

Debates on What Reviving the Precepts and Vinaya Meant in Thirteenth Century Japan

Paul Groner

Introduction

This paper augments and continues an essay I wrote earlier, “Reflections on the Movement to Revive the Precepts in Kamakura Japan: With a focus on Eison’s 叡尊 *Chōmonshū* 聴聞集,” that explores the meaning of the “revival of the precepts and Vinaya” (*kairitsu fukkō* 戒律復興) during the Kamakura period.¹ In that essay, I argued that the emphasis of the leaders of the movement during the thirteenth century often focused more on restoring monastic ritual than on such issues as reviving strict adherence to the monastic precepts or ethical considerations.

Even so, the thirteenth century in Japan was marked by a variety of efforts to revive or reinterpret the *Sifen lü*’s 四分律 (*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*) precepts and monastic ceremonies. Claims that the orthodox ordination lineage had been corrupted and was no longer valid led some monks to re-establish it through self-ordinations in which they would receive a sign from the Buddha that he had directly bestowed the precepts on them. However, traditional Vinaya interpretations would never have allowed self-ordinations to be used to full ordain monks. A major theme in these efforts were attempts to overcome Japanese Tendai 天台 claims that the bodhisattva precepts had rendered the Vinaya unsuitable for monastic discipline because it was a “Hīnayāna” teaching. The interaction of various claims led to a series of questions such as the following. Could

¹ “Reflections on the Movement to Revive the Vinaya: With a focus on Eison’s *Chōmonshū*.” In *Nihon Bukkyō no tenkai to sono zōkei* 日本仏教の展開とその造形 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2020), pp. 67-91 (Japanese translation, pp. 45-66).

the Vinaya be replaced, and if so, what would be used instead? Would the bodhisattva precepts be sufficient by themselves as guides for monastic discipline? Which sets of bodhisattva precepts should be used? How were the laity and monastics to be distinguished if both received the bodhisattva precepts? How should violations of precepts be handled? Who presided over full ordinations? What role should lineages play in the justification of ordinations? The positions of monks in Tendai and its opponents in the Nara 奈良 Schools were far from unified on either side of the debates. Moreover, the return of Shunjō 俊苜 (1166-1227) in 1211, after twelve years of studying the Vinaya and Tiantai in China raised serious questions about Japanese Tendai orthodoxy. The care with which he followed the procedures of Southern Song Dynasty 南宋 Buddhism stimulated many of the leaders of the reform movement in Nara to “return” to what they saw as more orthodox practices. My objective in this paper is to point out the background for the variety of positions taken and criticized by a group of thirteenth century monks. Any of these could be explored in greater depth but considering them as a group indicates the diversity and vibrancy of these developments in Japanese Buddhist history.

At least five lineages held views that influenced the revival of the Vinaya: 1) the various chapels at Tōdaiji 東大寺, particularly the ordination platform (Kaidan'in 戒壇院) lineage, 2) Kakujō's 覚盛 (1194-1249) Tōshōdaiji 唐招提寺 lineage, 3) Eison's 叡尊 (1201-1290) Saidaiji 西大寺 lineage, 4) Shunjō's 俊苜 Sennyūji 泉涌寺 Tiantai/ Tendai lineage, and 5) the various traditions of Mount Hiei's 比叡 Tendai lineage. All but Mount Hiei had a common interest in reviving the Vinaya ordination, but even some groups within Tendai were influenced by some of the procedures in the Vinaya.² This led to cooperation at times among many of the groups through such activities as distributing texts, lecturing, and participation in monastic

² Paul Groner, “Japanese Tendai Perfect-Sudden Precepts and the Vinaya,” *Tendai gakuho*, Tokubetsugō daishū 天台学報特別号第二集 (2018): 1-20; and ポール・グローナー, “安然の『普通授菩薩戒広釈』について——その背景と後代への影響,” 『日本仏教総合研究』 14 (2015): 5-7 (English version forthcoming in *Eastern Buddhist*).

ceremonies. At the same time, they differed on basic issues such as how a proper ordination lineage could be justified and how violations of the precepts could be handled. This paper is divided into three parts. First is an examination of the debate tradition that contributed to the emergence of a variety of views; this provides a sense of the social background for the emergence of varying positions. Second is an examination of a new emphasis on the correct performance of monastic ritual, which was partially occasioned by Shunjō's arrival in Japan. To what degree should Japanese monks develop their own ceremonies and interpretations and to what extent should they follow Indian and Chinese models? In the third part, an example of these discussions is presented by examining the ambiguities of using self-ordinations and nuances to re-establish a new ordination lineage. In particular, I focus on Kakujō's rebuttal against claims by some Nara monks that his self-ordination was virtually the same as Tendai ordinations.

Part 1. Debates on the Vinaya

Eison's *Chōmonshū* contains a passage describing how Kakujō prepared for a debate that would eventually lead to the self-ordinations performed by Kakujō, Eison, and several others in 1236. The debate was to be held at the Jōki'in 常喜院, a chapel at Kōfukuji that had been established in 1211 by the order of Jōkei 貞慶 (1155-1213) for the study of the Vinaya. One year earlier, Jōkei had met Shunjō right after his return from China. In Eison's autobiography, the *Kanjin gakushō ki* 感身学正記, the self-ordination that resulted from the preparations for this debate is the key dividing point in his account. Many of the doctrinal positions in the revival of the vinaya probably developed in such debates. However, many sources use the term "debate" (*rongi* 論議) in a variety of ways. Face to face debates (*tsugai rongi* 番論議 or *tsugi rongi* 継論議) were a feature of the revival as monks from Kōfukuji 興福寺, Tōshōdaiji, and other sites explored the interpretation of the *Sifen lü*. But other sources use the term in less precise ways, including the questions asked at lectures (*kōgi* 講議) and discussions of teachings

(*dangi* 談義).

