

On the National Treasure Scripture of the  
*Jingang chang tuoluoni jing* 金剛場陀羅尼經：  
A Response to Fujimoto Kō'ichi's Paper

Akao Eikei

This paper is a response to the views put forward by Dr FUJIMOTO Kō'ichi 藤本孝一 in his article 'On the National Treasure Manuscript of the *Jingang chang tuoluoni jing* and kōri' 国宝『金剛場陀羅尼經』と評について published in issue 3 of this journal, March 2018. For this, I examine the following four points which allow us to infer the date of the scripture copying.

1. Calligraphic style

The main text as well as the colophon of the scripture was written by the same hand. The Chinese characters are written in large bold strokes betraying a style similar to stela dedicated to Master Daoyin 道因法師碑 and engraved by famous calligrapher Ouyang Tong 歐陽通 (?-691) in year 3 of the Longshuo 龍朔 era (663). The scripture was clearly influenced by the same calligraphic style.

Another important clue is provided by the inscription on the copper plate known as 'Hokke sessō-zu' 銅板法華說相圖 or 'Senbutsu tahō buttō' 千佛多寶佛塔 (National Treasure owned by Hase-dera Temple 長谷寺) believed to have been manufactured in year 2 of the Monmu Tennō 文武天皇 era (698). Its writing style is extremely close to our scripture which suggests that the latter must have been copied not long after the manufacturing of the copper plate.

2. Colophon

A major hurdle in dating the scripture is the fact that the colophon only mentions the sexagenary cycle sign of 歲次丙戌年 giving no details about the imperial era. The system based on the sexagenary cycle is uniformly adopted in the wooden tablets excavated from the Fujiwara Palace 藤原宮 and dating before the enactment of the Taihō Code 大寶律令. Furthermore, the inscriptions on metal and stone of the Asuka 飛鳥 period before the Keiun 慶雲 era adopt the same system.

My paper also examines the use of the character 評 for what will later be commonly written as 郡, which suggests that dating the colophon before the Taihō 大寶 era is the most plausible conclusion.

3. Dyed paper

At the end of the scripture near the scroll bar we find a spot where the paper is not dyed.

This seems to suggest that the dyeing was done after the individual folios were pasted together. Notable examples containing undyed paper at the end of the scripture include the *Shengman yi ji* 勝鬘義記 (The British Library, Stein Collection, S. 2660), whose colophon shows it was copied in year 1 of the Zhengshi 正始 era (504), and the fragments of Scroll 28 of the *Dapin jing* 大品經 (brought by the Otani Expedition and currently housed at the Kyoto National Museum), which is believed to have been written in the 6<sup>th</sup> century.

#### 4. The date on the verso and the postscript

The date ‘year 18 of the Tenpyō era’ 天平十八年 written on the verso of the scripture paper is most likely explained as a later addition (pre-modern or modern?) by someone who concluded that 丙戌年 in the sexagenary cycle must refer to ‘year 18 of the Tenpyō era’. The calligraphic style of this notation lacks strength and good proportion. Furthermore, the Chinese characters look like being inscribed with a wooden brush or a brush with a bad tip and the right-side downward slanting stroke of 天 gives the impression of an unnatural manner of writing. It is hard to believe that this was written during the Tenpyō era.

Lastly, the scripture contains a postscript which mentions the name of Bodhisena: 右丙戌天平十八年波羅門僧正入國之歲. The Indian monk Bodhisena 菩提僊那, however, came to Japan in year 8 of the Tenpyō era (736) not in year 18 as mentioned in the postscript. It seems that the latter date was caused by a misunderstanding or some other reason.

\*

There are no doubt exceptions of dates given only in the sexagenary cycle as well as the use of the character 評 for *kōri*. However, before concluding that in the case of this scripture we also have to deal with exceptions it is necessary to take a broader view of the entire picture, including codicological and bibliographical information. In conclusion, there is no reason to suspect that 丙戌 in the colophon refers to year 15 of Emperor Tenmu’s era, i. e. 686.

Republication of *ṣaḍ-gati* 六道義, *aṣṭa-akṣaṇāḥ* 八難義, *dvādaśa-āyatanāni* 十二入義, and *aṣṭādaśa-dhātavaḥ* 十八界義 in *Eight Chapters on The Daijyo Gisyō Syō* 大乘義章抄 (a commentary on *The Dacheng Yizhang* 大乘義章) owned by Minobu Bunko

Tado Taichi

In *The Daijyo Gisyō Syō*, comprising 13 chapters, owned by Minobu Bunko, debates on each item in *The Dacheng Yizhang* were summarized by Kanjin 寛信 (1084-1153) of Kajuuji Temple 勧修寺. The content of this work indicates that *The Dacheng Yizhang* was widely recognized as an important document in the Sanron School to complement the religious doctrines of Jizang 吉藏 (549-623) in the context of Buddhist monks having learned both Sanron School and Shingon Esoteric Buddhism since the Heian Period (794-1185). Therefore, it is thought that by comparing and investigating various materials, including the Sanron School and *Hosshōji Mihakkō Mondōki* 法勝寺御八講問答記 texts, deciphering *The Daijyo Gisyō Syō* will enable a focused study of the issues debated in the Sanron School since the medieval period. The texts were owned by temples such as Todaiji Temple 東大寺 that provided the basis of the Sanron School. *The Hosshōji Mihakkō Mondōki* was written by Soshō 宗性 (1202-1278) of Todaiji Temple.

