

Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 21 • Number 1 • 1998

- JOHANNES BRONKHORST
Did the Buddha Believe in Karma and Rebirth? 1
- JINHUA CHEN
The Construction of Early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism:
The Japanese Provenance of Saichō's Transmission
Documents and Three Esoteric Buddhist Apocrypha
Attributed to Śubhākarasimha 21
- MIRIAM LEVERING
Dogen's *Raihaitokuzui* and
Women Teaching in Sung Ch'an 77
- TOM TILLEMANS
A Note on *Pramāṇavārttika*, *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and
Nyāyamukha. What is the *svadharmin* in Buddhist Logic? 111
- CHIKAFUMI WATANABE
A Translation of the *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā*
with the *Tarkajvālā* III. 137-146 125
- YANG JIDONG
Replacing *hu* with *fan*:
A Change in the Chinese Perception
of Buddhism during the Medieval Period 157

JINHUA CHEN

The Construction of Early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism:
The Japanese Provenance of Saichō's Transmission
Documents and Three Esoteric Buddhist Apocrypha
Attributed to Śubhākarasimha*

The principal founder of the Japanese Tendai school, Saichō 最澄 (767-822), is remembered not only for having brought Chinese Tiantai 天台 Buddhism to Japan but also for his alleged role in importing an Esoteric Buddhist tradition from China. This esoteric aspect of Tendai 天台 Buddhism, known as Taimitsu 台密, assumed such importance that some Tendai followers held that the esoteric aspect of their school embodied a higher form of Buddhism than the exoteric, i.e. the traditional Tiantai doctrines that had been brought by their patriarch from China.

The legitimacy of Saichō's esoteric tradition has been maintained by two "dharma-transmission certificates" (*fuhōmon* 付法文) reputedly conferred on Saichō by his chief Chinese esoteric mentor – Shunxiao 順曉 (n.d.). Two manuscripts, one preserved at the Bishamondō 毘沙門堂 temple in Kyōto¹ (the "Bishamondō MS") and the other at the Shitennōji

* This article is based on research done for my Ph.D dissertation. For a full discussion of the issues raised, see my dissertation (Jinhua CHEN, "The Formation of Early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan: A Study of Three Japanese Esoteric Apocrypha", unpublished Ph.D dissertation, McMaster University 1997; referred to as "CHEN's dissertation" in this article). I am very grateful to my McMaster teachers, Profs. Koichi SHINOHARA, Robert SHARF and Phyllis GRANOFF, as well as my Japanese supervisor Prof. Noritoshi ARAMAKI at Kyōto University, for their guidance as I wrote my dissertation and this article in particular. Dr. John KIESCHNICK of Academia Sinica in Taiwan and Elizabeth MORRISON from Stanford University read the draft at different stages. I want to thank them for useful suggestions about the arguments of this article and its style as well. Finally, I am grateful to Kazuma SUZUKI at the Italian School of Eastern Studies in Kyōto for the technical assistance he kindly provided.

1. The Bishamondō MS is reprinted on one front page of the 1912 edition of the *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集 (Hereafter DZ; A complete collection of the works by Master Dengyō [Saichō]); ed. Tendai shūden kankōkai, five vols. In this article the 1927-28 DZ version is used (ed. Hieizan senshuin-nai Eizan gakuin, five vols. [Hieizan: Toshō kankōkai, 1927-28; reprinted Tokyo: Nihon bussho kankōkai, 1975]).

四天王寺 temple in Ōsaka² (the “Shitennōji MS”), are widely regarded as the originals of these two *fuhōmons*. For their general historical and cultural value and in particular, for their unusual importance to the Japanese Buddhist tradition, these two manuscripts have been designated by the government of Japan as a “National Treasure” (*kokuhō* 國寶) and an “Important Cultural Property” (*juyō bunkazai* 重要文化財) respectively.

The Shitennōji MS, dated the eighteenth day of the fourth month, Zhenyuan 貞元 21 (805) in the Tang Dynasty, centres on the esoteric teachings Saichō is said to have received from Shunxiao. According to this *fuhōmon*, Shunxiao had initiated Saichō into some peculiar forms of esoteric teachings, the core of which consisted in correlating three groups of five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* (A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham, A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham, A-Ra-Ba-Ca-Na) with three ranks of *siddhi* (“attainment”): higher, intermediate and lower. The Bishamondō MS was supposedly written by Shunxiao one day after he wrote the first *fuhōmon*. It depicts an esoteric lineage in which Saichō is counted as the fourth successor. Further, it traces the esoteric lineage through Shunxiao (the third dharma-successor in the lineage) and his Korea-born but Chinese-educated master Yilin 義林 (n.d., the second successor), back to the prestigious Śubhākarasimha (637-735) (the first patriarch in this lineage).

The core of the Shitennōji MS is the unusual practice of correlating the three ranks of *siddhi* (attainment) with the three groups of five-syllable *dhāraṇīs*. The threefold classification of the category *siddhi* is

2. On December 6, 1965, a major national newspaper in Japan, Asahi Shimbun 朝日新聞, reported the discovery of a manuscript at the Shitennōji temple in Ōsaka. This manuscript claims to be a *fuhōmon* written for Saichō by his Esoteric teacher in China, Shunxiao. The experts who investigated the Shitennōji MS agreed on the authenticity of this *fuhōmon*. Regarded as important written evidence for the cultural communication between ancient China and Japan, this manuscript was designated as an “Important Cultural Property” shortly after it was made known to the public. Japanese calligraphy scholars are generally of the opinion that this manuscript was written in the typical Tang calligraphical style and must be regarded as Chinese in provenance (KIUCHI Gyōdō, *Tendai mikkyō no keisei* [The formation of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism], Tokyo: Keisuisha 1984: 43-50; ŌYAMA Ninkai, “Saichō denju Jungyō Ajari fuhōinshin [The dharma-transmission certificate from Ācārya Jungyō 順曉 (Ch. Shunxiao), as transmitted by Master Dengyō]”, *Bukkyō geijutsu* 96 [1974]: 80-95). To my knowledge, no one has ever expressed doubt about the authenticity of this manuscript and all Tendai scholars use it as a primary source for studying the appearance of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan and its relationship to Chinese Esoteric Buddhism.

by no means a new notion. It can be found in numerous esoteric texts translated into Chinese, for example, the *Susiddhikāra-sūtra* (Ch. *Suxidi jieluo jing* 蘇悉地羯羅經).³ In addition, the three five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* can be traced back to the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* (Ch. *Darijing* 大日經) and *Vajraśekhara-sūtra* (Ch. *Jin'gangding jing* 金剛頂經).⁴ Nonetheless, the three groups of five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* were rarely listed together side by side; their correlation with the three ranks of attainment is even more unusual. As a matter of fact, the threefold *dhāraṇī*-attainment correlation gets no scriptural support except in the three *siddhi* texts which, currently preserved in the *Taishō Tripiṭaka* under the numbers 905, 906 and 907, are attributed to Śubhākarasimha.⁵ Therefore, these three *siddhi* texts are generally taken to be the fundamental texts on the basis of which Shunxiao initiated Saichō into his esoteric lineage.

To recapitulate, the following account has been given of Saichō's effort to transmit an esoteric tradition to Japan: during his seven-month stay in China, Saichō was initiated into an illustrious lineage starting with Śubhākarasimha and culminating in Saichō's celebrated mentor Shunxiao, who, on the basis of three *siddhi* texts translated by Śubhākarasimha, transmitted to Saichō some esoteric teachings, the core of which is preserved in one of the two *fuhōmons* written by Shunxiao himself. This conventional view regarding the formation of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in Japan is still accepted uncritically by almost all Tendai scholars.

In this article, I will argue that the two *fuhōmons*, the Shitennōji MS and Bishamondō MS, were both forged in Japan by Saichō's followers in order to reinterpret and legitimize the esoteric transmissions Saichō allegedly received in China. The three *siddhi* texts were, moreover, written by Tendai monks to authenticate these two *fuhōmons*.

3. See my discussion in section I.C.

4. *Ibid.*

5. These three texts are (i) the *Sanshushicchi hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani hō* 三種悉地破地獄轉業障出三界秘密陀羅尼法 (T.905.18.909b-912b, hereafter T.905); (ii) the *Bucchō sonshoshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu sanjim bukka sanshushicchi shingon giki* 佛頂尊勝心破地獄轉業障出三界秘密三身佛果三種悉地真言儀軌 (T.906.18.912b-914c; hereafter T.906); (iii) the *Bucchō sonshoshin hajigoku tengosshō shutsusangai himitsu darani* 佛頂尊勝心破地獄轉業障出三界秘密陀羅尼 (T.907.18.914c-915c; hereafter T.907). Since all of these three texts focus on the Esoteric notion of *siddhi* (Ch. *xidi*; Jp. *shicchi*; "perfection" or "attainment"), I refer to them as the "three *siddhi* texts" in the following discussion.

**Part I. Saichō's Esoteric Transmission Documents (*Fuhōmons*):
Their Origin and Evolution**

I will use three sorts of sources in the discussion of the two *fuhōmons* attributed to Saichō. First, I will consult two works left by Saichō himself, the *Esshūroku* 越州錄 and the *Kenkairon* 顯戒論. There is no evidence that later editors significantly tampered with these works. The *Esshūroku* (The bibliography [of the Buddhist texts collected in] the prefecture of Esshū 越州 [Ch. Yuezhou 越州]) is one of two bibliographies attributed to Saichō.⁶ It contains a record of the Esoteric Buddhist texts and assorted paraphernalia that Saichō obtained during his brief sojourn in Yuezhou. The *Esshūroku* is dated the thirteenth day of the fifth month of 805.

The *Kenkairon* (On promoting the [Mahāyāna] precepts) was written by Saichō in his later years, when he came under attack from conservative Nara monks who charged that Saichō's Buddhist transmissions were of dubious value since they were obtained in the provinces of China, instead of in the capital.⁷ Nara monks advanced these vehement criticisms in order to frustrate Saichō's effort to establish a Mahāyāna precept platform on Mount Hiei 比叡山, which, they feared, would enable him to ordain his followers more easily. In the second month of Kōnin 弘仁 11 (820), Saichō submitted the *Kenkairon* to the court in order to counter the criticisms that his dharma transmissions from China were inauthentic.

Second, I will draw on two other works, the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechi-myakufu* 內証佛法相承血脈譜 and *Kenkairon engi* 顯戒論緣起, which, though originally composed by Saichō, were seriously altered and

6. The other bibliography attributed to Saichō is the *Taishūroku* 台州錄 (The bibliography [of the Buddhist texts collected in] the Prefecture of *Taishū* [Ch. Taizhou]). Both bibliographies can be found in the *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (The Buddhist *Tripitaka* newly edited in the period of Taishō 大正; hereafter abbreviated as T.; eds. TAKAKUSU Junjirō, et al. 85 vols., Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924-32; see T#2159, T#2160) and the *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* (vol. 5).
7. These criticisms were reflected in Saichō's own works; cf. the *Kenkairon* (DZ1: 106; T.74.2376. 590c) and the *Jō Kenkairon hyō* 上顯戒論表 (A memorial on submitting the *Kenkairon*; DZ5: 36-38). See also Paul GRONER, *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 7, 1984; herefter "GRONER's Saichō"), p. 154 (particularly note <163>).

extensively expanded by Saichō's immediate disciples and/or later Tendai editors. The *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* (A diagrammatic description of the secretly certified blood-lineages of the Buddha-dharma; in one fascicle; DZ1: 199-248) is generally regarded as the text Saichō refers to in his 819 *Jō Kenkairon hyō* 上顯戒論表 as *Buppō kechimyaku* 佛法血脈 (The blood-lineage of the Buddha-dharma), which he submitted to the court with the *Kenkairon* in 820. In the extant version, the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* is primarily concerned with proving the orthodoxy of the various transmissions Saichō received in China. It has, therefore, been highly prized within the Tendai tradition. However, the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, particularly the sections concerning Saichō's Northern Chan and esoteric lineages, has been subjected to serious criticism by modern scholars. Increasingly, scholars are concluding that the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* cannot simply be equated with the *Buppō kechimyaku* originally written by Saichō. Rather, it is either a different work entirely or, more likely, an emended, expanded, and altered version of the *Buppō kechimyaku*.⁸

The *Kenkairon engi* (Materials concerning the *Kenkairon*; in two fascicles; DZ1: 263-98) is a collection edited by Saichō into a single work in the third month of 821. Probably as a result of the criticism of the monks in Nara who questioned the orthodoxy of Saichō's teachings, much of the *Kenkairon engi* is devoted to proving that Saichō had studied under qualified teachers in China. Although it is almost certain that Saichō did compile a work called the *Kenkairon engi*, the *Kenkairon engi* that has come down to us cannot be regarded as a compilation by Saichō himself. Rather, I am of the opinion that the currently available version of the *Kenkairon engi* is the result of repeated alteration and expansion by later Tendai editors of an original text left by Saichō himself. Documents forged after Saichō's death were added to Saichō's *Kenkairon engi* in order to support claims for the legitimacy of Saichō's dharma-transmissions, the esoteric transmissions in particular.⁹ Furthermore, in comparison to primary Tendai sources like the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* 傳述一心戒文, *Eizan Daishiden* 叡山大師傳, and *Naishō buppō*

8. See SASAKI Kentoku, *Sange gakushoshiki shinshaku* (A new study of the *Sange gakushoshiki*) (Yamazaki: Hobundo 1938); FUKUI Kojun, "Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu shingi [A new understanding of the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*]", *Tendai gaku* 29 (1986): 1-9; 30 (1987): 1-6.

9. CHEN's dissertation: 92-94.

sōjō kechimyakufu, the *Kenkairon engi* achieved its present form at a relatively late date.¹⁰

Finally, a biography of Saichō (the *Eizan Daishiden*) and a collection of documents related to Saichō and the early Hieizan order (the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*) constitute the third group of primary sources for the following discussion. Both of these works were written and/or compiled by Saichō's immediate students. The *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* 傳述一心戒文 (Articles related to the transmission of the "one-mind precepts", in three fascicles; DZ1: 523-648; T.2379.74.634b-659a) was compiled by Kōjō 光定 (779-851) around 833-34. The majority of this collection is composed of documents related to the Hieizan community before or

10. Suffice it here to quote one piece of evidence for the relative lateness of the *Kenkairon engi* in the present form. As I will show in section I. A, a so-called "court certificate" proving Saichō's religious expertise is found in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* and the *Eizan Daishiden*. As quoted in both works, the "court certificate" represents Shunxiao as the third generation disciple of Śubhākarasimha ([Zen]mui sanzō daisan deshi [善]無畏三藏第三弟子). Yet, when quoted in the *Kenkairon engi*, the same "court certificate" describes Shunxiao as *Fukū sanzō daisandeshi* 不空三藏第三弟子 (cf. KIUCHI Gyōō, "*Kenkairon engi* ni okeru ichi mondai [A problem related to the *Kenkairon engi*]", *Tendai gaku* 14 (1972): 157-64), which can mean (i) the "third disciple of *Tripitaka Bukong*" or the "third-generation disciple of *Tripitaka Bukong*". Apparently, the *Kenkairon engi* editor did not understand this phrase as the "third-generation disciple of *Tripitaka Bukong*", since this would imply that Saichō's teacher Shunxiao was one generation junior to Kūkai's 空海 (774-835) teacher Huiguo, who was one of Bukong's disciples. Therefore, the editor understood the phrase to mean the "third disciple of *Tripitaka Bukong*", which makes Shunxiao a fellow student of and therefore comparable to Huiguo. However, the editor forgot that the phrase "daisandeshi" 第三弟子 in this context could only be understood as the "third generation disciple", since in the same document Saichō's Tiantai teacher Daosui was referred to as the *Chishadaishi daishichi deshi* 智者大師第七弟子, which can only be understood as the "seventh generation (rather than the 'seventh') disciple of Zhiyi 智顛 (538-597)". Daosui lived almost two centuries after Zhiyi and his discipleship under Zhiyi is out of the question. Therefore, in this context, the phrase "*daisandeshi*" or "*daishichideshi*" must be understood as the "third/seventh generation disciple", rather than the "third/seventh disciple". In other words, the *Kenkairon engi* editor, in including the "court certificate" in the *Kenkairon engi*, substituted "Fukū" (Ch. Bukong 不空 [706-774]) for "[Zen]mui" (Śubhākarasimha) and was unaware of or oblivious to the problem caused by this change. This change was obviously made for the purpose of associating Saichō with Bukong and redefining Saichō's esoteric tradition as of the *kongōkai* as well as *taizōkai* lineages.

shortly after Saichō's death. As such, it is an invaluable source for understanding the formation of the early Tendai order on Mount Hiei.