Detailed records of debates on the precepts and Vinaya are scarce, but a brief survey of debates by the monks of the Nara schools, particularly the Hossō 法相 and Risshū 律宗, provides some of the background for how these monks were educated. During the decades before and after Jōkei, large collections of Hossō debate topics were compiled, indicating that debate was an indispensable part of Hossō training; the most famous of these was the *Jōyuishikiron dōgakushō* 成唯識論同学鈔 (T 2263) with over one-thousand topics, edited by two of Jōkei's students. In addition, Kusunoki Junshō 楠淳證 recently published a study of the Buddhist path section (*Butsudō-hen* 仏道篇) of a collection of debate topics compiled by Jōkei, the *Jōyuishikiron jinshi shō* 成唯識論尋思鈔³. Clearly debate would have been a part of Hossō training in the thirteenth century and would have been used by those Nara monks who advocated a return to the Vinaya.⁴ The abovementioned passage in Eison's *Chōmonshū*, a collection of excerpts from his sermons, shows that debates on the precepts often focused on Ci'en's 慈恩 (632-682) "Essay on Manifested and Unmanifested [Form] (*Biao wubiao zhang* 表無表章)." Although the title of this text suggests that it was concerned how karma could be considered as a general concept, in terms of debates on the Vinaya, it was tied to considerations of the essence of the precepts (*kaitai* 戒体) that were conferred in ordinations. Ōtani Yūka noted that eight of the debate topics in the *Jōyuishikiron dōgakushō* were concerned with the subject.⁵ Other sources include brief mentions of debates on the precepts. A suggestive entry in the *Tōshōdaiji ge* 唐招提寺解 mentions face-to-face debates (*tsugi rongi* 繼論議) on the Vinaya. The scholar-monks (*gakuro* 学侶) from the Eastern and Western Golden Halls (Tōsai kondō 東

³ Kusunoki Junshō 楠淳證, *Jōsei-sen Jōyuishikiron jinshi shō no kenkyū: Butsudō-hen* 貞慶撰『唯識論尋思鈔』の研究—仏道篇— (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2019).

⁴ Kusunoki Junshō 楠淳證, "Hossō Rongi no Keisei to Tenkai 法相論議の形成と展開," *Girei ni miru Nihon no Bukkyō* 儀礼に見る日本の仏教 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2001), pp. 135-166.

⁵ Ōtani Yūka 大谷由香, "Jion daishi Ki no Muhyōshiki kaishaku 慈恩大師基の無表色解釈," *Ryūkoku daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyūka kiyō* 26 (2004): p.67.

西金堂) at Kōfukuji, sites that were also concerned with Vinaya, conducted face-to-face debates as part of the Yuima-e 維摩会 assembly. Kakujiō was a member of the hall-clergy (*dōshu* 堂衆), a lower class of monk; when he was ensconced at the Jōki'in preparing for his debates, the scholar-monks stopped him from participating in the debates on the precepts because of his lower status. The use of the term *ryūgi* 豎義 (literally establishing doctrine) in the *Chōmonshū* passage suggests that this was part of the ritual process for advancing in monastic rank, thus considerations of social class would have been expected.⁶ According to the *Tōshōdaiji ge*, this led Kakujiō and others to resort to the self-ordination to establish their own precepts lineage.⁷

Considerations of social class are important in the comparison between the Tōdaiji abbot (*bettō* 別当) Sōshō 宗性 (1202-1278) and his student, the renowned Kegon and Ritsu scholar Gyōnen 凝然 (1240-1321). Sōshō assiduously recorded debates on a variety of subjects, but not the Vinaya, perhaps because he violated a number of important precepts.⁸ Gyōnen, who studied Kegon under Sōshō (1202-1292) and was vitally interested in the Vinaya and bodhisattva precepts, did not participate in debates. Gyōnen is referred to as a precepts monk (*rissō* 律僧), a sometimes ambiguous term used to refer to both advocates of the Vinaya and/or the bodhisattva precepts. Because *rissō* sometimes were reclusive monks, they did not care for the importance placed on debate as leading to higher status in the monastic world. However, the role of the Vinaya for such specialists could change depending on the person and time period.⁹

⁶ Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄 and Tanaka Hisao 田中久夫, *Kamakura kyū Bukkyō* 鎌倉旧仏教 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1971), p. 207.

⁷ BZ 105: 56; Hosokawa, *Kanjin gakushō ki* 1: 72-73. Also see Groner, "Reflections on the Movement to Revive the Precepts in Kamakura Japan" for a translation of the *Chōmonshū* passage mentioning Kakujiō's preparation for debate.

⁸ Sōshō's violation of precepts on such issues as sexual relations, drinking, and gambling, as well as his attempts to limit such behavior are discussed in Groner, "Reflections on the Movement to Revive the Precepts in Kamakura Japan."

⁹ For the variety of uses of the term *rissō*, see *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 10: 1153c-1154a. For debates at Tōdaiji and *rissō*, see Nagamura Makoto 永村真,

Other sources mention debates on the precepts briefly, but without much detail. For example, according to the *Shōdai senzai denki* 招提千歳伝記, a text compiled in 1701, debates were held along with lectures on Daoxuan's works on the precepts every year on the third month of the tenth month at Tōshōdaiji, but no mention is made in the entry of when the debates began.¹⁰ Another text, the *Denritsu zugen geshū* 伝律図源解集, compiled around 1684, also mentions continuous lectures on the Vinaya at Tōshōdaiji around the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.¹¹ Recently Nagamura Makoto 永村真 has assembled a small set of materials that reflect the serious study of the Vinaya at sites such as Shōmyōji 称名寺, a site affiliated with Shingon Ritsu, and Tōdaiji through debates and lectures and argued that such debates continued into the Edo period.¹² In addition, Gyōnen reports that Kakujō often lectured on Taehyōn's 大賢 (fl. mid-eighth century) *Pōmmang kyōng kojōkki* ("Record of Old Traces of the *Fanwang jing*) and much less frequently on Daoxuan's texts.¹³

One of the most detailed sets of sources on debates on the precepts is found in the *Zoku Tendai shū zensho*'s volume 2 on the precepts. This focuses on texts compiled by the Tendai monks associated with Jitsudō Ninkū 実導仁空 (1309-1388), but gives little information on the debates on precepts in Nara temples. These and other documents, however, do show that Ninkū

Chūsei Tōdaiji no soshiki to keiei 中世東大寺の組織と経営 (Tokyo: Hanawa shobō, 1989), pp. 453-462.

