

ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION

The Current State of Sectarian Universities

[EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION] In order to introduce issues surrounding the contemporary training of Buddhist priests we invited professors from Taishō, Risshō, and Komazawa Universities to take part in a round-table discussion (*zadankai* 座談会) of the current state of sectarian universities. For many of our readers this will be a familiar format. A small group of experts are given topics and questions in advance, then brought together for a moderated discussion. While this type of arrangement may not produce the depth or consistency of argument that one finds in an academic article, it has the advantage of being able to generate a much broader range of opinions and issues. We felt therefore that this would be an ideal way to introduce an important topic about which little has been written. Another benefit is the mix of personalities and unscripted nature of the event, which can result in very frank discussions as well as fascinating tangents.

Readers will recognize that the three universities represented here are all in the Tokyo area. Unfortunately, financial and logistical limitations prevented the inclusion of professors from other schools, but we feel confident that the issues raised here are central to all sectarian universities. We also decided, after much debate, to limit ourselves to four discussants. This was based on a desire to include as many viewpoints and traditions as possible, while at the same time ensuring that each participant had enough time to express his opinions. In addition to having representatives from Zen, Pure Land, Nichiren, and Esoteric Buddhist schools, we also wanted to include professors from different generations in order to highlight changes over the last few decades. While this ran the danger of having the younger generation defer to their seniors, we feel that it actually sparked an unexpected level of candidness.

The four professors are Fujii Masao 藤井正雄, Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies at Taishō University, Ishii Seijun 石井清純, Professor of Buddhist Studies at Komazawa University, Koyama Tenyū 小山典勇, assistant professor of Buddhist Studies at Taishō University, and Watanabe Hōyō 渡辺宝陽, Professor Emeritus and former President of Risshō University. The editors would like to take this opportunity to thank each of them for their enthusiastic participation during the busiest time of the

Japanese academic year. The discussion took place at the University of Tokyo in February 2004. It ran close to three hours and resulted in a transcript of almost eighty pages of single-spaced Japanese text. This was edited down to nearly half that length, cleaned up, and sent back to the participants who then made corrections or clarifications on their comments. It was then translated into English and re-edited.

The session was chaired by Mark Rowe and Kikuchi Hiroki 菊地大樹, lecturer at the Institute for Historiographical Studies (Shiryō hensen jo 史料編纂所) at the University of Tokyo. It was transcribed by Wachi Yukei 和知右桂 and translated by Ryan Ward.

ROWE: Thank you for taking part in our discussion today. We are currently preparing a special issue on “Contemporary Buddhism in Japan” for the *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*. As part of the issue we had wanted to include an article on sectarian universities, but found that very little had been done on the subject. We then decided to follow the Japanese round-table model. This would allow us to invite the participation of top scholars representing a range of different Buddhist sects. There are two general goals for our discussion today. First, we would like to understand how priests are educated at Buddhist universities. Second, we would like to take a look at the current state of Buddhist universities and the issues that they may face in the future.

FUJII: Taishō University is a very small part of the Jōdo school’s (Jōdoshū 浄土宗) academic arm. Bukkyō University in Kyoto accounts for most of it. At Taishō, the Tendai school (Tendaishū 天台宗), the Buzan 豊山 and Chizan 智山 branches of the Shingon school (Shingonshū 真言宗), and the Jōdo school have all been brought together. I’m actually on the board of directors at both Taishō and Bukkyō Universities. At Taishō, I’m the academic dean of the Jōdo school. This is a position appointed by the Jōdo school. I’m also the head of the Kyōyōkai 杏葉会, an alumni organization for educators affiliated with the Jōdo school. There is also the Jōshūkai 浄宗会, which is the main youth organization for the Jōdo school. This group, which also falls under my supervision, is involved in activities like chanting the nenbutsu 念仏 and begging for alms (*takuhatsu* 托鉢). Because of these appointments, I’m responsible for writing the preface to the annual Jōdo publication *Mugekō* 無碍光. The university was reorganized in 1994, and the first batch of students under this reorganization began entering our graduate school in 1998, at which point we also restructured our graduate program. The first thing we did was get rid of the priest’s dormitory (*gakuryō* 学寮). We then switched from a yearlong system to the semester system and also changed our curriculum so that we could offer courses from nine in the morning until nine at night. These changes now compose one of the main foundations of our university. We also changed the actual times of courses during the day. All of this was done to meet the needs of our students. A

lot of them tend to sleep in, so we decided to focus our energies on the evening. In fact, the number of students taking the entrance exam for Taishō doubled because of this.

ROWE: I looked up some figures for 2003.¹

FUJII: 2003 had fairly large numbers. All together, it was about 5000.

ROWE: 4800.

FUJII: Yes. 4800. That's about right. The figures that the board of regents puts out are generally at about 4600 or so. This year it was around 4900. The graduate school is in addition to these figures. I'm sure Professor Koyama will be able to give more detailed information on the number of sectarian students, but I think it's at about 10 percent.

WATANABE: 10 percent of the whole school?

FUJII: 10 percent of the whole school. Until very recently 80 to 90 percent were Buddhist, but these figures have completely reversed. It's questionable at this point as to whether you can even refer to Taishō as a Buddhist university. Sectarian female students account for about 10 percent of the Buddhist student body, which is a very small figure. The overall student population is about half male, half female. Anyway, the number of females who have a sectarian affiliation is extremely small. Thus, we have to ask, what is the mission of Taishō University? It's a very interesting question. We also have to ask if a Buddhist university is even tenable in Tokyo. Professor Watanabe was President of Risshō University, so this kind of thing really must have gotten on his nerves. (Laughter)

WATANABE: In terms of Risshō's structure, and I'm not exactly sure what this means, we are the most secularized. We've also taken a fair amount of flack over this from the Nichiren school (Nichirenshū 日蓮宗). But I think it's not too much of a stretch to say that one characteristic of the Nichiren school is that we're a popular religion. Anyway, officially, the Nichiren school views Risshō as existing only to educate priests and often voices its dissatisfaction over the current state of the university. Actually, however, debate over whether Risshō should even have a broad-based literature department was already occurring as far back as 1924, when Risshō was first recognized as a university under the prewar academic system. When the postwar university system was initiated in 1950, we were one of the first sectarian schools to establish an economics department.