The *Eizan Daishiden* 叡山大師傳 (A biography of the great teacher of Mount Hiei [Saichō], one fascicle; DZ5: 1-48) has traditionally been attributed to Ichijō Chū 一乘忠, who has generally been thought to be Saichō's prized disciple Ninchū 仁忠 (?-824). However, compelling evidence has emerged to disprove this conventional identification of Ichijō Chū. Most likely, the actual biographer was Shinchū 真忠 (n.d.), another disciple of Saichō.¹¹

I.A. A "Court-certificate" in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*: The Glorification of Saichō's Chinese Esoteric Mentor Shunxiao

The *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* does not include any document that can be identified as either of the two *fuhōmons* attributed to Shunxiao. However, it does contain an official certificate (*kanchō* 官牒) which is of great relevance to this analysis since it represents Saichō's chief Chinese Esoteric mentor Shunxiao as a distinguished Buddhist priest. This reference to Shunxiao is reminiscent of the two *fuhōmons* attributed to Shunxiao, in which Shunxiao is also described as an extraordinarily eminent monk. This certificate claims to have been issued by the Kammu 桓武 (737-809, r.781-806) court to certify Saichō's religious achievements. The content of the certificate implies that it was issued in 806,¹² shortly

11. FUKUI Kojun, "Eizan Daishiden no seikaku [The character of the *Eizan Daishiden*]", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 36 (1970): 13-22; "Eizan Daishiden wo meguru ni san no mondai [Two and three problems related to the *Eizan Daishiden*]", *Tendai gaku* 15 (1973): 1-10; "Eizan Daishiden ni tsuite no kentō [An examination of the *Eizan Daishiden*]", *Tendai gaku* 31 (1988): 1-6. For the most recent study of this biography, see SAEKI Arika, *Dengyō Daishiden no kenkyū* [A study of the *Eizan Daishiden*], Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan 1992).
12. Kōjō failed to date this "court certificate". It is noted in his collection that this certificate was issued to Saichō on the insistence of Emperor Kammu (T.2379.74.643c12). Furthermore, this certificate indicates that Saichō was then forty years old. According to the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, Saichō died in 822 at the age of 56, which implies that he was born in 767 (cf. GRONER's *Saichō*: 19). Therefore, Saichō reached the age of forty in 806. In other words, this certificate, if authentic, must have been issued in 806 (Enryaku 延歷 25). Furthermore, Emperor Kammu died in early 806. This also implies that this "court certificate", if indeed granted to Saichō with Kammu's consent as the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* claims, must have been written no later than 806.

after Saichō returned from China.¹³ The main body of this “court-certificate” reads as follows:

Dwelling on Mount Hiei, the Eastern Mountain in the city of Heian 平安 [Saichō] has been assiduously practising for fifteen years. He has searched for the mysterious methods of recitation, and admired the exalted traces of Mount Tiantai.¹⁴ In the fourth month of Enryaku 延暦 23 (804), commissioned by imperial order, he crossed the sea to seek the Way. Arriving at the abode of Master Daosui 道邃, who is the seventh generation disciple after Master Zhizhe (i.e. Zhiyi 智顛 [538-597]) (*Chisha Daishi daishichideshi* 智者大師第七弟子) at the Guoqingsi 國清寺 temple in Taizhou 台州, he secured [from there] over two hundred fascicles of texts regarding the Tiantai teachings. Moreover, at the Longxingsi 龍興寺 temple in Yuezhou Prefecture he encountered Master Shunxiao who, as the third-generation disciple after Tripitaka Śubhākarasimha from India, was the “Great Virtuous One” (*daitoku* 大德; Skt. *bhadanta*) of a “State-protecting Temple” (*chinkoku dōjō* 鎮國道場), a “monk serving at the court chapel” (*naigubu* 內供奉). Entering into the *abhiṣeka* altar, he received the “Procedures of Attainment (*siddhi*) for the ‘Three Divisions’ (*sanbu* 三部).”¹⁵ In addition, he obtained more than thirty fascicles of texts about the teachings [for reciting the] *dhāraṇīs*, over ten pictures and samples of *maṇḍalas*, some implements for recitations, and so forth. Having obtained official certificates from the Administrative Assistant of Taizhou Prefecture Lu Chun 陸淳 and the Prefect of the Mingzhou 明州 Prefecture, in the sixth month of Enryaku 24 (805), he returned [to Japan] to report on his mission (DZ1: 573; T.2379.74.643c15-25, emphasis mine).

First and foremost, this “court certificate” is noteworthy for representing Saichō’s chief Chinese Esoteric mentor Shunxiao as an extremely prestigious master. According to the certificate, Shunxiao is (i) the third generation disciple of Śubhākarasimha, generally regarded as the first patriarch of the Matrix-realm (*taizōkai* 胎藏界) tradition of Esoteric Buddhism; (ii) a “Great Virtuous One” at a government-sponsored

13. Saichō returned to Japan in 805, very likely at the end of the sixth month of the year (cf. GRONER’s *Saichō*: 65).
14. Here, the “court certificate” describes Saichō’s practices in Esoteric Buddhism before his training in the Tendai doctrines. By doing that, the “court-certificate” seems to have given priority to Saichō’s esoteric study rather than to his training in Tendai teachings. This is remarkable because both before and after his study in China Saichō was primarily respected as a Tendai master.
15. Here, the “court certificate” certifies that Saichō received from Shunxiao the “Procedure for the Attainment of Three Divisions” (*sanbushicchi hō* 三部悉地法), which calls to mind the *sanshushicchi hō* (the “procedure for the three kinds of attainment”). As we will see below, the *sanshushicchi hō* is a key notion in a later version of Saichō’s *fuhōmon* (*fuhōmon* 2; i.e. the Shitenōji MS), which was also forged in Japan in the name of Shunxiao (see section I. C).

temple which was established for the protection of the country (the so-called *chinkoku dōjō* 鎮國道場); and (iii) a “monk serving at the court chapel” (*naigubu* 內供奉), or a “court chaplain”, a status reserved for only a few monks who were highly respected for both virtue and learning.

By representing Shunxiao as a prestigious monk, this “court certificate” differs strikingly from Saichō’s own *Esshūroku* bibliography. The *Esshūroku* describes Saichō’s encounter with Shunxiao and the esoteric initiation he received from him as follows:

[Then we] headed for the Longxingsi temple in Yuezhou, and visited the abode of Master Shunxiao [there]. Gishin 義真 and I followed the master to the Fengshan 峰山 temple east of Lake Jing.¹⁶ The Master [Shunxiao] guided us to repair the temple and then led us into the “*maṇḍala* altar of the five divisions *abhiṣeka* (*gobu kanjō mandara danjō* 五部灌頂曼陀羅壇場).” On the spot, he transmitted to us the methods of *dhāraṇīs* and sprinkled our heads with the water of *dhāraṇī*. Then, we copied the [texts about] the dharma-gates of recitation and the pictures regarding offering [ceremonies] as listed above. [Finally,] we had the texts collated (DZ4: 381).

In this *Esshūroku* passage Saichō represented his Chinese *guru* Shunxiao as an ordinary monk; that is, as a monk dwelling at the Longxingsi temple in Yuezhou. Except for this simple comment concerning Shunxiao of the Longxingsi, Saichō says nothing about the monk, making no mention of his titles, background or even the religious lineage to which he belonged.¹⁷ How should we understand the different ways in which the *Esshūroku* passage and the “court certificate” describe Shunxiao?

We know that Saichō presented his *Taishūroku* 台州錄 and *Esshūroku* bibliographies to the court in order to convince the emperor of the religious value of his study in China. Therefore, it was important that he establish the stature and eminence of his teachers. The more respectable his teachers in China were, the more easily he would succeed in impressing the emperor. Had Saichō really had a teacher as eminent as the

16. The original text reads as *kokyō* (*ko* 湖 = lake, *kyō* 鏡 = mirror). Here the correct reading may have been *kyōko* 鏡湖 (the Lake of Jing), as testified by the *Kenkairon* passage in which Saichō related, for the second time as far as we know, his encounter with and initiation by Shunxiao (cf. T.74.2376.590c12).
17. Another point must be noted in this *Esshūroku* passage. The five division *maṇḍala* mentioned in this passage seems to refer to the five divisions of a *kongōkai maṇḍala*, i.e. the divisions of Buddha, Lotus, Vajra, Jewel, and Dharma. Therefore, as originally depicted in Saichō’s own *Esshūroku*, the initiation by Shunxiao was likely of *kongōkai* origin.

Shunxiao represented in the “court certificate”, surely the *Esshūroku* would have described Shunxiao as such. In fact, Saichō merely refers to Shunxiao in the *Esshūroku* as an ordinary monk. This suggests that at the time Saichō compiled the *Esshūroku*, he did not regard Shunxiao as the eminent master described in the “court certificate”.¹⁸

Hence, the “court certificate”, at least the part glorifying Shunxiao, can be regarded as authentic only if the following two assumptions can be shown to be true: not only must it be supposed that during the several months between the submission of his bibliographies and the alleged issuance of this “court certificate” Saichō had decided to glorify Shunxiao to the degree described in the “court certificate”; it must also be supposed that this glorification was accepted by the court. However, evidence shows that at least as late as 820, when Saichō wrote the *Kenkairon* (fourteen years after this “court certificate” is said to have been issued), his understanding of Shunxiao’s status was essentially the same as it was when he composed the *Esshūroku*. In the *Kenkairon*, Saichō described his esoteric initiation from Shunxiao as follows:

18. The simple terms in which Saichō describes his *guru* Shunxiao in the *Esshūroku* also present an interesting and telling contrast to the way Kūkai described his master Huiguo. In his bibliography sent to the court, Kūkai describes the background of his *guru* Huiguo with great pride:

By chance, I fortunately encountered the master at the Dongtayuan 東塔院 monastery in the Qinglongsi 青龍寺 temple, whose name is *Ācārya* Huiguo. The *bhadanta* (“Great Virtue”) is the dharmatransmission disciple (*denbōdeshi*) of [Master] Daguangzhi (the “Master who possesses great and broad wisdom”, i.e. Bukong) of the Daxingshansi 大興善寺 temple. In virtue, he was respected by his contemporaries; by his way, he was esteemed as the “Teacher of the Emperor” (*teishi* 帝師). The three successive Tang emperors respected him and received *abhiṣeka* from him; four kinds of Buddhist devotees relied on him and learnt from him the Esoteric Treasures (T.55.2161. 1065a17-21).

Here, both Saichō and Kūkai were in the same situation: touting their spiritual lineages to the court. Saichō’s silence on the identity and background of Shunxiao is remarkable in comparison to the enthusiasm with which Kūkai talks about his Esoteric mentor in China. It is difficult to explain this striking distinction as merely a difference in their personalities. Instead, the difference strongly suggests that Saichō, until the compilation of his *Esshūroku* in the fifth month of 805, did not yet consider Shunxiao to be an extraordinarily eminent monk associated with a celebrated lineage and highly respected within the Buddhist order in his time.

Moreover, the governor of Mingzhou Prefecture, Zheng Shenze 鄭審則 (n.d.), had us escorted to Yuezhou to receive the *abhiṣeka*. Fortunately, we met Master Shunxiao from the Lingyansi 靈巖寺 Temple on Mount Taiyue 泰岳 (i.e. Taishan 泰山). At a temple on Mount Fengshan which is a mountain east of Lake Jing, Master [Shunxiao] conferred [upon us] the *abhiṣeka* of a dual transmission. Various instruments were also given in the initiation. After receiving the initiation, we immediately returned to the place where the ships for [our] return [to Japan] waited (T.74.2376.590c7-15; my emphasis).

While the *Esshūroku* passage merely observes that Shunxiao was a Longxingsi monk, the *Kenkairon* passage gives some further information about Shunxiao's background by indicating that he originally came from a temple called Lingyansi 靈巖寺 on Mount Taishan 泰山 (in present-day Taian City, Shandong 山東 Province). Beyond that, Saichō says nothing more about his primary esoteric mentor in China.¹⁹

As mentioned earlier, the *Kenkairon* was written to prove that Saichō had studied in China with qualified teachers and that the transmissions he received were orthodox. Consequently, if Shunxiao had been recognized – whether by Saichō himself or by others – as the prestigious monk portrayed in the “court certificate”, Saichō would not have failed to describe Shunxiao as such in a polemic work like the *Kenkairon*. Saichō's failure to do so indicates that, up to that point, he did not believe that Shunxiao had such a prestigious background. Without assurances by Saichō that his Chinese teacher was an eminent monk, the court would not have issued a certificate to the effect. Given Saichō's descriptions of Shunxiao in the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon*, it is unlikely that he would have made such assurances. Thus, the representation of Shunxiao in the “court certificate” in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* would seem to be inauthentic.

In addition to representing Shunxiao, Saichō's main Esoteric teacher in China, as an extremely respectable Buddhist priest, the “court certificate” describes Daosui as Zhiyi's seventh-generation disciple, suggesting that Daosui was the seventh Tendai patriarch after Zhiyi. This is contrary to the usual way Saichō refers to Daosui in, for example, the *Tai-*

19. It should also be noted here that the *Kenkairon* passage defines the initiation from Shunxiao differently. The *Esshūroku* passage describes this initiation as an *abhiṣeka* conducted on a five-division *maṇḍala*, suggesting to the reader that the initiation may have been of *kongōkai* origin. By contrast, the *Kenkairon* passage refrains from associating the Shunxiao initiation exclusively with a sort of *kongōkai abhiṣeka*. Rather, Saichō claims in the *Kenkairon* that the initiation he received from Shunxiao belongs to a dual esoteric transmission (*ryōbu*).

shūroku bibliography or in the *Kenkairon*. In the *Taishūroku*, Saichō merely refers to Daosui as “Master Daosui of the Western Capital [i.e. Chang’an], the Proctor of the Perfect Teachings on Mount Tiantai in the Great Tang” (*Daitō Tendaisan enshū zasu seikyō Oshō Dōzui* 大唐天台山圓宗座主西京和尚道邃; T.55.2159.1058a3-4). In the *Kenkairon*, Daosui is simply called “Master Daosui on Mount Tiantai” (Tendai Dōzui Oshō 天台道邃和尚, T.74.2376.590c8). Needless to say, having had the Tendai seventh patriarch as a teacher would have greatly strengthened the legitimacy of Saichō’s dharma transmissions from China. Therefore, Saichō would surely have called Daosui the Tendai seventh patriarch in his 805 *Taishūroku* and 820 *Kenkairon* had he really regarded Daosui as such.

Moreover, evidence suggests that Saichō may have regarded a Tiantai monk other than Daosui as the seventh Tendai patriarch. Saichō’s *Taishūroku* includes a biography of the “Tendai seventh patriarch Master Zhidu 智度” (the *Tiantai diqizhu Zhidu heshang luezhuan* 天台第七祖智度和尚略傳 [A brief biography of Master Zhidu, the seventh Tiantai patriarch]; T.55.2160.1059a5). Thus, at least in some sources, a monk called Zhidu (n.d.), rather than Daosui, is honoured as the seventh Tiantai patriarch. Had Saichō objected to accepting Zhidu as the seventh Tiantai patriarch, he would likely have excluded this biography from his bibliography. Consequently, it is hard to imagine that Saichō, shortly after submitting his bibliographies to the court, could recognize Daosui as the seventh Tiantai patriarch, for such a claim directly contradicts information given in one of his own bibliographies.

On the basis of these points, I conclude that the “court certificate” in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* should not be accepted as authentic. At the very least, sections of the “court certificate” glorifying Saichō’s teachers, Shunxiao and Daosui, were forged in Japan (probably by Kōjō, the compiler of the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*).

As evidenced by this fabricated “court certificate”, Saichō’s followers made every effort to glorify Saichō’s Chinese Esoteric *guru* Shunxiao, who appears to be a rather obscure monk in Saichō’s own descriptions in the *Esshūroku* and *Kenkairon*. Glorified in this way, Shunxiao became comparable to Kūkai’s principal *guru* Huiguo 慧果 (746-805), who had been Bukong’s prized disciple and was respected, according to Kūkai, by three successive Tang emperors.²⁰ Tendai Esoteric Buddhism was thus

20. T.55.2161.1065a17-21 (cf. note <18>).

represented as a credible rival of the Shingon 真言 school, at least in the sense that it had a Chinese patriarch as respectable as that of Shingon.

I. B. Saichō's *Fuhōmon* in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō Buppō Sōjō Kechimyakufu*: on the Authenticity of the Bishamondō MS

Both the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* contain a *fuhōmon* allegedly written by Shunxiao for Saichō after Shunxiao initiated him into Esoteric Buddhism. Comparing two versions of the *fuhōmon* in the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* and the *Eizan Daishiden*, we find that they are identical except for some slight differences.²¹ Therefore, either one of them was based on the other, or they were both derived from the same source. In either case, the two versions of the *fuhōmon* can be regarded as a single source for the purpose of this investigation. In the following discussion, I will refer to this document as “*fuhōmon*1”. The following is a full translation of this important document:

During the Kaiyuan period of the Great Tang, there was a great *Tripitaka* who was prince of an Indian Kingdom. His dharma-name was Zenmui 善無畏 (Ch. Shanwuwei; Skt. Śubhākarasiṃha). He turned the great “dharma-wheel” from the Great Nālandā Temple to the Great Tang. He transmitted the dharma to his “dharma-transmitting disciple” (*denbō deshi* 傳法弟子) Yilin, who was also “National Teacher” (*kokushi* 國師) and a great *ācārya*. One hundred and three years old, [Yilin] is now in the Kingdom of Silla, transmitting the dharma and turning the great dharma-wheel. He transmitted the dharma to his disciple the monk Shunxiao of the Great Tang, who was a “Great Virtue” and *ācārya* in a “State-protecting Temple”. [Shunxiao] transmitted the dharma to his disciple the monk Saichō from Japan, a “Great Virtue” who “serves at the court chapel”, and asked [Saichō] to turn the great dharma-wheel [in Japan]. The monk Saichō is the fourth [generation disciple] entrusted with the dharma and its transmission. [This certificate has been] written and recorded on the nineteenth day of the fourth month of Zhenyuan 貞元 21 (805). [Efforts must be made] to keep the Buddha-dharma from dying. [I, the] *Ācārya* and *Śramaṇa* Shunxiao write this [certificate] and entrust it to Saichō (DZ5: 19).

