1. INTRODUCTION

1. Chinese Buddhism and Sutra Commentaries

Buddhist texts began to be translated into Chinese around the mid-second century A.D., and as a result it became possible for the Chinese to study Buddhism through the medium of the Chinese language. The Buddhist canon may be broadly divided into scriptures (sūtras), treatises (abhidharma) and precepts (Vinaya), and as the study of Buddhism gradually advanced, commentaries began to be composed on works belonging to each of these three divisions. There already existed in China a long tradition of commentarial writings on the Confucian classics, and this tradition may have stimulated the composition of commentaries on Buddhist texts. This commentarial literature, which flourished especially from the Northern and Southern dynasties (Nanpeichao 非北朝) period through the Sung and T'ang 唐 dynasties, was such that it even surpassed in both quantity and quality commentaries on the Confucian classics produced during the same period.

Among Buddhist texts, the sūtras were the most suited to the study of Śākyamuni's thought, and so the greatest energy was devoted to composing commentaries on the sūtras. In addition, there was also a strong tendency, probably influenced by the above-mentioned native Chinese commentarial tradition, for Chinese Buddhists to give expression to their thought while adhering to the format of a scriptural commentary rather than by composing an independent work.

For example, in the case of Hui-yiian慧遠 (503–592) of Ch'ing-ying-su 上青亭寺, T'ien-t'ai T'ai-shih Chih-i 天台智者吉智 (538–597) and Chia-hsiang T'ai-shih Chi-tsung 智神通天和尚 (549–623), known as the "three great Dharma-masters of the Sui," commentaries on the sūtras account for a considerable proportion of their writings. In the case of Chi-tsung we find that, among the twenty-five works that he wrote, eighteen were commentaries on the following eleven Mahāyāna sūtras: Avatamsaka-sūtra, Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra, Śrīmālādevīśivārasana-sūtra, Saṃyaktattāsāsana-sūtra, Larger Sahāvatīvyūha, Kuan wu-liang-chou ching 観無量寿経, 87
2. Chinese Commentaries on the Lotus Sutra

It goes without saying that the Lotus Sutra has been widely revered in India, China and Japan as a sūtra representative of Mahāyāna Buddhism, and in China it was translated as the *Ching-fa-luo ching* (Sutra of the Flower of the True Dharma) in 286 by Chu Fa-hu (Dharmarākṣa; born ca. 230, died at age of 78). But because his translation was difficult to comprehend and, more importantly, because the study of Buddhism was at the time centered on Prajñāpāramitā doctrine, it may be said of this translation of the Lotus Sutra that it did not attract the attention of Buddhist circles to any great extent. But when it was subsequently translated anew by Chih-mo-lo-shih 师摩勒什 (Kumārajīva; 344–413 or 350–409) in 406 as the *Miao-fa-luo ching* (Sutra of the Lotus Blossom of the Wondrous Dharma), it finally moved into the limelight, as it were, and came to be widely studied.

The oldest extant Chinese commentary on the Lotus Sutra is the *Miao-fa-luo ching shu* (Commentary on the Sutra of the Lotus Blossom of the Wondrous Dharma) by Chu Tao-sheng (ca. 355–434). Tao-sheng studied under Kumārajīva, and he was highly appraised for his original and penetrating understanding of Buddhism on account of his views supporting the attainment of Buddhahood by *ichantika* (ichan-kei 一乘 mixing of diverse tones) and sudden enlightenment (am-ku 倚鴻). The version of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* in 6 fascicles introduced to China by Fa-hsien (Tao-hsien 大衍玄) expressed a negative attitude towards the attainment of Buddhahood by the lowly class of people called *ichantika*, but Tao-sheng, in spite of being criticized for going against the purport of the sūtra, nevertheless maintained in anticipation of the thought of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* in 40 fascicles translated by Tan-wu-nieh (Tao-pen-tien ching 大般說法會) that the *ichantika* was also endowed with Buddha-nature and would eventually attain Buddhahood; fur-
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thermore, asserting that Buddhist truth was indivisible and unitary, he also criti-
cized the theory of gradual enlightenment (chien-su 眞理), according to which this truth was realized in partial and gradual stages, and he maintained that it was only a question of whether one was enlightened or not.

Next there appeared the Fa-hua i-chi 法華注 (Commentary on the Lotus Sutra) by Fa-yün 法頤 (467–529) of Kuang-chai-sū 光宅寺, which was however not actually written by Fa-yün, but recorded by one of his disciples. Fa-yün was one of the “three great Dharmas-masters of Liang 端,” along with Chi-tung 智通 (438–522) and Seng-min 善敏 (467–527), and his exegesis of the Lotus Sutra was held in high regard throughout the Northern and Southern dynasties period (5c.5), from the era of contention in the early fifth century between the Sung 隋 dynasty (420–479) in Chiang-nan 長南 in the south and the Northern Wei 北魏 dynasty that unified northern China until the reunification of the Northern and Southern dynasties by Emperor Wen 文帝 of the Sui 厲 in 589. Fa-yün’s eminence was such that when interpreting the term ‘wondrous Dharma’ (miao-fa 微法) in his Fa-hua i-chi (Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sutra), Chi-li wrote, “all of the past and present interpretations, that of Fa-yün of Kuang-chai 光宅 is generally considered to be the best” (Taishō Ed., Vol. 33, p. 691c), and, treating Fa-yün’s interpretation as representative of earlier interpreta-
tions, made him the target of his criticism.

