

2-1-2020

Gomyō and Kūkai in early-Heian Intra-Buddhist Conversations

Ronald S. Green

Coastal Carolina University, rgreen@coastal.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/philosophy-religious-studies>



Part of the [Buddhist Studies Commons](#), [Comparative Philosophy Commons](#), [History of Philosophy Commons](#), [History of Religions of Eastern Origins Commons](#), and the [Japanese Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ronald S Green. "Gomyō and Kūkai in early-Heian Intra-Buddhist Conversations" American Philosophical Association - Central conference. Chicago, Illinois. 28 Feb. 2020. Presentation.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Humanities and Fine Arts at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy and Religious Studies by an authorized administrator of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact commons@coastal.edu.

Gomyō and Kūkai in early-Heian Intra-Buddhist Conversations

Ron Green
Coastal Carolina University

Abstract

This paper is about the relationship between the famous Japanese esoteric Buddhist Kūkai and the less-famous Gomyō, who you've probably never heard of but maybe should have. My paper responds to the work of two recent scholars, Fujii Jun, who says that Kūkai was a Sanron (Japanese Mādhyamika) priest, and Matsumoto Gyoyu, who speculates about the origins of and thinking behind certain passages in Kūkai's *Jūjūshinron*. The paper points to the intellectual significance for Kūkai of his close relationship with Gomyō and other Yogācāra scholars of his day, and how this is reflected in the *Jūjūshinron* and Kūkai's thought broadly. It proceeds through three sections: (1) Kūkai's connection to Japanese Yogācāra, (2) Connections between the *Jūjūshinron* and the Gomyō's *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*, and (3) Cosmology and panjiao and the *Jūjūshinron* and *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*.

Introduction

Many documents call Gomyō the top Japanese Yogācāra master of the late Nara and early Heian periods, the highest official of the Sōgō, Bureau of Priests, as well as one of the best minds in Japan in his day. I am especially interested in the influence Gomyō might have had on the development of Kūkai's thought and the culmination of his ideas in the *Jūjūshinron* or *Ten Abodes of Minds*, widely said to be Kūkai's *magnum opus*. Kūkai's dates are 774–835 and Gomyō's dates are 750–834. So, Gomyō was Kūkai's senior by 24 years. Gomyō lived to be 84 and Kūkai lived to be 61. Kūkai died (or entered long-term samādhi or *nyujō* as Shingon says) the year after Gomyō's passing. Gomyō was prolific and may have been much more influential on Japanese philosophy than currently acknowledged. Part of the reason that he is not recognized or well studied is likely that he came to be completely by Kūkai mythology that was largely responsible for the flourishing of Shingon, particularly in the late Heian and Kamakura periods. While researchers have pointed to Kūkai for producing the first panjiao scheme in Japanese history, for producing a unique Japanese panjiao in that he included non-Buddhist traditions, for first introducing Buddhist cosmology to Japan or doing so in a detailed way, I suggest that Gomyō was the first to do these and make other important innovations attributed to Kūkai and

that Gomyō was instrumental if not directly responsible for much of Kūkai's philosophical understandings of such issues.

Only one of Gomyō's writings is known to be extant, the *Daijō hossō kenjenshō* or *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*, Taishō 2309, which, along with Kūkai's *Jūjūshinron*, is the focus of my study. Gomyō's text is written in classical Chinese and has not been translated into modern Japanese or any other language. Only one half of one of its five fascicles, the one on hetuvidya logic, has been recently translated into English and German and recognized as an important contribution to the history of Japanese philosophy.

I. Kūkai's connection to Japanese Yogācāra

While Kūkai is generally thought of as a Shingon priest, in this study, it is important to note that Shingon did not exist as a separate Japanese Buddhist school or *shū* until sometime near the end of his life or after. There are three theories in an open debate about when Shingon was recognized as a separate *shū*. Shingon places the date to 807 based on statements in a document from 1089 called *Daishi Gogyōjō Shūki* (Record of Kūkai's Activities) that says Emperor Heizei proclaimed it that year. Another view dates the founding to 830, based on the idea that the *Jūjūshinron* was a part of the *Rokuhon Shūsho* (Works on the Six Principals Schools), commissioned by Emperor Junna. Gomyō's *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra* is included in this collection and is the source for the date 830. However, whether Kūkai produced the *Jūjūshinron* at that time and as part of this collection is debated and, in my opinion, unlikely, in part because his tenth fascicle is incomplete. This may be because Kūkai was still working on it in 835 when he entered *nyūjō*. In addition, Kūkai does not refer to Shingon as a *shū* in it or any other document he wrote, although he does refer to the other Japanese traditions as Hossō-shu, Sanron-shū and so forth. The third date argued as the time Shingon was recognized as an independent tradition is 835, the year it was given three annual ordinands and the year of Kūkai's passing.

Recent scholarship has argued that Kūkai was a Madhyamaka or Sanron monk, mainly based on the legend that Sanron master Gonzō ordained him. However, there is no evidence of ordination by Gonzō from the earliest records by and about Kūkai. Gonzō is known to have served alongside Kūkai on the Sōgō, Bureau of Priests, and at the same rank. Records show that he received the Abhiṣeka from Kūkai. Today in manga, in depictions along the Shikoku

pilgrimage route, and elsewhere, Gonzō is represented as Kūkai's ordination master and the one who introduced him to esoteric Buddhism through the mountain ascetic mantra practice called *Gumonjihō*, The Dharma for Retaining What is Heard. Several researchers have said that other priests during the early Heian period treated Kūkai as an affiliate of Mādhyamika. For example, Fujii Jun wrote that the famous Yogācāra monk Tokuitsu (781?-842?), a top thinker of Kōfukuji or the Nara Yogācāra Northern Temple tradition, who along with Gomyō a top thinker of Gangōji or the Nara Yogācāra Southern Temple tradition, both leading opponents of Saichō's Mahāyāna Ordination Platform, treats Kūkai as a Mādhyamika when he put a number of questions to him, including whether Kūkai believed that language existed at the ultimate level of ultimate truth, a criticism of doctrinal understanding that the same Hossō masters leveled at Bhāviveka elsewhere.¹ However, Tokuitsu's question is also found as part of the debate between Japanese Yogācāra's Southern Temple tradition and Northern Temple tradition, the first of sixteen points of contention between affiliates of Gangōji and Kōfukuji preserved in a contemporary work written in 815, *Zen'an's Record of the Light of the Lamp of Hossō-shū*.²