The Nichiren school has never received large-scale public funds. Although this differs somewhat depending on the historical period and the specific school

1. Refer to TABLE 3 on page 426.

of Buddhism in question, for the most part, Japanese Buddhist denominations have been protected and supported by the government. Of course, the Nichiren school is socially recognized, and to a degree has been the benefactor of state support, but this level of support was nowhere near, say, the amounts received by Zōjōji 増上寺 (a Jōdo temple), which had some 925,600 hectares of ground given to it by the bakufu, or Kaneiji 寛永寺 (a Tendai temple), which was granted 1,157,000 hectares of land. In our case, we focused our energies on spreading the teachings of Nichiren to the general populace.

FUJII: One of the characteristics of Risshō University is that you have a fairly large number of students who are members of new religions, right?

WATANABE: Yes. At the end of the sixteenth century there was what is referred to as the Fujufusei 不受不施 (“no receiving and no giving”) incident. Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–1582) had taken various measures to stifle the Nichiren school. After Oda’s rule, Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1537–1598), for the sake of creating merit (*tsuizen* 追善) for his deceased mother, ordered representatives from each school of Buddhism to gather in Kyoto and take part in a thousand-monk rite of offering to the ancestors (*sensō kuyōe* 千僧供養会). Most of the schools eagerly participated, seeing this as a chance to spread their doctrinal views, but the monk Nichio 日奥 (1565–1630) from Myōkakuji 妙覚寺 refused to have any part of it. For this, Nichio was banished to Tsushima, and persecution against the Fujufusei group itself intensified. The teaching and emphasis of more traditional Buddhist doctrines was permitted under Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 (1543–1616). However, absolute subservience to the bakufu’s policies was demanded in exchange for this freedom. I can’t think of a single daimyo who pledged their faith in the Nichiren school during this period. On the other hand, it appears that several women of the inner chambers were indeed Nichiren followers. It also seems that the power of these women helped to spread the Nichiren faith at the margins of society.

With the change in government in the Meiji period, schools that had once received bakufu support, like the Jōdo and Tendai denominations, really ran into a lot of trouble. Amid this conflict, in the first or second year of the Meiji period (1868–1912), there was a meeting of an interdenominational Buddhist federation (*Shoshū dōtoku kaimei* 諸宗道德会盟) at Shiba’s Zōjōji. The Nichiren school also participated in this. Close to Zōjōji, in Shiba, there’s an area known as Enoki, where the Nichiren temple Shōkyōji 承教寺 is located. The abbot of Shōkyōji was a young man named Arai Nissatsu 新居日薩 (1830–1888). Arai would later go on to become the first head priest (*Kanchō* 管長) of the Nichiren school in the modern era. Already at a fairly early age, Arai was using Shōkyōji as a base of operations to try and sort out all of the problems that the Nichiren school was facing. Because of changes in laws governing religion, the Danrin 檀林, the Nichiren school’s traditional center of learning, was abolished and the Great Teaching Academy (*Daikyōin* 大教院) was established within the grounds

of Shōkyōji in its place. With this, we have the beginning of the Nichiren school's modern educational institution. In retrospect, there were all kinds of problems with the transition to a Western educational system. Even the creation of the Imperial University (the forerunner of Tokyo Imperial University and the modern University of Tokyo) was not a very clear-cut process. Anyway, private universities were first recognized by the government about one hundred years ago. Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 (1835–1901) of the Keiō Juku 慶応塾 (Keiō University) and Ōkuma Shigenobu 大隈重信 (1838–1922) of the Tokyo Senmon Gakkō (東京専門学校; Waseda University) were involved in persuading the government to first accredit private schools via the Senmon Gakkō Act (Senmon gakkōrei 専門学校令). By the way, the Daigakurin 大学林, Rishō's first incarnation, was accredited in 1894. The University Act (Daigakurei 大学令) was passed in 1920 and private schools were officially recognized as universities. One of the necessary conditions for accreditation was that schools had to deposit one million yen to secure their candidacy. The actual fee appears to have been somewhat reduced as the government was concerned about the financial burden placed on schools after the Great Kanto Earthquake. There were about forty or so private universities at the time. Anyway, everyone jumped on board at this point.

The postwar education system was established in 1950. This system emphasized the importance of higher education for the general public and, accordingly, a great deal of liberalization was permitted. You also have a lot of schools that were established at this point. With these changes, the social significance of the university became much greater. Sectarian universities also focused on these wider social needs and, in time, grew in size.

It's important to realize that this struggle with the massive changes in higher education that occurred in the modern and postwar period had a very noticeable influence on sectarian universities.

FUJII: One example of a problem that occurred when Buddhist universities were being established was the use of the word *sōgaku* 僧学. Would *sōryo no gaku* 僧侶の学 (clerical education) gel with the concept of the modern university? Until now we've based ourselves on monastic education (*sōdōkyoiku* 僧堂教育), what exactly will we teach at the university? Faced with this, people then had to ask what exactly is meant by higher education. If academia is about looking at phenomena objectively, well, then, monastic education is extremely subjective. Therefore, it was thought that *sōgaku* wouldn't fit in with the modern university system. There was a great deal of debate at the time. Take Christian theology (in the West): in fact, it's included within the university. Ultimately, based on this kind of reasoning, sectarian studies were included in the curriculum. At Taishō, three schools of Buddhism, comprising a total of four different branches, came together to form our university. What was being aimed at was the creation of a multi-denominational Buddhist university, which, originally, would have included Rishō and

Komazawa Universities. The Sōtō school and the Nichiren school were internally very powerful and, ultimately, didn't agree to this. (Laughter)

WATANABE: Again, the Nichiren school is primarily a popular religion and is characteristically different from all of the schools that had received protection under the bakufu system. Even if higher-ups within the Nichiren school managed to have a dialogue with other denominations at the time, the average Nichiren priest wouldn't have gone along with a plan like this.