As for Chi-li himself, there is ascribed to him, in addition to the above Fa-hua kai-i, an annotated commentary on the Lotus Sutra entitled Fa-hua chen-chi 法華文例 (Textual Commentary on the Lotus Sutra), but neither of these two works was in fact written by Chi-li, and they are said to be based on notes of Chi-li’s lectures taken by his disciple Chang-an 章安 Tseng-ting 善通 (561–610), who later edited his notes and thus brings these two works to completion. As will be discussed below, an epoch-making study of their compilation has been made by Hira Shun’sei 洪市 (10).

Chi-tung, who is known for having completed the formulation of the doctrines of the San-lun 三論 or “Three Treatises” school (which attached greatest impor-
tance to Nagarijuna’s Madhyamaka-kārikā and Dharmakirti’s-lātāma and the Sāntāna-lātāma by his disciple Aryadeva), was the most prolific of the commentators on the Lotus Sutra, writing the Fa-hua kai-i (Profound Meaning of the Profunda-
dity of the Lotus Sutra), Fa-hua tu-ho 法華論演 (Commentary on the Lotus Sutra), Fa-hua yu 圓法華會 (Elucidation of the Lotus Sutra) and Fa-hua i-chi (Synopsis of the Lotus Sutra).

Lamby, Tsung-tsu Tsung-chi 梁末大师 (632–682) of the Fa-shang 仏山 school composed the Fa-hua i-chi (Synopsis of the Profundity of the Lotus Sutra).

The above figures were all Buddhists of renown in the history of Chinese Bud-


II. RESEARCH HISTORY

In the following I shall present a survey of the research that has been undertaken hitherto on the representative commentaries of the *Lotus Sutra* alluded to in the foregoing section. I shall, however, take up for consideration only studies that have been published in book form.


The aim of this work is to determine Nichiren’s position in the history of *Lotus* (or *Lotus Sutra*-oriented) thought and to examine his own thought and religion, and in order to accomplish the former of these two objectives the author examines the thought associated with the *Lotus Sutra* in India and China. That which concerns us here is Part 1, Section 3, dealing with *Lotus Sutra* thought in China. The contents of this section are as follows:

Chapter 1: The Period Prior to the Establishment of Orthodox *Lotus* Thought

1. The Views of Chù Fa-hu and His Disciples on the *Lotus Sutra*
2. The Views of Chù-mo-lo-shih and His Disciples on the *Lotus Sutra*
3. The Views of Fa-yün of Kuo-lang-chai-shu on the *Lotus Sutra*
4. The Views of Ch'ien-hsiang Ta-shih Chi-tang on the *Lotus Sutra*

Chapter 2: The Establishment of Orthodox *Lotus* Thought

1. The Views of T'ieh-chü Ta-shih Ch'i-hsü on the *Lotus Sutra*
2. The Views of Mia-ho Ta-shih Chu-jan 影東弘願 on the *Lotus Sutra*
3. The Views of Sên-ming Tsun-chê Chih-li 四明淨輝 on the *Lotus Sutra*

Chapter 3: The Emergence of Subsidary *Lotus* Thought

1. The Views of T'ou-en Ta-shih K'uei-chi 杜恩師開智 on the *Lotus Sutra*
2. The Views of Hsien-shou Ta-shih Fa-tsang 象首法藏 on 象首法藏’s interpretation of the *Lotus Sutra*
3. The Views of San-tsang Shan-wu-wei 三藏善五衛 and Ta-kuang-chih 他光智 on the *Lotus Sutra*
4. The Views of Pu-kung 大雲公 on the *Lotus Sutra*
tsang were considered to belong to the "period prior to the establishment of orthodox Lotus thought," and interpretations differing from that of Chih-i, such as those of Chi of the Fa-hsuan school, Fa-tsang and Ch'eng-kuan of the Hua-yen school, and Shun-su-wei (Subhakarashipha) and Puk-tung (Amogha-vajra), both known as translators of Esoteric Buddhist scriptures, are dealt with collectively as "subsidiary Lotus thought." One distinctive feature of the method adopted by Yamakawa in treating of the views of Chinese Buddhists on the Lotus Sutra was to examine their respective interpretations of important doctrinal points expounded in each of the twenty-eight chapters of the Lotus Sutra. Yamakawa must be given credit for his achievement in having surveyed for the first time the various interpretations of the Lotus Sutra found in China. In addition, there is still much that merits our attention today in his observations on these diverse interpretations of the Lotus Sutra and in his understanding of individual thinkers. But his view that Chih-i's interpretation represented the orthodox interpretation, as a result of which he set less value on other interpretations, was not necessarily based on an objective comparison of Chih-i and the other commentators, and there is no denying the impression that his comments do at times tend towards the extreme. In particular, given that it has now been demonstrated by Hirai Shun'ei (see (10) below) that there is considerable evidence of the influence of Chi-tiang's commentaries in the Fa-hua hsiian-i and Fa-hua wei-chi compiled by Kuan-ting, Yamakawa's examination of Chit-tang is outdated when considered in the light of the current state of research. Furthermore, since he deals with the views of a considerable number of people on the Lotus Sutra within the space of only a limited number of pages, his presentation as a whole assumes the character of a very general outline.

