

# The Circulation and Reception of Tiantai Commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* in East Asia\*

YAMAGUCHI HIROE 山口弘江

*Komazawa University*

*hymgch@komazawa-u.ac.jp*

**Abstract:** This study examines the creation, transmission and reception of commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* (*Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經) in the Tiantai tradition. Zhiyi 智顗 (538–598) in his later years was responsible for penning a commentary at the request of Yang Guang 楊廣 (569–618), the future Emperor Yang 煬帝 (r. 604–618) of the Sui dynasty (581–618). Guanding 灌頂 (561–632) later attached more material. Further textual developments occurred after this point. The body of texts within Tiantai that comprise these commentaries has a complex history of transmission that extends across several centuries and countries. The history behind the loss and recovery of critical texts requires detailed study. The present study builds upon the earlier work published by Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英 (1902–1984) and further illustrates the multiple instances of recovery, editing and recompilation of the commentaries, a situation that extended to Japan, where Tiantai literature from the Tang period, which had otherwise been lost on the mainland, was preserved.

**Keywords:** *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, Zhiyi, Guanding, Commentaries, Tiantai

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15239/hijbs.04.01.10>

---

\* Translated by Jeffrey Kotyk (University of British Columbia; jeffrey.kotykh@ubc.ca).

## 1. Introduction

Zhiyi 智顗 (538–598) of Tiantai 天台 in his late years at the request of Prince of Jin, [Yang] Guang 晉王 [楊] 廣 (569–618; the future Emperor Yang 煬帝 [r. 604–618] of the Sui dynasty [581–618]) set about writing a commentary to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* (*Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經), which had been translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413) into three fascicles. In the process of compiling his work, Zhiyi's illness continued to worsen day after day. Immediately upon his passing, a *Xuanyi* 玄義 ('Profound Meaning') comprised of six fascicles and a *Ruwen* 入文 (Entry into the Text; i.e., a running commentary) comprised of twenty-five fascicles were presented to the throne. However, this is not a commentary on the entire fourteen chapters of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, as it is lacking running interpretations of the six chapters from chapter nine ('Ru buer famen pin' 入不二法門品 [Chapter on the Entry into Non-Duality]). Zhang'an Guanding 章安灌頂 (561–632) therefore attached three fascicles of commentary on those six chapters. The Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* in this way became comprised of altogether thirty-four fascicles, incorporating the extant *Weimo jing xuanshu* 維摩經玄疏 [Profound Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*; hereafter *Xuanshu*; in six fascicles], and *Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩經文疏 [Commentary on the Text of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*; hereafter *Wenshu*; in twenty-eight fascicles].

Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英 (1902–1984), who led research in Japan on the study of Tiantai Buddhism during the twentieth century, carried out comprehensive research on the texts connected to Zhiyi and clarified the development of each of the texts one by one. In a series of studies Satō confirmed that the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* correspond to those texts personally authored by Zhiyi (i.e., these are texts directly related to his writings and which are believed to reflect Zhiyi's own ideas) and highly appreciated the material value of said commentaries in the study of Zhiyi's thought. Building on this theory, in recent years in Japan, research on the commentaries has greatly developed. Moreover, research on the commentaries in various other countries is also flourishing in response to Japanese research trends.<sup>1</sup>

Satō's research is also internationally renowned for established theory, which paved the way for clarifying the process of how the commentaries developed. On one hand, however, outside of Japan there is insufficient attention paid to the details of transmission behind the extant texts as well as textual issues, one reason for which was probably that Satō almost never referred to them. In light of these circumstances, the present study surveys the transmission of the commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* while pointing out issues in the extant texts, based upon my own work.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Transmission in China and Korea

### 2.1. The Original Forms of the *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu*

Presently, the *Xuanshu* is in vol. 38 of the *Taishō shinsbū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, while the *Wenshu* in #27 of the *Dai Nippon zoku zōkyō* 大日本續藏經 (vol. 18 of the *Shinsan Dai Nippon zoku zōkyō* 新纂大日本續藏經). These are preserved as separate texts.<sup>3</sup> However, after Zhiyi passed away, the two texts were considered one book comprised of both the *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu* when presented to Prince of Jin. One clear vestige of this is a line which appears at the heading of fascicle one of the *Xuanshu*, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> In recent times, Wang Xinhui's annotated version of the *Weimo jing xuanshu* 維摩經玄疏 was published by Shanghai guji chuban 上海古籍出版社 in 2018. Lee Chaeyun 李在胤 at Dongguk University 東國大學 in Korea is also advancing research. In Japan, Kanno Hiroshi 菅野博史 and Fujii Kyōkō 藤井教公 have been regularly publishing the fruits of their research and translation with notes of the *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu* respectively in academic journals.

<sup>2</sup> The present study is a revision in line with the theme of the symposium. It is based on material in Yamaguchi, *Tendai Yuima kyō sho no kenkyū*, 75–104. For further details, see this monograph.

<sup>3</sup> Regarding the extant texts of the *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu*, see Yamaguchi, *Tendai Yuima kyō sho no kenkyū*, 119–141.

Here, the five categories of profound meaning were written before the *Wen*. 今輒於文前, 撰五重玄義.<sup>4</sup>

Here *wen* 文 suggests a literal interpretation. *Wenshu* then seems to correspond to this. The heading of fascicle one starts from the following line:

Next, I will clarify the entry [interpretation] of this scripture 次明入此經文.<sup>5</sup>

There is no sense of it being a single book if the header starts suddenly with the word ‘next’ (*ci* 次). In this way, two books were not treated as two works, but rather they were clearly established as two parts in a serial relationship within one work (the *Xuanyi* and *Ruwen*). Again, not only in the heading section, but the scriptural interpretation in the *Wenshu*, premised on the interpretation of the three perceptions (*sanguan* 三觀) and distinctions of the four teachings (*sijiao* 四教) as described in the *Xuanshu*, repeatedly uses the phrases ‘concerning perceiving the mind’ (約觀心) and ‘concerning the teaching’ (約教). The following line of fascicle two in the *Wenshu* explains the differences in the *Xuanyi* and *Ruwen* regarding the application of the three perceptions and four teachings:

Question: ‘In the *Xuanyi*, in order to deeply explain this *sūtra* through the three perceptions and four teachings, [explanation through] the three perceptions is first, while the [explanation through] the four teachings is later. In the *Ruwen*, why are the four teachings first, while the three perceptions are later?’ 問曰, ‘玄義明三觀四教, 懸釋此經, 三觀爲前, 四教在後. 入文帖釋, 何得四教爲前, 三觀在後’.

Answer: ‘The *Xuanyi* discusses a profound meaning. Hence, the teachings are produced from perceptions [i.e., observation of the mind]. It is as it is said [in the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*], that scrolls of the

<sup>4</sup> *Weimo jing xuanshu*, T no. 1777, 38: 519a.

<sup>5</sup> *Weimo jing wenshu*, X no. 338, 18: 464a.

three thousand realms are extracted from a fine grain of dust. In the explanation of the *Ruwen*, one proceeds to truth from phenomena. Hence, first the four teachings are used to explain the text of the *sūtra*. In order to go back to [the meaning of the] text and get to the truth, the practice of perception [i.e., the three perceptions] must be implemented'. 答曰, '玄義論其玄旨, 教從觀出. 如破微塵出三千大千經卷. 入文帖釋、從事入理. 故先須四教, 銷釋經文. 尋文入理, 必須觀行'.<sup>6</sup>

Here, the problem is that the sequence of the three perceptions and four teachings. In the *Xuanyi*, the explanation is in the sequence of the three perceptions first and the four teachings latter, but why would the *Ruwen* have the explanation via the four teachings come first, with the explanation via the three perceptions later? The necessity for this order is explained. This question and answer also ought to be understood as a textual construction in which the explanation in the *Ruwen* is premised on the explanation in the *Xuanyi*.

## 2.2. Transmission before Zhanran

Speaking from the conclusion, the first turning point in the history of the transmission of the commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* was the creation of the *Weimo jing Lüeshu* 維摩經略疏 [Abbreviated Version of the Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] in ten fascicles by Jingxi Zhanran 荊溪湛然 (711–782), hereafter *Lüeshu*. Here I would like to survey the situation from before this.

It is clear from what Zhiyi himself writes in his last testament sent to Yang Guang, which is recorded in the *Guoqing bailu* 國清百錄 [Hundred Records of Guoqing Monastery], that Zhiyi while alive had written altogether thirty-one fascicles, which include the *Xuan-shu* in six fascicles, and the twenty-five fascicles which correspond to the explanations up to the Chapter of the Path to Buddhahood ('Fodao pin' 佛道品) in the *Wenshu*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Weimo jing wenshu*, X no. 338, 18: 477a–b.

<sup>7</sup> *Guoqing bailu*, T no. 1934, 46: 810a.

Judging from the fact that the later *Sui Tiantai zhizhe dashi biezhuān* 隋天台智者大師別傳 [Additional Biographical Information on Tiantai Zhizhe Dashi in the Sui Period; hereafter *Biezhuān*],<sup>8</sup> refers to the additional fascicles thought to have been added by Guanding, it is believed that before the year 605, i.e., year 1 of Daye 大業 era of the Sui Dynasty (when the *Biezhuān* is thought to have been completed) altogether thirty-four fascicles, augmented by chapter explanations left by Guanding, were already in a completed state.<sup>9</sup>

Subsequently in the Tang period, the biography of Zhiyi in fascicle seventeen of the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 [Extended Biographies of Eminent Monks] compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) gives the fascicle count of ‘thirty-seven’ for a text titled *Jingming shu* 淨名疏 [Commentary on the Pure Name (i.e., Vimalakīrti)].<sup>10</sup> Moreover, fascicles five and ten of the *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 [Record of the Inner (Buddhist) Texts], compiled by Daoxuan in year 1 of Linde 麟德 era (664) states, ‘*Weimo jie jing* [Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] (thirty fascicles; at the request of the Sui Emperor, together with the) (ren fascicles of the earlier *Xuan* and six fascicles of the later *Xuan*)’ (維摩經疏 三十卷隋帝請出,并前玄十卷,後玄六卷). It also lists *Sanguan yi* 三觀義 [Meaning of the Three Perceptions], *Sijiao yi* 四教義 [Meaning of the Four Teachings], and *Si xitan yi* 四悉檀義 [Meaning of the Four Accomplishments], and then finally states that Zhiyi’s works are ‘nineteen parts and eighty-seven fascicles’ (十九部、八十七卷).<sup>11</sup> When we take into account the number of fascicles of the other texts presented, the total sum of eighty-seven fascicles seems to be calculated as the *Weimo jing shu* [Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] as thirty fascicles and

<sup>8</sup> In the *Biezhuān* included in the *Taishō* canon, there is a line that reads, ‘Imperially ordered compilation, *Jingming jing shu*; running twenty-eight fascicles to the Chapter on the Path to Buddhahood’ 奉敕撰淨名經疏, 至《佛道品》爲二十八卷 (*Sui Tiantai zhizhe dashi biezhuān*, T no. 2050, 50: 197b), but the *Biezhuān* included in the first fascicle of the *Tendai reiō zūhon denshū* 天台靈應圖本傳集 reads, ‘*Jingming jing shu*: thirty-four fascicles’ 淨名經疏三十四卷 (ND 77: 327a).

