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Introduction

Kajiyama Yūichi 梶山雄一 (1925-2004), one of the most well-known
Japanese scholars of Buddhist Studies, is known to always have said to
students that Buddhist Studies, in particular Indian Buddhist Studies,
requires reading proficiency in the following eight languages: Sanskrit, Pāli,
Tibetan, Chinese, English, French, German, and Japanese. 1) The first four
languages are, of course, necessary for reading primary Buddhist sources.
Though the latter four might sound strange to those who know little about
Buddhist Studies, they are required in order to read secondary sources, i.e.,
scholarly papers and modern translations. Since Buddhist Studies was
originally a subfield of Indology, which European scholars established in the
latter half of the 18th century CE by applying their traditional philological
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1) Kajiyama (1983: 233)
method of studying classical Greek and Latin texts to classical Indian literature,\(^2\) there have been many scholars on Indian Buddhism whose native language is English, French, or German. Japan promptly and eagerly imported the Western philological style of Buddhist Studies in the late 19th century, and established departments of “Buddhist Studies” in many universities that have produced a large number of philological Buddhologists.\(^3\)

It is true that there are many Buddhologists who have mastery of all eight languages. However, plenty of excellent scholars do not make use of sources in all eight languages but still produce remarkable work. In any case, given that Kajiyama refers to Japanese as a language requirement for studying Indian Buddhism, in addition to English, French, and German, he likely judges Japanese scholarship to be as important as Western scholarship in the field of Buddhist Studies. This judgement is, of course, not groundless. There have been quite a few Western scholars of Buddhist Studies who carefully reference Japanese academic works in their research. J. W. de Jong (1921-2000), a giant in Indology, is undoubtedly one of the early Western scholars who extensively utilized Japanese scholarship and emphasized its importance in Buddhology. In his three-month lecture series given in Japan in 1973, for example, he regrettably stated that Western scholars were in general ignorant of the wealth of Japanese publications in the field of Buddhist Studies.\(^4\)

If what Kajiyama and de Jong said is taken at face value, Japanese scholarship in the study of Indian Buddhism appears to have attained a certain level of success. There may be several good reasons for this. One of the most plausible may be that Japanese scholars have had access to Chinese translations of Indian Buddhist texts,\(^5\) which are valued in philo-

\(^{2}\) Saigusa (1996: 89-96).
\(^{5}\) Sueki (2004: 224).
logical Buddhology as sources parallel, supplemental, or even alternative to insufficient Indic sources. As is well known, Buddhism was introduced via China into Japan in the sixth century CE and has since been studied for more than 1,300 years, mostly through Chinese texts. Traditionally, Japanese scholars have had a long-standing familiarity with Chinese Buddhist texts. In short, the successful development of modern academic research on Indian Buddhism in Japan seems to have resulted from Japan’s long Buddhist tradition. There are, however, two sides to many things. On one hand, Japanese Buddhist tradition has proven advantageous to modern Japanese scholarship on Buddhist Studies, but on the other hand, it has also caused several problems. It is well known, for example, that many Japanese scholars have not paid sufficient attention to Korean Buddhism, despite the fact that Buddhism was originally brought to Japan from Korea and at first Korean Buddhism strongly influenced Japanese Buddhism. This negative attitude toward Korean Buddhism seems to be rooted in the traditional Japanese perspective that Buddhism was transmitted intact from India to Japan via China, or the Sangokushikan 三国史観 “A Historical View of Buddhism [as Circulated in] Three Countries,” which is, according to Ishii (2014: esp. 57), traceable to Kūkai 空海 (774–835) and established by Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321). It is also noted that there is a strong tendency for Japanese Buddhist scholars to seek evidence of the popularity of the Amitābha cult in early India, which, in fact, has scarcely been found outside Chinese sources, and this tendency seems to be derived from the dominant tradition of the Amitābha cult in Japanese Buddhism.

When we consider these undesirable impacts of the long Buddhist tradition on modern Japanese scholarship in the field of Buddhist Studies,
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more troubling is the fact that Japanese scholars frequently cite Chinese Buddhist texts without translating them into modern Japanese.\(^9\) It is true that they often slightly alter the original Chinese text in order to facilitate reading. They frequently insert Japanese traditional code marks that indicate how to read sentences according to Japanese word order (\textit{kaeriten} 返り点), Japanese inflectional endings for adjectives and verbs (\textit{okurigana} 送り仮名), Japanese grammatical particles (\textit{joshi} 助詞 or \textit{joji} 助辞), and Japanese punctuation into the original Chinese text, and probably much more commonly in Buddhist Studies, they provide a corresponding Japanese rearrangement (\textit{kakikudashi-bun} 書き下し文). This artificial Japanese, however, is not what we may call a translation, because it retains almost all original Chinese words uninterpreted. It might be easy for older Japanese scholars to understand since as late as the early 20th century many highly educated Japanese were so well versed in classical Chinese literature that they were able to read it as well as native Chinese people.\(^{10}\) This is, however, not the case today. There are few, if any, Japanese scholars with such a high level of literacy in classical Chinese. When Chinese Buddhist texts are cited without any modern translation in the main discussions, most readers cannot fully grasp their meaning or follow discussions based on these citations. Moreover, given that when Pāli, Sanskrit, or Tibetan texts are cited in academic works, they are in general accompanied by modern language translations, it is odd or even inadequate that Japanese scholars leave all citations from Chinese texts untranslated in their works. It is true that they might simply and naively be following the example of their predecessors, who deemed Chinese literature too familiar to require translation. Doing so, however, has left their readers mystified and their works deficient.

\(^{10}\) Yoshikawa (2006: 8–30).
The problematic influence of the long Buddhist tradition on modern scholarship of Buddhist Studies described above is not well recognized by Japanese scholars. This may suggest that most of them take the traditional Buddhist perspectives and academic methods for granted and assume these to be invariably and uniformly shared by all others. They are, however, not universally accepted. Not only are these perspectives and methods exclusive to Japanese scholarship, but even within Japanese scholarship, they are not strictly standardized and have been accepted or used inconsistently.

One good example of such inconsistency will be discussed in detail in this paper. It is a discussion about a major technical Buddhist term: kōritsu 広律. This term has traditionally been used in association with the Buddhist monastic law code (Ch. 律; Skt. vinaya) by Japanese Buddhist scholars. More specifically, it has habitually been used by modern vinaya researchers to refer to several specific vinaya texts collectively, with these texts serving as central sources for their studies. It may not go too far to say, therefore, that kōritsu has been a key term in modern vinaya studies in Japan. The details of this key term, however, seem to have not been clarified sufficiently. There are many who refer to the term in their studies, but few, if any, who explain where it comes from or what it exactly means.