21. These slight differences between the two versions of Saichō's *fuhōmon* include the following: first, in the *Eizan Daishiden* the certificate is referred to as the *Jungyō ajari fuhōsho* 順曉阿闍黎付法書, while it is indicated in the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* as the *Jungyō ajari fuhōmon* 順曉阿闍黎付法文; second, whereas in the *Eizan Daishiden* version Saichō is addressed as “[My] disciple Monk Saichō, who is the ‘monk serving at the court chapel’ and a ‘Great Virtue’ from Japan” (*Nihonkoku gubu daitoku deshi sō Saichō* 日本國供奉大德弟子僧最澄, Saichō was simply called “[My] disciple Monk Saichō from Japan” *Nihonkoku deshi sō Saichō* 日本國弟子僧最澄) in the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* version.

Fuhōmon 1 represents Saichō's esoteric lineage as orthodox and respectable in origin. In particular, it depicts Saichō's esoteric transmission as coming from an extremely prestigious monk Shunxiao, a "Great Virtuous One" and *ācārya* at a "State-protecting Temple". If this document is authentic, the orthodoxy of Saichō's esoteric dharma transmissions would be firmly established. The question is, can it be accepted as authentic?

Before discussing *fuhōmon* 1 proper, let us discuss the Bishamondō MS mentioned at the beginning of this article. This manuscript is regarded by Tendai scholars as the original of *fuhōmon* 1. The Bishamondō MS differs from the *Eizan Daishiden* version of *fuhōmon* 1 on one important point. In the *Eizan Daishiden* version, Shunxiao calls Saichō "[My] disciple the monk Saichō, who is a 'Great Virtue,' a 'monk serving at the court chapel' in **Japan** (*nihonkoku* 日本國)" (*nihonkoku [nai]gubu daitoku deshi sō Saichō* 日本國供奉大德僧最澄, emphasis added). In the Bishamondō MS, Saichō is addressed as "[my] disciple the monk Saichō of **this country** (*honkoku* 本國, i.e. China)" (*honkoku deshi sō Saichō* 本國弟子僧最澄, emphasis added). Thus, this sentence in the Bishamondō MS implies that Shunxiao regarded Saichō as a Chinese monk. Is this possible? This turns out to be very unlikely, since it conflicts with other passages of this manuscript.

First of all, in the Bishamondō MS, Shunxiao refers to China three times.²² Each time he uses the word *Daitō* 大唐 (the Great Tang) or *Daitōkoku* 大唐國 (Country of the Great Tang). He never uses the term *honkoku*.

Secondly, in the Bishamondō MS, Silla (a part of Korea) is called the "Kingdom of Silla", rather than (a part of) "this country" (i.e., China). This indicates that at least in this document Shunxiao, its alleged author, considered Silla an independent country rather than a part of China. However, for geographical and cultural reasons, Korea was much more likely than Japan to be regarded as a part of China in Tang and Song China. It is reasonable to expect that, had Shunxiao indeed regarded Japan as belonging to "this country (China)", he would also have seen Silla as a part of China and therefore would not have referred to it as the

22. The Bishamondō MS refers twice to China as *Daitōkoku* (the Great Tang): (i) in the Kaiyuan 開元 period of the "country of the Great Tang"; (ii) [Śubhākara-siraha] transmitted the dharma-wheel to the "country of the Great Tang", it refers once to China as *Daitō* (the Great Tang): "Disciple the monk Shunxiao of the 'Great Tang.'"

“Kingdom of Silla”. Thus, the reference in the Bishamondō MS to Saichō as a Chinese monk appears to conflict with the author’s understanding that neither Japan nor Silla was a part of China.

Finally, the Bishamondō MS seems to relate the story of a country-to-country dharma transmission: having turned the dharma-wheel in (i) the country of the Buddha (*bukkoku* 佛國, i.e. India), Śubhākarasimha brought the dharma to (ii) Tang China, where he transmitted it to Yilin who took it to (iii) his homeland Silla after transmitting it to the Tang monk Shunxiao, who, in turn, transmitted the dharma to Saichō of (iv) China or Japan (depending on whether the text here gives *honkoku* [“this country” i.e. China] as in the Bishamondō MS, or *nihonkoku* [Japan] as in the *Eizan Daishiden* version of *fuhōmon* 1). In accordance with the logic implied in the Bishamondō MS, here Shunxiao, were he the author of this document, should have used the word *nihonkoku* (Japan) rather than *honkoku* (China) to indicate Saichō’s place of origin. Only with the word *nihonkoku* does the document present a complete country-to-country dharma-transmission.

So, the Bishamondō MS can be taken as having been written by Shunxiao himself only on the assumption that he mistakenly wrote the term *nihonkoku* as *honkoku* in the text; that is, on the assumption that Shunxiao left the character *ni* out of the original manuscript. This possibility cannot be categorically denied, but is extremely unlikely. In the eyes of Shunxiao and Saichō, the mistake would have been rather obvious, and given the document’s importance, would likely have been noted and corrected.²³

A more likely interpretation is that the true author of the Bishamondō MS was not Shunxiao but a Japanese monk, from whose perspective Saichō was, of course, a monk of “this country” (Japan). Thus, the Bishamondō MS was either forged as a *fuhōmon* in the name of Shunxiao or copied from an original text (identical with the *Eizan Daishiden*

23. We must bear in mind that Saichō is credited with the invention of the “national title” (*kokugō* 國號) of Japan, *Dainihon* 大日本 (The Great Nippon) (cf. SAKAMOTO Tairō, “Dengyō Daishi to Dainihon no kokugō [Master Dengyō and the national title “Dainihon”]”, in *Dengyō Daishi kenkyū* [A Study of Dengyō Daishi], ed. Tendai Gakkai; Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppansha 1975, pp.485-500). He must have felt strongly that Japan was an independent country. The phrase *honkoku sō Saichō*, which means the “monk Saichō of this country (China)”, would have been too objectionable to Saichō to have been ignored or overlooked.

version of *fuhōmon* 1 which addresses Saichō as “my disciple from Japan”) by a Japanese scribe who had inadvertently mis-copied the term *nihonkoku* as *honkoku*. To a Japanese, the mistake would not have been as obvious as it would have been to Shunxiao. Given that the author of the Bishamondō MS deliberately attempted to create the impression that it was an original document left by Shunxiao,²⁴ I am inclined to believe that it was forged as, rather than copied from, one of Saichō’s *fuhōmons*.

Even if there did exist a *fuhōmon* as presented in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, in which Saichō is addressed appropriately as a monk from Japan, it would still be hard to accept such a document as authentic; that is, as written by Shunxiao.

First, as argued in Section I.A, at least as late as 820 it is unlikely that Saichō regarded Shunxiao as a prestigious monk or identified him as the third-generation disciple of Śubhākarasīmha, a “Great virtue” at a “state-protecting Temple”, and a “court chaplain”, etc. Thus, the appearance of these terms in *fuhōmon* 1 casts a shadow on the authenticity of this document, which claims itself to be written by Shunxiao in 805, fifteen years earlier than the year 820.

Second, it warrants our attention that the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* does not include any document that can be identified as *fuhōmon* 1. Given the value *fuhōmon* 1 would have had for authenticating Saichō’s esoteric transmission, it is reasonable to expect that Kōjō would *not* have excluded it from his collection had he known of it. Therefore, the absence of *fuhōmon* 1 in his collection suggests that Kōjō knew nothing of this document when he was compiling the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* between 833-34. Either the document did not exist at that time and was written at a later time, or Kōjō overlooked one of the key manuscripts in his tradition. Since Kōjō is unlikely to have overlooked something so significant, it would appear that Saichō never received *fuhōmon* 1 from Shunxiao. Had Saichō possessed such a document, he would not have hidden it from Kōjō, whom Saichō trusted implicitly.²⁵

24. The efforts the author of the Bishamondō MS made to make the manuscript appear to be an original can be seen in the following facts. The text was stamped at the top, middle and bottom; no acknowledgement was made to the effect that the document was copied from an original text, etc.

25. Kōjō was highly trusted by Saichō, as evidenced by the fact that he acted as Saichō’s liaison to the court when Saichō, in his later years, negotiated with the

Third, the strongest evidence against the authenticity of *fuhōmon* 1 is the simple fact that *fuhōmon* 1 does not appear in Saichō's two bibliographies. This is particularly striking in the case of the *Esshūroku*, the bibliography of Buddhist texts and Esoteric implements Saichō secured in Yuezhou where the Shunxiao initiation is said to have taken place. As we know, Saichō submitted the two bibliographies to the court precisely to show the significance of his travels in China. The inclusion of *fuhōmon* 1 in his bibliographies would, without doubt, have enormously strengthened his implicit claim that his study in China was of great value. Thus, it is remarkable that *fuhōmon* 1 is not so much as mentioned in his bibliographies. Instead, Saichō's bibliographies contain two certificates signed by the governors of Taizhou and Mingzhou Prefecture, which certify that Saichō had sought Buddhist teachings there.²⁶ Saichō also mentions in the *Esshūroku* an esoteric instrument (a trifurcate *vajra*) which was given to him by his Esoteric master (presumably Shunxiao) as a "proof of dharma transmission" (*shingon oshō fuhōinjin sanko bazara ichiko* 真言和尚付法印信三鈷拔折羅一口,²⁷ T.55.2160.1059c8). Thus, in Saichō's two bibliographies, the inclusion of two official docu-

court to establish a Mahāyāna precept platform on Hieizan (GRONER's *Saichō*: 292). This plan was so crucial to the development of Saichō's school that he would have allowed only his most trusted student to represent him in these negotiations.

26. The two governors who signed the certificates for Saichō were Lu Chun and Zheng Shenze, who governed Taizhou and Mingzhou when Saichō visited the two prefectures. The two certificates are included in the *Taishūroku* and *Esshūroku* respectively (T.55.2159.1058a5-11; T.55.2160.1060a2-12).
27. This phrase literally reads: "one trifurcate *vajra* [given by] the Shingon master as a proof of dharma-transmission." It is worth stressing that the *fuhōinjin* 付法印信 mentioned here does not refer to any written certificate but only to an Esoteric instrument: a trifurcate *vajra*. The term *injin* 印信 does not necessarily mean a written certificate. In some cases, it means a certification *article* instead. Another example is found in a passage from Kūkai's bibliography, in which Kūkai, after listing eight kinds of Buddhist articles and esoteric instruments, like five-treasure, *samayavajra*, etc., makes the following remarks:

The eight articles as listed on the right were originally brought from Southern India by Ācārya Vajrabodhi. He transmitted them to Ācārya Daguangzhi 大廣智 (i.e. Bukong), who, in turn, transmitted them to Ācārya Qinglong 青龍 (i.e. Huiguo). Master Qinglong transmitted them to me Kū[kai]. These are the "certification articles for dharma transmission" (*denbōinjin*), and are what the myriad sentient beings rely on and take refuge in (T.55.2161.1064c20-1065a4).

ments issued by secular authorities contrasts strikingly with the absence of any mention of a certificate from any religious authority.

Furthermore, *fuhōmon* 1 claims to have been written by Shunxiao on the nineteenth day of the fourth month of 805; that is, almost one month before the compilation of the *Esshūroku*, which was dated the thirteenth day of the fifth month of 805. Therefore, if *fuhōmon* 1 were authentic, Saichō would have certainly been in possession of this document when he compiled the *Esshūroku* and he would have included it in the bibliography. For the purpose of supporting the orthodoxy of his esoteric transmission, this *fuhōmon* would have been as important as, if not more important than, the certificate issued by secular authorities in Mingzhou and the *vajra* given by his Esoteric master. Thus, the absence of *fuhōmon* 1 in the *Esshūroku* strongly suggests that Saichō did not secure such a document in China. In other words, *fuhōmon* 1, like the “court certificate”, was forged in Japan either by Saichō himself or by some later Tendai monk. It appears much more likely that *fuhōmon* 1 was not forged by the Tendai founder himself, but by one of his students.²⁸

As we have seen, the “court certificate” attributed to Saichō connects him with Śubhākarasimha by stating that his teacher Shunxiao was a third-generation disciple of the great Esoteric master. Yet the same “court certificate” says nothing about the details of this relationship. *Fuhōmon* 1 goes one step further by connecting Shunxiao to Śubhākarasimha through a Silla monk called Yilin, whom *fuhōmon* 1 represents as Shunxiao’s teacher. By incorporating Saichō into such a distinguished Esoteric tradition initiated by Śubhākarasimha, *fuhōmon* 1 seeks on the one hand to prove the orthodoxy of Saichō’s Esoteric tradition, and on the other, to affirm that Saichō’s esoteric tradition is of *taizōkai* origin.

28. This view is supported by the following two points. As noted above, *fuhōmon* 1 is not included in the *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, which was collected approximately one decade after Saichō’s death. On the other hand, if Saichō were the author of *fuhōmon* 1, he would have composed it after the submission of the *Kenkairon* in 820 and before his death in 822 (since the *Kenkairon* demonstrates no trace of an attempt to glorify Shunxiao or to connect Saichō himself with Śubhākarasimha). During this period, the most likely occasion for him to forge a document like *fuhōmon* 1 would have been when he collected the documents for the *Kenkairon engi*, which was completed in the third month of 821. However, the tremendous risk accompanying the presentation of a false document like *fuhōmon* 1 to the court may have been sufficient to deter Saichō from doing so.

I. C. Another Version of Saichō's *Fuhōmon* in the *Kenkairon Engi*: on the Authenticity of the Bishamondō MS

In the *Kenkairon engi*, we find another version of the *fuhōmon* attributed to Shunxiao (DZ1: 279-280). After comparing the *Kenkairon engi* version of the *fuhōmon* with *fuhōmon 1*, we find that the former is composed of two parts, one identical with *fuhōmon 1*, the other reading as follows:

In a room of a *maṇḍala* comprised of “Thirty-seven Deities” (*sanjushichison 三十七尊*) headed by Vairocana-Tathāgata,

- A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Khum – the higher rank of attainment;
- A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham – the intermediate rank of attainment;
- A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na – the lower rank of attainment.

Through the *abhiṣeka* (*kanjō 灌頂*), the *samayas* for the “three divisions” (*sanbu*) were conferred [by] *Ācārya Śramaṇa* Shunxiao. The methods for drawing pictures, samples and *mudrās* [were also transmitted]. On the eighteenth day of the fourth month of Zhenyuan 21 (805), [I, the] *Śramaṇa* Shunxiao of the Lingyansi temple on Mount Taishan, who am the “Great Virtue” at a “State-protecting Temple” and a “monk serving at the court chapel”, transmitted the *samayas* for the “three divisions” and [issued] this certificate to my disciple Saichō (DZ1: 279).

This part is entirely identical with the Shitennōji MS, which also claims to be a *fuhōmon* transmitted from Shunxiao. However, for the same reasons that led me to reject the authenticity of *fuhōmon 1*, I find it difficult to accept the *fuhōmon* stored in the Shitennōji temple (hereafter *fuhōmon 2*) as authentic. These reasons include (i) the absence of this document in Saichō's two bibliographies and (ii) the appearance in the manuscript of the terms glorifying Shunxiao (*chinkokudōjō daitoku* [a “Great Virtue” at a ‘State-protecting’ Temple], *naigubu* [a “court chaplain”]). As I argued in section I. A, as late as 820, Saichō did not, as far as we know, associate these terms with Shunxiao. In addition, one remarkable point in both *fuhōmon 1* and *fuhōmon 2* also casts doubt on the authenticity of both documents. In these two *fuhōmons*, Shunxiao refers to himself as a *daitoku* at a *chinkoku dōjō*, *Ācārya Śramaṇa*, *naigubu*, and so on. It is highly unusual for a monk to be so presumptuous as to list all of his titles in a document written for a student.

Futhermore, I find it unlikely that Saichō, during his several-day stay with Shunxiao,²⁹ would receive two separate *fuhōmons* from the same

29. On the twenty-fifth day of the third month of 805, Saichō arrived at the port of Mingzhou to await the ship that would carry him back to Japan. However, upon

teacher. As a rule, a *fuhōmon* is meant, on the one hand, to establish officially the discipleship of its holder under the master who signed and issued it; and, on the other, to confirm that such and such an esoteric transmission did indeed occur between the master and disciple as specified therein. Given the enormous value the esoteric tradition attached to face-to-face oral transmission (*menju* 面授) from master to disciple, esoteric masters must have written and issued *fuhōmons* with great care. In Saichō's case, if the two *fuhōmons* are authentic, then he would have received a second *fuhōmon* from Shunxiao only a day after obtaining the first. This would lead us to conclude that Shunxiao casually issued *fuhōmons* and/or that he wrote *fuhōmons* so carelessly (if not recklessly) that barely one day after the issuance of a *fuhōmon* to a newly initiated student, it suddenly occurred to him that he had to write a new *fuhōmon* for the same foreign student. Either conclusion directly contradicts the fact that, in Esoteric Buddhism, the composition and issuance of *fuhōmons* was a matter of great importance. It is, therefore, extremely unlikely that Saichō received two *fuhōmons* from Shunxiao in the space of two days. Ironically, the co-existence in Japan of two *fuhōmons* attributed to Shunxiao does not reinforce the authenticity of each of them, but, on the contrary, betrays the dubious source of, at least, one of them, presumably the one which appeared later (i.e. *fuhōmon* 2).³⁰

his arrival at the port he was told that their previously scheduled return trip would be delayed for about one and a half months. Saichō thus decided to visit Longxingsi and Fahuasi 法華寺, two local temples in Yuezhou, where Saichō had heard that a large quantity of Buddhist texts were stored (Stanley WEINSTEIN, "The Beginnings of Esoteric Buddhism in Japan", *Journal of Asian Studies* 34.1 (1974): 184). Saichō succeeded in securing a permit from the Mingzhou Prefect to continue his travels, which was issued on the sixth day of the fourth month (this permit is now preserved in the *Kenkairon engi*; DZ 1: 277-78). On the basis of this date, we assume that Saichō did not leave Mingzhou for Yuezhou before the sixth day of the fourth month. Furthermore, taking into account the time Saichō spent on the trip from Mingzhou to Yuezhou, it would appear that, prior to the eighteenth or nineteenth day of the fourth month of 805, to which *fuhōmon* 1 and *fuhōmon* 2 are dated respectively, Saichō had stayed with Shunxiao for no more than several days.