FUJII: Taishō was very conservative and really behind the times. We finally set out to change things, but even today we don't have an Economics Department. We have a Literature Department and a Humanities Department, which are really the same thing. Frankly, it's one department. This is where we differ from Risshō and Komazawa. Both of these schools were able, from very early on, to see the economic aspect of things and were thus able to position themselves as non-sectarian institutions. That didn't apply in our case. We regret having decided to go with a purely Buddhist framework.

KIKUCHI: I really think what Professor Watanabe has just said is extremely interesting. One, you see the Nichiren school as being secular. Two, you argue that the current state of Buddhist universities and their development can be traced back to the Meiji and Taishō periods. These seem to be the two points you are making. Could you speak a little bit more about this secularization in terms of, say, faculty, students, or curriculum? Or, perhaps, from when you first stood behind the lectern or began your scholastic endeavors, until today, what sort of changes have you seen and felt, and when do you believe these changes occurred?

WATANABE: OK. Well, ultimately, universities over-expanded under the post-war academic system. Japan's baby boom and the sudden growth of the post-war economy played a part in this expansion. The student movements (*gakusei undō* 学生運動) of the late 1950s and 1960s, which occurred on a global level, also had a role in these changes. I was the President of Risshō, so I'm somewhat responsible for this, but we currently have eight different departments. In terms of numbers, the overall percentage that the Buddhist Studies Department encompasses has, naturally, declined.

KIKUCHI: You're saying that the student movements led to the entire university...

WATANABE: There was a great deal of debate as to whether the government should force universities to undertake reform in order to help solve many of the problems these student movements were reacting against. The government eventually settled on this path. Opinion is divided on whether this was a good or bad thing, but the government decided that universities had to further open their doors to the growing number of potential students, improve their facilities

and curriculum, and also increase benefits for their faculty. The government did provide some financial support for all of this.

Private universities were faced with having to restructure their facilities and curriculum and increase faculty or they weren't going to make it as a university. As the universities expanded, the size of the faculty increased, academic specialties became more diversified, and the overall level of intellectual stimulation increased. That's a fact. I happen to be a specialist in Nichiren doctrine but this explosion in knowledge at Risshō, in my case, caused me to broaden my interests into areas like religious studies. This phenomenon in which you are suddenly interacting with many different scholars occurred. At the same time, one was also made painfully aware of the need for recognizing and maintaining the core or basis of their own specialty and also coming up with a way to systematically develop this specialty. Figuring out how to do this in a concrete manner is what is so difficult. (Agreement)

ROWE: Professor Ishii, how about you?

ISHII: A lot of what has been said holds true for Komazawa University as well. Honestly, we are a comprehensive institution that also happens to train priests. Out of about sixteen thousand students, one thousand or so are in Buddhist Studies.

ROWE: Students who are children of priests account for only about 2 percent of the overall student body.

ISHII: That's right. However, the principles on which Komazawa were founded upon are still alive and well. Courses in religious education are required for students in all departments and the Buddhist Studies faculty is responsible for carrying out this education. In other words, let me phrase it this way, the school's identity is manifested through this religious education, and this fact is very much recognized by the students and staff. This is true for both the Buddhist Studies Department and other departments as well. Let me say one other thing. Recently, I really think that religious education is completely absent from education in Japan. How should we go about emphasizing the necessity of religious education and having this education be easily accepted? These are questions that our faculty is striving to answer. One question that came up at Komazawa was, considering that we are a sectarian school, will a broad, academic religious education work in such an environment? Finally, though, the faculty argued that it was the Shūmuchō's 宗務庁 [the main administrative body of the Sōtō school] job to create priests. Our job, the faculty's job, should be to strive to teach basic academic methodology and provide a general body of academic knowledge for our students. I think a simple way of looking at this is to assume that the sectarian and academic aspects are for the most part separate. Of course, both of these aspects

have to be on equal footing and there are times when they merge. There are times, for example, when the Shūmuchō will recognize certain parts of our curriculum as being a requisite part of a priest's education and give credit for this. But the university isn't a trade school. We're an institute that gives out academic degrees, not priest's licenses.

FUJII: That holds true for all sectarian universities.

ISHII: We recently changed the priest's dormitory into what we call the training dorm (*kenshūryō* 研修寮). If you live in this dormitory for three years, you receive the most general level of ordination, the *nittōkyōshi* 二等教師. In this sense, we are gradually changing how we operate, so that the sectarian and non-sectarian aspects work together. When you overemphasize the sectarian aspects, however, the *honzan* 本山 starts to get upset because people stop coming for monastic training. At Komazawa we also have night classes in the junior college. Students in the undergraduate program can use the evening period to attend Chōkokuji (Chōkokuji betsuin 長谷寺別院), which is Eiheiiji's 永平寺 Tokyo sub-temple, and obtain their priest's license. Students have to keep this up for two years. The existence of these kinds of programs is how we keep the sectarian relationship of the school on par with the academic aspects. The overall feeling of the school, however, really is that of a comprehensive university that is, in a broad sense, centered on Buddhism and the Humanities Department. Komazawa began from the Humanities Department and the fact that our school is Buddhist is commonly understood in all of the departments.

By the way, the percentage of students who are registered clergy (*sōseki* 僧籍) is quite high. About 45 to 50 percent of our students in Sōtō Zen Studies are sectarian students. In Buddhist Studies this figure is 35 percent. About 10 percent of the Buddhist Studies Department and 5 percent of Sōtō Zen Studies is female. It's safe to say that about half of these female students are temple family members (*jizoku* 寺族) or have some kind of direct relation with a Sōtō temple.

