

Annen's Interpretation of the Tendai Ordination: Its Background and Later Influence

PAUL GRONER

WHEN THE history of the Japanese Tendai 天台 school is discussed, the founder Saichō 最澄 (767–822) is often credited with (or criticized for) rejecting the Vinaya and substituting the bodhisattva precepts from the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 in full ordinations. However, when subsequent Tendai history is considered, the interpretation of the Tendai precepts is much more complicated with such texts as the *Lotus Sutra* or esoteric *samaya* (Jp. *sanmaya* 三摩耶) precepts playing key roles. When citations of texts in sources from the late Heian 平安 (794–1185) through the Muromachi 室町 (1336–1573) periods are surveyed, the polemical texts that Saichō wrote on the precepts, such as the *Sange gakushō shiki* 山家學生式 (Rules for Students of the Mountain School) and *Kenkairon* 顯戒論 (Treatise Revealing the Precepts) are ignored by many exegetes with the exception of those arguing for a return to stricter monastic discipline, such as Kōen 興圓 (1262/63–1317) of the Kurodani 黒谷 lineage of Tendai and Ninkū 仁空 (1309–1388) of the Rozanji 廬山寺 lineage of Tendai. However, these were smaller traditions than the other Tendai lineages. The text that was continually, and frequently, cited by most Tendai lineages was the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒廣釋 (Detailed Explanation of the Universal Bodhisattva Precepts Ordination) of Annen 安然 (b. 841).¹

Early in my career, I wrote an article about the *Fanwang jing* and Annen's text.² As I have investigated the changes in Tendai views of

¹ *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*, T no. 2381. Hereafter, referred to as FBK in the notes.

² Groner 1990. The present article is a revised and expanded version of Groner 2015, which was published in Japanese.

ordinations, precepts, and monastic discipline in the years since then, my views evolved as I read additional primary source materials concerning the history of Japanese Tendai interpretations of the precepts and recent studies by several scholars. In addition, the development of digital texts such as CBETA, SAT, and the Tendai CDs³ has enabled me to investigate some of the sources of Tendai views on these subjects and consider the later influences of the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*. I thought the text deserved a second look, so decided to write this paper, which is divided into three parts. I begin with a consideration of the background of Annen's insistence that the Tendai ordination be a "universal ordination," in other words, an ordination that could be used by both lay and monastic practitioners. This was not an easy position to take because powerful figures in Tendai, particularly Enchin 圓珍 (814–891), argued against it. Second, I consider the de-emphasis on the actual observance of the precepts. In particular, the *Fanwang jing* precepts, never a particularly effective set of rules for the full ordinations of monks, were de-emphasized. In addition, various rationales for treating the precepts as expedients that could be ignored were advanced. The influence of a Korean exegete, Taehyōn 大賢 (fl. ca. mid-eighth century) on Annen's interpretation is particularly important, even though Annen does not mention him by name and twists his interpretations in important ways to support a lax interpretation of monastic discipline. Third, because Annen was the great systematizer of Tendai Esoteric Buddhism, some of the influences of esoteric Buddhism in the text are considered, including the *samaya* precepts and the realization of buddhahood with this very body (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成佛). Even so, the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* was primarily an exoteric text.

I. UNIVERSAL AND DISTINCT ORDINATIONS

When Annen gave the title *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* to his work on Tendai ordinations, he used the term *futsūju* 普通授, which I have translated as "universal ordination," that appears in no previous text. Although he does little to explain his usage in the text, I believe that the term *fu* 普, or *amaneku*, can be interpreted as strengthening the term *tsūju*, which I also translate as "universal ordination." One of the few passages in the *Futsūju bosa-tsukai kōshaku* that uses the term *futsūju* would seem to confirm this:

³ CBETA: *Zhonghua dianzi fodian xiehui* 中華電子佛典協會, <https://www.cbeta.org>; The SAT Daizōkyō Database, <https://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/satdb2015.php>; *Tendai denshi butten* 天台電子佛典 CD-ROM, 5 vols. (Ōtsu: Tendai Shūten Hensanjo, 2007).

Without distinguishing among everyone, the precepts are universally conferred (*futsūju*), and the seven groups are established according to the intentions of each recipient (*kaku zui shogyō* 各隨所樂), namely, the bodhisattva *biku*, *bikuni*, lay man, lay woman, male novice, female novice, and probationary nun.⁴

The term *futsūju* does not appear in any other Chinese text covered by CBETA, SAT, or in any Japanese Tendai texts included in Tendai CDs numbers 2–4, except for those of Annen.

A related term, *tsūju* 通受, also translated as “universal ordination,” does appear in many Indian and Chinese texts. Why did Annen choose to strengthen the sense of “universal” by adding the term *fu* to *tsūju*? A universal ordination is one in which precepts for lay believers and monastics are bestowed in the same ceremony. This sense of the term reflects the use of the bodhisattva ordinations in China in which the same ceremony might be used for both monastic and lay recipients, though usually with the monastics receiving them first. However, for Chinese monks, the bodhisattva precepts would augment the two-hundred-and-fifty precepts of the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (Skt. *Dharmaguptaka vinaya*), which were received through a distinct ordination (*betsuju* 別受) because monks received a set of precepts unique to their status. This is the sense in which it is referred to in the Nara monastic officials’ criticism of Saichō’s proposals:

“There is no [category of] bodhisattva monks in China, nor are there bodhisattva monks who have received distinct ordinations, but there are bodhisattva monks who have received universal ordinations.” I [Kōjō 光定 (779–858)] replied: “[If you say that] there are no bodhisattva monks with distinct ordinations, but there are bodhisattva monks with universal ordinations, then you don’t know [Saicho’s] intention.”⁵

The key issue is whether a universal ordination should be received on top of distinct ordinations as was usually the case in China or whether a universal ordination could qualify one to be a monk without first receiving a distinct ordination, as would be the case for Saichō.

When Saichō and Annen discussed universal ordinations, they noted that distinctions about which precepts are conferred depended on the recipient’s motivation. This interpretation probably depended on proof

⁴ T no. 2381, 74: 758a22–25.

⁵ *Denjutsu isshinkai mon* 傳述一心戒文, T no. 2379, 74: 643b3–5.

number twenty-four of Saichō's *Kenkairon*, which has the title "universal ordinations with separate observances" (*tsūju betsuji* 通受別持), a compound that would seem to have been first used by Saichō. In that proof, Saichō responds to the Nara monks' claim that a universal *Fanwang* ordination would have enabled animals and slaves to become monks and sit with the nobility. Saichō responded by noting *Fanwang jing* quotations that indicate monastics must wear robes; therefore, animals cannot become monks because they do not wear robes. He also noted that the precepts allow distinctions between groups, thus preserving at least major distinctions in social class. How this would be accomplished in ordinations is not specified and that problem was a vital concern of Enchin, the *zasu* 座主 (head of the Tendai school) for much of Annen's adulthood. In fact, Annen wrote the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* in 882, during the height of Enchin's tenure as *zasu*. The timing was probably not accidental, because Annen was reacting to Enchin's effort to correct some of the problems in Tendai ordinations that Saichō had left unresolved, particularly the issue of how lay and monastic practitioners were to be distinguished with this new Tendai ordination.

