

From Gyōnen 凝然 to Hirakawa Akira 平川彰: a cursory survey of the history of Japanese *Vinaya* Studies with a focus on the term *Kōritsu* 広律*

Kishino Ryōji (岸野亮示)

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

* I wish to thank Dr. Shayne Clarke for his careful reading of the final draft and insightful comments. I also thank Dr. Yao Fumi 八尾史 and Mr. Kadoya Warren for many useful suggestions. They led to a significant improvement of this paper. Special thanks also to the journal coordinator, Prof. Sowa Yoshihiro 曾和義宏 for his generous arrangements for this paper. I alone, however, remain responsible for any errors and inaccuracies. I would also like to express my gratitude to the incumbent of Fukuōji 福王寺, Kameo Shōkō 亀尾祥宏 for graciously showing me several copies of the important texts that the temple preserves. I gratefully acknowledge a research grant offered from Mishima Kaiun 三島海雲 Memorial Foundation.

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).

3) Maeda (1975: 351); K. Tamura (2005: 164-176).

4) de Jong (1975: 95-101).

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,⁶⁾ despite the fact that Buddhism was originally brought to Japan from Korea and at first Korean Buddhism strongly influenced Japanese Buddhism.⁷⁾ 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.⁸⁾

When we consider these undesirable impacts of the long Buddhist tradition on modern Japanese scholarship in the field of Buddhist Studies,

6) Mizutani (1981: 441–442).

7) E. Tamura (1986: esp. 45–54).

8) Rhi (2003: 167).

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 (*kaeriten* 返り点), Japanese inflectional endings for adjectives and verbs (*okurigana* 送り仮名), Japanese grammatical particles (*joshi* 助詞 or *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 (*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.

9) Kanaoka (1978); Sueki (1996: 348).

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 *Hasshūkōyō* 八宗綱要 (1269) by Gyōnen 凝然. Then, I inspect how Gyōnen uses the term *kōritsu* in his *Hasshūkōyō* and note that his usage may also be open to either of the two interpretations. In conclusion, focusing on the fact that the *Hasshūkōyō* began to be rapidly and intensively studied after the Meiji 明治 Era (1868-1912), I suggest Gyōnen's *Hasshūkōyō* strongly influenced modern Japanese *vinaya* study. In addition,

I refer to a possible Chinese source for Gyōnen's *kōritsu*.

Post-Hirakawa (1960).

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 lü* 十誦律 (a *vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins extant in Chinese), the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (a *vinaya* of the Dharmaguptakas extant in Chinese), the *Wufen lü* 五分律 (a *vinaya* of the Mahīśāsakas extant in Chinese), the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 (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).¹¹⁾ 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*

11) Clarke (2015: 1-2).

studies is *Ritsuzō no kenkyū*, 律蔵の研究 (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

12) Hirakawa (1960: 50, 59).

13) Satō (1963: 73).

14) e.g., K. Sasaki (1981: 24); S. Sasaki (1999: 247); Hiraoka (2002: esp. 188); Mori (2013: 11).

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-ṭīka* that fully includes both the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* and *vinaya-vibhaṅga*, and the *khandhaka* part (波羅提木叉・經分別と、犍度部の両方を完備した完全形の律藏).” 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 *prātimokṣa-sūtra* (*kaikyō* 戒經) and *kōritsu*. That is, T. Satō seems to interpret that *kōritsu* is the text in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*.

If we accept that *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* in the same way in one of his later works (Hirakawa, 1993: 101):

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

「広律」というのは「戒經」（戒本）にたいする言葉である。戒經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* (*ritsuzō* 律蔵) here, we certainly see that he also understands that *kōritsu* is in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* (*kaikyō* 戒經). Given that the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*, analysis of the *prātimokṣa* rules may be regarded as a text in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*, it may be possible to say that Hirakawa here and T. Satō (2008) suggest that *kōritsu* is another name for the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*. In fact, in his enumeration of five Chinese *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu*.¹⁵⁾

15) Hirakawa (1993: 18).

In any case, there are at least two interpretations of the term *kōritsu* in post-Hirakawa (1960) scholarship. One interpretation is that *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* 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 issaikyō: indo senjyutsubu* 国訳一切経・印度撰述部 (Japanese translation of Chinese *tripiṭaka*: 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 Kōyō 境野黄洋 (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 *Wufen lü*, the *Shisong lü*, the *Mohesengqi lü*, [*Mūla*]-*sarvāstivāda vinaya*, and the *Binaiye-vinaya*.

