

Jitsudō Ninkū on Ordinations

Paul GRONER

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, U.S.A.

Jitsudō Ninkū (1309-1388) played important roles in both the Tendai School and the Seizan branch of the Jōdo School, and was one of the most prolific and insightful monastic authors of his time; he also served as abbot of two important temples. His doctrinal and administrative concerns come together in his proposals to reform the ordination system on Mount Hiei. Part one of this essay is an investigation of the procedures followed in ordinations, focusing on an argument about whether Tendai monks should receive investiture in “comprehensive ordinations” (*tsūju*) or in “separate ordinations” (*betsuju*). Part two is an examination of how the ordination ceremony generates the karmic essence (*kaitai*) of the precepts. Part three explores Ninkū’s argument that ordinations were suitable for worldlings (*bonbu*). Even as he was attempting to strengthen monastic discipline, he maintained that the precepts were suitable for ignorant worldlings in a country distant from India during *mappō* (the period of the final decline of Buddha’s Dharma). Part four outlines Ninkū’s criticisms of two competing views of the precepts that arose among Tendai monks: the mix of ordinations and Esoteric consecrations represented by the consecrated ordination (*kaikanjō*) tradition that developed within the Kurodani lineage of the Tendai School and the use of the 250 precepts of the *Sifenlu* brought back to Japan by the monk Shunjō (1166-1227) of Sennyūji.

Keywords: NINKŪ, PERFECT-SUDDEN PRECEPTS, *FANWANGJING* (*BONMŌKYŌ*), TENDAI, SEIZAN BRANCH, *ENKAI GYŌISHŌ*, *KAIUSHŌ*, COMPREHENSIVE ORDINATION, SEPARATE ORDINATION, KURODANI LINEAGE, SHUNJŌ, ORDINATION-CONSECRATION

INTRODUCTION

In 822, the court gave the Tendai 天台 School permission to establish its own ordination platform and control its own ordination procedures. In addition, the Tendai School was permitted to use the precepts of the *Fanwangjing* 梵網經 and the *Lotus sūtra*

rather than those from the *Sifenlu* 四分律 as the basis for those ordinations. The author of these proposals, Saichō 最澄 (767-822), died one week before his proposals were approved by the court. In fact, although Saichō had long been one of the most eminent monks in Japan and had enjoyed the patronage of Emperor Kanmu 桓武 (737-806, r. 781-806), the court might well not have sanctioned his suggestions if he had not died at that time.¹ Its indulgence of Saichō can be explained as a demonstration of its grief at the death of an eminent monk.

The *Fanwangjing* was not a particularly good choice as the source of monastic rules. The text had been compiled in China, probably as an attempt to create a religious group that would include both lay and monastic believers.² In both China and Japan prior to Saichō's time, when the *Fanwang* precepts had been conferred on monks, they had usually been used in conjunction with the *Sifenlu* precepts. Thus Saichō's proposals were unprecedented. In subsequent years, individual Tendai monks made a number of attempts to use other texts to interpret the *Fanwangjing* precepts, sometimes augmenting the precepts with additional rules and other times rendering them virtually ineffective. As a result, by the Kamakura and Muromachi periods, Tendai monks advanced a wide variety of interpretations of precepts and ordinations.

In this article, I focus on Jitsudō Ninkū's 実導仁空 (1309-1388) interpretation of the Tendai ordination ceremony. Ninkū made one of the most sustained and serious attempts to adapt and augment the *Fanwang* precepts as guides for monastic discipline. He discussed the precepts repeatedly in a commentary, ordination manual, lectures, debate manuals and lists of rules compiled as he served as abbot of both Rozanji 廬山寺 and Sangoji 三鈷寺. I have used a variety of his writings to clarify his position on ordinations in this paper. Sets of rules for Rozanji and Sangoji have been particularly important for analyzing the specific sets of procedures used in ordinations. My analysis of Ninkū's doctrinal stance on the precepts is based on his extensive commentary on the *Pusajie yiji* 菩薩戒義記, a commentary on the *Fanwangjing* attributed to Zhiyi 智顛 (538-597) who was the de facto founder of the Tiantai School. Two unpublished texts have also been invaluable sources. The *Enkai gyōjishō* 円戒暁示鈔 (Admonishments and instructions on the Perfect precepts) is a two-fascicle work composed of discussions on ten topics concerning the precepts.³ The *Kaijushō* 戒珠鈔 (Compilation on the jewel of the precepts) is a two-fascicle debate manual that presents both sides of a number of issues concerning the interpretation of Zhiyi's *Pusajie yiji*.⁴

Ninkū's views reflected both the requirements of an administrator and the more theoretical positions of a scholar. The two temples at which he served as abbot played important roles in both the Tendai and the Seizan 西山 sect of the Jōdo School. In fact, Ninkū claimed that his views on the precepts were based on teachings that Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212) had only conferred on his disciple Shōkū 証空 (1177-1247), the founder of the Seizan sect.

The article is divided into four parts. In the first part, the procedures followed in the ordinations are investigated by focusing on an argument about whether Tendai monks

should be ordained according to procedures called “comprehensive” (*tsūju* 通受) or “separate” (*betsuju* 別受). Part two is an examination of how the ordination ceremony generates the karmic essence of the precepts. Part three explores some of the ways in which Ninkū argued that ordinations were suitable for worldlings (*bonbu* 凡夫). Ninkū explained the significance of ordinations in two seemingly contradictory ways. On one hand, he insisted that the procedures for conferring the precepts on monks should be tightened. At the same time, he repeatedly claimed that the ordination was appropriate for the ignorant worldling in a country distant from India during *mappō* 末法 (the period of the final decline of Buddha’s Dharma); his language and approach reflected his participation in Hōnen’s lineage. Part four outlines Ninkū’s criticisms of two competing views of the precepts that arose among Tendai monks: the mix of ordinations and Esoteric consecrations represented by the *kaikanjō* 戒灌頂 tradition that developed within the Kurodani 黒谷 lineage and the use of the 250 precepts of the Sifenlu brought back to Japan by the monk Shunjō 俊苒 (1166-1227) of Sennyūji 泉涌寺.

PART I. COMPREHENSIVE AND SEPARATE ORDINATIONS

Saichō had described ordination procedures in both the *Sange gakushō shiki* 山家学生式 (Regulations for Tendai monks) and the *Jubosatsukaigi* 授菩薩戒儀 (Ordination for the bodhisattva precepts). In his discussion of the precepts, Saichō sometimes had used language that suggested that the ordination could be conferred by virtually anyone on anyone else. For example, he had noted that husbands and wives could ordain each other and that the precepts extended to both lay and monastic believers.⁵ However, such a stance could obscure the difference between lay and monastic practitioners.

In an attempt to eliminate this ambiguity, Enchin 円珍 (814-891) tightened the rules by adding notes (*uragaki* 裏書) to Saichō’s *Jubosatsukaigi*. In doing so, he adopted many of the procedures that had been used in ordinations based on the procedures found in the *Sifenlu*, the source that Saichō had rejected as being a Hīnayāna text.⁶ For Enchin, a clear distinction had to be made between ordinations for lay believers and ordinations for monks. Without this differentiation, Nara monks could argue that because Tendai monks had been ordained with the same precepts used by lay practitioners, Tendai monks were not truly monks, but only novices or laymen. To counter such claims, in his notes to the ordination ceremony, Enchin substituted the term “the separate (sets of) precepts that result in liberation” (*betsugedatsukai* 別解脱戒) for terms such as bodhisattva precepts.⁷ For Enchin, ordinations were to be called “separate ordinations” (*betsuju* 別受), a term that referred to the practice of using different sets of precepts for the various religious statuses that a person might hold during his or her lifetime. A good example of separate ordinations is the manner in which people would receive progressively larger numbers of precepts as they moved from being lay believers to novices to fully ordained monks or nuns. Enchin’s notes on the ordination ceremony are an exam-

ple of an interpretation of Tendai initiation rituals as separate ordinations.

Enchin's contemporary Annen 安然 (fl. late ninth century) took a different approach. The title of his major text on the precepts, the *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku* 普通授菩薩戒広釈 (Extensive commentary on the comprehensive bodhisattva ordination) indicated that he viewed the ordination as being applicable to a wide variety of people. The term "comprehensive ordinations" mentioned in the title referred to the conferral of a single set of precepts on people regardless of their status. For example, as Saichō had noted both lay and monastic believers could receive the *Fanwang* precepts. Annen's interpretation of the ordination as comprehensive soon became the standard view in the Tendai School regardless of the concerns of Enchin and the disdainful critique of the Nara schools.