(2) Kusaka Daichi 但下大智, Taijōka shisshin—Hokke gengi tsukō artists' discount—法華玄教思想 (A guide to T'ien-t'ai studies: An exposition of the Fa-hua hsiian-i). Kyoto: Kökyō Shoin 華教新書, 1956 (repr. Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華園, 1976). This work is an exposition of the content of the Fa-hua hsiian-i as a whole.

(3) Shioda Gisen 塩田義真, Hokke kōgakushi no kenkyū 法華教育史の研究 (A study of the history of Lotus doctrine). Tokyo: Chūbō Shoin 集英社書院, 1960. This work resembles that by Yamakawa Chih (11); in that it too is a study of the history of Lotus Sutra thought in India, China and Japan. The contents of Part 2 ("History of Studies in China "), the section relevant to the subject of research on Chinese commentaries of the Lotus Sutra with which we are concerned here, are as follows:

Chapter 1: Chinese Translations and the Study of the Lotus Sutra
1. Chinese Translations of the Lotus Sutra
2. An Overview of Studies on the Lotus Sutra
Chapter 2: Early Chinese Commentators
1. Tao-sheng’s Fa-hua ching shu
2. Fa-yin’s Fa-hua t’ieh

Chapter 3: The Period of the Revelation of the True Meaning of the Lotus Sutra
1. The Doctrines of Nar-yeob Hu-i-suh 南岳慧思
2. T’ien-t’ai Chih-i’s Three Main Works on the Lotus Sutra

Chapter 4: The Period of Exchange with Exoteric Buddhism
1. San-hun Chi-tsang’s Commentaries on the Lotus Sutra
2. Fa-hsien K’uei-t’ai’s Fa-hua k’uan-tao
3. Hsia-yen Wot-hyo 元曉的Fa-hua t’ang-shen 華嚴宗要 (Essentials of the Lotus Sutra)

Chapter 5: The Period of Exchange with Exoteric Buddhism
1. I-hsien 阿含的Te-hih ching shu 大日經綫 (Commentary on the Mahayavacchini-Ksiamsodhi-sutra)
2. Pu-kung San-tsang’s Fa-hua kuan-chik i-hai 法華心機儀軌 (Ritual Manual for [Attaining] the Wisdom of the Lotus Sutra)

As is evident from the above table of contents, Shiota’s perspective is the same as that of Yamakawa insofar as he considers Chih-i’s three main works to have revealed the true significance of the Lotus Sutra. This book still merits reference today, in that Shiota summarizes in succinct terms the views of each thinker on the Lotus Sutra, but his presentation as a whole is inevitably introductory in nature. As regards the relationship between Chih-i’s three main works and Chi-tsang’s commentaries, the comments made on Yamakawa’s study apply in this case too.


This work essays a textual critique of all works ascribed to Chih-i himself or traditionally considered to represent records of his lectures, and it is a study that broke fresh ground in the history of research on T’ien-t’ai doctrine. Part 3 ("A Study of the Three Main Works of the T’ien-t’ai School") examines in detail the process whereby Chih-i’s three main works were compiled, and Satō points out links between the Fa-hua kuan-chik and Chi-tsang’s Fa-hua kuan-hun and between the Fa-hua wu-ho-chi and Chi-tsang’s Fa-hua kuan-hun and Fa-hua i-shou. But as is noted in Hirai’s criticism discussed below, Satō does not go far enough in clarifying the manner in which Kuan-tan composed the Fa-hua wu-ho-chi by referring to and modelling himself on Chi-tsang’s commentaries.

This is a volume of collected papers, and the papers relating to the subject under consideration here are Ōchō Enichī, “Chūgoku ni okeru Hokke shiō shi” (China on the Lotus thought in China) [Part 1, Chapter 3], and Andō Toshibo 広徳道夫, “Hokeyō to Tendai kyōgaku” (Hokeyō and Tendai dogma) [Part 2, Chapter 2, Section 1].

In Section 1 (“Lotus Doctrine at the Time of Chiu-mo-lo-shih’s Translation”) in the former of these two papers Ōchō deals very briefly with the views of Kumārajiva, Sēng Shō-sō 信祥, Chu Tao-sheng, Tao-jung, and Hui-kuan 隋顗 on the Lotus Sūtra; this is because he deals in greater detail with this subject in (7) below. In Section 3 of the same paper (“The Study of the Lotus Sūtra in China”), Ōchō examines the views of Fa-yün, Chi-tsaing, Chi-hai, and K’uei-chi on the Lotus Sūtra. His presentation is on the whole of a general, introductory nature.


