

A comparison of two recensions of the *Xiuyao jing*

Michio Yano

The *Xiuyao jing*, a book on Esoteric Buddhist astrology composed by Amoghavajra, was first translated into Chinese by Shiyao in 759 CE and was revised by Yang Jingfeng in 764 CE. At the end of the revised version Yang added a chapter on the method of weekday computation. Later, the revised edition with the additional chapter was arranged as the first fascicle and the first translation was put as the second fascicle. The *Xiuyao jing* in two fascicles was brought to Japan by Kukai in 806 CE. This text became the basic source book of Sukuyōdō school of Japanese astrology. The manuscript of the text was faithfully copied in Japan and there survive many old manuscripts which convey the original form of the text, while in China the text was frequently modified as a result of sinicization. There are many significant differences between the two recensions, namely, the old manuscripts in Japan on one hand, and the Tripiṭaka versions in China and Korea on the other. The present article compares the two recensions and shows the three major differences:

- (1) While the chapter on the method of weekday computation was preserved in the Japanese recension, it was omitted in the Tripiṭaka recension.
- (2) While the Japanese recension keeps the original 27 nakṣatra (lunar mansion) system, the Chinese Tripiṭaka recension has modified it into the 28 nakṣatra system.
- (3) At the beginning of the first fascicle, there is a significant hapology in the Tripiṭaka recension, while Japanese manuscripts preserve the correct reading.

Even among the old manuscripts in Japan there are some differences in the arrangement and labelling of diagrams. I have provided a list in the appendix to show the differences. In conclusion, emphasis has been placed on the importance of manuscripts preserved in Japan in the study of history of translation of Sanskrit Buddhist texts into Chinese.

On the Kongōji and Kōshōji manuscripts of the *Fangbian xin lun*

Yasutaka Muroya

The *Fangbian xin lun* 方便心論 (Taishō No. 1632), also known as **Upāyahṛdaya/Prayogasāra*, is a Buddhist manual of debate from an early phase in the history of Indian dialectics and logic, the phase prior to the solidification of distinct Buddhist traditions of reasoning. The original text in an Indic language like Sanskrit has been lost to us and is only indirectly available through the (most probably first) Chinese translation by Jijiaye 吉迦夜 and Tanyao 曇曜 of the Northern Wei Dynasty. The present paper focuses on text-critical problems of the Chinese translation that remain in spite of a critical edition by Hakuju Ui 宇井伯寿 (Tokyo 1925) and a recent detailed study by Michiko Ishitobi 石飛道子 (Tokyo 2006), and aims to discuss the genealogy of the text and its transmission by way of a stemmatic approach. In this paper, one hundred and two cases are selected from the collation of five primary sources in addition to the Taishō edition and four further texts recorded therein. A survey of their genealogical affiliation is made. The present author argues that the *Fangbian xin lun* is a text to which the so-called stemmatic analysis can be applied effectively if it is undertaken on the basis of genealogically more independent sources than the witnesses known from the Taishō edition (keyword: outgroup comparison). Such sources are found in old Japanese Buddhist manuscript collections. For the present contribution, two manuscript materials are taken into account. One of them, which is kept in the Kōshōji 興聖寺 (Kyoto) collection and was copied in 1166, appears to be genealogically related to the Kaibao zan 開寶藏 or the First Carving of the Goryeo edition 高麗初雕本. The other is the 13th-century manuscript in the collection of Kongōji 金剛寺 (Kawachinagano, Osaka), which is regarded as an “outgroup” manuscript, namely, a source/group of sources that is genealogically not subordinate to any other source/group. In order to examine the position of the archetype and prove its relationship to the Kongōji manuscript, four cases are discussed in detail on the basis of independent testimonies such as Huilin’s 慧琳 *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 (Taishō No. 2128) and the relevant catalogues of the Chinese Buddhist Canon. This examination makes it plausible that the Kongōji manuscript represents a textual transmission belonging to a manuscript tradition retained since the Nara period.

