏 (Jap. Fukūjūjū-butsu), cf. MD 1905c, and also n. 360 supra. As already indicated, Endō (1987: 302) suggests that in the former passage the Buddhas of the garbhādhātū were invoked, while now their counterparts in the vajradhātumāṇḍala are intended. From a ritual point of view, this is indeed a theoretical possibility, that is further sustained by textual evidence: 業 also denotes ‘action’, which reminds of the aforementioned ‘Knowledge of the Perfection of Action’, cf. 成所作智 in n. 357 above, a designation used for Amoghasiddhi, who resides in the north of the vajradhātumāṇḍala, whilst his counterpart in the garbhādhātumāṇḍala is precisely called Divyadundubhi-mega-nirghoṣa, see n. 360 supra. On Amoghasiddhi, also see Snodgrass 1988: 614ff.
Reaching out to Vajrasattva who vanquishes all [demons], the supreme Akāśagarbha Bodhisattva, who diligently confers consecrations, Avalokiteśvara, the World-savior, who manifests

---

368 薩埵金剛 (Jap. Satta-kongō) is generally known as 金刚薩埵 (Jap. Kongōsatta). Again, the compounds of a divinity name appear to be mirrored, cf. n. 367 above. In Shingon, Vajrasattva is considered the one who received the teachings from Mahāvairocana, and is thus considered second of the eight patriarchs, cf. BGD: 419, s.v. Kongōsatta. For a survey of the Shingon patriarchs, see: Rambach 1978: 16-24. Vajrasattva also is the first in the series of the so-called sixteen praṇītābodhisattvas, see: Yamasaki 1988: 90; MJ: 236, s.v. kongōshu. These praṇītābodhisattvas are part of the thirty-seven important venerables of the vajradhātumandala, where in groups of four they encircle the aforementioned four Buddhas, i.e. Akṣobhya in the eastern moon, Ratnasambhava in the south, Amitābha in the west, and Amoghasiddhi in the north, cf. BGD: 663, s.v. jōrokudaibosatsu. For a list of their other designations, see: Yamasaki 1988: 97. Vajrasattva is also the first of the four Bodhisattvas who attend Akṣobhya in the vajradhātumandala, and represents the stage in which the practitioner’s intent to attain enlightenment is first manifested, cf. SG: 686-688, s.v. Kongōshu. For a discussion of the attendant Bodhisattvas, see: Snodgrass 1988: vol. 2: 604ff. For a graphic representation of the thirty-seven Venerables, see: SJ: 292. The formula as the one who accompanies Akṣobhya in the east of the vajradhātumandala, but Vajrasattva also appears as central figure of the varjadhāra court in the south of the garbhadhātumandala, cf. SJ: 295, no. 59.

369 On the capitalization of ‘Bodhisattva’, see: n. 259 supra.

370 灌頂曼荼羅 (Jap. gōbukuramondo) is based on this text, but remains hardly researched. Noteworthy also, may be that neither Kūkai, nor Saichō considered it to be an esoteric text, cf. Groner 1984: 55, 58-70. The  수행만다라 (Jap. kōjō mandara) is based on this text, but remains hardly researched. Noteworthy also, may be that neither Kūkai, nor Saichō considered it to be an esoteric text, cf. Groner 1984: 47, n. 40. For more details, see: MD: 1416, s.v. sushitsuji mandara. For more on the Shingon initiation, see: Abe 1999: 122-125, 133-146. On abhiṣekha, also see chapter I: 3. 371 救世自在 (Jap. Kuse-Kanjizai), lit. Avalokiteśvara, the World-Savior, cf. BGD: 196c. Avalokiteśvara as such is generally referred to as 觀世音 (Jap. Kanzeon), lit. ‘he who observes the sounds [of suffering] in the world’, being the embodiment of compassion, cf. BGD: 197, s.v. Kanzeon bosatsu. Avalokiteśvara resides in the so-called padma group of the garbhadhātumandala. His attribute is a lotus, and he symbolizes speech as one of the three mysteries (cf. n. 447 infra). It is one of the manifestations of Mahāvairocana, cf. Kiyota 1978: 86. Together with Samantabhadra, Mahājūrī and Maitreya (cf. n. 381-383 infra) Avalokiteśvara is part of the four Bodhisattvas, who surround the Buddha in the central eight-petalled lotus of the aforementioned diagram. These Bodhisattvas each represent various stages of esoteric practice: Samantabhadra represents the arousal of the Vajra in the court of space in the west of the contemporay diagrams, these Thatpāhala, resulting in a threefold textual tradition (Jap. kanjizai), cf. SJ: 295, no. 59. 

372 救世自在 (Jap. Kuse-Kanjizai), lit. Avalokiteśvara, the World-Savior, cf. BGD: 196c. Avalokiteśvara as such is generally referred to as 觀世音 (Jap. Kanzeon), lit. ‘he who observes the sounds [of suffering] in the world’, being the embodiment of compassion, cf. BGD: 197, s.v. Kanzeon bosatsu. Avalokiteśvara resides in the so-called padma group of the garbhadhātumandala. His attribute is a lotus, and he symbolizes speech as one of the three mysteries (cf. n. 447 infra). It is one of the manifestations of Mahāvairocana, cf. Kiyota 1978: 86. Together with Samantabhadra, Mahājūrī and Maitreya (cf. n. 381-383 infra) Avalokiteśvara is part of the four Bodhisattvas, who surround the Buddha in the central eight-petalled lotus of the aforementioned diagram. These Bodhisattvas each represent various stages of esoteric practice: Samantabhadra represents the arousal of the Vajra in the court of space in the west of the contemporay diagrams, these Thatpāhala, resulting in a threefold textual tradition (Jap. kanjizai), cf. SJ: 295, no. 25, who resides in the lotus section in the north
[T. 2463: 7b20] *samādhi-yoga*,\(^{374}\) and the skilled Viśvakarman\(^{375}\), who is good at doing all jobs,\(^{376}\) I only request that you, Wheel-turners\(^{377}\) [of the *vajradhātumāṇḍala*], accept my invitation [to be my preceptors]!

(Say [this] three times.)

[MASTER]

Next, you should request the professors\(^{378}\) and the ritual instructors.\(^{379}\)

[DISCIPLES]

May Samantabhadra,\(^{380}\) Maitreya,\(^{381}\) Mañjuśrī,\(^{382}\) and Sarvanivāraṇa-Viṣkambhi\(^{383}\) [who reside in the *garbhahātumāṇḍala*] be my professors!

of the *garbhahātumāṇḍala*, cf. Snodgrass 1988: 246. However, Endō (1987: 302) states that Avalokiteśvara displays the mudrā of Vajradharma (金剛法 Jap. Kongōhō) Bodhisattva, who is depicted in the *vajradhātumāṇḍala* as an attendant of Amitābha in the west. For their interrelation, see Snodgrass 1988: 611.

\(^{374}\) 三昧瑜伽 (Jap. *sammai-yuga*). 三味 corresponds to Skt. *samādhi*, cf. BGD: 489c, *s.v. samma*. Skt. *samādhi* means ‘to bring together’, cf. SED: 1159, *s.v. samādhi*, which is the joining together of thoughts in an intense concentration and the whole union with the object or theme of the meditation. Kiyota (1978: 172) translates this term as ‘trance of concentration’. Soothill points out that it is interpreted as an indisruptible contemplation, by which the flow of thoughts is brought to a stand-still. Thus, the practitioner brings mind and thoughts in perfect balance. The aim, according to Soothill, is *mukti* or the freedom of all hindrances, attachment to desires, and reincarnations. Skt. *dhyāna* (定 Jap. *tei/chō*) is a simplified contemplation, *samāpatti* denotes a higher stage, and *samādhi* is the highest level of Buddhist *yoga*, cf. DCBT: 66-67, *s.v. 三味* (地). *瑜伽* is the transliteration of Skt. *yoga*, while *相應* (Jap. *sō-ō*), is its most commonly used translation. The term denotes unity between macro- and micro-cosmos, cf. BGD: 865, *s.v. sō-ō* and BGD: 1380b, *s.v. yuga*.

\(^{375}\) 昆首羯磨 (Jap. *Bishukamma*), Skt. Viśvakarman is the ‘all-doer’, or ‘maker’, the Indian Vulcan, architect of the universe and patron of artisans; interpreted as minister of Indra, and his director of work, cf. BGD: 1134c. Also see MD: 899c, *s.v. jūrokū daigo*. However, in Mikkyō this is another designation for either Ākāśagarbha (cf. supra n. 372), or Vajrakarma Bodhisattva (金刚業菩薩 Jap. Kongōō-bosatsu), cf. MD: 1854a, *s.v. 昆首羯磨*. The latter figure is the most central attending Bodhisattva of Amoghasiddhi in the north of the *vajradhātumāṇḍala*. Suppose, it were the *garbhahātā* figures invoked here, one would expect that Śākyamuni, head of the Śākya court in the east of the *garbhahātumāṇḍala* is addressed at this stage (cf. SJ: 295, no. 106), following a clockwise turn from SJ: 295, no. 59, over 185, and 25 to 106. On the relation between Viśvakarman and Vajrakarma, see Snodgrass 1988: 615.

\(^{376}\) 諸事業 (Jap. *shō jīgō*), cf. BKBD: 1090.

\(^{377}\) 転輸者 (Jap. *tenrinju*), cf. BGD: 991a, *s.v. tenrin*. The aforementioned four figures are part of the sixteen great Bodhisattvas in the center of the *vajradhātumāṇḍala*, and occupy the most central position in the four moons that surround Mahāvairocana. Cf. diagram in appendix B below. On *tenrin*, also see e.g. Snodgrass 1988: 421, n. 11.


\(^{379}\) 教授 (Jap. *kyōju*) is an abbreviation of 敎授師 (Jap. *kyōjushi*), referring to * anusāsanaçārīyas*, see: ibid. supra.

\(^{380}\) 普賢 (Jap. Fugen), lit. ‘Universal Virtue’, generally refers to Samantabhadra Bodhisattva, who represents the practice and meditation of all Buddhas, and in this sense is the counterpart of Mañjuśrī, who represents their wisdom and realization (cf. n. 382 below). Further see: DCBT: 374, *s.v.普*; BGD: 1179, *s.v. Fugen*; and also n.
These four Bodhisattvas are just like the auspicious jars, because when [even] one is lacking, it is impossible [to perform the abhiṣeka ritual].

1. Bodhisattva-mahāsattva Samantabhadra [lit. the Universal Virtuous One]:

universal [Skt. samanta] means ‘to spread everywhere’, and ‘virtue [Skt. bhadra]’ denotes ‘excellent virtuous’. In other words, [this implies that] the vow aroused from the intent to attain awakening, together with its


389 除蓋障 (Jap. Jokaishō; var. Jogaishō), lit. ‘Hindrance Remover’, cf. DCBT: 340; MD: 1218ff., s.v. Jokaishō-bosatsu, for a detailed discussion. According to Kiyota (1978: 92), his name means ‘eliminating obstacles’, and this Bodhisattva ‘represents jñāna radiating from the Hall of Vajrapāṇi’. Given that the former three Bodhisattvas are the central figures attending the four Buddhas surrounding Mahāvairocana in the middle of the garbhadhātumāndala (cf. Kiyota 1978: 85 and appendix B below), and the fact that this Bodhisattva was sometimes confused with Sūryaprabha (cf. Kiyota 1978: 143, n. 10), there may have also been some confusion in the present text. That is, the logical figure to be involved here would be Avalokiteśvara (cf. n. 374 supra), who would complete the circle, cf. SJ: 295, no. 7. Sarvanivāraṇa-Viśkambhin, however, is the central venerable in the outer south section, cf. SJ: 295, no. 157. Also Mahājñāpi appears in the outer ribbon, but in the east, cf. SJ: 295, no. 138. If the latter two were intended, then also Kṣitigarbha and Akāśagarbha would have to appear here (cf. SJ: 295, nos. 166 and 185 respectively), instead of the aforementioned Maitreya and Samantabhadra. The fact that there is a lot of confusion regarding this divinity is also pointed out by Snodgrass (1988: 182; 393, n. 4; 394).

390 贊瓶 (Jap. kenbyō), lit. ‘magic bottle’ from which all can be wished, cf. BGD: 329d. It is syn. to 德瓶 (Jap. tokubyō), cf. BGD: 1021d, which is also interpreted as ‘a talisman of power’, cf. DCBT: 432. Also an alternative rendering of 如意瓶 (Jap. nyoi byō) a container in which medicinal compounds, gems, gold, silver, etc., are placed. Its neck is decorated with a net made of flower, cf. DCBT: 211, BGD: 1060a, being vases used in the consecration ceremony, which is an indispensable tool. Endō (1987: 303) points out that this vase contains the ‘vow water’ (誓水 Jap. seisui, cf. BGD: 825c; syn. 金剛水 Jap. kongō su, cf. BGD: 420c) at the consecration that represents the four qualities (德性 Jap. tokushō, cf. BGD: 1021c) of Mahāvairocana. According to MD: 484a, 贊瓶 is synonymous to 宝瓶 (Jap. hōbyō), being Skt. kalasā, cf. MD: 2029, s.v. hōbyō, where the procedure of drinking the water is explained. For examples, see BGJD: 144, 290ff. s.v. 花瓶 (Jap. kebyō).

Also see 菩 (Jap. fu) in n. 268 and 381 above. On its meaning as Skt. samanta, cf. BKBD: 602. On the meaning word samanta, also see: Pinte G. 2010: 438, 440-441.


392 賢 (Jap. ken) as Skt. bhadra, cf. BKBD: 1112. Also see: BGD: 328d.

393 最妙善 (Jap. saimyō zen), in which 最妙 denotes ‘most excellent’, cf. BKBD: 616, s.v. 最妙. For meanings of the character 善 in Buddhist contexts, on the other hand, cf. NEBJ: 335b; BGD: 847a; and BKBD: 259.
cultivation, \(^{389}\) and the three activities [of body, speech, and mind of Mahāvairocana] \(^{390}\) are completely identical \(^{391}\) and all-pervasive. He is also called ‘adamantine [Skt. vajra]’. \(^{392}\) Vajra is a metaphor for the true reality of all things, \(^{393}\) it transcends all verbal expression and mental operation, and has also no basis. \(^{394}\) It does not show any constituents, \(^{395}\) and is timeless. \(^{396}\) It is unperishing, indestructible, free from fault, \(^{397}\) and unchangeable.

Therefore it is called ‘adamantine (Skt. vajra)’. To general convention, \(^{398}\) vajra has three meanings: i. ‘indestructible’; ii. ‘king amongst jewels’ \(^{399}\); and iii. ‘supreme amongst weapons’.

2. Bodhisattva Maitreya [lit. the Merciful One, is called so, because of] his four immeasurable states of mind, \(^{400}\) compassion \(^{401}\) is most valued.

---

\(^{389}\) 願行 (Jap. gangyō) means “to vow and perform the discipline the vow involves. Vow願 means the intention to attain good results and practice行 is the cultivation by which one gets the good results.” Muller in DBJ, s.v.願行. Also see: NEBJ: 68b; BGD: 200c, and DCBT: 476.

\(^{390}\) 三業 (Jap. sun gō) here denotes Skt. trikarman, or the three kinds of actions, i.e. physical (or activities of the body, 身業 Jap. shingō, cf. BGD: 771, s.v. shingō), mental (or activities of cognition, 意業 Jap. igō, cf. BGD: 40, s.v. igō), and verbal (or activities of the mouth, 口業 Jap. kukō, cf. BGD: 258, s.v. kukō), see: BGD: 462; MJ: 264, s.v. sangō. Other interpretations include: (1) good merit of present life, negative karma from present life, and merit from the impenetrable nature; (2) the discrepancy between good, bad and neutral karma; (3) merit arising from a normal rebirth, from Hīnayāna awakening, and from Mahāyāna awakening; and (4) the consequences of one’s present actions on this life, the next life, and the therupon following life, cf. DCBT: 68, s.v. 三業.

\(^{391}\) 金剛 (Jap. byōdō), cf. n. 248 and 362 supra, and also the discussion on the term samaya in chapter IV below.

\(^{392}\) 金剛 (Jap. kongō), equivalent to Skt. vajra, also meaning ‘indestructible’, cf. NEBJ: 179b; BGD: 418b. The symbol of the vajra is essential to esoteric Buddhism. For further reference, consult e.g. Snodgrass 1988: passim.

\(^{393}\) 實相義 (Jap. jissō gi) is defined as ‘the principle of the true nature of things’, corresponding to Skt. dharma-svabhāva-mudrā, cf. BGD: 598c. The T.-edition notes that the original ms. in KDZ reads 智 instead of 義, but TKDZ V: 170 also has 義, and neither Okada (1976: 15), nor Endō (1987: 303) mention this variant. 實相智 (Jap. jissō chi) denotes the complete knowledge of reality, i.e. that of Mahāvairocana, cf. DCBT: 423. In both cases, 實相 refers to the true original nature, absolute fundamental reality, the ultimate, and therefore, also to the Dharmakāya, cf. NEBJ: 140b; BGD: 598a.

\(^{394}\) 無所依 (Jap. mu sho e) contrast the adagio that all activity is contingent on something else, or needs a ‘basis’ in order to exist or function, cf. BGD: 1329c.

\(^{395}\) 諸法 (Jap. shohō) are factors that comprise phenomena, beings or things, cf. BGD: 690c. In other words, it has no mass, or it is free of space.

\(^{396}\) 無初中後 (Jap. mu shochūgo), lite. ‘without beginning, middle or end’, cf. BKBD: 761. In other words, it is free of time.

\(^{397}\) Here we follow Endō’s interpretation (1987: 303) of 過失 (Jap. ka’aka) as a compound, the first part of which is an abbreviation for 過失 (Jap. kashitsu), i.e. an error, or mistake, cf. BGD:155d, s.v. 過失.

\(^{398}\) 世間 (Jap. seken), cf. BGD: 816b.

\(^{399}\) 寶中之王 (Jap. hōjū no ō), i.e. diamond. Here to be distinguished from other connotations, cf. BGD: 1243d, s.v. 宝王 (Jap. hōō).

\(^{400}\) See 四無量心 (Jap. shī muryōshin) discussed in the context of 廣大之心 in n. 202 supra.

\(^{401}\) 慈 (Jap. ji) has also been interpreted as ‘kindness’ in the framework of the 四無量心, cf. n. 202 supra, but it is also used as an abbreviation of 慈悲 (Jap. jihi), denoting ‘compassion’, cf. n. 198 supra. Okada (1976: 15, n. 1)
3. Wonderful and Auspicious\textsuperscript{402} Bodhisattva [i.e. Mañjuśrī]: ‘Wonderful’ [Skt. mañju] means unequalled\textsuperscript{403} and unsurpassed,\textsuperscript{404} while ‘Auspicious’ [Skt. śrī] denotes the glory\textsuperscript{405} of delight.\textsuperscript{406} He is also called Marvellous Virtuous One,\textsuperscript{407} and the One with the Marvellous Voice.\textsuperscript{408}

[T. 2463: 7c5]

4. Hindrance Remover [i.e. Sarvanivāraṇa-Viṣkambhī].\textsuperscript{409} The various mental defilements of sentient beings can blind awakening. This Bodhisattva is capable of removing the fog of these hindrances and reveals the light of Mahāvairocana.\textsuperscript{410}

Therefore, invoke these four Bodhisattvas and make them your professors!

[DISCIPLES]

I summon the four Mahābodhisattvas\textsuperscript{411} Samantabhadra, Maitreya, Mañjuśrī and Sarvanivāraṇa-Viṣkambhī. Lest them be my professors!

[T. 2463: 7c10]

Enacting as my [karma-]ācāryas, you are able to confer the precepts that are the symbol of Bodhisattva purity.\textsuperscript{412} Oh, may you be merciful!

[MASTER]

Next, you should invite the three Mahābodhisattvas, [namely] Samantabhadra-Bodhisattva, Vajrasattva and Avalokiteśvara-Bodhisattva, to be your instructors!

---

points out that according to the ‘Thousand Arms Viddhī’ (千手軌 Jap. Senju kī), compassion (慈) actually is the samādhī of Samantabhadra of the east. The title 千手軌 is an abbreviation for 金剛頂瑜伽千手千眼觀自在菩薩修行儀軌經 Jap. Kongōchō yuga senju sengen Kanjizai-bosatsu shugyō giki kyō, i.e. T. XX, no. 1056. For more information, see BKD III: 492c; Chandra 1988: esp. 13-15ff.; Reis-Habito 1993: 118-119.

妙吉祥 (Jap. Myō Kichijō) is a translation of ‘Mañjuśrī’, cf. BGD: 1302d. The transliteration is 文殊師利 (Jap. Monjushiri), cf. n. 383 above.

更無等比 (Jap. kyō mutō hiti), lit. ‘there is not another like this’, cf. BGD: 1341c, s.v. mutō.

無過上 (Jap. mu kajō), cf. BKBD: 782, s.v. 無過.

善譽 (Jap. zen’yo) also denotes ‘fame’, or ‘good reputation’, cf. BKD: 852c.

妙德 (Jap. kakyō), cf. BKBD: 270

妙音 (Jap. Myō’on), cf. BGD: 1302a; BKBD: 357.

妙音 (Jap. Myō’on), cf. BGD: 1302a; BKBD: 357.

妙音 (Jap. Myō’on), cf. BGD: 1302a; BKBD: 357.

除蓋障, cf. n. 384 supra.

410 Here referred to as 大日 (Jap. Dainichi), on Mahāvairocana, see e.g. Pinte K. 2009a.

411 See n. 259 above regarding the difference between a ‘regular’ and a ‘great Bodhisattva’.

412 In contrast to the previous attestation, i.e. T. 2643: 7b15, both the T. and TKDZ-edition read 三昧戒 instead of 三昧耶戒. Normally, 三昧 refers to Skt. samādhi (cf. NEBJ: 249b BGD: 489c; BKBD: 23), but because 三昧 is an attested abbreviation for 三昧耶戒 (see n. 17 above) the addition of 耶 in KDKZ IV: 304 is followed here.
1. Bodhisattva Samantabhadra: he is precisely the embodiment of the Dharmakāya’s thusness,\textsuperscript{413} because he thoroughly\textsuperscript{414} cultivates all wholesome practices,\textsuperscript{415} in correspondence to the gate of effort,\textsuperscript{416} which is the expedient\textsuperscript{417} for preventing calamities.\textsuperscript{418}

[T. 2463: 7c15]

2. Bodhisattva Vajrasattva: he corresponds to the gate of adamantine wisdom,\textsuperscript{419} because this is the expedient for defeating enemies.\textsuperscript{420}

3. Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara: he accords to the gate of lotus samādhi,\textsuperscript{421} because this is the expedient for increasing merit.\textsuperscript{422}

These three sacred ones are called ‘the three [inseparable] aspects with unlimitedly mysterious and marvellous functions’,\textsuperscript{423} namely: wisdom,\textsuperscript{424}

---

\textsuperscript{413} 如如法身 (Jap. nyonyo hosshin) is explained by Okada (1976: 16, n. 1) as “the Dharmakāya giving evidence of the absolute truth of thusness”. Endō (1987: 304) similarly explains it as “the Dharmakāya being the embodiment of the true law of the absolute truth of thusness”. 如如 indeed is Skt. tathatā, denoting ‘suchness’, cf. BKBD: 344; BGD: 1063a; DCBT: 210. This link with Samantabhadra is taken from the Commentary on the MVS, cf. MD: 1744, s.v. nyonyo hosshin.

\textsuperscript{414} Instead of a compound such as 具修 (Jap. gushu), cf. BKBD: 174. 具 (Chin. ju) is an adverb 修 (Chin. xiu), and is interpreted as Jap. tsubusa ni, cf. Okada 1976: 16; Endō 1987: 305.

\textsuperscript{415} 漫行 (Jap. man gyō), cf. BKD: 1285d.

\textsuperscript{416} 精進門 (Jap. shōjin mon). 精進 denotes Skt. vīrya, which is the persistant effort or the diligence to benefit others and proceed on the path, cf. BGD: 731, s.v. shōjin. 然 here means ‘teaching’ or ‘approach’, i.e. that of the six perfections (六波羅蜜 Jap. ropparamitsu) or pure practices of bodhisattvas, i.e. charity (布施 Jap. fuse; Skt. dāna), morality (持戒 Jap. jikai; Skt. śīla), patience or forbearance (忍辱 Jap. ninniku; Skt. ksānti), vigour or effort (Skt. vīrya), meditation (禪定 Jap. zenjō; Skt. dhyāna) and wisdom (智慧 Jap. chie; Skt. prajñā), cf. BGD: 1463, s.v. ropparamitsu. According to MD: 1175c, there are three kinds of vīrya approaches (精進門三種 Jap. shōjinmon san shū). Also see MD: 806c, s.v. 三種精進 Jap. sanshu shōjin.

\textsuperscript{417} For 方便 (Jap. hōben), see n. 186 and 199 supra.

\textsuperscript{418} 息災 (Jap. sokusai), cf. BGD: 887c.

\textsuperscript{419} 金剛智慧門 (Jap. kongō chie mon) refers to the gate of Buddha wisdom, leading to the truth, cf. NEBJ: 30a; BGD: 951b, s.v. 精進門. It is the indestructible and adamantine virtue of wisdom, that denotes the capacity to remove hindrances, cf. MD: 705, s.v. 金剛智慧門.

\textsuperscript{420} 降伏 (Jap. gōbuku), is vanquishing defilements, afflictions, hindrances, or demons through the wisdom of enlightenment; also denoting to subdue others, cf. BGD: 405b, and also note 371 supra.

\textsuperscript{421} 蓮華三昧門 (Jap. renge-samai-mon). MD: 2298b, s.v. 蓮華三昧 gives the following relevant definitions: (1) the pure bodhicitta sweeping away all defilements, an interpretation related to innate purity of the lotus, but this is generally associated with Amitābha; and (2) the virtue of compassion and love, with is related to the pleasing characteristics of the lotus, and also designation to bring good fortune, which in turn refers to the virtue of merit, and this is associated –according to the Commentary on the MVS– with Avalokiteśvara.

\textsuperscript{422} 增益 (Jap. zōyaku), cf. BGD: 883a, which is also explained as 福徳 (Jap. fukuto), cf. MD: 2298b, s.v. 蓮華三昧. For 福徳, see eg. BGD: 1187d; BKBD: 897.

\textsuperscript{423} 無量不可思議妙用三點 (Jap. muryō fukashigi myōyō san ten),妙用 refers to the unimpeded virtuosity of the great sage seen in his or her capacity to devise an unlimited range of skillful techniques in teaching sentient beings, cf. BGD: 1305a; 不思議 is syn. to 不思議, cf. BGD: 1160a; for 無量, see: 四無量心 in n. 202 supra. 三點 lit. denotes ‘three dots’ e.g. in the graphic representation of the sound ı (伊字三點 Jap. ıji san ten), which in Sanskrit script is written in the form of three dots in a triangle (ī). Since these three line up with each other either horizontally or vertically, it is used as a trope for ‘neither the same nor different’. It is also associated with the three eyes of Śiva. At a later period the three were joined in writing, cf. NEBJ: 126b; DCBT: 200. For other
liberation, and Dharmakāya. So, the ‘three aspects’ encompass everything. Therefore, invoke these three Mahābodhisattvas and make them into your instructors!

[DISCIPLES]

[T. 2463: 7c20] Wholeheartedly, I invite the Bodhisattvas Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva, and Avalokiteśvara, to be my instructors! Oh, may you have mercy!

(Say this three times)

[MASTER]

Next, I will proclaim the proceedings.

Disciples, concentrate and listen carefully! Kind Sirs, now I will bestow the proceedings and confer the precepts! It is the right time for you to obtain the precepts, so pay attention and listen carefully to the proceedings:

[T. 2463: 7c25] Buddhas and Mahābodhisattvas in the ten directions, I beseech that you be mindful of your compassion! From today onward, until they reside in the bodhimāṇḍa, these disciples, will accept and study the [threefold] pure and marvellous precepts of all Buddhas and Mahābodhisattvas of the past,
present and future, that is, the whole gamut of disciplinary precepts,\textsuperscript{430} the precepts aimed at improving the situation of sentient beings,\textsuperscript{431} and the precepts related to the cultivation of goodness.\textsuperscript{432}

**[Disciples]**

[T. 2463: 8a1] From today onward, until infinity, I will fully accept and uphold them!

(Say this three times!)

**[Master]**

Disciples, you have fully accepted the [threefold] pure precepts of all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, so, uphold them accordingly!

Thus I have conferred the precepts.

---

\textsuperscript{430} \textit{攝律儀戒} (Jap. \textit{shō ritsugi-kai}), the first group of the three sets of pure precepts, cf. \textit{三聚淨戒} in n. 430 supra, referring to the full range of Hinayāna and Mahāyāna precepts, cf. BGD: 740b, s.v. \textit{shō ritsugi kai}, including the five precepts (see: De Groot 1893: 251), ten precepts (see: De Groot 1893: 252), and the two-hundredfifty precepts (De Groot 1893: 253), as well as precepts that are characteristic to Mahāyāna, such as the ten important precepts (cf. De Groot 1893: 32-39) and the forty-eight minor precepts (cf. De Groot: 40-83) expounded in the BMK.

\textsuperscript{431} \textit{饒益有情戒} (Jap. \textit{nyōeki ujō kai}), Skt. \textit{sattvārtha-kriyā-śīla} are the precepts for improving the situation of sentient beings, cf. BGD: 1068, s.v. \textit{nyōeki ujō kai}. Also attested as \textit{攝衆生戒} (Jap. \textit{shō shujō kai}, Skt. \textit{sattva-anugrāhakaṃ śīlaṃ), cf. BGD: 739a, s.v. \textit{shō shujō kai}; and ibid.: 832b, s.v. \textit{setsu shujō kai}. See also supra, n. 430.

\textsuperscript{432} \textit{攝善法戒} (Jap. \textit{shō zenhō kai}), Skt. \textit{kusāla-dharma-samgrāhaka-śīla} are the precepts related to the cultivation of goodness, as opposed to those that are aimed at warding off evil, cf. BGD: 739c, s.v. \textit{shō zenhō kai}. See also supra, n. 430.
Subsequently, I will differentiate the characteristics of the precepts!^433

[T. 2463: 8a5] You have already aroused the intent to attain awakening, and you are endowed with the bodhisattva precepts, but you should also practice the four methods [to approach people],^434 and [commit neither] the four pārajīkās,^435 nor [break] the ten important precepts!^436 Do not violate them!

---

^433 甄別戒性 (Jap. kenbetsu kaishō). For 甄別, cf. BGD: 328c, explaining that 甄 means ‘ritual’ (Jap. sai), while 別 is ‘to discern’, ‘to identify’, ‘to differentiate’. 戒性 denotes the ‘essence’, ‘characteristics’ or ‘appearance of the precepts’, in other words ‘the content’ of the precepts, cf. BGD: 164b. A discussion on the ‘essence of the precepts’ in contrast to their ‘function’ is in Groner 1984: 226, n. 44.

^434 四攝法 (Jap. shi shōhō). Also written 四振事 (Jap. shishōji), and sometimes abbreviated to 四振, i.e. Skt. catursamgrahavastu, the four methods that a bodhisattva uses to approach and guide sentient beings to the path, comprising of (1) 布施 (Jap. fuse), Skt. dāna or generosity; (2) 说法 (Jap. aigo), Skt. priyāvādātā is using kind words; cf. BGD: 15, s.v. aigo; (3) 利行 (Jap. rigyō), Skt. arthacāryā, behavior or actions that benefit other beings, cf. BGD: 1409, s.v. rigyō; and (4) 同事 (Jap. dōji), Skt. samānārthatā is also explained as ‘to cooperate for the sake of others’, cf. DCBT: 204, s.v. 同, but in this context is better conceived as ‘to offer help’, i.e. putting oneself on the same level of other beings in order to guide them to the path, cf. BGD: 1009, s.v. dōji. For more information, see: Willemen 1983: 117, n. 24; DCBT:175, s.v. 四攝法; and BGD: 524, s.v. shishōji.

^435 四波羅夷 (Jap. shi harai) denotes the four pārajīkas, or grave offences, commission of which will lead to the expulsion from the Buddhist community, i.e. (1) engaging in immoral sexual behavior or bestiality; (2) stealing; (3) killing a human being; and (4) lying about one’s spiritual attainments, cf. NEBJ: 277a; BGD: 529a. Some Mahāyāna works, however, offer variant interpretations, and also in esoteric Buddhism there are other connotations. According to Endō (1987: 318, n. 29), they are also called ‘capita oﬀences’ (断首罪 Jap. danshu zai, lit. oﬀences that entail being beheaded), implying that one looses one’s status as ‘world-renouncer’. He states that they are also termed 四重禁戒 (Jap. shi jū gonkai), and that in Mahāyāna terms, these comprise of (1) the prohibition of praising oneself and disparaging others (自讃他戒 or Jap. jisan kita kai); (2) the prohibition of stinginess and abuse of others (憐惜加毁戒 Jap. kenshakaku keki kai); (3) prohibition of holding resentments and not accepting apologies (瞋惜不受悔戒 Jap. shinshin fujuke kai); and (4) prohibition of denigrating the three treasures of Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha (譭三寶戒, Jap. hō sanbō kai). In Mikkyō, however, there is another set of important prohibitions, which Endō 1987: 318, n. 29 merely lists, without any further reference. They regard doing nothing that (1) discards the correct dharma; (2) runs counter to the intent to attain awakening; (3) is avarice of all things and phenomena (lit. dharmas), or (4) harms sentient beings. These prohibitions are expounded, in the second chapter of the MVS on the ‘Accessories and Mantras Necessary to Approach the Mañḍala’ (入曼荼羅具縁真言品 Jap. Nyū mandara guen shingon bon; often abbreviated to Guenbon; title translation according to Yamamoto Y. 2001: 13), i.e. in T. XVIII, no. 848: 12a29-b6: (次當於弟子 面起悲念心 行者應入中 示三昧耶偈 佛子汝從今 不惜身命故 常不應捨法 捨離菩提心 慼慇一切法 不利衆生行, which Yamamoto (2001: 34, with added italics) translates as: "[Next the yogin should have compassion on his disciple. He will enter inside the room and should show a samaya-gāhā:] ‘Oh son of the Buddha, you should henceforth not spare your body and life. You should never abandon the bodhicitta in all the dharmas. You should not do anything that has no advantage for sentient beings.’"

^436 十重戒 (Jap. jū jūkai) are the ten major precepts. These are further explained in the following paragraphs, but it may be noteworthy that these are not in accordance with what De Groot (1893: 43) calls ‘les commandements capitaux’ of Mahāyāna. For further discussion, see chapter IV below.
The four methods are: generosity, kindness, helpfulness, and empathy.\textsuperscript{437}

Be generous, because –for the benefit of all worldlings– you intend\textsuperscript{438} to restrain boundless greed;\textsuperscript{439}

Use kind words, because –for the benefit of all worldlings– you intend to suppress anger,\textsuperscript{440} vanity\textsuperscript{441} and [other infinite]\textsuperscript{442} defilements;

Be helpful, because –in order to fulfil your original vow– you intend to do well for other worldlings;

Be empathic, because –in accordance to having a good attitude and a constantly benevolent mind– you seek to become acquainted\textsuperscript{443} with good friends;\textsuperscript{444}

Thus are the four methods that should be practiced. Retain them accordingly!

Now, being about to enter this gate of [the teaching on the operation of]\textsuperscript{445} the three mysteries,\textsuperscript{446} that is to say,\textsuperscript{447} the mysteries of body, speech and mind,\textsuperscript{448} you should also cleanse yourself\textsuperscript{449} of the four hindrances.\textsuperscript{450}

\textsuperscript{437} See n. 435 supra.
\textsuperscript{438} Here, 欲 (Jap. yoku) relates to the aforementioned vows. Hence its translation as 'to intend', implying that the disciple already has promised to do so.
\textsuperscript{439} 慳貪 (Jap. kendon), Skt. mātsarya-mala, cf. BGD: 328, s.v. kendon. Also see: DCBT: 423, s.v. 慳.
\textsuperscript{440} 慾恚 (Jap. shini), Skt. kruddhi, cf. BGD: 790, s.v. shini. Note that the T.-edition has瞋 instead of 慾.
\textsuperscript{441} 慢 (Jap. kyōman), Skt. māna, cf. BGD: 240, s.v. kyōman.
\textsuperscript{442} Given that this passage is virtually identical to the MSZ (cf. chapter IV below), this addition is based on a note to the T.-edition of the MSZ, i.e. T. vol. XVIII, no. 917: 943, n. 12.
\textsuperscript{443} 親近 (Jap. shingon; var. shinkon). Also: 'to incline to', cf. BGD: 791, s.v. shingon.
\textsuperscript{444} 善知識 (Jap. zenchishiki), cf. BGD: 850, s.v. zenchishiki. Another meaning is ‘a good teacher’, cf. BKBD: 1061.
\textsuperscript{445} Addition based on the reading in Endō 1987: 307.
\textsuperscript{446} 三密 (Jap. san mitsu) Skt. trīghya or trīṇi guhyāni, i.e. body, speech (or voice), and mind (or thought) of Mahāvairocana. These mysteries are universal, because all beings, in body, voice, and mind, are only individualized parts of the absolute reality, but their originally enlightened nature is hidden from them by illusion. By practicing (Skt. sādhanā) physical signs and postures (Skt. mūdra), by voicing of formulas (mantras and dhāraṇī), and by meditation or contemplation (Skt. dhyāna and samādhi), one can attain perfection (Skt. siddhi), i.e. integration or union (Skt. adhiśṭhāna), i.c. 入我我入. See: NEBJ: 249b; BGD: 490b; DCBT: 63; Wayman 1992: 306, and 274, n. 82; and Abe 1999: 129-132, where a summary is given on Kūkai’s vision on the relation between the three mysteries and the Dharmakāya.
\textsuperscript{447} Endō 1987: 307 interprets 即 (Chin. ji) strangely as ‘by means of’.
\textsuperscript{448} 身口意 (Jap. shinkui; var. shinkōi), cf. BKBD: 1126.
\textsuperscript{449} 淨除 (Jap. jōjo), lit. ‘to purify and remove’, cf. BKBD: 730.
[T. 2463: 8a15] [1.] As for that what is called the ‘four hindrances’, the first hindrance is to cause various kinds of views of inequality towards both sentient beings and phenomena.

2. Causing [those who took] the oath of equality, to arouse various thoughts of restriction, is the second hindrance.

3. Causing beings to purchase fame and benefit, without having them strive for the most important cause, is the third obstruction.

4. Not being able to introspect, because of dissipation and laziness, is the fourth obstruction.

Thus, even when [you allow] these four hindrances to emerge slightly, you will damage yourself and harm others. Therefore, zealously promise to eradicate them, and keep to it!

Next, you should practice the four [vows to be upheld in all daily] demeanors. They are called the unconditioned virtues. While virtuously practicing them, you will steadily and spontaneously develop.

---

450 四障 (Jap. shi shō). According to MD: 944, s.v. shi shō, these are the four entities that hinder the practitioner, namely, evil demons (Skt. māra) who let the practitioner do evil things, the non-Buddhist paths who make him abandon goodness, (hungry) ghosts (Skt. preta) who defile his body, and spirits that defile his mind. In this text, however, other definitions are given.

451 平等誓 (Jap. byōdō sei) is explained as ‘showing great compassion equally toward all sentient beings’, cf. Endō 1987: 308.

452 For this interpretation of 种種限量之心 (Jap. shushu genryō no shin), cf. e.g. BGD: 335c, s.v. genryō.

453 Addition based on Endō’s reading (1987: 308): “目の前の… (Jap. me no mae no)”.

454 大事因縁 is an abbreviation of 一大事因縁 (Jap. ichi daiji innen) lit. ‘the most important cause’, i.e. to become enlightened and save all sentient beings from suffering, cf. NEBJ: 123b; BGD: 50b.

455 驚察身心 (Jap. kyōsai shinjin; var. ~ shinjin), lit. ‘to wander about and understand body and mind’.

456 放逸懈怠 (Jap. hōitsu kedai) of which the first denotes ‘negligence’ (Skt. pramāda), and the second ‘indolence’ (Skt. kausīda), both part of the six functions causing mental disturbance, cf. NEBJ: 36a; BGD: 929c, s.v. 大煩惱地法 (Jap. dai bonmō chi hō).

457 精勤 (Jap. shōgon), cf. BGD: 731.

458 Here alternative translation of 誓願, lit. ‘to vow’, cf. n. 204 supra.

459 四威儀 (Jap. shi igi), generally refers to the maintaining of correct behavior whilst being in the four postures of walking, standing, sitting, and lying down, cf. NEBJ: 277b, BGD: 574b, but in the context of esoteric ritual, it could also be an abbreviation for 四威儀用心 (Jap. shi igi yōjin), which involves a series of recitations of the A-syllable, cf. MD: 846. As such 威儀, however, denotes daily ‘behavior’ or ‘conduct’, cf. e.g. BGD: 33b; MD: 56, s.v. 威儀. (The latter also points out that this term can refer to a flat strap tied to a special kind of monks’ robe.) Endō (1987: 308) calls these ‘behaviors’ a ‘ritual’ (作法 Jap. sahō).
[These vows are:]

1. vowing to fully understand [reality] in accordance to the treasury of the correct teachings of all Tathāgatas;

2. vowing to vigorously practice in accordance to the correct practice of all bodhisattvas;

3. vowing to cultivate [yourself] in accordance to the method of all Tathāgatas who liberate people;

[T. 2463: 8a25] 4. [vowing to] rescue all sentient beings by means of the four embracing methods, free them from suffering, and bring them to happiness.

These are called the four unconditioned virtues. Uphold them accordingly!

Again, you who are about to enter the Gate of Dhāraṇīs, must be endowed with the three categories of [precepts that are the] symbols [of Buddhas].

This is treading in Tathāgata’s footsteps.

Fully focused, you must vow not to break [the rules of] the four pārājikā offences, even for an instant!

---

460 Lit. ‘they are called 無作’ (Jap. musa), which regularly denotes ‘being without origin or condition’, cf. NEBJ: 204a; BGD: 1324a.

461 T. LXXVIII, no. 2463: 8a21-22 reads: 次應修四威儀名無作於其功德運運之間自然增長, but when punctuated differently, namely: 次應修四威儀名無作於其功德運運之間自然増長, could perhaps also be translated as: “Next you should practice the repeated [practice] in the four postures that called unconditioned in their virtue. While repeatedly [practicing] them, you will spontaneously ameliorate”.

462 增長 (Jap. zōjō), lit. ‘increase’, cf. BGD: 882b.

463 今離 (Jap. ryōri), lit. ‘make them get rid of’ or ‘enable them to be free from’.

464 獲 is an abbreviation for 獲得 (Jap. kakutoku), lit. ‘to seize and obtain’, i.e. ‘to actualize’.

465 陀羅尼門 (Jap. darani mon) refers to the esoteric or tantric approach, which relies on dhāraṇīs. Syn. to 總持門 (Jap. sōji mon), cf. e.g. BGD: 877b. On dhāraṇī, see n. 268 supra.

466 三種三昧耶 (Jap. sanshu sammaya). These ‘three symbols’ are ‘the four methods’, ‘the four pārājikas’, and the ‘ten important precepts’ mentioned in T. 2463: 8a5ff. cf. p. 62 supra. These are further discussed in chapter IV below.

467 専精 (Jap. senshō), i.e. to focus on practice toward the attainment of enlightenment, cf. BGD: 838d.

468 四波羅夷 (Jap. shi harai), cf. n. 436 supra. Okada (1976: 19, n. 1) claims this term corresponds to Skt. pāśājīka (sic.), but this must be a spelling mistake.

469 無缺 (Jap. muketsu), lit. ‘without interruption’, cf. BKBD: 771. According to Kōda (1993: 381-382), until this sentence the HSBK ran parallel to the KSK (cf. n. 345 supra), and at this point again shifts to the JH BK. For further discussion, see chapter IV below.
As for that which is called the four parājikās, violating them would be like not continuing your life force whilst cutting of your head. Then your limbs would not have that which makes them act, and it would not take long before you fall apart. Well, the condition of the four kinds of vows regarding the intent of attaining awakening is precisely the life force of the correct teaching of Mahāyāna. Breaking them would be like practicing various virtues whilst being a corpse, which would not take long before it failed.

First is the vow of not abandoning the correct teaching or adhere to non-Buddhist practices. That is, you must practice, memorize and recite all correct teachings of the Tathāgatas. [Your effort should be] like the insatiable character of a great ocean consuming a hundred rivers. If you would follow a single doctrine amongst the explicit and partially revealed teachings of the various vehicles, or if you would be indifferent, or even if you would give rise to evil acts, then this would also be called a violation.

You must not break the first pārājika!

Will you be able to keep it?

(Yes, I am able to keep it.)
[MASTER]

Second is the vow of not to abandon the intent of attaining awakening. This intent of attaining awakening regards all bodhisattva practices. It is like a general’s banner. If he would give it up, then three armies would defeat, exploit, and ruin him, and others would take over his land. Therefore you must not abandon your intent of attaining enlightenment. If you would abandon the intent of attaining awakening, this would be called a breach of the second pārājika.

You must not violate it!

Will you manage to uphold it?

[DISCIPLES]

[T. 2463: 8b15] [Yes, I am able to keep it.]

[MASTER]

Third is the vow of not being greedy in all teachings. These various supreme teachings all are endeavors of the Tathāgatas, who practiced them with discarding their own lives. They obtained them after having their servants rest. They are the parental inheritance of all wordlings, which is not exclusive for one single [person]. If you are greedy, and not give the same [to everyone], this would be the equal to stealing the things appertaining to the three jewels, which would, therefore, be violating the third pārājika.

You must not break it!

Can you keep it?

[DISCIPLES]

[T. 2463: 8b20] [Yes, I am able to keep it.]

480 This sentence is dubious, and can perhaps also be translated as ‘his three armies will be defeated’.
481 Endō (1987: 311 and 318, n. 30) has a different interpretation, based on 他勝處 (Jap. tashōsho), lit. ‘that what is overcome by others’, which is another term for pārājika, cf. BGD: 896b.
482 慢 (Jap. kenrin), lit. ‘to be avaricious’, cf. BGD: 328d.
483 一切法 (Jap. issai hō) can also denote ‘all phenomena’.
484 三寶物 (Jap. sanbō motsu), i.e. images, banners, flowers, incense, etc. to Buddha; scripture scrolls, ink, paper, etc. to the Dharma, and cassock, bowl, monasteries, etc. to the Saṃgha, cf. DCBT: 64; BGD: 488b; Endō 1987: 318, n. 32.
Fourth is the vow of not to display unbeneficial behavior towards sentient beings. This is [put forward in this way] because of [underscoring] the difference with [practice of benefical behavior as one of] the four encompassing [methods]. Bodhisattvas cultivate the four embracing [methods] because [they wish to] completely include all sentient beings and offer them a chance$^{485}$ to enter the path, but because [conversely], as the opposite of the four embracing [methods], you would now hinder the worldling’s chances on the path and renounce to benefit them, this would be breaking the fourth pārājika. You must not violate it!

[T. 2463: 8b25] Are you able to uphold it?

[DISCIPLES]
[Yes, I am able to keep it.]

[MASTER]

Now, regarding these four vows,$^{486}$ [they have the following implications:]

Because of the first vow, you must all arouse the unconditioned virtue in accordance with the treasury of all correct teachings of the three periods$^{487}$ and in the ten directions;

Because of the second vow, you must all arouse the unconditioned virtue in accordance with the practice of all bodhisattvas in the ten directions;

Because of the third vow, you must all arouse the unconditioned virtue in accordance with the gate of saving all people in the three periods and the ten directions;

$^{485}$ Based on the reading of 機縁 (Jap. kien) in Endō 1987: 312.

$^{486}$ 戒 (Jap. kai), cf. n. 472 supra.

$^{487}$ 三世 (Jap. sanze) commonly denotes the ‘three periods’ of past, present, and future (cf. BGD: 478d), which is also the interpretation followed by e.g. White (2005: 363), but MD: 813a, s.v. sanze gives also other, more ‘esoteric’ explanations. Namely, according to the 10th chapter of the MVS-Commentary, 三世 may also denote the three poisons (三毒 Jap. sandoku) of greed, hatred, and delusion (cf. n. 164 and 169 above), or the three realms (三界 Jap. san kai) of desire, form, and formless (cf. n. 339 supra); while according to the last scroll of Kūkai’s Treatise on Differentiation between the Exoteric and Esoteric Teachings (for a translation, see Hakeda 1972: 151-156), it may also indicate the three mysteries (三密 Jap.) of body, speech, and mind (cf. Introduction: 2, n. 8 and n. 446 above), or even the three bodies (三身 Jap. san shin, cf. n. 152 supra).
Because of the fourth vow, you must all arouse the unconditioned virtue in accordance with the four embracing methods of reaching out to all sentient beings of the worlds in the ten directions!

Next I will explain the characteristics of the ten important precepts. What are these the ten important [precepts]?

1. You must not abandon the intent of attaining awakening, for this would hinder the realization of Buddhahood;
2. You must not reject the three jewels, nor take refuge with the external paths, for they are the heterodox teachings;
3. You must not slander the scriptures of the Three Vehicles, for they are all Buddhist teachings;
4. You should not have doubts when you cannot explain the most profound Mahāyāna texts, for this exceeds the bounds of commoners;
5. Supposing [you encounter] someone who has already aroused the intent to attain awakening, you should not instruct these teachings in such a way that he would act counter to this intent or turn to the Two Vehicles, for in doing so you would destroy the germ of the Three Jewels;
6. When seeing someone who has not yet aroused the intent to attain awakening, you should not instruct these teachings, in such a way that the thought of the Two Vehicles would emerge in their minds, for this would conflict with your original vow;
7. With regard to the people of the Hīnayāna, you should not talk about the profound and subtle Mahāyāna in an abrupt way, for in all likelihood this would generate accusations and disaster;

---

488 十重戒相 (Jap. jūjūkai sō). For 十重戒, see n. 437 supra; on 戒相, see n. 472 above. According to Kōda (1993: 381-382), this sentence marks the contents of the HSBK again turning to the KSK, cf. n. 345 and 470 above. For further discussion, see chapter IV below.
489 毁謗 (Jap. kihō; var. kibō), also ‘to reject’, cf. BGD: 212a.
490 佛法 (Jap. buppō), Skt. buddha-dharma.
491 界 (Jap. kyōgai) refers to ‘a sphere of cognition’, cf. NEBJ: 189b.
492 輒 (Jap. cho).
8. You should not arouse wrong views, for in doing you would cut off your good roots;\textsuperscript{493}

9. In the presence [of people] of the non-Buddhist path, you must not spontaneously declare that you are furnished with the subtle precepts of unsurpassed enlightenment (\textit{bodhi}), for this would cause them to strive for these teachings with thoughts of resentment and envy, and in case you find this hard to accept, you would cut across your intent to attain awakening, which would be disadvantageous to both [sides];

[T. 2463: 8c15]

10. You yourself should not do anything, which is harmful or unbefitting to the sentient beings, or not to stimulate\textsuperscript{494} others to do so, and in case you would witness someone doing so, you must not rejoice, for this would run counter to the teaching of benefiting others and cuts across your compassionate mind.