The distinction between separate and comprehensive ordinations was sometimes discussed by both Tendai and the Nara schools in terms of a basic classification called the three collections of pure precepts (*sanju jōkai* 三聚淨戒): the precepts prohibiting evil, promoting good, and benefiting sentient beings. When separate ordinations were conferred, sets of precepts such as those for lay believers, novices, monks and nuns were generally classified as precepts that prevented evil. When people subsequently received the bodhisattva precepts, they received the two other collections of pure precepts: those that encouraged good actions and those that benefited sentient beings. Thus, the ordination qualifying one to be a monk or nun was conducted separately from the ordination conferring the bodhisattva precepts.

Most Tendai scholars had followed Annen in arguing for "comprehensive ordinations" (*tsūju* 通受), maintaining the position that all of the three collections of pure precepts could be conferred simultaneously on a person regardless of his or her status. Thus the same ordination ceremony functioned to bestow the status of becoming a lay believer, novice or monk on a person and to confer the bodhisattva precepts. In fact, the *Fanwangjing* had specified that anyone who could understand the preceptor's words should receive the precepts.⁸ The recipient's aspirations and certain qualities defining one's status would automatically determine whether one was a lay believer, novice, monk or nun.⁹ Ninkū called this position "comprehensive ordinations with separate observances" (*tsūju betsuji* 通受別持), a term that also appeared in Saichō's *Kenkairon* 顯戒論 (Treatise revealing the precepts).¹⁰ However, Nara monks still criticized the Tendai practice of using comprehensive ordinations as confusing the statuses of lay and monastic believers.

Although Ninkū recognized that Tendai monks had traditionally used comprehensive ordinations, he advanced a number of arguments to support the contention that Tendai ordinations could be considered separate ordinations. For example, in the *Kaijushō* he suggested that statements conducive to comprehensive ordinations referred to the essence of the precepts (*kaitai* 戒体). Everyone has the same essence of the precepts; however, when the actual observance of the precepts (*kaigyō* 戒行) was considered, the precepts followed by lay and monastic believers were separate.¹¹ Elsewhere he went on to note that the difference between the essence and observance of the precepts is only provisional.¹²

This style of argument was typical of Ninkū. Instead of simply rejecting earlier Tendai views, he usually insisted that they referred only to a limited group of people or to a particular teaching; he then went on to explain how his view was more all-inclusive.

One of the main arguments for comprehensive ordinations had been the declaration in the *Fanwangjing* that everyone from kings to animals should be ordained and that those ordained entered the ranks of the Buddhas.¹³ Ninkū argued that this did not mean that the same ordination ceremony was appropriate for everyone regardless of status. Instead it should be interpreted as the affirmation of Buddha-nature in all who were ordained. Moreover, he noted that a variety of restrictions in traditional Tendai ordinations demonstrated that beings should not all be treated the same and that they did not all attain the same status through the ordination. For example, a precept required that monks wear robes, but animals certainly could not wear robes and thus could not become monks.¹⁴ Saichō had already pointed this out in the *Kenkairon*,¹⁵ but Ninkū carried the argument further by noting other distinctions between those who could receive the bodhisattva precepts and those who could not. For example, he argued that political restrictions would prohibit slaves from becoming monks; in fact, in the *vinaya*, one of the questions asked of each candidate for ordination was whether he or she was a slave.¹⁶ Such restrictions as the prohibition of the ordination of slaves had prevented the Buddhist order from becoming a refuge for those trying to escape their social obligations. Even the very ordination procedures suggested that different statuses were conferred. Only men who were to be ordained as monks were allowed to climb the ordination platform on Mount Hiei. Women were not allowed because they were not permitted on Mount Hiei. Ninkū thus argued for a position that he called “separate ordinations and separate observance” (*betsuju betsuji* 別受別持). Separate rituals and separate sets of precepts were to mark the beginning of a change in status in a practitioner’s religious life.

Evidence that Ninkū’s lineage did confer separate ordinations is found in a lineage document with a date of 1357 discovered at Tōji 東寺.¹⁷ The document consists of a lineage of “the transmission of the flame of the Mahāyāna separate precepts” (*dentō daijō betsugedatsukai* 伝灯大乘別解脱戒). The lineage began with Rushana and then progressed to Śākyamuni and a number of bodhisattvas, mentioning six generations in India. The transmission between India and China was handled by positing what must have been a literary relation between Kumārajīva (344-413), supposed translator of the *Fanwangjing*, and Huisi 慧思 (515-577). Because the two men could never have met face to face, the transmission of teaching must have been based on Huisi’s reading of one of Kumārajīva’s translations. Eight generations were mentioned in China before the transmission progressed to Japan. The lineage ended with Ninkū’s fellow student Shōgen 照源 (1072-1132), who signed his name as the “provisionally named bodhisattva *bhikṣu* Shōgen” (*kemyō bosatsu biku Shōgen* 化名菩薩比丘照源); the meaning of the term *kemyō* is considered later in this paper. Although Ninkū’s name does not appear in the document, the lineage agrees with Ninkū’s position on the use of separate ordinations as revealed by the use of the term *biku*, indicating that the use of separate ordinations can

be traced back at least to Shidō Kōkū 示導康空 (1286-1346), the monk who taught both Ninkū and Shōgen.¹⁸

The defense of the Tendai ordination as “separate” found in the *Kajjushō* was abstract. In his rules concerning ordinations, Ninkū described the concrete precepts to be taken in both the separate and comprehensive sets of ordinations. Ninkū followed Yijing 義淨 (635-713) in asking that lay believers receive the three jewels and five lay precepts before being taken as disciples (*nyūshitsu* 入室) and that they receive the ten precepts to qualify them as novices.¹⁹

When lay believers were ordained, Ninkū suggested that they receive the five lay precepts. He noted that when a comprehensive ordination was used, the terms “layman” (*ubasoku* 優婆塞) or “laywoman” (*ubai* 優婆夷) were not to be used to describe the five precepts. This was because those conferring the precepts in a comprehensive ordination did not need to specify distinctions in precepts. However, when the five lay precepts were conferred in a separate ordination, then the terms layman and laywoman were used to describe the precepts, thereby indicating that separate ordinations were used for each type of Buddhist.²⁰ Those lay believers who wished to receive a special set of precepts for a day were allowed to take the eight precepts traditionally given to pious lay believers.²¹

What precepts were conferred when a novice (*shami* 沙弥) was initiated? Ninkū stated that in comprehensive ordinations, the three collections of pure precepts were conferred. According to the ordination manuals by Zhanran 湛然 (711-782) and Saichō, these were the same precepts that were conferred when a person became a monk. However, Ninkū argued that in a separate initiation of a novice, the ten good precepts (*jūzenkai* 十善戒) were to be conferred; thus the novice received a different set of precepts than the monk when separate ordinations were used. Ninkū also noted that Enchin had used the ten precepts for novices (*Igikyō shamikai* 威儀經沙弥戒) found in the *Sifenlu*.²² In arguing for the adoption of the ten good precepts, Ninkū was clearly influenced by Saichō’s statement that the “Perfect ten good precepts” (*en jūzenkai* 円十善戒) should be used.²³ Many earlier Tendai monks, however, had interpreted this vague term as referring to the ten major precepts of the *Fanwangjing*. When referring to the ten good precepts for novices, Ninkū used the term “bodhisattva novice precepts” (*bosatsu shamikai* 菩薩沙弥戒). Ninkū’s care in setting up a sequence of precepts may seem superfluous to the modern reader, but Ninkū notes that “These days, after the head is shaved, no precepts are conferred and time mounts. This goes against Indian precedents and violates Saichō’s rules.”²⁴ In other words, the initiation of novices had become so lax on Mount Hiei that often candidates simply had their heads shaven and were given robes, but no precepts were bestowed. This had occurred in part because the initiation of a novice was an agreement between a teacher and student and thus was not as tightly controlled as the full ordination of a monk, which had to be conducted in front of an order of monks. Ninkū also noted that the monk who sponsored a novice should announce to the order that he was taking on a novice. Although a monk did not need

the order's permission to take on a novice, such a statement was required by some vinaya texts and helped to avoid misunderstandings.²⁵ However, Ninkū noted that few of his contemporaries went through this formality.²⁶ Ninkū's criticisms of the ordination standards among Tendai monks were probably not an exaggeration. Other movements to strengthen monastic discipline, such as the Kurodani lineage of Tendai monks and the various Zen lineages of this period frequently were critical of Tendai failures to observe the precepts.

