

第一部：翻刻

(1:1才)

神社考辨疑叙」

林道春嘗著本朝神社考三篇其係佛氏」

者採拾而附之不合己者議以其私意而肆」

罵詈深妬毒專毀聖賢之徽¹烈以惑庸俗之」

愚情在緇²徒之者見之寧³不深傷哉然尚」

欲才老度命世之人多⁴所憚而不輕以論之」

此篇歷數十年⁵天下橫行繇之間無識之巫』

(1:1ウ)

祝課虛⁶而破古好事之愚俗駕邪而失真⁷」

余也身類犬馬才同夏蟲多⁸癖隱溪架」

餘喘寄禪誦本自⁹雖拙詞筆同遊起事」

述此篇愚¹⁰慝¹¹微管¹²之所闕不得博洽焉寔救」

火之抱薪者也」

¹ Actually, Jakuhon uses an *itaiji* of 徽 (see Mor. V: 13333). The difference between the two is that the *gyōninben* has disappeared. This *itaiji* is not in the font.

² This character {糸+大} is listed in Jakuhon's *Iji-hen* 1:14a as an *itaiji* of 緇. It is not in the font.

³ Actually, Jakuhon uses an *itaiji* of 寧, which is not listed in Morohashi, but can be found in Jakuhon's in *Iji-hen* (1.8b, last row). the *itaiji* is not in the font.

⁴ Actually, Jakuhon uses an *itaiji* of 多 (see Mor. III: 5758), which is not in the font.

⁵ Actually, Jakuhon uses an *itaiji* of 年 (see Mor. II: 2745), which is not in the font.

⁶ Actually, Jakuhon uses an *itaiji* of 虛 (see Morohashi VI: 16321), which is not in the font.

⁷ Actually, Jakuhon uses an *itaiji* of 眞 (see Mor. III: 5968), which is not in the font.

⁸ Jakuhon again uses the *itaiji* (see Mor. III: 5758).

⁹ For the cursive form with which the character is written, see *Sōsho kensaku jiten*, p. 727-f.

¹⁰ This character is an *itaiji* of 懼; cf. Mor. IV: 11004.

¹¹ This character is an *itaiji* of 恥; cf. Morohashi IV: 10587.

¹² The first character, 微, is written somewhat irregularly, but recognizable. The second character is an *itaiji* of 管; cf. *Iji-hen* 1.21a. In the edition we use, there is a handwritten note in the top margin in which these two characters are glossed as 微 and as 筧・学, respectively. To the right of the first character the readings *hi* (= *bi*) and *usushi* ("faint") are added in *katakana*, and to its left, *sukunashi* ("few"). Underneath the other two characters is written *i* (in *katakana*), which stands for 異字 (*iji*) and indicates *variae lectiones*. Apparently, a reader found himself nonplussed by these two characters and made a note. His glosses for the first character are all right, and 学 is all right, too, as an interpretative gloss of 管 in the present context. 筧, however, is definitely a red herring.

正德六丙申仲春日□□雲石堂寂本書』

(1:2才)

神社考辨疑卷上」

社考序曰夫本朝者神國也神武帝¹³已來¹⁴王」

道惟弘○¹⁵中世寢微佛氏乘隙移彼西天之法」

變吾東域之俗王道既衰神道漸廢¹⁶」

□論曰惟本朝自神代及人代荒洪尚矣域」

□絕東海俗无異道神祇靈妙人民淳肅至」

□應神天皇馭寓自百濟儒教來本朝初聞」

□異國之風此知仁義之名爾後歷三百餘』

(1:2ウ)

□年欽明天皇時百濟貢佛像經論此時雖」

□有如物尾興中鎌子者愚執而相怪拒之」

□事賜蘇稻目奉之遂豐聰王子大興國界」

□嚮風夫治病之藥非邑中之產希世之珍」

□出遠異之國物生於異域而利不失¹⁷道出」

□□¹⁸於殊方而化无隔聖道无方神化无外」

□也何其言西天東域法俗之異耶若嫌異」

□域之教則仁義之教不可行於本朝然儒』

(1:3才)

□先來而變本朝何其不自慮耶¹⁹○言王道」

¹³ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 「繼天建極」 at this point.

¹⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 「相續相承。皇緒不絕」 at this point.

¹⁵ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 「是我天神之所授道也」 at this point.

¹⁶ Apart from the omissions noted above, the text agrees with *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365, lines 8-9.

¹⁷ The character in the text is an *itaiji* of 失, which is not in the font.

¹⁸ There is no discernible reason why the beginning of this line is one space lower than the rest.

¹⁹ This part of Jakuhon's reply is almost literally quoted by the Nichiren priest Nichidatsu 日達 (1677-1747) in his *Shinbutsu myōō ron* 神佛冥應論 (pr. 1720); see *Hokke shintō ron* 法華神道論 vol. 1 p. 58-59. In the first three fascicles, Nichidatsu criticisms of Razan's *Jinja-kō* follow the same pattern as Jakuhon's do. Nichidatsu refers to Jakuhon by beginning his quotation with 「雲石堂論曰」 (Unsekidō is one of Jakuhon's other names). He fails to indicate the end of his quotation and continues without indicating this

□既衰神道漸廢者抑不之思聞夫聖人之」
□道也无不善焉佛教為何為者哉其初門」
□以五戒十善導人佛不勸惡大觀以正法」
□順治書不云乎為善不同同歸于治焉²⁰宋」
□文帝謂何尚之曰適見顏延之宗炳著論」
□發明佛法甚為有理若使率土之濱皆令²¹」
□感此化朕則垂拱坐致太平矣向²²之曰百」
(1:3ウ)

□家之鄉十人持五戒則十人淳謹千室之邑」
□百人修十善則百人和睦持此風教以周」
□寰宇編戶億千則善人百万夫能行一善」
□則去一惡去一惡則息一刑²³陛下言坐致」
□太平是也呂夏卿曰小人不畏刑而畏地」
□獄若使天下之人事无大小以有因果不」
□敢自欺其心少²⁴侵凌争奪之風則豈不刑」
□措而為極治之世乎是佛教有裨於²⁵王政』
(1:4才)

with a quotation from *Shoku Nihon kōki* 續日本後紀. Note that Nichidatsu's quotation is part of the item that bears the title *Bidatsu-tei fu heishin jubutsu* 敏達帝不併信儒佛, which Jakuhon discusses below (1:10 才). Just like Jakuhon, Nichidatsu, too, claims that Emperor Bidatsu did not believe in Confucianism by quoting *Sendai kuji hongi taisai-kyō*; cf. Translation, note 93.

²⁰ See *Shujing*: "Charge to Zhong of Cai" 蔡仲之命:「王若曰:『民心無常, 惟惠之懷。為善不同, 同歸于治。為惡不同, 同歸于亂。』」

²¹ This character is not in the original text of Liu Mi 劉謐, *Sanjiao pingxin lun* 三教平心論.

²² The character is unmistakably 向, but in view of the context, and the text of *Sanjiao pingxin lu*, it must be a mistake for 尚.

²³ The passage from 1:3a (宋文帝) to 1:3b (則息一刑) is a quotation from *Sanjiao pingxin lun* (TZ 52, p.786a). The quotation is complete and, apart from the one addition mentioned above, correct.

²⁴ This character is not in the original text of *Sanjiao pingxin lun*; instead, it has '無'.

²⁵ *Bengi* 1:3b, lines 4-8 are also based on *Sanjiao pingxin lun* (TZ 52, p. 786a; the part that immediately follows the preceding), but the quotation is fragmentary. The complete text reads:「一刑息于家。萬刑息於國則陛下所謂坐致太平者。是也。唐李節送沙門疏言序曰。釋氏之教。以清淨恬虛為禪定。以柔謙退讓為忍辱。故怨爭可得而息也。以菲薄勤苦為修行。以窮達壽夭為因果。故淺陋可得而安矣。世降俗偷。不有釋氏以化其心。則勇者將奮而思鬪。智者將靜而思謀。阡陌之人將紛然而群起矣。呂夏卿得入師經曰。小人不畏刑獄而畏地獄。若使天下之人事無大小以有因果。不敢自欺其心。無侵陵爭奪之風。則豈不刑措而為極治之世乎。由是觀之。則釋教之有裨於世教也大矣。又何惡於教之三乎。」

□者古賢之所論可見繇之本朝真化以來」
□世王公卿士傾心遵奉之金刹玉盤櫛峙」
□鎮押國家擊天災消人過人蕩情偽尤仰」
□福田天下太平萬民淳化豈不在此乎」
□本朝自古異域不能相襲若間雖有臣士」
□之爭勢尚奉王者不為奪其位萬民不移」
□安堵所以屬王道之至治也且於神道也」
□自載此篇神社居多中不與佛者不為不』
(1:4ウ)

□鮮佛於神也高以本增以德愈盛愈顯天」
□下神社之盛也孰與其佛法未來以前乎何」
□其言由佛法神道漸廢乎」

又曰以其異端離我難立故設左道之說」²⁶

□論曰佛法來漢者孔子沒已六百年孔子」
□豈指佛法為異端乎²⁷是澆浮儒流之牽」
□強也²⁸朱子等由排病而掩佗之善開住後」
□學欲歸於己後學遂不辨延慶曰後學自』
(1:5才)

□無所燭者未免隨人指呼效而言之喚鐘」
□作甕者也²⁹列子託孔子言聖人西方之聖者」
□出於五帝三皇之上希逸曰非佛而何³⁰昔」

²⁶ Correct and complete quotation from Razan's preface to *Honchō jinja-kō*; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365, line 9-10.

²⁷ Jakuhon here paraphrases parts of the section *Bianming yiduan* 辨明異端 ("Analysis of Heterodox Views") of the second chapter of *Guiyuan zhizhi ji* 歸元直指集 by Zongben 宗本. The complete passage reads: 「漢明帝時佛法纔至中國。孔子已沒六百年矣。是故孔子不見佛法也。既不見佛法指佛何法為異端乎」; see *Wan xinzuan xuzangjing* vol. 61, p. 456b. For the complete text of the essay see Appendix III.

²⁸ This single sentence is Jakuhon's comment. Hereafter, Jakuhon's paraphrases from *Guiyuan zhizhi ji* continue.

²⁹ Jakuhon here again partially paraphrases passages from *Guiyuan zhizhi ji*. The original passages read: 「後學自無所燭者、未免隨人指呼效而言之喚鐘作甕也」 and 「晦菴密設牆塹關、住後學、令後學欲歸於己。是以力排佛也。要顯自己之功、圖掩他人之德」; see *Wan xinzuan xuzangjing* vol. 61, p. 456c.

³⁰ Quotation from *Zhuangzi Juanzhai kouyi* 莊子麴齋口義 ("Juanzhai's vernacular explanation of the

□於薄伽梵前十方神天受其囑奉行佛教」

□如斯尊高之佛教何假神而立耶」

又曰伊弉諾伊弉冉梵語也³¹」

□論曰此言是惑其名不弁和梵愚說也何」

(1:5ウ)

□足論乎夫山包蘭艾人糶³²真贗見艾而惑蘭」

□見贗而擬真其人是免愚耶儒者中自古曲」

□学阿世等之類不可勝計何為儒之醜為孔」

□子之咎乎尚亦積門之廣衍也多々逃役寄」

□活妖贗濫吹之汩³³異解異行之徒何其為」

□佛之醜乎駕浮誕者非公」

又曰日神者大日也³⁴」

□論曰大日者法身智身平等々々徧滿一切」

(1:6才)

□衆生界一切非情界為一切本初号名世所」

□依焉以日之名德為此佛出毘盧疏³⁵曰梵音」

□毘盧遮那者是日之別名也即除暗遍明之」

□義也圓明无际之德世間之日不可為喻但」

Zhuang Zi") by Lin Xiyi 林希逸 (1193-1270). The complete passage runs as follows: 「曰孔子之時、佛法未至中國。孔子知有佛法否。曰孔子曰西方之人有聖者焉。不治而不亂。不言而自信。不化而自行。蕩蕩乎民無能名焉。(出列子等)虞齋林先生曰。此章似當時已有佛之學。托夫子之名而尊之也。西方之人出於三皇五帝之上。非佛而何。」

³¹ Razan writes this, but not as his own opinion. It is his recapitulation of the contents of the *sadō no setsu* 左道之說. Cf. *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365, line 10.

³² The character is Mor. VIII: 27023.

³³ The character is an *itaji* of 流; see Mor. VI: 17205.

³⁴ Razan writes this, but, again, as his description of the contents of the "theory of the Left Way."

³⁵ An incomplete quote from *Tapiluzhena chengfojing su* 大毘盧遮那成佛經疏 1 (TZ 39, p. 579). The complete text reads: 「梵音毘盧遮那者。是日之別名。即除暗遍明之義也。然世間日則有方分。若照其外不能及內。明在一邊不至一邊。又唯在晝光不燭夜。如來智慧日光則不如是。遍一切處作大照明矣。無有內外方所晝夜之別。復次日行閻浮提。一切卉木叢林。隨其性分各得增長。世間眾務因之得成。如來日光遍照法界。亦能平等開發無量眾生種種善根。乃至世間出世間殊勝事業。莫不由之而得成辦。又如重陰昏蔽日輪隱沒。亦非壞滅。猛風吹雲日光顯照。亦非始生。佛心之日亦復如是。雖為無明煩惱戲論重雲之所覆障。而無所減。究竟諸法實相三昧圓明無際。而無所增。以如是等種種因緣。世間之日不可為喻。但取其少分相似故。加以大名。曰摩訶毘盧遮那也」。 *Tapiluzhena chengfojing su* was written by the Chinese Shingon priest Yixing 一行 (683-727).