This is a volume of collected papers, and it contains a number of papers relating to the subject under consideration here. English summaries of the papers are appended to the end of the volume, and I shall accordingly give only the English titles of the relevant papers (with some minor emendations).

Part 1


Chapter 2: Ōchō Enichī, “Chu Tao-sheng’s View on the Lotus Sūtra.”

Chapter 2: Tamura Yoshirō 塚村義郎, “Fa-yün’s Fa-hua i-chi.”

Chapter 3: Satō Tetsuei, “The Fa-hua hsin-i and Fa-hua ten-i-chi.”

Chapter 4: Satomi Taichō 齊見雄雄, “Chi-tsaing’s Fa-hua ch’ing hsin-lun.”

Chapter 5: Marruyama Takao 马山達雄, “Chi-tsaing’s Fa-hua i-chi.”

Chapter 6: Hirakawa Akira 平川昭, “Tao-hsuan’s translation and the Lotus Sūtra.”

Chapter 7: Suguro Shinjirō 杉浦信平, “K’uei-chi’s Fa-hua hsin-tsan.”

Chapter 8: Hibi Nobumasa 二比直正, “Chan-jan’s Fa-hua wen-i-chen lun 法華論五種論.”

Chapter 9: Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘克, “Chi-hui’s Fa-hua ch’ing wen-ch’ieh 法華論釋解.”

Chapter 10: Asai Endō 浅井英道, “Chi-hai 黄海’s Fa-hua ch’ing hui-i 法華 綱要義.”

This is a volume of collected papers and contains two papers relating to the subject under consideration here, "Jiku Denshu Hôkôjô shi no kenkyû" [The Study of Chu Tao-shêng's Fa-hua chêng shu] and "Hôkô kyôgaku ni okeru bushin mûki setsu" [The Theory of the impermanence of the Buddha's body in Lotus doctrine].

The former paper is divided into two parts, which the introduction, entitled "Chu Tao-shêng's Philosophical Background," consisting of the following six sections:

1. Chu Tao-shêng's Philosophical Status
2. The Study of the Chêng-fa-hua chêng during the Eastern Chin Period
3. The Buddhist Studies of Chih-tsun Fa-hua in Chiang-nan
4. The Buddhist Studies of Tao-an in Ch'ang-an
5. The Views of Hui-yuan ans [Chiu-mo-jô-shih] on the Lotus Sûtra
6. The Views of [Chiu-mo-jô]-shih's Disciples on the Lotus Sûtra

The main body of this paper, entitled "Chu Tao-shêng's Fa-hua chêng shu," consists of the following nine sections:

1. The Origins of the Organization and Composition of Tao-shêng's Commentary
2. Doctrinal Organization
3. The Ultimate Implications of the Lotus Sûtra
4. The Interpretation of the Title
5. The Subdivision of the Text
6. The Understanding of Its Diction
7. The Theory of the Three Carta, and the One Vehicle as an Expedient Means
8. The Meaning of Longevity and the Ninon-sûtra
9. Conclusion

This paper constitutes the most reliable study of Tao-shêng's Fa-hua chêng shu, and as such it has served as a firm base for subsequent research by other scholars. Its exposition of the views of Kâmarâja and his disciples on the Lotus Sûtra may also be considered to retain its value even today.

The second paper noted above deals with Fa-yüan's views that the Buddha's body as described in the Lotus Sûtra is impermanent in nature and that the eternity of the Buddha's body was first expounded in the Mahâyâna Mahâyâna Sûtras and with Chih-tsang's and Chih-lo's criticism of these views. Ochô's treatise is very much to the point and laid the foundations for subsequent research on this subject, but more detailed studies have now appeared.

This work contains a discussion of the different ways in which the text of the
Lotus Sūtra was subdivided in China, and it also deals with various interpreta-
tions of the concept of the One Vehic le. In content it is of an introductory
nature.

Maruyama Takao 大山孝雄, Hikkisōgyō kan'yō jennyū—Kichiō ni okuru
jōō to tenkai (An introduction to the
study of Lotus doctrine: Its acceptance and development in the case of Chi-

As is indicated by the subtitle, this work brings together the author’s research
on Chi-tsan’s commentaries on the Lotus Sūtra. Since the amount of research
on Chi-tsan’s commentaries prior to the publication of this volume was by no
means substantial, it may be considered to have greatly stimulated subsequent
research. Chapter 2 of the “Introduction” contains a convenient overview of
previous research on Chi-tsan’s commentaries on the Lotus Sūtra entitled “The
Study of Chinese Lotus Doctrine in Modern Japan: With a Focus on Chi-
tsan.” The main body of the book is divided into two parts, and Part I (“The
Acceptance and Development of the Idea of the Integration of Three Vehicles
into One Vehicle in the Lotus Sūtra”) consists of the following six chapters:

Chapter 1: A Summary of Chi-tsan’s Conception of the Integration of
Three Vehicles into One Vehicle in the Lotus Sūtra