Ninkū still required the monks under his supervision to climb the ordination platform (*kaidan* 戒壇) on Mount Hiei for their full ordination. Ninkū indicated the seriousness of the full ordination by a rule that required twenty-one days of confession before ordination. This presumably would have been conducted at the temples he supervised rather than Mount Hiei. Ninkū did not hold an office on Mount Hiei that would have enabled him to establish his reforms at the Tendai headquarters. In *Sifenlu* ordinations, no confession was required before ordinations. However, the Tendai ordination had been a mix of elements from a variety of sources including self-ordinations in which confession was used to purify the mind before receiving the precepts. Although Tendai ordinations were not self-ordinations, Saichō's ordination manual contained sections on both confession and the receipt of a sign (*kāsō* 好相) from the Buddha indicating that the confession had been effective and that the precepts had been received directly from the Buddha. These ordinations were conducted by a human teacher and thus could not be called self-ordinations in the strict sense of that term. In Tendai ordinations before Ninkū, the contents of the confession could vary considerably. Ninkū began his discussion of the confession ceremony by citing a passage from the *Fanwangjing* that mentions how one who has broken a major rule should confess until a special sign from the Buddha is perceived. The appropriate rule states that the confession can last anywhere from one week to a year.²⁷ Ninkū then continues,

Although these are not the rules for the first time one receives the precepts, we now adopt these rules of confession and use them before the ordination. As for the length of time of the confession, the *sūtra* listed three options: one week, two or three weeks, and one year; we have taken the middle option. According to the *Puxian guanjing*²⁸ 普賢觀經, the confession should be for twenty-one days. Now we have searched Buddhist sources and found that in accord with the nation's law, the period should be twenty-one days.

As for the format of the confession, if we follow the *Fanwangjing*, the precepts should be chanted during the six periods of each day.²⁹ Or the thousand Buddhas of the three time periods [past, present, and future] should receive one's obeisance. However, this only expresses one's respect, and one should probably vary it according to circumstances. If we follow the instructions of previous teachers, then we should use a single standard. For three time periods of each day, the Lotus repentance should be performed. At set times (*reiji* 例時), one should perform Amida's *nenbutsu*.³⁰ Every day, one should recite one fascicle of both the *Lotus sūtra* and the

Fanwangjing. Offerings of the Dharma should be prepared for the deity Sannō 山王 and for Dengyō Daishi (Saichō). One should pray that he will encounter no obstacle in receiving the precepts. ...

Before the ordination, one should be taught [the requisite doctrines]. If one does not understand the profound meaning of the threefold exegesis (*sanjū gengi* 三重玄義), then it will be difficult to receive the essence of the three collections of pure precepts³¹ at the time of the ceremony. [If one does not understand this,] then he should visit his teacher again and receive his guidance on the platform so that he truly will receive the precepts.³²

The twenty-one day period of confession services preceding the ordination was unusually strict; no such requirement was found in Saichō's *Sange gakushōshiki* or Ryōgen's 良源 (912-985) twenty-six rules.³³ The contents of the services were typical of medieval Tendai practice with the combination of Lotus and Pure Land practice. The recitation of the *Fanwangjing* marked it as preparation for the ordination.

The term "threefold profound meaning" referred to an exegetical system used in the *Pusajiejing yiji* 菩薩戒經義記, the commentary on the *Fanwangjing* attributed to Zhiyi. This text used a threefold system rather than the fivefold system found in many of Zhiyi's other works. For Ninkū, this unique exegetical system indicated the high regard in which Zhiyi held the second fascicle of the *Fanwangjing*, the section that contained the precepts. Thus Ninkū's major work on the *Fanwangjing*, *Bosatsukai giki kikigaki* 菩薩戒義記聞書 (Records of what was heard about Zhiyi's commentary on the bodhisattva precepts), was actually a commentary on Zhiyi's *Pusajiejing yiji*. In addition, two unpublished manuscripts by Ninkū, the *Enkai gyōjishō* and the *Kaijushō* both focused on the interpretation of passages from the *Yiji*. The emphasis on the *Yiji* in Ninkū's work has been understood in the Seizan sect to have been derived from Hōnen, who is said to have conferred his teachings concerning the *Yiji* only on Shōkū. In fact, Ninkū's works maintain a consistent doctrinal stance on the precepts throughout his life, perhaps indicating that his basic position might well have come from his teacher Shidō Kōkū 示導康空 (1286-1346), if not from Hōnen or Shōkū. The description of the twenty-one day confession period that preceded the ordination thus entailed practice as well as emphasized that the candidates for ordination understand the doctrinal basis behind Ninkū's view of the precepts.

Once the candidate had completed the confession, he was qualified to receive the full ordination. This consisted of the fifty-eight precepts of the *Fanwangjing*.³⁴ When separate ordinations were performed, Ninkū reserved these precepts for the fully ordained monk. In contrast, when the comprehensive ordination was conferred, these precepts had been conferred on anyone.

PART II. THE GENERATION OF THE ESSENCE OF THE PRECEPTS

The high point of the ordination of a monk is the instant at which the karmic essence of the precepts (*kaitai* 戒体) arises in the recipient. Tendai ordination manuals usually were based on the twelve-part ordination manual compiled by Zhanran and later revised by Saichō. The seventh section of this manual, when the precepts were actually conferred, was the high point of the ritual.³⁵ The candidate was asked three times whether he would observe the three collections of pure precepts. As he answered that he would do so, the preceptor told him that the essence of the precepts was approaching him. Finally, the last time he replied, the essence of the precepts entered the candidate.³⁶ At the same time, the essence was also said to be called forth from the candidate's own inherent nature.

Two accounts of Ninkū's own ordination exist. He described it in a note at the end of his biography of Shōkū, saying that he had been ordained in front of the two Buddhas at the Raigōin 来迎院 in Ōhara 大原 at the age of nineteen.³⁷ However, an eighteenth-century commentary on Shōkū's biography offered an alternative version, describing Ninkū's ordination as having taken place in front of the three jewels at the same site.³⁸ Although the two accounts are not mutually exclusive, the difference may indicate that later authors changed the description of the ordination to match Ninkū's insistence that the essence of the precepts arose from the three jewels, not the conferral of the three collections of pure precepts.

Ninkū had told his followers that they should be ordained on Mount Hiei, where they would have used the twelve-part ordination ceremony mentioned above. His interpretation of the ordination, however, differed from the traditional one. He had noted that the three collections of pure precepts were not mentioned in the *Fanwangjing*.³⁹ Chinese Tiantai monks such as Zhanran and his disciple Mingguang 明曠 had seen nothing wrong with the using teachings from other texts to supplement the *Fanwangjing*. Thus they had used passages from texts such as the *Dichijing* 地持經 that indicated that the three collections of pure precepts were the key to the emergence of the essence of the precepts. In fact, Ninkū too had consulted a variety of sources in his commentary on Zhiyi's *Yiji*. He noted, however, that commentaries on the *Fanwangjing* displayed no agreement on how the three collections of pure precepts should be integrated with the *Fanwang* precepts. Ninkū argued that in the case of the actual ordination, the three jewels, which are mentioned frequently in the *Fanwangjing*, should be considered the source of the essence of the precepts. Zhiyi had listed six ordination manuals in his commentary, the first of which was the *Fanwangjing*. That manual specified that first one paid obeisance to the three jewels. Afterwards, the precepts were explained. The order of the ritual indicated that the essence of the precepts arose through the three jewels, not the three collections of pure precepts.⁴⁰

Ninkū explained that the three jewels could be thought of at three levels. His explanation probably followed that of Mingguang, though he did not identify his source.⁴¹

The single essence of the three jewels (*ittai sanbō* 一体三宝) was the most profound; it was defined as the perfect principle of the true characteristics (*jissō enri* 実相円理). The second level was the three jewels considered in terms of separate characteristics (*bessō sanbō* 別相三宝). The three bodies of the Buddha (Dharma, reward, and manifested) served as the jewel of the Buddha, and the preaching of the various Buddhas was the jewel of the Dharma. Those bodhisattvas who had not yet attained supreme enlightenment constituted the jewel of the Buddhist order. The third level was the manner in which the three jewels remained in this world (*jūji sanbō* 住持三宝 or *jōjū sanbō* 常住三宝) after Śākyamuni had passed into *nirvana*: images of the Buddha served as the jewel of the Buddha, scriptures as the jewel of the Dharma, and monks with shaven heads and robes as the jewel of the order. The everyday sense of the three jewels thus consisted of the material objects that represented the unseen reality of Buddhas, bodhisattvas and their preaching.

At this point, we can return to a discussion of the term “provisionally named monks” with which those in Ninkū’s lineage signed their names. Kushida Ryōkō 榎田良洪 suggested a number of reasons for the usage.⁴² One is that in the age of the decline of the Dharma, no true bodhisattva monks could be found. Such an interpretation would be similar to the *Mappō tōmyōki*’s 末法灯明記 usage of the term *mukai myōji biku* 無戒名字比丘 (a monk in name only without the precepts).⁴³ Another explanation applies the term to monks who had violated the precepts and thus were not qualified to hold the precepts. After a consideration of these possibilities, Kushida concluded that the term was not used in a pejorative manner within the Seizan lineage, but did not go on to make clear to us the origins and meaning of the term. The most probable origin of this descriptor *kemyō* is in Ninkū’s discussion of the three levels of the three jewels. Following his usage, the monks who composed the order in the everyday sense of the word should be called provisionally named monks (*myōji kemyō biku* 名字仮名比丘).⁴⁴ Because the everyday interpretation of the three jewels was empowered by the single essence of the three jewels and because the power of Shana (Vairocana) butsu extended through *mappō*, paying obeisance to the third and lowest level of the three jewels enabled the practitioner to realize the essence of the precepts. Finally, the term “provisionally named monks” was used several times in Mingguang’s commentary, a source upon which Ninkū often relied.⁴⁵ Ninkū did not mention Mingguang’s use of the term.