- 取其少分相似故以大名曰摩訶毘廬遮那也」
- 是天竺善无畏之說唐一行禪師之記也且由竺」
- 墳日出世界在住劫之時日輪大從五十」
- 一由旬乃二千四十里也蓋日本則其量尚」

(1:6ウ)

- 剩繞須弥四州其靈德靈化不可測焉所」
- 以其有異談也本朝之神史自昔儒者称寓」
- 言謂虚誕春之見奈何」

又曰大日本国故名大日本国³⁶」

- 論曰大日者法身如来也修多羅曰无所」
- 從來亦无所去大日又号徧一切處都法」
- 界常寂常照何其以日本一小區為其本国」
- 亦是駕浮說者也」

(1:7才)

又曰³⁷本地佛而垂迹神也」

- 論曰本地之名言出華竺本者本有云非」
- 造成又初也祖也地者借万物能生義一
- 切法无不生自此者也凡世界成住壞空劫」
- 々終始无窮盡本地□□³⁸者乃謂其无始」
- 之无始故謂之本不生際一切本初本地」
- 之言是也本朝神說天先霧地先霧雖言」
- 異相似天成地定化生其中天祖神躬以謂」

(1:7ウ)

- 之垂迹凡神之為事也示迹於人間施化於」
- 万物非其本則不尊非其迹則不同³⁹佛積」

³⁶ The quotation is incorrect on two points; Razan writes 「大日本国故。名曰日本国」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365, line 10.

³⁷ Razan inserts the character 其 at this point; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365, line 11.

³⁸ There is no explanation for the two spaces inserted here.

□无量福智發无量誓願由德本之深構致」
□妙果之尊高若其高妙之境則非凡流之所」
□窺故駕彼福智願行而出化于人間所以諸」
□神之靈妙奇變而負荷无賴⁴⁰之衆生也如」
□一生修德者止乎身則不能垂妙變於世」
□舊事紀古事紀日本紀等所載本朝之神風」
(1:8才)

□不似儒說者可見焉夫鱗介之物不達臯」
□壤之事毛羽之族豈識游流之形耶⁴¹佛法
□之中小機尚不知大衍⁴²況復不談形身視」
□聽之外守文之俗学何知大道耶怪本迹」
□之冥寄者宜哉」

又曰時之王公大人國之侯伯刺史信伏不悟」
遂至令神社佛寺混乱⁴³而不疑⁴⁴」

□論曰昔梁荀濟者武帝之時不得其志上書』
(1:8ウ)

□鄙言詈僧毀佛實知不能排佛僧而假託」
□之諷其无識闇主王大怒將加顯戮濟密⁴⁵」
□逃於魏遂又為惡事見燒殺矣⁴⁶今春其言」
□不遜直指言王公大人者過彼濟遠矣惟」

³⁹ *dō* is to be interpreted in the sense of *dō* in the phrase *wakō dōjin* 和光同塵.

⁴⁰ *tayori nashi*: helpless, hapless, without support.

⁴¹ A slightly adjusted quotation from the third chapter of *Hong ming ji* 弘明集卷第三 (T2102; TZ 52, p. 16b); the original text reads: 「鱗介之物。不達臯壤之事。毛羽之族。不識流浪之勢。」

⁴² *daien*: "the great absolute".

⁴³ Razan has *konzatsu* 混雜 instead of *konran*; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365 line 12.

⁴⁴ Apart from the difference mentioned in the preceding note, the quotation is correct. Cf. *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365.

⁴⁵ This is an *itaiji* of 密, cf. Mor. IV: 7966.

⁴⁶ It is likely that snippets of the same third chapter of *Hong ming ji* have served here as a textual source for Jakuhon's account. The original text of *Hong ming ji* 弘明集卷第三 (T2103) reads: 「統知上書必不會旨。亦知不能排除佛法。直是恨帝不拔於微流無榮宦於朝廷也。所以鄙詞罵僧深文毀佛。其實奇意詈於上帝也」 (TZ 52, p. 129a). 「濟以不得其志」 (TZ 52, p. 131b). 「書奏。梁武大怒。集朝士將加顯戮。濟密逃於魏欲匡靜帝。事露為齊文襄燒殺之」 (TZ 52, p. 129a).

□夫大覺世尊崦嵫⁴⁷之日以法付國王大臣佛」

□法大而无外尊而无對歷代王臣崇奉厚」

□矣皆既有成書傳之雖逢三四排隨興隨」

□昌本朝王公大人欽歆殊邁于異邦何哉』

(1:9才)

□本朝神國也神佛本迹之名而利物之德」

□是同故神有感高僧之懿德而現有望威」

□福之法味而託此等之異軌寔繁其徽烈」

□春又自考拾相載焉時之王公大人感靈」

□悟真信伏安經像或始法會納封戸置供」

□僧神能歆享而國平人康賣炭之山人願」

□天之寒由佛國家若有災會之事則春可」

□喜駕焉』

(1:9ウ)

又曰神在而如亡神如為神其奈何哉⁴⁸」

□論曰以己之嫉妬責神神既黨佛容僧而不」

□奈何之故詈神為神不為神愚俗諺曰有」

□惡僧者而惡袈裟袈裟有何之咎耶春讎」

□佛惡僧及詈王公大人國之侯伯刺史至亡」

□神瞋毒之甚者何之所以耶痛夫」

又曰沙門不得入伊勢⁴⁹」

□論曰師鍊元亨釋書辨折決巫祝之誣妄』

(1:10才)

□春亦⁵⁰舉⁵¹其言且又發此言若鍊師(ママ)之說於」

⁴⁷ The compound 崦嵫 (Ch. Yanzi; J. Enshi) is the name of a mountain in Kansu. Anciently, it was supposed to be the place where the sun entered at night.

⁴⁸ The quotation is complete and correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 365, last two lines.

⁴⁹ The quotation is complete and correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 366, first line.

⁵⁰ The character used is the ancient form of 亦, Mor. III: 5761. See also the examples in Kodama, *Kuzushi kaidoku jiten*, p. 107, no. 1973/1974.

□有牽彊則何不論之乎然唯駕矯詐何其」

不公乎」

又曰敏達不信佛⁵²尾興⁵³鎌子不拜佛像是猶」

上古之遺風餘烈也⁵⁴」

□論曰敏達不信佛亦不信儒褒其不信者」

□則儒亦可排焉上古又无仁義若人嫌仁義」

□者可謂上古之遺風餘烈乎敏達令守屋』

(1:10ウ)

□燒佛俱率患乎瘡⁵⁵遂崩如尾興鎌子者非知」

□佛教而然焉盜犬吠堯豈不知之愚坎春以」

□黨己而賞為證是其非吠聲之狗乎」

又曰大史公修史記百三十篇梵漢居乎半⁵⁶」

□論曰史記中大宛一篇雖云西域蕃夷而」

□不及中天其他雖有西使之事數件非可」

□云其大反」

又曰且又議以己之意』⁵⁷

(1:11才)

□論曰載籍之為事也所以酌古傳來為天下」

□之公鑑也然以嫌己之私心專詆斥之唯」

□是私家之弊帚也何能為天下之公乎」

又曰庶幾世人之崇我神而排彼佛也⁵⁸」

⁵¹ The character used in the text is the ancient form of 擧; see Mor. I: 184.

⁵² Razan's text has 「敏達帝不信佛法」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 366, line 2.

⁵³ Razan's text uses the character 興 instead of 興. The latter character is correct.

⁵⁴ Apart from the differences mentioned above the quotation is correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 366, line 2.

⁵⁵ A partial quotation from *Nihon shoki*, where it says: 「天皇與大連卒患於瘡」. The first character, 俱, renders 與大連 ("ō muraji to"), and the second, 率, renders 卒 (*niwaka ni*); see *Nihon shoki* 20 (*Shintei zōho kokushi taikai: Nihon shoki, kōhen*, p. 115).

⁵⁶ The quotation is incomplete and contains mistakes. Razan writes: 「昔太史公之修史記也。上自黃帝。下及天漢。殆三千歲。一百三十卷之中。梵漢居于大半」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 366, line 4-5.

⁵⁷ The quotation is correct and complete; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 366, line 8.

⁵⁸ The quotation is correct and complete; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 366, line 9.

□論曰儒之所言神者造化之迹二氣之良」
□能也異本朝之神左氏曰晉假道於虞伐」
□號師還館于⁵⁹虞遂襲虞滅之⁶⁰今假我之」
□名排佛然我神相引而入于儒遂亡我神』
(1:11ウ)

□而已凡本朝崇神者亦能信佛知佛可崇」
□則能奉神神佛異信之人鮮矣殊本朝動」
□異茲欲襲通以邪法故□天下嚴制生此」
□土者不得一人而不入佛法然亦排佛以」
□為庶幾者何其所致乎不憚之甚矣昔於」
□支那也魏太武周武宗唐武帝皆有排臣」
□以帝威欲滅佛而終佛不滅君臣俱忽蒙」
□惡報傳奕數誣自取廢韓愈歐陽之徒宄⁶¹』
(1:12才)

□排也又不逢其君而自悶周世宗欲滅之不」
□得其佐⁶²春不逢如周主及三武不道之君為」
□不幸乎為幸乎夫佛者日月也側一手何」
□能掩之空費邪思深結罪根而已
又曰復上古之淳直民俗致內外之清淨⁶³」
□論曰上古之淳直者指儒佛未來以前耶」
□夫教者聖人適時合宜而設之以備于治」
□躰者也昔舜當五帝之末出焉時漸薄人漸』

⁵⁹ The text has 干, but that is clearly a mistake for 于. We have emended the text accordingly.

⁶⁰ An incorrect quotation from *Zuo zhuan*, "Duke Xi of Lu." The original text reads: 「晉滅號, 號公醜奔京師, 師還館于虞, 遂襲虞, 滅之」; see *Shunjū Sa-shi den* vol. 1, pp. 281-282.

⁶¹ In the text, the character has an extra dot, but it must be the character reproduced here (Mor. III: 7058).

⁶² Paraphrase of *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 (TZ 49, p. 386bc): 「志磐: 故魏太武以崔浩。周武以張賓衛元嵩。唐武以李德裕趙歸真。卒使大法被辱君臣俱蒙惡報。何彼此之不幸歟。至若舉行沙汰。如桓玄之在晉世。傅奕之在唐朝。姚崇之在明皇。李訓之在文宗。然皆牽於時事既行而復厄。以故一時小厄不若三武為禍之酷也。若周世宗天性毀佛。而不得其佐。韓愈歐陽修天性排佛。而不逢其君。」

⁶³ A correct quotation from *Jinjakō*; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 366, line 9.

(1:12ウ)

- 偽由之布五教以調之天下之教自此始」
- 也及周公之世時益薄人益偽於是乎広」
- 張法以化焉儒自此起焉其後孔子述而」
- 愈振⁶⁴所謂大道廢仁義出⁶⁵者也夫世淳人」
- 善則教无所施所以疾前无藥也⁶⁶当世季」
- 人惡之時也不可无教焉豈云上古耶揚」
- 子曰責冬之裘者以葛之易責飢之食者」
- 以飲之易⁶⁷是其不知時之宜譬也春非不』

(1:13才)

- 知唯心在排佛而誣也」
- 考曰余以謂夫佛法来于本朝者欽明十三」
- 年也百濟唯貢佛像經論而已先于八幡示現」
- 者雖及十有八九年而浮屠草昧未有習修」
- 者其間有若排闥⁶⁸之尾與⁶⁹鎌子輩者然則此」
- 神有菩薩号者始於延暦之際乎唯其曰我」
- 是譽田天皇八幡磨呂者余有信之大倭姬」
- 命在雄略帝時曰西天有真人亦是類也悉」

(1:13ウ)

⁶⁴ Paraphrase of *Tanjin wenji* 鐔津文集 14 (TZ 52, p. 724c): 「昔舜當五帝之末。其時漸薄其人漸偽。聖人宜之。乃設五教制五刑。各命官尸之。而契為司徒。專布五教。遂遺後世使率人為善。而天下有教自此始也。及周公之世復當三王之際。其時益薄其人益偽。而天下益難治。聖人宜之。遂廣其教法而備之。天下謂儒者之教。自周公起焉。其後孔子述而載之。詩書六經(或云六藝)而儒之教益振周季。」

⁶⁵ Paraphrase of *Daodejing* 18: 「大道廢，有仁義；智慧出，有大偽；六親不和，有孝慈；國家昏亂，有忠臣。」

⁶⁶ A regularly used Buddhist phrase, see for example *Kangyō shodenzūki* 觀經疏伝通記 by the Jōdo priest Ryōchū 良忠 (1199-1287): 「顯疾前無藥、機前無教之意」。 This expression was also adapted in the Ryōbu Shinto tradition in the text *Daijingu ryōkū no onkoto* 大神宮兩宮之御事 by Higaki Tsunemasa 檜垣常昌 (*Shinto taikai, ronsetsuhen* 5).

⁶⁷ A paraphrase of Han Yu 韓愈 (768-824), *Yuan dao* 原道 9. The original phrase reads: 「是亦責冬之裘者曰：「曷不為葛之之易也」責飢之食者曰：「曷不為飲之之易也」。 Jakuhon, however, probably quoted this phrase, from *Tanjin wenji* (TZ 52, p. 724c). This text continues with: 「韓子其亦知後世不可專用太古之道而譏其言之者。不知乎時之宜也。」

⁶⁸ Razan writes: 排闥 instead of 排闥.

⁶⁹ Razan writes 興 instead of 與. Correctly so, for the name should be written 尾輿, as in the Preface.

皆浮屠者依託附會而為言筆諸書耳不可」
不辨析⁷⁰」

□論曰菩薩号尤出釋典但神史所載之神託」
□不誣之則八幡太神既有无量劫來化生於」
□三有之託⁷¹何其拘佛法草昧耶若春之邪」
□思則唯以八幡為一凡人之一生脩德之」
□類怪其靈奇妙變者也然又信取八幡广」
□呂託以其己之所嫌怪之以其容己取之」
(1:14才)

□豈首鼠之兩端乎大倭姬命在雄畧之時」
□云西天真人者大倭姬不為神人則止焉」
□為神人則不可以凡愚而擬焉易曰神以」
□知來⁷²大倭姬神人而云西天真人者不可」
□怪焉若又本朝通韓用漢字久矣數百年」
□之間佛法然聞者不可知焉列子西方聖」
□者註林氏⁷³曰似當時有佛之學載籍中明」
□漢明以前支那有佛教⁷⁴本朝之佛何亦以」
(1:14ウ)

□一偏癖怪之乎」

考曰夫伊勢八幡者本朝二所宗廟而君臣」
上下各无不欽敬奉仕浮屠氏見其如此曰」
本地佛也垂迹神也遂引神明入⁷⁵佛氏時君」

⁷⁰ Razan uses the character 析; see Mor X: 38657-46 for the compound 辨析. Apart from the differences noted in this and the previous two footnotes, Jakuhon quotes correctly. See *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 380, line 7-11.