<sup>9</sup> Satō, *Tendai Daishi no kenkyū*, 76–77.

<sup>10</sup> *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2060, 50: 567c.

<sup>11</sup> *Da Tang neidian lu*, T no. 2149, 55: 284a–b; 332a.

the *Sanguan yi*, *Sijiao yi* and *Si xitan yi* as one fascicle each. These latter three were written first in response to the request of Prince of Jin. The *Xuanyi* is a recompilation of these. The three works were, it seems, drafts so to speak, and it appears that these were later circulated individually. The *Si xitan yi* was lost, but the *Sanguan yi* (*X* vol. 55) and *Sijiao yi* (*T* vol. 46) are extant.<sup>12</sup> When we then consider the number (twenty-seven fascicles) given in the *Xu Gaoseng zhuan*, I believe that it also corresponds to the number which includes Guanding's augmented thirty-four fascicles plus each of the single fascicles of the three texts. However, this calculation contradicts the thirty fascicles for the *Weimo jing shu* as recorded in the *Da Tang neidian lu*.

After Daoxuan, the most important record which conveys the reception of the relevant material before Zhanran is the postscript of the *Wenshu*:

This one commentary [on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] is altogether 34 fascicles. The first 31 fascicles, with the *Xuan(yi)* and (*Ru*)*wen*, were written by Tiantai Zhizhe Dashi for Lord Yang (i.e., Yang Guang), and are [an explanation] which run to the 'Chapter of the Path to Buddhahood'. [The explanation] from after the 'Chapter on the Entry in Non-Duality' is of three fascicles, and the commentary was personally recorded before by Dharma Master [Guan]ding, who was [Zhiyi's] successor. Here it is recorded that they were combined into one item and transmitted to later generations. In the eighth lunar month of the first year of Ruyi 如意 era (692) of the Great Zhou, Yiwei 義威 (?–692+), who was a monk of Tiangong si 天宮寺, made a copy. It was at the age of sixty that he received this, and it was in the hopes for the Buddha's wisdom and vowing that it was to repay the Triple Gem that he went to Fahua si 法華寺 in Jiangnan 江南 and completed the copying of this text. He exerted himself [in copying the text] whenever and wherever, and not wavering to the very end.

<sup>12</sup> The *Sijiao yi* has been conflated with a work of a similar title by Ch'egwan/Ch. Diguan 諦觀 (?–970) (*Ch'ōnt'ae sagyo ūi* 天台四教儀 or *Sagyo ūi* 四教儀), but it is an entirely separate text.

In the twelfth lunar month in year 22 of Kaiyuan era (735) during the Great Tang, Daoyi 道儀 (?–735+), a monk of Fahua si in Kuaiji 會稽 County, went to Qingtai si 清泰寺 in Puyang 浦陽, and completed a copy with the version of Tiangong si. In year 13 of Tianbao era (754), Fuyan 福嚴 (?–754+) copied [this manuscript]. 此經一部疏, 合三十四卷. 上《玄》、《文》三十一卷, 是天台智者大師為楊主出, 至《佛道品》. 《不二法門品》下有三卷疏, 是補處頂法師, 往前私記, 接成一部, 流傳後代, 故以記之耳. 維大周如意元年, 歲次壬辰八月, 天宮寺僧義威傳寫. 誓願受持, 以期佛慧, 為報三寶, 往江南法華寺, 斯文乃盡, 爾年六十. 處處霄夕, 至死無倦. 大唐開元二十二年十二月, 會稽郡法華寺僧道儀, 往浦陽清泰寺, 依天宮寺本寫訖. 天寶十三載, 福嚴寫.<sup>13</sup>

Here two important points of information are recorded. First, the three fascicles added by Guanding to the thirty-one from Zhiyi's lifetime are individually recorded, which is how the number came to be thirty-four. Second, three instances of recopying occurred in 692, 735, and 754. As will be explained later, since it is believed that the *Lüeshu* was produced in year 2 of Guangde 廣德 era (764), the record conveys the circumstances immediately prior. The biographical details of Yiwei, Daoyi and Fuyan seen in the text are all uncertain. However, Tiangong si is the temple where Huiwei 慧威 (634–713), the fourth patriarch of Chinese Tiantai, resided.<sup>14</sup> Fahua si is the temple where Zhiwei 智威 (?–680), the third patriarch, resided.<sup>15</sup> Qingtai si in Puyang is the temple where Zuoxi Xuanlang 左溪玄朗 (672–753), who was the teacher of Zhanran, studied.<sup>16</sup> All of these

<sup>13</sup> *Weimo jing wenshu*, X no. 338, 18: 703c.

<sup>14</sup> *Song Gaozeng zhuan*, T no. 2061, 50: 26.875b–c: 'Shi Xuanlang ... visited Dharma Master Huiwei of Tiangong si in Dongyang' (釋玄朗...因詣東陽天宮寺慧威法師).

<sup>15</sup> *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2061, 50: 6.739a–b: 'Tang Biography of Zhiwei of Fahua si in Chuzhou' (唐處州法華寺智威傳).

<sup>16</sup> *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2061, 50: 26.875c4–5: 'He was ordained and stationed by decree at Qingtai si on day nineteen of intercalary month five in year 1 of Ruyi' (如意元年閏五月十九日, 敕度配清泰寺).



were bases in the history of the Tiantai order during the Tang dynasty. Zhanran stayed at this Qingtai si and referred to the *Wenshu*, and later compiled the *Lüeshu*. Based on these points, it is probably valid to consider that the three figures in question were also scholar monks of the Tiantai lineage.

In this way it is known that from the early to mid-Tang, the *Xuan-shu* and *Wenshu* were circulated as a single text, the *Weimo jing shu*.

### 2.3. Transmission after Zhanran until the End of the Tang Dynasty

According to the preface to the *Lüeshu*, written by Zhanran's disciple Liang Su 梁肅 (753–793), the *Lüeshu* was written in the year of *jiachen* 甲辰.<sup>17</sup> Based on this account, Hibi Senshō 日比宣正 established that Zhanran had stayed in Puyang between 762–763 (the Baoying 寶應 era), and from this inferred that the year in which the *Lüeshu* was written was 764 (year 2 of Guangde 廣德 era), which fell on *jiachen*. Furthermore, the *Fabua Xuanyi shiqian* 法華玄義釋籤 [Explanation of the Profound Meaning of the *Lotus Sūtra*] was completed in the same year, so it is difficult to think that two great works were written at the same time, and Hibi thought that this happened when Zhanran was staying at Qingtai si in Puyang, since he consulted the *Wenshu* to write the *Lüeshu*.<sup>18</sup> However, I believe that the writing of the *Lüeshu* was completed within a short period of time after Zhanran had returned to Mount Tiantai. This is because the author's preface of the *Lüeshu* records Zhanran making a vow before the grave of Zhiyi.<sup>19</sup>

Among Zhanran's works, there is also a *Weimo jing shuji* 維摩經疏記 [Commentary to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*], hereafter *Shuji*, in three fascicles. As we do not have information which shows the time when it was written like the *Lüeshu*, it is difficult to establish

<sup>17</sup> *Quan Tang wen* 518.5270b: 疏成之歲, 歲在甲辰. This is also cited by Zhiyuan in the *Weimo jing lüeshu chuiyu ji*, T no. 1779, 38: 713c: 維摩經略疏垂裕記.

<sup>18</sup> Hibi, *Tōdai Tendai gaku josetsu*, 46, 224.

<sup>19</sup> For my views on the matter of the *Lüeshu* having been written in a short period of time, see Yamaguchi, *Tendai Yuima kyō sho no kenkyū*, 167–169.

the date of composition. Hibi inferred that the *Shuji* was produced after the year 777 (year 12 of Dali 大曆 era) when the *Fabua wenju ji* 法華文句記 [Further Account of the Phrases in the *Lotus Sūtra*] was completed since we see expressions which are thought to be citations from the *Fabua wenju ji*.<sup>20</sup> Chi Limei 池麗梅 points out the possibility that a *Jingming guang shuji* 淨名廣疏記 [Extensive Annotations on *Vimalakīrti* Commentary] in six fascicles might have existed as a commentary on the *Wenshu* separate from the *Shuji*.<sup>21</sup> The validity of this requires further investigation.

Moreover, Zhanran in fascicle one of the *Fabua wenju ji* refers to the fascicle counts in separate works:

Again, the earlier *Xuan*[*yi*] dealing with the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* is altogether comprised of ten fascicles. Based on this, the commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* were written for the Prince of Jin [to whom it was presented]. An abridged *Xuanyi* was written, and it differed from the earlier *Xuan*. Thus, the earlier *Xuan* was divided into three parts, each of which were given titles. *Sijiao* was six fascicles, *Sixi* was two fascicles, and *Sanguan* was two fascicles. In the two fascicles [of the *Sanguan*], the explanations are written in extremely fine detail. 又《淨名前玄》總有十卷。因爲晉王著《淨名疏》。別製《略玄》，乃離《前玄》，分爲三部，別立題目。謂《四教》六卷、《四悉》兩卷、《三觀》兩卷。彼兩卷中，文甚委悉。<sup>22</sup>

In the aforementioned *Da Tang neidian lu* by Daoxuan, three works all appear to have been regarded as one fascicle, but through Zhanran's account here the separate version was distinguished into altogether ten fascicles: the *Sijiao yi* in six fascicles, the *Si xitan yi* in two fascicles, and the *Sanguan yi* in two fascicles.

<sup>20</sup> Hibi, *Tōdai Tendaigaku josetsu*, 347–373. It is also pointed out that when the *Shuji* was created, it is possible that the *Lüeshu* was consulted.

<sup>21</sup> Chi, *Tōdai Tendai Bukkyō fukkō undō kenkyū josetsu*, 92. By establishing a separate existence of the *Jingming guang shuji*, the *Shuji* is positioned as a kind of research note for the *Wenshu* used at the time of the creation of the *Lüeshu*.

<sup>22</sup> *Fabua wenju ji*, T no. 1719, 34: 159.

In addition, as a fact from when Zhanran was alive, fascicle five of the *Song Gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 [Song Biographies of Eminent Monks] draws attention to an event in the year 775 (year 10 of Dali era), in which an account records that Qingliang Chengguan 清涼澄觀 (738–839) studied the ‘Tiantai *Zhiguan* and commentaries to scriptures such as the *Lotus* and *Vimalakīrti sūtras*’ (天台止觀法華維摩等經疏) from Zhanran.<sup>23</sup> From here we notice contemporary scholastic circumstances in which the Tiantai commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* was studied as a foundation text in Tiantai studies alongside the so-called three great works of Tiantai (*Mohe zhiguan* 摩訶止觀, *Fahua xuanyi* and *Fahua wenju*). Again, Daoxian 道暹 (active 760s–770s), regarded as the disciple of Zhanran, wrote the *Weimo jing shuji chao* 維摩經疏記鈔 [Summary of the *Shuji*] as a commentary to the *Shuji*. The complete text was lost, but contents from chapter three (‘Shi dizi pin’ 釋弟子品 [Chapter on Śākyamuni’s Disciples]) to chapter five (‘Shi wenji pin’ 釋問疾品 [Chapter on Śākyamuni’s Inquiry on the Ill One]) are extant.<sup>24</sup>

In this process, the *Weimo jing shu*, comprised of the *Xuanyi* and *Ruwen*, became divided into the *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu* and then circulated. That development started from a relatively early period, after 764 when Zhanran wrote the *Lüeshu* in ten fascicles. As far as I know, the oldest record is in the *Dengyō Daishi shōrai Taishū roku* 傳教大師將來台州錄 [Record of Items Brought from Taizhou by Dengyō Daishi; hereafter *Taishū roku*], from Japan in year 805 (year 24 of Enryaku 延暦 era). As we will examine later, what Saichō 最澄 (767–822) brought him back to Japan upon returning to Japan after concluding his studies in China was the *Xuanshu* in six fascicles and *Lüeshu* in ten fascicles. Therein the *Wenshu* is not included. The basis for the transmission of a thirty-four fascicle version had already changed at by the beginning of the ninth century when not even fifty years had passed since the appearance of the *Lüeshu*.