In this paper, I survey recent and former Japanese vinaya scholars’ usages of the term kōritsu in reverse chronological order. I note that there seem to be at least two interpretations of the meaning of this term. Furthermore, I note that these scholars’ usages of the term are most likely derived from the one found in the Hashshūkōyō 八宗要 (1269) by Gyōnen 凝然. Then, I inspect how Gyōnen uses the term kōritsu in his Hashshūkōyō and note that his usage may also be open to either of the two interpretations. In conclusion, focusing on the fact that the Hashshūkōyō began to be rapidly and intensively studied after the Meiji 明治 Era (1868–1912), I suggest Gyōnen’s Hashshūkōyō strongly influenced modern Japanese vinaya study. In addition,
I refer to a possible Chinese source for Gyōnen’s kōritsu.


We have six vinaya texts that are generally thought to be fully preserved and affiliated with six different schools: the so-called Pāli vinaya (the vinaya of the Theravādins), the Shisong lit 十誡律 (a vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins extant in Chinese), the Sifen lit 四分律 (a vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas extant in Chinese), the Wufen lit 五分律 (a vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas extant in Chinese), the Mohesengqi lit 摩訶僧祗律 (a vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas extant in Chinese), and the so-called Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya (a collection of the vinaya texts attributed to the *Mūlasarvāstivādins preserved in Tibetan and to a lesser degree in Chinese and Sanskrit). These six texts have at least two parts in common. One part comprises the prohibitive rules for individual monks and nuns with the title ‘prātimokṣa-sūtra’ (Skt.) and the analysis of these rules. The second part comprises the rules that govern not only behavior of individual monks and nuns but also the actions of the monastic community as a corporate entity. This second part also includes the formal procedures and formularies for Buddhist ceremonies (e.g., ordination). The first part is usually referred to as ‘vinaya-vibhaṅga’ (Skt., Pāli), while the second part is generally known as khandhaka (Pāli).

As we will see below in detail, many current Japanese vinaya researchers refer to the six vinaya texts that retain these two parts as kōritsu 広律. Who was the first to do so? What is the source of the reference? In order to answer these questions, it might be good to start by inspecting the most influential work of the doyen of modern vinaya studies in Japan: Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 (1915–2002). Hirakawa left us a large number of works that primarily concern vinaya texts. The first book of his vinaya
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studies is *Rilsuzō no kenkyū*, 律藏的研究 (1960). This book is, as Hirakawa himself states, intended to provide general information about *vinaya* literature, and just as intended, it has been frequently cited as the sole informative handbook for *vinaya* materials in general. In this book, Hirakawa states that *kōritsu* signifies the six *vinaya* texts listed above, and describes them in general as falling into four categories: the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, the formularies for Buddhist ceremonies (the *karma-vācanā*), the *kōritsu*, and the commentary. 12) He does not provide, however, any further details about the term itself. He neither mentions the source nor gives a definition. The same pattern may be found in the other monumental *vinaya* study published in the 1960s, the *Genshi bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū* 原始仏教教団の研究 (1963) by Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄 (1901–2000). Satō also explains that the term *kōritsu* refers to the six *vinaya* texts and represents one of the categories of *vinaya* texts. 13) He does not give, however, any sufficient grounds for his explanation. Given that he referenced Hirakawa (1960), Satō may very well have naively followed Hirakawa in his use of the term *kōritsu*. In fact, this naive attitude is common among Japanese *vinaya* researchers in general. There are many who use the term to refer to the six *vinaya* texts without any specific details. 14) Since most of these researchers cite Hirakawa (1960), there is a possibility that they have simply accepted his assertion that the term *kōritsu* signifies the six *vinaya* texts. This possibility might be supported by the fact that, as we will see below in detail, before Hirakawa (1960) there were many *vinaya* studies in which the *vinaya* texts referred to as *kōritsu* were not exactly the same as the six.

As I noted above, in any case, Hirakawa does not clearly explain the meaning of the term *kōritsu* in his book published in 1960. This may be the
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14) e.g., K. Sasaki (1981: 24); S. Sasaki (1999: 247); Hiraoka (2002: esp. 188); Mori (2013: 11).
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reason why few post-Hirakawa (1960) studies explain the meaning of kōritsu. Furthermore, even when it is explained, the explanation differs widely. Funayama (2003: 2), for example, provides a simple description: “(Kōritsu is) the complete text that retains every requisite component for the vinaya (律典として必要な各要素を備えた完本).” S. Sasaki (2015: 2) provides a somewhat detailed description: “(Kōritsu is) the complete form of the vinaya-piṭaka that fully includes both the prātimokṣa-sūtra and vinaya-vibhaṅga, and the khandhaka part (波羅提木叉・経分別と、鞭度部の両方を完備した完全形の律薫).” These explanations of the term kōritsu given by two prominent scholars are worded differently. However, both seem to convey the same meaning. Both suggest that kōritsu is the ‘complete’ vinaya text that includes all components. Some of the scholars who reference Hirakawa (1960), however, interpret the term in a different way. Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄 (1924–), for example, refers to the term kōritsu in his overview of the Sifen lü 四分律 with explanatory comments as follows (T. Satō, 2008: 62 [56]):

The Sifen lü comprises two prātimokṣas — the Sifenlü-biqiu-jieben and the Sifenlü-biqiuni-jieben, in addition to kōritsu (the text that explains in detail the circumstances in which vinaya rules were established, the interpretations of the rule wordings, and so on).

『四分律』には、広律（戒律制定の次第や戒文の解釈等を詳しく説明した書）のほかに、『四分律比丘戒本』と『四分律比丘尼戒本』の二本の戒経がある。

T. Satō’s explanation of the term kōritsu might superficially resemble that of S. Sasaki. It may be noted, however, that unlike S. Sasaki, T. Satō does not suggest here that kōritsu is something ‘complete.’ Rather, he simply
states that it is an explanatory text. It may also be noted that he indicates that the vinaya texts related to the *Sifen lü* 四分律 fall into only two categories: the *pratimokṣa-sūtra* (kaikyō 戒經) and *kōitsu*. That is, T. Satō seems to interpret that *kōitsu* is the text in contradistinction to the *pratimokṣa-sūtra*.

If we accept that *kōitsu* means the ‘complete’ vinaya text made up of several components, the interpretation of the term suggested by T. Satō (2008) might seem strange. It is, however, not the only such interpretation. In fact, Hirakawa himself also defines *kōitsu* in the same way in one of his later works (Hirakawa, 1993: 101):

‘*Kōitsu*’ is the term that is partnered with ‘*kaikyō* 戒經 (*kaihon* 戒本) [*pratimokṣa-sūtra*]’. The *vinaya-piṭaka* that glosses the provisions of the *kaikyō* is referred to as ‘*kōitsu*.’