⁷¹ Jakuhon here paraphrases a phrase from *Jinjakō* that slightly precedes this quote: 「八幡大神託曰我無量劫來化生於三有」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 380, line 5.

⁷² Quotation from *Yijing: Daxici* 10.

⁷³ The annotation from which Jakuhon quotes is *Liezi Juanzhai kouyi* 列子齋齋口義 by Lin Xiyi 林希逸 (1193-1271); see: Mor. VI: 14551-285.

⁷⁴ Jakuhon partly quotes and partly paraphrases Lin Xiyi; the original text reads: 似當時已有佛之學，托夫子之，名而尊之也，西方之人出於三皇五帝之上，非佛而何，然則佛之書入於中國雖在漢明帝之時。

惑而不悟至令其恣睢橫行或奪神戶掠有」

封而納之⁷⁶寺院吁神何不罰之哉⁷⁷」

□論曰君子不謾⁷⁸於人善言去迷天下歸仁」

□可為師敬者由来久矣其挿私肆詈君」

(1:15才)

□子之所恥也春暝嫉之甚孰忍聞耶本迹」

□之事及時君惑之侮言前既論之但天下」

□神社中僧者之与者不鮮自古迄□□□⁷⁹」

□御當家為時君皆惑而不悟時臣亦无識乎」

□何其其言之不遜耶且神戶納于寺院責」

□神之不罰焉其可知以神不罰而神之容」

□昔勝海守屋之徒以己嫉課神慮燒佛燃」

□寺即時大殿天火是人愚而不知神以清」

(1:15ウ)

□无嫉妬不悟神也明同乎佛矣⁸⁰」

考曰余案宋六乙居士論放生之事謂佛氏」

自稱為慈悲而貴放生禁殺生昔庖犧氏始」

畋獵以充庖厨万世稱為聖人若如佛說則」

庖犧者地下之罪人也⁸¹可謂公論⁸²」

⁷⁵ Razan inserts the character 于 at this point.

⁷⁶ Razan inserts the character 于 at this point.

⁷⁷ Apart from the two omissions noted above, the quotation is complete and correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 380, lines 11-13.

⁷⁸ Cf. also the *itaiji*, Mor. X: 35991.

⁷⁹ This use of □□□ functions as a kind of honorific so that the reference to the present Tokugawa dynasty comes at the beginning of the next sentence.

⁸⁰ These lines are based on the preface of *Taisei-kyō: Suiko-tennō*. The original text is: 「勝海大夫、同大連物部守屋燒佛像、即時大殿天火。是先人愚、而以己嫉量神慮、還不知神以清、無嫉妒、不悟神也明、同乎佛。」; see *Zoku shintō taikei, Sendai kuji hongī taiseikyō*, vol. 1, p. 8-9.

⁸¹ Razan refers to Ouyang's "Tang Stele Inscription of the Pond for Releasing Animals 唐放生池碑 of Tianbao 10 (751)", to be found in *Ouyang Wenzhong 文忠 quanji* 142 (*Jigulu bawei 集古錄跋尾* 9:11b-12a). Ouyang's note on the stele inscription is dated Zhiping 治平 1/8/10 (1064). The complete text is: 「右『放生池碑』, 不著書撰人名氏。放生池, 唐世處處有之。王者仁澤及於草木昆蟲, 使一物必遂其生, 而不為私惠也。惟天地生萬物, 所以資於人, 然代天而治物者常為之節, 使其足用而取之不過, 故物得遂其生而不夭。三代之政如斯而已。『易大傳』曰: 「庖犧氏之王也, 能通神明之德, 以類萬物之情。作結繩而為

□論曰夫祇莊雍穆之徒立君臣之節崇賢」

□聖之業未遑苑囿之麗遊獵之靡也⁸³庖犧」

□氏有聖德始畫八卦以通神明之德造書』

(1:16才)

□契以代結繩之政所以万世為聖人也豈」

□以田獵之一事万世為聖人耶務在獨樂」

□不顧衆庶忘國家之政貪雉兔之獲則仁」

□者不繇也⁸⁴若以其田獵為業者不為非地」

□下之罪人焉凡六一之詆佛者師韓愈張」

□天覺謂觀脩之書尺牒々以老病自悲戚」

□々无所容視愈之貶潮不達天命求仙禱」

□神同一見趣也所脩唐書瑜不掩瑕臆度』

(1:16ウ)

□褒貶而為吳縝糾⁸⁵其謬者二百餘條愈之」

□肆筆頗多謬論同意識也⁸⁶脩後見祖印排」

□佛之心已消會其旨⁸⁷与愈交大顛送高閑」

□同一趨⁸⁸向也⁸⁹春以彼之言為公論其合己」

網罟，以佃以漁。」蓋言其始教民取物資生，而為萬世之利，此所以為聖人也。浮圖氏之說，乃謂殺物者有罪，而放生者得福。苟如其言，則庖犧氏遂為地下之罪人矣。治平元年八月十日書。」 The quotation from the "Great Commentary" of the *Yijing* is from the "Great Appendix" or *Xicizhuan, xia 2*; it is not quite correct.

⁸² A complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 381, lines 3-4.

⁸³ 「祇莊雍穆之徒、立君臣之節、崇賢聖之業、未皇苑囿之麗、游獵之靡也」 is a quotation from Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53 B.C. - 18 A.D.), *Yuliefu* 羽獵賦; see *Wenxuan* 8 (the quoted passage is at the very end of the *fu*). In *Mor.* VIII: 24665-17 the first two characters are glossed *tsutsushimi-uyamau*: "to be modest and reverent."

⁸⁴ Correct quotation from Sima Xiangru, *Shanglin-fu* 上林賦 (*Wenxuan* 8), where it also says: 「務在獨樂，不顧衆庶。忘國家之政，貪雉兔之獲，則仁者不由也。」

⁸⁵ This character (*Mor.* VIII: 27267) is glossed as *tsugeru*. In view of the title of Wu Zhen's book, 『新唐書糾謬』, the intended character will be 糾, glossed as *tadasu*; see *Mor.* VIII: 27227.

⁸⁶ Jakuhon here partly paraphrases a passage from *Sanjiao pingxin lun 2* (*TZ* 52, p. 791a); the original text reads: 「張無盡謂、『觀修之書尺。牒牒以老病自悲。雖居富貴之地。戚戚無所容』。視愈之不達天命求仙禱神。同一見趣也。所修唐書。瑜不掩瑕。張無盡謂、『其臆說褒貶。而為吳縝。糾其繆者二百餘條』。視愈之肆筆成文。頗多繆論。同一意識也。」 The characters 貶潮 and 度 that Jakuhon uses are not in the original text.

⁸⁷ See *Fozu tongji* 45 (*TZ* 49, p. 414b), where we find the following phrase: 「見祖印。排佛之心已消。故心會其旨。」

⁸⁸ This character (*Mor.* X: 37124) is glossed as *oyobu, hashiru*; it is also an *itaiji* of 趨 (*Mor.* X: 37258),

□以為美脩師愈春師脩踐履亦同春有當」

□親之祥忌而飯僧作詩所以其所守不正」

□也」

考曰礼戒暴天物聖人鈞不綱⁹⁰弋不射宿是』

(1:17才)

有義存焉彼浮屠氏豈得知義乎見牛未」

見羊君子不身踐者是義之所存也⁹¹」

□論曰天道至仁也豈令人殺生以養生哉」

□書曰惟天地万物父母父母之於子也愛」

□而愍之何其加害乎⁹²殺害之事何天地之」

□意乎所以礼戒暴天物也洪氏曰孔子少」

□貧賤為養与祭或不得已而鈞弋然盡物」

□取之出其不意亦不為也⁹³以羊易牛者君』

(1:17ウ)

□子之心忍其未見不能忍其見也孟子之」

□論古為未盡矣⁹⁴若以不見恣殺則濫也何」

glossed as *hashiru*. The compound 趨向 is attested *ibid.* (37258-5).

⁸⁹ Quotation from *Sanjiao pingxin lun 2* (TZ 52, p. 791a): 「視愈之交大顛送高閑稱馬彘。回一趨向也。」

⁹⁰ The character used in here is an *itaji*, which is not in the font, but the intended character is *gang* 綱 (rope), as in the *Jinja-kō* and in the relevant passage in *Lunyu*; for details, see the annotations to the translation.

⁹¹ Complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 381, lines 4-6.

⁹² The whole passage from 天道至仁 to here is based on *Hyōnjōngnon* 顯正論 ("Showing the Correct Principles - A Dissertation") by the Korean monk Kihwa (Hamhō Tūktong) 己和・涵虛得通 (1376-1433). The text was first printed in 1526 (Jiajing 5). *Hanguk Pulgyo Chōnsō* mentions four further editions of the text, two of which are dated (Jiajing 16 and 23), and two of which are not. The complete text corresponding to this passage is: 「曰、暴殄天物、聖人之所不與也。況天道至仁、豈令人殺生以養生哉。書云、惟天地萬物父母、惟人萬物之靈。亶聰明作元后、元后作民父母。天地既為萬物之父母、則生乎天地之間者、皆天地之息也。天地之於物也、猶父母之於子也。子有愚智之殊、猶人與萬物之有明昧也。父母之於子也、雖愚不肖、亦愛而愍之。猶恐不得其養焉。況其加害乎。」; *Hanguk Pulgyo Chōnsō* vol. 7, p. 219b.

⁹³ The quotation of Hong Xingzu is included in Zhu Xi's *Lunyu jizhu*: 洪氏曰: 「孔子少貧賤、為養與祭、或不得已而鈞弋、如獵較是也。然盡物取之、出其不意、亦不為也。此可見仁人之本心矣。待物如此、待人可知;小者如此、大者可知。」. For further details about Hong Xingzu, see the translation.

⁹⁴ This is an almost verbatim quotation from an entry in Kokan Shiren's commonplace book, *Tsūkō* 通衡 4 (= *Saihoku-shū* 19). Here it says: 「齊王以羊易牛、孟子以為仁術。蓋君子之心、忍其未見、不能忍其見也、予謂孟子之論未盡矣。夫人君之行刑也、有司存焉、豈躬自之乎。若以不見恣刑、我懼其濫焉。」; see *Kōtei Gozan bungaku zenshū: Shibunshū* 1, p. 289.

□亦不忍未見乎憐宿而何不憐不宿乎」
□是以會以有義存知有義存則知其不可」
□焉易曰古之聰明睿智神武而不殺⁹⁵其殺」
□之不可而事出乎不得已也佛立大戒以」
□不殺居先蓋制其源者也絕貪全慈俗之」
□所難也』

(1:18才)

考曰世称應神帝之所化為金色鷹者若果」
然則不放生而何為搏擊之物乎⁹⁶」

□論曰夫神者不測也其化類不為不多櫛」
□八玉神化鵜天人熊命化金色鳶坂神化」
□白鹿日本武命化白鳥皆所謂我神之奇」
□怪妙變也不可以凡情而議焉至搏擊何」
□其為実類之貪業耶」

考曰及母后之征三韓其必戰死者又不少』
(1:18ウ)

何不放生于彼時而放生于此時哉神豈二」
心哉余思退夷平賊者神助而請放生者妖」
巫賸僧之託也⁹⁷」

□論曰理不得止則雖戮三軍而不為慘理」
□以非罪而雖殺一卒不為仁自黃帝世々」
□諸聖王有戰殺皆不為不仁母后征三韓」
□也有勿殺之制彼時不為不憐之理不得」

⁹⁵ A complete and correct quotation from *Yijing: Xici, shang*. See also Translation, note 161.

⁹⁶ Complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon Shisō tōsō Shiryō* vol. 1, p. 381, line 6.

⁹⁷ Complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon Shisō tōsō Shiryō* vol. 1, p. 381, line 6-8. Razan's source for this part of *Jinja-kō* is *Genkō shakusho* 22. The original text reads: 「養老四年。正月。僧尼公驗始焉。八月。敕都下四十八寺。一日夜讀藥師經。祈右僕射藤公病也。九月。日隅二州亂。朝廷祈宇佐神宮平寇。大神託曰。交鋒之間。死傷多矣。我甚憐之。願寇平之後。置放生於諸州。八幡放生會自此始焉。十二月。詔曰。眞詮佛乘。化在音聞。唱禮轉經。元有規矩。此來僧尼。或出私曲。妄作別調。後生之輩。慣習成俗。若不變正。恐壞聲教。自今當式唐沙門道榮及沙門勝曉轉唱。餘皆停之。」

□止者也八幡養老之託猶神而不憐其死』

(1:19才)

□傷乎遂神非二心焉春以神為不仁彼時」

□不放生此時亦不可放生放生唯為僧巫」

□之假託誣神何其至于此乎且放生之事」

□於僧巫也不有絲毫之分何其勞邪僻之」

□言耶」

考曰我邦神代事代主神以釣魚遊鳥為樂」

又天孫之子兄弟有山幸海幸依此見之神」

亦何必專好放生哉⁹⁸』

(1:19ウ)

□論曰若夫如異邦三皇以前未有火化粒」

□食冬穴夏巢茹毛飲血本朝之元始玄風」

□亦然所以其有神代釣魚遊鳥也事代主」

□為大國主神之子而不可无神德何其以」

□釣魚遊鳥之一事而為神乎若是止此一」

□事則不為善神唯一獨樂之罪人也此等」

□神豈不仁乎」

考曰統日本紀天平十勝寶元年十一月八』

(1:20才)

幡太神託向京師即請僧四十口悔過七日於」

宮南梨原宮造新殿為神居○余謂聖武孝」

謙共淫⁹⁹于佛氏故有此等之事史筆何不穢乎¹⁰⁰」

⁹⁸ Complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō Tōsō Shiryō* vol. 1, p. 381, lines 8-9.

