



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **A Transmission and its transformation : the Liqujing shibahui mantuluo in Daigoji**

Hunter, H.J.

### **Citation**

Hunter, H. J. (2018, September 26). *A Transmission and its transformation : the Liqujing shibahui mantuluo in Daigoji*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/65999>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/65999>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/65999> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Hunter, H.J.

**Title:** A Transmission and its transformation : the Lijujing shibahui mantuluo in Daigoji

**Issue Date:** 2018-09-26

**CHAPTER THREE: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAIGOJI LIQUJING  
MANTULUO AND THE MANDALAS OF THE MATRIX AND ADAMANTINE REALMS  
(GENZU MANDARA) OF THE SHINGON SCHOOL**

**INTRODUCTION**

We have now demonstrated that the Daigoji *Liqujing shibahui mantuluo* is not based on Amoghavajra's *Liqushi*.<sup>1</sup> Chapter Three will extend our inquiry by attempting to identify generic features in the iconography of the Daigoji exemplar. We will then discuss the relationship between these features and the visual and textual traditions upon which they are based, and so clarify the historical context of the iconography. We will pay particular attention to divergences from Amoghavajra's prescriptions in the *Liqushi* and to the development of the qualitatively different iconographic type present in the Daigoji *Liqujing shibahui mantuluo*.

As we have seen, the notes appended to the Kanchi'in set of mandalas by Genkaku match the iconography of the figures in the Daigoji exemplar. These notes serve to identify some of the sources of this iconography.

Although the Kanchi'in set of the *Liqujing mantuluo* that survive today are line drawings in black ink on paper, Genkaku appears to be discussing a *colored* Daigoji set of mandalas in some of his notes.<sup>2</sup> Closer scrutiny reveals that in most of these cases, he is citing descriptions from earlier iconographic writings on the colored versions of the Shingon school's Matrix Realm Mandala (*Genzu taizōkai mandara*) and Adamantine Realm Mandala (*Genzu kongōkai mandara*).

One of these texts, Shunnyū's 淳祐 (890-953) *Taizōkai shichishū* 胎藏界七集 compiled in Enchō 1 延長元年 (923), is the source of the first description of Jālinīprabha and Ratnakūṭa.<sup>3</sup> Shinjaku's 眞寂 (886-927) *Daihi taizō futsū daimandarachū shoson shuji hyōshi gyōsō shōi shosetsu fudōki* 大祕胎藏普通大曼荼羅中諸尊種子標幟形相聖位諸說不同記 (hereafter, *Shosetsu fudōki*) is the origin of the second part of the description.<sup>4</sup> Comparison between the Kanchi'in set of mandalas and the two latter works shows that Shunnyū's *Taizōkai shichishū* is the source for the descriptions of Trailokyavijaya, Ākāśagarbha, Mañjuśrī's attendants, and Brahmā, while Shinjaku's *Shosetsu fudōki* is the basis for the accounts of Sahacittotpādita-dharma-cakra-pravartin, two of Mañjuśrī's attendants, and Mahākāla.<sup>5</sup>

We have no direct evidence that Genkaku consulted a colored version of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo*, and the notes, which record the colors of the figures, their mudrās, and their attributes, clearly derive from these two earlier works.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the iconography in Genkaku's notes, which matches that of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo*, corresponds on the whole to the iconography of the Shingon school's set of the tradition of the Matrix Realm and Adamantine Realm Mandalas (*Genzu mandara*) that Shinjaku and Shunnyū discuss in their texts.<sup>7</sup> Thus, as far as we know, Genkaku never used a colored Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo* and took all his information on colors from secondary sources. Nevertheless, Genkaku referred to these two earlier works *because* the iconography of the Daigoji exemplar was identical to that of the Shingon school's *Genzu mandara*.

## AN EXPLANATION OF THE COMPARATIVE MATERIALS

The matches between the iconography of the Daigoji *Liqujing shibahui mantuluo* and that of the Shingon school's *Genzu mandara* recorded in a number of Shingon sources support the contention that the *Genzu mandara* was the iconographic source of the Daigoji exemplar.

In the *Shosetsu fudōki* Shinjaku outlines the differences between the iconography of the “revealed illustration” 現圖 (*genzu*), a “certain illustration” 或圖 (*aruzu*), a “mountain illustration” 山圖 (*sanzu*), and occasionally an “Engakuji illustration” 圓覺寺圖 (Engakuji zu). The “mountain illustration” can be identified as the matrix mandala of the Tendai school.<sup>8</sup> There has been a long scholarly dispute over the identification of the “certain illustration” and “Engakuji illustration,”<sup>9</sup> but Scroll 1 of the *Shosetsu fudōki* confirms a connection between Kūkai 空海 (774-835) and the *Genzu*.<sup>10</sup> In Shinjaku's work, the term *Genzu* thus designates the matrix mandala that Kūkai received from his Chinese Master Huiguo 慧果 (746-805) during his stay in Chang'an in 805.<sup>11</sup> The term *Genzu mandara* was not used in Kūkai's time.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, *Genzu* eventually came to include both the mandalas of the matrix and the adamantine realm (as known as the Mandala of the Nine Assemblies of the Adamantine Realm) that Huiguo transmitted to Kūkai.<sup>13</sup>