[T. 2463: 8c20] As for these precepts, they are not the same as the Hīnayāna [precepts] that are limited to one lifespan\textsuperscript{495} and to one billion spheres.\textsuperscript{496}

Moreover, the disciplinary precepts\textsuperscript{497} of the \textit{śrāvakas} are conditioned\textsuperscript{498} and created,\textsuperscript{499} and have final \textit{nirvāṇa}\textsuperscript{500} as their ultimate culmination.

The precepts that I have now conferred, by contrast, are born from [a Buddha’s] omniscience,\textsuperscript{501} and their final destination is the ocean of \textit{sarvajñā},\textsuperscript{502} where there is no decay.\textsuperscript{503}

\textsuperscript{493}善根 (Jap. \textit{zengon}) refers to positive habits that bring good retribution, with the roots of a tree used as a metaphor for goodness, cf. NEBJ: 336a; BGD: 849b.

\textsuperscript{494}教 (Jap. \textit{kyō}), lit. ‘to instruct’.

\textsuperscript{495}一期 (Jap. \textit{ichigo}), cf. BGD: 47a; Endō 1987: 318, n. 33.

\textsuperscript{496}三千世界 (Jap. \textit{sanzen sekai}) refers to three times a thousand spheres, making up the domain of a Buddha, cf. NEBJ: 261a.

\textsuperscript{497}律儀 (Jap. \textit{ritsugi}) refers to Skt. \textit{samvara}, i.e. the precepts of restraining evil through moral discipline, cf. NEBJ: 235b; BGD: 1419c.

\textsuperscript{498}因縁 (Jap. \textit{innen}), cf. NEBJ: 129b; BGD: 72b.

\textsuperscript{499}造作 (Jap. \textit{zōsa}), cf. BGD: 879c.

\textsuperscript{500}無餘涅槃 (Jap. \textit{muyo nehan}) is the state of total liberation from all physical and mental condition, in contrast to \textit{nirvāṇa} where the body still exists, cf. BGD: 1349b; Okada 1976: 21, n. 1.

\textsuperscript{501}一切智 (Jap. \textit{issai chi}), cf. NEBJ: 132a; BGD: 60a.

\textsuperscript{502}薩般若 (Jap. \textit{satsubannya}) is the transliteration of the Skt. \textit{sarvajñā}, while 一切智 (cf. n. 501 supra) is its translation, cf. BKBD: 9, s.v. 一切智.

\textsuperscript{503}窮盡 (Jap. \textit{gūjin}), e.g. lit. ‘to dissolve’, cf. BGD: 286d, in contrast to the aforementioned \textit{nirvāṇa}, in which the afflicting hindrances in the mind are cut off and the body that is composed of the five aggregates is extinguished.
Further, in the śrāvaka teachings, even though there are some who are in training, and some who train no more, they both fully study the hindrances, but their rank is not the same. However, the arousal of the unconditioned discipline does not have the discrimination of inferior and superior.

Well, this is also the same for bodhisattva discipline. Even though from the initial arousal of the intent until the forty-second stage there seems to be no equality, but [when you uphold all these precepts] at the same time they universally pervade the dharmadhātu, you arouse unconditioned wholesome roots, you are the same as the Tathāgata, and then there is rather no discrimination between reification and deconstruction.

Now I conclude the conferral of the precepts. I will transmit this Dharma treasure [containing the aforementioned teachings] to you, for you are no different from Buddhas who reside in the world. You are the true disciples of Buddha! I am investing you in the rank of Buddhahood! This is supreme most exalted, incomparable and unequalled precept!

This is the gate of quickly eradicate all hindrances and immediately actualizing enlightenment (bodhi)!

Next you can transfer your merit, cultivate your virtues, and so on.

The End

RITUAL FOR [CONFERRING] THE PRECEPTS BEING THE SYMBOL OF BUDDHAS
(One scroll)

---

504 學無學 is an abbreviation for 有學無學 (Jap. ugaku mugaku), with the former referring to a practitioner who is still in the level of training and who is not yet perfected as an arhat, and is in the first three stages of training, while the latter refers to someone who has attained the fourth stage of 'no more training', cf. NEBJ: 323b, s.v. ugaku; BGD: 81a, s.v. 有學; and for more information, cf. Muller in DBJ, s.v. 四向四果 (Jap. shikō shika).

505 無作律儀 (Jap. musa ritsugi). On 無作, see n. 461 supra; for 律儀, cf. n. 347 and 498 above.

506 菩薩律儀 (Jap. bosatsu ritsugi). According to Köda (1993: 381-382), this point marks the end of the HSBK’s accordance with the KSK, cf. n. 345, 470, and 489 above. For further discussion, see chapter IV below.

507 These are the stages in the bodhisattva path, originally established in Yogācāra, including the ten abodes (十住 Jap. jū jū, cf. NEBJ: 149b; BGD: 654d), ten practices (十行 Jap. jū gyō, NEBJ: 147a; BGD: 652a), ten dedications of merit (十廻向 Jap. jū ekō, cf. NEBJ: 146b), the ten stages (十地 Jap. jū jū, cf. NEBJ: 148b), and virtual enlightenment (等覺 Jap. tōgaku, cf. BGD: 1003a), to which later marvellous enlightenment (妙覺 Jap. myōgaku, cf. DCBT: 235; BGD: 1302b) was added.

508 佛眞子 (Jap. butsu no shinshi), cf. BGD: 1195b. Note that in the previous text, 佛子 (Jap. busshi) has been translated as 'disciple', whilst lit. denoting 'child of Buddha', cf. NEBJ: 23b; BGD: 1192c, s.v. 佛子.

509 佛位 (Jap. butsui), cf. BGD: 1190a.

510 戒 (Jap. kai).

511 迴向 (Jap. ekō), cf. NEBJ: 52b; BGD: 102c.
IV. THE HSBK AND KŪKAI’S PRECEPTS VIEW

As may be clear from the preceding chapter, the HSBK can be considered a so-called “ritualpraktisches Schrift” (儀軌 Jap. giki; Skt. viddhi; kalpa), which explains the procedure for conferring the precepts that are promulgated as the symbol (Skt. samaya) of Buddhas.\(^{512}\) Just as is the case with other esoteric Buddhist texts, the HSBK emphasizes pragmatic aspects, i.e. what one does, visualizes, or says in a certain ritual context. Such texts have been compared to scores:

Der überlieferte Text erfüllt seine Funktion erst in einer “Aufführung”. Dazu ist jedoch ein (grösstenteils mündlich und geheim) überliefertes Wissen von der “Aufführungspraxis” notwendig. Das Textverständnis ist also nicht vom Wissen der operatorischen Überlieferung und ihrem pragmatischen Vollzug zu trennen.\(^{514}\)

However, although the translation may have shown that this kind of texts were not written as literature to be read, they can be treated as an object of scientific research in so far that they can be read in the context of other texts.\(^{515}\) Although it has been argued that such a reading may imply a certain “hermeneutical ambiguity”,\(^{516}\) a contextual reading is necessary if one is to address questions related to the provenance of the ritual manual’s contents, or its authenticity.

**Questioning the authenticity of the HSBK**

It is a historical fact that the HSBK has circled together with Kūkai’s SKJ since ancient times.\(^{517}\) However, based on the observation that the contents of the HSBK is mainly is a composition of two other sources (namely the HSBK and KSK, cf. infra), it has been argued that the HSBK is not written by Kūkai.\(^{518}\)

---

\(^{512}\) Lehnhert 2001: 996.

\(^{513}\) According to Ueda T. (1933: 140), the HSBK is “the samaya precepts ritual [preceding] the dharma transmission consecration (傳法灌頂三昧耶戒作法 Jap. denpō-kanjō sammaya-kai sakuhō).” On consecration, also see chapter I: 3 above, s.v. abhiṣeka.

\(^{514}\) Lehnhert 2001: 997.

\(^{515}\) Lehnhert 2001: 1002.

\(^{516}\) That is, when one “looking for” meaning in a certain text, and one thinks to have “found” it, still another person can also “find” something else, cf. Lehnhert 2001: 1003.

\(^{517}\) Kōda 1993: 382.

\(^{518}\) E.g. Tomabechi 1989.
The passages that correlate with those texts can be summarized as follows:\textsuperscript{519}

Table 1. General correlations of HSBK with JHBK and KSK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSBK (T. LVII, no. 2463)</th>
<th>//</th>
<th>main subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6b11-7b08 JHBK           | - introduction: reasons for arousing bodhicitta  
|                          | - invocation of all Buddhas                    
|                          | - the four universal bodhisattva vows          
|                          | - explanation of sūtra quotes on bodhicitta    
|                          | - explanation of sūtra quotes on Dharmakāya    
|                          | - mantra recitation and worship of all Buddhas 
|                          | - repentance                                   
|                          | - formal notice on precepts conferral          
|                          | - three refuges                                
|                          | - sūtra quotes on bodhicitta                   |
| 7b09-8a29 KSK            | - inquiry on ability to uphold the Buddha precepts 
|                          | - summoning all Buddhas as witnesses           
|                          | - summoning 8 Buddhas, and 4 Tenrinja as preceptors  
|                          | - summoning 4 Bodhisattvas as professors       
|                          | (+ explanation of their names)                 
|                          | - summoning four Mahābodhisattvas as instructors 
|                          | (+ explanation)                               
|                          | - proclamation of the proceedings              
|                          | - bestowal of the threefold pure precepts      
|                          | - four methods                                 
|                          | - four hindrances                              
|                          | - four vows of demeanor                        |
| 8b01-8c02 JHBK          | four parājikas                                 |
| 8c03-8c24 KSK           | - ten important precepts                       
|                          | - explanation on the bodhisattva precepts      |
| 8c24-9a03               | /   | concluding remarks                            |

\textsuperscript{519} Page references based on Kōda 1993: 381-382, where the correlations in the TKDZ-edition are given. Their counterparts in the T-edition are also indicated in n. 345, 470, 489, and 507 to chapter III above. The sections of the T-edition of the HSBK that run parallel with the JHBK are marked in bold in appendix A.1.
The first text that has been compared to the HSBK is the Manual for Taking Vows for Arousing Bodhicitta (Jap. Ju hotsu bodaishin-kai mon 受発菩提心戒文, abbreviated to JHBK).\(^{520}\) This manual is included as the 20\(^{th}\) book in the Thirty-volume-set of Buddhist Sūtras (三十帖策子, Jap. Sanjūō sakushi, cf. appendix D), a collection of texts that was imported by Kūkai in 806.\(^{521}\) Even though both texts are, indeed, remarkably close, already from the first page of the manuscript onwards, it is clear that they are not exactly the same.

This may be illustrated in the sample of the manuscript reproduction below, in which character variants have been highlighted in blue, while green marks passages that are not attested in the HSBK. Yellow points at different phrasings, and purple marks characters that are in the HSBK, but not in the JHBK:

---

**Figure 1. Sample of discrepancies between JHBK and HSBK**

---

\(^{520}\) BKD V: 114d, s.v. 受発菩提心戒文 only mentions that Kūkai is the author of this text, but gives no further reference to its presence in any collection. The title 受発菩提心戒文 appears to be mentioned only in one catalogue throughout the T. canon, namely in the 根本大和尚真跡策子等目录 (Jap. Konpon daiōshō shinshaku sakushi-tō mokuroku), i.e. T. LV, no. 2162: 1067a14), but no information is given on the authorship or dating.

\(^{521}\) For more information, see: BD: 1552b.
The second text that has been put side by side the HSBK is the *Record on the Abhiśeka Samaya Vows (Kanjō sammayakai 灌頂三昧耶戒, abbreviated to KSK, cf. appendix E)* that was allegedly composed by Ennin (円仁, 794-864). This would logically entail that the completion of the HSBK must have happened after Ennin’s times, implying that it is virtually impossible that the HSBK is Kūkai’s genuine compilation. Indeed, lining up both texts, there are –to say the least– a lot of similarities, but this does not necessarily mean that the HSBK borrowed from the KSK. It may very well be just the other way around.

To begin with, there is no incontestable evidence for the KSK actually being either Ennin’s own work, or for him having imported the text. The KSK is not listed in any of Ennin’s own catalogues (T. LV, nos. 2165-2167), but in two other interesting catalogues. The first is of his master’s redaction, namely the *Catalogue [of Texts, Iconographies, and Ritual Instruments] collected by Saichō in Yuechou,* that lists the material Saichō collected in the Longxingsi (龍興寺), where in 805, just before his return to Japan after an eleven month trip to China, he was instructed into esoteric Buddhism. The second catalogue that mentions the KSK, is compiled by Ennin’s disciple Annen, namely the *Encompassing Catalogue on the Category of the Shingon Esotericism of all Hierophants,* which –at least according to its colophon– was compiled in 885 (Gangyō 9). In this catalogue’s *Section on the Three Abhiśekas,* there is a part called *Catalogue on Samaya Precepts Manuals,* in which the KSK is listed immediately following the MSZ, preceding the JBKG (cf. infra).
Moreover, even though the HSBK undoubtedly is analogous to the KSK, it is hard to imagine that there was a direct transmission between them (in the sense, for example, of on-site copying), not in the least because there are frequent distinctions in the characters of the respective texts, and also the word order of the sentences differs significantly. The samples in table 2 (see p. 77 below) may illustrate this unequivocally. Character variants are highlighted in orange; the passages marked in green are parts that occur only in either of the texts; blue indicates different characters and/or theoretical copy mistakes; while purple points at variant phrasings.

Aside from the KSK and the JHBK, also two other texts have been connected to the HSBK, namely the JBKG and MSZ, which in contrast to the previous manuals are perhaps more readily available (i.e. T. XVIII, nos. 915 and 917 respectively, which are in appendices F and G below). JBKG refers to the [Ritual on the] Conferral of the Precepts of Arousing the Intent to attain Awakening (授発菩提心戒, Jap. Ju hotsu bodaishin kai), which is attributed to Amoghavajra, while MSZ stands for 無畏三藏禪要 (Jap. Mui-sanzō Zen’yō). This latter text has been ascribed to Śubhākarasimha. But also this text correlation is not unproblematic.

For instance, the HSBK quotes from other sūtras (see e.g. chapter III: 49-50), but these citations are not in any of the aforementioned texts. Also, various mantras in the HSBK have been traced back to the JBKG and MSZ (see e.g. chapter III: 45-46, n. 317 and 48, n. 335), but because they are also attested in many other texts, this cannot possibly pass as a decisive argument for their interrelation. If it would, a formula that also occurs in a text by Kūkai’s master Huiguo (cf. chapter III: 42, n. 281), would then, conversely, also be an indication of the HSBK’s hypothetical authentic transmission.

533 Kōda 1993: 382.
534 See e.g. Ueda T. 1933: 140-141; Tomabechi 2008: 467ff., and esp. 479 for a schematic overview.
535 For other titles, see: BKD V: 115, s.v. 授発菩提心戒. On the text’s contents, see: BKD V: 103, s.v. 受菩提心戒儀.
536 For a study and annotated translation in Dutch, see Pinte 2004. An English edition is currently in preparation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSBK (T. LXXVII, no. 2463)</th>
<th>KSK (ND XLI, no. 79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7b09-10: 次問言。諸仁者能受持一切諸佛菩薩最勝最上大律儀否答言能持</td>
<td>176a: 次應問言諸佛子志心能受持一切菩薩最勝最上大律儀 不（答言能）</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7b11-22: 次請賢聖三請弟子某甲等奉請十方一切諸佛為大尊證願大德為我作證明弟子某甲等  | 176a-176b 次請賢聖（三説）弟子某甲等 恭請十方一切諸佛為大尊證
奉請雄猛阿闍佛最勝寶生佛大悲阿彌陀佛成就不空業佛
此諸無上尊至心稽首請
奉請四大菩薩及薩金剛菩薩降伏於一切勝上虚空藏菩薩能授諸灌頂
救世觀自在菩薩顯三昧瑜伽得
如是轉輪者唯願受我請（三説）
次請和上
弟子奉請無動如來寶生如來阿彌陀如來天鼓雷音如來為我作和上
我依和上故得受具足菩提清淨三味耶戒（三説）
次請羯磨阿闍梨弟子某甲等奉請普賢菩薩慈氏菩提善德除蓋障菩薩為我作羯磨阿闍梨
我依闍梨故得受具足菩提清淨三味耶戒
次請教授阿闍梨弟子某甲等奉請普賢菩薩觀音為我作教授阿闍梨
我依闍梨故得受具足清淨三味耶戒
於七a 复請四大菩薩是四菩薩猶如賢瓶闕一不可                                  |
| 7b23-25: 次應奉請羯磨及教授普賢慈氏妙德除蓋障為羯磨阿闍梨
如是四菩薩猶如賢瓶闕一不可                                                      | 177a:  fade to see |
Nevertheless, some passages are remarkably alike. For instance, the HSBK section on the four methods (cf. translation in chapter III: 63) almost exactly matches the MSZ (identical phrases are marked in bold):

Table 3. Parallels between MSZ and HSBK sections on the four methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSZ (T. XVIII, no. 917: 943c6-c14)</th>
<th>HSBK (T. LXXVIII, no. 2463: 8a4-8a12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>第十修四攝門</td>
<td>次甄別戒性</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>諸佛子等如上已發菩提心具菩薩戒已</td>
<td>己發菩提心具菩薩戒竞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>然應修四攝法及十重戒不應虧犯</td>
<td>復應修四攝法及四波羅夷及十重戒不應缺犯其四</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>其四攝者所謂布施愛語利行同事</td>
<td>其四攝者所謂布施愛語利行同事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爲欲調伏無始懶貪及饒益衆生故應行布施</td>
<td>爲欲調伏無始懶貪及利益有情故應行布施</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爲欲調伏嗔恚憍慢煩惱及利益衆生故應行愛語</td>
<td>爲欲調伏嗔恚憍慢煩惱及利益有情故應行愛語為</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爲欲親近大善知識及令善心無間斷故</td>
<td>爲欲親近善知識及令善心無間斷故</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>應行同事如是四法此修行處</td>
<td>應修同事如是四法是修行處</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same striking similarity is also found when putting the respective passages on the ten important precepts of the HSBK side by side the ten prohibitions of the MSZ (cf. translation in chapter III: 69 above):

Table 4. Parallels between MSZ and HSBK sections on the ten precepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSZ (T. XVIII, no. 917: 943c6-944a4)</th>
<th>HSBK (T. LXXVIII, no. 2463: 8c3-8c19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>諸佛子受持菩提戒所謂十重戒者</td>
<td>次說十重戒相所謂十重者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>今當宣説至心諦聽</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>一者不應退菩提心妨成佛故</td>
<td>一者不應退菩提心妨成佛故</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>二者不應捨三寶歸依外道是邪法故</td>
<td>二者不應捨離三寶歸依外道是邪法故</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三者不應毀謗三寶及三乘教典佛性故</td>
<td>三者不應毀謗三乘教典佛性故</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>四者於甚深大乘經典不通解處不應生疑惑</td>
<td>四者於甚深大乘經典不通解處不可生疑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>非凡夫境故</td>
<td>非凡夫境界故</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>五者若有衆生已發菩提心者不應說如是法</td>
<td>五者若有衆生已發菩提心者不應說如是法</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>令退菩提心趣向二乘斷三寶種故</td>
<td>令彼退菩提心趣向二乘斷三寶種故</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
六者未發菩提心者亦不應説如是法
令彼發於二乘之心違本願故

七者對小乘人及邪見人前不應輒説深妙
大乘恐彼生謗獲大殃故

八者不應發起邪見等法
邪見等法令斷善根故

九者於外道前不應自説我具無上菩提妙戒
令彼以瞋恨心求如是物不能辦得退菩提心

十者但於一切衆生有所損害及無利益
皆不應作及教他作見作隨喜

弟弟某甲
始從今身乃至當坐菩提道場
歸依如來無上三身
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依一切不退菩提僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依無上三身諸佛
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧

弟子某甲等盡未來際
歸依方廣大乘法藏
歸依不退菩薩僧
Notwithstanding the above similarities, it has to be noted that the differentiation into various sections that have been identified as parallels to other texts, might not be so rigid as it may at first glance appear (cf. table 1 supra). For instance, in a passage that –according to the aforementioned scheme– runs parallel to the KSK, the HSBK states that Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva and Avalokiteśvara are called the “three inseparable aspects with unlimitedly mysterious and marvelous functions”, i.e. wisdom, liberation and Dharmakāya (T. LXXVIII, no. 2463: 7c18-19, cf. translation in chapter III: 59), and compares them to the three dots in the graphic representation of the Skt. syllable ।.

Interestingly, this simile may be drawn from the Nirvāṇasūtra:

As for the meaning of causality, śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas do not understand this very profound meaning. They do not learn about the three dots of the syllable । of the secret treasury that is attain liberation, nirvāṇa and mahāprajñā.

The fact that precisely this text is explicitly quoted in a HSBK section correlating with JHBK (cf. T. LXXVIII, no. 2463: 7b5ff., translated in chapter III: 49 supra) may suggest that the different “parts” that are allegedly following the lines of the KSK and JHBK are actually closer connected than suggested so far.

Moreover, in case the HSBK would indeed not have been composed by Kūkai, then no traces of its contents should be found in his uncontested writings. Or, also the other way around, one may ask what elements in the HSBK are clearly discussed in texts that have undoubtedly been written by Kūkai. As is apparent from the above samples, perhaps the most important issues in searching for coherence are related to precepts.

At the core of the following pages, therefore, lies the tracing of analogies between the precepts view expounded in the HSBK and that in Kūkai’s oeuvre. In other words, it comprises a contextual reading of the HSBK within the framework of the works in which Kūkai expounds his precepts view, as well as those texts on which this view was coined.

538 See chapter III: 59, n. 423.
539 T. XII, no. 375: 627b10-12.: 因縁義者聲聞緣覺不解如是甚深之義不聞伊字三點而成解脱涅槃摩訶般若成祕密藏. On this text, see: chapter III, n. 335 above.
**Kairitsu: disentangling vinaya and śīla**

When discussing “precepts views”, Japanese studies most generally use the term 戒律観 (Jap. kairitsukan). However, as Mark Unno has already pointed out, 戒 (Jap. kairitsu), which is a core concept in East Asian Buddhology, has no consistent equivalent in Sanskrit or any of the other Indic and Central Asian languages in which Buddhism was promulgated.540

Nevertheless, in Western language publications, the conventional English translation for kairitsu is ‘precepts’, which blurs the fact that this term actually denotes two separate systems of Buddhist precepts. Namely, while the character 戒 (Jap. kai) commonly points at the Sanskrit word śīla, 律 (Jap. ritsu) most often refers to vinaya. Since there is no comparable term like śīla-vinaya* in the known Indic sources, kairitsu thus appears to take on its own particular meanings in East Asian contexts.541

When falling back on the original meanings of the Sanskrit words śīla and vinaya, it is noteworthy that the term śīla derives from the root śīl, meaning among other things ‘to do’, ‘act’, and ‘make’. Initially it signified ‘custom’, ‘proclivity’, or ‘character’, and then became a word meaning ‘good custom’, ‘good activities’, and ‘morality’.542 In the Indian Brahmanic cultural tradition, śīla was therefore first and foremost a kind of deontological code associated with a certain profession. With the social shift to a Buddhist organisation of society, śīla gradually became an overall term for the Buddhist virtues expressed in universal moral principles applicable both to laity and the clergy. So, according to context, there are two levels of śīla: (1) character and moral behaviour in general; and (2) specific rules of monastic life.543

The word vinaya, by contrast, is formed by the combination of the prefix vi- and the verbal root nī, basically meaning ‘to lead’, ‘train’, ‘educate’. This compound originally meant ‘education’ and ‘discipline’, but then took on the sense of ‘rule’.544 And indeed, the Buddhist vinayas comprise of disciplinary regulations or monastic law strictly aimed at regulating the everyday conduct of priests and nuns.545

---

541 Unno 1994: 15.
544 Mori Shōji, quoted in Abe 1999: 48.
What then are the major differences between śīla and vinaya, or between kai and ritsu? Referring to the work of Mori Shōji, Unno distinguishes the six features, which may be outlined in the following manner.\(^{546}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>śīla</th>
<th>vinaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. positive cultivation of the good</td>
<td>1. negative prohibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. autonomously maintained morals</td>
<td>2. externally enforced law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. individually-orientated</td>
<td>3. communally-orientated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. general moral principles</td>
<td>4. detailed practical transgressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. based on the śūtra literature</td>
<td>5. based on the vinaya literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. for all Buddhist practitioners</td>
<td>6. only for the monastic community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, there are clearly two kinds of precepts: on the one hand, one can define śīla precepts as the general moral principles, which an individual Buddhist, whether ordained monastic or layperson, autonomously decides to follow in order to actively cultivate good. Vinaya precepts, on the other hand, comprise of an extensive series of negative prohibitions constituting the monastic penal code, used to restrain and regulate the practical daily life of novices, monks and nuns of the Buddhist community, that is, the prātimokṣa.\(^{547}\)

In the words of Bruno Petzold, “the double word ‘kai-ritsu’ has the twofold meaning of monastic rule founded on morality, or monastic rule comprising of moral commandments”.\(^{548}\) Consequently, he considers śīla as the foundation of the vinaya, or in other words, he sees the concrete disciplinary vinaya precepts as part of the more general moral śīla precepts. In this way, the term kairitsu does not solely refer to the whole of formal articles on prohibitions (i.e. prātimokṣa) and practical regulations for the Buddhist community, but covers a much broader range of ethical perspectives than solely the ecclesiastical regulations.\(^{549}\)

Before going any further, we should first explain how vinaya and śīla are related to each other on the pragmatic plain, or in other words, are these two sets of precepts complementary or mutually exclusive in the religious life of the Buddhist practitioner?

---

\(^{546}\) Unno 1994: 16.

\(^{547}\) The prātimokṣa comprises eight categories of precepts according to the saṃgha group one belongs to Dessein and Heirman 1999: 245-248; Tsomo 1992: 143.


\(^{549}\) Also see Ueda T. 1933: 124.
As Shingon or *mantrayāna* practice has often been presented as the ultimate form of *mahāyāna*, we might look at this question from the perspective of a Mahāyānist. In this respect, Richard Gombrich points out that it is crucial to understand that “being a Mahāyānist is the same as to be a *bodhisattva*, and both terms denote a *religious condition*, not a social role”.\(^{550}\) This difference between spiritual state and status or social standing logically implies that morality (*śīla*) is divergent from discipline (*vinaya*). That is, “They pertain to two separate dimensions of Buddhist life: the *śīla* precepts advise on the ideal behaviour for a swift attainment of the religious goal of salvation, while the *vinaya* precepts are the mundane rules of daily conduct by which the clergy live”.\(^{551}\)

Notwithstanding this clear distinction between the religious pragmatics of *śīla* and *vinaya*, Buddhist scholarship has blended the terms *kai* and *ritsu*. For example, in Mahāyāna texts, the oldest core of the Buddhist disciplinary code for monastics, namely the *prātimokṣa*, is also called *saṃvara-śīla* or ‘moral code of restraint’, or to explain with Gombrich:

> The *prātimokṣa* is negative, a catalogue of things one undertakes not to do. The *bodhisattva* (i.e. the Mahāyānist) is not to rest content with being moral in this negative sense, but must also do positively moral things… [This is called] *kuśala-dharma-samgrāhakam śīlam*… [which] is whatever good, beyond the moral code of restraint, one accumulates with body or voice towards the great Enlightenment. In other words, it is what one does *in addition to*, not instead of, observing the *prātimokṣa*.\(^{552}\)

It is precisely this last issue, i.e. that in the continental tradition upholding the *vinaya* precepts was the condition for entering the social state of a monastic, who could in addition take the *bodhisattvaśīla* precepts to create a distinct profile for his/her religious condition, that was turned around in early Heian Japan by Saichō. His idea was that it were the *bodhisattvaśīla* (*kai*) that classified a neophyte as a Tendai monk, who after his twelve year training retreat on Mt. Hiei could in addition take the *vinaya* precepts (*ritsu*) as a provisional and –therefore inferior– ‘Hinayāna’ ordination.\(^{553}\)

This context offers an opportunity to vanquish a wide-spread misconception regarding *vinaya*, that unfortunately still is apparent in certain Buddhological works, and might be called the ‘*mahāyāna-vinaya* delusion’. At present there still are some scholars who have done pioneering work in Buddhist Studies, but are –for some unclear reasons– evidently confused, to say the least, when it comes down to the *vinaya* in East Asia. To give only one example.

---

\(^{550}\) Gombrich 1998: 47, emphasis added.


\(^{553}\) Abe 1999: 50-52; Groner 1984: 195ff.
titles of publications such as *Le Code du Mahāyāna en Chine* by Jan Jakob Maria De Groot (1893) may suggest that Mahāyānists have developed a disciplinary code of their own. Other scholars, such as Bruno Petzold, for example, go even further and make such statements like “in India we also find a Mahāyāna Vinaya” or “the Mahāyāna Vinaya was more powerful in China than in India”.554

As the above paragraphs have asserted, such ideas are wrong, for there is no and has never been such a thing as a *mahāyāna-vinaya*.555 As we have seen, the term ‘Mahāyāna’ is at best referring to some alleged superior stage in the spiritual progress of a Buddhist practitioner, and has nothing to do with regulations for monastic life. What is correct, however, is that instead of producing a separate collection of *vinaya* precepts, Mahāyāna developed its own system of *śīla* precepts within the – predominantly Chinese apocryphal – *sūtra* literature which emphasized cultivation of good and helping of others.

As has been pointed out by Unno, the canonical foundation of *kai* and *ritsu* further implies that *kairitsu* at best is to be defined as consisting both of *sūtra* as well as *vinaya* precepts.556 Perhaps it is this link with literature that made Yuasa Yasuo define *kairitsu* as the “precepts and canons”, which he considers to be “the essence of the actualities of Buddhist cultivation”. Although he argues also that the compound term *kai-ritsu* itself is a “neologism not found in Indian Buddhism”, he distinguishes the following specific cultural meanings:557

The first is “*ritsu* in the sense of *vinaya*, the regulations internal to the Buddhist monastic order or *samgha*” and pertains to –what Yuasa considers as– “Indian Buddhism”.558 Its connection to “cultivation” is formulated as:

> Leaving the secular world and entering the *samgha*, one renounces all secular responsibilities and submits to the constraint of the canons. The articles in the canons are called *prātimokṣa* and one will be punished for violating them, that is, one must atone for wrongdoing. […] Consequently, the *vinaya* is a self-governing system of laws for maintaining the order’s organization. […] The Indian religious order generally forms a sacred region with extraterritorial rights beyond the intervention of any secular power. Consequently, those who have left the secular world are free of all constraints of secular laws. […] Freedom from secular law is a right claimed by the *samgha* itself, and the secular powers of Indian society have traditionally recognized this right. Therefore, the religious world and the political world are completely separate social systems. This indicates a dualism in the Indian view of the world between religion and politics, and consequently, between the sacred and the secular. In this regard, to regulate one’s everyday life in accordance with various determinations of the

---

554 Petzold 1995: 466 and 472 respectively.
In order to fully grasp his words, it is important to note that he insists on the fact that, contrary to such notions as a “Christian Church”, samgha only pertains to the monastic or ordained community and does not relate to the needs of the laity.560 In Yuasa's view, the second meaning of kairitsu is “precepts (kaî) or śīla,” the essence of which he defines as “the norms for daily life that a lay person, either wishing to enter the samgha or to become a devout Buddhist lay person, adopts autonomously through his or her own resolution”.561 And it is precisely in this choice that lies a fundamental difference between the first and the second meaning of kairitsu:

The precepts (śīla) and the canons (vinaya) are, in principle, the same for anyone who leaves the secular world, for in such a case, one submits oneself to the constraints of the vinaya. But, although the contents of the vinaya are also referred to as “precepts” (śīla), the constraints of the vinayas is not autonomously like the śīla for lay persons, but heteronomous in that it involves externally imposed sanctions. The precepts for the lay person [i.e. the five precepts of not to kill, steal, lie, commit adultery, or drink intoxicants...] are accepted out of the believer’s own resolve. Consequently, at least theoretically, they are not prohibitive imperatives of the “Thou shalt not…” sort, but, rather, they express the positive resolution of the will, “I will not…” In this respect, the precepts essentially differ from the Judeo-Christian commandments. To accept the precepts is to impose upon oneself constraints beyond the norm of ordinary life. In spite of the fact that the content of the Five Precepts seems to resemble closely to the moral laws of our ordinary understanding, they theoretically involve something else – one’s own choice of a way of life above and beyond the social norms under which ordinary people in society are constrained.562

Thus, according to Yuasa, the two terms, vinaya and śīla, constitute the rudiments of kairitsu. However, “since they are rooted in traditional Indian society, their content changed radically as Buddhism spread to East Asia”.563 For instance, “with respect to vinaya, the Indian duality between religion and politics did not have a correlate in China, […] where there was no tradition of recognizing extraterritorial privileges for religion […] and by the end of the T’ang Dynasty, almost all Buddhist orders […] were subsumed under the sovereignty of secular law”. 564

561 Yuasa 1987: 88, with added emphasis.  
563 Yuasa 1987: 89.  
564 Yuasa 1987: 89.
In Yuasa’s interpretation, such changes also implied a shift in the nature of Buddhist “cultivation”:

In Indian Buddhism, a life of observing the vinayas meant a complete separation from the secular order and, consequently, religious cultivation can be termed an extrasecular practice. But China is different. There cultivation can be termed an intrasecular practice, having the characteristic ambiguity of going beyond the secular standards of life while still in the midst of the secular order. In this sense, the theoretical Indian distinction between the vinaya and the sīla is lost.\(^{565}\)

It should be recalled that in the early eight century the SBR, or the Chinese translation of the Dharmaguptakavinaya, was imposed by imperial decree on the whole of China as the only and most influential scriptural authority for monastic ordination practise.\(^{566}\) Its regulations were followed by monastics both of the Hinayāna (or perhaps less pejorative: śrāvakayāna) and Mahāyāna. It is one of the so-called four major influential vinaya texts (四大律 Jap. shī dairitsu) that were transmitted to East Asia from early Indian Buddhism, aside from the Chinese translations of the Sarvāstivāda-,\(^{567}\) Mahāśāsaka-,\(^{568}\) and Mahāsāṃghika-vinayas.\(^{569}\)

However, as a supplement to the SBR precepts, Mahāyānists generally took the bodhisattvaśīla, which –at least for East Asian practitioners–\(^{570}\) are explained in the BMK.\(^{571}\) Although fundamentally divergent in scope, there are clearly parallels between the vinaya precepts of the SBR and the sūtra precepts of the BMK. The main similarities can be found in the content of the most important precepts, which –to make things even more complicated– are in both cases referred to as kai, or śīla.

The vinaya prescribes, for instance, that all male and female novices have to uphold ‘ten commandments’ (十戒 Jap. jukkai). The first five, or Skt. pañcaśīla (五戒 Jap. gokai), comprise of the precepts for laypeople and are supposed to ensure a rebirth in the human realm, the latter five are especially for neophytes: (1) not to kill; (2) not to steal; (3) not to commit adultery;\(^{572}\) (4) not to speak falsely; (5) not to consume alcohol; (6) not to use adornments of flowers, nor perfumes; (7) not to perform as an actor, juggler, acrobat, or go to

---

\(^{565}\) Yuasa 1987: 90.

\(^{566}\) Heirman 2007: 7. Also see chapter II: 17 above.

\(^{567}\) 十説律 Jap. Jūjuritsu (T. XXIII, no. 1435).

\(^{568}\) 五分律 Jap. Gobunritsu (T. XXII, no. 1421).

\(^{569}\) 摩訶僧祇律 Jap. Makasōgirisu (T. XXII, no. 1425). On these vinayas, see: Pinte K. 2009c.


\(^{571}\) See chapter II: 18-19, n. 94.

\(^{572}\) According to the SBR, novices have to refrain from any sexual activity whatsoever, while the BMK speaks of no sexual misconduct between husband and wife, and no adultery.
watch and hear them; (8) not to sit on elevated, broad, and large divans or beds; (9) not to eat except in regulation hours; and (10) not to possess money, gold or silver, or precious things. Although the BMK shares the first five precepts, it gives another set for the latter five: i.e. (6) not to speak of the sins of those in orders; (7) not to vaunt self and depreciate others; (8) not to be avaricious; (9) not to be angry; and (10) not to slander the ‘three jewels’ or ‘triple gem’ (Skt. *triratna*).\(^{573}\)

However, table 7 below indicates that there are also other differences between these texts.\(^{574}\) Already from this general picture, it is clear that –even though the creation of an extra set of *sūtra* precepts of *bodhisatvaśīla* for Mahāyānists further blended the terminological distinction between *kai* and *ritsu*– both systems of precepts, at least in China, co-existed in a complementary way.\(^{575}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Comparison between SKB and BMK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>number of precepts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monks 250, nuns 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ordination prescriptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. layman (<em>upāsaka</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. laywoman (<em>upāsikā</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. male novice (<em>śrāmaṇera</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. female novice (<em>śrāmaṇerikā</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. aspirant nun (<em>śīkṣamānā</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. full fledged monk (<em>bhikṣu</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. full fledged nun (<em>bhikṣunī</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• quorum of 10 monks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dealing with transgressions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eligibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>community type</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{573}\) DCBT: 101b, s.v. *戒*,

\(^{574}\) Based on Unno 1994: 22-25.

\(^{575}\) For the situation in Japan before Kūkai’s time, see chapter II supra.
As is clear from the above, the Hinayāna precepts that are said to be the foundation of ‘kairitsu’ are disciplinary, ascetic, formalistic, negative and individual. Given that the absolute strict and formal observance of precepts are considered the greatest obligation of monastics, it has been argued that Mahāyāna Buddhism originated as a reaction against this kind of strong observance of disciplinary rules. This is allegedly because the formalistic observance of precepts is “not the fundamental spirit of Buddhism, and that the true essence of Buddhism lies elsewhere”, implying that –seen from the perspective of a Mahāyāna-bodhisattva– Hinayānist practice can be considered inferior.  

In the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra, Upāli, who was one of the principal disciples of the historical Buddha and is reputed to be the compiler of the vinaya, is accounted to have said:

> Lotus flowers do not grow in the highlands. They grow precisely in the mud of the low and damp marshes. [...] The seeds of the Tathāgata are precisely all kleśas and the three poisons.

While Indian and Chinese Hinayāna monastics considered the acquisition of an absolute unobstructed, ascetic and formal life, in which they keep the precepts, such quotes have been used to justify the abandonment of the vinaya disciplinary rules in Japan, trailblazed by such figures as Saichō. As already seen above, Saichō established a platform for the ‘perfect and sudden Mahāyāna precepts’ (大乗圓頓戒壇 daijō endonkaidan) on Mt. Hiei, emphasizing that these Mahāyāna sīla comprise the sole code by means of which one could become a bodhisattva-monk, whilst rejecting the full precepts of the SBR. 

---

576 Also see: Ueda T. 1939: 118.
577 維摩經 Jap. Yuimagyō is an Indian Mahāyāna sūtra expounding the deeper principle of Mahāyāna as opposed to lesser vehicle teachings, focusing on the explanation of the meaning of non-duality. A significant aspect of the scripture is the fact that it is a teaching addressed to high-ranking Buddhist disciples through the mouth of the lay bodhisattva Vimalakīrti, who expounds the doctrine of emptiness. There are three extant Chinese translations: the 維摩詰所說經 (Chin. Weimojie suoshuo jing; Jap. Yūmakitsus shosetsu kyō, i.e. T. XIV, no. 475) by Kumārajīva (344-413) in 406 (cf. Lancaster 1979: 56, no. 119); 說無垢稱經 (Chin. Shuo wugoucheng jing; Jap. Setsu mukushō kyō, i.e. T. XIV, no. 476), translated in 650 (cf. Lancaster 1979: 57, no. 121) by Xuanzang (玄奘, 602-664); and 維摩詰經 (Chin. Weimojie jing; Jap. Yūmakitsu kyō, i.e. T. XIV, no. 474), translated in 228 (cf. Lancaster 1979: 57, no. 120). There are several English translations, especially of the Kumārajīva version, cf. Lusthaus in DBJ, s.v. 維摩經. For more information, also see: BKD XI: 122.
578 Ueda T. 1939: 118-119.
579 Ueda T. 1939: 119.
Kūkai’s vinaya(s)

Kūkai, on the other hand, had a totally different approach to the vinaya rules. Undoubtedly the most quoted passage in this respect is from the Kōnin, which Kūkai wrote in 814 (Kōnin 4): 581

When people aspire to travel far, they have to rely on their legs. For those who pursue the way of the Buddhas, the precepts are their legs. Beware, practitioners: hold fast to both the exoteric and esoteric precepts, our two legs, and live a pure life free of transgressions. 582

Analogous to his discrepancy between the ‘exoteric and esoteric teachings’, 583 the above quote shows that Kūkai also speaks of the ‘exoteric precepts’ (顯戒, Jap. kenkai). As for what is meant by them, he adds:

The exoteric precepts consist of the three refuges, the eight prohibitions, the five admonitions, the precepts for śrāvakas, bodhisattvas and others. There are also separate rules for the four groups of the saṃgha. 584

Consequently, Kūkai’s ‘exoteric precepts’ comprise at least (1) the three refuges in Buddha, Dharma and Saṃgha that all Buddhist followers take; (2) the eight precepts for strict lay Buddhists were meant to follow on poṣadha (布薩 Jap. fusatsu) days, 585 (3) the five moral restrictions to be observed by Buddhist householder-practitioners, 586 (4) the vinaya rules (i.e. two-hundred and fifty rules of the SBR), as well as (5) the bodhisattva vows of the BMK. 587

581 Yamasaki 1967: 252 and 256. The text is in KDZ II: 861ff. Also see chapter II: 23.
583 This is expounded especially in his Treatise on the Differentiation of the Exoteric and Esoteric Teachings (辨顯密二教論, Jap. Ben kenshū-nikyō ron, cf. T. no. 2427), where he argues for the supremacy of esoteric over exoteric teachings, because the former were espoused by the Dharmakāya Buddha. There is a roughly annotated translation of the introduction and last part of the text as Treatise on the Difference between the Exoteric and Esoteric Teachings by Hakeda (1972: 151-157), and Distinguishing the Two Teachings of the Exoteric and Esoteric by Abe (2000: esp. 212-219, 131-234, and 261-270). Full translations are by Giebel (2004: 15-62) and White (2005: 249-328).
585 I.e. the 8th, 14th, 15th, 23rd, 29th and 30th of the lunar calendar. These prohibitions are not to kill, not to take things not given; no ignoble (i.e. sexual) conduct; not to speak falsely; not to drink alcohol; not to use cosmetics, perfumes, jewelry, or engaging in dancing, singing, or seeing such performances; not to sleep on beds or seats that are high off the ground, wide, or ornately ordained; and not to eat out of regulation hours, i.e. after noon. See: Oroval in DBJ, s.v. 布薩.
586 They are: not killing; not stealing; no debauchery; no false speech; no consumption of alcohol. These are binding on laity, male and female, as well as on monks and nuns. The observance of these five ensures rebirth in the human realm. Muller in DBJ s.v. 五戒 (Jap. go kai).
587 The four groups of the community, i.e. (1) bhikṣus/bhikṣunīs, (2) sīkṣamānas, (3) śrāmaṇeras/śrāmaṇerikās, (4) upāsakas/upāsikās each receive the precepts according to their position. Also see: p. 50, n. 346 and p. 87, table 7 supra.
As can be seen in the biographical records that are compiled by Gonzō (勤操, 754-837), Kūkai renounced secular life (出家得道 Jap. shukke-tokudō) and received the novice (沙彌 Jap. shami) precepts at the age of twenty-four. He is accounted to have received official ordination, that is according to the full precepts of the SBR, at the Tōdaiji ordination platform in 804, i.e. at thirty-one. Although some scholars have doubted his taking of the SBR ordination, at least two sources give positive evidence.

First, the Biography posthumously honoring the High Priest and Preceptor Kūkai (贈大僧正空海和上傳記 Jap. Zō dai-sōjō Kūkai wajō denki) reads:

> He received the full precepts in the Kaidan’in of Tōdaiji on the 9th day of the 4th month of the 23rd year of Enryaku (延暦二十三年四月九日, i.e. 804.5.21).

Second, there is also a Kongōji (金剛寺) manuscript that reads:

> On the 9th day of the 4th month of the present year [i.e. Enryaku 23, being 804], the full precepts were conferred upon Kūkai in the Kaidan’in of Tōdaiji. His [precepts] master was Gonzō (勤操, 758-827).

Moreover, also in his Will in Twenty-five Articles (御遺告二十五箇條 Jap. Go-yuigō nijūgo-kajō, further: GYG) Kūkai stressed that Shingon adepts should receive the full precepts at the Tōdaiji Kaidan’in. Thus, Kūkai appears to have followed the commonly established precepts attitude, which was centered around the customary SBR vinayā ordination in Nara.

It has been suggested, however, that it is quite surprising that Kūkai’s writings do not contain a single trace of his opinion on Saichō’s establishment of the aforementioned exclusive platform for the bodhisattva-monks ordination at Hiei, not in the least because it must have been a huge problem to the contemporary religious community. But perhaps even more unexpected is that also the SBR, even though undoubtedly being the general current in contemporary China and Japan, is not mentioned as such in Kūkai’s oeuvre.

---

588 Ueda T. 1933: 127. Abe 1999: 110. Before his ordination, he lived as a self-ordained shidōso, and so-called ubasoku. For its particular connotations see Abe 1999: 76ff. On the reliability of texts used to determine the date of his ordination, see Abe 1999: 482, n. 105. Here, and in the following, ages are given according to the Chinese traditional counting, in which at birth one is one year old.

589 Ueda T. (1933: 127, n. 1), for instance, states that there is no certainty about Kūkai’s initiation being based on the SBR tradition, and suggests that it perhaps concerns rather the Shōritsu-gikai (Jap. Shōritsu-gikai), i.e. the first group of the three categories of pure precepts (cf. chapter II: 20 s.v. threefold pure precepts), for which the term ‘Dharmaguptaka precepts’ (四分律戒, Jap. Shibunritsu-kai) has been representatively used.


592 A modern Japanese version of this text is e.g. in KDKZ VIII: 36-95.

593 KDZ II: 797, cited in Ueda T. 1933: 127, n. 2.

594 Ueda T. 1933: 128.
In the vinaya section of the SGR, a catalogue of sūtra, vinaya and śāstra texts which Shingon adepts were required to study, for instance, Kūkai did not mention the SBR. Instead, he states that the precepts are expounded throughout the twelve divisions of the canon, and especially in the 50 volumes of the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya (根本説一切有部毘奈耶 Konpon-setsu-issai-ubu-binaya; often abbreviated to 有部律, Jap. Uburitsu, further: UBR).

Although the Shingon curriculum outlined in this Catalogue was meant to supplement the standard works of the Nara schools, and not to replace them, it may require further explanation why Kūkai’s catalogue does not include the SBR, notwithstanding the fact that he received the full set of precepts in accordance to this vinaya. In other words, the problem is that Kūkai himself appears to have been ordained according to the SBR traditions, but adopted the UBR instead of the SBR as that which has to be studied in the Shingon school.

Ueda Tenzui (1932 and 1933) has suggested at least four reasons in this context: (1) earlier esoteric patriarchs also relied on the UBR; (2) the contents of the UBR has a rich esoteric colour; (3) Yijing, the translator of the UBR, was an adherent of esoteric Buddhism; (4) at that time the UBR was the most recent vinaya available.

Indeed, the translation dates of the other vinayas range between 404-424, but Yijing began translating parts of the UBR only between 700-711, which is approximately three centuries later. The UBR was not only brought to China much later than the other vinayas, but there was also never an opportunity for the UBR to become a living tradition in China and be included amongst the prevailing codes used in monastic ordination practise, because just at that time, the influential vinaya master Daoxuan (596-667) who founded the Nanshan (南山) precept school (律宗, Jap. risshū) recommended all monastics in China to allow only the

---

595 Also see: Introduction: 1, n. 3 above.
597 Chin. Genben shuoyiqie youbu pinaiye (i.e. T. XXIII no. 1442). The 50 fascicles translation by Yijing (義淨, 635-713) was completed in 703 at Ximing Monastery. Although this text bears strong resemblances to the Jūjiritsu 十誦律 (Chin. Shisonglü) or Ten Recitations Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins (T. XXIII, no. 1435) it is not the same vinaya. Its main difference also to SBR is its extensive usage of Mahāyāna terminology and esoteric spells. The Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya is often ambiguously referred to as 有部律 Uburitsu (Chin. Youbulū), but this term may also point at the Sarvāstivāda-vinaya. See: Clarke 2006: 3, n. 4. For more information on the interpretation of the term 有部律 in this context, see: Ueda T. 1932.
598 Ueda T. 1932: 5 adds that the UBR was allegedly composed in the same region as where esotericism flourished.
599 Ueda T. 1933: 128. In the following, the second and third argument are left aside.
600 Ueda T. 1932: 17.
601 For a study of this school, see: Mizuno 1993.
SBR, which was officially sanctioned by an imperial decree that was promulgated to that effect.

Furthermore, as there is no Chinese translation of the *mūlasarvāstivāda-poṣadha* ceremony in the Chinese canon, how could the a *Mūlasarvāstivāda-saṃgha* have existed without it? While the other *vinaya* traditions are frequently discussed in Chinese records, there is hardly any mentioning of the UBR, and no evidence has been found that it was ever practiced in China. Neither *vinaya* sections in monks’ biographies, nor historical records give any reference to a *Mūlasarvāstivādin* ordination being given in China.\(^\text{602}\) Hence, it may be only natural that Kūkai listed the UBR instead of the SBR. Moreover, it has been speculated that “when speaking of it in the dual thought of emptiness and existence”, the SBR is “the tenet of void” (空宗 Jap. *kāshū*) and the UBR is “the tenet of existence (有宗 Jap. *ushū*)”, while Mikkyō is “the religious teaching on the original existence (Jap. 本有の 宗教 *hon’u no shūkyō*)”, \(^\text{603}\) i.e. of Buddha nature being inherently present in all beings.

