

Paul GRONER

## Training Through Debates in Medieval Tendai and Seizan-ha Temples

This article focuses on the debate system formulated by monks surrounding Jitsudō Ninkū (1309–1388), a figure who played an important role in both Tendai and Jōdoshū Seizan-ha. A large amount of doctrinal literature from this group has been published in recent years, including debates and extensive lectures on the Tendai, Esoteric Buddhism, Pure Land, and Mahayana Vinaya (*Fanwangjing*) traditions. By focusing on sets of monastery rules and the colophons written by these monks, details emerge of a training system that focused on doctrinal study, lecture, and debate. The care with which these texts were composed and revised suggests the vitality of their tradition.

KEYWORDS: debate—Tendai—Seizan-ha—monastic discipline—Sangoji—Roanji

Paul GRONER is a professor of religious studies at the University of Virginia.

FROM THE beginning of the Japanese Tendai 天台 School in the early ninth century, the issue of how to train monks in the tradition has been a major concern. Frequently this issue was associated with the requirements for ordination, the contents of the ordination, or with practices immediately following ordination. For example, at the time the founder of the school, Saichō 最澄 (766/767–822), became a monk, candidates to become officially recognized monks (*nenbundosha* 年分度者) were required to be able to recite a certain number of scriptures and to live a pure or celibate life. The emphasis was clearly placed on training monks to perform rituals that would produce karmic merit that could be transferred to protect the nation and its ruler. In 798, the court's emphasis shifted so that candidates for ordination had to be able to demonstrate their mastery of doctrine (MOCHIZUKI and TSUKAMOTO 1966–1968, 5: 4162c). As a result, candidates from all schools were supposed to pass a test demonstrating their mastery of their school's teachings. This was further emphasized when each school was asked to submit a text outlining its teachings in 824.

When Saichō tried to establish an independent ordination on Mount Hiei, he proposed two tracks for monks: a meditation course (*shikangō* 止観業) that emphasized Tendai teachings, and an esoteric course (*shanagō* 遮那業) that focused on the *Darijing* 大日經 (*Mahāvairocana-sutra*) and other scriptures. In both cases, recitation of texts and the performance of rituals were combined with doctrinal studies. Evidence for this can be seen in the early descriptions of the halls established on Mount Hiei and the lectures and debates held on such days as the anniversary of Zhiyi's 智顛 death, the Shimotsuki-e 霜月会. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of Saichō's proposals was the requirement that monks be ordained on Mount Hiei rather than at Tōdaiji 東大寺 in Nara and then spend the next twelve years sequestered (*rōzan* 籠山) on Mount Hiei (GRONER 2000).

Although Saichō's plans to train monks continued to influence monks in later generations, they were impractical for several reasons. First, a period of twelve years on Mount Hiei was so idealistic that it was abandoned almost immediately (GRONER 2002, 8, 28, 59–60). Monks had obligations to their parents and patrons that drew them away. The second major issue concerned the precepts that were received at ordination. Saichō had rejected the Vinaya precepts traditionally used to ordain monks that were found in the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (*Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*). Although few monks followed all of these rules, they did provide a model of how monastic life should be conducted. In their place, Saichō used the precepts of the Brahma Net Sutra (Ch. *Fanwangjing*; Jp. *Bonmōkyō* 梵

網經), a set of precepts found in a Chinese apocryphal text that traditionally had been conferred on both lay and monastic practitioners. The penalties for infringements of the precepts and the administrative procedures for enforcing adherence were vague. As a result, the interpretation of the precepts has been an important focus of disputes in the Tendai School. However, the Brahma Net precepts rarely served as a direct guide for training monks. They were simply too terse (GRONER 1990; 2007). Moreover, they often focused on prohibitions as much as recommendations about how to practice.

Monastery rules sometimes contain insights into how monks were trained; the petitions that Saichō submitted to the court take the form of rules for the monastery on Mount Hiei. Shortly before he died, he wrote rules that were not subject to court approval, such as a prohibition on such acts as hitting young boys (*dōji* 童子) (GRONER 2000, 159–60). These reflect the monastery's autonomy, which would grow as time passed. One of the most extensive sets of rules was a set of twenty-six composed by Ryōgen for Mount Hiei; they explain such issues as how monasteries were governed, what ceremonies were held, and whether all monks were required to attend. Ryōgen tried to limit the celebrations that accompanied some rituals, control the growing threat of violence among monks, and instill a strict system of debates. Ryōgen's rules were expected to apply to all of Mount Hiei (GRONER 2002, 236–39, 345–66). Other sets of rules applied to specific areas, halls, or to certain rituals; sometimes these rules might be set by a major donor or by a court member concerned with the effectiveness of ritual performances. Some rules had an official or semi-official status, particularly if they concerned the administration of manors or rituals used in protecting the state. Such sets cover a variety of topics, including the performance of rituals and participation at assemblies, monastic dress, how monks were feted and treated at assemblies, the number of attendant monks of different ranks who were permitted to attend, the requirements for appointment to monastic offices, when monks were permitted to leave the confines of Mount Hiei, prohibitions on raising horses and oxen on the mountain, prohibitions on the possession of weapons, and prohibitions of women and alcohol (OKANO 2004).

Rules written by individual monks that were intended to be applied to their followers at specific temples are perhaps one of the richest sources for insights into training. At times, these were concerned with making sure that monks in the same lineage would be appointed to administer temples and properties. Examples of these are found in instructions left by Ennin and Ryōgen.<sup>1</sup> Still other sets of rules were formulated by the leaders of a particular monastic movement and intended to guide the training and practice of monks. For example, the Tendai monk Kōen's 興円 (1263–1317) rules describe such features as an

1. For Ennin's rules, see GRONER 2002, 307–308; for Ryōgen's rules, see GRONER 2002, 345–66.

administrative system, a calendar of rituals, and reflect efforts to reinstate a period of seclusion, but this only applied to the Kurodani 黒谷 lineage (GRONER 2009).

A question that always arises when such rules are investigated is how long they were observed and whether they were enforced. The twelve-year period of seclusion is a good example of this problem. Because records indicate admiration when a monk did fulfill the twelve years, it clearly was unusual. Does a rule specifying that monks should refrain from a particular activity indicate that some were breaking it? For example, does a rule prohibiting the drinking of alcohol indicate that many monks were doing so, or is it simply carried over from earlier codes such as the Vinaya or *Fanwangjing*?

This article focuses on a specific monk, Jitsudō Ninkū 実導仁空 (1309–1388), who was abbot of two important temples, Rozanji 廬山寺 and Sangoji 三鈷寺, both near Kyoto. He was a consummate educator and formulated several sets of rules that set out the guidelines that he felt should be followed in training monks. Under his guidance, the monks who surrounded him produced a large number of documents on monastic discipline belonging to several genres: commentaries, lectures, ritual manuals, and temple rules. A list of the sets of temple rules and their dates compiled by Ninkū helps reveal the extent of his concern with this genre.

1356/8/4: *Kyōin zōji ryaku mondō* 教院雜事略問答 (“Brief questions and answers about miscellaneous matters of the doctrinal halls”), 1 fascicle. Compiled at Nishiyama by the monk Ninkū at the Mahayana temple (Daijōji 大乘寺). T no. 2362. Revised at Rozanji, 1371/5/25.

1357/10/26: *Shingaku bosatsu gyōyōshō* 新学菩薩行要抄 (“Essentials of practice for bodhisattvas who have just begun studying”), 1 fascicle. Compiled by the provisionally named monk E'nin 慧仁 [an alternative name for Ninkū] at Binmanji 敏満寺 in Ōmi. Ninkū notes that he had begun the compilation of the text a year earlier at Nishiyama [where Sangoji was located]. T no. 2382.

1358/9/11: *Zaushō* 座右鈔 (“Compilation to be kept at the right side of one’s seat”), 1 fascicle. Compiled in honor of the thirteenth anniversary of the death of his teacher Jidō Kōkū 示導康空 (1286–1346). T no. 2641.

1367/8/11: *Kōin gakudō tsūki* 講院学堂通規 (“Comprehensive rules for the study halls at lecture temples”). Compiled by the old abbot of Nishiyama Nin(kū) at Sangoji. T no. 2643.

1373/7/14: *Shoshin gyōgoshō* 初心行護鈔 (“Rules for beginners to practice and observe”) at Rozanji; edited later that month at Sangoji. Recorded by the bodhisattva monk Nin(kū). T no. 2642.

I focus on the rules concerning the intellectual training of monks in order to describe the academic system he established. Other rules concern such issues as clothing, eating, bathing, using the toilet, and ritual in sufficient detail to indi-

cate that monks were to be mindful of how they conducted themselves, but the focus of Ninkū's efforts is clearly on their education and intellectual training.

Finally, one last issue should be noted. Ninkū was affiliated with both the Tendai School and with the Seizan 西山 lineage of the Jōdoshū 淨土宗, a tradition that went back to Shōkū 証空 (1177–1247), Hōnen's 法然 (1133–1212) disciple whose affiliations with nobility and Tendai monks saved him from exile. In fact, Ninkū, referred to as Ninkū Jitsudō 仁空実導 in the Seizan tradition, wrote the first biography of Shōkū and played an important role in organizing its temples. At the same time, Ninkū lectured on Mount Hiei and required his monks to be ordained on Mount Hiei. Few important distinctions between Tendai and the Seizan-ha appear in the rules that he composed for the temples he oversaw and the two traditions enjoyed close relations during Ninkū's lifetime. In fact, many Tendai monks traced their ordination lineages through Hōnen. Ninkū claimed that his views on the bodhisattva precepts were based on a special transmission of teachings on Zhiyi's commentary on the *Fanwangjing*, the *Pusajie yiji* 菩薩戒義記 (T no. 1811, "Record of the meaning of the bodhisattva precepts") that had come from Hōnen through Shōkū.