Fujiwara no Mitsuyori (Katsura Dainagon Nyūdō) as Priest:
Précis and Transcription of the *Dainagon Nyūdō Kanjō ki* by Fujiwara no Korekata

Shigeo Fujiwara

According to the colophon, the detailed interlinear punctuation marks or *kunten* for guiding the Japanese reader of the sacred Chinese text *Gaoseng zhuan* (Jp. *Kōsōden*; *Lives of Eminent Monks*) included in the Song dynasty Tripitaka in the possession of Iwayamadera Temple in Minamichita-machi, Aichi Prefecture, were inserted by one Katsura Dainagon Nyūdō. This official title, which literally means “Priest-Counselor of Katsura,” refers to Fujiwara Mitsuyori (1124–1173). Mitsuyori was born into the Hamuro house, which belonged to the Kajūji clan and had an illustrious history as imperial bureaucrats. Mitsuyori himself was a noted imperial bureaucrat under Emperor GoShirakawa (1127–1192; r. 1155–1158). Mitsuyori appears in a number of military chronicles and collections of short tales (Jp. *setsuwa*), which describe both his achievements and personality. In 1164 Mitsuyori retired from official life at the age of 41, and entered the priesthood to pursue a life devoted to the practice of Esoteric Buddhism at the Hamuro villa, located in Katsura in the western outskirts of the city of Kyoto. In 1171 Ninkaku of Ninnaji (1108 or 1110–1181) conferred the status of *ācārya* (preceptor) on Mitsuyori in the Hirosawa (Nishi no in) School Esoteric *abhiṣeka* consecration ritual. The ritual was recorded by Mitsuyori’s younger brother, Fujiwara no Korekata (1125–after 1201) in a document known as the *Dainagon Nyūdō Kanjō ki*. This document, formerly in the collection of the Kanesawa Bunko, is now in the collection of the Maeda Ikutokukai Sonkeikaku Bunko. This record is a valuable source of information about Mitsuyori’s activities after entering the priesthood, which are otherwise almost unknown. In addition, it also reveals important details about Mitsuyori’s practice of Esoteric Buddhism, and the influence of his entry into the priesthood upon other members of his family.

Translation by Rachel Saunders

The Authorship of the *Notes on the Meaning of the Diamond [Cutting] Wisdom*
(Dunhuang Manuscript S 1087)

Bhikṣu Dingyuan (Zhaoguo Wang)

Dunhuang Manuscript S 1087 is written on both sides. One of the sides contains a text called *Notes on the Diamond [Cutting] Wisdom* 金剛般若義記. The lack of its final portion has made the identification of its author very difficult. The Japanese scholar Ui Hakuju conjectured long ago that the authorship could be ascribed to Tanshen 曇琛, a monk active during the Sui Dynasty, but no clear evidence has been adduced so far.

The present study is the first in-depth attempt to investigate the authorship of the text on the basis of sound philological and historical proofs. I carefully examine here not only the content of the text but also the historical records concerning Tanshen and his works as well as his quotations surviving in Jizang's 吉藏 opus. Last but not least, the evidence found in Buddhist catalogues recently found in Japan has provided important clues. This investigation leads to the conclusion that the authorship of the text can indeed be ascribed to Tanshen.

Last but not least, the essential clues offered by the Japanese sources have made it once again clear how important it is to include them in the study of Chinese Buddhism alongside the traditional Chinese sources.

The first half of Daoxuan's (596–667) life and the formation of the first version of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 completed in the Zhenguan era (627–649)

Limei Chi

The study of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* has now made a remarkable progress, while that of Daoxuan's biography, which is based on Masumi Fujiyoshi's research, has little new that deserves to mention. Given that over the course of its formation the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* was not only added and recompiled by later generations of people but also supplemented by Daoxuan himself, it is necessary to examine Daoxuan's activities, especially changes in his intentions while compiling the work. Moreover, as new knowledge has amassed in recent years from a rapid progress in the study of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, its application to the study of Daoxuan's biography makes it necessary to reexamine if it matches his activities. So far, although things taking place while the work was recompiled have been extensively studied, one of the basic problems related to the formation of the work and Daoxuan's biography, why originally Daoxuan planned to complete the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* by Zhenguan 19 (645), has never been explored.

This article is to address the problem abovementioned by carefully examining Daoxuan's life and activities up to his mid-and-old age once again. It thoroughly reevaluates Daoxuan's situation surrounding the "twelve years of hermit" in Mount Zhongnan, and revisits the traditional studies on the so-called "period of his itinerant in the Shu region". Finally, it reveals what Zhenguan 19, the year taken as the latest in the first version of the *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, meant to Daoxuan and its relevant background.