Enchin

Enchin went to China from 853 to 858, only a few years after the disastrous Huichang 會昌 persecution of Buddhism, which peaked in 845. After his return, Enchin served in a number of administrative positions, eventually being named *zasu* from 868 to 891. During this time, he administered Tendai ordinations, adding notes on the reverse side of the ordination manual (*uragaki* 裏書) that had been written by Saichō, and which in turn was based on an earlier manual by the sixth Chinese patriarch Zhanran 湛然 (711–782). He found the monks on Mount Hiei 比叡 under his charge undisciplined, and grumbled that they were not very different from laymen. Many of his concerns and his desire to institute a distinct ordination system on Mount Hiei are found in his 887–88 commentary on the *Guan Puxian jing* 觀普賢經 (Visualization of the *Samantabhadra Sutra*), the capping sutra of the *Lotus Sutra* and the text on which much of the Tendai ordination ceremony was based. One of his most important objectives was to teach young monks how to behave. He complained:

The novices (*shami* 沙彌) of this country are mostly devoid of Buddhist teachings. They do not know the six types of

mindfulness,⁶ do not observe the rainy season retreat, do not go to the hall for the fortnightly assembly, and do not understand the rules for the two robes,⁷ begging bowl, or cloth for sitting. They have no shame. How are they different from lay believers? How can they use alms? . . . Today's shavepates have no mind to observe the precepts and lack the practices that have come down to us. When they are mixed with those on our Tendai mountain, how do we know whether to call them Buddhist or secular? Those who obtain initiation certificates and the precepts for monks and nuns do so only for their own livelihood and have no sense of protecting the Dharma or observing the precepts.⁸

The emphasis on proper deportment, particularly how robes were to be constructed and worn, observance of how special invitations to meals were to be allocated, and the seating arrangements in rituals reflect Enchin's experiences in China. The manner in which Enchin referred to the Tendai practitioners as *shami*, or novices, rather than monks (*sō* 僧) is significant. While he was in China, he distinguished several of his students as novices, while he was a monk, but then eventually had two of them ordained with the full precepts of the Vinaya.⁹ However, ambiguities remain about these usages.

While Enchin was in China, he collected twenty-one texts on the Vinaya, from both the Nanshan 南山 (South Mountain) and Dongta 東塔 (Eastern Pagoda) traditions of Vinaya exegesis. Enchin's interest in the Vinaya can be seen from the fact that he probably used the ten precepts for novices from the Vinaya in initiations, thus differing from other Tendai exegetes who used the ten good precepts or the ten major precepts of the *Fanwang*

⁶ The six types of mindfulness (*rokunen* 六念) are knowing (1) when the next fortnightly assembly will be held, (2) whether one has received an invitation to eat (away from the monastery), (3) how many years of seniority one has accumulated by successfully completing rainy season retreats, (4) whether one has exceeded the permitted number of robes and other possessions, (5) whether one is eating with his order, and (6) whether one is free of illness and able to practice assiduously. These appear in several Vinaya texts and were also cited by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). The term is also found in the *Guan Puxian jing*, but without an explanation as to its meaning (T no. 277, 9: 394a26).

⁷ The two robes refer to *man'e* 縵衣, "robes for novices," which are made up of five and seven columns of cloth, respectively.

⁸ Enchin, *Bussetsu Kanfugen bosatsu gyōhōkyō monku gōki* 佛說觀普賢菩薩行法經文句合記, in *Bussho Kankōkai* 1912–22, vol. 26, p. 508a–b.

⁹ Tokyo Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 1901, pt. 1, vol. 1, pp. 639–46.

jing for initiations.¹⁰ However, he continued to use the *Fanwang jing* precepts for full ordinations, following Saichō's example, even as he urged the adoption of Vinaya procedures for full ordinations, such as requiring prospective monks to be twenty years old.

In the *uragaki* of Saichō's ordination manual, Enchin noted:

In China, the majority [of bodhisattva ordinations] were universal, and a minority were distinct. Thus, when this ritual [manual] was composed, it did not include sections specifying that the candidate for ordination be twenty years old or that the candidate have the three robes and a begging bowl. Now, on our ordination platform, the majority are distinct ordinations and the minority are universal ordinations. The [recipients of the ordination] should wear robes and fulfill the other requirements according to the teaching. Thus we must thoroughly deal with requirements concerning age, robes, and begging bowls. If this is not the case, then distinct ordinations cannot be established and will clearly differ from the teaching. When [these requirements] are not included, then the precepts cannot be conferred on those following us. The attitudes in Mahayana and Hinayana rules differ, but the distinct ordination for the most part is not different. The eighteen requisite items [mentioned in the *Fanwang jing* that monks should carry] and monastic robes differ from the laity.¹¹

Enchin also specified that the candidate for ordination must have the permission of his parents and the government.¹² In the event that the candidate

¹⁰ Saichō had specified that the "perfect ten good precepts" be used for this purpose, but what he intended was not clear (*Sange gakushō shiki*, T no. 2377, 74: 624a6). As a result, various sets had been used by Tendai monks. Ninkū clearly states that Enchin used the ten precepts from the Vinaya (Tendai Shūten Hensanjo 2006, p. 501a). The source for this assertion is not clear, but may come from Enchin's commentary on the *Guan Puxian jing*, in which he cites Vinaya school sources in his discussion of the precepts for novices (Tokyo Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 1912, vol. 26, p. 505a). I have found no early certificates for initiation from Enchin's lineage in the *Onjōji monjo* 園城寺文書 or *Heian ibun* 平安遺文 that would corroborate this.

¹¹ T no. 2378, 74: 633a16–22.

¹² *Ju bosatsukai gi uragaki* 授菩薩戒儀裏書, DZ vol. 1, p. 320. The expression used to ask whether the candidate had his parents' permission is the same as that found in the *Sifen lü* and Daoxuan's commentaries. Because Enchin had collected a number of texts on the *Sifen lü* while he was in China, his use of such phrases is not surprising. See *Nihon biku Enchin nittō guhō mokuroku* 日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目錄, in Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 1970–73, vol. 95, p. 62b. Another indication of his reading of the Vinaya master Daoxuan's

was not twenty, he might vow to take the ten basic precepts and the precepts of the novice. In his notes, Enchin refers to both nuns and female novices, suggesting that he hoped to have an order of Tendai nuns.¹³

Enchin's efforts did not succeed for the most part, even though some later monks, particularly Kōen of the Kurodani lineage and Ninkū of the Rozanji lineage, made efforts in the same direction, but these were minorities within the Tendai tradition.¹⁴

Thus, Annen's *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* was composed at a key point in Tendai history when Tendai ordinations and monastic discipline might have developed in several different directions. Although the history of the Tendai precepts at the end of the ninth century is not clear, within several decades, Annen's view had come to dominate Tendai views on the ordination, which is considerably different from that of Enchin. His emphasis on passages from the *Lotus Sutra* identifying holding the sutra as being equivalent to observing the precepts, the *Fanwang jing* passage identifying the ordination with entering the ranks of the buddhas, and the *Yingluo jing* 瓔珞經 passage stating that the precepts could never be lost had become commonplace within Tendai.¹⁵ At the same time, the precepts themselves had receded in importance.

II. DE-EMPHASIZING THE PRECEPTS (*kaihō* 戒法)

The emphasis on universal ordinations left Annen with a problem of how monastics and lay believers were to be distinguished. Leaving it as simply a problem for the recipient's intention, as Saichō had suggested, seemed inadequate. What if the intention of the recipient and teacher differed? Or if the intention of either changed? If the recipient determined the content of the ordination, the role of the teacher conferring the precepts would be called into question. Ennin 圓仁 (794–864) raised such problems in his *Ken'yō daikai ron* 顯揚大戒論.¹⁶ The group of monks around Ninkū later criticized it by arguing that it could mean that if one's

works is found in a mention of a text on the ordination platform at Jetavana that had a bodhisattva precepts platform, though in this case the reference remains unclear (DZ vol. 1, p. 305).