Ninkū argued that the only reason that Tendai monks in the past had realized the essence of the precepts when they vowed to observe the three collections of pure precepts was because they had earlier paid obeisance to the three jewels. When the twelve-part ordination ceremony used by Zhanran and Saichō was followed, Ninkū’s interpretation placed the highpoint of the ordination right at the beginning, and made the rest of the ceremony seem superfluous. Critics of Ninkū’s views asked why such elements as confession should be performed after the essence of the precepts had been obtained.⁴⁶ He replied that when the Buddhas and bodhisattvas are called down to confer the precepts following the three jewels, the candidate paid obeisance to them as the separate charac-

teristics of the three jewels, the three jewels as invisible objects in the world. However, because the candidate had already placed his faith in the three jewels that abided in this world (*jōjū sanbō*), this section of the ceremony could be seen as simply encouraging the candidate, rather than conferring the precepts. Ninkū argued that the human being who officiated in the seventh section of the ceremony, conferring the precepts, did not actually confer (*ju* 授) the precepts, but rather transmitted (*den* 伝) them. Thus the three jewels represented by physical objects in which the candidate placed his faith at the beginning of the ceremony were still the basis of the ordination.⁴⁷ Despite Ninkū's arguments, the traditional order of placing one's faith in the three jewels as a precursor to the obtaining the essence of the precepts seemed to make more sense because confession purified the practitioner so that he might receive the essence of the precepts.⁴⁸ In fact, Ninkū's ordination manual may have been intended to instill a special interpretation in the candidate as he underwent the traditional ordination on Mount Hiei. Ninkū noted that his ordination manual was secret and not to be shown to outsiders. His insistence on shifting the emphasis of the ordination away from the three collections of precepts undoubtedly is related to his efforts to use separate ordinations. If the three collections had remained the high point of the ceremony, his followers would have been using a comprehensive ordination.

The issue of the three jewels also arose when Ninkū considered the issue of whether ordinations had to be conducted in front of an icon of the Buddha and a scripture. He argued strenuously that ordinations had to be conducted in front of the physical objects of an icon of the Buddha and a scripture because the three jewels present after Śākyamuni had entered *nirvāṇa* had to be physically present for a person to receive the essence of the precepts.⁴⁹

Contrary to Ninkū's argument, several passages in the *Fanwangjing* indicated that physical objects were not necessary. For example, according to the *Fanwangjing*, if a person could understand the teacher's words, that person would be allowed to receive all the precepts.⁵⁰ Another passage indicated that only faith was necessary to have the precepts.⁵¹ Icons were only mentioned several times in the *Fanwangjing*. For instance, a person who could not find a good teacher might go before an icon and confess until he received a sign from the Buddha indicating that the precepts had been received, a procedure that is called a "self-ordination" (*jisei jukai* 自誓受戒).⁵² Other passages required that fortnightly confessions and repentance ceremonies be conducted in front of an icon of the Buddha.⁵³ None of these passages specifically required that an icon be used when a qualified teacher conducted the ordination. Moreover, because the three jewels referred to more than physically present objects, an actual image of a Buddha and scripture would not seem to have been necessary for ordination.

Ninkū's insistence on the presence of the physical objects associated with the three jewels was closely connected with his view of the necessity for a ritual appropriate for the ignorant worldling. Although physical objects might not be required if the object of faith was the single essence of the three jewels or the separate characteristics of the three jew-

els, during *mappā* they were necessary. Because the physical objects representing the three jewels were intrinsically connected with the single essence of the three jewels, they served to empower the ordination and insure that the recipient entered the lineage of those who had received the precepts. In making his argument, Ninkū was able to draw on a passage in Zhiyi's commentary that suggested that an icon of the Buddha and scripture were vital to the performance of the ordination.⁵⁴

PART III. FAITH AND ORDINATIONS

Many of the arguments in the *Kaijushō* concern whether worldlings could receive and confer the precepts. Ninkū repeatedly emphasized that the precepts should be available to anyone during the period of the decline of the Dharma. In this section, three of the topics presented in his debate text, the *Kaijushō* are put forward: the role of faith in receiving the precepts, whether a worldling could confer the precepts, and whether ordinations conferred the Buddha-nature on a person.

Ninkū raised the issue of whether faith was required for a person to receive the bodhisattva precepts.⁵⁵ According to the *Fanwangjing*, virtually anyone from kings to slaves could receive the precepts as long as he or she had the ability to understand the words of the teacher.⁵⁶ The precepts were to be conferred on people regardless of their defilements, religious capacities, or other criteria. How, then, could Ninkū, who elsewhere argued for the universal applicability of the precepts, maintain that faith was required? Many medieval monks believed that faith could develop after the ordination.

The issue was further complicated by a passage in Zhiyi's *Yiji* that described six elements of faith as a requirement for the precepts. The first three were held in common with Hīnayāna practitioners: belief in cause and effect, the belief that if the truth is discerned the path will be realized, and the belief that precepts do, in fact, exist and are effective. For the Mahāyāna practitioner three additional elements of faith were added: the belief that the minds of both oneself and others are the Buddha-nature; the belief that if the supreme good is cultivated results will be obtained; and the belief that the result is characterized as being eternal, blissful, the Self, and pure.⁵⁷ Faith so profound was criticized by Ninkū's opponents, however, as being difficult to attain and surely not readily available to the ignorant worldling. As a result, they took the position that "understanding the teacher's words" and "having faith" referred to separate issues and that understanding the teacher's words was the key element in receiving the precepts during *mappā*.

Ninkū responded by arguing that faith was the basis of the three jewels. A person who was being ordained had departed from heterodox ways and entered the Buddhist path. How could faith not be required? Moreover, Ninkū argued that because separate passages in the *Fanwangjing* note that understanding led to the precepts and that faith led to the precepts, faith and understanding must be identical.⁵⁸ The passage concerning

the requirement that the candidate for ordination need only understand the teacher's words listed a variety of beings that should receive the precepts ranging from kings to animals. Ninkū noted that a wide variety of faculties were represented in such a list. Thus, the understanding and faith required for ordination need not be so difficult to attain. The description of the various elements of faith found in the *Yiji* did not refer to the most profound aspects of Buddha-nature teaching, but only to the faith that sentient beings have the Buddha-nature.

Just as Ninkū argued that the recipient could be an ordinary person, so did he maintain the position that the preceptor, the person who transmitted the precepts, could be an ordinary person.⁵⁹ In making this argument, he was concerned with the requirement specified in the commentaries by both Zhiyi and Mingguang that five virtues (*gotoku* 五德) were required of an ordained bodhisattva (*shukke bosatsu* 出家菩薩) who conferred the precepts. He or she must (1) observe the precepts, (2) have at least ten years of seniority, (3) know the literature on the precepts (*ritsuzō* 律藏), (4) be a master of meditation and reflection (*zenshi* 禅思), and (5) be a master of the literature on wisdom (*ezō* 慧藏).⁶⁰ This list indicated that the teacher had to be an accomplished master. In addition, Zhiyi had mentioned that the teacher should have attained the inner (*naibon* 内凡) or outer stages (*gebon* 外凡) of the worldling or be a true person (*shinnin* 真人).⁶¹ Moreover, if a teacher did not fully understand the precepts but pretended to know them, he or she had violated a minor precept.⁶² All of these passages indicated that the person conferring the precepts should be spiritually and intellectually advanced.