「広律」というのは「戒経」（戒本）にたいする言葉である。戒経の条文を解説した律蔵を「広律」というのである。

Though it is not completely clear what Hirakawa means by the term *vinaya-piṭaka* (*ritszō* 律蔵) here, we certainly see that he also understands that *kōitsu* is in contradistinction to the *pratimokṣa-sūtra* (kaikyō 戒経). Given that the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*, analysis of the *pratimokṣa* rules may be regarded as a text in contradistinction to the *pratimokṣa-sūtra*, it may be possible to say that Hirakawa here and T. Satō (2008) suggest that *kōitsu* is another name for the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*. In fact, in his enumeration of five Chinese *kōitsu* texts that are attributed to five different schools in the same work, Hirakawa refers to monks’ and nuns’ *vinaya-vibhaṅgas* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as *kōitsu*.\(^{15}\)

In any case, there are at least two interpretations of the term *kōitsu* in post-Hirakawa (1960) scholarship. One interpretation is that *kōitsu* is the complete *vinaya* text that retains all components; the other is that it is a text in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, the commentary on the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* rules. It seems that the first interpretation is more popular than the second among current Japanese scholars, since famous *vinaya* experts assert that *kōitsu* is a complete *vinaya* in their studies. Before Hirakawa (1960), however, the situation seems to have been quite the opposite. The second interpretation was more popular among major *vinaya* researchers. Many of them, moreover, regarded one specific *vinaya* text as *kōitsu* that we mostly do not regard so today. We will explore their use of the term in the following section.

**Pre-Hirakawa (1960)**

One of the most important achievements in the field of modern *vinaya* research in Japan before Hirakawa (1960) is undoubtedly the publication of “*ritsubu* 律部 (Vinaya Section)” in the series of “*Kokuyaku īssaikyō: indo senjyutsu* 国訳一切経・印度撰述部 (Japanese translation of Chinese *tripitaka*: the section of Indian texts).” Through this publication project that took place between 1929 and 1936, thirty-four Chinese translation texts that concern Buddhist precepts and monastic law codes were ‘translated’ into *kakikudashi-bun* 書き下し文. They are still widely cited by many scholars.

This series of *kakikudashi* translations of *ritsubu* 律部 was accomplished by seven leading figures in the late 19th and early 20th centuries: Katō Kanchō 加藤観澄 (1868–1938), Sakaino Köyō 境野洋洋 (1871–1933), Nagai Makoto 長井真琴 (1881–1970), Ōno Hōdō 大野法道 (1883–1985), 西本龍山 (1888–?), Ueda Tenzui 上田天瑞 (1899–1974), and Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄 (1901–2000). Of these seven scholars, Katō Kanchō 加藤観澄 and Ōno Hōdō 大野
法道 were responsible for one and eleven texts each, respectively, all of which concern Bodhisattva precepts. This is likely because they specialized in texts closely related to Bodhisattva precepts, such as the Fanwang jing 梵網經, rather than canonical vinaya texts. It is not easy, therefore, to find references to the term kōritsu 広律 in their research. The other five scholars were, on the other hand, well versed in the canonical vinaya texts. They were responsible for canonical vinayas and related texts in the series of kakikudashi translations. They also published other vinaya studies. These scholars all use the term kōritsu in their works, but in slightly different ways, as follows.

Ueda Tenzui took charge of the Shisong lü 十誦律 in the Kokuyaku issaikyō series. In the preface to his kakikudashi translation, he refers to the term kōritsu in the following:

“The Vinaya-piṭaka can be classified into various categories. But one of the most representative categories is the so-called kōritsu, which explains in detail the monks’ and nuns’ vinaya rules. There are six kōritsu texts in Chinese translation: the Sifen lü, the Wufén lü, the Shisong lü, the Mohesengqi lü, [Mūla]-sarvāstivāda vinaya, and the Binaiye-vinaya.

Here we find at least two notable points regarding our discussion. First, Ueda does not refer to kōritsu as a ‘complete’ text but rather as an explanatory text. Second, he counts the Binaiye 鼻奈耶 as a kōritsu text. Given that

16) Ueda (1938: 1).
the *Binaïye* is generally thought to be an incomplete text insofar as it contains only what we commonly regard as *vibhaṅga*,\(^\text{17}\) it may be safe to say that Ueda does not regard the *kōritsu* as something complete. In any case, it should be noted that the *vinaya* texts that T. Ueda collectively referred to as *kōritsu* are not the same as those we commonly regard as such today.

Nishimoto Ryūzan contributed the most to the series of *kakikudashi* translations of the *vinaya* section. His works are remarkable in terms of both quantity and quality. He was in charge of the following: the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律, *Jietuojie jing* 解脱戒経, the *Wufen lü* 五分律, most of Yijing’s 義净 (635–713) corpus of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and one *vinaya* commentary (the *Luershiermingliao lun* 律二十二明了論). His *kakikudashi* translations totaled sixteen volumes, which account for more than 60 percent of the whole (twenty-six volumes). Furthermore, as S. Sasaki (1999: 245, n. 1) notes, his precise readings and detailed notes distinguish him from the other four scholars.

This industrious scholar’s understanding of the term *kōritsu* is indicated in the prefaces to his *kakikudashi* translations of the *Mohesengqi lü* in 1930 and *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶 in 1933. In the former, Nishimoto (1930: 5–10) refers to the *Shisong lü* 十誦律, the *Sifen lü* 四分律, the *Wufen lü* 五分律, and the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 as the *vinaya* texts that have been traditionally called the “Four Major *Kōritsu* (四大広律),” and explains that *kōritsu* texts “include detailed annotations (詳細なる注釈を付せる).” Furthermore, he states that “the structures of the *kōritsu* texts, such as the *Sifen lü*, the *Wufen lü*, the *Shisong lü*, and Pali *vinaya*, are generally identical (四分・五分・十誦・巴利等の広律の組織は大凡一定せるものである).” In the latter, Nishimoto (1933: 11) describes the *Binaïye* 鼻奈耶 as “the oldest translation of the extant *kōritsu* (現存広律中最古訳)” and refers to it with the compound “*binaya-kōritsu* 鼻奈耶広律” several times. It

\(^{17}\) Clarke (2015: 72).
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is obvious from these descriptions that Nishimoto, like Ueda, took kōitsu to be an explanatory text rather than a complete text, and regarded the Binaiye as the kōitsu. It might also be noted that Nishimoto does not refer to the Mūlasarvastivāda-vinaya as one of the kōitsu texts in the series of kakikudashi translations. We see again that the vinaya texts Nishimoto refers to with the term kōitsu are different from those referred to by many current scholars.