**Ordination as condition for abhiṣeka**

When –as Ueda suggests– Kūkai’s predecessors in the Shingon traditional lineage indeed took UBR ordination, one may ask whether this ordination was considered a condition for partaking in the *samaya* precepts ritual, which is –as the reader may recall– preliminary to *abhiṣeka*. Kūkai is the last in the row of the so-called ‘traditional eight great patriarchs who expounded the doctrine’ (伝持八祖 Jap. *denji-hassō*), starting with the two legendary figures Nāgārjuna (龍樹 Jap. Ryūju, 2\(^{\text{nd}}\)-3\(^{\text{rd}}\) century) and Nāgabodhi (龍智 Jap. Ryūchi, 2\(^{\text{nd}}\)-3\(^{\text{rd}}\) century). They are followed by the three Tang masters Vajrabodhi (金剛智 Jap. Kongōchi, 671-741), Amoghadvaja (不空[金剛] Jap. Fukū[kogō], 651-780), and Šubhākarasimha ([善] 無畏 Jap. [Zen]mui, 637-735), as well as the latter’s disciple Yixing (一行 Jap. Ichigyō 673-727), and Huiguo.\(^\text{604}\)

\(^\text{602}\) Ueda T. 1932: 4. \\
\(^\text{603}\) Ueda T. 1933: 128, referring to the work of Jiun-sonja 慈雲尊者 (1718-1804), cf. *MD*, p. 901c. \\

When he [i.e. Vajrabodhi] was just ten years old, because of his knowledge of quiescence, he “left home” in order to study treatises on linguistics and grammar. At fifteen, he studied the treatises of Dharmakīrti. ⁶⁰⁶ At the age of twenty, he received the full precepts, and he studied the discipline of Hinayāna and Mahāyāna for [a period of] six years. When he was thirty-one, he travelled to southern India [in order to] become a student of [lit. meet] a disciple of Nāgārjuna bodhisattva, whose name was Nāgabodhi. He was seven hundred years of age and is now still alive. Seven years went by [in which Vajrabodhi] honored and paid homage [to his master], who instructed him on the *Vajraśekhara-yoga-sūtra* ⁶⁰⁷ and the Dharma gate [i.e. teachings] of all dhāraṇīs held by Vairocana, as well as all the Mahāyāna scriptures and the five fields of knowledge. ⁶⁰⁸ He received the fivefold abhiṣeka [i.e. of the STTS] ⁶⁰⁹ and amongst the secrets of all Buddhas, there was nothing he did not understand. ⁶¹⁰

In other words, Vajrabodhi received the full precepts at the age of twenty, and after that, he received abhiṣeka from Nāgabodhi in southern India, but the text gives no details on which vinaya was used. Nevertheless, the FHD also contains information on Amoghavajra:

When he was just fourteen, in the country of Jáva he met the great Trepiṭaka Vajrabodhi, who became his teacher. The high priest first tested him by teaching him the siddham script and having him recite Sanskrit stūras. [The number of] Sanskrit words is immense, but he listened to all of them without fail. Thus, he was permitted to enter the platform in order to receive the precepts for arousing bodhicitta. He was only fifteen years old when he left home! Consequently, he sailed the southern ocean on a boat with a dangerous structure. He was frightened by the waves that struck [the boat], since the waves were shaped like shadows that followed him. In the eight year of Kaiyuan (i.e. 720 CE) he arrived to the east of the Luo [river in Chang’an?]. In the twenty-fourth year (i.e. 724 CE), the year of jiazi, when he was a young man of about twenty years, he approached the [Mūla]sarvāstivādin

---

⁶⁰⁵ The text is e.g. in KDKZ II: 379ff. This text appears not to mention neither Śubhākarasimha or Yixing.


⁶⁰⁷ 金剛頂瑜伽經 Jap. Kongōchōyugakyo. As pointed out by Sundberg (2011: 180-181, n. 29), this presumably is a version of the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha* (further: STTS). 金剛頂 is frequently restored to *Vajraśekhara* by other commentators, but as Giebel (1995: 109) pointed out, the Siddham characters provided by Kūkai read Vajra-usahaan, i.e. Vajroṣṭha with sandhi. However, there is a *Vajra-śekhara-mahā-guhyya-yogatantra* (an explanatory tantra of the STTS) registered in the Tibetan Tohoku catalogue, Sundberg ibid. referring to Hartzell 1997: 381.

⁶⁰⁸ 五明論 Jap. Go myōron refers to Skt. paśca-vidyā, i.e. “the five sciences or studies of India: (1) grammar and composition (śabda-vidyā); (2) the arts and mathematics (śilpakarma-sthāna-vidyā); (3) medicine (cikitsā-vidyā); logic-epistemology (hetu-vidyā); and (4) philosophy (adhyātma-vidyā), which Monier-Williams calls the “knowledge of the supreme spirit, or of ātman,” the basis of the four Vedas; the Buddhists regard the Tripitaka […] as their inner philosophy.” Muller in DBJ, referring to JEBD: 85b. Also see: BGD: 376a and DCBT: 119.

⁶⁰⁹ According to Sundberg (2011: 181, n. 31), this refers to the five families (kula) of deities, i.e. Buddha or Tathāgata, Vajra, Ratna, Padma, and Karma.

stone ordination platform at Jianfusi and received upasampadā (lit. [the ordination ritual for those] close to perfection, i.e. full ordination). Thus, following Vajrabodhi, Amoghavajra entered the ordination platform in order to receive the precepts for arousing bodhicitta, and after that, he evidently received the full precepts in correspondence with the UBR. Moreover, it is stated that he received abhiṣeka from Nāgabodhi:

Then he met ācārya Nāgabodhi, held his elbow and kneeled while he was walking in order to question him on discipline, immediately showing him the great Tang country and entrusting him with golden utensils and similar things. Nāgabodhi said: “That which I treasure is the mind, not these valuables!” and promptly gave him the Scripture of the One Hundred Thousand Praises of the Yoga on the Vajra Peak of the Eighteen Assemblies, together with the Scripture on the Ten Thousand Praises of the Womb that is the Great Assembled Compassion of Mahāvairocana, the mantras for the fivefold abhiṣeka, the secret collection of sūtras and śāstras, which in Sankrit amounted to [a collection containing] over five hundred parts. All this, for the sake of transmitting it.

As for Kūkai’s master, Huiguo, the FHD states that he received the samaya precepts from Amoghavajra, and only after that, he received the full precepts:

Therefore, it is that [he received] the Dharma transmission consecration from Amoghavajra, the One of the great Xingshansi with great and vast wisdom in the tripitaka. In the days he was still a young boy of about seven years, he listened to the great illuminated meditation master, who showed him the tripitaka […]], conferred upon him the samaya Buddha precepts, and allowed him to receive the stage of abhiṣeka. […] When reaching the age of a young man of twenty years, he advanced to the [stage of the ordination with] the full [precepts] connected to the Four Part [vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas, i.e. the SBR]. He studied the tripitaka and understood it.

Moreover, in the Epigraph of Preceptor Huiguo (恵果和尚之碑 Jap. Keika-ōshō no ishibumi), which is collated in the second scroll of the Seireishū (性霊集) Kūkai’s collection of his

611 KDZ I: 19-20, quoted in Satō 1991: 64: 年甫十四於闍婆國見大弘教三藏金剛智而師事之和上初試教悉曇章令誦梵經梵言賒切一聞無墜便許入壇授發菩提心戒年甫十五與出家焉隨侍南溟乘航架險驚波鼓浪如影隨形開元八年方至東洛十二年甲子年方弱冠於薦福寺依一切有部石戒壇所而受近圓. This extract is almost identical to a passage in the fifteenth scroll of Yuanzhao’s (圓照, fl. 778) 貞元新定釋教目録 (Chin. Chengyuan xinding shijiao mulu) i.e. T. LV, no. 2157: 881a15-a19. On Kūkai’s treatment of this text, its relation to the FHD, and its credibility, see Sundberg 2011: 140-141, and esp. n. 62.


master's poems, memorials, inscriptions, etc., it is stated that Huiguo received the full precepts according to the SBR, and afterwards received *abhiṣeka*:

He first [received ordination] according to the correct method of the Four Part *vinaya* and then he [received ordination] based upon the *abhiṣeka* of the Three Mysteries.

So, Kūkai asserts in his own texts that his immediate predecessors in the esoteric lineage also received the full precepts. This means that Ueda is –at least in part– correct in stating that they took full precepts, but only one of them took the UBR precepts, namely Amoghavajra, while the *vinaya* that was used for Vajrabodhi’s ordination is unknown, and Huiguo was ordained in the SBR tradition.

Nevertheless, the biographical accounts in the FHD, can be checked, and supplemented with data on the Tang period patriarchs retrieved from other –and undoubtedly more reliable– sources. According to the *Zhenyuan period* (785-805) Revised Catalogue of Canonical Buddhist Texts (*貞元新定釋教目録* Chin. *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu*), compiled in 800 by Yuanzhao (圓照, fl. 778), for instance, Vajrabodhi became a novice (Skt. *śramaṇera*) at Nālandā when he was ten. And the same source confirms the FHD account that he was fully ordained at the age of twenty. Further, the *Biography of Vajrabodhi of the Guangfu Temple in Luoyang, [Capital] of the Tang [Dynasty]* (*唐洛陽廣福寺金剛智傳* Chin. *Tang Luoyang Guangfusi Jingangzhi zhuān*), collated in Zanning’s (贊寧, 919-1001), *Song [Dynasty] Biographies of Great Monks* (*宋高僧傳* Chin. *Song Gaoseng zhuan*), which was completed in 988, stated that Vajrabodhi became a monk at the age of sixteen:

> At the age of sixteen, he was enlightened by the Buddha’s doctrine [...] He cut [his hair and put on] a dyed [robe] and became a monk.

And the same source also indicates that he was initiated in the esoteric teachings when he was around thirty years:

> When he was fully ordained, he heard the lectures of the *vinayas* of the eighteen schools. Again he went to West India to study the Hinayāna treatises and the doctrine of yoga, Three

---

615 For more information, see appendix H, s.v. poetry.


617 Chou 1945: 273, n. 6 referring to T. LV, no. 2157: 875b3-4: 年始十歲於那爛陀寺出家. On this catalogue, also see chapter III: 35, n. 227 supra.

618 Chou 1945: 274, n. 9 referring to T. LV, no. 2157: 875b6: 年二十受具戒.

Secrets, and *dhāraṇī*. By the time ten years had passed, he had become conversant with all the three Piṭakas.620

Amoghavajra, on the other hand, is accounted to have become Vajrabodhi’s lay disciple at the age of thirteen,621 and according to the *Biography of Amoghavajra of Daxingshan Temple in Chang’an [who worked under the Tang]* (唐京兆大興善寺不空傳, Chin. *Tang Jingzhao Da Xingshansi Bukong zhuan*), which is collated in Zanning’s aforementioned work, at the age of fifteen:

The Master [i.e. Vajrabodhi] was surprised [by his diligence] and ordained him as a bodhisattva. Having led [Amoghavajra] to the *Vajradhātumāṇḍala* and tested him by [observing the place where] he threw a flower [on the maṇḍala], the Master knew that he was going to advance the doctrine greatly. By the time he was fully ordained, he became an expert in expounding the *Vinaya* texts of the *Sarvāstivādin* School.622

However, there are at least two problems with this passage that dates from the end of the 10th century. First, what Chou translates as “ordained him as a bodhisattva” (cf. 受菩薩戒 Jap. *ju bosatsu-kai* in n. 622 below), which literally reads “conferred upon him the *bodhisattvaśīla*”, is rendered two centuries earlier by Zhao Qian (趙遷, fl. ca. 766-774), as “[conferred upon him] the precepts of the intent to attain awakening (菩提心戒 Jap. *bodaishin-kai*)”.623

However, the *Stele Inscription for the Commander Unequally in Honor, Officer of Probationary Director of the State Ceremonial, the Duke of Su, being the Acārya of Great and Vast Wisdom in the Tripiṭaka [i.e. Amoghavajra], of the Great Xingshan Temple of the Great Tang* (大唐故大徳開府儀同三司 試鴻臚卿 肅國公大興善寺大廣智三藏和上之碑, Chin. *Datang-guda dade Kaifu Yidong Sansi shihong luqing Su-guogong Da Xingshansi Daguangzhi-sancang-heshang zhi bei*),624 composed by Amoghavajra’s disciple Feixi (飛錫, fl. 742-765), dated Dali 9 (大暦九年, i.e. 774), reads that at thirteen, Amoghavajra was

620 Chou 1945: 274 (with added italics), translating T. L.V, no. 2061: 711b12-b15: 況登戒法遍聽十八部律又詣西印度學小乘諸論及瑜伽三密陀羅尼門十餘年全通三藏. Note that 戒法 is interpreted by Chou in the same sense as 具戒 in n. 618 supra.
621 Chou 1945: 285 and 321, appendix M, suggesting that it may also have been fifteen.
“conferred the precepts of arousing the intent to attain awakening (發菩提心戒 Jap. *ju hotsu bodaishin kai*), while he “left home” at fifteen.\(^{625}\)

Second, the “full precepts” (*具戒* Jap. *gukai*, cf. n. 622 below) and the “vinaya texts of the Sarvāstivādin School” are also problematic, because –as already pointed out in chapter IV: 91 above– the term 有部 (Jap. *ubu*) does not stand for the *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya*, but for the UBR.

Moreover, the 10\(^{th}\) century biographical account can be supplemented with more details on the age at which Amogavajra was fully ordained, all of which indicate that he was twenty.\(^{626}\)

This may imply that he was initiated into esotericism before he was ordained as a monastic, but –just as is the case with the precepts in the HSKB– the “bodhisattva precepts” and/or the “precepts of arousing the intent to attain awakening” conferred upon Amoghavajra actually were part of a separate ritual detached from the *abhiṣeka*, in this case the initiation in the *vajradhātu*.

In short, one reason for Kūkai’s stressing the importance of full ordination, may have been that prior to Kūkai’s times, esoteric patriarchs appear to have taken *abhiṣeka* only after being fully ordained. Before full ordination, one could take a separate ritual, detached from the one preliminary to *abhiṣeka*, in which the *bodhicitta* or *samaya* precepts (cf. infra) were conferred:

---

\(^{625}\) T. LII, no. 2120: 848b26: 十三 […] 授發菩提心戒年甫十五與出家焉.


\(^{627}\) Chou 1945: 286, n. 6.

---

### Table 8. Ordination and consecration ages of Kūkai's predecessors in the esoteric lineage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>出家 (沙彌十戒)</th>
<th>發菩提心戒</th>
<th>具足戒</th>
<th>灌頂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vajrabodhi</td>
<td>10 or 16</td>
<td>三昧耶佛戒</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoghavajra</td>
<td>13 or 15</td>
<td>[發菩提心戒]</td>
<td>ca. 20 [UBR]</td>
<td>“later”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huiguo</td>
<td>ca. 7</td>
<td>[三昧耶佛戒]</td>
<td>ca. 20 [SBR]</td>
<td>“later”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūkai</td>
<td>24 (797)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 (804)</td>
<td>32 (805)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


The question, then, still remains if this does mean that Kūkai considered receiving the full precepts as an absolute must, or in other words, were (and are) the full precepts—in Kūkai’s view—a prerequisite for the receiving abhiṣeka, or its preceding samaya precepts ritual? Concerning this question, Satō (1991) quoted the 16th article of the GYG:

Subsequently, you should take the full precepts at the Tōdaiji precepts platform.628

He also recalled the Kōnin saying:

You should firmly adhere to the exoteric and esoteric precepts, be pure and do not run counter to them!629

However, although both the GYG 630 and the Kōnin have been identified as a forgery,631 Satō found it worthwhile to re-address this problem, and considered the following four perspectives: (1) full precepts ordination is a condition for consecration; (2) the samaya precepts suffice to partake in the consecration, without having taken the full precepts; (3) full precepts ordination is not a condition for the consecration, when ordination is added to the samaya precepts, it is an expedient for saving other beings; and (4) the full precepts must be taken after the samaya precepts.632

Amongst these positions, the first one, Satō claims, is compatible with the standpoint of Tibetan esoteric Buddhism, because the first condition for the esoteric abhiṣeka in Tibetan esotericism is taking the full set of three precepts, i.e. in the sequence with the Hinayāna precepts first, followed by the bodhisattva precepts, and finally the samaya precepts.633

The second, namely the viewpoint of simply taking the samaya precepts, denotes the idea that Shingon followers should reject the exoteric precepts and only take the samaya precepts, which was manifested at the end of the Kamakura period.634 Also in the Edo period, this idea of simply taking the samaya precepts can be seen, for instance, in the first part of Donjaku’s (疎寂, 1674-1742) Record of the Procedure for Constructing the Precepts Platform for the Dharma Transmission Abhiṣeka (伝法灌頂戒場作法事記, Jap. Denbō-kanjō kaijō-sahō jiki):

---

628 KDZ II: 797, read by Satō (1991: 66) as: 即ち、東大寺の戒壇に於いて、具足戒を受けしめよ.
633 The reader’s attention is drawn to the fact that this is quite different from the threefold pure precepts, discussed in chapter II: 20 above. Also see Kanaoka 1976: 105.
In case you directly take the esoteric precepts based on the doctrine of such texts as the *Mahāvairocanasūtra*, it is not necessary to follow the exoteric precepts. This method is explained in detail in the commentary on the 17th chapter regarding studying the expedient means.\(^635\)

Satō’s third perspective corresponds to Saichō’s position, who emphasized provisionally taking the Hīnayāna precepts, while he asserts that his fourth option is a merely theoretical one.\(^636\) According to Satō, contemporary Shingon adepts, however, take the *abhiṣeka* ceremony only after having taken the full precepts, which is –he advocates– also the orthodox standpoint taken by Kūkai.\(^637\) But there is no consensus in this respect.

Tomabechi, for instance, advocates that the third position is Kūkai’s standpoint. Namely, based on the description of the 14 dialogues in the *Precious Key to the Secret Treasury* (秘蔵宝鑰, Jap. *Hizō hōyaku*, further: *Precious*), which Kūkai wrote ca. 830 as an abbreviation of his *Treatise on the Ten Stages* (十住心論, Jap. *Jūjushinron*, further: *JJSR*),\(^638\) he concludes the following, to just cite one part:

> Therefore, for a bodhisattva of the Mantra Gate that leads to a higher stage of mind, the full precepts is not the discipline that is observed, but to the utmost become expedient means for the guidance and benefit of sentient beings. Consequently, if by abandoning the Hīnayāna precepts, one causes other sentient beings to loose their *bodhicitta*, and commit the fault of slandering the true dharma, this is rather transgressing the *samaya* precepts which are the four fundamental prohibitions. In other words, because a bodhisattva, who has become a renunciant monk in order to guide sentient beings, observes the full precepts as the practice of expedient means and not [for the sake of] disciplinary restraints, [this practice] becomes the discipline of the bodhisattva. Conversely, in case that observing the Hīnayāna precepts does not benefit sentient beings, or in case one benefits sentient beings by showing features of abandoning the Hīnayāna precepts, isn’t this also abandoning the Hīnayāna precepts?!\(^639\)

Moreover, Nasu Seiryū (那須 政隆), another Kūkai specialist, on the other hand, states the following:

> Furthermore, the fact that the founder [Kūkai] here and there explained that one should observe the exoteric precepts such as the five, eight, ten, and complete [precepts] and the like, does not mean that this is indispensable for Shingon practitioners, and because all precept

---

\(^{635}\) Satō 1991: 67 referring to the first volume of the *Rituals Section of the Japanese Translations of Esoteric Buddhist Texts* (国訳密教事相一, Jap. *Kokuyaku Mikkyō, Jissō ichi*): 436, reading 若し大日経等の説に依らば直に秘密戒を受けて、必ずしも顕戒を具することを用ゐず. 此の義具さには疏の第十七に、方便学処の中に釈するが如し. However, it has to be noted that this chapter is no. 18 and not 17.


\(^{637}\) Satō 1991: 67. On Kūkai stressing that –for clergy initiated into Esotericism– the *samaya* precepts must be upheld on the basis of the *vinaya*, see Abe 1999: 54.

\(^{638}\) Abe 1999: 335. The text of the *Precious* in KDZ I: 417-473. In 830 emperor Junna (r. 823-833) ordered the Buddhist denominations to present a treatise on the essentials of their teachings. The *JJR*, it appears, “was so complex and difficult that the emperor had Kūkai condense it”, cf. Hakeda 1972: 67.

\(^{639}\) Tomabechi 1990a: 51.
teachings get an esoteric meaning when one comprehends the spirit of the esoteric precepts, it is even unnecessary to strongly deny the practice of the exoteric precepts. Essential is whether one realizes the spirit of the esoteric precepts.\textsuperscript{640}

Now, when returning to the main question, namely does the HSBK reflect aspects of Kūkai’s precepts view, perhaps the most striking passage that hints at any opinion on vinaya, is the one containing the following formal notice:

Suppose you previously took full ordination, you must again take the three refuges, because this other [ordination of yours] is limited!\[641\]

It is not necessary to demarcate a location [for the ordination], for [the ritual space] equals the dharma realm. Do not request to transfer your attendance to someone else, because you will have no other occasion!\textsuperscript{641}

Although not directly discussing vinaya itself, the “full ordination” in this fragment in all likelihood refers to the SBR precepts conferred at the Tōdaiji platform. In this respect, Satō (1991), acknowledging that it concerns a little later than Kūkai’s period, quotes an official document of the Department of State (太政官符 Jap. Daijōkan-pu), issued from the central administration to the provinces, dated on the 25th day of the 3rd month of Jōgan 7 (i.e. 864):

The above is called a document of Eun (798-869), who obtained the position of ōshō, hōgen and shō-sōzō. He picked up an old precedent [saying that] everyone who [is about to] obtain tokudō, [should] first execute the karman [procedures] of entering priesthood. Then let him enter a temple. Particularly the annual ordinands [have to stay there] for [a period of] two years. The special ordinands [have to stay] for three years. Let them train in the practice of praising śramanas. After this is done, begin [with having them] study and receive the precepts. […] Fix their ordination day before the fifteenth of the fourth month. Invite the ten teachers of the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna, who confer the precepts and assemble them in the Precepts Platform Hall of the Tōdaiji. Conform the teachings, inquire about the thirteen difficulties and the ten restraints. Subsequently, make them climb the platform to receive the precepts. Immediately after the precepts conferral, leave them peacefully in the Precepts Platform Hall. Send the teachers who confer the teachings away during the summer months. Have [the candidates] cultivate and study the 250 bhikṣu precepts and the three thousand regulations.\textsuperscript{642}

Just like Kūkai advised, the HSBK thus appears to assert that one takes (or may have taken) full ordination before partaking in the samaya precepts and the abhiṣeka ritual. At the same

\textsuperscript{640} Satō 1991: 68.

\textsuperscript{641} T. LXXVIII, no. 2463: 7a17-19, cf. chapter III: 45 above.

\textsuperscript{642} Satō 1991: 66, quoting: The source text reads: 右得少僧都法眼和尚位惠運牒稱伏撿舊例凡有得度者先與度緣次令入寺就中年分度者經二箇年臨時度者經三箇年令練沙稱之行然後初聽受戒 […] 四月十五日以前定其受戒日請集傳戒大小十師於東大寺戒壇院依教法問十三難並十遮然後令登壇受戒即受戒畢後安置戒壇院差教授師夏月之間令修學比丘二百五十戒三千威儀, the latter being the 250 bhikṣu rules multiplied by four for the conditions of walking, standing, sitting, and sleeping, and again multiplied by three for past, present, and future.
time, however, –and again just like Kūkai in many of his works– the text does not hesitate to stress the uniqueness of the concerning ritual.

In addition, although some scholars assert that it represents Kūkai’s political skillfulness, the main reason for Kūkai’s advocacy of receiving the full precepts undoubtedly is that it was precisely this ordination that was accepted as the mainstream religious policy of the state in contemporary Japan, a fact that also the HSBK appears to accept. In conclusion, Kūkai definitely stressed the importance of the monastic *vinaya* regulations, which belong to the category of ‘exoteric precepts’. Even though there is no consensus on the matter, the fact that his predecessors in the esoteric lineage took full ordination prior to their esoteric initiations, must have played an important role.

However, Kūkai’s SGR also clearly indicated that his followers should also uphold śīla. Although the general Sino-Japanese translation of śīla is 戒 (Jap. kai, cf. supra), the term has also been transliterated as 尸羅 (Jap. shira). As seen, the term śīla commonly denotes behavioural and/or moral discipline practiced both by lay as by ordained practitioners. Aside from the literally senses already discussed, various other interpretations have been attributed to śīla. Amongst the most basic are the following:

Pure and cool or 清凉, i.e. chaste; also by 戒 restraint, or keeping the commandments; also by good disposition 性善 [or: ‘wholesome quality’]. It is the second *pāramiṭā*, moral purity, i.e. of thought, word, and deed. The four conditions of śīla are chastity, calmness, quiescence, and extinction, i.e. no longer perturbed by the afflictions. Also, perhaps śīla, a stone, i.e. a precious stone, pearl, or coral.

**Ten important prohibitions**

Indeed, as distinct schools of thought developed within the Buddhist tradition, diverse sets, and interpretations of śīla came into being. Probably the most wide-spread sets of śīla are the ten commandments’ (十戒 Jap. jukkai) which all novices have to uphold, whilst the first five are for all laymen and are supposed to ensure a rebirth in the human realm.

As shown above (cf. supra: 87), these śīla also appear in the BMK, where they are called “les commandements capitaux”. However, as is evident from the summary in table 9 below,

---

644 DCBT: 101b, s.v. 尸羅, with added italics.
646 De Groot 1893: 43.
they are quite different from the “ten important prohibitions” (十重戒, Jap. jūjūkai) that are expounded in the HSKB and the MSZ (cf. supra: 78, table 4).

Table 9. Ten important prohibitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>BMK</th>
<th>MSZ = HSBK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>not to kill</td>
<td>not to abandon your bodhicitta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>not to steal</td>
<td>not to reject the Three Jewels, nor take refuge with the non-Buddhist paths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>not to commit adultery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>not to lie</td>
<td>not to have doubts when you cannot fathom the deep meaning of the Mahāyāna texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>not to consume alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not to use flower adornments or perfume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>not to perform as an actor, juggler, acrobat, or go to watch them</td>
<td>not to be avaricious, nor to arouse wrong views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>not to sit on elevated, big divans or beds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>not to eat except in regulation hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>not to possess money, gold, silver, etc.</td>
<td>not to slander the Three Jewels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be noteworthy that in contrast to the aforementioned distinction between kai and ritsu (cf. supra 82, table 6), all śīla expounded here are formulated as negative prohibitions, i.e. as things “not to do”. However, as opposed to the pragmatical vinaya rules in the first column, the six latter precepts of the BMK clearly are on the level of ethics, i.e. to promote positive thoughts. Even though, one may say that the same applies to those of the HSBK (and the MSZ), those śīla appear to be especially centered around arousing and preserving bodhicitta,

647 The full HSBK translation is in chapter III: 69. On parallels with the MSZ, see p. 76, and 78-79 above.
or the intent to attain awakening, while at the same time stressing the unique and exalted character of the teachings, a feature that, again, is also strongly present both in Kūkai’s own works as well as in the main texts on which he built his doctrinal system.

For example, Yamasaki argues, that while the MSZ—and thus also the HSBK—“formally use[s] the ten precepts that have an old tradition, their spirit is the foundation for the sanmaiya-kai.” He refers in this context to the MVS chapter on Receiving the Expedients and Learning the Discipline (受方便學處品 Jap. Ju hōben gakusho-hin, i.e. scroll VI, chapter 18). According to him, it is said that “the śrāvakas also preach the path of the ten good activities (十善業道 Jap. jūzen gōdō), and secular people, as well as the outer (i.e. non-Buddhist) paths also practice them”, but wonders where the difference with the ten good precepts of esoteric Buddhism lies. It is not very surprising that in order to answer this question, Yamasaki relies on text quotes. The first is from the MVS:

Lord of Mysteries, in the case of the code of training for the śrāvaka vehicle, [though] I have taught it, it is divorced from wisdom and expedient means, enjoins the achievement [of morality], fosters [one-sided knowledge, and is not the same as practicing the path of the ten wholesome actions. Worldlings, furthermore, because they are divorced from attachment to the [petty] self, are subject to another cause (i.e., the divine self). The bodhisattva, on the other hand, cultivates the Great Vehicle, enters the equality of all dharmas, and embraces wisdom and expedient means, and his actions unfold for the sake of both himself and others. Therefore, Lord of Mysteries, the bodhisattva here takes hold of wisdom and expedient means, enters the equality of all dharmas, and should be diligent in his training.

Second is the Heizei, in which Kūkai wrote:

As Nāgārjuna said: “There are five kinds of precepts: men-and-god precepts, śrāvaka precepts, pratyekabuddha precepts, bodhisattva precepts, and samaya precepts [for Buddhas]. The fifth [kind, namely] the samaya precepts [for Buddha] are the precepts which are bestowed today. The ten [conventional] good precepts are similar in the five classes outlined above. Furthermore, just as there are four and ten types of distinctions in the śrāvaka and bodhisattva precepts, there are distinctions in the samaya precepts. However, their meaning varies, even though their names remain the same. Thus, although the four types of precepts offered in the śrāvaka and bodhisattva categories [mentioned] here are as usual, they have a different meaning in the present case, to which we will return. [However,] let it be clear that it is not only the precepts, but also the corresponding wisdoms that change accordingly.

---

648 Yamasaki 1967: 258.
649 Yamasaki 1967: 258.
651 KDZ, II: 159-160 equalling T. LXXVII, no. 2461: 2a22-b1: 故臨猛菩薩說戒有五種云云人天聲聞緣覺菩薩三昧耶佛戒五味戒今所授者也十善戒通五種隨其廣狹有淺深耳如聲聞菩薩戒有四重十重三昧耶戒亦有之然其名同義趣別何者聲聞菩薩四重如今此戒四重者亦如後說非只戒異定慧亦別 若言乘五乘
In third instance, Yamasaki quotes the *Kōnin*:

> All precepts are rooted in the ten good (ones), and the ten good (ones) are rooted in the one mind of *samaya*.\(^{652}\)

A fifth, and final passage is taken from the SKJ, in which –after having explained that there are two kinds of precepts (cf. supra)– Kūkai states:

> [The first is *vinaya*, which, interpreted, is discipline. The second is *śīla*, which, interpreted, is pure and quiescent.] Visualizing all sentient beings is as having the four obligations in one’s own body. Therefore dare not to harm or kill them!\(^{653}\)

Based on these quotes, Yamasaki concludes that the esoteric explanation of ten good precepts is not the same as in Hīnayāna, but that they amount to the expedient of wisdom, even though they are expressed in the familiar phrasing of considering oneself as the four obligations. In other words, “the profound spirit of the *sammaiya-kai* can be expressed straightforwardly based on the single observation of the equality of self and others.”\(^ {654}\) Undoubtedly, this may need some further explanation.

*Ten stages of mind*

Again, in contrast to the *vinaya* precepts, *śīla* comprise ethical guidelines for approaching others, that is, a moral code that is connected to one’s state of mind. As may be clear from the above, the foremost writings in which Kūkai addresses his view on *śīla* are the *Heizei* and the SKJ.

In the *Heizei*, Kūkai writes that –just as there are differences in the teachings of the eight schools, namely the six “Nara schools”\(^ {655}\) and the two “Heian schools” of Tendai and Shingon– there are also differences in each school regarding the precepts.\(^ {656}\)

---


\(^{652}\) Yamasaki 1967: 258.

\(^{653}\) T. LVII, no. 2462: 6a4-6, cited without reference in Yamasaki 1967: 259: [二尸羅翻云清涼寂靜] 觀一切衆生猶如己身及四恩是故不敢殺害其身命. First part of the translation by White 2005: 369, where the last sentence appears to have been overlooked.

\(^{654}\) Yamasaki 1967: 259.

\(^{655}\) Cf. chapter II: 22, n. 118.

\(^{656}\) Endō 1972: 7 referring to KDZ II: 159-160: 164-165.
As Katsumata has pointed out, the *Heizei* is structured around four sections, of which the initial sentences that begin with “this” (夫, Jap. *so*). For the second and third sections, the text gives a classification of the eight schools and says:

The first three are called Hinayāna, the next four are called Mahāyāna. The last one is the secret Vajrayāna.

Moreover, the teachings of the first seven schools, i.e. all except Shingon, are but one of the so many decrees from the Law (*dharma*) King, issuing from his governmental offices [...]; they are miraculous remedies applied in accordance with the occasion by Śākyamuni, the emperor of the Buddhist law (*dharma*) and king of medicine.

The teachings of Shingon, by contrast, are:

(The code (*dharma*) that is about to be sworn to at the present moment) [being] the Secret Maṇḍala performed by Tathāgata Mahāvairocana, who resides in the mind palace of the adamantine realm of essence, and who manifests himself as the five Tathāgatas, who represent as many wisdoms in their quadruple body-form, together with their many cohorts.

Taking the example of depending the treatment, and administration of drugs according to the disease, Kūkai states in the SKJ that there are also different kinds of Buddhist teachings depending on the people’s abilities, namely:

Medicine produced of one thousand two hundred plants and seventy-two types of non-aging concoctions is formulated into a prescription for relief of bodily sickness, the twelve sets of profound teachings and the eighty-four thousand teachings of the *sūtras* offer compassionated precepts directed at the ailments of the mind. Just as there is no panaceaic medicine for a hundred different bodily ailments, so there is no one *sūtra* teaching for the myriad ailments of the mind. For this reason, the Bhagavān offers various medicines for the cure of various maladies.

---

657 Katsumata 1970: 92 referred to in Endō 1972: 7, identifying KDZ II: 154c, 158l, 163g, and 165i respectively. This corresponds to the following sections in T. LXXVIII, no. 2461: 1a6 (夫八繕深海 ff.); 2a04 (夫過此大虚廣大者 ff.); 2c29 (夫氣海雖微忽起滿界之雲 ff.); and 3b12 (若夫一千二百藥草 ff.).


Aside from the *Heizei* and the SKJ, there are also many clues for Kūkai’s precepts view in the JJSR, but—in comparison to the former two—this text is more philosophical, not in the least because in this text Kūkai indicates the stages of mind (住心 Jap. *ju*shin) that accord to beings’ capacities, and the thereupon depending teachings. The JJSR and the Precious, which is an abbreviation of the former text (cf. 99 supra), give the following stages:

Table 10. Characteristics of the ten stages of mind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stage</th>
<th>mind</th>
<th>features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.    | the lowly man, goatish in its desires | - uncontrolled desire  
- urge for food, alcohol, and sex  
- attachment to permanent ego and fame  
- striving to improve material life  
- not realizing one’s faults |
| 2.    | ignorant and childlike, yet abstemious | - beginning ethical actions  
- egoistic observance of ethics  
- attachment to purification  
- to maintain peace of the country  
- to give comfort to individuals  
- to forsake evil and cultivate good |
| 3.    | infantlike and fearless | - primitive deity worship  
- hoping for (temporary) rebirth in heaven  
- egoistic asceticism, yoga, and devotion  
- egoistic accumulation of merit  
- escapism/pessimistic world view  
- false belief in permanent individual soul  
- isolating one man from another |
| 4.    | recognizing existence of psychophysical constituents, denying a permanent ego | - only recognizing the five constituents  
- four reflections  
- gaining the eightfold emancipation  
- realizing the six supernatural powers |

662 Endō 1972: 60 listing the following passages: JJSR, scroll 1, in KDZ I: 126, 133, 138, 140-141, 145-146, 158-169; scroll 2 in KDZ I: 181-190; scroll 3 in KDZ I: 220-221, 231, 232-235; scroll 9 in KDZ I: 392-393 etc.
665 四念處 (Jap. *shi nenjo*), i.e. the four bases of mindfulness, which are explained by White (2005: 358, n. 699) as the four reflections, which “are those upon which one should contemplate in an effort to destroy the effects of the obstacles to enlightenment, and to induce enlightenment, […] being (1) the realization of the impurity of the physical body, (2) of the nature of suffering impinging in all sensations of the body, (3) of the inherently impermanent nature of the mind, and (4) of the lack of a permanent individual self-nature”, i.e. 身 (Jap. *shin*), 受 (Jap. *ju*), 心 (Jap. *shin*), and 法念處 (Jap. *hō nenjo*) respectively.
666 八背捨 (Jap. *hachi haisha*). According to Hakeda (1972: 159, n. 10), these are “the eight stages of meditation to gain mental liberation: to meditate that all things are impure; to reduce attachment to external objects; to meditate on pure forms but not to develop any attachment, on infinite space, on boundless consciousness, on the state of non-being, on the state of neither thought nor non-thought; and to attain the state of complete cessation of all mental activities.”
667 They can be obtained by the practice of yoga: supernatural action, vision, hearing; ability to read the minds of others; knowledge of former states of existence; and freedom from vexation, cf. Hakeda 1972: 159, n. 11.
5. freed from the seed of the cause of karma
- extirpating the seed of ignorance
- knowledge of emptiness
- meditating on twelve links of causation
- apathetic attitude toward others
- lack of sympathy for fellow beings
- obtain wisdom without instruction

6. Mahāyāna with sympathetic concern for others
- unconditional compassion for others
- all phenomena exists in the mind only
- world of objects is invalid
- leading to the four wisdoms
- first instance of great compassion

7. realizing that the mind is unborn
- no useless arguments by eight negations
- discovering unity in diversity

8. being truly in harmony with the One way
- mind is one, and originally pure
- subject and object interpenetrate
- importance of Lotus sutra
- threefold truth
- six grades

9. profoundest exoteric Buddhist mind that is aware of its nonimmutable nature
- elements are nonimmutable of their own
- the dharmadhātu is not yet the ultimate
- need to proceed by receiving revelation
- importance of Avatamsakasūtra

668 These so-called twelve niṣpānas (十二因縁 Jap. nijū inner) that make up the wheel of life are usually listed in the way that the prior situation is the condition for the arising of the next situation. Also, in the same order, if the prior condition is extinguished, the next condition is extinguished. They are linked to their causation of rebirth: “(1) nescience, as inherited affliction from the beginningless past; (2) karma, good and evil, of past lives; (3) conception as a form of perception; (4) nāmarūpa, or body and mind evolving (in the womb); (5) the six organs on the verge of birth; (6) childhood whose intelligence is limited to sparśa, contact or touch; (7) receptivity or budding intelligence and discrimination from six or seven years; (8) thirst, desire, or love, age of puberty; (9) the urge of sensuous existence; (10) forming the substance, bhava, of future karma; (11) the completed karma ready for rebirth; (12) old age and death. The first two are associated with the previous life, the other ten with the present.” Muller in DBJ, s.v. 十二因縁. Also see Hakeda 1972: 70, n. 20.

669 四智 (Jap. shi chi) White 2005: 359-360, n. 704: “the four wisdoms are as follows, with their accompanying deities which embody the characteristics of the particular wisdoms: (1) adarśa-jñāna (the great mirror wisdom of Aksobhya); (2) samata-jñāna (the universal wisdom of Ratnaketu); (3) pratyavekṣana-jñāna (the profound visualizing wisdom of Amitābha); and (4) kṛtya-anuṣṭāna-jñāna (the perfecting wisdom of Amoghasiddhi).” These wisdoms, and their relation to the five wisdoms in Kūkai’s system are discussed in Hakeda 1972: 83-85.

670 According to Hakeda (1972: 160, n. 14), these are: unborn, imperishable, unceasing, non-constant, non-identical, not different, not going away, and not coming.

671 三諦倶融 (Jap. san tai kuyū), i.e. all things are void; all things are temporary; all things are in the middle state between these two. White (2005: 361, n. 710) explains this as consisting of: (1) the truth of emptiness: all things are essentially and fundamentally empty in nature; (2) the truth of phenomena: though all phenomenal manifestations are merely that, they serve to represent that which is real; and (3) the means, transcending the dichotomous relationship of the foregoing two, indicating that the two previous truths are essentially equivalent in that all three truths are interrelated and integrating. This scheme is based on Nāgarjuna.”

672 六即表位 (Jap. roku soku hyō), “These constitute six levels of practice in the Tiantai philosophy, defining the transition from the initial awakening of mind to attaining the fruits of Buddhahood. They underscore the principle that ‘sentient beings are none other than Buddha’ (衆生即佛 Jap. shūjō soku butsu), cf. White 2005: 361, n. 711 (with altered transcription), where a classification is found.
In Kūkai’s system, each of these stages corresponds to a religious denomination, which is also characterized by its own precepts: 673

Table 11. Precepts for stages 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stage</th>
<th>religion/philosophy</th>
<th>precepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>nihilism &amp; determinism</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Confucianism &amp; lay Buddhism</td>
<td>- three human duties674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- five cardinal virtues675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- five precepts676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- ten precepts/good deeds677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hinduism &amp; Daoism</td>
<td>- six practices678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- four mental concentrations679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Hinayāna</td>
<td>- four noble truths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śrāvakayāna</td>
<td>- 250 vinaya precepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pratyekabuddhayāna</td>
<td>Buddhist precepts without ordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

673 Endō 1972: 60. This is also found in the SKJ, cf. White 2005: 358ff.
675 五戒 (Jap. go kai), i.e. not to kill, not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to speak falsely, not to consume alcohol, cf. supra: 102. For the last one, an alternative is sometimes given (cf. n. 677 below). The Precious links the five cardinal virtues of Confucianism to the five Buddhist precepts: (1) benevolence = not to kill, meaning “to treat others as you would want others to treat you, and to practice charity”; (2) righteousness = not to steal, meaning “to save things and to share them with others”; (3) propriety = not to commit adultery, denoting “to observe the five ceremonies in good order” (these are: sacrifice to ancestors, funeral rites, ceremonial rules of hospitality, military rites, and initiation and marriage ceremonies, cf. Hakeda 1972: 168, n. 40); (4) wisdom = not to drink alcohol, for “by heeding this, one can discern and reason well”; (5) sincerity = not to lie, being “to act upon one’s words”, cf. Hakeda 1972: 168.
676 Cf. supra: 101-102. Although the first four are the same, Hakeda (1972: 167, n. 39) gives another set for the last six precepts, namely: not to use exaggerated speech, not to slander, not to evocate, not to covet, not to give way to anger, and not to hold biased views. He fails to see, though, that Kūkai maintained not to drink alcohol as the fifth precept (cf. Hakeda 1972: 168, and n. 676 above).
677 亦行 (Jap. roku gyō), i.e. to perceive in contemplation that the world below is painful, coarse, and full of impediments, and that the world above is pure, exquisite, and free from impediments. Hakeda 1972: 159, n. 7.
678 四禅 (Jap. shi zen). According to Hakeda (1972: 159, n. 8), these denote “the four stages of meditation performed in the world of form, a world higher than that of desire, but lower than that of formlessness. The first stage is characterized by the powers of investigation, reflection, joyfulness, bliss, and samādhi; the second by serenity, joyfulness, and samādhi; the third by equanimity, remembrance, wisdom, bliss, and samādhi; and the fourth, by neither pain nor joy, equanimity, remembrance, and samādhi.”
And from the sixth stage to the ninth stage, i.e. the level of Mahāyāna, Kūkai also links the stages of mind to the *samādhi* of the four Great Bodhisattvas, it is, by the way, not surprising that precisely these figures are summed up in the HSBK.680

Table 12. Vows of stages 6-10 and corresponding *samādhi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stage</th>
<th>denomination</th>
<th>vows</th>
<th><em>samādhi</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Mahāyāna</td>
<td>Yogācāra (Hossō)</td>
<td>Maitreya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mahāyāna</td>
<td>Mādhyamika (Sanron)</td>
<td>Mañjusrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mahāyāna</td>
<td>Tientai (Tendai)</td>
<td>Avołokiteśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mahāyāna</td>
<td>Huayan (Kegon)</td>
<td>Samantabhadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Vajrayāna</td>
<td>Shingon</td>
<td><em>samaya</em> vows for Buddhas (Mahāvairocana)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this way, Kūkai offers the detailed circumstances of each teaching, and recognizes the value of each miraculous cure. However, at the same time, he discriminates between the teachings constituting “the nectar expounded by the *para-sambhogakāya*” (stages 2-9) and “the precepts of the Shingon *mandala* teachings expounded by Svabhāva-dharmakāya Mahāvairocana” (stage 10).686

---

680 Cf. chapter III: 55-60. One could speculate that in the HSBK ritual, actually representatives of the respective schools are invited. This link needs further investigation, for in the contemporary *bosatsukai* ceremony conducted at Kōyasan, for instance the preceptor represents Maitreya and the professor Mañjuśrī, see Suzuki 1990: 118.

681 Boundless loving kindness, compassion, joy at the sight of other’s happiness, and equanimity, cf. Hakeda 1972: 197, n. 129.

682 Charity, kind speech, beneficial acts, and adapting oneself to others, cf. Hakeda 1972: 197, n. 130.

683 Saving sentient beings, extinguishing defilements, study the Buddhist doctrines, realizing unsurpassed enlightenment, cf. chapter III: 33, n. 203.


686 Endō 1972: 60; White 2005: 362. There are four *dharmakāyas* (四種法身 Jap. *shishu hosshin*), or perhaps better the “Dharmakāya in four forms” is a term that according to Hakeda (1972: 83) comes from the STTS (his references in ibid., n. 16 are incorrect, though, and should be T. XVIII, no. 867: 254a1). It denotes the particular Mikkyō classification of the *trikāya* theory (cf. chapter III: 29, n. 152 above) into: (1) *svabhāva-dharmakāya* (自性法身 Jap. *jisshō hosshin*, also abbreviated to 自性法身 Jap. *jisshō shin*, cf. BGDJ: 555a, s.v. 自性身; 554c, s.v. 自性身), or the “Dharmakāya in absolute state”, being the self-nature or essential nature, that is ultimate truth per se. It is the absolute aspect of Mahāvairocana, “the true Body of gnosis of all Buddhas”, revealing itself to “its own emanations, that his, all beings and the universe, and engaging in a monologue which reveals the
Thus, Kūkai’s division between exoteric and esoteric teachings and their respective precepts (cf. supra), cannot be treated separate from his Ten stages thought. This made scholars such as Ueda argue that Kūkai’s precepts view, has to be perceived as being approachable from two perspectives: (1) “nine exoteric and one esoteric”, which he calls “the relative standpoint” (相対的立場 Jap. sōtaiteki tachiba), and (2) “nine exoteric and ten esoteric”, which he says, is the absolute standpoint (絶対的立場 Jap. zettaiteki tachiba). The first perspective differentiates the exoteric teachings from the tenth stage of Shingon Mikkyō, and considers the previous stages (1-9) are expedient teachings for the attainment of the tenth stage. The second perspective, by contrast, perceives each and every stage as a manifestation of Mahāvairocana’s virtue, and therefore, also embodiments, or expressions of Shingon Mikkyō. According to Ueda, it is exactly in this point that one finds the reason for Kūkai accepting both the exoteric and the esoteric precepts, even though he considered the latter as as the most profound.⁶⁸⁷

Four types of mind

The SKJ says that those who are about to practice and board the esoteric vehicle should first of all arouse the four kinds of mind, namely, the minds of faith (信心 Jap. shinjin), great compassion (大悲心 Jap. daihi shin), supreme truth (勝義心 Jap. shōgi shin), and great enlightenment (大菩提心 Jap. dai bodai shin).⁶⁸⁸
In this text, Kūkai gives ten meanings for the first mind, which are cited from the first scroll of the *Explanation of the Treatise on Mahāyāna*:689

Firstly, the Mind of Faith is awakened due to a desire for firm resolve, and the desire not to retreat. There are ten types of this mind. The first has the meaning of ‘Clear and Pure’, in that it causes the mind to be clear and pure. The second has the meaning of ‘Resolve’ in that it causes the mind to be steadfast. The third has the meaning of ‘Bliss’ in that it causes the mind to be relieved from various anxieties. The fourth has the meaning of ‘Tireless’ in that it rids the mind of indolence. The fifth has the meaning of ‘With Gladness’ in that it cultivates the mind that takes joy in the excellent acts of others. The sixth has the meaning of ‘Respect’ in that it neither slights nor belittles those possessed of excellent virtue. The seventh has the meaning of ‘Obedience’ in that it follows that which is seen and heard, and does not differ. The eighth has the meaning of ‘Praise’ in that it rejoices freely in the excellent acts of others. The ninth has the meaning of ‘Non-Destruction’ in that it is single-minded, never forgetting. The tenth has the meaning of ‘Love of the Virtuous’ in that it causes the fulfillment of the mind of compassion.690

However, the same passage also occurs in Kūkai’s *Heizei*,691 dated 822, of which a less literal–and therefore perhaps also more clear–translation has been published:

First, the confident mind is produced so that one may be empowered to maintain strong resolve without faltering. There are ten meanings to the term “confidence”: purity, so as to purify and render the mind clear and bright; resolve, in order to fortify the nature of the mind; joy, in order to cut short all frustrations; lack of disdain, so that negligence might be abandoned; equanimity, in order to hold the same attitude in all situations; respect, in order that one not react aggressively to words or actions; praise, in order that all actions be the object thereof; indestructibility, in order that the mind may remain set; and love, in order that the great compassionate mind may appear.692

Here, the ‘mind of faith’ is rendered as ‘confident mind’, but there are also variant translations for other types of mind: whilst the ‘mind of great compassion’ stays the ‘great compassionate

---

691  692  KDZ II: 117-145. Perhaps the most accessible source text of this passage is in T. LXXVIII, no. 2461 3c8-17.
mind’, the aforementioned ‘mind of supreme truth’ becomes the ‘critical mind’, and the ‘mind of great enlightenment’ has been simply translated as the ‘awakened mind’. 693

The Bodhicitta-śāstra (菩提心論 Jap. Bodaishiron, further: BDSR), 694 expounding the doctrine of the three kinds of bodhicitta, i.e. supreme truth, vows and samādhi, 695 around which Kūkai constructed his SKJ, reads the following:

The Buddhas and bodhisattvas, long ago when in their causal state, finished awakening this [Bodhi] Mind, taking as their precepts [Skt. śīla] supreme truth, [the] vow [to practice] and samādhi, not for a moment forgetting, even until becoming Buddhas. 696

In order to understand the view on śīla as given in the aforementioned quote from the BDSR, however, the ‘great compassionate mind’ which is perhaps the most crucial, because “this great compassionate mind is also called the mind of the vow to practice”. 697 This mind is said to be aroused only by the Mahāyāna bodhisattva, who visualizes all sentient beings as himself, and “[throughout] the three periods [of past, present, and future], he perceives all as his own four obligations” 698 In short, a great compassionate mind puts others first. It is the mind of taking away suffering and conferring peace. 699

The third mind, that of ‘supreme truth’, or the ‘critical mind’ has also been called the ‘profound prajñā mind’. 700 It concerns “the mind of attaining various differentiations between the teachings”, which are explained in accordance with the JJSR doctrine, on which Kūkai grafted his classification of successive doctrines: the Shingon bodhisattva, passes through the previous nine stages, arouses bodhicitta, and practices enlightened behavior with this mind. 701 This profound prajñā mind is also mentioned in the SKJ in order to analyse the various Buddhist teachings, and is also called the esoteric adorning mind (秘密莊嚴心 Jap. himitsu

694 Full title: 金剛頂瑜伽中發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心論 Jap. Kongōchō-yuga-chūhōtsu-anokutara-sammyaku-sambodaishin ron is the Treatise on Bodhi Mind which has been attributed to Amoghavarjra (705-774), cf. T. XXXII, no. 1665. Kūkai heavily relied on this text to espouse the sokushin-jōbutsu doctrine, cf. White 2005: 13, esp. n. 5.
695 For more information on these three types, see: White 2005: 211.
698 White 2005: 363. These are the obligations to one’s parents, sentient beings, king, and three jewels of Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha.
Moreover, it is also what is summarized in one phrase in the MVS as “The master of mysteries asks: what is bodhicitta-shīla? [Answer:] It is truly knowing one’s own mind.”