The *Shosetsu fudōki* records the iconography of the first generation of copies of the colored set of mandalas that Kūkai introduced to Japan; that is, the set that was made in Kōnin 12 (821).<sup>14</sup> Shinjaku noted the minutest details of color and pose in his comparison of the iconography of the *genzu*, the *aruzu* and the *sanzu* versions of the matrix mandala.<sup>15</sup> These descriptions correspond, on the whole, to the iconography of the figures in the Omuro wood-block version 御室版 (1869) of the matrix mandala.<sup>16</sup> Since it is reliable, clear, and easily accessible, I will be referring below to the Omuro printed version of the *Genzu mandara*, which includes the mandalas of the matrix and adamantine realm.<sup>17</sup>

I will also refer to the *Bizangji* 祕藏記 (Record of the Secret Treasury), a work whose author and date are controversial, as I present in this chapter. This document contains the earliest discussion of the iconography of the Shingon school's *Genzu mandara*. The *Bizangji*'s iconographic descriptions of the figures of the Mandala of the Nine Assemblies of the Adamantine Realm and Matrix Mandala and their positions as diagrammed in the appended illustrations of these two mandalas<sup>18</sup> correlate with the iconography and positions of the figures recorded in Shinjaku's *Shosetsu fudōki* and Shunmyō's *Ishiyama shichishū*, as well as the Omuro wood-block printed version. In fact, in his *Kongōkai shichishū* Shunmyō quotes the *Bizangji* material on the appearance and positions of the Venerables throughout his entries on the *Kongōkai mandara*.<sup>19</sup>

Finally, I will be consulting Tendai materials. Tendai monks Ennin and Enchin both recorded in their inventories copies of the matrix mandala and the mandala of the adamantine realm.<sup>20</sup> In a number of Tendai sources the mandalas that have been examined are called the *zenbon* 前本 and the *kōhon* 後本,<sup>21</sup> an apparent reference to the temples on Hieizan where the original exemplars were kept.<sup>22</sup> There are correspondences between the iconography of the *Genzu taizōkai mandara* as described in the Shingon sources cited and that of the *zenbon* in the Tendai works.<sup>23</sup>

To sum up, although its names differ in Shingon and Tendai sources, in the Heian period both schools used a mandala whose iconography corresponds to that of the present-day version of the Matrix Realm and Adamantine Realm (*Genzu mandara*) that Kūkai received from his Chinese

master, Huiguo. Thus, the *Genzu mandara*, the main iconographic source of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo*, was not the sole preserve of the Shingon school.<sup>24</sup>

### COMPARISON OF THE *GENZU MANDARA* AND THE DAIGOJI *LIQUJING MANTULUO*: THE MIXING OF VARIANT ESOTERIC BUDDHIST ICONOGRAPHICAL SYSTEMS

The substitution of the iconography of the *Liquhui* 理趣會 (Guiding Principle Assembly) of the *Genzu kongōkai mandara* for that of the Vajrasattva Mandala (fig. 2, *T. Zuzō*, vol. 5, 3044, p. 777, No. 2) in the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo* supports the contention that Amoghavajra's *Liqushi* is not the sole source for the latter.<sup>25</sup> There are occasional inconsistencies where elements of earlier visual traditions appear, but it is clear that the *Genzu mandara* was the primary source for the iconography of the Daigoji exemplar, with the *Genzu taizōkai mandara* the most important secondary source. These sources are used in two main ways. The first is by depicting the Daigoji exemplar's figures according to the iconography used in either or both; the second, by juxtapositioning their iconographies within individual Daigoji mandala or occasionally among sets of mandalas.

In the Daigoji exemplar, the figures of Mahāvairocana and three of the Eight Great Bodhisattvas — Vajrasattva, Avalokiteśvara and Ākāśagarbha — are represented by iconography derived from both the *Genzu taizōkai* and the *Genzu kongōkai mandara*. All other figures in the Daigoji exemplar, with the single exception of that of Īśāna, draw exclusively on one or the other of the sources, either the *Genzu taizōkai mandara* or the *Genzu kongōkai mandara*.<sup>26</sup>

Another fundamental trait of the Daigoji exemplar's iconography is the conspicuous presence of iconographic elements from the *Genzu taizōkai mandara*. The figure of Mahāvairocana, who forms the Mudrā of Meditation in the Opening Assembly Mandala (fig. 1, *T. Zuzō*, vol. 5, 3044, p. 776, No. 1), is the most obvious instance. This mudrā, which is not prescribed in the *Liqushi*, identifies Mahāvairocana in all the versions of the matrix mandala in the Sino-Japanese tradition. There are a number of other examples that show an unmistakable iconographic influence from the *Genzu taizōkai mandara*.<sup>27</sup>

