

Jichihan and the Restoration and Innovation of Buddhist Practice

Marc BUIJNSTERS

The various developments in doctrinal thought and practice during the Insei and Kamakura periods remain one of the most intensively researched fields in the study of Japanese Buddhism. Two of these developments concern the attempts to restore the observance of traditional Buddhist ethics, and the problem of how Pure Land tenets could be inserted into the esoteric teaching. A pivotal role in both developments has been attributed to the late-Heian monk Jichihan, who was lauded by the renowned Keron scholar-monk Gyōnen as “the restorer of the traditional precepts” and patriarch of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism.” At first glance, available sources such as Jichihan’s biographies hardly seem to justify these praises. Several newly discovered texts and a more extensive use of various historical sources, however, should make it possible to provide us with a much more accurate and complete picture of Jichihan’s contribution to the restoration and innovation of Buddhist practice.

Keywords: Jichihan — esoteric Pure Land thought — Buddhist reform — Buddhist precepts

AS WAS NOT UNUSUAL in the late Heian period, the retired Regent-Chancellor Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078–1162) renounced the world at the age of sixty-three and received his first Buddhist ordination, thus entering religious life. At this ceremony the priest Jichihan officiated as Teacher of the Precepts (*kaishi* 戒師; *Kōfukuji ryaku nendaiki* 興福寺略年代記, Hōen 6/10/2). Fujiwara no Yōrinaga 藤原頼長 (1120–1156), Tadazane’s son who was to be remembered as “The Wicked Minister of the Left” for his role in the Hōgen Insurrection (1156), occasionally mentions in his diary that he had the same Jichihan perform esoteric rituals in order to recover from a chronic illness, achieve longevity, and extinguish his sins (*Taiki* 台記 Kōji 1/8/6, 2/2/22; Ten’yō 1/6/10). Although a fair number of his public perform-

ances have been recorded, it remains rather obscure what contemporaries thought of the late Heian monk Jichihan 実範 (ca. 1089–1144),¹ founder of the Nakanokawa temple 中川寺 and of the branch in the Shingon school that bears the same name. The fact that he never held a position of importance in the clerical hierarchy, that his biographies are extremely succinct, and that quite a few of the works attributed to him seem to have been lost, not only creates the impression that much of his thought was opaque, but also inclines one to think that it was mediocre.

A fair number of renowned monks from the Kamakura period (1185–1333), whose religious background varied considerably, however, convey an entirely different image. The *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釋書 (p. 135b), composed in 1322, describes the history of Buddhism in Japan and contains Jichihan's oldest biography; it mentions that the famous Hossō priest Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1213) praised his *Daikyōyōgishō* 大經要義鈔, an extensive commentary on one of the fundamental esoteric scriptures, the *Dainichikyō* 大日經. The Taimitsu monk Shūra 秀邏 (n.d.), on the other hand, criticized Jichihan's view on Tendai esoteric Buddhism in the same commentary, because Jichihan rejected Enchin's 円珍 (814–891) and Annen's 安然 (841–915?) objections against Kūkai's 空海 (774–835) classification system (*kyōhan* 教判).² The renowned Kegon scholar monk Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321) showered Jichihan with exuberant praise and considered him both the restorer of the traditional precepts (*kaihō chūkō* 戒法中興; *Risshū gyōkanshō* 律宗瓊鑑章, p. 18b), and one of the six patriarchs (*so* 祖) or sages (*tetsu* 哲) of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism (*Jōdo hōmon genryūshō* 淨土法門源流章, p. 196a). The founder of the Japanese Pure Land school, Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212), is claimed to have said that Jichihan instructed him in the precepts (*Enkō daishi gyōjō ezū yokusan* 圓光大師行狀畫圖翼贊, p. 144; TANAKA 1912, pp. 939–48).³ Finally, Shingon priests such as Kakuban 覚鑁 (1095–1143), Dōhan 道範 (1178–1252),

¹ His name is also pronounced as “Jippan” or “Jitsuhan”. I have followed Nakano Tatsue in his explanation that in the Shingon school the name 実範 is read as “Jichihan” (NAKANO 1934, p. 286).

² Although this commentary, considered to be his magnum opus, has played a rather significant role in the controversy between the Shingon and esoteric Tendai schools about Kūkai's classification system, it has hardly received any attention in the various studies on Jichihan. The only exception is the article by SHISHIŌ Enshin, who concludes that although Jichihan ardently defended Kūkai's point of view, his interpretation of Enchin's and Annen's arguments was erroneous (1930). According to the *Mikkyō daijiten*, Shūra belonged to the Hōman-ryū 法曼流, one of the fifteen Taimitsu branches. Jichihan's brother, Sōjitsu, is considered the founder of this branch.

³ This claim is clearly a fabrication. When Jichihan passed away in 1144, Hōnen was only 12 years old and his religious career at Hieizan had yet to start.

and Raiyu 頼瑜 (1226–1304) each acknowledged the value of Jichihan's esoteric Pure Land thought.

A more recent appraisal of Jichihan comes from Kuroda Toshio. In his much acclaimed works on medieval Japanese religion, Kuroda argues that, contrary to the prevailing view, medieval religious life was not dominated by the ideologies of the newly founded Kamakura schools, which he characterized as marginal and heterodox currents (*itan-ha* 異端派), but by the ideological system of the already existing Nara and Heian schools. As a whole he calls this the exoteric-esoteric system (*kenmitsu taisei* 顕密体制), which he designates as the orthodox movement (*seitō-ha* 正統派). In between these two groups, he distinguishes a group of reformers whose ideas and activities did not cross the boundaries of orthodox thought (*kaikaku-ha* 改革派). KURODA considers Jichihan, on account of the efforts he made to restore the observance of the traditional precepts (*kairitsu fukkō* 戒律復興), as one of the earliest representatives of this reformist group (1994, pp. 212, 243).

Nevertheless, sobriquets like “restorer of the traditional precepts” and “patriarch of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism” require further explanation. As for the first sobriquet, until recently only two of Jichihan's works were known in which he described the initiation in the Buddhist precepts: the *Tōdaiji kaidan-in jukai shiki* 東大寺戒壇院受戒式 (T. 74, no. 2350; hereafter *Tōdaiji shiki*) and the *Shukke jukaihō* 出家受戒法 (NDKS 3, no. 316). Since these works are manuals in which Jichihan mainly relied on commentaries of former times, they hardly tell us anything about his own *kairitsu* thought. There is a rather miraculous tale in most of Jichihan's biographies about his initiation in and subsequent propagation of the traditional precepts, but the credibility of the tale has been doubted by modern scholars (ŌYA 1928a, p. 236). This lack of substantial sources compels us to question whether the claim of Jichihan being the “restorer of the traditional precepts” can be justified. Besides, one could also wonder if the miraculous tale in Jichihan's biographies really should be dismissed as a complete fabrication. Through an analysis of the postscript to the *Tōdaiji shiki*, a review of the *Jubosatsukaihō* 受菩薩戒法 and the *Fusatsu yōmon* 布薩要文, two newly published manuscripts on the precepts (KODERA 1978, 1979), as well as an examination of several related historical sources, I hope to shed some light on these problems.

The lack in quantity of materials has made it difficult to determine on what grounds Jichihan could have been considered “a patriarch of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism.” One of the first Japanese catalogues that enumerated the scriptures, commentaries, and annotations on Amida and the Pure Land was the *Jōdo ehyō kyōronshōsho mokuroku*

浄土依憑經論章疏目錄 (DBZ-SGZ 96, no. 907), which was compiled by the Jōdo priest Chōsai 長西 (1184–1266). In this catalogue, six titles are attributed to Jichihan (pp. 143–50), but only one of these seems to be still extant: the *Byōchū shugyōki* 病中修行記. In this work Jichihan explains how one's final moments should be used to secure rebirth in a Pure Land, but the alleged ambiguities in the way he expressed himself or in the doctrinal points of view he took, have contributed to a variety of opinions among modern scholars about whether his Pure Land thought belonged to the Tendai or Shingon tradition, and whether the *Byōchū shugyōki* contained any innovative elements. Fortunately, two of Jichihan's Pure Land works have been rediscovered (SATŌ 1956, 1965, 1972), while fragments of two previously unknown works are quoted in the writings of several Shingon and Jōdo priests. This extension of textual sources provides the opportunity to sketch a clearer picture of the development of Jichihan's Pure Land thought and to find an explanation for the reason why he was called "a patriarch of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism."

Jichihan's Personal Background and Training

Although none of Jichihan's biographies, nor any other source, mentions the year in which he was born, it is possible to make a fairly accurate guess. The *Genkō shakusho* informs us that Jichihan was the fourth child of Councillor Fujiwara no Akizane 藤原顯実 (1049–1110). The *Sonpi bunmyaku* 尊卑分脈 (Compilation of genealogies) confirms that Akizane had six sons, of which the fourth one was Jichihan (p. 12). The third son, Sōjitsu 相実, was a Tendai scholar monk who, at the age of 78, passed away in 1165, which implies that he was born in 1088. Because there is no indication whatsoever that Sōjitsu and Jichihan were twins, nor that they were born from a different mother, Jichihan must have been born after 1088, probably the following year or the one thereafter (SATŌ 1965, p. 23). This would fit the date of his first known public performance. In the first month of 1110, Jichihan participated as an assistant in the *Goshichinichi no mishuhō* 後七日御修法, a yearly ceremony at the imperial palace that was held for the health of the emperor and peace of the country (*Kakuzenshō* 覺禪鈔, Tennin 3/1/8). Jichihan's task as Protector of the Relics (*sharimori* 舍利守) was of minor importance and one befitting a twenty-year-old priest (KUSHIDA 1975, p. 117).

Jichihan first entered Kōfuku-ji 興福寺, where he was instructed in the teachings of the Hossō school. The *Genkō shakusho* mentions that his first teacher was the Shingon priest Genkaku 嚴覚 (1056–1121) of Daigo-ji 醍醐寺, from whom he received the abhiṣeka initiation (*denbō*

kanjō 伝法灌頂) in 1116. The sequence of first studying in Kōfuku-ji followed by this abhiṣeka initiation, however, is incomplete. This is sustained by the fact that some four years before, Jichihan had founded the Nakanokawa temple, which implies that in 1116 he already must have been an initiated Shingon priest. Jichihan's abhiṣeka initiation is also recorded in the *Kechimyaku ruijūki* 血脈類集記 (Record of methodologically classified transmissions of the teaching), in which it is confirmed that at that time Jichihan already was an initiated disciple of Kyōshin 教真 (?–1126?), a resident of Kōmyō-ji 光明寺 (p. 102). Kyōshin was a disciple of Meizan 明算 (1021–1106) of Mt. Kōya's Chūin 中院 branch. The *Kechimyaku* contains a chart of transmissions of this branch in which the teacher-disciple relationship between Kyōshin and Jichihan is confirmed as well (pp. 120, 350, 406). Nothing else is known about Kyōshin's residence in Kōmyō-ji, but this temple and its inhabitants were closely related to Jichihan's activities (SATŌ 1972, pp. 61–67; KUSHIDA 1975, pp. 135–43). There are, however, several sources that provide some additional information about the relationship between Kyōshin and Jichihan. The first part of the training of a Shingon monk contains the course on *shōmyō* 声明, in which the correct pronunciation of esoteric texts and the writing of *shittan* 悉曇, a style of Sanskrit used for the rendering of esoteric syllables, are taught. One of the *shōmyō* traditions in the Shingon school is named after Shūkan 宗観 (fl. 1144). The lineage of transmissions in this tradition shows that Shūkan received his initiation from Jichihan, while the latter was trained in it by Kyōshin. This corroborates once more the likelihood that Jichihan started his study of *mikkyō* with Kyōshin (ŌYA 1928a, pp. 248–51).

The year in which Jichihan was initiated by Kyōshin is not known, but the two are recorded to have met in the Ryūkō-in 龍光院 on Mt. Kōya, one of Kyōshin's other abodes:

The *ajari* Kyōshin of Mt. Kōya saw in a dream a golden *Kongōsatta*, who climbed the winding path to the supreme gate and entered his dwelling. When he awoke, he was excited and wondered if someone capable of learning the esoteric teaching would come to him. Then, this saint [Jichihan] came and told him that it was his wish to be instructed in the esoteric teaching. Thereupon he instructed him completely, without keeping back anything at all.

(*Shinzoku zakki mondōshō* 真俗雜記問答鈔, no. 24/29)

There is no substantial proof that Kyōshin influenced Jichihan's ideas either on the Buddhist precepts or on Amida and the Pure Land. The only indication that could point in the direction of the former is that

Kyōshin, too, was apparently involved in the study of the Buddhist rules of conduct. He wrote an abbreviated manual on the initiation in the bodhisattva-precepts (*Jubosatsukai ryakusahō* 授菩薩戒略作法), which still survives in a single manuscript (ISHIYAMADERA 1991, p. 450). Jichihan wrote about the bodhisattva-precepts as well, but a possible relation between their ideas remains uncertain, because the contents of Kyōshin's manual are as yet unknown.

