

## About the Understanding of Esoteric Teachings Among Myoe's Disciples

Sei Noro

*Rokudai Muge Gisho* (六大無導義抄) in two fascicles is a commentary on the Sokushin Jobutsu Gi (即身成仏義) which was written by Jyunsho-bo Koshin who was a disciple of Myoe. Myoe's idea of a correspondence between Hua-yan and Esoteric Teachings in his latter years is a distinguishing feature of his philosophical development, but his reference to attaining Buddhahood in this body (Sokushin Jobutsu) are few and none of those works remain. But within this work one can observe a continuity from Myoe by the use of several Hua-yan teachings. This is a crucial text for understanding the doctrine of attaining Buddhahood in this body (Sokushin Jobutsu) at Kosan Temple.

Although I have already republished fascicle I of this text together with an explanation, I have yet to make a report on the lower fascicle II. As a result of conducting a survey of a text dating to the Forth year of Kencho (1252) possessed by Toshodai Temple, it is clear that this is a valuable manuscript which was written in a time considerably close to the period in which Koshin wrote his work the Sokushin Jobutsu Gi.

In this paper I give an outline of fascicle II which has yet to be introduced together with its republication.

The comparative study of *Guang-hong-ming-ji* between the old Japanese edition and the existent woodblock editions

Mayuko Kawakami

*Guang-hong-ming-ji* was edited by Dào Xuān for the purpose of the protection of the Buddhist creed. It contains a number of significant historical records, including the project of building a reliquary tower during the Sui dynasty. Although its several editions do not reveal much difference, there are many cases of slight character changes between the woodblock editions, and the choice of particular characters leads to the differently interpreted sentences.

This article examines the old Japanese edition (the Old Edition) of *Guang-hong-ming-ji*, transcribed by hand in various parts of Japan during the Heian and the Kamakura eras. Given the possibility that the Old Edition modeled after the Tang text that had arrived in Japan during the Nara period, the edition can be considered more faithful to the Tang original than the others.

In an effort to determine whether the original of the Old Edition was one of woodblock editions or the text from Tang China, this article compares the Old Edition with woodblock editions focused on the relatively well-preserved volumes of 7, 17, and 30. The result are as follows: a) all three volumes in the Old Editions show differences from all the existent woodblock editions, b) the Old Edition consistently uses the same characters where it deviates from the woodblock editions, and c) *Guang-hong-ming-ji*, on several occasions, avoids writing the Tang emperors' names as they were by leaving the names incomplete or substituting a certain character, such as 武 for 虎 or 人 for 民.

The emperors' names called for a more extensive research, and the examination of how the Tang emperors' names are represented in all the thirty volumes of *Guang-hong-ming-ji* reveals further instances of incomplete names or character substitutions of 虎, 淵, 民, 世, and 治. It can be concluded that the original of the Old Edition came from the Tang era when the emperor must have been obliquely referred to, excluding the possibility that it was from the Song period that approached the naming taboo of the Tang emperors differently.

These findings shed a new light on the “隋國立舍利塔詔” section in Volume 17, which should now be interpreted in accordance with the Old Edition. Two insights follow: a) the stronger emphasis was put on the presence of a mountain in deciding the location of the reliquary tower construction, but b) the Sui military campaigns in various regions were given priority over the tower project.

## Old Japanese Manuscripts of the *Bianzheng lun* and Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō*

Satoru Fujiwara

The “Chapter on Transformed Buddha-Bodies and Lands” of the *Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信証 by Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1262) contains extensive quotations from the *Bianzheng lun* 弁正論 by Falin 法琳 (572-640). The *Kyōgyōshinshō* has been studied in detail from various viewpoints until now, but the portion containing the quotation of the *Bianzheng lun* has not been studied sufficiently. One reason for this lack of attention is that the quotation of this work in the *Kyōgyōshinshō* differs considerably from the original text, such that it appears to have been confused or corrupted in the quotation. Previous scholars have attempted to solve this problem by comparing the quotation with some other texts of the *Bianzheng lun*. But the texts used in these comparisons were printed later than the *Kyōgyōshinshō* was written, so Shinran could not possibly have used them in making his quotation. This paper aims to show what text Shinran referred to when writing his quotation. The oldest proof of the presence of the *Bianzheng lun* in Japan is a record that states it was copied in the Nara era (747). It has been pointed out that old Japanese manuscripts of Buddhist scriptures produced around this time are of a different genealogy from the texts that were printed in later eras. I examined the Kongōji 金剛寺, Nanatsudera 七寺 and Kōshōji 興聖寺 manuscripts of the *Bianzheng lun* which belong to this category of old Japanese Buddhist manuscripts. There are many similarities between these texts and the quotation in the *Kyōgyōshinshō*. Presenting the results of these investigations, this paper proves that the text that Shinran referred to in making his quotation fits broadly within the category of old Japanese manuscripts of the *Bianzheng lun*.

The Original Text of the Kasuga Edition of the *Gobu daijō kyō*  
and the Reasons for Choosing a Copy-Text

Isamu Sasaki

This paper has two goals:

- A. To show that the Kasuga edition 春日版 of the *Gobu daijō kyō* 五部大乘經 (hereafter K-Gdk), which basically reproduces the text of the Song edition 宋版 of the Buddhist Canon, also includes readings from old Japanese manuscripts.
- B. To examine the reasons for choosing the copy-texts for the K-Gdk.

My research has led to the following conclusions:

- A. After the manufacturing of the wooden blocks of the K-Gdk on the basis of the Song edition, the editors emended the text by adopting readings which agree with the old Japanese manuscripts. Chapter titles were also included.
- B. The K-Gdk made use of the Sixi edition of the Song Canon 宋版思溪版 as the copy-text for the following texts: the *Da fangdeng da ji jing* 大方等大集經, the *Da fengguang fo huayan jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經, the *Mohe bore poluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經, and the *Da banniepan jing hou fen* 大般涅槃經後分. This is because the Sixi edition of the Song Canon was close to the readings of the old Japanese manuscripts. As far as the *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經 is concerned, the K-Gdk editors adopted the Tōzen-ji edition of the Song Canon 宋版東禪寺版 as the copy-text. The reason was the same: the latter's readings were close to the old Japanese manuscripts.

Those parts which were emended and/or added to the wooden blocks most likely represent important variant readings.

I hope that further research on the Sixi edition and other Song editions of the Canon as well as on old Japanese manuscripts and incunables will bring a significant contribution to the study of Buddhism in its various aspects.