According to other passages, a teacher of the precepts need not have attained such a high status. Ninkū repeatedly cited a passage in the *Fanwangjing* that declared that the bodhisattva precepts were specifically for ignorant worldlings.⁶³ He noted that during *mappō* sages were difficult to find. Moreover, he demonstrated that the interpretations of the stages mentioned in the passages concerning outer and inner stages of the worldling were not uniform. Thus attempts to limit the teacher of the precepts to those above a specific stage were futile. According to Ninkū, both the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna precepts were intended for worldlings (*bon'i* 凡位). The only precepts that were peculiar to sages (*shō* 聖) were the precepts that spontaneously accompanied meditative states (*jōgukai* 定共戒) and the precepts that spontaneously arose with Buddhahood (*dōgukai* 道共戒).⁶⁴

In addition, Ninkū attacked the view that the teacher of the precepts must have attained a high spiritual level in a section of the *Kajushō* with the title, "Whether the defilements are an obstacle to obtaining the precepts according to our school."⁶⁵ He cited a passage in the *Yiji* that stated, "Because the defilements are always present, we do not call them obstacles."⁶⁶ If the defilements were an obstacle to serving as teacher of the precepts, then there would be no teachers during *mappō*. Much of Ninkū's argument was based on the verses found at the beginning of the *Fanwangjing*. He summed up the meaning of these verse with the phrase "the four precepts and the three encouragements" (*shikai sangon* 四戒三勸). The "four precepts" referred to how the bodhisattva precepts

had been transmitted from (1) Shana (Vairocana), to (2) Śākyamuni, to (3) bodhisattvas, and finally to (4) sentient beings in an unbroken lineage. Thus the worldling during *mappō* could receive the very same precepts as the Buddha Shana. The three encouragements referred to how sentient beings were urged to receive the precepts, observe them and then chant them. Both of these teachings led to the maintenance of an unbroken lineage that extends to the present.⁶⁷

The argument that the defilements were obstacles was based on the *Yuqielun* 瑜伽論 passage that stated that the four accompanying defilements (*shizuibonnō* 四随煩惱) are obstacles to good (*byakuhōshō* 白法障).⁶⁸ If the essence of the precepts were the mind that perceived the true characteristics of phenomena (*jissōshin* 実相心) such defilements would have to be obstacles to the establishment of the essence of the precepts. Moreover, the defilements are impure, but the precepts and the path that they lead to are pure. How could defilements not be impediments to the path?

Ninkū replied to such arguments by noting that if the defilements were obstacles, then no one could receive the precepts. Moreover, the essence of the precepts was not based on the mind, but on inherently provisional matter (*shōmusa keshiki* 性無作仮色).⁶⁹ As a result, defilements that affect the mind could not be obstacles to obtaining the precepts. The practical import of the argument was that ordinary people could confer and receive the precepts even if they had defilements.

The third issue in this section concerns the relationship between the precepts and Buddha-nature. In stressing the importance of ordinations, Ninkū raised the question in a section of the *Kajjushō* with the title: “On whether, according to the Bonmō School (Bonmōshū 梵網宗), one has the seeds of Buddha-nature (*Bushō shūji* 仏性種子) before receiving the bodhisattva precepts.”⁷⁰ The question seems odd coming from a Tendai scholar. Tendai has traditionally argued for the universal and inherent qualities of Buddha-nature, even going so far as to maintain the position that trees and grasses realize Buddhahood (*sōmoku jōbutsu* 草木成仏).⁷¹ How could Ninkū argue against Tendai orthodoxy that the ordination ceremony conferred Buddha-nature?

His reasoning was that the *Fanwang* tradition did maintain this position, and he cited as evidence a passage from the *Fanwangjing*: “The one precept, the adamantine precept, is the origin of all Buddhas, the source of all bodhisattvas, the seeds of Buddha-nature. All sentient beings have the Buddha-nature. All consciousnesses, forms, feelings, and minds enter the Buddha’s precepts.”⁷² Thus the ordination would seem to be the basis of the Buddhist path in some sense. Ninkū noted that Annen thus argued that the essence of the precepts was Suchness (the fundamental quality of all phenomena) and Buddha-nature.⁷³

Ninkū then presented a strong argument for his opponent’s position. In his discussion, his imaginary opponent suggested that the view that beings only have Buddha-nature seeds after ordination resembled the Hossō 法相 position that five types of nature existed in sentient beings because it indicated the possibility that some beings did not have Buddha-nature. Ninkū’s imaginary opponent then presented a position that would

seem to be a compromise. He noted that the merits of Shana butsu's (Vairocana Buddha) precepts could be classified into two aspects: that which is inherently possessed (*shōtoku* 性得) and that which is attained through practice (*shutoku* 修得). The inherently possessed aspect was present before the ordination, the aspect possessed through practice was present after ordination.

Ninkū responded by arguing that according to the Perfect and Replete Teachings (*enjitsukyō* 円実教), no distinction should be made between the inherent and acquired. This is what Zhiyi referred to in his brief description of the essence of the precepts when he discussed it in terms of whether it had been called forth through an ordination or not.⁷⁴ When Annen classified the precepts into three categories—those transmitted through a lineage of teachers, those called forth from within the candidate for ordination, and those that are inherent in everyone—he was classifying them in terms of the ordination.⁷⁵ Ninkū's opponent had raised the issue that Tendai exegetes claimed that even the non-sentient had Buddha-nature and realized Buddhahood. Ninkū acknowledged this argument, but left responding to it for another unspecified time.⁷⁶ Instead, he addressed the issue of how to reconcile his position with the view that all with a mind possess the Buddha-nature. As scriptural support for his position, Ninkū cited the *Yinglojing* 瓔珞經, a text closely associated with the *Fanwangjing* that modern scholars have determined to be apocryphal: "If one does not receive these precepts, then one should not be called a being with consciousness and feelings; [such an entity] is no different than an animal and should not be called human."⁷⁷ Ninkū concluded, "The *sūtra*'s intent is that those people who do not receive the precepts are not sentient and are the same as walls and tiles."⁷⁸ He thus went even further than the *Yinglojing*. By arguing that those without the precepts were like walls and tiles, he avoided arguments that even animals had the Buddha-nature. All of these debates supported Ninkū's view that the ordination was both a vital part of religious practice and available to the worldling during *mappō*.

PART IV. NINKŪ'S CRITICISMS OF OTHER TENDAI ORDINATION TRADITIONS

At the time Ninkū advanced his interpretation of the ordination ceremony, other Tendai temples employed a wide variety of interpretations of the ordination. Ninkū's criticisms of the laxity of ordination procedures may well have been directed at the monks of Mount Hiei. As was noted above, in one set of rules, he noted that teachers often initiated novices by simply giving them robes and shaving their heads, but not bothering to confer precepts on them. Such comments tended to be general lamentations over the state of ordinations among Tendai monks. In the *Gyōjishō*, Ninkū specifically criticized several other Tendai attempts to reform the precepts. In the following paragraphs, two of these movements—Shunjō's use of the *Sifenlu* precepts and the Kurodani *kaikanjō* (ordination-consecration) ceremony—are considered.

Saichō had suggested that historical precedents existed in which the *Fanwang* ordinations were used to ordain monks. By Ninkū's time, reports of Buddhism in China had clearly indicated that Tiantai monks used the *Sifenlu* precepts. Ninkū clearly recognized this, admitting that Huisi and Zhiyi, the two founders of Chinese Tiantai, had been ordained with these precepts. He attributed this to the historical development of Chinese Buddhism as a tradition in which all three vehicles were studied and practiced. He noted that the Chinese had based their use of the Hīnayāna precepts on the Tendai principle of "opening and reconciling" (*kaie* 開会) teachings. This approach enabled Tendai monks to interpret virtually any Buddhist teaching so that it could be reconciled with the highest teaching. The Hīnayāna precepts could thus be understood as being in agreement with Mahāyāna teachings; a number of passages in the works of Zhiyi and Zhanran were cited to support this view. Ninkū argued that another type of interpretation must also be considered: the relative (*sōtai* 相對) nature of teachings, the exegetical position by which various views were seen as being opposed to each other. To explain this, Ninkū noted the examples of *śrāvakas* (Hīnayāna practitioners) who had received precepts such as those of the *Sifenlu* when the Buddha preached Hīnayāna teachings; however, when the Buddha began to preach Perfection of Wisdom teachings, he rejected those precepts. In a similar manner, Tendai monks should recognize that the Hīnayāna precepts should be rejected.

A return to the Chinese Tiantai practice of using *Sifenlu* ordinations had been advocated by Shunjō, who had based his teaching on that of Lingzhi Yuanzhao 靈芝元照 (1048-1116), a Tiantai master whose teachings included the *Sifenlu* precepts as well as Tiantai and Pure Land practices. Yuanzhao was particularly noted for his extensive commentaries on three works on the precepts and monastic procedures by Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667), the most authoritative Chinese exegete of these topics. When Shunjō carried texts by Yuanzhao back to Japan, it confirmed what some Nara monks had longed argued: the Japanese Tendai position on the precepts was not even in agreement with its Chinese antecedents. The problem presented by this revelation helps to explain why Ninkū devoted so much space in the *Gyōjishō* to an explanation of the difference between the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna precepts.⁷⁹ The explanation was not simply a matter of reiterating Saichō's position, but of defending the Tendai School against new critics from both within and without.