¹³ DZ vol. 1, p. 319.

¹⁴ Ōtsuka 2009, pp. 135–37, 200–202.

¹⁵ FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 758c16–18, 777c27, 758c29–759a2; *Lotus Sutra*, T no. 262, 9: 34b15–17; *Fanwang jing*, T no. 1484, 24: 1004a20–21; *Yingluo jing*, T no. 1485, 24:1021b2–8.

¹⁶ T no. 2380, 74: 664b4–17.

intention (*igyō* 意樂) changed, then one's practices and status might change.¹⁷

In the introductory fascicle of the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*, Annen describes ten types of intention for receiving the bodhisattva precepts:

1. Those who intend to realize buddhahood with this very body
2. Those who intend to hold the rank of a bodhisattva
3. Those who intend to be a bodhisattva who goes directly (*jikiō bosatsu* 直往菩薩) to the goal of buddhahood
4. Those who intend to convert to Mahayana
5. Those who intend to never lose the precepts
6. Those who intend to receive the precepts anew (*jūju* 重受)
7. Those who intend to pay recompense for the four blessings (*shion* 四恩: from one's parents, sentient beings, rulers, and the three treasures)
8. Those who intend to be protected by all
9. Those who intend to become the king of all
10. Those who intend to convert the beings of the three realms¹⁸

Each of these is supported by a scriptural reference. For example, the realization of buddhahood is supported with a passage from the *Fanwang jing* that appears repeatedly in medieval Tendai texts on the precepts, much more frequently than any passage on a specific precept: "All beings with minds are embraced in (*setsu* 撰) the Buddha's precepts. If sentient beings receive the buddhas' precepts, they enter the ranks of the buddhas. Their rank is the same as those with great realization. They are truly children of the buddhas."¹⁹ The sixth category, reordinations, is discussed at length because this permits an ordained person to receive the precepts anew if a major precept has been broken that would entail losing the precepts or, according to some sources, by reciting *dhāraṇī* if a heinous sin (*gyakuzai* 逆罪) has been committed. In all of these, the intention to join a monastic or lay order is never specifically mentioned as a motivation. Several of these are concerned with spiritual development, such as realization of buddhahood with this very body and becoming a bodhisattva who goes directly to buddhahood. Others seem more this-worldly: gaining protection, becoming a king, or returning the four blessings, but in no cases does entry into a religious order as a beginning practitioner play an important role.

¹⁷ *Kairon shichō ryakushō* 戒論視聽略抄, Tendai Shūten Hensanjo 2006, p. 588b; FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 776c22–23.

¹⁸ T no. 2381, 74: 758c15–760b1.

¹⁹ FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 758c16–18; *Fanwang jing*, T no. 1484, 24: 1004a19–21.

The Decline of the Influence of the Fanwang Jing

When Saichō's *Shijō shiki* 四條式 (Rules in Four Articles), *Kenkairon*, and *Ju bosatsukai gi* 授菩薩戒儀 (Ordination Manual for the Bodhisattva Precepts) are considered, the *Fanwang* precepts are clearly important.²⁰ The ordination described in Saichō's manual is for initiating monks and replaces the use of the *Sifen lü* by asking whether the new monk will observe the ten major precepts at the end of the ceremony. A modern scholar might reasonably think that one of the first tasks for Tendai monks might have been to interpret the *Fanwang* precepts so that they could serve as a guide for monastic discipline. In fact, the *Fanwang* precepts were not very suitable for this task because they were a mix of precepts for lay and monastic practitioners. Instead, Tendai texts focused on the ordination and how it should be interpreted. Annen's *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* played a major role in the loss of influence of the actual precepts of the *Fanwang jing*. Instead of focusing on monastic discipline, passages in the *Fanwang jing* that identified the precepts with buddha-nature were emphasized over the literal discussions of conduct.²¹ The following passage from the third section, "Inviting the Teachers," uses an esoteric text to demote the *Fanwang* precepts to a level similar to Vinaya precepts and inferior to the esoteric *samaya* precepts.

If we follow the *Jingangding yijue* 金剛頂義決 (Determinations of the Shingon), the *Fanwang jing* precepts are the shallow and abbreviated (*senryaku* 淺略) [teachings] of the *Vajraśekhara* (*Kongōchō* 金剛頂).²²

The *Jingangding jing dayujia mimi xindi famen yijue* 金剛頂經大瑜伽祕密心地法門義決 (Determinations of the Great Yoga Secret Mind-ground Law Teaching of the *Diamond Protuberance* [or *Apex*] *Sutra*) by Amoghavajra (Ch. Bukong Jingang 不空金剛; 705–774) was based on oral instructions concerning ritual and was valued by Japanese practitioners. Because it is the oldest extant commentary and the only Chinese commentary on the *Jingangding jing* 金剛頂經 (Skt. *Vajraśekhara*; *Diamond Protuberance Sutra*), it has been particularly valued in Japan.²³ However, the

²⁰ See *Shijō shiki*, T no. 2377, *Kenkairon*, T no. 2376, and *Ju bosatsukai gi*, T no. 2378. These are discussed in Groner (1984) 2000.

²¹ Shirato 1987.

²² FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 764b9–12.

²³ The text seems to appear in bibliographies of works brought from China under different names, making a textual history difficult. For an analysis, see Kiyota 1985.

passage quoted above on the status of the *Fanwang jing*²⁴ is almost never cited in Chinese texts, but appears frequently in Japanese texts. Enchin mentions the passage in a set of questions that he sent to China around 882, roughly the same time Annen wrote the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*; in the *Sasa gimon* 些些疑文, Enchin asked how the *Fanwang jing* would fit in with eighteen assemblies of the *Jingangding jing*. However, the *Sasa gimon* is a set of questions without answers and no clear interpretation of the passage appears in it.²⁵ Annen's *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* could then be considered a response to such a question insofar as the precepts are identified as expedients based on the *samaya* precepts.

The statement that the *Fanwang jing* is shallow and abbreviated is cited in a number of Annen's works on esoteric Buddhism: the *Shingonshū kyōji gi* 眞言宗教時義,²⁶ the *Kanchūin senjō jigō kanjō gusoku shibun* 觀中院撰定事業灌頂具足支分,²⁷ and the *Bodaishin gi shō* 菩提心義抄.²⁸ Annen's numerous citations of this passage are evidence of a sustained effort to de-emphasize the role of the *Fanwang* precepts throughout his life.

The tenth section of the traditional Chinese Tiantai 天台 and Japanese Tendai ordination manual by Zhanran, and the subsequent manual reedited by Saichō, explain the contents of the ten major rules of the *Fanwang jing*, asking the ordinee whether he or she can observe each of them. This section is called the explanation of the characteristics [of the precepts] (*sessō* 説相) by both Zhanran and Saichō.²⁹ It mirrors the traditional ordination based on the Vinaya in which the *pārājika* (grave wrongdoings) would be explained to the new monk; the other rules could be taught later. A comparison of the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* with the manuals by Zhanran and Saichō reveals significant differences in approach. Annen renames the section "characteristics of the precepts" (*kaisō* 戒相).³⁰ The difference is significant because it allowed Annen to mention a wide variety of precepts, including those of the Vinaya and Yogācāra sources, all of which the bodhisattva might observe as expedients so that he could harmonize with and benefit others (*wakō rita* 和光利他). The term used to refer to this list of various precepts

²⁴ T no. 1798, 39: 808a22.