Curriculum

ISHII: As far as our curriculum goes, well, we changed it eight years ago. Other than that, we reworked the entrance exam system a bit, but not a lot else has changed. You could say that we've made a lot of little changes, but nothing too major. Our current curriculum, however, has reached its limits and we've just started to work on restructuring it. This is only beginning to be discussed, so nothing is very clear at this point. There was a period in time where we had a great number of so-called *ronin* 浪人 students. In order to facilitate this large number of potential students, many universities had to temporarily increase the number of kids they accepted each year. There were so many students looking for schools to enter that they would just matriculate without any encouragement on the part of

the universities. This is no longer the case. Exactly eight years have passed since we reformed our curriculum. The overall feeling at school is that we are now in a period of transition.

WATANABE: How are you changing your curriculum?

ISHII: Well, eight years ago we liberalized things, reducing the number of prerequisite courses and making it possible for students to be able to choose more electives.

WATANABE: In both departments?

ISHII: Correct. We are split into the Sōtō Zen Studies Department and the Buddhist Studies Department, but they're pretty much mutually connected. Somehow, though, I feel that this connection is no longer functioning as it should. I think a great part of this is due to decreasing scholastic ability on the part of students. The general attitudes of students are also changing. The overall feeling is that it's going to be difficult to get our students motivated to learn unless we put more of an emphasis on the fundamentals and are able to present a very methodical and organic integration between our various courses.

WATANABE: Specifically, what do you mean by this relationship between courses?

ISHII: Well, to some extent, this exists even now. You have your general education courses and then specialized work. First-year students take general education courses, students in their second and third years take an introduction to the Sōtō school's history or a general introduction to the history of Japanese Buddhism. Students in their third and fourth years read and analyze specific Buddhist texts. That's how we have our curriculum integrated. At least that's how it's supposed to be integrated, but this doesn't seem to be understood by the students. More specifically, we have a numbering system for lectures (1.2.3.4), which is assigned based on the specific history and region that a course deals with. This numbering system seems to work in the case of a specific region, say for Indian or Chinese Buddhism, but when it's applied to specific Buddhist texts, like early or middle Mahayana, Chinese texts, or Japanese texts, it doesn't seem to be as clear of a process. This is also very difficult because the understanding and categorizing of texts changes based on specific areas of specialization and the views of individual professors. We need to come up with a clearer system for categorizing our courses. This is a real problem for our professors.

WATANABE: I always hear about how Komazawa does everything so well. Both the administration and the professors really worked hard and tried all kinds of things to liberalize their curriculum. However, and this is based on my own personal experience, I wonder to what degree Buddhist universities understood what this liberalization really meant.

FUJII: One thing that I learned from Komazawa was how to put the principles upon which a university is founded into practice. I was actually teaching at Komazawa when they started to liberalize their curriculum. I must have taught there for about ten years all together. Ultimately, if it's a Buddhist institution, you have to take those founding principles and convey them to the entire university. Unfortunately, this ideal tends to become very vague [in practice] and somehow diffuse. What we thought of (at Taishō) was this: The chief concern of Buddhism is the human being. Therefore, we ended up with our "humanities" department. That's why Taishō's Buddhist Studies Department disappeared and the Humanities Department arose in its place. We wanted to be founded on the principles of humanity and really consider the many aspects of human interaction.

One other thing. In our case, in order to better meet the needs of our students, we now have day and night courses. Actually, we don't like to refer to the night courses as "night courses." We asked ourselves how we could bring in more non-traditional students, many of whom work during the day. This was a big issue for us, and is why we now have courses from 5 PM onward. In order for this to work, for both (working) non-traditional students and professors, though, you need a campus in the middle of the city. The annual costs for this are exorbitant.

WATANABE: Yes, Taishō really does unusual things like that.

FUJII: Yes, we do. We also invested a lot of capital and rounded up all kinds of renowned professors. The question of how to fully implement our founding principles, like Komazawa had done, was also an important issue for us.

ISHII: Well, even at Komazawa, and this may not be all that surprising, many departments put up a great deal of resistance to our Buddhist principles.

FUJII: Right, that happened. The Social Sciences Department was particularly opposed.

ISHII: Exactly. The Social Sciences Department put up a huge fight. But the department that wouldn't require their students to take zazen was the law faculty (Everyone: Really?) Zazen is a required course for all departments.

FUJII: This is what I meant by the founding principles becoming vague or diffuse. It's a Sōtō university but people don't know anything about zazen. They ask, "What do you mean, Buddhist principles?" There was a great deal of opposition.

WATANABE: That's pretty incredible. At least from our standpoint (Laughter).

ISHII: Up until ten years ago, we required two years of zazen. We called this the "Religious Studies" course. First-year students would take an introduction to Buddhism and second-year students a course on zazen. We now call this course "Buddhism and Humanity," and it has been reduced to a one-year program,

which is mandatory for all students at Komazawa. The Buddhist Studies Department's position is that we will not allow this course to be diminished any further.

FUJII: As Buddhist universities become more open to the general population their standing as sectarian institutions changes. Buddhist universities have to ask themselves if they want to carry out full-fledged monastic training for priests and receive money from the parent religious group or if they want to become a secular institution. Both approaches have advantages and disadvantages.

WATANABE: I think that's a common issue faced by all Buddhist universities. I also think that we've attempted to solve all of our problems solely through technical means (constantly increasing the curriculum and making changes in the university's infrastructure). Lately, though, I feel this is somehow not working.

KIKUCHI: Listening to all of you, it seems that all Buddhist universities are similar in that they are attempting to develop themselves based on the needs of modern society and yet, at the same time, remain founded on a religious, Buddhist, or sectarian education. In the case of Risshō this has already led to the formation of eight different departments. It seems that all of these schools are attempting to develop a broader, multi-faceted education.

ISHII: No, that's wrong.

KIKUCHI: Wrong?