30. The argument that *fuhōmon* 2 appeared later than *fuhōmon* 1 is based on the following considerations. *Fuhōmon* 1 was included in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu*, neither of which contains *fuhōmon* 2. *Fuhōmon* 2 is only found in the *Kenkairon engi*. The absence of *fuhōmon* 2 in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* implies that *fuhōmon* 2 may have appeared later than *fuhōmon* 1. In other words, *fuhōmon* 2 appeared at such a late date that the author or editor of the *Eizan Daishiden* and

In addition to these four pieces of evidence arguing against the authenticity of *fuhōmon 2*, one peculiar aspect of its content also suggests that it was written at a late date. *Fuhōmon 2* seems to try to depict the Shunxiao initiation in terms of “three divisions” (*sanbu*), the three esoteric traditions represented by the three fundamental Esoteric Buddhist scriptures (the *Darijing*, *Jin'ganding jing* and *Suxidi [jueluo] jing*). *Fuhōmon 2* represents the core of the Shunxiao initiation as a threefold correlation between the three five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* and the three ranks of attainment (higher, intermediate and lower). The first two *dhāraṇīs*, which are correlated with the higher and intermediate ranks of attainment respectively, are found in the *Darijing* (T.848.18.20a19; 52b12-28), while the third, correlated with the lower rank of attainment, is traceable to a text closely related to the *Jin'ganding jing* (T.1173.20.710b).³¹ Therefore the author of *fuhōmon 2* seems to have used the three five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* to represent the *Darijing* and the *Jin'ganding jing*, two basic texts for the dual esoteric transmission. Furthermore, *fuhōmon 2* correlates the three *dhāraṇīs* to the three ranks of attainment. The *locus classicus* of this threefold classification of the Indian notion *siddhi* (attainment) is found in the *Suxidi jing*,³² the text representing the

the editor of Saichō's *Buppō kechimyaku* (i.e. the author of the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyaku*) had no chance to see *fuhōmon 2* and were therefore unable to include it in the works under their redaction (it is assumed here that, given the value *fuhōmon 2* would have had for certifying Saichō's esoteric tradition, the authors/editors of the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyaku* would have included it in their works had they known of it). Moreover, the relative lateness of *fuhōmon 2* is also corroborated by the fact that the *Kenkairon engi*, in which *fuhōmon 2* is included, achieved its final form later than both the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyaku* (see note <10>).

31. This identification of the sources for the three groups of five-syllable *dhāraṇī* is made by the celebrated third-generation Tendai leader Enchin 圓珍 (814-891) in his *Ketsuji sanshushicchi hō* 決示三種悉地法 (Hereafter KSSH; A decisive explanation of the procedure related to the “three kinds of attainments”) (*Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 [A complete collection of the Buddhist texts of the Great Japan; hereafter BZ.], eds. TAKAKUSU Junijirō et al, 100 vols. Tokyo: Yuseidō, 1913-22; reprinted Tokyo: Kodansha, 1970-73; ed. Suzuki gakujuutsu zaidan 27: 985a13-18).
32. Though the notion of “the three ranks of attainment” (*sanhon shicchi* 三品悉地) is also mentioned in other esoteric texts (e.g. the *Darijing*), the most extensive and authoritative discussion of this notion is found in the *Suxidi jing*, which devotes a whole chapter (Chapter Sixteen) to the notion (T.18.891.614a21-c13; see also the relevant passages in 603c3-7).

third Esoteric tradition in the *sanbu* system, the *Soshicchi-bu* 蘇悉地部. Thus, *fuhōmon 2* appears to advocate, albeit implicitly, a form of the *sanbu goju* 三部互糅 idea (the notion that the three Esoteric traditions are complementary and inter-penetrating).

According to MATSUNAGA, in Chinese Esoteric Buddhism, the *Suxidi jing* was placed on a par with the *Darijing* and the *Jin'gangding jing* sometime during the 830s.³³ The *Suxidi jing* was not included in the Hieizan *shanagō* 遮那業 curriculum until Ennin 圓仁 (794-864) returned from China in 847. Ennin may have learned of the importance of the *Suxidi jing* during his study in Chang'an 長安 between 840 and 847, which was exactly the time when the *Suxidi jing* was steadily gaining popularity within Chinese Esoteric Buddhist circles. Given the timing, the *sanbu goju* implication in *fuhōmon 2* makes it difficult to regard it as having been written by Shunxiao since in 805 the *Suxidi jing* had not yet been accepted as one of the three fundamental texts in Chinese Esoteric Buddhism.

On the other hand, the fact that the author of *fuhōmon 2* seems to have had knowledge of the *sanbu goju* idea makes it possible to approximate the period in which *fuhōmon 2* was written. Since Ennin is the person responsible for introducing the Japanese Tendai sect to the *sanbu* idea, it seems safe to date the appearance of *fuhōmon 2* to sometime after 847, the year Ennin returned to Japan. Moreover, Enchin mentions *fuhōmon 2* in his KSSH (BZ.27.985a1-8), which was completed circa 873.³⁴ Therefore the appearance of *fuhōmon 2* can be tentatively dated between 847 and 873.

The late date of *fuhōmon 2* presents a new problem. Why, after the appearance of *fuhōmon 1*, was the forgery of *fuhōmon 2* necessary? Indeed, the agenda underlying the forgery of the *fuhōmon 2* appears to have been very complicated. Here I can only make some brief com-

33. MATSUNAGA Yūkei, *Mikkyō no rekishi* [A history of Esoterism], Sāra sōsho, no.19, Kyōto: Heirakuji Shoten 1969, pp. 147-48. The date is based on a passage in a famous record of the two esoteric transmissions (*taizōkai* and *kongōkai*) (T.2081.51.786c10-14). Though the full name is *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji* 兩部大法相承師資付法記 (Jp. *ryōbu daihō sōjō shishi fuhō ki*; The record of master-to-disciple transmissions of the two-division great dharma; T#2087), this record is better known as “Haiyun xuemai” 海雲血脈 (Jp. “Kaiun kechimiyaku”) in East Asian Esoteric Buddhism. It was completed in 834 by a Chinese monk called Haiyun 海雲 (n.d.).

34. For the dating of this essay by Enchin, see CHEN's dissertation: 161-62.

ments. First, I have shown that the Bishamondō MS was flawed by a serious mistake (Saichō was wrongly addressed as a monk coming from “this” [i.e. Chinese] country), a mistake that may have been noticed by later Tendai editors, who corrected it by changing “this country” to “Japan”. In view of this, we might assume that the author of *fuhōmon 2* may have forged the document because he was not satisfied with *fuhōmon 1* and wanted to provide a better version of Saichō’s *fuhōmon*.

I would also suggest that *fuhōmon 2* may have been forged as a part of a complicated polemical agenda. As we know, *fuhōmon 2* is significantly different from *fuhōmon 1* insofar as it equates the core of the Shunxiao initiation with the threefold *dhāraṇī*-attainment correlation. This new description of the Shunxiao initiation seems to have been aimed at redepicting the Shunxiao initiation as one in the “three traditions” (*sanbu*). As shown in his 820 *Kenkairon*, Saichō, in his later years, tended to reinterpret the Shunxiao initiation as a dual transmission (see note <19>). It is very likely that this new interpretation of Saichō’s initiation was stimulated by his association with and study under Kūkai, who may have made Saichō aware of the importance of the Diamond-realm tradition and the *ryōbu goju* 兩部互糅 idea.³⁵ Since Shingon followers prized Kūkai’s tradition as the sole orthodox esoteric lineage incorporating the dual transmission, Tendai monks after Saichō tried to outshine Shingon by redefining Saichō’s esoteric initiation as belonging to the three traditions (the two plus a third represented by the *Suxidi jing* / *Soshicchi kyō* 蘇悉地經).

If, as I have argued, *fuhōmon 2* was not written by Shunxiao, then is it possible to identify its actual Japanese author? The most obvious suspect is Enchin 圓珍, whose KSSH represents, as far as I can tell, the earliest known textual source referring to *fuhōmon 2*. Furthermore, this treatise by Enchin was exclusively dedicated to the scriptural source of the “procedure of three ranks of attainment”, the core of *fuhōmon 2*. Enchin’s close connection with *fuhōmon 2* suggests the possibility that he was the real author of this document. However, one fact renders the possibility of Enchin’s authorship unlikely. In 882, Enchin prepared some questions for his former teachers in Chang’an. Among these

35. See KIUCHI Gyōdō, “Dengyō Daishi no taikon ryōbu ni tsuite (Concerning Master Dengyō’s [notion of] the two divisions of *taizōkai* and *kongōkai*)”, *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 26 (1965): 164-65; ABÉ Ryuichi, “Saichō and Kūkai: A Conflict of Interpretations”, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22/1-2 (1995): 103-37; CHEN’s dissertation: 35-42.

questions is one regarding the threefold *dhāraṇī*-attainment correlation that is found in *fuhōmon 2*.³⁶ This suggests that *fuhōmon 2* was, very likely, not written by Enchin himself. The author of *fuhōmon 2* would have had a greater knowledge of the threefold *dhāraṇī*-attainment correlation than that indicated in Enchin's questions to his Chinese teachers.

With Enchin excluded as the likely author of *fuhōmon 2*, Ennin (or possibly a Tendai monk in his line) immediately emerges as the most likely person to have composed *fuhōmon 2* in the name of Shunxiao. We know that *fuhōmon 2* implicitly advocated the *sanbu goju* idea and that it was Ennin who first introduced this idea into the early Tendai school. The two decades between 847 and 873, to which I have dated the formation of *fuhōmon 2*, were exactly when Ennin, as the chief Tendai representative, was actively struggling with the Shingon school over the orthodoxy of their respective Esoteric traditions. Without a doubt, the Tendai sect would have benefited greatly from a "dharma-transmission certificate", like *fuhōmon 2*, that not only supports the orthodoxy of the Esoteric tradition Saichō was said to have secured from China but also suggests that Saichō's Esoteric tradition was inherently superior to Kūkai's, since Saichō's tradition was of "three divisions" (*sanbu*) while Kūkai's was merely of two.

In the preceding discussion, I analysed several documents included in four major Tendai works, the (i) *Denjutsu isshinkaimon*, (ii) *Eizan Daishiden*, (iii) *Naishō buppō sōjō kechimyakufu* and (iv) *Kenkairon engi*. These documents are either identified as, or appear closely connected to, Saichō's *fuhōmons*; yet, as I have shown, these documents represent the effort of Saichō's followers to reinterpret and legitimate the Esoteric transmissions ascribed to Saichō.

The *Denjutsu isshinkaimon* contains a so-called "court certificate" which claims to be an official document issued by the Kammu court to certify Saichō's religious attainment. However, on close inspection, this "certificate" turns out to be of dubious provenance and is noteworthy for its attempt to elevate Saichō's main Esoteric mentor Shunxiao, by claiming that he was an extremely prestigious monk who was a third generation disciple of the great Indian Esoteric master Śubhākarasīṃha.

36. This question is found in BZ.27.1033a5-8. For a full discussion of the implications of this question, see CHEN's dissertation: 162-64.

We find in the *Eizan Daishiden* and the *Naishō buppō sōjō kechi-myakufu* a *fuhōmon* allegedly written by Shunxiao for Saichō. This *fuhōmon* was also forged in Japan in order to incorporate Saichō into a celebrated lineage supposedly initiated by Śubhākarasimha and continued by (i) Yilin, a Korean monk who, this *fuhōmon* says, had transmitted esoteric teachings to Shunxiao, (ii) Shunxiao himself and (iii) Saichō. The appearance of this *fuhōmon* marked the formal formulation of the Tendai idea of its Esoteric lineage, which, according to this *fuhōmon*, could be traced back to China and eventually India.

Finally, we find a second version of Shunxiao's *fuhōmon* in the *Kenkairon engi*. This version of the *fuhōmon* proved to be essential for the formation of some central ideologies supporting early Tendai Buddhism. It reinterprets the esoteric transmission Saichō received from Shunxiao as a threefold *dhāraṇī*-attainment correlation, implying the *sanbu goju* idea. The esoteric tradition Saichō received from Shunxiao was thus characterized as an integration of three esoteric transmissions (the *kongōkai* 金剛界, *taizōkai* 胎藏界 and *soshicchi* 蘇悉地). This claim was advanced for the purpose of outshining the Shingon tradition, which represented itself as the combination of two esoteric transmissions known as *kongōkai* and *taizōkai*.

As a result of the sustained efforts made by Saichō's immediate students (particularly Kōjō and Shinchū) and his second generation disciples (with Ennin as their brilliant representative), Saichō's esoteric tradition was firmly established by the middle of the ninth century. However, despite the enormous help the Tendai monks could have drawn from such fabricated documents as *fuhōmon*² when they competed with the Shingon school for domination of the Japanese esoteric tradition, they may have been always embarrassed that the threefold *dhāraṇī*-attainment correlation stipulated therein had no scriptural support. The Tendai school felt the urgent need to provide some scriptural support for the threefold correlation. It is precisely this sectarian agenda that prompted yet another forgery, this time of three *siddhi* scriptures (*Taishō* nos. 905, 906, and 907), composed in Japan by Tendai monks to resemble Chinese translations from Sanskrit. It is to these three texts that we turn in the next part.

Part II. Legitimation and Scriptures: The Japanese Provenance of Three Esoteric Buddhist Texts Attributed to Śubhākarasimha

The three *siddhi* texts bear similar titles and appear to be closely related in content. In fact, T.907, which is the shortest of the three texts, is wholly reproduced in both T.905 and T.906. T.907 begins with a detailed description of the various worldly benefits that the author believes the five Sanskrit syllables (A, Vam, Ram, Hum, Kham) will produce if properly recited. Next, the five syllables are correlated with “five viscera”, five kinds of natural and social phenomena, five directional buddhas, and five divisions of a *maṇḍala* associated with five elements (earth, water, fire, wind, and space). This is followed by the division of the Esoteric category *siddhi* into three ranks (lower, intermediate and higher) and the correlation of three five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* (A-Ra-Ba-Ca-Na; A-Vi-Ra-Ha-Kha; A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham) with three kinds of attainment (“emerging”, “entering”, and “mystery”). Finally, T.907 ends with a twenty-two line verse or *gātha*. A major part of T.905 consists of correlating more Buddhist and Esoteric fivefold categories with a number of indigenous Chinese fivefold categories grouped together through the *wuxing* 五行 (“five-phases”) pattern in traditional Chinese thought. T.906, except for the parts which can also be found in T.907, takes the idea of *hajigoku* 破地獄 (“destroying hell”) as its key theme.

As a result of their importance to the entire Tendai tradition, the three *siddhi* texts have attracted sustained and intense scholarly attention, and have been subjected to extensive critical examinations. A number of Japanese scholars who have made important contributions to our understanding of these three basic Tendai texts,³⁷ have rejected the conven-

37. ŌMURA Seigai, *Mikkyō hattatsushi* [A history of the development of Esoterism], 5 vols. pp. 432-36, Tokyo 1918; MATSUNAGA Yuken, “Sanshushicchi hajigoku giki no kenkyū [A study of the *Sanshushicchi hajigoku giki*]”, in *Mikkyō kenkyū* 35 (1929): 1-18; KANBAYASHI Ryūjō, “Hajigoku sanshushicchi hō hyakutei [A brief explanation of the Hajigoku *sanshushicchi hō*]”, in *Kokuyaku issaikyō* (*Mikkyō bu*, vol.3; Tokyo: Daitō 1931: 80-94; NASU Zenryū, “Sanshushicchi hajigoku giki no kenkyū (A study of the *Sanshushicchi hajigoku giki*)”, in *Miyamoto kyōju kinen Indogaku bukkyōgaku ronshū* (1954): 431-44; YOSHIOKA Yoshitoyo, “Korin kuji hishaku to dōkyō gozōkan [The *Korin kuji hishaku* and Taoist *gozōkan* (the contemplation of ‘five viscera’)]”, in *Mikkyō bunka* 69-70 (1964): 77-97; OSABE Kazuo, *Tōdai mikkyōshi zatsukō* [A study of the Esoteric history in the Tang], Kobe: Kobe shoka daigaku gakujutsu kenkyūkai 1971: 209-52; MATSUNAGA Yūkei, “Sanshushicchi to hajigoku [The *sanshushicchi* (“three

tional view that the three *siddhi* texts were translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by Śubhākarasimha. This consensus is based on the following three considerations. First, the three *siddhi* texts are absent from two major Tang Buddhist bibliographies in which most, if not all, of Śubhākarasimha's translations have been included.³⁸ Second, the three *siddhi* texts appear too Chinese in style to have had corresponding Sanskrit originals. What is particularly remarkable is the appearance in the three *siddhi* texts of such peculiarly indigenous Chinese ideas as *wuzang* 五臟 (Jp. *gozō*; "five viscera"). Third, the three *siddhi* texts are too syncretic in content and therefore too late in time to have been translated by Śubhākarasimha, who apparently had no knowledge of the syncretic ideas contained in them.³⁹

In their examination of the three *siddhi* texts, Japanese scholars have made important observations. However, when they assumed, from the

kinds of attainment") and *hajigoku* ("destroying hell")], in *Mikkyō bunka* 121 (1976): 1-13; KIUCHI Gyōō, *Tendai mikkyō no keisei* [The formation of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism], Tokyo: Keisuisha 1984; MISAKI Ryōshū, *Taimitsu no kenkyū* [A study of Taimitsu Esoteric Buddhism], Tokyo: Sobunsha 1988: 499-508; and MIZUKAMI Fumiyoshi, "sanshushicchi hō to sanshin shingon [The *sanshushicchi hō* (procedure of the threefold attainment) and the *dhāraṇī* for the three [buddha-]bodies]", *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 73 (1988): 253-57.