²⁵ Bussho Kankōkai 1912–22, vol. 27, p. 1048.

²⁶ T no. 2396, 75: 391c22, 400a26, 406c2.

²⁷ T no. 2393, 75: 234a24–26.

²⁸ T no. 2397, 75: 513a20, 548a9.

²⁹ Zhanran, *Shou pusajie yi* 授菩薩戒儀, X no. 1086, 59: 356c1–22; Saichō, *Ju bosatsukai gi*, T no. 2378, 74: 629a11–b26.

³⁰ T no. 2381, 74: 775c–777b.

is *hōben gakusho* 方便學處, which can be translated as “expedient trainings.” It is also the title of the eighteenth chapter in the *Dari jing* 大日經, a source for esoteric views of the precepts.³¹ Although Annen does not expound on this usage of the term in this section, elsewhere in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* he explains four esoteric precepts and an expanded view of the ten good precepts in a manner that suggests esoteric *samaya* precepts were the foundation of all precepts.³² The result is a more diffuse presentation of the precepts than the more narrowly focused discussions in the manuals by Zhanran and Saichō. This section concludes by asking the candidate whether he (or she) will observe each of the ten major *Fanwang* precepts, following the manuals by Zhanran and Saichō. However, this part of the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* is abbreviated once the question about the first major precept has been asked. In fact, the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* would be impossible to use for this section without referring to Zhanran and Saichō. The overall impression is that for Annen the ten major precepts of the *Fanwang jing* are simply an afterthought.

The eleventh section of the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* consists of a disquisition on observance (*hōji* 奉持) of the precepts. In the manuals by Zhanran and Saichō, this section is called an “exhortation to observe the precepts” (*gonji* 勤持) and is placed last and is very short.³³ Annen expanded it and exchanged its position with the section on extensive vows (*kōgan* 廣願), which had been the last section in the manuals by Zhanran and Saichō. The section on observance includes ten categories and discusses the various rationales for observing and violating the precepts. The result is very different from an exhortation to observe the precepts. The ten categories are:

1. Exhaustively holding the various precepts (*ippen ji shokai mon* 一遍持諸戒門)
2. [Holding] greater or lesser [number of precepts] in accord with one’s intentions (*zuishin tashō mon* 隨心多少門)
3. Following the inherently moral precepts, but allowing [violations] of those which are cultural obstacles (*goshō kosha mon* 護性許遮門)
4. Expedient of not violating the precepts (*hōben mubon mon* 方便無犯門)

³¹ T no. 848, 18: 39a6, 39a–40a.

³² T no. 2381, 74: 764b10–12.

³³ Zhanran, *Shou pusajie yi*, X no. 1086, 59: 356c23–357a14; Saichō, *Ju bosatsukai gi*, T no. 2378, 74: 629c.

5. Allowing the superior and controlling the inferior (*koshō seiretsu mon* 許勝制劣門)
6. Not violating [the precepts] because they are in accord with one's wishes (*zuigyō mubon mon* 隨樂無犯門)
7. Not violating [the precepts] out of fear (*fui mubon mon* 怖畏無犯門)
8. Going in accord with what is superior does not constitute a violation (*zuishō mubon mon* 隨勝無犯門)
9. Abandoning the Hinayana precepts is not a violation (*shashō mubon mon* 捨小無犯門)
10. By holding the ultimate one observes the precepts (*kukyō jitoku mon* 究竟持得門)

The first of these rubrics encourages observance of all precepts regardless of whether they are secular, Hinayana, or lesser forms of Mahayana. As Annen wrote, “Thus even if they are not the rules of the true vehicle, one should observe the rules of the provisional, Hinayana, human, and deity vehicles. If one does not observe all of these, he will cause others to despise [them], fail to benefit others and cause them to drop into bad rebirths.”³⁴ From that point on, rationales for both observing and violating the precepts under certain circumstances are presented, with an increasing emphasis on rationales for violations. For example, the second topic focuses on the *Yingluo jing*'s assertion that one does better to receive the precepts and violate them than to not receive them while observing them.³⁵ In the next discussion, the importance of observing the inherently moral precepts while permitting violations of the precepts that are based on cultural obstacles and norms is presented, but then this is followed by the view that even inherently moral precepts may be violated when necessary as an expedient means. For each of the rubrics, Annen cites canonical sources. Following the first rubric, which is supported by quotations from the *Fanwang jing* and the *Yingluo jing*, sources that would have been highly respected by the Tendai school, he cites passages from Yogācāra sources that would have been respected by Tendai critics in the Nara schools.

Several examples concerning the observation of the precepts demonstrate the significance of this discussion. In the fourth rationale, acting out of expedient means, the *She dasheng lun* 攝大乘論 (*Mahāyāna-saṅgraha*) is quoted: “If one sees a way of benefitting others, then even the ten wrongdo-

³⁴ T no. 2381, 74: 777b10–13.

³⁵ T no. 1485, 24: 1021b14–17.

ings are permitted. Even if one commits the ten practices such as killing as an expedient, they are not sins. They lead to myriad fortunes and the rapid realization of enlightenment.”³⁶

In the fifth rationale, “allowing the superior and restricting the inferior,” he cites the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論: “For bodhisattvas, not troubling sentient beings is their precept; this is not the same as *śrāvakas* who seek nirvana in the present. As for sexual desire (*in'yoku* 姪欲), although it does not trouble sentient beings, it does bind the mind and so is considered a major wrongdoing. Bodhisattvas do not seek nirvana in the present; they go to and fro in samsara because they have the proper preparation to do so.” Annen then concludes, “The practice of the precepts on desire and hatred should be practiced like this. It is like selling liquor, which delights oneself and others.”³⁷ This passage might have meant a lot to Annen because one of his teachers, Tankei 湛契 (817–880), had been laicized by the court for an affair, resulting in resentment from many Tendai monks over the court’s action.³⁸ The passage that Annen cites from the *Da zhidu lun* is not found in the text as we have it today, nor have I found a passage that it might have been based on. This is one of several passages in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* that have been difficult or impossible to trace.

In the sixth rationale, following one’s wishes but not violating the precepts, Annen notes:

If one wishes to cut off sexual desire, and strives with great effort to do so, his delusions will gradually increase, and he will be unable to see things correctly. To stop his deranged thoughts, he must abandon [his efforts to stop them]. For example, in fishing, when the fish is strong, but the hook is weak, one will lose both the fish and the hook. If one loosens the hook and line, he will definitely catch the fish. You should understand all like this.³⁹

³⁶ FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 777b26–28; Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664), *She dasheng lun*, T no. 1594, 31: 146b28–c1, but not cited by Taehyōn. This passage is cited by such figures as Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321) and Eison 叡尊 (1201–1290). I hope to compare their approaches in the future.

³⁷ FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 777c6–11; Taehyōn, *Pōmmanggyōng kojōkki* 梵網經古述記, T no. 1815, 40: 700c17–20; also see T no. 1815, 40: 705a6–7.

³⁸ Groner 1987, pp. 134–36.

³⁹ FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 777c16–19. No corresponding passage is found in Taehyōn’s commentary on the *Fanwang jing*.