ISHII: Wrong. In terms of curriculum, we leave those decisions up to the individual departments. I was only talking about the Buddhist Studies Department. As I said, there's a fair amount of criticism from the other departments. How should I put this? Buddhist Studies or Sōtō Zen is representative of Komazawa. It might also be best to say that Eiheiji, rather than the Sōtō school in general, is representative of Komazawa. This is what our university is founded on and what accounts for its unique character. In fact, to a fair degree, this is recognized as being one of our school's major selling points. It also leads to us in Buddhist Studies feeling stigmatized by the other departments. They will tell us that they're paying our bills. However, there is still the general recognition that the Buddhist Studies Department is at the heart of the school. In other words, even if we allow for a multi-faceted, diverse academic system, there are certain unchanging, or unchangeable, ideals that exist for us.

WATANABE: Well, that recognition is something that has been built up since after the war. Our predecessors put a great deal of effort into developing the Buddhist Studies departments.

KOYAMA: Professor Fujii related his experiences as the Literature Department chair, so I won't go out of my way to say anything more about the overall structure

of Taishō. And although Professor Fujii did address this a moment ago, let me talk about the changes that happened in our Buddhist Studies Department. These changes began about five years after I joined the faculty at Taishō. We currently have a general Buddhist Studies Program, and within this program we have four different sections for teaching the specific doctrines of each school that is represented at Taishō: Tendai, Shingon (Buzan and Chizan), and Jōdo. The number of students in the program, however, is on the decline, and we decided to come up with ways to increase these numbers. Originally, Buddhist Studies meant intellectual and doctrinal history, but this approach by itself doesn't really meet the needs of our students. Therefore, we thought that by having a program on Buddhist Culture (Bukkyō bunka kōsu 仏教文化コース) and another for Hands-on Buddhism (Jissen kōsu 実践コース), and this is an odd way of putting it, even if a student isn't into book learning, they can study how to create Buddhist iconography (*butsuga* 仏画) or, say, experience going on a pilgrimage (*junrei* 巡礼). This is why we now have separate programs for Buddhist culture and hands-on immersion. The first graduates of this program will be this year. We now have a fairly defined system as to what courses students take in the intellectual history program, the hands-on program, and the Buddhist culture program. About forty students enter the Buddhist Studies Department annually. The Buddhist Culture course has exceeded our expectations and is the most popular. The hands-on course has the fewest students. About forty students enter our program annually. Out of these forty students, fifteen to twenty or more will enter the Buddhist Culture course, the intellectual history section is next, and the hands-on course is last, with about seven or eight students entering. Why is the hands-on program last? This is somewhat of a problem related to internal institutional matters, but all of the professors in the hands-on program are priests, so students tend to think, "How exciting. Sutra copying (*shakyō* 写経)." It would be nice if we could point out that we offer courses in Buddhist painting (*shabutsu* 写仏) and they would think something like, "Buddhist painting! I've heard that really renowned artists teach at Taishō!" But the level of awareness for this kind of thing is just not strong enough. We actually have a really amazing professor named Somegawa Eisuke 染川英輔 who does Buddhist paintings. Even with someone like this on our faculty, it's really hard for us to market this program to students. Unfortunately, there are also budgetary constraints, which means we have to use professors who are already at Taishō. I think this is why the hands-on course doesn't catch on.

WATANABE: What exactly goes on in the hands-on course?

KOYAMA: My line of reasoning was that "hands-on" primarily means doing things like sutra copying and, say, constructing Buddhist statues. I thought it would be nice if we could facilitate activities like this.

WATANABE: So, technical skills?

KOYAMA: Right. Craftsmanship. Wasn't it Risshō that had something like this?

WATANABE: In our case, within our Buddhist Culture program, we have a course for restoring Buddhist statues. This is a while back now, but we had two programs within the Buddhist Studies Department: Buddhology (Bukkyōgaku 仏教学) and Buddhist Culture (Bukkyō bunka 仏教文化). We've since changed the names slightly and now have a specialization in Buddhist Thought and History (Bukkyō shisō rekishi senkō kōsu 仏教思想歴史専攻コース) and another in Buddhist Culture (Bukkyō bunka senkō kōsu 仏教文化専攻コース).

KOYAMA: Anyway, so that's one thing. Another idea, as we're dealing with hands-on matters, is to have students learn basic Buddhist etiquette and be able to perform certain ritual practices and, in the final stages of their education, embark on a pilgrimage. This is one way to get students to reaffirm Buddhist culture and Buddhist knowledge. One concept that we are trying out this year is to have students create what we refer to as a graduation project. Students compose a travelogue of their pilgrimage and we give them credit for this in lieu of a thesis. That's the current state of our Buddhist Studies Department. At this point we are still figuring out what works and what doesn't.

Let me mention one other thing. Until quite recently, there were no sectarian female students in our Buddhist Studies Program. In the last ten years or so this number has been on the increase and, when you inquire as to why this is, many of these female students explain that they were born in a temple and, hence, are going to become an *obō-san* お坊さん (priest) [Translator's Note: The vernacular *obō-san* is specifically used here in contrast to the more technically sounding *sōryō*]. Female students can obtain their priest's license and become, say they are affiliated with the Chizan branch, a Chizan *obō-san*. This was completely unheard of until very recently and I think this is indicative of the increase in the inheritance of temples.

I'd like to mention something else, but let me first say a word about my personal background. I studied Hinduism as both an undergraduate and graduate student. Although I am affiliated with the Shingon school's Chizan branch, I had never dealt with sectarian studies. Well, it turned out that I ended up in a sectarian research facility and my first job was dealing with proselytization and propagation. My previous training had given me a deal of distance or separation from sectarian studies and their traditions. As I didn't have experience in these areas, I think I haven't been very concerned with traditional institutional methods. Rather, I've been more focused on pedagogical questions. In other words, I don't come from the position where you first learn sectarian doctrine and then move on to learning how to proselytize and spread the teachings of your school. Instead, I think you need to consider the necessity of beginning with

teaching proselytization and propagation. That being said, it's difficult to deny the absolute power that is still held by sectarian studies and doctrine. One of the questions we have to ask is how to go about dismantling this power. Fortunately, I've been involved in working with a special course to teach proselytization, which was established in 1989. The big problem we faced was that we weren't sure exactly what we should teach and what kind of theories we should base our teachings upon. There were so many ideas as to what we should do that it became really difficult to come up with a single conclusion. One answer I came up with was that we needed to emphasize the religiousness of Buddhism, and by this I mean the Buddhist emphasis on renunciation and the inner life, its concept of interiority. This is a very central point of Buddhism. At the same time, another dimension to consider is the social role that religion plays, its social function. How can one, as a member of the clergy, interact with society at large? If you don't begin from this question, doctrine ends up being nothing more than a lot of flowery talk. These questions are what I am dealing with right now.