Having considered the transmission of the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* during the Tang dynasty, what is also im-

<sup>23</sup> *Song Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2061, 50: 737a.

<sup>24</sup> *Weimo jing shuji chao*, X no. 345, vol. 19.

portant is the flourishing of the commentary by Daoye 道液 (active 760–804) at Dunhuang. The biography of Daoye is unclear, but he is believed to have been a scholar monk who engaged in translating *sūtras* while active primarily at Zisheng si 資聖寺 in Chang'an.<sup>25</sup> Among his representative works is the *Jingming jing jijie Guanzhong shu* 淨名經集解關中疏 [Guanzhong Commentary on the Exegeses of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] in two fascicles, based on the *Zhu Weimojie jing* 注維摩詰經 [Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. Based on Daoye's preface, he wrote his piece in 760 (year 1 of Shangyuan 上元 era) and then revised it in 765 (year 1 of Yongtai 永泰 era). Therein he also cites Zhiyi's explanation in addition to the *Zhu Weimojie jing*.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, as a commentary related to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, there is the *Jingming jing Guanzhong shi chao* 淨名經關中釋抄 [Guanzhong Summary of Explanations of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. The beginning starts with saying, 'As stated in Tiantai 天台云', and is comprised of citations of the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* throughout, which is a characteristic point of the text. As Daoye's commentary occupies the greater part of copies of commentaries related to *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* excavated at Dunhuang, it was a mainstream text for the study of said *sūtra* at Dunhuang during the eighth to ninth centuries. This means that at the same time the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* and Tiantai studies were studied as far away as Dunhuang via Daoye's line. The textual organization of the *Jingming jing Guanzhong shi chao* was circulated with the title *Tiantai fenmen tu* 天台分門圖 [Lineage Charts of Tiantai], which might be said to offer further evidence.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Matsumori notes that Daoye most valued the interpretation of Sengzhao 僧肇 (384–414?), in addition to the point that Zhiyi's interpretation was similarly treated alongside the interpretation of Kumārajīva. See Matsumori, '*Jōmyō kyō kanchū shaku shō to Tendai bunmon zu*' and 'Shishōji Dōeki ni yoru Tendai-bunken no inyō nitsuite'.

<sup>26</sup> *Jingming jing Guanzhong shi chao*, T no. 2778, 85: 440a.

<sup>27</sup> See Matsumori, 'Shishōji Dōeki ni yoru Tendai-bunken no inyō nitsuite'.

## 2.4. Transmission in the Song Dynasty

Owing to the chaos toward the end of the Tang and during the Five Dynasties period, the Chinese Buddhist world took a deep blow and Tiantai was not an exception to this. Fascicle eight in the *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 [Chronicle of the Buddha and Patriarchs] by Zhipan 志磐 (1220?–1275?) records the biography of Luoxi Yiji 螺溪義寂 (919–987), in which the miserable circumstances of the end of the Tang are relayed as follows:

[Due to first the An-Shi rebellion and later the Huichang persecution of Buddhism,] the corpus of texts became fragmented and those who would transmit them had nothing available. The master [Yiji] frequently lamented this and made an effort to trace [the texts]. The first found text in the old repository of Jinhua was just one commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*. 殘編斷簡, 傳者無憑. 師每痛念, 力網羅之, 先於金華古藏, 僅得《淨名》一疏.<sup>28</sup>

As a result of the An-shi Rebellion (755–763) and Huichang Persecution of Buddhism (842–845), many Tiantai texts were lost. What remained was just ‘one commentary on *Vimalakīrti*’ discovered from the old repository of Jinhua 金華. It is unclear which of the commentaries this was (*Xuanshu*, *Wenshu*, or *Lüeshu*), but the ‘one commentary on *Vimalakīrti*’ was in Yiji’s eyes a kind of hope for a revival of doctrinal studies. Later, Yiji collected texts from Korea and Japan, and restored the collection. Ciyun Zunshi 慈雲遵式 (964–1032) produced the *Tiantai jiaoguan mulu* 天台教觀目錄 [Catalogue of Tiantai Teachings and Meditations] in 1029 (year 7 of Tiansheng 天聖 era) with the aim of collecting the works of the Kaibao Canon (*Kaibao zang* 開寶藏).<sup>29</sup>

This catalogue, which is included in the first fascicle of the *Tian-*

<sup>28</sup> *Fozu tongji*, T no. 2035, 49: 190c.

<sup>29</sup> Regarding the contemporary situation, there is an account in the *Yang Wengong tanyuan* 楊文公談苑 [Garden of Discourse with Yang the Literary Master]. See Kotyk, ‘The Medieval Chinese Vision of Japan’, 373.

*zhu bieji* 天竺別集 [Separate Collection of Tiantai (Monastery) (i.e., Zunshi)], records the following about the situation of texts related to the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* in the eleventh century.

*Weimo xuanyi*: five fascicles .... *Sijiao yi*: four fascicles. The above 76 fascicles were that which was taught by Zhizhe, and were entered into the canon of scriptures which was newly compiled by the court. 《維摩玄義》五卷.....《四教義》四卷<sup>30</sup>\*.....已上七十六卷智者 31 說, 聖朝新編入大藏.

Herein, that *Weimo xuanyi* 維摩玄義 [Profound Meaning of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] is not of six fascicles, but five, is a problem, but it is almost unmistakably denoting the *Xuanshu*. Next, Zhanran's *Lüeshu* and *Shuji* were also added to the canonical texts.<sup>32</sup> Again, the separately circulated version of the *Sijiao yi* was added to the canonical list, but it is noteworthy that the *Sanguan yi* and *Si xitan yi* were excluded. In this way in the transmission history, even among the separately circulated versions, only the *Sijiao yi* was recognized as having that significance. There was a clear trend toward treating it as an individual item. It appears that in the *Tiantai jiaoguan mulu*, the *Sanguan yi* and *Si xitan yi* were not afforded independent value, as their contents were included in the three great works of Tiantai.

<sup>30</sup> *Sijiao yi*, T no. 1929, 46: 780c:

If one wishes to understand in detail [the five times and eight teachings (*wushi bajiao* 五時八教)], see fascicle four in the *Jingming xuanyi*, as the characteristics of the [four] teachings are all distinguished [in this part of the text]'. 若要委明之者。...乃淨名玄義中四卷。全判教相。

Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大 (1907–1986) in the appendix of the *Shōwa kōtei Tendai Shi kyō gi* 昭和校訂 天台四教儀 (p. 26) believes that the line *Jingming xuanyi zhong sijuan* 淨名玄義中四卷 'ought not be regarded as referring to the *Si jiao yi*'. Also, *Chongnok*, T no. 55: 1178a, '*Sijiao yi*, four fascicles; some just have twelve fascicles together' 四教義四卷或有十二卷本開合而已。It is clear that the Korean *Sijiao yi* was primarily four fascicles.

<sup>31</sup> *Tianzhu bieji*, X no. 951, 57: 23b.

<sup>32</sup> *Tianzhu bieji*, X no. 951, 57: 23c.

*Sanguan yi*: two fascicles. *Si xitan*: 2 fascicles. ... The above nine fascicles were taught by Zhizhe, and here they are included in the three great works [so they are not added to the list of canonized items]. 《三觀義》二卷, 《四悉檀》二卷... 已上九卷 智者說, 今參入<sup>33</sup> 大部。

The *Weimo Xuanshu* cited next, I believe, is the *Wenshu*, judging from the fascicle count of twenty-eight. Although it is confirmed that it was extant at the time, it was not added to the canonical list.

*Weimo Xuanshu*: twenty-eight fascicles ... the above 33 fascicles were taught by Zhizhe. That work is extant, but it has not been added to the 《維摩玄疏》二十八卷... 已上三十三卷智者說,<sup>34</sup> 其本現存, 但不入大藏

With regard to the disregard for the *Wenshu*, similar to the *Tiantai jiao guan mulu*, in the *Tiantai jiao suihan mulu* 天台教隨函目錄, which is included in the first fascicle of the *Tianzhu bie ji*, we can see a further concrete account as follows:

*Weimo jing xuan*: 5 fascicles; *Weimo jing lüeshu*: 10 fascicles. *Weimo jing guang shuji*: 6 fascicles. *Sijiao yi*: 4 fascicles. ... The *Weimo jing shu* was in the beginning 28 fascicles in its extended (full) version. Later people thought that the length of its text was bothersome, so Jingxi [Zhanran] abbreviated it to ten fascicles. Parts with many words were cut down with the meaningful parts remaining. This is why the extended version was not really transmitted, whereas the abbreviated version was widely transmitted. The 6 fascicles of the *Shuji* appear to be a commentary on the 28 fascicles, but the master passed away while this remained undetermined. Although the indicated text is somewhat different [from the *Wenshu*], the meaning exactly matches. 《維摩經玄義》五卷; 《維摩經略疏》十卷; 《維摩經廣疏記》六卷;; 《四教義》四卷; ... 《維摩經疏》, 先有廣本二十八卷。後人患其文多, 故荆溪略爲十卷。言繁則剪, 帶義則存。故廣本罕傳, 略本盛行矣。《疏記》六卷, 猶對廣疏, 未暇治定, 然師云亡, 雖指文少殊, 亦釋義宛合。<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> *Tianzhu bieji*, X no. 951, 57: 25b.



The underlined part—‘...the extended version [*Wenshu*] was not really transmitted, whereas the abbreviated version [*Lüeshu*] was widely transmitted’—shows the real situation at the time in which the *Lüeshu* was mainstream.