In the *Jūjūshinron*, Kūkai ranks Yogācāra sixth out of ten positions and Mādhyamika as seventh. However, this might not represent his assessment of their relative sophistication. As Minoru Kiyota writes: "Because Kūkai described the Shingon truth-concept from the Mādhyamika perspective and the manner in which one perceives of that concept from the Yogācāra perspective, it seems that Mādhyamika and Yogācāra should have been given equal weight."³ According to Kiyota's understanding, Kūkai turned to Mādhyamika for a metaphysical understanding of the true nature of the universe and to Yogācāra for guidance with the epistemic experience. He intentionally flip-flops between the two as needed. We return to this important point in section three below.

There is much evidence that Kūkai expanded his understanding of Buddhist philosophy through a long and warm relationship he maintained with Gomyō, who, unlike Gonzō, outranked him on the Sōgō board. Records show that Kūkai attended Gomyō's public lectures and interacted with other Japanese Yogācāra masters in interpreting doctrine. For example, Ryuichi Abe has pointed out that the Yogācāra monk Shūen (769-833), who was only five years older

¹ *Kūkai no shisōteki tenkai no kenkyū* (Studies on the developments of Kūkai's thought).

² *Hossō tōmyō ki* 法相燈明記, T. 71 n. 2310, 1 fascicle.

³ This quote is from an unpublished manuscript on the philosophy of Kūkai and Shingon, which I edited for Professor Kiyota.

than Kūkai, asked Kūkai to write a tantric interpretation of the *Golden Light Sūtra*, which Shūen then used as the bases of a public lecture he gave. Abe describes Shūen as "the leading scholar-priest of the Hossō School, renowned for his prolific composition of commentaries to the Lotus and other scriptural texts." It was around this time that Shūen became the Chief Administrator of Kōfukuji. Shūen was also famous for restoring the Mount Murōji monastery, a sub-temple of Kōfukuji and a center for austerities where adherents of various schools congregated east of Nara (Froner 291). Murōji also became an important center of Shingon studies in the early Heian period and it is likely that Shūen was instrumental in supporting Kūkai's induction in the 824 into the Sōgō (Abe 238-240). According to Inoue Mitsusada, who studied a catalogue of writings by Japanese Buddhist priests, in late Nara period, such texts were extremely scarce. Those that were produced paved the way for early Heian writers. Among these influential Nara texts were 14 by Shūen and 16 by Gomyō, both Kūkai's colleagues at the Sōgō (Abe 40). Some texts identify Shūen as Tokuitsu's teacher (p. 205). Tokuitsu was 12 years younger than Shūen and 7 years younger than Kūkai. Other evidence of this closeness to Kōfukuji Yogācāra can be seen in that fact that one of Kūkai's leading disciples, Shintai, was registered as a priest at Kōfukuji. In addition, in 827, Gomyō was appointed to a high post at Tōji temple in Kyoto, after the Tōji had been put in Kūkai's charge (Kasahara 105).

By Kūkai's own account as well as biographical statements about him by those who knew him, exposure to the Gumonjihō had a profound effect on his life. We see this in his earliest biography, the *Biography of Sōzu Kūkai*, written by his close disciple Shinzei, who Kūkai appointed to collect his writings. Shinzei writes:

He became a Buddhist layman and for some time went alone to engage in ascetic practices on the precipices of famous mountains and in the innermost recesses of lonely valleys surrounded by steep cliffs. Once, while he was meditating atop Mt. Tairyū in Awa, the great sword of Ākāśagarbha Bodhisattva came flying toward him. Thus, the Bodhisattva showed his own mystical powers in response [to Kūkai's austerities]. Another time, while Kūkai was meditating with closed eyes, the planet Venus entered his mouth; the Bodhisattva had revealed to him the Buddha's supernatural power. In winter, when the snow fell heavily, Kūkai's hardships were great; he disciplined himself by exposing his body to the elements, clad in a cloth made of arrowroot fiber. In summer he practiced repentance day and night, all the while eating no grain."⁴

⁴ Hakeda 1972:16.

A similar account appears by Kūkai in his *Honored Spoken Memento or Last Will*.

Many eminent Nara priests engaged in religious exercises in mountain forests, including Gomyō, Shūen, and other elite Nara clerics who served the court alongside Kūkai, as officials at the Sōgō (310). Gomyō's eulogy in the *Shoku Nihon Kōki*⁵ entry for the 11th day of the 9th month of the first year of the Jōwa era (834) says the following.

When he was 15 years old, Gomyō entered Mt. Yoshino and did asceticism. His teacher was Great Dharma Master Banki (万耀大法師) of Gangōji temple. When he was 17 years old, he became a monk and right away studied the Mahāyāna tradition called Hossō from Gangōji temple's Great Master Shōgu. During the first half of the month he would enter into the deep mountains and practice the Ākāśagarbha Dharma. In the latter half of the month, at his home temple, he would concentrate on making the tenets of the sect clear to the public. As for the way he would grant the teachings to others, in the end, he handed it down on an individual basis.

From this we can see that Gomyō spent half of the month in a temple in half of it in the mountains. It is possible that the mountain temple where he went was Yoshino's Hiso Sanji (比蘇山寺). Also, we can understand from this that in the mountains he practiced Gumonjihō, the Ākāśagarbha Dharma (Minowa 113-14).