Chapter 2: The Five Vehicles and Three Inductions in the Fa-hua houan-
hua

Chapter 3: The Five Vehicles and the Three Herbs and Two Trees in the
Chapter “Parable of Medicinal Herbs”

Chapter 4: The Theory that the One Vehicle is True and the Two Vehicles
are Provisional and the Theory that the One Vehicle is True and
the Three Vehicles are Provisional in the Fa-hua i-shu

Chapter 5: The Inclusion of the One Vehicle in the Three Vehicles and
Exclusion of the One Vehicle from the Three Vehicles in the Fa-hua yu-i

Chapter 6: The View of the Buddha’s Body in the Fa-hua yu-i

Part 2 (“Various Questions in the Study of Lotus Doctrine”) consists of four
chapters and the chapters of relevance here are as follows:

Chapter 2: Chi-tsan’s View of the Three Periods [of the True Dharma,
Imitative Dharma and Latter Dharma] and the Subsequent Five Hun-
dred Years

Chapter 3: The Concept of the Last [Days of the] Dharma and the
Subsequent Five Hundred Years in China

This book closes with an annotated Japanese translation of the Fa-hua yu-i (in the
traditional kasodō 仏話 style).

The objective of this work is to demonstrate that the Fo-hua wen-chü, counted among the three main works of the T'ien-i school, was composed after Chih-i's death by his disciple Kuang-ting, who heard himself completely on Chi-tsang's Fo-hua hsüan-lun and Fo-hua i-shu, to which he referred and on which he modelled the Fo-hua wen-chü. The text-critical study of Chih-i's writings had been initiated by Satō Tetsuet (see (4) above), but it was still not totally free of the constraints of sectarian loyalties and it had not been sufficiently thorough-going as textual criticism per se. But as a result of Hirai's study, the dependence of the Fo-hua wen-chü on Chi-tsang's Commentaries was fully elucidated. Since this work represents an epoch-making study of the relationship obtaining between Chih-i's and Chi-tsang's Commentaries on the Lankā Sūtra, I shall discuss it in some detail. The table of contents is as follows:

Chapter 1: Chih-i and Chi-tsang's Commentaries on the Sūtras
Chapter 2: Various Problems concerning Chih-i's Commentaries on the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa
Chapter 3: The Fo-hua hsüan-lun and Fo-hua hsüan-lun
Chapter 4: The Meaning of the Four Methods of Interpretation Employed in the Fo-hua wen-chü and Chi-tsang's Four Methods of Interpretation
Chapter 5: Quoted Works Found in the Fo-hua wen-chü and Fo-hua i-shu
Chapter 6: Accounts of Chi-tsang Found in 'Shōshin's Hokkeka shiki

Part 2: Criticisms of the Compilational Background and Tradition of the Fo-hua wen-chü
Chapter 1: Compilational Background of the Fo-hua wen-chü
Chapter 2: Textual Editions of the Fo-hua wen-chü
Chapter 3: Problems concerning the Analytical Breakdown of the Sūtra
Chapter 4: The Meaning of the Four Methods of Interpretation Employed in the Fo-hua wen-chü and Chi-tsang's Four Methods of Interpretation

Chapter 1: Introduction: Chih-i and Chi-tsang—Problems Surrounding Their Commentaries on the Sūtras
Chapter 1: Chih-i and Chi-tsang's Commentaries on the Sūtras
Chapter 2: Various Problems concerning Chih-i's Commentaries on the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa
Chapter 3: The Fo-hua hsüan-lun and Fo-hua hsüan-lun
Chapter 4: The Meaning of the Four Methods of Interpretation Employed in the Fo-hua wen-chü and Chi-tsang's Four Methods of Interpretation
Chapter 5: Quoted Works Found in the Fo-hua wen-chü and Fo-hua i-shu
Chapter 6: Accounts of Chi-tsang Found in 'Shōshin's Hokkeka shiki

Part 2: Criticisms of the Compilational Background and Tradition of the Fo-hua wen-chü
Chapter 1: Compilational Background of the Fo-hua wen-chü
Chapter 2: Textual Editions of the Fo-hua wen-chü
Chapter 3: Problems concerning the Analytical Breakdown of the Sūtra
Chapter 4: The Meaning of the Four Methods of Interpretation Employed in the Fo-hua wen-chü and Chi-tsang's Four Methods of Interpretation