Finally, there is the mind of great bodhicitta, which comprises two types, namely actively-seeking bodhicitta (能求菩提心 Jap. nōgu bodaishin), and passively-sought bodhicitta (所求菩提心 Jap. shōgu bodaishin). Actively-seeking bodhicitta is the mind of the practitioner seeking enlightenment (bodhi), while passively-sought bodhicitta denotes “that which is described as the body of the inexhaustible, sublime, vajra realm. In this realm, Mahāvairocana equally shares the four dharmakāyas and the four maṇḍalas which constitute the original nature of all sentient beings.” To abide in this mind is called the secret samādhi, which indicates that great bodhicitta is nothing else than samādhi.

Therefore, synthesizing the above four kinds of mind, the SKJ connects them as:

The Buddha-Tathāgatas constitute the precepts through Great Compassion, Supreme Truth, and Samādhi, never forgetting for a moment.

This brings us back to Kūkai’s ten stages, because –at least according to Satō– the JJSR also preaches on the stage of the supreme mind (shōgi shin 勝義心) that is explained in the SKJ.

The passage reads:

The Tathāgata preaches this distinction clearly. For this reason, [the practitioner] should take up this tortoise mirror and differentiate. The ordinary man, ram-like and deluded, produces works chiefly of the ten evils, being addicted to the pleasures of the three poisons and the five desires, oblivious to the fact that in his next existence he is to fall subject to the extreme pain of the three paths. For this reason, the person possessed of the knowledge of Shingon should not rejoice. As for the teachings of the vehicle where the mind is foolish and childlike, yet capable of forbearance: though one comes, gradually, to a belief of cause and effect, and

---

702 Endō (1972: 15, n. 45) refers to the tenth scroll of the JJSR in KDZ I: 397.
703 Endō (1972: 15, n. 46) refers to T. XVIII, no. 848; c1-2: [秘密主]云何菩提謂如實知自心.
704 English terms by White 2005: 368, s.v. S23.
705 The four maṇḍalas (四種曼荼羅 Jap. shishu mandara) are particular aspects of each of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas: (1) mahā maṇḍala comprise the marks of their body; (2) samaya maṇḍala are the marks of their attributes, such as rings, flowers, swords, etc.; (3) dharma maṇḍala are their seed syllables (Skt. bija); (4) karma maṇḍala are their acts, statutes, or images, cf. White 2005: 406. For more information, see MD 943, s.v. shishu mandara, referring to MD: 1024 s.v. shi mansōdai (四曼相大), discussing the four maṇḍalas, the four marks, and the four great elements).
performs the five constants and the five precepts, this is simply cause, and he does not gain the rejoicing of the heaven of rebirth. Therefore, [the person possessed of the knowledge of Shingon] should not rejoice. [...] Those of the Mind most aware of its ultimate nature, though they claim insight into the dharmadhātu, and attest to the body of the three worlds; and though they are as Indra’s net and obtain the one great Dharmaśāla, yet this is the causal state of becoming Buddha, the first mind of the Buddha. They fail to become possessed of the five marks of becoming a Buddha and the four mandalas. For this reason, they cannot abide. They consider that not gaining is gaining, and that not attaining is attaining. In this way, by following the teachings of the Tathāgata, and by means of supreme wisdom, one effects a discrimination of the vehicles and awakens bodhicitta. If there is a person, and he should ride on a vehicle such as this, taking the path and the destination whither it leads, this still is not that which is called supreme, pure bodhicitta. For this reason, the bodhisattvas of the Shingon teaching transcend these stages, awakening bodhicitta, and performing bodhicitta practice.\textsuperscript{710}

In this passage, Kūkai states (1) that the differentiation in the ten stages of mind is judged upon the supreme mind; and (2) that Shingon practitioners should not be enamored by the first until the ninth stages, but should be drawn towards the secret adorned mind. In other words, Kūkai’s SKJ advocates that the above stages of mind come forward by means of contemplating the non-self-nature of all phenomena in view of the wisdom of profound prajñā.\textsuperscript{711}

Also, by means of the profound wisdom of the profound prajñā, one visualizes the foregoing nine stages of mind, that there is no self-nature. How can there be no self-nature? It is as the freezing of winter which, when it encounters the spring, melts and flows away; a nugget of gold, when is fired, also melts and disappears. These teachings all arise from prayayā [i.e. the second cause] having no self-nature. Therefore, although those ordinary beings, ‘Nonsagacious and ramlike’, have evil natures, through education in good knowledge they will awaken the ‘Foolish, childish mind, capable of forbearance’. [...] Because the being of the ‘Mind that is in total unity with the one-way’ receives of the wonderful enlightenment of the Buddhas, he awakens the ‘Mind most aware of its ultimate nature’. Because the being of the ‘Mind most aware of its ultimate nature’ wishes after the mind of the supreme vajra mind, he awakens the ‘Mind that is secret and sublime’. Because all of these are through the absence of self-nature, they roll forward and are perfected.\textsuperscript{712}

\textsuperscript{710} White (2005: 365-367) translating KDZ II: 134-136, corresponding to T. LXXVIII, no. 2462: 5b17-c13: 如來明説其差別是故攬此龜鏡可簡得異生羝羊凡夫專造十不善等業耽三毒五欲之樂不曾知後身墮三途極苦是故真言有智人不可樂著愚童持齋人乘之法雖云漸信因果行五常五戒等猶是人中之因不得生天之樂是故不

\textsuperscript{711} Satō 1991: 62.

\textsuperscript{712} White (2005: 370-371) translating KDZ II: 138, corresponding to T. LXXVIII, no. 2462: 6a16-a29: 又以深般若妙慧觀前九種住心無自性云何無自性謂如冬凍遇春即泮流金石得火即消鎔諸法皆從縁生無自性是故異
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Even though the above paragraphs have clarified that Kūkai’s SKJ is undoubtedly based on the BDSR, Yamasaki (1967) underlined that there are also considerable differences between these two texts:

1. There is a difference in style. Namely, the BDSR “preaches on the basis of a grandiloquent, strict and highbred style”, for example:

   [The ācārya who possesses great and vast wisdom (i.e. Amoghavajra) said:] If there is a person of superior faculties and supreme wisdom, he does not take joy in the outer (i.e. non-Buddhist) paths or the teachings (dharma) of the two vehicles (for śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas). [By contrast], the one who possesses magnanimity, is resilient, and lacks mental disturbance is suitable to cultivate the vehicle of Buddhas.”  

   The SKJ, on the other hand, “gives the feeling of making a familiar, intimate appeal to the broader, general public”, e.g. “if there is a good man, good woman, bhikṣu, bhikṣuṇī, a man or a woman of pure faith, who wishes to enter this vehicle in order to practice…”.

2. Yamasaki points out that the BDSR explained three kinds of enlightened mind (bodhicitta), that is (1) the samādhi mind, “devoted to the meditation upon the three mysteries”, (2) the mind of practicing the vow of great compassion, “aimed at the worldly and unworldly (i.e. religious) saving of all sentient beings”, and (3) the mind of ultimate truth “that is always seeking unsurpassed bodhi, and discards the inferior in order to obtain the superior by means of wisdom”, while –by adding the mind of faith– the SKJ arrives at four kinds of mind: (1) the mind of faith, (2) of great compassion, (3) supreme truth, and (4) great bodhicitta.

   According to Yamasaki, this classification is based on a passage in the tenth chapter of the *Sūtra containing Dhāraṇīs for Safeguarding the State, Realm and Ruler* (守護國界主陀羅尼經, Jap. *Shugo kokukaisu darani kyō*; further: *Safeguarding Sūtra*):

   Thus, all [of you], without exception, take the mind of faith as the foundation [for your practice], take the profound *prajñā* as your guide, and make the mind of great bodhicitta as well as the mind of great compassion into your adornments.

---

715 Yamasaki 1967: 257.
Moreover, he remarks that the SKJ reveals ten kinds of meanings of this mind of faith, not on the basis of the BDSR, but by using the ten meanings of faith from the first scroll of the *Explanation of the Treatise on Mahāyāna*, i.e. (1) clear and pure, (2) resolve, (3) bliss, (4) tireless, (5) with gladness, (6) respect, (7) obedience, (8) praise, (9) non-destruction, and (10) love of the virtuous.\(^{717}\) From this, Yamasaki concludes that “keeping the sanmaiya-kai, means experiencing joy for being able to observe the supreme actions of others and praise them from your mind which is free of delusions (lit. mud) and is pure,” although, he adds, “surely, this is not simple”.\(^{718}\)

3. According to Yamasaki, Kūkai explains in the SKJ that the mind of great compassion “is the mind that is aroused because of perceiving the three periods as oneself”, which “concretely means that he visualizes the four obligations and makes them into the compassionate mind aimed at rescuing the four obligations that are submerged in the ocean of suffering”:

[Further], when I see through the three periods (of past, present, and future), all is perceived as my own four obligations [i.e. to one’s parents, sentient beings, ruler of state, and to the three jewels, but] the four obligations [of others] are all falling in the three evil destinies and undergo uninterrupted suffering.

I am their child, but also their resource. When I deny myself, how can I rescue them?! Therefore, I arouse this mind of great kindness and great compassion.\(^{719}\)

Yamasaki explains that the four obligations discussed here are the obligations towards one’s parents, ruler of state, three jewels and sentient beings, which are preached in the *Mahāyānasūtra on the Mind Ground Contemplation* (大乗本生心地観経 Jap. *Daijō honshō shinjikan kyō*),\(^{720}\) and he conjectures that “because Kūkai was personally transmitted this text from Trepiṭaka Prajña when he was in China, he brought this new idea of the four obligations back to Japan, and used it both in the *Kōnin*, as well as in the SKJ, after which “the thought of these four obligations also widely influenced general society in later times”\(^{721}\).

---

\(^{717}\) Yamasaki 1967: 257. Also see p. 103 supra.

\(^{718}\) Ibid. On the sanmaiya-kai, see the section on the four capital prohibitions: 118ff. infra.


\(^{720}\) Often abbreviated to Shinjikankyō, trans. Prajña, i.e. T. III, no. 159: esp. 297a12ff.

\(^{721}\) Yamasaki 1967: 258.
4. As we have shown above, also Yamasaki observed that the ten good precepts (十善戒 Jap. 
jū zenkai) which are explained in the SKJ –and also the HSBK– are not attested in the BDSR, 
but are preached in the MVS (cf. supra: 103).

5. Nevertheless, a fifth point of difference that Yamasaki perceives relates to the classification 
of, and taxonomy used for those destined and non destined for bodhisattvahood. He further 
oberves that “the names of the various kinds of minds that occur in Kūkai’s later 
masterpiece, the JJSR, as well as those in its abbreviation, the Precious – are entirely the 
same as those in the SKJ, but asserts that “prototype of the JJ SR was already completed in the 
SKJ.”

According to Yamasaki, at the date of the compilation of the SKJ, many sentences were added 
and/or erased, but because the text is similar to the last half of the Heizei, this implies that 
SKJ must have been compiled after the consecration of emperor Heizei (822), and before he 
started compiling the JJ SR (824).

6. Yamasaki points out that “although the various rituals that are explained in the BDSR – 
such as the visualization rituals on the sun and moon disk, of the A-syllable, and the fivefold 
practice for achieving the body of Vairocana– are not discussed in the SKJ, the text does 
mention that if one practices the three mysteries by visualizing sun and moon disk, one will 
suddenly penetrate into the light of Mahāvairocana, as well as the honored ones of the five 
and three divisions. Moreover, he says that “while the rituals are transmitted elsewhere, the 
SKJ stresses that the cultivation of samādhi is of major importance.”

7. Also with respect to the seventh difference, Yamasaki first turns to the SKJ:

The aforementioned teachings constitute the nectar of that what is preached by the response and 
transformation bodies of the Buddha. What I will confer now, [however] are the samaya precepts for 
Buddhas, that is to say, these are the precepts of the Shingon mandala teachings as expounded by the 
Svabhāva-dharmakāya Mahāvairocana.
According to Yamasaki, this concerns Kūkai’s original interpretation that was already expounded in the Treatise on Differentiating the Exoteric and Esoteric Teachings, but was unprecedented in India and China, namely: the differentiation of the exoteric and esoteric teachings according to the Buddha bodies, in which two taxonomies (i.e. exoteric and esoteric) accord with three bodies (i.e. the nirmāṇa- and sambhogakāya are exoteric, while the dharma is esoteric), and especially its application on the level of precepts, i.e. “that the sanmaiya-kai, being the esoteric precepts, are the precepts of the Dharmakāya”.

In sum, Yamasaki not only concludes that the SKJ is structured around the BDSR, but also, notwithstanding the fact that the SKJ is founded on the sanmaiya-kai that are expounded in various other ritual manuals, it argues that these precepts are the precepts of the Svabhāva-Dharmakāya. The text explains that they are the “hidden key to the path toward the realization of Buddhahood in this life,” and according to him, the SKJ “expands these precepts to the plain of concrete daily life”, in the form of the four obligations, the ten good actions, etc.

This is precisely what is also expounded in the HSBK, in which after the threefold pure bodhisattva precepts (chapter III: 60-61), the characteristics of the samaya precepts (ibid.: 61) are explained in terms of the four methods (ibid.: 62), the four vows and their relation to the four hindrances, ibid.: 63-64), the four parājikās (ibid.: 65) and the ten important prohibitions (ibid. 68-69). When speaking of the esotericization of Buddhist precepts, perhaps the most clear example is that of the four parājikās, or four capital prohibitions.

Four capital prohibitions

Central to the ritual bestowal of the samaya precepts, is the conferral of two verses (Skt. gāthā). The first is called the “verse told in the ear” (耳語偈 Jap. nigo-ge), for during the actual ritual it is whispered in the ear of the candidate prior to entering the consecration platform. The second is the “verse on the samaya precepts” (三昧耶戒偈 Jap. sanmaiya-kai-
ge), which is normally conferred at the conclusion of the abhiśeka, but sometimes both can coincide.  

The verse on samaya (Skt. samaya-gāthā) is expounded in the second chapter of the MVS, on the Accessories and Mantras necessary to approach the Maṇḍala (further: Accessories):  

Practitioner, you should focus, for I will now proclaim the verse on the samaya [precepts]: Disciple of Buddha, because from now onwards you must not spare your life to never abandon the teachings (Skt. Dharma), depart from your intent to attain awakening (Skt. bodhicitta), be avarice of all things and phenomena (Skt. dhammas), or harm sentient beings, the Buddha has preached the samaya [precepts]. That you [must] follow these precepts well, [means that] you [should] protect them as if you were protecting your own life. You should respect them in all serenity, and prostrate at the feet of [your master,] the wise venerable, follow his teachings and the practices that he has established, without arousing thoughts of doubts.  

The MVS commentary on the Accessories chapter reads:  

You should deepen and cultivate the mind of compassion and mindfulness. Whispering you [should now] proclaim the samaya precepts. You must not allow all others who have not yet went to the platform hear this.  

---  

733 Endō 1972: 2. See also MD: 1715a, s.v. nagokai 聽裏戒.  
735 T. vol. 18, no. 848: 12b1-8, cited without reference indication in Yamasaki 1967: 254: 次當於弟子而起悲念 心行者應入中示三昧耶偈 佛子汝從今不惜身命故 常不應捨法 捨離菩提心 慳惜一切法 不利衆生生 佛説三昧耶 汝善住戒者 如護自身命 護戒亦如是 懽誠恭敬 稽首聖尊足 所作隨教行 勿生疑慮心. Endō’s (1972: 2) partial reading is: “仏子汝今より身命を惜まざる故に正法を捨て菩提心を捨離し一切の法を慳吝し衆生を利せざる行をなすべからず仏三昧耶を説きたまえ汝善住戒者自身の命を護るが如く戒を護ることも亦是の如くせよ." There are –at least– three other translations of the full passage available, the one more literal than the other: “Then taking those trainees the mantrin should instil a compassionate frame of mind in them, and teach the samaya commitments to them: “From this day forward, you should never abandon the holy Dharma and bodhicitta, even for the sake of your life. You should not be parsimonious, nor do what harms beings. All the Buddhas prescribe these samaya commitments to you, well-discipled one. You should guard them just as you guard your life!” With faith and devotion, the trainees should bow at the guru’s feet, and then with very certain minds, they should accept all of that, cf. Hodge 2003: 147, adding Buddhaguhya’s commentary. Or: “Then, arousing thoughts of compassion toward the disciple, the practitioner should take him inside [the mandala] and reveal the samaya verses: ‘Son of Buddha, henceforth, not begrudging of life or limb, you should never abandon the Dharma, forsake the bodhi-mind, be miserly with any dharmas, or do anything that does not benefit beings. The Buddha has taught the samaya for you who abide well in the precepts, and just as you guard your life, so too you should guard the precepts.’ With utmost sincerity and reverence [the disciple] should bow at the feet of the honored [ācārya], and acting in conformity with the teaching, he must not engender any doubting thoughts”, cf. Giebel 2005: 59. A third reads: “Next the yogin should have compassion on his disciple. He will enter inside the room and should show a samaya-gāthā: ‘Oh son of the Buddha, you should henceforth not spare your body and life. You should never abandon the bodhicitta in all the dharmas. You should not forsake the mind of enlightenment. You should not grudge all the dharmas. You should not do anything that has no advantage for sentient beings.’ The Buddha preached the samaya: ‘Oh you who observe the discipline, just as you protect your body and life, you should observe the discipline. You should salute sincerely and reverentially the feet of the sacred one. Conduct in accordance with the teaching. Never conceive a doubt,” cf. Yamamoto Y. 2001: 34. On 德尊 (Jap. shōson), here translated variously as ‘guru’, ‘ācārya’ and ‘sacred one’, see chapter III: 47, n. 329.  
736 T. vol. XXXIX, no. 1796: 661c7-8, referred to in Ueda 1933: 144.
The same precepts, equally known as the ‘four important prohibitions’ (四重禁戒 Jap. *shi jū gonkai*, see e.g. chapter III: 62, n. 435 above), are also attested in the *Recitation Sūtra*.

Abridged from the STTS:

Next, you should take [the disciple] to the great platform, and preach the *samaya* [precepts]. Make him [pay] firm [attention], and address him as follows: “Good son, you should firmly protect the correct teachings, [because provided] you go against them, or are forced to display hatred and harm, you will cut off your [good] fate. You should not depart from cultivating the intent to attain awakening. Toward those people who seek dharmas, you should not be avarice.

Even though amongst [the behaviour of] all sentient beings there are small things that do not benefit them, you must not give rise to them. This is the meaning of the supreme phrases, it is the practice of the sages. Now I have fully explained it to you."^{737}

In addition, the *MVS-Commentary* explains the following:

Now the conferral of these four precepts has been completed. Summarizing their precepts characteristics, you must surely know that they are the four capital offences (Skt. *pārājikās*) of the esoteric treasury.^{738}

So, the aforementioned four fundamental prohibitions are the most fundamental precepts of esoteric Buddhism, and –just as is explained in the HSBK (cf. chapter III: 62ff.)– their precept characteristics (*戒相*, Jap. *kaisō*)^{739} are the four *pārājikās*.^{740} This is further amplified in the 17th chapter of the *MVS-Commentary*:

[Therefore], rejecting [the Gem of] Buddha, this is interrupting the fate of all bodhisattvas and cutting off the roots of their attainment Buddhahood. If you engage in sexual debauchery, stealing, killing, and lying, you will only be hindered on your path, but this is not cutting off the foundations for attaining Buddhahood. Therefore, it is only committing a serious crime (Skt. *sthūlayāya*). Because [the Gem of] Buddha cannot be rejected, the same applies to the Dharma and Saṃgha. [This is just as in the *śrāvakavyāna*] scriptures. Furthermore, it is said that “throwing away one scroll of the scriptures or behavioral rules [is like] rejecting the seven groups [of Buddhist disciples] and give birth to one person.” Namely, that [is meant] in the sense that one prevents somebody from not attaining the full precepts. All the more, [does this hold true] for all bodhisattvas! It is the same as boarding the one path and attain the site of enlightenment. Every Buddha is not differentiated, nor discriminated. Therefore, you must understand what you reject, namely, you cut off the fate of all Dharmas.] The intention to

---


^{738} T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 671a9-10: [今此四戒如受具竟已略示戒相當知即於秘密藏中四波羅夷也] which Endō (1972: 2) translates as: “今此の四戒は受具し竟りて略して戒相を示すが如し. 当に知るべし. 即ち是れ秘密藏中の四波羅夷なり.”

^{739} 戒相 (Jap. *kaisō*).

attain enlightenment is likewise. This is the foundation of all practice. If you discard the mind of enlightenment, then you do not possess the teaching of all bodhisattvas. Therefore, rejecting it is also a severe crime.

Thus, according to esoteric doctrine, the four pārājikās of sexual misconduct, stealing, killing, and lying that are expounded in Hinayāna, are nothing but sthūlāśayas, while breaking the four important MVS prohibitions is a capital crime (斷首罪 Jap. danshu-zai), implying that one cuts the foundation for attaining Buddhahood.

It has been pointed out that these four prohibitions have been expanded to ten important prohibitions (十重禁戒 Jap. jū jū gonkai) in the 17th chapter of the Commentary on the MVS, that is:

1. not to reject Buddha,
2. not to reject the Dharma,
3. not to reject the Saṃgha,
4. not to depart from the mind of aspiration to enlightenment (bodhicitta),
5. not to slander/criticize the teachings and scriptures of the three vehicles,
6. not to be avarice of all dharmas,
7. not to obtain erroneous views,
8. be determined to arouse the great [compassionate] mind,
9. perceive the capacities [of others in order to] guide them,
10. always giving alms.

As seen above (cf. 101-102, table 9 supra), both the MSZ and the HSBK also list a set of ten important prohibitions. Even though their appellations slightly differ, it has been pointed out that at their core lie the aforementioned four prohibitions. Their relation can be summarized in table 13 below.

---


742 The above quote speaks of 偸蘭 (Jap. chūran), which is an abbreviation of 偸蘭遮 (Jap. chūransha), of which there are four levels: (1) grave crimes in the area of pārājika, that is crimes which one must repent for before the entire saṃgha; (2) lesser crimes in the area of pārājika that one may confess to a group of four people outside the saṃgha; (3) serious crimes in the area of saṃghāvaśesa, which one may confess to a group of four people outside the saṃgha; (4) lesser crimes in the area of saṃghāvaśesa; one may confess to a single person. See Muller in DBJ, s.v. 四偸蘭遮.


744 Yamasaki 1967: 254-255: 不捨仏戒、不捨法戒、不捨僧戒、不捨離菩提心戒、不謗一切三乗経法戒、不慳恡一切法戒、不得邪見戒、於発大心観察戒、観察機根引導戒、常行布施戒.

745 Yamasaki 1967: 255.

746 Endō 1972: 3.

747 Based on Ueda 1933: 134.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL PROHIBITIONS</th>
<th>MVS Commentary</th>
<th>MSZ = HSBK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. abandon Dharma</td>
<td>1. reject Buddha</td>
<td>1. abandon bodhicitta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. abandon bodhicitta</td>
<td>2. reject Dharma</td>
<td>2. reject three Jewels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. be avaricious</td>
<td>3. reject Samgha</td>
<td>3. taunt the scriptures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. abandon bodhicitta</td>
<td>4. have doubts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. taunt the scriptures</td>
<td>5. teach bodhisattvas counter to bodhicitta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. be stingy</td>
<td>6. teach Hīnayānists counter to bodhicitta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. arouse wrong views</td>
<td>7. instruct Hīnayānists Esoteric Teachings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. be unwary in interaction with bodhisattvas</td>
<td>8. arouse wrong views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. not lead beings in accordance to their capacities</td>
<td>9. speak about esoteric precepts to non-Buddhists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. not practice charity</td>
<td>10. harm sentient beings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Four en ten prohibitions
The full MSZ passage reads:

1. Do not abandon your enlightened mind (*bodhicitta*), for this would hinder the realization of Buddhahood;
2. Do not reject the Triple Gem, nor take refuge with the external paths, for they are the heretical (i.e. non-Buddhist) teachings;
3. Do not taunt the Three Jewels and the scriptures of the Three Vehicles, for otherwise you would turn your back on your Buddha nature;
4. Have no doubts when you cannot fathom the deep meaning of the texts of the Greater Vehicle, for this exceeds the bounds of the ordinary man;
5. Supposing [you encounter] sentient beings who have already aroused their enlightened mind, you must not instruct the [esoteric] teachings in such a way that they act counter to this enlightened mind, or turn their attention to the Two Vehicles, for in doing so you would destroy the germ of the Three Jewels;
6. Nor should you instruct the [esoteric] teachings to those who have not yet aroused *bodhicitta* in a way that the thought of the Two Vehicles would emerge in their minds, for this would conflict with your original vow;
7. With regard to the people of the Lesser Vehicle, as well as in the presence of people of the heterodox teachings (lit. who have wrong views), you must not talk about the profound and subtle Greater Vehicle in an abrupt [and revealing] way, for in all likelihood this would generate fraud and disaster;
8. You must not arouse wrong views, for in doing this you would cut off your “good roots”;
9. In the presence of [people] of the non-Buddhist path, you must not spontaneously declare that you are furnished with the subtle precepts of unsurpassed enlightenment (*bodhi*), for in doing so they would strive for thoughts of resentment and envy. In case you find this hard to accept, you would cut across your [own] intent to attain awakening (*bodhicitta*), which is disadvantageous to both [sides];
10. You should not do anything, which is harmful to sentient beings or aggrieves them. You also must not stimulate others to do so and in case you do witness someone doing so, you must not rejoice, for this runs counter to the teaching of benefiting others and cuts across the compassionate mind.\(^{748}\)

The commentary on the MVS chapter on ‘Receiving the expedients and learning the discipline’ (受方便学処, Jap. *Ju hōben gaku sho*; further: *Expedients chapter*, i.e. *MVS-Commentary*, chapter 18),\(^{749}\) says that the four fundamental prohibitions for bodhisattvas are the so-called “precepts regarding the wisdom that is unimpeded with regard to the three periods” (cf. discussion on different designations on page 137 below).

\(^{748}\) T. XVIII, no. 917: 943c18-944a4: 一者不應退菩提心妨成佛故二者不應捨三寶歸依外道是邪法故三者不應毀謗三寶及三乘教典背佛性故四者於甚深大乘經典不通解處不應生疑惑非凡夫境故五者若有衆生已發菩提心者不應説如是法令退菩提心趣向二乘斷三寶種故六者未發菩提心者亦不應説如是法令彼發於二乘之心違本願故七者對小乘人及邪見人前不應説深妙大乘菩提法令彼生詭詭故八者不應發起諸邪見等法令斷善根故九者於外道前不應説示我具無上菩提妙戒令彼以瞋恨心求如是物不能辦得令退菩提心二倶有損故十者但於一切衆生有所損害及無利益皆不應作及教人作見作隨喜於利他法及慈悲心相違背故.

\(^{749}\) Title translation by Yamamoto Y. 2001: 150.
These are explained in the *Accessories* chapter (cf. supra: 119) as: not to reject the three jewels; not to reject the bodhicitta etc. It is to the aforementioned four fundamental prohibitions of the *Accessories* chapter (cf. supra: 119) that the following six are added in order to arrive at the ten fundamental prohibitions:

(5) Do not slander the teachings [expounded] in the texts of the three vehicles;

(6) You should not arouse avarice of all dharmas;

(7) Do not obtain false views;

(8) Do not give advice to people who have aroused the great *bodhi* mind which would cause them to fall back;

(9) Do not preach the greater teachings to Hinayāṇists, nor preach lesser teachings to Mahāyāṇists;

(10) Do not give others tools to harm sentient beings.

In this respect, the commentary on the *Accessories chapter*, cites the *Guhyatrantra* (蕤呬耶經, Jap. *Suikiyakyō*):

[Next, expound the [following] samaya precepts to all disciples, that is: From today onwards],

1. you will permanently revere and make offerings to the three jewels, all bodhisattvas, and honored ones of the *mantra* [vehicle];

2. Constantly take confidence in the *Mahāyāna sūtras*;

---

750 今不捨三宝、今不捨菩提心, quoted in Endō 1972: 3. This actually refers to T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 757b26-29: 如前三世無障礙戒中先令不捨三寶又令不捨菩提之心此即菩薩真四重禁也若菩薩生如是心捨離於佛即名破於重禁, which may be translated as: “Causing [the disciple] first not to reject the three jewels, and further not to reject the bodhicitta, which is part of the aforementioned precepts that engender the wisdom which is unimpeded with regard to the three periods; these precisely are the true four fundamental prohibitions of the bodhisatta. If a bodhisattva arouses such a mind that discards Buddhahood, then it is called breaking the fundamental prohibitions.”

751 Endō 1972: 3: “(5) 不謗一切三乘經法; (6) 不應於一切法生慳悋; (7) 不得邪見; (8) 不於發大心人勸發令退; (9) 不於小乘人前説大法、不於大乘人前説小法; (10) 不得施與他人害物之具. This list is a summary of T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 757c18-758-a16: 其四如前所述更有六重並為十也第五重禁者謂不謗一切三乘經法若説者即是謗佛法僧菩提心故犯重也以祕密藏中一切方便皆是佛之方便是故謗於一切方便法即是謗一切方便法也乃至世間治産業藝術等事雖有正理相順是佛説者亦不得説何况三乘法第六不應於一切法生邪見若犯重禁也以菩薩集一切方便法為一切衆生若有所秘密即是説菩提故犯重也第七不應於一切方便法生於慳悋若犯重禁也以菩薩集一切方便法為一切衆生若有所秘密即是説菩提故犯重也第八於發大心人勸發其心不令退移也若見其懈退而勸發之或阻止其心若令離無上菩提之道即是違逆一切方便法故犯重也第九於小乘人前説大法或於大乘人前説小法而説小法行犯重禁此即是方便不具以違逆如來方便故慈機説法為人天眾故犯重也第十菩薩常行方便施然不施與他人害物之具謂施酒施毒藥刀杖之類一切不饒益他之具即犯重也以菩薩常行方便利他行今則相背故犯重也當知前不殺等是將順他人意又初入法者所持之戒今次説十事乃是一切菩薩正行之戒也若菩薩以正順後十戒故假使行前十事中而不為犯.”

752 Full reconstructed title: *Sarva-maṇḍala-sāmānīya-vidhi-guhya-tantra*. Describes the procedures for creating and using abhiṣeka-mandalas. No Sanskrit version survives, but the text exists in Tibetan and Chinese translation, the latter attributed to Amoghavajra. To date, the author is not aware of any translations and/or text studies in Western languages. The passage in question is T. XVIII, no. 787: 771 a,b5, quoted in Endō 1972: 13, n. 13: “次為彼等說此三摩耶戒汝等從今常於三寶及諸菩薩諸眞言尊恭敬供養於大乘經恒生勝解凡見一切三寶亦見受三摩耶戒者當生愛樂於尊者所恒生恭敬於諸天神不得嗔嫌應須供養於其外教不得信學凡來求者隨有施與於諸有情恒起慈悲於諸功德勤求修習常樂大乘於明藏行恒勤精進持誦眞言於經明藏所有祕密之法無三摩耶者皆不應為説眞言及印.”
The mere glance at all those who have taken the samaya [precepts] should arouse loving delight;
That which is constantly aroused towards the honored ones is respect;
You should not cherish feelings of hatred toward the honored ones, and with utmost faith you should study the scriptures of the outer paths;
When a commoner comes to you with a request, give [help] according to your power;
For all sentient beings you will constantly arouse compassion;
Cultivate and practice the various merits wholeheartedly;
Always rejoice in Mahāyāna, and do not obtain indolence toward mantra practice;
You should not preach the teachings that are endowed with secrets to those who have not [taken] the samaya [precepts].

In the Abridged Record on the Matrix Consecration (胎蔵灌頂略記 Jap. Taizō-kanjō ryakki; further: Abridged Record), this has been expanded with one crucial line, as a result of which ten important prohibitions emerge that are different both from those expounded in the MVS-Commentary, as well as from those from the MSZ:

Next, preach all of the disciples the samaya precepts.
There are ten fundamental [prohibitions]:
(1) [From] today onwards you always make offerings to the three jewels, all bodhisattvas, and all honored ones of the mantra [vehicle] with utmost respect;
(2) towards the mahāyāna scriptures, you will constantly arouse confidence;
(3) the mere sight of all those who have taken the samaya should arouse love and joy;
(4) that what you arouse toward the honored ones is respect;
(5) you must not cherish feelings of hatred toward all honored ones, and with faith you [should] study the scriptures of the outer paths;
(6) donate according to your power to commoners who come with a request;
(7) For all sentient beings you will constantly arouse compassion;
(8) Cultivate and practice the various merits wholeheartedly (lit. with an utmost mind);
(9) Always rejoice in Mahāyāna, and do not obtain indolence toward mantra practice;
(10) You should not preach the teachings that are endowed with secrets to those who have not [taken] the samaya [precepts].

753 T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 672b18-26, referred to in Endō 1972: 3: [次爲都説三昧耶戒汝等從今日] 常三寶及諸菩薩諸真言尊恭敬養於摩訶衍經恒生信解凡見一切受三昧耶者當生愛樂於尊者所恒起恭敬不應於諸尊所懷嫌恨心及與信學外道經書凡來求者隨力施與於諸有情恒起慈悲於諸功德勤心修習常樂大乘於真言行勿得懈廢所有秘密之法無三昧耶者不應為説。The numbers in the above translation, however, are based on an identical passage from the隨要記 (Jap. Zuiyōki), compiled by the Tendai monk Kōgei (皇慶, 977-1049), i.e. T. LXXV, no. 2407: 817a14-26:

754 Endō 1972: 3, referring to KDZ II: 196: 次爲都説三昧耶戒有十重一汝等從今日常於三寶及諸菩薩諸真言尊重恭敬供養二於摩訶衍經恒生信解三是見一切受三昧耶者當生愛樂於尊者所恒起恭敬不應於諸尊所懷嫌恨心及與信學外道經書凡來求者隨力施與於諸有情恒起慈悲於諸功德勤心修習常樂大乘於真言行勿得懈廢十所有秘密之法無三昧耶者不應為説。The same fragment is also attested in Annen’s (安然, 841-880) 大日經供養持誦不同 (Jap. Dainichikyō kuyō jīju fudō), i.e. T. LXXV, no. 2394: 320b12/17-26: "[八十五都説三昧耶戒: 瞿醯云阿阇梨如上所説作護摩已以用淨水灑諸弟子頂上廣示曼荼羅位教彼大印及明王眞言令坐一處持誦之次教以香華供養本尊及餘諸尊竟次第而坐師自誦般若經令彼聽之次爲都説三昧耶戒有十重一汝等從今日常於三寶及諸菩薩諸真言尊重恭敬供養二於摩訶衍經恒生信解三是見一切受三昧耶者當生愛樂於尊者所恒起恭敬不應於諸尊所懷嫌恨心及與信學外道經書凡來求者隨力施與於諸有情恒起慈悲於諸功德勤心修習常樂大乘於真言行勿得懈廢十所有秘密之法無三昧耶者不應為説。"
Aside from these ten fundamental prohibitions, the *Expedients* chapter of the MVS also discusses the so-called ‘ten good precepts’ (十善戒 Jap. *jū zenkai*):

Then Vajradhāra, the master of mysteries, told the Buddha: “Oh, Bhagavan, I pray, will you please let Bodhisattvas and Mahāsattvas have *jīāṇa-upāyā* (wisdom-expedient) and let them explain what they have exercised to devotees, and let the devotees have no doubt of the Bodhisattvas and Mahāsattvas to be free from suspicion so that their mind is indestructible in the course of transmigration?” As soon as he said so, Bhagavan Vairocana observed all the *dharma dhātu* with the eyes of the Tathāgata and told Vajradhara, the master of mysteries: “Listen, oh Vajrapāṇi, I will now explain the way of dextrous practice. Bodhisattvas and Mahāsattvas who dwell here will be able to master Mahāyāna. Oh master of mysteries, bodhisattvas should observe the precept of not depriving life. This should not be done.”

That which is meant here is the first of the ‘ten good precepts’. The full set being not to:

1. deprive life, or not to kill;
2. take what is not given, or not to steal;
3. indulge in sexual misconduct, i.e. not to commit adultery;
4. speak falsely, i.e. not to lie;
5. speak harshly, or not to use immoral language;
6. backbite;
7. speak senselessly, or use harmful speech;
8. desire;
9. be angry, or ill-willed;
10. have evil views.

On the relation between the ten ‘good precepts’ and ‘prohibitions’, the *Commentary* reads:

That which should be known about this not killing etc. [i.e. the ten good precepts] mentioned before, is that they signify the respect towards others and further that they are the precepts which those who enter the Dharma have first of all to uphold. The ten things [i.e. the ten prohibitions] just mentioned are precisely the precepts for the correct conduct of all bodhisattvas. If the bodhisattva, because he correctly upholds these ten precepts [i.e. the ten prohibitions], supposing he practices one of the former ten things [i.e. the ten good precepts], then he will not commit an offence.

所懷嫌恨心及與信學外道經書六凡來求者隨力施與七於諸有情恒起慈悲八於諸功徳勒心修習九常樂大乘
於眞言行勿得懈廢十所有祕密之法無三昧耶者不應爲説, with added emphasis. Note that except from the emphasized phrase, this passage is the same as in Kōgei’s manual, cf. n. 753 supra. Moreover, Endō (1972: 13, n. 14) refers to a passage in the *大日經疏妙印鈔* (Jap. *Dainichikyō shomyōinshō*) by Shingon priest Yūban (宥範, al. Ryōgen 了源, 1270-1352), i.e. T. LVIII, no. 2213: 330c10/19-24: [七從瞿醯下明引瞿醯説十戒中又三初總明加持教誡等次第二明都説三昧耶戒三明説十種方便戒 初文自可見云云二從次爲下明都説三昧耶戒中次者如此以般若經之意教化開導已次説三昧耶戒故云次也爲都者總爲諸應度弟子説四重三昧耶戒等也故云次爲教都説三昧耶戒也三從汝等下明十種方便戒中是即今經説四重不説十種方便戒故引瞿醯明其戒相也] 謂所謂一於三寶境界致恭敬二於大乘經怛生惠解三於受三昧耶人生愛樂四於尊者恒起恭敬五不應嫌恨諸尊信學外書六來求者隨力施與七於諸有情恒起慈悲八於諸功徳勒心修習九常樂大乘十於眞言行勿得懈廢十一明結中餘如供養法初品中廣明者指行學品第一也 These links remain the subject of future investigation.

755 Yamamoto’s translation (2001: 150) of the word 戒 in the compound 不奪生命戒 (Jap. *fudatsu shōmyō kai*) as “discipline” has been altered to “precept”.
757 Ueda 1933: 132. Compare other sets in table 9 above.
758 Ueda 1933: 144, n. 5, referring to T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 758a12-16, quoted supra: 124, n. 750.
In comparison to the ten fundamental prohibitions of Hīnayāna, it has been pointed out that the latter have no “wisdom-expedient” (慧方便 Jap. e-hōben), but are formal and undynamic rules that pertain to vinaya per se. The ten good precepts, on the other hand, possess “the expedient of knowledge-wisdom, based on the contemplation of the equality of all dharmas”. For example, a bodhisattva should part from the intention of killing during the whole of his life, and as a bodhisattva it is only natural that he knows that he should protect the lives of others. However, if he would kill out of compassion in order to free beings from the karmic retribution of evil deeds, this would not be violating the precepts. Also a lay bodhisattva who keeps the first five precepts not merely upholds them formally and for his own benefit, as a śravaka would do, but in accordance with his altruistic intention of benefitting others. 759

Tracing the origins of ‘samaya precepts’

Now, the final part of the HSBK (cf. chapter III: 60ff.) expounds the ‘samaya precepts’ for Buddhas in terms of the aforementioned four parājikas and ten prohibitions, but it may be surprising that although they are specified as sanmaiya-kai in the MVS-Commentary, the term is not mentioned as such in the MVS itself.

The MVS-Commentary, which is a key source for Kūkai’s Abridged Record, seeks the origin of the ‘samaya precepts’ in the following text:

The Guhyatantra says: “When [the disciple] is about to enter the platform, the ācārya should have him say the following words: ‘I, disciple X, according to the Dharma, I have constructed this maṇḍala.’ [Then] allow the disciple to enter, whatever his fortune, or social class, he has become an exquisite dharma vessel to attain fulfillment, he only aspires to enter the platform in order to display these characteristics and throw a flower. Next, the disciple should open his eyes, and make him visualize the [bodhi] maṇḍa. Address him with a joyful mind, and say: ‘Now you are looking at this marvelous maṇḍala. Profoundly arouse reverence and faith. You have already aroused all Buddha houses and the various radiant honored ones all together give you divine protection. All auspicious [signs], up to each one of the siddhis are manifested before you. Therefore, adhere firmly to the samaya precepts and you should continuously cultivate the dharma teachings of the mantras. [Next, make the disciple extensively make offerings to the sacred assembly of the maṇḍala.] 760

759 Ueda 1933: 132.
This passage accords to the chapter on the fire ritual (Skt. *homa*) of the *Guhyatantra*:

Next, you should open your eyes and look at the maṇḍala. With a joyful mind the master (ācārya) says the following to his disciple: “Now, you gaze at this exquisite maṇḍala. Profoundly arouse reverence and faith. Until now you have aroused several Buddha families, and their various brilliant mantras have already empowered you. All auspicious [omens] and every one of the *siddhis* of realization are manifested. Therefore, uphold the *samaya* precepts, and as for the *mantra* teachings, apply their recitation.”

Also the eighth chapter of the *MVS-Commentary* on the *Accessories chapter* is a citation from the last scroll of the *Guhyatantra*:

[Subsequently, you should explain the verse on *samaya*. That is [the verse containing] the four kinds of important prohibitions of the secret treasury. As for this verse which is connected to the sages (Skt. *ārśa-gāthā*), you should explain it as follows.] The *Guhyatantra* says: “Disciple, after having approached the western gate to worship [certain Buddhas], the master (ācārya) should address all Honored ones, saying: I, master X have bestowed consecration upon [disciple X]. Now I entrust him to all Honored ones to instruct him the *dhāraṇī* treasury”. Having said these words, [the master] should open his parasol and let [the disciple] stand [under it], and accordingly [the master should] explain him the *samaya* precepts before [approaching] the maṇḍala, [after which he tells the disciple: “Now you have attained [the position of] master of spells and diagrams (Skt. *maṇḍala-dhāraṇī-ācārya*)].”

The above passages of the *Guhyatantra* being cited in the *MVS-Commentary*, appear to be among the earliest instances where *sanmaiya-kai* (‘*samaya* precepts’) is mentioned. The Tibetan translations of the same passages, however, do not contain this sequence: in the first case, the Tibetan version only reads *dam-tshig*, that is ‘*samaya*’ only, without a word for ‘precepts’, and in the second case the word ‘*samaya*’ is not mentioned at all.

---

761 瞿醯經 (Jap. *Kugekyō*, var. *Kukeigyō*) is another name for difference with 鬱嘿耶經 (Jap. *Suikiyakyō*), i.e. T. XVIII, no. 897, attributed to Amoghavajra, cf. MD: 330, s.v. 瞿醯經; BKD II: 151-152, s.v. 瞿醯壇多羅經 (Jap. *Kukeidantarakyō*).


763 阿利沙 (Jap. *arisha*) is a transliteration of a Sanskrit word, meaning “connected with the sages”. Connected with the *ṛṣis*, or holy men; especially their religious utterances in verse. It also a title of a Buddha, cf. DBJ, s.v. 阿利沙; and therefore, also a designation of the master.

764 Endō 1972: 5, also giving the Tibetan translation, quoting T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 666c17/18-23: [即當爲説三昧耶偈所謂秘密藏中四種重禁此等皆是阿利沙偈下當釋之：] 瞿醯云弟子至西門禮拜已阿闍梨當白諸尊云我某甲已與某甲灌頂竟今付屬諸尊令持明藏作是語已應放其傘今起立對曼荼羅前爲説三昧耶戒汝今已成就曼荼羅持明阿闍梨竟, being taken from T. vol. 18, no. 897: 770c29-771a4[5]: 亦至西門前即數禮拜其傘隨身來去蓋頭其阿闍梨啓請諸尊作如是言我某甲與某甲灌頂畢已今付屬諸尊令持明藏作是語已應放其傘。今起立對曼荼羅前爲説三摩耶戒; [汝今已成曼荼羅阿闍梨持明藏者].
Moreover, when comparing other attestations of ‘samaya precepts’ in the Chinese Guhyatantara, the Tibetan translation only reads dam-tshig, without the addition of ‘precepts’. 765 Nevertheless, as the attentive reader may already have noticed in aforementioned samples (see e.g. citations in supra: 119 and 125), there are also many instances in Chinese texts, where samaya is attested without the addition of ‘precepts’, even though this is undoubtedly intended. 766

Other examples, include, for instance, the fourth scroll of Vajrabodhi’s translation of the Recitation Sūtra Abridged from the STTS reads:

Explain the samaya [to the disciple] before approaching the great platform. 767

Also Amoghavajra’s translation of the Ritual on Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī of the STTS, mentions ‘taking samaya’:

Take the samaya in obedience to an authorized master. 768

However, Amoghavajra’s translation of the Sūtra containing the Ritual Protocol for the Dhāraṇīs [used] by Ānanda to feed Fire-spitting [Hungry Ghosts], Essential in the Collection of Yoga [Practices] by contrast, has the sequence ‘samaya precepts’:

Next, bestow them the seal (mudrā) of the samaya precepts. That is, join both hands (lit. bind the two wings) and raise both middle fingers (lit. ‘patience’ and ‘vow’) so that they resemble a needle, repeating two times the following mantra: Om, samayas tvam! Now the bestowal of the samaya precepts upon you is completed. 769

This is also the case in his Karmic Conditions which brought about Teaching Ānanda on Feeding Fire-spitting [Hungry Ghosts], essential in the Collection of Yoga [Practices]:

[The Buddha spoke to Ānanda: “If you aspire to be bestowed the ritual on feeding the hungry ghosts, must confirm its authority by means of instruction by a master on yoga and profound samādhi.}

765 Endō 1972: 6, doubting that the original form of sanmaiya-kai will ever be reconstructed because the Sanskrit manuscript of the Guhyatantara is no longer extant.
767 金剛頂瑜伽中略出念誦經 (Jap. Kongōchō yuga-chū ryakujū nenju kyō), i.e. T. XVIII, no. 866: 252b7: 至大壇前為説三摩耶… This text is a collection of translations and various practices from the STTS, cf. BKD III: 494a.
768 金剛頂經瑜伽文殊師利菩薩法 (Jap. Kongōchō yuga Monjushiri-bosatsu hō), i.e. T. XX, no. 1171: 705c13: 應從師受三摩耶.
When you are someone who takes joy in practicing, you should pursue studying with a yogācārāya. When you are someone who has aroused the unsurpassed and great bodhicitta, took the samaya precepts, and has entered the great maṇḍala in order to receive abhiṣeka, then you are permitted to receive [instruction. When you take the abhiṣeka of the fivefold knowledge of Tathāgata Mahāvairocana, you will be introduced into the rank of acārya, and you will be able to transmit the teachings].

In all, it appears that—at least in the writings and translations by the Tantric masters Vajrabodhi, Śubhākarasimha, Amoghavarja, and the like—samaya and ‘samaya precepts’ were both used in the same sense. This means that understanding ‘samaya’ equals to understand the ‘samaya precepts’, but what does the term ‘samaya’ denote?

**Samaya**

Regarding the problem of translating the word samaya, David Snellgrove notes:

>In translating the word samaya] I have often used the word ‘sacrament’, and this requires some explanation. The Sanskrit term is samaya, which means literally ‘coming together.’ In ordinary classical Sanskrit usage it means an occasion, a suitable time, a compact, a convention, etc. In Buddhist tantric usage it becomes a crucial term in that it signifies the ‘coming together’ of transcendent being and immanent being. Thus an image of any kind as prescribed by tradition, once properly consecrated (or empowered) is possessed by the divinity, and for this kind of “coming together” samaya is used. To call such an empowered image a “symbol” of the divinity is scarcely adequate, but sometimes one has to make do with such an interpretation. The ultimate aim of tantric yoga is the self-identification of the practicing yogin with the divinity he is invoking and whose powers he then appropriates. This form of “coming together” is also known as samaya, when the word “union” might suggest itself as a tolerable translation. Similarly in the ceremonies we are now reviewing [i.e. those preserved in the chapter of the Saṃvarodaya Tantra containing recipes for the making of suitable liquors] the sacrificial offering (Sanskrit bali, Tibetan gtor-ma) is consecrated to the divinity who is being invoked, and thus comes to represent the divinity. For the fierce divinities who are central to so many tantric rituals, the best offerings, as we have noted, are flesh and blood and other bodily substances. By partaking of these consecrated items, one absorbs the nature of the divinity, and for this use of samaya, “sacrament” suggests itself as a fit translation. […] Thus once the sacrificial items are “consubstantiated” with the chosen divinity one partakes of his even higher qualities. The association of ideas between this meaning and the Christian understanding of sacrament scarcely requires further elaboration. In the Buddhist tantric understanding the samaya becomes a “pledge” of a “coming together” of the divinity with the image that represents him, the sacrificial offering that “embodies” him, or with the yogin or even the faithful worshipper who is one-pointedly intent upon him. “Pledge” is probably the best word in English to cover the whole range of interpretations, and it is thus that the

---

Tibetans translated the term (samaya = dam-tshig), but it would scarcely convey the intended meaning to an initiated reader. Using different English words to translate the same Sanskrit word has the disadvantage of giving the impressions that this word has a variety of meanings. This may be argued in certain cases, e.g., where this word means “occasion,” but in the present case samaya in its Buddhist tantric sense has one meaning embracing all interpretations, which I have just attempted to give. It is thus a highly mystical term, used in its own right as a powerful mantra.

As is also apparent from important doctrinal texts, the word samaya undoubtedly has a vast range of different meanings. For instance, chapter nine of the MVS-Commentary, reads that samaya is an antonym of kāla:

According to Sanskrit sources, “former time” is called kāla, which means a long period (for example, the three parts of one year), while “latter time” is called samaya, which is a small to medium period, and just as amongst the six hours of day and night, [also samaya] has further subdivisions.773

Amoghavajra’s translation of the Sūtra on the Samaya of the Reality of Great Bliss and Adamantine Non-emptiness that Transcends the Principle of Prajñāparāmitā774 gives the following four meanings:

The word samaya designates “original vow”, but also “time”, as well as “duration”, and it is also a synonym for “maṇḍala”.775

According to Yamasaki, there are also many meanings and usages of the word samaya, ranging from a “mark” (標幟 Jap. hyōji) in the case of the samaya form (三昧耶形 Jap. sanmaya-kei), to such things as “consecration” (Skt. abhiseka).776

Kūkai explains the esoteric meaning of the word samaya in siddham script777 in the Heizei:

The term sa-ma-ya refers to the Three Treasuries, namely, to the Three Parts [of Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha]. The term sa refers to the various doctrinal truths. Truth is something that can be gained only through meditation in the practice of the samādhi of great compassion of [bodhisattva] Avalokiteśvara.