#### *Ninkū and the Lecture Temple Tradition*

The "Comprehensive rules for the lecture and study halls," compiled at Sangoji, offers an overview of Ninkū's objectives. The year after this text was compiled, Ninkū became abbot of Rozanji. Because both Sangoji and Rozanji were called doctrinal temples (*kyōin* 教院), the rules were probably applicable to both the Tendai and Pure Land temples under Ninkū's supervision, though with some differences in emphasis explained below. According to the "Comprehensive rules for the study halls at lecture temples" (*Kōin gakudō tsūki*),

Tendai, Shingon, the Perfect precepts [*enkai* 円戒], and Pure Land are the four traditions that we study. As for daytime lectures, invited people give some of them; other lectures are given by people when it is convenient. Each of the four teachings should be expounded, but they should not be mixed. At night, we study; this consists of quiet reflection on the meaning of the texts and should be conducted so that neighboring monks are not bothered. Whether it is esoteric or exoteric, whether it is the way of sages [*shōdō* 聖道] or Pure Land, students should study what they wish; they also may study in groups. However, as for provisional and Hinayana teachings, even though they may be considered aids to the path, students should not even get a whiff of such other traditions in this room. (T 83: 534c2–8)

The four traditions mentioned were used by both the Rozanji Tendai tradition and the early Seizan lineage of the Jōdo School. The admonition against mixing traditions is significant. One of the reasons for the decline of monastic disci-

pline in Japan had been the use of Esoteric Buddhist and Pure Land teachings that promised to obviate the bad karma from violations through *dhāraṇī* or the *nenbutsu*. The tension between Pure Land and the “path of the sages” found in many Pure Land traditions is rejected by affirming the validity of each. A similar approach is used in discussing Esoteric and Exoteric Buddhism; the term “Shingon” in this rule refers to Tendai Esoteric Buddhism (Taimitsu 台密), not to Kūkai’s Shingon School, a usage frequently found in Tendai materials. In addition, Ninkū’s refusal to interpret the traditions in terms of each other helped him maintain an intellectual integrity that was unusual in his day. His careful choice of which texts to read and his appreciation of the historical development of Tendai stand in marked contrast to the free-wheeling interpretations of doctrine found in many *hongaku* (original enlightenment) texts. At the same time, each of these traditions used classification of doctrines to make claims about the validity of doctrine, practice, and training. Ninkū recognizes these, but does not allow such claims to obviate or diminish the study of the four traditions he recognizes.

The rule does not suggest that monks were completely free to study whatever they wished. The prohibition on Hinayana and certain Mahayana traditions gave monks certain guidelines. The questions used in the Tendai and precepts debate manuals that Ninkū and the monks around him produced focused on works by Zhiyi 智顛 (538–597) and Zhanran 湛然 (711–782), two of the most authoritative figures in the Chinese Tiantai tradition. Texts from the *hongaku* tradition were cited rarely, if at all.

The above passage may seem like a vague encouragement to study, but Ninkū employed debate and lecture as the main focus of his educational system. Although a debate system is not mentioned in the preceding quotation, many of the texts compiled by Ninkū were clearly intended as debate manuals. Terms such as *rissha* 堅者 (a candidate in the debates or examinations) and *tandai* 探題 (a judge in debates) are found in the colophons to other texts, indicating that debate was undoubtedly used along with lecturing. Because Ninkū frequently presented a vigorous defense of positions of which he was critical, the debate texts provide a valuable record of the breadth of opinions held by Tendai and Seizan monks. In addition, a period of questioning accompanied some of the lectures as questioners responded to lecturers that covered a variety of topics used in debates. These procedures would have been used to sharpen and test the academic quality of students.

The debate tradition was strenuous and would have required intense memorization, reading, and concentration. Although some scholars make a distinction between intellectual activities and practices such as meditation and ritual performance, for Ninkū intellectual study clearly shaped the monk.<sup>2</sup> A monk

2. I find the work by Robert SHARF (1995) on the modern emphasis on religious experience particularly useful in this regard.

would focus on a small number of significant texts, memorizing key passages that pertained to preset topics. He would learn how to explain the topic and both defend and attack a position. In formal debates, the topic on which he would be questioned would be chosen by lot, so that a monk would not know the subject he would speak on ahead of time. (This differs from modern reenactments of debates.) While he was faced with the stress of a public performance at the monastery, the monk would be required to recite from memory a variety of passages concerning his topic, some of which seemed to be contradictory. The monk was allowed a certain degree of creativity in resolving these seemingly contradictory issues. Thus a monk could not adopt a Hossō position, but he could adopt a variety of positions within the Tendai or Seizan-ha traditions. The process of memorization and defending one's views served as a form of indoctrination as the monk incorporated the views he studied into a world view and interpretation of Buddhist teachings.

According to Ninkū, the training at these lecture halls consisted primarily of attending lectures in the daytime and studying at night. The lectures were to be enlivened with discussions and debate.

In the daytime, the head of the assembly [*hossu* 法主], preceptor, or knowledgeable elder should discuss the teaching. Or people from the assembly should draw lots and take turns asking questions of the lecturer.

(T 83: 534b26–27)

Other practices, such as meditation, were considered to be worthwhile as long as they did not interfere with study.<sup>3</sup> Ninkū's rules should not be interpreted as excluding the rituals and meditations that monks had traditionally performed to gain patronage from the state and powerful nobles; in fact, the rules are specifically for the study hall, not for the entire monastery. More information on Ninkū's biography would help determine the place of ritual in his activities. Ninkū does consent to perform prayers in 1374 (*Yanagihara-ke kiroku* 柳原家記録, DS 6.41: 109), but otherwise his biography seems to lack much involvement with prayers for the nobility. At times, he is involved with establishing the institutional basis of his temples (*Rozanji monjo* 廬山寺文書, DS 6.30: 1), but most of the snippets of biographical information we have show him constantly lecturing and educating monks. The primacy of study is demonstrated in the following entry:

At night, each should bring his books and they should gather in the study hall [*gakushitsu* 学室]. They should sit quietly and open their books. Activities such as reciting the sutras, chanting *dhāraṇī*, reciting the Buddha's name and

3. Centuries earlier, Ryōgen (912–985) had also tried to establish a balance between study and ritual. A set of twenty-six rules for Mount Hiei written by Ryōgen was preserved at Rozanji and quoted by Ninkū; this is translated as *Eishō Nasu* in GRONER 2002, 345–66.

practicing meditation are all good, but go against the rules of this room because they prevent the advance of learning. One should strive and be careful of heresy [*itan* 異端]. (Kōin *gakudō tsūki*, T 83: 534b–c)

No provision was made for regular meditation periods in any of Ninkū's sets of rules; the rituals typical of Tendai such as the constantly sitting or constantly walking *samādhi* are not mentioned, though Ninkū does recommend meditation if one awakes early (*Shoshin gyōgo shō*, T 83: 534a15). However, a calendar of rituals is not included in the rules in contrast to the rules used in the Kurodani lineage, another Tendai lineage with detailed rules that competed with Ninkū's tradition (GRONER 2009, 190). Finally, a short history of Rozanji compiled in 1559 begins with a statement that when it was founded Rozanji practice consisted of "the Lotus *samādhi* and the discernment of the Sudden-Perfect single reality in the morning and the *nenbutsu samādhi* and wanderings in the nine degrees of rebirth in the Pure Land in the evening" (*Rozanji engi* 廬山寺縁起, BUSSHO KANKŌKAI 1912–1937, 117: 457a). The formula of combining *nenbutsu* with recitation of the *Lotus Sutra* is found frequently in Tendai writings (KIUCHI 1978). However, when the history of Rozanji touches on the lecture system, the regular recitations of the *Lotus* and *nenbutsu* or any other ritual are not mentioned, though offerings to the Medicine Buddha do appear.<sup>4</sup> A fuller description of the halls at doctrinal temples would help in determining the activities of monks, but I have not found detailed descriptions.<sup>5</sup> One more clue to the relation between study and ritual performance is found in the instructions given by Jien 慈円 (1155–1225), one of the most eminent Tendai monks of his day, to Shōkū when Jien gave Sangōji to Shōkū. Because Ninkū wrote Shōkū's earliest biography and respected him as the founder of the Seizan tradition, Ninkū probably agreed with the general guidelines found in the biography. Pure Land practice was described as having "three major components: 1. uninterrupted *nenbutsu*; 2. praises of Amida during the six periods of the day; and 3. debate consisting of questions and answers concerning such topics as how the lotuses of rebirth were

4. A survey of documents concerning Sangoji and Rozanji in the databases of the Historical Institute also does not indicate the regular performance of such rituals. However, a number of documents are concerned with manors (*shōen* 莊園) and the naming of the temples as "prayer temples," events that probably involved some sort of ritual services; the support of serious academic monks might have been thought to produce significant karmic benefits for the patron. The volume of *Dai Nihon shiryō* that will include the materials for Ninkū has not yet been published and was not available online when research for this paper was conducted.