Gumonjihō is an esoteric practice for increasing long-term memory used, for example, for memorizing an entire sūtra. Practitioners should first gather provisions for 100 days of food and proceed to a quiet retreat. In practice, a full moon is drawn at the top of a piece of coarse silk. In the center of it, an image of Ākāśagarbha Bodhisattva is drawn. This is installed in a consecrated space, where one pays respect to it and *dhāraṇī* is chanted. The practitioner closes his or her eyes and meditates on the full moon that contains the bodhisattva in its heart (similar to today's Ajikan practice and to the *kasina* practice of Theravada Buddhism). It can be done in one long period of sitting each day, in which case the *dhāraṇī* is chanted 10,000 times. If it is to be spread out over two sitting sessions in a day, the *dhāraṇī* is recited 5000 times at each sitting. Either way, the

⁵ Fourth of the six classical Japanese history texts.

practitioner aims to chant the *dhāraṇī* one million times over a period of 100 days. Kūkai wrote about this practice in the introduction to his book *Sangō Shiiki* (*Pointing Out the Tenets of the Three Teachings*).

Around the time Kūkai undertook the practice, there was a legend that a Yogācāra monk named Shin'ei (神叡 ?–737) attained supernatural abilities (maybe extraordinary memory) from undertaking this Ākāśagarbha Bodhisattva practice. Shin'ei took time to practice while serving at Gangōji, Gomyō's temple, and Hōryūji in Nara.

Perhaps more important for figuring out who taught Kūkai the Gumonkuji is that Grand Master Shōgu (勝虞大僧都 732-811, sometimes called 勝悟), who the *Shoku Nihon Kōki* names as Gomyō's master, was from a non-aristocratic family of Itano district of Awa Province, an area that is today a part of Tokushima in Kūkai's home island of Shikoku. The *Biography of Sōzu Kūkai* and Kūkai's *Sangyō Shiiki* says that Kūkai successfully undertook the Gumonkuji on a mountainside in Awa Province. Shōgu studied as a disciple of Shin'ei, named above as having gained supernatural abilities from the Gumonkuji. Shin'ei is also called Yoshino Sōzu, High Priest of Mount Yoshino. Before Gomyō, he was evaluated as the most learned priest of Hosso. Some of his disciples became high priests, including Gomyō and Taien 泰演 (? -736) a Hossō monk monk at Saidaiji temple. If we look at the make-up of the Sōgō board at the time that Kūkai was appointed, we can see that a majority of its members were a part of the elite group that practiced the Gumonkuji. The board consisted of Gomyō, Yogācāra master of Gangōji as the top priest, Kūkai and Mādhyamika priest Gonzo at the second rank, and Shūen, Yogācāra priest of Kōfukuji at the third rank. That being the case, although scholarship says that the Nara government valued sūtra study and exposition as the standard for appraising and promoting monks, it appears that esoteric practice may have possibly played a role in promotion as well.

The strongest confirmation of Kūkai's intellectual debt to Gomyō comes from his own written testimony to this. Preserved by Shinzei and today counted as document 104 in the Collected Prose and Poetry of Kūkai (*Henjō hakki seireirshū*, aka *Shōryōshū*) is the "Late Autumn Congratulation to the Great Virtuous Chief Executive of Gangōji Temple (Gomyō) on his eightieth birthday", a title that Shinzei may have added, but signed Shamon (Śramaṇa) Henjō Kongō (All-pervasive Vajra), which is Kūkai's esoteric name. Kūkai's tribute to Gomyō reads as

follows:

The wild geese that soar in the heavens do not fail to observe order in their sequence. The ants that tiptoe on the ground also guard the order they display. What then of the foremost souls of heaven and earth, the leaders of those equipped with knowledge, with exquisite eyebrows and long lives? The *Book of Rites* has a passage on village drinking (to honor the elders).⁶ Sūtras praise offering lodging (to eulogize them).⁷ These are in accord with good.

The Great Virtuous High Priest (Daisōjō) of Gangōji temple, advancing on 80 years, has a great understanding of the twelfefold (division of Buddhist writings).⁸ He deeply explored and has excellent knowledge of the treatises of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu.⁹ He embraces the writings and synthesizes the meanings in the compositions of Cien¹⁰ and Huizhao.¹¹ In the daytime he sets the trap and snare and forgets to eat. At night he observes the fish and rabbit and does not lie down.¹²

For this reason, students seeking his teachings gather like clouds from near and far, and the ill, young, and old come together around him like the mist. He practices the beautiful virtues of enriching oneself and enriching others, and performs the Six Paramitas. He can be said to be a pillar in the House of the Buddha, and a great general of the Dharma Gate. A sharp saw easily cuts through its pouch (revealing itself to the world),¹³ and the call of the swamp crane reaches the heavens. The former Emperor Kōnin selected Gomyō to be a Senior Prelate, and Emperor Tenchō, the present emperor, appointed him to the office of Senior Priest. I have heard of old that “People can be broadened by the Way.”¹⁴ I have seen today that “The Way can be broadened by a person.”

⁶ The *Book of Rites* describes a village drinking ritual to honor the chief, based on respect for elders. Note 7, KKZ 707.

⁷ The *Samādhirājacandrapradīpa-sūtra* (T. No.639) explains a memorial service held overnight to honor a virtuous elderly monk, called “offering lodging” 供宿.

⁸ dvādaśāṅga-dharma-pravacana 十二部經 : The twelve-fold classification of the 'Words of [Buddha] Dharma': 1. sūtra, 2. geya, 3. vyākaraṇa, 4. gāthā, 5. udāna, 6. nidāna, 7. avadāna, 8. itivṛttaka/ityuktaka, 9. jātika, 10. vaipulya, 11. adbhuta-dharma, 12. upadeśa.