More proof of influence can be found in the case of Jichihan's other Shingon teacher, Genkaku. Some of the details of Jichihan's esoteric Pure Land thought were recorded by the Shingon priest Raiyu. In his *Hishō mondō* 秘鈔問答 (Collected questions and answers on esoteric matters), he gives an account of Jichihan's initiation in Amida's fundamental mudra and mantra (*Amida konpon ingon* 阿弥陀根本印言) by Genkaku:

Initially, the saint Jichihan was someone of the Hossō school. Afterwards he relied on Shingon. At the occasion of his initiation in the fundamental mudra and mantra of Amida, he learned the oral transmission that [Amida's] mudra arouses the Buddha-natured lotus mind in one's state of illusions and defilements that cause the perpetual cycle of rebirth and death. Faith was engraved in his inmost heart and overwhelming joy remained in his body. Finally, he took Genkaku of the Kajūji as his teacher and he mastered a deep knowledge of the esoteric teaching. (T. 79.308c)

Even if this initiation meant the awakening of Jichihan's faith in Amida, which, as we will see, is dubious, this description still lacks details about its doctrinal contents. Amida's fundamental mudra and mantra are explained in the fourth chapter of the *Rishushaku* 理趣釈 (T. 19, no. 1003) and in the *Muryōju nyorai kangyō kuyō giki* 無量寿如来觀行供養儀軌 (T. 19, no. 930). One of Raiyu's contemporaries, however, provides some additional but puzzling information about Jichihan's initiation. In his *Dato hiketsushō* 駄都秘訣鈔, the Shingon priest Gahō 我宝 (?-1317) claims that during the ceremony, Genkaku referred to a phrase in the Medicine King chapter (*Yakuō bon* 藥王品) of the *Lotus Sūtra*, which he said corresponded to the meaning of Amida's fundamental mudra (p. 274). It is a mystery why Genkaku would have referred to this Medicine King chapter, because it is unrelated either to Amida or to the concept of mudra. The previously quoted *Hishō mondō* contains one other bit of relevant information about this initiation, which seems to be more credible:

Manual [on the Amida ritual] from [Jichihan of] Nakano-kawa: the meaning... of [A]mida's mudra and mantra are

according to the explanation transmitted by my teacher. It can be found in the *Rishushaku* et cetera. (T. 79.308c)

According to the *Genkō shakusho*, Jichihan also went to Myōken 明賢 (fl. 1098) from Yokawa 横川, with whom he studied the Tendai doctrines. At that time, Yokawa was a centre of Tendai Pure Land studies and there are strong indications that, initially, Jichihan's Pure Land thought was influenced by this teacher. The previously mentioned catalogue by Chōsai also includes three works that are attributed to Myōken, but none of them has been transmitted. One of these works bears the title *Ōjōron gonemon shigyōgi* 往生論五念門私行儀 (Personal manual on the fivefold practice leading to rebirth in the Pure Land [as explained] in the *Ōjōron*). One of the six works by Jichihan that are listed in the same catalogue is titled *Ōjōron gonemon gyōshiki* 往生論五念門行式. Although this work has not been transmitted either, the similarity between both titles suggests that Jichihan's work was written as a result of the instruction he had received from Myōken. As will be discussed hereafter, a newly discovered manuscript that bears the title *Nenbutsu shiki* 念仏式, contains an explanation of this fivefold practice and has been designated as a later copy of Jichihan's *Ōjōron gonemon gyōshiki*. The doctrinal thought in this manual is clearly based on Tendai Pure Land doctrines. The contents of Jichihan's remaining four works that are listed in Chōsai's catalogue are as yet unknown, but a glance at their titles suggests that they bear a strong Tendai influence as well.⁴

The origins of Amidist practices in the Tendai school can be traced to the *jōgyō zanmai* 常行三昧 (constant walking meditation), which is described in one of the school's basic texts, the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* 摩訶止観 (Jpn. *Makashikan*). Jichihan's biography in the *Shōdai senzai denki* 招提千歳伝記 is somewhat more specific about his study with Myōken and mentions that it contained the study of the [*Maka*] *shikan* (p. 245b).

The particulars of Myōken's life and works are largely unknown, but Fujiwara no Munetada 藤原宗忠 (1062–1141) occasionally mentions him in his diary, the *Chūyūki* 中右記. On one occasion he refers to an event in 1098 when, according to Munetada, Myōken was 73

⁴ The *Kanmuryōjyūkyō kamon* 観無量寿経科文 is probably based on a commentary on the *Kanmuryōjyūkyō* by either the Chinese Tendai patriarch Chih-i or the Chinese Pure Land master Shan-tao. The *Hanjuzanmaikyō kannen amida butsu* 般舟三昧経観念阿弥陀仏 is possibly a commentary on the *jōgyō zanmai* practice that is explained in the *Mo-ho chih-kuan*. The *Miken byakugōshū* 眉間白毫集 is most likely based on Genshin's *Amida butsu byakugō kan* 阿弥陀仏白毫観 and the corresponding part in his *Ōjōyōshū* (SATŌ 1972, p. 73). A manuscript of the *Rinjūyōmon* 臨終要文 seems to be still extant (KUSHIDA 1975, p. 169), but it is not clear if this text is based on Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū* (ŌTANI 1966, pp. 43–45), or that its contents are in the line of the *Byōchū shugyōki* (KUSHIDA 1975, p. 159).

years old (Jōtoku 2/8/27). This implies that when Jichihan received his initiation from Genkaku in 1116, Myōken would have been 91 years old. Although neither the year that Jichihan went to Yokawa, nor the year that Myōken passed away, have been recorded, it is rather implausible that Jichihan only started his study with Myōken when the latter would have been 91 years old. It is therefore safe to assume that Jichihan's initiation in Amida's fundamental mudra and mantra was preceded by his study of Tendai Pure Land doctrines with Myōken.

Altogether, three priests—Kyōshin, Myōken, and Genkaku—have been designated as Jichihan's teachers.⁵ Of these three, only Kyōshin was engaged in the study of the precepts. The contents of his only known work on this subject are as yet unknown, but the fact that both he and Jichihan wrote about the bodhisattva-precepts suggests a possible influence of the former on the latter. On the other hand, although Jichihan's biographies are mainly preoccupied with his involvement in the Buddhist precepts, they do not include one single word on Kyōshin.

There are strong indications that, through Myōken's tutelage, Jichihan's Pure Land thought was initially influenced by Tendai Pure Land doctrines. Of the six works that are listed in Chōsai's catalogue, five seem to be related to the Pure Land thought of Hieizan. Only the *Byōchū shugyōki* shows a development towards new ideas. Almost two decades before he wrote this work, Genkaku instructed him in the esoteric meaning of Amida.

Prosperity and Decay of the Traditional Precepts

After several failed attempts, the Chinese priest Chien-chen 鑑真 (Jpn. Ganjin 687–763) finally reached Japan in 754, where he founded the Japanese Ritsu school. The ideology of this school sets forth the monastic rules in four divisions (*shibunritsu* 四分律) and is based on the premise that the observance of the *sanjujōkai* 三聚淨戒 (the three ideals of a bodhisattva: keeping the precepts, practicing virtuous deeds, and displaying mercy to all sentient beings) forms the seed for the realization of Buddhahood. Ganjin erected the first ordination

⁵ Scholars have argued that either Hanjun 範俊 of Mandara-ji 曼荼羅寺 (1038–1112) or Hōgen 芳源 of Ninna-ji 仁和寺 (fl. 1096) could have been one of Jichihan's teachers (SATŌ 1972, p. 59; ŌTANI 1966, p. 55; KUSHIDA 1975, p. 123–26). There is no substantial evidence at all, however, to support these opinions. As Kushida has pointed out, Hanjun was already too ill in 1102 to perform the initiation of Genkaku. Besides, the *Kakuzenshō* remarks that at the time of the *Goshichinichi no mishuhō* in 1110, Hanjun was replaced by Genkaku as master of the ceremony because of the former's indisposition. There is a chart of transmissions of the teaching in which Jichihan is referred to as a disciple of Hōgen (NAKANO 1934, p. 288), but records that could support this alleged relationship are not available.

platform at Tōdai-ji 東大寺 and some time thereafter he was assigned to Tōshōdai-ji 唐招提寺, which had been built for the study of the Buddhist precepts.

These precepts consist of *kai* 戒 (Skt. *sīla*), which denote the rules for the prevention of evil deeds by one's body, speech, and mind; and of *ritsu* 律 (Skt. *vinaya*), which comprise the commandments for the restraint of all passions that delude one's mind. Together they form the stipulations that a fully-fledged male or female member of the Buddhist community (*biku*[*ni*] 比丘 [尼]) must observe. The number of *kai* and *ritsu* differed depending on whether one was a layman, a novice, or fully ordained, but a *biku* had to observe 250 commandments, while for a *bikuni* there were even 348 rules of conduct. Full ordination in the precepts (*gusokukai* 具足戒) had to be officiated by three Masters of the Precepts and witnessed by seven others (*sanshi shichishō* 三師七証).

After Ganjin's demise, the *kairitsu* tradition was carried on by Hōshin 法進 (709–778), Nyohō 如法 (?–815), and Buan 豐安 (?–840), but from the beginning of the Heian period onwards, the study of the precepts, and the ordination ceremony that went with it, gradually started to decline. A major reason for this development was the propagation of a different set of precepts by the founder of the Japanese Tendai school, Saichō 最澄 (767–822). This new set consisted of only 58 commandments, and it is easy to imagine that it was much more attractive to abide by a lesser number of rules. Saichō asked the court's permission to build an independent ordination platform, which caused a heated debate between Enryaku-ji 延暦寺 and the Nara schools. Some of the details of this debate will be discussed in the third section of this essay. Finally, the court decided to grant Saichō's request and the construction of the new ordination platform started shortly after his demise.

Not only the traditional *kairitsu* ordination fell into disuse; many sources give evidence that even the observance of the precepts as such began to deteriorate. The *Nihon sandai jitsuroku* 日本三代実録 (Veritable record of three generations [of emperors] in Japan) emphasizes that the ordination of the priest E'un 慧運 in the third month of 865 was still conducted in the old-fashioned way, but it also laments the fact that already many novices neglect their study, that they do not know the difference between observing and violating the precepts anymore, and that they dishonor both Masters of the Precepts and government officials (Jōgan 7/3/25). The most obvious examples of repeated violation of the precepts were, of course, the numerous conflicts between the armed monks (*sōhei* 僧兵) of the large monasteries. In the first year of Tenroku (970), the Tendai abbot Ryōgen 良源 (912–985) wrote a petition in which he observed that groups of

armed monks at Hieizan threatened the scholar priests and kept them from their studies. To stop this oppression, Ryōgen warned that it was forbidden for monks to wear arms, to conspire, or to kill sentient beings (*Tendai zasu Ryōgen kishō* 天台座主良源起請). In other cases, monks were accused of clandestine romances and even of marriage (*Kojidan* 古事談, p. 66; *Zoku honchō ōjōden* 続本朝往生伝, p. 25). The author of the *Mizu kagami* 水鏡, Nakayama Tadachika 中山忠親 (1131–1195), could not help complaining that the ignorance of the regulations was the reason that priests and laymen lately even wanted to drink saké (*Kirei mondō* 遺嶺問答, p. 449).

A full account of the degeneration process in the Ritsu school is recorded in Gyōnen's works on the history of this school:

The Ritsu school had its place in all of the seven large monasteries [of Nara], but during later generations this was gradually discontinued and the exposition [of the precepts] fell short. From the demise of Buan [in 840] until the reign of Emperor Sanjō [from 1011 to 1016], more than 170 years went by and in this period the observance of the precepts became little by little neglected and unpracticed. From that time until the reign of Emperor Toba [from 1107 to 1123], more than one hundred years passed by and in this period the observance of the precepts went out and they were no longer practiced.

(*Risshū gyōkanshō* 律宗瓊鑑章, p. 52)

Gyōnen also described the failing process of succession in the Ritsu school:

Since the high priest Ganjin transmitted the Buddhist precepts, the Preceptor has been considered the continuator of the Ritsu school.... This has been the case for a long time without interruption. The Ritsu school has been represented in the various temples, but since ancient times it has been [Tō]shōdai-ji that carried on [its tradition].... From the first year of Emperor Suzaku's reign [in 930] onwards, the Preceptors have resided in this temple, carried on the Ritsu tradition, and the school's continuity was uninterrupted and many-branched. The [Preceptors'] names and deeds, however, were not recorded, which makes it difficult to know who they were. Nevertheless, the study [of the precepts] continued and the school's successors followed each other. Since the year 931 until the first year of Emperor Toba's reign [in 1108], 178 years have passed, but the names of those who have continued the teaching are unknown.

(*Sangoku buppō denzū engi* 三国仏法伝通縁起, pp. 19–20)

In both works, Gyōnen leaves no doubt that it was because of Jichihan's efforts that this ongoing deterioration came to a halt. The various biographies of Jichihan contain two narratives, interrupted by a short interlude, in which his involvement in the restoration of the traditional precepts is described. In chronological order, these biographies tell the following story:

Jichihan was already studying the Hossō, Shingon, and Tendai teachings, but he lamented the fact that he was not able to find a Master of the Precepts who could initiate him in the monastic rules. In the year 1109 (*Tōshōdai-ji engi nukigaki ryakushū* 唐招提寺縁起拔書略集, p. 106b) or 1111 (*Shōdai senzai denki*, p. 275a), he went to the Kasuga 春日 Shrine to pray for an oracle. On the night of the seventh day he had an auspicious dream in which he saw pure water flowing through a brass pipe that led from Tōshōdai-ji to Nakanokawa. When he awoke, he thought the dream was a good omen. The next day he left for Tōshōdai-ji, but when he arrived he saw that its buildings were ruinous and uninhabited. Part of the temple compounds had been turned into cultivated fields and one low-ranking monk who had remained was plowing them. When Jichihan asked him if there were not any *biku* in the temple, the anonymous monk answered that, although he had not fully mastered them, the Preceptor Kaikō 戒光 once instructed him in the fundamental scriptures on the precepts.⁶ Thereupon they went into Ganjin's commemoration hall and at his request, Jichihan was ordained in the precepts. Afterwards, Jichihan went back to the Nakanokawa temple, where he started to lecture on the *kairitsu* and performed the ordination ceremony. As a result, the study of the precepts began to flourish again (*Genkō shakusho*, p. 135b).

When the building of the Jōshin-in 成身院, the main hall of the Nakanokawa temple, was finished, Jichihan went back to Tōshōdai-ji in the year 1116 and he asked the court's permission to make repairs. In the third month of the following year, thirty-eight monks, among them Gyōson 行尊 and Kakugyō 覺行, were ordained in the bodhisattva precepts at the Tōdai-ji ordination platform (*Tōshōdai-ji engi nukigaki ryakushū*, p. 106b; *Shōdai senzai denki*, p. 245c).