The eighth rationale, following the superior does not constitute a violation, relies on the three collections of pure precepts (*sanju jōkai* 三聚淨戒; discussed below).⁴⁰ It concludes with a paraphrase of the *Lotus Sutra*, “‘If one can preach the *Lotus Sutra*, this is called holding the precepts.’ Even if one violated the precepts preventing evil, if he held those promoting good and those benefitting sentient beings, how could this not be holding the precepts?”⁴¹

In the last of the ten rationales, “Holding the ultimate is observing the precepts,” he notes that all is suchness (*shinnyo* 眞如). When this is realized, such distinctions as observing and violating the precepts are superseded.

Annen’s recitation of the ways in which the precepts might be observed or violated concludes with a note that all ten of the rationales depend on the first of the three collections of pure precepts, which prevented wrongdoing. However, when the second of the three collections, precepts encompassing good, are considered, virtually any action might be permitted as long as it did not violate four major esoteric precepts: (1) not abandoning the aspiration to enlightenment, and (2–4) not abandoning any of the three jewels. Although Annen did not identify this formula with esoteric views of the precepts, he probably relied on the *Dari jing yishi* 大日經義釋 (Commentary on the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*) of Yixing 一行 (683–727).⁴²

Much of this section is based on Taehyōn’s commentary on the *Fanwang jing*, the *Pōmmanggyōng kojōkki* 梵網經古迹記, which lists a number of approaches to observing and violating the precepts. However, Annen stressed the rationales for violating the precepts much more than Taehyōn. Taehyōn was the founder of the Yogācāra tradition in Korea and one of the most prolific Korean authors, but his Yogācāra works followed the interpretation of the Korean monk Wōnch’uk 圓測 (613–695), who studied Yogācāra under Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664), the translator of many Yogācāra texts. His interpretation differed dramatically from Ci’en 慈恩 (632–682), the de facto founder of the Faxiang (Jp. Hossō 法相 school). Taehyōn also wrote about

⁴⁰ For a brief discussion of the three collections of pure precepts and the key difference between Hossō and Tendai interpretations, see Groner 2017, pp. 144–45.

⁴¹ T no. 2381, 74: 777c27–28; this is a loose paraphrase of *Lotus Sutra*, T no. 262, 9: 34b15–17.

⁴² T no. 2381, 74: 778a24; *Da Piluzhena chengfo jing shu* 大毘盧遮那成佛經疏, T no. 1796, 39: 672b18–20. The formulation of the *samaya* precepts here is different from many. Yixing’s *Da Piluzhena chengfo jing shu* is an example of a text important to Tendai that used this formulation.

the Huayan 華嚴 (Jp. Kegon) tradition. Annen could have exploited the differences between the Yogācāra views of the Hossō authorities and such figures as Paramārtha (499–569) and Taehyōn, much as Saichō did,⁴³ but chose not to identify Taehyōn in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*. At times, when the source of a quotation of a sutra in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* cannot be located, Annen is simply quoting Taehyōn; this is the case with the passage from the *Da zhidu lun* mentioned above. However, Annen never cited Taehyōn or his commentary by name in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*, perhaps because Taehyōn was considered to be a Faxiang monk and had been cited extensively by the Hossō monk Zenju 善珠 (723–797) in his commentary on the *Fanwang jing*, the *Bonmōkyō ryakusho* 梵網經略疏.⁴⁴ Saichō and Kōjō both cited Taehyōn, but by Annen’s time, perhaps this was more difficult because of the increasing friction between the Tendai and Hossō schools. Citing Yogācāra texts might seem odd for a tradition that stressed the one-vehicle position, but Taehyōn primarily used the precepts from the *Bodhisattva-bhūmi* to augment the *Fanwang jing*.⁴⁵ After Annen’s time, Taehyōn was cited in the Shingon Ritsu 真言律 movement⁴⁶ and well over one hundred times by Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321) in his voluminous Kamakura-period commentary on the *Fanwang jing* precepts, the *Bonmō kaihon sho nichiju shō* 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔. In contrast to these works, Taehyōn was not mentioned in many of the more theoretical works on Tendai precepts. However, Tendai monks who stressed the literal interpretation of the precepts such as Kōen and Ninkū did cite his commentary by name.

Confession and Expiation

The last topic in looking at the decline of adherence to the precepts is a consideration of what the act of committing heinous sins might entail. One of the key preliminary moments in a traditional ordination according to the Vinaya occurred when a candidate was asked about issues that would disqualify him for ordination, such as whether he had committed a *pārājika* offense during his current lifetime or had shed the blood of a Buddha (an

⁴³ Groner (1984) 2000, pp. 102–4.

⁴⁴ Ōtani and Utsunomiya 2011, p. 148.

⁴⁵ Yoshizu 1989, pp. 106, 117, n. 39.

⁴⁶ Ōtani and Utsunomiya 2011. Note that the Shingon Ritsu monk Eison’s subcommentary on Taehyōn’s work *Bonmōkyō koshakki gekan kamon bugyō monjū* 梵網經古迹記下卷科文輔行文集 (in Matsumoto and Nakano 1914–21, vol. 2, pp. 227–536), advocates strict adherence and thus differs from Annen’s interpretation.

offense that only applied to Devadatta). Some issues were obstacles that might be remedied, such as whether he had his parents' or spouse's permission. In the case of the Tendai bodhisattva ordination, Annen discussed the various wrongdoings and noted that violations of the major precepts might be vanquished by confession, or if that failed, by receiving the precepts again.⁴⁷ The key disqualifying issue was whether a person had violated the seven heinous sins: shedding the Buddha's blood, patricide, matricide, killing a preceptor, killing a teacher (*ajari* 阿闍梨), splitting the Buddhist order, and killing a sage. Annen then noted that some teachers had mentioned that a *dhāraṇī* in a text called the *Jifayue* 集法悅⁴⁸ could vanquish the five heinous sins (the above seven minus killing a preceptor and killing a sage). He then argued that if this were true of the five heinous sins, it must be true of the seven sins as well. Although the use of a *dhāraṇī* might suggest the influence of esoteric Buddhism, this is questionable. As well, the *Jifayue* narrative of a monk who commits the heinous sins and then uses *dhāraṇī* to overcome the bad karma is actually a Jataka tale; it appears in Nara-period records of manuscripts, and was cited by the two Korean exegetes, Ūijōk 義寂 (fl. late eighth century) and Taehyōn, in their commentaries on the *Fanwang jing*, which have virtually no esoteric influence.⁴⁹ However, Annen cites the *dhāraṇī* in several other works, suggesting the ambiguities inherent in whether it is considered esoteric.⁵⁰ The Korean commentators express some hesitation in allowing that the *dhāraṇī* could vanquish the karma arising from heinous wrongdoing, but Annen is more positive about the *dhāraṇī*, arguing that if this were true of the five heinous sins, it would surely apply to the seven. Vanquishing bad karma is not the same as conferring the precepts again, but Annen uses the *Guan Puxian jing* to argue that the precepts making one a monastic might be “naturally accomplished” (*jinen jōju* 自然成就).⁵¹ The term “naturally accomplished” indicates that the precepts could be conferred without the participation of an order.

In conclusion, Annen pays lip service to the importance of observing the precepts, even including the Vinaya, in some of his statements. However, the end

⁴⁷ Groner 2012.

⁴⁸ For a thorough and insightful investigation of the text, see Silk 2008.

⁴⁹ Ishida 1982, bibliography, no. 1795.

⁵⁰ *Shoajari Shingon mikkyō burui sōroku* 諸阿闍梨真言密教部類總錄, T no. 2176, 55: 1122b3; *Kanchūin senjō jigō kanjō gusoku shibun*, T no. 2393, 75: 234a26–29. Debates arose in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries about whether a person who had committed any of the seven heinous sins could confess the wrongdoing and be ordained (Kubota 1984).