In Chapter 1 of Part 1 Hirai criticizes Satō Tetsuet's study of the commentaries on the Vajracchedika Prājñāpāramitā ascribed to Chih-i and Chi-tsang and puts forward a new view. It is believed that the Ching-lang pen-ch'i ching sha 金輪普照經 (Commentary on the Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra) in 1 fascicle ascribed to Chih-i was not actually composed by Chih-i, and when it is compared with the
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Chapter 2 deals with Chih-i's commentaries on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra* (Wei-mo ching hsian-shu 繇摩怨玄疏 [Profound Commentary on the *Vimala-sūtra*: 6 fasc.] and fascicles 1–25 of the *Wei-mo ching wen-shu 繇摩怨文疏 [Annotated Commentary on the *Vimala-sūtra*: 28 fasc.]), to which great importance has been traditionally attached since they have been regarded as representative of the few works actually composed by Chih-i. In 598, the year following Chih-i's death, they were presented by Kuan-tsing and Pu-ming 明普 to King Kuo of Chin 唐武宗 (who later became the emperor Yang-ti 奉明帝), and since Chih-tang, who was then in Ch'ang-an, would have written his commentaries on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra* (Ching-ming kuan-tsean 聖徵論 [Treatise on the Profundity of the *Vimalakirti-sūtra*: 8 fasc.]; *Wei-mo ching lian-shu 繇摩怨論疏 [Brief Commentary on the *Vimala-sūtra*: 5 fasc.] and *Wei-mo ching tsu-shu 繇摩怨論疏 [Commentary on the *Vimala-sūtra*: 6 fasc.]) no earlier than 599, it is properly speaking inconceivable that there should be evidence of any influence of Chih-i's commentaries in Chih-i's commentaries. But given that Chih-i himself expected his disciples to make additions and corrections to his commentaries and that there is a strong possibility that Kuan-tsing and Chih-tang met in Ch'ang-an, it is possible that there may be evidence of influence of Chih-i's commentaries in Chih-i's commentaries, and when the commentaries of both are compared, it is in fact possible to discover a number of passages in Chih-i's commentaries, although few in number, where reference has been made to Chih-tang's commentaries. By this means Hirai seeks to demonstrate that even Chih-i's commentaries on
the Vimalakirtideva-sutra are not untouched by the general tendency evident in Chih-i's \textit{sutra} commentaries, namely, the tendency to be marked by the influence of Chi-tsang's commentaries.

Chapter 3 deals with the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i}, a work which according to the later traditions of the T'ien-t'ai school represents either a record of notes taken by Kuan-ting of lectures given by Chih-i on specific dates at specific places or a record of Chih-i's lectures to which Kuan-ting added his own views. But according to Hirai the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i} is of a totally different character, and he entertains strong suspicions that the entire work was composed by Kuan-ting himself and that Chih-i played no part whatsoever in its composition. As is discussed below, Hirai entertains similar suspicions in regard to the \textit{Fo-hua teh-chi}, and in that latter instance they are fully borne out by his arguments. But in the case of the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i} they are not adequately proven and remain no more than suspicions. He ascertains the influence of the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-lun} on the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i}, already pointed out by earlier scholars, and also discusses fresh evidence of this influence, demonstrating that the section "Introducing Old Interpretations" among the four sections on "Revealing the Essence of the \textit{Lotus Sutra}" in the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i} was composed on the basis of the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-lun}. But since these sections that have come under the influence of the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-lun} constitute but a small portion of the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i} as a whole, one is forced to conclude that Hirai's suspicions have not been adequately proven.

In Chapter 1 of Part 2 Hirai summarizes the results of his research on the compilation of the \textit{Fo-hua teh-chi}. Kuan-ting himself states that he heard Chih-i lecture on the \textit{Lotus Sutra} only once at Chih-ling 金陵 (Chien-yeh 埀樂) when he was 27 years old (387) and that he later revised his notes at the age of 69 (629), thus producing the \textit{Fo-hua teh-chi}. When compared with the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i}, however, the \textit{Fo-hua teh-chi} contains in its extant form an incomparably larger number of passages that were written on the basis of Chi-tsang's \textit{Fo-hua huiian-lun} and \textit{Fo-hua i-shu}. The text of the \textit{Fo-hua teh-chi} was, moreover, made public only in 629, considerably later than the \textit{Fo-hua huiian-i}, and it is also known that Kuan-ting's revised text of the \textit{Fo-hua teh-chi} was so confused that Ts'ui-hsi Hsien-lang 謝先朗 (673-754) had to reedit it.

On the basis of the above facts, Hirai conjectures that the stance of Chih-i, a revolutionary practitioner of rare genius whose expositions of the \textit{Lotus Sutra} were marked by pithiness and profoundness, would have been in direct contrast to that of the traditional expositors of the \textit{sutra}, whose expositions were always literal, and he therefore suggests that Chih-i himself did not in fact give any lectures expounding the \textit{sutra} text word-by-word or, if he did, it would have been only in a very incomplete form. If this should have been so, it then becomes possible to explain the reasons for the considerable delay in the compilation of the \textit{Fo-hua teh-chi} and for the marked influence of Chi-tsang's commentaries. Hirai also
makes the bold suggestion that Kuan-ting waited until after the death of Chi-tsang (625), author of the Fa-hua hsin-lun and Fa-hua s-su on which the Fa-hua wen-chi is totally dependent, before making public the text of the Fa-hua wen-chi.

As for Kuan-ting’s motivation in compiling the Fa-hua wen-chi, Hirai perceives here a strong desire on the part of Kuan-ting to exalt the achievements of Chih-i, a revolutionary practitioner of rare qualities, by further attributing to him the status of a traditional sūtra commentator. In addition, Hirai also speculates that Kuan-ting himself wrote only a part of the extant text of the Fa-hua wen-chi and that it may have been revised and expanded by later scholars.