In the third year of Hōan 保安 (1122), during the Eight Lectures on the *Lotus Sūtra* (*Hokke hakkō* 法華八講) in the Kasuga Shrine, scholar monks were discussing the situation of the *kairitsu* study. They concluded that this study, traditionally a specialty of the assistant monks

⁶ The *Genkō shakusho* is the oldest source that mentions this anonymous monk. The *Shōdai senzai denki* is the only source that mentions both the anonymous monk and the Preceptor Kaikō as his teacher. In the *Tōshōdai-ji engi* and the *Denritsu zugenshū* the anonymous monk and the Preceptor Kaikō turn out to be the same person.

(*dōshu* 堂衆) who resided in the main halls of Kōfuku-ji and Tōdai-ji, had decayed and that for that reason the ordination at the Tōdai-ji platform had virtually come to a halt. They ventured the opinion that if a learned priest would be willing to study the tenets of the Ritsu school, the teaching of the precepts and the ordination of *biku* could become prosperous again. When the assistant monk Gonzai 欣西 of the Western Hall of Kōfuku-ji heard of this he decided that, because he knew of such a learned priest, he would pay a visit to Jichihan of the Nakanokawa temple. There he pleaded for his help to restore the study of the precepts. Jichihan complied with his request and in the eighth month of that year he wrote a manual on the ordination in the precepts (the *Tōdaiji shiki*). Afterwards, the tradition of the Ritsu school gradually began to prosper again (*Denritsu zugengeshū* 伝律図源解集, p. 311b; *Tōshōdaijige* 唐招提寺解, p. 151c).

The high priest Zōshun 藏俊 (1104–1180) of Kōfuku-ji studied the *kairitsu* under Jichihan and the tradition of the Ritsu school continued when Zōshun was ordained by him (*Rissū kōyō* 律宗綱要, p. 379; *Tōshōdaiji engi nukigaki ryakushū*, p. 106b).

This summarizes the story of Jichihan's contribution to the restoration of the *kairitsu* tradition according to his various biographies. The obvious question is, of course, to what extent the details of this story can be verified. Even more important is the question whether Jichihan's efforts really led to the restoration of the old *kairitsu* tradition.

Fact and Fiction in Jichihan's Biographies

The story of Jichihan's visit to Tōshōdai-ji and his subsequent ordination in the old *kairitsu* tradition by an anonymous monk is, in spite of its being recorded in his oldest biography, generally considered as fictional (ŌYA 1928a, p. 236). In fact, the history of the Ritsu school between the demise of the Ritsu priest Buan in 840 and Jichihan's time, seems like the proverbial terra incognita. It is not surprising, then, that not one single substantial fact can be found about the anonymous monk, or the Preceptor Kaikō, or their immediate predecessors. Still, this does not mean that this part of Jichihan's biography should be dismissed as pure nonsense. It can be argued on three points that it is very likely that Jichihan indeed visited Tōshōdai-ji in 1109 or 1111 to study the precepts.

The first point concerns the situation of Tōshōdai-ji at that time. One of the main arguments against the story in the *Genkō shakusho* and similar biographies has been that, if Tōshōdai-ji was in such a ruinous state, uninhabited and its grounds partly turned into rice

fields, the presence of a priest who could teach and ordain Jichihan in the precepts would be very unlikely. Another interpretation, however, is also possible. The description of Tōshōdai-ji and Gyōnen's account of the situation of the Ritsu school during the latter part of the Heian period could easily have been exaggerated in order to make the contrast with Jichihan's laudatory efforts even more outstanding. Presumably, the situation of Tōshōdai-ji had not deteriorated to the extent as suggested, nor did the place lack residents. Several sources support this argument. The *Honchō seiki* 本朝世紀 mentions that the annual lecture on the *Ninnōgyō* 仁王經 for the year 1099, which was intended as a prayer to end the turmoil in the country, was to be performed in twelve shrines and twelve temples. Among the names of the respective shrines and temples listed is Tōshōdai-ji (p. 304). A certain Ōe no Chikamichi 大江親通 made pilgrimages to the seven great monasteries of Nara both in 1106 and in 1140, of which he kept a personal record: the *Shichidaiji junrei shiki* 七大寺巡礼私記. One of his travels led him to Tōshōdai-ji, and he described its various temple halls and Buddhist images in great detail (NARA 1982, pp. 190–205).⁷ There is even a stronger indication that, at the time of Jichihan's supposed visit, Tōshōdai-ji was still operating. When the novice Genkai 源海 received his full ordination at the Tōdai-ji *kaidan-in* in 1109, this ceremony was officiated by the prescribed Ten Masters of the Precepts, one of them being the priest Hōjō 芳静 of Tōshōdai-ji (*Kongō-ji monjo* 金剛寺文書, Tennin 2/12/10).

The second argument that can be made concerns the chronology of Jichihan's whereabouts between 1109 (or 1111) and 1116, during which he may have visited Tōshōdai-ji. The *Genkō shakusho* mentions that, after his initiation, Jichihan returned to the Nakanokawa temple. The text continues with a description of this temple's foundation:

Initially, Jichihan lived in [Enjō-ji at] Ninjoku-san. Picking flowers he reached the fields and mountains of Nakanokawa. When he saw its superb environment he asked the court's permission to build a temple. He named it Jōshin-in. Afterwards he went back again to Tōshōdai-ji. (p. 135c)

If this sequence can be believed, Jichihan visited Tōshōdai-ji for the first time in either 1109 or 1111. Then he had the Jōshin-in built, after which he went back to Tōshōdai-ji in 1116. The next question is, of course, when the Jōshin-in, the main hall of the Nakanokawa temple,

⁷ In addition, there is also a tale in the *Konjaku monogatari-shū* 今昔物語集 (part 16, tale no. 39), which relates about the theft of a Kannon statue of Tōshōdai-ji. The *Konjaku monogatari-shū* was written shortly after 1106, but this tale cannot be dated.

was built. Unfortunately, documents about the financing of this temple hall or the court's permission to build it have not been preserved. The answer, however, can be found in a manuscript with the title *Shunka shūgetsu shōsō* 春華秋月抄草. In this work, which was written by the high priest Sōshō 宗性 (1202–1278) of Tōdai-ji, one chapter is dedicated to the commemoration of Jichihan:

In the third year of Ten'ei (1112), the saint Hongan (Jichihan) was impressed by this environment and had a temple hall built.
(HORIIKE 1957, p. 51)

Obviously, the construction of the Jōshin-in started in 1112 and, judging from the date mentioned in a list of inscriptions in temple bells, it was close to completion in 1114 (HORIIKE 1957, p. 51). This sequence links up very well with the timing of Jichihan's two visits to Tōshōdai-ji.

The third and most convincing argument can be found in the postscript of the *Jubosatsukaihō*, Jichihan's earliest work on the Buddhist precepts:

This was written and completed in Ten'ei 4 (1113), second month, twenty-second day, *kinoe tatsu* (zodiacal signs), during the hour of the horse (11 a.m.–1 p.m). I pray that transferring my merits to the realm of the cosmic law and that fulfilling the precepts, will promptly lead me to Buddhahood. Buddha's disciple Jichihan.
(KODERA 1978, p. 93)

This leaves no room for doubt that around or before 1113, nine years before he wrote the *Tōdaiji shiki*, Jichihan was already involved in the study of the Buddhist precepts. Another manuscript, of which only fragments have been preserved, has been identified as an incomplete copy of the *Jubosatsukaihō* and is notably stored in Tōshōdai-ji (KODERA 1978, pp. 79–80). It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the story about Jichihan's visit to Tōshōdai-ji is, on the whole, credible.

It seems, however, that the problem is located somewhere else. The main point of the story in the biographies is that Jichihan was ordained in the same *kairitsu* tradition that was brought to Japan by Ganjin. In Jichihan's time, this tradition only existed in name. It is precisely for that reason that the anonymous monk and the Preceptor Kaikō were put on stage, because by doing so an uninterrupted and authentic transmission of this tradition could be suggested. This obvious fabrication will be discussed in the fourth section of this essay.

Next comes the intermezzo of Jichihan's request to the court in 1116 to make repairs, which was followed by the ordination of thirty-eight monks at Tōdai-ji the next year. Because there are no records that could either confirm or refute the first event, this matter has to

be left untouched. More can be said, however, of the reputed ordination of the thirty-eight monks. Of this group, only Gyōson 行尊 (1057–1135) and Kakugyō 覺行 (1075–1104) are mentioned by name, but it will be clear that Kakugyō, because of the year that he passed away, could not have been among them.

Another argument against this part of the story has been that, while these monks were said to have received the traditional, full ordination, it was not until 1122 that Jichihan wrote about the *gusokukai* in his *Tōdaiji shiki* (ISHIDA 1963a, p. 492). The source on which Ishida's argument is based was written in the eighteenth century, long after Jichihan's demise. There is, however, a much earlier source that has been overlooked and that refers to this event as well. According to the *Tōshōdaiji engi nukigaki ryakushū*, which was compiled in 1395, the thirty-eight monks were not ordained in the *gusokukai* but in the bodhisattva precepts, about which, as we have seen, Jichihan wrote a work in 1113 (p. 106b). The dearth of sources makes it difficult either to confirm or to dismiss the veracity of the events in 1116 and 1117. Because it has been demonstrated that Jichihan's study of the precepts in *Tōshōdaiji* in itself is plausible, it only seems natural that after his initiation, Jichihan for his part started to teach and ordain others in the precepts as well. This is confirmed by the *Genkō shakusho* (p. 135b).

The events of 1122 and thereafter, when Jichihan was asked by one of the assistant monks of Kōfuku-ji to restore the study and observance of the precepts, which led to his compilation of the *Tōdaiji shiki*, have considerably more verifiable clues. During the Heian period, the community within the compounds of the large monasteries developed into groups of a different social standing, each with its own specialty. One of these groups was that of the assistant monks (*dōshu*), who served the scholar monks and were responsible for the maintenance of the temple halls. Traditionally, their specialty was the study of the precepts, and the position of Preceptor was granted to someone of this group (*Nanto sōzoku shokufukuki* 南都僧俗職服記, p. 237b). The assistant monks of Kōfuku-ji resided in the Eastern and Western Main Halls (*Kōfukuji tōzai kondō* 興福寺東西金堂). The identity of the person or persons who went to Jichihan with the request to help restore the *kairitsu* tradition is slightly confusing. Most sources speak of a certain Gonzai 欣西, alias Nanshōbō 南勝房, who belonged to the Western Main Hall of Kōfuku-ji. Only the *Tōshōdaijige* speaks of someone called Kaizō 快増 (p. 151c). There are, however, records that confirm the historicity of both monks.⁸

⁸ Only TANAKA Minoru makes a distinction between Gonzai and Kaizō (1976).

In 1170, a conflict erupted between Kakunin 覚仁 (fl. 1127–1201), head of Tōdai-ji, and the *dōshu* of Kōfuku-ji. Documents about this conflict reveal that *daihōshi* Gonzai 大法師欣西, assistant monk of the Western Main Hall of Kōfuku-ji, denied the accusation that he had shut down fields of which the revenues were meant for the Daibutsuden of Tōdai-ji. According to these documents, Gonzai had entered the Nakanokawa temple [in 1138] at the age of forty-two, where he had lead a diligent and secluded life for thirty-two years. He is also praised by his fellow assistant monks for observing and studying the precepts (*Kōfukuji saikondō manshutō kaian* 興福寺西金堂満衆等解案; *Sō Gonzai saimon an* 僧欣西祭文案). This confirms Gonzai's relation with Jichihan's temple and his involvement in the study of the *kairitsu*. More proof of this relation can be found in the records that list Jichihan's disciples. One of them was a certain Kakua 覚阿, who had three disciples by himself, one of them being Gonzai (*Kechimyaku ruijūki*, pp. 120, 152).

The relation between Kaizō and Jichihan's temple is confirmed by the postscript to the *Fusatsu yōmon* 布薩要文 (Essentials about the exposition of the precepts), a manuscript that is stored in the repository of the Ishiyama temple. According to its preface, this text is partly based on a manual by Nakanokawa Enkōbō (= Jichihan). At the end of this manuscript, a separate section has been added with the title *Kekkai hōhō* 結界方法 (Guideline to settle the boundaries [of the area where the precepts are to be observed]). The closing sentence of the *Kekkai hōhō* states that this section was originally compiled by Jichihan as well. It contains the following postscript:

Hōen 4 (1138), *tsuchinoe uma* (zodiacal signs), fourth month, twenty-seventh day. This was copied from a borrowed manuscript by Jō[...]bō Kaizō of the Ritsu school. I also applied for a manuscript by the saint Ichiinbō. (KODERA 1979, p. 43)

One of the sobriquets of Gonzai's teacher Kakua was Taifu Shōnin Ichiinbō 大夫上人一印房. In various records, Gonzai is referred to with epithets such as Unkeibō 雲慶房, Kūkeibō 空慶房, and Chūsen or Tadanori 忠暹, but the name Kaizō is not among them. Therefore, there can be no doubt that Gonzai and Kaizō are names belonging to different persons. Although there are not more details available about the identity of Kaizō, it has become evident that he was involved in the study of the precepts as well.

The high priest Zōshun 藏俊 (1104–1180) of Kōfuku-ji allegedly continued the tradition of the Ritsu school after Jichihan. Because there is not one single text by Zōshun, either preserved or listed in some catalogue, that could confirm his active involvement in the

study of the precepts, this assertion seems rather doubtful.⁹ Of course, his name is mentioned by various chroniclers in their obligatory enumerations of those who carried on the tradition of the Ritsu school, but that does not prove anything. The only additional source that supports the reputed teacher-disciple relation between Jichihan and Zōshun is the previously quoted *Kōfukuji ryaku nendaiki*. After the remark that Jichihan officiated as Teacher of the Precepts at the ceremony of Fujiwara no Tadazane's ordination, the former is described as someone from the Hossō school and as the teacher of Zōshun from Nakanokawa.

The tradition of the Ritsu school is said to have been restored through Jichihan's efforts, but although at the end of the twelfth century the revaluation of Buddhist ethics gradually began to spread and eventually would mature into a popular movement, there was still one problem that had to be solved.