Besides this, one noteworthy matter as a scholastic trend regarding the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* during the Song dynasty was the authoring of the *Weimo jing lüeshu chuiyu ji* 維摩經略疏垂裕記 [Bequeathed Account on the Abbreviated Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*; hereafter *Chuiyu ji*], in ten fascicles by Gushan Zhiyuan 孤山智圓 (976–1022) in 1015 (year 8 of Dazhong Xiangfu 大中祥符 era). According to Zhiyuan’s preface, his motivation behind writing this was to correct errors by recording a commentary for the *Lüeshu* because five misunderstandings had arisen in the simultaneous reading of the *Lüeshu* with the *Shuji*. Zhiyuan also refers to the fascicle count in the separately circulated version in fascicle three of the *Niepan xuanyi fayuan jiyao* 涅槃玄義發源機要 [Essentials on the Source of the Profound Meaning of the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra*]:

The earlier written *Xuanyi* was divided into three parts, namely, the *Sixi* in 4 fascicles, the *Sijiao* in 4 fascicles, and the *Sanguan* in 2 fascicles. 開《淨名前玄》以爲三部：謂《四悉》四卷、《四教》四卷、《三觀》兩卷。<sup>36</sup>

Here, *Sixi sijuan* 四悉四卷 probably means that the *Si xitan yi* is of four fascicles, but even considering the content of the first fascicle of the current *Xuanshu*, as well as assuming that, until this, the *Si xitian yi* was generally of two fascicles, it is difficult to believe that the fascicle count was actually four in number..

As we can see from above, come the Song dynasty, we can determine that there was a trend in which the *Lüeshu* became mainstream, while the *Wenshu* was poorly regarded. The *Lüeshu* abbreviates the contents of the *Wenshu* without changing it, with the result that there are a number of parts in which expressions have been signifi-

<sup>36</sup> *Niepan xuanyi fayuan jiyao*, T no. 1766, 38: 34b.



cantly revised.<sup>37</sup> While reading Zhanran's *Lüeshu* one must take into account the *Shuji* in connection to the *Wenshu* while furthermore studying and referring to Zhiyuan's *Chuiyu ji*. The complexities between the correspondences in the texts may have left the scholar monks losing their will to go back to the *Wenshu*.

Moreover, although the *Xuanshu* was added to the canonical list, in actuality it was not entered into the canon. However, in the Song dynasty, woodblock prints were published and part of that was transmitted to Japan. Among the Song-era prints handed down at Chōryū-ji 長瀧寺 in Nōshū 濃州 (Shirotori-chō 白鳥町 in Gujō-gun 郡上郡 of Gifu Prefecture), there is a copy of the *Xuanshu*. An Edo period scholar monk of the Anrakuritsu 安楽律 tradition, Shutoku Honjun 守篤本純 (1702–1769), published the *Saikō Yuima-kyō gengi* 再校維摩經玄義 [Revised Edition of the Profound Meaning of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] with detailed critical annotations based on the Song-era print from Chōryū-ji. In addition, a copy of the Song-era print of the *Xuanshu* was also handed down at Kōsan-ji 高山寺 in Toganō 桐尾, Kyōto. As will be explained later, that line of transmission also lasted until modernity even in China.

Finally, again, we might confirm the reception of the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* during the Tang dynasty through catalogues of *sūtras* and historical sources.

First, the most important is the *Sinp'yōn chejong kyōjang ch'ong-nok* 新編諸宗教藏總錄 [Newly Compiled Comprehensive Record of the Canonical Works of the Various Schools] edited by Ūich'ōn 義天 (1055–1101) in the year 1090 (year 6 of Sukchong 肅宗 of Koryō 高麗). In the first fascicle the following account is given in the listing of commentaries connected to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* that were transmitted at the time in Koryō:

*Weimo jing* ... *Shu*: 28 fascicles. *Xuanyi*: 6 fascicles. *Xuanlun*: 7 fascicles. The above were taught by Zhiyi. *Guang Shuji*: 6 fascicles, *Lüeshu*: 10 fascicles. The above were taught by Zhanran. *Chuiyu ji*:

---

<sup>37</sup> Regarding the abridgement of the *Lüeshu*, see Yamaguchi, *Tendai Yuima kyō sho no kenkyū*, 161–183.

10 fascicles, *Ke*: 6 fascicles, taught by Zhiyuan. 《維摩經》...《疏》二十八卷、《玄義》六卷、《玄論》七卷. 已上智顗述. 《廣疏記》六卷、《略疏》十卷. 已上湛然述; 《垂裕記》十卷、《科》六卷, 智圓述.<sup>38</sup>

It is unclear what kind of text *Xuanlun* in seven fascicles (玄論七卷) here is specifically referring to. Jizang 吉藏 (549–623) has a *Jingming xuanlun* 淨名玄論 [Profound Treatise on of the *Vimalakīrti*] in eight fascicles. Uicheon's *Sinp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* follows Zhiyuan's *Chui yu ji* and only cites a 'commentary in twelve or six fascicles' (疏十二卷或六卷) with regard to Jizang's texts related to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*. As we can compare this to Jizang's *Weimo jing yishu* 維摩經義疏 [Commentary on the Meaning of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*], it is a possibility that here *Xuanlun* is an adulteration of Jizang's *Jingming Xuanlun*. Moreover, with regard to the separately circulated version, Uicheon's *Sinp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* only records the *Sijiao yi*. We ought to understand that the *Sijiao yi* in the classification scheme in Uicheon's *Sinp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* was regarded as a text which taught the doctrines intrinsic to Tiantai, rather than as being a separately circulated version of a commentary to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, given that the *Sijiao yi* was listed in a largely separate way from the commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, and because it is placed among those works cited which explain meditative contemplations such as the Four Bases of Mindfulness (*sinian chu* 四念處) and *Xiao zhiguan* 小止觀 [Smaller Cessation and Observation].<sup>39</sup>

Further, the accounts related to the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* are confirmed in fascicle twenty-five of the *Fozu tongji*, compiled somewhat later by Zhipan in 1269 (year 5 of Xianchun 咸淳 era):

... *Weimo xuanshu* <sup>6 fascicles,</sup> *Sijiao yi* <sup>4 fascicles, text extracted from *Weimo xuanshu*.</sup> The above 76 fascicles were reported by Ciyun in order for them to be entered into the Great Canon in year 2 of Tiansheng era. *Weimo Wenshu* <sup>28 fascicles, written for Emperor Yang. Jingxi abbreviated it to 10</sup>

<sup>38</sup> *Sinp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok*, T no. 2184, 55: 1170a.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, 1178a.

fascicles, and it is just called the *Lüeshu* (Abbreviated Commentary). They were respectively circulated along with the aforementioned *Xuanshu*. ... The above total of 33 fascicles were not entered into the canon. ....《維摩玄疏》<sup>六卷</sup>、《四教義》<sup>四卷</sup>《維摩玄疏》離出之文。右七十六卷，天聖二年慈雲奏入大藏。《維摩文疏》<sup>二十八卷</sup>，為<sup>楊帝撰</sup>，荊溪<sup>略為十卷，但稱略疏，與前玄疏各行</sup>.....右共三十三卷，未入藏。<sup>40</sup>

In the inserted notes following the *Weimo wenshu*, the circumstances in the Song dynasty regarding the circulation of the *Xuanshun* and *Lüeshu* are recorded. Furthermore, the *Fozu tongji* treats the *Sanguan yi* as a work of Zhanran.<sup>41</sup> This kind of understanding does not appear prior to the *Fozu tongji*, and there is a high possibility that it was a mistake of fact by Zhipan.

## 2.5. Circulation and the History of Canonization from the Yuan Dynasty

In the Song dynasty, although the *Lüeshu* became mainstream for the study of Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, there are few historical sources that relate information about the later transmission of it and how it was studied. Among these, although it is not a set of glosses to the commentary, the *Weimojie suoshuo jing wuwo shu* 維摩詰所說經無我疏 [Commentary on the Not-Self of the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*] by Youxi Chuandeng 幽溪傳燈 (1554–1628) in twelve fascicles, is important as a commentary to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* which was written based on Tiantai doctrine. It is noteworthy in that in the preface from 1625 (year 5 of Tianqi 天啓 era), it is recognized that although most of Zhiyi's works had been lost, the Dharma teaching of intrinsic inclusiveness (*xingju* 性具) was clearly explained in the *Xuanshu*.<sup>42</sup>

Also, in the 'Kōbon *Jōmyō-kyō* so jo' 廣本淨名經疏序 [Preface to the Extended Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] of the

<sup>40</sup> *Fozu tongji*, T no. 2035, 49: 258b–c.

<sup>41</sup> *Fozu tongji*, T no. 2035, 49: 189a; 259b. Chi writes, 'We believe it is clearly the work of another person', and does not add it to the total sum of works by Zhanran. See Chi, *Tōdai Tendai Bukkyō fukkō undō kenkyū josetsu*, 85–86.

<sup>42</sup> *Weimojie suoshuo jing wuwo shu*, X no. 348, 19: 576b.

*Wenshu*, the terrible circumstances of textual transmission after the Song dynasty are related together with quoted words of Ouyi Zhixu 藕益智旭 (1599–1655):

In the time of the Song, the entry of Tiantai texts into the canon was unfortunately forgotten and these were hardly circulated among people. In the time of the Barbarian Yuan, they were finally lost. Lingfeng Zhixu in a communication to Zhang Zhongzhu explained, ‘The commentary to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* is preserved in the Eastern Sea [in Korea], with great effort it would again shine in this land [in China]. Would that not be something to greatly celebrate?’ 宋時台教入藏，不幸見遺，人間罕傳。逮胡元，終爾亡失。靈峰旭師復張中柱書有言，‘《維摩疏》久錮海東，儻仗鼎力，復照此地，乃千古奇事，日夜祝之’。<sup>43</sup>

The quoted words of Zhixu are from a reply addressed to a figure named Zhang Zhongzhu.<sup>44</sup> According to the source text, Zhixu appealed for support, saying that the *Liumiao famen* 六妙法門 [Six Excellent Gates of Dharma] and *Wenshu* were lost in China, but as they were extant on the Korean peninsula, he wanted to recover them back to China.

Among trends in modern times, scholars noticed the existence of texts from Zhongxiang Hermitage 衆香庵 in Yangzhou 揚州, which were referenced by Zhou Shujia 周叔迦 (1899–1970). Zhou Shujia’s *Shidian conglu* 釋典叢錄 [Catalogue of Buddhist Scriptures], which is included in the second volume of *Zhou Shujia Foxue lunzhu ji* 周叔迦佛學論著集 [Collected Buddhist Studies Papers of Zhou Shujia], is an analysis of titles of Buddhist works, but therein he introduces the *Wenshu* of the extended canon alongside a version of the *Xuanshu*

<sup>43</sup> ‘Kōbon Jōmyō-kyō so jo’, *Weimo jing wenshu*, X no. 338, 18: 462a.

<sup>44</sup> *Lingfeng Ouyi Dashì zonglun*, J no. B348, 36: 5.341c4: 復張中柱。From the contents of the letter, Zhang Zhongzhu is thought to have been a Confucian scholar. As representative items that might function as an introduction to Tiantai texts, the *Dasheng zhi guan famen* 大乘止觀法門, *Xiao zhi guan* 小止觀 and *Mohe zhi guan* 摩訶止觀 are recommended. Their features are also explained.

explained as ‘*Xuanyi* of the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra* in six fascicles, Yangzhou Zhongxiang Hermitage edition’ (維摩詰所說經玄義六卷揚州衆香庵本).<sup>45</sup> Here, it is pointed out that in the earlier versions of the *Xuanshu* in Japan, the disorder in contents due to a disordering in the old manuscripts emerges in fascicle five. It is also pointed out that even in Japan, from comparing the Song-era prints in the Edo period, the Yangzhou Zhongxiang Hermitage edition is believed to be a version from the Song-era line of transmission.