5. In contrast, a list of rules for Chinese doctrinal temples does list the various halls at the ideal doctrinal monastery, indicating that it is not too different from those at a Zen temple, with the major differences being that the doctrinal temples had a lecture hall and halls for rituals often associated with Tiantai monasteries such as repentance and rites for the deliverance of creatures of water and land (SUZUKI 1975, 308–11).

portrayed in the three Pure Land scriptures, resolving doubts about rebirth in the Pure Land, vows concerning the nine grades of rebirth, and determining the efficacy of the *nenbutsu* in both this life and the future” (*Zenne shōnin e* 善惠上人絵, DS 5.23: 242). At the same time, Jien instructed Shōkū to preserve the memory of Kanshō 觀性 (n.d.), who had helped found Sangoji by preserving the mix of Tendai, Esoteric, and Pure Land traditions. Images of both the Pure Land patriarch Shandao 善導 (613–681) and the de facto founder of Tiantai, Zhiyi, were installed in the temple, reflecting the mix of Pure Land and Tendai that had been favored by Shōkū. Lectures on Pure Land topics, particularly the *Contemplation Sutra*, were to be given on the death days of Shandao and Hōnen each month (*Zenne shōnin e*, DS 5.23: 241). Thus, debate and study were a central aspect of practice, but were combined with ritual practice.

Ninkū contrasts lecture temples with *zenji* 禪寺, a term that I have translated as “meditation temple”; however, the term also has the sense of “Zen temple,” in other words temples belonging to the Zen school. In fact, Ninkū’s usage of the term seems to include both senses at times. When I have translated it as “meditation temple” I have tried to reflect the manner in which Ninkū separates meditation from doctrinal study when he considers the three trainings (*sangaku* 三学), a usage that allows him to de-emphasize the practice of traditional Tendai meditations. The concluding provision of Ninkū’s “Comprehensive rules for the study halls at lecture temples” contains the passage:

Now the ages of the true Dharma and the Semblance of Dharma [*shōzō* 正像] have passed. The essentials of the Dharma are scarcely seen in the texts of the teaching. Who would not cling to them? How much more so is this the case at monasteries where the practice has been divided into three areas? Thus Zen mainly practices meditation. Specialists in the Vinaya mainly transmit the precepts. Our group is called the lecturers. If we do not explain and listen, then what will our function be? (T 83: 534c24–27)

At first, the precepts may seem to be relegated to Vinaya temples in Ninkū’s system because he distinguished between temples that focused on the *Sifen lü* and doctrinal temples, but the students and teachers of the doctrinal temples were expected to strictly observe the Brahma Net precepts as Ninkū interpreted them (GRONER 2003). Ninkū’s interpretation of the Brahma Net precepts differed from that found at the Tendai headquarters on Mount Hiei because he argued that the precepts had the same status as the Perfect teaching of the *Lotus Sutra*, the supreme scriptural authority in Tendai. In contrast, many of the monks on Mount Hiei subordinated the Brahma Net precepts to the *Lotus Sutra*, allowing them to argue that they could ignore the Brahma Net precepts as long as they upheld the *Lotus Sutra* (GRONER forthcoming).

A strict schedule for the training of those who stayed at the temple is explained in other rules.

Those who have been studying for a long time do not need time off. Those between fifteen and twenty should receive one night off out of every ten. (Every month they will receive three days off; but they may not use each other's days off. Everyone [mentioned] below should follow this rule.) Those thirty and over will receive two nights off, and those forty and over will receive three nights off [out of every ten]. If they exceed this number, then they have violated our rules. We shall decide the gravity of their offense in accordance with the number of violations. Some may be asked to provide paper and brushes to the Study, and others to provide food or lamps for the students. If they are absent for more than three nights out of ten and have no excuse, then they are not fit to be fellow students. When the order discusses and decides on a remedy, they should ostracize him [*bonbō* 梵法].<sup>6</sup> By order of the assembly [*shumyō* 衆命], corvée labor [*kuyaku* 公役] can be levied. In case a person is ill or has an emergency, then he may ask for leave [*seika* 請暇] and [his situation] does not fall under this rule. (*Kōin gakudō tsūki*, T 83: 534c)

The first rule in the “Comprehensive rules for the study halls at lecture temples” notes, “When they are over fifty, then they are old, and we should not add rules. Whether they come or not depends on their own will” (*Kōin gakudō tsūki*, T 83: 534b19–20). The application of rules depended on the age of the students, with more freedom given to monks as they advanced in age and training. Other sets of rules used by Ninkū display the same strict attitude towards young practitioners, relaxing them for the elderly and infirm. For example, monks are not to nap, but the rule is relaxed for those who are old or sick if they shut the door to their room (*Shoshin gyōgo shō*, T 83: 534a10–16). The titles of two of his sets of rules reflect his concern for the education of young monks: “Essentials of practice for bodhisattvas who have just begun studying”<sup>7</sup> and “Rules for beginners to practice and observe.”

These rules indicate the assiduousness of study at Ninkū's temples, with the details concerning possible punishments in this rule revealing the seriousness with which infractions were treated. If the Brahma Net precepts were followed, most infractions could be expiated by a simple confession, a policy that had led

6. The term *bonbō* refers to *bondan* 梵壇 (platform in Brahma's heaven). A platform was constructed before a shrine to Brahma. When a deity had committed a wrongdoing, he was forced to stand on the platform and not permitted to speak to the other gods as they passed by. The same type of treatment was given to monks who violated certain rules, resulting in a prohibition on talking to the monk who had committed the offense.

7. The term *shingaku* 新学 is probably a reference to *shingaku bosatsu* (bodhisattvas who have just developed the aspiration to enlightenment) found several times in the *Fanwangjing*.

to lax adherence at some Tendai temples. Ninkū clearly felt the need for more serious remedies and mentioned fines, ostracism, and labor as penalties.<sup>8</sup> In addition, the reference to decisions by the assembly indicates the presence of an administrative structure that would decide on the application of punishments. In doing so, he was influenced by monastery rules that had been formulated by some of his predecessors, particularly Ryōgen's twenty-six rules, which were preserved at Rozanji.

Although other temples reserved study for a smaller group of monks who qualified for it either through family connections or academic ability, Ninkū argued that everyone should study. For example, the "Compilation to be kept at the right side of one's seat" included a rule with the title "One should not make distinctions between the bright and the dumb; all should study." Ninkū argued that those who were not academically gifted should simply redouble their efforts. The rule continues, "However, some will have received orders to attend to administrative duties or will have made separate vows to perform obeisance, confession, or *nenbutsu*. Such people are exempted from this rule."<sup>9</sup> Thus this rule recognized the contribution that might be made by monks who were engaged in ritual rather than study, but clearly gave study the primary place. In addition, Ninkū's rules do not reflect unalterable social classes in the monastery. Monks presumably moved from study to other activities and back: "From within the order, the elders should take turns serving as administrators for one-year terms [*nen'yo* 年預]" (*Kōin gakudō tsūki*, T 83: 534c23). In the "Comprehensive rules for the study halls at lecture temples," he warned against monks who did not study: "If one person does not study, it will affect others. This will be a sign of the decline of the Dharma. Is this not like the commission of the crime of splitting the order (T 83: 534c28–535a2)?"

Ninkū recognized the importance of periods of relaxation that would accompany assiduous study, particularly through the use of teas and infusions:

When the lecture is over, powdered green tea [*tencha* 点茶] may be served to take away the fatigue brought on by the talk. Around six, an infusion [*yu* 湯] can be prepared to help with the fatigue of studying. At some temples, the medicinal infusions<sup>10</sup> [*sayaku* 茶薬] are part of the communally owned property. Sometimes those monastics and lay believers connected with the

8. Ninkū laments the difficulties that Tendai monks have had in dealing with wrongdoing and notes that his rules are designed to help the situation (*Zaushō*, T 83: 531c17–25).

9. T 83: 531a–b; the same admonition, not to discriminate according to academic ability, is also found in the *Kōin gakudō tsūki*, T 83: 534b17–18.

10. I follow ŌTSUKA (2009, 233) in interpreting the term 茶薬 as referring to medicinal infusions rather than the usage found in some Zen sources as foods accompanying tea.

observance are asked to contribute.... We should take the provisions of the past as our standard. (Kōin *gakudō tsūki*, T 83: 534c20–23)

The tea was prepared with powdered green tea. The infusion consisted of hot water with unnamed herbs or medicines. ŌTSUKA (2009, 233) suggests that ginger may have been used.

Ninkū is considered to be a leading monk in both the Seizan tradition of the Jōdo School and the Tendai School. Differences between the positions that he might have taken because he served at a temple belonging to a particular tradition frequently are not clear. Even the place where a particular set of rules was edited does not always provide much information about what stance Ninkū was taking. For example, the “Brief questions and answers about miscellaneous matters of the doctrinal halls” was compiled in Nishiyama (the location of Sangoji), but then revised at Rozañji (T 74: 786c). However, the last rule in the “Compilation to be kept at the right side of one’s seat,” a collection of rules for the Sangoji, a major temple in the Seizan tradition, contains important information about the balance that he assigned to the various traditions he espoused while at Sangoji. The rule has the title “All the merits from one’s practice should be dedicated to (rebirth) in the Pure Land.”

The periods of true and counterfeit practice have passed. The period of the end of the Dharma [*mappō* 末法] is now upon us. We have left the path of the sages far behind us. If we do not entrust ourselves to superior circumstances, then how will we be saved? Amida has vowed to help sentient beings transcend this world and to save those sunk in rounds of birth and death. This is praised by the various teachings and encouraged by the various teachers. Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra vowed to return to the west. Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu have written verses praising the land of bliss. Above, the sages vow to seek it; below, how could worldlings reject it?