772 Snellgrove 1987: 165-166, with added emphasis. On the etymology of samaya, see Takahashi 1980.
773 T. vol. 39, no. 1796: 673a3-6: 據梵本前時名迦羅是長時之時 (如一歳有三分等) 後時名三摩耶是時中小時如晝夜六時之中復更有小分等. cited in Yamasaki 1967: 252. Indeed, PSD: 67 defines kāla as a “small part, esp. one-sixteenth […], small division of time, ranging between 8 seconds and about 2½ minutes according to different statements.
775 T. XIX, no. 1003: 609b19-21: 三昧耶名為本誓亦名時亦名期契亦為曼茶羅之異名. Following this excerpt, is an explanation of the four maṇḍalas, cf. supra: 113, n. 705.
777 On siddham, see Van Gulik 1980.
The term *ma* refers to that which the self cannot gain, namely, emptiness. Emptiness is another name for the Tathāgata who does not promote false reasoning—[that is, the bodhisattva] Maitreya—and it is known as the practice of great wisdom. The term *ya* means vehicle, but refers to a vehicle that cannot be boarded. The Vajrasattva of primordial being is without beginning or end, and knows neither production nor destruction; its nature is constant and equal to the void. Since it neither comes nor goes, who could board it? Its course has already been run. This is why it is termed “unboardable vehicle.” The three virtues delineated above form the attributes of the Tathāgata Mahāvairocana. Mahāvairocana’s physical attributes are all subsumed under these three syllables, and it is in order to reveal this that the term *sa-ma-ya* is used.778

This explanation is accounted to be based on such comments as those related to the meanings of the *siddham* syllables in the second MVS chapter on *Accessories*,779 and the *Syllables* section of the STTS.780

Kūkai’s *Notes on the Secret Treasury* (秘藏記 Jap. *Hižōki*)781 state the following:

[The word] *samaya* has many meanings. For now, [let it suffice to understand that] it expresses four meanings. The first is the meaning of ‘equality’ (平等, Jap. *byōdō*). The second is ‘vow’ (誓願, Jap. *seigan*). The third is ‘sudden awakening’ (驚覺, Jap. *kyōkaku*).782 The fourth is ‘removing hindrances’ (除垢障, Jap. *jo kushō*).783

This seems to be closely related to—if not based on, or even taken from—the four meanings given in the in ninth chapter of the *MVS-Commentary*:


779 Endō 1972: 9 and 14, n. 38, referring without passage reference to T. vol. 18, no. 848: 10b2-20: 若字門一切諸法生不可得故社字門一切諸法戰敵不可得故吒字門一切諸法慢不可得故咤字門一切諸法長養不可得故捺字門一切諸法住處不可得故喃字門一切諸法法界不可得故婆字門一切諸法怨對不可得故荼重聲字門一切諸法執持不可得故多字門一切諸法如如不可得故他字門一切諸法因不可得故秘密主仰若捺那麼於一切三昧自在速能成辨諸事所為義利皆悉成就


781 Title translation by Abe (2000: 124-125), where it is also indicated that this text “consists of one hundred fragmentary sections of his handwritten record of the oral instructions he received from Hui-guo.”

782 According to DCBT: 488 this term means “arouse, stimulate”. However, according to the FGD: 6927, it means “sudden awakening”.

783 KDZ II: 7, cited in Endō (1972: 10), and Yamasaki (1967: 252). Endō (1972: 15, n. 42) indicates that this passage is identical to a fragment of the *Notes on Essential Sentences in the Commentary on the MVS* (大日経疏要文記 Jap. *Dainichikyō-so yóbun* [var. *yōmon* *ki*]), collated in KDZ I: 604.
Regarding “samaya”, it has the meaning of ‘equality’; it has the meaning of ‘original vow’ (here: 本誓, Jap. honzei); it has the meaning of ‘removing hindrances’; it has the meaning of ‘sudden awakening’.\(^{784}\)

The Heizei, on the other hand, gives three meanings:

Samaya is a Sanskrit word. The Chinese renderings denote such meanings as ‘original vow’, ‘equality’, ‘acquisition’ (攝持, Jap. shoji).\(^{785}\)

Thus, two of these meanings are identical to those given in the Commentary:\(^{786}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MVS Commentary</th>
<th>Heizei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. original vow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. removing hindrances</td>
<td>acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sudden awakening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first of Kūkai’s three meanings of ‘equality’, ‘vow’, and ‘acquisition’ has been explained in more detail by Endō (1972):

It is said that equality denotes ‘triple equality’ (三平等, Jap. san byōdō) because it is the equality of the three secrets of body, speech and mind, which are also called the three divisions (三部, Jap san bu).\(^{787}\) By means of attaining equality of the three secrets by forming mudrās on/with the body, reciting mantras with the mouth, and abiding in samādhi in the mind, one abides in equality with the three secrets of the Tathāgata. It is needless to say that the three parts are the three divisions of Buddha, vajra and lotus (仏金蓮, Jap. butsu kon ren), and that they are instrumental to the four types of mandala and the four kinds of dharmakāya of every Buddha. All these Honored ones are mutually equal: neither more nor less, neither superior nor inferior.

---

\(^{784}\) This is suggested both by Endō (1972: 10), as by Yamasaki (1967: 252), but neither of them gives an exact reference. The source in question is: T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 674c3-4: 三味耶是平等義是本誓義是除障義是驚覺義.

\(^{785}\) KDZ II: 161, cited in Yamasaki (1967: 252) and Endō (1972: 10), translation by Grapard 2000: 157-158. According to Muller in DBJ this term literally means: “to gather and keep”, “to collect and maintain”, or “to take and keep”. However, it is also related to Skt. adhiṣṭhāna, cf. chapter III: 42, n. 278 and 63, n. 446. Hence its rendering as ‘acquisition’. Endō (1972: 15, n. 41) notes that while Kūkai’s Meaning of the Syllable Hūṃ (吽字義 Jap. Unjigi) also gives the same three meanings (i.e. KDZ I: 546, cf. translation in Hakeda 1972: 246ff. and Giebel 2004: 105ff.), his Title Analysis of the Fanwangjing (梵網經解題 Jap. Bonmōkyō kaidai, i.e. KDZ I: 817) gives the three meanings of ‘concentration’ (等持 Jap. tōji), ‘vow’ (誓願 Jap. seigan), and ‘jewel’ (宝 Jap. hō), while the Letter of the Initiatory Unction of Emperor Saga (嵯峨天皇灌頂文 Saga tennō kanjōbun, i.e. KDZ IV: 459) gives the three meanings of ‘vow’, ‘equality’, and ‘triple gem’ (三宝 Jap. san bō).

\(^{786}\) Endō (1972: 15, n. 44) remarks that in the variant edition of the Meaning of Attaining [Enlightenment] in this Body (異本即身義 Jap. Ihon sokushingi, i.e. KDZ IV: 43-59) only the two meanings of ‘equality’ and ‘original vow’ are attested.

\(^{787}\) Endō (1972: 10) does not give any further textual reference for this claim.
All these Buddhas who are vast and innumerable are nothing else than the Buddha [nature] of one sentient being. The seventh chapter of the MVS-Commentary on Accessories indicates that paramārtha (波羅麼他 Jap. haramata), which is rendered both as 'supreme truth' (第一義 Jap. daiichi gi) as well as ‘ultimate truth’ (勝義 Jap. shōgi), is not separate from the real character of all phenomena (諸法實相 Jap. shohō jissō), and states that because all phenomena (lit. dharmas) entirely and in the same way penetrate the dharmaadhātu, they are ‘equal’, neither higher nor lower, neither stronger nor weaker. 788 Therefore, ‘equality’ is nothing else than ‘supreme truth’. 789

This ‘supreme truth’, reminds of the aforementioned quote from Kūkai’s SKJ (see supra: 112):

The Buddhas and bodhisattvas, long ago when in their causal state, finished awakening this mind, taking as their precepts supreme truth, vow, and samādhi, not for a moment forgetting, even until becoming Buddhas.

In this respect, the BDSR quotes the first chapter of the MVS:

According to the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra, all phenomena (dharmas) are devoid of marks (無相 Jap. mushō), that is to say, they are characterized by emptiness (Jap. 虚空 kokū). 790

Moreover, BDSR states:

Completing the performance of this visualization is called the bodhicitta of supreme truth. It should be known that all dharmas are ultimately empty. Already realizing that dharmas are of a non-arising nature, and that the true mind itself is tathātā, one does not perceive ‘body-and-mind’. Abiding in the realm of wisdom that is quiescence, equality, and truth, one is not caused to retreat. If the mind of delusion arises, it is recognized but must not be followed. When delusion ceases, the mind is quiescent. The ten thousand virtues are perfected, and their profound implementation is inexhaustible. (Therefore, the Buddhas of the ten directions take as their precepts the acts and vows of ultimate truth, and it is those beings equipped with this mind who can turn the Dharma wheel, benefiting self and others.) 791

788 The relevant passage is T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 654a29-b13: 梵云波羅麼他翻為第一義或云勝義薩底也此翻為諦諦義於娑字門説之今此波字門正明第一義相龍樹云第一義名諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義一切法不離諸法實相不破不壞故復次諸法中第一名為涅槃如阿毘曇云云何無上法謂智縁盡智縁盡即是涅槃若見波字即知一切法不離第一義第一義不破聖人心中所得以聖人於一切法中不取相故復次一切法皆人平等法界則無高下豈欲令無生法中有勝劣相耶是故第一義不可得也頗字門一切諸法不堅如聚沫故者.


790 As hinted by Endō (1972: 15, n. 48), the respective passage in the MVS is T. XVIII, no. 848: 1c5: [秘密主]諸法無相謂虛空相. For unclear reasons, however, White (2005: 219, n. 330), refers for this to T. XVIII, no. 848: 9b, where the respective phrase is not found. The passage of the BDSR, on the other hand, is in T. XXXII, no. 1665: 537b9-10: 如大毘盧遮那成佛經云諸法無相謂虛空相，which has been translated by White (2005: 219, s.v. B14) as follows: "As stated in the Mahāvairocanaśāstra: ‘All dharmas are without marks, their marks are the marks of emptiness’. "

791 Endō 1972: 11, citing T. XXXII, no. 1665: 573b9/10-14/16: (如大毘盧遮那成佛經云諸法無相謂虛空相)作是觀名勝義菩提心當知一切法空已悟法本無生心體自如不見身心住於寂滅平等究竟眞實之智令無退

It is stated in the *Buddhāvatamsaka-nāma-mahāvaiṣṇa-sūtra*, as follows:

Compassion is foremost, wisdom is primary;
Expedient means suit them both.
In the pure heart of Faith
Is found the immeasurable power of the *tathāgata*.
The revelation of unobstructed wisdom
Is through self-realization, and not others-originating.
Being equipped as is the *tathāgata*;
One awakens this most superior mind.
As Buddha-sons, first awakening
A profound treasure mind such as this,
Then transcend the state of the ordinary man,
And enter the realm of the acts of the Buddha;
Being born in the house of the Buddha,
A *gotra* devoid of deficiencies,
In equanimity with the Buddha,
He will certainly attain the unsurpassed Bodhi.  

From this, it has been concluded that what is called ‘supreme mind’ in the BDSR, actually denotes the ‘realm of equality’ (平等界 Jap. *byōdō kai*).
As for the second meaning of samaya, Kūkai’s Heizei reads that ‘original vow’ (honzei) is an alternate word for ‘vow’ (seigan):

The term ‘original vow’ indicates the lack of distinction that the Buddha maintains between himself and all other living beings. It is for this reason that he formulated this great vow, and that he practices compassion accordingly. This vow consists of the Four Incommensurables and the Four Acquisitions.\(^{794}\)

More specifically, it is the ‘great vow’ (大誓願, Jap. dai seigan) that denotes vowing to practice (行願 Jap. gyōgan) the four immeasurable states of mind,\(^{795}\) the four methods of winning people over,\(^{796}\) etc. –that are also expounded in the HSBK– in order to benefit all sentient beings. This undoubtedly fits the vow of practice preached in the BDSR (cf. supra: 112).\(^{797}\)

The Heizei also explains the third meaning of samaya. That is, ‘acquisition’ based on the samādhi of interpenetration as is evident from the aforementioned “[Mahāvairocana] entering me, and I entering him” (入我我入 Jap. nyū ga, ga nyū).\(^{798}\)

The term ‘acquisition’ means entrance into the self and entrance of the self. The Buddhas of oneself, numerous as specks of dust, easily enter the self of others; while the Buddhas of another self, numerous as specks of dust, easily penetrate one’s own mind’s Buddhas, and thus in complete reciprocity carry out the functions of acquirable and acquired, of potential and realization. If one meditates upon this principle, one acquires the universal mind [lit. the mind of good and evil of self and others].\(^{799}\)

In short, the MVS Commentary gives the four meanings for samaya in terms of ‘equality’, ‘original vow’, ‘removing obstacles’, and ‘sudden awakening’. Even though Kūkai undoubtedly relied on this text, the ‘samaya precepts’ of the Heizei, SKJ, and HSBK are drawn from the meanings expounded in the BDSR, i.e. ‘supreme truth’, ‘vow’, and ‘samādhi’.\(^{800}\)
The latter two of the meanings of the MSV Commentary have been substituted with ‘acquisition’, resulting in the three meanings of ‘equality’, ‘original vow’, and ‘acquisition’:

Table 15. Doctrinal meanings of *samaya*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MVS Commentary</th>
<th>Heizei / SKJ / HSBK</th>
<th>BDSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>supreme truth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>original vow</td>
<td>vow [to practice]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>removing hindrances</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td><em>samādhi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>sudden awakening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other designations*

By now it has become evident that the ‘*samaya* precepts’ are not to be considered merely as ‘precepts’, but conceal special aspects of esoteric Buddhism, and also, that their essence is discussed in a variety of texts, the most important amongst which are passages on ritual contained in the MVS, its commentary, STTS recitation sūtras, the *Safeguarding Sūtra*, *Guhyatantra*, etc. as well as in the JBKG and MSZ, which—as we have seen (cf. supra: 76)—are closely connected to the HSBK. When scrutinizing these texts, especially noteworthy is the large variety of different designations that are used to denote ‘*samaya* precepts’.

For instance, the designation attested in the first chapter of the MVS on *Performing the Deed of Mantra and Dwelling in the Mind of Bodhi* is “precepts of abiding in non-action” (住無為戒 Jap. *ju mut kai*), that is, transcendence. The *Accessories* chapter, on the other hand, includes the phrases “precepts of the wisdom that is unimpeded with regard to the three periods” (三世無障礙智戒 Jap. *sanze mushō gechi kai*), and “seal of abiding in the wisdom that is without conceptual proliferations (住無戲論智印, Jap. *jū mukeron-chi in*).

---

800 Endō 1972: 12.
801 The following examples are drawn from Yamasaki’s enumeration (1967: 251), and also that by Ueda (1933: 137-138), but it has been cross-checked, and supplemented with exact references.
803 T. XVIII, no. 848: 2a2-3: [倦成就]住無為戒, which Yamamoto (2001: 4) merely translates as: “[One who obtains this samādhi…] (will accomplish) the morality of the pure mind of bodhi.” (Emphasis added).
804 T. XVIII, no. 848: 6a25-26. Also translated as “discipline of the wisdom of non-hindrance in the three worlds” (Yamamoto Y. 2001: 18) and “discipline of the wisdom without obstacle in the three worlds” (Yamamoto Y. 2001: 19).
805 According to Yamasaki (1967: 251), this designation is mentioned in this chapter, but it is as yet not retrieved in the Taishō text, nor in any of the English translations. Here, Jap. *chi’in* is not translated as ‘wisdom-seal’,
Chapter eight on the *Practice of Manḍalas by Turning the Wheel of Syllables*\textsuperscript{806} reads “unsurpassed and correct precepts” (無上正等戒 Jap. mujō shōtō kai),\textsuperscript{807} while the *Expedients* chapter includes the term “the highest and auspicious non-active (i.e. transcendent) precepts of the Tathāgatas” (如來無上吉祥無為戒, Jap. nyorai mujō kichijō mui kai).\textsuperscript{808}

Moreover, the *MVS-Commentary* adds a number of other appellations, including “precepts on the original source of the self-nature of all sentient beings” (一切衆生自性本源之戒, Jap. issai shūjō jishō hongen no kai),\textsuperscript{809} “precepts of the fulfillment of the ten thousand virtues of original nature” (本性萬徳具足戒, Jap. honshō mantoku gusoku kai)\textsuperscript{810}, “naturally pure and adamantine precepts” (性淨金剛戒, Jap. shōjō kongō kai),\textsuperscript{811} “precepts of the undefiled inherent nature” (無漏自性之戒, Jap. murō jishō no kai),\textsuperscript{812} and “precepts of the original source of the inherent nature of all sentient beings” (一切衆生自性本源戒, Jap. issai shujō jishō hongen-kai).\textsuperscript{813}

The JBKG speaks of “precepts for the intent to attain awakening” (菩提心戒, Jap. bodaishinkai),\textsuperscript{814} while in the MSZ they are called “precepts regarding the undefiled and pure Dharma on the inner realization of all Buddhas” (諸佛内証無漏清浄法戒, Jap. shobutsu naishō murō shōjō hōkai),\textsuperscript{815} and “precepts of the correct Dharma” (真法戒, Jap. shinpō kai).\textsuperscript{816}

Interestingly, not only also major doctrinal texts and ritual manuals dating from before Kūkai, but also his own texts list various other designations for ‘*samaya* precepts’. The *Kōnin*, for instance, includes the terms “esoteric precepts” (密戒, Jap. mitsukai), “precepts for Buddhas”

\textsuperscript{806} 転字輪曼荼羅行品 Jap. Tenjirin mandara gyō hon, i.e. MVS, scroll 3, chapter 8.
\textsuperscript{807} Yamamoto Y. 2001: 90 renders this as “anuttara-samyak-śīla”.
\textsuperscript{808} T. XVIII, no. 848: 40a11-12. Translation based on Yamamoto Y. 2001: 153.
\textsuperscript{809} Retrieved in T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 757a11-12.
\textsuperscript{810} Cited in Yamashita 1967: 251, but not as such retrieved in the T.-canon. What is attested, however, is 本性萬徳具足戒 (Jap. honshō mantoku gusoku kai) in T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 766a22.
\textsuperscript{811} Attested e.g. in T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 757a12.
\textsuperscript{812} See e.g. T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 766b9.
\textsuperscript{813} Quoted in Ueda 1933: 138, but not yet found in the T.-canon.
\textsuperscript{814} E.g. T. XVIII, no. 915: 941a4.
\textsuperscript{815} E.g. T. XVIII, no. 917: 944a22, variously cited by Ueda (1933: 138) as “uncontaminated and pure precepts of the inner realization of all Buddhas” (諸佛内証無漏清浄戒, Jap. shobutsu naishō murō shōjō-kai). A preparatory survey has shown that this designation was taken over in *大日經疏妙印鈔* (Dainichikyō-sho myōin-shō, i.e. T. vol. 58, no. 2213) by Yūban (a.k.a. Ryōgen, 1270-1352) and in *小野六帖* (Ono rokujō, i.e. T. LXXVIII, no. 2473) by Ninkai (a.k.a. Senshin, 955-1046).
\textsuperscript{816} T. XVIII, no. 917: 944a24-25, and b25.
(佛戒, Jap. butsu kai; var. bukkai), “precepts for arousing bodhicitta” (発菩提心戒, Jap. hotsu bodaishin kai), “precepts of non-action” (無為戒, Jap. mui kai), etc.\(^{817}\)

It appears that in Kūkai’s works the word ‘samaya precepts’ only became prominent –namely in the SKJ, and in all likelihood also in the HSBK– that were written after his bestowal of abhiṣeka upon emperor Heizei, that is when he was 49 years old, when he started to use the designations encountered in the HSBK, namely “precepts being the esoteric symbol of Buddhas”, or “precepts being Buddha symbols”.\(^{818}\)

Although, as hinted by the concordance in appendix C below, the word ‘sanmaiya-kai’ is attested in many other texts, many of them dating well before Kūkai’s time. Even though this lifts only a corner of the much larger veil that forms my ongoing investigations, it is needless to say that further research is needed both to scrutinize these sources in order to establish a historical time frame of the terms’ origins, as well as to disentangle the aforementioned terminological jumble and describe its evolution within the context of the consecration rituals performed by masters of later Shingon subdenominations.

However, the following paragraphs already present an initial explanation of some of the most striking amongst the above designations, especially those expounded the MVS, the authoritative text on the subject.\(^{819}\)

Restating briefly, the passages in the MVS, in which the samaya precepts are specifically addressed, are the following: (1) the verses on the ‘four fundamental prohibitions’ as well as the ‘precepts concerning the wisdom that is unimpeded with regard to the three periods’ in the Accessories chapter in the second volume; (2) the regulations expounded in the context of the practical methods for reciting mantras in the explanations on the ‘instruction of spells’, or dhāraṇī (持明禁戒 Jap. jimyō-gonkai) in the fifth volume; and (3) the ‘ten good precepts’, the ‘five precepts’, and the ‘four capital offences’ in the explanations of the teachings on expedients in the 18th volume.\(^{820}\)

Regarding the ‘precepts on the wisdom that is unimpeded with regard to the three periods’, the MVS reads:

\(^{817}\) Yamasaki 1967: 252, referring to KDZ II: 861. Also listed in Ueda 1933: 144.
\(^{818}\) Yamasaki 1967: 252, referring to KDZ II: 133. On these translations, see Chapter III: 26 supra.
\(^{819}\) Yamasaki 1967: 252.
\(^{820}\) Ueda 1933: 118 and Yamasaki 1967: 253.
The practitioner who holds [i.e. has received] the mantras has thus absorbed them. Command him [i.e. the disciple] to take refuge three times of his own accord and let him repent for his previous offences. Rubbing his body with incense [as an oblation] and offering flowers and the like; [let him] worship all Bodhisattvas. You should confer upon him the ‘precepts of the wisdom that is unimpeded with regard to the three periods’ [i.e. past, present and future]. Subsequently, you should give him a toothpick821 […]

Question: Why are they called ‘precepts’?

[Answer:] It means that you must observe this even at the risk of losing your own life, and pay homage to all buddhas and bodhisattvas. The reason therefore is that if you would lose your own body, this would mean that you lose the ‘Three Things’.

Question: What is meant by these ‘Three [Things]’?

[Answer]: These are body, speech, and mind. Therefore, a son of a good family, by means of taking the precepts of body, speech, and mind, he attains [the position of] being called a bodhisattva. Why is it so? Because he is freed from [the erroneous deeds of] body, speech, and mind. [Oh] Bodhisattva-mahāsattvas, you should study it like this.822

In short, in accordance with devoting oneself to all Buddhas, becoming one of them, and obtaining their knowledge, it concerns the precepts of leaving all sins of the three activities823 behind, and that which expresses this concretely and altruistically are the aforementioned four capital prohibitions of a Bodhisattva.

As Ueda has shown, according to the explanatory notes in different commentaries, when forming the wisdom-seal (智印 Jap. chi’ìn, i.e. Skt. jñāna-mudrā)824 of Bodhisattva Nisprapañcavīhāri,825 one observes the precepts of the perfection of the pure wisdom of the Tathāgatas.826 He adds:

821 歯木 (Jap. shimoku; var. shiboku), or Skt. danta-kāṣṭham is a kind of toothpick, ca. 15 cm of length, used during the esoteric Buddhist initiation ceremony, in which the so-called shimoku-kaji (i.e. empowerment by shimoku) is carried out on the samaya precepts platform. The disciple has to hold a shimoku with his right fang, in order to mentally chew away all defilements, cf. MJ: 323a. For a picture, see BGDJ: 477. For more information, cf. BGDJ: 476, s.v. shimoku. See also Yamamoto Y. 2001: 18. Personal communication with Dr. Van der Veere has yielded that – at least in contemporary denbō kanjō rituals – it is more than a ‘toothpick’. The candidate brings a shimoku as a symbolic gift. In fact it is a piece of wood, the one side flat, the other rounded, on which one binds a flower or leaves of the shimiki (Skimmia japonica) with a kongōsen (colored vajra cord). For an illustration, also see Gonda 1928: s.v. shimoku.


823 Cf. chapter III: 57, n. 390.

824 See BGDJ: 950b.

825 Jūmukenronkō, cf. MJ: 239, no. 50, s.v. kongōjūin 金剛手院. For Jūmukenron, see MD: 894c.

826 Ueda T. 1933: 118.
Given that every single Buddha of the three realms attains Bodhi with this path, one speaks of ‘precepts of the unimpeded wisdom of the three periods’ (i.e. Skt. tatpurusa). Moreover, because making the ‘unimpeded wisdom of the three realms’ into precepts, the Buddha wisdom of the equality of the three [secrets of Body, Speech and Mind] being innate nature, becomes pureness and is leaving behind crime, abiding in Buddha Wisdom is further precepts (i.e. Skt. karmadharya). Consequently, abiding in Buddha wisdom means abiding in the great wisdom of the threefold identity of the three secrets, and is witnessing that the Body cannot be realized according to the ten kinds of illusions that arise from conditions, which further means that the five precepts and the ten good precepts are the characteristics of the precepts which come from this Body.

As for the designation ‘precepts on the instruction of spells’, it has been explained that this is the observance of the regulations (Skt. vrata) for the so-called “one session period”, which Shingon practitioners observe in order to attain siddhi. These rules are explained in the fifteenth volume of the MVS (cf. supra). Aside from the meaning of regulations which the ‘one who holds the spells (Skt. vidhyadharin) has to observe, there is also the explanation of “dhāraṇī is vrata”, or “spells equal instructions”. Therefore, the practice of the six months recitation is warding off negative phenomena, stops evil action and is in itself ‘precepts on the instruction’. The MVS says:

At that time Vajrapāni asked the World-honoured Vairocana further in verses about the ‘precepts concerning the instruction of spells’, because it is part of the bodhisattva practice that has to be learnt by all Bodhisattvas of the Mantra school.

Then, Vajrapāni asks the following five questions to Vairocana Tathāgata: (1) How does one accomplish the ‘precepts on the instruction’; (2) How does one abide in the precepts; (3) How does one practice without attachment; (4) How long does one hold the ‘precepts on the instruction; and (5) How does one attain the same virtue and influence of Vairocana? Vairocana Tathāgata answers them, but few details are mentioned on the ‘precepts on instruction’. Hower, according to Ueda, that which has to be looked at concerning the characteristics of these precepts, is the ritual of the six months recitation. In order to attain siddhi, the holder of the spells does the following:

---

827 三平等 (Jap. sanbyōdō), i.e. “the esoteric doctrine that the three –body, mouth, and mind– are one and universal. Thus in samadhi the Buddha body is found everywhere and in everything (pan-Buddha), every sound becomes a mantra, and these are summed up in mind, which being “universal is my mind and my mind it,” cf. DBJ, referring to DCBT: 64; BGDJ: 486a.

828 禁戒 (Jap. gonkai) refers to morality (i.e. śīla), which means abstaining from wrongdoing and avoiding evil by adhering to the regulations. It can also mean temporary discipline, specific to a certain situation, that is vrata.

829 一定期間 (Jap. ittei kikan), i.e. the recitation during six months (六月念誦 Jap. rokugatsu nenju).

830 Ueda T. 1933: 118.

831 Ueda T. 1933: 118 referring to T. XVIII, no. 848: 37b19.

832 Ibid.
During the first month, he contemplates the yellow-coloured maṇḍala of the vajra sphere and pictures himself sitting in it, he himself becoming the syllable āḥ and forming the five-pronged vajra seal with his hands, while reciting the syllable āḥ. While visualizing this, the syllable āḥ is recited incessantly by means of abdominal respiration with nasal inhalation. Inducing the virtue of the syllable āḥ being the element Earth, he continues until it expresses one character and one taste with Vairocana, who is the principle of Truth.

In the second month, he visualizes the white-coloured circle of the element Water and the syllable vaḥ. In the third month it is the visualization of the red-coloured triangle of the element Fire and the syllable ra. In the fourth month it is the visualization of the black-coloured semicircle (or: half-moon-shape) of the element Wind and the syllable ha. In the fifth month, it is the compound visualization of the Water-circle and the Earth-square. In the sixth month, it is the compound visualization of Fire and Wind.

Subsequently, during the first month one does not consume anything other than milk. In the second month, one is restricted to water. In the third one does not request any food and one eats only when it is donated. During the fourth month it is provided that one consumes only the wind. During the fifth month one does not eat any food, but one consumes the inhaled and exhaled breath of reciting mantras. In the sixth month, the syllable ha is considered as representing all nutrition.

Because “dhāraṇī is vrata”, one can say that these regulations on food are nothing else than vrata, or ‘precepts’. However, six months recitation is something which is provisionally explained and when also the instructions assume that format, they are the ‘three equalities of the reality of Mahāvairocana,’ the actual adamantine contemplation. The samaya precepts are not different from this, and especially are to be observed by the esoteric practitioner during the ‘one session period’, but because this period is based on one lakṣa (i.e. a hundred thousand), only ending when one attains siddhi, it is in fact not a fixed period at all.

The fifth chapter of the MVS-Commentary, also explains the meaning of ‘precepts of the wisdom that is unimpeded in the three periods’, and supplements this with the designations ‘adamantine seal of abiding in non-conceptual proliferation’, and ‘precepts of abiding in non-action’:

The reason why bodhisattvas aspire (lit. arouse the mind in order) to receive training in the expedient means, is because they all [want to] attain the pure wisdom and compassion of the Tathāgatas, [which enables them] to thoroughly understand all phenomena (dharmas) of the three periods in [just] a single thought, without [experiencing any] obstructions. The reason why there are [people] who abide by these precepts, is because from the first moment that one experiences the luminous path, that is, when there is suchness and one does not think about conjecturing, or forces [oneself] to understand, then, by means of these precepts, one will personally be able to arouse Buddha compassion, and one will also [understand] the

833 六趣方曼荼羅 (Jap. kongōhō mandara), cf. MD: 651a. s.v. gorin 五輪.
834 五股金剛印 (Jap. goko-kongō-in), cf. MD: 583c, s.v. 五股ノ印 goko no in.
835 水輪 (Jap. suirin), cf. MD, p. 651a. s.v. gorin 五輪.
836 Ueda T. 1933: 129.
837 Ibid.
limitedness of the discipline of the two vehicles. Therefore, it is called the ‘precepts of the wisdom that is unimpeded in the three periods’. 838

[... The Mahāvairocanasūtra says: “If a son of a good family abides by these precepts, then he should unite body, speech, and mind, and make it one.”] As for these precepts, the Sanskrit/Indic [text] call them samvara, which refers both to ‘cause’ as well as ‘attainment’, and bears the meaning of ‘precepts’. That which is called the expedient of compassion, precisely is that which is assembled and attained, while ‘śīla’, on the other hand, means ‘pure’. Further, samvara also bears the meaning of ‘equality’. The Buddha says unite body, speech and thought. This precisely is the dharma gate of the triple equality [of these mysteries], and that which is obtained is called the ‘precepts that are undefiled in the three periods’. (Just as the Buddha outlined the instructions [lit. teachings and discipline, or: prohibitions] on behalf of all śrāvakas, and spoke: “this path of the three activities is pure, and is the human rebirth of a great sage”. After twelve years passed, he slightly adapted their meaning and established the various categories of discipline. Now, as for these abridged precepts for [the holder of] spells (dhāraṇīs), it is likewise: if a practitioner [practices] the triple equality of the expedients of the three activities all in the correct order (or: correctly), then he should understand, and instantly possess every single discipline of all buddhas.) Moreover, splitting (or: disentangling) the network of various thoughts, this is also a meaning of samvara. Namely, it refers to the network of the various views of conceptual proliferation. The two aspects of horizontal and vertical duplicate each other and are entangled. Therefore, it is called ‘net(work)’. Now, practitioner, the activities of visualizing (i.e. mind), body, and speech are fundamentally not separate entities, but are closely related, [because] when returning to their origin, they are nothing but one mind, and the true (or: real) characteristic of this mind is eternal, it is equal to the dharma-dhātu. Therefore, when abiding by these precepts, the various activities of body, speech, and mind all have (or: share) the same single aspect [by means of which] the immeasurable net(work) of views are all cleansed. Hence, the meaning of ‘adamantine seal of abiding without conceptual proliferations’ is obtained. (The fact that the Mahāvairocanasūtra says: “Do not construct all phenomena (Skt. dharmas)” [is because] the various categories of the five aggregates (Skt. skandhas, i.e. matter, sensation, perception, mental formations, and consciousness) are based on defilements (Skt. kleśa), and defilements are based on activities. These various activities all emerge form body, speech, and mind, which resembles reducing the division between body, speech, and mind [in order] to create the path of the ten categories of good and evil actions. Study these clues, which are countless and limitless. Therefore, the three activities are simply that what you [should] cultivate, namely it is the practice that offers advancement and has effect. If one fails to advance, then [that is because] of having distorted perceptions. Because of distorted perceptions, innumerable characteristics are created, and, all these characteristics are that what keeps you from attaining the unimpeded Buddha knowledge.) Now, practitioner, deeply contemplate the phrases on the arousal of the ten causes, and fully understand the absolute non-arising of the three activities, as well as eternal non-activity of the dharma-nature. Therefore, it is called ‘precepts of abiding in the unconditioned’. 839

838 菩薩所以發心攝受方便學處皆爲成就如來清淨智慧於一念中了達三世諸法無罣礙故其有住斯戒者乃至初見心明道時即有如是不思議勢分以此戒親能發生佛慧又對二乘律儀有限量故以三世無障礙智爲名也, i.e. T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 626b26-c2, cited in Yamasaki 1967: 253, with added emphasis.
839 [經云若族姓子住是戒者當以身語意合而爲一者此戒梵云三嚩羅是共縁共成此戒之義所謂慧方便等之所集成若尸羅者但是清淨義也又三嚩羅是平等義佛言以身口意合爲一者即是住三平等法門所以得名三世無障礙戒也 (如佛爲諸聲聞略説教誡則云此三業道淨是大仙人道從十二年後稍演其義成種種律儀今此持明略戒義亦如是若行人三業方便悉皆正順三平等處當知具一切諸佛律儀也) 復次裂諸想網是三嚩羅義調戲論諸見之網經緯相成重複交絡故名爲網今行者觀身口業自無別體統末歸本唯是一心而此心實相常是平等法界是故住此戒時種種身口意業皆同一相無量見網皆悉淨除是故得名住無戲論金剛印也經云不作一切諸法者種種五陰依於煩惱煩惱依於業是種種業皆由身口意生如約身口意分爲十種善惡業道究其條緒則無量無邊是故三業凡所修行則有進趣之行失進趣者則爲倒想由倒想故有無量相生爲此諸相所礙不得佛無
From this perspective, abiding by the ‘samaya precepts’ comes down to offering your own body, speech, and mind, that is your entire body and entire soul to the Buddhas. The word ‘samaya’ per se designates ‘equality’, while ‘precepts’ denotes either saṃvara or śīla. Skt. Saṃvara means ‘control’, ‘regulation’, etc., but in the citation above it denotes ‘the attainment of the expedient of compassion’, which also points at ‘equality’. It is precisely this ‘equality’ that forms the culmination of the HSBK ritual practice, in which the disciple becomes, or actually is reminded of the fact that he is Buddha.

礙智) 今行者深觀十緣生句了知三業畢竟不生法性自爾常無動作是名住無為戒也, T. XXXIX, no. 1796: 629b12/13-2728c4-6, cited in Yamasaki 1967: 253-254, with added emphasis.

V. CONCLUSION

As shown above (Chapter II), precepts conferred in Buddhist ordination rituals reached Japan only in the Nara period, but were further institutionalized in the course of the early Heian period. In this context, Kūkai embraced both vinaya and sīla, which have been coined together in the term kairitsu (Chapter IV). It has been clarified that Kūkai complied with the existing system of SBR ordinations at Tōdaiji, but—for several reasons that have been pointed out above—added the UBR as the vinaya to be studied in the Shingon curriculum. However, in order to stress the uniqueness of Shingon, he promoted the introduction of a third, and new set of precepts, namely the samaya.

Kūkai stated that one must also strictly uphold the exoteric precepts, and instructed his disciples to get full ordination on the precepts platform of Tōdaiji, for “given the absolute all-embracing principle of the maṇḍalas, upholding the Hīnayāna precepts as such is also upholding the esoteric samaya precepts”. In opposition to those for śrāvakas, pratyeka-buddhas, and mainstream Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, the HSBK (Chapter III) calls these fundamental precepts of Mikkyō ‘the symbol of Buddhas’. They are a crucial condition for being bestowed esoteric consecration, for “those who are about to enter this vehicle must first of all abide by the precepts. These are named samaya, and the teaching is called Shingon.”

Some scholars have argued that Kūkai cannot be considered the genuine author of the HSBK (Chapter IV), mostly because of its relation with principally two other texts: the first being either Kūkai’s own work, or of unknown authorship (JHBK), and the second (KSK) being allegedly composed by Ennin. When reading the HSBK within the framework of Kūkai’s precepts view, however, there are many indications that adduce arguments in support of the hypothesis that it may have been precisely the opposite.

In this respect, one may recall the discussion on the origin of the Hizōki that has traditionally been centered around two theories, that is, either it is the record of Amoghavajra’s instruction to Huiguo, Kūkai’s handwritten notes of oral instructions received from Huiguo. The validity

841 Ueda T. 1933: 142.
842 BKD IX: 116d, s.v. Sanmaiyakaigi.
of the first interpretation is solely depending on the connection of Amoghavjra’s instructions on a single ritual procedure to a colophon attached to a Hizōki ritual manual that is allegedly imported by Ennin. As Abe says, “because Huiguo studied with Amoghavajra, such an identity does not necessarily suggest that he is the author of the Hizōki. On the other hand, the Hizōki contains many elements that emphasize the unity of the garbha and vajradhātu manḍalas and highlight the distinction between the exoteric and esoteric. These elements, absent in Amoghavjra’s other writings, are the hallmark of Kūkai’s texts”.

In the same way, also the HSBK invocation of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of both manḍalas stresses their unity, and the precepts expounded clearly make the distinction between the exoteric and esoteric approaches. Even though undoubtedly more research is needed, the undeniable presence of elements in the HSBK that are consistent with Kūkai’s precepts view, as distilled from his own writings, suggests that questioning the HSBK’s authenticity is no longer tenable.

In my view, the JHBK and KSK can very well have been two separate texts that actually comprise Kūkai’s notes of oral instructions he received from Huiguo during his stay in China between 804-806. Upon his return to Japan these were later (cf. infra) combined into one ritual manual, the HSBK, which has always circulated together with his SKJ, being its “preface” that contains the sprouts for the JJSR, his magnum opus compiled on imperial command around 830.

It has also been pointed out that the ritual procedure of the HSBK appears to be based on such texts as the JBKG and the MSZ. That is, while the mantras are borrowed from the former, the format of the precepts conferral ritual as such is taken from the latter. However, the four capital and the ten important prohibitions expounded in the HSBK are not attested in the JBKG, and while the ten important prohibitions are discussed in the MSZ, the four are not. The ten important prohibitions are an elaboration on the four capital prohibitions, but only the four major prohibitions are considered to be the esoteric pārājikā offences. We can therefore argue that it was precisely the HSBK that added these key elements to the established esoteric initiation procedure, and brought it to a higher level. It is exactly with the exposition of the pārājikā offences in esoteric terms that the HSBK gives evidence of a culmination of an esotericization process of the Buddhist precepts.

---

844 Abe 1999: 487-488, n. 60.
Moreover, as already suggested by e.g. Yamasaki (1967), the close relation of the HSBK with texts of which the authenticity has not been questioned, such as the SKJ, Kōnin and Heizei, may indicate that the former has been composed at the same time when Kukai wrote the latter texts, i.e. ca. 822. Of course, he incorporated the guidelines of other guidebooks (such as the MSZ and JBKG) into the HSBK ritual manual, but –as for instance Abe (1999) has shown– exactly this strategy was crucial in his construction of esoteric Buddhist discourse.

Ultimately, it was in the HSBK ritual manual that Kūkai institutionalized the samaya precepts as a crucial tool to officially sanction entrance into the community of esoteric practitioners. They not only “signify a dramatic transformation” for the disciple, who by passing through this rite –as the HSBK says– ‘marks himself as a Buddha’, and is acknowledged as such by the esoteric community, but –as later divergent interpretations exemplify– also point at a crucial transformation in the perception of Buddhist precepts in Japan.

Precepts taken by practitioners of various religious denominations exceed geographic boundaries and have been always transformed over time, but the samaya express the possibility to access the innermost essence of the original enlightened nature of humans, rather than being an ethic code administering practical regulations for all one’s daily actions.

As Kūkai said (see also chapter IV: 103-104), non-Buddhist denominations pursue an afterlife in heaven by cultivating the ‘ten good deeds’, śrāvakas rely on the ‘four noble truths’, and pratīkabuddhas cultivate vows for individual liberation, bodhisattvas practice the six pārāmitās, as well as the four methods, and cultivate the threefold pure precepts. However, the ‘precepts that are the mark of Buddha’ are the special precepts of esotericism, for indeed, with samaya being equality, or the universal identity with the entire cosmos as embodied in Mahāvairocana, one may conclude, perhaps with the paradox of the samaya code, that is, all beings are equal, but some realize it more than others…

845 Orzech 2011b: 85.
POSTSCRIPT:

RE-CONSIDERING “BUDDHIST ESOTERICISM”

As we move further into the twenty-first century, it has been pointed out that “the legitimacy of Western science and rationalism” is being challenged by two opposite, but mutually reinforcing, movements, which Arthur Melzer (professor in political science at Michigan State University) has called “the ancient force of religious orthodoxy and the ‘postmodern’ one of historicism and cultural relativism.” Indeed, in the age of globalized consumer capitalism, perhaps more than ever in the history of humankind, individuals feel an urge to construct ‘new’ ways to express their identity, based on a discourse of ‘difference’ and ‘uniqueness’ (see for instance, the ganguro or ‘black face’ alternative fashion trend of died hair and tanned skin amongst Japanese young female Tokyoites).

However, in a simultaneous reaction to an increasingly pluralistic world, there also appears a return to ‘traditional’ forms of Weltanschauung, that are highly influenced by orthodox interpretations of religion (one example of which being the activities of Europeans jihadi). In so far ‘historicism’ is perceived as “the theory and practice which privileges historical explanation on the grounds that ideas, values, and practices ... are discrete products of particular cultures rather than trans-historical manifestations of essential, universal features of human identity and society” (even though one might ask why historicism itself is repeating the same mistake by presenting yet another ‘trans-historical’ scheme, cf. ‘history’, ‘culture’, etc.), it may—as Melzer suggests—indeed be presented as a postmodern critique of absolutist conceptions of value and knowledge. Thus considered, historicism may very well relate both to cultural relativism, that is, historicism is relativist not only because it emphasizes an endless variety of cultures as peculiar individualizations, but also because it is ‘observer-dependent’, in the Mannheimian sense of “all historical knowledge is relational knowledge, and can only be formulated with reference to the position of the observer”.

Writing dissertations also makes us observers, and it is precisely this observer-position that conditions our research perspectives. Ultimately, the pursuit of ‘objective’ knowledge cannot be totally free from any subjective contamination or bias, personal aims or purposes, but in accordance with contemporary standards of academic research, as an observer, one must at

---

848 Melzer 2006: 279.
least try to approach the research subject with an as high as possible degree of ‘epistemic objectiveness’ (or observer-in-dependence). One of the first steps, then, is to reflect on the ‘objectiveness’ not only of the methods that are at our disposal to conduct the research, but also of the categories that are available to describe its subject.

The subject of the present project pertains to the history of religions, and more precisely, focused on the emergence and development of ‘esoteric precepts’ of samaya, a term used as a literal translation of 密戒 (Jap. mitsu-kai). When asking, however, what this qualifier ‘esoteric’ in this context means, both primary sources and secondary works remain surprisingly silent. Moreover, it seems that historians of religion have used the term ‘esoteric’ to refer to a ‘special’ (and therefore ‘different’) category of ‘Buddhism’, without paying much (if any serious) attention to how they define it, nor to what its analytical utility might be when applied, for instance, in a discussion of ‘Buddhist’ phenomena in medieval Japan.\(^{850}\)

Indeed, based on its semantic connections to the indigenous term mikkyō, it has been argued that the English word ‘esoteric’ is preferred over ‘tantric’ when addressing ‘Vajrayāna Buddhism’ in East Asia (including Japan).\(^{851}\) However, the conditions of the possibility to impose derivations of the concept ‘esotericism’ on this context seem to be hardly of consideration.\(^{852}\) Surely, as Griffith Foulk has insisted, even though “it is sometimes objected that historians, especially intellectual or religious historians, should not impose their own categories on the foreign countries they study,” the reality remains that “when it comes time to explain and interpret what one has learned, using one’s own language, and operating within the constraints of one’s own academic discipline, it is manifestly impossible to use only concepts borrowed from the foreign tradition that is the object of study.”\(^{853}\) In the context of this dissertation the main problem, however, is not the mere imposition of the qualifier ‘esoteric’ as such, but rather, the fact that this is often done without sufficient attention for the connotations this term may invoke to the English-versed reader who may have preconceptions about ‘esotericism’ quite different from those warranted in the East Asian Buddhist context.\(^{854}\)

---

\(^{850}\) Exceptions are Payne 2006, Orzech 2006 and Orzech at al. 2010.

\(^{851}\) On this preference, see e.g. Orzech 2006: 36. For “the trouble with Tantra” and the category of ‘Tantrism’, cf. ibid.: esp. 36-38.

\(^{852}\) One, although implicit, exception to this negligence may be Orzech 2006.


\(^{854}\) Although Groner 1990 in passing called for caution in the use of the term ‘esoteric’, because “in contemporary Western religious culture ‘esoteric’ can carry connotations unwarranted in the East Asian Buddhist context,” an in-depth treatment is still lacking.
Esoterism and/or esotericism: what’s in a name?

According to The MacMillan Encyclopedia of Religion, edited by the famous historian of religion Mircea Éliade (1907-1986), the English term ‘esotericism’ –formerly known as ‘esoterism’ – is borrowed from the French word ‘ésotérisme’, which was first coined in 1828 by the French philosopher and historian Jacques Matter (1791-1864). The Dictionnaire critique de l’ésotérisme (1998), also contains an entry on the term’s history. Here, the French historian of esotericism, Jean-Pierre Laurent (1935-) traces the recent use of the noun ‘ésotérisme’ back to France of the 1830-40s, and simultaneously substantiates that the adjective ‘ésotérique’ (English: esoteric) was already attested in documents of the end of the eighteenth century.

Regardless of the question, whether it was the adjective or the noun that was first invented, there appears to be academic consensus over the fact that the emergence of both terms actually date back to a so-called ‘epistemological rupture’ that occurred already from the fifteenth century onwards. According to Carole Frosio, author of ‘L’ésotérisme entre histoire et tradition’ (published in the Brill series Aries I/1, 2001: 88-125), it is in this light that one may see “the creation of the more appropriate term ‘esotericism’ by Anglo-Saxon academics”.

Interestingly, Frosio refers to the opinion of proponents of so-called ‘Western esotericism’ that, generally speaking, there are two meanings of ‘ésotérisme’, namely “ésotérisme comme connaissance secrète” and “ésotérisme comme type de connaissance ou d ’expérience renvoyant à un lieu, à un centre et partant de là, les moyens, les techniques destines à atteindre ce lieu”. Based on this double definition, Frosio makes a distinction between ‘esoterism’ and ‘esotericism’. While the former in her view pertains to those two meanings, the latter, on the other hand, is limited to the history of ‘Western’ or ‘occidental’ esoteric currents that are “parfaitement circoncrits dans le temps et dans l’espace”. As a consequence, she observes that “la recherché universitaire limite son accès au religieux à l’étude d’événements humains

---

856 Edited by Jean Servier (1918-2000), an ethnologist, who was professor at the Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences in Montpellier.
857 Frosio 2001: 96; von Stuckrad 2005: 80. Laurent is the founder of Politica hermetica, an association for the study of the social influence of “Western” esoteric thought that publishes a journal of the same name.
858 Implied here is so-called “Renaissance Paganism”, cf. von Stuckrad 2006.
859 Frosio 2001: 96, n. 4. Translated from French original.
déroulés dans le temps et l’espace à partir de la conscience que des croyants ont d’une réalité “méta-empirique” exprimée de façon empirique”.861

Regardless of these discriminations, it has to be pointed out that both the English and the French words for ‘esotericism’ stem from the Greek ἐσωτερικός and refer to “what is ‘inner’ or hidden, what is known only to the initiated few, and closed to the majority of mankind in the exoteric world”.862 In other words, they bear a meaning of “what is interior and therefore out of sight”. 863 Indeed, just as Charles Orzech has pointed out, in its earliest usage, ‘esotericism’ appears in “a contrastive or binary pairing”. This usage can be traced back to the early second-century claim in a satire by the Syrian rhetorician Lucian of Samosata (ca. 125-180 C.E.), that the founder of Western philosophy, Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.), drew a distinction between his ‘esoteric’ and ‘exoteric’ works.864

**Esotericism as form of thought**

The first influential definition of ‘esotericism’ as an object of academic inquiry is in the work of Antoine Faivre (emeritus of the École Pratique des Hautes Études at the Sorbonne), who is considered the ‘father’ of the study of ‘Western esotericism’ in the European academia. Given that Faivre aspires to respect cultural ‘differences’,865 he restricts himself to “modern and contemporary currents of Western esotericism,” and dismisses “essentialist, universalist, doctrinal and thematic criteriologies of esotericism as inadequate.”866

864 Orzech 2006: 39, where he refers to Urban 2003: 273-274. See also von Stuckrad 2005: 80, which mentions that the term ‘exoteric’ is older than ‘esoteric’. There is also an increasing attention for the study of esotericism in the work of other philosophers. See e.g. the treatment of Heidegger by Waite 1998, of Machiavelli, Galileo, Leibniz and others in Bagley 1992: esp. 232-235, or of Diderot, Toland, and Rousseau in Melzer 2006: esp. 280.
865 Faivre 1992: 18, cited in Frosio 2001: 98: “Du mot ésoérisme, il s’agit de faire bon usage. De ne pas le considérer comme porteur d’une valeur spirituelle ou sémantique que par lui-même il ne détient pas […] De considérer qu’il s’agit d’une forme d’esprit, d’un style d’imaginaire […] L’approche propose ici traduit un double souci. D’une part, le respect des différences; d’autre part, la nécessité d’une recherche empirique, sans a priori idéologique, des voies transverbales ou des chemins de raccordements.”
866 Faivre explains this in his definitive book Access to Western Esotericism (New York, State University of New York Press: 1994; which includes the first English edition of his Accès de l’ésoterisme occidental, Paris: Gallimard, 1986). In contrast to a typology that is clearly delimited in time and place, e.g. Faivre’s restriction to ‘modern’ and ‘Western’ currents, “essentialist criteriologies define ‘esotericism’ as a universal and therefore trans-historical phenomenon; although its manifestations may differ, the essence of ‘esotericism’ is always and everywhere the same.” Even though “essentialist criteriologies are universal, but not all universalist criteriologies are essentialist,” Faivre nevertheless rejects non-essentialist universalist criteriologies of esotericism”. His example is Pierre A. Riffard’s identification of esotericism as an ‘anthropological structure’ (cf.
The main criterion for his approach to ‘esotericism’ is a family resemblance based on “a form of thought” (French: *forme the pensée*),\(^{867}\) that has six fundamental characteristics: (1) universal interdependence; (2) living nature; (3) imagination and mediations; (4) transmutation, (5) praxis of concordance; (6) transmission. The first four he calls ‘intrinsic’ or indispensable, the latter two ‘secondary’ or ‘relative’, that is, these features do often, but not always occur.\(^{868}\)
Esotericism as group mentality with an internal structure

In contrast to Faivre, who historically and geographically delimits ‘esotericism’, Lee Irwin (professor of religious studies at the College of Charleston, and specialist in the history of Native American religions) considers ‘esotericism’ as a ‘global’ phenomenon\(^{869}\) that may be defined in two ways. That is, either in terms of “its external social relations and tensions with parent religious traditions, [as well as] its place within a larger cultural context often ignorant or dismissive of esoteric concerns, or [in terms of] its internal sanctioning processes by which members become fully fledged masters of their school.”\(^{870}\)

According to Irwin, ‘esotericism’ can be characterized as an “external group mentality” centered on three intersecting aspects, and internally as built around a fourfold structural core. The three aspects are: (1) hierarchical; (2) socially secretive, and (3) relatively unknown or marginalized by a conservative majority of a conventional religious tradition. The five key elements of the structural core comprise: (1) the unfolding spiritual teachings in a progressive, step-by-step manner; (2) the presence of a concept of ‘initiatic grace’; (3) the relation to “unique and special theologies whose cosmic dimensions are highly personalized”; (4) the “incorporation of physical disciplines borrowed from various Yogic … and Tantric … schools; and (5) a recasting of cosmological perceptions and beliefs as impacted by theories in modern science.”\(^{871}\)

---

\(^{869}\) He writes: “Increasingly, the structural contents of contemporary American esoteric thought are being borrowed from highly diverse sources, particularly Eastern religions which have become increasingly popular and widespread. The entire "new age" movement is largely a deconstruction of normative, exoteric Christianity through a process of gradual acceptance of Eastern teachings, many of which are highly esoteric. For example, Tibetan Buddhism has increasingly influenced both American and Europeans through the formation of various institutions, monasteries, and popular teachers, who give open seminars on Tantra, teach meditation, hold empowerment ceremonies, and instruct Westerners in various esoteric arts or practices. … The global future of esotericism is not and cannot be bound by its relationship to any particular religious tradition or institution. The history of increasing religious pluralism on a global scale reflects an opening of intellectual and spiritual horizons which can only result in an increasing complexity in future conceptualization of "esotericism". Scholarship in this area needs to address itself to a greater analysis of the multi-traditional influences that have impacted the formative history of esotericism in both Europe and America. Further, the impact of this cross-fertilization has also impacted thought and perception in the religious cultures of India, Japan, and Southeast Asia (and somewhat less, China). The influence is not only one way, but part of a greater international exchange, starting in the nineteenth century with ideas that have profoundly affected Eastern thinkers like Aurobindo or Gandhi or the Dalai Lama and certainly has affected the many Eastern teachers that have emigrated to western countries. In the process, the very core concepts of Eastern religions are changing and evolving, as are the esoteric teachings of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. In such dynamic circumstances, the liminal group or the creative individual who is not part of a particular religious tradition has an incredible wealth of materials to draw on in formulating an esoteric view of spirituality. In such a context, the future of esotericism will surely become increasingly global, international, and pluralistic.” (Irwin 2001: 33-34, emphasis added)

\(^{870}\) Irwin 2001: 2.