Furthermore, the version of the *Weimo jing xuanshu* annotated by Wang Xinhui 王新水 (published in 2018) is unique as it is based on the *Taishō* edition reproduced in CBETA with reference to the extended canon as well as the Tiantai canon (Tainan shi 台南市, Zhanran si 湛然寺, 1996).<sup>46</sup> I have been unable to view this version of the Tiantai canon up close, but just looking at the annotations by Wang, it appears to be a relatively good quality text which corrects the errors of the *Taishō* canon. However, with regard to the disorder pointed out by Zhou Shujia, the Tiantai canon does not seem to point anything out and the annotator just switches around passages based on speculation from dividing the text. We then know that the Tiantai canon is not based on the Song-era print.

Concerning the circumstances of the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* and related texts in the history of canonization, there are basically few things we ought to look at. The *Xuanshu*, *Wenshu*, *Sanguan yi*, and *Chuiyu ji* were never entered into canon until they were included in the *Dai Nippon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經 [Great Japanese Extended Canon], which was completed in 1912 (year 1 of Taishō era). Although the *Lüeshu* and *Shuji* were recorded in the Jin Canon (Jinzang 金藏), later they were similarly not canonized like the *Xuanshu*. As to the related texts, only the *Si jiao yi* was often canonized. In China it was included in the *Jin Canon*, as well as the Ming-era *Yongle nan zang* 永樂南藏 [Yongle-era Southern Canon], *Beizang* 北藏 [Yongle-era Northern Canon], *Jingzang* 徑藏

<sup>45</sup> Mao, ed., *Zhou Shujia foxue lunzhu ji*, 976–977. The opening has slightly different text. Included in Li, ed., *Zhou Shujia Foxue lunzhu quanji*, 1948–1949.

<sup>46</sup> Wang, ed., *Weimo jing xuanshu Tiantaizong xilie*, 4.

[Jingshan Canon], and Qing-era *Longzang* 龍藏 [Dragon Canon]. Even in Japan, it was recorded early in the *Shukusatsu daizōkyō* 縮刷大藏經 [Compact Printed Canon]. The *Sijiao yi* exceeded beyond the scope of being a commentary to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* and was often consulted as a foundational text for the study of Tiantai. That point was also a clear tendency in the transmission in Japan.

### 3. The Transmission in Japan

#### 3.1. Ganjin's Arrival with Buddhist Materials

It is held that Ganjin 鑑真 (688–763) brought Tiantai texts to Japan. Ganjin arrived in Japan after overcoming a number of difficulties and struggles in 753 (year 5 of Tenpyō Shōhō 天平勝寶 era). The *Tō daiwajō tōsei den* 唐大和上東征傳 [Record of the Eastern Mission of the Great Monk of the Tang], which is included in the *Youfang ji chao* 遊方記抄 [Digest of Travel Accounts], records the texts that Ganjin brought with him. Therein, apart from the *Sijiao yi*, no other related literature of the Tiantai commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* is mentioned.<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, the earlier cited postscript for the *Wenshu* records that a copying was undertaken in the year 754 (thirteenth year of Tianbao 天寶 era). This was after Ganjin came to Japan, so at the very least, the current *Wenshu* cannot be considered to have been part of the materials brought by Ganjin.

However, given that there is an account which says that Saichō made a copy, we cannot entirely deny the possibility that Ganjin brought with him the commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*. Saichō in 785 (year 4 of Enryaku 延暦 era) before going to China is said to have at age nineteen met with the Tiantai texts brought by Ganjin and was moved to tears. That scene is also depicted in the *Fusō ryaku-ki* 扶桑略記 [Abbreviated Chronicle of Fusō], which records Japanese history until the year 1094 (year 8 of Kanji 寛治 era). Saichō's copied texts from then are cited as follows:

<sup>47</sup> *Tō daiwajō tōsei den*, T no. 2089, 51: 993a.

He was able to copy the *Yuandun zhiguan* [i.e., *Mohe zhiguan*], *Fabua xuanyi*, *Fabua wenju shu*, *Sijiao yi* and *Weimo guangshu*, altogether in 34 fascicles. 得寫《圓頓止觀》、《法華玄義》、《法華文句疏》、《四教義》、《維摩廣疏》卅四卷等。<sup>48</sup>

Here the ‘three great parts’ (i.e., the Three Great Works of Tiantai) are listed together with the *Sijiao yi* and an ‘extensive commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* in thirty-four fascicles’.<sup>49</sup> Problems concerning the veracity of this as a historical reality remain, but even if these anecdotes are exaggerated, here the title of ‘extensive commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*’ is cited, which we ought to view as an example in which it was recognized as a representative Tiantai text at the time. Similarly, it is clear from other records in catalogues of old manuscripts that the *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu* were brought to Japan first in the form of thirty-four fascicles together as one item.<sup>50</sup>

### 3.2. The Texts Brought by Saichō and the Later Transmission

The *Taishū roku* in the categorization of texts brought by Saichō lists a section of ‘Vimalakīrti Works’ (*Weimo bu* 維摩部), and records that five texts related to the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* were brought.

<sup>48</sup> *Fusō ryakuki, Shintei zōho kokushi taikēi*, vol. 12: 110.

<sup>49</sup> As we see largely identical cited text in Enchin’s *Hieizan Enryakuji Ganjososhi gyōgō ki* (ND 78: 76a), it is believed that the author of the *Fusō ryakki*, who was the Tendai monk Kōen Ajari 皇圓阿闍梨, consulted this work. The *Hieizan Enryakuji Ganjososhi gyōgō ki* records the *Eizan Daishi den* 叡山大師傳. Identical content is seen in the *Eizan Daishi den* (ND 78: 53a), but there is no record of fascicle counts. These records are all noteworthy in that they emphasize that Saichō copied the text brought by Ganjin.

<sup>50</sup> The *Ko shōgyō mokuroku* 古聖教目錄 from directly under the section listing the commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* has the following: ‘*Weimo Xuan-shu Ruwen*, three fascicles (upper, middle, and lower), Zhizhe’ 維摩玄疏入文三十四卷 上中下 智者. See Makita & Ochiai, *Nanatsudera koitsu kyōten kenkyū sōsho*, 164.



*Weimo jing Xuanshu*: 6 fascicles By Zhizhe Dashi, 116 pages 維摩經玄疏六卷 智者大師出 一百一十六紙;  
*Weimo jing Shuji*: 3 fascicles Also 6 fascicles Written by Master Jingxi, 148 pages 維摩經疏記三卷 或六卷 荆溪和尚撰 一百四十八紙

The above two texts are 9 fascicles, stored in the same box 已上二部九卷同帙.

*Weimo jing Lüeshu*: 10 fascicles Written by Master Jingxi, 394 pages 維摩經略疏十卷 荆溪和尚撰 三百九十四紙;  
*Weimo jing shu siji*: 3 fascicles [of the three fascicles] the first one is the Xuanyu, written by Daosui, one of the disciples holding transmission of the Dharma, 148 pages

維摩經疏記三卷 上卷玄義 傳法弟子 道邃撰 一百四十八紙;  
*Sijiao yi*: 12 fascicles By Zhizhe Dashi, 97 pages 四教儀十二卷 智者大師出, 51 九十七紙

Here the separately circulated *Sijiao yi* is included, but although the *Si xidan yi* and *Sanguan yi* are seen in the list of books written on the left column funerary inscription in front of the tomb of Zhiyi (dated to 734 / year 22 of Kaiyuan era), they are recorded in the catalogue of lost works (*keppon mokuroku* 欠本目錄), which is a list of texts that could not be acquired.<sup>52</sup>

The fifteen divisions in the following catalogue listing different themes (*zuibu mokuroku* 隨部目錄) has texts following the different topics, such as Cessation-Observation (*Zhiguan bu* 止觀部), the *Lotus Sūtra* (*Fahua bu* 法華部), and Vimalakīrti. These were recorded based on the funerary inscription on the left column in front of the tomb of Zhiyi. The heading has the *Sanguan yi*, but since this is assigned to the Cessation-Observation division, there might have been a separate *Sanguan yi* besides the two-fascicle version in the catalogue of lost works. Again, if we look at those items assigned to the divisions of Vimalakīrti, and Four Teachings (*Sijiao yi bu* 四教義部), it continues with *Shi ershiwu sanmei yi* 釋二十五三昧義 [Meaning of the Twenty-five *Samādhis*], *Simen yi* 四門義 [Meaning of the Four Gates], *Situ yi* 四土義 [Meaning of the Four Grounds], and *Si xitan yi* 四悉檀義 [Meaning of the Four Accomplishments]. We would expect that these were extracted from the parts in which the *Sijiao yi*, *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu* were explained in detail, but concerning the *Si xitan yi*, in the same way of the previous example of the *Sanguan yi*,

<sup>51</sup> *Taishū roku*, T no. 2159, 55: 1056a; DZ 4: 355.

<sup>52</sup> *Taishū roku*, T no. 2159, 55: 1057a–b; DZ 4: 362–364.



it might have indicated a different item from a separately circulated version, I believe, and now I just want to point out that possibility.

Saichō did not bring the *Wenshu*. Assuming that the aforementioned copy of the version brought by Ganjin was real, I believe that it omitted the *Wenshu*, which is large in volume. It was difficult to study the *Lüeshu* and *Wenshu* together, but later in Japan, Hocchibō Shōshin 寶地房證眞 (twelfth to thirteenth century) tried to dispel that difficulty by authoring the *Yuima so shiki* 維摩疏私記 [Private Record on the Commentary to *Vimalakīrti*] in two fascicles. It was through this sort of intricacy that, I believe, a trend arose subsequently in which the *Lüeshu* alone was thought to be sufficient.

Furthermore, with regard to Saichō, Tamura Kōyū 田村晃祐 pointed out his reference to the *Xuanshu* and citations of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* in the *Zaishō haishu gi* 再生敗種義 [Meaning of the Restoration of the Rotten Seeds], while Ōkubo Ryōshun 大久保良峻 drew attention to the citations of the *Wenshu* in the *Kenkai ron* 顯戒論 [Treatise on Clarifying the Precepts].<sup>53</sup> We know that Saichō not only copied and brought with him commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, but also fully understood their contents.

Later, according to the catalogue of items brought back from China by Jikaku Daishi 慈覺大師, Ennin 圓仁 (794–864), the *Nittō shin gu shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目錄 [Catalogue of Newly Sought Holy Teachings in the Tang], there is an account where he copied the *Sanguan yi* in two fascicles at Huayan si 華嚴寺 at Mount Wutai 五臺.<sup>54</sup> The main aim of Ennin's pilgrimage was acquiring the transmission of the esoteric teachings, but Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英 points out that Ennin sought to augment what Saichō could not bring back to Japan.<sup>55</sup> There is great significance that the *Sanguan yi* in this way was brought into the repository at Mount Hiei.

Meanwhile, among the catalogues of texts brought back to Japan by Chishō Daishi 智證大師, Enchin 圓珍 (814–891), we only see the *Sijiao yi* in the *Fukushū*, *Onshū*, *Taishū gutoku kyō ritsu ron so shoki gesho tō mokuroku* 福州温州台州求得經律論疏記外書等目錄 [Catalogue of *Sūtras*, *Vinaya*, Treatises, Commentaries and

<sup>53</sup> Tamura, 'Saichō to *Yuima kyō*'; *Kenkai ron*, DZ 1: 78.