¹⁰ BZ 105: 400a.

¹¹ BZ 105: 103-104.

¹² Nagamura Makoto 永村真, "Chusei ritsuin no kaigi to kaihō 中世律院の戒儀と戒法," *Kanazawa bunko kenkyū* 金沢文庫研究 333 (2014): 38-48.

¹³ ND, *Kairitsushū shōsho* 3: 46b. The source of this is the sixth fascicle of Gyōnen's *Risshū gyōkan shō* 律宗瓊鑑章, the only extant fascicle of a supposed sixty-fascicle text. This includes valuable information about the lineages of Vinaya and those who studied it. A recent study by Nōtomi Jōten 納富常天 based on some fragments of the text clarifies the structure of the text and suggests that it was actually only six fascicles long. Moreover, the text provided the basis of the shorter *Risshū kōyō* 律宗綱要 (T 2348), which is extant in two fascicles. *Risshū gyōkan shō ni tsuite* 律宗瓊鑑章について," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 9.2 (1961): 558-559.

was aware of Shunjō.¹⁴

The term “debates,” need not always refer to the formal debates held in temples that were accompanied by complex rituals and often resulted in monks advancing in rank. The definition can be widened to include the questioner who was frequently present to enliven lectures (*kōgi* 講義) by asking questions or the presence of discussions of doctrine (*dangi* 談義), which frequently used a question and answer format.¹⁵ In fact, most of the materials consulted for this essay used a question and answer format, sometimes reflecting contrasting views by introducing them with phrases equivalent to “If that is the case, then...” or “Even so...”

Part 2. What was Revived?

The term revival of the precepts and Vinaya (*kairitsu fukkō* 戒律復興) used to describe the movement around Eison and Kakujiō is a modern term, not found in their writings. The revival has often been interpreted as a renewed interest in morality and stricter Buddhist practice.¹⁶ However, recent research by Nishiyama Isao 西山功 and others has suggested that

¹⁴ Groner, “Hokurei no kairitsu: Jitsudō Ninkū wo chūshin ni 北嶺の戒律—実導仁空を中心— (The Precepts on the Northern Peaks [Tendai] with an emphasis on Jitsudō Ninkū,)” 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究叢書 Nantogaku Hokureigaku no sekai 南都学・北嶺学の世界, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2018, pp. 137-165.

¹⁵ Tomabechi Seiichi 苦米地誠一 has clarified the usages of these terms in his essay, “Rongi no rekishi to Shingonshū 論義の歴史と真言宗,” 龍谷大学アジア仏教文化研究叢書 日本仏教と論議, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2020, pp. 271-314. His treatment of the issues extends well beyond the Shingon school.

¹⁶ The Nara National Museum’s exhibition on Kakujiō for the 770th anniversary of his death was entitled “Kamakura jidai no Tōshōdaiji to kairitsu fukkō 鎌倉時代の唐招提寺と戒律復興.” The catalogue with the same title featured (Nara: Nara National Museum, 2019) the observance of a ritual commemorating Kakujiō’s waving of a fan to shoo mosquitoes away because he did not want to kill them, which was held annually on the anniversary of his death. The ritual probably only goes back to the Tokugawa period and emphasizes the ethical aspect of the precepts in a manner that probably was not originally stressed in Kakujiō’s practice (p. 6).

this should be interpreted as an emphasis on the orthodox (*nyohō* 如法) performance of monastic ceremonies, particularly ordinations, fortnightly assemblies and rainy season retreats.

Monks associated with the revival of the Vinaya like Jippan 実範 (d. 1144), Jōkei, Kakujō and Eison certainly studied the Vinaya, but frequently were not sure how to put it into practice. The distinction between study and practice is mentioned in a number of medieval texts.¹⁷ For example, Kakujō discusses the difference between studying texts (*gaku* 学) and putting them into practice (*gyō* 行) in his *Bosatsukai tsūju kengi shō*.¹⁸ While both are important, he clearly felt that study was more important. The lack of a basic understanding of practice is illustrated by a story from Genkyū's 元休 (n.d.) *Tetteishō* 徹底章, a text that considers Nara views of the precepts from the perspective of Sennyūji and the Risshū.¹⁹ Jōkei, who was deeply interested in the Vinaya at the end of his life, met Shunjō shortly after his return from China in 1211. The next year, Jōkei asked his student Kakushin 覚真 (1170-1243) to establish a hall, the Jōki'in 常喜院 at Kōfukuji for the study of the precepts. Jōkei is said to have questioned his own understanding of two terms— *chōe* 長衣 and *chōhachi* 長鉢, literally long robe and long begging bowl. These appeared in Daoxuan's *Sifenlü xingshi chao* 四分律行事鈔, a text studied by monks in the early Kamakura period who were concerned with the Vinaya.²⁰ Although Jōkei could explain the first term as referring to the length of robes (an incorrect interpretation), he was baffled by the second term: what would a long bowl mean? He sent one of his monks Chisokubō 知足房 (aka Kainyo 戒如, n.d.) to ask Shunjō about the terms. Shunjō explained that the terms referred to possessing more than the permitted number of robes and bowls.²¹ Shunjō then sent a copy of Yuanzhao's

¹⁷ Note how Nagamura Makoto's essay refers to this in the title, "Chūsei Ritsuin no kaigi to kaihō."

¹⁸ *Bosatsukai tsūju kengi shō* 菩薩戒通受遣疑鈔, T2353.74.50c15-19.