Today, Zen teachings do not discuss the Buddha’s intentions. They do not follow the sagely instructions. Some of them are lost in their dark realizations<sup>11</sup> [*anshō* 暗証] expecting light within three births. Others practice on platforms seeking sudden enlightenment with this very body.<sup>12</sup> This is because all of them have not studied very much and their wisdom is shallow; thus they do not know the purport of the teachings. Saichō, in his vows concerning seclusion on Mount Hiei [*Rōzan hotsuganmon* 籠山発願文] states, “Although I have lived for half a century, which of the six destinies [I will be reborn into] is not

11. The term “dark realizations” is found in Zhiyi’s texts; it refers to those monks who are so one-sidedly devoted to meditation that they neglect learning.

12. This is a reference to *sokushin jōbutsu* (realization with this very body). The preceding mention of realization within three lifetimes, originally a Kegon teaching, was maintained by some who argued for realization with this very body (GRONER 1989, 62–63).

yet certain. Thus I have returned to the mountain to practice the *nenbutsu* so that I might be reborn in the Pure Land.”<sup>13</sup> When Ryōgen was ill, he wrote a verse expressing his thoughts that included the line, “One should only think of the Western Land and should not think of anything else.”<sup>14</sup> Who among the Tendai practitioners can think differently? Thus within our tradition, although externally we perform exoteric and esoteric rites, internally we do not forget [Amida’s] compassionate vow that he will include everyone. Within our temples, we always create a separate hall solely dedicated to Pure Land practices. In the fields and villages you should encourage [people to become] acquainted with these teachings and broadly propagate Pure Land teachings. These are the patriarchs’ vows and our teachers’ promises. Strive [to follow them] and do not violate them. (Zaushō, T 83: 531b–c)

While this might have been Ninkū’s view while he was at Sangoji, it is difficult to find internal evidence for this attitude in all of his works. Moreover, he notes that externally his monks perform exoteric and esoteric rites even as they focus on Pure Land, an attitude that is consistent with many Tendai practitioners, but not later Jōdoshū advocates.

13. According to Ninkū, he had found Saichō’s vow to remain secluded on Mount Hiei in Saichō’s own handwriting. The text is only known from four short quotations in Ninkū’s works. The authenticity of the text is not clear. Although its contents are not in conflict with events in Saichō’s life, certain elements do differ with Saichō’s other works. Among them is the quotation cited here. Saichō was interested in the constant walking meditation, a practice with Pure Land elements that resulted in a meditation on emptiness, not in rebirth in the Pure Land. The emphasis on rebirth in this citation thus differs with Saichō’s other writings. Although Asada Masahiro has found a passage similar to the one about rebirth in Saichō’s letters, that letter concludes with the suggestion that Saichō and the addressee will look forward to seeing Maitreya, not Amitābha, in the future. Although both types of belief could be found in Tendai, the argument for the text’s authenticity is thus weakened.

The text suggests that Saichō embarked on the same twelve-year period of seclusion on Mount Hiei that he required of his students. Although such an action by Saichō is not mentioned in any of his biographies, Asada Masahiro has suggested that it might not have been included in biographies because Saichō died before completing it. Finally, the text suggests that the main sources for Mahayana precepts were the Comfortable Practices (*anrakugyō* 安樂行) of the *Lotus Sutra* and the three profound precepts (*sanjinkai* 三深戒), probably an alternative term for the three collections of pure precepts. However, the term *sanjinkai* is not found in either Saichō’s writings or Tiantai sources through the Tang dynasty. Moreover, the Brahma Net precepts are not mentioned in the text, perhaps an indication that it dates from a later time. For arguments that generally support its authenticity, see KODERA 1975; ASADA 1981; KIUCHI 1986). I am inclined to doubt its authenticity.

14. This sentence is found in *Ganzan daishi rishōki* 元三大師利生記, in *Zoku Tendaishū zensho*, edited by TENDAI SHŪTEN HENSANJO (1988), Shiden 2: 257a. This is a late work, composed in 1863. The sentence is not found in any of the earlier biographies of Ryōgen included in *Zoku Tendaishū zensho*.

In contrast to the *Zaushō*, the last rule in “The Essentials of practice for bodhisattvas who have just begun studying” places the emphasis on Tendai and Esoteric Buddhism without even mentioning Pure Land.

Question: We should study both provisional and ultimate teachings at the doctrinal halls. Why do we only spread Tendai teachings?

Answer: The provisional and Hinayana schools use words as expedients, but ultimately words cannot express the final truth. Thus according to the *Daji* 大集, “The most profound truths cannot be explained. The ultimate truth is devoid of both spoken and written words” [T 13: 13c13].... This can only be found in the ultimate chanting of mantras and [Tendai] *shikan* meditation. These [practices] raise up the Perfect sounds of the goal of Buddhahood to reveal the words of Suchness. The outlines of doctrines at the doctrinal halls are found in this. How much more is this true for the rules for the great Tendai monasteries! The various schools do not have the same intention. The rules of the great doctrinal halls [*daikyōin* 大教院] were established during the Song dynasty. Tendai constitutes the main subject of study. Thus we follow the patterns of both countries [China and Japan] in propagating the One-vehicle.

(T 74: 786c)

Ninkū seems to have been able to avoid mixing traditions. Thus in the *Kaijushō* 戒珠抄 (Compilation on the pearl of the precepts) and *Endonkai gyōjishō* 円頓戒曉示抄 (Counsels on the Perfect-Sudden precepts), two of his major debate texts on the Sudden-perfect precepts, neither Pure Land nor esoteric teachings are directly mentioned, a position in keeping with his guideline of not mixing traditions. However, he does constantly stress the role of the precepts for worldlings during the period of the end of the Dharma *mappō*, themes that seem to remind us of Hōnen’s own practice, even if he did not stress the precepts for most people.

### *The Origins of the Doctrinal Temple System in Japan*

In his “Brief questions and answers about miscellaneous matters of the doctrinal halls” (*Kyōin zōji ryaku mondō*), Ninkū described the origins of the lecturing tradition he espoused. He identified the lecturing temples with the solely Mahayana temples (*ikkō daijōji* 一向大乘寺) that Saichō had mentioned in his proposals to the court (GRONER 2000, 138–41), and then traced this tradition back to both India and China.

Question: Can examples of these three types of halls be found in India or China?

Answer: Solely Mahayana temples, solely Hinayana temples, and mixed temples are found in India. Saichō used the customs of India in writing his rules for Mahayana temples. In addition, Emperor Gaozong 高宗 [1107–1187, r. 1127–1162] classified temples into three types: meditation temples, Vinaya

temples, and lecturing temples. For each type, he established “five mountains and ten monasteries” [*gozan jissetsu* 五山十刹].<sup>15</sup> The Vinaya temples resemble Hinayana temples because they primarily study the *Hinayāna vinaya-pīṭaka*. The meditation temples resemble the mixed temples because the monks at them follow a mixture of Hinayana and Mahayana rules of dignity. The lecture temples resemble the solely Mahayana temples because the monks in them primarily transmit the three trainings [*sangaku* 三学] of Tendai.

(*Shingaku bosatsu gyōyōshō*, T 74: 785b)

Ninkū’s statement in the above passage tracing the tradition of doctrinal temples back to Saichō’s mention of solely Mahayana temples was based on travel diaries by Xuanzang 玄奘 (600 or 602–664) and Yijing 義淨 (635–713). Saichō, however, used an idiosyncratic interpretation of Xuanzang’s travel diary. For Saichō, the classification referred to the types of precepts used in the monasteries. Tendai monks were expected to use only the Brahma Net precepts, which were unknown in India. Xuanzang, however, used the classification to refer to the types of doctrines studied and rituals performed, not the precepts observed. In the next quotation in this paper (cited below), Yijing is said to have located solely Mahayana temples in western India, giving them a location. However, Saichō ignored Yijing’s statement that immediately followed his classification of temples, which stated that both Hinayana and Mahayana temples shared the same precepts (*Kenkairon* 顯戒論, HIEIZAN SENSUIN 1975, I: 55–56; T 54: 205c; TAKAKUSU 1896, 14). Yijing’s travel diary contained detailed descriptions of Indian Buddhist monastic practices that were based on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya*. Ninkū was thus able to use Yijing’s descriptions to introduce elements from several Vinayas back into Tendai practice, thereby augmenting the terse precepts found in the Brahma Net Sutra (GRONER 2001).

Because Vinaya temples were said to be affiliated with the Vinaya master Nanshan Daoxuan’s 南山道宣 (596–667) lineage, Ninkū’s description of them as being similar to solely Hinayana temples may seem apt. However, the founder of the Nanshan Vinaya school, Daoxuan (596–667), had argued that the *Sifen lü* was partially Mahayana (*buntsū Daijō* 分通大乘). Subsequent Vinaya thinkers such as Eison 叡尊 (1201–1290), the founder of the Shingon Ritsu tradition, had interpreted the *Sifen lü* in Mahayana terms. The Shingon Ritsu had gained large numbers of temples and adherents by the time Ninkū was active. In addition,

15. Very little information on the five mountains system exists in Song documents, but later texts do suggest that the five mountains system was subsequently extended to vinaya and doctrinal temples (HUANG 1989, 313–14). For a brief discussion of the three types of temples in China, see YÜ 1981, 147–49; SCHLÜTTER 2008, 41, 45, 49). Morten Schlütter suggests that the Tiantai scholar Siming Zhili 四明知礼 (960–1028) played a key role in the emergence of doctrinal temples in an effort to counter the dominance of Chan temples, a view that Ninkū’s rules indirectly support.