Sakaino Kōyō translated the Sifen lü 四分律 in three volumes in the kakikudashi series. He seldom mentions the term kōitsu in his kakikudashi translations. His other works published before the series of kakikudashi translations, however, contain frequent uses of the term. In his other work regarding the Sifen lü, for example, Sakaino describes the Sifen lü, the Wu fen lü, the Shisong lü, and the Mohesengqi lü as “the completely translated and transmitted kōitsu texts (完全に律仏の譯仏されたものの).” Furthermore, he refers to the Binaiye 鼻奈耶 as “the first of the kōitsu texts that were translated [into Chinese] (律仏の譯仏された最初).” Here we see that Sakaino also interpreted the Binaiye as the kōitsu. He makes no mention of the reason or source for the interpretation.

Nagai Makoto is renowned especially for being one of the editors of the critical edition of Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Pāli vinaya, the Samantapāsādikā. In the kakikudashi series, Nagai translated the Shanjianliū piposha 善見律毘婆沙, which is known as a Chinese version of the Samantapāsādikā. In this kakikudashi translation, the term kōitsu does not appear. In his other work about Pāli texts, however, which was published about ten years earlier, he does refer to kōitsu. More importantly, he notes the source for the term as follows:

19) Sakaino (1928 [vol. 1]: 9; 16).
20) Nagai (1922: 69).
[The word] ‘Pātimokkha’ (Skt. Pratimokṣa; [Chin.] 波羅提木叉) is translated into Chinese as kaihon 戒本. Gyōnen 凝然, taking it in contradistinction to the kaihon 戒本, refers to what includes both the Sutta-vibhaṅga (exegesis) and the Khandhaka (the part of kendo 捷度) as kōritsu, and refers to the former and the latter as shijikai 止持戒 and sajimonkendo 作持門捷度, respectively (see [Chapter of] risshū 律宗 of the Hasshūkōyō 八宗綱要).

Pātimokkha (梵 Pratimokṣa 波羅提木叉) は漢に戒本と譯してゐる、凝然は、戒本に対して Sutta-vibhaṅga (本文解明) と Khandhaka (捷度部) とを合せたものを廣律と稱し、前者を止持戒、後者を作持門捷度法と称してゐる (八宗綱要＝律宗参照)。20)

First and foremost, we see that Nagai, unlike the other scholars,21) explicitly noted Gyōnen’s Hasshūkōyō (1269) as the source for the term kōritsu, saying that Gyōnen defined it in the Hasshūkōyō as the vinaya text that is composed of both the vibhaṅga 和 the khandhaka parts. Though it is uncertain whether Gyōnen actually defined the kōritsu in this way — which we will discuss in detail below — it should be noted that Nagai himself seemed to regard the kōritsu as such a vinaya text. In fact, in the passages that follow the one quoted above, Nagai enumerated the Sifen lü 四分律, the Wufen lü 五分律, the Shisong lü 十誡律, the Moheṣengqi lü 摩訶僧祇律, and Yijing’s vinaya corpus, saying: “there are five Chinese translations that we can refer to as kōritsu (廣律と称し得べきものの漢訳が五種現存する),” and furthermore, refers to the Binaïye 鼻奈耶 as the 6th Chinese vinaya text that might possibly be included in the kōritsu (廣律中に数へ得べきものとしては、六鼻奈

21) Yamada (1925) also states that the term kōritsu is used by Gyōnen. Though he does not reference Nagai (1922), his statement appears to be based on Nagai’s, since the wording is almost the same.
These passages suggest that Nagai hesitated to regard the *Binaiye* as *kōitsu*, and this hesitation is probably due to his understanding that the *kōitsu* should comprise not only the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* but also the *khandhaka*. Given that Ueda, Nishimoto, and Sakaino all refer to the *kōitsu* in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* rather than including both the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and *khandhaka* and regard the *Binaiye* as the *kōitsu*, it seems that Nagai’s opinion about the *kōitsu* is somewhat unique. More specifically, it is closer to that of many current scholars. This suggests that there were already two interpretations about the *kōitsu* in pre-Hirakawa (1960) scholarship.

In summary, in our brief survey of modern Japanese *vinaya* scholars’ studies prior to Hirakawa (1960), we found at least two facts about the term *kōitsu* that many of us otherwise would not clearly recognize. One is that the *Binaiye 鼻奈耶*, which comprises the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone, and thereby, would not be regarded as *kōitsu* by many recent scholars; was frequently regarded as *kōitsu*. The other is that Gyōnen’s *Hasshūkōyō* was cited as
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22) Nagai (1922: 31-36).

23) Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善 (1884-1937) also asserted that the *kōitsu* includes both *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and *khandhaka* parts in his lecture at Otani University given in 1928 (Akanuma, 1998: 432). Akanuma’s opinion about the *kōitsu* is, however, not the same as Nagai’s and that of many current *vinaya* scholars. Unlike them, Akanuma counted the *Binaiye 鼻奈耶 as kōitsu* and said that seven *vinaya* texts are usually referred to as *kōitsu*.

24) There are a few of post-Hirakawa (1960) *vinaya* studies in which the *Binaiye 鼻奈耶* is referred to as *kōitsu*. e.g., Tokuda (1974: 1); Okumura (2000: 69). In fact, in his book published in 1960, Hirakawa does not completely reject the perspective that the *Binaiye 鼻奈耶* may be referred to as *kōitsu*. Rather, he states that it could be regarded as an ‘imcomplete *kōitsu* 不完全な広律.’ (Hirakawa, 1960: 159, n. 1).

25) Ōchō E’nichi 橋超慧日 (1906-1995) might be one of the few early modern scholars who did not regard the *Binaiye as kōitsu*. In his book published in 1958 based on his dissertation, Ōchō refers to the *Shisong liu* 十誡律, the *Sifen liu* 四分律, the *Moesesengqi liu* 摩訶僧祇律 and the *Wufen liu* 五分律 as Four Major *Kōitsu* in Chinese translation, and states that the *Binaiye does not explain vinaya rules in so much detail as the kōitsu* (Ōchō, 1958: 159). It may also be noted that he describes *kōitsu* as “what comprehensively includes all the *vinaya* rules (一切の戒律を網羅したものを).” (Ōchō,
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the source for the term kōitsu, as opposed to any Indic or Chinese text. Given that the eminent scholars of modern Buddhist Studies described above had sufficient knowledge of Indic Buddhist texts and Chinese translations, their failure to mention any source of the term kōitsu other than the Hasshūkōyō might suggest that it does not appear in Chinese translations of Indian Buddhist texts. In fact, there are only a few dictionaries of Buddhist terminology published so far that include an entry for kōitsu, and the Hasshūkōyō is the sole source of the term mentioned in any of them.  