律藏に種々の区別があるがその代表的なるものは比丘比丘尼の戒律を詳説する所謂広律である。漢訳広律に四分律・五分律・十誦律・摩訶僧祇律・有部律・鼻奈耶律の六種あり¹⁶⁾。

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 *Binaiye* is generally thought to be an incomplete text insofar as it contains only what we commonly regard as *vibhaṅga*,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* 解脫戒經, the *Wufen lü* 五分律, most of Yijing's 義淨 (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 *Kōritsus* (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 Pāli *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 *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 as “the oldest translation of the extant *kōritsus* (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).

is obvious from these descriptions that Nishimoto, like Ueda, took *kōritsu* to be an explanatory text rather than a complete text, and regarded the *Binaiye* as the *kōritsu*. It might also be noted that Nishimoto does not refer to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as one of the *kōritsu* texts in the series of *kakikudashi* translations. We see again that the *vinaya* texts Nishimoto refers to with the term *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* 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 *Wufen lü*, the *Shisong lü*, and the *Mohesengqi lü* as “the completely translated and transmitted *kōritsu* texts (完全に廣律の譯傳せられたもの).” Furthermore, he refers to the *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 as “the first of the *kōritsu* texts that were translated [into Chinese] (廣律の譯傳された最初).”¹⁸⁾ Here we see that Sakaino also interpreted the *Binaiye* as the *kōritsu*. 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 *Shanjiantū pīposha* 善見律毘婆沙, which is known as a Chinese version of the *Samantapāsādikā*.¹⁹⁾ In this *kakikudashi* translation, the term *kōritsu* does not appear. In his other work about Pāli texts, however, which was published about ten years earlier, he does refer to *kōritsu*. 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* 犍度) as *kōritsu*, and refers to the former and the latter as *shijikai* 止持戒 and *sajimonkendo* 作持門犍度, 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、戒本に對して *Sutta-vibhaṅga* (本文解明) と *Khandhaka* (犍度部) とを合せたものを廣律と稱し、前者を止持戒、後者を作持門犍度法と稱してゐる (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* and 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 lǜ* 四分律, the *Wufen lǜ* 五分律, the *Shisong lǜ* 十誦律, the *Mohesengqi lǜ* 摩訶僧祇律, and Yijing’s *vinaya* corpus, saying: “there are five Chinese translations that we can refer to as *kōritsu* (廣律と稱し得べきものの漢訳が五種現存する),” and furthermore, refers to the *Binaiyē* 鼻奈耶 as the 6th Chinese *vinaya* text that might possibly be included in the *kōritsu* (廣律中に數へ得べきものとしては、六鼻奈

20) Nagai (1922: 31–32).

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.

耶あり).²²⁾ These passages suggest that Nagai hesitated to regard the *Binaiye* as *kōritsu*, and this hesitation is probably due to his understanding that the *kōritsu* should comprise not only the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* but also the *khandhaka*. Given that Ueda, Nishimoto, and Sakaino all refer to the *kōritsu* in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* rather than including both the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and *khandhaka* and regard the *Binaiye* as the *kōritsu*, it seems that Nagai's opinion about the *kōritsu* is somewhat unique. More specifically, it is closer to that of many current scholars.²³⁾ This suggests that there were already two interpretations about the *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* by many recent scholars,²⁴⁾ was frequently regarded as *kōritsu*.²⁵⁾ The other is that Gyōnen's *Hasshūkōyō* was cited as

22) Nagai (1922: 31–36).

23) Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善 (1884–1937) also asserted that the *kōritsu* includes both *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and *khandhaka* parts in his lecture at Otani University given in 1928 (Akanuma, 1998: 432). Akanuma's opinion about the *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* and said that seven *vinaya* texts are usually referred to as *kōritsu*.

24) There are a few of post-Hirakawa (1960) *vinaya* studies in which the *Binaiye* 鼻奈耶 is referred to as *kōritsu*. 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 *kōritsu*. Rather, he states that it could be regarded as an 'incomplete *kōritsu* 不完全な広律.' (Hirakawa, 1960: 159, n. 1).

25) Ōchō E'nichi 横超慧日 (1906–1995) might be one of the few early modern scholars who did not regard the *Binaiye* as *kōritsu*. In his book published in 1958 based on his dissertation, Ōchō refers to the *Shisong lü* 十誦律, the *Sifen lü* 四分律, the *Mohesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律 and the *Wufen lü* 五分律 as Four Major *Kōritsus* in Chinese translation, and states that the *Binaiye* does not explain *vinaya* rules in so much detail as the *kōritsu* (Ōchō, 1958: 159). It may also be noted that he describes *kōritsu* as "what comprehensively includes all the *vinaya* rules (一切の戒律を網羅したもの)." (Ōchō,

the source for the term *kōritsu*, 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 *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu*, and the *Hasshūkōyō* is the sole source of the term mentioned in any of them.²⁶⁾