The Dispute Between Saichō and the Nara Schools

During his stay in China, Saichō was ordained in the Mahāyāna bodhisattva precepts (*daijō bosatsukai* 大乘菩薩戒) by his teacher Tao-sui 道邃 (n.d.). In the spring of Kōnin 9 (818), several years after his return to Japan, Saichō addressed several of his disciples and told them that from now on they would not observe the Hīnayāna precepts (*shōjō shibunritsu* 小乘四分律), but that they would start, through self-ordination (*jisei jukai* 自誓受戒), to observe the Mahāyāna precepts (*Eizan daishi den* 叡山大師伝, p. 472). In a missive to the court some two months later, Saichō wrote that those who wanted to follow the path of a bodhisattva (*dōshin* 道心) should be considered a country's treasure. Saichō ascertained, however, that in Japan only an ordination ceremony in the Hīnayāna tradition existed. Because the Tendai school was founded for Mahāyāna monks, he proposed that from now on the monks at Hieizan would be trained as such. This would include their ordination in the bodhisattva precepts (*Gakushō shiki* 学生式, p. 40). In fact, this amounted to a request for independence from the state-run ordination system (*nenbun dosha* 年分度者). Obviously, the court did not grant permission, because some three months later Saichō sent another missive that explained the proposed training of monks at Hieizan in even more detail (*Gakushō shiki*, p. 41). In the third month of the following year, Saichō sent a petition to the court in which he

⁹ A thorough study of the life and works of Zōshun has been published by Ōya Tokujō, but none of the sources that are presented by Ōya have confirmed the link between Zōshun and the study of the precepts (1928b).

asked permission for the construction of an ordination platform at Hieizan (*Tendaihokeshū nenbundosha eshōkōdai shiki* 天台法華宗年分度者同小向大式, pp. 42–43). To emphasize his argumentation, Saichō explained the differences between the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna *kairitsu* tradition and compared these to the actual situation in his school and those in Nara. The latter combined the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna teachings, enshrined Binzuru in the refectory, observed the 250 Hīnayāna precepts, and required three Masters of the Precepts and seven witnesses for their ordination ceremony; a proper ordination was not possible if even one of them would be absent. His own school, on the contrary, based its teaching exclusively on Mahāyāna tenets, enshrined Monju in the refectory, observed the 58 bodhisattva precepts, and executed their ordination ceremony with a Master of the Precepts; in the case that a Master of the Precepts was not available, self-ordination was also possible. Because of these differences, another ordination platform was compulsory.

The reaction of the Nara schools, through the channels of the Buddhist supervisors (*sōgō* 僧綱), was predictably negative. Every monk had to be ordained in the Hīnayāna precepts. After that, one could also undergo the ordination in the bodhisattva precepts. Ordination in the bodhisattva precepts in itself was not sufficient and therefore not in conformity with the Buddhist rules. The Nara schools claimed that their own *kairitsu* thought, which united the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna traditions, was essentially based on Mahāyāna doctrines. Besides, the privilege of proposing changes in secular or religious regulations belonged to the sovereign or to the Buddhist authorities, not to the common people or to ordinary monks (that is, Saichō; ŌYA 1987, pp. 408–10). The details of this dispute, which continued for a while, are only known through the transmitted writings of Saichō and his disciples. None of the documents that were issued by their opponents (the Nara schools) have been preserved. In any case, the court finally approved the construction of a new ordination platform shortly after Saichō's demise.¹⁰

This controversy flared up again at the beginning of the Kamakura period, when the call for the restoration of old values was made. Both Jōkei and the Ritsu priest Kakujō 覚盛 (1193–1249) wrote polemical works in which they tried to convince their readers that the *kairitsu* tradition of the Nara schools was superior to that of the Tendai school. It was not until the second half of the thirteenth century, however, that the *kairitsu* tradition of the Nara schools was adjusted and really

¹⁰ The conflict between Saichō and the Nara schools has been described in great detail by ŌYA (1987) and by GRONER (1984, pp. 107–65).

started to flourish. In works such as the *Sangoku buppō denzū engi* and the *Risshū gyōkanshō*, Gyōnen reviews the history of the Japanese Ritsu school that started with Ganjin and, after a period of decay, gradually became prosperous again. The credit for starting this revival went to Jichihan.

Jichihan's Kairitsu Thought

Jichihan's oldest work on the precepts, the *Jubosatsukaihō* (Rules for the initiation in the bodhisattva precepts), is a manual in which this initiation ceremony is described in sixteen steps (KODERA 1978, pp. 80–93). In the first half of the text, Jichihan dwells upon those scriptures and commentaries on which he has based his work, while in the second half he explains how these sixteen steps of the ceremony are to be executed. Here, most of his attention is directed to an explanation of the ten principal commandments (*jūjūkinkai* 十重禁戒) as they were described in the *Bonmōkyō* 梵網經. In his preface, Jichihan announces that, although many texts that comment on this ceremony do exist, he will rely primarily on the exposition by Hsüan-tsang 玄奘 (Jpn. Genjō 600–664), the Chinese priest who transmitted the Hossō teaching from India to China. One of Hsüan-tsang's writings on the precepts bears the title *Jubosatsukaihō* as well. This text was transmitted by his disciple Hui-chao 慧沼 (Jpn. Eshō ?–714), who incorporated it in his *Collection on the Encouragement of the Mind that Aspires for Enlightenment* (*Kanpotsu bodaishinshū* 勧発菩提心集, T. 45, no. 1862). Hsüan-tsang's exposition is considered as one of the basic manuals in the Hossō school for the initiation in the bodhisattva precepts. From the beginning of the Kamakura period onwards, Jōkei, Kakujō, and Eison (叡尊 1201–1290), among others, strove for the restoration and popularization of the *kairitsu* tradition of the Nara schools. Kakujō and Eison in particular, used that part of Hui-chao's Collection that commented on the observance of the precepts as a guideline for their own studies. It has been assumed that Eison was the first priest in Japan who made a handwritten copy of and wrote a commentary on this *Collection* (BD 2, p. 110d). In the second part of his manual, however, Jichihan quotes almost the complete text of Hsüan-tsang's manual, which indicates that he must have been familiar with Hui-chao's *Collection* as well, and that he used it as a source for his own study long before Kakujō and Eison did so. On the other hand, nowhere in his *Jubosatsukaihō* does Jichihan speak of restoration, nor does he mention who or what stimulated him to write this manual. In fact, the *Jubosatsukaihō* almost entirely consists of quotes from scriptures and commentaries by Chinese and Korean scholar monks from the Hossō school;

as a result Jichihan's own ideas remain virtually invisible. Even so, is it still possible to draw some inferences. The *Jubosatsukaihō* leaves no doubt that Jichihan also studied the Mahāyāna precepts. This corroborates another part of Jichihan's biographies. In his *Risshū kōyō*, Gyōnen remarks that after his initiation in the *shibunritsu*:

[Jichihan] extensively searched for summaries [on the precepts].... He gained a clear understanding of the spiritual power 体, the rules 法 and significance 義 of the precepts of the three Vehicles; old texts on the *bonnō* [precepts], annotations by various masters, the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna precepts; he mastered and memorized them all. (p. 379)

Apparently, the *Jubosatsukaihō* was one of the results of this extensive study. Two years after he finished this work, Jichihan initiated thirty-eight monks in the bodhisattva-precepts at the Tōdai-ji platform, during which time he most likely followed the instructions of his own manual.

It is striking that, contrary to those who continued the *kairitsu* revival after him, Jichihan does not write one single word on the former differences in opinion about the contents and intrinsic values of the bodhisattva precepts between the Nara and Tendai schools, let alone mention that he refuted the latter's point of view. In a period that was said to be characterized by the decay of the *kairitsu* tradition, Jichihan's early interest in the Buddhist precepts is remarkable, but the significance of this *Jubosatsukaihō* is rather limited because it hardly contains any personal remarks or ideas. Only a small personal touch in the list of intended bonds (*hotsugan* 発願) at the end of the text, proves to be the proverbial exception. This list is a verbatim reproduction of the one in Hsüan-tsang's manual, but whereas Hsüan-tsang prays that his merits of keeping the precepts will lead all sentient beings to Maitreya's paradise, Jichihan prays that his merits will make it possible for all sentient beings to attain rebirth in Amida's Pure Land (KODERA 1978, p. 93).

Nine years later, Jichihan wrote the *Tōdaiji kaidan-in jukai shiki* 東大寺戒壇院受戒式 (Manual on the ordination in the precepts at the Tōdai-ji platform). This time Jichihan explicitly stated his intentions:

During the Tenpyō-shōhō period [from 749 to 757], the Chinese Master of the Precepts Ganjin came to our court. He promised our emperor to build this ordination platform and through the *byakushi konma* 白四羯磨 ritual, he ordained many [novices] as *biku*. The observance of the Buddhist teaching is nothing but the very foundation of the protection of our coun-

try. Since then, more than 360 years have passed by, but the degeneration of the people and their disregard of the Buddhist regulations have become unparalleled. Who would not be sad?
(T. 74, no. 2350, p. 32c)

Then Jichihan announces that he has not given in to the temptation to bother the reader with his own ideas and he carefully lists the works from which he has compiled this manual. It is only in the first half of the postscript that some of his personal views come to the surface. Jichihan quotes “someone” who wonders if the summarized ordination (*tsūju* 通受) could be sufficient to realize the essential nature of a bodhisattva monk (*bosatsu-biku shō* 菩薩比丘性).¹¹ The expression “summarized ordination” refers to the idea that one single ordination in the ten major and forty-eight minor commandments would enable the initiated to become a *bosatsu-biku*. In his reaction, Jichihan categorically refutes this point of view by referring to several commentaries in which it is stated that a full ordination in all precepts individually (*betsuju* 別受) is compulsory in order to realize the nature of a *bosatsu-biku*. There are no special (read: easier) commandments for someone who wants to follow the path of a bodhisattva.

It would be only natural to think that this “someone” should refer to Saichō or another master of the Tendai school, but because the *kairitsu* thought of the Tendai school is not the subject of discussion in this postscript, this “someone” probably refers to one of the Kōfuku-ji scholar monks who ventured his opinion, as Kōfuku-ji was where the actual initiators of the compilation of this manual were (ISHIDA 1963b, p. 76). Whoever this “someone” may be, insofar as Jichihan’s own *kairitsu* thought can be gathered from the *Tōdaiji shiki*, there is no doubt that it was very traditional. In this respect, the *Tōdaiji shiki* is not a work of special interest. It is rather intriguing, however, that it was Kōfuku-ji of all places where the call for the revaluation of the moral precepts originated, for this was the temple that formed the very nucleus of violent conduct by soldier monks in the old capital.

Another point of interest is how practical the *Tōdaiji shiki* was, since its usefulness has been regarded as extremely doubtful (ISHIDA 1963a, pp. 491–92). According to the *kairitsu* tradition of the Nara schools, the ordination ceremony had to be executed in the presence of three Masters of the Precepts and seven witnesses. Jichihan’s manual does not deviate from this stipulation. It is almost certain that at the time that Jichihan wrote his manual, this was not possible anymore. Masters

¹¹ Someone who appears to be a Hinayāna *biku*, but whose inner realization amounts to the nature of a Mahāyāna bodhisattva (NAKAMURA 1988, p. 1221).

of the Precepts only existed in name. Otherwise, it would not have been necessary for either of Jichihan's first biographers to come up with a *deus ex machina* in the form of the mysterious and anonymous monk who initiated Jichihan in the orthodox *kairitsu* tradition. In the second section of this essay, it has been argued that the account of Jichihan's visit to Tōshōdai-ji and his subsequent ordination in the precepts at this place is credible indeed. The claim that he was ordained in the *gusokukai* in a correct way, however, must be relegated to the realm of fantasy. In fact, considerable doubt was already ventured in one of his biographies, where his desire to receive the full ordination is praised, but the correctness of the ceremony itself is rejected (*Shōdai senzai denki*, p. 208c).

After completing the *Tōdaiji shiki*, Jichihan kept exerting himself to restore the study and observance of the precepts. In the first year of Daiji (1126), he wrote a short treatise about the process of becoming a true *biku* through the various stages of emancipation that resulted from the actual observance of the precepts individually (*Bisshu betsugedatsukai* 苾芻別解脱戒).¹² In a few cases, Jichihan officiated as Teacher of the Precepts when court ladies renounced the world and took their vows (*Chūyūki* 中右記, Daiji 2/9/22 and Chōshō 3/10/25). Because the *Kekkai hōhō* section at the end of the *Fusatsu yōmon*, which was originally compiled by Jichihan as well, was hand-copied in Hōen 4 (1138), the Nakanokawa temple complex at that time already must have had a *sekkaidō* 説戒堂, a temple building that functioned as the place where the precepts were expounded and where monks purified themselves by repenting their sins. The *Tōdaiji zasshūroku* 東大寺雜集録 lists the various temple buildings of Nakanokawadera, one of which bears the name "Purification Hall" (Shōjō-in 清浄院; HORIIKE 1958, p. 46), possibly the *sekkaidō* of this temple. Jichihan's other well-known work on the precepts, the *Shukke jukaihō*, was written in the last year of his life, and this shows once more that he dedicated the better part of his career to the restoration of the monastic rules of conduct.

The doubts that have been raised about the account of Jichihan's initiation in the precepts and of his subsequent efforts to initiate others, the fundamental problem of the unfeasibility of his *Tōdaiji shiki*, as well as the virtual lack of any personal interpretation of the *kairitsu*

¹² Kushida mentions that a manuscript with the title *Bisshu betsugedatsukai* has been preserved in Shinfuku-ji 真福寺 in Nagoya. Although the author of this manuscript is not mentioned, KUSHIDA argues that, because it was copied in 1184 in one of the halls of the Nakanokawa temple and bore some similarities with the postscript to the *Tōdaiji shiki*, this text was probably written by Jichihan (1975, p. 133). A much stronger indication in favor of this point of view, however, can be found in the *Enshō shōnin gyōjō*, in which Gyōnen states that one of Jichihan's works was titled *Betsu gedatsu*.

doctrines, have created the view that Jichihan's contribution to the restoration of the Nara *kairitsu* tradition was actually of a rather questionable, formal, and superficial nature. The refutation of some of these doubts, and the image portrayed above of a lifelong commitment to the study and observance of the precepts, however, clearly contradict this view.