⁹ Two Yogācāra masters, Asaṅga (320-390 CE) and Vasubandhu (330-400 CE).

¹⁰ Cien is Chinese Yogācāra master Kuiji (632 - 682), also known as The Great Teacher of Cien Monastery. Kuiji was Xuanzang's direct disciple and played a key role in establishing the Chinese Yogācāra lineage, the Weishi or Faxiang tradition.

¹¹ Huizhao (650–714) was a student of Xuanzang and the second patriarch of Chinese Faxiang, succeeding Kuiji.

¹² This is a reference to *Zhuangzi*, “External Things”, which says, “A trap is for fish: when you've got the fish, you can forget the trap. A snare is for rabbits: when you've got the rabbit, you can forget the snare. Words are for meaning: when you've got the meaning, you can forget the words. Where can I find someone who's forgotten words so I can have a word with him?” It means in the daytime Gomyō would study sūtras and forget to eat and contemplate at night in disregard for sleep.

¹³ A sharpened saw is capable of puncturing the pouch in which it is stored and revealing itself to the outside world, a reference to The Records of the Grand Historian (Watanabe and Miyasaka, 434). Therefore, Kūkai suggests that Gomyō is of a caliber that liberates him from the binds of the everyday world.

¹⁴ This is a reference to the Analects: “The Master said, ‘It is Man who is capable of broadening the Way. It is not the Way that is capable of broadening Man.’” 子曰人能弘道非道弘人也 (Watanabe and Miyasaka, 435; Lau, 136;

This poor Śramaṇa is grateful for having been accepted as a lower vegetable in his garden (that is, a disciple).¹⁵ I aspire to straighten up and grow to equal the height of this saint.¹⁶

I lament that observance of courtesy has slackened and am saddened that morality is on the decline. Therefore, I partake in the ritual of drinking country wine out of reverence to my senior, and offer lodging to this gentleman of superior learning.

A few of us shall meet for a casual tea gathering and we hope that it will be an opportunity to partake in Gomyō's supreme wisdom. This will be the day that the golden breezes of autumn whistles through shafts of bamboo, and the emerald dew sheds tears of joy on the chrysanthemums. Gandharva will proclaim music and Kinnara will then dance.¹⁷ The lonesome resonation of the eight sounds will cause the four orders (of devotees) to forget sensory flavors.

Words are insufficient, so I offer a poem:

| | |
|------|--|
| 寂業遺教 | The teachings Shakyamuni left behind |
| 轉授其人 | are passed on from person to person. |
| 三藏稽古 | Following the Tripitaka of old, |
| 六宗惟新 | the Six Schools reflect anew. |
| 法相之將 | The future of Hossō |
| 推師當仁 | will be an extension of the master's benevolence. |
| 瑚璉其體 | His bones are a sacrificial vessel of precious gems. |
| 龍象其身 | His body is like a dragon. |
| 弁挫邪鏢 | His speech cracks the sword of heresy. |
| 智明正因 | His supernormal cognition is the correcting cause. |
| 講經講論 | He lectures on sūtras and discusses treatises. |
| 乍秋乍春 | Whether in autumn or in spring, |
| 聽者市井 | listeners come from places of markets and wells, |
| 學徒雲臻 | students gather like clouds. |

¹⁵ The 便蒙 uses lower vegetation to mean disciple. KKZ footnote 28, 708.

¹⁶ The KKZ says Kūkai is grateful to Gomyō for providing him with a lower seat on the Sogo and aspires to be equal to him. Williams translates these lines as follows: I am grateful to be one of his disciples, and I wish to be equal to this great saint. The phrase 思齊 (wish to be an equal) is likely a reference to the Analects: “The Master said, ‘When you meet someone better than yourself, turn your thoughts to becoming his equal. When you meet someone not as good as you are, look within and examine your own self’”子曰見賢思齊焉見不賢而內自省也 (Watanabe and Miyasaka, 535; Lau, 74; Kanaya, 58).

¹⁷ In Hindu mythology, a kinnara is a paradigmatic lover, a celestial musician, half-human and half-horse (India).

| | |
|------|--|
| 著世幽趣 | The sublime import of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu's teachings |
| 非公不陳 | cannot be taught if not made available to all. |
| 兩帝仰止 | Revered by Emperors Saga and Junna, |
| 四衆梁津 | the Four Classes of Believers take shelter in his teachings. |
| 名賓僧正 | Although he may hold the title of Senior Priest, |
| 實德佛隣 | in reality his virtue is next to that of the Buddha. |
| 伊余尚德 | Here I revere his virtue. |
| 設饌迎賓 | A celebration is held and guests are welcomed. |
| 絲竹金土 | The tones from silk, bamboo, gold and earthen instruments |
| 感動鬼神 | inspire and move demons and gods. |
| 怨親既歎 | Friends and foes already rejoice, |
| 何況昵親 | so, would not those close to him celebrate all the more? |
| 卓彼人寶 | A superior man — he is a treasure |
| 可謂國珍 | Who can be said to be a marvel of the nation |

In addition to attesting to Gomyō's outstanding abilities as a Buddhist scholar, teacher and administrator, Kūkai casts himself as Gomyō's disciple and hopes to be like him. We should also notice that Kūkai mentions Six Schools or *shū*, which likely does not include Shingon. Likewise, in the *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*, Gomyō describes the so-called Six Schools of Japanese Buddhism and does not mention Shingon, much less Shingon-shū anywhere in his discussion. This suggests that Gomyō considered Shingon a group of supplementary practices that Buddhists of any tradition were free to adopt or not with no contradiction to the tenets of their own schools. This may have been Kūkai's view as well. This attitude may also be reflected in the close ties to Yogācāra scholars that Kūkai maintained in contrast to Saichō. Given these facts, it is surprising that no one has suggested that Kūkai was a Yogācāra priest and disciple of Gomyō.