\(^{871}\) When considered externally, the three intersecting aspects are: (1) **Hierarchical**, which in his view, is evident from the transmission of the teachings from master to disciple. This is possible only “in successive stages of
Esotericism as Janus-faced elitism

A third approach to ‘esotericism’ is advocated by Hugh Urban (cf. supra). He argues that “the esoteric tradition is based on a central Janus-faced identity or a clear split between the esoteric and exoteric realms.” That is, “it allows the individual to live a seemingly orthodox, traditional, conservative life in the outer social world, while at the same time, leading a secret inner life, often involving powerful heterodox or even antinomian esoteric practices.” Based on this, Urban advocates that esotericism, contrary to many popular conceptions, is “by no means primarily a “counter-cultural” or “subversive” [nor revolutionary] phenomenon.” Rather, it is very often an elitist phenomenon, the province of highly educated, affluent and powerful intellectuals, who wish, not to undermine [nor over-throw] existing social [or

initiatic training, and after sufficient preparation requiring lengthy periods of discipline and often special empowerment rituals.” In other words, “the central condition for accessing esoteric knowledge is membership in a relatively small circle of usually male practitioners.” (Irwin 2001: 1); (2) Socially secretive. This idea relates to his definition of esotericism as those “teachings or practices that resist orthodox interpretations, and are ‘hidden’ because of issues of political or religious persecution”. (Irwin 2001: 1. For a treatment of ‘forbidding knowledge’ in European esoteric traditions, see Allen 1996); and (3) Relatively unknown or marginalized by a conservative majority of a conventional religious tradition, which as Irwin argues, “stems from an extrapolation of the tension between the ‘known’ or commonly accepted orthodoxy of a religious tradition and the ‘unknown’ (or institutionally unrecognized) teachings or practices of various esoteric groups within that religious tradition.” Therefore, “the status of such groups is often marginalized by the refusal of the parent religion to recognize the legitimacy of various non-conventional interpretations or practices.” (Irwin 2001: 1. Italics added)

In addition, Irwin maintains that there is a structural core inherent to esotericism, which comprises five key aspects: (1) Unfolding spiritual teachings in a progressive, step-by-step manner “(even where spontaneity is emphasized) that leads to new insights and awareness.” According to Irwin, this phased process is further “elaborated in a series of gradual revelation, or progressive insights, leading to desired realizations of spiritual truth”, and may be facilitated by employing “elaborate rituals, ceremonial initiations, moral and ethical training, physical disciplines, and inner development techniques that are taught over a sustained period of learning.” (Irwin 2001: 5, emphasis added); (2) Presence of a concept of ‘initiatic grace’ or “the transfer of power or special ability from a teacher to a student.” This he relates to the idea that the “inner structural process of esoteric transmission of understanding” does not only occur “through the simple learning of intellectual ideas or the mastery of a certain vocabulary or external ritual behavior.” On the contrary, it is the transmission itself that one is to regard as “a medium of spiritual affirmation, an ‘awakening’ by which the recipient comes to fully value the reality of that which is transmitted.” Moreover, this empowerment is conceived “as a psychic or soulful realization of fluid currents and emanations that constitute a more illumined state of awareness or a more empowered state of being,” and these currents are often “related to cosmic entities, sometimes mythicized and sometimes not, whose value is expressed in symbols of unification or harmonic wholeness.” (Irwin 2001: 5-6); (3) The relationship to “unique and special theologies whose cosmic dimensions are highly personalized” and “involve an often radical re-personalization of the physical world.” (Irwin 2001: 6); (4) The “incorporation of physical disciplines borrowed from various Yogic … and Tantric … schools, [including] meditation, recitation of sacred names, the use of ritual implements and drawings, arcane gestures, combined with visualization techniques.” (Irwin 2001: 6-7); and (5) especially in contemporary globalized forms, “a recasting of cosmological perceptions and beliefs as impacted by theories in modern science”. (Irwin 2001: 7-8. With added emphasis)

For this, he draws upon the work of Gerhard (a.k.a. Gershom) Scholem (1897-1982), a specialist in Jewish mysticism who worked at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Urban 1997: 3. For more information on Jewish mysticism, see e.g. Berman 2009.

See e.g. Morrission 2008; and also von Stuckrad 2005: esp. 81.
religious and political] structures, but subtly to reinforce them, or else bend and reshape them according to [or in order to suit] their own [private] interests”.

In short, Urban perceives esotericism as a type of elitism that employs “three primary strategies”: (1) What one might call a social strategy, namely “the creation of a new social space or private sphere, which promises ‘equality’ and liberation for all classes, while at the same time constructing new and more rigid hierarchies”; (2) a hermeneutical strategy or “style of reading texts”, which “appropriates the authority of traditional scriptures, while at the same time asserting the superiority of esoteric exegesis”; (3) a ritual strategy, which in his view, is enacted especially through secret initiation, and “creates a homology between the body of the initiate, the hierarchy of the cosmos and the hierarchy of the esoteric sect, inscribing the individual in the body of the order, and inscribing the order into the human body.”

Esotericism as gnosis

As editor-in-chief of Esoterica, an academic journal for the study of esotericism, Arthur Versluis wrote in his ‘Gnosis: A Modest Proposal’ (2002) that “no single methodological approach – be it empirico-historical, typological, internal, or otherwise – should dominate this field of study, for each genuinely investigative approach has something to offer in developing a broader and deeper understanding of esotericism.” A fourth definition, therefore, is his description of ‘esotericism’ as “a term referring to cosmological or metaphysical religious or spiritual knowledge that is restricted to or intended for a limited group, and not for society at large.” In other words, he perceives the word ‘esoteric’ as referring to “secret or semi-secret spiritual knowledge, including both cosmological and metaphysical gnosis … [as well as] phenomena classed as mysticism.”

874 Urban 1997: 1; original emphasis left aside, and additions taken from ibid.: 3. For his conception of “elitism”, see ibid. 32, n. 7. In this reasoning, esotericism may be less ‘socially secretive’ than at first glance suggested in Irwin’s aforementioned external characterization. However, also Irwin acknowledges the ‘elitist’ aspect: “Another aspect of esotericism is the problem of "elitism" or the tendency for esoteric schools to emphasize adherence to core doctrines that are intellectually sophisticated but requisite for advancement into the "advanced" circles of that school. In turn, this tends to reinforce tensions between in-group and out-group members who do or do not conform to the intellectual or emotional expectations of the core membership. The authoritative structures of esotericism have revolved around the experiences of the founder, the elaboration of teachings and practices based on foundational experience presented in a "graded" advancement, the sanctioning of advanced members who have reduplicated the requisite experiences, the training of members in various types of arcane lore, and the conferring of status titles on those considered to have mastered the full teachings of the school.” (Irwin 2001: 2)

875 Urban 1997: 1, with additions taken from ibid. p. 4. The term ‘social strategy’ is my interpretation.
Central to his interpretation is that he considers the concept of ‘gnosis’ as the core characteristic of esotericism. He further advocates that the recognition of the ‘unique’ nature of ‘esotericism’ is the condition for its full development as a field of scholarly inquiry. In his view, this ‘uniqueness’ lies not in its “trans-disciplinary nature alone, but the fact that its manifold currents are each concerned with new ways of knowing, with the transcendence of the self-other dichotomy.” Thus, “while purely historical research obviously has its place in this field, the most important works will be those … that also seek to reveal the kinds of consciousness esotericism entails, that seek to bring us into new ways of seeing and knowing.”

876 “I choose to define esotericism primarily in terms of gnosis because gnosis, of whatever kind, is precisely what is esoteric within esotericism. ‘Esotericism’ describes the historical phenomena to be studied; ‘gnosis’ describes that which is esoteric, hidden, protected, and transmitted within these historical phenomena. Without hidden knowledge to be transmitted in one fashion or another, one does not have esotericism.” (Versluis 2002: 10)

According to Versluis, there are two meanings or layers of gnosos, namely: (1) cosmological gnosos, which is “knowledge or direct perception of hidden or esoteric aspects of the cosmos” and “still entails a subtle dualism of subject-object”, but “to some extent belongs to the realm of knowledge, and reveals correspondences between subject and object, or between humanity and the natural world” upon which one draws “in order to achieve some aim”; and (2) metaphysical gnosos, which he defines as non-dualistic and “direct spiritual insight into complete transcendence.” (Versluis 2002: 2)

In his view, the word “gnosis” thus refers to “direct spiritual insight into the nature of the cosmos and of oneself” and while “cosmological gnosos… illuminates the hidden patterns of nature as expressing spiritual or magical truths… metaphysical gnosos, on the other hand, represents direct insight into the transcendent. These terms are not mutually exclusive but exist on a continuum: visionary experiences in general belong to the realm of cosmological gnosos, but they may nonetheless convey metaphysical gnosos.” (Versluis 2002: 10)

Versluis’ main argument is based on the idea that esoteric phenomena are “connected primarily by one thing: that to enter into the particular arcane discipline is to come to realize for oneself secret knowledge about the cosmos and its transcendence. This secret or hidden knowledge is not a product of reason alone, but of gnosos—according to esotericism, it derives from a supra-rational source.” Therefore, “we cannot adequately investigate, singly or comparatively, variants of esotericism without an awareness from the outset that we are entering into unfamiliar territory for the strictly rationalist or scientific mind, and that in order to understand it in any genuine way, we will have to learn at least imaginatively to enter into it.” (Versluis 2002: 11)

In other words: What we are discussing here is no simple matter. For while the conventional historian must work with rather straightforward historical data—dates, events, major figures— to this the historian of esotericism must also confront an entirely new additional dimension that we may as well describe from the outset as gnosos. This dimension cannot be addressed by conventional history alone, precisely because gnosos represents insight into that which is held to transcend history. A visionary revelation, for instance, occurs in time, but according to the visionary that which is revealed does not belong to time alone. As eighteenth-century visionary Jane Leade wrote, to enter into the visionary realm, one must cast off from the “shore of time.” So must the historian of esotericism attempt to do, at least imaginatively if not in fact, or his or her history may well devolve into mere reductionism and even denigration due to a failure of understanding. And this imaginative effort is all the more difficult if one is attempting to deal with not one but two culturally disparate forms of esotericism. (Versluis 2002: 11) For Versluis “the effort to enter into the perspective one is studying” is “the adventure the study of esotericism offers the scholar that few other fields can present”. (Versluis 2002: 12)

**Esotericism as anthropological structure**

The fifth, and perhaps most controversial, definition of ‘esotericism’ is found in the book *L’ésotérisme: Qu’est-ce que l’ésoterisme* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1990) by Pierre Riffard. He perceives esotericism as “an anthropological structure”, meaning that “it is fundamental to being, one finds it in all societies, in all periods, on various levels, more or less hidden, but always there. Where man is, there is esotericism, because mystery is the stuff of humanity and constitutes man.”

As the title of his second *magnum opus* suggests, i.e. *Esotérismes d’ailleurs – Les ésotérismes non-occidentaux: primitifs, civilisateurs, indiens, extrême-orientaux, monotheists* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1997), he does not restrict his research to ‘Western’ forms of esotericism.

On the contrary, according to Riffard, esotericism can be defined as “an occult teaching, doctrine or theory, technique or procedure, of symbolic expression, metaphysic order and initiatic intention,” or in other words, “an esotericism is a teaching that takes the form of a secret doctrine or an initiatic organization, a spiritual practice or an occult art.” Subsequently, he lists “eight invariants” that characterize the anthropological structure of esotericism “wherever and whenever it manifests itself”: (1) authorial impersonality; (2) an opposition of esoteric to exoteric; (3) the concept of the “subtle” mediating between spirit and matter; (4) a theory of correspondences; (5) the esoteric significance of numbers; (6) the ‘occult sciences’; (7) the ‘occult arts’; (8) initiation.

Moreover, Riffard identifies two methods for gaining knowledge of esotericism: the external method of the scholars, which considers esotericism as a fact to be studied by means of critical-historical, comparative, phenomenological, structuralist and anthropological approaches, and the internal method of the esotericists themselves, which reveals itself as the adept’s reflection on esotericism itself, a form of self-analysis. As Riffard concludes, “while the external method is indispensable for authorial identification, dating, establishment of texts and restoration of works, and understanding of the cultural milieu, the internal method remains indispensable for all that is related to meaning rather than to facts. In short, the

---

879 Riffard 1983: 125, translated from French original.
880 Riffard 2008: 96, translated from French original.
external method deals with what is circumstantial; the esoteric method expresses what is fundamental.”

Thus, from the above five criteriologies, it is clear that historians of esotericism have made substantial efforts to define what they mean by the term ‘esotericism’. We can present these typologies in a table (displayed on the next page), ranging from Faivre’s ‘form of thought’ as a family resemblance of ‘modern and Western currents’ to Riffard’s universal ‘anthropological structure’. Now, as examples from our preceding study on the HSBK (marked in bold additions in table 16) suggest, these definitions are also potentially valid characterizations of ‘esoteric’ Buddhism.

**Studying esotericism**

According to Pierre A. Riffard (professor of philosophy, Université des Antilles et de la Guyane), when talking about those who study esotericism, whether privately or in academia, one must distinguish between the esoteric practitioner, or ‘esotericist’ (French: l’ésotériste), and the ‘esoterologist’ (French: l’ésotérologue). That is, at least in his view, “the esoterologist is a researcher who departs from the hidden in order to go to the known, from the invisible to the visible, and opposes himself from that moment onwards from the esoteric, a searcher of the inaccessible star in a world that is foreign to the intellectual mind”. Thus, the study of esotericism (again, French: ésotérisme) may be called ‘esoterology’ (French: ésotérologie) or perhaps even ‘esoteric studies’.

That is, “synthetic and theoretical knowledge that is able to compare and interpret, search for patterns and types, and find structures and functions,” the goals of which are, amongst others, “the history of esotericism in general, the study of the idea of esotericism, and the analysis of its object, its method, its production, its language, its influence and conditions”.

---

885 Riffard 1990: 12-13, cited in Frosio 2001: 98. A similar discussion, that is the distinction between Buddhologist, Buddhist theorist, Buddhist practitioner, and Buddhist, is Wallace 1999.
886 Frosio 2001: 98. Translated from French original.
887 The term “esoteric studies” is my interpretation, by analogy with “Buddhist studies” for “Buddhology”.
Table 16. Criteriologies of ‘esoteric’ and HSBK thought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAIVRE</th>
<th>IRWIN</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>VERSLUIJS</th>
<th>RIFFARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“form of thought”</td>
<td>“group mentality”</td>
<td>“Janus-faced elitist strategy”</td>
<td>“gnosis”</td>
<td>“anthropological structure”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universal interdependence (Svabhāva-Dharmakāya)</td>
<td>hierarchical (three masters)</td>
<td>progressive teaching (three abhiṣekas)</td>
<td>social equality/hierarchy (samaya/silence)</td>
<td>authorial impersonality (HSBK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living nature (Svabhāva-Dharmakāya)</td>
<td>socially secretive (samaya-gūthā)</td>
<td>initiatic grace (kaitai)</td>
<td>hermeneutical authority/superiority traditional/esoteric text/exegesis (unsurpassed vs. citations)</td>
<td>opposition eso-/exoteric (Nikyōron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imagination &amp; mediation (maṇḍala &amp; worship)</td>
<td>personalized cosmos (Mahāvairocana)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(semi-)secret knowledge (samaya code)</td>
<td>the ‘subtle’ as mediator (subtle precepts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transmutation (man-Buddha integration)</td>
<td>physical disciplines (mantra and mudrā)</td>
<td></td>
<td>cosmological/metaphysical (three secrets)</td>
<td>theory of correspondences (Buddhas – wisdoms – directions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concordance (samaya // JJSR)</td>
<td>relatively unknown/marginalized (early Shingon)</td>
<td>influence of modern science*</td>
<td>homology of bodies human/cosmos</td>
<td>significance of numbers (four, eight, ten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transmission (samaya as condition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(man-Buddha integration) initiate/order (bodhisattva-saṅgha)</td>
<td>‘occult sciences’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘occult arts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiation (HSBK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* According to Irwin, this applies only to contemporary globalized forms.
As noted above, against the background of an increasing globalization of capitalism, since the end of the nineteenth century, European and American scholars in religious studies share an growing interest in a wide variety of doctrines, texts, rituals, artifacts, and technologies, which have been classified under the heading ‘esotericism’, and they, in turn, have been termed esoterology or esoteric studies.

Until today, however, it must be pointed out that the production of knowledge on ‘esotericism’ appears to be highly conditioned by modern academic and cultural boundaries (see also Frosio’s comment above). This has resulted in a far-reaching disciplinary segmentation that, seems all too often coined along ‘East-West’ dichotomies, which is especially apparent in the emergence of such seemingly independent subfields as ‘Western esotericism’ and ‘Buddhist esotericism’.

**Western esotericism**

Despite the field’s concern with tracing terminological genealogies, it was not before the last decades of the twentieth century that the history of esotericism, with its purported origins in ‘Western’ philosophy, received official sanctioning as a field of scientific research.\(^{889}\) This was especially marked by the assignment of the worldwide first especially endowed chair for the ‘Histoire des courants ésotériques et mystiques dans l’Europe moderne et contemporaine’ (formerly ‘Histoire de l’ésotérisme Chrétien’ established in 1965) to Antoine Faivre in the École Pratique des Hautes Études at the Sorbonne in 1979. The following year, the Hermetic Academy was founded in the United States.\(^{890}\)

From 1986 onwards, this association has created several research projects within the American Academy of Religion (AAR), and departing in 2004 ‘Western esotericism’ became a permanent program unit.\(^{891}\) Another important center for esoteric studies was established in 1999 at the University of Amsterdam, where a whole Bachelor and Master program is dedicated to the study of ‘Western esotericism’, and where Wouter Hanegraaff holds a

---

\(^{889}\) McCalla 2001: 440, which also includes a list of pioneers in the scholarly treatment of ‘Western’ esoteric currents. According to von Stuckrad 2005: 80-81, research into what today would be called ‘Western esotericism’ dates back to Frances Yates, 1899-1981.

\(^{890}\) Faivre 1999: x.

\(^{891}\) Hanegraaff 2009: 126.
specially endowed university chair for the study of Western esotericism—in particular, for the study of Hermeticism and related currents.\textsuperscript{892}

Following the work of Faivre, other internationally established scholars, such as Hanegraaf and Arthur Versluis (Michigan State University) launched peer-reviewed academic journals such as \textit{Aries} and \textit{Esoterica}. Their editorial boards, in turn, hosted international workshops and symposia on the subject, which soon culminated in the creation of new scholarly organizations, for example, the Association for the Study of Esotericism (ASE) in 2002 and the European Society for the Study of Western Esotericism (ESSWE) in 2005.

\textbf{Buddhist esotericism}

Historically speaking, there appears to have been a clear connection between the Western and Buddhist esotericism, also known as esoteric Buddhism (cf. infra). This can be perceived, for instance in the accounts given by Lee Irwin, who says: “In 1879 Olcott and Blavatsky visited India and met English esotericist A. P. Sinnett who published \textit{Esoteric Buddhism} (1883) […] Sinnett went on to publish many articles and books on theosophy and its connections with Eastern religions.”\textsuperscript{893} And also:

In 1880, Blavatsky and Olcott took five (lay) vows at a Buddhist temple in Galle, Ceylon, taking refuge in the Buddha as the first westerners and esotericists to embrace Theravāda Buddhism. In 1882, the Indian Theosophical Society was moved from Bombay to Adyar, where it is still active to the present. Olcott was invited to Japan (1888) by the Jōdo Shinshū (Pure Land) Buddhists where he gave over 75 lectures on Buddhism and Theosophy, contributing to rising interests in Japanese esotericism; in the same year the American writer Percival Lowell published his popular \textit{The Soul of the Far East} and in 1894, \textit{Occult Japan}, specifically on 'esoteric Shintō'.\textsuperscript{894}

Even though this “history of connection and reference has yet to be fully researched or developed”,\textsuperscript{895} it is not very surprising that it were precisely leading representatives of the

\textsuperscript{895} Irwin 2001: 11.
very theosophy that became the object of studies in Western esotericism, who have introduced the term ‘esoteric Buddhism’ to the academia, even more because:

[The term] ‘esoteric Buddhism’ was first used to refer to theosophical doctrines passed down among supposedly initiated Buddhist masters, a theory put forward by the Theosophist A.P. Sinnett in his *Esoteric Buddhism* (1883). It is also found in the late-nineteenth-century writings of other Theosophists, notably H.P. Blavatsky. The term also appears in a pamphlet titled “Esoteric Buddhism” by Rev. W.E. Parson for the Council of the United Missions in Japan, 1886. About the same time, Edward Heneage Dering wrote two articles in “The Month” which were reprinted as *Esoteric Buddhism: The New Gospel of Atheism*, by Washbourne (1887). From there it apparently made its way into late essays of Max Müller (1901) and thence into the broader public consciousness. *This decidedly quirky and colonialist genealogy* is cause for caution in adopting the term “esoteric Buddhism,” though it appears that its origins have been largely forgotten.

Just as is the case for ‘Western esotericism’, even though publications on ‘esoteric Buddhism’ date back to the early 1880s, over a century passed until from the 1970s onwards, esotericism as a phenomenon perceived in the Buddhist traditions of East Asia started to receive the attention of scholars working at European and American research institutes. This was partly triggered by the first translations of some basic Japanese introductions on the topic for the Anglophone public, such as Yamasaki’s *Shingon: Japanese Esoteric Buddhism* (1988). The few available comprehensive English-language treatments, however, emerged only after the turn of the millennium, with the works of Ryūichi Abe (2000), Richard K. Payne (2006), and Charles D. Orzech et al. (2010).

Unlike the academic channels for scholars working on Western esotericism, however, European and American researchers of Buddhist esotericism are hardly organized in specialized institutions, and have very few academic societies and journals of their own. Many scholars are, therefore, still dependent on the goodwill of either established broad-ranged organizations (e.g. AAR and AAS), or specialized Japanese associations and scholarly journals, such as the Japanese Association for the Study of Esoteric Buddhism (Nihon Mikkyō Gakkai) at Taishō University. One noteworthy exception, perhaps, is the Society for Tantric Studies (STS), founded in 1985 by Charles Orzech (University of Glasgow, at that time in North Carolina, Greensboro), James Sanford (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), and Glen Hayes (Bloomfield College). Some aspects of “Buddhist esotericism” are also addressed in the *International Journal for Tantric Studies* (first issue August 1995).

---

897 As Orzech points out, there is a close relation between “Tantric” and “Esoteric Buddhism”, for “esoteric is the term most frequently used by modern scholars to describe Tantras in East Asia,” or in other words, “of the
Approaching esotericism

Even though ‘Western’ and ‘Buddhist esotericism’ both are relatively new in the history of modern science, the approaches taken by historians of esotericism have already been criticized not only for being diverse, but also because they lack an overall methodology and precise criteria for the establishment of a global research framework. Or, as Hugh Urban (professor in Comparative Religions, Ohio State University) observed already over a decade ago, notwithstanding the fact that “there are, of course, many fine studies on specific [either ‘Western’ or ‘Buddhist’] esoteric traditions”, contemporary historical scholarship in esoteric studies remains largely fragmented in an array of research niches, for which “any broader cross-cultural framework” is still absent. This absence of dialogue and interaction is all the more surprising, when we recall that the study of ‘esoteric Buddhism’ was historically actually engaged in by the very students of what now has been termed ‘Western esotericism’.

However, this historical relation does not necessarily mean that one is to approach ‘esotericism’ solely from a ‘Western’ perspective. As Lee Irwin (professor of religious studies at the College of Charleston, and specialist in the history of Native American religions) cautioned in 2001, “a strictly "Western" approach to esotericism can only limit the perspective by which esoteric and spiritual practitioners are increasingly affected by currents quite beyond the normative history of European esotericism,” and “the very construction of "esotericism" as European is deeply problematic, even though there is without doubt a genuine history of esotericism on the European continent, particularly in its problematic rapprochement with Christianity”.

Despite this unvarnished critique, nothing fundamental appears to have changed in the research mentality, since this urge for historical precision when dealing with “esoteric”

---

variety of terms replacing the term “Tantric” Buddhism, the word “Esoteric” is the most widely used”. (Orzech 2006: 30 and 39 respectively). For more information on the term ‘tantric Buddhism’, cf. infra.
899 Urban 1997: 2. Four years earlier, Urban had pointed out that despite a growing interest the subject of esotericism, it remains not only “one of the most-persistent and pervasive, and yet also most poorly understood and most frequently distorted, aspects of the history of religions”, but also a subject that is “theoretically confused with in the [larger] academic community”. He simultaneously criticized the lack of “adequate attention given to the concrete social and political role of the esoteric traditions within their historical context.” (Urban 1997: 1-2) Indeed, the bulk of the analyses by historians of religions still “remain disappointingly general, universalistic, and largely divorced from the social and historical context… in which esoteric traditions emerge, and with which they are inextricably intertwined”. He therefore argues that esotericism has “by definition…very real and very direct social and political implications (i.e., the distinction between those who know and those who do not),” and that “if we ignore these dimensions, we are overlooking an extremely significant aspect of this complex phenomenon”. (Urban 1997: 2)
900 Irwin 2001: 32-33, with added emphasis.
subjects was still apparent in 2006, when regarding contemporary philological research on esoteric Buddhism, Charles Orzech saw himself compelled to warn his colleagues:

Indeed, our research must take account of the local social realities in a careful matter... the more removed one is from the setting of translation, the more local social realities and ideological systems dominate things. To deny such consideration would be, on the one hand, to obscure a remarkable pan-Asian phenomenon and, on the other hand, to obscure its local realities.\(^\text{901}\)

Moreover, in his introductory essay to *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia: a Handbook for Scholars* (E.J. Brill, 2011), which is the most recent and by far the only English-language comprehensive work on the subject, Orzech also expressed his concern with problems of such categories as “esoteric(-ism)” and “esoteric Buddhism”.\(^\text{902}\) During the preparatory stages of the project, Orzech underscored not only the necessity “to disaggregate the all too often confused and confusing terminology,” but also emphasized that although “at some level all research and interpretation involves bias and teleology,” especially as historians, “we always stand in the present interpreting the past in terms of present concern”.\(^\text{903}\)

This does not alter the fact, however, that both the perspective from which we approach the objects of our inquiry, as well as the terminologies and taxonomies we employ in order to analyze them should be clearly defined. In other words, as he wrote already in 2006:

Whatever else may be the case if we are historians, the taxonomies of later historical periods should not be applied to earlier phenomena without notice and explanation. Further, the taxonomies and hermeneutics of those we study (and their doctrinal, social, and ritual evolution) should not be conflated with our own taxonomies and hermeneutics... The construction, promulgation, and political and religious utility of such categories as “Tantric”, “esoteric” versus “exoteric,” “school” or “sect” and so on is not merely the purview of scholars – it is part of the fabric of historical and religious developments throughout history. Indeed, if we examine any of the major “sectarian” labels... we find that each is the vehicle for polemical definition and redefinition... Behind all this is the common, human penchant for seeing things in clear-cut binaries.... The metaphorical basis of such taxonomies is one of purity versus pollution and miscegenation, and it should be understood in the light of contemporary radical theories [of especially nineteenth-century Western scholars] as well as the history and development of religious taxonomies.\(^\text{904}\)

---

\(^{901}\) Orzech 2006: 34, with added emphasis.

\(^{902}\) One exception might be the first attempt to bring a state of the field in Payne 2006.

\(^{903}\) First page of the draft, ‘Prelegomena to the Study of Esoteric Buddhism’ that was electronically distributed to the Brill project’s collaborating scholars in the course of 2010.

\(^{904}\) Orzech 2006: 32-35, emphasis partly in original. Ibid. 32, n. 14 refers to the introduction in Payne 2006: esp. 1-27. Among the examples given in this context is the anachronistic application of the late Edo period Japanese categories of *jun*- vs. *zōmitsu* to the Chinese canon or of the twelfth-century Tibetan four-fold taxonomy of *Tantra* to earlier materials in India.
In sum, even though scholars evidently use a ‘Western’ category such as ‘esoteric’ when they discuss aspects of ‘Buddhist culture’ in ‘the East’, one might ask why, then, have virtually no attempts thus far been made to, accordingly, also borrow from the methods applied in the study of ‘Western esotericism’ to approach such an ‘Eastern’ phenomenon as ‘esoteric Buddhism/Buddhist esotericism’. Of course, the main precondition for such an endeavor would be that we regard ‘esoteric Buddhism/Buddhist esotericism’, as a peculiar manifestation of a more general, perhaps universal, current of ‘esotericism’.

However, given that, as Melzer argues, contemporary scholars are ‘under the spell of the historicizing imperative’ 905, any notion that would surpass the emphasis on cultural ‘difference’ and social ‘locality’ of the historical instance, is likely to be inconceivable. But, does that necessarily have to keep us from at least try to consider its theoretical possibility, or must this withhold us from learning from the methods that our colleague-historians of religions apply to approach ‘their own’ and ‘different’, but in terminological terms quasi analogous field of ‘esotericism’? In short, without being aimed at providing a definite answer to the question of how ‘esotericism’ should or must ideally be defined or studied, the following is meant merely as an initial impetus to this dissertation’s reflections on the vows of ‘esoteric Buddhism’.

**Towards a transcultural esotericism?**

Let us take as a starting-point the working hypothesis that ‘esotericism’ may be considered as a ‘trans-cultural’ concept that has epistemic relevance in the historical study of religions. With ‘trans-cultural’ I mean it is free from what the Russian postmodern theorist Mickhail Epstein calls “the self-deification and fetishism of specific cultural groups”. 906 In our case these ‘groups’ are the historians of religion who independently engage in the subjects of ‘Western esotericism’ and ‘Buddhist esotericism’. Departing from this premise, I will first address some of the representative contemporary approaches to ‘Western esotericism’, and subsequently turn to the question whether these may convincingly be transferred to ‘Buddhist esotericism’.

---

905 Melzer 2006: 279.
906 Although the notion ‘trans-cultural’ is object to academic debate and will surely be closer addressed in my future work, it is limited here to the Epsteinian notion of ‘trans-culture’. See: Epstein 1995: 10, referred to in Thurlow 2000.
Notwithstanding the evident increase in academic recognition, in her ‘Esotérisme entre Histoire et Tradition’, a review of Jean Servier’s *Dictionnaire critique de l’ésotérisme*, Carole Frosio observes that a wide range of various topics are put under “the simple and unique denomination esotericism”.\(^{907}\) Indeed, the question is “what are the criteria for considering certain cultural phenomenon as ‘esoteric’?\(^{908}\) Over the past decades, scholars working on the history of esotericism in religious traditions have tried to define their main subject’s hallmarks in matrix-like lists. While some characterizations approach esotericism as a universal, trans-historical phenomenon, and thus as a wide and inclusive field, other definitions present themselves as historical constructs that pertain only to one peculiar temporal and geographically delimited situation such as ‘modern and contemporary Western esoteric currents’.\(^{909}\)

As for the first question, it seems that ‘esotericism’ has been defined either in terms of listing specific elements (such as esoteric exegesis and necessity of initiation), or by listing characteristics (for example, the use of special forms of yoga or the emphasis on the authority of the teacher).\(^{910}\) Moreover, as shown above, it appears that at least some of the features also pertain to ‘esoteric’ Buddhism.

To recall a few features, as an external group mentality (Irwin), for instance, it is hierarchical in so far the several stages of initiation (or consecration) are accessible only after having trained for a certain time under a recognized master. There is clear evidence that since the ninth century, in the tradition that in later times would become known as the Shingon school, candidates are granted gradual access to the study of a twofold ritual system centered on the textual and mandalic lineages of the *garba*- and *vajradhātu*. Their progressive mastery of these systems is marked by several consecrations.\(^{911}\)

In turn, also the fact that it is ‘marginalized by a conservative majority’ may apply to (certain historical instances) of ‘esoteric’ Buddhism. The bulk of the doctrinal interpretations and rituals of what in later generations would be termed as the Tachikawa-ryū that emerged in 14th century Japan, for instance, were considered heretic by the Shingon contemporaries of the Kōyasan Chūnryū. As for the internal core with personalized cosmologies, one could

---

\(^{907}\) Frosio 2001: 88, translated from French original.


\(^{909}\) For more perspectives, see: Hanegraaff 1998.

\(^{910}\) Based on suggestions in Payne 2006: 9-10 regarding the category ‘Vajrayāṇa’.

mention the perception of Mahāvairocana as the “cosmic Buddha”, who is identical to the entire dharmadhātu.

Also the social strategy (Urban) is apparent in ‘esoteric’ Buddhism/Buddhist esotericism in Japan. The writings of Kūkai (774-835), for instance, clearly indicate that all sentient beings are fundamentally equal in their potential for attaining enlightenment. However, based on the scheme of the “ten stages of mind” according to the individual’s capacities, which is coined on ‘traditional’ Mahāyānist classifications (such as Bodhicittasāstra), Kūkai simultaneously draws an upward spiral of diverse teachings, culminating in the unsurpassed ‘esoteric’ approach. The ritual strategy is apparent, for instance, when prior to the initiation/consecration ceremony proper, the samaya precepts are conferred in order to underscore not only the identity of the individual and the (cosmic) buddha(s), but also the identity of initiate and ācārya.

Surely, also many other features would be applicable to (at least some form of historical instance of) ‘esoteric’ Buddhism, but the aforementioned examples may suffice for the present discussion. Thus, as things stand now, it appears that the established characterizations indeed may be transferred to ‘esoteric’ Buddhism. Would this mean, then, that in response to Urban’s aforementioned plea, these approaches have the potential to offer a larger framework for a cross- and/or trans-cultural definition of esotericism that is no longer confined to the esoteric traditions of European origin, but is also applicable to ‘non-Western’ forms of esoteric practice and thought?912

Despite the fact that some features (e.g. mediation, hierarchy, cosmos, etc.) are reoccurring in several matrices, and may be applied to some instances of East Asian cultural phenomena that have been identified as representative of ‘esoteric’ Buddhism; the samples as such already clearly show that the existing category schemata of ‘esotericism’ are quite diverse and surely not universal.913 Even when one would attempt to include all features of the available characterizations in one overarching ‘trans-cultural’ matrix, the problem—as Richard Payne points out—remains that the elements and/or characteristics listed (1) are not all found in every stance of the subject of interest; (2) do not exist separately from our use of them as generalizations; (3) are not all unique to the subject; (4) may reflect the self-understandings promoted by the religious tradition of the compiler of the list, rather than those of the tradition

912 See also Versluis 2002: 1-2, where he explicitly mentions the potential for the study of “Vajrayāna Buddhism”.
913 See also Payne 2006: 2.
under consideration; (5) may be more speculative than well-grounded in historical evidence; and (6) imply a monolithic, unchanging, essentialized conception and normative vision of the subject, without attending to the differences in various bodies of literature that result from historical development.  

Thus, the hypothesis of a ‘trans-cultural esotericism’ that does not take into account the ‘uniqueness’ of the historical instant seems not sustainable. However, does this imply that we have to ban all ‘esoteric’ from our studies of Vajrayāna in East Asia, or in the present case, from an inquiry on samaya precepts ritual in early Heian Japan?

Indeed, a core problem remains that a possible ‘trans-cultural’ characterization does not take into account the –at least in the light of the historicizing imperative of postmodernism– crucial specific historical, social and cultural contexts of concrete manifestations of one or the other ‘esoteric’ aspect, tradition, text or ritual. Moreover, as Payne points out, it is important to keep in mind what Derek Bickerton wrote on representation: “We observe reality from a point defined by our species (and cultural, and individual) makeup, our observations can only be made through representations, and representations always both add to and subtract from what they represent”.  

In other words, “all representations are of necessity constructive and selective”. A category such as ‘esotericism,’ therefore, is actually no more, but also no less, than “an (idealized) imaginal object”. Thus, we have to keep in mind that, just like ‘religion’, ‘Western’, ‘modern’, ‘Christianity’, or ‘Buddhism’, also ‘esotericism’ is a constructed intellectual category.

In his call for critical reflection on the categories we use, Payne leaves us to think about the following questions: (1) Was the category employed by the historical figures being studied

Based on Payne 2006: 10. Without going into much detail, or discussing all of his observations, for clarity’s sake some examples may be in place. Not all features are found in every stance of the subject of interest, may be clear, for instance, from the fact that Irwin’s second external feature of esotericism as being “socially secretive”, which largely relates to “persecution”, does not apply to the “esoteric” teachings of Amoghavajra in early 8th century Tang China. On the contrary, they were undoubtedly under the overt patronage of the state, rather than persecuted. Further, the fact that not all aspects unique to the subject is perhaps most pertinent in the idea that access to esotericism is intrinsically bound to the condition or prerequisite of initiation, or in Frosio’s words, “un glissement entre “ésoterisme” et “initiation”, even though initiation processes are certainly not monopolized by esoteric traditions. (Frosio 2001: 93-94)

Bickerton 1990: 233, cited in Payne 2008: 177. Emphasis added. While Payne is Dean of the Institute for Buddhist Studies at Berkeley, Bickerton is linguist and professor emeritus at the University of Hawaii, Manoa. Referred to here is his Languages and Species (1990)


In his introduction to one of the only English-language collections of essays on Tantric Buddhism in East Asia (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2006), Payne urges for critical awareness and reflection in our use of such categories: “In the study of a religious tradition, terminological considerations are more than simply definitions.
themselves (emic) or is it a later imaginative reconstruction (etic)?

(2) What does the category occlude and what is its social utility? (3) What does the divergence of the category scheme from other schemata reveal about who has formulated it and about the things being categorized? (4) Which intellectual (such as doctrine, logic, and belief) and sociopolitical concerns does the history of the category scheme reflect? And (5), in how far do our own intellectual categories (e.g. religion vs. philosophy) correlate with the ‘object’ of our study?

In addition, according to Payne, the question of terminology and definition in the study of religion is currently approached from three dominant perspectives: the comparative, phenomenological, and postmodern approach. Even though he underscores that, “a fully informed study of religion considers all three as complementary and mutually corrective,” the above-mentioned characterizations have shown that this is clearly not always the case.

The ‘objects’ of our study are not natural entities, not things that can be pointed to, but rather social entities, constructions. This means that we cannot use ostensive definitions, those that simply point out an exemplary instance of a category. We need rather to recognize that the terms and categories employed are in large part our own creation, and avoid reifying them by turning them into objects existing independently of our use. As such, we are responsible for the terms we use and for using them with adequate reflection on the presumptions they bring –often covertly– into the field of study.” (Payne 2006: 3) That is to say, as he further points out, “categories … are often simply presented as natural and unproblematic, as if the categories simply reflected some reality found out there” (Payne 2006: 2)

919 Payne 2006: 2-3 drawing on the work of José Cabezón, who occupies the XIVth Dalai Lama Endowed Chair in Tibetan Buddhism and Cultural Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara.

920 Meant here is the anthropological distinction between emic and etic categories. “Emic categories are those used by a specific social group, while etic ones are those used by those outside that group to talk about that group.” (Payne 2006: 4) On the problematic nature of such an epistemological distinction, cf. Payne 2006: 228, n. 10.

921 Payne 2006: 3.

922 In Payne’s view, “comparative studies are interested in similarities and continuities between religious traditions, and as a consequence terms are used as a means of identifying general characteristics of religion found in various instances.” (Payne 2006: 3) Considering “esoteric Buddhism” or “Buddhist esotericism” and “Western esotericism” as part of a larger, category of “esotericism” may, I am aware, heavily depend on the argument by analogy, that is, “two things appear to be similar so there must be some significant connection between them.” Even though, as Payne pointed out, “in logic, the argument by analogy is considered to be one of the very weakest forms of argumentation,” still, “analogies are perhaps the most prevalent forms of argument” and in addition, “the argument by analogy is the core of the comparative method”. (Payne 2006: 23-24)

In his plea for a cross-cultural approach to ‘global esotericism’ as a ‘group mentality’ (cf. supra), Irwin emphasizes that esoteric traditions “sever themselves from a broader, global and international perspective of spirituality.” (Irwin 2001: 4. For the term ‘global esotericism’, see ibid.: esp. 30) He explains his view as follows: “Other models for understanding esoteric spirituality abound in Eastern religious traditions that are increasingly penetrating into Western social and cultural environments. Many of these ‘Eastern’ models are being adapted to Euro-American cultural and social environments, resulting in the emergence of new forms of esotericism, neither conventionally Eastern nor Western … [or] longer bound by ethnocentric histories of persecution or intellectual dismissal. This rich, fertile exchange of spiritual perspectives has resulted in a broadening of the concept of esotericism to increasingly embrace a multi-spiritual pluralism whose roots connect with religious traditions on a global basis. Buddhism [for example] can no longer be confined to Tibet, Japan, or Southeast Asia but is increasingly part of Euro-American religious thought … while devotees of the Indian God Krishna can be found in major American and European cities. In this context, esotericism takes on a whole new dimension of meaning no longer connected to parent religious traditions in a local sense. The increasingly rapid exchange of views, the sharing of knowledge on a global basis (aided by electronic technologies) has increased the accessibility of esoteric texts and facilitated the formation of emergent global networks dedicated to esoteric studies. But
esoteric in what sense? In the headlong rush to communicate, much is in danger of being lost at the very same time that new horizons are opening through increased accessibility and sharing.” (Irwin 2001: 4-5) Although these networks seem to be still in an embryonic stage, also Riffard, who characterizes esotericism as an “anthropological structure” (cf. supra), argues for a comparative approach to esotericism. He even outlines some features that may form the basis criteria for a potential comparison: (1) mythical origins; (2) cosmic cycles; (3) chains of initiation; (4) secret books; (5) mystical names; (6) occult etymologies; (7) analogic translation; (8) spiritual translation; and (9) magical uses of esoteric writings or art works. (Riffard 1998: 65-71, cited in Versluis 2002: 8.) Also Urban’s research on ‘Indian Tantra and French Freemasonry’ is clearly comparative. He phrases the goal of his work as follows: “Why do a comparison? Following J.Z. Smith, I suggest that the value of such a comparison is much the same value that we gain from a good metaphor, in Maw Black’s sense of the term: by bringing together and juxtaposing two different, previously unrelated things, we can gain new insights into both. I am by no means searching for some universal archetypes or deeper identity; rather, I am simply employing comparison as a pragmatic tool or heuristic device, which can help us to see new things that would otherwise go unnoticed.” (Urban 1997: 3) These attempts notwithstanding (another example of comparative studies of esotericism is the work of Durdjevic 2010), there appears to be still much resistance against such comparative endeavours from both scholars of ‘Western esotericism’ and of ‘esoteric Buddhism’, if not because “similarities alone … are meaningless” and “their significance emerges only in the light of a theory, an idea about how things work.” (Payne 2006: 2) then because, especially from the phenomenological side (cf. infra), it is insisted that is it too early to engage in such studies for practical reasons: In the future, comparative esotericism will take its place as a subspecialty, but for now the field as a whole is in its infancy, with vast primary research yet to be done, whole histories yet to be written. Before we can compare European alchemy with that of South India, we must first have a firm grasp of European alchemy itself! And that is a goal as yet not attained, one that will require not only a wide range of knowledge, but the imaginative capacity to interpret it.” (Versluis 2002: 12. Other obvious reasons may include the lack of sufficient access to the material, the necessity of mobility for field research, or the need of adequate foreign language capacities).

Another approach is phenomenology. In following Payne’s view, phenomenological studies of religion may be considered as informed by two different understandings of the goal of study,” whereby “one usage … is basically concerned with typology, that is, creating comprehensive systems of categories according to which the phenomena of religion may be understood.” The other he understands, is “informed by Husserlian phenomenology.” the goal of which is “the accurate description of experience so as to be able to characterize the objects of experience.” Both understandings, he adds, are however, “either in service of or not distinguished methodologically from the comparative understanding of the study of religion.” (Payne 2006: 3-4. For a study on the problem of the term “phenomenology of religion” and its correlation with ‘comparative religion’ and ‘typology’, see: Pye 1974) Although all five samples mentioned above, are clearly aimed at constructing matrices of characteristics for (their own analysis of) esotericism, at least two can be further included under the phenomenological approaches. First, this is clearly the case when considering the Faivrean “histrionic approach”, which is largely confined to the typology of esotericism in the historical construct of “a form of thought”. On the other hand, the claim that the phenomenological approach is methodologically closely related to comparative studies may be illustrated with the aforementioned comparative work of Irwin, in which he simultaneously argues: “The issue of experience is crucial to many esoteric traditions, particularly those whose emphasis has been on the affirmation of mystical forms of spirituality. … These tensions often revolve around the question of authority and who has the right to sanction or recognize the validity of any member’s religious experiences. Many esoteric traditions have embraced processes of internalization by which external religious beliefs are broken down and reevaluated through progressive experiences often of an emotional, symbolic, and visionary nature. In turn, this has often led to new esoteric formulations critical of existing institutional beliefs or traditional doctrines. … The tensions between intellectual beliefs (or faith) as defined by institutionalized traditional authorities and religious experiences of the individual as a member of an esoteric group are particularly acute when institutional religions are meshed with political authority. […] From a ‘Western’ historical perspective, the history of esotericism is inseparable from a history of persecution and mainstream institutional criticism by orthodox religionists … who deny the value and importance of maintaining viable, non-orthodox spiritual views or alternative spiritual associations. Much of Western esotericism has been driven by a tense and often conflictual relationship with institutionalized religious authority.” (Irwin 2001: 2-3, with added emphasis) According to Versluis, who considers gnostics as being the central characteristic to esotericism, “it is wrong to valorise historical information while denigrating an esotericist’s insight into the tradition itself; in brief, an emic or internal approach may be much more valuable and insightful than an etic or external one.” In order to substantiate this importance of research on experience, and also its validity in comparative studies, he gives the example of the work of Corbin: “If Riffard offers a framework for a methodological approach to comparative esotericism, a comparative esotericism in practice was created by Henri Corbin (1903-1978), whose many and influential books were based upon his phenomenological or internal approach to Islamic and primarily Persian
However, regardless of these three dominant methodological approaches in the study of the history of religions, there seems to be one common denominator shared not only by the contemporary scholars in the field of esotericism, but until today remains at the foundation of the scientific method, namely empiricism. Perhaps this is a helpful approach.