1958: 13). This description may suggest that Ōchō, unlike many of his contemporaries, took kōitsu as a ‘complete’ text.  

Taking everything into account, a plausible conclusion is that the modern Japanese *vinaya* researchers’ preferred term is derived from a scholarly Japanese monk’s work in the 13th century CE.

Now that we have discovered the primary source for the term *kōitsu*, it may be natural and appropriate to proceed to an immediate discussion. There are, however, a few other pre-modern Japanese Buddhist texts in which another notable usage of the term appears. We will cover these in the following section before discussing the *Hasshūkōyō*.

**The Late Edo 江戸 Period**

We have seen above that there are many scholars who take *kōitsu* 広律 in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa*-sūtra. This suggests that *kōitsu* may be identified with the analysis of the *prātimokṣa*-sūtra, i.e., the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*. In fact, as I noted above, there are a few scholars who use the term *kōitsu* to signify the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone. This usage is probably unexpected to

---

*Mohan bukkyō jiten* 模範佛教辞典, ed. by Tōhō shoin henshūbu 東方書院編輯部, Osaka: Daibunkan Shoten 大文館書店 (1932); *Nihon bukkyōgo jiten* 日本佛教語辞典, ed. by Iwamoto Yutaka 岩本裕, Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社 (1988); *Nihon bukkyōshi jiten* 日本仏教史辞典, ed. by Ōno Tatsunosuke 大野達之助, Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan 東京堂出版 (1979); *Nihon bukkyōshi jiten* 日本仏教史辞典, ed. by Imaizumi Yoshio 今泉裕夫, Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館 (1999); *Reibun bukkyōgo daijiten* 例文仏教語大辞典, ed. by Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞隆, Tokyo: Shōgakukan 小学館 (1997); *Shin Bukkyō jiten* 新・佛教辞典, eds. Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞隆 et al., Tokyo: Seishin Shobō 誠信書房 (1962); *Zhongyingshui fojiào cidian* 中英仏佛教辞典, ed. by Changchunshu cidian bianyi zu 常春樹辭典編輯組, Xindian: Changchunshu Shufan 常春樹書房 (1991); *Zuixin hanying foxue dacidian* 最新漢英佛學大辭典, eds. William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous, Taipei: Xinwenfeng Chuban (1982). An entry for *kōitsu* was found in only six of these. Except for three dictionaries one of which only provides the reading of the Chinese characters “広律,” (*Gyakubuki bukkyōgo jiten* 逆引仏教語辞典), and the other two do not mention any source (*Bukkyō daijii* 佛教大辭彙; *Kairitsu wo shirutameno shōjiten* 戒律を知るための小辞典), the other three dictionaries (including a Chinese publication) all refer to the *Hasshūkōyō* as the source of the term *kōitsu* (*Kōsetsu bukkyōgo daijiten* 広説仏教語大辞典; *Reibun bukkyōgo daijiten* 例文仏教語大辞典; *Foguang dacidian* 仏光大辞典).
those who assume that kōitsu refers to the vinaya text comprising not only the vinaya-vibhaṅga but also other parts. This usage was, however, popular at least within a certain vinaya study circle in the late Edo 江戸 period.

As was noted in detail by Clarke (2006), there were several eminent monks of the Shingon 真言 school in the late Edo period who valued the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya as much as the standard, traditional vinaya in Japan, the Shifen lü 四分律, since the founder of their school, Kūkai 空海 (774–835) instructed that his pupils should rely on the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya. Gakunyo 学如 (1716–1773) was one of the Shingon school monks who insisted that they follow Kūkai’s instruction. He was such a radical Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya fundamentalist that he officially declared his temple, Fukuōji 福王寺, to be the place of study and practice of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya. There are several texts attributed to him that concern the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya. The Shōburushū 小部類集 is one of them. A copy of it transcribed in 1802 (享和二年) is preserved in Fukuōji.²⁷ This work consists of several miscellaneous short texts in two volumes. The first of the texts is a list of canonical vinayas and related texts, all of which were undoubtedly significant to Gakunyo and his fellow monks. The following list begins with Yijing’s 義浄 vinaya corpus and gives not only the text titles and their fascicle (Jp. kan 卷) numbers but also their abbreviations.

○ 廣律 抄書シテ廣ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部毘奈耶 五十巻
○ 律攝 抄書シテ摂ト云ヘシ 根本薩婆多部律攝 十四巻 或廿巻
○ 尼律 根本説一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶 二十巻

○ 雑事 抄書シテ雑ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部雑事 四十巻
○ 破僧事 抄書シテ破僧ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部破僧事 十八巻
○ 目得迦 抄書シテ得迦ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部目得迦 五巻
○ 尼陀那 抄書シテ尼陀那ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部尼陀那 五巻
○ 薬事 根本説一切有部薬事 十八巻 元廿巻
○ 夏事 根本説一切有部安居事 一巻
○ 皮事 根本説一切有部皮革事 一巻 上下巻
...（以下略）...

For our discussion, it is sufficient to consider only the first item, the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* for monks (根本説一切有部毘奈耶), in the above list. It indicates that the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* for monks is referred to as ‘*kōitsu* 廣律’ and it could be further shortened to one character ‘*kō* 廣’. Here we clearly see that the term *kōitsu* is used to signify the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone. This usage seems to have been common among the Shingon *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* observers. A good example is found, for example, in a copy of the Edo-period commentary on Yijing’s travel record, titled “*Nankaikikinaihōden inko* 南海寄帰内法伝引拵,” which is also preserved in Fukuōji and must have circulated at least within the circle of the Shingon *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* monks.28) In the comments on the phrase “十三杜多 (thirteen *dhūtas*),” for example, the term *kōitsu* appears in the following:

[The number of *dhūtas*] is twelve in the Korean [print] version [of the *Nankaikikinaihōden* 南海寄帰内法伝]. The *Shibun* [*ritsu*] 四分 [律], the

28) Cf. Tokuda (1974: 138); cf. *Kokusho sōmokuroku* 国書総目録 vol. 6, p. 288: *Nankaikikiden inko* 南海寄帰伝引拵, preserved in *Shuchin* 種智院 (1 vol.) and *Kōyasan Sanpōin* 高野山三宝院 (2 vols., published in 1790 [寛政二年]). The copy preserved in Fukuōji is only the second of two volumes. It says that it was transcribed in 1804 (文化元年) but does not mention the author’s name. K. Sasaki (1985: 339), however, notes that this text was authored (*sen* 撰) by Mitsue (?). 密慧.
There is no doubt that the term kōitsu 廣律 in the above passage designates the vinaya-vibhaṅga for monks, because ‘thirteen dhūtas (十三杜多)’ do appear in the eighteenth fascicle (juan 卷) of the Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye 根本説一切有部毘奈耶 (T. 1442 [23] 723a16-24).