Continuing from my previous paper, this paper contributes to the basic research on *The Daijyo Gisyō Syō* by presenting a partial republication of the last four items (*ṣaḍ-gati* 六道義, *aṣṭa-akṣaṇāḥ* 八難義, *dvādaśa-āyatanāni* 十二入義, and *aṣṭādaśa-dhātavaḥ* 十八界義) from nine in *Eight Chapters on The Daijyo Gisyō Syō*. The republication of all the nine items in *Eight Chapters* is thus completed by this paper.

Debates in the republished *Eight Chapters* are partially common to debates in *The Gisyō Mondō* 義章問答 owned by the Todaiji Temple Library. Therefore, it can be confirmed that by around 1136 保延 2 年, when the *Daijyo Gisyō Sanjyukko* 大乘義章三十講 (thirty discourses of the *Dacheng Yizhang*) was said to have been started at Todaiji Temple, most of the essentials of each debate had been determined, the content of each debate was summarized in *The Daijyo Gisyō Syō* and *The Gisyō Mondō*, and the debates were communalized by both the Nara and Tendai schools of Buddhism.

## On the *Jin'gang ding yujia zhong lüechu niansong jing* in Six Scrolls

Tomabechi Sei'ichi

The *Jin'gang ding yujia zhong lüechu niansong jing* 金剛頂瑜伽中略出念誦經 in four scrolls 四卷 translated by Vajrabodhi 金剛智 is a ritual manual attached to the *Sarvatathāgatattavasamgraha* 初會金剛頂經. It represents the earliest translation into Chinese of a text belonging to the *Jin'gang ding jing* 金剛頂經 corpus. It was first introduced to Japan by Kūkai 空海.

Apart from this, we also have a six-scroll version of the *Jin'gangding yujia zhong lüechu niansong jing* brought to Japan by En'nin 圓仁, but it did not attain a wide circulation. In recent years, a manuscript of the text has been discovered and later published. This version is quite different from Vajrabodhi's four-scroll translation. The differences actually suggest that the text may have been translated from another source rather than being an edited augmented version produced in China on the base of the four-volume version.

The picture is complicated by the fact that a six-scroll version of the text belonging to a different lineage was discovered at the Tō-ji 東寺 and Ishiyama-dera 石山寺. The Ishiyama-dera manuscript appears to be a modified version which collates both the six-scroll version and Vajrabodhi's four-scroll translation.

Another textual witness is the *Jingang ding jing yi jue* 金剛頂經義訣, brought to Japan by Kūkai, a text which is considered an exegetical work dedicated to the *Jin'gangding yujia zhong lüechu niansong jing*. Unfortunately, only the first scroll of this text is extant, but judging from its citations from the *mūla*-scripture, it appears to be a commentary on the six-scroll version. However, rather than matching En'nin's text it corresponds to the Ishiyama-dera version. This suggests the possibility that the editorial work done on the Ishiyama-dera version was carried out in parallel with the exegetical efforts which resulted in the *Jingang ding jing yi jue*.

A Study of the Catalogue of *Ryūkoku Gakko Naiten Genzon Mokuroku* 龍谷学龔内典現存目錄, edited by Chidō 智洞

Mannami Hisako

In the early modern period of Japan, the Gakurin 学林, school of Nishi Honganji 西本願寺, imported the Tripitaka of Jiaxing 嘉興藏, a printed version of the Tripitaka convenient for research use, from China as early as 1674 (Enpo Era 2 延宝二). In the following years, the library of the Gakurin improved remarkably, following the progress of education and research with printed books.

In the 3rd year of the Temmei Era 天明三年 (1775), Chidō (智洞: 1736-1805) compiled a catalog of the school's collection, *Ryūkoku Gakko Naitenn Genzon Mokuroku* 龍谷学龔内典現存目錄: Current Catalogue of the Ryūgoku School Collection). It was a huge catalog that describes 4, 699 copies of the Buddhist scriptures (including the Tripitaka of Jiaxing), 4, 577 canons and 122 apocryphal texts.

However, when I checked various books, I found that the *Ryūkoku Gakko Naitenn Genzon Mokuroku*, which is in the Gakurin's collection, was not copied in the third year of the Tenmei Era but a little later. There were prototypes before that, and even after it was completed, there were repeated additions and revisions, so we can say that it was an unfinished work.