After a flattering description of Yuanzhao's achievements, Ninkū observed that Yuanzhao maintained that Tiantai and the *Sifenlu* precepts advocated by Daoxuan were in agreement. These teachings had been brought to Sennyūji 泉涌寺 in Kyoto. Although Ninkū was clearly referring to Shunjō, he did not mention him by name, but did state that Sennyūji monks had cited passages from Huisi and Zhiyi in support of their position. Ninkū argued, however, that such a stance was the same as that held by the seven leaders of the Nara schools who had opposed Saichō.⁸⁰ Ninkū pointed out that these Tendai monks had made a basic mistake; they clung to the views in the Hīnayāna and Pervasive Teachings (*tsūgyō* 通教) that all Buddhists shared the same precepts, but did not recognize the Separate and Perfect Teachings (*betsuengyō* 別円教) that the precepts

differed depending on what Buddhist views were followed. Furthermore, Ninkū argued that the monks of Sennyūji misinterpreted the *Lotus sūtra* teaching of reconciling the teachings (*kaie* 開会) and the *Nirvāṇa sūtra* teaching that the precepts should be maintained (*furitsu* 扶律). By incorrectly clinging to the view that doctrinal differences should be reconciled, Sennyūji practitioners ignored the differences between provisional and ultimate. They would not only fail to see the important differences between the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, but they would also ignore the differences in meditation and wisdom between the traditions; thus they would be unable to maintain such solely Mahāyāna meditations as the three discernments in an instant or the three thousand realms in an instant, two ways of describing the ultimate goal of Tendai teachings and practices. Differences between good and evil and between heterodox and orthodox would also be obviated.

Ninkū argued that the Sennyūji monks confused two major types of preaching: *shōjū* 攝受 (encompassing and accepting) and *shakubuku* 折伏 (breaking and suppressing). Although the *Lotus sūtra* has a variety of approaches including refuting (*hakai* 破廢) wrong positions and reconciling (*kaie* 開会) other doctrines to the ultimate teaching, “It takes *shakubuku* as its main position, refuting other vehicles to demonstrate that there are not two or three (vehicles), but only one wondrous vehicle.”⁸¹

Ninkū used the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* as a contrast; he explained that even as it refuted wrong positions, it took the conciliatory *shōju* as its main position, thereby establishing the four teachings on the basis of the perfection and eternal aspects of the Buddha-nature and treated the Hīnayāna precepts (*shōkai* 小戒) as being valid. The practitioner was then faced with the seeming contradiction between the acceptance of the Hīnayāna precepts by the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* and their rejection by the *Lotus sūtra*. Ninkū argued that Saichō resolved this contradiction with his proposal that new practitioners only receive the Perfect precepts; they were then to spend twelve years sequestered on Mount Hiei. Only after they had advanced in practice could they provisionally receive the Hīnayāna precepts in order to live with the monks of Nara and travel and benefit sentient beings. Ninkū took the traditional Tiantai view that the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* was intended to benefit those beings that were not saved through the Lotus sūtra. Statements that the Hīnayāna precepts should be followed should be interpreted as referring only to those beings that had not been saved by the *Lotus sūtra*.⁸² The argument by Shunjō and monks of the Sennyūji tradition that Tendai monks receive the Hīnayāna precepts at the beginning of their practice failed to take account of Saichō’s contribution to Tendai thought.

Were there other senses in which the Hīnayāna precepts might be used? Ninkū went on to note that the details of following the eighty thousand rules of the *Fanwangjing* were not clear in this polluted world. In fact, the *Fanwang* precepts were very short and included little discussion as to how they were to be interpreted. Ninkū argued that the Hīnayāna “sword” (*ken* 劍) should be used to supplement the great (Mahāyāna) rules.⁸³ But in no sense should Hīnayāna rules be taken as the basis, nor should the distinction between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna be obscured. Ninkū further clarified his position by

suggesting that the Buddha preached the *Fanwang* precepts directly after his enlightenment, a position based on the close association of the *Fanwangjing* with the *Huayanjing*. Because some of those who listened had inferior faculties, he then preached the five, eight, ten, and full precepts. This account of the Buddha's preaching followed the *Lotus sūtra*'s description of Śākyamuni Buddha's decision to preach Hīnayāna teachings to those with lesser faculties.

Finally, Ninkū considered the interpretation of the story of the *śrākava* who heard the Buddha's sermons three times 三周, which is found in the *Lotus sūtra*. If the pattern followed by these *śrākava* is followed, they would have received the Hīnayāna precepts first and the bodhisattva precepts later. However, Ninkū argued that they had received the bodhisattva precepts in the distant past and simply forgotten that they had done so. Thus he supported the pattern of having beginning practitioners receive the bodhisattva precepts first.⁸⁴

The last half of the tenth section of the *Gyōjishō* was devoted to a denunciation of the *kaikanjō* 戒灌頂 (ordination-Esoteric consecration), a tradition that claimed to be a secret transmission from Saichō.⁸⁵ The *kaikanjō* tradition developed around figures such as Kōen 興円 (1263-1317) in Kurodani 黒谷. Initially it was a secret ceremony held when a monk had completed twelve-year period of practice on Mount Hiei (*rōzan* 籠山); by the time Ninkū wrote, it may have evolved in other ways that are not yet clear. The *kaikanjō* was sometimes called a re-ordination (*jūju* 重受) because it was given after the ordination that marked a person's initiation as a Tendai monk. A number of Esoteric Buddhist elements—the emphasis on secrecy, the use of the term *kanjō* 灌頂 (consecration), and the emphasis on the transmission between teacher and student—can be found in the ritual. Although the masters of the *kaikanjō* often argued that it was not an Esoteric ritual, Ninkū's criticism focuses on the ambiguities that arose from combining elements of an Esoteric consecration with a regular ordination.

Ninkū began his criticism of the *kaikanjō* tradition by tracing the ordination lineage from Saichō up through the time of Hōnen. Hōnen's students produced two lineages: the Nison'in 二尊院 that began with Shinkū 信空 (1146-1228) and the Seizan that began with Shōkū. According to Ninkū, the Seizan lineage received certain important teachings concerning the precepts that were not given to Shinkū such as the importance of the threefold profound interpretation (*sanjū gen'okugi* 三重玄奥義) and the interpretation of the *Fanwangjing* as a one-chapter one-fascicle bodhisattva precepts *sūtra* (*ippon ikkan kaikyō* 一品一卷戒經).⁸⁶ Ninkū disparaged the *kaikanjō* tradition, claiming that it was indicative of the gradual degeneration of the Nison'in lineage.

Ninkū particularly criticized the *kaikanjō* tradition of only conferring the transmission on a single person at a time (*yūju ichinin no kaihō* 唯受一人戒法). He observed that Saichō and Gishin had received the precepts from Daosui 道邃 (n.d.) in China along with twenty-seven other people. After his return to Japan, Saichō had presided over an ordination in the Central Hall with Enchō as the elder (*jōshu* 上首). Ninkū noted that when the basic documents used in performing ordinations on Mount Hiei are checked,

nothing similar to the *kaikanjō* could be found.

Ninkū asserted that the advocates of the *kaikanjō* tradition claimed that it was based on a one-fascicle text by Saichō with the title *Kaidan'in chūdai shōgonki* 戒壇院中臺莊嚴記 (Record of the adornment of the central altar of the ordination platform).⁸⁷ Ninkū criticized the text, arguing that Saichō had died by the time the court granted permission for the construction of the ordination platform and would not have written such a text. Ninkū's careful attention to the chronology of Tendai history is a marked contrast to the careless manner in which historical events were treated in many of the oral transmissions (*kuden* 口伝). He concluded that the *kaikanjō* was simply a free interpretation developed by monks to inculcate faith in the recipient by using Esoteric Buddhist elements.

CONCLUSION

As the abbot of two major monasteries, Ninkū strove to reform the Tendai ordination system. He refuted Nara criticisms that the comprehensive ordination traditionally used by Tendai monks did not actually qualify a person to be a fully ordained monk by re-defining Tendai ordination procedures so that specific precepts were conferred at each stage of a person's career. By specifying the content of the precepts at each stage of a person's career, Ninkū strove to restore monastic discipline at the temples he supervised. As a part of his efforts, he had his monks engage in debates about the doctrinal basis of the Tendai ordination with the result that the foundations of Tendai monastic discipline were analyzed in a manner virtually unprecedented at that time. Ninkū was particularly forceful in arguing that the precepts were not suited only for those who had advanced on the Buddhist path. He repeatedly emphasized that the ordinations and precepts were suited for the worldling in a far-off country during the period of the final decline of Buddha's Dharma. Finally, he refuted efforts by exegetes who suggested a return to the Chinese Tiantai tradition of ordaining monks with the *Sifenlu* precepts or who interpreted ordinations by introducing Esoteric elements into them.

REFERENCES

Asada 1999

Asada Masahiro 淺田正博, *Sonkaku shōnin shoshahon Mappō tōmyōki kōdoku* 存覚上人書写本末法燈明記講読. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 1999.