Analysis of the iconography of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo* thus reveals that those figures that do not correspond to the prescriptions in the *Liqushi* match, with few exceptions, the iconography of the figures in the *Genzu mandara*. Further, the Daigoji iconography includes iconographic elements that clearly derive from the *Genzu taizōkai mandara*. The result is a different iconography than that which Amoghavajra prescribes in the *Liqushi*. Finally, and most important, the mixing of the iconography of the *Genzu kongōkai* and *Genzu taizōkai mandara* and the juxtaposition of the iconography of the Opening Assembly Mandala (No. 1, fig. 1) with that of the Mahāvairocana Mandala (fig. 3, *T. Zuzō*, vol. 5, 3044, p. 778, No. 3) demonstrates a concerted effort to link the iconography of the *Genzu kongōkai* and the *Genzu taizōkai mandara*.

### HISTORICAL CONTEXT IN TANG CHINA

The generic distinction between the iconography in the *Liqushi* and that of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo* is that the first lacks and the second incorporates the iconography of the Shingon school's Matrix Realm Mandala (*Genzu taizōkai mandara*), juxtaposing iconography from the Matrix Realm and Adamantine Realm Mandalas (*Genzu taizōkai* and *kongōkai mandara*) and elements derived from the Matrix Realm (*Genzu taizōkai mandara*) in a work ostensibly devoted

to a text in the lineage of the Adamantine Realm. These features provide clues to the historical context for the iconography of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo*.

In the following pages I will outline the different concerns of the Chinese masters Amoghavajra, his disciple Huiguo and Huiguo's second-generation disciple Faquan 法全 (active mid-to late ninth century), to demonstrate three points:

- 1) The ideology of the nonduality of the two transmissions of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and their accompanying mandalas postdates Amoghavajra.
- 2) This unified ideology was established during Huiguo's lifetime and was propagated by his immediate disciples.
- 3) The rites of the matrix and the accomplishment of special powers (*susiddhi*) were of major concern to Faquan.

The last of these had a particular influence on the iconography of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo* and so will be discussed in a later chapter.

Although the Shingon school states that the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* is the source of their Matrix Realm Mandala (*Genzu taizōkai mandara*), and the first chapter of the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* is the source of their Mandala of the Adamantine Realm (*Genzu kongōkai mandara*), these texts do not supply all of the iconography we find in these mandalas. As we have noted, the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* provides only the general concept of the main figures of its matrix mandala, which is expounded in its second chapter, the *Rumantuluo juyuan zhenyan pin*.<sup>28</sup> Vajrabodhi's *Jingangding yuqie zhong luchu niansong jing* 金剛頂瑜伽中略出念誦經, a manual for rites concerning the adamantine realm, and Amoghavajra's *Jingangding yuqie zhenshi dajiaowang jing* 金剛頂瑜伽真實大教王經, which translate only a part of the first of the four chapters of the Sanskrit *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha*, give no more than an outline of the mandala of the adamantine realm, recording the positions, mudrās and the symbolic forms of the figures in this mandala while providing no further details.<sup>29</sup>

### **Amoghavajra and the Ideology of the Nonduality of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha***

The Japanese art historian Ishida Hisatōyō 石田尚豊 argues in his *Mandara no kenkyū* 曼荼羅の研究 that the sources of the iconography of the Shingon Mandala of the Adamantine Realm (*Genzu kongōkai mandara*) are the *Shewuai dabeixin datuoluoni jing jiyifa zhongchu wuliang yi nanfang manyuan butuoluo haihui wubu zhuzundeng hongjingli fangwei ji weiyi xingsezhichi sanmoye biaozi mantuluo yigui* 攝無礙大悲心大陀羅尼經計一法中出無量義南方滿願補陀落海會五部諸尊等弘誓力方位及威儀形色執持三摩耶標幟曼荼羅儀軌 (hereafter, the *Shewuai yigui*) and the *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing* 法華曼荼羅威儀形色法經. Ishida accepts these two ritual manuals as works that were translated by Amoghavajra. He is correct to the extent that these two manuals provide descriptions of the figures that are found in the central assembly (*Jōjin'ne*) of the Shingon school's Mandala of the Adamantine Realm, as well as those that appear in the school's Matrix Realm Mandala.<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, Mochizuki Shinkō, the compiler of the *Bukkyō daijiten*, conjectures that the mandala described in the *Shewuai yigui* is based on the Shingon *Genzu mandara*, and that the text was composed after the composition of

these two mandalas.<sup>31</sup> In neither case would it be possible to accept Amoghavajra as responsible for these two texts. I agree with this implied conclusion, for three reasons.