WATANABE: Addressing the question of proselytization is one traditional characteristic of Taishō. In the Edo period, the Jōdo, Tendai, and the Shingon schools all received a great deal of support from the bakufu. In the Meiji period, however, this support disappeared, and all of these schools were plunged into institutional crisis. I think these denominations had to discover new points of departure, and one of these points was to very seriously become engaged with proselytization. Ultimately, I think this is coming from the reality that a given group can't always do things based just on that group's own ideals alone. On top of this reality, Professor Koyama, I'm really impressed by the fact that you are utilizing your own personal background to deal with concrete aspects of your school's proselytory activities.

KOYAMA: In the mid-1950s and 1960s many of the orthodox Buddhist denominations started establishing research facilities. You also had various Buddhist movements that appeared: the Dobokai Movement (*Dōbōkai undō* 同朋会運動), the Monshinkai Movement (*Monshinkai undō* 聞信会運動), and so forth. Soka Gakkai's 創価学会 Shakubuku Movement (*Shakubuku daigyōshin* 折伏大行進) greatly influenced these groups, and, at the time, every denomination felt that they had to create their own sense of religious identity. This is what the research facilities were working on. Personally, I was involved with the Shingon Chizan branch's Tsukushiai movement (*Tsukushiai undō* つくしあい運動). For some reason, though, this movement eventually folded. Anyway, in that sense, I was involved with the question of proselytization from the beginning.

ISHII: Recently, at Komazawa, the sectarian character has, and this is a strange way of putting it, been watered down. We actually have four professors in the Buddhist Studies faculty who no longer are registered priests. At Komazawa,

Indian, Tibetan, and Chinese Buddhism are very popular with students. General Religious Studies is also extremely popular. I mean really popular! Fortunately, the Literature Department has a Religious Studies program within their Cultural Studies section. We've relied on them and things have worked out very well. Anyway, Religious Studies is amazingly popular. The current situation is such that professors in Religious Studies often have up to sixty students under their supervision who are writing graduation theses. At the same time, everyone is still aware of the fact that zazen is the mainstay of our school, that we are following the founding principles of Sōtō Zen. Simultaneously, though, we want to provide students with the widest and most academic education possible. This sense of commitment is particularly strong in the Buddhist Studies Department. You were just talking about hands-on education or practice, but, in our case, we tend to do hard-core intellectual history. We also move beyond just Buddhism, and look at other histories and ways of thought in India, Tibet, China, and Japan. This is all properly tied-in with broader religious studies. I think this sense of commitment is held by all of us teaching in Buddhist Studies.

KOYAMA: Within our Buddhist Studies Program, when we started thinking about having separate sections for ideas, culture, and hands-on Buddhism, we also had to face the fact that sectarian studies have their own traditions and in many ways haven't changed a whole lot. The people involved don't change and there's little interaction with others on the outside. We tried to remove these barriers and increase interaction, so that scholars in sectarian studies would begin to consider their work from a cultural or a practical perspective. However, in the last two or three years there has been an even stronger tendency on the part of sectarian studies to focus just on doctrine. The attitude seems to be, "You guys take care of all that other stuff. We're going to do sectarian doctrinal studies to an even greater degree."

WATANABE: In Komazawa's case, they've had very capable and strong leaders in the postwar period. On top of this tradition and history, it seems to me that they've been able to go beyond departmental differences and create a broad, interconnected curriculum. To some extent this is true of the other Buddhist universities as well, but I think it's particularly salient at Komazawa. Let me talk a little bit about Risshō for a moment. We cover both doctrine and history within our sectarian studies program (Nichiren doctrinal studies). In our Buddhist Studies Department we originally had two programs: Buddhology and Buddhist Culture. We recently changed the names of these programs and reconsidered what we were teaching in them. We now have a specialization in Buddhist Thought and History and another in Buddhist Culture. Risshō's academic community is very small and although we have clearly delineated areas of study, there is a great deal of interaction among faculty of different areas of specialization on a daily basis.

FUJII: Without doubt, there's interaction between specialists. That's not to say that sectarian studies aren't mired down though. At Taishō, in order to break through these boundaries, we reconsidered how we should go about constructing our curriculum. As I said a moment ago, we split the day into two sections and also increased our general education courses, which students can attend irrespective of their departmental affiliation. In one major, sectarian studies, for example, we clearly defined the number of credits you need from that area of study. We let each individual department decide these requirements. We then figured out how many general education credits were needed; how many credits from the Literature Department, say, students in Buddhist Studies needed. What we were trying to do was let the students themselves make choices based on their own interests and also facilitate interdepartmental interaction. In reality, though, there are so many demands from professors on their students that it makes it difficult for all of this to work. Students in sectarian studies, for example, tend to remain with students in sectarian studies.

ISHII: In our case, sectarian studies, tends to mean Sōtō Zen Studies. However, being a faculty member in Zen Studies means nothing more than being in charge of zazen courses. You will get faculty members in Zen Studies who, as students, were studying, say, the Three Sastras (*sanron* 三論). This sort of varied experience is perfect for supervising zazen. We'll get people who will start off in Buddhist Studies as an undergraduate, move to studying Dogen 道元 (1200–1253) as a graduate student, and end up teaching in Zen Studies. I think I may be the only one who came from the Zen Studies Department and is still doing what I started with. Within this framework things aren't mired down. In fact, the recent trend for us is to have students take into account Buddhist doctrine in its entirety.

WATANABE: All faculty in the sectarian studies department at Risshō are graduates of the department.