¹⁹ The date of composition is not clear, but it is said to have been copied in 1327, so it was probably composed before that date.

²⁰ For 長鉢, T1804.40: 72c25, 103a23; for 長衣, numerous places in the canon.

²¹ The rules on bowls and robes spread to temples outside of Risshū; see Mujū,

commentary on Daoxuan's text, the *Sifenlu xingshi chaozi chiji* 四分律行事鈔資持記,²² to Jōkei. Yuanzhao's commentaries on the Vinaya from a Chinese Tiantai perspective both helped clarify the Vinaya and gave the Nara monks significant ways to criticize Japanese Tendai as deviating from Chinese precedents.

Two years after the self-ordination, Eison, Kakujo and others set the boundaries (*kekkaï* 結界) for the ritual performance of the fortnightly assembly;²³ this was a vital aspect of orthodox ritual because it determined who was required to participate in ceremonies. Kakujo performed the central role of reciting (*sekkai* 説戒) the *prātimokṣa*, the list of precepts, but wept during the ceremony. When Eison asked why, Kakujo replied that he had been part of a ceremony many years before and when he declared that his conduct was pure, it had only been a formality. Now, he explained, he had performed it in an orthodox manner for the first time, which entailed much more than simply reciting the *pratimokṣa*).

Such attention to the details of monastic ceremonies appears frequently in the documents concerning Eison and Kakujo. The backstory behind Kakujo's emotional reaction to participating in an orthodox fortnightly assembly is vital to understanding this revival. Shunjō's disciple Jōshun 定舜 (n.d.) was asked to lecture at Kairyūji 海龍王寺 for three months in 1237, shortly after the self-ordination while Eison was residing there;²⁴ this would have corresponded to the rainy season retreat. Jōshun's lectures and the procedures surrounding his stay would have introduced Eison and Kakujo to the practicalities of performing monastic rituals following the procedures used in Song dynasty China. The use of

Zōtanshū 雑談集 (Tokyo: Miyai shoten, 1973), p. 105; also see Ōtsuka Norihiro 大塚紀弘, *Chūsei zenritsu Bukkyō ron* 中世禪律仏教論 (Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppansha, 2009), pp. 136, 214.

²² ND Kairitsushū shōsho 2: 681b-682a.

²³ Hosokawa, *Kanjin gakushōki* 1: 95; *Chōmonshū*, item 39, Tanaka and Kamata, *Kamakura kyū Bukkyō*, pp. 206-207.

²⁴ *Tōdaiji kyōgaku* 東大寺教学部 (ed.), *Tōdaiji Enshō shōnin gyōjō* 東大寺円照上人行状, (Nara: Tōdaiji toshokan: 1977), p. 7.

Song Dynasty pronunciations (*sōon* 宋音) might have been one aspect of this, but so would the complex procedures involving the definition of the ritual space (*kekkaï* 結界), the adornments of the altar, the seating arrangements, and so forth. The use of chairs would have been an obvious way of demonstrating the increasing use of Chinese monastic ritual.²⁵ In many ways, Eison appreciated the monasticism that Shunjō had brought back from China: robes, begging bowl, chair (*sōjō* 僧牀), observance of the fortnightly assembly, and the rainy season retreat. These lectures centered on Daoxuan's *Sifenlü xingshi chao* 四分律行事鈔 (T no. 1804) but extended to other sources. Eison and others were thus introduced to a broader range of sources and ceremonies based on the Vinaya than they had known before.²⁶

Similar issues can be seen when ordinations are considered. The emphasis on the orthodox performance of ceremony appears in a number of passages from the thirteenth century. For example, Eison refers to Jōkei's desire for an orthodox ordination in the following passage from the *Chōmonshū*:

As for the Arising of the Study of Vinaya in Nara, according to the record of the Saint of Kasagi 笠置 [Jōkei], began when the Saint was thirteen years old, he was ordained on the ordination platform; ten monks were in attendance, and he thought he had received the [full] precepts. However he really did not know the Vinaya. A person thirteen years old, even with the powers of the seven buddhas, cannot

²⁵ I am particularly indebted to Nishitani Isao's 西谷功 painstaking research to clarify the connections between Shunjō's arrival in Japan and the importation of Chinese Buddhist ritual procedures ("Nansō Bukkyō kara mita Kamakura-ki kairitsu fukkō undo no shosō: Nyohō no sōin seikatsu to girei jissen no shiten kara 南宋仏教からみた鎌倉期戒律復興運動の諸相: 「如法」の僧院生活と儀礼実践の視点から," in *Risshū kaigakuin* 律宗戒学院 [ed.], *Kakujō shōnin onki kinen Tōshōdaiji no dentō to kairitsu* 覚盛上人御忌記念唐招提寺の伝統と戒律 [Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2019], pp. 137-172). For a detailed discussion of what might have been involved in the ceremonies for the fortnightly assembly, see pp. 152-159.

²⁶ See Tokuda Myōhon 徳田妙本, "Shunjō Risshi to Nankyō Ritsu ni tsuite 俊苧律師と南京律について," in Ishida Mitsuyuki (ed.) *Shunjō Risshi: Kamakura Bukkō seiritsu no kenkyū* 俊苧律師・鎌倉仏教成立の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1972), p. 71.

receive the [full] precepts.²⁷

Another passage from the *Chōmonshū* concerns the decision by Eison and Kakujiō to undertake distinct ordinations nine years after their self-ordination even though they should have had ten or more years of seniority to serve as preceptors. They pondered whether they should perform the ordination even though it would be going against the rules.²⁸ In the end, they decided that the value of conducting the ritual outweighed the minor offense they would be committing.