38. These two major Buddhist bibliographies are (i) the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (The Buddhist bibliography [compiled] in the Kaiyuan period) completed in 730 by Zhisheng 智昇 and (ii) the *Zhenyuan shijiao lu* 貞元釋教錄 (The Buddhist bibliography [compiled] in the Zhenyuan period) compiled in 799 by Yuanzhao 圓照. Upon his arrival in China in 716, Śubhākarasimha immediately attracted patronage from Emperor Xuanzong 玄宗 of the Tang Dynasty. Therefore, his translations must have been officially sponsored and should have been included in the two officially sanctioned Buddhist bibliographies.
39. The three *siddhi* texts, for instance, define the *gobu* 五部 (the "five-divisions of a Diamond-realm *maṇḍala*") as divisions of (i) *vajra*, (ii) lotus, (iii) karma, (iv) treasure, and (v) emptiness. This kind of classification is akin to the notion of the five divisions that became prevalent with the further development of some new-style esoteric teachings which have been generally called the Diamond-realm (Ch. *jin'gangjie* 金剛界; Jp. *kongōkai*; Skt. *vajradhātu*) line of Esoteric Buddhism. Some initial forms of this Esoteric Buddhist tradition had already been introduced to Tang China by Vajrabodhi. However, it was not until the time of Bukong that it began to appear in its full-fledged form; and Bukong did not become involved in religious activities until several decades after the death of Śubhākarasimha. Consequently, it seems anachronistic to connect Śubhākarasimha with any complete and mature version of the five-division idea. Thus it is difficult to credit Śubhākarasimha with the translation of the three *siddhi* texts in which the five-division idea is so prominent.

apocryphal status of the three *siddhi* texts, that they must have been composed in China, these scholars may have been misled by two tacit but unfounded assumptions: (i) that all apocryphal texts in Chinese were composed in China, and (ii) that a text strongly coloured by some ideas undoubtedly originating in China was necessarily written in China. It is well known that classical written Chinese was the *lingua franca* of much of East-Asia. A text written in Chinese was *not* necessarily written in China. In the same vein, the incorporation of some indigenous Chinese ideas (with *wuxing* as the example *par excellence*) into a text does not necessarily mean that it was composed in China, since some indigenous Chinese ideas, like *wuxing*, were also accepted and practised in other East Asian countries, including Korea and Japan. Thus, it is necessary to consider the possibility that the three *siddhi* texts were composed outside of China, but within the Chinese cultural sphere. Much of the textual evidence suggests that these texts are in fact of Japanese origin.

II. A. The Primacy of T.907 over T.905 and T.906

Before examining the hypothesis of the Japanese origin of the three *siddhi* texts, it is necessary to establish that of the three *siddhi* texts, T.907 is the oldest, and was wholly reproduced in T.905 and T.906. Below I compare the five *gāthas*, or verses, in the three *siddhi* texts in order to ascertain whether the four *gāthas* in T.905 and T.906 originated from the single *gātha* in T.907. If it can be shown that these four *gāthas* were composed using the single *gātha* in T.907 as a source, it is also likely that the other parts of T.905 and T.906 which parallel T.907 are also derived from T.907.

The single *gātha* in T.907 (hereafter referred to as G.907), which comes at its conclusion, reads like a standard *gātha* used to end a *sūtra*:

- (1) I prostrate myself before Vairocana-buddha
- (2) whose pure eyes open like lotus flowers.
- (3) Controlling the "three realms", he is the teacher of humans and celestial beings as well.
- (4) With a great enlightened mind he is the saviour of this world.
- (5) The profound and wonderful *dhāraṇīs* [constituting] the empowering methods
- (6) flow into the "gate of syllable A" [representing] non-production.
- (7) The white curl which is formless possesses true and universal wisdom,
- (8) perfect and permanent like the sun and the moon.
- (9) Akṣobhya and Ratnasambhava, as the saviour of the world,
- (10) Amitābha, Amoghasiddhirāja,
- (11) all residing in the propitious wheel of attainment,

- (12) transmit this wonderful dharma and proselytise to all sentient beings.
- (13) The compassionate and self-existent Trailokya-vijaya-rāja
- (14) and the Vajrasattva Āryācalanātha,⁴⁰
- (15) never breaking their vows, always come [to rescue sentient beings] on time.
- (16) After accomplishing the *vajra*-like feats, they return to the *vajra*-fields.
- (17) I, relying on Vairocana-buddha,
- (18) open the “wisdom-*mudrā*” of the mind and set up the goal.
- (19) Universally embellished by countless merits,
- (20) [let us] enter together into the *dhāraṇīs* [leading to] all the *sugatas*.
- (21) May those who have the opportunity to study and cultivate together [these Esoteric teachings]
- (22) dwell peacefully in the supreme, pure sea! (T.907.18.915c1-11)

The first part of G.907 (lines 1-12, T.907.18.915c1-6) is devoted to the merits of the five buddhas (i.e. Vairocana, Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi) (with the first eight lines devoted to Vairocana-buddha and the last four to the other four buddhas); then, in the second part (lines 13-16, T.907.18.915c7-8), the two *rājas* (Trailokya-vijaya-rāja and Āryācalanātha) are praised. Finally, in the third part (lines 17-22, T.905.18.915c9-11), the author vows that he will follow Mahāvairocana-buddha until he succeeds in obtaining enlightenment and is thereby reborn in the pure-land. The final wish is that all practitioners will reside peacefully in the paramount “Sea of Purity”.

In T.905, the first *gātha* (hereafter G.905/1) is found near the beginning of the text (T.905.18.909b26-c6). Except for four lines,⁴¹ the lines of G.905/1 are identical with lines 1-16 of G.907 (T.907.18.915c1-8). The second *gātha* in T.905 (T.905.18.912a28-b1, hereafter G.905/2) is composed of six lines, which are precisely identical with lines 17-22 of G.907 (T.907.18.915c9-11). Thus, the lines of the two *gāthas* in T.905, with the exception of four lines in G.905/1, are identical with the 22 lines of G.907.

40. Trailokya-vijaya-rāja (the “Deity-descending-from-the-three-worlds”) and Āryācalanātha (the “Immovable Deity”) are the two renowned *rājas* that accompany and serve Mahāvairocana-buddha.
41. These four lines are: “The body, mouth, and mind constitute the three mysteries / which form the transformation-body; / Five wheels and five kinds of wisdom are of five parts / which completely cover the wheel of the dharma-field” (T.905.18.909c2-4). They were taken from a *gātha* at the beginning of an esoteric tract attributed to Śubhākarasīmha, the *Cishi Pusa luexiu yujia niansongfa* 慈氏菩薩略脩瑜伽念誦法 (The contemplation and recitation methods for a simplified form of yoga-practice, as preached by Bodhisattva Maitreya; T.114) (see T.1141.20.590a16-18).

While the high level of correspondence between G.907 and G.905/1, 2 suggests that these *gāthas* are closely related, the nature of that relation is to be determined. Did G.905/1 originally exist as an independent, coherent *gātha*? The first eight lines of G.905/1 focus on Mahāvairocana-buddha (the head of the “five buddhas”), and the last eight lines are devoted to the other four of the “five buddhas” and two *rājas*.⁴² As such, these two groups of lines appear to form a set. Between these two groups of lines lie four lines taken from an Esoteric tract attributed to Śubhākarasimha (T.1141). These lines comprise a discussion of the “three mysteries” and “five wheels”, thus disrupting the relationship defined by the other two groups of lines in G.905/1. Thus, in G.905/1, two thematically related parts are separated by a third which is unrelated to either of the other two. It is very unlikely that an author would write on one topic, shift to another unrelated subject with no transition, and then return, again without transition, to the first topic. Thus, it is very unlikely that G.905/1 was written by a single author. Rather, this *gātha* seems to have been constructed from two groups of eight lines removed from a second source, with the insertion between them of four additional lines. G.905/1 does not appear to be an independent, coherent *gātha*. G.907, on the other hand, is quite consistent. It is logical to conclude that T.907 is earlier than T.905.

By comparing G.907 to the two *gāthas* in T.906, it is possible to show that T.907 also has primacy over T.906. One of the two *gāthas* in T.906 appears in the middle of the text (T.906.18.913c4-6, hereafter G.906/1), while the other is attached to the text (T.906.18.914b12-19, hereafter G.906/2). The six lines of G.906/1 parallel the first six lines of G.907 (T.907.18.915c1-3), while the 16 lines of G.906/2 are identical with lines 7-22 of G.907 (T.907.18.915c4-11).

In G.907, lines 1-8 form an inseparable whole, which is devoted to Vairocana-buddha. Turning to the two *gāthas* in T.906, we find that the same eight lines have become separated: the first six lines form an independent *gātha* (G.906/1), whereas the last two were used to begin G.906/2. These two lines, in praise of one of the remarkable features attributed to Vairocana-buddha (i.e. his “white curl”), should have originally followed the six lines in G.906/1, all of which are dedicated to

42. Mahāvairocana-buddha plus the other four buddhas form the famous “five buddhas”, while the two *rājas* are usually represented as two companions of the five buddhas, especially of Vairocana-buddha.

Vairocana-buddha. Therefore, the two *gāthas* in T.906 seem not to have been originally written as separate parts of T.906, but were instead formed by breaking one internally consistent *gātha* (i.e. G.907) into two. This suggests that the two *gāthas* in T.906, like other parts of the same text paralleling T.907, were borrowed from T.907.

II. B. The Provenance and Date of T.907

It would appear that of the three *siddhi* texts, T.907 is the earliest. It is included in its entirety in both T.905 and T.906. Given that the borrowed verses are most likely to have been borrowed from T.907 into T.905 and T.906, I think it is safe to conclude that T.907 was similarly taken into T.905 and T.906, rather than grafted out of these texts to form an individual text. For this reason, the status of T.905 and T.906 will be better understood if the provenance and date of T.907 are established.

No evidence has emerged to show that any of the three *siddhi* texts is mentioned in any Chinese Buddhist bibliography or in any other Buddhist source circulating in China. Furthermore, it seems very unlikely that Saichō or Kūkai had any knowledge of the three *siddhi* texts.⁴³ In which source, then, was T.907 mentioned for the first time? Enchin's KSSH, which we discussed toward the end of part (I), appears to be the first textual source to refer to T.907 since it mentions the ideas of the "threefold attainment".

Is it possible that T.907 was known to Enchin and that he used this text when writing his KSSH? In fact, the existence of a text such as KSSH seems to suggest the opposite, that Enchin was unaware of T.907 when he wrote KSSH. Both the title and content of KSSH demonstrate that Enchin wrote this work in order to clarify scriptural support for the *sanshushicchi hō* 三種悉地法 procedure. At the time, there was mounting doubt both inside and outside Tendai circles as to whether the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure had a scriptural source.⁴⁴ Had a text such as T.907 been available in Japan at the time, there would have been no

43. This is deduced from the absence of the three *siddhi* texts in the bibliographies of Kūkai and Saichō (cf. MISAOKI Ryōshū, "Taimitsu no soshicchi wo meguru shōmondai [various problems involved in the *Soshicchi* issue in Taimitsu]", in *Mikkyō bunka* 149 (1985): 79-95).

44. As is to be shown below, even the eminent Tendai leader Henjō (817-890), after receiving the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure from Enchin, continued to question the existence of canonical support for the procedure.

doubt as to the existence of a scriptural source for the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, and writing KSSH would have been unnecessary. T.907, containing as it does the three kinds of attainment correlated to the three five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* and traditionally regarded as a translation of an Indian text, would surely have provided scriptural legitimacy.⁴⁵

In addition, a close reading of KSSH reveals no evidence that Enchin ever quoted from or even referred to T.907 in KSSH. On the contrary, a careful examination of KSSH corroborates the argument that Enchin knew nothing of T.907 while writing KSSH. As Enchin's only work devoted exclusively to the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, KSSH, despite its brevity (it is composed of no more than 1,000 characters), not only contains a number of sentences and ideas that have parallels in T.907, but also seems to have referred (at least three times) to a text that must have looked like T.907. First, in reporting the instructions he received from Faquan 法全, Enchin emphasizes six points, five of which echo sentences in T.907:

- (i) two sentences describing Prabhūtaratna's role in selecting from the *Darijing* and *Jin'gangding jing* five Sanskrit syllables (A, Vam, Ram, Hum, Kham), which are said to bring about immeasurable, indescribable merits (BZ.27.985b2-5; T.907.18.915a17-20);
- (ii) a sentence to the effect that reciting the five syllables once equals reciting the whole *Tripitaka* one million times (BZ.27.985b6-7; T.907.18.915b24);
- (iii) a correlation between the five syllables and the five buddhas in five directions (BZ.27.985b7; T.907.915a12-15);
- (iv) a correlation between the five syllables and five kinds of social or natural phenomena (BZ.27.985b7-10; T.907.18.915a8-12);
- (v) the identification of the five syllables as the "*dhāraṇī* for the *dharmakāya*" (BZ.27.985b11; T.907.18.915c29-b1).

45. For the way T.907 correlates the three *dhāraṇīs* with three kinds of *siddhis* and three buddha-bodies, see T.907.18.915b9-c29, "The following three *dhāraṇīs* [corresponding to] the three kinds of attainment ... A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na (this is the *dhāraṇī* for the lower rank of attainment) is called the 'attainment of emerging' ... A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham (this is the *dhāraṇī* for the middle rank of attainment) ... called the 'attainment of entering' ... A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham (this is the higher rank of attainment) ... (is) also called the 'attainment of accomplishment' ... Among these three kinds of attainment, the 'attainment of emerging' [corresponds to] the attainment of 'transformation-body' (*nirmānakāya*); the 'attainment of entering' [corresponds to] that of 'retribution-body' (*sambhogakāya*); the 'attainment of mystery' [corresponds to] that of *dharmakāya*".

The fact that five of Faquan's instructions to Enchin have parallels in T.907 might at first seem to suggest that these points is based on T.907 itself or on some very similar textual source. However, if Faquan did have such a text in mind when offering Enchin these five points of instruction, we would expect him to refer Enchin to that text, just as he did when he spoke of the "two buddhas" and referred Enchin to the Esoteric texts belonging to the "two divisions" (*ryōbu* 兩部).⁴⁶ Furthermore, Enchin attributes these points to Faquan, not to any textual source. Had Enchin known that these points were derived from a text, we may assume that he would have referred the readers directly to the textual source, instead of merely observing that these points were imparted to him by Faquan (see BZ.27.985b11-12).

Second, at first glance it may seem that Enchin refers to T.907 in KSSH in his description of a *yōshō* 要抄 collection possessed by Ninchū, one of Saichō's most trusted disciples (BZ.27.985b13-17). According to Enchin's description, this collection not only contains several sentences that are virtually identical to those found in T.907, it also defines the Indian notion of *siddhi*, as does T.907, in terms of "emerging", "entering" and "accomplishment". These parallels might suggest that this *yōshō* collection may have been T.907 or one of the two texts derived from it. Nonetheless, the following three reasons make it difficult, if not impossible, to identify the *yōshō* with either T.907, T.905 or T.906. Firstly, according to Enchin, Ninchū's collection includes the *dhāraṇīs* corresponding to the "three-bodies". This comment probably refers to the threefold correlation between the "three buddha-bodies" and the three five-syllable *dhāraṇīs*, a threefold correlation of the kind Enchin found carved on a pillar at a temple in Luoyang (cf. BZ.27.985a 9-12). Yet T.907 and its two derivative texts do not include a correlation between the "three buddha-bodies" and the triple five-syllable *dhāraṇīs*. Secondly, in his brief description of that *yōshō*, Enchin mentions the three kinds of *siddhis* and three *dhāraṇīs* for the three buddha-bodies

46. With regard to the "two buddhas", Faquan is said to have told Enchin:

As for the two buddhas, they are completely discussed in the various sūtras belonging to the "Two Divisions". For this reason, I say nothing about them. You can understand them by yourself (BZ.27.985b11-12).

Here, Faquan did not speak specifically about the "two buddhas" on the assumption that Enchin could consult the various sūtras affiliated to the "Two Divisions" (referring to the Esoteric texts affiliated with the *Darījīng* and the *Jin'gangding jīng*), in which the topic of "two buddhas" is treated in detail.

but, remarkably, says nothing about the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure of correlating the three *siddhis* with the three *dhāraṇīs*. The most important element of a text like T.907 for Enchin, as the author of the KSSH, would have been the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure itself, which forms the central theme of his treatise. Therefore, had this *yōshō* been T.907, Enchin, in referring to it, would not have left the *sanshushicchi hō* unmentioned. Thirdly, if Nichū, who died in 824, already knew T.907, how could Enchin have been ignorant of this important text six decades later (882) and been forced to ask his former teachers in China for the textual support of the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure (see below).