In Chapter 2 Hirai collates the Ming edition of the Fa-hua wen-chi, used as the base text of the Taishō edition, with the Hōryūji manuscript (also referred to by the editors of the Taishō edition) and the manuscript formerly kept at Ishiyama-dera 伊勢寺 and thought to date from the early Heian 平安 period (with only fasc. I extant), and he presents some fresh material based on his collation of fascicle 1.

Chapter 3 deals with the subdivision of the text of the Lotus Sūtra as presented in the Fa-hua wen-chi, where it is divided into the essential teachings (phāna-bhāsā 大論), and trace teachings (chi-sen 措述), both of which are further subdivided into an introductory section, a main section and a closing section. Hirai suggests that this method of subdivision is not based on Chih-i’s exposition, but was devised anew by Kuan-ting with reference to Chi-tsang’s Fa-hua s-su, and he also makes the comment that it is not as logically consistent as Chi-tsang’s subdivision of the text.

In Chapter 4 Hirai examines the four methods of interpretation: employed in the Fa-hua wen-chi (phāna-bhāsā 大論教, sūtra-chi-zai-chi 釈教教, phāna-bhāsā 大論教 and kiun-hin-chi 金輪經), maintaining that as methods of scriptural exegesis they have neither universality nor validity, and he suggests that when one takes into account the similarities between the basic ideas behind these methods of inter- pretation and Chi-tsang’s fourfold interpretation, consisting of sūtra-zai-chi 釈教教 (ordinary interpretation based on literal meaning), phāna-bhāsā 大論教 (interpretation focusing on the relative relationship between one concept and another and on their interdependence), kiun-hin-chi 金輪經 (interpretation that presents by means of concepts the ultimate truth transcending conceptual understanding) and au-fang-chi 無方教 (interpretation that takes cognisance of the free play of ultimate truth from the standpoint of ultimate truth), there is a possibility that they were formulated by Kuan-ting under the influence of Chi-tsang.

In Chapter 5 Hirai compares the work quoted in the Fa-hua wen-chi with those quoted in the Fa-hua hsin-lun and, pointing out that not only do both works share a considerable number of sources, but there are also many identical passages quoted in both works, he suggests that this too is the result of the author of the Fa-hua wen-chi having referred to the Fa-hua hsin-lun.
Chapter 6 deals with the Hakkatsu shiki 楽楽疏記 (Private Notes for a Commentary on the Lotus Sutra) by the Japanese scholar Hōeisai 依水作真 (12th cent.—early 13th cent.), and, noting that this work refers to Chi-tsing's Fa-hua 傳法華経论, Hirai points out that Shōbun 時賢 levels severe criticisms at Miao-lèi 妙師蘭若's Ta-shih Chan-jen 破壊大智論僧 (711–782) for having presented errorneous interpretations in his Fa-hua unh-chi 作為 傳法華無上論诠释 (Notes on the Fa-hua unh-chi) as a result of his failure to refer to the Fa-hua kōan-lun. Part 3 constitutes the central part of Hirai's book, and in Section 1 he compares parallel passages in the Fa-hua unh-chi and Fa-hua kōan-lun and demonstrates that the Fa-hua unh-chi was written after the model of the Fa-hua kōan-lun, while in Section 2 he compares parallel passages in the Fa-hua unh-chi and Fa-hua i-shu 傳法華三部, and similarly demonstrates that the Fa-hua unh-chi was written with reference to the Fa-hua i-shu too, although its dependence on the Fa-hua i-shu is not as great as its dependence on the Fa-hua kōan-lun. As a result of Hirai's research, it has now become necessary to undertake careful comparisons with Chi-tsing's commentary on the Lotus Sutra when studying Chi-tsing's Fa-hua unh-chi, and this is greatly facilitated by the fact that Hirai's book presents all the material from Chi-tsing's commentary on which the Fa-hua unh-chi draws.

This work presents the original text of fascicle 1 of the Fa-hua kōan-lun together with a rendition in the traditional kantoku style, a modern Japanese translation, and notes, and an exposition of its content.

This is a volume of collected papers, and those of relevance here are the following papers dealing primarily with Chi-tsing's commentary on the Lotus Sutra:
1. A Consideration of the Formation of Chi-hsing Ta-shih's Concept of 'Two Canonical Divisions'
2. Chi-hsing Ta-shih's Ideas on Doctrinal Classification
3. The Development of Chi-hsing Ta-shih's Ideas on Doctrinal Classification
4. The Compilation and Revision of Chi-hsing Ta-shih's Sutra Commentaries