KOYAMA: We have what is known as the Buddhist Propagation Program (Bukkyo dendō kōsu 仏教伝道コース), which is designed for sectarian students who are entering Taishō with the goal of receiving clerical training. The specific admission requirements for this program are recommendation letters and the submission of paperwork. We encourage students in this program to obtain their priest's license while they are still a student. If it's Jōdo or Tendai, or what have you, you just take the appropriate credits, and you can become ordained. So, when you have a program like this in place, no matter how much we talk about having courses in intellectual history, or hands-on courses, or courses on Buddhist culture, these students just focus on getting the bare minimum of credits needed to become a priest. They have a very narrow way of thinking about things and just aren't interested in the courses we design. (General agreement)

FUJII: We try and think up all kinds of different programs, but the truth is that the students just aren't interested. This is the same at both Komazawa and Taishō.

ISHII: It's the same. It's exactly the same. That's why we need to have a curriculum that forces students to take certain courses, even if they don't want to.

FUJII: When people such as myself entered the clergy, the Literature Department was a very difficult place to be affiliated with if you wanted to become ordained while still a student. Rather, it was easier to enter the Buddhist Studies Department, as many of the courses were also counted as credits leading to ordination. This system still exists. Buddhist Studies is the easier path if you intend to become a priest. By being at school for a certain number of years and obtaining a certain number of credits, you receive your ranking as a priest (*sōkai* 僧階). This way of thinking is the same with the Tendai, Shingon, and Jōdo schools. The system is worked out so that it is clearly defined as to where your ranking will be if you study abroad, or get x number of credits, and so forth.²

ISHII: Does this ranking have a close relation to the number of credits you take?

FUJII: Yes, and I think this is a problem.

ISHII: Graduation from Komazawa has no direct relevance for students who intend to become priests. At Komazawa, you can obtain the lowest priest ranking, the *nitōho* 二等補, but this just makes the time you need to spend at the *honzan* a bit shorter. As Sōtō Zen, at least in theory, is practice-based, you have to spend time at the *honzan* if you want to become ordained.

FUJII: The argument there is whether we should make it more difficult or easier to become ordained. At Taishō we have a class called "Hands-On Buddhism (Jissen Bukkyō 実践仏教)," in which students have to go to the *honzan* appropriate to their sectarian affiliation. The idea is that the university is where we teach academic knowledge and the *honzan* is where one becomes ordained.

WATANABE: At Risshō we also have a very clearly defined system like this. At the same time, you have a lot of priests who decide that it's enough to get by in life with the lowest level of ordination possible. In other words, technically, they are members of the Nichiren school, but they carry out their religious activities in their own fashion. There aren't many of these kinds of priests, but people with this mentality certainly exist.

FUJII: This is true. Many students purposely graduate without becoming

2. Refer to TABLES 1 and 2, pp. 424–25.

ordained. It's quicker to graduate and then take a specialized training course to obtain the various levels of ordination.

WATANABE: No. What I mean is that some students are satisfied with the most basic level of ordination. They don't want anything more than this, whether it can be obtained through a specialized training course or not.

FUJII: Well, it's the same at Taishō. Students just want their basic ordination and don't even try to get anything higher than that. (Laughter). It used to be that one's academic ranking and priest's ranking were one thing. Now, though, academic status and one's status as a priest are two different things. The problem is that these two aspects are no longer equally balanced. Once students leave university they have to be re-educated at the *honzan*, but, as Professor Watanabe just mentioned, many of these people have no intent of obtaining any higher form of clerical ranking once they reach this point. Even if they become successful priests, they don't even bother to go through the necessary formal procedures to be recognized thusly.

WATANABE: They don't need to. It never becomes a problem for them.

FUJII: That's it! Because of my job, I often have to beg people to obtain a higher level of ordination. I even have to go to a lot of really elite priests, some who are even professors, and beg them as well. They still refuse. They say they don't care about their rank within, say, the Jōdo school, as long as they continue to get paid for performing funerals.

I think this is the same at every university. How do we go about properly creating and defining clerical identities along with general social identities? This is a fundamental question. The problem of monastic education versus general secular education is the same sort of thing.

WATANABE: I don't mean to change the subject, but I wonder to what degree the Buddhist sangha is even recognized in Japanese society. We're often taught that religion—Christianity, in places like the US or Europe—forms the basis of society, and we often think that the relationship between religion and society is exactly the same in every country. I think it's fair to say that post-Meiji Japan did a good job of getting along with and emulating its Western counterparts. At the same time, this social revolution, which took place in such a short span of time, may have been a little too much. In many ways, the current Japanese response to globalization—the constant desire to adopt that which is new—is very similar to what we did in the Meiji period. It's as if there is some form of cultural DNA and, without even realizing it, we are repeating the same thing over and over. I think that one can argue that behind the Western idea of religious freedom is a great deal of trust and faith in religion. When you look at the modern period, say, after the Meiji Restoration, you have Shimaji Mokurai's

島地黙雷 (1838–1911) famous “Petition Concerning the Broadening of Religious Freedom” (*Shinkyō jiyūka ni kansuru kenpakusho* 信教自由化に関する建白書), which was published in 1875. Well, the problem of religion and politics has existed ever since. After World War II, because of criticism of state Shinto and the involvement of religious organizations during the war, there was a general trend to not recognize religious education (this excludes certain Christian missionary schools and Buddhist universities, where religious education was still actively pursued). There currently is an imbalance between the public disavowal of religious education and the private avowal of religion. This is one reason why it so hard for Japan to form a consensus on religious freedom. I think, albeit slightly, this has had an influence on sectarian universities and sectarian departments.

FUJII: This is true, that the sangha and society are not totally in sync, but this is also because Buddhism is based on social renunciation. There is a very strong aspect of Buddhism that doesn’t want to deal with society. When this is so, then you have to deal with the question of the sangha’s modality, of the modality of Buddhism itself. If renunciation is the key to Buddhism, then it’s possible that one may not have a strong relationship with the secular world. This is one basic principle of Buddhism, correct? This is why people who are recognized for their achievements within the sangha are not always recognized in the greater society.