Finally, in KSSH Enchin refers to an one-fascicle tract, the *Sanshushicchi hō*, which, he says, was translated anonymously. Since the three *siddhi* texts (T.905 in particular) are sometimes known as *Sanshu shicchi hō*, one might argue that Enchin was referring to one of them. However, the translation of the three *siddhi* texts is attributed to Śubhākarasīrṃha. If the *Sanshushicchi hō* was T.907 or one of its derivatives, the translator of the *Sanshushicchi hō* would have been known. Moreover, as Enchin himself states in KSSH, the teachings contained in the *Sanshushicchi hō* do not agree with the ideas Enchin expounded in KSSH. Since a comparison of KSSH with T.905, T.906 and T.907 reveals a general agreement, the tract *Sanshu shicchi hō* does not correspond to any of the three *siddhi* texts. I would suggest that this text, the *Sanshushicchi hō* mentioned in KSSH, may be another text, the *Qingjing fashen Biluzhe'na xindi famen chengjiu yiqie tuoluoni sanzongxidi* 清淨法身毘盧遮那心地法門成就一切陀羅尼三種悉地 (T.899).⁴⁷

47. That the *Sanshushicchi hō* mentioned in KSSH might have referred to T.899 is based on the following considerations. As it is preserved in the *Taishō Tripiṭaka*, T.899 is in one fascicle and its translator is unidentified. Further, it is true that except for its threefold classification of the notion *xidi / sicchi*, T.899 bears almost nothing in common with the three *siddhi* texts or KSSH. All these are consistent with Enchin's description of this text called "Sanshushicchi hō". More importantly, an postscript attached to T.899 (T.899.18.781b15) identifies T.899 with a text, titled "Da Biluzhe'na sanzongxidi fa" 大毘盧遮那三種悉地法, which is included in the Buddhist bibliography compiled by Jōgyō 常曉 (?-866), one of the eight *nittō hakke* 入唐八家 pilgrims (for the inclusion of the *Da Biluzhe'na sanzongxidi fa* in Jōgyō's bibliography, see T.2163.55.1070a3). If this identification is justifiable (as I believe), T.899 was also known by a title very close to "Sanzongxidi fa" (Jp. "Sanshu sicchi hō"). Finally, Jōgyō submitted his bibliography to the court in Shōwa 承和 6 (839) (see T.2163.55.1069a13). This means that T.899 had already found its way to Japan by 839, and therefore could easily have been accessible to Enchin when he wrote KSSH, which was written

In summary, KSSH does contain several elements that are also found in T.907. However, a close examination reveals that two of these elements were attributed by Enchin himself to (i) oral instruction imparted to him by one of his Chinese teachers or (ii) a *yōshō* collection treasured by Ninchū, which cannot be identified as T.907. The text which Enchin mentions in KSSH by the title “Sanshu shicchi hō” also cannot be identified as T.907 or either of its two derivative texts. None of these three apparent citations in fact refers to T.907 and therefore none of them can establish Enchin’s knowledge of T.907.

On the contrary, a close examination of KSSH reveals that Enchin was not aware of T.907 when he wrote KSSH. In KSSH, Enchin tries to identify the canonical sources for the triple five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* corresponding to the three ranks of attainment (BZ.27.985a13-18). He traces the first two sets of triple *dhāraṇīs* (correlated with, respectively, higher and intermediate ranks of attainment) to two chapters in the *Darijing*, and traces the third set to a scroll in the *Jin’gangding jing*, referred to as the *Jin’ganddingjing Manshushili Pusa wuzi xintuoluoni pin* 金剛頂經曼殊師利菩薩五字心陀羅尼品 (T.1173) (BZ.27.985a13-18). Yet, in speaking of the canonical sources for the three *dhāraṇīs*, Enchin remains remarkably silent on T.907, which would have been a much better canonical source for the three *dhāraṇīs* than the two chapters in the *Darijing* and the one chapter in the *Jin’gangding jing* (the *Darijing* and *Jin’gangding jing* each contain only one or two of the three groups of five-syllable *dhāraṇīs*, while all three *dhāraṇīs*, as well as their correlations to the three kinds of attainment, are included in T.907). Thus, we may assume that Enchin, who did refer to the *Darijing* and *Jin’gangding jing* as the scriptural sources for the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, would have referred in KSSH to T.907 for the same purpose had he known of this text.

I have argued that the very existence of KSSH and Enchin’s failure to refer to T.907 in this treatise establish Enchin’s ignorance of T.907 during the period when KSSH was composed. This is confirmed not only by an analysis of the text of KSSH itself but also by evidence outside the text. Most significantly, it is likely that KSSH was written sometime around 873 and yet evidence suggests that at least as late as 882 Enchin had not yet read any of the three *siddhi* texts.

no earlier than 871 (we know this for KSSH referring to an official document which was dated to Jōgan 貞觀 13 (871), see BZ.27.986a3).

Since Enchin himself failed to date KSSH, the actual period of composition is open to speculation. However, evidence indicates that it was probably written in, or slightly later than, the year 873. In that year, Enchin submitted a petition to the court on the fourteenth day of the second month, Jōgan 15 (873), proposing that the title of *ajari* 阿奢梨 (Skt. *ācārya*) be awarded to Henjō 遍昭 (BZ.28.1326b4-1327a3). His petition was soon approved. Moreover, according to Enchin's chronicle, the *Chishō daishi nenpu* 智証大師年譜 (compiled in 1467),⁴⁸ at the ceremony of awarding the *ajari* title to Henjō, which was held on the ninth day of the ninth month in Jōgan 15 (873), Enchin also transmitted to Henjō the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure (BZ.28.1291a13-14; cf. BZ.28.1327c). In addition, Annen 安然 reports that Henjō, after receiving the transmission, continually inquired about the existence of any scriptural source for the procedure.⁴⁹ Some Japanese scholars have suggested that Henjō's request for a scriptural source may have prompted Enchin to write KSSH (BKD 3: 136). Since Henjō received his *ajari* title and was initiated into the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure in 873, it seems likely that KSSH was written circa 873.

That Enchin did not know of T.907 until 882 is deduced from the fact that as late as 882, Enchin was still searching for the scriptural source for the three *dhāraṇīs* and their correlation to the three ranks of attainment or the three buddha-bodies. According to Enchin's Chronicle and a letter entitled "Jō Chierin sanzō sho" 上智慧輪三藏書 (A letter to *Tripiṭaka* Chierin,⁵⁰ BZ.28.1336-9), in the seventh month of Genkei 元慶 6 (882) Enchin wrote to Zhihuilun 智慧輪 to ask for instruction on questions that he confessed had long perplexed him. With this letter, Enchin sent to Zhihuilun a list of questions, referred to as "Kishū" 疑集 (A collection of questions) in the letter. In this list, which is now preserved as *Kimon* 疑問 (Questions) in the *Chishō Daishi zenshū* 智証大師全集, we find the following question:

48. *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* (A complete dictionary of the Buddhist texts, hereafter BKD; ed. ONO Gemmyō, 12 vols., Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 1932-36) 8: 8.
49. For Annen's report of Henjō's attitude toward the threefold attainment, see my discussion in the next section.
50. Ch. Zhihuilun; Skt. Prajñācakra, one of Enchin's previous Esoteric masters in China, whose brief biography is found in the *Song gaosengzhuān* 宋高僧傳 (Biographies of eminent monks [compiled in] the Song Dynasty; T.2061.50. 723a4-12).

A Vi Ra Hum Kham (the body of dharma)
 A Vam Ram Hum Kham (the body of retribution)
 A Ra Pa Ca Na (the body of transformation)

On the wall of the Tiangongsi 天宮寺 temple in the Eastern Capital [of China] (i.e. Luoyang 洛陽) was carved [a statement to the effect that these three groups of five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* are the *dhāraṇīs* for the [buddha's] "three bodies" (*trikāya*). *On which scripture is this saying based? It is also said that [these three groups of] dhāraṇī correspond to the three ranks of attainment. Does this have any canonical support? If there is any unmistakable [scriptural] support, please show its source in detail and take the trouble to teach me* (BZ.27.1033a5-8; emphasis added).

This question centres on the scriptural source for the threefold *dhāraṇī*-body (or *dhāraṇī-siddhi*) correlation. The existence of this question suggests that at least as late as 882 Enchin had not read T.907 or its derivatives, since T.907, which correlates the three *dhāraṇīs* to the three buddha-bodies (cf. note <45>), would have been just the sort of scriptural source for which Enchin was looking. Had Enchin known of T.907, it would not have been necessary to write to Zhihuilun on this matter. Therefore, we must conclude that Enchin was unaware of T.907 and thus unable to quote from it when he wrote KSSH around 873 (nine years prior to 882).

How, then, should the textual parallels between his KSSH and T.907 be interpreted? As a rule, textual parallels between two texts can be explained by one of these two hypotheses: either (i) both texts borrow from a third source, or (ii) one text borrows from the other. The first hypothesis is not applicable to the textual parallels in T.907 and KSSH. As noted above, a majority of the textual parallels in T.907 and KSSH are credited by Enchin to the oral instruction he received from Faquan. Since it is likely that Faquan himself did not consult scripture or any other source for these instructions, the textual parallels in T.907 and KSSH should properly be explained by the second hypothesis.

As argued above, Enchin was not aware of a text like T.907 when he wrote KSSH; therefore, T.907 could not have been Enchin's source for the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure. The sentences and ideas shared by KSSH and T.907 must have been taken from KSSH by the author of T.907. The ideas in T.907 that have parallels in KSSH must have been based on knowledge of KSSH. Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that Enchin's KSSH was ever transmitted to a country outside Japan where Chinese was also used, such as China or Korea. If T.907 used KSSH as a textual source, then T.907 must have been manufactured in Japan.

The Japanese origin of T.907 is also suggested by its use of several lines from the *Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon* 念持真言理觀啟白文. An explanation of the principle and contemplation of the *dhāraṇī*-reciting) attributed to Kūkai. This text contains the following eight lines:

All of the Tathāgatas
 [possess] wisdom-water like the sweet dew;
 All the Buddhas of the “three times”
 [possess] wonderful medicines like the finest cream.
 With one syllable entering into the [five] viscera,
 [the practitioners] become immune to every kind of illness.
 [they are able to] attain immediately
 the empty and tranquil buddha-body.⁵¹

A passage in T.907 closely resembles this eight-line section of Kūkai’s work:

The *dhāraṇīs* for the five-section as listed in the right are the pearl-liquid made of the *sweet dew* of “non-production” (*anutpādatva*) which comes from *all the Tathāgatas, the wonderful medicines of the finest cream* of the buddha-nature. *With one syllable entering into the five viscera, [the practitioner] will become immune to any kind of illness.* Even more for those who practice the contemplation of sun, that of moon. [They are able to] *immediately attain the empty and tranquil buddha-body* (T.907.18.915a26-29; emphasis added).

As has been suggested by MISAKI, it is very unlikely that either Saichō or Kūkai ever knew anything of T.907 (cf. note <43>). Therefore, the appearance of these sentences, which are so similar to the lines in Kūkai’s text, in T.907 strongly suggests that these sentences were written on the basis of Kūkai’s text. As far as we know, as with Enchin’s KSSH, Kūkai’s *Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon* never found its way to any East-Asian country other than Japan (e.g. China or Korea) where Chinese was also used. This implies that T.907 was composed in Japan, either by Enchin or by someone else who had not only the incentive to create a text like T.907 but also the opportunity to read Enchin’s KSSH and Kūkai’s text.

Is it possible that T.907 was composed by Enchin himself? Enchin was clearly in great need of a text like T.907 which could be used as a decisive rebuttal to the challenge that the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, as depicted in one of Saichō’s *fuōmons*, was not grounded in the canon. However, the proposition that Enchin may have authored T.907 seems

51. *Kōbō Daishi zenshū* 弘法大師全集 (A complete collection of the works by Kōbō Daishi [Kūkai]), 5 vols., HASE Hoshu et al. eds. (Kyōto: Yoshikawa Kobunkan 1910) 5: 95.

irreconcilable with the existence of his KSSH. Had Enchin written T.907 before KSSH, KSSH would no longer have been necessary. T.907 would have already presented scriptural support for the threefold *dhāraṇī-siddhi* correlation. Had he created T.907 after the composition of KSSH, he would not have done so *unless and until* he had succeeded in keeping KSSH from circulation (the best way, of course, would have been to destroy it), since it would have been to his tremendous disadvantage to have left behind a work so close to and therefore so strongly reminiscent of a text which he had composed in the name of Śubhākarasīmha. Therefore, the similarities between T.907 and KSSH strongly suggest that Enchin had no role in the forgery of T.907. This further suggests that T.907 was written by a Tendai monk other than and most likely after Enchin (obviously it would be safer and more convenient to forge a scripture, based on a contemporary's work, after the person's death). Consequently, we can conclude that T.907 was in part based on Enchin's KSSH; but, that it was not written by Enchin but appeared in Japan after Enchin's death in 891.

If Enchin was not the author of T.907, then who was? One natural candidate is Annen (841-?), another great Tendai scholar-monk who was born approximately 30 years after Enchin. It is thanks to Annen that a text that can be identified as T.907 was "discovered" and made known to the world for the first time. In the sixth fascicle of his seven-fascicle work, the *Taizōkai daihō taijuki* 胎藏界大法對授記 (A record of face-to-face transmissions of the great procedures belonging to the Matrix-realm [line of Esoteric Buddhism]; T.2390; hereafter TDT), Annen referred to a text called "Sonshō hajigoku hō" 尊勝破地獄法:

In addition, during the time Konpon Daishi 根本大師 of Mount Hiei (i.e. Saichō) stayed in Tang China, Ācārya Shunxiao transmitted to him the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, the seal and document of which are preserved in the *Kenkairon engi*. [The document] says, Am-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham (the higher rank of attainment), A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham (the intermediate rank of attainment), A-Ra-Pa-Sa-Na (the lower rank of attainment). The *mudrā* for the cultivation [of the procedure] is not included [in the document]. Ācārya Chin (i.e. Enchin) said, "The great Master transmitted [the procedure] to Kōchi 廣智, who transmitted [it] to Tokuen 徳圓; Tokuen transmitted [it] to [me], Enchin." Enchin transmitted it to the Great ācārya, i.e. the Gonsōjō 權僧正,⁵² who often doubted the existence of the methods [for securing the "three ranks of attainment"]. *Recently, I discovered*

52. The *gonsōjō*, a high-ranking monastic post second only to the *sōjō* 僧正 (the highest monastic official supervising the Buddhist order), here refers to Henjō, who was promoted to that position in 868.

a copy of the text called *Sonshō hajigoku hō* containing the three groups of *dhāraṇī* corresponding to the three kinds of attainment, which are close to those taught by Ācārya Shunxiao. The text reads, “A-Ra-Pa-Ca-Na (which is called the “attainment of Emerging”), A-Vi-Ra-Hum-Kham (which is called the “attainment of Entering”), A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham (which is called the “attainment of Mystery”, also called “the attainment of accomplishment” and “wonderful attainment” [Skt. *susiddhi*]). A-Vam-Ram-Hum-Kham, which are illustrated as the five sections, five buddhas, five wheels, the [five] contemplations of earth, lotus, sun, moon and space, are also called the “*dhāraṇī* for the dharma-body” (T.2390.75.98b1-12; emphasis added).

Annen suggests that, as far as he knows, he is the first to discover the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*, which contains the peculiar form of estoteric teaching that Shunxiao had allegedly transmitted to Saichō. Although all three *siddhi* texts have been known as the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*, the specific use of this title by Annen and his quotations from this text establish that he is referring neither to T.905 nor to T.906, but to T.907.

First, of the three *siddhi* texts, T.905 is the only one whose title does not contain the term “Sonshō” 尊勝, one of the two core components of the title by which Annen refers to the text. Also, T.906 and T.907 are both known by the alternate title, “Bucchō sonshō shin hajigoku hō” 佛頂尊勝心破地獄法 (T.906.18.914b20, T.907.18.915c12), which is close to Annen’s “Sonshō hajigoku hō”. In contrast, the alternate title for T.905 is “Sanshushicchi himitsu shingon hō” 三種悉地祕密真言法, which is totally different from “Sonshō hajigoku hō”. Therefore, judging from the titles, the text Annen refers to as the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* in TDT could be T.906 or T.907, but is probably not T.905.

An analysis of the quotation Annen took from the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* reveals its source. According to the quotation, in this *Sonshō hajigoku hō* the five Sanskrit syllables are correlated with the “five sections”, “five buddhas”, “five wheels” and the five contemplations centring on the earth, lotus, sun, moon and space. Annen also identifies the “five syllables” as the “*dhāraṇīs* for the dharma-body”. In T.907 the “five syllables” are first correlated to the “five buddhas” (915a12-15), and then to the “five sections/wheels” and “five contemplations” (cf. 912a 23-26). This corresponds with Annen’s quotation precisely. In T.906, the “five syllables” are correlated not only with the “five Buddhas” (912b21-24), “five sections”, “five wheels”, and “five contemplations” (912c17-21), but also with “five shapes” (square, full-moon-like [i.e. round], triangular, half-moon-like [i.e. semi-circular], full-moon) and “five colours” (yellow, white, red, black, and colour of all colours [i.e.

green]) (912c17-21). T.905 goes farther. One of its major sections is devoted to the correlation of the “five syllables” to a series of fivefold categories (both Buddhist Esoteric and Taoist), in addition to “five Buddhas”, “five sections”, “five wheels”, and “five contemplations” (see T.905.18.909c7-910b25). Furthermore, as reported by Annen, in the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* the five syllables were further identified as the “*dhāraṇī* for the dharma-body” *after* they had been correlated with the “five sections”, “five wheels” and “five contemplations”. This is completely consistent with T.907 but not T.906. In T.907, it is only *after* those fivefold correlations are made that the five syllables are further identified as the “*dhāraṇī* for dharma-body” (915a29-b1). In the case of T.906, the identification of the “five syllables” as the “*dhāraṇī* for dharma-body” is made, however, several lines *before* those correlations are introduced (912c7-8). Therefore, the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* as mentioned in Annen’s work is not T.906, but T.907.