The few examples included here from the texts that circulated among the Shingon 真言 monks who promoted the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya in the late Edo-period are sufficient to conclude that they commonly recognized the term kōitsu as indicative of the vinaya-vibhaṅga alone.\(^{29}\) It is not certain whether the other monks, i.e., those who regarded the Sifen lü 四分律 as the one and only vinaya, also used kōitsu in the same way.\(^{30}\) In any case, it

---

\(^{29}\) The same pattern is easily found in the detailed annotations — which were, according to Clarke (2006: 27), composed by Mitsumon 密門 (d. 1788), one of Gakunyo’s fellows — inserted into the late Edo-period printing in five volumes of Yijing’s 義淨 translation of the Vinaya-samgraha (Genbensapduobu lithe 根本婆多部律摄) (the second item in the above list) that contains a foreword written by Gakunyo in 1764 (明和甲申) and was published in 1771 (明和八年); cf. H. Baba (2016: 269-271). The Vinaya-samgraha is a handbook of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya and refers to the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya throughout, but it does not always indicate specific locations of the source. Mitsumon’s annotations, however, frequently indicate these sources by providing specific text titles, mostly abbreviated to the forms in the above list. The reference to the vinaya-vibhaṅga is indicated by either kōitsu 廣律 or kō 広.

\(^{30}\) There is, however, a chance that non-Mūlasarvāstivādin monks in Edo-period also used kōitsu as a reference to the vinaya-vibhaṅga. In his Dan Tainin ha Reishi shō 弹穂忍破霊芝章, for example, which was written as the refutation of Tainin’s 弹穂忍 (1705-1786) position on the color of monks’ robes, Shinjun 震純 (?-1778), one of the Jōdō 净土 tradition monks in Edo-period who highly valued the Sifen lü 四分律, refers to
should be noted that *kōitsu* was used by a certain number of premodern scholar-monks to signify not a *vinaya* text in its entirety but only a part of it.

Gyōnen’s *Hasshūkōyō*

Lastly, we will discuss Gyōnen’s *凝然 Hasshūkōyō* 八宗綱要, the likely source of modern scholars’ use of the term *kōitsu* 広律. Gyōnen (1185–1333) was a prominent Japanese scholar-monk in the Kamakura 磐倉 period. He is known for his extensive knowledge of various Buddhist traditions and famous for having written an enormous number of works.\(^{31}\) The *Hasshūkōyō* was Gyōnen’s first work (1269). This work is a handbook of the teachings of the eight major Buddhist traditions (*ritsu* 律, *kusha* 像舍, *jōitsu* 成実, *hossō* 法相, *sanron* 三論, *tendai* 天台, *kegon* 華厳, and *shingon* 真言) and two minor traditions (*zen* 禪 and *jōdo* 净土) in Japan during his time. In this handbook, the term *kōitsu* appears in the chapter of *ritsu* 律 tradition at least three times. We will consider each instance individually through Leo M. Pruden’s English translation in the following. The first appears in the explanation of the history of transmission of the *vinaya* texts in China:

I

然傳で震旦-総有-四律及以五論-。其四律者、一者十誦律、訳成-六十一卷-、是薩婆多部律也。二者四分律、訳成-六十卷-、是曇無德部律也。三者僧

\(^{31}\) Blum (2002: 18).
However in all only four Vinaya [piṭakas] and five commentaries on them were transmitted to China. The four Vinayas are (1) the Vinaya in *Ten Recitations (Jūju-ritsu)*, which makes up sixty-one fascicles in its Chinese translation. This is the Vinaya [piṭaka] of the Sarvāstivādins. (2) the *Fourfold Vinaya (Shibun-ritsu)*, which makes up sixty fascicles. This is the Vinaya [piṭaka] of the Dharmaguptakas. (3) the *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya (Makasōgi-ritsu)*, which in Chinese translation comprises forty fascicles. This is the Vinaya [piṭaka] of the Sthaviravādins, those of the two original divisions within the Sangha who were inside the cave, since the name “Mahāsāṅghika” is common to both groups. (4) the *Fivefold Vinaya (Gobun-ritsu)*, which in translation comprises thirty fascicles. This is the Vinaya [piṭaka] of the Mahiśāsakas. Only the *prātimokṣa* section of the Vinaya [piṭaka] of the Kāśyapiyas was transmitted to China; the full text has not yet been introduced to China.  

In this passage, Gyōnen first describes four *vinaya* texts affiliated with the Sarvāstivādins, Dharmaguptakas, Mahāsāṅghikas, and Mahiśāsakas, and then refers to two texts affiliated with the Kāśyapiyas. Given that *vinayas* of the first four schools that Gyōnen describes include not only the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* but also other parts, and thereby are generally thought to be fully preserved texts, the unavailable *vinaya* of the Kāśyapiyas that Gyōnen designated as *kōitsu* could similarly be a composite text. Pruden's transla-

---

tion of the term kōritsu as “the full text” suggests that he considers it to be a composite text. It might be possible, however, to consider kōritsu here as a reference to the vinaya-vibhaṅga alone, because, as Gyōnen explains, the prātimokṣa-sūtra that is thought to be attributed to the Kāśyapiyas is extant and available to us, but the corresponding vinaya-vibhaṅga has not come down to us. It is not completely clear, therefore, what Gyōnen exactly means by the term kōritsu in this passage.

The second passage in which kōritsu appears in the Hashhūkōyō concerns the history of the Sīfen lü 四分律 tradition. It begins with a question about the origin of the tradition in China and Japan, and the term kōritsu appears in the corresponding answer as follows:

II

問。震旦日本何時伝乎。答。曹魏之世、法時尊者、創受戒へ、姚秦之世、覺明三蔵始傳受律へ。是震旦受戒之由来也。

Question: When was this tradition transmitted to China and to Japan? Answer: During the Ts’ao Wei Dynasty the Venerable Dharmakāla first carried out an ordination ceremony. During the Yao Ch’in Dynasty, the Tripiṭaka Master Buddhayaśas first [translated and] transmitted the complete text of a Vinaya [piṭaka]. This is the history of the transmission of the precepts into China.

Gyōnen refers to the vinaya text transmitted by Buddhayaśas as kōritsu. Considering that Buddhayaśas translated the Sīfen lü 四分律 and one

prātimokṣa-sūtra text, there seems to be no doubt that the term kōritsu here signifies the Sifen lū. This, however, does not mean that Gyōnen regards kōritsu as the “complete” vinaya text, as Pruden’s translation suggests. It is still possible that Gyōnen regarded kōritsu as the vinaya-vibhaṅga and referred to the Sifen lū as kōritsu because the Sifen lū includes the vinaya-vibhaṅga. This possibility is, in fact, supported by the third passage in which kōritsu appears.