First, the attribution of the *Shewuai yigui* and the *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing* to Amoghavajra is poorly supported. The two texts are not included in a list of translations and compositions that Amoghavajra himself drew up in the eleventh month of 771 and presented to the Chinese Emperor Daizong 代宗 (r. 762–779) to be entered into the imperial catalogue of Buddhist texts.<sup>32</sup> They do not appear in the *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋經目錄 that Amoghavajra's disciple, the monk Yuanzhao 圓照 (719–800), compiled in the late eighth century.<sup>33</sup> They are absent from the inventories of the articles that the eight Heian pilgrim-monks 入唐八家 (*nittō hakke*) brought back, and are not found in the Tendai monk Annen's (841–915?) *Shoajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku* 諸阿闍梨真言密教部類總錄, a recapitulation of all the inventories, both official and unofficial, of these early pilgrims.<sup>34</sup> This long, unbroken silence suggests that the texts were Chinese works composed after Amoghavajra's death.

Second, there are a number of differences between the *Shewuai yigui* and the *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing* and the ritual manuals Amoghavajra listed in the inventory of translations and compositions that he presented to the Chinese emperor.

- Amoghavajra's ritual manuals are characterized by the description of the phases of a rite for which he explains the mudrās that are to be formed, the mantras that are to be chanted and the mandalas that are to be envisioned, as well as a description of the spiritual and material benefits that will accrue from the performance of the rite. These features are absent in both the *Shewuai yigui* and the *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing*.<sup>35</sup>
- Both the *Shewuai yigui* and the *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing* conflate in their mandalas deities from the two major Esoteric Buddhist mandalic traditions and this conflation is not found in Amoghavajra's ritual manuals. The iconography for many deities in the mandalas prescribed in these two manuals matches that of the deities in the *Genzu mandara*. Moreover, the way the material from from these two manuals is used might be taken as evidence that both of them were composed after the creation of the *Genzu mandara*.<sup>36</sup>
- Certain features of the mandalas in the *Shewuai yigui* and the *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing* sometimes contradict the directions that Amoghavajra gives in his ritual manuals. For instance, the placement of Mahāvairocana in the mandala described in the *Shewuai yigui* is very unusual. Mahāvairocana, the Buddha from whom the cosmos emanates in the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha*, is placed to the east of the southern gate in the mandala's second court (T.1067:131b-132b). He is paired with Bodhisattva Ratnapāramitā from the *Genzu kongōkai mandara* and together they attend on Ratnasambhava, the Buddha of the south in the *Genzu kongōkai mandara*. Thus, he is subordinate to the four Buddhas of the four directions, who are placed in each of the four gates of this court, a feature not found in any of Amoghavajra's works.<sup>37</sup>
- The *Shewuai yigui* exhibits inconsistencies between text and iconography that seem unlikely in a work from his hand. There are, for example, discrepancies between the contents of the concepts explicated in the first part of this work and the iconography of the accompanying mandala. Inconsistencies are seen in the members of the Five Families, the rites they preside over and the mandala's iconography.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, it is doubtful that Amoghavajra authored these texts because they use concepts that are found nowhere in his attested writings. For instance, the concepts of Principle 理 (*li*) and Wisdom 智 (*zhi*) and their allocation, first to the left and right hands (Bodhisattva Sahasrabhuja-Avalokiteśvara's primary pair of hands [Principle and Wisdom] forms the Mudrā of Entering Meditation 理智入定印 [T.1067:130b15]) and then to the Matrix Mandala and the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm, given in the introduction of the *Shewuai yigui*, are not found in any of his other ritual manuals.<sup>39</sup>

We have noted that the traditions of the matrix mandala and the mandala of the adamantine realm — the texts they are based on, and the ritual practices associated with them — evolved separately in India. On the other hand, the *Shewuai yigui* confirms that in Chinese Esoteric Buddhism after Amoghavajra the two mandalas came to be seen as a unit symbolized by such concepts as Principle and Wisdom. That is, the two were brought into one system in which they enjoyed equal status. Ishida claims that this process was initiated by Amoghavajra. However, as I have shown, the attribution of these two texts to Amoghavajra can hardly stand. Hence, a different source for this interpretation will have to be found, and the traditional dating of the process will have to be revised.

To sum up, one feature of the mandalas described in the *Shewuai yigui* and *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing* that points to a date after Amoghavajra's time is the mixing of iconographies from the Mandalas of the Matrix and Adamantine Realms.<sup>40</sup> The intent to set side by side the iconographies of these mandalas that characterizes the iconography of the Daigoji exemplar of the *Liqujing mantuluo* also indicates a date of composition after Amoghavajra.

### **Huiguo's Transmission of the Paired Mandalic Realities Recorded in the Writings of His Disciples**

Visual and documentary evidence suggests that the Chinese monk Huiguo, a disciple of Amoghavajra, was the first to pair the two major Esoteric Buddhist mandalas. It was during his career that the two independent traditions of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and their accompanying mandalas came to be interpreted as a single, comprehensive unit. The iconography of the present day Shingon set of *Genzu mandara*, whose prototype dates to the late eighth century, as well as the transmission that Kūkai, whom the Japanese Shingon school claims as their founder, said he inherited from his Chinese master Huiguo, corroborates the existence of this new interpretation.