Shunjō's 俊苧 (1166–1227) Sennyūji 泉涌寺 tradition utilized the *Sifen lü* to ordain Tendai monks, following Chinese Tiantai tradition and using commentaries on Daoxuan's works by the Tiantai monk Lingzhi Yuanzhao 靈芝元照 (1048–1116), a figure who is responsible for the establishment of the Vinaya tradition during the Song dynasty and perhaps for the redefinition of a Vinaya temple from the meaning of a hereditary temple to a temple identified with the Vinaya tradition (SCHLÜTTER 2005, 157). The Chinese Tiantai tradition represented by Yuanzhao presented both challenges and opportunities for Japanese Tendai. Ninkū's rules carefully balanced the competing claims of Vinaya and Saichō's demand for a new system. Ninkū's doctrinal system, represented by a return to the Chinese Tiantai works of Zhiyi and Zhanran, led him to reject many of the extreme positions of the *hongaku* traditions popular among many Japanese Tendai monks.

Ninkū and his predecessors apparently had heard descriptions of the classification system used for Chinese temples from travelers. He referred to this classification in his biography of Shōkū, the *Seizan shōnin engi* 西山上人縁起, noting that although Vinaya and meditation temples existed in Japan, a system of doctrinal temples had not been created.

In Song China, temples are divided into three classes: Vinaya temples, meditation temples, and doctrinal temples. The observances of the doctrinal temples are patterned after the Mahayana temples of western India. Thus the court petitioned for the adoption of these *bodhisattva* rules of deportment. The earlier emperor [Go-Daigo 1288–1339, r. 1318–1339] admired this proposal and issued an order establishing temples to protect the nation. Although Vinaya and meditation temples have long existed in Japan, the rules used in doctrinal temples of China have not yet been propagated [in Japan]. The sage Enkū 円空<sup>16</sup> traveled to China and met with the scholars Rangtan 壤坦 and Yunxian 允憲, thereby receiving the Tiantai Siming 天台四明 traditions. After Enkū returned to this country, he established Daijionji<sup>17</sup> 大慈園寺 as a place where the Chinese tradition of lecturing temples could be instituted.

(WASHIO 1925–1933, *Denki-bu* 1: 371).

16. Ninkū mentions one of Shōkū's students by the name of Enkū in Shōkū's biography, who is identified by being named after his lodgings, Ryūshinbō 立信房 (*Seizan shōnin engi*, WASHIO 1925–33, *Denki-bu* 1:363; OKUMURA 1986). Although this monk became the sixth abbot of Sangōji, none of his biographies mention a trip to China, an episode that would have been so important and impressive that it surely would have been included in his biographies. Ōtsuka Norihiro has resolved the problem by noting that the monk who travelled to China is associated with different lodgings, Ritsuenbō 律円房 (ŌTSUKA 2009, 185–87). However, little is known about his biography.

17. Rangtan (also written 壤坦) and Yunxian are both mentioned in documents connected with the Mountain-home (Shanjia 山家) tradition of Siming Zhili; they were connected with the Upper and Lower Indian Temples in Hangzhou, two sites known as doctrinal temples. Shunjō's student Shiju 思就 visited the same two figures when he went to China (ŌTSUKA 2009, 180–81, 185).

A few other examples of earlier Japanese monks who were aware of the existence of doctrinal temples in China can be noted. Shunjō (1166–1227) mentioned doctrinal temples as sites where monks studied a variety of teachings.<sup>18</sup> Shunjō's temple Sennyūji is sometimes called a *ritsuji* (Vinaya temple) suggesting the ambiguity that was present in the use of the terms “doctrinal temple” and “Vinaya temple” before Ninkū's time; moreover, the sense of the term in China was gradually moving from a hereditary temple to a temple governed according to Vinaya principles, the meaning that it had for Sennyūji. Dōgen mentions the

---

Daijionji was a site where Ninkū's teacher Kōkū 康空 (1286–1346) spent considerable time. Because it is one of the earliest temples identified with the *kyōji* tradition, information about it is important, but many of the details about the temple are not clear. According to the *Shoji rekidai*, the temple was located on the property at Hachijōin 八条院, an appellation that referred to Princess Akiko 暎子 (1137–1211); because she was a fervent Buddhist and established a number of temples, this explanation seems plausible, but Daijionji is not found in documents associated with her (DS 4.1: 154–65). Another document from Sangoji describes it as Kenreimon'in's 建礼門院 (1155–1213) former palace, but then notes that information about the temple is difficult to find (DS 6.9: 42). Recent research by Ōtsuka indicates that the temple included several buildings that reflected its Chinese heritage, including a lecture hall, hall for Nyoirin Kannon, and an Eastern Chinese Hall (Tōdōdō 東唐堂). The temple is said to have been honored by receiving a plaque calligraphed by Retired Emperor Go-Saga (1220–1272, r. 1242–1246), but other examples of such an honor do not appear during this period, casting doubt on the record; however, Go-Saga was assiduous in his interest in Buddhism and was curious about customs in China where such plaques were awarded; thus support of a new movement influenced by Chinese developments would not have been surprising (*Zen Shōnin e* 善慧上人絵, DS 5.23: 261; ŌTSUKA 2009, 186).

Other information about the people associated with the temple and Tendai monks with connections in China indicates some of the ways Ninkū might have heard about doctrinal temples in China. The property seems to have passed to Ankamon'in 安嘉門院 (1209–1283) and then to the Kujō 九条 clan. During this period, Enkū may have been appointed abbot of the temple. It seems to have been affiliated with the Jimon 寺門 lineage of Tendai. Several other Jimon monks had connections to China during the thirteenth century, including Keisei 慶政 (1189–1268), who went to China in 1217 and returned in 1218. Keisei was the oldest son of Kujō Yoshitsune 九条良経 (1169–1206), the clan associated with the Daijionji. After returning from China, he retired to the Nishiyama area, where he founded the Hokkesanji 法華山寺, near the area where Ninkū would later reside as abbot of Sangoji. Keisei is the author of a number of works, including *Kankyō no tomo* 閑居友 (A companion in solitude), a text that includes a number of stories about women; perhaps for this reason, the author-nun Abutsu-ni 阿仏尼 (d. 1283), who had served as a lady-in-waiting under Akamon'in, would later study under Keisei (PANDEY 1995, 325–56). Ankamon'in was connected with the Daijionji temple, where Enkū would later reside. Thus circumstantial evidence would suggest that Ninkū was aware of Keisei. Ryūben 隆弁 (1208–1283), who sent a letter to Chinese monks at the Upper Indian Temple 上天竺寺 in Hangzhou, was also associated with Onjōji. Although such connections indicated an interest in China, they apparently did not lead to the importation of the doctrinal temple tradition. Daijionji was at first called a *ritsuji* or Vinaya temple.

18. Ryōchū's 良中 (1199–1287) *Kangyō gengibun dentsūki* 觀經玄義分伝通記 (JŌDOSHŪ KAISHŪ 1970–1972, 2: 81a) includes a passage that refers to the doctrinal temple at Sennyūji, suggesting that Shunjō identified with Chinese usages of the term for Tiantai temples.

three types of temples in China in the *Hōkyōki* 宝鏡記 (KODERA 1980, 130–33, 244–48).

None of these sources indicates a deep knowledge of the rules used at doctrinal temples in China to guide the training of monks. While Dōgen and other monks associated with the Zen tradition brought rules for monastic discipline from China, no such rules were brought for Chinese doctrinal temples before or during Ninkū's lifetime. Nor did any Chinese monk come to Japan to establish a doctrinal temple during Ninkū's lifetime. Ninkū's knowledge of doctrinal temples probably came from traveler's reports rather than written documents. He never quoted any rules from identifiable Chinese doctrinal temples in his monastic rules. Instead, Chinese influence at the doctrinal temples seems to have been primarily cultural and to have been expressed by the use of chairs (*kyokuroku* 曲桌), fly whisks (*hossu* 扨子), portraits of masters, the use of Buddhist literary names (*dōgō* 道号), and drinking tea and infusions (*yu* 湯).

Ninkū's mention of "Tiantai Siming" refers to Zhili's "Mountain home" (Shanjia 山家) tradition of Tiantai; Ninkū's adoption of this tradition served as a counter to the prevailing original enlightenment tradition in much of Tendai. The debate texts associated with Ninkū's groups are primarily based on Zhiyi's works, but occasionally refer to original enlightenment texts. In a discussion in which he argues for the use of silk robes, Ninkū cites Saichō, Yijing, and Siming to support his criticism of Daoxuan's rejection of silk robes (*Shoshin gyōyō shō*, T 74: 786a8–17). However, Ninkū's interest in going back to the texts written by Zhiyi and Zhanran is not a reflection of Siming Zhili's influence. In fact, most Japanese commentators chose not to emphasize the debates between the Shan-jia and Shanwai sects of Tiantai that had been so pronounced in Song dynasty Tiantai. Instead, Japanese monks in Ninkū's tradition were influenced by Japanese discussions of Chinese Tiantai works (KUBOTA 2000; 2006). Moreover, Ninkū was not trying to recreate Chinese Tiantai temples. This is clearly seen in his attitudes towards the precepts. He keeps the Brahma Net ordinations used in the Japanese Tendai tradition; at the same time, he develops a new interpretation of them based on Zhiyi's commentary on the Brahma Net Sutra; the result is a tradition that looks back to a combination of Saichō and Zhiyi for its authority. Ninkū was generally critical of Song dynasty subcommentaries on Zhiyi's commentary on the Brahma Net Sutra.