⁵¹ *Guan Puxian jing*, T no. 277, 9: 393c9; FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 759b8–10.

result of his commentary is to consider both the precepts of the *Fanwang jing* and Vinaya as expedients and to argue that violations of both could be expiated through confession, reordination, or the recitation of powerful *dhāraṇī*.

III. ESOTERIC ELEMENTS IN THE *FUTSŪJU BOSATSUKAI KŌSHAKU*

The esoteric *samaya* precepts play an important role in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*; in the section on inviting the teachers, Annen states:

Specifically, the precepts of the *bodhisattva-piṭaka* refer to the *samaya* precepts of all the buddhas. In full, they include the four *pārājikas*, the ten major precepts, the four grave wrongdoings (*shī dai shōzai* 四大性罪),⁵² and the ten expedient trainings (*jū hōben gakusho* 十方便學處).⁵³

The vague terminology in this statement probably refers to the section on precepts in the eighteenth chapter of the *Dari jing*, “Receiving the Code of Training with Expedient Means.” The passage in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* is ambiguous in its abbreviated explanation of how the *samaya* precepts lie at the basis of all precepts. This is certainly due to the lack of a set Tendai explanation of the *samaya* precepts when Annen wrote the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*, but some of his subsequent works clarify his position. Several scholars have tried to explain Annen’s system with varying degrees of success, but a thorough investigation of this issue lies beyond this work.⁵⁴ Annen’s position provided the basis for the view that almost all precepts could be seen as expedients and violated when necessary.

The term *samaya* precepts appears only twice in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*. These mentions are followed by a description from texts related to the *Diamond Protruberance Sutra* of how Śākyamuni could not realize enlightenment until the various buddhas came down and conferred the *samaya* precepts on him.

Long ago Śākyamuni bodhisattva practiced for six years and then sat in the place of enlightenment, but did not realize supreme enlightenment. All of the buddhas came and conferred the *samaya*

⁵² The four *samaya* precepts of ch. 18 of the *Dari jing*: slandering the Dharma, abandoning the bodhi-mind, miserliness in teaching the Dharma, and causing harm to beings.

⁵³ FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 764b9–12. The ten expedients are found in ch. 18 of the *Dari jing*, which are an expansion of the ten virtuous deeds.

⁵⁴ Among the most successful efforts are Teramoto 2011a and 2011b, Kubota 1986, Tomabechi 2005, and Mano 2012.

precepts on him. Then going through the five stages of realization of buddhahood (*gosō jōbutsu* 五相成佛),⁵⁵ the world honored one with the direct path (*jikidō* 直道) suddenly entered the buddha realm (*bukkai* 佛界).⁵⁶

This story is well known as a reworking of Śākyamuni's enlightenment in esoteric terms; it indicates that the traditional practices of Mahayana were not effective in realizing supreme enlightenment and that only esoteric Buddhist practices could bring one to the ultimate stage.

The five stages of realization of buddhahood are a set of meditations or insights (*kan* 觀) and mantras that were conferred on Śākyamuni (frequently referred to as Siddhartha in these accounts) to bring him to ultimate enlightenment. The esoteric practitioner repeats these. The conflation of the *samaya* precepts with these five stages suggests that for Annen the Tendai ordination was not just an initiation into an order, but a realization of buddhahood.

This theme is explored further in the seventh section of the manual called "Conferring the Precepts." Following the manuals by Zhanran and Saichō, the three collections of pure precepts are conferred. However, Annen argues that three interpretations of these exist: "(1) The precepts that are transmitted and received, (2) the precepts that emerge (*hottoku* 發得), and (3) the precepts that are inherent."⁵⁷ He notes that this analysis is found in the *Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 (Skt. *Yogācārabhūmi śāstra*).⁵⁸ Annen did not develop the three views of the precepts in his other works, nor did they play a significant role in later texts that were available to me for a digital review. In the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*, he seems to be hunting for a system and terminology to express his views. The ritual directions for the conferral of

⁵⁵ Usually rendered as *gosō jōshin* 五相成身: to achieve the body (of Mahāvairocana) by practicing a fivefold meditation. Various formulations of this exist, but an example can be found in the *Hizō hōyaku* 秘藏宝鑰 (Precious Key to the Secret Treasury) of Kūkai 空海 (774–835): "Have an insight into the Mind; meditate on the enlightened Mind; to visualize the enlightened Mind in the form of a *vajra*; to transform one's mind into a *vajra*; and to realize unsurpassed enlightenment and obtain an adamant body like a *vajra*" (Hakeda 1972, p. 220). Such formulations could be filled out in a variety of ways; see Tado 2008 and 2015.

⁵⁶ *Fa putixin lun* 發菩提心論, T no. 1665, 32: 572c13–14; FBK, T no. 2381, 74: 764b12–15.

⁵⁷ T no. 2381, 74: 773c2–3.

⁵⁸ T no. 1579, 30: 522a10–22. However, the *Yuqie shidi lun* lists four types. Two of the categories—the precepts correctly transmitted and the innate precepts—correspond to Annen's categories, but the other two—precepts through repetition and precepts in accord with expedients—do not. Because Annen's category of precepts that emerge would require buddha-nature, it probably would not have fit in with Yogācāra thought.

the precepts in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* are repetitious, with rituals consisting of the proposition and three votes (*byaku shikonma* 白四羯磨) and simple declarations (*tanbyaku* 單白) for each of the three types of precepts.

The three collections of pure precepts that occupied the central place in the ordinations described by Zhanran and Saichō now only have an auxiliary role as an aspect of the precepts conferred and received. Instead, the ordination serves as a virtual realization of buddhahood. In fact, at one point Annen uses the realization of buddhahood with this very body (*sokushin jōbutsu*) to categorize teachings.

Annen's use of *sokushin jōbutsu* in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* differed significantly from his later treatments in his texts that dealt more substantively with esoteric Buddhism. Terms such as the six elements (*rokudai* 六大), which played a key role in both the *Sokushin jōbutsu gi* 即身成佛義, attributed to Kūkai 空海 (774–835), and in Annen's view of the realization of buddhahood with this very body in later works, are not mentioned in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*.⁵⁹

For Saichō and his immediate disciples, realization of buddhahood centered on the attainment of the first abode (*shojū* 初住), the stage when a person first gained some insight into ultimate truth. Subsequent stages consisted of deepening that insight until supreme enlightenment was realized. In the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*, the realization of buddhahood is used with another Tendai classification system, the six degrees of identity (*roku-soku* 六即). According to the Tendai theory of the six identities, worldlings (*bonbu* 凡夫) and sages are fundamentally identical, but a series of attainments allow for a hierarchy of stages as that identity is realized. In the following passage, this system is used to present a classification of scriptures, but at the same time suggests a series of realizations of buddhahood. The ordination is thus seen as much more than an entry into a religious order, although it is represented as entry into a group of buddhas and bodhisattvas. As seen in the following lengthy quotation, when the precepts are viewed against this system, the *Fanwang jing* occupies a low spot in the hierarchy.

According to the *Sutra on Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue jing* 圓覺經), “All sentient beings have originally realized buddhahood.” This refers to identity in principle (*risoku butsu* 理即仏).

⁵⁹ Ōkubo 2004, pp. 305–7. The connection between the six degrees of identity and realization of buddhahood with this very body, as well as an absence of mentions of the six elements, is also found in Annen's *Sokushin jōbutsu gi shiki* 即身成佛義私記, a text that focuses on the exoteric interpretation of the realization of buddhahood with this very body.