II. Connections between the *Jūjūshinron* and the *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*

As The *Jūjūshinron* is thought to illustrate Kūkai's view of Buddhism, it occupies a position of great importance in Shingon's doctrinal framework to this day. Many have suggested that it documents Kūkai's awakening experience in ten stages. The main arguments about when and why it was written are summarized as follows.

There are five major theories about the year Kūkai wrote the *Jūjūshinron*. The opening salutation in the *Jūjūshinron* reads, "I now compose this text based on the emperor's edict." While it appears then that it was written in response to an edict issued by the emperor, some have suggested that it was actually composed as a way to return the favor bestowed on Kūkai and the world by the grace of the Buddha. The only concrete piece of evidence of the date seems to be the opening line of the *Jūjūshinron* quoted above. However, even though Kūkai says that he wrote the doctrine of the ten abodes of mind based on the edict of the emperor, we do not know which emperor issued the edict.

According to the first theory, during the Kōnin era (810-824), Emperor Saga (reigned 806-809) issued an edict requesting that each specialist of eight schools of Japanese Buddhism submit an outline of their tradition's principles. At the time, Kūkai submitted two treatises, the *Sokushin jōbutsugi* (The Meaning of Attaining Buddhahood in the Lifetime) and the *Jūjūshinron* (Treatise on the Ten Abodes of Mind). Because the *Jūjūshinron* is extensive (ten fascicles) and its content is difficult to understand in its comprehensiveness, the emperor issued another edict to Kūkai, asking him to shorten and summarize the *Jūjūshinron*. In response, Kūkai wrote and submitted the *Hizō hōyaku* in three fascicles. This perspective is seen in the *Hizō hōyaku kanju* (秘藏寶鑰勘註) by Reiyū Hōin (賴瑜法印, 1226-1304), which is considered to have been composed a Kamakura period Shingon master. The sentence "The eight school's treatises of the Seiryoden pavilion" is first seen in *Doshaku koengi* by Kakuban (1095-1143). The Seiryoden is one of the seventeen pavilions of the Heian palace used as the emperor's residence. The date of the compilation of the eight school's treatises and the major personas in the Seiryoden are various. Therefore, we cannot establish one accurate date and who the personas are. Although Buan's writing says the emperor required summaries from eight schools of Japanese Buddhism, only six compositions are known. According to this theory, the *Jūjūshinron* would have been written sometime before 824 (the end of the Kōnin period).

According to a second theory, Emperor Junna (reigned 823-833) issued an edict during the Tenchō era (824-834), maybe Tenchō 7 (830), requiring the specialists of each school to compose an outline of their tradition's teachings. Accordingly, Kūkai composed the *Jūjūshinron* and *Hizō hōyaku* during this period. The second theory is seen in medieval works by Tohan and Yūkai's 宥快 (1345-1416), and elsewhere. Pre-modern scholars generally accepted this theory.¹⁸

A third theory holds that each school received an edict from Emperor Saga and they submitted their texts during the Tenchō era of Emperor Junna. This theory was established in the *Seijustsu Jūjūshinron shiki*, Shūon's *Jūjūshinron kaju*, and elsewhere. This theory merges elements of the first and second theory above.

In addition to these three theories, Myōrui referred to the 177 fascicles of *Ryurukokushi* in his *Ginmishisho*, the eight school treatises of the Seiryoden pavilion was in the ninth year of the Tenchō era of emperor Junna, 832. If so, the *Jūjūshinron* and the *Hizō hōyaku* were submitted to Emperor Junna two years after Gomyō's writing.

There is a recent theory that says Kūkai composed The *Jūjūshinron* and the *Differences in Two Kinds of Teachings, exoteric and esoteric* as companion volumes to answer the questions that Yogācāra master Tokuitsu had put to him. According to this theory, Kūkai spend many years composing these documents and was still working on the unfinished *Jūjūshinron* at the end of his life.

Table 4 shows these six doctrinal outlines, known collectively as the *Tenchō rokuhon shūsho* (天長六本宗書, *Tenchō era Writings of Six Schools*) that were allegedly presented to the court.

¹⁸ The secondary text to back up this theory, in which texts are shown to be composed during emperor Junna's Tenshō era, are *Kairitsu tengiki* and *Daiji genshin sho*. According to the first chapter of the *Ganshin sho*, "Now our holy court universally issued an edict to various temples and required them to present an outline of their schools. Kōmyō encountered prosperous fortune...received the emperor's edict, was extremely delighted, and humbly submitted the book titled Sekimondo in five fascicles, as named Daijo Genshin sho... The year is the 7th year of the Tenchō era, ?? month."

Table 4 *Tenchō era Writings of Six Schools*

| School | Title (Japanese, Chinese graphs, English rendering) | Author | Size | Taishō number |
|---|--|--|--------------|---------------|
| Shingon (esoteric) | Himitsu mandara Jūjūshinron (秘密曼荼羅十住心論, Treatises on the Mysterious Maṇḍala of the Ten Abodes of Mind) | Kūkai (空海, 774–835) | 10 fascicles | T. 77 n. 2425 |
| Hossō (Yogācāra) | Daijō hossō kenjenshō (大乘法相研神章, Chapter providing a Brief Study of the Mahāyāna Yogācāra) | Gomyō (護命, 750-834) | 5 fascicles | T. 71 n. 2309 |
| Sanron (Madyamika) | Daijō sanron digishō (大乘三論大義鈔, Summary of the Virtue of the Mahāyāna Three Treatises) | Gen'ei (元觀, d. 840) | 4 fascicles | T. 70 n. 2296 |
| Kegon (Huayan, Avataṃsaka) | Kegonshū ichijō kaishinron (華嚴宗一乘開心, Opening the Mind to the Kegon School's Single Vehicle) | Fuki (普機, d.u., active in Tenchō era, 824-834) | 6 fascicles | T. 72 n. 2326 |
| Tendai (Lotus Sūtra) | Tendai hokkeshū gishū (天台法華宗義集, Collected Meaning of the Tendai Lotus School) | Gishin (義真, 781-833) | 1 fascicle | T. 74 n. 2366 |
| Ritsu (Vinaya) | Kairitsu denraiki (戒律傳來記, Record of the Transmission of the Vinaya) | Buan (豐安, 764?-840) | 3 fascicles | T. 74 n. 2374 |
| Some of these are not currently know to be extant. Likewise, while Gomyō's Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra in five fascicles is extant in its entirety, only the first fascicle of the document by Buan (豐安, 764?-840) of the Ritsu (vinaya) school is known to exist. | | | | |