Much of the appeal of doctrinal temples was probably due to the need to develop an institution based on Chinese models that could compete with Zen temples and also lead to the rejuvenation of the Tendai tradition. Thus, Ninkū used the system to argue that the doctrinal (Tendai) temples should be viewed on an equal basis with Zen and Risshū 律宗 (Vinaya-school) temples. Although other differences existed between the various types of temples in China, such as the manner in which abbots were appointed, the monks around Ninkū were pri-

marily interested in the implications of the system for doctrinal affiliation and governmental patronage. In China, the designation of temples as doctrinal halls (*kyōin*) had implied certain procedures to be followed in the appointment of abbots and the performance of rituals; in addition, doctrinal halls had focused on the academic study of Buddhism, especially on Tiantai, Huayan, and Faxiang interpretations. However, in Japan, Ninkū focused primarily on their significance for the promotion of the study of Tendai and Pure Land doctrine.

### *Other Rules for Training*

A major theme in Ninkū's rules is reintroducing the rules and procedures from the Vinaya to Tendai and Seizan-ha practice. At the same time, Ninkū was committed to the "reforms" instituted by Saichō when he substituted the Brahma Net precepts for those of the *Sifen lü*. As Ōtsuka Norihiro has pointed out, Ninkū was sometimes influenced by Daoxuan's *Sifen lü shanbu suiiji jiemo* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨 (T no. 1808, "Procedures from the Four-part Vinaya edited in accord with religious faculties"), a discussion of procedures to be followed in the monastery (ŌTSUKA 2009, 211). This text had also been used by various Kamakura period figures in their attempts to revive the precepts.

Ninkū also used other sources to augment his rules. Bodhisattva precepts and procedures specified in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and other Mahayana texts were sometimes used. Because the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* took a different view from traditional Tendai views of the Brahma Net Sutra on a variety of issues, including the inclusion of the precepts from the Vinaya in Mahayana monasticism and whether the essence of the precepts could be lost, this was an unusual step for a monk in the Tendai tradition. In addition, Ninkū was interested in earlier Tendai monks' usages of monastic discipline. A copy of Ryōgen's twenty-six rules was found at Rozanji. Ninkū consulted the procedures for the fortnightly assembly used by Ryōnin 良忍 (1072–1132) and Jien.

Among the topics included in Ninkū's "Essentials of practice for bodhisattvas who have just begun studying" are such issues as giving a proxy to another monastic when one cannot attend the fortnightly assembly (*yoyoku* 與欲), provisionally giving donations to others when limits are exceeded (*setsujō* 説淨), and the procedures for holding the rainy season retreat and for ending it. Detailed instructions about the size and use of robes were included. Although some of these issues, such as the rainy season retreat, were alluded to in the Brahma Net Sutra, few details were given. Ninkū's use of the Vinaya was clearly intended to strengthen monastic discipline.

The "Rules for beginners to practice and observe," was written in 1373 at Rozanji when Ninkū was abbot; it was then revised at Sangoji (T 83: 534b8–11). The provisions in it were thus applicable to both temples. Ninkū wrote about the

procedures and decorum to be observed in everyday life, probably basing it on Daoxuan's *Jiaojie xinxue biqiu xinghu lüyi* 教誡新學比丘行護律儀 (Admonitions and teachings for new monks to practice and observe, T no. 1897). Daoxuan's rules had been printed and distributed to temples emphasizing the precepts, particularly Sennyūji, Kurodani, and Saidaiji, three of the temples that emphasized a revival of monastic discipline (ŌTSUKA 2009, 234). At times Ninkū's wording was close enough to Daoxuan's work to indicate that he must have consulted it. Ninkū was also familiar with the rules being used at Zen temples, as indicated by his fervent rejection of them in several cases (T 83: 532C09, 533A11–12).

Ninkū's rules consisted of detailed descriptions of how to enter and leave halls; admonitions not to disturb one's neighbors by making noise, fanning oneself too vigorously, or talking; the procedures to be followed when using the toilet and eating; and rules about the decorum to be followed when greeting each other. Monks were only to eat before noon. The rules call for attention to how one carries oneself and thinks of others. Monks are warned against private chats and jokes, laughing in a loud voice, and lying down in public. In addition, certain activities that might have been used by fervent Pure Land practitioners were discouraged:

One's own private chanting and reading of scriptures should not be done in the midst of the order.... Some will recite in a loud voice as they use the rosary; this is not allowed. One should not take scriptures to another person's quarters or a public place to read them. They should be read in front of the Buddha in a pure place in one's own room. (T 83: 533C6–9)

If a monk was sick or elderly, he was excused from some of the rules. In short, they call for mindful attention to everyday life.

### *Doctrinal Temples and the Efficacy of Ninkū's Rules*

How long did Ninkū's training system last? Up to this point, I have focused on Ninkū's rules because they provide the clearest picture of this system. The history of debate in Tendai, however, extends back for centuries (GRONER 2002, 128–66); on a more limited scale, its history at Rozanji and Sangoji extends at least back to Ninkū's teachers.

One of Ninkū's teachers, Myōdō Shōgen 明導照源 (1298–1368), established the study and debate of the four traditions at Rozanji as part of his efforts to revive traditional Tendai studies, specifically referring to the Tendai (*shikangō* 止觀業) and esoteric courses (*shanagō* 遮那業) that Saichō had specified; like Saichō, he dedicated the recitation of scriptures to the protection of the state (*Rozanji monjo* 廬山寺文書, *Rozanji engi* 廬山寺緣起, DS 6.29: 307–8). Emperor Go-Daigo supported him, perhaps as part of the same program that led to the establishment of the Five Mountains system for Zen temples.

Ninkū also studied under Jidō Kōkū 示導康空 (1286–1346). Like Myōdō, the character *dō* 導 in his name indicates that he belonged to Shōkū's Seizan-ha tradition. Emperor Go-Daigo was a patron, and Kōkū served as his preceptor (DS 6.10: 39–43). An imperial order from the Karyaku 嘉暦 era (1326–1329) is referred to in both the Sangoji records and in Ninkū's biography of Shōkū. This refers to Emperor Go-Daigo's establishment of doctrinal temples, probably around the same time he was establishing the Five Mountains system for Zen monks (*Sangoji monjo* 三鈷寺文書, DS 6.10: 40; *Shingaku gyōyōshō*, T 74: 785b4; *Zenne shōnin e*, DS 5.23: 261). The emperor was also interested in Vinaya and supported several masters of precepts from both Shingon Ritsu and Tendai. Although Kōkū's rules for doctrinal temples do not survive, they probably served as the basis for many of Ninkū's directives. In addition, Kōkū studied the same four traditions on which Ninkū focuses his debates.

Terms such as “doctrinal monk” (*kyōsō* 教僧) or “doctrinal temple” were rarely used, in contrast to more commonly used terms such as “Zen monks” or “Vinaya monks” (律僧), indicating that the identification with the institution of doctrinal temples was not as strong (ŌTSUKA 2009, 243). However, the production, editing, and copying of debate manuals and other works by Ninkū and his followers indicate that the lecture and debate system flourished during the fourteenth century at Rozanji, Sangoji, and the temples affiliated with them. The production of a text sometimes lasted for decades as the lecturer would appear annually on the anniversary of the death of a major figure in the tradition to continue the series; the organization of a group of monks to record a lecture, check on sources, polish the text, and confer with a lecturer on the finished product demonstrated that it was much more than a single scholar writing. The site of the lectures and debates varied, indicating a system of lectures and debates among the temples. A trusted student would take notes and then the lecturer would review them. Both debate and lecture texts included the names of the monk putting forth a view, revealing a vigorous exchange of ideas and interpretations. By attributing opinions to a specific monk rather than ascribing them to a major figure in the tradition, the freedom to suggest new interpretations was maintained. Proof of the vitality of the tradition is found in the voluminous materials that survive and their existence at various temple archives. The *rodan* 廬談 series of debates were copied into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The publication of the “Essentials of practice for bodhisattvas who have just begun studying” (*Shingaku bosatsu gyōyō shō*), compiled by Ninkū at Sangoji, revised at Binmanji 敏滿寺, and then published by the Rozanji abbot Shigyoku Myōkū 志玉明空 in 1400, indicates the continuing influence of the rules (ŌTSUKA 2009, 211). Myōkū also published the “Brief questions and answers about miscellaneous matters of the doctrinal halls.” However, the publication of a woodblock edition of the “Compilation to be kept at the right side of one's seat” in 1727 by Kōmyōji 光明寺, after

what the colophon described as a long period of neglect, suggests that even though some monks were aware of the rules, the influence of Ninkū's guidelines had declined (*Zaushō*, T 83: 532a2–6).

In the following paragraphs, some of the literature pertaining to the lecture and debate system at Sangoji and Rozanji during the fourteenth century is briefly surveyed as an indication of the immense vitality of the system. All four of the traditions mentioned by Ninkū are represented. Extensive records of the debates at Rozanji (*rodan*, literally discussions at Rozanji) have been preserved; there are various versions of these with varying numbers of fascicles.<sup>19</sup> The records were eventually copied from the library at Nikkō 日光 when Tenkai 天海 (1536–1643) revived the Tendai School; others were found in Nichirenshū archives (DS 6.29: 313). Two volumes have been published and one more is planned for the *Zoku Tendai-shū zensho*; these are based on topics from Zhiyi's three major works (the *Fahua xuanyi*, *Fahua wenju*, and the *Mohe zhiguan*) and cover the years 1314–1367. These documents are of varying quality. Some are carefully kept records that appear to be based on actual debates. Others only present an individual's notes on a topic. The participants and audiences mentioned in these include monks for a broad variety of sites on Mount Hiei. Shōgen belonged to a variety of lineages, including some from the Danna-ryū 檀那流 and Eshin-ryū 恵心流, two of the dominant lineages on Mount Hiei. Their opinions are mentioned in the *rodan* literature. At the same time, some important views are not represented, including those of the Kurodani-ryū 黒谷流 and Kōshū 光宗 (1276–1350), the author of the voluminous *Keiranshūyōshū* 溪嵐拾葉集 in 116 fascicles (FUJIIHARA 1993). Even so, the *rodan* literature gives one a sense of intellectual life in much of fourteenth century Tendai.