The catalog is unique in a few points. First, Chidō changed the order of the scriptures in the Tripitaka of Jiaxing in a very different way from the original, with the other books which belonged to the Gakurin library. Secondly, the titles in the Tripitaka of Jiaxing are mixed with the other books in the collection of the Gakurin so that the rearrangement reflects research results of contemporary Japanese Buddhist studies. It is not a mere catalog of the library but a high research achievement made possible by Chidō's academic ability and insight.

Genchi 玄智 (1734-1794), who cooperated in this work, had once envisioned a new compilation of the Tripitaka and proposed how to make its catalog. Although it never came to fruition, Chidō's *Ryūkoku Gakko Naitenn Genzon Mokuroku* was very close to Genchi's idea.

We should not forget that in the latter half of the early modern era in Japan, academic monks such as Genchi and Chidō had so broad a perspective to think about compiling and editing the Tripitaka in a new way.

# A study of the various manuscripts of the *Yiqiejingyinyi* 一切經音義

Li Naiqi

This thesis deals with the ancient manuscripts of the *Yiqiejingyinyi* in Japan, and examines the relationship and systematic classification of the manuscripts according to the differences in annotations.

The *Yiqiejingyinyi* was compiled in the Tang dynasty, with a total of 25 volumes and about 10,000 entries. The *Yiqiejingyinyi* is the oldest existing Buddhist dictionary, reflecting the pronunciation of the early Tang dynasty, and contains more than 450 Buddhist scriptures, which gives us an idea of the types and contents of Buddhist scriptures that were in circulation at that time.

The *Yiqiejingyinyi* contains mainly Japanese manuscripts and Chinese printed books. There are also fragments of ancient manuscripts from Dunhuang in France, England, Germany and Russia.

After the arrival of *Yiqiejingyinyi* in Japan, it was widely copied. There are at least two possible lineages of late Heian period 平安後期 manuscripts of the *Yiqiejingyinyi* extant in Japan. Although previous studies have clarified the systematic classification of individual volumes, the systematic classification of the whole of the Japanese manuscripts of the *Yiqiejingyinyi*, including other volumes, remains unresolved.

In this paper, we first study the Goryeo 高麗 manuscripts and the existing Japanese manuscripts of the *Yiqiejingyinyi*, and compare the annotations that differ between the various manuscripts. Finally, based on the aggregation and analysis of the differences, we will attempt to infer the relationship between the manuscripts and their systematic classification.

On the Manuscript of Scroll VII of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* Chinese Translation  
in the Taisho University Library

Watanabe Mariko

From the mark stamped on Scroll VII of the Chinese translation (made by Śikṣānanda 実叉難陀) of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, housed now in the Taisho University Library, it can be seen that it was once in the possession of the Kōzanji Temple 高山寺. According to Okuda Isao 奥田勲, there are twelve manuscripts of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* Chinese translation in the Kōzanji Temple Collection.

The Taisho University manuscript has a colophon reading: 正安四年、朝玄 ‘year 4 of the Shōan era [i. e. 1302], Chōgen’, which suggests that it was copied at the Kōzanji Temple during the Kamakura period. The text seems to have been collated with various versions in 1230 and 1302–1303. If we check the relevant part of the *Kōzanji kyōzō tenseki monjo mokuroku* (Part Two) 高山寺経蔵典籍文書目録第二, we see that Scrolls IV to VII are indeed missing from the current Kōzanji collection. This further corroborates the fact that the provenance of the Taisho University manuscript is the Kōzanji Temple.

Let take a closer look at the relevant codicological data. The manuscript cover is brown paper decorated with a golden grass pattern and strewn with gold foil. There is no title on the cover page. The title is written on the inside: 大方広仏華嚴経普賢三昧品第三 卷七新訳. Below the inner title page, we find written in black ink: 廿紙 ‘20 folios’. The manuscript, however, has only 11 folios, but this is because it has lost 9 folios (between folio 4 and the current folio 5).

The size of the cover is 26.6 cm in length and 21.7 cm in width, the whole paper is 26.6 cm in length and 455.4 cm in width. The folios have suffered some paper and insect damage, but the general condition is good. The manuscript appears to have been repaired at least twice so far.

The colophon tells us that Chōgen 朝玄 collated the manuscript at the Kozanji Temple on the fifth day of the third month of year 4 of the Shōan era (1302). It even adds that day was cloudy, with occasional rain. The content of the colophon is consistent with the format of the manuscript.

Some Chinese characters in the manuscript have noted the Japanese reading 振仮名 in *katakana* 片仮名 in black ink while the punctuation is written in red ink. Occasionally we also find supplementary notes. The number of characters per line is usually 17 characters, but some lines contain 18 characters or even 20 characters.

If we compare the manuscript with the TaishōCanon 大正大藏經 text, we see that some of the former's readings match with the Korean Canon edition 高麗版 while others with the Yuan Canon edition 元版. Furthermore, we find three variant readings not attested in the Taishō Canon critical apparatus. All this calls for further research.