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

- 26) For example, I looked in twenty-three dictionaries that are easy to access: *Bukkyō daijii* 佛教大辭彙, ed. by Bukkyō daigaku 佛教大學, 3 vols. Tokyo: Fuzanbō 富士房 (1914–1922); *Bukkyō daijiten* 仏教大辭典, ed. by Oda Tokunō 織田得能. Tokyo: Ōkura-shoten 大倉書店 (1917); *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大事典, eds. Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽 et al. Tokyo: Shōgakkan 小学館 (1988); *Bukkyōgaku jiten* 仏教学辭典, eds. Taya Raishun 多屋頼俊, Ōchō E'nichi 横超慧日, and Funahashi Issai 舟橋一哉. New version 新版. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館 (1995); *Bukkyō indo shisō jiten* 仏教・インド思想辭典, eds. Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道 et al. Tokyo: Shunjyūsha 春秋社(1987); *Bukkyō jirin*, eds. Fujii Senshō 藤井宣正, Nanjō Bun'yū 南條文雄, and Shimaji Daitō 島地大等. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin 明治書院 (1912); *Bukkyō yōgo jiten* 仏教用語事典, ed. by Sudō Ryūsen 須藤隆仙. Tokyo: Shinjinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社 (1993); *Bukkyō yōgo jiten* 仏教用語事典, ed. by Sudō Ryūsen 須藤隆仙. Compact version (コンパクト版). Tokyo: Shinjinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往来社 (1999); *Chūgoku bukkyōshi jiten* 中国仏教史辭典. ed. by Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. Tokyo: Tokyōdō Shuppan 東京堂出版 (1981); *Foguang dacidian* 仏光大辭典. ed. by Ciyi 慈怡 and Xingyun dashi 星雲大師, 8 vols. Gaoxiong: Foguang chubanshe 佛光出版社 (1988); *Gyakubiki bukkyōgo jiten* 逆引仏教語辭典, ed. by Gyakubiki bukkyōgo jiten henshū iinkai 逆引仏教語辭典編纂委員会. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō (1995); *Hanying foxue dacidian* 漢英佛學大辭典 (A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms: with Sanskrit and English Equivalents and a Sanskrit-Pali Index), eds. William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous. Taipei: Chengwen Chubanshe 成文出版社 (1968); *Iwanami bukkyō jiten* 岩波仏教辭典, ed. by Nakamura Hajime 中村元 et al. Second edition 第二版. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten 岩波書店 (2002); *Japanese-English Buddhist dictionary*. Fourth edition. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社 (1984); *Kan'yakutaishō bonwa daijiten* 漢訳対照梵和大辭典, ed. by Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲来. Enlarged and corrected edition 増補改訂版. Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujyutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団 (1979); *Konsaisu bukkyō jiten* コンサイス佛教辭典, ed. by Ui Hakuju 宇井伯寿. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社 (1980); *Kairitsu wo shirutameno shōjiten* 戒律を知るための小辭典, ed. by Asada Masahiro 浅田正博. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂 (2014); *Mochizuki bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典, ed. by Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, 10 vols. Enlarged and corrected edition 増訂版. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協会 (1954–1963);

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 *kōritsu*, 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 *kōritsu* 広律 in contradistinction to the *prātimokṣa-sūtra*. This suggests that *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* to signify the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone. This usage is probably unexpected to

Mohan bukkyō jiten 模範佛教辭典, ed. by Tōhō shoin henshū bu 東方書院編輯部. Osaka: Daibunkan Shoten 大文館書店 (1932); *Nihon bukkyōgo jiten* 日本佛教語辭典, ed. by Iwamoto Yutaka 岩本裕. Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社 (1988); *Nihon bukkyōshi jiten* 日本仏教史辭典, ed. by Ōno Tatsunosuke 大野達之助. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan 東京堂出版 (1979); *Nihon bukkyōshi jiten* 日本仏教史辭典, ed. by Imaizumi Yoshio 今泉淑夫. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 吉川弘文館 (1999); *Reibun bukkyōgo daijiten* 例文仏教語大辭典, ed. by Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿. Tokyo: Shōgakkān 小学館 (1997); *Shin Bukkyō jiten* 新・佛教辭典, eds. Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞麿 et al., Tokyo: Seishin Shobō 誠信書房 (1962); *Zhongyingri fojiao cidian* 中英日佛教辭典, ed. by Changchunshu cidian bianyi zu 常春樹辭典編撰組. Xindian: Changchunshu Shufang 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 *kōritsu* was found in only six of these. Except for three dictionaries one of which only provides the reading of the Chinese characters “広律,” (*Gyakubiki bukkyōgo jiten* 逆引仏教語辭典), 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辭典), the other three dictionaries (including a Chinese publication) all refer to the *Hasshūkōyō* as the source of the term *kōritsu* (*Kōsetsu bukkyōgo daijiten* 広説仏教語大辭典; *Reibun bukkyōgo daijiten* 例文仏教語大辭典; *Foguang dacidian* 仏光大辭典).

those who assume that *kōritsu* 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 學如 (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 *Shōburuishū* 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 義淨 *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 五十卷
- 律攝 抄書シテ攝ト云ヘシ 根本薩婆多部律攝 十四卷 或廿卷
- 尼律 根本説一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶 二十卷

27) Cf. Tokuda (1974: 139); cf. *Kokusho sōmokuroku* 国書総目録, ed. by Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店 (Revised and supplemented edition. Tokyo: 1989–1991), vol. 4, p. 487: *Shōburuiju* 小部類聚, preserved in Shuchiin 種智院; cf. *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辞典, ed. by Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙 (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社, 1964), vol. 5, p. 294: *Shōburuiju* 小部類聚, 2 vols., preserved in Kyōto (Tōji) senmongakkō 京都 (東寺) 専門学校.