⁹⁹ The *itaiji* in the text (Mor. VII: 18065) is not available in the ordinary font.

¹⁰⁰ The quotation is neither correct nor complete. See *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, pp. 381 (line 10) - 382 (line 1). The complete quotation is: 「統日本紀十七、天平勝寶元年十一月、八幡大神、託宣向京。遣石川朝臣年足、藤原朝臣魚名等、以為迎神使。所歷之國、道路不令污穢。十二月、遣五位十人、散位二十人、六衛府舍人各二十人、迎八幡神于平群(へタリ)郡。是日戊寅入京、即於宮南梨原宮、造新殿為神宮。請僧四十口、悔過七日、(一云、東大寺供養日、八幡大神、託社女、入寺禮佛、於是以為東大寺鎮守。)、余謂、聖武孝謙、共淫于佛氏、故有此等之事。史筆何不穢耶」。

□論曰劉向序戰國策曰史氏之法具記一」

□時之事辭善惡必書初无所決擇¹⁰¹古¹⁰²為以」

□知春秋之意歐陽修唐書喜韓愈之其攘」

□斥佛老乃隱其惡惡大宗之復立浮圖」

□乃掩其長凡唐人歸依佛教而欽從敬信」

(1:20ウ)

□者則極其貶斥名卿賢士多与禪者遊有」

□機緣事迹者則憤 ㄟ 削去¹⁰³論者以不為公焉」

□続日本紀載時事真道繼繩不私是異歐」

□之行春之所嫉曲木惡真繩之謂¹⁰⁴也」

考曰頼朝置鶴岡供僧職¹⁰⁵讀法華大般若等」

令祈禱是亦随国俗沿¹⁰⁶襲之餘習耳不足論也¹⁰⁷」

□論曰朝公立自刑餘之微身啓嘉運抗明」

□威寔佛神信力之所致也唯為鶴岡一件随」

(1:21才)

□国俗耶其造神社仏宇寄封戸寶物者不」

□可勝計非朝公其心嫌佛僧而其事随國」

□俗者可知焉其言欲以朝公黨于己之惡」

□佛僧何證之有耶」

¹⁰¹ Complete and correct quotation from Chen Jinglong 陳景隆 (b. 1393), *Kongguji* 空谷集 1, p. 15a-b. Contrary to Jakuhon's source *Kongguji*, however, the quotation is from the preface written by Bao Biao 鮑彪 (Song), who composed a commentary 鮑氏戰國策注 (see Mor. XII: 46074-68), not from Liu Xiang's 劉向 preface signed "Guanglu-daifu chen Xiang" 光祿大夫臣向, and reproduced at the beginning of the *Yiwen Yinshuguan* edn (Taipei, 1969), pp. 8-13.

¹⁰² The character is incomplete, but 古 seems to be intended. Cf. the same character *gu* 17b-2.

¹⁰³ The same phrase occurs in *Sanjiao pingxin lun* 2 (TZ 52, p. 790b). The complete passage reads: 「喜其攘斥佛老。乃隱其惡著其善。而稱其佐佑六經太宗濟世安民。為不出世之君。公則惡其復立浮圖。乃掩其長責其短。而指為中才之主。凡唐人歸向大乘教。而欽從敬信者。公則極其貶斥。其名卿賢大夫多與禪衲遊。有機緣事跡。者公則憤憤削去而不書。」

¹⁰⁴ The expression stems from *Suichu-fu* 遂初賦 by Liu Xin 劉歆 (d. 23 B.C.). The complete quotation is: 「曲木惡真繩兮、亦小人之誠也」; see Mor. V: 14280-247.

¹⁰⁵ This character is a *zokuji* of 職.

¹⁰⁶ In our copy of *Jinjakō bengi* there is a note, written by a reader at the top of the page, outside of the frame, that specifies the readings of 沿 as エン and シタガフ.

¹⁰⁷ Complete and correct quotation. See *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 388, lines 3-4.

考曰兼俱何為者哉若主神事之宗源宜排」

異端忌佛僧不然天兒屋根之罪人也¹⁰⁸」

□論曰凡神之忌佛者妄祝之矯言古人之」

□所決也若有神戾佛者邪神也兼俱主神』

(1:21ウ)

□事之宗源非誣妄之類深鈎遠索知神佛之」

□理而不誣者也春以其不黨己議之天兒屋」

□根无忌佛兼俱以不忌佛僧何其為其罪」

□人乎傳曰女无美惡入室見妬美女惡女之」

□仇¹⁰⁹豈不然哉」

考曰傳教弘法慈覺智證見我国神国而多人¹¹⁰」

帰敬¹¹¹遂揚言謂伊勢者大日日吉者釈迦我」

遣神明化彼日本時王公大人信伏不悟¹¹²』

(1:22才)

□論曰此言与序辞及謂八幡之中不異但」

□遣神明化之言修多羅説佛有三輪之遺」

□化謂身舍利口經説意神明也此等非彼」

□之所知謾議四大師四大師者本朝高標」

□之權化也彼以凡庸之嫉妬非之盜跖之」

□徒非孔子者也且謂王公大人之不悟者」

□亦及數前所以其深瞋恨而不覺其繁耶」

□不遜之言一至于此耶』

(1:22ウ)

¹⁰⁸ Complete and correct quotation. See *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 410, line 1.

¹⁰⁹ Jakuhon here incompletely quotes the conclusion of the biography of Bian Qiao (*Bianqiao Cang-gong zhuan* 扁鵲倉公伝) in Sima Qian, *Shiji* 史記 105 (*Liezhuan* 列伝 45; vol. 9, p. 2817). The complete quote is: 「太史公曰: 女無美惡, 居宮見妬; 士無賢不肖, 入朝見疑。」

¹¹⁰ In the text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* the order of 多 and 人 is inverted.

¹¹¹ In the text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* the character 而 is inserted at this place.

¹¹² Apart from the differences noted above, this is a correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 418, line 12 - p. 419, line 1.

考曰夫佛者一點胡而夷荻之法也變神国」
為黠胡之國譬如下喬木而入幽谷君子之所」
不取也¹¹³」

□論曰昔傳變指佛云胡神韓歐之徒皆效」
□以有此言佛國者中天竺也胡者諒北天」
□之夷荻也漢隋未知中天指佛國為胡儒」
□者殊不知世界之宏曠无际只以四海九」
□州為中国莊子曰六合之外聖人存而不』
(1:23才)

□論六合之內聖人論而不議¹¹⁴唯止於四海」
□六合而更无去處矣譬之居井蛙見昔何」
□承天与僧惠觀論¹¹⁵支那天竺邊正圖日影」
□而遂以印土為世界之中支那是一東夷」
□也矧復此日域者夷之夷者也然謾佛為」
□黠胡夷荻古曰¹¹⁶聞道而不行与不聞道而」
□不行二者何惡焉¹¹⁷蓋不聞而不行者愚而」
□已矣聞而不行者姦也愚焉可哀姦焉不』
(1:23ウ)

□可怨况不啻不行却毀之是可惡之大者也」
□春為不知則愚也知而言之則姦也尚亦毀」
□之其可惡之大者也范蔚宗著西域傳曰」

¹¹³ Complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 419, lines 1-2.

¹¹⁴ A complete and correct quotation from the second book van de *Zhuangzi*, "Jiwulun" 齊物論 10. Schipper translates: "Over wat zich buiten de Zes Uitersten van de wereld bevindt, dat bewaart de Heilige Mens voor zichzelf en hij doet er geen uiteenzettingen over. Dat wat zich binnen de grenzen van de wereld bevindt, daarover geeft de Heilige Mens wel zijn commentaar, maar hij voert daarover geen discussies." (Schipper, Kristofer, vert., *Zhuang Zi. De innerlijke geschriften*, p. 63.)

¹¹⁵ For his rendering of this discussion between He Chengtian and Huiguan, Jakuhon probably based himself on Congyi 從義, *Sijiaoyi jijie* 四教儀集解 1 (*Wan xinzuan xucangjing* 卍新纂續藏經 No. 976; vol. 57, p. 554b: 「宋朝慧嚴慧觀法師與太史官何承天論中邊之國嚴觀乃以周公土圭測影之法一尺五寸用測日影夏至之日猶有餘陰既有餘陰則此方非中矣若天竺國此日則無餘陰故定為中國也」.

¹¹⁶ The following lines, until 「可惡之大者矣」, are a quotation from Kokan Shiren's essay *Ri Shi ron* 李斯論 (*Saihoku-shū* 15); see *Gozan bungaku zenshū. Shibun-shū dai-1 shū*, pp. 231-232.

¹¹⁷ *Ri Shi ron* inserts 「我惡彼聞而不行者矣」 at this point.

□靈聖之所降集賢懿之所挺生¹¹⁸寔佛出中」
□天弘中道移其中天之大法於此偏夷之」
□小國不亦幸乎故神々沿法水增威福以」
□為幸矣然變神国為胡之言君子取之乎」
□春之儒欲變神国為魯邦而亡神不亦似』
(1:24才)

考曰理當心地之神道神以傳神皇以傳」

皇皇道神道不二」¹¹⁹

□論曰凡言心地者剽竊佛經神以傳神之」
□道者天兒屋根命天太玉命其宗源齊源」
□也是与儒說二氣之良能造化之迹大異」
□彼若以己為本朝之神道則失己彼若以」
□之合於己則失此彼之其云神道者不可」
□不怪焉』

(1:24ウ)

考曰余案山家要略傳教歸朝之秘文也教」
称山家大師大師真以金毘羅為三輪明神」
耶但不知其徒託師以為言耶夫教吾方之」
知顛湛然也而猶有若是之妖妄鳴乎浮屠」
之弊至于此哉雖傳奕韓愈其如之何」¹²⁰

□論曰傳教大師以倣儻非常之姿通神域¹²¹」

□有所感而以金毘羅為三輪明神不然」

□則何其誣神明賺末徒乎非其人則不知』

¹¹⁸ The passage from 范蔚宗 until here is a quotation from *Sanjiao pingxin lun* (TZ 52, p. 787c), which in its turn is quoting from *Hou Han shu* ("History of the Later Han Dynasty") 88 (*Liezhuan* 78:30b); there it says: 「靈聖之所集賢懿之所挺生」.

¹¹⁹ The quotation is incomplete; the complete quotation would be: 「殊不知理當心地之義。我國天照大神以降。神以傳神。皇以傳皇。皇道神道。豈二哉。謂之理當心地」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 419, lines 6-7.

¹²⁰ It is a correct and complete quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 420, line 4-6.

¹²¹ *Itaiji* of 域; see Mor. XI: 41700.

(1:25才)

- 其境¹²²焉春唯聞金毘羅天竺之神亦思三」
- 輪明神者大己貴命以異域隔別之凡局」
- 議山家大師既高皇產靈尊降大西國此」
- 後大國主命亦往至于厥國¹²³焉然則三輪」
- 明神不為不在於彼金毘羅三輪殊方名」
- 異神一也筆韋者秦楚之殊而非物之別」
- 矣且傳奕之豺心梟辭七上疏時有法琳」
- 明槃二高僧作論折之李陆¹²⁴政作内徳論』

(1:25ウ)

- 亦辨焉其邪說不能揜遂被刑韓愈之攘」
- 斥貶潮陽後為契嵩陆見非其書三十篇」
- 如斯輩之排於世也无一言之行者佛教」
- 愈隆彼排愈狂春亦舐奕愈之唾餘海畔」
- 之逐臭者也』

¹²² This part of Jakuhon's reply is also quoted in Nichidatsu's *Shinbutsu myōō ron* 神佛冥應論 2 (*Hokke shintō ron* vol. 1 p. 86. For Nichidatsu, see note 19 above.

¹²³ Quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 5 (*Jingi hongī jō* 神祇本紀上): 「天祖詔曰:『汝六世尊, 降於大西國, 而生神種子。』高皇產靈尊即降大西國, 生鑫御魂命及鑫產女命。此二神婚合, 生銀御魂命。」; see *Taisei-kyō* vol. 1, p. 116."

¹²⁴ The character used in the text is either not attested in the dictionaries or it just might be an *itaiji* of Mor. XI: 41607 陆, which in its turn is an *itaiji* of 師 (Mor. IV: 8886).

(2:1才)

神社考辨疑卷下」

考曰¹²⁵逮見道智竊神劔也慨然試筆削曰盜」

竊草薙劔不克得昔聖人作春秋齊豹陽虎」

書盜况其餘乎又况妖僧之智乎書以為戒¹²⁶」

於是乎見神劔之弥靈也浮屠之益妖也¹²⁷」

□論曰元亨釋書載新羅道行擬草薙劔¹²⁸曷」

□為不族道行盜也¹²⁹夫劔者非僧之具佛制」

□不畜僧何欲之乎蓋道行唯竊服者不本僧」

(2:1ウ)

□焉况復竊之佛立大戒盜居第二佛不許一」

□針一草若犯之者擯之僧則不盜盜則非僧」

□釋書不族者是也孔子春秋畧其名書盜者」

□亦是也春見道行幸駕之謂浮屠之益妖」

□者何哉聞有昔亂臣賊士而云今臣士皆乱」

□賊乎不可以人而議道焉往年京師儒者」

□泰順者盜之黨而被刑戮見之云儒者皆」

□盜乎何其其言之不盡不公耶」

(2:2才)

考曰真濟洛陽人¹³⁰世言濟見染殿皇后迷而」

¹²⁵ In *Honchō jinka kō* the part Jakuhon quotes is preceded by the following words: 「余嘗欲修本朝綱目。有志而未果。」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 470, line 8.

¹²⁶ Jakuhon here omits the following words: 「庶濫竊之輩有懼也。然闕入大社門。徒一年。闕入中社門。杖八十。亂入小社中。笞五十。是衛禁律之所載也。道智誠不免誅焉。而又神官亦不得無罪矣哉。虎咒出於柙。龜玉毀於櫝中。是誰之過歟。神官宮司。何不能守哉。吾(於是乎。)」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 470, lines 9-12.