How would Eison and Kakujiō have known about the requirements to be a preceptor? Daoxuan's *Jiaojie xinxue biqiu xinghu lüyi* 教誡新學比丘行護律儀 (Admonitions and teachings for new monks to practice and observe, T no. 1897),²⁹ served as a guide for the new order. It had been printed and distributed to temples emphasizing the precepts, particularly Sennyūji, Kurodani, and Saidaiji, three of the temples that emphasized a revival of monastic discipline.³⁰

The significance of the fortnightly assembly and the rules for ordinations are open to several interpretations. They can certainly be considered in the light of strengthening monastic discipline. Monks were supposed to confess any violations or leave before the *prātimokṣa* was

²⁷ Kamata and Tanaka, *Kamakura kyū Bukkyō*, p. 219. According to the notes for this entry, in “Gedatsu shōnin mikata jōki 解脱上人御形状記,” Jōkei would have been eleven years old.

²⁸ Kamata and Tanaka, *Kamakura kyū Bukkyō*, p. 208, translated in Groner, “Reflections on the Movement to Revive the Vinaya (kairitsu fukkō 戒律復興) in Kamakura Japan,” pp. 81-82.

²⁹ Daoxuan's *Jiaojie xinxue biqiu xinghu lüyi* 教誡新學比丘行護律儀 (Admonitions and teachings for new monks to practice and observe) T 1897. 45: p0871b12-13. Eison lectured on it two years after the self-ordination (*Nenpu, Saidaiji Eison denki shūsei*, p. 120).

³⁰ Ōtsuka, *Chūsei zenritsu*, p. 234. The requirements for seniority to officiate at the ordination are mentioned in a commentary written in Japan late in the thirteenth century, see “Kyōkai gishō 教誡儀鈔,” in *Kanazawa bunko shiryō zensho, daigo kan, kairitsu-hen* 1 金沢文庫資料全書第五卷戒律篇 1, pp. 22b-23a. For the complex process of compiling the commentary and cross-checking its references, see pp. 25-26.

recited. The monks at Shōmyōji 称名寺 during the early fourteenth century were supposed to have memorized the *prātimokṣa* and to be able to chant it, but this did not mean that they necessarily understood it in detail.³¹ such sources as temple rules indicate that the *prātimokṣa* was memorized and chanted at fortnightly assemblies. This could be considered an indication of a tightening of monastic discipline, but this is not necessarily the case. The list of precepts is terse and difficult to understand. If monastic discipline was being strengthened, lectures on the *prātimokṣa* would seem to be necessary. However, such lectures appear rarely in Eison's autobiography and chronology even though the recitation of the *prātimokṣa* is mentioned. In the *Kanjin gakushō ki*, he mentions the recitation as part of his orthodox practice when he first performed the rainy season retreat.³² This took place in 1241, several years after the self-ordination. The language is like that found in the description of the first orthodox performance of the fortnightly assembly. However, in the later parts of his autobiography and chronology, the recitation of the *prātimokṣa* and lectures on it are increasingly mentioned as Saidaiji obtained texts from China and the understanding of Saidaiji monks matured.

A second possibility is that fortnightly assemblies and ordinations could be interpreted as merit-making ceremonies with much less emphasis on actual monastic discipline.³³ How else should Jōkei's ordination at such a young age be interpreted or fortnightly assemblies that included the recitation of precepts but little explanation of their interpretation?

Eison's only significant work primarily focusing on the Vinaya is a brief survey of monastic ritual, the *Risshū saji konma* 律宗作持羯磨, but

³¹ Nagamura Makoto, "Chūsei ritsuin no kaigi to kaihō," pp.38-39. Note how Eison strove to understand and memorize Vinaya texts, including the *prātimokṣa*, going without sleep (lying down?) for five rainy season retreats (Tanaka and Kamata, *Kamakura kyū Bukkyō*, p. 207.

³² Hosokawa, *Kanjin gakushō ki* 1: 346.

³³ Nagamura Makoto, "Chūsei ritsuin no kaigi to kaihō," p. 42. Similar issues arise in the Tendai School (Groner, *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), p. 240.

this omits the procedures for expulsion and suspension because Eison claimed they would have been used rarely; however, violations of these precepts would not have been unusual.³⁴ Monastic discipline may not have been a paramount concern at this time for Eison and Kakujiō, at least to the extent that they were willing to challenge high-ranking monks over these issues. However, some evidence to the contrary can be found. Sōji 総持 compiled a commentary on the nun's *prātimokṣa* in 1251, shortly after Eison had established an order of nuns.³⁵ Did he do so because he needed it for ritual purposes, because the nuns needed guidance, or both? Whatever the case, he stated that if a more authoritative source emerged, it should be used. As time passed, detailed commentaries on the *Sifen lü prātimokṣa* were compiled, such as Gyōnen's *Shibunritsu kaihonsho sanshū ki* 四分律戒本疏賛宗記 in twenty fascicles, composed near the end of Gyōnen's life at the request of monks from Kaijūsenji 海住山寺 around 1310 to 1312.³⁶

Perhaps lecturing and compiling commentaries on the *Sifen lü* did not seem central to the revival's movement at first, an issue that may have been influenced by the situation in China. Daoxuan's three major works on the precepts and Yuanzhao's commentaries on them were not included in the Chinese canon until 1246. Printings of these texts followed around 1260.³⁷

Interest in the *Fanwang jing*, particularly in Taehyōn's 大賢 (n.d.) commentary, the *Pōmmang kyōng kojōkki* ("Record of Old Traces of the *Fanwang jing*") is evident throughout Eison's life. This commentary had been known since the Nara period and was used extensively in Zenju's 善珠 (729-797) commentary on the *Fanwang jing*, and later in Annen's 安然 *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒広釈, though Annen never mentioned

³⁴ *Risshū saji konma* 律宗作持羯磨, ND, *kairitsushū shōsho* 戒律宗章疏 2: 594b. The entire text is only thirty pages long.

³⁵ *Kanazawa bunko shiryō zensho, daigo kan, kairitsu-hen*, pp. 65-116. Hosokawa Ryōichi 細川涼一, *Sairinji Sōji to ama* 西琳寺惣持と尼, in Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄 and Nishiguchi Junko 西口順子, *Sukui to oshie* 救いと教え (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1989), pp. 121-164.