Since TDT not only refers to but also quotes from T.907, it would seem to provide the *terminus ante quem* of T.907. Unfortunately, TDT is undated. It is necessary to examine other sources in order to date T.907. Another of Annen’s works, a bibliography of Esoteric Buddhist works called “*Sho ajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku*” 諸阿闍梨真言密教部類惣錄 (A complete bibliography of various *dhāraṇī* esoteric [works brought back from China by] the [Japanese] *Ācāryas*; T.2176)⁵³ proves useful in this matter. The *Hakke hiroku* 八家秘錄 records a one-fascicle text called “*Sonshō hajigoku darani giki*” 尊勝破地獄陀羅尼儀軌 (The procedure of the utmost wonderful *dhāraṇīs* for destroying hell). The

53. This bibliography is better known as *Hakke hiroku* 八家秘錄 (A secret bibliography [based on the bibliographies by] the eight masters). It was initially compiled in 885 and revised in 902. One edition of the *Hakke hiroku* dates the revision to the seventh day of the fifth month, Engi 延喜 2 [902] (T.2176.55. 114a16), while the other dates it to the third day of the third month, Ninna 1 [885] (footnote [1], T.2176. 55.1114), barely four months after the first version of the bibliography was finished. In view of the volume and importance of the bibliography, it is very unlikely that Annen had decided to redo the bibliography so soon after its initial completion. The latter dating is therefore less tenable (cf. CHEN’s dissertation: 172-73). The “eight esoteric bibliographies” that Annen used in compiling his own bibliography refer to the eight Japanese Esoteric masters who, travelling to study in Tang China, were known as the *nittō hakke*: (i) Saichō (767-822), (ii) Kūkai (774-835), (iii) Jōgyō (?-864), (iv) Engyō 圓行 (799-852), (v) Ennin (794-864), (vi) Eun 慧運 (798-869), (vii) Enchin (814-891), and (viii) Shūei 宗叡 (809-884).

interlinear note appended to this entry indicates that this text is also alternately known as *Sanshu shicchi hō* (T.2176.55. 1117a17). It is also noteworthy that in the bibliography Annen follows this *Sonshō hajigoku darani giki* with another one-fascicle text entitled “*Sanshushicchi fuhō*” 三種悉地付法 (The dharma-transmission of the threefold attainment; T.2176.55.1117a18), which the interlinear note corresponding to this entry identifies as Saichō’s *fuhōmon* included in the *Kenkairon engi* attributed to Saichō (T.2176.55. 1117a18).

Evidence shows that the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* quoted in Annen’s TDT and the *Sonshō hajigoku darani hō* recorded in his bibliography are one and the same text, specifically, T.907.⁵⁴ This affirms that T.907 was already recorded in the *Hakke hiroku*, either in its 885 edition or in the revised version finished in 902. As argued above, T.907 was most likely composed after 891. Therefore, T.907 was not recorded in the 885 draft of the *Hakke hiroku* but was added to the revision in 902. This means that T.907 appeared in Japan no later than 902. Consequently, I conclude that T.907 was written in Japan between 891 and 902.

Although it is not possible to establish the authorship of T.907 irrefutably, it seems likely that the author of T.907 was Annen. Annen is the first to have reported the existence of T.907. As we know, Annen was the most prominent Taimitsu representative after Enchin and Henjō. Like Enchin, Annen may have been motivated to legitimize the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure with authoritative textual sources. As a result, he had a motive to forge a text such as T.907, thus providing scriptural support for the practice of correlating the triple five-syllable *dhāraṇīs* to the three kinds/ranks of attainment. Finally, Annen apparently had access to Enchin’s KSSH, which includes the oral instructions from Faquan to Enchin. It would have been quite easy for Annen to write a text containing the main points of Faquan’s instructions and then to make public the “discovery” of the text.

Here, one or two words about the polemical agenda underlying the composition of T.907 seem appropriate. I think the above arguments establish that T.907 was manufactured in Japan to authenticate the Esoteric tradition attributed to Saichō in general and the *sanshushicchi*

54. First, the two titles are nearly identical. Second, both texts are closely connected to Saichō’s *fuhōmon*. In TDT, Annen uses the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* as a scriptural source for the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, exactly the core of Saichō’s *fuhōmon*, while the *Hakke hiroku* places the *Sonshō hajigoku darani hō* side by side with Saichō’s *fuhōmon*.

hō procedure depicted in one of his *fuḥōmons* in particular. This is clear not only because T.907, along with its two affiliated texts (T.905 and T.906), presents the only known textual support for the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, but also because its “discovery” was proclaimed at an occasion when its “discoverer” (if not “inventor”) Annen was pre-occupied with locating the scriptural source for that peculiar esoteric procedure. Finally, the strong polemical motives implied in KSSH,⁵⁵ the most basic

55. Note, for example, the following statement in KSSH:

“This [procedure] is recorded in the “official certificate” (*kanchō*) [which authorized the conferment of the title of] *ācārya* in the thirteenth year of the Jōgan period (872). Those who, out of their ignorance, slander my master will be guilty of a crime punishable by death. Driven by a deep pity for them, I hereby offer the irrefutable evidence [for the authenticity of the *sanshushicchi hō*]. I hope my purpose [of writing this treatise] can be understood by those who have a sense of shame” (BZ.27.986a3-5).

This statement suggests that at the time Enchin wrote KSSH Saichō was accused of having transmitted to Japan some esoteric teachings lacking scriptural support. As Enchin himself explains here, his motive in writing this treatise was precisely to convince those who slandered Saichō that Saichō’s esoteric transmission has canonical support.

In addition, another short treatise by Enchin which is closely connected with KSSH, the *Kyōji ryōbu hiyōgi* 教示兩部秘要記 (An explanation of the esoteric, fundamental teachings related to the two divisions [of esoteric teachings]; hereafter KRHG; BZ.28.1087-8), also tries to justify the Taimitsu lineage as depicted in Saichō’s *fuḥōmon*:

Śubhākarasīnha from India transmitted it, Master Yilin in China passed it on, and Dharma-master Shunxiao taught it to [Master] Eizan (i.e. Saichō). Thus, although the three countries (India, China and Japan) are geographically separated, the essence of the “One-vehicle” is nonetheless communicable. The sūtras and teachings, transmitted from masters to disciples, become illustrious. [The transmission of teachings] is clearly recorded in the official certificates. But there are some persons who insisted that these syllables, not found in the *Jin’gangding jing*, do not have scriptural support. They are exactly like those who, regarding themselves as infallible while always blaming others, end up by incurring losses to themselves. Why? The two sūtras do contain some passages which unambiguously [support the authenticity of these *dhāraṇas*]. Unable to reach the truth, one has no right to blame others (BZ.28.1087b3-8)

The lineage under discussion here is precisely identical with that described in Saichō’s two *fuḥōmons*. It is clear that the legitimacy of this Taimitsu lineage, along with the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, had been severely attacked by some Japanese Buddhists.

source for T.907, make explicit the sectarian purpose of such texts. T.907 was composed to pass as an esoteric scripture, which, since it contains the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, the Tendai monk hoped could be used to counter the attack on this essential teaching transmitted within the Tendai school.

Thus, we arrive at the following conclusion with regard to the provenance and date of T.907: T.907 was written in Japan, probably by Annen, between 891 and 902 on the basis of several texts,⁵⁶ including Enchin's KSSH, for the purpose of legitimizing the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure Saichō is said to have brought back to Japan from China.

II. C. The Provenance and Dates of T.905 and T.906

In the previous section I argued for the Japanese origin of T.907. If I am correct, T.905 and T.906, as two texts derived from T.907, must also have been composed in Japan. In this section, I will show that, even without resorting to my conclusion on the provenance of T.907, there is sufficient evidence to establish the Japanese origin of at least T.905 (if not of T.906 as well) independently.

As noted in section II. A, T.905 was enlarged on the basis of T.907. In addition to those passages that were taken directly from T.907, T.905 contains two substantial sections not found in T.907.⁵⁷ The first section

56. The author of T.907 made much use of *Darijing* and its sole Chinese commentary by Yixing 一行 (683-727) (*Darijing shu* 大日經疏, T.1796), which was held to be an authoritative text by almost every Esoteric Buddhist tradition in East-Asia. One *Darijing* passage (T.848.18.20a17-19) was quoted in T.907 (T.907.18.915b14-16). Two lines from a *gāthā* in the *Darijing* (T.848.18.45a8) were used to begin the single *gāthā* in T.907 (T.907.18.915b18). A whole passage in T.907 (T.907.18.915b7-8) is derived from Yixing's commentary (T.1796.39.609c8-9). Further, the title of T.907 is closely connected with that of the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經 (T.967). Some ideas propounded in this sūtra were also incorporated in T.907 (CHEN's dissertation: 183). Finally, as noted above, several lines from the *Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon* by Kūkai were included in T.907, though in a prose form.

57. Although mainly composed of these two major sections and T.907, T.905 contains a brief passage (T.905.18.911a2-4) quoted from the *Suxidi jieluo jing* (cf. T.893.18.603c6-8) and a long passage (T.905.18.911a5-11), which was written on the basis of several passages from two esoteric sūtras, the *Jin'gangding chaosheng sanjie jing shuo Wenshu wuzi zhenyan shengxiang* 金剛頂超勝三界經說文殊五字真言勝相 (The excellent appearances of Mañjuśrī's five-syllable *dhāraṇī*, as preached in the *Jin'gangding chaosheng sanjie jing*; T.1172; cf. T.1172.20.709a18, 709a19-21, 709b27-28, 709b28-29, 709b29-c1) and the *Jin'gangding jing Manshushili Pusa wuzi xintuoluonipin* (The chapter about

is found near the beginning of T.905 (T.905.18.909c7-910b25). Probably written largely by the author himself, this section includes five sentences (T.905.18.909c7-9, 909c24-27, 18.910a8-9, 910a19-21, 910b5-6) with parallels in KRHG (cf. BZ.28.1087a8-9, 1087a10-11, 1087a12, 1087a13-14, 1087a15-16).⁵⁸ The second section is found at the end of T.905 (T.905.18.911a27-912a27). This long section, with the exception of one passage (in 911b4-6), can be divided into two groups: (i) fourteen passages copied from Yixing's *Darijing* commentary⁵⁹ and

Mañjuśrī's five-syllable heart-*dhāraṇī* preached in the *Jin'gangding jing*; T.1173; cf. T.1173.20.710a17-19).

58. In addition, it is remarkable that several passages in the famous Chinese Buddhist apocryphon, the *Tiweipoli jing* 提謂波利經 (The book of Trapuṣa and Bhallika), were also used in this section of T.905 (cf. T.905.18.909c15-16, 910a15-16, 910a29-b2; for their *Tiweipoli jing* parallels, see MAKITA Tairyō, *Gikyō no kenkyū* [A study of Buddhist apocrypha], Kyōto: Jimbun kagaku kenkyūsho 1977, p.178).
59. As was noted above, the three *siddhi* texts contain a number of esoteric ideas which did not become popular for a long time after the death of Śubhākarasimha and Yixing. Therefore, I assume that the three *siddhi* texts were written after Śubhākarasimha and Yixing and that the 14 passages in T.905 which have parallels in Yixing's commentary must have been borrowed from Yixing's commentary. In accordance with the ways they are related to Yixing's commentary, these 14 passages can be divided into the following four groups:
- (i) seven passages (found in [1] 911b1-4, [2] 911b6-10, [3] 911b14-18, [4] 911b20-22, [5] 911b22-23, [6] 911c5-6, [7] 912a8-18), which were directly taken from the following seven passages in Yixing's commentary: (1) T.1796.39.656a17-20, (2) 623a6-10, (3) 653b1-4, (4) 705c27-29, (5) 706b13-15, (6) 706a7-11, and (7) 647b2-14;
 - (ii) two passages (911b18-21, 911c24-26) which are almost directly quoted from Yixing's commentary with only some slight adaptations (cf. 750a15-18; 788a13-15);
 - (iii) four passages which resulted from the combination of two or more passages in Yixing's commentary: (1) the T.905 passage in 911b10-13 was based on two passages in the commentary (cf. 746a4 and 666b16-19); (2) the T.905 passage in 911b23-c5 was based on the following three passages in the commentary: 666b19-25, 631b2-5 and 789a27-b3; (3) the T.905 passage in 911c10-24 was written on the basis of the following two long passages in Yixing's commentary: 788a25-b14 and 788b14-23; (4) the T.905 passage in 912a5-7 was based on the following five sentences from the commentary: 586b21, 586c23, 587b7, 586c18-19, and 586b15-16.
 - (iv) one passage (911c6-10) which can be regarded as a summary of a long passage in Yixing's commentary (cf. 787c25-788a12).

(ii) five passages⁶⁰ paralleled in three of Enchin's works, specifically, KRHG, the *Zashiki* 雜私記 (The miscellaneous, personal notes; hereafter ZSK; BZ.27.977-984), and the *Daibirushana jōdōkyō shinmoku* 大毘盧遮那成道經心目 (The heart and eyes of the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*; hereafter DKSM; BZ.26.648-655). In addition, the author of T.905 also inserted two sentences (T.905.18.911a2, 911a25-26), parallels to which are found in KRHG (cf. BZ.28.1087a4, 1087b2-3), into sections taken from T.907. Thus, T.905 shares a total of seven sentences and five passages with three of Enchin's works. How should we understand these textual parallels?

There are only two possible explanations for the textual parallels between T.905 and Enchin's works: either both Enchin and the T.905 author owe these textual parallels to a third source, or one of them copied from the other. The first explanation being very unlikely,⁶¹ the textual parallels between T.905 and Enchin's works must be understood by means of the assumption that one text borrowed from the other.

We can determine the identity of the textual borrower if we can rule out the possibility that Enchin knew anything of T.905 when he wrote these three works. Since we know that as late as 882 Enchin knew nothing of the three *siddhi* texts (among which is T.905), to try to date

60. These five passages are found in (i) T.905.18.911a27-b1 (KRHG parallel in BZ.28.1087a17-b2), (ii) 911c26-912a3 (ZSK parallel in BZ.27.980a10-13), (iii) 912a3-5 (its three component sentences have their parallels in DKSM [BZ.26.652b8, 653a4, 653a8]), (iv) 912a18-22 (two sentences of which find their parallels in DKSM [BZ.26.652a15, 650a5-6]), and (v) 912a21-27 (KRHG parallel in BZ.28.1087b8-1088a4).

61. The author of T.905, in writing/compiling its concluding section, makes frequent reference to Yixing's commentary. Consequently, had these passages been quoted from a third source, it is likely that they would have quoted from Yixing's commentary. Yet these passages are not included in Yixing's commentary and cannot have been derived from this source. Furthermore, neither Enchin nor T.905 acknowledges that these passages were taken from a third source. However, it is the following fact that makes the existence of a third source for these passages extremely unlikely: T.905 and KRHG share two identical passages and seven sentences. In view of the brevity of both T.905 and KRHG (T.905 is of no more than 4,400 characters, while the KRHG contains barely 800 characters), it is very unlikely that the two texts *happened* to agree in quoting so many virtually identical passages from a third source. The only reasonable explanation must be that one of them copied these passages from the other. Similarly, the remaining three passages shared by T.905 and Enchin's works can also be explained by this hypothesis.

these three works seems to be a good strategy to determine whether or not Enchin has quoted from T.905. If the three works (or even one of them) can be shown to have been composed before 882, then we can conclude that Enchin could not have used T.905 in writing these works.

The ZSK passage that is paralleled by one passage in T.905 is dated by Enchin himself to the twenty-fourth day of the twelfth month, Jōgan 4 (872) (BZ.27.981a7). In other words, this ZSK passage was written precisely one decade before 882. According to the postscript at the end of DKSM, Enchin wrote DKSM while staying at the Monastery of Shitennōji on Mt. Jōzan 上城 in the Prefecture of Chinzei 鎮宰, following his visit to Mt. Tiantai (BZ.26.654b17-655a2). This implies that DKSM was written shortly after Enchin returned from China in 858, almost a quarter of a century before 882. We have no reliable evidence with which to date KRHG, which Enchin himself failed to date. Nonetheless, this treatise is closely related to KSSH and seems to have been written around the same time, that is, around 873, almost one decade before 882 (cf. BKD 3: 136).

Thus, at least two (i.e. ZSK and DKSM) of Enchin's three works, which share textual parallels with T.905, were composed before 882. Therefore, we can say with confidence that the three passages in T.905 whose parallels were found in these two works by Enchin were either taken directly from, or re-written on the basis of, Enchin's works. As for KRHG, though its dating as proposed here is far from certain, we have evidence to show that Enchin's students ascribed one passage shared by T.905 and KRHG to Enchin, rather than to Śubhākarasīṃha, the alleged translator of T.905.⁶² This suggests that at the time of editing this posthumous work of Enchin, his disciples were still unfamiliar with T.905. Otherwise, they would certainly have hesitated to collect into their master's *Zakki* a passage which could also be found in a sūtra putatively translated by Śubhākarasīṃha. At the very least, they would have noted that this passage is also found in T.905. This also supports the

62. The T.905 passage in 912a21-27, paralleling one KRHG passage in BZ.28.1087b8-1088a4, was included in Enchin's *Zakki* 雜記 (The miscellany, BZ.28.1116a7-15), which was probably edited by Enchin's disciples after his death. Presumably, this *Zakki* includes Enchin's occasional remarks, lectures, and comments which seemed important to his disciples. In this short collection, the passage is marked as Enchin's (who was called *sannō* 山王, the "mountain-king" [Enchin once served as the abbot of the Sannōin 山王院 monastery on Mount Hiei]).

view that Enchin never read T.905. Otherwise, given the importance of this text, it is extremely unlikely that Enchin would have failed to refer his students to it.