The *Shanagō anryū* 遮那業案立 (T no. 2416, “Considerations of the Esoteric course”) in thirteen fascicles, compiled between 1358–1385 under Ninkū's direction, is a record of debates on esoteric topics. The *Sōketsushō* 搜決鈔 (“Compendium of inquiring and determining”; TENDAISHŪ KANKŌKAI 1973–1974, vols. 10 and 13,) is Ninkū's lectures on the first two fascicles of the *Darijing yishi* 大日經義釈 (Yixing's 一行 commentary on the *Mahāvairocana-sutra*) from 1379–1381; his student Shigyoku Myōkū 明空志玉 (d. 1406) recorded the lectures and then checked the accuracy of his transcription and the accuracy of the quotations with his teacher (TENDAISHŪ KANKŌKAI 1973–1974, 10: 3). The twelve-fascicle record of Ninkū's lectures is the most complete and authoritative Tendai commentary on the *Darijing yishi*. Many of Ninkū's comments were based on debate topics. By focusing on the first two fascicles of Yixing's commentary, Ninkū reveals an important aspect of his educational strategy: students began with

19. Biographical information on Myōdō Shōgen and the colophons of many texts associated with the debates are found in DS 6.29: 305–17.

a relatively short text, but then lectures and debates led them to a variety of other sources.

Several collections of debate topics that focus on *Pusajie yishu* 菩薩戒義疏 (T no. 1811), Zhiyi's two-fascicle commentary on the Brahma Net Sutra, are found in the *Zoku Tendai-shū zensho, Enkai 2* (TENDAI SHŪTEN HENSANJO 1988–present); an extensive commentary by Ninkū is also found in the *Tendai-shū zensho*, vol. 15 (TENDAISHŪ KANKŌKAI 1973–1974). Important nuances of Ninkū's warning against mixing traditions are revealed in these texts. Aspects of other traditions that would undermine the precepts are avoided. At the same time, Ninkū interprets Tendai classifications of doctrine in such a way that the precepts are considered Perfect Teaching, on a par with the *Lotus Sutra*.

Ninkū's teacher Kōkū lectured on Shandao's commentary from 1342–1345 at the Daijionji for a fortnight in the seventh month of each year; he focused on one fascicle each year, turning his attention to passages that were vital for the Seizan tradition and explaining them in an understandable fashion. At times, questions and opinions from his students are recorded in the text. Ninkū recorded the lectures and edited them into the *Kangyōsho kōeishō* 觀經疏康永抄 (BUSSHO KANKŌKAI 1912–1937, vol. 12). This text was used as the basis for a number of Seizan commentaries.

Ninkū's *Kangyōsho gujinshō* 觀經疏弘深抄 (“Compilation of the profundities in the commentary on the *Contemplation Sutra*”) in ten fascicles is a record of his lectures on Shandao's commentary on the *Contemplation Sutra* (TENDAISHŪ KANKŌKAI, vol. 4); this text includes records of comments on issues by other scholars (HIROSE 1934; YANAGISAWA 2004). An analysis of the texts cited in the *Gujinshō* reveals that the *Lotus Sutra* is the most frequently cited sutra, clearly pointing to the Tendai origins of many of the positions. Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū*, Hōnen's *Senchakushū*, and the Chinese works that influenced them are cited by Ninkū, but Song dynasty works on Tiantai Pure Land are ignored. Two sets of debate questions and answers on Pure Land issues, the *Rongishō* 論義鈔, also exist. An eight-fascicle text is a record of debates conducted by Kōkū's disciples that was held on the seventh anniversary of Kōkū's death. The six-fascicle version in which Ninkū both poses questions and answers them (*jimon jitō* 自問自答) was compiled by Ninkū (INAGAKI 1936; ITŌ 1985).

The biography of Ninkū's disciple, Myōkū, reveals that the doctrinal temple system developed further. Myōkū became abbot of Rozanji after Ninkū died in 1388. Rozanji burned down in 1397, but Myōkū was able to rebuild it almost immediately; the next year the Shōgun Ashikaga Yoshimitsu 足利義滿 (1358–1408) and the head of the *monzeki* temple at Shōrenin 青蓮院, Prince Sondō 尊道 (1332–1403), were able to meet there, signifying its importance. In the eighth month of 1402, the Chinese emperor sent two monks to Japan; Tianlun Daoyi 天倫道彝 and Yi'an Yiru 一菴一如 (1352–1425), the abbot of the Upper Indian

doctrinal temple (*Shang tianzhu jiaosi* 上天竺教寺) in Hangzhou; they were “enlighteners” (*zhujue* 覺義), administrators in the Central Buddhist Registry (*senglusi* 僧錄司);<sup>20</sup> this was probably the first direct contact of Japanese monks with a representative of Chinese doctrinal temples in Japan. Yiru brought a Chinese compilation of rules for doctrinal temples, the *Jiaoyuan qinggui* 教苑清規 (XIN WEN FENG 1993, no. 968), with him and presented it to Rozanji. The text, however, was not used at Sangoji. The woodblock plates of the original *Jiaoyuan qinggui*, which had been preserved at the Upper Indian Monastery in Hangzhou, had been lost in a fire, but then augmented (*zengxiu* 增修) around 1347 by Ziqing 自慶 (n.d.); this is the version brought to Japan (“Afterword” of the *Jiaoyuan chinggui*, XIN WEN FENG 1993, 57: 351a9; ŌTSUKA 2009, 281; SUZUKI 1975).

Although several hundred Zen monks from both China and Japan participated in exchanges between the two countries (FOGEL 2009, 25, 28), contacts with representatives from doctrinal temples were very rare. The Chinese emissary-monks had an audience with the retired shōgun Ashikaga Yoshimitsu at his residence in Kitayama in the eighth month of 1402.<sup>21</sup> The Chinese monks went to Mount Hiei with Myōkū, the abbot of Rozanji, showing their interest in the Japanese Tendai establishment (*Kanenobu kōki* 兼宣公記, cited in DS 7.6: 51). The next year on 2–19, Myōkū was summoned to his residence and appointed as an official emissary (*kenminshi* 遣明使) to travel to China along with the two Chinese monks and with the abbot of Tenryūji 天龍寺, Kenchū Keimitsu 堅中圭密, and Shōan Bon’un 祥菴梵雲 (d. 1417).<sup>22</sup> This marked the beginning of the revival of official trade with China that featured Gozan monks; Kenchū Keimitsu would be appointed head of three of these missions and was eventually appointed abbot of Nanzenji 南禪寺, the head temple of the Gozan system (TAMAMURA 2003, 170–71). Myōkū died on board the ship either to or from China, but the trip was completed by another monk, Shōchin 照珍 (n.d.) (*Rozanji daidai jūji* 廬山寺代々住持, DS 7.6: 51). The effect of these travels on the later history of training and the role of debates in both Rozanji and Sangoji is unclear. In particu-

20. For the Chinese administrative system at this time, see Yū 1981, 166–67. Daoyi is said to have died while he was in Japan; Yiru wrote a work on the divisions of the *Lotus Sutra* text (ZHENHUA 1999, 2 and 834).

21. Their visit is described in a number of sources; see DS 7.5: 666–78; 7.6: 47–52. In the *Zek-kairoku* 絶海録 the monks are described as a Zen monk (*zensō* 禪僧) and a lecturing monk (*kōsō* 講僧). A number of questions concerning texts were composed to be sent to China following the example of the questions sent by Genshin 源信.

22. *Zenrin kokuho ki* 善隣国宝記 (compiled 1470), DS 7.6: 47–51; VERSCHEUR 2006, 106–16; TAMAMURA 2003, 324. Bon’un served as abbot of Tenryūji (DS 7.27: 6–11). Little is known of Myōkū; Tamamura refers to him as a *rissō* 律僧 (170), but he seems to mistake him for another monk. Myōkū’s major contribution to Tendai literature is recording the *Sōketsushō*, Ninkū’s sub-commentary on Yixing’s commentary on the *Darijing*.

lar, knowing more about the role that the *Jiaoyuan qinggui* might have played at Rozanji would be fascinating. That set of rules was compiled at a time when Tiantai was struggling to assert its identity against Chan and was dealing with the increased popularity of the esoteric traditions from Tibet, issues somewhat similar to those challenging Japanese Tendai.

### *Conclusion*

For many people, the term “training” suggests meditation and ritual as opposed to the more intellectual pursuits of reading, memorization, and debate; however, such an emphasis may reflect attempts to modernize religious training by emphasizing the category of “religious experience.” Ninkū’s rules provide a different perspective by emphasizing the importance of intellectual training. In fact, meditation is de-emphasized in a period when the Dharma is in decline, while memorization, reading, and debate become the focus of Buddhist training and practice. The extensive discussion of points of disagreement led monks to gain insights into Buddhist teachings and world views and to utilize the teachings in their preaching and practice. An extensive debate literature connected with Ninkū’s temples, Rozanji and Sangoji, exists; some of it has been published in collections of Tendai and Seizan-ha materials. These publications indicate that the debate system was vigorous and creative during the fourteenth century, with voluminous records of lectures and debates being copied by various temples.