After Jichihan had passed away, the problem of how to execute the full ordination in a correct way still remained bothersome. At the end of his life, Jōkei wrote the "Petition to stimulate the observance of the precepts," in which he mused:

[Once], the ordination in the precepts in Nara, which, by imperial decree, was strictly performed to the rules by three Masters of the Precepts and seven witnesses [who were selected] from the seven great monasteries, was considered the condition for acquiring the spiritual power of precept-observance. Granted, [nowadays] the *biku* are not pure 不清淨 and the regulations [of the ordination] are not according to the teaching 不如法, but would it not be a very good prospect if there were one or two among them who learned the regulations, for how could that be in vain? (*Kairitsu kōgyō gansho* 戒律興行願書, p. 59)

His wish would not be answered until 1236, when Eison, Kakujō, Yūgon 有嚴 (1186–1275), and Ensei 円晴 (1180–1241) explored the possibility of becoming a true *biku* through self-ordination. It was only then that the *kairitsu* tradition of the Nara schools underwent a real innovation.

Pure Land Thought in the Shingon School

The underlying principle of the doctrines in the Shingon school implies that the practitioner strives for the realization of direct enlightenment in this world and in the present body (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成仏). In the Pure Land teaching, on the other hand, this world is considered as impure (*edo* 穢土), and the ulterior aim is rebirth in the paradise of a saving buddha (*gongu jōdo* 欣求淨土), which is situated outside this world. The most popular of these saving buddhas was Amida, whose paradise was thought to be in the Western direction (*saihō jōdo* 西方淨土). It seems that there is hardly any room to unite these two ideologies. Nevertheless, among the esoteric scriptures there are several texts that not only describe methods to realize direct enlightenment in this world, but also dwell upon the possibility of attaining rebirth in a Pure Land. Two of these texts are the *Rishushaku* 理趣釈 (T. 19, no. 1003) and the *Muryōju nyorai kangyō kuyō giki* 無量壽

如来觀行供養儀軌 (T. 19, no. 930), both translated by the sixth Shingon patriarch Amoghavajra (Jpn. Fukū 不空 705–774). The *Rishushaku* is the commentary on one of the fundamental esoteric scriptures, the *Rishukyō* 理趣經 (T. 8, no. 243), in which Dainichi Nyorai expounds from a level of perfect wisdom that the innate nature of all phenomena is pure in itself. The fourth chapter of the *Rishushaku* explains that Amida Buddha, who is also referred to by his esoteric names Tokujishō-shōjōhosshō Nyorai 得自性清淨法性如来 and Kanjizaiō Nyorai 觀自在王如来, resides in his state of enlightenment as Muryōju Nyorai in a buddha paradise, while he manifests himself as the bodhisattva Kanjizai in the defiled worlds. The second half of this fourth chapter especially elaborates on the merits of Amida's one-syllable mantra. According to the text, the esoteric syllable *hrīh* represents Amida's domain of enlightenment, and when this syllable is correctly visualized and contemplated, not only can all difficulties in the present life be conquered, but supreme rebirth in a Pure Land can be realized as well. In other words, this one-syllable mantra contains merits that can be of profit both in this life and the hereafter (*Rishushaku*, p. 612bc).

The *Muryōju giki* describes the meditation process and accompanying mantras and mudras of the esoteric Amida ritual, through which the practitioner will be able to attain rebirth in the paradise of Ultimate Bliss (p. 67c). This transition to a paradise of Ultimate Bliss, however, is by no means limited to the period after death. Through the union with the three secret manifestations of the deity (= Amida), is it also possible to transform this world into a paradise of Ultimate Bliss (pp. 69b, 70b).

Both texts were introduced in Japan during the early Heian period, but when the faith in Amida Buddha began to spread among all layers of society, the Pure Land doctrines that had been developed in the Tendai school already dominated religious life. In the works that were written by the founder of the Japanese Shingon school, Kūkai, the concept of rebirth in a Pure Land is hardly discussed. On several occasions, he quoted from the two above-mentioned works, but nowhere does he actively elaborate on Pure Land thought as such. When he introduced the Shingon teaching, Kūkai especially attached importance to doctrines and concepts that explained the possibility of realizing Buddhahood in this life and this world. At the same time, he emphasized the differences between the Shingon teaching and those of the already existing schools.¹³ It is perhaps for this reason that, initially, Pure Land thought was rather neglected in the Shingon school.

¹³ The most obvious example is Kūkai's *Benkenmitsu nikyōron* 弁顯密二教論 (Treatise on the differences between the teachings of the exoteric and esoteric schools; T. 77 no. 2427).

After Kūkai, this situation did not change for quite some time. To some extent this is not very surprising. The esoteric tenets and rituals that dominated religious life glorified prosperity in this life and in this world, and this corresponded perfectly with the actual situation and general mood. During the second half of the tenth century, however, Pure Land Buddhism and *nenbutsu* practices rapidly gained in significance, due to various circumstances such as an increasing religious pessimism, social and political instability, and the activities of wandering ascetics (*hijiri* 聖). This development culminated in the Pure Land classic, the *Ōjōyōshū* 往生要集, which was written by the Tendai abbot Genshin 源信 (942–1017). Throughout the Heian period, Pure Land teachings thrived the most at Mt. Hiei, but from the first half of the twelfth century onwards, priests from the Shingon school started to write about the esoteric meaning of Amida and the Pure Land as well. Their ideas came to be known as *himitsu nenbutsu* 秘密念仏 (esoteric *nenbutsu*). The priest who is commonly considered as the one who inserted Pure Land doctrines in the frame of the Shingon teaching is Kakuban.

Such being the case, Gyōnen's enumeration of the Japanese patriarchs of Pure Land Buddhism in his *Jōdo hōmon genryūshō* 淨土法門源流章 (Composition on the origins of the Pure land teaching) seems rather puzzling. Among the six names that are listed, one Shingon priest is included, only it is not Kakuban that is mentioned but one of his contemporaries: Jichihan. Unfortunately, Gyōnen does not refer to a specific work of Jichihan, which leaves us to wonder why he attached such value to Jichihan's Pure Land thought.

Jichihan's First Period of Pure Land Thought

The previously mentioned Catalogue of scriptures, commentaries, and annotations on Pure Land Buddhism by Chōsai assigns the authorship of six titles to Jichihan. In 1956 Satō Tetsuei introduced a manuscript under the title *Nenbutsu shiki* 念仏式. According to its postscript, this text was hand-copied by the monk Kakushō 覺聖 in 1135. Because the front page is missing, neither the original title nor its author are known. The text itself is based on the *gonenmon* 五念門 (fivefold practice for attaining rebirth in Amida's Pure Land). This practice was originally described in Vasubandhu's *Jōdoron* 淨土論, one of the commentaries that functioned as a basis for Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū*. On this and two subsequent occasions, Satō argued that the author of the *Nenbutsu shiki* had to be Jichihan and that the text itself should be considered as a later copy of the *Ōjōron gonemon gyōshiki*, one of the six titles that were listed by Chōsai.

Through internal textual evidence, Satō demonstrated that the author of the *Nenbutsu shiki* must have been someone who was: well versed in the Buddhist scriptures; interested in Tendai meditation; strongly influenced by Tendai Pure Land thought; connected in some way with the Hossō school; familiar with basic Shingon doctrines; and alive after 985 (the year Genshin completed the *Ōjōyōshū*, by which the *Nenbutsu shiki* is strongly influenced) and before or around 1135 (the year in which Kakushō completed his copy). He concluded that the only priest we know of who meets all these conditions is Jichihan. Furthermore, this assumption is strengthened by both the fact that Shōkaku was one of Jichihan's disciples and that there is a similarity between the structure of the *Nenbutsu shiki* and, judging from its title, the *Ōjōron gonenmon gyōshiki* (SATŌ 1972, pp. 45–50). Although there is no conclusive proof, Satō's hypothesis has generally been accepted as being plausible. But even so, if the *Nenbutsu shiki* and Jichihan's *Ōjōron gonenmon gyōshiki* are indeed one and the same work, this only means that Jichihan's early Pure Land thought was based on Tendai Pure Land doctrines, which is neither surprising nor remarkable.

There are even more indications that, at one time, Jichihan's ideas were under the influence of Tendai Pure Land thought. Three Jōdo priests—Ryōchū 良忠 (1199–1287), Shōgei 聖岡 (1341–1420) and Ryōei 良栄 (1342–1428)—quote fragments of a work with the title *Anjin yōjinshū* 安身養神集, of which they mention Jichihan as the author and whom they even refer to as someone from the Tendai school (*Gengi-bunki* 玄義分記, pp. 194–95; *Denzūki nyūshō* 伝通記繹鈔, pp. 508, 510; *Jōdoshū yōshū kenmon* 浄土宗要集見門, p. 320; *Ōjōyōshūgiki* 往生要集義記, pp. 344–45). These quotations from the *Anjin yōjinshū* were used as illuminating examples in their commentaries on the *Ōjōyōshū* and on Shan-tao's 善導 (613–681) *Kanmuryōjubutsu kyōsho* 觀無量寿仏経疏.

Nevertheless, one problem still lingers. Gyōnen described Jichihan as one of the six pioneers of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism. This suggests that he somehow must have distinguished himself from his contemporaries; but even when the *Nenbutsu shiki* and the fragments that were quoted by Ryōchū, Ryōei, and Shōgei are accepted as being written by Jichihan, this eulogy seems hardly justified. Although the *Nenbutsu shiki* displays a broad learning, it does not contain any innovative ideas. What strikes one most, however, is that in none of the commentaries on the Pure Land teaching that were written after Jichihan's lifetime, can even one single reference to or quotation from either the *Nenbutsu shiki* or the *Ōjōron gonenmon gyōshiki* be found. Although Gyōnen did not refer to one of Jichihan's works in particular, he did mention that Jichihan “has greatly provided us with compositions and

summaries [on the Pure Land teaching] that are *widely circulated and used in the world*" (p. 196a; italics mine). Contrary to the *Nenbutsu shiki* or the works that were listed by Chōsai, three of Jichihan's other works on Amida and the Pure Land were regularly quoted in the works of various priests, which indicates that their contents exercised a certain influence. These three works are the *Byōchū shugyōki* 病中修行記 (Record of religious practices during illness), the *Amida shidai* 阿弥陀次第 (Amida manual) and the *Amida nakanokawa* 阿弥陀中川. Their contents clearly show a departure from the ideas of the *Nenbutsu shiki*. The date of compilation of the last two works is unknown, but the *Byōchū shugyōki* was written in 1134, some ten years before Jichihan's death.

The Byōchū shugyōki

The very short postscript to the *Byōchū shugyōki* suggests a possible reason why Jichihan wrote this work:

The winter of Chōjō 3 [1134], eleventh month. Written down in a hurry because I am afflicted by a slight illness.

(*Shingonshū anjin zensho* 真言宗安心全書, p. 785)

The *Byōchū shugyōki* is meant for the Shingon practitioner and contains eight instructions: 1) the practitioner is advised not to lay down his life when, during a serious illness, the end seems near, but to try to prolong it through medical treatment and by praying to the Buddha; 2) especially when he still has his vitality, he should perform single-mindedly religious practices that are aimed at the realization of enlightenment; 3) the practitioner should meditate on Fudō myōō 不動明王 for protection and have proper thoughts that are free from lust, hatred, and ignorance during the last moments of his life; 4) he must clear away his self-inflicted illusions; 5) he must protect himself against wrongdoings that have not materialized yet; 6) he is advised to meditate on the four aspects of the Absolute Body of Amida (*Amida no shishu hosshin* 阿弥陀四種法身); 7) he is instructed to meditate on the four forms of Amida's mandala (*Amida no shishu mandara* 阿弥陀四種曼荼羅); 8) finally, Jichihan proclaims that the practitioner can realize enlightenment through the practice of *sanmitsu kajī* 三密加持, which aims at union with the three secret manifestations of the deity (= Amida) (pp. 781–85).

Until now, the analysis of the *Byōchū shugyōki* by modern scholars has largely been centered on the question of the doctrinal tradition to which this work belongs. In several studies, the *Byōchū shugyōki* has been compared with Kakuban's *Ichigo taiyō himitsushū* 一期大要秘密集 (Esoteric collection of the essential points in a lifetime; pp. 1197–1220)

and *Amida hishaku* 阿弥陀秘釈 (Esoteric explanation of Amida; pp. 1191-95). These works of Kakuban, however, represent esoteric *nenbutsu* in its purest form, whereas the *Byōchū shugyōki* provides a practical method for attaining rebirth in Amida's Pure Land, patterned after esoteric conventions, but at the same time interlaced with ambiguous doctrinal explanations and elucidated with quotations deriving from Tendai Pure Land (e.g., the *Ōjōyōshū*) and Chinese Pure Land texts (e.g., the *Kankyōsho jōzengi* 觀經疏定善義) (KUSHIDA 1964, pp. 181-211; 1975, pp. 159-84; SATŌ 1972, pp. 74-78; 1979, pp. 404-18). There can be no doubt about Jichihan's own intentions: he wrote the *Byōchū shugyōki* for the Shingon practitioner. Moreover, as will be discussed below, the arguments of these scholars can be questioned on several points. Perhaps of even more importance, however, is the question why the *Byōchū shugyōki* seems to have enjoyed a considerable influence. It is not very likely that this influence depended on the choice of some phrases that Jichihan borrowed from other texts. It was rather Jichihan's way of inserting and adjusting Pure Land thought, through which he tried to actualize and simplify esoteric practice, that contributed to its "being widely circulated and used in the world."