Daijō kaidan'in ki

Daijō kaidan'in ki 大乘戒壇院記, in *Zoku Tendaishū zensho* 續天台宗全書 *Enkai* 円戒, 1. Shunjōsha, 1985.

Dengyō daishi zenshū

Hieizan Senshūin Fuzoku Eizan Gakuin 比叡山專修院附属叡山学院, ed.,

- Dengyō daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集. Sekai Seiten Kankōkyōkai, 1989.
- Endonkai hikikigaki*
Endonkai hikikigaki 円頓戒秘聞書. In Jōdoshū Seizan-ha Shūmuin 淨土宗西山派宗務院, *Seizan zensho* 西山全書 (Kyoto, 1913-1922) bekkān 3.
- Groner 1984
Paul Groner, *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School* (Seoul: Po Chin Chai, 1984.; reprinted with a new introduction. University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.
- Groner 1990
Paul Groner, “*The Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen’s *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*,” in Robert Buswell, ed., *Buddhist Apocryphal Literature*. University of Hawai'i Press, 1990, pp. 251-290. Japanese translation: 「梵網經」と日本天台における僧侶の戒行: 安然「普通授菩薩戒広釈」の研究 (*Bonmōkyō to Nihon Tendai ni okeru sōryo no kaigyō: Annen Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku no kenkyū*). Translated by Yoshimura Makoto, Satō Kōyū, and Oka Junshō. *Ronsō: Aija bunka to shisō*3 (December 1994): 117-175.
- Groner 2000
Paul Groner, “Early Japanese Tendai Views on the Realization of Buddhahood by Grasses and Trees: Determinations from China (Tōketsu 唐決).” In *Bukkyō to kankyō: Risshō daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kaisetsu gojūshūnen kinen ronbunshū* 仏教と環境：立正大学仏教学部開設50周年記念論文集, ed. Mitomo Ken'yō 三友健容. Maruzen, 2000, pp. 21-40.
- Groner 2001
Paul Groner, “Ninkū Jitsudō’s View of the Hīnayāna Precepts,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 50.1 (December 2001): 523-27.
- Groner 2002
Paul Groner, *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei*. University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
- Kaijushō
Kaijushō 戒珠鈔. Copy made by Fukuda Gyōei 福田堯穎. (Referred to by fascicle and section number.)
- Kokubun Tōhō Bukkyō sōsho*
Washio Junkyō 鷲尾順敬, ed., *Kokubun Tōhō Bukkyō sōsho* 國文東方佛教叢書. Meicho Fukyūkai, 1992.
- Kushida 1969
Kushida Ryōkō 櫛田良洪, “Seizan kyōdan no bosatsukai sōjō o megutte” 西山教団の菩薩戒相承をめぐって. In Fukui Hakushi Shōju Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 福井博士頌壽記念論文集刊行會, ed., *Tōyō bunka ronshū* 東洋文化論集. Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1969.
- Mori 1996
“Kanmongi no kaihansha Kūkaku shōnin ni yotte kondō saretā Ninkū Jitsudō shōnin to Eatsu Shōnin” 『觀門義』の開版者空覺上人によって混同された

- 仁空実導上人と恵篤上人. In Mori Eijun Zenshū Kankōkai 森英純全集刊行会, ed., *Mori Eijun zenshū* 森英純全集. Kyoto: Seikōsha, 1996.
- Sasaki 1999
Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑, *Shukke to wa nanika* 出家とはなにか. Daizō Shuppan, 1999.
- T
Takakusu Junjiro 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭 (eds.), *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924-1932. 100 vols.
- Takakusu 1966
Junjirō Takakusu, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695) by I-tsing*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1966.
- Terai and Shikii 1989
Terai Ryōsen 寺井良宣 and Shikii Shūjō 色井秀讓, *Kaikanjō no nyūmonteki kenkyū* 戒灌頂の入門的研究. Osaka: Tōhō Shuppan, 1989.
- Yamaguchi 1928
Yamaguchi Kōen 山口光円, “Jitsudō Ninkū shi ni tsuite” 実導仁空師について, *Shinkō no tomo* 信仰の友 257 (1928): 5.

NOTES

- ¹ These events are described in Groner 2000.
- ² Both the Fanwangjing and Annen’s interpretation of the text are examined in Groner 1990, pp. 251-290; translated into Japanese by Yoshimura Makoto, Satō Kōyū, and Oka Junshō as Groner, “*Bonmōkyō* to Nihon Tendai ni okeru sōryo no kaigyō: Annen *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku no kenkyū* 「梵網經」と日本天台における僧侶の戒行: 安然「普通授菩薩戒広釈」の研究, *Ronsō: Ajia bunka to shisō* 論争: アジア文化と思想 3 (December 1994): 117-175.
- ³ The author of the *Gyōjishō* is listed as Shōgen 照源 (1072-1132) in the *Honchō taiso senjutsu mitsubu shomoku* (*Dainihon shiryō* 6.29:312). However, Shōgen died in 1368, three years before the colophon for the *Gyōjishō* was written. The author of the colophon was a monk named Kōjō 幸承 who referred to the author of the text as the “Later Teacher” (*kōshi shōnin* 後師上人). Mori Eijun 森英純 has suggested that Kōjō might have first studied with Shōgen, but then taken Ninkū as his teacher after Shōgen’s death. Thus, “later teacher” might have referred to Ninkū (Mori 1996, 1:48-49). Mori also discussed other issues before arriving at the conclusion that the text is by Ninkū. An investigation of the contents reveals many similarities with Ninkū’s other works, but also some differences. At this point, it is not clear whether the differences arise because the author was someone other than Ninkū or reflected a change in Ninkū’s views over time. I have relied on a manuscript from Taishō University. References refer to the fascicle and section number. I thank Nomoto Kakujo 野本覚成 and his staff on the editorial board of the collected works of the Tendai School (Tendai Shūten

Hensanjo 天台宗典編纂所) for their assistance in finding this and other texts.

- ⁴ I have used a copy of the *Kaijushō* made by Fukuda Gyōei 福田堯穎. Because the pagination of different manuscripts would vary, I refer to the text by fascicle and section number.
- ⁵ *Dengyō daishi zenshū*, 1: 19, 133, 543.
- ⁶ Saichō's claim that the *Sifenlu* was a "Hīnayāna" text was not accepted by the Nara Schools and served as the focal point of a continuing set of arguments in Japanese Buddhism. The beginnings of this debate are the focus of my book, *Saichō*.
- ⁷ *Dengyō daishi zenshū*, 1: 306, 308, 309.
- ⁸ *T*, 24: 1004b7.
- ⁹ In the *Gyōjishō*, Ninkū attributed this position to Annen on the basis of the *Futsū kōshaku*.
- ¹⁰ *Dengyō daishi zenshū*, 1: 119-121; *Kaijushō* 2.3.
- ¹¹ *Kaijushō* 2.3; 2.5.
- ¹² *Kaijushō* 1.15. In this section, Ninkū considered the proposition that the essence of the precepts might be the ten major and forty-eight minor precepts of the *Fanwangjing*. Usually the essence of the precepts was not considered to have such specific content. In suggesting that the actual contents of the precepts could be identified with the essence of the precepts, Ninkū emphasized the importance of monastic discipline.
- ¹³ *T*, 24: 1004a20.
- ¹⁴ *T*, 24: 1008a24; 1008b25.
- ¹⁵ *Dengyō daishi zenshū*, 1: 119-121.
- ¹⁶ Sasaki 1999, p. 90.
- ¹⁷ The document is reproduced in Kushida 1969, p. 330. The reason why a Tendai document was preserved at a Shingon temple is not clear.
- ¹⁸ A different lineage, that of an unbroken lineage from person to person similar to that used in Zen lineages, is suggested in *Kaijushō* 2.11 and *Endonkai hikikigaki*, bekkān 3:606a. The difference between that lineage and the one used by Shōgen may indicate that the two monks differed in their interpretation of the precepts lineage.
- ¹⁹ *Zaushō*, *T*, 83: 528a; *Nanhai jigui neifa chuan* 南海寄歸內法傳, *T*, 54: 219b22; Takakusu 1966, pp. 95-96. For a discussion of the significance of Ninkū's use of Yijing's travel diary, see Groner 2001, pp. 523-27.
- ²⁰ *Shingaku bosatsu gyōyōshō*, *T*, 74:784a.
- ²¹ *Shingaku bosatsu gyōyōshō*, *T*, 74:784a-b.
- ²² *Shingaku bosatsu gyōyōshō*, *T*, 74: 783d. According to the *Shingaku bosatsu gyōyōshō*, novices who receive the comprehensive ordination should receive the three collections of pure precepts, not the ten major precepts. Enchin had noted that those who were under twenty years old should take both the ten basic precepts (probably the ten major precepts from the *Fanwangjing*) and the ten precepts for novices (*Jubosatsukaigi uragaki*, *Dengyō daishi zenshū* 1: 319).
- ²³ Groner 1984, pp. 118-119.
- ²⁴ *Zaushō*, *T*, 83:528a.
- ²⁵ Sasaki 1999, pp. 65-66, 254, note 32.
- ²⁶ *Zaushō*, *T*, 83:528a.