Heterodox Texts, etc., Acquired in Fuzhou, Wenzhou and Taizhou] when it comes to a record of Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*.<sup>56</sup> With the commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, it appears that Enchin made an effort to gather new texts, since we see texts authored in the Tang dynasty, such as Daoyi's commentary, listed in the *Chishō Daishi shōrai mokuroku* 智證大師請來目錄 [Catalogue of Items Brought by Chishō Daishi].<sup>57</sup>

In addition to this, some particularly important sources which show the relevant transmission within the Tiantai school include the *Tendai-shū shōso* 天台宗章疏 [Commentary on the Writings of the Tendai School], which was offered to the throne by the monk Gennichi 玄日 (?–921) of Enryaku-ji at the order of Daigō Tennō 醍醐天皇 in 914 (year 14 of Engi 延喜 era), and the *Sannō-in zōsho mokuroku* 山王院藏書目錄 [Catalogue of Books in the Repository of Sannō-in], which is a catalogue of books stored in the repository of Sannō-in at Tōdō 東塔 of Mount Hiei around the year 925 (year 3 of Engi era). The *Tendai-shū shōso* cites titles comprised of 642 fascicles in 181 texts utilized by the Tendai school. Among the texts related to Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, it records eight texts starting with the *Xuanshu* in six fascicles and the *Wenshu* in twenty-eight fascicles.<sup>58</sup> The *Sannō-in zōsho mokuroku* was originally four books, but only two are extant. Therein 2959 fascicles in 1090 texts are recorded, and although we see the *Sanguan yi*, *Sijiao yi* and *Xuanshu* in addition to Zhanran's *Shuji* and *Lüeshu*, there is no record of the *Wenshu*.<sup>59</sup> We cannot come to a definitive judgment, since this catalogue is not complete, but given that there is no record of the *Wenshu* among the listing of the *Xuanshu*, *Shuji* and *Lüeshu*, we ought to view this as a high probability that the *Wenshu*

<sup>54</sup> *Nittō shin gu shōgyō mokuroku*, T no. 2167, 55: 1085a.

<sup>55</sup> Satō, *Tendai Daishi no kenkyū*, 85–86.

<sup>56</sup> *Fukushū, Onshū, Taishū gutoku kyō ritsu ron so shoki gesho tō mokuroku*, T no. 2170, 55: 1095b.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, 1105b.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid, 1136a–b.

<sup>59</sup> Satō, 'Shoki Eizan no kyōzō ni tsuite'.

was not stored at *Sannō-in*.

Furthermore, there is the *Tōiki dentō mokuroku* 東域傳燈目錄 [Catalogue of the Transmission of the Lamp in the Eastern Regions] of 1094 (year 8 of Kanji era), which covers the stored texts of various schools in the late Heian period, and was compiled by Eichō 永超 (1014–1095) of Hossō-shū 法相宗. In this we see records of the separately circulated *Sijiao yi* and *Sanguan yi*, in addition to the *Si xitan yi* in two fascicles, which was thought to have been lost early on. We know that different arrangements of the fascicles were transmitted to Japan since the *Wenshu* in twenty-eight fascicles is noted to also have versions comprised of thirty-four, thirty-seven and thirty fascicles.<sup>60</sup>

What is clear from this transmission history is that only the *Sijiao yi* as a separately circulated version was widely circulated. The result is that it gradually took a position as a work supplementing the *Fabua xuanyi*, and was largely received in a form accompanying the Three Great Works of Tiantai. The *Goshōrai mokuroku* 御請來目錄 [Catalogue of Brought Items (by Kōbō Daishi 弘法大師, Kūkai 空海)]<sup>61</sup> as well as the repository of Shōmyō-ji 稱名寺,<sup>62</sup> include the *Sijiao yi* along with the Three Great Works, a fact that shows an orientation among other schools in Japan to accept the works of Tiantai. We can see at the same time a reflection in China of research trends and the state of their canon. As the structure of the *Xuanshu*, similar to the *Fabua xuanyi*, was used for the five categories of profound meaning (*wuchong xuanyi* 五重玄義), its overall significance was gradually lost, but the separately circulated *Sijiao yi*, which is a part of the original form of the *Xuanshu*, came to exercise an important function as a detailed explanation of the four types of content for teaching the Dharma (*huafa sijiao* 化法四教).

<sup>60</sup> *Tōiki dentō mokuroku*, T no. 2183, 55: 1151b.

<sup>61</sup> *Goshōrai mokuroku*, T no. 2161, 55: 1046a.

<sup>62</sup> In the listing of Chinese Tiantai works extant at Shōmyō-ji, among the stored texts held to be authored by Zhiyi, alongside the Three Great Works are recorded four versions of the *Sijiao yi* (altogether thirteen booklets). See Shioiri & Ikeda, 'Kanazawa Bunko ni okeru Tendai tenseki'.

In addition to this, Shōshin's work on commentaries was important. It is said that he read through the canon sixteen times without knowing of the Genpei War. The works of Shōshin, who lived in the turbulent time from the end of the Heian to the early Kamakura periods, were quite numerous starting with his *Shiki* ('private record') on the Three Great Works. Among those works, there are three related to the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* which are extant: *Yuima genryaku shō* 維摩玄略鈔 [Abridged Digest of the Profundity of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*], *Yuima sho shiki* 維摩疏私記 [Private Record on the Commentary to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] and *Shikyō gi shō* 四教義抄 [Digest of the *Sijiao yi*].<sup>63</sup>

The primary matters in the relevant transmission history until the medieval period in Japan conclude at the abovementioned point. In the early modern period, going into the Edo period, the transmission of the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* shows some new developments.

### 3.3. The Publishing Activities of the Anrakuritsu Tradition in the Edo Period

In the Edo period (1603–1868), economic activity was stable and printing technology evolved. Buddhist books were also printed in great quantity. Based on the *Shōwa genzon Tendai shōjaku sōgō mokuroku* 昭和現存天台書籍綜合目録 [Composite Catalogue of Extant Tendai Works in the Shōwa Period], edited by Shibuya Ryōtai 渋谷亮泰 in 1978, the order of texts published related to Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* are as follows. Also, only the oldest records are selected when it comes to items which were repeatedly reprinted:

Genna 2 元和二年 (1616) Zhanran *lüe* 湛然略 *Weimo jing* *Lüeshu*  
維摩經略疏 (T vol. 38)

<sup>63</sup> On their respective features, see Yamaguchi, *Tendai Yuima kyō sho no kenkyū*, 95–96.

- Genna 4 元和四年 (1618) Zhiyi 智顗 *Sijiao yi* 四教義 (T vol. 46)  
 Shōhō 5 正保五年 (1648) Zhiyi 智顗 *Weimo jing Xuanshu* 維摩經  
 玄疏 (T vol. 38)  
 Jōō 2 承応二年 (1653) Chuandeng 伝燈 *Weimojie suoshuo jing  
 wuwo shu* 維摩詰所説經無我疏 (X vol. 30)  
 Enpō 3 延宝三年 (1675) Zhiyuan 智円 *Weimo jing lüeshu chuiyu ji*  
 維摩經略疏垂裕記 (T vol. 38)  
 \*Genroku 5 元禄五年 (1692) Zhanran 湛然 *Weimo jing shuji* 維摩  
 經疏記 (1 part)<sup>64</sup> \*Edited by Shū'un 秀雲  
 Kyōhō 10 享保十年 (1725) Zhiyi 智顗 *Sanguan yi* 三觀義 (X vol.  
 2–4)  
 Genbun 4 元文四年 (1739) Zhanran 湛然 *Weimo jing shuji* 維摩經  
 疏記 \*Edited by Ryōnin 亮潤 (X vol. 28)  
 Genbun 5 元文五年 (1740) Zhiyi 智顗 *Weimo jing xuanshu* 維摩經  
 玄疏 \*Edited by Honjun 本純  
 Hōreki 11 宝暦十一年 (1761) Zhiyi 智顗 *Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩  
 經文疏 \*Edited by Honjun (X vol. 27–28)

The early period of publication of Tiantai texts was when Mount Hiei started using typeset printing, the most thriving time said to be around the Genna period (元和年間) to the early half of the Kanei period (1624–1645).<sup>65</sup> The publication of this period included the *Lüeshu* and *Sijiao yi*. These were historically the most important texts among those related to commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*. The publication also was quickly carried out as the handwritten manuscripts which were the basis for the printed editions were already in order. Next was the *Xuanshu*, but the publication of the *Wenshu*, which was

---

<sup>64</sup> According to the 'Yuimakyō sho ki jo' 維摩經疏記序 [Preface to the *Weimo jing shuji*], by Shū'un in Genroku 元禄 5 (1692), although the *Weimo jing shuji* was lost in Japan for a time, the preface writer, Shū'un, happened to discover part of it. It is further said that he put this together with a part he acquired at Rakuhaku Zenmon 洛北禪門 and published the text. The first fascicle is a commentary of fascicles 1–4 of the *Wenshu*, while the second fascicle is a commentary from fascicles 17–21.

<sup>65</sup> Kawase, *Zōho kokatsujiban no kenkyū*, 300–303.

together produced with the *Xuanshu*, was significantly delayed.

The *Shuji* and *Wenshu*, which were published later on, are unique in being what in modern philology would be called critical editions. Furthermore, apart from this, in 1728 (year 13 of Kyōhō 享保 era) the *Lüeshu* was published by Ryōnin 亮潤, and in 1740 (year 5 of Genbun 元文 era) the *Xuanshu* was published by Shutoku Honjun. Further, the *Sanguan yi* published in 1788 (year 8 of Tenmei 天明 era) was completed based on Honjun's commentary. Not growing weary of the editions he had already put into circulation, he collected..., he collected as many variant editions as were available at the time, and continued publishing critical editions that added to their scholarship.

Among these, the one which is particularly important is the *Saikō Yuima-kyō gen gi*, which was edited by Honjun on the basis of the Song-era edition. Honjun cited 127 parts that differ from the Song-era edition, and 4 places where errors occurred in the same edition, and adds his own pointers in 23 places based on his own knowledge. Also, he corrects the disorder which occurred in fascicle five. However, in the *Taishō* canon, this good edition was never consulted.<sup>66</sup>

A greatly important point to which we should pay attention is that the figures related to these publishing activities were all scholar monks belonging to the Anrakuritsu tradition, which played an important role in the Tendai history of the Edo period. Anrakuritsu was a branch based out of Anrakuritsu-in at Mount Hiei which esteemed the *Si fen lü* 四分律 [the *Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka]. Why did they exert themselves in the publication works? I would like to read and grasp the intention in the two prefaces attached to the *Wenshu* whose publication was realized late among the other texts.