Whereas Ishida Hisatōyō and other Shingon scholars identify Amoghavajra as the founder of the tradition of paired mandalas, the late Buddhologists Mochizuki Shinkō, Ōmura Seigai and Toganoo Shōun state that the transmission of the two mandalas as a set began with Huiguo. Contemporary Buddhologists accept the attribution to Huiguo.<sup>41</sup> Because there are no writings that can with certainty be assigned to Huiguo, these scholars have cited specific writings by Kūkai as evidence for the content of Huiguo's transmission.<sup>42</sup> The above-mentioned scholars argue that the common denominator of these works is *liangbu* 兩部 (*J. ryōbu*). This term refers to the “dual categories,” the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and their accompanying mandalas, and a closer examination of these writings reveals that Kūkai employs the term “dual categories” numerous times to describe the content of Huiguo's transmission. The term “dual categories” signifies that the teachings of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and their mandalas were seen as a two-part unit.



In view of the importance attached to the figure of Huiguo, whose thought and activities seem to exemplify a new stage in the Sinification of the Esoteric Buddhist teachings, it will be necessary to re-examine the references to Huiguo in Kūkai's writings. I will start with the *Shōrai mokuroku*, a memorial that Kūkai wrote directly upon his return from China and presented to Emperor Heizei in 806. Hence, it is a dated text, the first in which Kūkai refers to the contents of Huiguo's transmission. Here, Kūkai uses the term "dual categories" to characterize the teachings of the Esoteric Buddhist tradition that he inherited from Huiguo:

I was fortunate enough, thanks to the compassion of the great master, a national teacher of great merit, to study the great methods of the dual categories 兩部之大法 [of the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and *Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi sūtra* and their mandalas] and to learn the yoga practices of the many Venerables.<sup>43</sup>

In specifying the religious items that he brought back from China Kūkai once again employs the term "dual categories":

I have now imported the teachings of the Adamantine Vehicle, which is contained in more than one hundred texts, and the ocean-like assemblies [of Venerables who are depicted in their physical forms] in the great mandalas of the two categories 兩部大曼荼羅海會.<sup>44</sup>

In the same text the term "dual categories" also defines the content of the transmission that Huiguo tells Kūkai he had received from Amoghavajra:

I [Huiguo] got to study the secret mudrās of the great methods in two categories 兩部大法祕密印契. As for the rest of his disciples, whether monk or laity, some studied the great teaching in one part 一部大法 and some got [to learn] one mudrā of one Venerable 一尊一契, but they did not get to learn them all [as I did].<sup>45</sup>

The term "dual categories" occurs again in a passage of the *Shōrai mokuroku* where Huiguo urges Kūkai to return to Japan to propagate the esoteric teachings,<sup>46</sup> and eight times in the biography of Huiguo in Kūkai's *Fuhōden* 付法傳,<sup>47</sup> four of these in the section dealing with the transmission Huiguo received from Amoghavajra.<sup>48</sup> A passage from Amoghavajra's last testament and a memorial that Huiguo presented to the Chinese Emperor Daizong in 775 immediately follows.<sup>49</sup> Inserted between these two quotations in the *Fuhōden* is another statement that contains the term "dual categories":

[Among] the three thousand [disciples] of Confucius there were four of virtuous conduct. [Among] Broad Wisdom [Amoghavajra]'s several ten thousands [of disciples] there were eight [who received] formal acknowledgment of [his transmission]. Among them seven obtained [instruction and initiation in] the one category of the Adamantine Realm 金剛界一部. [Huiguo of] Qinglong[si] obtained concurrently the position of teacher of the dual categories 兩部師位.<sup>50</sup>

Kūkai also excerpts the *Datang shendu Qinglongsi Dongtayuan guandingguoshi Huiguo Asheli xingzhuang* 大唐神都青龍寺東塔院灌頂國師慧果阿闍梨行狀 (Account of Conduct of Master Huiguo, the Consecration Teacher of the Nation of the Hall of the Eastern Stupa of Qinglongsi in Chang’an of the Great Tang), which was written by Huiguo’s Chinese disciple Wu Yin 吳愨,<sup>51</sup> in which the term “dual categories” occurs another three times.<sup>52</sup> However, a comparison of Wu Yin’s account of Huiguo’s transmission with that given in the *Datang Qinglongsi sanzhaogongfeng Dade xingzhuang* 大唐青龍寺三朝供奉大德行狀, another biography of Huiguo by an unknown compiler, reveals discrepancies.<sup>53</sup> The most significant of these is that the term “dual categories” is not used in the *Datang Qinglongsi sanzhaogongfeng Dade xingzhuang* to describe Huiguo’s transmission. Nevertheless, this term does appear in Wu Yin’s description of the wall paintings that Huiguo had painted in the interior of the Consecration Hall 灌頂堂 and on the walls beneath the Stūpa of the Buddha 浮圖塔.<sup>54</sup> It is this description that scholars cite as evidence of Huiguo’s concrete pairing of the two originally independent mandalas.<sup>55</sup>