¹²⁷ Jakuhon omits the final words of Razan's comment (「神司之猶怠也」). Apart from the omissions mentioned in this and the preceding notes Jakuhon's quotation is correct.

¹²⁸ See *Genkō shakusho* 21:7b. *Genkō shakusho* quotes *Nihon shoki*, which dates the event to Tenji 7 (668) and reads「是歲、沙門道行盜草薙劔、逃向新羅、而中路風雨、荒迷而歸」; see *Nihon shoki* 27: *Tenji-tennō ki* (*Nihon shoki, Kōhen*, p. 295; Aston, *Nihongi* vol. 2, p. 290). The quotation in *Genkō shakusho* differs on two points from the text in *Nihon shoki*: it omits the characters 沙門, and it substitutes 擬 for 盜. See Translation, note 243, for Shiren's comment on these points.

¹²⁹ Quotation from *Genkō shakusho* 21:10, lines 4-5.

不平遂死為魅又稱真濟之靈為大天狗是」
乃愛宕山太郎坊也¹³¹」

□論曰真濟之履歷載在于傳紀為魅之事」
□无根是唯无動寺相應之徒欲揚應而作」
□此妄乎遂載元亨釋書濟師貞觀二年滅」
□藤太后罹妖病者寬平五年也相去三十」
□四年其浮誕可檢焉春幸駕之為大天狗」

(2:2ウ)

□聞人誰不知邪心乎」
考曰聖德太子事¹³²傳燈錄雲居道膺傳謂南」
岳思大和尚生倭國作王¹³³鑑真又曰我聞南」
岳思公生和國弘佛法¹³⁴果然否¹³⁵曰再生之說」
浮屠氏之所言也非吾儒之所專言也雖然」
羊祜圓澤之事是史傳之所稱亦不可誣乎」
有說于此人物之生也皆天地陰陽之所感」
生者自息死者自消譬如逝川之不舍晝夜¹³⁶」

(2:3才)

¹³⁰ At this point *Jinja-kō* inserts the following:「正六位上紀朝臣御國子也。所謂柿本紀僧正是也。從弘法大師。受密教。承和初。奉詔入唐。其歸朝後。入高尾峯。不出十二年。嘗於高尾神護寺建寶塔。安五大虛空藏像。文德帝天安二年八月不豫。真濟看侍。外退後失志隱居。先是與專亮抗驗而負。至此愈快々。貞觀二年二月死。年六十一。」。 This part of Razan's text is mainly a paraphrase of Shinzei's biography in *Genkō shakusho* 3:5a-6b. A few mistakes have, however, been made somewhere in the process of transcription and printing: 專亮 must be 慧亮 or 惠亮, and 快々 must be 怏々.

¹³¹ Apart from the omission mentioned in the preceding note Jakuhon's quotation is complete and correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, pp. 493-494.

¹³² At this point *Jinja-kō* inserts:「標出日本紀所載。既已如右。或問曰。」。

¹³³ Quotation from *Chuandenglu* 17 (T2076; TZ 51, p. 334c):「吾聞、思大和尚生倭國作王、虛實」。

¹³⁴ Quotation from Ganjin's biography in *Genkō shakusho* 1:10a-b. The phrase 生和國 also occurs thrice in the reminiscences of the Tendai monk Kōjō 光定 (779-858), *Denju isshin kaimon* 傳述一心戒文 (3 fasc.; T2379: TZ 74, p. 645c, 646a, 653c). On p. 645c we find the phrase「慧思禪師、生和國而弘佛法」; it is *not, however*, put into the mouth of Ganjin. A similar, but not identical phrase occurs in another of Ganjin's biographies, *Tōdai-wajō tōsei den* 唐大和上東征傳 (*Gunsho ruijū* 69; vol. 4, p. 541), where it says:「昔聞、南嶽思禪師遷化之後、託生倭國王子、興隆佛法、濟度衆生。」。 N.B. *Jinja-kō* inserts at this point:「聖德太子事我知之。且又曰。所行于世之太子傳。具載此事。未知」。

¹³⁵ At this point *Jinja-kō* inserts:「余答」。

¹³⁶ Reference to *Lunyu* 9.17:「子在川上、曰、逝者如斯夫、不舍晝夜」。

更无一息之間斷也今年之春非去年之春」

樹頭之花非復根之花¹³⁷」

□論曰再生之說彼欲不言則史傳既多矣」

□不能誣而口言不可誣亦強誣焉其生者」

□自息死者自消之譬以逝川春花是本念」

□と无常之義也水滔と而日度時冉と行」

□暮¹³⁸寔不舍晝夜更无一息之間斷前念」

□去後念續今生去來生續遂有去今來之』

(2:3ウ)

□三際如樹頭之花者落則既朽矣非其花」

□復根而出若无種根則止矣有種根則得」

□天地氣運之緣來春亦有花人身死非復」

□先身有神識而引業託後身如火傳薪北」

□齊顏之推家訓曰形體雖死精神猶存人」

□生在世望於後身似不連¹³⁹屬及其沒¹⁴⁰後則」

□与前身猶老少朝夕耳¹⁴¹」

考曰¹⁴²聚散遲速如火之初滅而烟氣猶鬱¹⁴³乎』

(2:4才)

故有鬼神之感格有厲靈之來出有精爽之」

依託有魂魄之流行而其終由太¹⁴⁴虛无所不」

之何蹤跡之遺有哉況其人死又託胎乎」¹⁴⁵

¹³⁷ Apart from the omissions mentioned in the preceding notes, Jakuhon's quotation is correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 521.

¹³⁸ Jakuhon is quoting here from *Tanshifu* 歎逝賦 (*Wenxuan* 18) by Lu Ji 陸機 (261-303): 「悲夫、川閱水以成川、水滔と日度、世閱人而為世、人冉と行暮。」 Jakuhon makes a mistake in the last clause, when he substitutes 時 for 人.

¹³⁹ The original text of *Yanshi jiaxun* has 相 instead of 連.

¹⁴⁰ The original text of *Yanshi jiaxun* has 歿 instead of 沒.

¹⁴¹ Apart from the two discrepancies noted above, this is a complete and correct quotation from *Yan Shi jiaxun* 10 (*Gui xin* 歸心).

¹⁴² The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 雖然 at this point.

¹⁴³ An *itaiji* of 鬱; cf. Mor. VI: 15978.

¹⁴⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has the character 大 instead of 太.

□論曰人死又有來出等者不能誣然不知」

□神不滅而說以多途今言宋儒之澆浮也」

□子貢問孔子曰人死有知乎無知乎子曰」

□吾欲言死之有知將恐孝子順孫妨生以」

□事死吾欲言死之無知將恐不孝之子棄』

(2:4ウ)

□其父子而不葬賜欲知死者知與無知非」

□今之急後自知之未晚也¹⁴⁶是其孔子不為」

□無之證也何其誣孔子而信宋儒自惑ㄟ」

□人乎道安法師二教論曰唯業報理微通人」

□尚昧思不能及邪見是興或說人死神滅」

□更無來生<是云斷」見外道>或聚散無窮心神無間<是」云」

□常見」外道>或云吉凶苦樂皆天所為<是云佗」因外道>或計」

□諸法自然不由因<是云無」因外道>¹⁴⁷是天竺外道之中』

(2:5才)

□四異執也春之類皆不出之彼之言不可不思」

□慝¹⁴⁸焉」

考曰佛氏三世之說今之果夙之因也今之因」

後之果也其要至令人ㄟ修善止惡而¹⁴⁹下愚庸」

昧不悟此意恐懼疑惑遂以為實有三世是必

野狐耳¹⁵⁰」

¹⁴⁵ Apart from the above-mentioned discrepancies, this is a complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 521, line 9-11.

¹⁴⁶ Jakuhon here paraphrases a passage from *Shuo Yuan* 說苑 ("Garden of Persuasive Stories"; fasc. 18 [Bianwu 辨物, "Discerning things"]. 31) by Liu Xiang 劉向 (77 B.C. - 6 A.D.): 「子貢問孔子:『死人有知無知也』。孔子曰:『吾欲言死者有知、恐孝子順孫妨生以送死也。欲言無知、恐不孝子孫棄不葬也。賜欲知死人有知將無知也、死徐自知之、猶未晚也』。」

¹⁴⁷ Quotation with minor discrepancies from the text of *Erjiaolun* in *Guang hongming ji* 廣弘明集 (T2103; TZ 52, p. 142c), where it says: 「惟業報理微、通人尚昧。思不能及。邪見是興。或說人死神滅、更無來生<斷見也>。云聚散莫窮、心神無間<常見也>。或言吉凶苦樂、皆天所為<他因外道>。或計諸法自然、不由因得<無因外道>果。」

¹⁴⁸ See above, notes 10 and 11.

¹⁴⁹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 已 at this point.

□論曰佛教三世之說釋然無疑信而有徵¹⁵¹如」

□儒者雖云積善有餘慶積惡有餘殃¹⁵²顏冉』

(2:5ウ)

□夭疾盜跖強壽幽厲為天子孔子只陪臣」

□齊景千駟夷齊餓死¹⁵³斯皆善惡無徵網¹⁵⁴惑」

□茲生¹⁵⁵蕭¹⁵⁶遠不能暢其流子玄未得詳其源¹⁵⁷」

□智所不明力所不抗¹⁵⁸佛教三報永以解此」

□躡亦深矣是以自彼漢明我欽明之後世」

□ㄨ 歷居多聖賢王公大人皆厝心而崇信」

□稟教以歸敬¹⁵⁹今春狂悖謾罵以野狐世ㄨ」

□聖賢皆為下愚庸昧果然乎天下之人皆』

(2:6才)

□有心不蘭之乎」

考曰若夫祭祀祖考存其至誠則洋ㄨ乎如」

見如在譬如植梅子得梅樹種杏仁得杏樹」

¹⁵⁰ Apart from the above-mentioned omission, the quotation is complete and correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol 1, p. 521, lines 11-12.

¹⁵¹ These four characters occur quite a number of times in the Buddhist corpus, and three times in connection with the Three Worlds: see *Guang hongming ji* (T2103), TZ 52, pp. 107b and 186a, and *bianzheng lun* 辯正論 (T2110), TZ 52, p. 536a.

¹⁵² Reference to one of the commentaries (*Wenyan* 文言) of the second hexagram of the *Yijing*: 「積善之家必有餘慶、積不善之家必有餘殃。臣弑其君、子弑其父、非一朝一夕之故。其所由來者漸也。由辨之不早辨也。」

¹⁵³ Reference to *Lunyu* 16.12: 「齊景公有馬千駟，死之日，民無德而稱焉。伯夷叔齊餓于首陽之下，民到于今稱之。」

¹⁵⁴ The character is an *itaiji* of 網; cf. Mor. VIII: 27315.

¹⁵⁵ Quotation from *Erjiaolun*; see T2103 (TZ 52, p. 142b), where it says: 「斯皆善惡無徵、生茲網惑。」

¹⁵⁶ The text has an *itaiji* for 蕭 that is not in the corpus.

¹⁵⁷ A paraphrased quotation from *Bianming lun* 辨命論 ("On distinguishing fate") by Liu Shun 劉峻 (462-521; see Mor. II: 2224-363). *Bianming lun* was a famous text. It is included in a number of collections, one of which is *Wenxuan*. Jakuhon's text is slightly different from the text in *Wenxuan* 54; there it says: 「蕭遠論其本而不暢其流，子玄語其流而未詳其本。」

¹⁵⁸ There are phrases in the Chinese corpus that resonate with these two lines. In *Chuci: Liubuju* 楚辭：六卜居 there is the line 「智有所不明」; see Hoshikawa Kiyotaka, ed., *Soji*, Shin'yaku Kanbun Taikai 34 (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1970), p. 276. Somewhere in the *œuvre* of Song Lian 宋濂 (1310-1381) the lines 「功有所不全、力有所不任、才有所不足」 seem to exist. For the identification of the final character, see above, 1:20b, line 7, where the identical form appears, with the *furigana agu*.

¹⁵⁹ Quotation from *Sanjiao pingxin lun* (TZ 52, p. 784c), which says: 「王道庾亮之徒。戴逵許詢之輩。皆厝心而崇信。並稟教以歸依。」

於物已然人亦如此是蓋一氣之條理也故」

曰非其鬼而祭之誣也¹⁶⁰」

□論曰如前說人死散太虛去无蹤迹然亦」

□存至誠則如見如在以其不在者為如見」

□如在是非誠誣者也且若祖孫一氣脉絡』

(2:6ウ)

□之說者殊不知形盡一生无常主神馳六」

□道无常家何其待氣脉之孫祭而出乎夫」

□羹藜者難与談大牢¹⁶¹執偏者不可論真道」

□焉」

考曰平氏所撰太子傳¹⁶²載¹⁶³太子嘗令人造陵」

墓而告曰断此處截彼處不欲有繼嗣也夫」

子孫不續豈云大咎孔子遺教无後嗣者為不」

孝吾為釋迦弟子不為孔子弟子¹⁶⁴見耶¹⁶⁵穌者』

(2:7才)

之書論而及此无後為不孝則伯夷叔齊不」

聞有子夷齊其為不孝乎有後為孝則多買」

妾婦而悉色欲者其為孝乎余惟夫太子之」

言与耶穌之論共拘于一偏失其中正者也」

¹⁶⁰ A complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 521, line 12-14.

¹⁶¹ Jakuhon is paraphrasing the first two lines of the first *song* 頌 ("eulogy") of *Wenxuan* 文選 47, 「聖主得賢臣」("A Holy Lord obtains a Wise Minister") by Wang Bao 王褒 (fl. 60 B.C.): 「夫荷旃被毳者、難與道純綿之麗密。羹藜哈糗者、不足與論大牢之滋味。」; see also Translation, note 295.

¹⁶² The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 曆 at this point; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 522, line 1.