In the study of esotericism, there are mainly two forms, that is, ‘historiographic empiricism’ and ‘sympathetic empiricism’. The first type is especially apparent in the work of Wouter Hanegraaff. He argues that “an a priori typology might well be valid, but it should not be a

---

Sufi works, but with an eye to the works of such European figures as Swedenborg, Böhme, Oetinger, and Baader. Corbin is perhaps best known for bringing to the fore the concept of the mundus imaginalis, or imaginal realm of visionary encounters with revelatory spiritual figures. This concept of an imaginal realm had a substantial impact in the world of arts and letters as well as psychology … Corbin revealed the spiritual worldview of figures like Sufi visionary Suhrâwardî from what Corbin held to be the inside out—he saw things as much as possible from Suhrâwardî’s own perspective while drawing on his own background in Western esotericism. … Although he did not directly address methodological considerations in the rigorous way … Corbin thus may be seen as a pioneer in the field of comparative esotericism, a pioneer who insisted on the central importance of understanding one’s esoteric subjects from within, not merely from without. Yet Corbin is in fact contemptuous of historicist emphasis on accumulating external data; for him, far more important is one’s understanding of the esoteric perspective about which one is writing. Of course, Corbin may well be charged with having gone beyond what is proper to the historian of religions precisely for this reason, but this charge he would probably wear as a badge of honor. For Corbin’s work is like that of no other scholar I know: with his open exhortation to his readers to enjoin in a “battle for the soul of the world,” to become warriors in a spiritual chivalry, to transcend what he saw as a modern imprisonment in mere history, to enter into the visionary world of Persian spirituality, his work may indeed be seen as a kind of spiritual exhortation as much as an effort in comparative esotericism.” (Versluis 2002: 9)

The third currently dominant approach is postmodern. According to Payne, it “focuses on the specific instance and its social, historical, and cultural locatedness,” a focus on the location of the specific that “arises from a self-reflective awareness of our own involvement in the creation and imposition of categories, often for reasons other than purely intellectual ones.” For postmodern studies, he further argues, “terms are in the service of making distinctions, and not with identifying similarities or establishing value-laden hierarchies.” (Payne 2006: 4) Although some aspects of the characterizations discussed above may to some extent be regarded a postmodern in their approach of esotericism, it is especially the recent work of Orzech that is exemplary in this context. In his ‘The “Great Teachings of Yoga,” the Chinese Appropriation of the Tantras, and the Question of Esoteric Buddhism’ (2006), Orzech’s main focus is in fact on the “locatedness” of esoteric Buddhism: “Both Sharf and McBride credit Zanning (919-1001) as the source of the Esoteric school … Sharf posits that a distinctive “Esoteric Buddhism” first arises as an exegetical category in the writings of Zanning at the end of the tenth century … To sum up the findings of Sharf and McBride it would seem that, from the Six Dynasties through the Tang, the term “esoteric teaching” is used to designate what this or that writer feels is superior or best in the tradition, and it [is] only in the tenth century that we see the emergence of an exegetical category that contrasts “esoteric teaching” with “exoteric teaching” to designate a particular lineage, school, or tradition comparable to Shingon in Japan or Vajrayâna sects in Tibet.” (Orzech 2006: 42-44).

923 Hanegraaff is affiliated to the University of Amsterdam, cf. supra: 160. However, also Faivre advocates “an empirical, historical criterion of esotericism as the most conductive scholarly approach to its study.”(McCalla 2001: 441) In other words: Methodologically, it appears far more fruitful to begin with the empirical observation that esotericism is a Western concept, and that this concept derives from an ensemble of varied and sometimes problematic materials which are sufficiently challenging when studied within that context. It is a matter of studying the genesis and the various transformations of these modern Western esoteric currents in a diachronic way which highlights the differences and disruptive factors within the specific currents, as well as the affinity or antipathy evinced by these currents in their relationship to one another or in their relationship with other forms of thought. Thus, it is a matter of emphasising these things, rather than demonstrating a ‘continuity’ of what would be an overarching esotericism per se, above all traditions. (Faivre and Voss 1995: 63-64, cited in McCalla 2001: 441) According to McCalla, both Hanegraaff and Faivre argue that “empirical research must be based on methodological agnosticism with regard to religious and philosophical ‘first principles,’” and must fully recognize the historicity of religious phenomena.” According to McCalla (specialist in the history of the study of religion
foundation for understanding the field as a whole” and that indeed, “a fully-developed academic study of esotericism should give attention to all the dimensions which may be distinguished in religious traditions generally (social, ritual, experiential, doctrinal, mythic, ethical, and symbolic”). Instead of applying a priori ideological constructs to esotericism as the subject of religious studies, he pleads for an “empiricist” and historiographic approach “with an informed, open, and, so much as possible, neutral mind”. Moreover, focussing on the distinction between the ‘religionist’ emic perspective “from within a particular religious viewpoint” as opposed to a more neutral historical, ‘empiricist’ etic approach, Hanegraaff considers “a continuing and (self-) critical dialectics of emic material and etic interpretation […] the indispensable foundation for an empirical study of esotericism which wishes to go beyond mere description.”

The second, ‘sympathetic’ form of empiricism is more specifically found in the work of Versluis (cf. supra), who questions Hanegraaff’s sharp division between the ‘religionist’ and ‘empiricist’ perspectives. He considers “a failure to understand and accurately convey what one is studying” as well as “ignorance of and hostility to one’s subject, even if under the guise of a studied neutrality” the great vices of an overemphasized and/or extreme etic position. Therefore, he follows the anthropological stance of “balancing etic and emic approaches, of and of religious thought in Europe, Mount Saint Vincent University), this argument is a specific application of the methodological proposals put forward for the study of religion in general by Jan G. Platvoet (Senior Lecturer in the Comparative Studies of Religions at Leiden University). (McCalla 2001: 441) Platvoet “distinguishes empirical research from ‘religionist’ and ‘positivist-reductionist’ pursuits. Believers view religion from the perspective of a ‘multiple tier cosmology’: an empirically perceptible realm and one or more meta-empirical, non-perceptual realms” (Platvoet 1990: 184). “Scholars who study religion are dependent on believers expressing their awareness of a meta-empirical reality in empirical perceptible ways (words, images, behaviour, etc.).” (McCalla 2001: 441)

“As scholars, they do not themselves have direct access to the meta-empirical: ‘They can find “religion” only in the historical religions of humankind, and can analyse those religions only as events in its history, and as institutions of human societies by which definite personal and societal needs, religious as well as non-religious, are met’. (Platvoet 1990: 185). Because scholars can thus neither verify nor falsify the existence of a meta-empirical reality, or any claims made about it, methodological agnosticism is the only proper attitude. Empirical researchers, Platvoet continues, do not limit themselves to the empirical because they wish to claim that it is the only reality (privately they may believe the opposite) but because it is the only one accessible to them for investigation. They hold to their ‘one tier cosmology’ non-axiomatically, while positivist-reductionists hold to it axiomatically, that is, as an ideology, and religionists hold axiomatically to a multiple tier cosmology. Empirical research cannot accept any axiomatic beliefs about the ultimate nature of reality (see Platvoet 1990: 186-187).” (McCalla 2001: 441-442) McCalla further writes “Faivre affirms that scholars can approach the meta-empirical realm of the believer only through its historically available expressions, and with the help of methodological tools and conceptual models. The empirical method therefore rejects metaphysical premises of religionists and draws methods of interpretation that are not intrinsically those of the esotericists themselves but which are historical, sociological and psychological. The empirical method, Faivre adds, corresponds to the attitude of laicity (laïcité) in the technical French institutional sense, which characterizes the spirit in which one studies religious sciences in the public institutions created for this purpose (see Faivre 2000: xxvii).” (McCalla 2001: 442)
on the one hand entering into a culture in order to understand it while on the other hand retaining the status of observer and analyst.” In order to balance “on the one hand the virtues of scholarship that strives to achieve a standard of objectivity, and on the other hand the virtues of an approach that seeks to sympathetically understand one’s subject, to understand it from the inside out, so to speak”, he advocates an intermediate position that incorporates both *emic* and *etic* approaches, which he calls a “sympathetic empiricist perspective.” Or, as he further phrases: “an investigator must attempt to understand the world in almost certainly unfamiliar ways, and this requires a sympathetic approach to various figures, writings, and works of art, open to the unexpected, yet also retaining some sense of critical distance.”

In his view, this is the indispensable methodological approach to investigate esoteric subjects that ultimately are only recognizable and understandable from the *emic* perspective of the religious practitioner—or in Hanegraaff’s words, “religionist”– and are virtually inaccessible with an *etic* approach.

In general, the approaches toward the study of esotericism may be delineated into three major categories, namely: the “pro-esotericist”, “anti-esotericist”, and “empirical-historical” approach. Following the standpoint of Versluis, the empirical-historical perspective covers a spectrum that ranges from: ‘internal’, meaning “writing from within the perspective of the tradition itself”, to ‘empiricist,’ or “a more or less neutral approach”, to ‘reductionist,’ that is, “an effort to reduce a given religious subject to non-religious constituent parts –i.e., power relationships, social constructs, and so forth.”

At the extremities of what Versluis considers the empirical-historical approaches are two attitudes that can distort the picture of our inquiry into esotericism, namely: on the one hand Perennialism and Traditionalism, and on the other hand, (ideologically charged) reductionism. This spectrum can be schematized in the following table:

---

926 Versluis 2002: 12.
928 On anti-esoteric polemics, see e.g. Hanegraaff 1998, 1999, and esp. 2005.
929 Versluis 2002: 5.
930 Drawing from the work of Mark Sedgwick, Payne (2008: 177) explains: “Traditionalism has its roots in Romanticism, and combines Perennialism [and anti-rationality] with anti-modernism”. Moreover, he observes that Traditionalists often emphasize that there is a universal esoteric core common to all religions, which is only accessible through authentic initiation. The validity of the initiation into religious traditions is “an idea itself rooted in Romantic nostalgia for an idealized past.” Indeed, there is no doubt that, in an attempt to counter the rising emphasis on rational materialism, early nineteenth-century European authors shared a common interest in India as a source for a “primordial tradition” (*philosophia perennis*) or a “universal revelation” of “esoteric”
remain faithful to the subject one is investigating, otherwise one risks to be led astray.” (Versluis 2002: 5)

In works one is studying is necessary to understand them, but also that “it is extremely important to attempt to teachings. (Irwin 2001: 16-18, n. 16, referring to Schwab 1984: 205, 216-19, passim; Faivre 1994: 82 ff.; Versluis 1993: 23; Lopez 1995: 32; Batchelor 1995: 252).

According to Versluis, however, Perennialism is “the general term referring to those who see all various world religious traditions as having common features and perhaps as deriving from common origins or spiritual archetypes,” while traditionalism is “the subset of Perennialism espoused by figures like René Guénon, Ananda Coomaraswamy, and Frithjof Schuon that [as a doctrinal system] insists on the spiritual importance of religious tradition in contradistinction to a decadent modern world, […] underscoring uncompromisingly that there is such a thing as timeless truth and that the esoterist [and not Faivre’s ‘esotericist!’] can have access to it.” (Versluis 2002: 7)

As also Hanegraaff argues, “the first necessary step towards establishing the study of esotericism as a serious academic pursuit would be to demarcate it clearly from the perennialist perspective.” He insists that because Perennialism, just like Traditionalism, “considers its own metaphysical framework to be the absolute truth about the nature of religion,” this “logically precludes the possibility of discovering anything new or unexpected.” Traditionalism is based, he holds, on the premise that “if you understood, you would agree; if you disagree, obviously you don’t understand.” (Hanegraaff 1995: 110, cited in Versluis 2002: 8) According to Versluis, “Indeed, one scarcely finds any references among the Traditionalists to Western esoteric traditions such as alchemy or Christian theosophy, and in their works the term “esoterism” replaces “esotericism” as a theoretical concept expressing a unity of all religions rather than referring to any particular form of esotericism. In short, Hanegraaff concludes: Traditionalist “esoterism” [note the different word] is a means (for the most part from outside academia), for the comparative study of all religions from a particular doctrinal basis, and thus is not relevant for the study of Western esotericism…. As Hanegraaff points out, Traditionalism does reflect a fairly radical perspective that rejects modernity as degenerate and that dismisses much of contemporary academic study. Yet it does raise questions that eventually must be answered when we turn to the comparative study of religions and in particular to the study of various forms of esotericism not only Western but also Asian. On what basis can one compare, say, Buddhist Tantric and European alchemical traditions? Is it permissible to acknowledge that the Ungrund or Nichts of Böhme corresponds in some respects and perhaps in many to the Buddhist concept of shunyata or emptiness? And if so, then does this in turn mean that these disparate traditions do indeed point toward the same experience of transcendence, as a Franklin Merrell-Wolf would certainly insist? Or are we to claim dogmatically that we must study European traditions only in relation to themselves and that there is nothing to be gained by seeing whether there are parallels or correspondences between, say, Sufi, Taoist, Hindu, or Buddhist and European forms of alchemy? If one says ‘yes’ to this last question, one has effectively cut off the possibility of any comparative study of esoteric traditions.” (Versluis 2002: 8)

According to Payne, the main rhetorical strategies employed by Traditionalists in order to create a contemporary version, or interpretation (concealed under the guise of being an explanation), of Buddhism—and by extension, to generate preconceptions regarding the nature of religion as a general category— are selective representation and overcoding. (Payne 2008: 179) Therefore, Payne calls for caution in the use of the term “esoteric”, because “in contemporary Western religious culture “esoteric” can carry connotations unwarranted in the East Asian Buddhist context. These take the form of preconceptions regarding a universal category of “the esoteric”…. which manifests through the particular forms of different religious traditions. This is the view of Perennialism, which holds that there is a mystical core to all religions, and that that core mystical experience—open to all “true” initiates— is the same in all religions. Differences in the expression of this essence are explained away as the simply unavoidable consequence of expressing an ineffable experience of the higher reality through the contingencies of a particular language and culture.” In short, he claims that he is “not concerned with “Buddhist esoterism”; not, that is, with the Buddhist form of the Perennialist conception of the universal category of the esoteric, but with “esoteric Buddhism”, the form of Buddhism that presents itself as constrained by concerns for the transmission of its powerful psycho-spiritual technologies only to those capable of using those technologies properly.” (Payne 2006: 8) Moreover, he notes that “the issue of the subsumption of Buddhism under the universalizing –hegemonic– discourse of Perennialism is not simply a matter of conflicting interpretations, nor of conflicting claims of authority, legitimacy, or authenticity. Perennialism, also called Traditionalism, is strongly authoritarian in character and has historical connections with Fascism.” (Payne 2006: 229, n. 26)

In contrast to what Fitzgerald, a recent proponent of reductionism defines as “ontological reductionism”, being the fear of opponents of reductionism that “the putative transcendent” will be lost (Fitzgerald, quoted in Versluis 2002: 5), Versluis writes: “the real problem with reductionism is that it may well lead to profound misreadings or distortions of primary sources”, arguing not only that “some sympathy with the authors and works one is studying is necessary to understand them”, but also that “it is extremely important to attempt to remain faithful to the subject one is investigating”, otherwise one risks to be led astray. (Versluis 2002: 5) In respect to the validity of reductionist discourse, Versluis argues that the subfield of (Western) esotericism is not flawed by Judeo-Christian assumptions: “In recent years, the field of religious studies has sustained a number of
Table 17. Versluis’ spectrum  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>perennialist (traditionalist)</th>
<th>internal (religionist)</th>
<th>empirical (empiricist)</th>
<th>reductionist</th>
<th>ideologically charged reductionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perspective of the tradition itself</td>
<td>+/- neutral (sympathetic) observation</td>
<td>reduction to non-religious constituent parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the view of Versluis, even when one writes from an empirical perspective, “i.e. as a more or less neutral observer of historical figures, works, or events– one may still acknowledge and draw upon” a sympathetic or, in terms of Hanegraaf’s model, “an emic approach, drawing upon the perspective of the alchemist or theosopher [i.e. the religious practitioner] without for all that presenting oneself as [a religious practitioner, whether] an alchemist or theosopher”.932 Alternatively, he describes the ‘sympathetic empiricist perspective’ as follows:

I am arguing, here, for an empirico-historical approach that does not descend to mere reductionism, but that remains open to insights that can only come from a sympathetic understanding of one’s subject. This does not necessarily entail an explicitly “believer’s” viewpoint in the sense that a scholar is seeking to “convert” his or her readers, but it does entail some indebtedness to the insights that can only come from within the perspective of that controversies and even attacks from within concerning the nature of the field and the degree to which it is still indebted to its origins (within the Western university) in Christian theology; only one of the arguments being that the entire field of religious studies is fundamentally flawed by what critics believe are its often hidden Judeo-Christian assumptions. This argument, however, (if and when it is indeed a valid argument and not grossly overstated) applies to comparative religion and in particular to comparisons between monotheistic and non-monotheistic traditions– it does not apply to the field of Western esotericism inasmuch as the field exists largely (although by no means exclusively) in a Judeo-Christian context to begin with.” (Versluis 2002: 5) According to Versluis, “the fundamental argument of Fitzgerald and others” is “to reduce religious studies to cultural-historical studies or to eliminate religious studies entirely”. (Versluis 2002: 6)

In his journal entitled No Souvenirs, the famous Romanian historian of religions Mircea Eliade (1907-1986) criticized the reductionism of some historians, “that does not seek to understand the phenomena it is studying on its own terms, but instead attempts to explain a given religious phenomena away as something else” (Versluis 2002: 6) for being “a neurotic attitude” and he attacked them for having neglected, what he calls “the hermeneutic of religious creations”: “I would like to analyse the attitude of historicists of all kinds […] all those who believe that one can understand culture only by reducing it to something lower (sexuality, economics, history, etc.) and to show that theirs is a neurotic attitude. The neuropath demystifies life, culture, the spiritual life […], he can no longer grasp the deep meaning of things, and consequently, he can no longer believe in their reality. […] I have never affirmed the insignificance of historical situations, their usefulness for understanding religious creations. If I haven’t emphasized this problem, it is precisely because it has been emphasized too much, and because what seems to me essential is thus neglected: the hermeneutic of religious creations.” (Eliade 1977: 144; quoted in Versluis 2002: 6. Emphasis added) Following Eliade, and having noted that “anti-esotericism and [ideologically charged] reductionism so often go hand in hand”, Versluis writes that “reductionism almost always is a function of ideological distortion: one approaches a given topic […] with some sort of ideological axe to grind, and while one may offer some limited insight into the social manifestations [of the subject] as a result, one will almost certainly do it an injustice precisely because ‘the hermeneutic of religious creations’ has been lost along the way.” (Versluis 2002: 6) 932 Versluis 2002: 5.
current or figure one is studying. [...] If we can’t answer that question [namely how a particular practitioner of esotericism understands the tradition out of which he is writing] faithfully, I would suggest there is a serious danger that we are doing that subject an injustice. A studied sympathetic neutrality toward one’s subject allows us to enter at least imaginatively into the alternative worldview we are studying and to faithfully convey it to others. Ideologically charged scholarship may be fashionable from time to time, but because it cannot answer faithfully this question of how a given figure understood and conveyed his or her own esoteric perspective, it is not helpful for the kind of foundational historical research necessary for us to come to understand the breadth and depth of this new field. 933

In conclusion (if in this ongoing consideration, one is already to draw any that are not tentative), we can –at least for now– accept that “the combination of rigorous historical, empirical research and a critical-mindedness that recognizes the conceptual status of ‘esotericism’ as a scholarly construct is the prerequisite for the acceptance of its study as a legitimate field of academic research”. 934 Although some have argued that “there is perhaps little to be gleaned from attempts to define esoteric Buddhism” and that “rather, discussions rooted in the examination of specific instances, and particularly of marginal cases, would seem to be productive lines of inquiry,” this does not necessarily is “to suggest that critical, self-reflective inquiries about what we mean by esoteric Buddhism, … are not productive”. 935 Moreover, we might also have to acknowledge that stressing the ‘unique instance’ of ‘esoteric’ phenomena might make lose us sight of ‘the bigger picture’. Indeed, as Orzech points out, our analytical construct, i.e. that of ‘esoteric Buddhism’ as working definition, obviously “fits some features and historical moments better than others, and obviously it meshes with some aspects of indigenous taxonomies better than others”. 936 One may therefore just accept that some of the categories we employ have analytical utility as a scholarly convention, “as long as we are careful to spell out how we are using it and why…” 937

933 Versluis 2002: 6, with added emphasis.
936 Orzech 2006: 70.
937 Orzech 2006: 69.
APPENDIX A. SOURCE TEXTS

1. HSBK (T. LXXVIII, NO. 2463)

6b11: 祕密三昧耶佛戒儀一卷
6b12: 夫欲發無上菩提之心應先深心觀察。十
6b13: 方諸佛清淨性海湛寂圓明本無生滅。廣大
6b14: 無礙無相無常寂滅相。愍諸衆生為諸妄
6b15: 想煩惱迷覆淨心不覺不知。昏昏默默貪
6b16: 瞠癡毒日夜燒溺。六賊攻劫五欲纒縛。昏狂
6b17: 既盛無所覺知。愍念此輩從大悲流演化
6b18: 身不生而生無相現相。假起言説示現去
6b19: 來。皆爲憐念我等衆生起方便智施權實
6b20: 是故我等慚愧。諸佛慈悲方便愍念衆生
6b21: 沈淪苦海。應當發起廣大之心誓願斷除一切
6b22: 一切有情誓求速證無上菩提諸佛勝果
6b23: 誓願度脱諸衆生界
6c01: 生染淨心。尋逐根源本無生滅。十方求之
6c02: 妄心流轉即名衆生染汚之身。開發照悟即
6c03: 名諸佛清淨法身。故不增不減經云。不離
6c04: 畜生界有法身。不離法身。有衆生界。衆
6c05: 生界即是法身。法身即是衆生界。又言。衆
6c06: 生界清淨應知即法身。法身即涅槃。涅槃
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即如來。以是觀之。一切衆生性淨法身與諸佛身本無差別。而諸佛如來昔在因地迷本法身與我無異。然發大精進勤修正行已成正覺。我今云何貪戀游泥不起正行。故發是心。又觀眾生沈淪苦海。迷自心源喪失惠命。愍念彼等與我法身平等無二。云何信任不垂救拔。是故勇猛發起大悲度諸眾生破魔怨敵。是故發起菩提之心。次應啓請一切諸佛弟子某甲等稽首和南十方諸佛毘盧遮那清淨法身報身化身萬德圓滿一切如來及諸菩薩摩訶薩降臨道場以大慈悲拔濟我等。以大智慧照明我等。今者為欲發起大菩提心。棄捨生死破壞魔衆。摧伏外道超越二乘誓求諸佛大悲行願。是故我今歸依頂禮普禮賢聖以我功德力如來加持力及以法界力普供養而住。普供養眞言曰。唵誐誐嚢二合斛至心懺悔。從過去無始已來乃至今日於今日無明迷覆違失淨心妄想攀緣起諸。願以清淨殊勝香花憧幡寶蓋飲食燈燭。常願供養一切諸佛及諸菩薩一切賢聖。以我功德力如來加持力及以法界力普供養而住。普供養眞言曰。唵誐誐嚢引三婆嚩日羅二合斛。至心懺悔。從過去無始已來乃至今日於今日無明迷覆違失淨心妄想攀緣起諸。
分別、貪嗔癡等無量煩惱。

7a09: 分別、貪嗔癡等無量煩惱。

7a10: 惡。起諸我慢謗佛法僧。侵奪盜竊一切財。

7a11: 物。故殺誤殺損害衆生。縱恣愚癡起諸貪。

7a12: 染。飲酒食犬及以薰辛污穢伽藍浸損常。

7a13: 住妄言緒語惡口兩舌。

7a14: 如是等罪無量無邊。

7a15: 我今至誠發露懺悔。

7a16: 侵奪盜竊一切財。

7a17: 恒。

7a18: 締。

7a19: 合。

7a20: 無異處故。

7a21: 弟子某甲等。盡未來際歸依無上三身諸佛。

7a22: 歸依方廣大乘法藏。歸依不退諸菩薩僧。

7a23: 弟子某甲等。歸依佛竟。歸依法竟。歸依僧竟。

7a24: 我等今者與諸菩薩和合發心竟。盡未來際常無退轉。

7a25: 須結界。不欲説欲。

7a26: 三歸真言曰。

7a27: 弟子某甲等。我從今日發菩提心。誓願斷除。

7a28: 一切衆惡。誓願修習無邊法門。誓願度脫一切衆生。誓求如來一切勝果。誓願修習無邊法門。誓願度脫一切衆生。誓求如來一切勝果。誓願修習無邊法門。誓願度脫一切衆生。誓求如來一切勝果。誓願修習無邊法門。誓願度脫一切衆生。誓求如來一切勝果。誓願修習無邊法門。誓願度脫一切衆生。誓求如來一切勝果。誓願修習無邊法門。誓願度脫一切衆生。誓求如來一切勝果。誓願修習無邊法門。誓願度脫一切衆生。誓求如來一切勝果。誓願修習無邊法門。

7b01: 提道場常無退轉。願尊證知我是菩薩三說。

7b02: 二合野引婆娑次次。

7b03: 然薩啣波頌覓引彌煬日囉二合野引婆娑次次。皈依方廣大乘法藏。皈依不退諸菩薩僧。

7b04: 引彌。

7b05: 是故得名最無。華嚴經云。佛子始發生如是妙寶心即超凡夫位入佛所行處。

7b06: 如是等罪無量無邊。

7b07: 當坐菩。乃至當坐菩。華嚴經云。佛子始發生如是妙寶心即超凡夫位入佛所行處。
次問言。諸仁者能受持一切諸佛菩薩最勝
最上大律儀否答言。能持
次請賢聖三請
弟子某甲等。奉請十方一切諸佛為大尊證。
願大德為我作證明
弟子某甲等。奉請無動寶生阿彌陀天鼓雷
音為作和尚。爲依和尚故得受具足菩薩
清淨三昧耶戒。爲我作和尚。慈愍故也
至心奉請雄猛阿閦鞞。最勝寶生尊。大悲
阿彌陀。成就不空業。此諸無上尊。至心稽首
請。及薩埵金剛降伏於一切。勝上虚空藏能
授諸潅頂。救世觀自在顯三昧瑜伽。巧毘首
羯磨善作諸事業。如是轉輪者唯願受我請
三説
次應奉請羯磨及教授
普賢慈氏妙德除蓋障爲羯磨阿闍梨。如是
四菩薩。猶如賢瓶闕一不可。第一普賢菩薩
摩訶薩。普者遍一切處。賢者最妙善義。謂菩
提心所起願行及以三業。悉皆平等遍一切
處。又名金剛。金剛者喩實相義過一切語
言心行適無所依。不示諸法無初中後。不
盡不壞離諸過惡。不可變易。故名金剛。世
間金剛有三種義。一不可壞。第二慈氏菩薩
於四無量心慈最爲稱首。第三妙吉祥菩薩。妙者更無等比
義。無過上義。吉祥者嘉慶之善譽。亦名妙
d德。亦曰妙音。第四除蓋障菩薩。衆生種種心
c垢能翳菩提。此是菩薩能除蓋障之羅霧
現大日之光。是故奉請此四菩薩爲羯磨
羯磨善作諸事業。如是轉輪者唯願受我請
三説
阿闍梨。奉請普賢慈氏妙吉祥除蓋障四大
7c10: 菩薩。為我作羯磨阿闍梨。為作阿闍梨故
7c11: 得授菩薩清淨三昧戒。慈愍故
7c12: 次又應奉請普賢菩薩金剛薩埵觀自在三
7c13: 大菩薩。爲教授阿闍梨
7c14: 第一普賢菩薩即如如法身。具修萬行對精
7c15: 進門。息災方便故。第二金剛薩埵菩薩對金
7c16: 剛智慧門。降伏方便故。第三觀自在菩薩對
7c17: 蓮華三昧門。增益方便故。此三聖者名曰無
7c18: 量不可思議妙用三點。即般若解脱法身。是
7c19: 故三點攝一切法。所以奉請此三大菩薩。
7c20: 懇應作教授阿闍梨。至心奉請普賢菩薩
7c21: 金剛薩埵菩薩觀自在菩薩。爲我作教授阿
7c22: 闍梨。慈愍故三說
7c23: 次說羯磨
7c24: 諸佛子至心諦聽。今與仁者羯磨授戒。正
7c25: 是得戒之時。至心諦聽羯磨。仰願十方一切
7c26: 諸佛諸大菩薩慈悲憶念。此諸佛子等。始從
7c27: 今日乃至當坐菩提道場受學過去現在未
7c28: 來一切諸佛諸大菩薩清淨妙戒。所謂攝律
7c29: 儀戒。饒益有情戒。攝善法戒。具足受持始
8a01: 從今日盡未來際三說
8a02: 諸佛子等。具足受持諸佛菩薩清淨戒竟。是
8a03: 事如是持。授戒竟
8a04: 次甄別戒性
8a05: 已發菩提心具菩薩戒竟。復應修四攝法
8a06: 及四波羅夷及十重戒。不應缺犯。其四攝者
8a07: 所謂布施愛語利行同事。爲欲調伏無始
8a08: 堊貪及利益有情故應行布施。爲欲調
8a09: 慾嗔恚懶慢煩惱及利益有情故應行愛
8a10: 語。爲欲饒益有情及滿本願故應修利
8a11: 行為欲親近善知識及令善心無間斷故
8a12: 應修同事。如是四法是修行處。是事如是
8a13: 持。今人此三密門即身口意密復應淨除
8a14: 四障。所謂四障者。於有情中及一切法中
8a15: 作種種不平等見。是第一障。二者於平等誓
8a16: 中作種種限量之心。是第二障。三者諸有所
8a17: 作隨順名利不為大事因縁。是第三障。四
8a18: 者放逸懈怠不能驚察身心。是第四障。如
8a19: 是四障若纔起時。即自損亦損於他。是故精
8a20: 勤誓願斷除。應如是持
8a21: 次應修四威儀。名無作。於其功德運運之
8a22: 間自然增長。一者於一切如來正法藏中誓
8a23: 願解了。二者於一切菩薩正行之中誓願勤
8a24: 行。三者於一切如來度人門中誓願修習。
8a25: 四者於一切有情中以四攝法而救濟之。
8a26: 令離苦獲安。是名四無作功德。應如是
8a27: 持
8a28: 將入陀羅尼門復具三種三昧耶。是踐如
8a29: 來所行之迹。必須專精四波羅夷誓無缺
8b01: 犯。所謂四波羅夷者。若有毀犯由如斷頭
8b02: 命根不續。則一切支分無所能為不久散
8b03: 壞。菩提心戒四種戒相。亦是大乗正法命根。
8b04: 若破壞者。由如死尸雖修種種功德不久
8b05: 敗也
8b06: 第一不應捨正法而起邪行戒。為如來一
8b07: 切正教皆當修行受持讀誦。由如大海吞納
8b08: 百川無厭足心。右於諸乘了不了義。隨於
8b09: 一法生捨心及起邪行。即名毀犯。第一
8b10: 波羅夷。不得犯。能持否答。能持
8b11: 第二不應捨離菩提心戒。此菩提心菩薩
8b12: 萬行。猶如大將幢旗。若喪失幢旗即是三
8b13: 軍敗績墮他勝處。是故不應捨離菩提心。
8b14: 若離菩提心。是名犯第二波羅夷。不得犯。
8b15: 能持否
8b16: 第三於一切法不應悭悋戒。此諸勝法皆
8b17: 是如來勤苦修行損棄身命。乃至為其僮僕
8b18: 床座然後得之。是一切衆生父母遺財。非
8b19: 獨為一。若悭悋不與同於盜三寶物。故犯
8b20: 第三波羅夷。不得犯。能持否
8b21: 第四不得於一切衆生作不饒益行戒。此
8b22: 是四攝相違法故。菩薩修行四攝普攝一切
8b23: 衆生為人道因緣。而今反作四攝相違起
8b24: 衆生障道因緣舍饒益。故犯第四波羅夷。不
8b25: 得犯。能持否
8b26: 今此四戒以持初戒故於十方三世一切正
8b27: 法藏中皆生無作功德。由第二戒故於十
8b28: 方一切菩薩行中皆生無作功德。由第三
8b29: 戒故於十方三世一切度人門皆生無作功德
8c01: 德。由第四戒故於十方世界一切衆生及四
8c02: 攝事中皆生無作功德
8c03: 次說十重戒相。所謂十重者。一者不應退
8c04: 菩提心。妨成佛故。二者不應捨離三寶
8c05: 歸依外道。是邪法故。三者不應毀謗三乘
8c06: 教典。皆佛法故。四者於甚深大乘經典不通
8c07: 解處不可生疑。非凡夫境界故。五者若
8c08: 復有人已發菩提心者不應説如是法。
8c09: 令彼退菩提心趣向二乘斷三寶種故。六
8c10: 見未發菩提心者亦不應説如是法。
8c11: 令彼發於二乘之心違本願故。七者對小
8c12: 乘人不應説說深妙大乘。恐彼生谤獲大
8c13: 殆故。八者不應發起邪見。斷善根故。九
8c14: 者於外道前不應自說我具無上菩提妙
8c15: 戒。令彼以嗔害心求如是法不能辨得
8c16: 退菩提心。二俱損故。十者但於有情中所
8c17: 損害及無利益。皆不應令自作及教他作。
8c18: 見作隨喜即於利他法中及以慈悲相違背
8c19: 故。如是戒者 不同小乘一期為限量三千
8c20: 爲境界。又聲聞律儀因緣造作以無餘涅槃
8c21: 爲究竟。今此所授從一切智生。終趣薩般
8c22: 若海無有窮盡。又聲聞法中難有具足煩
8c23: 惱學無學等階次不同。然所發無作律儀則
8c24: 無優劣之異。今此菩薩律儀亦復如是。雖
8c25: 復最初發心乃至四十二地階次不同。然一
8c26: 時普遍法界發起無作善根。則與如來更
8c27: 無增減之異。今授戒已竟。將紹法寶與佛
8c28: 在世更無異也。即是佛真子。當補佛位。是
8c29: 則最上最尊無比無等之戒也。速滅罪障頓
9a01: 證菩提之門也
9a02: 次可有迴向。所修功德等云云
9a03: 三昧耶佛戒儀一卷終
無生滅大無礙無相無為常寂滅實際諸生為諸妄想煩惱迷覆既

夫欲發無上菩提之心應先深心觀察十方諸佛清净性海湛寂透明本

密三昧耶佛戒儀一卷

二．HSBK(TKDZ) V:165-176
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APPENDIX B. Central maṇḍala layout according to the HSBK

Garbhadhātumaṇḍala

A: Acala/Akṣobhya [⇒ Ratnaketu]  
B: Ratnaketu [⇒ Saṃkusumitarāja]  
C: Amitāyus  
D: Divyadundubhimaneśvarakṣa

a: Samantabhadra  
b: Maitreya  
c: Mañjusri  
d: Sarvanivṛttaścakṣa = Avalokiteśvara

Center of Vajradhātumaṇḍala

A: Akṣobhya  
B: Ratnasamādhi  
C: Amitābha  
D: Amoghasiddhi

a: Vajrasattva  
b: [Vajratāna] = Ākāśagarbha  
c: [Vajradharma] = Āravālokiteśvara  
d: [Vajraśrava] = Viśvakarmā

UPADHYAYACARYA  
KARMACARYA  
ANUSANACARYA
**APPENDIX C**

Concordance of 'sanma/maiya]-kai'-compounds and sequences in the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.</th>
<th>三昧耶戒 (339)</th>
<th>三摩耶戒 (181)</th>
<th>三昧戒 (37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X~/~X (244)</td>
<td>序 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first sight, a digital search results in 12 hits, but it regards sequences of combinations ending in -*samat(ya)*, followed by those starting with *kai*.-

* But: *昧=摩* in '<甲-ed.' (T. vol. 19: p. 20, n. 26)
<p>| 24 | 1487 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 (<del>具) |
| 26 | 1521 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (佛</del>) |
| 28 | 1549 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 (2 -不具足) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1 -不具足) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1 戒~) |
| 31 | 1592 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>瞋恨) |
| 39 | 1796 | 3 (1 堅持</del>) | 1 |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
| 40 | 1805 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (知</del>) |
| 46 | 1954 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
| 55 | 2160 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 57 | 2204 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 58 | 2213 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 1 (</del>) |
|  |  | (2 受~) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 十重</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 十善戒及十重</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (6 漢</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (2 況</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 指此</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 四重</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 佛具足</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 戒此</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (2 四重禁名</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 <del>面名</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (</del>) |
|  |  | (1 佛具足~) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 指此</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
|  |  | (1 佛具足</del>) |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
| 2214 | 1 (</del>) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
| 2215 | 1 (</del>) |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (<del>) |
| 59 | 2216 | 41 | 1 |  |  |  | 8 (</del>) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>页码</th>
<th>含义</th>
<th>原文</th>
<th>备注</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2217</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1 阿闍梨~) (1 堅持~) (1 指~) (1 - 指) (1 - 一切如來~) (1 指持-[中]) (1 指持) (1 罪惡-文)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>(1 無為戒~同義)</td>
<td>(1 師~) (1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2219</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1 得~) (1 -名) (1 授~) (1 入-場 [入佛-場 in 甲])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1 明獲<del>如說行中) (1 名為住正見真實</del>) (1 [傳法治病] 受~[之時]) (1 受~[之時]) (1 授~[之時]) (1 -私記) (1 十方三世諸佛同一本誓 ~)</td>
<td>(1/1) 1 (勤修~)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>(1 [彼密言及] -[等])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2225</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1 [禁戒之謂] ~) -</td>
<td>(1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1 -心)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2241</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1 -[者]) (1 指-場) (2 受-[1 of which + - 位])</td>
<td>(1 - 位) (1 - 場)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1 舍規天皇-文) (1 -信心)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1 菩提心~) (1 -文)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2294</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 2358a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2373</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(入定受~)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(一切如来~)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2384</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 2387</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(授~)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2393</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2394</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2396</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2397</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(義釋~)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2399</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(授~)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(破~)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(破~)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2408</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2409</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(名~)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 2414</td>
<td>3 (1-次)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2415</td>
<td>2 (1-受~)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2416</td>
<td>3 (1 四波羅夷~)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2434</td>
<td>1 (~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2435</td>
<td>1 (~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2441</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2442</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2443</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2446</td>
<td>2 (1 堂境諸佛~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2462</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2463</td>
<td>1 (受具足菩薩清浄)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2468</td>
<td>1 (受持諸佛~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2470</td>
<td>1 (受持諸佛~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2473</td>
<td>1 (受具足菩薩清浄)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2482</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2483</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2484</td>
<td>1 (受菩薩~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2487</td>
<td>3 (1 頭摩事)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2488</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2495</td>
<td>4 (1 賛菩提心~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2496</td>
<td>1 (受菩薩~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

197
| 2497 | 1 ( / ) | 1 | 1 | 2 | (1 - 作法) | 1 (~ 作法) | 1 |
| 2498 | 1 (准 - 之儀授戒體) | 1 | 1 | 2 | (1 - 率) | (1 - 作法事) |
| 2499 | 4 (1 - 習) | 3 | 2 | (1 - 作法) | (1 - 作法) | 1 | 1 |
| 2500 | 8 (1 ~ 作法) | 1 | 2 | (1 - 道場) |
| 2501 | 3 (1 /) | 1 (~ 作法) |
| 2502 | 1 (授真言) | 1 (~ 作法) |
| 2503 | 2 (1 /) | 1 (~ 作法) |
| 2504 | 2 (1 /) | 1 (~ 作法) |
| 2505 | 1 (佛性 - [文]) |
| 2506 | 1 (前廊行 - 指圖) |
| 2507 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2508 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2509 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2510 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2511 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2512 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2513 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2514 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2515 | 1 (大師 - 之中) |
| 2516 | 3 (1 /) | 1 (~ 作法) |
| 2517 | 1 (發菩提心) |
| 2518 | 3 (1 /) | 33 |
| 2519 | 9 | 9 |
APPENDIX D

JHBK (SS XX: 42b-52c)
稽元日何信任非垂授化是故发释梵提之心
次应合普一切诸佛
谛子其甲等稽首右南方诸佛
毗卢遮那清净法身
身化身万德因身明一切如来及诸佛法光
诸佛无摩诃遮那释梵天
身行法身万德因身明一切如来及诸佛法光
我今归依著教著礼著佛著众
著一者众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
如是众长者优越一切诸佛大悲行行
此三合野住娑婆三合野
夫欲修身慎行，要先捨惡進善。捨惡而調身口意。進善者，專修戒定慧。慧者即一切陀羅尼門。定者即是切三摩地門。欲入此二門者，要藉正戒以爲根本。而是三門如世伊字。闕一不可。自有古先大德。則有求那跋陀羅三藏達磨、師師傳授。唯詮三摩地門。又有三藏瞿多、三藏留支、唯集陀羅尼門。近有三藏善無畏與金剛菩提流志。即天竺高德此土傳燈。鳩此三門歸乎一揆。其定慧門者乃是滅煩惱之要津。登涅槃之正路。甚深微妙難可測度。既是速超佛地據果酬因。若不發増上心、精勤勇採者。則不合得聞勝上法門。欲入法門者先發菩提心。方進菩薩戒。然後登前佛地受法三寶所。以決定勤誠受佛正戒。次應歸命（三説）。

弟子某甲歸命十方一切諸佛及諸菩薩。大菩提心爲大導師。能令我等離諸惡趣。能示人天及涅槃路。是故我今頂禮常住三寶（歸命已）。次應供養。

弟子某甲等十方世界所有一切最上最妙華香幡蓋。天廚肴膳。天樂奇音。無量莊嚴。無邊勝事。供養諸佛及諸菩薩大菩提心（供養已）。次應懺悔（三説）。

弟子某甲等自從無始已來乃至今日貪瞋癡等。
一切煩惱。及忿恨等諸隨煩惱。惱亂身心。廣造諸罪。身業不善。斷衆生命。劫盜他人所有財寶。於人非人行不淨行。口業不善。作虛詭語。染汚心語。間和合語。惡口罵詈語。意業不善。起瞋。及起邪見。
一切煩惱無始相續纏染其心。如是三業造罪無量。或殺父殺母。殺阿羅漢。出佛身血。破和合僧。毀謗三寶。破齋破戒。飲酒啖肉。如是等罪無量無邊。
今日至誠發露懺悔。一懺已後永斷相續更不復造。唯願三寶加威護念。能令我等罪障消滅。至心頂禮常住三寶（懺悔已）。
次歸依三寶（三説）。
弟子某甲等願從今身乃至當坐菩提道場歸依如來無上三身。歸依方廣大乘法藏。歸依一切不退菩薩摩訶薩。唯願十方一切諸佛諸大菩薩證知我等。至心頂禮常住三寶（三説）。
次發菩提心（三説）。
弟子某甲等始從今日乃至當坐菩提道場誓度無量諸有情類。皆令免離生死大苦。今所發心復當遠離我法二相。我法平等無自性故。唯願十方一切諸佛諸大菩薩證知我等。至心頂禮常住三寶（三説）。
次應問言。
諸佛子志心能受持一切菩薩最勝最上大律儀不（答。言能）。
次請賢聖（三説）。
弟子某甲等奉請十方一切諸佛爲大尊證。奉請雄猛阿陛佛。最勝寶生佛。大悲阿彌陀佛。成就不空業佛。此諸無上尊至心稽首請。
奉請四大菩薩及薩金剛菩薩。降伏於一切
勝上虚空藏菩薩能授諸灌頂。救世觀自在菩
薩顯三昧瑜伽得毘首羯磨。善作諸事業。如
是轉輪者四菩薩。唯願受我請(三説)。
次請和上。
弟子奉請無動如來寶生如來阿彌陀如來天鼓
雷音如來。為我作和上。我依和上故得受具足菩
薩清淨三昧耶戒(三説)。
次請羯磨阿闍梨。
弟子某某等奉請普賢菩薩慈氏菩薩妙徳菩薩
除蓋障菩薩。為我作羯磨阿闍梨。我依闍梨故得
受具足菩薩清淨三昧耶戒。
次請教授阿闍梨。
弟子某某等奉請普賢薩觀音。為我作教授阿
闍梨。我依闍梨故得受具足清淨三昧耶戒。
復請四大菩薩。是四菩薩猶如賢瓶闕一不可。
第一奉請普賢菩薩摩訶薩。普者遍一切處。賢者
最妙善。謂菩提心所起願行及以三業悉皆平等
遍一切處。復名金剛。金剛者喩實相義。過一切語
言心行。遍無所依。不示諸法初中後。不盡不壞離
諸過患。不可變易故名金剛
（世間金剛者有三種義。一不可壞。二寶中之王。三者戰具中勝）。第二奉請慈氏菩薩摩訶薩。於四無量。慈最為稱首。
第三奉請妙吉祥菩薩摩訶薩。妙者更無等比無
過上者。吉祥者嘉慶之善譽。亦曰妙徳。亦曰妙音。
第四奉請除一切蓋障菩薩摩訶薩。衆生種種心
垢能翳菩薩淨眼。每籍靜慮(卍有缺字歟)。猶如盲者不
覩日光。所以奉請此四大菩薩摩訶薩。為我作羯
磨阿闍梨（三説。慈悲故）。
復請普賢菩薩摩訶薩。此菩薩即如法身。具修萬行（息災方便故）。

復請金剛薩菩薩摩訶薩。對金剛智慧門（降伏方便故）。
復請觀音自在菩薩摩訶薩。對蓮華三昧門（增益方便故）。
此三聖者名曰無量不可思議妙用三點（即般若解脱法身）。
是故三點攝一切法。所以奉請此三大菩薩摩訶薩。為我作教授阿闍梨（三説。慈悲故）。

次説羯磨授戒。
諸佛子。至心諦聽。今與仁者羯磨授戒。正是得戒之時。至心諦聽羯磨。十方諸佛諸大菩薩慈悲憶念。此諸佛子始從今日乃至當坐菩提道場。受學過去現在未來一切諸佛諸大菩薩清淨妙戒。所謂攝律儀戒。饒益有情戒。攝善法戒。此三種戒具足受持。

始從今日盡未來際諸佛子具足受持諸佛菩薩清净戒竟。是事如是持（已上。授戒竟）。
已發菩提心具菩薩戒竟。復應修四攝法及四波羅夷及十重戒等。不應缺犯。
其四攝者。所謂布施愛語利行同事。為欲調伏無始慳貪及饒益有情故應行布施。為欲調伏瞋恚慢煩惱及利益有情故應行愛語。為欲饒益有情及滿本願故應行利行。為欲親近大善知識及令善心無間斷故名為同事。如是四法是修行處。是事如是持。今入三密門即是身口意密。復應淨除四障。四障者。一於有情中及一切法中作種種不平等見。是第一障。二者於平等誓中作種種限量之心。是第二障。三者於平等誓中作種種限量之心。是第二障。
不為大事因縁。是第三障。四者放逸縱意不能
警察身心。是第四障。如是四障若纔起時即為
自損亦損於他。是故精勤誓願除斷。應如是持。
次應修四律儀。
名為無作。於其功德運運之間自然增長。一者於
一切如來正法藏中誓願解了。二者於一切菩薩
正行之中誓願勤行。三者於如來度人門中誓願
修集。四者於一切有情中以四攝法而救濟之令
離苦獲安。是名四無作功德。應如是持。

將入陀羅尼門。復具四種三昧耶。是踐如來所行
之跡必須專精四波羅夷。誓無缺犯。波羅夷者。毘
尼藏中廣明四波羅夷。一者不得捨正法而起邪
見。若舍正法是第一波羅夷。不得犯。能持不。二
者不得離菩提心。若離菩提心是第二波羅夷。不
得犯。能持不。二者不得離菩提心。若離菩提心是第二波羅夷。不
得犯。能持不。三者於一切法中不應慳吝。於一
切法中有所慳吝是第三波羅夷。不得犯。能持不。
四者於一切有情中起饒益行。若於有情之中不
起饒益行是第四波羅夷。不得犯。能持不。
既能護持如是四波羅夷。從一切智生終趣薩波
若海。本末堅固猶若金剛。於一念中恆殊勝進轉
深轉廣。常興義利。如巧色摩尼珠應念出寶。周遍
法界無有制限。今更慇懃重説十戒相。其戒相者
是謂十重。一者不應退菩提心。妨成佛故。二
者不應捨離三寶。歸依外道。邪見法故。三者不
應毀謗三乘教典。背佛法故。四者於甚深大乘
經典不通解處不應生疑。非凡失境界故。五者
若復有人已發菩提心者不應說如是法令彼退
菩提心趣向二乘。斷三寶種故。六者見未發菩提
提心者亦不應說如是法令彼發於二乘之心。違本願故。七者對小乘人及邪見人前不應説深妙大乘。恐彼生讒獲大罪故。八者不應發起邪見。斷善根故。九者於外道前不應自說我具無上菩提妙戒。恐彼生讒獲大罪故。十者但於有情中有所損害及無利益皆不應自作及教他作見作隨喜。即於利他法中及以慈悲相違背故。

今授戒已。將紹法寶。如佛在世無異此也。是佛眞子。當補佛處。此法深奧難可信受。未可對衆委曲具陳。亦應隨機審授。種種觀察方乃具縁。必須堅信決除疑網。佛言。我今開甘露味門。若有信者得歡喜也。知信方爲初淨心堅固則能增長菩提。然諸有情根機不同大聖設教亦復非一。不可偏執一法互相是非。尚無得人天果報。何况無上道耶。或有專行布施成無上道耶。或有專持戒行亦成佛道。乃至忍辱精進禪定智慧等。及八萬四千塵沙法門皆得悟入。今依金剛頂經。大日世尊順瑜伽教即是無上無等方便。速滅衆罪速具種智。何以故。所謂瑜伽即是三業相應。若無間斷速證佛果。又應覺除五種障。一謂根本煩惱及八萬四千上中下品障蓋。二謂過去及現在造諸重罪。三謂得勝生處。不假修集以根爲障。四謂已得無障不逢善友不得聽法。五謂已遇善知識得聞正法。然有種種因縁。兩不和合。妨修般若。既離五障於自心中常見十方諸佛。猶如浮月漸漸增明至十五日。能不動潮。以身語意興種種供養雲。以無盡廣大
觀廣修諸度。復由思量淨得解無量語言陀羅尼門。已得陀羅尼故能知一切眾生心行。乃至視聽嗅觸亦皆互用無有障礙。能作佛事不息如來種故。行人內具如上功德外為諸佛護持。於生死中而無染著即是清淨尸羅。非造作法故云住無為戒。如聲聞戒要由白四羯磨衆縁具足方始得生。又須守護如妨利刺。一其長盡戒亦隨之。此陀羅尼戒則不如是。一受已後。世世生處不相捨離。不假受持。常無缺犯。戒品之體境智增明自然朗悟。本云。應徳三年九月二日（1086）以唐院本寫了。預大法師 良祐。[灌頂三昧耶戒（仁之本）終]
受菩提心戒儀一卷