³⁶ ND *Shōjōritsu shōsho* 1: 397-732.

³⁷ Nōtomi Jōten 納富常天, "Sōchō kyōgaku to Tan'ei (ichi) 宋朝教学と湛睿 (一)," *Kanazawa bunko kenkyū* 24.1-2 (1978): 6.

Taehyōn's name. It then disappeared for several centuries and reappeared in the works by the Nara monks involved in the revival movement. Ōtani Yūka's excellent study of the reception of Taehyōn's commentary indicates that the text seems to have been mostly ignored in China, but was introduced again in Japan with the importation of the "Continuation of the Canon" 続藏經 from Korea.³⁸ This collection was compiled and published under the auspices of Ūich'ōn 義天 (1055-1101) as part of the *Koryō sokchanggyōng* 高麗続藏經 ("Koryō Supplement to the Canon"). Several transmissions to Japan are recorded in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Subcommentaries by many of the major figures in the Vinaya revival movement were composed and certainly occupied more of Japanese attention than the Vinaya at first.³⁹ Some of these were extensive, such as Eison's *Bonmōkyō koshaku ki bugyō monjū* 梵網經古述記輔行文集, which is over three-hundred pages long in the *Nihon daizōkyō*.⁴⁰ Also note that Eison compiled an influential set of comments on the rituals for the bodhisattva precepts, the *Bosatsukai konma mon shakumon shō* 菩薩戒羯磨文釋文抄 that was based on Yogācāra sources.⁴¹ Eison's autobiography records numerous entries of lecturing on Taehyōn's commentary, beginning when he was forty-one years old and continuing up into his eighties. These lectures would sometimes last for several days. An emphasis on the ten major precepts is often mentioned. Many of these probably focused on large groups of lay practitioners. In addition, numerous mentions of fortnightly assemblies on the *Fanwang jing* precepts occur in Eison's autobiography, particularly in his eighties, a pattern that can be traced back to Jianzhen's 鑑真 (Jp. Ganjin,

³⁸ Ōtani Yūka 大谷由香, "Taiken *Bonmōkyō koshakki* no Nihon ni okeru katsuyō ni tsuite 大賢『梵網經古述記』の日本における活用について," *Ryūkoku daigaku ronshū* 492 (2018): 1-42.

³⁹ Tokuda Myōhon 徳田妙本, "Risshū bunken mokuroku 律宗文献目録," in Yoshimura Shuki 芳村修基 (ed.), *Bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū* 仏教教団の研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1968), appendix pp. 49-52.

⁴⁰ ND *Daijō ritsu shōsho* 2: 227-536.

⁴¹ ND *Daijōritsu shōsho no yo* 大乘律章疏之余, pp. 141-159.

688-763) disciple Fajin 法進 (709-778).⁴²

In summary, much of the early history of the thirteenth century revival focuses on an emphasis on monastic ceremonies more than on the ethical dimensions of the precepts of the Vinaya. The ten major precepts of the *Fanwang jing* as interpreted in Taehyōn's commentary are a recurring theme. These emphases are reflected in Eison's chronology (*nenpu* 年譜), which notes that 97,010 monastic and lay people received *Fanwang jing* ordinations.⁴³ In contrast, many fewer received monastic ordinations.

Part 3. Kakujo's Defense of his Position as Being Different from Tendai Ordination

The self-ordination conducted by Kakujo and Eison was similar to that used by Saichō's Tendai School; both used a universal ordination conferring the three collections of pure precepts to confer the essence or nature of being a monk. A sign from the Buddha served to confirm the successful reception of the precepts.⁴⁴ Without the precedents of Tendai and even earlier, the self-ordinations before Jianzhen arrived in Japan with orthodox ordinations, Kakujo might have encountered more difficulty in arguing for the validity of his tradition. At the same time, Kakujo and Eison were deeply involved in Hossō doctrine and were aware of the long tradition of Hossō criticisms of Tendai, particularly of its interpretation of the precepts. In this section, Kakujo's efforts to explain how he differed from Tendai in his works, the *Bosatsukai tsūbetsu ni ju shō* 菩薩戒通別二受鈔 (*Compendium on the*

⁴² Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞磨, "Ganjin ni okeru fusatsu no igi 鑑真における布薩の意義," *Nanto Bukkyō* 21 (1968): 1-8.

⁴³ *Saidaiji chokushi Kōshō bosatsu gyōjitsu Nenpu* 西大勅諭興正菩薩行実年譜, *Saidaiji Eison denki shūsei*, p. 199. Also see Lori Meeks, "Vows for the Masses: Eison and the Popular Expansion of Precept-Conferral Ceremonies in Premodern Japan," *Numen* 56.1 (2009): 1-43.

⁴⁴ Ōtani Yūka 大谷由香 describes self-ordination by Eison and Kakujo as the transformation of Mount Hiei's Perfect precepts by Nara: "Eizan enkai no Nantoka" 叡山円戒の南都化 ("Nissōsō Shunjō to Nanto kairitsu fukkō undō 入宋僧俊苾と南都戒律復興運動," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 65.2 [2017]: 610).