¹⁶³ Razan is quoting here, though rather freely, from *Denryaku*; see *Shusho Taishi den* 4:30a-31a, where it says: 「冬十二月、太子命駕科長墓處、覽見造墓者、直入墓內、四望謂左右曰、此處必断、彼處必切、欲令應絕子孫之後。墓工隨命、可絕者絕、可切者切。太子大悅。即夕旋駕、歎謂妃曰、遙憶過去、因果相按、吾未賽了、禍及子孫、子孫不續、豈云大咎、孔子遺教、无後嗣者為不孝矣、吾為釋迦大聖弟子、豈為孔子小賢弟子乎。妃答啓曰、左之右之、依殿下命耳、三從之妾、更何異望。太子喜之。」

¹⁶⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the characters 「是言如何。余答曰。頃年」 at this point; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 522, line 3.

¹⁶⁵ The character used here and on p. 2:7a, line 4, is written as 耶, but in view of the context, 耶 clearly is the character we need. That is also the character used in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō*.

我身體髮膚者父母之遺體也無我則無父」
母又無祖先有我則可以追遠可以揚父母」
善豈與草木同朽共禽獸齊斃哉宜哉無後」
為不孝矣¹⁶⁶』

(2:7ウ)

□論曰以人為隣則人以我亦為隣太子耶」
□蘇拘于一偏失中正募以無後為不孝春亦」
□豈一偏者歟夫堯舜之聖立雖無地湯武之」
□德餘苗不紹¹⁶⁷以此為罪此為不孝為與草」
□木同朽共禽獸齊斃哉尊莫尊乎道美莫」
□美乎德釋門齊戒脩心以道報恩以德嗣」
□德¹⁶⁸漢和真化以降德聲照載籍之上有道」
□之高僧其數幾許孰與儒汜¹⁶⁹之有名行者』

(2:8才)

□耶豈是與草木同朽共禽獸齊斃者耶」
考曰太子吾邦稱其聖知而今云為釋迦弟」
子不為孔子弟子若信此言則太子聖膳氏為」
妃不可無男女山背大兄王者太子之子也不」
可無父子以推古為天子不可無君臣余疑」
是蓋非太子之言耶¹⁷⁰」
□論曰釋教多途出家自是其一法也薙染」

¹⁶⁶ But for the omissions specified in the preceding notes, the quotation is complete and correct; cf. *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 522 lines 1-7.

¹⁶⁷ Similar locutions occur quite frequently, but not the identical one. The closest is the following line from *Tongjilun* 通極論 by the monk Yanzong 彦琮: 「至如立錐無地、非慕堯舜之德、餘苗不紹、豈傳湯武之聖」; see *Guang hongming ji* 4. On Yanzong and another text of his, *Futianlun* 福田論 (*Guang hongming ji* 52), see Saitō Takanobu, "Gensō sen *Fukuden-ron* to sono senjutsu igi."

¹⁶⁸ These two lines will have been inspired by the following *passus* in *Tanjin wenji* 鐔津文集 1 (T2115; TZ 52, p. 651b-c): 「曰、為佛者齋戒修心、義利不取。雖名亦忘、至之遂通於神明。其為德也、抑亦至矣。推其道於人、則無物不欲善之。其為道、抑亦大矣。以道報恩、何恩不報。以德嗣德、何德不嗣」。 *Tanjin wenji* (19 fasc.) is the posthumously collected literary works of the monk Qisong 契嵩 (1007-1072).

¹⁶⁹ *Itaiji* of 流; see Mor. VI: 17205.

¹⁷⁰ This is a complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1 pp. 522, lines 8-10.

□者唯小乘之儀大乘則主心不言相焉且』

(2:8ウ)

□登地以去无沙門之形¹⁷¹大論曰佛弟子有七』

□衆其中優婆塞優婆夷乃在家也¹⁷²太子有君』

□有妃子而為釋迦之弟子者何怪之有』

考曰太子淫¹⁷³佛氏不知我道耶吁使太子好』

儒如好佛民至于今頼其德惜乎真可惜哉¹⁷⁴』

□論曰太子年十四揚韓貢字付和訓令吾』

□民通韓韓人通吾矣同年興儒学集群卿』

□使博士学弼講演儒書物部大連大怒訶』

(2:9才)

□学弼曰吾神玄遠孔丘孟軻食狗夷人何知』

□神上自今以後不入異虚諸臣皆退学弼』

□血泣太子曰時未矣當至¹⁷⁵由是思之太子』

□是為本朝之儒宗然尚其膚淺而民之福』

□少故不厚之實以如好佛則儒大興必矣春』

□之所以羨惜嫉恨也』

¹⁷¹ This is a quotation from *Da-Song seng shilüe* 大宋僧史略 3 (TZ 54, p. 253a): 「究其心游佛理、行切苦空、證聖之深、登地以去、則無沙門之形也。佛法汚隆、王臣制作、遇其抑勒、知復奈何。凡百學徒、觀此思事。」. *Da-Song seng shilüe* (3 fasc.) is a history of Buddhism in China. It was written by the monk Zanning 贊寧 (919-1001), and completed in 999.

¹⁷² *Dalun* 大論 is short for *Dazhidulun* 大知度論, a commentary on *Nehan-kyō* reputedly written by Nāgārjuna 龍樹 and translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva. The explanation of the division of the Buddha's disciples into seven categories is quoted from *Dazhidulun* 10 (TZ 25, p. 130b): 「佛弟子七衆、比丘比丘尼學戒尼沙彌沙彌尼優婆塞優婆夷。優婆塞優婆夷是居家、餘五衆是出家。出家在家中更有二種、若大若小、小者童男童女。餘者爲大。」.

¹⁷³ This is an *itaiji* of 淫; see Mor. VII: 18065. N.B. The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 于 at this point.

¹⁷⁴ Apart from the omission mentioned in the preceding note, the quotation is complete and correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 522, lines 10-11.

¹⁷⁵ This passage is based on the Preface of *Taisei-kyō* 大成經: 「吾大王集群臣於日門之陣、召博士、學弼、命令群臣學八經。又大連守屋與大夫勝海同言:『不偏敬吾神託宣、何習異國人語乎。皇子雖明敏、瓢髮何知深理』。拂群臣、停儒學。學弼血泣白大王、大王不怒、慰學弼曰:『乃勿憂之。時以未矣、當有時至也。果通儒釋於世、而俾臣民精乎人倫、明乎因果。理以竭之、然神不怒、人益悅。是皆先人之愚也、不可隱之矣』。書成果如言也。」; see *Taisei-kyō*, vol 1, p. 9. The incident is described again, in different words, under the 8th month of Yōmei 1 (see *Yōmei-tennō ki: op. cit.* fasc. 31; Vol. 2, pp. 269-270). No similar incident is mentioned in *Denryaku* or in *Nihon shoki*.

考曰世俗所稱有可信者有可疑者有可排」
者太子未來記吾初疑之世未曾有見之者』
(2:9ウ)

是亦浮屠誇說之事耳夫讖緯術數聖人所」
排也雖太子作之不可信也況无之乎設使」
有之復後世託言于太子也¹⁷⁶」

□論曰世之傳言者不可勝計焉摩尼空聞」
□名麟鳳誰見實¹⁷⁷然世不誣之由來遠矣太」
□子未來記以其不見何為无之耶讖記往」
□ㄟ在史籍佛典謂之懸記能預以告者也」
□太子神聖何无之乎詩曰聖人知未然¹⁷⁸記』
(2:10才)

□曰至誠之道可以前知¹⁷⁹然謂雖太子作之」
□不可信也夫¹⁸⁰孔子之言不行於定哀見忌」
□於子西取讎於桓魋招毀於叔孫是等皆」
□非孔子之不善春不信太子每ㄟ過議之」
□亦其類也」

考曰放生之事余已論八幡之中今言其餘¹⁸¹」
惻隱之心仁之端也¹⁸²君子所貴乎不殺者誠¹⁸³」

¹⁷⁶ This is a complete and correct quotation. See *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1 pp. 522, lines 12-14. N.B. Not only the quotation from *Jinja-kō*, but also the complete reply by Jakuhon, is quoted in *Kōbunko* 廣文庫 (1918) under the lemma *Miraiki* (see *op. cit.*, vol. 18, p. 1010).

¹⁷⁷ Quotation from Kūkai's *Hizōhō-ron* 秘藏寶鑰; see TZ 77, p. 366b: 「摩尼空聞名。麟鳳誰見實。然則不見麟鳳、不可絕羽毛之族。不得如意、不可拋金玉之類。」。

¹⁷⁸ No such phrase is found in the *Shijing*.

¹⁷⁹ Quotation from *Zhongyong* 24.

¹⁸⁰ Here begins a correct, but incomplete quote from *Yunming lun* 運命論 ("Treatise on Destiny"; *Wen xuan* 文選 53) by Li Kang 李康 (196-265). The complete passage reads: 「夫以仲尼之才也、而器不周於魯衛、以仲尼之辯也、而言不行於定哀、以仲尼之謙也、而見忌於子西、以仲尼之仁也、而取讎於桓魋、以仲尼之智也、而屈厄於陳蔡、以仲尼之行也、而招毀於叔孫」。

¹⁸¹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 乎 at this point.

¹⁸² Quotation from *Mengzi* 2A6 in which the Four Beginnings 四端 are listed: 「惻隱之心、仁之端。羞惡之心、義之端也。辭讓之心、禮之端也。是非之心、智之端也」。

¹⁸³ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 死者 at this point.

不可復生則誰人无惻隱哉愛親而仁民以』

(2:10ウ)

及物是所謂廣仁之道也彼釋氏廢父母而憐」

虫魚不亦悖乎投身虎狼餒¹⁸⁴肉蚊蚋¹⁸⁵不亦愚」

乎天之生萬物也人為貴故聖人出制礼義」

犧牲于宗廟¹⁸⁶烹割于庖厨炮炙于藥方何必」

不殺哉¹⁸⁷」

□論曰凡天地与我同根万物与我一躰¹⁸⁸出」

□於同根一於其躰者何分而殺乎况復修」

□多羅說生々世々為親為子為禽獸无不』

(2:11才)

□經其生雖鳥獸生々之親子也何其不憐」

□乎其生々之親子尚憐况於今生之親乎」

□然尚若晨昏區々之養共作輪廻之業同」

□沈永劫之苦故以一形身之養不為真孝」

□佛教割愛出家修善品救識神不亦大乎」

□所謂大行不顧細謹大礼不辭小節者也¹⁸⁹」

□大伯捨大王而逃荆蠻孔子美而為至德¹⁹⁰」

¹⁸⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 餓 (Mor. XII: 44163) instead of 餓 (Mor. XII: 44236), but in view of the readings — *ueru* ("to be hungry, to starve") versus *kau*, *kurawaseru* ("to keep, to give to eat") — the latter character must be preferred.

¹⁸⁵ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 蠱 (Mor. X: 33318) instead of the *itaiji* □ (Mor. X: 32836).

¹⁸⁶ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 廟 (Mor. IV: 9489) instead of the *itaiji* 廟 (Mor. IV: 9400).

¹⁸⁷ Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, this is a complete and correct quotation; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1 pp. 523, lines 8-11.

¹⁸⁸ The phrase 天地與我同根、萬物與我一體 occurs quite frequently in the Buddhist corpus. One locus is in *Zhao lun* 肇論 ("Zhao's Discourses") by Sengzhao 僧肇 (384-414); see TZ 45, p. 159b: 「齊觀即彼已莫二、所以天地與我同根、萬物與我一體。同我則非復有無。異我則乖於會通。所以不出不在。而道存乎其間矣。」。

¹⁸⁹ A largely correct quotation from *Shiji* 7 ("The Annals of Xiang Yu 項羽本紀"), 19. The only difference is, that *Shiji* writes 小讓 ("small concession"), whereas Jakuhon writes 小節 ("small restraint"); see *Shiji* vol. 1, p. 314

¹⁹⁰ A reference to *Lunyu* 8.1, where Confucius praises Taibo for having refrained from accepting the throne of Zhou. The quotation in *Lunyu* reads: "子曰：「泰伯，其可謂至德也已矣。三以天下讓，民無得而稱焉。」"。

□未嘗曰去而廢父佛氏身高踏大方志遠』

(2:11ウ)

□出物表救群生為任修万行忘苦經曰我」

□等与衆生皆共成佛道¹⁹¹及物者如斯何其」

□廢父母焉投身虎狼餒肉蚊蚋者為物忘」

□已大士之事也釋尊之因位有其事釋尊」

□名大覺沛光徧燭通大千而開化¹⁹²為聖中之」

□大聖¹⁹³過去未来无不洞見現在沙界无不」

□通了¹⁹⁴然春云佛愚者其何之所為一切重罪」

□可懺悔謗佛之罪不能懺悔罪狀經說寔繁』

(2:12才)

□今不悉出焉犧牲之事雖盛礼其不得止」

□之古儀也故古賢云君存其礼則廢之¹⁹⁵亦」

□可也是以梁武犧換麩野見殉換土皆所」

□以其存法也千載以為美焉左氏曰苟有」

□明德則蘋蘩藟藻之菜潢汙行潦之水可」

□羞於王公可薦於鬼神¹⁹⁶聖賢之心聖賢之」

□言可欽從焉礼云玉帛云乎¹⁹⁷真礼義豈止」

¹⁹¹ A common phrase at the end of Buddhist rituals that is used by way of merit transference (*ekô* 回向). The index to the *Taishō dai-zōkyō* gives forty-four hits for this phrase.

¹⁹² A partial quotation from *Bianhuopian* 辯惑篇 2, in; *Guang hongming ji* 廣弘明集 5; TZ 52, p. 117c. The complete text reads: 「且佛名大覺照極機初。審性欲之多方。練病藥之權道。故能俯現金姿。垂丈六之偉質。流光遍燭。通大千而闡化」。 The differences in the quoted part are that Jakuhon uses 徧 instead of 遍, and 開 instead of 闡.

¹⁹³ This phrase can be found both in *Bianweilu* 辯偽錄 2 (TZ 52, p. 760a) and in *Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載 22 (TZ 49, p. 717c).

¹⁹⁴ A largely correct but incomplete quotation from *Sanjiao pingxin lun* (TZ 52, p. 782c). The complete phrase reads: 「過去塵沙劫未來塵沙劫無不洞見。現在塵沙界眾生塵沙心無不了知。 . The part 「無不了知」 at the end is changed by Jakuhon into 「无不通了」.