Gomyō organizes his writing into the following 14 chapters comprising five fascicles using the popular question-answer. There are no such questions and answers in Kūkai's *Jūjūshinron*, but there are in the *Hizōhōyaku*, considered to be a rewrite of it.

In recent scholarship, Matsumoto, Gyoyū¹⁹ describes how Kūkai relies most heavily on *Bonjōkaijishō* (On the Realms and Stages from the Ordinary through the Sacred) as the source of his information in the first six fascicles of the *Jūjūshinron*, which includes his treatment of Yogācāra as the sixth and longest fascicle.

¹⁹ 『十住心論』の研究：『凡聖界地章』の引用を中心として=A Study of "Jūjūshinron": On the Quotations from "Bonjōkaijishō".

The *Bonjōkaijishō* was compiled by Liangbi 良賁 (717–777), priest of Ch'ing-lung-ssu temple in Ch'ang-an, China. He served as a member of Amoghavajra's translation team and was a disciple of the Indian esoteric master. Liangbi wrote the two fascicle *Bonjōkaijishō* to provide a bridge between mainstream Sinitic intellectual Buddhism and Amoghavajra's tantric tradition, just as Kūkai does in terms of Japanese Buddhism. Also like Kūkai, Liangbi discusses Buddhists practitioners in terms of the spiritual abodes. According to Matsumoto, Kūkai quotes 80% of the characters contained in the *Bonjōkaijishō*, about 30,000 characters, which is around 45% of the total sentences in the *Jūjūshinron* through the sixth abode, that of Yogācāra. According to Matsumoto, although Kūkai does not state this, the description of Yogācāra from the *Bonjōkaijishō* accounts for about three quarters of the the sixth fascicle.

In his analysis of how Kūkai changes the content of the *Bonjōkaijishō*, Matsumoto points to seven difference and analyses two of these. Next, I consider these points and the organization of the *Jūjūshinron* in terms of likenesses to and differences from Gomyō's *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*.

III. Cosmology and panjiao and the *Jūjūshinron* and *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*

Five of the seven points of departure that Matsumoto lists pertain to Kūkai's interpretation of cosmology, which various researchers state is unique to Kūkai at places. However, it can be shown that Kūkai's derivations have a relationship to the ideas found in Gomyō's *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*, which his seems to quote verbatim at least once.

In Gomyō's first fascicle, under the heading "General description of the differences in the three worlds" section, he spends some time describing Buddhist cosmology in detail. Such a description is found in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, which Gomyō names as his source. Kūkai gives a quite similar description of the particulars of Buddhist cosmology in his *Jūjūshinron*. While Kūkai names many sources for the ideas he presents in *Jūjūshinron*, he clearly applies quotations in different contexts than they appear in the originals.

Matsumoto finds that in the first abode of mind in the *Jūjūshinron*, Kūkai first describes the "natural-world" in which people live by quoting the *Bonjōkaijishō*. He then supplements the explanation with a description of the 3000 *chiliocosms* before returning to the *Bonjōkaijishō* for

the narrative about the "three evil destinies". One of the 14 topics comprising Gomyō's *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra* is "General outline of 3000 *chiliocosms*." Kūkai's added description closely parallels Gomyō's outline that is based on the *Yogācārabhūmi-Śāstra*.

Also in the first abode, Matsumoto says that Kūkai quotes the *Bonjōkaijishō* in describing Asura as existing in the animal realm of the five destinies, but then deviates from the *Bonjōkaijishō* by saying that Asura also exist independent of the animal realm. Matsumoto says that Kūkai further differs by quoting the *Shokyoyoshu* and Yijing's *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra* to describe how people with "ten evil behaviors end up being reborn as asura, rather than dividing asuras from the human realm as the *Bonjōkaijishō* does.

Like Kūkai, Gomyō also locates asuras in several places, including among us in the human realm. Gomyō writes:

Next is the abode of the light asuras (明修羅). There are five kinds of these. The first type is the most feeble that currently dwell in the mountains among humans. There are great caves in the mountains to the west of this land. These are probably where these asura live. The second type dwell in a home in the ocean at the northern foot of Mt. Sumeru, 21,000 yojanas down. Rāhu-asuras reside there. Next, 21,000 yojanas lower, there is another palace of asuras. Bali asuras live there. Next, 21,000 yojanas lower, there is another palace of asuras. Śambara asuras live there. Next, 21,000 yojanas lower, there is another palace of asuras. Vimalacitra asuras live there. This is how it is to eighty-four thousand yojanas below Mt. Sumeru. The *Sutra on the Arising of Worlds* disagrees with this explanation. Later scholars considered the Realm of Desire to have thirty-six grounds and summarized them.²⁰

In the last two sentences above, we can see Gomyō's pluralism, which appears throughout his document and may be a character trait seen in his openness to Shingon practices.