- 雑事 抄書シテ雑ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部雑事 四十卷
 - 破僧事 抄書シテ破ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部破僧事 十八卷
 - 目得迦 抄書シテ得迦ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部目得迦 五卷
 - 尼陀那 抄書シテ陀那ト云ヘシ 根本説一切有部尼陀那 五卷
 - 菓事 根本説一切有部菓事 十八卷 元廿卷
 - 夏事 根本説一切有部安居事 一卷
 - 皮事 根本説一切有部皮革事 一卷 上下二卷
- ... (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 ‘*kōritsu* 廣律’ and it could be further shortened to one character ‘*kō* 廣.’ Here we clearly see that the term *kōritsu* 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 “*Nankaikikinai-hōden inko* 南海寄帰内法伝引拠,” 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 *kōritsu* 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 sōmoku roku* 国書総目録 vol. 6, p. 288: *Nankaikikiden inko* 南海寄帰伝引拠, 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.

[*Dai*] *chido* [*ron*] [大] 智度 [論], and so on all [give it] as twelve. The *Gedatsu* [*dō*] *ron* 解脱 [道] 論 enumerates thirteen. However, the *kōritsu*, in the 18th [fascicle], on the right of 21 [*chō* 丁?], enumerates thirteen *dhūtas*.

高麗本二十二ヲ作, 四分, 智度等皆十二也。解脱論二十三ヲ説。然ニ廣律第十八廿一右十三杜多ヲ説。

There is no doubt that the term *kōritsu* 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 *Genbenshuoyiqiyoubu 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 *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* 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-saṃgraha* (*Genbensapoduobu lǐshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝) (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-saṃgraha* 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 *kōritsu* 廣律 or *kō* 広.

30) There is, however, a chance that non-*Mūlasarvāstivādin* monks in Edo-period also used *kōritsu* as a reference to the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*. In his *Dan Tainin ha Reishi shō* 彈諦忍破靈芝章, for example, which was written as the refutation of Tainin’s 諦忍 (1705-1786) position on the color of monks’ robes, Shinjun 震純 (?-1778), one of the Jōdo 淨土 tradition monks in Edo-period who highly valued the *Sifen lü* 四分律, refers to

should be noted that *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* 広律. Gyōnen (1185–1333) was a prominent Japanese scholar-monk in the Kamakura 鎌倉 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* 俱舍, *jōjitsu* 成実, *hossō* 法相, *sanron* 三論, *tendai* 天台, *kegon* 華嚴, and *shingon* 真言) and two minor traditions (*zen* 禪 and *jōdo* 淨土) in Japan during his time. In this handbook, the term *kōritsu* 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

然伝震旦總有四律及以五論。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

kōritsu as one of the three — the other two are *kaihon* 戒本 (*prātimokṣa-sūtra*) and *hō kendo* 法撻度 (one chapter of the *khandhaka* part): 木蘭染ノ法戒本ト広律トニ有り。乾陀ノ説ハ法撻度洗洗ノ文ニテ説相別ナリ。知ヌ戒本広律ハ華語ノ木蘭ヲ挙ケ法撻度ハ梵語ノ乾陀ヲ挙タルナリ。汝律文ヲ詳ニ見サルナリ (川口 1981, 607) This passage might suggest that Shinjun 震純 regards *kōritsu* as the *vinaya* text that is neither the *prātimokṣa-sūtra* nor the *khandhaka* part, that is, the *vinaya-vibhaṅga*.

31) Blum (2002: 18).

祇律、訳成_二四十卷_一、是根本二部中窟内上座也、大衆名通_二部_一故。四者五分律、訳成_二三十卷_一、比五部中弥沙塞部律也。迦葉遺律、唯伝_二戒本_一、**広律未_レ流**³²⁾。

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 Mahīśāsakas. Only the *prātimokṣa* section of the Vinaya [*piṭaka*] of the Kāśyapīyas was transmitted to China; the full text has not yet been introduced to China.³³⁾

In this passage, Gyōnen first describes four *vinaya* texts affiliated with the Sarvāstivādins, Dharmaguptakas, Mahāsāṅghikas, and Mahīśāsakas, and then refers to two texts affiliated with the Kāśyapīyas. 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 Kāśyapīyas that Gyōnen designated as *kōritsu* could similarly be a composite text. Pruden’s transla-

32) Kamata (1981: 134-137).

33) Pruden (1994: 36).

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 Kāśyapīyas is extant and available to us,³⁴⁾ 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 *Hasshūkōyō* concerns the history of the *Sifen 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、姚秦之世、覺明三藏始伝広律。是震旦伝戒之由来也³⁵⁾。

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.³⁶⁾

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

34) The *Jietuo jiejing* 解脱戒經 (T. 1460 [24]). cf. Hirakawa (1960: 145-146); Clarke (2015: 82).