¹⁹⁵ We have not been able to establish the origin of this quotation, or the identity of this ancient sage.

¹⁹⁶ An incomplete quotation from *Zuo zhuan*, "Duke Yin 隱公," third year, section 2. The complete quotation reads: 「君子曰、信不由中、質無益也。明恕而行、要之以禮、雖無有質、誰能閒之。苟有明信、澗谿沼沚之毛、蘋蘩藟藻之菜、筐筥錡釜之器、潢汙行潦之水、可薦於鬼神、可羞於王公」.

¹⁹⁷ An incomplete quotation from *Lunyu* 17.11. The complete passage reads: 子曰:「禮云禮云, 玉帛云乎哉。樂云樂云, 鐘鼓云乎哉」.

□犧牲乎盛礼猶如斯况復於鑿菹也何其』

(2:12ウ)

□以殺乎」

考曰仁者雖得天下不殺一不辜而殺与不」

殺又在仁中程子作蝸頌曰殺則害仁放則」

害義¹⁹⁸仁義豈果二哉欲知殺不殺之理先看」

此頌¹⁹⁹」

□論曰仁者不殺一不辜然則犧牲之於鳥」

□獸也鳥獸有何辜乎又放其不辜而何害」

□義乎殺之者遂不可為仁焉程子之言何』

(2:13才)

□定是程出邪詖之語者不為不多為静齋²⁰⁰」

□逃²⁰¹虚見非之春唯如泰山愛慕之私也人」

□不為公焉」

考曰敏達²⁰²七年太子奏曰白黒月初八十四五」

是為六齋²⁰³此日諸天檢察國政乞²⁰⁴天下禁殺」

詔許之²⁰⁵彼所謂天者其何為者²⁰⁶哉想夫²⁰⁷在上」

而監下明察正直者此六檢國政他日不檢」

乎政有大小有美惡唯不殺生為大而美乎夫』

¹⁹⁸ See *Er Cheng chuanji: Henan Cheng-shi yiwen* 1:1a. The original text uses the character 傷 instead of 害. Unfortunately, this single line is all that has remained of the ode.

¹⁹⁹ The quotation is complete and correct. See *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 523, lines 12-14.

²⁰⁰ The character used in the text is 齋, but no compound 静齋 is attested, while a compound 静齋 (Mor. XII: 42578-98) exists. As Jakuhon often uses 齋 and 齋 interchangeably, this is the most likely solution.

²⁰¹ The *itaiji* Jakuhon uses (Mor. XI: 38938) is not in the font.

²⁰² The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 帝 at this point.

²⁰³ The character used in the text is 齋, but again it must be 齋; see above, note 175. *Infra* we have made the same adaptation. N.B. A compound 六齋 exists (Mor. II: 1453-384), but the meanings do not fit the present context.

²⁰⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 允 instead of 乞.

²⁰⁵ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 「是與子所言。不同耶。曰。此佛氏之說也。姑就而議之。」 at this point.

²⁰⁶ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* does not have the character 者.

²⁰⁷ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* does not have the character 夫.

(2:13ウ)

人君之政一日万機百官之所職万民之所
瞻也太子告敏達推古何不以仁義之政而
以六齋日哉以六齋止殺而言國政者吾為
太子甚恥之²⁰⁸」

□論曰六齋日之說文寔繁太子之所言如
□四天王經及六齋功德經之說此時太子
□生六歲經未渡六齋之說本朝所未聞是
□其一竒也六齋之事案智度論所演曰如』

(2:14才)

□佛法中日无好惡隨世惡日開緣故教持
□齋²⁰⁹是日惡鬼逐人有持齋善福之者避凶
□得福²¹⁰是隨天竺之舊風²¹¹者也蓋取六日者
□如三長月神有日分而此六日當其惡神
□故齋之是唯示在家者也若出家長時齋
□戒也在家亦不限之或一日二日乃至半
□月隨其堪而齋戒若礼記曰致齋三日者
□以為清明之德²¹²是所以在家之放蕩不能』

(2:14ウ)

□長時也六齋之事春謾議焉且議太子告
□敏達推古不以仁義之政蓋太子以仁義

²⁰⁸ Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, the quotation is correct. See *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 523, line 14 - p. 524, line 4.

²⁰⁹ Quotation from *Dazhidulun* 13 (TZ 25, p. 160b): 「如佛法中、日無好惡。隨世惡日、因緣故。教持齋受八戒。」. Jakuhon has 開緣 instead of 因緣, and he omits the final three characters. We have translated according to Jakuhon's text.

²¹⁰ Partial quotation from a slightly earlier passage in *Dazhidulun* 13 「問曰。何以故、六齋日受八戒修福德。答曰。是日惡鬼逐人欲奪人命。疾病凶衰令人不吉。是故劫初聖人、教人持齋修善作福、以避凶衰。是時齋法不受八戒」.

²¹¹ This is the old form of the character 風; see Mor. II: 1765.

²¹² This is a paraphrase, rather than a quotation of *Liji: Jitong* 祭統 6: 「是故君子之齊也、專致其精明之德也。故散齊七日以定之。致齊三日以齊之」; see Takeuchi Teruo, ed., *Raiki* vol. 2 (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1977), pp. 734-735. Jakuhon writes 清明 instead of 精明.

□不為必治道然尚初興儒教如十七憲法」
□等者皆備²¹³國家之治体精要可見焉不止」
□必亦六齋春非不知之知而掩之姦也若」
□又太子雖无仁義之教而止六齋不為以」
□非國政所以宋文云國人皆善則垂拱致」
□治者²¹⁴是也治何必止仁義乎上古无仁義』
(2:15才)

□之名世非至治乎夫國无定教教无定主²¹⁵」
□是以聖賢之道合宜而張之事在濟物而」
□非私心春為太子甚耻之太子為春甚可」
□恥之」

考曰太子乘甲斐驪駒²¹⁶上富士嶽○²¹⁷是余之所」
訝也世之褒美太子者每 過誇而鑠其美」
惟不少矣²¹⁸太子駕青龍車入隋國取南岳舊」
房法華經凌虛空而歸日本則愈疑愈訝余』
(2:15ウ)

豈信哉案釋迦譜其託誕于淨飯王宮而為」
悉陀太子十九年中種 祥瑞神反²¹⁹不可勝」
數也彼撰聖德太子傳者亦蓋見悉陀太子」
之譜而羨慕相似耳²²⁰」

²¹³ This character is an *itaiji* of 備; see Mor. I: 737.

²¹⁴ The phrase is repeated in *Sanjiao pingxin lun* (TZ 52, p. 786a), where Emperor Wen of the Song is quoted as saying: 「若使率土之濱、皆感此化、朕則垂拱、坐致太平矣」。 Cf. above, pp. 1:2b-3a and note 23.

²¹⁵ This looks like a quotation, but we have not been able to trace it.

²¹⁶ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* writes 駒, and even adds *furigana* to specify the reading of the compound 驪駒 (*kurokoma*). However, 駒 and 駒 are different characters. 駒 (Mor. XII: 44587), pronounced *di*, means "a horse with a white blaze" or "a superior horse," while 駒 (Mor. XII: 44663), pronounced *zhu*, means "a horse of two years, a small horse." Of course, 駒 is a very rare character, and *Denryaku* also writes 駒 (see *Shusho Denryaku* 2:20a-21a) when reporting this story, so 駒 must have been the intended character. N.B. *Denryaku* describes the event at length, and dates it to Suiko 6 (598).

²¹⁷ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following at this point: 「舍人調使麻呂隨之。＜此馬。甲州所獻。故為名。＞奈何。余答曰。都氏富士山記。不云太子登陟之事。俗間所傳之緣起。亦不載此事。」

²¹⁸ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following at this point: 「今云昇富士岩。猶且疑之。而云」。

²¹⁹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 變 instead of 反。

□論曰佛教之中声聞下劣也目徹三世身現」
 □十八石壁无碍²²¹虚空能飛²²²太子不測神用」
 □与凡庸何擬乎春不信太子之事者春之」
 □邪心也太子之神千載天下信之而不誣』
 (2:16才)
 □焉烏可倚一人之私而毀千載之信聖者」
 □之神耶」
 考曰守屋之廢佛以我為神國也馬子之崇」
 佛蔑如神祇也穴穗皇子也推古皇女也立」
 穴穗為是乎立推古為是乎○²²³馬子²²⁴弑崇峻」
 太子何黨馬子不討賊哉²²⁵因循以從則馬子之」
 罪亦有所分耶²²⁶」
 □論曰守屋之廢佛以我神國而嫌其異教者』
 (2:16ウ)
 □儒亦同也春亦是之哉馬子脩舊事紀讚」
 □述神祇未有蔑如神祇守屋之謂神国者」
 □不見其迹唯挿²²⁷私心而課神耳凡守屋馬」
 □子之是非史籍之所存也守屋廢佛春以」

²²⁰ Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes *Jinja-kō* is correctly quoted; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 524, lines 5-10.

²²¹ This character (Mor. IV: 7421) is a variant of 碍 (Mor. VIII: 24283), which is an *itaiji* of 礙 (Mor. VIII: 24542).

²²² Quotation from Kūkai's *Hizō hōron* 秘藏寶論 2 (TZ 77, p. 366a): 「生空三昧、知神我之幻影。無生盡智、斷煩惱之後。有其通也、則虧蔽日月、顛覆天地。目徹三世、身現十八。石壁無礙、虚空能飛。其德也、則輪王頂接、釋梵歸依。」

²²³ Jakuhon omits the following passage: 「是未可定。則馬子未為得。而守屋未為失也。馬子殺穴穗。則首惡有所歸耶。我惟馬子之意。立女主令太子委政。太子素善遇馬子然則太子之政。馬子之心也。不即位而有其威者」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 525, line 3-6.

²²⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 「也其後果」 a this place.

²²⁵ Jakuhon omits the following passage: 「太子宗室也。已揚守屋之惡。發稻城之役。守屋未嘗弑君也。其惡其罪。何在哉。親見馬子之弑殺。而」; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 525, lines 6-7.

²²⁶ Apart from the omissions mentioned in the preceding notes, the quotation is correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1 pp. 525, lines 2-8.

²²⁷ This character is not attested in the dictionaries, nor in Jakuhon's *Iji-hen*. We take it to be an *itaiji* of 挿 (Mor. V: 12119), which is an *itaiji* of 插 (Mor. V: 12346).

□愛之掩其惡馬子奉佛春以憎之揚其惡」
□其立推古者以姉也天照太神雖女与宗」
□庸矣其弑崇峻也崇峻惡馬子云如斬猪」
□頸²²⁸禍出于君孟子曰君視臣如土芥臣視』
(2:17才)

□君如寇讎²²⁹朱云土芥則踐踏之而已矣斬」
□芥之而已矣其賤惡之又甚矣寇讎之報」
□不亦宜乎²³⁰然尚非紂暴武仁則不得免罪」
□太子之宥恕者不可以其私貽後世之醜」
□焉蓋初守屋欲立穴穗王子而咀用明帝」
□帝天又謀誅諸王子成穴穗之事事發馬」
□子与諸王子謀伐守屋馬子有功然亦誅」
□及馬子高鳥盡良弓藏狡兔死良狗烹者²³¹』
(2:17ウ)

□也且馬子大家也天下騷動不可止忍之」
□則止天下之害夫道者法之本也法者道」
□之枝也枉法而存道聖者之取舍也舜為」
□天子皋陶為士瞽瞍殺人陶執之舜馳而」
□乞²³²枉法而存道者是也犬馬有勞則君子」
□能愍焉且馬子偉器奉國史之命而成焉」
□豈千載之盛事者欤春唯以其私容易議」

²²⁸ Reference to *Nihon shoki* 21 (*Nihon shoki, kōhen*, p. 131) under Sushun 5/10/4: 「有獻山猪。天皇指猪詔曰。何時如断此猪之頸、断朕所嫌之人。多設兵仗有異於常。」. See also Razan's two disquisitions on Soga no Umako, *So Bashi ga ben* 蘇馬子辯, in: *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26 (*Bunshū* vol. 1, pp. 293-204).

²²⁹ See *Mengzi* 4B.3. The correct quotation is: 「君之視臣如土芥、則臣視君如寇讎」.

²³⁰ A complete and correct quotation from Zhu Xi's commentary on this pericope; see *Mengzi jizhu* 孟子集註 8.2b.

²³¹ For this adage, see Mor. XII: 45313-692. The *locus* quoted there is *Shiji* 92, the biography of Han Xin, Marquess of Huaiyin 淮陰侯韓信. Here it says: 「信曰:果若人言、狡兔死、良狗亨。高鳥盡、良弓藏。敵國破、謀臣亡。」; see *Shiji* vol. 8, p. 2627. See also Hayashi Razan, *Shigen-shō* 『唇言抄』, the very first page.

²³² A partial quotation from *Mengzi* 7A.35: 「桃應問曰:舜為天子、皋陶為士、瞽瞍殺人、則如之何。孟子曰:執之而已矣。然則舜不禁與。曰:夫舜惡得而禁之。夫有所受之也。然則舜如之何。曰:舜視棄天下,猶棄敝屣也。竊負而逃、遵海濱而處,終身訢然、樂而忘天下。」 N.B. The phrase 馳而乞 is lacking.