This work represents a study of Chi-tsang's Fa-hua hsien-lun. Part 1 ("Study") consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 ("The Compilation of the Fa
hua hsien-lun") surveys the history of the study of the Lotus Sutra prior to Chi
tsang and discusses the stance and methodology of Chi-tsang's commentary in the Fa-hua hsien-lun. Chapter 2 ("The Fa-hua hsien-lun and Fa-hua jhi-chi") fo
cuses on the criticism of Fa-yuín's Fa-hua jhi-chi in the Fa-hua hsien-lun, and Hirai discusses in particular Chi-tsang's criticism of Fa-yuín's view that the first half of the Lotus Sutra reveals the cause and the second half reveals the effect and his criticism of Fa-yuín's view that the Buddha's body as described in the Lotus Sutra is impermanent. Chapter 3 ("The Transmission of the Fa-hua hsien-lun") is a study of the transmission of the Fa-hua hsien-lun in the Japanese Sanron 三論 school (corresponding to the Chinese San-lun school). In Chapter 4 ("The Fa
hua hsien-lun and Subsequent Commentaries on the Lotus Sutra") Hirai examines the influence of the Fa-hua hsien-lun on Wōn-hyō's Fa-hua t'ang-yao, Chi's Fa-hua hsien-lun and Shōtoku Taisi's 大師 Taisō's Hōktō gishō (Commentary on the Lotus Sutra). Chapter 5 ("The Text of the Fa-hua hsien-lun") describes the various manuscripts of the Fa-hua hsien-lun.

Part 2 ("Annotated Translation") presents the text of the first four fascicles of the 10 fascicles of the Fa-hua hsien-lun together with a Japanese translation in the traditional kana style and notes. In particular, the elucidation in the notes of sources quoted in the Fa-hua hsien-lun is the result of considerable effort on the part of the author and will be of great benefit to future researchers.

(14) Young-ko Kim, Tao-shêng's Commentary on the Lotus Sutra: A Study and Translation. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990. This work presents a study and annotated English translation of Tao-shêng's commentary on the Lotus Sutra. Since Tao-shêng's commentary has not yet been translated into modern Japanese, this represents its first rendition into a modern language. There has already appeared, however, a Japanese translation in the traditional kana style (Sanbô Bukka Komyôji, Tokyo: 三箇文化研究会年報, Nös. 9 (1976) and 12 (1979)), and a single-character concordance has also been recently published privately by Okuno Mitsuyoshi 岡野光賢 and Hareyama Skinkei 玉山鑑 monk (July 1992). The table of contents of Kim's work is as follows:

Part I: Introduction
Chapter 1. Tao-shêng's Prehistory: The State of Buddhist Studies in China
Chapter 2. Tao-shêng's Biography
Chapter 3. Tao-shêng's Works
Chapter 4. Tao-shêng's Doctrines
Chapter 5. Tao-shêng's Influence and the Impact of His Doctrines

Part II: A Critical Study of Tao-shêng's Commentary on the Lotus Sutra
Among the studies of Chinese commentaries on the Lotus Sutra, I have in the above surveyed representative works that have been published in book form. Lastly, I wish to comment briefly on the present state of research as reflected in annotated translations of the representative commentaries on the Lotus Sutra.

As noted above, an English translation and single-character concordance of Tao-sheng's commentary have already been published (14)). As for Fa-yüan's Fa-hua t'ieh, there has not yet appeared even a kundoka-style translation, and when one considers the extent of the influence exerted by this work on the commentaries by Chi-tang and Chi-hi-i, it is to be hoped that an annotated translation and study will be published soon. In regard to the Fa-hua t'ieh-chi, there has appeared only a kundoka-style translation, while in the case of the Fa-hua hsiin-lun there have appeared in addition to a kundoka-style translation an annotated translation of fascicle 1 in modern Japanese (11)) and an annotated English translation of the final third of fascicle 1b and all of fascicle 2 (15)). As for Chi-tang's Fa-hua hsiin-lun, there has appeared an annotated kundoka-style translation of the first 4 fascicles (11)), while in the case of the Fa-hua yu-i a kundoka-style translation is available, and there have already appeared translations of the Fa-hua yu-i in both modern Japanese and kundoka style with notes (15 and 16). There has not, however, appeared even a kundoka-style rendition of the Fa-hua T'ung-luh, and among Chi-tang's commentaries this is the commentary about which there is the least amount of research available. It is

Chapter 6. Tao-sheng and the S`.a`damaprapa`ntaka
Chapter 7. Literary Aspects
Chapter 8. Central Ideas
Chapter 9. Traces of Tao-sheng's Doctrines
Chapter 10. Conclusions
Part III: Translation

This work contains an annotated English translation of part of the Fa-hua hsiin-lun (from towards the end of fascicle 1b [Taišō Ed., Vol. 33, p. 691a] to the end of fascicle 2b).

This work presents a translation in modern Japanese of the Fa-hua yu-i together with a rendition in the traditional kundoka style, notes, and an exposition of its content.
to be hoped at any rate that annotated translations and indexes based on sound textual research will eventually be made available for each of these commentaries on the *Lotus Sūtra*.

There have also been published many academic papers dealing with Chinese commentaries on the *Lotus Sūtra*, but space has not permitted me to discuss these here. Recent years have seen a burgeoning of research in Japan on Chi-tsang’s commentaries on the *Lotus Sūtra*, and on this subject reference may be made to the bibliography appended to Hirai Shun’ei (ed.), *San’rō kōgaku no kenkyū* 三論教 学の研究 (Studies in San’rō doctrine; Tokyo: Shunjisha, 1990).

(additional note)