In contrast to the biography of Huiguo, where it appears eight times, the term “dual categories” appears only once in the *Fuhōden* biography of Amoghavajra. At the beginning of this biography, Kūkai cites the Chinese sources he used: the *Daizongchao zeng Sikong Dabianzheng Guangzhi sanzang heshang biao zhiji* and the *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu*, both by Yuanzhao. The sentence that contains this term is inserted into a passage from the monk Feixi’s 飛錫 stele biography 碑銘 of Amoghavajra, which is included in Yuanzhao’s *Daizongchao zeng Sikong Dabianzheng Guangzhi sanzang heshang biao zhiji*.<sup>56</sup> It concerns the teachings that a certain Master Samantabhadra imparted to Amoghavajra during the latter’s sojourn in Sri Lanka 師子國. Kūkai’s version of this passage is as follows:

Then, Master [Nāgajñāna 龍智阿闍梨]<sup>57</sup> conferred on him the scripture [composed] in one hundred thousand verses [concerning] the Yoga [methods] of the Adamantine Crown in Eighteen Assemblies 十八會金剛頂瑜伽十萬頌經, the scripture in one hundred thousand verses [concerning the teaching of] Mahāvairocana’s [Mandala Born from the] Matrix Repository of Great Compassion 大毘盧遮那大悲胎藏十萬頌經, secret texts [concerning] mantras and consecrations for the Five Families [of the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm] 五部灌頂真言祕典, as well as [other] scriptures and scholastic discourses 經論 — more than five hundred sacred Sanskrit texts 梵夾 in all. In this way [Amoghavajra] could get all [the sacred works in] this master’s transmission. *He had received all of his instructions concerning the teachings on the great mandalas of the two categories* 兩部大曼荼羅, *as well as on the appearances of the Venerables, and he was not unlike a receptacle [wherein this master’s teachings had been poured without spilling a drop]*.<sup>58</sup>

This account differs in various ways from that found elsewhere.<sup>59</sup> Most important for our purpose here, the term “dual categories” occurs in a sentence that is not found in the original Chinese source, and so is most likely an insertion by Kūkai himself.<sup>60</sup> The term “dual categories” is found frequently in the works of Huiguo’s disciples Wu Yin and Kūkai to define their master’s

transmission, based on the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and the *Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi sūtra*, but it is never seen in the original Chinese biographies of Amoghavajra or Vajrabodhi.<sup>61</sup>

The third work cited as a record of Huiguo's transmission is the *Bizangji* 祕藏記, a compilation with about a hundred entries that explicates Esoteric Buddhist terms and practices. There are two versions of this work: extended and abbreviated. Although the contents are largely identical, the extended version appends descriptions and two illustrations of the Buddhist cosmos that is to be visualized during the ritual phase of the visualization of the sanctuary 道場觀, as well as an enumeration of the figures of the Matrix Mandala and the central assembly of the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm, with illustrations of the positions of the figures.<sup>62</sup> An inscription on this version states that the work was given to an unidentified Japanese pilgrim-monk in 839 by the Chinese monk Wenbi 文秘 of Qinglongsi 青龍寺.<sup>63</sup> Wenbi was a disciple of Yicao 義操, Huiguo's most accomplished disciple, and had received from Yicao initiation into the rite of the Adamantine Realm.<sup>64</sup> This work contains both the phrase "mandalas of the two categories" and the polar pair Principle 理 and Wisdom 智. In fact, the very first entry, in which the main figures and the basic composition of the Shingon school's *Genzu mandara* are explained, is entitled "Mandalas of the Two Categories".<sup>65</sup>

Although this description of the mandalas of the two categories focuses on the most important sections of the Matrix Realm Mandala, omitting the Halls of Mañjurī, Sarvanivāraṇaviṣkambhī, Kṣitigarbha, Ākāśagarbha and Susiddhi and the other eight assemblies of the Mandala of the Nine Assemblies of the Adamantine Realm, the extended version of the *Bizangji* does contain more complete information about the compositions of these mandalas. For instance, in this version, a diagram of the Mandala of the Nine Assemblies of the Adamantine Realm comes shortly after the above-cited passage on the mandalas of the two categories.<sup>66</sup>

As mentioned above, appended to the text of the extended version there is a list of the deities that are depicted in the central assembly of the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm and in the complete Matrix Realm Mandala, and in a note under each deity's name the deity's color, mudrā and, in some cases, distinctive characteristics are given. Diagrams of the two mandalas accompany this enumeration.<sup>67</sup> The *Bizangji*'s description of the features of the deities and their positions in the accompanying diagrams of the mandalas correspond, on the whole, to those in the Shingon *Genzu mandara*, which Kūkai received from Huiguo in 805.<sup>68</sup>

The terms Principle and Wisdom are explained in a number of entries in the *Bizangji* and their nonduality is clarified in one of these entries as follows:

The letter *a* is the seed letter of Vairocana's Dharma Body of Principle and the letter *vaṃ* is the seed letter of the Dharma Body of Wisdom. Principle and Wisdom are not separate from each other. Principle awakens the functioning of Wisdom and Wisdom awakens Great Compassion. Great compassion can be likened to water. The letter *vaṃ* is the seed letter for the element water. Therefore, it is regarded as the seed letter for the Dharma Body of Wisdom.<sup>69</sup>

There are also parts where the terms Principle and Wisdom are allocated to the Matrix Realm Mandala and the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm respectively.<sup>70</sup> However, because a number of passages in the *Bizangji* are direct citations from the *Shewuai yigui* and other works, problems of authorship and date again arise. Although the most recent Japanese scholarship does not agree on the date of the *Bizangji*, it has established that the work was not composed by Kūkai

and that its earliest date may be 839.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, its contents seem to reflect Huiguo's concerns because its explanations center upon the two mandalas whose iconography corresponds to the Matrix Realm Mandala and the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm (*Genzu mandara*) that Huiguo bestowed upon Kūkai.

To sum up, in his presentation of his master Huiguo's transmission in the *Shōrai mokuroku* and the *Fuhōden*, Kūkai gives priority to the “great methods of the two categories” 兩部大法, which he says he inherited from Huiguo. Kūkai's version of the transmission that Huiguo received from Amoghavajra contradicts that given in the *Datang Qinglongsi sanzhaogongfeng Dade xingzhuang*, and so, argue some Japanese scholars, we should accept Kūkai's description of his master's teachings in these works with a degree of caution. Kūkai is legitimatizing his new transmission in the *Shōrai mokuroku* and the *Fuhōden*, and to do this he puts forward an interpretation based solely upon the dual system of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha*, purposely ignoring other, equally important components of the Esoteric Buddhist teachings.<sup>72</sup> Moreover, the *Datang Qinglongsi sanzhaogongfeng Dade xingzhuang* does not contain the term “dual categories” and Kūkai does not use this term to describe Huiguo's transmission in the epitaph he wrote for Huiguo's tombstone.<sup>73</sup>

On the other hand, the germ of Kūkai's system must have originated in the transmission he inherited from Huiguo,<sup>74</sup> and the Matrix Realm Mandala and the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm that he received from Huiguo, and the *Bizangji*, an oral record of the Esoteric Buddhist teachings most likely transmitted by one of Huiguo's second generation disciples, do serve to elucidate the content of Huiguo's teachings.<sup>75</sup> Although there is no solid evidence that Kūkai actually hung the two mandalas up as a pair, his use of the term “dual categories” in many of his memorials, letters and votive texts indicates that he considered them a set.<sup>76</sup> Kūkai's plan for the temple complex of Kongōbuji on Kōyasan was symbolic of the two aspects of Mahāvairocana as represented in the pairing of the Matrix Realm Mandala and the Mandala of the Adamantine Realm,<sup>77</sup> a pairing which, as we have seen, characterizes the transmission of his Chinese master Huiguo. Furthermore, in spite of the questions surrounding the authorship of the *Bizangji*, the pairing of the terms Principle and Wisdom in this work also derives from this transmission. Kūkai uses these polar terms in many of his writings, and although the phrase “the nonduality of Principle and Wisdom” 理智不二 (*richi funi*) that is used in the post-Kūkai Shingon school to characterize their doctrine is not actually found, the underlying assumption is that of their nonduality.<sup>78</sup>

These entries in Kūkai's *Shōrai mokuroku*, *Fuhōden*, and *Shingon fuhōden*, as well as those from the *Bizangji*, thus exhibit a phase in the Sinification of the Indian Esoteric Buddhist teachings characterized by the pairing of the two transmissions of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and their mandalas under the rubric of “dual categories.”

The author and date of the *Shewuai yigui* and the *Fahua mantuluo weiyi xingsefa jing* are difficult to determine, but the content of these two ritual manuals would seem to belong to a phase of the Esoteric Buddhist teachings that were influenced by Huiguo's transmission, as described in the works of Kūkai, in that of Huiguo's Chinese disciple WuYin, and in the *Bizangji*, rather than by that of Amoghavajra. Evidence for this statement will be given in the chapter that follows.

## Faquan and the Rites of the Matrix and Accomplishment of Special Powers

The conflation of the teachings of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha*, the “dual categories,” with the themes of yet another text, the *Susiddhikara sūtra* (Scripture on Effectuating the Accomplishment of Special Powers) marks a further stage in the Chinese interpretation of Indian Esoteric Buddhist doctrines.<sup>79</sup> This development is characteristic of the Esoteric Buddhist teachings of the late Tang period (836–907). The Buddhologist Osabe Kazuo 長部和雄 states that there was in Esoteric Buddhism of the late Tang a revival of the popularity of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and a rediscovery of the *Susiddhikara sūtra*.<sup>80</sup> The *Susiddhikara sūtra* is a collection of ritual practices that the Shingon school regards as ancillary to the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra*, but which Tendai esoteric lineages sees as much more significant. In fact, in the late Tang the *Susiddhikara sūtra*, after undergoing differing interpretations and classifications, assumed a prominent status. Representative of this phase of Esoteric Buddhism in the late Tang is, for example, the teachings of the ninth-century master Faquan, which centered on the rites of the matrix and the accomplishment of special powers (*susiddhi*).