35) Kamata (1981: 140).

36) Pruden (1994: 38).

prātimokṣa-sūtra text,³⁷⁾ there seems to be no doubt that the term *kōritsu* here signifies the *Sifen lü*. 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 lü* as *kōritsu* because the *Sifen lü* 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 lü*. It is the end of the brief survey of the *Sifen lü* and immediately follows the explanation of the categories of the monks’ rules.

III

次明_二尼戒_一、比丘尼戒本律說相、唯有_二三百四十一戒_一。東為六段。一八波羅夷、二十七僧殘、三三十捨墮、四一百七十八單提。五八提舍尼。六百衆學。尼無_二不定_一、其七滅諍古來諍論、或可_レ有、或不_レ可_レ有云云。... (途中略)... 故加_二七滅_一、總有_二三百四十八戒_一。此亦不_レ出_二五篇_一、準_二比丘戒_一可_レ知、此為_二二部_一廣律_一、本律前半所說法門分齊如_レ此、止持戒也³⁸⁾。

Next we shall explain the nuns’ precepts. The precepts of the *bhikṣuṇīs* 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 *pratideśanīyas*, 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

37) Hirakawa (1960: 239-242).

38) Kamata (1981: 167-168).

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 “*nibu kōritsu* 二部広律.” Since in another passage Gyōnen uses the expression *nibu* 二部 to indicate the two groups of monks and nuns,⁴⁰⁾ the phrase *nibu 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 *nibu 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 — *nibu kōritsu* — should only be a part

39) Pruden (1994: 44).

40) Kamata (1981: 153); Pruden (1944: 42).

41) Kamata (1981: 153); Pruden (1944: 41-42).

of the *Sifen lü*, 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 *Sifen lü*, 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 *Sifen lü* 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,"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 *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu* is mostly taken to be a reference to six *vinaya* texts: the Pāli *vinaya*, the *Shisong lü* 十誦律, the *Sifen lü* 四分律, the *Wufen lü* 五分律, the *Mohesengqi lü* 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 *kōritsu* texts.
- In the Edo period, there was a circle of scholar-monks that explicitly referred to the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* alone as *kōritsu*.
- The term *kōritsu* 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 *kōritsu*, 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 that 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.⁴³⁾ 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. Kakujo 覚盛 (1194-1249) and Eison 叡尊 (1201-1290), for example, were known to study the chapter titled *Bio mubiao* 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 遁倫), which is well known to have been repeatedly cited in various works by many Japanese *vinaya* experts before Gyōnen, including Kakujo 覚盛 and Eison 叡尊 (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 *Hasshūkōyō* 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 *Hasshūkōyō* 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 *Hasshūkōyō*. He published a commentary on the *Hasshūkōyō* in 1980.⁴⁴⁾ 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 *Hasshūkōyō*.⁴⁵⁾ There seems to be no doubt, therefore, that the *Hasshūkōyō* 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 *kōritsu* originates from anything other than the Gyōnen's first work.

In regard to the major question of where Gyōnen's *kōritsu* 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,⁴⁶⁾ which was established by Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667), uses the term *guanglü* 広律 several times in his *Sifenlü 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 *guanglü* is similar to Gyōnen's *kōritsu*; it seems to be taken as both the composite *vinaya* text that includes the *vinaya-vibhaṅga* and the

44) Hirakawa (1980). Sakaino also published two commentaries on the *Hasshūkōyō*; A. Satō (2009: 622).

45) Hirakawa (1984: 9).

46) Hirakawa (1980: 250).

vinaya-vibhāṅga alone.⁴⁷⁾ 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*.⁴⁸⁾ In fact, Gyōnen quotes Yuanzhao’s works at least twice in the *Hasshūkōyō*, and one of the quotations is from the *Sifenlü hangshi chao zhichiji* 四分律行事鈔資持記.⁴⁹⁾ 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.⁵⁰⁾

47) See, *inter alia*, T. 1805 [40] 169b6-7: 至姚秦時。十誦廣律初翻... 其次四分, 僧祇, 五分, 三部廣文, 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 *guanglü* 廣律 frequently appears in Daoxuan’s 道宣 works. The term is, however, not found so easily in his works. The *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 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 *guanlü* in Daoxuan’s *Sifenlü biqiuhanzhu-jieben shu* 四分律比丘含注戒本疏, which is collected in the *Shinsan Dai Nihon Zoku Zōkyō* 新纂大日本統藏經. Since the *guanlü* 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_一, 非_レ無_レ其致_一, 然教所被止在_二根機_一, 今分_二廣律_一不_レ出_二三品_一, 如_上受說等法_一為上人教 德衣財食, 為中人教 訶人滅諍, 為下人教 據_レ此, 為_レ論, 則此篇聚, 大歸不_レ在_二上_一也。

48) R. Ueda (1975: esp. 10-13).

49) Hirakawa (1981: 295-297; 312-314).