According to the *Fanwang jing*, “If sentient beings receive the Buddha’s precepts, they enter into the ranks of the buddhas.”⁶⁰ This refers to “entering a degree of realization of Buddhahood with this very body through verbal instruction” (*sokushin nyū myōji* 即身入名字). The status of verbal identity is for those with the lowest of the [nine grades] of religious faculties.

According to the *Sutra of the Benevolent King* (*Renwang jing* 仁王經), “If one receives, holds, reads, and chants [this scripture],”⁶¹ one immediately becomes a buddha (*soku ibutsu* 即爲佛). This refers to entering the ranks of the buddhas with this very body with contemplative practice (*sokushin nyū kangyō butsui* 即身入觀行佛位). This is for the eighth lowest of the [nine grades] of religious faculties.

According to the *Sutra on the Discernment of Samantabhadra* (*Puxian guan jing* 普賢觀經), “A practitioner realizes the purity of the six faculties.”⁶² This refers to the entry into the ranks of those who resemble buddhas but have not realized that stage with this very body (*nyū sōji butsui* 入相似佛位). This is for the seventh lowest of the [nine grades] of religious faculties.

According to the *Sutra of Myriad Meanings* (*Wuliang yi jing* 無量義經), if one receives and holds this sutra, then “one will realize acquiescence to the non-production of dharmas with this very body.”⁶³ This is entry into the identity of practice with this very body. This is for the sixth lowest of the [nine grades] of religious faculties.

If one enters the inherent seeds (*shōshu* 性種)⁶⁴ of buddha ranks with this very body, one has the fifth of the [nine grades] of faculties. If one enters the seeds of the path (*dōshu* 道種) with this very

⁶⁰ T no. 1484, 24: 1004a20.

⁶¹ The exact phrase does not occur in the *Renwang jing*, but the list of four practices appear repeatedly; for an example close to the usage here, see T no. 246, 8: 839c16–18.

⁶² A paraphrase of several passages in the *Guan Puxian jing*, such as T no. 277, 9: 389c21, 390c27.

⁶³ T no. 276, 9: 388b13. This passage appears in the questions that Saichō’s disciple Kōjō sent to China (*Tōketsu* 唐決, X no. 942, 56: 692a12).

⁶⁴ The four types of seeds in this section are based on a passage in the *Yingluo jing* (T no. 1485, 24: 1012b25), which was then expanded into a more detailed hierarchy in Tiantai passages, with the various types of seeds corresponding to the practices ranging from the ten practices (*jūgyō* 十行) to the ten grounds (*jūji* 十地). Typical is Zhanran’s commentary on the *Fahua xuanyi* 法華玄義 (T no. 1717, 33: 887a9–11).

body, one has the fourth highest of the [nine grades] of faculty. It also states, “When the bodhisattva ascends to the seventh ground, he enters the Buddha’s rank of seeds of the sage (*shōshu* 聖種) with this very body.” This is the third of the [nine grades]. If he realizes virtual enlightenment with this very body, then he has the second of the [nine grades].

According to the *Lotus Sutra*, “In the instant he hears this [teaching of the *Lotus Sutra*], he is able to thoroughly realize supreme enlightenment.”⁶⁵ This is entering buddhahood with supreme enlightenment and only for those with the highest degree of faculties. Thus you should know that the rules of the precepts (*kaihō*) are only the realization of the fruits of the path and no recompense for violations exist.⁶⁶

Annen uses the categories to classify teachings in a way that is significantly different from Saichō. The realization of buddhahood with this very body is virtually the same as the six degrees of identity, so much so that the two doctrines are linked with such terminology as verbal realization of buddhahood with this very body (*myōji sokushin jōbutsu* 名字即身成佛). The *Fanwang jing* is placed at the bottom of the hierarchy, below the *Lotus Sutra* and its opening and closing scriptures. The *Fanwang jing* would consistently rank lower than the *Lotus Sutra* in these schemes for the Eshin 慧心 and Danna 壇那 lineages in Tendai, the traditions that dominated the Tendai establishment on Mount Hiei during the middle ages. Both were fictitiously said to have their origins in the disciples of Genshin 源信 (942–1017) and were characterized by verbal transmissions and original enlightenment thought. Even when the *Fanwang* precepts gained in stature, such as in the Rozanji lineage, it was because Ninkū argued that it was a “perfect teaching,” in other words, the highest teaching in the Tendai hierarchy, equivalent to the *Lotus Sutra*. The perfect teaching was said to be complete and to include the essential truth of both Hinayana and Mahayana. The teaching was universally and directly transmitted to all who were ready for it. The passage does not specifically link ordinations with esoteric Buddhism, but Annen must have been aware of efforts by his predecessors to identify the *Lotus Sutra* with the principle, but not the practice of, esoteric Buddhism.

⁶⁵ T no. 262, 9: 31a10.

⁶⁶ T no. 2381, 74: 765b7–16.

Despite Annen's tentative suggestion of connections between the perfect-sudden precepts (*endonkai* 圓頓戒)⁶⁷ and the *samaya* precepts, this was not an area that he developed. Later Tendai exegetes sometimes rejected the connections between the perfect-sudden precepts and esoteric Buddhism. For example, although Ninkū was certainly interested in both esoteric Buddhism and the precepts, he argued that for pedagogical purposes they should be kept separate.⁶⁸ In the Kurodani lineage, the practice of "consecrated ordination" (*kai kanjō* 戒灌頂) was said to not be an esoteric Buddhist practice even though the term *kanjō* was often used in esoteric rituals.⁶⁹ However, such efforts to separate the perfect-sudden precepts and the *samaya* precepts did not hinder the development of teachings of the *samaya* precepts in the context of esoteric Buddhism.

CONCLUSION

Annen wrote the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* at a key point in the development of Tendai views of the precepts. If ordinations had followed the path laid out by Enchin, procedural elements from the Vinaya would have been incorporated into Tendai monasticism, but not the two-hundred-and-fifty precepts for fully ordained monks from the Vinaya. The universal ordination advocated by Annen gave Tendai monks much more freedom to interpret ordinations in a variety of ways. At the same time, it was vague about such questions as the distinction between monastic and lay practitioners.

Annen's efforts to describe the *Fanwang* precepts as expedients, much like the precepts of the Vinaya, led to an absence of a coherent guide to monastic behavior. Sets of rules for particular monasteries or the Tendai school in general fulfilled this role, but they depended on a strong abbot or *zasu* for their implementation. When Tendai monks such as Ninkū or Kōen went back to the *Fanwang* precepts, they usually interpreted them on the basis of the *Pusajie yishu* 菩薩戒義疏, the commentary attributed to Zhiyi 智顓 (538–597), the de facto founder of Chinese Tiantai.⁷⁰

By identifying ordination with the realization of buddhahood by Śākyamuni portrayed in esoteric texts, Annen fundamentally changed the

⁶⁷ Groner 2017, p. 137.

⁶⁸ Groner 2011, p. 237.

⁶⁹ Groner 2009, p. 194.

⁷⁰ Murakami Akira (2011) has convincingly argued that this commentary was actually written after the time of Zhiyi.

meaning of the ordination. The emphasis on the ordination as entry into an order of monastics was weakened and the ritual as a sacrament marking religious attainment of some sort was strengthened. Rather than citing specific precepts from the *Fanwang jing*, the *Fanwang jing* was usually cited as placing the ordinee in the ranks of buddhas.