We are thereby able to conclude that when Enchin wrote the three works which share a number of textual parallels with T.905, he knew nothing of T.905 and therefore could not have quoted from T.905. All the passages in T.905 that appear in Enchin's works must have been taken from Enchin's works, and not *vice versa*. In other words, T.905, like T.907, was also composed in Japan, where a borrowing from Enchin's works could have occurred.

Now we turn to T.906. A close textual analysis of T.906 reveals that it is composed on the basis of the following seven sources: the first is, needless to say, T.907; the second is two passages in Yixing's commentary;⁶³ the third is several passages that can be found in an Esoteric text translated by Bukong (T.1056) and a work by Annen as well (i.e. the *Kongōkai daihō taijuki* 金剛界大法對授記 [A record of face-to-face transmissions of the great procedures belonging to the Diamond-realm [line of Esoteric Buddhism]; T.2391; hereafter KDT]);⁶⁴ the fourth is one passage that is found exclusively in KDT;⁶⁵ the fifth is a passage that is probably taken from another *kongōkai* text – T.878;⁶⁶ the sixth is several sentences from one of Zhiyi's commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*;⁶⁷ and the seventh is several passages probably written by the author of T.906 himself.⁶⁸

A key to unravelling the provenance of T.906 is provided by the textual parallels shared by T.906 and Annen's KDT. It is possible either

63. T.906.18.912c17-24, for the parallel in Yixing's commentary, see T.1796.39.586b11-13; 727c8-23.

64. T.906.18.912c25-913a2, its T.1056 parallels in T.1056.20.75a11-19; T.906.913a2-12, for its parallels in T.1056 and KDT, see T.1056.20.75a19-22, T.2391.75.139c24-29.

65. T.906.18.913a12-18, its KDT parallel is found in T.2391.20.139c29-140a8.

66. T.906.18.913a18-b3, its parallel in T.878 is found in T.878.18.336a3-c12.

67. T.906.18.913c27-29, for the original text in Zhiyi's work, see T.1777.38.553a20-21

68. These passages include (i) a large passage (T.906.18.912c23-913b25) describing a *maṇḍala*-like picture, in which several syllables are transformed into a number of images characterizing a buddha-field peopled by Mahāvairocana-buddha and his companions; (ii) T.906.18.913b4-8; (iii) T.906.18.914a1-b11, in which the tri-chiliocosm is classified into three ranks and some characteristic ideas of *hajigoku* are propounded.

that (i) KDT borrowed the passage from T.906, or (ii) T.906 took this passage from KDT. The second assumption is closer to the truth, because Annen, as I will show below, had not read T.905 by the time he wrote KDT.⁶⁹ If this is true, T.906 was not only based on T.907 but also drew from one of Annen's works, which attests to the Tendai origin of T.906.⁷⁰

Having determined the Japanese origin of T.905 and T.906, let us attempt to determine how closely we can approximate their dates. It is remarkable that Annen mentioned neither T.905 nor T.906 in his *Hakke hiroku* and TDT, although he did mention in both of them a text that I have identified as T.907. As noted above, in referring to or quoting from T.907 in TDT or the *Hakke hiroku*, Annen was pre-occupied with canonical support for the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure in Saichō's *fuhō-mon*. Without doubt, the existence of two esoteric texts like T.905 and T.906 would have considerably strengthened his claim that the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure was supported by scripture. In view of this, had Annen known of T.905 or T.906, we may assume that he would have referred the reader to the two texts in his TDT and *Hakke hiroku*, as he did with T.907. Thus, Annen's failure to mention T.905 or T.906 in TDT or *Hakke hiroku* suggests that he did not know the two texts when he composed/compiled TDT/*Hakke hiroku*.

Considering Annen's rare erudition and the likelihood that he would have appreciated the significance of T.905 and T.906 had they come to his attention, Annen's ignorance of T.905 and T.906 in 902, the year he

69. As is to be discussed below, Annen did not know T.905 and T.906 when he wrote TDT. Given the similar form and nature of TDT and KDT, the two works must have been written at approximately the same time. Thus, there is little chance that Annen had read T.906 by the time of writing KDT, let alone used it in his KDT. Here, I confess to the speculative nature of this dating of KDT and Annen's connection with T.906. Fortunately, we have more reliable evidence to establish that T.905 and T.906 were composed by other people who lived after Annen. As noted in section II. A, the author of T.905 or T.906, in dividing G.907 into two *gāthas*, erroneously separated several lines of G.907 which are devoted to the same theme and therefore cannot be read separately. This would mean that the author of T.905 or T.906 is unlikely to have been the author of this *gātha* in T.907, who probably was Annen. In other words, T.905 or T.906 was very unlikely to have been written by Annen. Furthermore, T.905 or T.906 was prepared on the basis of T.907. Therefore, T.905 and T.906 were prepared in Japan after Annen.

70. Another piece of evidence for its Tendai origin is its use of one of Zhiyi's commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*.

finished revising the *Hakke hiroku*, suggests that T.905 and T.906 did not exist at that time. Thus, the year 902 can be tentatively set as the *terminus post quem* for the composition of T.905 and T.906.

The *terminus ante quem* of T.905 and T.906 can be determined with reference to the *Shijūjō ketsu* 四十帖訣 (T.2408, Forty chapters of instructions), compiled by a Tendai monk called Chōen 長宴 (1016-1081). According to the *Shijūjō ketsu*, Chōen's teacher Kōgei 皇慶 (977-1049) remarked:

A different version of the *Sonshō hajigoku* says, "The 'dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom' is also called the body of retribution" (and so forth). This passage is consistent [with what I said here]. It calls the "dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom" the "principal [retribution]" (*shō[hō]* 正[法]), implying that the object and wisdom correspond with each other in a mysterious way (T.2408.75.871c29-872a2).

This remark, which Chōen dates to the twenty-third day of the seventh month of Eishō 永承 2 (1047) (T.2408.75.870c19), provides an important clue for setting the *terminus ante quem* of T.905. Of the three *siddhi* texts, T.905 is the only text containing the phrase, "The 'dharmakāya-as-the-wisdom' is also called the body of retribution", quoted by Kōgei in the *Shijūjō ketsu* (T.905.18.909c27-28). Therefore, T.905 was known to Kōgei in 1047. Hence, this year can be established as the *terminus ante quem* of T.905, and T.905 must have been composed in Japan some time between 902 and 1047.

The same *Shijūjō ketsu* also records a comment Kōgei is alleged to have made in the fourth month of Chōkyū 長久 3 (i.e. 1042) on a text called "Sonshōhajigoku hō" 尊勝破地獄法. The comment reads:

The master [Kōgei] says: "The five wheels are exactly the five wisdoms and five buddhas, just as [it is discussed] in the *Sonshō hajigoku hō*" (and so forth). [This comment was] made in the fourth month of Chōkyū 3 (T.2408.75. 827a18-19).

Judging by the title alone, the *Sonshō hajigoku hō* may be any of our three *siddhi* texts. However, since of the three *siddhi* texts only T.906 correlates the five wheels with five wisdoms and five buddhas (T.906. 18.912c17-21), this text called "Sonshō hajigoku hō" must have been T.906. T.906 was, then, known to a Tendai monk by 1042. Thus, the year 1042 can be given as the *terminus ante quem* for the composition of T.906, and T.906 must have been composed in Japan some time between 902 and 1042.

This part has examined the origins of three Esoteric Buddhist texts that are preserved in the *Taishō Tripitaka* under the numbers 905, 906 and 907. With regard to the provenance of these three *siddhi* texts, Japanese

scholars, rejecting the traditional view of ascribing all of them to Śubhākarasīmha, have unanimously concluded that they were composed in China. Compelling textual evidence, however, shows that the three *siddhi* texts were all composed in Japan. I have in this part established the *terminus post quem* and *terminus ante quem* of the three *siddhi* texts as follows: (1) T.907: 891-902; (2) T.905: 902-1047; (3) T.906: 902-1042. On the basis of the textual evidence currently at our disposal, Annen is the most likely candidate for the authorship of T.907, the earliest of the three *siddhi* texts.

In this part I have also discussed the textual sources of these three *siddhi* texts. T.907 was based mainly on Enchin's KSSH, which was written to legitimize the esoteric teachings and lineage as described in a dharma-transmission certificate (*fuhōmon*) attributed to Saichō. The author of T.907 availed himself of the *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing*, *Darijing*, Yixing's commentary on the sūtra and most strikingly, a text attributed to Kūkai (*Nenchi shingon rikan keibyakumon*). The formation of T.907 can be shown as follows:

Ketsu sanshushichi hō (Enchin) + *Foding zunsheng tuoluoni jing* (T.967) + *Darijing* (T.848) + *Darijing shu* (Yixing)(T.1796) + *Nenchi rikan Keibyakumon* (Kūkai) ==> T.907

In contrast to T.907, the formation of T.905 and T.906 prove to be relatively complicated. Apart from T.907, which was wholly reproduced in T.905, three treatises by Enchin, Yixing's *Darijing* commentary, several esoteric sūtras (including the prestigious *Suxidi jieluo jing*), and finally, an early Chinese Buddhist apocryphon, the *Tiweipoli jing*, which exerted a sustained influence on Chinese Buddhism, were used in the composition of T.905. The formation of T.905 can be outlined as follows:

T.907 + Enchin (*Kyōji ryōbu hiyōgi*, *Dai Birushana jōdōkyō shinmoku*, *Zashiki*) + Yixing (*Darijing shu*) + T.1141 (*Cishi Pusa lue-xiu yujia niansongfa*) + T.1172 (*Jin'gangding chaoshengsanjiejing shuo Wenshu wuzi zhenyan shengxiang*) + T.1173 (*Jin'gangding jing Wenshushili Pusa wuzi xintuoluoni pin*) + T.893 (*Suxidi jieluo jing*) + *Tiweipoli jing* ==> T.905

T.906 is strongly influenced by *kongōkai* works. The author of T.906 used at least two passages from a work by Annen concerning the

kongōkai-line teachings and practices transmitted in the Tendai esoteric tradition. Incorporated into T.906 were also several passages from some *kongōkai*-related sūtras, such as T.878 and T.1056. Interestingly, the author of T.906 also included passages from one of Zhiyi's commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, the *Weimojing xuanshu* 維摩經玄疏. Thus, the formation of T.906 can be summarized as follows:

T.907 + Annen (*Kongōkai daihō taijuki*) + T.878 (*Jin'gangding jing jin'gangjie dadaochang Biluzhe'na Rulai zishouyongshen neizhengzhi juanshu foshenyimingfo zuishangcheng mimi sanmodi lizanwen* 金剛頂經金剛界大道場毗盧遮那如來自受用身內証智眷屬佛身異名佛最上乘秘密三摩地禮贊文) + T.1056 (*Jin'gangding yujia qianshou qianyan Guanzizai Pusa xiuxing yigui jing* 金剛頂瑜珈千手千眼觀自在菩薩脩行儀軌經) + T.1777 (*Weimojing xuanshu*) ==> T.906

It is important to recognize the polemical context within which the three *siddhi* texts were composed. An “international” dharma-transmitting lineage, first proposed in a *fuhōmon* attributed to Saichō (i.e. the Bishamondō MS) and then maintained by the whole Tendai tradition, connects Saichō and other Tendai patriarchs with the celebrated Indian Esoteric Buddhist master Śubhākarasimha. According to this *fuhōmon*, Saichō was linked to Śubhākarasimha through a monk called Yilin (whom this *fuhōmon* describes as a leading disciple of Śubhākarasimha) and his disciple – Shunxiao, Saichō's putative Esoteric mentor in China. In the Post-Saichō Tendai school this “international” dharma-transmission was promoted so enthusiastically that the legitimacy of the whole Tendai tradition became heavily dependent on it. This, however, presented the Tendai school with a problem: the threefold *dhāraṇī*-attainment correlation (better known as *sanshushicchi hō*), which occupied a central place in the Esoteric teachings attributed to Saichō, had no known scriptural support. Without scriptural support, the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure, the “international” dharma-transmission, and thus, the foundations of the Tendai esoteric tradition were open to question. The existence of the canonical source for the *sanshushicchi hō* procedure was even doubted by some eminent Tendai leaders themselves. Some non-Tendai monks openly accused Tendai of lacking any scriptural support for the fundamental Esoteric teachings attributed to Saichō. I have tried to show in this part that T.907, as well as two affiliated texts (T.905 and T.906), were written in Japan in order to rebut this allegation.

Conclusions

This article consists of a critical study of the formation of early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism (also known as “Taimitsu”) in early Heian Japan. It focuses on one aspect of the sectarian and polemical environment in which Taimitsu was created and developed into a significant presence in Japanese religious life. The polemic environment under discussion in this article was characterized by a fierce and protracted sectarian controversy between Tendai and Shingon over the orthodoxy of the esoteric tradition allegedly brought back to Japan from China by Saichō, the founding patriarch of the Tendai school.

I began with an investigation of how Saichō and his followers responded to the challenge which was mainly posed by their rivals, the Shingon monks. Shingon monks questioned the authenticity of the Tendai esoteric tradition. We find that at the outset Saichō suggested in his *Esshūroku* bibliography that the initiation he received from Shunxiao was close to a *kongōkai* transmission. However, in his late years when he defended in the *Kenkairon* his Buddhist transmissions from China, Saichō reinterpreted his initiation from Shunxiao as composed of a dual transmission (i.e. *taizōkai* and *kongōkai*).

After Saichō died in 822, his immediate and/or second-generation disciples, who were eager to create a full-fledged Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism capable of competing with Shingon, attempted to legitimate and develop the esoteric tradition in the name of their master. Their effort in this regard is evidenced in a series of documents which were either left by Saichō himself and seriously altered by them, or prepared by them independently within the two to four decades after their master’s demise.

A so-called “court edict” was first forged, or altered, in order to glorify Shunxiao, Saichō’s chief Esoteric mentor in China. Then, a “dharma-transmission certificate” (*fuhōmon*) was forged in order to establish formally the historical reality of the esoteric initiation Saichō received from Shunxiao on the one hand, and to incorporate Saichō into a prestigious lineage starting from Śubhākarasimha on the other. Subsequently, probably immediately after Ennin returned from China, a document was deliberately prepared within the Tendai circle as a second *fuhōmon* from Shunxiao. This new *fuhōmon* is of great significance not merely for its reinterpretation of Saichō’s initiation from Shunxiao, but also for its implicit claim that Saichō was initiated into an esoteric tradition which was composed of a triple esoteric transmission (the *soshicchi*

in addition to *taizōkai*, *kongōkai*) and therefore superior to the dual esoteric transmission Kūkai received from China. Finally, as the scriptural support for the peculiar Esoteric teachings in terms of which Saichō's initiation was reinterpreted in this new *fuhōmon*, three *siddhi* texts were composed successively by Tendai monks. The great Tendai scholar-monk Annen was very likely the author of T.907, which I have proved to be the earliest of the three *siddhi* texts.

The conclusions at which this article arrives undercut the historical validity of the traditional view of the establishment of the Tendai form of Esoteric Buddhism in Japan. However, it is my hope that these negative conclusions can be turned into a positive agenda for future research. Now that we know that most of the documents regarding Saichō's esoteric transmissions were composed sometime after Saichō's death and in the course of the evolution of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism, we can begin a more focused historical investigation of this process. Scholars can turn from a fruitless search for the roots of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism in China to a closer look at Japan.

In addition, I hope that this article might draw more scholarly attention to a host of Buddhist apocrypha which, with their Indian origin denied, have long been regarded as Chinese but which might have been produced in Japan or Korea.

As I show in part two, there exists ample evidence suggesting the Japanese origin of the three *siddhi* texts. Unfortunately, some unfounded assumptions have prevented scholars working on the three *siddhi* texts from carefully assessing the relevant evidence. They have accepted almost without hesitation that China is the sole possible source for any allegedly Buddhist scriptures whose Indian origin became, in one way or another, discredited. This practice has been recently challenged by Robert BUSWELL, who argues for the Korean origin of a Buddhist apocryphon, the *Jin'gang sanmei jing* 金剛三昧經 (Kor. *Kumgang sammaê-kyōng*; Jp. *Kongō sanmai kyō*; Skt. *Vajrasamādhisūtra*), which, he argues, was written in Korea but also circulated in China, and exerted an enormous influence on Chinese Buddhism, particularly the formation of Chan ideology.⁷¹

71. Robert BUSWELL, *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: Vajrasamādhī Sūtra, A Buddhist Apocryphon*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1989).

BUSWELL's research underscores, on the one hand, the necessity of reevaluating the "international" role the Chinese language had played for a long period in the evolution of East Asian civilization. On the other, by re-identifying as Korean a Buddhist apocryphon which has been long accepted as Chinese, BUSWELL's work calls for a re-appraisal of the contributions non-Chinese East Asian people (who once used Chinese) have made to East Asian civilization. It reminds us that not all textual sources in Chinese were necessarily written by Chinese and in China. I hope that this article will contribute to this important reevaluation.