Before proceeding with an analysis of this actualization and simplification, it is necessary to outline Jichihan's view of the Pure Land, of the relation between Amida and sentient beings, and of the *nenbutsu*. In his sixth instruction, Jichihan describes Amida as the deity of the Lotus section who is situated in the Western direction that is called Ultimate Bliss. Most scholars consider this to be a description that corresponded with the traditional exoteric view of a western paradise that is situated outside this world (SATŌ 1965, p. 38; KUSHIDA 1975, p. 177). But as has been pointed out, this sixth instruction could also refer to the visualization of the Lotus section of the *Kongōkai mandala* 金剛界曼荼羅, which is positioned in the western direction and has Amida as its central deity (ŌTANI 1966, p. 50). Nowhere does Jichihan describe the afterlife or the Pure Land. This is not strange, because from a *mikkyō* point of view, Amida and his realm are not different from our own mind. The process of rebirth takes place in our own mind and body. Therefore, Jichihan advises the practitioner to concentrate on the four aspects of Amida's Absolute Body (*shishu hosshin* 四種法身), which are to be contemplated as one entity and equal to the realm of phenomena. Because one's own mind corresponds to this realm (*gashin soku ichidaihokkai* 我心即一大法界), our own mind and Amida's intrinsic nature and realm are equally absolute and without distinction.

The practices in the *Byōchū shugyōki* are primarily, although not exclusively, meant as a method of *nenbutsu* at the time of one's death

(*rinjū gyōgi* 臨終行儀). The exposition of the *rinjū gyōgi* originated with the Chinese Pure Land patriarch Shan-tao, while in Japan it was Genshin who was the first to elaborate on Shan-tao's exposition in his *Ōjōyōshū*. In some way or another, Jichihan, Kakuban, Jōkei, and others were all more or less influenced by Genshin's *rinjū gyōgi*, but one striking feature of the *Byōchū shugyōki* is that, contrary to the usual tendency to urge the practitioner to obey by all means the recommended instructions, Jichihan explicitly states that he leaves it to the practitioner's own volition to make use of his instructions or not (p. 785). Another fundamental difference with the *Ōjōyōshū* and similar texts is that in the present work the recommended practices do not follow the usual pattern, in which the practitioner relies on the saving grace of Amida (*tariki* 他力); rather, he is encouraged to rely on his own efforts (*jiriki* 自力).

An example of how Jichihan adjusted Pure Land thought to actualize esoteric practice can be found in his seventh instruction, in which he explains the contemplation of Amida's four types of mandalas. First, the practitioner has to contemplate Amida's fourfold body as one entity. Next, he visualizes the seed syllable *hūm* between Amida's eyebrows, which will transform into a white curl (*miken byakugō* 眉間白毫) that emits countless radiant lights (*kōmyō* 光明). Jichihan explains that this white curl is endowed with Amida's four mandalas, which are inseparable in their quality (*fusōri* 不相離): the white curl itself corresponds to the *dai mandara* 大曼荼羅, its manifestation of meritoriousness corresponds to the *sanmaya* 三昧耶 *mandara*; the insight it brings about when becoming a regular mode of action corresponds to the *hō* 法 *mandara*, while the protection and guidance (*sesshu* 攝取) by the radiant light that leads human beings to salvation correspond to the *katsuma* 羯磨 *mandara*. Finally, the practitioner is advised to pray that he will be guided and protected by this radiant light and that it will bring him the realization during his last moments that one's own mind is identical to the Absolute Body of the deity of veneration. Jichihan especially pays attention to the meaning of this *sesshu*, but because he based his elucidation on Shan-tao's explanation of the three types of relationships between Amida and sentient beings (*san'en* 三緣), scholars have not refrained from emphasizing this non-esoteric influence. Nevertheless, as ŌTANI has demonstrated (1966, p. 52), the real significant point is that Jichihan simply deleted those parts from Shan-tao's commentary that were not consistent with the Shingon doctrines. Because Jichihan's instructions are directed at the practitioner's union with the three secret manifestations of the deity, he intentionally neglected the passages where Shan-tao explained that the intrinsic nature of the Buddha and sentient beings are diametrically opposed

to each other (*shōbutsu fuitsu* 生仏不一). By doing so, Jichihan adjusted non-esoteric Pure Land thought in a way that suited his explanation of the non-duality between Buddha and sentient beings (*shōbutsu funi* 生仏不二).

An example of how Jichihan tried both to actualize and to simplify esoteric practice can be found in his eighth instruction, in which he describes three methods of practice that aim at the mystic union with the three secret manifestations of the deity (*sanmitsu kaji*). The three-secrets practice that Jichihan chooses is the A-syllable visualization. The A-syllable, as the first syllable of the Sanskrit word *ādyanūtpāda* (originally unborn; Jpn. *honpushō* 本不生), symbolizes the true nature of the myriad phenomena of the universe, transcending birth and death, ephemerality and permanence, and all other dualities in one single symbolic form. The esoteric teaching uses this seed syllable in the three-secrets practice as a means to experience suprapersonal reality. In his first method, Jichihan follows the traditional threefold explanation of the A-syllable that all phenomena are void and without an intrinsic nature (*kū* 空), that at the same time they are permanent and unchanging (*u* 有), from which it follows that all elements, which derive from the A-syllable, are uncreated (*fushō* 不生).

In his second method, however, Jichihan gives a new interpretation. He explains that the hand posture, which expresses the secret of the deity's bodily actions (*shinmitsu* 身密), comprises all conduct and he connects this concept with the reverential posture of the practitioner. The mantra, which expresses the secret of the deity's speech (*kumitsu* 口密), comprises all utterings and this is connected with the invocation of the three syllables that constitute Amida's name. Contemplation of these three syllables as a whole (*kugi* 句義) and separately (*jigi* 字義), correspond to the secret of the deity's mental actions (*shinmitsu* 心密). At this point, Jichihan distributes the threefold explanation of the A-syllable over the three syllables of Amida's name: "A" symbolizes that all things are uncreated 不生, "mi" that the self is not subject to changes 有, and "da" that the true state of things is enlightenment 空. In this way, Jichihan actualized esoteric practice by being the first who conflated the visualization of the A-syllable and the visualization of Amida.

Jichihan's first two methods were meant for daily use and for special occasions respectively. His third and last method, on the other hand, is very short and to the point, and especially intended to be used at the moment of one's death. Here, Jichihan shows an inclination to simplify his method by emphasizing the invocation of Amida's name over contemplation. He distinguishes his own methods from the *rinjū gyōgi* practices in the *Ōjōyōshū*, which he does not refute but

simply categorizes as being based on the common explanation from a Mahāyāna point of view. He does not encourage the exclusive invocational *nenbutsu* that was to be advocated by Hōnen either, but rather adds here a method of esoteric *nenbutsu* that could suit even those with a small capacity and predisposition for religious practice.

Around the same time that Jichihan finished his *Byōchū shugyōki*, Kakuban was harassed by factional disputes on Mount Kōya, as a result of which he secluded himself in the Mitsugon-in 密嚴院, where he started the practice of observing silence for one thousand days (*sen-nichi mugongyō* 千日無言行) from the first month of 1135 onwards. In the period between 1135 and his death in the twelfth month of 1143, Kakuban wrote several works on the esoteric meaning of Amida and the Pure Land. It is clear, however, that two of these works were written under the influence of Jichihan's *Byōchū shugyōki*. Kakuban's *Ichigo taiyō himitsushū*, which comprises nine instructions instead of eight, has more or less the same structure and purpose as the *Byōchū shugyōki*, but because the former, while mentioning Jichihan's name, contains a long citation of the latter, there can be no doubt about who influenced whom. In fact, the influence of the *Byōchū shugyōki* on Kakuban's thought goes even further. Kakuban's first instruction and the first part of the second one are almost verbatim quotes of Jichihan's first two instructions. Furthermore, the contents of that part of his eighth instruction in which he urges the practitioner to pray to Fudō Myōō, correspond to Jichihan's third instruction. Moreover, in his *Amida hishaku* (Esoteric explanation of Amida), which is thought to be written after 1139 (SATŌ 1979, pp. 417–18), Kakuban comes up with a detailed and complicated explanation of the three syllables that constitute Amida's name. The core of his explanation, however, is identical to Jichihan's distribution of the threefold meaning of the A-syllable over the three syllables of Amida's name. These similarities show that Kakuban's esoteric Pure Land thought was substantially influenced by Jichihan, but a distinctive development in Kakuban's thought was that he, contrary to Jichihan, flatly rejected the exoteric view of Amida and the Pure Land. Besides, whereas Jichihan's instructions aim at the realization of *sokushin jōbutsu* through the contemplation of one specific deity (*issonbō* 一尊法)—that is, Amida—Kakuban's explanation also extends to the relationship between Amida and Dainichi Nyorai: Amida should be viewed as one port of the wide gate that is Dainichi Nyorai (*fumon soku ichimon* 普門即一門); they are one body, only their names are different (*dōtai imyō* 同体異名). A third characteristic feature of Kakuban's Pure Land thought was the connection he made between the *nenbutsu* (the secret of speech in the three-secrets practice) and the inherently existing life-breath of all

organic bodies, by substantiating the in-breath to the utterance of “A” and the out-breath to the utterance of *hūm*, the core syllables in the evocation of Amida’s essential being.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the chronology delineated above clearly shows that it was Jichihan with whom the development of esoteric Pure Land thought started.

After Jichihan and Kakuban, esoteric Pure Land doctrines were further developed by Jōhen 静遍 (1165–1223) and systematized by his disciple Dōhan. Jōhen, who belonged to one of the lineages of *dharma*-transmission that started with Jichihan, wrote—in a reaction to Hōnen’s famous treatise—the *Zoku senchaku mongiyōshō* 続選釈文義要鈔, in which he explained his Pure Land thought from a *mikkyō* point of view, basing his ideas on works that were written by Jichihan and Kakuban, as well as many others.¹⁵ His disciple Dōhan wrote the *Himitsu nenbutsushō* 秘密念仏抄 (Treatise on the esoteric nenbutsu), in which he explained the differences in Pure Land thought between the exoteric (in particular Tendai) and esoteric (Shingon) schools by using a three- or four-layer structure representing the various levels of understanding and interpretation; it does not come as a surprise that he ranked Shingon to the most profound level(s) of understanding. In his explanation of the contemplation of Amida’s name, body, and realm, Dōhan emphasized the non-dualistic relationship between Amida and the sentient beings, and he supported his statement with a full quote of Jichihan’s eighth instruction (pp. 79–80). Dōhan’s interpretation of the esoteric meaning of the three syllables of Amida’s name is detailed and versatile, but again the core of his exposition corresponds with Jichihan’s distribution of the threefold meaning of the A-syllable over the three syllables of Amida’s name.

As will become even more evident in the next section, various Shingon monks were influenced by Jichihan’s Pure Land thought. Although this influence did not cross the borders of Shingon thought in the way that Kakuban’s Pure Land thought did, it was finally acknowledged by priests from outside the Shingon school as well. The oldest text in which someone from outside the Shingon school acknowledged esoteric *nenbutsu* as a distinctive form of practice is the *Keiran shūyōshū* 溪嵐拾葉集 (pp. 551a–c, 552a), written by the Tendai monk Kōshū 光宗 (1276–1350). Kōshū distinguished four types of *nenbutsu*: esoteric *nenbutsu*, Tendai *nenbutsu*, Mahāyāna *nenbutsu* (as expounded in Gen-shin’s *Ōjōyōshū*), and Jōdoshū *nenbutsu* (as advocated by Shan-tao and Hōnen). The esoteric *nenbutsu* he described, however, is clearly based

¹⁴ For a more detailed description see SANFORD 1994.

¹⁵ According to KUSHIDA (1964, p. 214). I have not been able to check the *Zoku senchaku mongiyōshō* myself.

on the link that Kakuban forged between the inherently existing life-breath and the practice of *nenbutsu*.

The Pure Land priest Eon 懷音 (?–1714) published, finally, in 1672 an extensive collection on the forms of *nenbutsu* in the various schools (*Shoke nenbutsushū* 諸家念仏集). In his review of esoteric *nenbutsu* he starts with a survey of the various esoteric scriptures in which Amida's name, body, and realm are explained. Then he switches to the related commentaries that were written over the centuries by various scholar monks. At this point he first quotes the last three instructions of the *Byōchū shugyōki*, to which he adds his own commentary (pp. 705–11). Obviously, Eon considered the Pure Land thought of the *Byōchū shugyōki* as the starting point from which esoteric *nenbutsu* thought further developed.

At the end of the previous section I referred to two of Jichihan's other works on the esoteric Amida ritual. These works, the *Amida shidai* and the *Amida nakanokawa*, were introduced by SATŌ Tetsuei (1958, 1965), who divided the development of Jichihan's Pure Land thought into three periods. According to Satō, the first period of Jichihan's Pure Land thought was characterized by a strong influence from Genshin's *Ōjyōshū* in particular and Tendai Pure Land thought in general. He counted the *Nenbutsu shiki* and the *Anjin yōjinshū* as belonging to this period. The second period showed a transformation towards esoteric Pure Land thought, although snatches of Tendai Pure Land thought still remained perceptible. He saw the *Byōchū shugyōki* as a product of this period. In the third and last period, this transformation was completed and Jichihan's Pure Land thought was now exclusively based on the esoteric tenets of the Shingon school. SATŌ considered the *Amida shidai* and the *Amida nakanokawa* to be written in this period (1965, pp. 36, 40, 47). It remains to be seen, however, whether this division into three periods is entirely correct. The propriety of the third period in particular is questionable. The two texts that are said to represent this period are not only undated, but judging from their contents they also could have been written shortly after Jichihan's initiation in 1116. The contents of these two works will be discussed in the next section.

The Middle or Final Stage of Jichihan's Pure Land Thought?