Esoteric Buddhist elements were cited in the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*, particularly when interpreting all the precepts as developments of the *samaya* precepts. In addition, the ordination could be seen as a reenactment of how the buddhas assembled and conferred the esoteric precepts on Śākyamuni when he failed to realize enlightenment using exoteric teachings. However, Annen did not develop the esoteric potential of these approaches when he discussed the realization of buddhahood with this very body in terms of the precepts. Instead, the teaching was used as a classification of exoteric texts on the Mahayana precepts.

Finally, passages from the scriptures used by Annen appear repeatedly in later texts on the Tendai precepts. These changes did not occur immediately after Annen wrote the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*. A chronology of how the interpretation of the precepts developed is not possible at this point, but within several centuries of his death, the significance of Annen's views was obvious.

ABBREVIATIONS

- DZ *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 伝教大師全集. Edited by Eizan Gakuin 叡山学院. 5 vols. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1975.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35.
- X *Wan xu zang jing: Zang jingshu yuan ban* 卍續藏經：藏經書院版. Edited by Xin Wen Feng Bian Shen Bu 新文豐編審部. 150 vols. Taipei: Xin Wen Feng Chu Ban Gong Si, 1993–94.

REFERENCES

- Bussho Kankōkai 佛書刊行会, ed. 1912–22. *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書. 151 vols. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai.
- Groner, Paul. (1984) 2000. *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- . 1987. "Annen, Tankei, Henjō, and Monastic Discipline in the Tendai School: The Background of the *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku*." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14, nos. 2/3, pp. 129–59.

- . 1990. “The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen’s *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*.” In *Buddhist Apocryphal Literature*, edited by Robert Buswell, pp. 251–90. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- . 2009. “Kōen and the ‘Consecrated Ordination’ within Japanese Tendai.” In *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, edited by James Alexander Benn, Lori R. Meeks, and James Robson, pp. 178–207. New York: Routledge.
- . 2011. “Training Through Debates in Medieval Tendai and Seizan-ha Temples.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 38, no. 2, pp. 233–61.
- . 2012. “The Role of Confession in Tiantai/Tendai Bodhisattva Ordinations.” In *Sins and Sinners: Perspectives from Asian Religions*, edited by Phyllis Granoff and Kōichi Shinohara, pp. 216–42. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2015. “Annen no *Futsūju bosatsukai kōshaku* ni tsuite: Sono haikai to kōdai e no eikyō” 安然の『普通授菩薩戒広釈』について：その背景と後代への影響. *Nihon bukkyō sōgō kenkyū* 日本仏教総合研究 14, pp. 3–22.
- . 2017. “Japanese Tendai Views of the Precepts.” In *Rules of Engagement: Medieval Traditions of Buddhist Monastic Regulation*, edited by Susan Andrews, Jinhua Chen, and Cuilan Liu, pp. 131–56. Bochum/Freiburg: Project Verlag.
- Hakeda, Yoshito. 1972. *Kūkai: Major Works*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ishida Mosaku 石田茂作. 1982. *Shakyō yori mitaru Narachō bukkyō no kenkyū* 写経より見たる奈良朝仏教の研究. Tokyo: Hara Shobō.
- Kiyota Jakuun 清田寂雲. 1985. “*Kongōchō kyō giketsu no kōgō ni tsuite*” 金剛頂経義訣の校合について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 67 (34, no. 1), pp. 57–64.
- Kubota Tetsumasa 窪田哲正. 1984. “Enkai ni okeru shichigyaku jukai no mondai” 円戒における七逆受戒の問題. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 64 (32, no. 2), pp. 750–53.
- . 1986. “Annen no samayakai setsu ni tsuite” 安然の三昧耶戒説について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 69 (35, no.1), pp. 150–53.
- Mano Shin’ya 真野新也. 2012. “Annen ni okeru samayakai to enkai” 安然における三昧耶戒と円戒. *Tendai gakuho* 天台学報 54, pp. 115–23.
- Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎 and Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧, eds. 1914–21. *Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大藏經. 49 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Daizōkyō Hensankai.
- Murakami Akira 村上明. 2011. “*Bosatsukai gisho* to *Bonmōkyō* to no kanrensei” 『菩薩戒義疏』と『梵網經』との関連性. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 125 (60, no. 1), pp. 46–51.
- Ōkubo Ryōshun 大久保良峻. 2004. *Taimitsu kyōgaku no kenkyū* 台密教学の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Ōtani Yuka 大谷由香 and Utsunomiya Keigo 宇都宮啓吾, eds. 2011. “Chishakuin shōgyō ni okeru tenseki, bunsho no kisōteki kenkyū” 智積院聖教における典籍・文書の基礎的研究. *Nihon gakujutsu shinkōkai kagaku kenkyūhi kiban kenkyū B hōkokusho* 日本学術振興会科学研究費基盤研究 (B) 報告書, pp. 136–50.
- Ōtsuka Norihiro 大塚紀弘. 2009. *Chūsei zenritsu bukkyō ron* 中世禅律仏教論. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.
- Shirato, Waka. 1987. “Inherent Enlightenment (*hongaku shisō*) and Saichō’s Acceptance of the Bodhisattva Precepts.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14, nos. 2/3, pp. 113–27.

- Silk, Jonathan A. 2008. "The *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*: Translation, Non-Translation, Both or Neither?" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31, nos. 1/2, pp. 369–420.
- Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団, ed. 1970–73. *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書. 100 vols. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- Tado Taichi 田戸大智. 2008. "Gosō jōshin kan no Nihonteki tenkai: Annen to Saisen o chūshin ni" 五相成身觀の日本的展開：安然と濟暹を中心に. *Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō* 東洋の思想と宗教 25, pp. 83–99.
- . 2015. "Hannya yaku kyōten ni okeru gosō jōshin kan" 般若訳経典における五相成身觀. In *Ōkubo Ryōshun kyōju kanreki kinen ronshū: Tendai, Shingon shoshū ronkō* 大久保良峻教授還暦記念論集：天台・真言諸宗論攷, edited by Ōkubo Ryōshun Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Ronshū Kankōkai 大久保良峻教授還暦記念論集刊行会, pp. 227–59. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Tendai Shūten Hensanjo 天台宗典編纂所, ed. 2006. *Zoku Tendaijū zensho, Enkai 2* 続天台宗全書, 円戒 2. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Teramoto Ryōshin 寺本亮晋. 2011a. "Annen to samayakai" 安然と三昧耶戒. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 125 (60, no. 1), pp. 102–5.
- . 2011b. "Taimitsu no samayakai no kaisō to sono gaikan" 台密の三昧耶戒の戒相とその概観. *Tendai gaku* 53, pp. 105–13.
- Tokyo Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 東京大学史料編纂所, ed. 1901–present. *Dainihon shiryō* 大日本史料. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Tomabechi Seiichi 苔米地誠一. 2005. "Taimitsu no samayakai sahō ni okeru 'kaitai' no kōsei" 台密の三昧耶戒作法における「戒体」の構成. In *Mandara no shosō to bunka: Yoritomi Motohiro hakushi kanreki kinen ronbunshū* マンダラの諸相と文化：頼富本宏博士還暦記念論文集, edited by Yoritomi Motohiro Hakushi Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 頼富本宏博士還暦記念論文集刊行会, pp. 361–74. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Yoshizu Yoshihide 吉津宜英. 1989. "Hōzō izen no Bonmōkyō sho chūshakusho ni tsuite" 法藏以前の『梵網經』諸註釈書について. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教學部研究紀要 47, pp. 94–119.