- ²⁷ *Fanwangjing*, *T*, 24: 1008c.
- ²⁸ *Puxian guanjing*, *T*, 9: 389c.
- ²⁹ Chanting the precepts six times a day is mentioned several times in the *Fanwangjing*; see *T*, 24:1008c15. Each day was divided into six periods, three in the daytime and three at night.
- ³⁰ The references here probably indicate that the Lotus confession was to be conducted over the three periods into which the daytime was divided, while Pure Land rituals were to be performed during the set times of the evening.
- ³¹ According to the ordination manuals by Saichō and Zhanran, the essence of the precepts was conferred at the instant one agreed to receive the three collections of pure precepts for the third time; see *Dengyō daishi zenshū*, 1:320-322.
- ³² *Zaushō*, *T*, 83: 528c-29a.
- ³³ An English translation of the *Sange gakushō shiki* is included in Groner 1984. An English translation of Ryōgen's twenty-six rules can be found in Groner 2002.
- ³⁴ *Endonkaigi hikikigaki*, p. 611.
- ³⁵ The twelve parts of the ordination ceremony are listed in Groner 1990, p. 261.
- ³⁶ Saichō, *Jubosatsukaigi*, *Dengyō daishi zenshū*, 1:321-22.
- ³⁷ *Seizan shōnin engi*, in *Kokubun Tōhō Bukkyō sōsho*, 1.5:373.
- ³⁸ *Seizan shōnin engi hōonshō*, cited in Yamaguchi 1928, p. 5. The location of the ordination at Ōhara rather than on Mount Hiei deserves further study; it probably indicates that Enryakuji might well have lost its control over the ordination process as governmental supervision of ordinations weakened and other important Tendai centers emerged.
- ³⁹ *Kaijushō* 2.12 (On whether the *Fanwang* precepts arise through the three refuges).
- ⁴⁰ *Fanwangjing*, *T*, 24:1009a27; *Yiji*, *T*, 40:568a.
- ⁴¹ Mingguang, *Tiantai pusajie shu*, *T*, 40: 582a. For Ninkū's explanation see, *Endonkaigi hikikigaki*, pp. 606-607.
- ⁴² Kushida 1969, pp. 333-335.
- ⁴³ For a discussion of this term, see Asada 1999, pp. 97-127.
- ⁴⁴ *Endonkaigi hikikigaki*, p. 607a.
- ⁴⁵ *T*, 40:597b.
- ⁴⁶ *Kaijushō* 2.12.
- ⁴⁷ *Endonkaigi hikikigaki*, pp. 609-610.
- ⁴⁸ *Endonkaigi hikikigaki*, p. 618. In *Kaijushō* 1.6, Ninkū argued that the *Fanwang* precepts pervaded the three collections of pure precepts. His argument is designed to exalt the status of the fifty-eight *Fanwang* precepts and does not even mention the ordination ceremony. However, the argument could have been used to reconcile the role of the three collections of pure precepts in the traditional Tendai ordination with Ninkū's explanation of the ordination.
- ⁴⁹ *Kaijushō* 2.9.
- ⁵⁰ *T*, 24: 1004b10.
- ⁵¹ *T*, 24:1004a18.
- ⁵² *T*, 24: 1006c6.
- ⁵³ *T*, 24:1008a22; *T*, 24: 1008c14.

- ⁵⁴ *T*, 40:567c. For Ninkū's argument, see *Kaijushō* 2.9.
- ⁵⁵ *Kaijushō* 1.10 (On whether one without faith can receive the precepts).
- ⁵⁶ *T*, 24:1004b10.
- ⁵⁷ *T*, 40:567b. The four qualities of supreme enlightenment are based on the *Nirvāna-sūtra*.
- ⁵⁸ *T*, 24: 1004a18; 1004b7-10.
- ⁵⁹ *Kaijushō* 1.7 (On whether an ignorant worldling can preside over an ordination).
- ⁶⁰ *T*, 40:567c. They are also described in Mingguang's commentary (*T* 40:582b4), but not found in the *Fanwangjing*.
- ⁶¹ *T*, 40:567c21-22. Explanations of these stages differ depending on which teaching is being considered. For someone in the bodhisattva vehicle, the inner stages of the worldling correspond to the three stages of worthies within the ten abodes; the outer stages of the worldling are said to correspond to the ten degrees of faith. The "true person" is one who has realized enlightenment.
- ⁶² *T*, 24:1006b1-6.
- ⁶³ *T*, 24:1003c21; *Bosatsukai giki kikigaki, Seizan zensho* bekkān 3:129. Ninkū's final answer to the issue of worldlings serving as teachers of the precepts is missing from the *Kaijushō* 2.7. However, his answer is not difficult to determine from his other writings.
- ⁶⁴ *Gyōjishō* 2.4.
- ⁶⁵ *Kaijushō* 1.11.
- ⁶⁶ *T*, 40:567b15.
- ⁶⁷ The four precepts and the three encouragements were given a prominent place in commentaries by both Zhiyi and Mingguang; for examples, see *T*, 40: 569c8 and 584b21.
- ⁶⁸ The four accompanying defilements (investigation, scrutiny, remorse and torpor) accompany major defilements. However, they may arise in good, bad, or morally neutral circumstances and thus carry no necessary moral value (*Yuqie shidilun*, *T*, 30:622c5). The discussion of how they differ from the good is found in *T*, 30:480a.
- ⁶⁹ This argument is based on a scholastic argument about whether the essence of the precepts was mental or provisionally material. I plan to address this topic in the future.
- ⁷⁰ *Kaijushō* 1.16.
- ⁷¹ See Groner 2000, pp. 21-40.
- ⁷² *T*, 24: 1003c23; this passage is one of the few in Tiantai sources that included the term "seeds of Buddha-nature;" the term should probably be interpreted as being a synonym for Buddha-nature. The terms "one precept" (*ikkai* 一戒) and adamant precepts (*kongōhōkai* 金剛宝戒) from the *Fanwangjing* that play an important role in Japanese Tendai are not even mentioned in the *Yiji*.
- ⁷³ Groner 1990, pp. 268-270.
- ⁷⁴ *Pusajie yiji*, *T*, 40:566a1.
- ⁷⁵ *Futsū kōshaku*, *T*, 74:773c. However, Ninkū never does explain how the inherently possessed precepts in Annen's system differed from those which he rejected.
- ⁷⁶ Although Ninkū may seem to be avoiding an important aspect of the argument, he usually kept the various traditions he studied separate. The issue of the realization of the non-sentient belonged to debates on Tendai doctrine based on Zhiyi's three major works, not to debates on the precepts based on the *Yiji*.

⁷⁷ *T*, 24:1021b4.

⁷⁸ *Kaijushō* 1.16.

⁷⁹ *Gyōjishō* 2.4.

⁸⁰ *Gyōjishō* 2.4.

⁸¹ *Gyōjishō* 2.4.

⁸² *Gyōjishō* 2.4.

⁸³ For more on this topic, see Groner 2001, pp. 523-27.

⁸⁴ *Gyōjishō* 2.4

⁸⁵ I plan to publish a study of this tradition in the near future. For Japanese studies, consult the many articles by Terai and Shiki 1989.

⁸⁶ The view that precepts constituted an independent text, distinct from the two-fascicle *Fanwangjing* is one of the hallmarks of Ninkū's thought. I plan to explore this teaching in future research.

⁸⁷ This text is found in the *Daijō kaidan'in ki*, 1: 126-27.

要旨

実導仁空の受戒論

ポール・グローナー

天台宗と浄土宗の西山派双方において重要な役割を果たした仁空（1309-1388）は、多作で見識に富んだ僧院の著述家であると同時に2つの重要な寺の住職も務めていた。仁空の教義上、行政上の関心は比叡山の受戒制度の改革にあった。本稿の第1部は受戒手続きの研究であり、特に天台宗の僧が戒を通受で受けるべきか、別受で受けるべきかに焦点を当てている。第2部は、受戒式がいかに戒律の精神(戒体)を生み出しているかの考察である。第3部は授戒は凡夫に適しているという仁空の議論である。仁空は寺院の規律の強化に積極的に取り組む一方で、授戒は末法の世にあってインドから遠く離れた地の無知な凡夫にもふさわしいものであると主張した。第4部は天台宗僧の間で持ち上がった戒に関する相反する2つの見方についての批判が述べられている。その2つとは、天台宗の黒谷派に受戒と密教の灌頂と混合された戒灌頂と、泉涌寺の俊覽によって日本にもたらされた四分律の250戒の使用であった。