Kūkai writes the following about asuras in the first abode of mind:

"Uncountable evil karma results from the ten unwholesome behaviors. Availing oneself of this evil karma results in uncountable retributions. Although these effects are uncountable, they do not leave the three evil realms, that is to say, the realms of

²⁰ T2309_71.0004c09-c20.

hell, hungry ghosts, and animals. In addition, there are the two other realms of humans and asuras"²¹

This is why Matsumoto says Kūkai does not place asuras in the three evil realms. Kūkai continues a few lines later:

"The *Sutra on the Arising of Worlds* says that 1000 yojanas past the east of Mt. Sumeru, beneath the ocean is the land of asura king Vimalacitra. Its length and breath are 80,000 yojanas. There is one large tree there called a reborn citrá-pāṭala. The circumference of its roots is a full 7 yojana. It is 21 yojanas from the entrance to the land and it is 100 yojanas high...Devas' enemies are called asura. There are two types. One type is included in the realm of hungry ghosts. The second is included in the realm of rebirth as animals. The ones in the realm of hungry ghosts are hungry ghosts with Mara bodies and possess strong supernatural powers. The ones that are in the animal realm reside in the ocean with king Rāhu-asura. In the realm of desire, they can transform their bodies large or small at will. At times, asuras are thought of and contemplated as goddesses (female devas) covered with jewels and pearls of variegated colors. Their bodies radiate with dazzling light like Sumeru. These radiant jewels are blue, yellow, red, and black. Their minds are very arrogant, thinking they are heavenly and so forth.

...Through lack of faith and a desire to fight, one is reborn among the Rāhu-asura. There, one day and night equals 500 human years and the lifespan is 5000 years. ...

If people make offerings outside of Buddhism and do not practice chastity, make offerings in transgression and do not have correct thoughts, they will be reborn among Mahoraga asuras. ...

If a person is of mistaken views and unaware of karmic retribution sees those among the best who diligently practice eating one meal a day, follows that person and gives alms to them, and says, "What virtue does a lowly person have?", that person will be reborn as an asura in Hahava (cold) hell."²²

²¹ T2425_.77.0304c06-T2425_.77.0304c09.

²² T2425_.77.0309a22-T2425_.77.0309c120.

While Kūkai's description does not follow Gomyō's exactly, the basics are close.

Matsumoto also says that Kūkai deviates from the *Bonjōkaijishō*, even though he quotes it, in speaking of Ten Bhumi in the third abode as ten grounds of heavens but in the sixth abode, which is about Yogācāra, Kūkai talks about the Ten Bhumi in terms of "ten stages" of bodhisattva development. This may be an important issue linking Kūkai and Gomyō in an interpretation that, according to Matsumoto differs from that found in the *Bonjōkaijishō* and other documents. Matsumoto also points to Kūkai's treatment of Chakravatin kings in this context.

The *Jūjūshinron* mentions Ten Bhumi (十地) 10 times. Two of these are found at the beginning of the second abode and second fascicle as follows:

Devas practice the ten wholesome causes. Receiving (alms of) bract leaves, flowers and fruits, they are decidedly extraordinarily fearless. In this way, they give rise to the succession of the ten grounds. The ram's (i.e., non-Buddhists of the 2nd abode) winter tree quickly spreads open in spring becoming a park of beautiful flowers. Worldling's stone fields are instantly connected to the autumn land of flourishing fruit. There, the ten grounds of humans and devas begin to open up.²³

Later in the same abode of mind Kūkai writes:

The *Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā* (十住論)²⁴ says, The second ground of the bodhisattva abode is constantly creating chakravartin kings. This is the second of the ten grounds and is called the ground of freedom from defilement.²⁵

In comparison, Gomyō writes the following about this topic:

Second is the ground free from defilement. Endowed with pure precepts, it is detached from extremely subtle infractions and the stain of afflictions. Therefore, it is called the ground of freedom from defilement."²⁶

Both Kūkai and Gomyō consider the ten bhumis to be a part of Buddhist cosmology consisting of provisionally physical locations, which are at the same time provisionally mental abodes. Gomyō equates the heavenly lands he describes in the first fascicle of *Chapters*

²³ T2425_77.0314a12- a15.

²⁴ A commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* 十地經 attributed to Nāgārjuna 龍樹, translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 around 405 CE. Consists primarily of an explanation of the bodhisattva stages contained in the *Huayan jing*.

²⁵ T2425_77.0321b19-b20.

²⁶ T2309_71.0045c19-c20.

Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra with meditative *jñanas*. He interprets what is taken to be the physical make-up of the cosmos in terms of consciousness-only. For Kūkai, the ten bhūmis are also ten *jñanas*, which he relates to his description of Buddhist cosmology that parallels that of Gomyō. For Kūkai, the connection of ten bhūmis, *jñanas*, and the structure of the cosmos is viewed in terms of what might be called his special tantric panpsychism. That is to say, all of these elements are decisively the same in terms of Mādhyamika emptiness and of the ultimate truth of the Dharmakaya and the manner we perceive this is via Yogācāra consciousness-only, as Kiyota wrote.

As Matsumoto notes, Kūkai returns to the ten bhūmis in the sixth abode, the abode of Yogācāra as follows:

All together, the stages of practice are called ten grounds. They are called grounds because they support emergent growth. The *Avatamsaka Sūtra* says, Vajragarbha bodhisattva said, I have not conceptualized the various buddha lands. Therein the Tathāgata did not explain the ten grounds. The *Weishi lun* says,

Without grasping and not conceptualizing,
there is supramundane cognition.
Abandoning duality in deliberations,
thereby transformation of the basis is directly attained.²⁷

When bodhisattvas have completed following the first step of the path of seeing, they eliminate the remaining hindrances and gain transformation of the basis. Again, that is to say, through repeated practice devoid of discrimination, there is detachment from the grasped and the grasper. Hence it is described as "without grasping and not conceptualizing." Because there is elimination of the worldly, it is called "supramundane".²⁸

This entire passage also appears in Gomyō's work, beginning in the same place. The exact quote is from Xuanzang's *Cheng weishi lun* referencing the *Weishi lun*. Of the thirty quotations of these lines in the Taishō canon, Kūkai and Gomyō's writings are the only two that leave out the words "a commentary says" (C. *lun yue* 論曰) that appears in the *Cheng weishi lun* after the verse about transformation. Therefore, I would like to suggest that Kūkai's source for the quote is Gomyō. While Kūkai and Gomyō's quote begin at the same point, where Gomyō's

²⁷ Vasubandhu: *Triṃśikāvijñapti*, 18-19.