Records of lectures and debates indicate that monks were trained by focusing on certain texts; these sometimes were selected so that monks might have to explain a seeming contradiction or ambiguity. As monks’ studies progressed, they might rely on a wider variety of texts to clarify doctrinal issues. Doctrinal positions were not completely codified. The names and dates recorded for debates reveal that a variety of positions might be held, though monks could not go so far as to adopt the view of a competing school. Both the format of some lectures and temple rules reveal that considerable thought went into the training of young monks.

The institutional history of doctrinal or lecture temples provides insight into the relation between Chinese and Japanese Buddhism. The importation of Zen models of monastic discipline and practice to Japan was conducted through the travels of many Chinese and Japanese monks, but the development of doctrinal temples followed a different pattern. Visits by representatives of doctrinal temples and the import of Chinese rules for doctrinal temples occurred only late in the process. As a result, the development of doctrinal temples in Japan depended on travelers’ reports; the leaders of doctrinal temples relied on a mix of influences from a variety of sources, including Tendai temple rules and Vinaya commentaries. Many of the same figures who supported Zen temples,

particularly Emperor Go-Daigo and the shōgun Ashikaga Yoshimitsu, were also patrons of doctrinal temples, partly out of a desire to reform monastic discipline and learning at Buddhist temples by importing Chinese Buddhist traditions. Chinese monks from doctrinal temples and a Chinese compendium of rules for them only arrived in Japan after Ninkū's death.

Ninkū's career reveals a different view of the development of Pure Land doctrine than that put forward by many advocates of sectarian Buddhism today. Because Shōkū, the patriarch of the Seizan tradition, was not exiled, his tradition was particularly strong after Hōnen's death and closely allied with Tendai institutions. The use of similar debate topics at both Seizan and Tendai temples and the ordination of Seizan monks on Mount Hiei indicate the closeness of their relation during the fourteenth century. Ninkū in particular played a key role in the organization of Seizan doctrine and institutions; besides his activities in debate and monastic discipline in both traditions, Ninkū's authorship of the first biography of Shōkū is noteworthy.

## REFERENCES

### ABBREVIATIONS

- DS *Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本史料, ed. Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 東京大学史料編纂所. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku, 1968–present.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. 85 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭, eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1932.

### SECONDARY SOURCES

ASADA Masahiro 浅田正博

- 1981 Dengyō Daishi Saichō no ōjō shisō ni tsuite: “Rōzan hotsuganmon” ni tsuite 伝教大師最澄の往生思想について—「籠山発願文」について. *Shinshū kenkyū* 25: 28–40.

BUSSHO KANKŌKAI 仏書刊行会, ed.

- 1912–1937 *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai.

FOGEL, Joshua

- 2009 *Articulating the Sinosphere: Sino-Japanese Relations in Space and Time*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

FUJIHIRA Kanden 藤平寛田

- 1993 Myōdō Shōgen to Rozanji-ryū gikasho “Rodan” ni tsuite 明導照源と廬山寺流義科書「廬談」について. *Tendai gaku* 35: 83–87.

GRONER, Paul

- 1989 The *Lotus Sutra* and Saichō's interpretation of the realization of Buddhahood with this very body (*sokushin jōbutsu*). In *The Lotus Sutra in Japanese Culture*, ed. George and Willa Tanabe, 53–74. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- 1990 The *Fan-wang ching* and monastic discipline in Japanese Tendai: A study of Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*. In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell, Jr., 251–90. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- 2000 *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- 2001 Ninkū Jitsudō's view of the Hīnayāna precepts. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 50: 6–10 (left pagination).
- 2002 *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- 2003 Jitsudō Ninkū on ordinations. *Japan Review* 15: 51–75.
- 2007 Can the precepts be lost? Can the precepts be violated? The role of the *Pusajie Yiji* 菩薩戒義記 in medieval Tendai discussions of the precepts. *Tendai gaku* 165–200.
- 2009 Kōen and the “consecrated ordination” within Japanese Tendai. In *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, ed. James Alexander Benn, Lori R. Meeks, and James Robson, 178–207. New York: Routledge.
- Forthcoming The Lotus Sutra and the Perfect-Sudden precepts (*endonkai* 円頓戒). In *The Lotus Sutra in Japan*, edited by Paul Groner.

HIEIZAN SENSUIN FUZOKU EIZAN GAKUIN 比叡山専修院附属叡山学院, ed.

- 1975 *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.

HIROSE Kan'yū 廣瀬觀友

- 1934 *Gujinshō josetsu* 弘深抄序説. *Seizan gaku* 6: 15–35.

HUANG Minzhi 黃敏枝

- 1989 *Songdai Fojiao shehui jingji shi lunji* 宋代佛教社會經濟史論集. Taipei: Xuesheng Shuji.

INAGAKI Shintetsu 稲垣真哲

- 1936 *Rongishō ni tsuite: Rokkanbon o chūshin to shite* 論義鈔に就て一六巻本を中心として. *Seizan gaku* 8: 48–61.

ITō Shōjun 伊藤正順

- 1985 *Ryō Rongishō no sōiten* 両論義鈔の相違点. *Seizan gaku* 33: 106–108.

JŌDOSHŪ KAISHŪ HAPPYAKUNEN KINEN KEISAN JUNBIKYOKU 淨土宗開宗八百年記念慶讚準備局, ed.

- 1970–1972 *Jōdoshū zensho* 淨土宗全書. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

KIUCHI Gyōō 木内堯央.

- 1978 *Asa daimoku yū nenbutsu* 朝題目夕念仏. *Nihon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 43: 233–44.

- 1986 “Rōzan hotsuganmon” shinsen-setsu e no shiken 「籠山発願文」真撰説への私見. *Tendai gaku* 28: 60–64.
- KODERA Bun'ei 小寺文颯
- 1975 Jitsudō Ninkū no mita Dengyō Daishi shinpitsuhon “Rōzan hotsuganmon” no danpen ni tsuite 実導仁空のみた伝教大師真筆本『籠山発願文』の断片について. *Tendai gaku* 17: 101–106.
- KODERA, Takashi James
- 1980 *Dōgen's Formative Years in China: An Historical Study and Annotated Translation of the Hōkyōki*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- KUBOTA Tetsumasa 窪田哲正
- 2000 Myōdō Shōgen no “Jippunimon kikigaki” 明導照源の『十不二門聞鈔』. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 49: 174–78.
- 2006 Shōgen no “Shikan girei Inokuma shō” ni tsuite 照源の『止観義例猪熊鈔』について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 55: 159–64.
- MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 望月信亨 and TSUKAMOTO Zenryū 塚本善隆, eds.
- 1966–1968 *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辞典. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.
- OKANO Kōji 岡野浩二
- 2004 Enryakuji no kinsei-gata jiinhō ni tsuite 延暦寺の禁制型寺院法について. In *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会, ed. Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平 and Fukuda Eijirō 福田栄次郎, 5–35. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- OKUMURA Gen'yu 奥村玄祐
- 1986 Fukakusa-ha so Enkū Ryūshin Shōnin 深草派祖円空立信上人. Kyoto: Jōdoshū Seizan Fukakusa-ha Jimusho.
- ŌTSUKA Norihiro 大塚紀弘
- 2009 *Chūsei Zenritsu Bukkyōron* 中世禅律仏教論. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.
- PANDEY, Rajyashree
- 1995 Women, sexuality, and enlightenment: *Kankyo no tomo*. *Monumenta Nipponica* 50: 325–56.
- SCHLÜTTER, Morten
- 2005 Vinaya monasteries, public abbacies, and state control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279). In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, ed. William Bodiford, 136–60. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- 2008 *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song Dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- SHARE, Robert
- 1995 Buddhist modernism and the rhetoric of meditative experience. *Numen* 42: 228–83.

SUZUKI Gihō 鈴木宜邦

- 1975 Kyōen shingi ni tsuite 教苑清規について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 47: 308–11.

TAKAKUSU Junjirō, trans.

- 1896 *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago*. London: Clarendon Press.

TAMAMURA Takeji 玉村竹二

- 2003 *Gozan zensō denki shūsei* 五山禪僧傳記集成. Kyoto: Shibunkaku.

TENDAISHŪ KANKŌKAI 天台宗刊行会, ed.

- 1973–1974 *Tendaishū zensho* 天台宗全書. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō.

TENDAI SHŪTEN HENSANJO 天台宗典編纂所, ed.

- 1988–present *Zoku Tendaishū zensho* 續天台宗全書. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TŌKYŌ DAIGAKU SHIRYŌ HENSANJO 東京大学資料編纂所, ed.

- 1901– *Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本資料. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

VERSCHEUR, Charlotte von

- 2006 *Across the Perilous Sea: Japanese Trade with China and Korea from the Seventh to the Sixteenth Centuries*. Ithaca: Cornell University East Asia Program.

WASHIO Junkei 鷺尾順敬, ed.

- 1925–1933 *Kokubun Tōhō Bukkyō sōsho* 國文東方佛教叢書. Tokyo: Kokubun Tōhō Bukkyō Sōsho Kankōkai.

XIN WEN FENG CHU BAN GONG SI 新文豐出版公司

- 1993 *Wan xu zang jing* 卍續藏經. Taipei Shi: Xin wen feng chu ban gong si.

YANAGISAWA Masashi 柳沢正志

- 2004 Ninkū no *Kangyōsho gujinshō* ni okeru in'yō bunken ni tsuite 仁空の『觀經疏弘深抄』における引用文献について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 52: 511–14.

Yü, Chün-fang

- 1981 *The Renewal of Buddhism: Chu-hung and the Ming Synthesis*. New York: Columbia University Press.

ZHENHUA 震華

- 1999 *Zhongguo fojiao renming dacidian* 中國佛教人名大辭典. Shanghai: Shanghai Cishu Chubanshe.