50) Needless to say, I have no intention of saying that Yuanzhao 元照 was the first to use the term *guanglü* 廣律 in China. There are several texts in which *guanglü* appears that are attributed to those who lived earlier than Yuanzhao. The *Dachengfayuanyanilinzhang* 大乘法苑義林章 (T. 1861 [45]) by Ji 基 (632-682), for example, has the chapter titled *Bio wubiao* 表無表色. This chapter mainly concerns *lüyi* 律儀 (Skt. *saṃvara*) ‘self-restraint,’ which is thought to be one of the *wubiao* 無表色 (Skt. *a-vijñapti-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 lun* 瑜伽師地論 (*Yogācārabhūmi*) (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

REFERENCES

- Akanuma (Chizen) 赤沼智善 1991 *Akanuma Chizen chosaku senshū* 赤沼智善著作選集 vol. 3: *Bukkyō kyōtenshi ron* 佛教經典史論 (Reprinted Edition). Niigata: Ushio Shoten うしお書店.
- Baba (Hisayuki) 馬場久幸, 2016 *Nikkan kōryū to kōraiban daizōkyō* 日韓交流と高麗版大藏經. Kyoto: 法藏館.
- Blum (Mark L.) 2002 *The Origins and Development of Pure Land Buddhism: a Study and Translation of Gyōnen's Jōdo Hōmon Genrushō*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke (Shayne), 2006 “Miscellaneous Musings on Mūlasarvāstivāda Monks: The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Revival in Tokugawa Japan.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33 (1), 1-49.
- , 2015 “Vinayas” entry in *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, edited by Jonathan A. Silk, Volume 1, 60-87. Leiden: Brill.

一切, 守護奉行。由此, 得名守護別解脫律儀者, 是名, 受隨法學處支。). We see that Ji 基 comments on the terms *pinaiye* 毘奈耶 (*vinaya*) and *biejietuo* 別解脫 (*prātimokṣa* [-*sūtra*]) by adding *guanglü* 廣律 and *jieben* 戒本, respectively. Though it is difficult to know what *kōritsu* exactly means here, it should be noted at the least that *kōritsu* seems to appear as a text in contradistinction to *jieben* (*prātimokṣa* [-*sūtra*]). There are at least two more of Ji's 基 works in which the term *kōritsu* occurs. One is the commentary on the Maitreya-sūtra (the *Mileshangshengdoulutianjing zan* 彌勒上生兜率天經贊, T. 1772 [38]) and the other is the one on the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra* (the *Shuowugouchengjing shu* 說無垢稱經疏, T. 1782 [38]). The *kōritsu* found in these two texts are, however, more ambiguous than the one in the *Dachengfayuanyanlin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章. For the moment, I only note the locations of where *kōritsu* occurs in the two texts: T. 1772 [38] 286c4; T. 1782 [38] 993c21, 1010a18, 1055c18. Apart from Ji's 基 works, the famous commentary on the *Yogācāra-bhūmi* by Daolun 道倫 (or Dunlun 遁倫), who is dated to a few decades later than Ji 基 (Mizutani [Hayashi], 2015, 187-188) or the *Yugulun ji* 瑜伽論記 (T. 1828 [42]) also refers to the term *kōritsu*: ... “謂, 或有是毘奈耶所說, 非別解脫所說”者, 五部廣律。非是一卷別解脫戒本也。“或有是毘奈耶所說, 亦是別解脫所說”者, 此即, 就彼五部廣本合, 有一卷別解脫戒。即為俱句。“是故一切總, 有三處。一, 增上現行”者, 即作持也。“二, 增上毘奈耶”者, 五部廣律。“三, 增上別解脫,”者, 一卷戒本。The passages with quotation marks are citations from the *Yogācāra-bhūmi* (T. 1579 [30] 867b9-11): 謂, 或有是毘奈耶所說, 非別解脫所說。或, 有是毘奈耶所說, 亦是別解脫所說。是故, 一切總略而, 言有三學處。一增上現行。二增上毘奈耶。三增上別解脫。When the citations from the *Yogācāra-bhūmi* are compared with Daolun's 道倫 comments on them, it becomes clear that *pinaiye* 毘奈耶 and *biejietuo* 別解脫 are regarded by Daolun as equivalent to *guanglü* 廣律 and *jieben* 戒本, respectively. Though it is uncertain which *vinaya* texts Daolun refers to as ‘five *guanglüs* 五部廣律’ and ‘one fascicle of the *jieben* 一卷戒本’ in this context, it is notable that Daolun seems to use the term *guanglü* 廣律 as one of two categories of *vinaya* texts — the other is *jieben* 戒本.