The basic theme of the *Susiddhikara sūtra* is how to bring about the success of Esoteric Buddhist rites. In particular, this text explains the rules for rituals that center on the figures of the Buddha, Padma, and Vajra Families. It gives instructions about all the possible components of these rituals, and the rules are set forth in elaborate detail so as to ensure the success (*siddhi*) of the rites. The rites and accomplishments (*siddhi*) presented in the *Susiddhikara sūtra* are divided into the three grades of high, middle and low. Central to Faquan’s teachings was the concept of the mantras of threefold accomplishments 三種成就眞言. This concept of the mantras of threefold accomplishments has been taken from the *Susiddhikara sūtra*. The mantras, however, are not from the *Susiddhikara sūtra*, as we shall see.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, at some point during the late Tang Dynasty, this scripture came to transcend the distinctions between the teachings and practices of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha*.<sup>82</sup>

The significance of the *Susiddhikara sūtra* in Faquan’s transmission and in Chinese Esoteric Buddhism of the mid-ninth century shows how the categorization of the major Esoteric Buddhist texts has changed since Huiguo and Kūkai. The Chinese monk Haiyun 海雲, a contemporary of Faquan, states in the *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji* 兩部大法相承師資付法記 (Account of the Transmission from Teacher to Disciple of the Great Methods of the Two Categories), his synopsis of the Chinese Esoteric Buddhist system: the Korean Master Hyonch’o [C. Xuanchao] 玄越 transmitted the *Vairocanābhisambodhi* and the *Susiddhikara sūtras* to Huiguo, and Master Huiguo in turn passed on these teachings to a number of disciples, including the Japanese monk Kūkai.<sup>83</sup> On the other hand, Kūkai places the *Susiddhikara sūtra* in a lower category, as a work of Discipline (*vinaya*), in his *Shingonshū shogaku kyōritsuron mokuroku* 眞言宗所學經律論目錄 (Catalogue of Scriptures, Rules of Disciple and Philosophical Treatises for Those Who Study the Mantra Doctrine), listings of essential works that were required reading for Shingon monks.<sup>84</sup> The *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* thus formed the two major categories in the transmission that Kūkai said he received from Huiguo and the *Susiddhikara sūtra* was only a subordinate text.

However, the ranking of the *Susiddhikara sūtra* became higher after Huiguo’s death in 805. In the *Liangbu dafa xiangcheng shizi fufa ji*, Haiyun puts the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-*

*saṃgraha* and the *Vairocanābhisambodhi* and *Susiddhikara sūtras* on the same level as “the great teachings in three categories” 三部大教.<sup>85</sup> The *Susiddhikara sūtra* was central to the Esoteric Buddhist systems that the Tendai monks Ennin 圓仁 (794–864) and Enchin formulated upon their return from Tang China and to subsequent Tendai esoteric lineages. Medieval Shingon treatises record that it also formed an important component of Shūei’s transmission.

## CONCLUSION

Research thus reveals that the iconographic changes evident in the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo* are not contemporary with Amoghavajra’s *Liqushi* but reflect instead the interpretations of later Chinese masters. The systematized ideology of the nonduality of the two transmissions of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and their accompanying mandalas postdates Amoghavajra.

Further, *Liqushi* explanations and mandala prescriptions shed little light on the pronounced role given to the Matrix Realm Mandala (*Genzu taizōkai mandara*) that characterizes the iconography of the Daigoji *Liqujing mantuluo*. The tendency to interpret a text that belongs to the extended corpus of the Eighteen Assemblies of Yoga of the Adamantine Crown in the context of the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* suggests influence from another master. Considering that the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* enjoyed a revival and the *Susiddhikara sūtra* underwent reinterpretations in the late Tang, that the rites of the matrix and accomplishment categories were important to Faquan, and that Faquan transmitted these rites to his Japanese disciples Ennin, Enchin and Shūei, I think we are justified in taking a closer look at Faquan’s transmission, and also examining the iconographic materials brought back by these Japanese monks. Such examinations will be undertaken in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

In the next chapter, Chapter Four, I will argue that despite the presence of elements from the *Vairocanābhisambodhi* and *Susiddhikara sūtras*, the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* and other works in the corpus of the Eighteen Assemblies of Yoga of the Adamantine Crown form the backbone of Amoghavajra’s writings. There is no indication that Amoghavajra saw the *Vairocanābhisambodhi sūtra* and the *Sarvatathāgata-tattva-saṃgraha* as texts of equal importance. In this respect, Huiguo and later masters differed from him markedly, and it is their interpretation that has been passed down to the present day.