According to Raiyu's *Hishō mondō*, Jichihan was deeply impressed when he learned the deeper meaning of Amida's fundamental mudra and mantra during his *denbō kanjō* initiation. It is therefore quite easy to imagine that during his career he must have performed the separate

Amida ritual himself many times. The various currents in the Shingon school such as the Ono branch 小野流 and the Kanjūji branch 勧修寺流, to which Jichihan *de jure* belonged, each had their own tradition in performing the Amida ritual. It seems that Jichihan, too, wrote a manual for this Amida ritual that was peculiar to his own Nakanokawa branch. Several collections of esoteric rituals quote fragments of a text that is titled “Manual for the Amida ritual by Jichihan of Nakanokawa” (*Nakanokawa Jichihan Amida shidai* 中川実範阿弥陀次第). Unfortunately, only a few parts of this manual have been preserved and they are too fragmentary to reconstruct a sufficient part of the original text. Yet the contents of these few quotations and the context they are used in draw attention to several points in particular. One point of attention concerns the distinction that is made by Raiyu in his quotations of Jichihan’s manual. The textual basis and the sequence in which the various parts of the Amida ritual were performed were the same for all branches in the Shingon and Taimitsu schools, but in their practical application these branches used different methods based on different transmissions. In his *Hishō mondō*, Raiyu quotes Jichihan’s manual not only by way of illustration or explanation, but also in order to make a distinction between the practical application in Jichihan’s Nakanokawa branch and those in the other currents of the Shingon school (pp. 177a, 307bc, 308abc). Moreover, because Jichihan’s manual is also quoted by several contemporaries of Raiyu, copies of this manuscript must have circulated among Shingon scholar monks in the same way as did the *Byōchū shugyōki*.¹⁶

Satō Tetsuei considered this manual a product of the final stage in Jichihan’s Pure Land thought. There are, however, some objections possible against this line of thinking. First of all, it must be established that in none of the few fragments of this manual that have been preserved is rebirth in a Pure Land a topic of discussion. Because the manuscript itself no longer seems to be extant, it is impossible to determine the year in which this text was written. In one of the preserved fragments, however, Jichihan refers to the initiation he received from Genkaku (T. 19, p. 308c). This particular lineage of transmissions that started with Genkaku and contained the explanation of the esoteric meaning of Amida’s fundamental mudra and mantra is still acknowledged in the Shingon school. A collection of this school’s testimonials or seals of transmission (*injin* 印信, the documents a teacher gives to his disciple certifying that the latter has been duly ordained) also contains the *injin* of the Nakanokawa branch. This makes it possible to follow the lineage of the priests that were initiated in this tradition.

¹⁶ See *Byakuhō kushō*, Tz 6, pp. 367, 368, 370. *Hishō kuketsu*, SZ 28, pp. 28, 30, 31, 33.

From these records it can be gathered that in the first year of Gen'ei (1118), two years after his own *denbō kanjō*, Jichihan initiated his disciple Chōyo 重譽 (fl. 1118–1142) in the same tradition. Both Jichihan's reference in the Amida manual to his own initiation in 1116 and the fact that Chōyo's initiation took place in 1118 could be indications that this Amida manual was not written only at the end of Jichihan's life but had already taken shape shortly after the events of 1116 and 1118 (YATAKU 1989, pp. 17, 18).

Unlike the *Amida shidai*, copies of the *Amida nakanokawa* manuscript are still extant. The copy that was disclosed by Satō Tetsuei is preserved in the repository of Saikyō-ji 西教寺, east of Kyoto.¹⁷ It has the following postscript:

Recorded by the saint Jichihan.

I copied this in the lodgings of the Nenbutsu sanmai-in of Tennō-ji from a manuscript of Tō-ji in the fifth year of Shōan (1175), fifth month, eleventh day. [The monk] Shōshun.

I finished copying this in the third year of Kenkyū (1192), third month, twenty-first day. The monk Renjaku.¹⁸

In this short text, Jichihan explains the contemplation on Kanjizai-ō Nyorai (= Amida). In accordance with the exposition in the *Rishushaku* and the *Muryōju nyorai kangyō kuyō giki*, Jichihan identifies Amida as one of Dainichi Nyorai's virtues who manifests himself in the Pure Land as Muryōju Nyorai and who, in the manifestation of the bodhisattva Kanjizai, resides in the defiled worlds. In fact, this point of view is completely in accordance with Kakuban's *dōtai imyō* concept and this way of thinking is once more corroborated in Jichihan's collection of secret transmissions on the *Rishushaku* (*Rishushaku kuketsushō* 理趣釈口決鈔):

Kannon (=Kanjizai) and Amida (=Muryōju), although they differ in their defiled and Pure abodes, and in their being the cause and the accomplishment, have no distinction in their essential nature. Moreover, each of the various deities individually is part of the wide gate that consists of Dainichi's whole essence. Therefore, the Kannon of this stage corresponds with the wide gate that is Dainichi. (p. 336)

¹⁷ According to the *Tendai shoseki sōgō mokuroku*, another copy has been preserved in the Manshu-in 曼殊院 (SHIBUYA 1943, p. 647a). The monk Shōshun belonged to the Taimitsu branch Hōman-ryū as well (see footnote 2).

¹⁸ On three occasions, SATŌ Tetsuei published pictures of this manuscript (1958, 1965, 1972), but in his studies he has only given a partial transcription of the text itself. I have tried to reconstruct the remaining parts.

The text of the *Amida nakanokawa* is divided into three sections. The first contains a threefold exposition on Amida's state of being, name and esoteric sobriquets, and discusses Amida's above-mentioned manifestations. Jichihan illustrates his explanation with quotations that are exclusively taken from esoteric texts and commentaries such as the *Hizōki* 秘藏記 and the *Dainichikyōsho* 大日經疏. The second section explains the five stages of the contemplation. Jichihan gives a short description of the insights that will arise in the mind of the practitioner when he engages in the contemplation of Kanjizai-ō Nyorai. In this short passage, he elaborates on the concept that, through the contemplation of the deity's merits, the mind of enlightenment (*bodaishin* 菩提心) will arise in the practitioner, which will bring about the fruit of realization.

The third and main part of the text is dedicated to a commentary on the passage in the *Muryōju nyorai kangyō kuyō giki*, in which the contemplation on the bodhisattva Kanjizai is expounded (p. 71a). Jichihan explains that this passage incites the practitioner to enter the contemplation, teaches him the contemplation proper, and instructs him in the corresponding mudras and mantras. The doctrinal foundation of his explanation is based on the fourth chapter of the *Rishushaku* (p. 621a), which he quotes frequently. During the contemplation, the practitioner visualizes in his mind a moon disk on which the esoteric syllable *hr̥h* is placed. This syllable, which represents Amida's domain of enlightenment, emits radiant light and transforms into an eight-petalled lotus, in the middle of which Kanjizai bodhisattva is seated on a lotus throne. In his left hand Kanjizai bodhisattva holds a lotus. This lotus symbolizes the bodhisattva's compassion with which he contemplates the pure nature of all sentient beings. The posture of his right hand radiates the energy that unfolds the buddha nature of one's own mind. On the eight petals of the lotus are eight buddhas sitting in meditation with their faces directed at Kanjizai. The practitioner visualizes this eight-petalled lotus as being equal to the vast space that includes one's own body. Finally, he forms the mudra of Kanjizai.

As was the case with the *Amida shidai*, copies of this *Amida nakanokawa* circulated during the Kamakura period among various Shingon scholar monks. In the middle chapter of his *Himitsu nenbutsushū*, Dōhan discusses the Lotus contemplation (*rengē zanmai* 蓮華三昧), which unfolds the innate pure mind of sentient beings. This unfolding is compared to the unfolding of an eight-petalled lotus on which Amida and eight bodhisattvas are seated. These nine venerables are endowed with numerous merits of infinite value. Here, Dōhan refers to the corresponding passages in the *Muryōju giki* and the *Rishushaku*,

after which he finally concludes with a lengthy quotation from “the esoteric explanation of Jichihan” (SAZ 2, pp. 241–42), which corresponds with the third section of the *Amida nakanokawa*. Besides Dōhan, several contemporaries such as Raiyu, Ryōzen 亮禪 (1258–1341), Ryōson 亮尊 (contemporary of Ryōzen), and Kyōjun 教舜 (fl. 1264–1287) were also influenced by Jichihan’s interpretation of the Amida ritual, and they quoted the *Amida nakanokawa* in their works on various occasions.¹⁹

One of the catalogues in which several of Jichihan’s works were listed is the *Shoshū sōshoroku* 諸宗草疏錄 (Catalogue of commentaries in the various schools). Among the works in this catalogue that are attributed to Jichihan, one bears the title *Kanjizai-ō sanmaji* 觀自在王三摩地 (Contemplation on Kanjizai-ō [= Amida]). Because the contents of the *Amida nakanokawa* amount to an explanation of the same contemplation, this manuscript has been designated as a later copy of the *Kanjizai-ō sanmaji* (SATŌ 1965, p. 46).

It is certainly true that, as Satō has pointed out, the doctrinal thought of both the *Amida shidai* and the *Amida nakanokawa*, contrary to that of the *Nenbutsu shiki* and the *Byōchū shugyōki*, is based purely on tenets of the Shingon school. In this respect, his theory about the three stages of development in Jichihan’s Pure Land thought is rather plausible. One objection against this hypothesis, however, has already been raised: from a different point of view it can also be argued that the *Amida shidai* might have been written shortly after Jichihan’s initiation in 1116. Besides, both the *Amida shidai* and the *Amida nakanokawa* are focused on the esoteric Amida ritual itself, rather than actually discussing Pure Land ideas in general. Because the latter text is undated, no conclusive proof can be given for it being written during the last decade of Jichihan’s life. A second objection that can be made against Satō’s theory emanates from records concerning Jichihan’s final years that do have a date. As SATŌ has pointed out (1965, p. 48; 1972, pp. 63–65, 90), these records suggest that Jichihan had taken up the desire to attain rebirth in Amida’s western paradise (*saihō ganshō* 西方願生), which is opposite to the *mikkyō* notion of aiming for rebirth in this body and in this world.

During his final years, Jichihan resided at Kōmyōsan-ji. In the sixth month of Hōen 7 (1141), he was instructed by the office of the retired Emperor Toba to perform the *Mukujōkō daranihō* 無垢淨光陀羅尼法, which was intended as a veneration ritual (*keiai-hō* 敬愛法) in order to stimulate the convalescence of the retired emperor, who suffered from a rather severe illness. The *Mukujōkō daranikyō*, the scripture on

¹⁹ See *Rishushaku hidenshō*, p. 282ab; *Hishō mondō*.

which this ritual is based, contains various passages in which it is proclaimed that when the *mukujōkō* mantra is uttered, the beneficiary will attain rebirth in the Pure Land of Ultimate Bliss (T. 19, p. 917). For that reason, this ritual had become associated with the faith in Amida's western paradise. In this case, however, the ritual was not meant as a prayer for an auspicious rebirth, but for the convalescence of the retired emperor; it was for this reason that Jichihan omitted Amida's name in the announcement of the ritual. Nevertheless, at the end of the list of utensils that he needed to perform this ritual, Jichihan stated that they were tailored to Amida as an object of veneration. For the same reason, Jichihan concealed the image of Amida and put up the *Kongōkai*-mandala that depicted various deities (*Kakuzenshō*, Hōen 7/6/19).

This record suggests that, although a practitioner of esoteric rituals and a prolific writer of commentaries on *kairitsu* and *mikkyō* doctrines, Jichihan's personal faith in Amida during his final years possibly inclined to a desire for rebirth in this deity's western paradise. If this interpretation is valid, it would confirm the reliability of the only record in which Jichihan's demise is mentioned. Three years after the performance of the *Mukujōkō daranihō*, Fujiwara no Yorinaga wrote in his diary:

What I heard afterwards: today, the saint Jichihan passed away at Kōmyōsan.... Someone said: "He will be reborn in Amida's Pure Land of Ultimate Bliss." That is because this saint set his mind on rest and peace in Amida's paradise for many years.

(*Taiki*, Ten'yō 1/9/10)

Conclusion

During the transition from the Heian to the Kamakura period, socio-political anxiety, discontent with the moral decline in the monastic order, and religious pessimism led to two important developments. First, there was a renewed interest in traditional Buddhist ethics. Second, there was an increasing desire for a peaceful existence in this world and an auspicious rebirth in the afterworld that was expressed in a rapidly growing faith in the grace of saving buddhas and the blissfulness of their enticing paradises. The central problem of the first development was how to restore the traditional method of initiating *biku* that was introduced in Japan by Ganjin. Because legitimate Masters of the Precepts, without whom such an initiation would not be in accordance with the teaching, only existed in name, another solution had to be found.

Central to the second development were the methods, initially dominated by the Tendai school, that could induce rebirth in Amida's paradise. The influence of Tendai's Pure Land doctrines in general and that of Genshin's Pure Land classic, the *Ōjōyōshū*, in particular, stimulated the development of a Pure Land philosophy in other schools as well. In the case of the Shingon school, however, the central problem was how to insert the tenets that rejected this world as impure and advocated salvation in the paradise of a saving buddha outside this world into the frame of esoteric doctrines that were focused on the realization of enlightenment in this world and the present body. If we are to believe the Kamakura scholar monk Gyōnen, Jichihan played a pivotal role in both developments.

The solution for restoring the possibility of becoming a true *biku* was finally found in 1236, when Eison and others discovered that the practice of certain austerities could bring about visions of a buddha or bodhisattva, which were deemed to be necessary for becoming a *biku* through self-ordination. Although this development had nothing to do with Jichihan's own activities, it can be argued that this discovery was the final result of a process in which the renewed interest in the observance of the precepts as such had started to prosper more and more. Insofar as it can be gathered from his works, Jichihan's *kairitsu* thought was very conservative, but because he dedicated the better part of his life to the study and practice of the Buddhist rules of conduct, he distinguished himself and stimulated many others to do the same. In this respect, Jichihan can be duly considered as the restorer of the *kairitsu* tradition.

Jichihan was one of the first who tried to adapt Pure Land thought to Shingon doctrines. Contrary to his contemporary Kakuban, Jichihan did not stress the demarcation between esoteric and exoteric Pure Land thought, nor did he reject the latter's value. Instead, he distinguished himself by innovating and actualizing standard esoteric practices, in particular the three-secrets practice that he used as a method of contemplating Amida and invoking this deity's name.