- Fukushi (Jinin) 福士慈稔, 2009 “Jūyon seiki madeno nihon ritsuzō kankei shōsho ni mirareru shiragi, kōrai bukkyō ninshiki 十四世紀までの日本律蔵関係章疏にみられる新羅・高麗仏教認識.” *Minobusan daigaku bukkyō gakubu kiyō* 身延山大学仏教学部紀要 vol. 10, 93-106.
- Funayama (Tōru) 船山徹, 2003 “Goseiki chūgoku niokeru bukkyōto no kairitsu no kairitsu juyō 五世紀中国における仏教徒の戒律受容.” In: *Tō sō dōkyō no shinsei shisō kenkyū: Heisei 13-14 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho (kenkyū daihyōsha Yamada Takashi)* 唐宋道教の心性思想研究: 平成13-14年度科学研究費補助金研究成果報告書 (研究代表者 山田俊). 1-14.
- Hirakawa (Akira) 平川彰, 1960 *Ritsuzō no kenkyū* 律蔵の研究, Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- , 1980 *Hasshūkōyō: Butten kōza* 八宗綱要: 仏典講座39. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版.
- , 1984 “Sōron: bukkyō kenkyū no tebiki 総論: 仏教研究の手引.” In: *Bukkyō kenkyū nyūmon* 仏教研究入門, ed. by Hirakawa Akira. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版, 7-30.
- , 1993 *Nihyaku gojyūkkai no kenkyū I: Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 14* 二百五十戒の研究 I: 平川彰著作集14. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Hiraoka (Satoshi) 平岡聡, 2002 *Setsuwa no kōkogaku* 説話の考古学. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Ishii (Kōsei) 石井公成, 2014 “Sangoku buppō dentsū shikan no kōzai: sōgo kōryū suru ajia bukkyō no shiten kara 三国仏法伝通史観の功罪—相互交流するアジア仏教の視点から.” In: *Kōkyō suru tōhō no chi: kanbun bunkaken no rinkaku (chi no yūrashia 5)* 交響する東方の知: 漢文文化圏の輪郭 (知のユーラシア 5), ed. by Horiike Nobuo 堀池信夫 et al. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin 明治書院, 57-82.
- de Jong (J.W.), 1975 *Bukkyō kenkyū no rekishi* 仏教研究の歴史, trans. by Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Kajiyama (Yūichi) 梶山雄一, 1983: *Kū no shisō: Bukkyō niokeru kotoba to chinmoku* 空の思想: 仏教における言葉と沈黙. Kyōto: Jinbunshōin 人文書院.
- Kanaoka (Shōkō) 金岡照光, 1978: *Bukkyō kanbun no yomikata* 仏教漢文の読み方. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Kamata (Shigeo) 鎌田茂雄, 1981 *Hasshūkōyō: Bukkyō wo shinni yoku shirutameno hon* 八宗綱要: 仏教を真によく知るための本. Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社.
- Kawaguchi (Kōfū) 川口高風, 1981 “‘Zagu kenshō roku’ wo meguru ronsō 『坐具顕正録』をめぐる論争.” In: *Kairitsu shisō no kenkyū* 戒律思想の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店, 583-628.
- Maeda (Egaku) 前田恵学, 1975 “Nihon ni okeru kindai bukkyōgaku 日本における近代仏教学.” *Zen kenkyūsho kiyō* 禅研究所紀要. No. 4 & 5, 349-353.

- Mori (Shōji) 森章司, 2013 *Sanga to ritsuzō shokitei no keisei katei: genshibukkyō seiten shiryō niyuru shakusonden no kenkyū 18 (kiso kenkyū hen VIII)* サンガと律藏諸規定の形成過程: 原始仏教聖典資料による釈尊伝の研究18 (基礎研究編 VIII). Tokyo: Chūogakujyutsu kenkyūsho 中央学術研究所.
- Mizutani (Kōshō) 水谷幸正, 1981: “Kankoku bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu shisō 韓国仏教における戒律思想.” In: *Kairitsu shisō no kenkyū* 戒律思想の研究, ed. by Sasaki Kyōgo 佐々木教悟. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平樂寺書店, 439-478.
- Mizutani (Hayashi) (Kana) 水谷 (林) 香奈, 2015: “Dōrin (Tonrin) shūsen ‘Yugaron ki’ ni tsuite: Ki sen ‘Yugaron ryakusan’ tonon kankei kara.” 道倫 (遁倫) 集撰『瑜伽論記』について: 基撰『瑜伽師地論略纂』との関係から. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教学研究64 (1) 186-191.
- Nagai (Makoto) 長井真琴, 1922 *Konpon butten no kenkyū* 根本仏典の研究. 東京: Tenchi Shobō 天地書房.
- Nishimoto (Ryūzan) 西本龍山, 1930 *Kokuyaku issaikyō: ritsubu 8: Makasōgiritsu* 国訳一切経・律部 8: 摩訶僧祇律. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- , 1933 *Kokuyaku issaikyō: ritsubu 19: Konponsetsuissaiibu binaya* 国訳一切経・律部19: 根本説一切有部毘奈耶. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Ōchō (E'nichi) 横超慧日, 1958 *Chōgoku bukkyō no kenkyū* 中國佛教の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館.
- Okumura (Hiroki) 奥村浩基, 2000 “‘Binaya’ to ‘Jūjuritsu’ 『鼻奈耶』と『十誦律』.” *Pārigaku bukkyō bunkagaku* パーリ学仏教文化学 Vol. 14, 69-77.
- Pruden (Leo M.), 1994 *The Essentials of the Eight Traditions by Gyōnen: Translated from the Japanese by Leo M. Pruden / The Candle of the Latter Dharma by Saichō: Translated from the Japanese by Robert Rhodes*. (BDK English Tripiṭaka: 107-1, 3) Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Rhi (Juhung) 2003 “Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism: An Assessment of the Visual Evidence,” *The Eastern Buddhist* XXXV, 1&2, 152-201.
- Saigusa (Mitsuyoshi) 三枝充恵, 1996 Nakamura Hajime 中村元 & Saigusa Mitsuyoshi 三枝充恵, *Baudda: bukkyō* バウツダ: 仏教 (Reprint). Tokyo: Shōgakkan 小学館.
- Sakaino (Kōyō) 境野黄洋, 1928 *Kairitsu kenkyū: kokuyaku daizōkyō, furoku* 戒律研究: 国訳大藏経・付録. Tokyo: Kokumin Bunko Kankōkai 国民文庫刊行会.
- Sasaki (Kyōgo) 佐々木教悟, 1981 “Indo oyobi tōnan ajia no bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu shisō インドおよび東南アジアの仏教における戒律思想.” In: *Kairitsu shisō no kenkyū* 戒律思想の研究.
- , 1985 *Kairitsu to sōgya: indo, tōnan ajia bukkyō kenkyū* 戒律と僧伽: インド・東南アジア仏教研究 I. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平樂寺書店.
- Sasaki (Shizuka) 佐々木閑, 1999 *Shukke toha nanika* 出家とは何か. Tokyo: Daizō