First is the *Kōbon Jōmyō-kyō sho jo*, written by Kōjun Shinnō (1722–1788). Kōjun Shinnō was born as the second imperial prince

---

<sup>66</sup> Recently Kanno Hiroshi has referred to Honjun's critical edition and his annotated *Yuima kyō gensho senroku* 維摩經玄疏籤錄. See Kanno, 'Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū (3)', 'Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū (4)', 'Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū (5)', 'Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū (6)'.

to Nakamikado Tennō and served twice as the abbot of Tendai. He was a figure known for assisting and protecting Anrakuritsu. It is unknown whether Kōjun Shinnō had particular faith in the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, but at the beginning of the preface he records his recollection that because he was prone to illness, he had permitted the printing, but in actuality it was not undertaken. What is first imagined from this is that Shinnō might have felt that his illness overlapped with Vimalakīrti's illness and, therefore, he held a special concern for the printing of the *Wenshu*. Also, in Japan, it is a noteworthy point that there was firm faith in the Golden Grain Tathāgata (*Konzoku Nyorai* 金粟如來), who is referred to by Prince Shōtoku 聖德 (574–622) in the *Yuima-kyō giso* 維摩經義疏 [Commentary on the Meaning of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. In Chapter Six of the *Konjaku Monogatari-shū* 今昔物語集 [Anthology of Tales from the Past to the Present], there are meritorious deeds, such as illness being healed when the student makes a copy of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, and also stories in which they are reborn in the World of the Golden Grain where Golden Grain Tathāgata, the precursor of Vimalakīrti. Kōjun Shinnō, who was ill, was greatly conscious of the various types of folklore proclaiming the merit of protecting and upholding the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*.

Also, in Shinnō's preface, the words of the aforementioned Ouyi Zhixu are quoted. From a quote of a line lamenting its loss in China, we can see that the precious complete version was discovered in Japan, and we can also detect the pride that it came to be published. The second preface, Honjun's 'Shinkoku *Yuima-kyō monjo jo*' 新刻維摩經文疏序 [Preface to the Newly Printed Commentary on the Text of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*], similar to Kōjun Shinnō, is from 1761 (year 11 of Hōreki 寶曆 era). The details on the discovery are recorded as follows:

However, unfortunately, the transmission of the *Wenshu* was lost at our Mount Hiei, with only a few fascicles remaining. Moreover, the fragmentary parts which remained were not sufficient for reading. [Therein], Ji'en of Keizu-in in the old repository of Neiraku found [the *Wenshu*] and the *Shuji* of Zhanran together. He brought with them a hidden treasure. Due to the great efforts of Ejun of Kaku-jō-in, permission was granted to circulate them. Thus, under the



orders of Tōei Dai'ō [Kōjun Shinnō], [the *Wenshu* and *Ji*] together were placed in the [repository] Jōjin-zō. Immediately, printing was planned as Tōei Dai'ō made me proofread it. 但憾《文疏》一部，本山失傳，其僅存數卷。亦惟殘簡，不足采覽。往歲鷄頭慈瑗，揆得寧樂古藏，併《荊溪記》，齋來珍祕。既而以覺常惠順等苦獎，乃許弘通。因共奉東睿大王命旨，得以定心藏中。尋又謀梓行，俾餘校閱。<sup>67</sup>

Here it is explained that at the time the *Wenshu* in a complete form was not extant even at Mount Hiei. As seen earlier, until the Heian period, it was preserved in various places. In 1571 (year 2 of Genki 元龜 era), Mount Hiei was put to the torch by Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–1582), resulting in the burning of most of the stored texts. The *Wenshu* was already lost. It is said that a copy together with the *Shuji* were discovered at the old repository of Neiraku 寧樂 (in Nara 奈良). This old repository was specifically Kōfuku-ji 興福寺, which is made clear from the fact that the Ryōjun's 'Koku Jōmyō sho ki jo' 刻淨名疏記序 [Preface to the Printed Edition of the Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*] from 1738 (year 3 of Genbun era), which was attached to the *Shuji*, states, 'I particularly searched throughout the Southern Capital and Kōfuku and finally acquired a complete copy' (特索諸南都興福、果獲全帙).<sup>68</sup> Kōfuku-ji belongs to Hossō-shū, but as everyone knows, they are a temple that convenes a 'Ritual for the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*' (Jp. *Yuima e* 維摩會). The text in question was probably stored as a work related to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*.<sup>69</sup>

Similarly, the *Shuji* discovered at Kōfuku-ji was published in 1739 (year 4 of Genmon era). The printing of the *Wenshu* was twenty-two years later than this. The reason was explained by Honjun as follows:

Someone said that as the *Lüeshu* was already circulating in the world, why use the *Wenshu*, which is long and complicated. I do not think that is so. What the Great Master of Tiantai first created was thir-

<sup>67</sup> 'Shinkoku Yuima-kyō monjo jo', *Weimo jing wenshu*, X no. 338, 18: 462b.

<sup>68</sup> 'Koku Jōmyō sho ki jo', *Weimo jing shuji*, X no. 340, 18: 870a.

<sup>69</sup> The whereabouts of this manuscript which is thought to have been discovered at this time is uncertain.



ty-four fascicles which combined the *Xuanshu* and *Wenshu*. ... In the year *kanoe-tatsu* of Hōreki [1760], we courageously proceeded and used our own funds and finally had it printed. 或曰：‘略疏既行布寰中，又何用此浩繁爲？’余謂不然。初祖師之製，合玄文爲三十有四卷。...寶曆庚辰，沙門某甲等，勇進捨資，遂得上木焉。<sup>70</sup>

Here, it is made clear that the opinion existed that there was no need to publish the twenty-eight fascicle version of the *Wenshu*, since the *Lüeshu* in ten fascicles was already circulated. In response to that, Honjun explained about the original format of the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*: that in the first place the *Xuanshu* had been written together with the *Wenshu*. In the omitted part of the above quotation, he strongly insisted that favoring the condensed *Lüeshu* actually went against the will of Zhanran. Eventually, in the year 1760 (year 10 of the Hōreki era), Honjun's group used their personal assets to arrange a printing.

#### 4. Conclusion

The Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* were originally transmitted in the format of thirty-four fascicles. The background behind the division in today's *Xuanshu* in six fascicles and *Wenshu* in twenty-eight fascicles is the creation of Zhanran's *Lüeshu* in ten fascicles and its rapid spread. As a result, the *Wenshu* eventually became neglected and was lost in China come the Yuan dynasty, and there was a strongly rooted trend in which Japanese scholar monks of the Edo period also felt that the *Lüeshu* was sufficient. Therein a handwritten manuscript from Kōfuku-ji was found and Honjun in his indefatigable effort managed to get the *Wenshu* printed. However, in the editing of the *Taishō* canon, while the result may not be widely known, once again the *Xuanshu* and *Lüeshu* were compiled into a combined format and furthermore it was an unfortunate matter that Honjun's critical edition of the *Xuanshu* was not adapted.

<sup>70</sup> 'Shinkoku Yuima-kyō monjo jo', *Weimo jing wenshu*, X no. 338, 18: 462c.

Following Satō Tetsuei's research, the importance of the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* came to be recognized and the eyes of researchers also turned toward the *Wenshu*. Going back through the twists and turns of the transmission history, today, the fruition of Honjun and the efforts of others are being realized with the respect once again afforded to them as when the works were created. In order to further develop research on the Tiantai commentaries to the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*, it is a pressing matter to get Honjun's critical edition adapted into the digital canons such as CBETA.

## Bibliography

### Abbreviations

- DZ*      *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集. See Secondary Sources, Hieizan senshūin fuzoku Eizan gakuin, ed.
- J*        *Jiaxing dazang jing* 嘉興大藏經. See Secondary Sources, Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi, comp.
- ND*      (*Zōhi kaitei*) *Nihon daizōkyō* (增補改訂)日本大藏經. See Secondary Sources, Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, ed.
- T*        *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. See Secondary Sources, Takakusu & Watanabe et al., eds.
- X*        (*Wan*) *Xuzang jing* 卅字續藏經. See Secondary Sources, (*Wan*) *Xuzang jing*.

### Primary Sources

- Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 [Great Tang Record of Inner (Buddhist) texts]. 10 *juan*. By Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) in 664. *T* no. 2149, vol. 55.
- Eizan daishi den* 叡山大師傳 [Biography of Great Master Eizan (Saichō)]. 1 *kan*. By Ichijō Chū 一乘忠 (Ninchū 仁忠 [d.u.] or Shinchū 眞忠 [d.u.]) in 823. *DZ* vol. 5.
- Fahua wenju ji* 法華文句記 [Further Account of the Phrases in the *Lotus Sūtra*]. 10 *juan*. By Zhanran 湛然 (711–782). *T* no. 1719, vol. 34.

- Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 [Comprehensive History of the Buddhas and Patriarchs]. 54 *juan*. Comp. Zhipan 志磐 (1220?–1275?) between 1258 and 1269. *T* no. 2035, vol. 49.
- Fukushū, Onshū, Taishū gutoku kyō ritsu ron so shoki gesho tō mokuroku* 福州温州台州求得經律論疏記外書等目錄 [Catalogue of *Sūtras*, *Vinaya*, Treatises, Commentaries and Heterodox Texts, etc., Acquired in Fuzhou, Wenzhou and Taizhou]. 1 *kan*. By Enchin 圓珍 (814–891). *T* no. 2170, vol. 55.
- Fusō ryakuki* 扶桑略記 [Abbreviated Chronicle of Fusō (i.e., Japan)]. 16 of the original 30 *kan* extant. Attributed to Kōen Ajari 皇圓阿闍梨 (d.u.). Reference made to Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美 (compiled), *Shintei zōho Kokushi taikēi* 新訂增補國史大系 [Compilation of Japanese Historical and Juridical Texts (from the Fourteenth Century)] (66 vols. Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館, 1929–1966), vol. 12.
- Goshōrai mokuroku* 御請來目錄 [Catalogue of Brought Items (by Kūkai 空海)]. 1 *kan*. By Kūkai 空海 (774–835). *T* no. 2161, vol. 55.
- Guoqing bailu* 國清百錄 [One Hundred Documents related to the Guoqing Monastery]. 4 *juan*. Comp. Guanding 灌頂 (561–632) in 607. *T* no. 1934, vol. 49.
- Hieizan Enryakuji Ganjo soshi gyōgō ki* 比叡山延曆寺元初祖師行業記 [Account of the Conduct and Accomplishments of the Primamry Patriarch of Enryakuji at Mount Hiei]. 1 *kan*. By Enchin 圓珍 (814–891). *ND* vol. 78.
- Jingming jing Guanzhong shi chao* 淨名經關中釋抄 [Guanzhong Summary of Explanations of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. 2 *juan*. Daoye 道液 (active 760–804). *T* no. 2778, vol. 85.
- Kenkai ron* 顯戒論 [Treatise on Clarifying the Precepts]. 3 *kan*. By Saichō 最澄 (767–822) in 820. *DZ* vol. 1 / *T* no. 2376, vol. 74.
- Lingfeng Ouyi Dashi zonglun* 靈峰藕益大師宗論 [Principle Teachings of Great Master Lingfeng Ouyi]. By Ouyi Zhixu 藕益智旭 (1599–1655). 10 *juan*. *J* no. B348, vol. 36.
- Niepan xuanyi fayuan jiyao* 涅槃玄義發源機要 [Essentials on the Source of the Profound Meaning of the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra*]. 4 *juan*. By Gushan Zhiyuan 孤山智圓 (976–1022). *T* no. 1766, vol. 38.
- Nittō shingu shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目錄 [Catalogue of Newly Sought Holy Teachings in the Tang]. 1 *kan*. By Ennin 圓