開府儀同三司特進試鴻臚卿肅公食邑三千戸賜紫贈司空諡大鑒正號大廣智大興善寺三藏沙門不空奉詔譯
弟子某甲等稽首歸命禮遍虚空法界十方諸如來瑜伽總持教諸大菩薩衆及禮菩提心能滿福智聚令得無上覺是故稽首禮佛眞言曰唵薩嚩怛他多引跛娜滿那喃迦嚧彌次應運心供養弟子某甲等十方一切刹所有諸供養花鬘燈塗香飲食幢傘蓋誠心我奉獻諸佛大菩薩及諸賢聖等我今至心禮普供養虚空藏眞言日唵誐誐曩引三婆嚩嚩曰囉二合斛次應懺悔弟子某甲等今對一切佛
諸大菩薩衆 自從過去世
無始流轉中 乃至於今日
愚迷眞如性 起虛妄分別
貪瞋癡不善 三業諸煩惱
及以隨煩惱 違犯他勝罪
及餘罪愆 等 譹謗佛法僧
侵奪三寶物 廣作無間罪
無量無邊劫 不可憶知數
自作 教 他作 見聞及隨喜
復依勝義諦 眞實微妙理
聖慧眼觀察 前後中三際
彼皆無所得 自心造分別
虛妄不實故 以爲慧方便
平等如虚空 我悉皆懺悔
誓不敢覆藏 從今懺已後
永斷 不復作 乃至成正覺
終更不違犯 唯願十方佛
一切菩薩衆 哀愍 加 譫我
令我罪障 滅 是故 至心
悔滅 罪 眞言 日
唵 薩嚩跛波捺賀引 喃囉二合野引 喃二
次當受三歸依
弟子某甲等 從今日 以往
歸依諸如來 五智三身佛
歸依金剛乘 自性眞如法
歸依不退轉 大悲菩薩僧
740c29: 归依三寶竟 終不更歸依
741a01: 自利邪見道 我今至心禮
741a02: 三歸依真言日
741a03: 喪步引欠
741a04: 次應受菩提心戒
741a05: 弟子某甲等 一切佛菩薩
741a06: 從今日＊以往 乃至成正覺
741a07: 誓發菩提心
741a08: 有情無邊誓願度 福智無邊誓願集
741a09: 佛法無邊誓願學 如來無邊誓願事
741a10: 無上菩提誓願成
741a11: 今所發覺心 遠離諸性相
741a12: 蕪界及處等 能取所取執
741a13: 諸法悉無我 平等如虛空
741a14: 自心本不生 空性圓寂故
741a15: 如諸佛菩薩 發大菩提心
741a16: 我今如是發 是故至心禮
741a17: 次誦受菩提心戒真言日
741a18: 喪冒地嚥多母相波二合那野引彌
741a19: 最上乘教受發菩提心戒懺悔文
741a20: 弟子某甲等。歸命十方一切諸佛諸大菩薩
741a21: 大菩提心為大導師。能令我等離諸惡趣。能
741a22: 示人天人大涅槃。是故我今至心頂禮
741a23: 弟子某甲等。十方世界所有一切最勝上妙。
741a24: 香花麝蓋種種供養。奉獻一切諸佛菩薩。至
741a25: 心頂禮
741a26: 弟子某甲等。自從過去無始已來。乃至今日。
貪瞋癡等種種煩惱。及忿恨等諸隨煩惱。惱亂身心。廣作一切身業不善殺盜邪婬。口業不善妄言綺語惡口兩舌。意業不善貪瞋邪見。種種煩惱。無始相續纒染其心。令身口意造罪無量。或殺父母殺阿羅漢。出佛身血破和合僧。毀謗三寶打縛衆生。破齋破戒飲酒食肉。及食五辛。如是等罪無量無邊。不可憶。今日誠心發露懺悔。一懺已後。永斷相續更不敢造。唯願十方一切諸佛諸大菩薩。加持護念。能令我等罪障銷滅弟子某甲等。自從今身乃至當坐菩提道場。於其中間。歸依如來無上三身。歸依方廣法藏。歸依一切不退菩薩僧。歸依佛竟。歸依法竟。歸依僧竟。從今已後更不歸依二乘外道。唯願十方一切諸佛。證知我等。至心頂禮弟子某甲等。始從今身。乃至當坐菩提道場。於其中間。誓發無上菩提心。今所發心。復當遠離我法二相。顯明本覺。如平等鏡智現前。得善巧智。具足圓滿普賢之心。唯願十方一切諸佛諸大菩薩證知我等。至心頂禮。
南無東方阿閦佛 南無南方寶生佛 南
南無西方阿彌陀佛 南無北方不空成就
南無清淨法身毘盧遮那佛
海仁睿

942b28: 無畏三藏禅要
942b29: 中天竺摩伽陀国王子那爛陀竹林寺
942c01: 藥師諱輸波迦羅。唐言善無畏。刹利種
942c02: 豪貴族。共嵩岳會善寺大德禪師敬賢和
942c03: 上。對論佛法。略敘大乘要旨。開開衆生心
942c04: 地令速悟道。及受菩薩戒。羯磨儀軌。序之
942c05: 如左
942c06: 夫欲入大乘法者。先須發無上菩提心受大
942c07: 菩薩戒身器清淨。然後受法。略作十一門分
942c08: 別
942c09: 第一發心門 第二供養門 第三懺悔門
942c10: 第四歸依門 第五發菩提心門 第六問遮
942c11: 難門 第七請師門 第八羯磨門 第九結
942c12: 界門 第十修四攝門 第十一十重戒門
942c13: 第一發心門
942c14: 弟子某甲等。歸命十方一切諸佛諸大菩薩
942c15: 大菩提心。爲大導師。能令我等離諸惡趣。能
942c16: 示人天大涅槃路。是故我今至心頂禮第二供養門次應教令運心。
942c17: 遍想十方諸佛。及無邊世界。微塵剎海。恒沙諸佛菩薩。想自
942c18: 身於一一佛前。頂禮讚歎供養之
942c19: 弟子某甲等。十方世界所有一切最勝上妙。
942c20: 香華薦蓋種種勝事。供養諸佛及諸菩薩大
942c21: 菩提心。我今發心盡未際。至誠供養至心
942c22: 頂禮
第 三 懺 懺 門

弟 子 某 甲。自 從 過 去 無 始 已 來。乃 至 今 日。

貪 瞋 癡 等 一 切 煩 惱。及 忱 恨 等 禱 隨 煩 惱。

惱 亂 身 心 廣 造 一 切 罪。身 業 不 善 殺 盜 邪

貪 瞋 邪 見。一 切 煩 惱 無 始 相 續 纏 染 身 心。令

身 口 意 造 罪 無 量。或 殺 父 母。殺 阿 羅 漢。出 佛

身 血。破 和 合 僧。毀 謳 三 寶。打 縛 衆 生。破 齋

破 戒。飲 酒 噛 肉。如 是 等 罪。無 量 無 邊 不 可

憶 知。今 日 誠 心 發 露 懺 懺。一 懺 已 後 永 斷 相

續 更 不 敢 作。唯 愿 十 方 一 切 諸 佛 諸 大 菩 薩

加 持 護 念。能 令 我 等 罪 障 消 滅。至 心 頂 礼

弟 子 某 甲。始 從 今 身 乃 至 當 坐 菩 薩 道 場。故

依 如 來 無 上 三 身。歸 依 方 广 大 乘 法 藏。歸 依

一 切 不 退 菩 薩 僧。惟 愿 十 方 一 切 諸 佛 諸 大 菩 薩

菩 薩。證 知 我 等。至 心 頂 礼

第 四 歸 依 門

弟 子 某 甲。始 從 今 身 乃 至 當 坐 菩 薩 道 場。歸

依 如 來 無 上 三 身。歸 依 方 广 大 乘 法 藏。歸 依

一 切 不 退 菩 薩 僧。惟 愿 十 方 一 切 諸 佛 諸 大 菩 薩

菩 薩。證 知 我 等。至 心 頂 礼

第 五 發 菩 薩 心 門

弟 子 某 甲。始 從 今 身 乃 至 當 坐 菩 薩 道 場。

誓 發 我 法 二 相。顯 明 本 覺 真

現 前 得 善 巧 智。具 足 圓 滿 證 般 菩 薩。證 知 我

等。至 心 懺 懺
第六問遮難門

先問。若有犯七逆罪者。師不應與授戒。應教懺悔。須七日二七日乃至七七日。復至一年

懺悔須現好相。若不見好相。受戒亦不得

得戒。諸佛子汝等。從生已來。不殺父耶有輕犯者。應須首罪。必不隱藏。得大罪報。乃至彼等犯者亦爾。無犯者答無

汝等不殺母耶。不出佛身血耶。不殺阿羅漢耶。不殺和尚耶。不殺阿闍梨耶。不破合僧耶。汝等若犯如上七逆罪者。應須對眾發露懺悔。不得覆藏。必墮無間受無量苦。若依佛教發露懺悔者。必得重罪消滅得清淨身。入佛智慧速證無上正等菩提。若不犯者但自答無。諸佛子等。汝從今日乃至當坐菩提道場。能精勤受持一切諸佛諸大菩薩。最勝最上大律儀戒否。此名所謂三聚淨戒。攝律儀戒。攝善法戒。饒益有情戒。汝等從今乃至成佛。於其中間誓不犯能持否答能。於其中間。不捨離三聚淨戒四弘誓願能持

否答能既發菩提心受菩薩戒。惟願十方一切諸佛大菩薩。證明我等。至心頂禮。弟子某甲等。奉請十方一切諸佛及諸菩萨。觀世音菩薩。彌勒菩薩。虚空藏菩薩。普賢菩薩。執金剛菩薩。文殊師利菩薩。金剛藏菩薩。除蓋障菩薩。及餘一切大菩薩衆。憶昔本願。來降道場。證明我等。至心頂禮。弟子某甲等。奉請十方一切諸佛及諸菩薩。
請釋迦牟尼佛。爲和上。奉請文殊師利。爲羯磨阿闍梨。奉請十方諸佛。爲證戒師。奉請一切諸大菩薩。爲同學法侶。唯願諸佛諸大菩薩慈悲故。哀受我請。至心頂禮

諸佛子諦聽。今爲汝等羯磨授戒。正是得戒之時。至心諦聽羯磨文

諸佛子等。始從今日。乃至當坐菩提道場。受學過去現在未來一切諸佛菩薩淨戒。所謂攝律儀戒。攝善法戒。饒益有情戒。此三淨戒具足受持如是

諸佛子等。始從今日。乃至當證無上菩提。當具足受持諸佛菩薩淨戒。今受淨戒竟。是事如是持如是

諸佛子等。如上已發菩提心。具菩薩戒已。然應修四攝法及十重戒。不應虧犯。其四攝者。所謂布施愛語利行同事。爲欲調伏無始貪、瞋、憍慢煩惱。及饒益衆生故應行布施。爲欲饒益衆生故應行愛語。爲欲饒益衆生及滿本願故應修利行。爲欲親近大善知識。及令善心無間斷故應行同事如是四法

諸佛子受持菩薩戒。所謂十重戒者。今當宣
説至心諦聽

一者不應退菩提心。妨成佛故。二者不應捨三寶歸依外道。是邪法故。三者不應毀謗三寶及三乘教典。背佛性故。四者於甚深大乘經典不通解處。不應生疑惑。非凡夫境故。五者若有衆生已發菩提心者。不應説如是法令退菩提心趣向二乘。斷三寶種故。六者未發菩提心者。亦不應説如是法令彼發於二乘之心。違本願故。七者對小乘人及邪見人前。不應輒説深妙大乘。恐彼生謗獲大殃故。八者不應發起諸邪見等法。令斷善根故。九者於外道前。不應自説我具無上菩提妙戒。令彼以瞋恨心求如是物。不能辦得令退菩提心。二俱有損故。十者但於一切衆生。有所损害及無利益。皆不應作及教人作見作隨喜。於利他法及慈悲心相違背故

已上是授菩薩戒竟。汝等應如是清淨受持。勿令虧犯已受三聚淨戒竟次應受觀智密要禪定法門大乘妙旨。夫欲受法。此法深奧。信者甚希。不可對衆。量機密授。仍須先爲説種種方便。會通聖教令生堅信決除疑網。然可開曉。輸波迦羅三藏曰。衆生根機不同。大聖設教亦復非一。不可偏執一法互相是非。尚不得人天報。況無上道。或有單行布施得成佛。或有唯修戒亦得
作佛。忍進禪慧。乃至八萬四千塵沙法門。

一一門人悉得成佛。今者且依金剛頂經設一方便。作斯修行乃至成佛。若聞此説當自淨意寂然安住。於是三藏居衆會中不起坐。寂然不動如入禪定可經良久。方從定起遍觀四衆。四衆合掌扣頭。珍重再三而已。三藏久乃發言曰。前雖受菩薩淨戒。今須受諸佛內證無漏清浄法戒。方今可入禪門。入禪門已。要須誦此陀羅尼。陀羅尼者。究至極同於諸佛。乘法悟入一切智海。是名眞法戒也。此法祕密不令輒聞。若欲聞者。先受一陀羅尼曰

唵 三 去 昧 耶 薩怛鑁此陀羅尼令誦三遍。即合聞戒及餘祕法。亦能具足一切菩薩清淨律儀。諸大功德不可具説。又為發心。復授一陀羅尼曰

唵 鬥 地 喃 多 母 忒波 二合 娑 野此陀羅尼復誦三遍。即發菩提心乃至成佛。堅固不退。又為證入。復受一陀羅尼曰

唵 咥 逝 逝 逝 咥 逝 逝 逝 逝 逝

944a15: 作佛。忍進禪慧。乃至八萬四千塵沙法門。
944a16: 一一門人悉得成佛。今者且依金剛頂經設
944a17: 一一方便。作斯修行乃至成佛。若聞此説當自
944a18: 淨意寂然安住。於是三藏居衆會中不起坐
944a19: 坐。寂然不動如入禪定可經良久。方從定起
944a20: 遍觀四衆。四衆合掌扣頭。珍重再三而已
944a21: 三藏久乃發言曰。前雖受菩薩淨戒。今須受
944a22: 諸佛內證無漏清浄法戒。方今可入禪門。
944a23: 入禪門已。要須誦此陀羅尼。陀羅尼者。究竟
944a24: 至極同於諸佛。乘法悟入一切智海。是名眞
944a25: 法戒也。此法祕密不令輒聞。若欲聞者。先受
944a26: 一陀羅尼曰

944a27: 唵 三 去 昧 耶 薩怛鑁
944a28: 此陀羅尼令誦三遍。即合聞戒及餘祕法。亦
944a29: 能具足一切菩薩清淨律儀。諸大功德不可
944b01: 見説
944b02: 又為發心。復授一陀羅尼曰

944b03: 唵 鬥 地 喃 多 母 忒波 二合 娑 野
944b04: 此陀羅尼復誦三遍。即發菩提心乃至成佛。堅固不退。又為證入。復受一陀羅尼曰

944b08: 此陀羅尼復誦三遍。即發菩提心乃至成佛。
唵 呀 呀 多 鉢羅 二合 底 丁以切 咏 尾禮切引 曼 去

迦 嘍 轉舌 迷

此陀羅尼復誦三遍。即得一切甚深戒藏。及具一切種智。速證無上菩提。一切諸佛同聲共説

又為人菩薩行位。復授一陀羅尼曰

此陀羅尼若誦三遍。即證一切灌頂曼荼羅位。於諸祕密聽無障礙。既入菩薩灌頂之位。堪受禪門。已上授無漏眞法戒竟

又先為擁護行人。授一陀羅尼曰

此陀羅尼若誦三遍。即證一切灌頂曼荼羅。於諸祕密聽無障礙。既入菩薩灌頂之位。堪受禪門。已上授無漏眞法戒竟

又先為擁護行人。授一陀羅尼曰

魔邪不嬈。如淨白素易受染色行人亦爾。罪已滅。速證三昧。又為行者授一陀羅尼曰

持誦之法。或前後兩箇陀羅尼。隨意誦一

箇。不可並。恐興心不專

夫欲入三昧者。初學之時。事絶諸境屏除咎。
944c09: 務。獨一靜處半跏而坐已。須先作手印護持。
944c10: 以檀慧並合髻。其戒忍方願。右押左正相叉
944c11: 著二背上。其進力合髻頭相拄曲。開心中
944c12: 少許。其禪智並合髻即成。作此印已。先印頂
944c13: 上。次印額上。即下印右肩。次印左肩。然後印
944c14: 心。次下印右膝。次印左膝。於一一印處。各誦
944c15: 前陀羅尼。七遍乃至七處訖。然後於頂上散
944c16: 印訖。即執數珠念誦此陀羅尼。若能多誦二
944c17: 百三百遍。乃至三千五百亦得。每於坐時。誦
944c18: 滿一洛叉。最異成就。既加持身訖。然端身
944c19: 正住如前半跏坐以右押左不須結全跏。全
944c20: 趴則多痛。若心緣痛境即難得定。若先來全
944c21: 趴坐得者最爲妙也。然可直頭平望。眼不用
944c22: 過開。又不用全合。大開則心散。合即惛沈。
944c23: 莫緣外境。安坐即訖。然可運心供養懺悔。先
944c24: 標心觀察十方一切諸佛。於人天會中爲四
944c25: 衆說法。然後自觀己身。於一一諸佛前以三
944c26: 業虔恭禮拜讚嘆。行者作此觀時。令了了分
944c27: 明如對目前。極令明見。然後運心於十方世
944c28: 界。所有一切天上人間。上妙香華幡蓋飲食
944c29: 珍寶種種供具。盡虛空遍法界。供養一切諸
945a01: 佛。諸大菩薩。法報化身。教理行果。及大會
945a02: 衆。行者作此供養已。然後運心於一一諸佛
945a03: 菩薩前。起殷重至誠心。發露懺悔。我等從
945a04: 無始來至于今日。煩惱覆心久流生死。身口
945a05: 意業難具陳。我今唯知廣懺。一懺已後。永
945a06: 斷相續。更不起作。唯願諸佛菩薩以大慈悲
力。加威護念攝受我懺。令我罪障速得消滅

次應發弘誓願。我久在有流。或於過去。曾

行菩薩行。利樂無邊有情。或修禪定。勤行精

進護持三業。所有恒沙功德。乃至佛果。唯願

諸佛菩薩興慈願力。加威護念令我乘斯功德。速與一切三昧門相應。速與一切陀羅尼門相應。速得一切自性清淨。如是廣發誓願。

令不退失速得成就

次應學調氣。調氣者。先想出入息。從自身

中—一支節筋脈。亦皆流注。然後從口徐徐

而出。又想此氣。色白如雪潤澤如乳。仍須

知其所至遠近。還復徐徐從鼻而入。還令遍身

中。乃至筋脈悉令周遍。如是出入各令至三

作此調氣。令身無患冷熱風等悉皆安適。

後學定。輸波迦羅三藏曰。汝初學人。多懼

心動念罷息進求而專守無念以爲究竟者。即覓増長不可得也。夫念有二種。一者不善念。二者善念。不善妄念。一向須除。善法正

念。不令復滅。真正修行者。要先正念增修。

後方至於究竟清淨。如人學射久習純熟。更

無心想行住恒與定倶。不怕不畏起心。爲患

於進學

次應修三摩地。所言三摩地者。更無別法。直

是一切衆生自性清淨心。名爲大圓鏡智。上

自諸佛下至蠢動。悉皆同等無有增減。但爲

無明妄想客塵所覆。是故流轉生死不得作
佛。行者應當安心靜住。莫緣一切諸境。假想一圓明猶如淨月。去身四尺。當前對面不高。量同一肘圓滿具足。其色明朗内外光潔。世無方比。初雖不見久久精研尋當徹見。已。即更觀察漸引令廣。或四尺。如是倍增。乃至滿三千大千世界極令分明。將欲出觀。如是漸略還同本相。初觀之時如似於月。遍周之後無復方圓。作是觀已。即便證得解脫一切蓋障三昧。得此三昧者。名爲地前三賢。依此漸進遍周法界者。如經所説名爲初地。所以名初地者。爲以證此法昔所未得。而今始得生大喜悅。是故初地名曰歡喜。亦莫解了。即此自性清淨心。以三義故。猶如於月。一者自性清淨義。離貪欲垢故。二者清涼義。離瞋熱惱故。三者光明義。離愚癡闇故。又月是四大所成究竟壞去。是以月世人共見。取以爲喩。令其悟入。行者久久作此觀。觀習成就不須延促。唯見明朗更無一物。亦不見身之與心。萬法不可得。猶如虚空。亦莫作空解。以無念等故説如虚空非謂空想。久久能熟。行住坐臥。一切時處。作意與不作意。任運相應。至成佛。唯是一道更無別理。此是諸佛菩薩內證之道。非諸二乘外道境界。作是觀已。一切佛法恒沙功德。不由他悟。以一貫之。自然通達。能開一字演説無量法。剎那悟入諸
945c03: 法中。自在無礙。無去來起滅。一切平等。行此
945c04: 漸至昇進之相久自證知。非今預説所能究
945c05: 竟。輸波迦羅三藏曰。既能修習。觀一成就已。
945c06: 汝等今於此心中。復有五種心義。行者當知。
945c07: 一者剎那心。謂初心見道一念相應。速還忘
945c08: 失。如夜電光。暫現即滅。故云剎那。二者流
945c09: 注心。既見道已念念加功相續不絶。如流奔
945c10: 注。故云流注。三者甜美心。謂積功不已
945c11: 得虛然朗徹身心輕泰翫味於道。故云甜美。
945c12: 四者摧散心。爲卒起精懃。或復休廢。二俱違
945c13: 道故云摧散。五者明鏡心。既離散亂之心。
945c14: 鑒達圓明一切無著。故云明鏡。若了達五心
945c15: 於此自驗。三乘凡夫聖位可自分別矣。汝等
945c16: 行人初學修定。應行過去諸佛祕密方便加
945c17: 持修定法。一體與一切總持門相應。是故。
945c18: 應須受此四陀羅尼。陀羅尼曰
945c19: 噁速乞叉摩二合嘌日囉二合
945c20: 嘹速乞叉摩二合嘌日囉二合
945c21: 別本漢注嘹蘇乞叉嘌日囉
945c22: 此陀羅尼。能令所觀成就
945c23: 噁速瑟吒二合嘌日羅二合
945c24: 嘹底瑟吒二合嘌日羅二合
945c25: 此陀羅尼。能令所觀無失
945c26: 噍娑頗囉二合嘌日囉二合
945c27: 嘹娑頗囉二合嘌日囉二合
945c28: 此陀羅尼。能令所觀漸廣
唵 僧 賀 引 囼 嘍 日 囼 二 合

此陀羅尼。能令所觀廣。復令漸略如故

如是四陀羅尼者。是婆誐梵。自證法中甚深

方便。開諸學人令速證入。若欲速求此三摩

地者。於四威儀。常誦此陀羅尼。剋念用功勿

暫虛廢。無不速驗。汝等習定之 人。復須

知經行法則。於一靜處平治淨地。面長二十五

肘。兩頭豎標。通頭繋索。纔與胸齊。以竹筒盛

索。長可手執。其筒隨日右轉平直來往。融心

普周視前六尺。乘三昧覺任持本心。諦了分

明無令忘失。但下一足便誦一眞言。如是四

眞言從初至後。終而復始。誦念勿住。稍覺

疲懈。即隨所安坐。行者應知入道方便深

助進。如脩心金剛。不遷不易。被大精進甲

胄。作猛利之心。誓願成得爲期。終無退轉之

異。無以雜學惑心令一生空過。然法無二相

心言兩忘。若不方便開示無由悟入。良以梵

漢殊隔。非譯難通。聊蒙指陳。隨憶鈔録。以

傳未悟。京西明寺慧警禪師。先有撰集。今

再詳補。頗謂備焉

南無稽首十方佛。真如海藏甘露門

三賢十聖應真僧。願賜威神加念力

希有總持禪祕要。能發圓明廣大心

我今隨分略稱揚。迥施法界諸含識

無畏三藏受戒懺悔文及禪門要法 一卷
General overviews and background literature

Regardless of some exceptions, such as Katō (2006), Japanese secondary material on Kūkai is only too often characterized by a bias towards venerating Kūkai as the founding father of the Shingon School, cf. Matsunaga (1984). At present, two monographs offer a substantial English introduction to Kūkai: Hakeda (1972) and Abe (2000). Anyone interested in the subject should first take refuge in these books. Although Hakeda (1972) is the best point of departure for undergraduate students to retrieve information on Kūkai’s life and read translations of his major works, so far Abe (2000) undoubtedly remains the standard academic reference. Shaner (1985) is one of the few English publications that deal extensively with Kūkai’s philosophy. To absorb the cultural atmosphere of the Heian period aristocratic circles in which Kūkai flourished, Weinstein (1999) is an authoritative basis. Amongst introductions to the general background of Japanese Buddhism, Eliot (2005) is one of the best classics. English introductions to Shingon include, amongst others, Kiyota (1978), but for additional information, refer to R.K. Payne’s OBO entry on *Shingon*.


A must for everybody interested in Kūkai, but portrays him as founder of esoteric Buddhism in Japan. Contains a selection of abridged translations, easily accessible for undergraduate students.


One of the few noteworthy English introductions to Shingon, including an annotated bibliography and glossary of technical terms on pp. 148-158 and 159-178 respectively. Highly recommended for intermediate readers.


One of the many comprehensive Japanese works on Kūkai by the 412th abbot of Kongōbuji, the Shingon headquarters on Kōyasan.
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Standard reference work discussing the cultural background in which Kūkai flourished. On Kūkai, esp. p. 473ff.


The best available English study on Kūkai, including partial translations of his work and a selective bibliography for further study. Gives an unprecedented discursive analysis of Kūkai’s thought and approach to Buddhism.


Critical analysis of Kūkai studies in Japan by one of the leading specialists in the field. Recommended for advanced usage only.

**Bibliographies**

Although there are several Japanese books offering guidance in skimming for decent publications on esoteric Buddhism, e.g. Matsunaga (1996), annotated bibliographies exclusively dealing with Kūkai are quite rare and often remain restricted to collector’s items or lean towards over-specialization, cf. Takagi (1990). Thus far, Inui (1990) is the only recommendable printed bibliographical resource published in English.


One of the very few bibliographies of Western language studies on Kūkai and Shingon, incorporating a general overview of bibliographies, catalogues, dictionaries, encyclopedias, and works on Japanese Buddhism, fundamental to any layman in the field. The part on Kūkai covers translations of his major works and studies on his life and thought, esp. pp. 151-158.


Bibliographical study of Japanese secondary material published on Kūkai’s thought, recommended for users with specialization in (Japanese) philosophy only.


Online bibliography covering English material on Kūkai, but at times unreliable in its biased commentaries.

**Primary sources**

Kūkai’s collected works (zenshū 全集) are only available in Japanese book series, of which neither online or CD-ROM digital versions have thus far been provided. A comprehensive English version is still lacking. Kūkai wrote in a pre-modern Japanese version of literary Chinese (kanbun 漢文), but for those familiar with modern Japanese, the most accessible collection is the edition by Kōbō Daishi Zenshū Henshū Iinkai (1987), while Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūsho (1968) stays of high value for advanced research. Based on content, style, absence from early catalogs, etc. some texts have, however, been identified as spurious in pre-modern times. In most collections the order of the texts therefore reflects this traditional understanding of Kūkai’s authorship, but their interpretations are too lenient by modern standards. Although some of the texts attributed to Kūkai are now understood clearly not to be his work and the authorship of others is still being contested, see e.g. Matsuda (2003) and Fröhlich (2007), an encompassing English publication on authenticating and legitimating mechanisms in Kūkai’s textual oeuvre is still unavailable. Indeed, there are plenty of Japanese articles discussing individual texts, and as many conflicting opinions, but beyond the information and selection of texts in the Teihon Kōbō Daishi Zenshū, edited by Kōyasan Daigaku Mikkyōbunka Kenkyūjo Kōbō Daishi Chosaku Kenkyūkai (1992-1997) very little consensus on alleged authenticity is given in one place. Major texts attributed to Kūkai are also preserved in Japanese editions of the Buddhist canon and in other Japanese collections of Buddhist scriptures. Takakusu et al. (1924-1935) remains the most widely used and accessible version of the Buddhist canon. There are several online versions of the Chinese Tripitaka, such as Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (CBETA) [http://www.cbeta.org], but most comprehensive still is the searchable Saṃgaṇīkīrtatā Taiṣotripitakaṃ (SAT) Daizōkyō Text Database (1998).

Takakusu, Junjirō 高楠, 順次郎), Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡部, 海旭), and Ono Genmyō 小野, 亦妙), eds. 1924-1935. Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大蔵経. Tōkyō: Daizō shuppan kabushiki kaisha, 100 vols.

The Taishō canon (commonly abbreviated as T.) includes 3,360 works in total, with 28 traditionally attributed to Kukai: nos. 2161, 2190, 2199a-b, 2200, 2203a, 2211a-g, 2221-2233, 2236a-c, 2237, 2246, 2284, 2425-2428a-g, 2429-2431, 2461-2464, 2701, and 2921.


Collection of Kūkai’s works in classical Chinese with the indications for Japanese readings (kanbun no kundoku 漢文の訓読), including an introductory volume that mainly contains biographies. For advanced philological research valuable indices are in vol. 7.


This collection offers the pre-modern Japanese (bungo 文語) readings of Kūkai’s entire work, parallel to their richly annotated modern Japanese translations, forming an ideal alternative for those who have not learned classical Chinese and/or its Japanese reading (kanbun no kundoku 漢文の訓読).


The best collection of “original” texts to date, including useful information on the –for large part sectarian– Kūkai authorship discussion.


Covers the first 85 vols. of the Taishō canon and offers linked searches of Japanese language secondary scholarship through INBUDS (Indian and Buddhist Studies) database. [http://www.inbuds.net/eng/index.html] and Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (Denshi Bukkyō Jiten 電子仏教辞典) [http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb]


[http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/71102/uhm_ma_3075_r.pdf]

Analysis of Sangō shiki (cf. *Apologetic Fiction* below), Shōrai mokuroku (see *Catalogue of Imported Items* infra) and Gojuigō (cf. *Biography* infra) based on Genette’s narrative ideas. Includes also references to other attributions, e.g. Iroha poem, see: p. 1, n. 2.


Although sometimes lacking precision, this book on the significance of writing and reading includes a chapter on the economic and ritual influence of the acceptance as authentic of a forged record purportedly the work of Kūkai, Kōya goshuin engi 高野御手印縁起, pp. 69-119.
Biography

Kūkai’s disciple Shinzei (真済, 780-860) is believed to have been the first to compose a biography of Kūkai. Many Japanese introductions (nyūmon 入門) have been published on Kūkai’s life, but by far the best study on Kūkai’s life is Katō (1989). The most accessible overviews given in English are contained in Hakeda (1972) and Abe (2000), see: *General Overviews and Background Literature*. Hakeda gives the most accessible overview on Kūkai’s life, esp. pp. 13-60 and includes a useful chronological table of Kūkai’s life, 277-279. Hakeda discusses Kūkai’s China experience on pp. 29-34. Abe includes very useful information on Kūkai’s date of birth, cf. p. 20 and p. 454 n.1; on Kūkai’s dissent, pp. 69-112. His biography is discussed on pp. 4-8, 22-23, 40-42, 46-47, 55-63, and 386-388. For his travel to China, see pp. 113-150. Abe’s analysis of Kūkai’s autobiographical writings is found on pp. 74-75, 84-85, and 89-90. Kūkai’s autobiographical writings are also discussed in Matsuda (2003: 12-35, cf. *Primary Sources* supra). However, a book-length work incorporating full English translations of Kūkai’s biographies and autobiographical writings is still lacking. Borgen (1982) gives the most detailed English account of the Japanese embassy Kūkai joined when he went to China in order to study esoteric Buddhism. Abe (1995) is one of the few English studies on Kūkai’s relationship to Saichō (最澄, 767-822), and Hinonishi (2002) is the only recent source addressing the subject of Kūkai’s epithets. Although as such not scholarly in scope, Kōbō Daishi Eden 弘法大師絵伝 or illustrated Kūkai biographies are important material for the study of popular devotional views on his life. There are several Japanese articles on the subject, but most of them are outdated. Sekiguchi (1988), however, might be representative of the few more accessible accounts.

Shinzei (真済), comp. 1968. “Kūkai sōzuden 空海僧都伝”. In Kōbō Daishi Zenshū 弘法大師全集. Edited by Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūsho (密教文化研究所), introductory vol. (shukan 首巻), 1-5. Ōsaka: Dōhōsha.

The Biography of Kūkai, Director of Priests is attributed to Kūkai’s direct disciple Shinzei (真済, 780-860), and is believed to be the earliest extant and therefore most accurate biography of Kūkai. Hakeda (1972) is largely based on this text, but as yet there is no full English translation available.


Kūkai’s journey to China with many details not included in other accounts, including partial translations of the ambassador's report to the emperor, and Kūkai’s letter to the governor of Fujian.


Interesting chapter on Kūkai folk belief and scenes from his life in artistic representations, part of a richly illustrated series in 6 vols. on Japanese Buddhism.


Regardless of its publication date, still one of the most authoritative works on Kūkai’s life and aftermath. Largely based on primary sources, remains one of the best introductions both for beginners and advanced learners with an intermediate knowledge of Japanese.


Influential article offering a revisionist look at the relationship between the two pivotal figures in Heian period Japanese Buddhism history, suggesting an emphasis on policy rather than on personal affairs.

One of the very few English publications on this subject, tracing the origins of *namu daishi henjō kongō* 南無大師遍照金剛, the mantra for praising and hailing Kūkai.


One of the few decent online English resources on Kūkai. Contains excerpts from a very accessible, though still unpublished book-length biography.

**Legends and attributions**

Kūkai is revered as a universal saint (cf. *Pilgrimage and Devotion* infra) and has been described in hagiographical writings as possessing magical powers and exceeding in his broad knowledge of Chinese culture, including literature, calligraphy and arts. Kūkai legends have brought about several series of attributions, ranging from mystical contacts with long deceased Buddhist masters, over the invention of the *kana* script to the introduction of homosexuality. Although Kūkai legends have penetrated a vast array of publications, as yet no comprehensive monograph solely dedicated to the subject is available. Some of them, however, have been treated in a revised biography by Abe (2000), *passim*, see *General Overviews and Background Literature* supra. Abe also discussed the attribution of the *kana* syllabary, esp. pp. 390-398. On Kūkai and male-male sexuality, Schalow (1992) is the core sources, although Faure (1998) and Pflugfelder (1999) also include further references.


So far the best treatment of Kūkai as the favorite legitimating figure in homo-erotic iconography.


Leading study on homosexuality in Japan, including several references to Kūkai as legitimator and patron of male love, esp. pp. 50-85.


Novel that is loosely based on Kūkai’s life, recommended for entertainment’s sake only.
Pilgrimage and devotion

Kūkai-worship still plays a central role in the religious experience of thousands of people in contemporary Japan. Aside from to the tourist site of Kōyasan, pilgrimages in honor of Kūkai are made throughout Japan. Probably best known is the Shikoku hachijūhakkasho 四国八十八箇所, a pilgrimage to eighty-eight sacred places in Shikoku, treated e.g. by Moreton (2001), but has been unsurpassably discussed by Reader (1999) and (2005), together with Tanabe (e.g. 1998), one of the leading experts in this subject. Probably the first English treatment of Kūkai’s more general popular allure is Casal (1959), while Kitagawa (1976) offers an introduction into devotional aspects. Although presented as non-academic travel account, Nicoloff (2008) is exemplary of publications that include references to the belief in Kūkai’s eternal presence on Mt. Kōya. Tanabe (1999), on the other hand, offers the first English translation of a text legitimizing Kōyasan pilgrimage.


One of the first English studies on Kūkai-worship. Recommended for contextualization purposes.


Interesting entry on Kūkai devotion in a collection of essays based on seminars held at the Divinity School, University of Chicago, from 1972 to 1973.


Short essay on Kūkai-worship, by one of the leading specialists in Japanese pilgrimage culture in a highly recommendable book for anyone interested in the for a long time neglected practical aspects of Japanese religion.


Translation of the Kongōbuji konryū shugyō engi in a collection of religious texts dating from the eighth through the twentieth centuries, each preceded by useful introductory summaries and contextualizations. Also including bibliographical references and index.


Although not very innovative, offers a discussion of Kūkai as the alleged founder of the Shikoku pilgrimage on pp. 7-10.

Leading examination of *Shikoku hachijūhakkasho* 四国八十八箇所 practice, focusing on contemporary Japan, but also discussing historical background, esp. pp. 107-186. Includes several appendices of high practical use both for researchers as practitioners.


Not presented as an in-depth scholarly work, but draws a well-written picture of present-day Mt. Kōya. Surely recommended for introductory purposes and including brief, though generally useful annotations, esp. on annual festivals and rituals. For a discussion of Kūkai’s life and legend, pp. 31-74. On Kūkai’s mausoleum (goby御廟): p. 229 ff.

**Material culture and visual arts**

As an artist Kūkai is probably best known for his calligraphy, cf. Kimura (1973), Yamamoto (1984) and Kodama (1998). However, the statues, ritual implements, texts, scroll paintings, mandalas, etc. he brought back from China and listed in his *Catalogue of Imported Items*, see heading below, may have had a much deeper influence on Japanese culture, cf. Bogel (2007). Moreover, there are several series of painted scrolls depicting scenes from Kūkai’s life, and form an interesting source for studying popular and devotional aspects surrounding the Kūkai legends and biography. Aside from the treatment in Sekiguchi (1988), cf. *biography* supra, illustrated Kūkai biographies (*Kōya Daishi gyōjō zue* 高野大師行状図絵) are also discussed in catalogues of special exhibitions, such as Izutsu (2002) and Kyōto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (2003).


Short essay in Kūkai’s artistic production in a major collection of esoteric Buddhist art, including a discussion of his calligraphy.


Short essay on based on a comparison of Saichō’s and Kūkai’s use of calligraphy.


Catalogue of 2002 exhibition in Honolulu, with special section on art treasures related to Kūkai and Kōyasen on pp. 33-50, including biographical scroll paintings, e.g. on p. 45, with explanation on p. 155, no. 8.

Kyōto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (京都国立博物館) et al. (eds.) 2003. *Kūkai to Kōya: Kōbō Daishi nitto sen nihyaku nen kinen* 空海と高野山弘法大師入唐一二〇〇年記念 (Kūkai and Mount Kōya: 
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Including calligraphies both in Kūkai’s hand (e.g. pp. 34-37, plate 2), as well as those attributed to him (e.g. p. 98, plate 46), illustrated Kūkai biographies (e.g. pp. 45-49, plate 11), early copies of Kūkai manuscripts (e.g. p. 100, plate 49)


Innovative study on the influence of Kūkai’s catalogue on the material culture of Japan. Highly recommended for everyone interested in this subject.

**Catalogue of Imported Items**


Basic reference work on classics in the literature of Japan, containing a chapter on ‘Kūkai and his master’, which gives a partial translation of the catalogue, 63-66.


**Commentaries on Buddhist scriptures**

As a Buddhist scholar-monk, Kūkai wrote several commentaries on Buddhist scriptures, including texts from the sūtra, tantra and vinaya literature, e.g. on the Principle Transcending Sūtra (Rishukyō 理趣經) and the Japanese selection from the Chinese version of the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra (Dainichikyō 大日經). These commentaries most often took the form of ‘title-analyses’ (kaidai 開題), which comprise a particular form of textual exegesis that analyze titles of scriptures and explicate their importance. One of the leading experts in the study of this genre is Murakami 2000 and Murakami 2004. One of the exceptions to this format was his composition of the Hannya shingyō hiken 般若心經秘鍵 or Secret Key to the Heart Sūtra, a commentary that has often been included amongst his major works. Even
though there are no English studies and/or translations of the majority of his commentaries, the Secret Key has been translated into English by Hakeda (1972): 262-275 and in German by Kawahara (1992).


Title-analysis of the Principle Transcending Sūtra, i.e. Amoghavajra (705-770/4), trans., Dairaku kongō fukū shinjitsu sanmaiya-kyō 大樂金剛不空真實三昧耶經 (T. vol. 8, no. 251: 848a2- c23). Translated into English by Hakeda (1972) and in German by Kawahara (1992).

Kūkai’s Title-Analysis of the Mahāvairocana Sūtra refers to Śubhakaraśīṃha (637-735) and Yixing 一行 (683-727), trans. Daibutsu jōbutsu jinben kai-kyō 大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經 (T. vol. 18, no. 848: 1a2- 55a4).


The Secret Key to the Heart Sutra is a highly influential exegesis of Xuanzang 玄奘 (ca. 600-664), trans. Hannya haramitta shingyō 般若波羅蜜多心經 (T. vol. 8, no. 251: 848a2- c23). Translated into English by Hakeda (1972) and in German by Kawahara (1992).


For the first time in any Western language addressing Kūkai’s relation to this scripture, giving background information for a better understanding of his Rishukyō kaidai.


The first fully annotated German translations of four of Kūkai’s major works, including Geheimschlüssel des Herzstüters der zur Vollendung gebrachten Weisheit (Hannya-shingyō-hiken) on pp. 125-151, already published in 1983 in Mikkyō Bunka 密教文化 (Journal of Esoteric Buddhism) 141: 28-54.


Example out of a series of articles published from 1999 onwards by the leading expert on Kūkai’s kaidai, giving an unprecedented objective academic perspective the proselytizing scope of Kūkai’s apologetic works.

Murakami, Yasutoshi (村上, 勝友). 2004. “Kūkai no shisō to ‘kaidai’ 空海の思想と『開題』 (A Few Problems in Kūkai's ‘Kaidai’).” In Onozuka Kichō hakase koki kinen ronbun-shū: Kūkai no shisō to bunka 小野塚幾澄博士古稀記念論文集: 空海的思想と文化 (Kōbō Daishi Kūkai's Thought and
Part of a series of articles published from 1999 onwards by the leading expert on Kūkai’s kaidei, for the first time addressing the problem of Kūkai’s interpretative strategies he used in his commentaries.

**Major doctrinal treatises**

For scholars the most appealing amongst Kūkai’s works have proven to be his treatises, in which he promulgated his vision on esoteric Buddhist doctrine and praxis. Because they form the basis for understanding Kūkai’s thought, these treatises have been widely studied by (mostly Japanese) scholars in Buddhist philosophy and religious studies. Four of them are of major importance, and are included in the standard Japanese edition of the Buddhist canon, i.e. Takakusu et al. (1924-1935), cf. *Primary Sources* supra.

In the *Himitsu mandara jū jāshin ron* (秘密曼荼羅十住心論, T. no. 2425: 303a2-362c20) or *Treatise on the Ten Abiding Stages of Mind According to the Secret Manḍala*, cf. Abe (2000: esp. 327-329, see *Basic Overviews and Background Literature* supra), Kūkai argues for the supremacy of Shingon over all other religious systems. As yet, this text has not been entirely translated in English, but Todaro (1984) gives an annotated translation of the last chapter, and some excerpts are included in de Bary et al. (2001): 168-170, cf. *Catalogue of Imported Items* above.


The third work is the *Treatise on [the Difference between] Exoteric and Esoteric Buddhism* (Ben kenmitsu-nikkyō ron 辨顯密二教論, T. no. 2427: 374c22-381b15) and argues for the supremacy of esoteric over exoteric teachings, because the former were espoused by the Dharma-kāya Buddha. There is a roughly annotated translation of the introduction and last part of *Treatise on the Difference between the Exoteric and Esoteric Teachings in Hakeda* (1972: 151-157), and *Distinguishing the Two Teachings of the Exoteric and Esoteric*, in Abe (2000: esp. 212-219, 131-234, and 261-270). Full translations by Giebel (2004: 15-62) and White (2005).

The fourth treatise, *The Meaning of Becoming Buddha in this Life* (Sokushin jōbutsu-gi 真言宗即身成佛義, T. 2428a-f: 381b18-401b26), also known as *Questions and Answers concerning the Meaning of Attaining Buddhahood in this Very Body according to the Mantra School* (Shingonshū sokushin jōbutsu gi mondo 真言宗即身成佛義問答) discusses the ability to attain Buddhahood in one’s very existence, being a major theme that characterizes liberation according to Shingon doctrine, and having exerted major influence on other denominations of Japanese Buddhism. The text has been studied in Gardiner (1986), and is partially translated in English by de Bary (2001; esp. pp. 165-168, see: *Catalogue of Imported Items* supra.)


The first English introduction to the Precious Key, but difficult to retrieve.


Seminal work on the Precious Key, included in the leading journal for esoteric Buddhist scholarship in Japan.


Partial annotated translation of this major treatise by one of the specialists in the field, completed in the framework of a translation program for Kūkai’s text by Kōyasan University.


One of the first academic inquiries into the question of realizing Buddhahood in this life as expounded by the Shingon creed. Regardless of its troublesome availability, still recommended for complementary study.


Seminal work that refutes long-accepted misinterpretations on the category of exoteric Buddhism.


Gives annotated translations of five major works by Kūkai. Although already included in Hakeda (1972), Giebel has made a successful effort to update some of Hakeda’s outdated terminology. For The Precious Key to the Secret Treasury, 133-216.


The first encompassing English study on Kūkai’s interpretation of bodhicitta. Because of the technicality of the subject, recommended for advanced students and scholars only. For a fully annotated translation of the Benkenmitsu-nikyōron, 249-328.

Annotated translation of Kūkai’s *Sokushin jōbutsu gi*, with a short introduction. Reprint of Inagaki’s 1975 publication in the Ryūkoku Translation Pamphlet Series no. 4 (Kyōto: Ryūkoku Daigaku butten honyakubu).

**Linguistic and semiotic works**

One could argue with a good degree of confidence that Kūkai was a linguist *avant-la-lettre*: he is not only thought to have intensively studied classical Chinese, Sanskrit and Siddham script, but was particularly fascinated by writing and sound as signs, the power of mantras, and their representation of reality, see esp. Abe (2000), cf. *General Overviews and Background Literature*, cited above. In general three treatises have been regarded as crucial, and their primary classical Chinese texts are included in the standard Japanese edition of the Buddhist canon, i.e. Takakusu et al. (1924-1935), cf. *Primary Sources* supra.


The second work is *The Meaning of the Hūṃ Syllable* (*Unji-gi* 吞字義, T. no. 2430: 404b14-408a29). As Abe’s (2000: 289) *On the Sanskrit Letter Hūṃ*, cited above under *General Overviews and Background Literature* points out, this text solves the problem of Kūkai’s seemingly contradictory claim for the non-origination of letters at the same time of them all deriving from the A-syllable. The *Unji-gi*, of which the primary text is included in the T.-canon, has been translated in English by Hakeda (1972): 246-262, cf. *General Overviews and Background Literature*, cited supra, but the most recent and accessible translation is Giebel’s (2004) *The Meanings of the Word Hūṃ*: 105-132, cf. *The Precious Key to the Hidden Treasury* cited above. For a German translation, consult Kawahara’s (1992) *Die Bedeutung des Zeichens HŪṂ*: 81-124, refer to *Commentaries on Buddhist Scriptures* supra.

While he was residing at Ximingsi in Chang’an, Kūkai is accounted to have studied Sanskrit and *siddham* (J. *shittan* 悉曇), the latter being a calligraphic script used for the representation of mantras and seed syllables (*S. bijās*). This is illustrated by the third text of this category, *The Meaning of the Sanskrit Siddham Letters* (*Bonji Shittanji moshaku-gi* 梵字悉曇字母釋義, T. no. 2701: 361a3-364a15). Abe (2000) is by far the best treatment of the text. Abe transcribes the title as *Bonji Shittan jimo narabi ni shakugi*, which he translated as *Essential Characters of the Sanskrit Siddham Script and their Interpretations*, esp. 291-293. On *bijas* in Japan, see Vira (1965). The best study on *siddham* is van Gulik (1980), one of the few Western language studies on the subject.

Collection of calligraphies by famous Japanese priests, including a short introduction. For specialized reference only.


One of the best introductions to siddham, recommended for all students in the field.


Short semiotic essay for the first time addressing the importance of Kūkai’s language philosophy.


Critical analysis of Kūkai’s language philosophy by one of the leading experts on Japanese philosophy, together with a richly annotated translation of the first part of Kūkai’s Shōji jissō-gi. As yet there is no English edition available.


Discusses the problems of language and meaning, including a detailed description of the esoteric Buddhist meditation practice centered on bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha (J. Kokūzō 虚空藏).

**Ritual manuals**

At least four ritual manuals attributed to Kūkai have been canonized. Just as is characteristic of most ritual texts of the Buddhist tradition, however, Kūkai’s manuals have been largely ignored by European and American scholarship in the fields of religion and Buddhist studies. One exception is the Abhiṣeka of the Abdicated Emperor Heizei, which has been partially treated by Abe (2000): 193-204 passim, cf. *General Overviews and Background Literature* cited above, and translated by Grapard (2000). As far as the other manuals are concerned, only the Sanmaiya-kai jo, which is a preface to the ritual for conferring the esoteric Buddhist precepts, has been addressed in English by White (2005).


A translation of the *Heizei tennō kanjōmon.* Useful in relation to the commentary on this text in Abe (2000).


The first encompassing English study on Kūkai’s interpretation of bodhicitta. Because of the technicality of the subject, recommended for advanced students and scholars only. On the *Sammaya-kaijo*, 357-372.

### Apologetic fiction

Already in 797, Kūkai wrote his first masterpiece, *Sangō shi’iki 三教指帰* (also: *Sanyō-shiikki*), a "religious novel" (Hakeda 1965) avant-la-lettre, "quasi-autobiographic fiction and Buddhist apologetic" (Abe 2000: 74, cited above under *General Overviews and Background Literature*) or "fictional autobiography" (Matsuda 2003: 13, cf. *Primary Sources* supra), in which he evaluates Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism. The title has been translated as *Indications to the Three Teachings* by Hakeda (1972), cf. *General Overviews and Background Literature* supra, and by Abe (2000) as *Demonstrating the Goals of the Three Teachings*, the latter being the best reading. English translations are in Hakeda (1972: 101-139), Yamamoto (1985), and Bary (2001: 157-162, cf. *Catalogue of Imported Items* supra). On Kūkai’s early ideas on Confucianism, see Kinoshita (1968) and Abe (2000: 102-104); on Daoism, see Abe (2000: 86-88). The fictional, apologetic and autobiographical qualities of the *Sangō shiiki* are discussed in Matsuda (2003: 12-22) and Abe (2000: 102-107).

Classic work, discusses the *Sangō shiki* as a literary text.


Interesting discussion of the Kūkai’s early thoughts on Confucian values, but copy can be difficult to access.


Outdated, but still the only French translation of the *Sangō shi’iki*.


Partial translation of Kūkai’s *Sangō shiki*.

**Poetry**

Probably the best known collection of works ascribed to Kūkai, is the *Seireishū* 性靈集 (also: *Shōryōshū*; full title: *Henjō hakki seireishū* 遍照發揮性霊集, tentative English title: *Collection in Which the All-Illuminator Displays His Spiritual Nature*), but aside from the brief discussions in e.g. Matsuda (2003: 35-44, cf. *Primary Sources* supra) an English study and complete translation is still lacking. This collection of prose and poetry in 113 chapters was allegedly compiled by one of Kūkai’s direct disciples, and is believed to have marked the transition from anthologies compiled upon imperial decree to those made on an individual basis. For introductions to Kūkai’s poetry, Ibson (1987) and Ury (1999) are the best places to start. Aside from the poetry found in the *Seireishū*, Kūkai wrote a treatise on the rules of poetic composition, i.e. *Bunkyō hifuron* 文鏡秘府論. For a study, see Bodman (1978).


Popular approach to Kūkai’s poetry, but of low interest to the specialized public.


Gives an annotated Dutch translation of fourteen texts from the *Seireishū*. For general introductory purposes only.


One of the basic encyclopedic entries dealing with Kūkai’s Chinese learning and poetry. On Kūkai, see 376ff.

Fully annotated translation of the Seireishū into Modern Japanese, including prints of the classical Chinese original texts.

Green, Ronald S. The Mysterious Mirror of Writing: Kūkai’s Poetry and Literary Theory. [http://ww2.coastal.edu/rgreen/kukaipoetry.htm]

English translations with short introduction to Kūkai’s poetry, including: (1) Contemplation of the Nine Appearances; (2) Autumn day viewing Shinsen’en Garden; (3) Climb the Mountain to Contemplate the Hermit; and (4) Thesis on The Mysterious District of the Mirror of Writing.
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