Universal and Distinct Bodhisattva Ordinations) and the *Bosatsukai tsūju kengi shō* 菩薩戒通受遺疑鈔 (Compendium dispelling doubts about the universal bodhisattva precepts ordination; hereafter cited as *Dispelling Doubts*) are investigated. Differentiating these views do not seem to be of paramount importance in most of the other works on ordination produced by Risshū monks such as Eison and Ryōhen 良遍 (1184-1252) around this time, but still deserves attention insofar as it helps to clarify some of the influences and differences between the traditions. The basic problem is posed in *Dispelling Doubts*, when after citing several Kōfukuji monks who bitterly opposed the Tendai position, Kakujo assumes the Tōdaiji position and asks the rhetorical question concerning his self-ordination: “Why do you turn your back on your own school and adopt the Tendai position?”⁴⁵

Kakujo forcefully rejects this criticism in several ways. In the *Compendium on the Universal and Distinct Bodhisattva Ordinations* (*Bosatsukai tsūbetsu ni ju shō* 菩薩戒通別二受鈔), he belittles the Tendai position:

If one only receives the *Fanwang jing* ten major and forty-eight minor precepts that are not shared 不共 [with followers of the Vinaya], this would be for eunuchs and such. But if one receives the distinct *prātimokṣa* of the three vehicles and seven types of Buddhists [specified in the Vinaya], then this would not be appropriate for eunuchs and such.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ *Bosatsukai tsūju kengi shō*, T 2353.74.49c29-50a1.

⁴⁶ Minowa Kenryō 襄輪顯量, “Kakujo-sen *Bosatsukai tsūbetsu ni ju shō*: honkoku narabi ni yakuchū” 覚盛撰『菩薩戒通別二受鈔』翻刻並びに訳注. *Ōkurayama Ronshū* 大倉山論集 42 (1998): 214. This is based on Taehyōn’s 大賢 commentary on the *Fanwang jing*, the *Pōmmang kyōng kojōkki* 梵網經古迹記 and was influenced by the Ci’en’s *Biao wubiao zhang* in which the bodhisattva precepts are said to be available for those without any sexual organs or with both sets (T 1861. 45: 312a15-16; cited by Kakujo in the *Bosatsukai tsūbetsu ni ju shō*, T 2354. 74: 55b6-7). For a rendering of this passage into English, see Charles Muller’s translation *Exposition of the Sutra of Brahma’s Net, Collected Works of Korean Buddhism*, Vol. 11 (Seoul: Compilation Committee of Korean Buddhist Thought, Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism. 2012), p. 253. Although the sense of this passage is difficult to understand, I have chosen to interpret it as part of Kakujo’s rejection of Tendai.

Although he does not specifically mention Tendai in this passage, Kakujo understood the Tendai position on the basis of Saichō's writings that specified that only the *Fanwang jing* bodhisattva precepts were received to make one a monk. To describe this position as being primarily for eunuchs was harsh indeed.

In other sections of that text, he follows a Risshū delineation of two types of Buddhist scriptures: 1) texts that teach and transform (*kekyō* 化教) and 2) texts that restrain people, in other words precepts (*seikyō* 制教). The first type applies to everyone, despite their various religious faculties, while the second applies only to certain groups. Thus, for Kakujo, the *Fanwang jing* would be a text that could be used to teach anyone. In contrast, the distinct ordinations of the Vinaya could be used to instill the nature of a *bhikṣu* only on those with appropriate religious faculties. In other words, Tendai monks were confusing the two types of teaching when they used the *Fanwang jing* to ordain monks.

In *Dispelling Doubts*, Kakujo went through the positions in Saichō's *Shijō shiki* 四条式 (Rules in Four Articles), which provided the basis for Saichō's *Kenkai ron* 顯戒論, in considerable detail to refute the argument that Kakujo had in fact adopted the Tendai position. Saichō began his argument by classifying temples as purely Hīnayāna, purely Mahāyāna, and as mixed Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. He argued that Tendai should be purely Mahāyāna; hence the precepts of the Vinaya could and should be discarded. Kakujo's counterargument is that a distinction must be made between doctrine, here called the vehicle (*jō* 乘) and the precepts. While distinctions between such concepts as Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna can be made doctrinally, all temples follow the same precepts. Thus, monks would all follow the same rules regardless of their sectarian or doctrinal identity.⁴⁷ Saichō had based his arguments on the travel diaries of Faxian 法顯 (337?-422?), Xuanzang 玄奘 (602-664), and Yijing 義淨 (635-715). In fact, Yijing had noted that the differences between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna were doctrinal,

⁴⁷ Minowa, "Kakujo-sen," pp. 224.

but that everyone followed the precepts from the Vinaya.⁴⁸ Saichō ignored this passage even though it followed a passage that he quoted, and Kakujō also did not refer to it. Even so, Kakujō concludes: “Although these vehicles are not the same, as far as monastic discipline is concerned, the three types of temples are the same. How could there be differences?”⁴⁹

An important part of Saichō’s campaign was replacing the Hīnayāna arhat Piṇḍola with the Mahāyāna bodhisattva Mañjuśrī as elder (*jōza* 上座) presiding over the dining hall. In doing so, he was following the great Esoteric Buddhist translator Amoghavajra’s (Bukong 不空, 705-774) lead. Kakujō noted that Saichō had cited *The Questions of Mañjuśrī* (*Wenshu wenjing* 文殊問經) to support his position. Although Saichō did cite this text in the *Kenkai ron*, he did not do so specifically to support installing Mañjuśrī as *jōza*, nor does the text seem to play a key role in Amoghavajra’s petitions.⁵⁰ Rather Kakujō notes that it is an important text in the corpus that focuses on Mañjuśrī, but then argues that nowhere does it specify that Mañjuśrī should be installed as *jōza*. Moreover, Kakujō notes that Śākyamuni had specified that Piṇḍola should be installed as *jōza* in the dining hall and did not specify that this had any connection with Hīnayāna or Mahāyāna. Thus, Kakujō notes that installing Mañjuśrī as *jōza* had no scriptural support.⁵¹

Elsewhere, Kakujō displayed his knowledge of Chinese Tiantai, citing such texts as Zhanran’s 湛然 (711-782) commentary on Zhiyi’s 智顛 (538-597) *Mohe zhiguan* (*Zhiguan fuxing zhuan hongjue* 止觀輔行伝弘決): “Thus I know that there is no Mahāyāna or Hīnayāna within the precepts. This depends on the recipients’ motivation. These are the middle path, as one enters the non-substantial, the provisional, and the restraints of phenomena.