- 仁 (794–864). *T* no. 2167, vol. 55.
- Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 [Complete collection of Tang prose]. 1,000 *juan*. Comp. Dong Gao 董誥 (1740–1818) and others between 1808–1819. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1983.
- Sinp'yŏn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* 新編諸宗教藏總錄 [Newly Compiled Comprehensive Record of the Canonical Works of Various Schools]. 3 *gwon*. By Uicheon 義天 (1055–1101). *T* no. 2184, vol. 55.
- Song Gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 [Song Biographies of Eminent Monks]. 30 *juan*. By Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001) and others in 988. *T* no. 2061, vol. 50.
- Sui Tiantai zhizhe dashi biezhuan* 隋天台智者大師別傳 [Additional Biographical Information on Tiantai Zhizhe Dashi in the Sui Period]. 1 *juan*. By Guanding 灌頂 (561–632). *T* no. 2050, vol. 50.
- Taishū roku* 台州錄 [Full title: *Dengyō daishi shōrai Taishū roku* 傳教大師將來台州錄; Taizhou Catalogue]. 1 *kan*. By Saichō, 804. *T* no. 2159, vol. 55.
- Tianzhu bieji* 天竺別集 [Separate Collection of Tianzhu (Monastery) (i.e., Zunshi)]. 3 *juan*. By Ciyun Zunshi 慈雲遵式 (964–1032). *X* no. 951, vol. 57.
- Tiantai sijiao yi* 天台四教義 [The Tiantai Doctrine of the Four Teachings]. 12 *juan*. By Zhiyi 智顗 (538–598). *T* no. 1929, vol. 46.
- Tō daiwajō tōsei den* 唐大和上東征傳 [Record of the Eastern Mission of the Great Monk of the Tang]. 1 *kan*. By Shinnin Gankai 眞人元開 (722–785). *T* no. 2089, vol. 51.
- Tōiki dentō mokuroku* 東域傳燈目錄 [Catalogue of the Transmission of the Lamp in the Eastern Regions]. 1 *kan*. By Eichō 永超 (1014–1095). *T* no. 2183, vol. 55.
- Weimo jing lüeshu chuiyu ji* 維摩經略疏垂裕記 [Bequeathed Account on the Abbreviated Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. 10 *juan*. By Gushan Zhiyuan 孤山智圓 (976–1022) in 1015. *T* no. 1779, vol. 38.
- Weimo jing shuji chao* 維摩經疏記鈔 [Summary of the *Weimo jing shuji*]. 5 *juan*. By Daoxian 道暹 (active 760s–770s). *X* no. 345, vol. 19.
- Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩經文疏 [Commentary on the Text of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. 28 *juan*. By Zhiyi 智顗 (538–598). *X* no. 338, vol. 18.

- Weimo jing xuanshu* 維摩經玄疏 [Profound Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. 6 *juan*. By Zhiyi 智顗 (538–598). *T* no. 1777, vol. 38.
- Weimojie suoshuo jing wuwo shu* 維摩詰所說經無我疏 [Commentary on the Not-Self of the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*]. 12 *juan*. By Youxi Chuandeng 幽溪傳燈 (1554–1628). *X* no. 348, vol. 19.
- Xu Gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 [Further Biographies of Eminent Monks]. 30 *juan*. Initially compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) in 645. *T* no. 2060, vol. 50.

## Secondary Sources

- Chi Limei 池麗梅. *Tōdai Tendai Bukkyō fukkō undō kenkyū josetsu: Keikei Tannen to sono Shikan bukyō dengu ketsu* 唐代天台仏教復興運動研究序説——荊溪湛然とその『止観輔行伝弘決』 [Introduction to the Revival Movement of Tiantai Buddhism in the Tang Dynasty: Jingxi Zhanran and his *Zhiguan fuxing zhuanhong jue*]. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大東出版, 2008.
- Hibi Senshō 日比宣正. *Tōdai Tendaigaku josetsu*. 唐代天台学序説 [Introduction to Tiantai Doctrinal Studies in the Tang Dynasty]. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林, 1966.
- Hieizan senshūin fuzoku Eizan gakuin 比叡山傳修院附屬叡山學院, ed. *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集 [Complete Collection of the Works of *Dengyō Daishi Saichō*]. 5 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Bussho kankōkai 日本佛書刊行會, 1975 (reprint from 1926).
- Kanno Hiroshi 菅野博史. ‘*Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū* (3)’ 『維摩經玄疏』 訳注 (3) [Annotated Translation of *Weimo jing Xuanshu* (3)]. In *Tada Kōbun meiyo kyōju koki kinen ronbunshū: Tōyō no jihi to chie* 多田孝文名誉教授古稀記念論文集——東洋の慈悲と智慧 [Papers in Honor of Professor Emeritus Tada Kōbun: Eastern Compassion and Wisdom]. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林, 2013.
- . ‘*Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū* (4)’ 『維摩經玄疏』 訳注 (4) [Annotated Translation of *Weimo jing Xuanshu* (4)]. *Sōka Daigaku jinbun ronshū* 創価大学人文論集 [Soka University Studies in Humanities] 29 (2017): 1–33.
- . ‘*Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū* (5)’ 『維摩經玄疏』 訳注 (5)

- [Annotated Translation of *Weimo jing Xuanshu* (5)]. *Sōka Daigaku jinbun ronshū* 創価大学人文論集 [Soka University Studies in Humanities] 30 (2018): 61–84.
- . ‘*Yuima kyō gen sho yakuchū* (6)’ 『維摩經玄疏』 訳注 (6) [Annotated Translation of *Weimo jing Xuanshu* (6)]. *Sōka Daigaku jinbun ronshū* 創価大学人文論集 [Soka University Studies in Humanities] 31 (2019): 115–148.
- Kawase Kazuma 川瀬一馬. *Zōho kokatsujiban no kenkyū* 増補古活字版之研究 [Research on Old Typeset Prints, Expanded Edition], vol. 1. Tokyo: Nihon koshosekishō kyōkai 日本古書籍商協会, 1967.
- Kotyk, Jeffrey. ‘The Medieval Chinese Vision of Japan: Buddhist Perspectives in the Tang and Song Periods’. *Studies in Chinese Religions* 6, no. 4 (2020): 360–385.
- Li Sen 李森, ed. *Zhou Shujia foxue lunzhu quanji* 周叔迦仏学論著全集 [Complete Works of Zhou Shujia’s Studies on Buddhism], vol. 5. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 2006.
- Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 (supervisor), and Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典, ed. *Nanatsudera koitsu kyōten kenkyū sōsho: dai roku kan Chūgoku, Nihon kyōten shōsho mokuroku* 七寺古逸經典研究叢書第六卷 中国・日本經典章疏目錄 [Series Research on Fragmentary Scriptures at Nanatsudera: Catalogues of Scriptures and their Commentaries in China and Japan, vol. 6]. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社, 1998.
- Mao Shuangmin 毛雙民, ed. *Zhou Shujia Foxue lunzhu ji* 周叔迦仏学論著集 [Collected Papers on Buddhist Studies by Zhou Shujia], vol. 2. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1991.
- Matsumori Hideyuki 松森秀幸. ‘*Jōmyō kyō kanchū shaku shō to Tendai bunmon zu*’ 『浄名経関中釈抄』と『天台分門図』 [The *Jingming Jing Guanzhong Shichao* and the *Tiantai Fenmen Tu*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 63, no. 1 (2014): 489–494.
- . ‘*Shishōji Dōeki ni yoru Tendai bunken no inyō nitsuite*’ 資聖寺道液による天台文献の依用について [Quotations from Tiantai Texts in Zisheng si: Daoye’s Annotations of the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 64, no. 1 (2015): 509–514.



- Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧 et al., comps. *Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō* 大日本續藏經 [Extended Buddhist Canon of Great Japan], 120 cases. Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin 藏經書院, 1905–1912.
- Okubo Ryōshun 大久保良峻. ‘*Yuima kyō monjo* to Tendai kyōgaku: Butsu nitsuite no rikai wo chūshin ni’ 『維摩經文疏』と天台教学——仏についての理解を中心に [The *Weimo jing Wenshu* and Tiantai Doctrinal Studies: A Focus on the Understanding of the Buddha]. In *Tendai Daishi kenkyū* 天台大師研究 [Research on the Great Master of Tiantai], edited by Tendai Daishi Kenkyū Henshū Inkai 天台大師研究編集委員会 [editorial committee for *Tendai Daishi kenkyū*], 199–220. Tokyo: Tendai Gakkai 天台學會, 1997.
- Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英. ‘Shoki Eizan no kyōzō ni tsuite: Shinshutsu no *Go-kyōzō mokuroku* *Go-kyōzō ki mokuroku* wo chūshin toshite’ 初期叡山の経蔵について——新出の『御経蔵目録』『御経蔵檀目録』を中心として [About the Repository of Scriptures at Mount Hiei in the Early Period: With a Focus on the Newly Discovered *Go-kyōzō mokuroku* and *Go-kyōzō ki mokuroku*]. *Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 仏教学研究 [Research in Buddhist Studies] 8–9 (1953): 67–86.
- . *Tendai Daishi no kenkyū* 天台大師の研究 [Research on the Great Master of Tiantai]. Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百花苑, 1961.
- Shioiri Ryōdō 塩入良道, and Ikeda Rosan 池田魯參. ‘Kanazawa Bunko ni okeru Tendai tenseki’ 金沢文庫における天台典籍 [Tiantai Works in the Kanazawa Repository]. *Kanazawa Bunko shiryō zensho* 金沢文庫資料全書 [Complete Works of the Kanazawa Repository], vol. 3. Yokohama: Kanagawa 神奈川県立金沢文庫, 1979.
- Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団, ed. (*Zōhi kaitei*) *Nihon daizōkyō* (増補改訂) 日本大蔵經 [Japanese Buddhist Canon, Revised and Supplemented]. 100 vols. Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社, 1973.
- Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭 et al., eds. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大蔵經 [Buddhist Canon Compiled during the Taishō Era (1912–1926)]. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–1932.
- Tamura Kōyu 田村晃祐. ‘Saichō to *Yuima kyō*’ 最澄と維摩經 [Saichō



- and the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*]. *Tōyō Daigaku tōyōgaku kenkyū* 東洋大学東洋学研究 [Tōyō University Asian Studies] 22 (1988): 1–7.
- (*Wan*) *Xuzang jing* 卅字續藏經 [Man Extended Buddhist Canon]. 150 vols. Xin wenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, Taipei 臺北, 1968–1970. Reprint of Nakano et al., comps., *Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō*.
- Wang Xinshui 王新水, ed. *Weimo jing xuanshu Tiantaizong xilie* 『維摩經玄疏』天台宗系列 [*Wemojing Xuanshu*: Series of the Tiantai School]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社, 2018.
- Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, comp. *Jiaxing dazang jing* 嘉興大藏經 [Jiaxing Canon]. Taipei: Xinwenfeng 新文豐, 1987.
- Yamaguchi Hiroe 山口弘江. *Tendai Yuima kyō sho no kenkyū* 天台維摩經疏の研究 [Research on Commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra* in Tiantai]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai 國書刊行會, 2017.