The value that Gyōnen attached to Jichihan's activities and writings was obviously not diminished by doubts about whether his initiation in the precepts was properly executed or not, or whether his Pure Land thought belonged to the Tendai or Shingon tradition. It was rather the fact that the *Tōdaiji shiki*, the *Byōchū shugyōki*, and, to some extent, the *Amida shidai* and *Amida nakanokawa*, were widely circulated and used by various scholar monks, that prompted him to lavish on Jichihan such exuberant praise. It seems to me that because Jichihan did not follow a singular sectarian path, nor expressed controversial

ideas, nor founded a new school, he has been classified as a member of the “group” in Kuroda’s classification system that still needs the most research: the reformist group. It has become evident that Jichihan must be regarded as one of the first important thinkers of this group, not so much because of the influence of his *kairitsu* thought, but rather because of the influence of his ideas about esoteric *nenbutsu*.

ABBREVIATIONS

- BD *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 仏書解説大辞典. Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙, ed. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1974.
- DBZ-BK *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, ed. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1911–1922.
- DBZ-SGZ *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* (reprint), Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団, ed. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1979.
- DKIM *Dai Nihon komonjo ie wake monjo* 大日本古文書家わけ文書. Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku Shiryō Hensankai 東京帝国大学史料編纂会, ed. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1904–1996.
- GR *Gunsho ruijū* 群書類従. Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一, ed. Tokyo: Keizai Shuppansha, 1893–1902.
- HI *Heian ibun* 平安遺文. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, ed. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō, 1964–1980.
- JZ *Jōdoshū zensho* 浄土宗全書. Jōdoshū Kaishū Happyakunen Kinen Keisan Junbikyoku Hakkō 浄土宗開宗八百年記念慶讃準備局発行, ed. Tokyo: Sankibō, 1970–1972.
- KDZ *Kōgyō daishi zenshū* 興教大師全集. Tomita Kōjun 富田穀純, ed. Tokyo: Hōsenji, 1977.
- NDKS *Nihon daizōkyō kairitsushū shōsho* 日本大藏經戒律宗章疏. Nihon Daizōkyō Hensankai 日本大藏經編纂会, ed. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1985. (Reprint)
- NDRS *Nihon daizōkyō rishukyōshaku shōsho* 日本大藏經理趣經釈章疏. Nihon Daizōkyō Hensankai, ed. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1985. (Reprint)
- SAZ *Shingonshū anjin zensho* 真言宗安心全書. Hase Hōshū 長谷宝秀, ed. Kyoto: Rokudaishinbōsha, 1913–1914.
- SZ *Shingonshū zensho* 真言宗全書. Takaoka Ryūshin 高岡隆心, ed. Tokyo: Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai, 1933–1939.
- SZKT *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai* 新訂増補国史体系. Kokushi Taikai Henshūkai 国史体系編集会, ed. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1929–1967.
- T. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 et al., eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai and Daizō Shuppan, 1924–1932.

- Tz *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō zuzō* 大正新修大藏經図像. Appendix to T.
 ZGR *Zoku gunsho ruijū* 続群書類従. Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一, ed. Tokyo: Naigai Shoseki, 1931–1933.
 ZJZ *Zoku Jōdoshū zensho* 続浄土宗全書. Jōdoshū Kaishū Happyakunnen Kinen Keisan Junbikyoku Hakkō, ed. Tokyo: Sankibō, 1974.
 ZST *Zōho shiryō taisei* 増補史料大成. Zōho Shiryō Taisei Kankōkai 増補史料大成刊行会, ed. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1981–1983.
 ZZGR *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū* 続々群書類従. Ichishima Kenkichi 市島謙吉, ed. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1906–1909.

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Amida hishaku* 阿弥陀秘釈, KDZ 2.
Amida nakanokawa 阿弥陀中川, see SATŌ 1958, 1965, 1972.
Amida shidai 阿弥陀次第, see SATŌ 1965, 1972.
Anjin yōjinshū 安心養神集, JZ 2, 3, 11, 15.
Byakuhō kushō 白寶口抄, Tz 6.
Byōchū shugyōki 病中修行記, SAZ 2.
Chūyūki 中右記, ZST 10.
Daikyōyōgishō 大經要義鈔, DBZ-BK 42.
Dato hiketsushō 駄都秘決鈔, SZ 23.
Denritsu zugengeshū 伝律図源解集, DBZ-SGZ 64 no. 483.
Denzūki nyūshō 伝通記糴鈔, JZ 3.
Eizan daishi den 叡山大師伝, ZGR 8.
Enkō daishi gyōjō ezu yokusan 圓光大師行狀畫圖翼賛, JZ 16.
Enshō shōnin gyōjō 円照上人行狀, ZZGR 3.
Fusatsu yōmon 布薩要文, see KODERA 1979.
Gakushō shiki 学生式, ZGR 8.
Gengibunki 玄義分記, JZ 2.
Genkō shakusho 元亨釈書, DBZ-SGZ 62 no. 470.
Himitsu nenbutsushō 秘密念仏鈔, ZJZ 15.
Hishō kuketsu 秘鈔口決, SZ 28.
Hishō mondō 秘鈔問答, T. 79 no. 2536.
Honchō seiki 本朝世紀, SZKT 9.
Ichigo taiyō himitsushū 一期大要秘密集, KDZ 2.
Jōdo ehyō kyōronshōsho mokuroku 浄土依憑經論章疏目錄, DBZ-SGZ 96 no. 907.
Jōdo hōmon genryūshō 浄土法門源流章, T. 84 no. 2687.
Jōdoshū yōshū kenmon 浄土宗要集見門, JZ 11.
Jubosatsukaihō 受菩薩戒法, see KODERA 1978.
Jubosatsukai ryakusahō 授菩薩戒略作法, see ISHIYAMADERA 1991.

- Kairitsu kōgyō gansho* 戒律興行願書, NDKS 2.
Kakuzenshō 覺禪鈔, DBZ-BK 45-51.
Kanpotsu bodaishinshū 勸発菩提心集, T. 45 no. 1862.
Kechimyaku ruijūki 血脈類集記, SZ 39.
Keiran shūyōshū 溪嵐拾葉集, T. 76 no. 2410.
Kirei mondō 遺嶺問答, GR 9.
Kōfukuji ryaku nendaiki 興福寺略年代記, ZGR 29.
Kōfukuji saikondō manshutō kaian 興福寺西金堂滿衆等解案, HI no. 3547.
Kojidan 古事談, SZKT 18.
Kongōji monjo 金剛寺文書, DKIM 7.
Muryōju nyorai kangyō kuyō giki 無量寿如来觀行供養儀軌, T. 19 no. 930.
Nanto sōzoku shokufukuki 南都僧俗職服記, DBZ-SGZ 50 no. 404.
Nenbutsu shiki 念仏式, see SATŌ 1965, 1972.
Nihon sandai jitsuroku 日本三代実録, SZKT 4.
Ōjōyōshū giki 往生要集義記, JZ 15.
Rishushaku 理趣积, T. 19 no. 1003.
Rishushaku hidenshō 理趣积秘伝鈔, NDRS.
Rishushaku kuketsushō 理趣积口決鈔, NDRS.
Risshū gyōkanshō 律宗瓊鑑章, NDKS 3.
Risshū kōyō 律宗綱要, NDKS 3.
Sangoku buppō denzū engi 三国仏法伝通縁起, DBZ-SGZ 62 no. 467.
Shinzoku zakki mondōshō 真俗雜記問答鈔, SZ 37.
Shōdai senzai denki 招提千歳伝記, DBZ-SGZ 64 no. 481.
Shoke nenbutsushū 諸家念仏集, ZJZ 15.
Shoshūshōshoroku 諸宗章疏録, DBZ-BK 1.
Shukke jukaihō 出家受戒法, NDKS 3, no. 316.
Sō Gonzai saimon an 僧欣西祭文案, HI no. 4871.
Sonpi bunmyaku 尊卑分脈, SZKT 59.
Taiki 台記, ZST 23.
Tendaihokeshū nenbundosha eshōkōdai shiki 天台法華宗年分度者回小向大式, ZGR 8.
Tendai zasu Ryōgen kishō 天台座主良原起請, HI 2 no. 303.
Tōdaiji kaidan-in jukai shiki 東大寺戒壇院受戒式, T. 74 no. 2350.
Tōshōdaiji engi nukigaki ryakushū 唐招提寺縁起拔書略集, DBZ-SGZ 85 no. 712.
Tōshōdaiji ge 唐招提寺解, DBZ-SGZ 64 no. 479.
Zoku honchō ōjōden 続本朝往生伝, DBZ-BK 107.

SECONDARY SOURCES

GRONER, Paul

- 1984 *Saichō: The establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley: Buddhist Studies Series 7.

HORIIKE Shunpō 堀池春峰

1957 Yamato Nakanokawadera no kōsei to Jichihan 大和中川寺の構成と実範. *Bukkyō shigaku* 6(4): 43–57.

1958 Yamato Nakanokawadera no kōsei to Jichihan. *Bukkyō shigaku* 7(1): 46–58.

ISHIDA Mizumaro 石田瑞磨

1963a Nantokai no saikō 南都戒の再興. In *Nihon Bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no kenkyū* 日本仏教における戒律の研究, pp. 490–97. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

1963b Jichihan ni tsuite—sono “Jukai shiki” wo tōshite 実範について—その『受戒式』を通して. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 11(1): 76–85.

ISHIYAMADERA BUNKAZAI SŌGŌ CHŌSADAN 石山寺文化財総合調査団

1991 *Ishiyamadera no kenkyū* 石山寺の研究, 2 vols. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

KODERA Bun’ei 小寺文穎

1978 Nakanokawa Jichihan sen “Jubosatsukaihō” ni tsuite 中川実範撰『受菩薩戒法』について. *Eizan Gakuin kenkyū kiyō* 1: 76–94.

1979 Ishiyamadera zōhon “Fusatsu yōmon” (Nakanokawa ryū) ni tsuite 石山寺蔵本『布薩要文』(中ノ川流)について. *Eizan Gakuin kenkyū kiyō* 2: 41–59.

KURODA Toshio 黒田俊雄

1994 *Kuroda Toshio chosakushū* 黒田俊雄著作集, vol. 2. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

KUSHIDA Ryōkō 櫛田良洪

1964 Himitsu nenbutsu shisō no bōkkō 秘密念仏思想の勃興. In *Shingon mikkyō seiritsu katei no kenkyū* 真言密教成立過程の研究, pp. 181–232. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

1975 Kakuban to Jichihan to no kōshō 覚鑑と実範との交渉. In *Kakuban no kenkyū* 覚鑑の研究, pp. 113–87. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kyōbunkan.

NAKAMURA Hajime 中村 元

1988 *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 仏教語大辞典. Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki.

NAKANO Tatsue 中野達慧

1934 Jichihan denbō 実範伝法. In *Kōgyō daishi seiden* 興教大師正伝, pp. 285–92. Tokyo: Sesōkan.

NARA KOKURITSU BUNKAZAI KENKYŪJO 奈良国立文化財研究所 ed.

1982 Shichidaiji junrei shiki 七大寺巡礼私記. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo.

ŌTANI Teruo 大谷旭雄

1966 Jichihan “Byōchū shugyōki” ni tsuite 実範『病中修行記』について. *Bukkyō bunka kenkyū* 13: 43–58.

ŌYA Tokujō 大屋徳城

1928a Jichihan oyobi sono shisō 実範及びその思想. *Nihon Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 1: 233–52.

- 1928b Inmyō no shūseika Zōshun 因明の集成家藏俊. *Nihon Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 1: 253–82.
- 1987 Nara Bukkyōshiron 寧楽仏教史論. In *Ōya Tokujō chosaku senshū* 1, pp. 397–434. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- SANFORD, James H.
- 1994 Breath of life: The esoteric nenbutsu. In *Esoteric Buddhism in Japan*, Ian Astley, ed., pp. 65–98. The Seminar for Buddhist Studies (SBS) Monograph 1. Copenhagen and Aarhus: SBS.
- SATŌ Tetsuei 佐藤哲英
- 1956 “Nenbutsu shiki” no sakusha ni tsuite 『念仏式』の作者について. *Ryūkoku Daigaku ronshū* 353: 141–51.
- 1958 Tendai gakusō Shūen no kenkyū 天台学僧宗淵の研究. In *Shūen shōnin no shūshū shiryō ni tsuite* 宗淵上人の蒐集資料について, Shin’a Shūen Shōnin Sankōkai 真阿宗淵上人讃仰会, ed., pp. 18–26. Kyoto: Hyakka-en.
- 1965 Nakanokawa Jichihan no shōgai to sono Jōdokyō 中ノ川実範の生涯とその浄土教. *Mikkyō bunka* 71/72: 21–52.
- 1972 “Nenbutsu shiki” no kenkyū 『念仏式』の研究. Kyoto: Hyakka-en.
- 1979 *Eizan Jōdokyō no kenkyū* 叡山浄土教の研究. Kyoto: Hyakka-en.
- SHIBUYA Ryōtai 渋谷亮泰
- 1943 *Shōwa genzai Tendai shoseki sōgō mokuroku* 昭和現在天台書籍総合目録 vol. 2. Tokyo: Meibunsha.
- SHISHIŌ Enshin 獅子王円信
- 1930 Taitōryōmitsu no kyōhanshijō ni okeru ronsō 台東両密の教判史上における論争. *Mikkyō kenkyū* 39: 2–43.
- TANAKA Chichō 田中智肇
- 1912 Hōnen shōnin to Jichihan risshi to no kankei ni tsuite 法然上人と実範律師との関係に就て. *Shūkyōkai* 8(12): 19–28.
- TANAKA Minoru 田中 稔
- 1976 *Samurai bongē kō* 侍凡下考. *Shirin* 59(4): 524–28.
- YATAKU SHOHŌRYŪ INJINRUIJŪ KANKŌKAI 野沢諸法流印信類聚刊行会, ed.
- 1989 *Tōmitsu shohōryū injinruijū* 東密諸法流印信類聚, vol. 8, pp. 3–25. Osaka: Tōyō Shuppan.