Shuppan 大蔵出版.

- , 2015 “Daini ketsujū kiji ni okeru ‘Makasōgiritusu’ no tokushu sei: naze jūji ga arawaretainoka 第二結集記事における『摩訶僧祇律』の特殊性: なぜ十事が現れないのか.” *Indogaku chibettogaku kenkyū* インド学チベット学研究19, 1-30.
- Satō (Atsushi) 佐藤厚, 2009 “Sakaino Kōyō no ‘Hashhūkōyō’ kaisetsu ni tsuite 境野黄洋の『八宗綱要』解説について.” *Sakaino Kōyō senshū dai nana kan: Hashhūkōyō kōwa* 境野黄洋選集第七卷: 八宗綱要講話. Tokyo: Ushio Shoten Shinsha うしお書店新社, 611-648.
- Satō (Mitsuo) 佐藤密雄, 1963: *Genshi bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū* 原始仏教教団の研究. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林.
- Satō (Tatsugen) 佐藤達玄, 2008 *Shibunritsu biku kaihon; Shibun bikuni kaihon* 四分律比丘戒本; 四分比丘尼戒本. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Sueki (Fumihiko) 末木文美士, 1996 *Nihon bukkyōshi: Shisōshi toshiteno apurōchi* 日本仏教史: 思想史としてのアプローチ. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.
- , 2004 *Kindai nihon to bukkyō: kindai nihon no shisō, saikō II* 近代日本と仏教: 近代日本の思想・再考 II. Tokyo: Toransubyū トランスビュー.
- Takai (Kankai) 高井観海, 1940 “Daijō hōen girinshō 大乘法苑義林章.” In: *Kokuyaku issaikyō: shoshūbu 2* 国訳一切経・諸宗部 2. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Tamura (Enchō) 田村圓澄, 1986 *Bukkyō denrai to kodai nihon* 仏教伝来と古代日本. Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社.
- Tamura (Kōyū) 田村晃祐, 2005 *Kindai nihon no bukkyōsha tachi: haibutsukishaku kara bukkyō ha doutachinaottanoka* 近代日本の仏教者たち: 廃仏毀釈から仏教はどう立ち直ったのか. Tokyo: Nihonhōsōshuppanyōkai 日本放送出版協会.
- Tokuda (Myōhon) 徳田明本, 1974 *Risshū bunken mokuroku* 律宗文献目録. Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑.
- Ueda (Tenzui) 上田天瑞, 1938 *Kokuyaku issaikyō: ritsubu 7: Jyūjyuritsu* 国訳一切経・律部 7: 十誦律. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Ueda (Reijō) 上田靈城, 1975 “Kamakura bukkyō ni okeru kairitsu no shūhaka 鎌倉仏教における戒律の宗派化.” *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 112, 1-29. (Reprinted in *Kairitsu no sekai* 戒律の世界, 703-734).
- Yamada (Kaijō) 山田契誠, 1925 “Kōritsu no seiritsu ni tsuite 広律の成立について.” *Mikkyō kenkyū* 密教研究18, 71-96.
- Yoshikawa (Kōjirō) 吉川幸次郎, 2006 *Kanbun no hanashi* 漢文の話. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房.