The third passage describes the categories of the nuns’ rules of the Sifen lū. It is the end of the brief survey of the Sifen lū and immediately follows the explanation of the categories of the monks’ rules.

III

次明〜尼戒〜、比丘尼戒本律説相、唯有〜三百四十一戒〜。東為六段。一八波羅夷、二十七僧殘、三三十捨壇、四一百七十八單提。五八提舍尼。六百衆学。尼無〜二不定〜、其七滅諦古来説論、或可、有、或不、可、有云云。... (途中略)... 故加〜七滅〜、総有〜三百四十八戒〜。此亦不〜出〜五篇〜、準〜比丘戒〜可、知、此為〜二部〜広律〜、本律前半所説法門分斉如、此、止持戒也。

Next we shall explain the nuns’ precepts. The precepts of the bhikṣunīs are, as itemized in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya Piṭaka, three hundred forty-one, grouped into six divisions: (1) eight pārājikas, (2) seventeen saṅghāvaśeṣas, (3) thirty niḥsargika-pāyantikas, (4) one hundred seventy-eight pāyantikas, (5) eight pratideśāniyas, and (6) one hundred rules of training. The nuns’ precepts do not have the two indeterminate precepts. There has traditionally been a debate concerning the seven methods of settling disputes [about whether they are included within

the nuns’ precepts or not]: some say that they are, and some say that they are not. ... If one were to add the seven methods of settling disputes, then there would be a total of three hundred forty-eight precepts. These precepts also do not exceed the five sections, which may be known by referring to the monks’ precepts. This concludes the first part of the full Vinaya piṭaka, the commentary on prātimokṣa for monks and nuns. The classification of the teachings as presented in the first half of the Vinaya piṭaka is as given above. These are the prohibitive precepts.39)

Only the last part of this passage is relevant to our discussion, and the most important phrase is “niбу kōritsu 二部広律.” Since in another passage Gyōnen uses the expression niбу 二部 to indicate the two groups of monks and nuns,40) the phrase niбу kōritsu may be interpreted as either ‘two kōritsus of the groups of monks’ and nuns” or ‘the kōritsu of the groups of monks’ and nuns.” The first interpretation clearly denies that the term kōritsu here refers to the Sifen lü, because there could not be two vinaya texts titled Sifen lü. Even the second interpretation suggests that the kōritsu should not signify the Sifen lü in its entirety, because Gyōnen describes it as being “presented in the first half of” the Sifen lü. This description indicates that Gyōnen’s kōritsu in this third passage is only a part of the Sifen lü. Moreover, Gyōnen states that niбу kōritsu is “the prohibitive precepts (止持戒).” Given that in another passage, Gyōnen describes the Sifen lü as comprising the prohibitive and the injunctive precepts, which are essentially equivalent to the vinaya-vibhaṅga and the khandhaka parts,41) what Gyōnen refers to as the prohibitive precepts — niбу kōritsu — should only be a part

of the Sīfen lù, or specifically, the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*. It seems reasonable, thus, that the term *kōritsu* here should be taken as a reference to the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* of the Sīfen lù, as Pruden’s translation “the commentary on *prātimokṣa*” suggests.

In our survey of the three passages (I, II, and III), we have recognized at least three facts in regard to the use of the term. First, *kōritsu* in passage I could refer to either the composite text that includes both the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and the *khandhaka* parts or the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone. Second, the term in passage II probably signifies the Sīfen lù 四分律. Third, the term in passage III unquestionably refers to the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone. These facts could be best understood through two explanations. First, Gyōnen uses the term *kōritsu* fairly inconsistently; he uses it sometimes to refer to the composite *vinaya* text, and other times to refer to the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone. Second, he consistently regards *kōritsu* as the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and uses the term to signify not only the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* itself but also the *vinaya* text that includes the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* as one part. Given that Gyōnen is known as the first major historian of the Japanese Buddhist tradition and left a large number of lucid and detailed writings that indicate “an analytical and well-ordered mind,”\(^\text{42}\) the second explanation seems to be more plausible than the first. It should be noted, at any rate, that Gyōnen uses the term *kōritsu* as a reference to the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone in passage III. It should also be noted that he does not mention that the *kōritsu* includes the *khandhaka* part anywhere in the three passages. This might mean that we lack textual justification for thinking that *kōritsu* should be a composite text that includes both the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and the *khandhaka* parts.

\(^{42}\) Blum (2002: 69)
Conclusions and Desiderata

In sum, I hope to have noted and demonstrated at least the following five points in this paper:

• Modern Japanese *vinaya* scholars have interpreted the term *kōitsu* in two ways. The first is that it signifies the complete *vinaya* text that includes all the *vinaya* components, such as the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and the *khandhaka*. The second is that it signifies a text in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*.

• After Hirakawa (1960), the first interpretation seems to be more popular than the second, and the term *kōitsu* is mostly taken to be a reference to six *vinaya* texts: the Pāli *vinaya*, the *Shisong lì* 十誦律, the *Sifen lì* 四分律, the *Wufen lì* 五分律, the *Mohesengqi lì* 摩訶僧祇律, and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Before Hirakawa (1960), on the contrary, the second interpretation seems to be more popular than the first and the *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶, which comprises the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone, was frequently regarded as one of the *kōitsu* texts.

• In the Edo period, there was a circle of scholar-monks that explicitly referred to the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone as *kōitsu*.

• The term *kōitsu* that modern *vinaya* researchers have habitually used does not seem to be a Chinese translation of an Indic word, but rather sourced from Gyōnen’s *Hasshūkōyō*.

• In the *Hasshūkōyō*, Gyōnen does not provide a clear definition of the term *kōitsu*, and uses it as a reference to the *vinaya* text that comprises the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and other texts, and the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone.
The most can be said about these five points is that the use of the term kōritsu is not firmly established in Japanese Buddhist scholarship. It has changed over time. Different scholars attribute different meanings to the term. This serves as a reminder that we should not use this traditional Buddhist term haphazardly. If we need to use it for research, we should at least note the ambiguity of it. Moreover, it might be preferable to mention that the term seems to be derived from Gyōnen’s Hasshūkōyō, and to indicate in which way one is using it.