□又有安昌殺玄同論以太子馬子安昌為』

(2:18才)

□日本之三賊以太子馬子奉佛為此獍言」

□何其妬害甚哉」

考曰或又問曰太子曰神道者根本也儒道」
者枝葉也佛道者花実也²³³余答曰此非太子」
之言也後來卜部中臣之所託²³⁴也太子无獻」
王好古之心而有蕭衍講經之質若令太子」
好神如好佛則豈費多少之財立若干之寺」
哉奉儒如奉釋則何謂篤信三宝哉只佛為』

(2:18ウ)

根本神儒為枝花蓋太子之意也吁以寺院」
為学校而佛事為祭祀教之以孝弟勸之以」
忠誠則神道人道豈其二哉惜乎太子之不」
如此也²³⁵」

□論曰太子生七歲敏達天皇感其生才問」

□儒釋之言時太子有此言且有三教一種」

□之釋文春每々相怪古云疑者事之害²³⁶也」

□実矣且太子著方袍講經義作寺像者所』

(2:19才)

□以其駕願來也若於神道也初立神家学」

²³³ Similar texts are found in Yoshida Kanetomo, *Yuitsu shintō myōhō yōshū* 唯一神道名法要集, and in *Taisei-kyō*. The relevant passage in *Myōhō yōshū* is: 「吾日本生種子。震旦現枝葉。天竺開花実。故佛教者。為万法之花実。儒教者。為万法之枝葉。神道者。為万法之根本。」; see *NST 19: Chūsei shintō ron*, p. 328a-b; p. 234. In *Taisei-kyō* 31 it says: 「神道道根本、與天地發、以說人始道也、儒道道枝葉、與生藜而發、說人中道也、仏道道花、實人智熟后發、說人終道也。」; see edn *Zoku Shintō taikēi*, vol. 2, p. 259. N.B. The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts 「此言如何」 at this place.

²³⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 托 instead of 託.

²³⁵ Apart from the discrepancies mentioned in the preceding notes, the quotation is correct and complete; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1 pp. 525 line 12 -526 line 2.

²³⁶ A quotation from *Shiji* 92, the biography of the Marquess of Huaiyin (cf. above, note 231). It says: 「故知者決之斷也、疑者事之害也。」; see *Shiji* vol. 8, p. 2625.

□奉詔令蘓馬子集錄神代事迹然則太子」
□神道之啟迪也何其為不好神耶以寺院為」
□學校教孝弟勸忠誠者彼以為美以我教」
□判十住心見之是第二住心分齊猶不与」
□小乘声緣競太子之洪烈非春之所知域」
考曰案世称南天²³⁷菩提達磨來²³⁸日本遇太子」
故以飢人為達磨謂其埋所為達磨墳余謂』

(2:19ウ)

是非達磨也蓋浮屠好事者之為而後世沿²³⁹襲」
而不悟其非而已余見日本紀等²⁴⁰只云太子」
云飢人耳未曾云達磨也²⁴¹夫此飢者真異人」
哉²⁴²欲使太子執礼居敬而下天下之上²⁴³夫太」
子素非傲者然異人尚垂其警戒耳下邳老」
人令張良進履以授異書遂得黄石于穀城」
山下今此片岡飢人令太子下馬与食服酬」
和²⁴⁴歌以遺紫衣於槲上彼此一時也神異一』

(2:20才)

同也非遇太子則无垂教戒非顯神異則无」
示後世²⁴⁵」
□論曰片岡之飢人為達磨事以不載其名」
□之書證之以載其名之書不信之世之所」

²³⁷ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 竺 at this point.

²³⁸ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 于 at this point.

²³⁹ This is an *itaiji* of 沿; cf. Mor. VI: 17179.

²⁴⁰ Instead of 等, the text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 「及拾遺倭歌集」.

²⁴¹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts at this point the not very illuminating phrase 「不□□□□□磨矣」.

²⁴² The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the phrase 「想其嗟來蹴爾必不受焉。蓋太子攝國政。此異人」 at this point.

²⁴³ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 士 instead of 上.

²⁴⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 倭 at this point.

²⁴⁵ Apart from the discrepancies noted above, the quotation is correct; see *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 527, line 2-8.

□傳書其取捨任²⁴⁶己之忤容會以居多之言」

□雖以太子為日本之賊遂不能誣今亦稱」

□焉以飢人為異人引穀城山下之黃石石」

□之出人者何其不怪乎磨師者人而出入」

(2:20ウ)

□活路門之權化也不可怪者怪之其可怪」

□者不怪之皆私之所掩也」

考曰我邦自古稱天狗者多矣皆靈鬼之中」

其較著者相稱曰天狗²⁴⁷其類中鞍馬僧正為」

巨魁世之所稱鞍馬²⁴⁸僧正愛宕²⁴⁹太郎比良山」

次郎伊都那²⁵⁰三郎富士太郎上野妙義○²⁵¹此等」

類甚夥或為狐或為童或為鳩飛行或為僧」

為山伏出²⁵²人間或為鬼神貞或為佛菩薩相」

(2:21才)

時々出現其說曰見人福則轉為禍遇世治」

則復為亂或發火災或起鬪爭歷代天子之」

中讚岐院為金色大鳶長一丈餘後鳥羽院」

為被髮長翼之沙門後醍醐院為高鼻勾爪」

之王²⁵³又沙門之有慢心及怨怒者多入天狗」

之中所謂傳教弘法慈覺智證等皆是也○²⁵⁴」

²⁴⁶ The character in the text looks like 任 (Mor. I: 417), but this is obviously a mistake.

²⁴⁷ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the phrase 「是非蚩尤旗星之義」 at this point; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 552, line 11.

²⁴⁸ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 山 at this point; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 552, line 12.

²⁴⁹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 山 at this point; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 552, line 12.

²⁵⁰ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has the character 奈 instead of 那; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 552, line 12.

²⁵¹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following phrases at this point: 「(上野妙義)坊。常陸筑波法印。彦山豐前坊。大山伯耆坊。大峰善鬼。金平六。比叡山法性坊。肥後阿闍梨。葛城行者。高間坊。高雄內供奉。如意嶽天狗」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 552, line 13-14.

²⁵² The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 于 at this point; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 1.

²⁵³ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts at this point the phrase 「乘五緒龍車。其餘猶多」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 3-4.

慈惠者著甲冑攻三井寺²⁵⁵覺鑿得造作魔心」
當傳法院²⁵⁶其後多武峯方等法師狂言曰吾」
(2:21ウ)

是覺鑿也怒目睨人²⁵⁷又和州堯信為天狗言」
而告慶円曰吾是中院僧都也²⁵⁸我徒有神力」
者三百餘類伺人死作燒害自古高僧碩師」
臨終多遭魔燒²⁵⁹皆我之所為也其說又曰²⁶⁰我」
輩或為法然日蓮發自廢他廢之慢或為采西」
而飛廉于京城或為普門而魘魅于龍山或為」
小野文觀勸天子討平族起元弘之乱或為」
疎石妙吉令尊氏直義失同胞之恩師直師」
(2:22才)

泰乖君臣之礼是等皆²⁶¹我輩所為也○²⁶²貞和五」
年出羽國羽黒²⁶³山伏名雲景者將往天龍寺」
遇老山伏于西郊景与此登愛宕山見一座」
中有異僧彼告曰是所謂玄昉真濟寬朝慈」
惠頼豪仁海等也其上坐人 ㄋ 者淡路帝井」

²⁵⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following phrases at this point: 「柿本紀僧正。入高雄峯。起大慢心。為太郎坊。或曰。和泉堺側。有與紀僧正同名者。以我慢心。死而為魅。尊意者。與群鳥同翔於橫川之杉」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 4-6.

²⁵⁵ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts at this point the phrase 「燒千手院」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 6.

²⁵⁶ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following phrases at this point: 「高野衆徒。忿而鼓譟。攻鑿房。不見鑿而見不動。衆徒曰。是必鑿也。飛石中不動。時血流。衆徒大呼曰。非狐狸。非天狗。非不動。是覺鑿也」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 7-8.

²⁵⁷ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following phrases at this point: 「取火箸燒爐中。手自弄之曰。我始作即身成佛之印。是兩部秘奧之印明也」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 9-10.

²⁵⁸ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following phrases at this point: 「浮屠巫祝。豈能降我哉。我心慢罵之。揮斥之」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 10-11.

²⁵⁹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has the character 撓 instead of 燒; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 12.

²⁶⁰ The phrase "*sono setsu ni mata iwaku*" suggests that Razan is quoting again from a different source, but it remains unclear which text it is.

²⁶¹ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has the character 亦 instead of 皆; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 553, line 14.

²⁶² The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the following phrases at this point: 「近代細川勝元無嗣。祈于愛宕山。而産政元。政元為管領<大心院>。死而為崇。祭之為立祠。是又愛宕之榮術太郎之屬也」; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 554, line 1-2.

²⁶³ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 山 at this point; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 554, line 3.

上皇后或著袞龍²⁶⁴或持金笏崇德帝為金鷄」

展大翅源為朝橫弓矢侍其傍後鳥羽院後」

醍醐院皆同席而在各談世間治乱興亡之』

(2:22ウ)

事已而景將歸老山伏告曰是太郎坊之所居」

也景如夢而醒其身惘然在于大内舊迹²⁶⁵樹下²⁶⁶」

□論曰春之惡言甚者以何之心然乎聞人」

□誰不聞乎天狗事取世俗之浮說云鞍馬」

□僧正為巨魁見一書曰素盞烏命猛氣滿」

□胸腹而餘成吐物化成神姬神而威強人」

□身獸頭鼻長牙長善神所計以在左者早」

□逆謂為右自名云天逆每姬命²⁶⁷ <天狗同>春』

(2:23才)

□多由太平記取童子戲弄之草子彼怪則」

□怪嫌怪而亦取怪其易移者乃私心之然」

□也彼信取太平記然其所言可信結城入」

□道等之地獄事凡太平記俗間評判寔錄²⁶⁸」

□春尚架之初傳教弘法諸宗祖師徽声之」

□高僧皆為天狗此高僧等出聖朝助風化」

²⁶⁴ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the phrase 「繡日月星」 at this point; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 554, line 5.

²⁶⁵ The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* inserts the character 椋 at this point; see *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 554, line 7.

²⁶⁶ The quotation corresponds to *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, pp. 552, line 11 - 554, line 7. The story about Unkei and the old *yamabushi* is based on *Unkei mirai no koto* 「雲景未來記事」, which is included in volume twenty-seven of *Taihei-ki* 太平記 (see Appendix V).

²⁶⁷ Although the figure of Amanozako 天逆每 first appeared in *Sendai kuji hongī*, the wording Jakuhon uses here strongly suggests that he based himself on the apocryphal *Sendai kuji hongī taiseikyō*. *Taisei-kyō* 5: *Jingi hongī, jō* 神祇本紀上 (*Zoku shintō taikei* vol. 1, p. 119) contains the following passage: 「又服狹雄尊猛氣，滿胸腹、而餘成吐物、化成天狗神。神而威強、其軀、人身頭獸首也。鼻長、耳長、牙良獸也。左右不隨意、則太怒、甚荒。雖大力神、乃懸于鼻、挑於千里。雖強堅刀戈、輒咋卦於牙、壞以作段段。每事出知不能穩止、中善神所計、而以在左者早逆謂為右、又在前者即謂為後而以在。左者早逆謂。為。右又在。前者即謂。為。後白推名乎目兮名：天逆每自推名乎、名天逆每尊。吞天之逆氣、獨身而生兒。名天魔雄命。不順天尊命、諸事造為、不成順善。八百萬神等、悉方便矣。」

²⁶⁸ This character is an *itaiji* of 繁 (*shigeshi*); see Mor. VIII: 27512.

□或印迹於異域法於本朝遺烈實遠矣」

□高歷數百之歲華國界頌²⁶⁹奉其徒幾千万』

(2:23ウ)

□於本朝也雖路頭之孩兒无不欽焉春何」

□為者哉雖以文字之役食公錄非用其道」

□禿其頭僧其官<法印>渠以嫉妬叨謗辱²⁷⁰權化高」

□汩狂發不慮人心乎」

考曰近有桑門崇²⁷¹傳者自言吾習太元明王法」

是吉備大臣之所秘授而世人希知也○²⁷²余恐世」

人²⁷³惑于此也²⁷⁴」

□論曰太元之法者小栗柄常曉入唐所傳』

(2:24才)

□也像軌供規尤為深奧其云吉備大臣等」

□非正法如斯之類不可勝數古德有弁折」

□以此等事寄話²⁷⁵妖賈之輩雖今世尚多皆」

□不与正宗其邪者在人而已矣非翹佛法之」

□中而然諸道亦有焉」

□

²⁶⁹ The compound 頌奉 is not attested in the dictionaries. This part of the *Bengi* is quoted in *Gen sandaishi rishō ki* 『元三大師利生記』 (1863), the chapter 「慈惠大師往生要集を軌範とすべしと告命之事」, which gives the compound 頌奉; see *Zoku Tendaijū Zensho, Shiden* vol. 2 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1988), pp. 273b-274a. That compound, too, is not attested.

²⁷⁰ For the compound 謗辱 see Mor. X: 35817-19

²⁷¹ The character used in *Bengi* looks suspiciously like an *itaiji* of 密, and certainly not like the *itaiji* of 崇; see Jakuhon's *Iji-hen* 1:8a and 1:4b, respectively. The text in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō*, however, has 崇, however, which in view of the context is obviously correct.

²⁷² Jakuhon omits line 3 (end) - 11 (first half). The omitted part reads as follows: 「其説云。有五行筆法。謂水火點畫也。以弘法書門額。朱雀米雀。大極火極而附會之。又有旗幕紋。謂長短色體也以八幡太郎。詣男山。與大江都督。相製造。而誇説之。又有擇日吉凶。以宣明曆所云。而取星宿支干。以牽合之。又有方角違避。以迷故三界城。悟故十方空。本來無東西。何處有南北。而結成之。而以爲。悟且空者。太元明王是也。是乃人々。本命元星。無日之可擇。無方之可避。無物之可忌。於易爲先天。爲無極。於天台。爲眞如。爲天真。於眞言。爲阿字第一命。爲本不生。於禪爲本分。爲空劫以前。余聞彼與貴人話。其底蘊雖未言。而推見之。其極不過若斯而已矣。是蓋入彼室。操彼戈。而代彼之意也。余於續日本紀詳視吉備公之事迹。未嘗有授太元明王法者焉。」

²⁷³ The edn in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* has 世之尊貴 instead of 世人; see *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 202, line 11.

²⁷⁴ This quotation corresponds to *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* vol. 1, p. 566, line 3-11.

²⁷⁵ The character might just as well have been 活, but that would not fit the context.

□

神社考辨疑卷下終』

(2:24ウ)

□正徳六丙申仲春日』

□□書林

京寺町五條古川三郎兵衛』

江戸通町十軒棚同進七』