²⁸ *Jūjūshinron*: T2425_77.0340a08- a13; Gomyō: T2309_71.0045c01c06.

stops, Kūkai continues to quote the *Cheng weishi lun*. However, Kūkai's quote omits three and a half lines in the Taishō rendering of the *Cheng weishi lun* and continues with, "The seeds of the two hindrances are called debilitations."²⁹ Likewise, Gomyō continues as follows after his quote of the *Cheng weishi lun*:

Question: What are the two kinds of debilitation?

Answer: The seeds of the two hindrances, afflictive and cognitive, are called debilitations.³⁰

Afterword

According to Professor Kiyota, Shingon adheres to the traditional *daśabhūmi* scheme of Yogācāra. That being the case, are *kengyō* (exoteric Buddhism) and *mikkyō* (esoteric Buddhism) the same of Kūkai as far as bodhisattva practices are concerned? Insofar as the items within the *daśabhūmi* scheme are concerned, there is no difference. What distinguish the two are their overall interpretations. *Kengyō* conceives of the *daśabhūmi* scheme as graded stages of practice to realize enlightenment, while Shingon conceives of it as one organic embodiment of enlightenment, not as stages to eliminate something and to gain something in sequential order. As such, Shingon presupposes that the Mahāvairocana-essence (bodhicitta) underlies all stages, even at the first stage, a concept that Shingon would call the "first stage as final" (初地即極 *shoji soku goku*) theory beginning in the late Heian Period. Thus, Shingon claims that *kengyō* is Bodhisattvayāna, the vehicle of graduated bodhisattva practice, while *mikkyō*, which does not negate the merits of bodhisattva practices, is nonetheless Buddhayāna, the vehicle that presupposes that the Mahāvairocana-essence exists at all stages.

The tables below show the organization of Kūkai's *Jūjūshinron* and Gomyō's *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*. This is followed by a brief comparison of Gomyō's treatment of the Six Schools of Nara Buddhism plus Tendai in the third fascicle of his work with Kūkai's references to these traditions in the *Jūjūshinron*.

²⁹ *Jūjūshinron*: T1585_31.0050c29-c30.

³⁰ Gomyō: T2309_71.0045c09-c10.

Ten Abodes of Mind with Corresponding Vehicles and Traditions

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Mind of a Ram | Animal vehicle (teaching which goes to an unwholesome depth) | } Three abodes of mind of the mundane world | } Exoteric teachings (<i>kengyō</i>) |
| 2. Mind of a Foolish Child | Human vehicle | | |
| 3. Mind of a Young Child | Vehicle of Heavenly beings | | |
| 4. Mind of Aggregates-only and No-self | Śrāvaka vehicle | } Hīnayāna | |
| 5. Mind That Has Eradicated the Causes and Seeds of Karma | Pratyekabuddha vehicle | | |
| 6. Mind Concerned for Others | Hossō (Yogācāra) | } Four Mahāyāna traditions | |
| 7. Mind Awakened to the Non-birth of the Mind | Sanron (Madhyamika) | | |
| 8. Mind of the One Path As It Really Is | Tendai | | |
| 9. Mind of Ultimate Own-naturelessness | Kegon | | |
| 10. Mind of Secret Adornment | Shingon | Vehicle of Esoteric Buddhism | |

Gomyō's Organization of *Chapters Summarizing Mahāyāna Yogācāra*

Fascicle 1

- General description of the differences in the three worlds.
- General description of the differences in the five destinies.
- General description of the differences in the four kinds of births.
- General description of good and evil cause and effect.

Fascicle 2

- General outline of 3000 *chiliocosms*.
- General outline of the overall tenets of Consciousness Only.

Fascicle 3

- General outline of the benefits of Buddhist teachings.
- General outline of Buddhist time-periods assemblies.
- General outline of the differences in each of the various traditions.

Fascicle 4

- General outline of the *Nyāya-praveśa* (Buddhist logic)
- General outline of the differences in the *gotras*.

Fascicle 5

- General outline of the first arousal of the aspiration for enlightenment.
- General outline of cultivating the next stages of practices.
- General outline of perfecting the cause and fulfilling the fruition.

Six Schools plus Tendai in Gomyō's and Kūkai's writings.

In Gomyō's third fascicle, under the heading "General outline of the differences in each of the various traditions", there are the following.

- Huayan/Kegon school (Kūkai's 9th)
- Vinaya (not treated by Kūkai)
- The Three Treatise School, Sanron (Mādhyamika) (Kūkai 7) Gomyō says there is no dispute between Mādhyamika and Yogācāra and that they share Nāgārjuna as a founder. But, a problem arose from Bhāviveka's misinterpretation of doctrine.
- Yogācāra (Kūkai's 6th)
- The Tendai School (Kūkai's 8th)
- Satyasiddhi (成実宗, Jōjitsu-shū, Realization of True Reality) based on the *Tattvasiddhi-śāstra* or *Satyasiddhi-śāstra* (not treated by Kūkai, although he quotes the śāstra once in the first fascicle)
- The *Abhidharmakośa* School (Kūkai does not treat it but quotes the *Abhidharmakośa* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* 20 times). Gomyō says it is roughly equivalent to Sarvāstivāda and that the *Abhidharmakośa* was transmitted through Yogācāra via Dōshō and studied at Tōdaiji and elsewhere.