⁴⁸ T 2125. 54: 205c08; Takakusu Junjirō, *I-tsing, A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695)*, p. 14.

⁴⁹ T 2353. 74: 52b04-5.

⁵⁰ *Kenkairon*, in Hieizan senshuin fuzoku Eizan gakuin 比叡山專修院附属叡山学院 (ed.) *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 伝教大師全集 (Tōkyō : Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1989) 1: 86.

⁵¹ T 2353. 74:52b6-c9.

These can be called the full precepts that are held.”⁵² Kakujō also noted Chinese Tiantai positions that relied on the “opening and reconciling” (*kaie* 開会) approach to doctrine that enabled the so-called “Hīnayāna” precepts to be interpreted as Mahāyāna.⁵³

In *Dispelling Doubts*, Kakujō further analyzed the Tendai position and explained how it differed from his stance. His argument was largely based on Saichō’s *Kenkai ron*, which in turn was structured around Saichō’s *Regulations in Four Parts* (*Shijō shiki* 四条式). Much of this discussion revolved around which precepts were conferred and how they were conferred. Kakujō was defending himself against at least two distinct attacks. First, Tōdaiji monks would have asked why he was rejecting the lineage that had come when Jianzhen first introduced orthodox ordinations based on the *Sifen lü* to Japan. These conferred the nature of being a *bhikṣu* (*biku shō* 比丘性) through asking the question and then three votes (*byakushi konma* 白四羯磨). Kakujō rejected this lineage on the basis of the decline of monastic discipline and the Dharma,⁵⁴ but then he also needed to justify self-ordinations as conferring the nature of a *bhikṣu*. To do this, he relied on the *Zhancha jing* 占察經 (T no. 839) as the only scriptural source (*sutra*) justifying his position. This was a controversial choice for several reasons. First, the self-ordinations of Japanese monks before Jianzhen brought orthodox ordinations to Japan had relied on this text, but their ordinations had been rejected in favor of Jianzhen’s ordinations. Second, the authenticity of the *Zhancha jing* had been questioned by Chinese monks and

⁵² *Zhiguan fixing zhuan hongjue*, T 1912. 46: 255a10-12; *Bosatsukai tsūbetsu niju shō*, T 2354. 74: 57c04. Note that some Tendai exegetes such as Hōchibō Shōshin had rejected Zhanran’s position arguing that it was not clear whether the interpretation depended on the intention of the teacher or the student (*Shikan shiki* 止觀私記, BZ 22: 379; Shōshin attributes his rejection to Ennin). At the same time, Zhanran’s view was also known outside of Tendai circles. For example, Mujū 無住 (1227-1312) cited it in both the *Zōtanshū* 雜談集 (Yamada Shozen, *Zōtanshū* [Tokyo: Miyai shoten, 1973], p. 104) and the *Shasekishū* 沙石集 (Watanabe Tsunaya, *Shasekishū* [Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1966, p. 177).

⁵³ T 2354. 74: 57c10.

⁵⁴ T 2353. 74: 50b5.

its views on self-ordination were generally not accepted, even though a very few Chinese monks had mentioned the text's position on self-ordination.⁵⁵ Limitations of space prevent further exploration of this topic in this paper, but I plan to continue this discussion.⁵⁶

Conclusion

A variety of interpretations of ordinations and precepts is evident during the thirteenth century, extending to both the Nara and Tendai traditions. Many of these emerged in the context of both formal debates and informal discussions of doctrine among monks as part of lectures. The first part of this paper examines how these debates provided the background for these movements.

The second part of the paper challenges the usual perception that the so-called “revival of the precepts and Vinaya” entailed a revival of strict monastic discipline and moral concerns. A careful reading of the sources indicates that the major emphasis, at least at the beginning of the movement, was a revival of monastic ceremonies and the re-establishing of ordination lineages. Much of this can be traced back to Shunjō's arrival in Japan after years of studying and practicing in Japan. The lack of Vinaya texts and the difficulty in understanding them probably hindered a deep understanding of the precepts in the Vinaya until late in the thirteenth century. Significant differences among the traditions are evident in such major areas as whether one or several ordinations should be performed and what they encompassed, whether self-ordinations were valid, and how expiation of offenses should be treated.

The third and last part of the paper takes one theme and examines ambiguities and nuances in how Kakujiō interpreted the self-ordination

⁵⁵ *Enryaku sōroku* 延暦僧録, included in the *Nihon yōmon shō* BZ 101:69a.

⁵⁶ “Jūsan seiki Nihon ni okeru kairitsu fukkō no kotonaru kaishaku 十三世紀日本における戒律復興の異なる解釈,” in Kusunoki Junshō 楠淳澄, Noro Sei 野呂靖, and Kamyama Takahiko 亀山隆彦 (eds.), *Nihon Bukkyō to Rongi* 日本仏教と論議, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2020.

that he used to claim that he had re-established an ordination lineage. In fact, his self-ordination so resembled the Japanese Tendai ordination that had long been rejected by Nara monks that he was accused of turning his back on his own tradition in favor of Tendai. As a result, Kakujō pointed out the differences between Risshū and Tendai ordinations, closely reading Saichō's works on the precepts. However, he seemed ignorant of later Tendai discussions of the precepts, such as Annen's *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*. Kakujō's seeming ignorance of later developments in Tendai raises questions about how much mutual awareness existed between the Nara and Tendai schools, but they certainly must have been aware of each other to some degree.

Abbreviations

- BZ Nanjō Bun'yū 南条文雄 et al. (ed), *Dainihon Bukkyō zensho*. Tokyo: 仏書刊行会, 1911-1922.
- ND Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧 et al. (ed.), *Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大藏經. Tokyo: Nihon daizōkyō hensankai 日本大藏經編纂会, 1914-1919.
- T Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 et al. (ed), *Taishō Shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. Tokyo: Daizōkyō kabushiki kaisha 大藏出版株式会社, 1922-1934.