I have no intention of saying that Gyōnen was the first to use the term kōritsu in Japan. There must have been many scholarly monks who were familiar with the vinaya among his predecessors and contemporaries, and some of them may have used the term before him. It seems, however, that no other work in medieval Japan had as significant an impact as Gyōnen’s Hasshūkōyō on modern Japanese Buddhist scholars. It is well known that the Hasshūkōyō has been highly regarded and intensively studied as an influential handbook of Buddhism since the Meiji Era (1868–1912). Pruden (1994: 1) notes that there were few commentaries of the Hasshūkōyō composed before this time and enumerates at least eighteen commentaries composed during the Meiji Era and five in the following 大正 Taishō Era (1912–1926). A. Satō (2009: 611) also notes that the Hasshūkōyō rapidly received considerable attention by Japanese Buddhist scholars specifically between Meiji 10 and 30 (1878–98). He explains that it is because Japanese Buddhist traditions,

---

43) There may be a good chance that before the Hasshūkōyō was made public the term kōritsu was widely known among vinaya masters in Kamakura 鎌倉 era. Kakujō 兖盛 (1194–1249) and Eison 致尊 (1201–1290), for example, were known to study the chapter titled Bio mubiaose 表無表色 of the Dacheng fayuan yilin zhang 大乘法苑義林章 (Yoshihara, 1992: 17), in which the term kōritsu appears. Furthermore, it should also be noted that the Yugalun ji 瑜伽論記 by Daolun 道倫 (or Dunlun 道倫), which is well known to have been repeatedly cited in various works by many Japanese vinaya experts before Gyōnen, including Kakujō 兖盛 and Eison 致尊 (Fukushi, 2009), also has a passage including the term kōritsu. For details of the occurrence of kōritsu in the Dacheng fayuan yilin zhang 大乘法苑義林章 and Yugalun ji 瑜伽論記, see n. 50 below.
after having undergone the extensive anti-Buddhist movement in the early Meiji era (haibutsu kishaku 廃仏毀釈), were seriously damaged, and in order to recover from the damage, wide educational reforms and new curricula were made. The Hashūkōyō was introduced as an essential handbook of Buddhism. Given that many of the early modern Japanese Buddhist scholars were more or less related to the Buddhist traditions, it is probable that they mostly learned from the Hashūkōyō and kept it as a handy guide. This may also be supported by the fact that Hirakawa Akira, who represents modern Japanese Buddhist scholars, was also a fervent propagator of the Hashūkōyō. He published a commentary on the Hashūkōyō in 1980. In the guidebook to Buddhist Studies that he edited in 1984, he recommends to beginners not only several modern scholars’ handbooks, but also Gyōnen’s Hashūkōyō. There seems to be no doubt, therefore, that the Hashūkōyō is as popular with modern Japanese Buddhist scholars as any other medieval Buddhist text. This, in turn, suggests that there seems to be little, if any, chance that modern Buddhist scholars’ use of the term kōitsu originates from anything other than the Gyōnen’s first work.

In regard to the major question of where Gyōnen’s kōitsu comes from, it has yet to be sufficiently addressed. For further research, however, it is at least worth noting here that Yuanzhao 元照 (1048–1116), who is known for his efforts to revive the Sifen lü 四分律 tradition in China, which was established by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), uses the term guanglì 広律 several times in his Sifenlì hangshi chao zhichiji 四分律行事鈔資持記 (T. 1805 [40]). A quick and cursory survey of this work gives the impression that Yuanzhao’s guanglì is similar to Gyōnen’s kōitsu; it seems to be taken as both the composite vinaya text that includes the vinaya-vibhaṅga and the

This might be no surprise if we take into consideration that Gyōnen was largely indebted to Yuanzhao — rather than Daoxuan — in regard to his understanding of the *vinaya*. In fact, Gyōnen quotes Yuanzhao’s works at least twice in the *Hasshūkōyō*, and one of the quotations is from the *Sifenlitī hangshi chao zhichijī* 四分律行事鉅資持記. Though it is not possible to immediately conclude here that Gyōnen exclusively follows Yuanzhao with respect to the use of the term *kōritsu*, it is safe to say that a thorough investigation of Yuanzhao’s references to the term could be a good starting point for tracing its Chinese source.

---

47) See, *inter alia*, T. 1805 [40] 169b6–7: 至姚秦時，十誦廍律初翻 ... 其次四分，僧祇，五分，三部教文，並傳此地；T. 1805 [40] 176b22–23: 上列六部，前之四部，戒本廣律，此土已翻；T. 1805 [40] 166a9: 二部廣律戒本，對辨優劣. Given that Yuanzhao 元照 authored several commentaries on Daoxuan’s works, it might be expected that the term guanlī 広律 frequently appears in Daoxuan’s 道宣 works. The term is, however, not found so easily in his works. The *Taishō Shinshū Daiizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, for example, includes at least twenty works attributed to Daoxuan 道宣, and I tried the online text database (SAT), searching twenty works for the term, but it did not come up in any of them. I have found just one passage that includes guanlī in Daoxuan’s *Sifenlitī biqiaozhuanhu-jieben shu* 四分律比丘含注戒本疏, which is collected in the *Shinsan Dai Nihon Zoku Zōkyō* 新纂大日本続藏經. Since the guanlī in the passage is very ambiguous at least to me, I just cite it here to guide further research (Z. 714 [39] 746a): 有人云，如……上所說—，非……其致—，然教所止在……根機—，今分……廣律—不……三品—，如……受説等法—為上人教 德衣財食，為中人教。説人滅法，為下人教。據此，為……論，則此篇聚，大歸不……上二—也.

48) R. Ueda (1975; esp. 10–13).


50) Needless to say, I have no intention of saying that Yuanzhao 元照 was the first to use the term guanlī 広律 in China. There are several texts in which guanlī appears that are attributed to those who lived earlier than Yuanzhao. The *Dachengfayuanyilin-zhang* 大乘法苑義林章 (T. 1861 [45]) by Ji 基 (632–682), for example, has the chapter titled *Bio wubiaose* 表無表色. This chapter mainly concerns *lītyi* 律儀 (Skt. *samvara*) ‘self-restraint,’ which is thought to be one of the *wubiaose* 無表色 (Skt. *a-vijñātapī-rūpa*) ‘physical things in unmanifested forms’ and acquired through observance of the *vinaya* rules, and has been well studied in the Japanese Buddhist tradition: Takai (1940: 3); Hirakawa (1980: 494). The term *kōritsu* appears once in the chapter (T. 1861 [45] 302 a4–8): 二 “受隨法學處” 支， “自初受後，於毘奈耶，別解脫中，所有隨順，苾芻尸羅，若彼所引，衆多學處，於彼一切，守護奉行，由此，得名守護別解脫律儀者。” 此意即顯，受戒已後，廣律毘奈耶，戒本別解脫中，隨順所受戒法... As I denote with quotation marks, this is a part of the exegesis on a passage of the *Yugashide lum 瑜伽師地論* (Yogacārabhūmi) (T. 1579 [30] 591a1–4: 自此以後，於毘奈耶別解脫中，所有隨順，苾芻尸羅，若彼所引，衆多學處，於彼
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