KIKUCHI: There has been the attempt to meet the needs of contemporary students by developing things like a hands-on Buddhism program. In the process, a new form of Buddhist education has been created. At the same time, it seems fair to say that doctrinal authority is still very strong. I think that’s what Professor Fujii is talking about. I think it’s possible to view the inability of these two aspects, the practical and the theoretical, to forge a common basis as one reason that the sangha is diverging from society in general.

ROWE: Last year, the Sōtō school’s Comprehensive Research Center for Zen Buddhism (Sōtōshū sōgō kenkyū sentā 曹洞宗総合研究センター) published a book entitled *Sōsai* 葬祭. Reading the preface by Nara Yasuaki 奈良康明, one gets the feeling that there is a gap between priests who are involved with doctrine and those who are involved with proselytization. I would like to hear your opinions on this. This is my way of thinking, and maybe this is an oversimplification, but the research facilities seem to be analogous with proselytization.

WATANABE: Komazawa has a total of four research and training facilities, which are comprehensively integrated.

ISHII: Do you mean the Comprehensive Research Center for Zen Buddhism? That’s not part of Komazawa.

WATANABE: No?

ISHII: That's run by the Shūmuchiō. There are a total of three different research sections, including one for proselytization, so I think you can't just say that these facilities are just analogous with proselytization. These sections are further split into doctrinal and proselytary sections, and they then deal with specific issues. How about putting it this way: research centers exist neither solely for proselytization nor solely for expounding doctrine. They each function in their own manner.

WATANABE: Meaning, although doctrinal research deals primarily with doctrinal research, it's also necessary to consider the historical and cultural aspects along with the current reality of the sect. In this case, as you can imagine, it becomes necessary to deal with very concrete things: funerals, prayer (*inori* 祈り), and so forth. How then can we go about clearly delineating these aspects? This is no doubt the question.

ISHII: Well, this is a big question. As was brought up a moment ago, this is the problem of how to understand the place of the Buddhist sangha's idea of leaving home, of renunciation.

FUJII: Exactly. I think the Sōtō school still retains this idea of renunciation the strongest.

ISHII: I think so. The question we must consider is what kind of approach to take with society at large. Where does one get involved and where does one avoid involvement? It's this relationship between doctrine and reality that is so incredibly difficult to solve. How then can we go about dealing with this relationship?

FUJII: I agree. That's it.

WATANABE: In other words, you need to create a theoretical edifice for the propagation of Buddhism. Also, we need to ask what sort of stance should be taken towards society in general. Issues like these are dealt with at the research facilities.

FUJII: The Jōdo school has the Comprehensive Jōdo Research Center (Jōdoshō sōgō kenkyūjo 浄土宗総合研究所), which publishes Jōdo-related reference materials and holds symposiums.

WATANABE: There are all kinds of people involved with the research going on in these facilities. You have quite a few people who are religious studies specialists.

FUJII: That's right! Religious studies! I'm actually a religious studies scholar

myself. (Laughter) In that sense, the research facilities also have to figure out how to have a relationship with academia. They're not just focused on the question of spreading Buddhism.

WATANABE: At Risshō, we have the Nichiren Doctrinal Research Facility (Nichiren kyōgaku kenkyūjo 日蓮教学研究 所) and the Center for the Study of Lotus Sutra Culture (Hokkekyō bunka kenkyūjo 法華經文化研究所). Outside of Risshō, you also have the Nichiren Buddhism Modern Religion Institute (Nichirensū gendai shūkyō kyogaku kenkyūjo 日蓮宗現代宗教学研究 所), which addresses the various problems that the Nichiren school is facing from a contemporary perspective. This center is not completely uninvolved with doctrinal issues, but the basic stance is to let these issues be dealt with by the research facilities within Risshō. Outside of Risshō, the Nichiren school also has the Kangakuin 勧学院, which deals with doctrinal questions from a sectarian standpoint. They also are in charge of supervising the doctrinal education system from the sectarian side of things.

FUJII: I should briefly explain why the Comprehensive Jōdo Research Center became “comprehensive.” Within our school there was the Buddhist Liturgy Studies Group (Hōshiki kenkyūkai 法式研究会), which was a bunch of people studying ritual. Then you had the Propagation Group (Fukyōkai 布教会). You also have the Kyōgakuin 教学院, which deals with doctrine. These three separate groups were integrated into a single research facility located in Shiba, behind Zōjōji in Tokyo.

WATANABE: The Jōdo school and the Sōtō school are constantly in contact with each concerning these matters.

FUJII: We had a consortium meeting between Jōdo and Sōtō research facilities last April. We hold meetings like this, as I think that there are certain problems shared by all schools of Buddhism: although there is a specific organizational framework in place, in reality, one has to ask if everything is functioning as it is designed to. This is difficult.

KOYAMA: In terms of affiliation, I belong to the Shingon school's Chizan branch. Our first research facility was the Research Center for Propagation and Proselytization (Kyōka kenkyūjo 教化研究所). This facility then changed its organizational structure and is now known as the Denbōin (伝法院). The Denbōin has two sections: one that deals with doctrinal issues and one that deals with contemporary religious problems and how to further spread Shingon teachings. Recently, we have also formed the Proselytization and Propagation Center (Kyōka sentā 教化センター), which is designed to deal with proselytization and the direction that the Shingon school is headed. This facility specifically addresses our followers and their needs via the clerical medium. In

the case of the Chizan branch, there is a doctrinal section and then a developmental section, which deals with concrete actualities.

FUJII: As far as the question of how these facilities relate to the university, well, in the case of the Jōdo school, we offer general education courses at the Comprehensive Jōdo Research Center. We also will designate specific temples where courses can be taken. Specifically, we currently rely on three large temples, Dentsūin 伝通院, Yūtenji 祐天寺, and Jōshinji 浄真寺. Each school of Buddhism represented at Taishō is the same in this respect. Students can receive a certain number of credits by being affiliated with one of these temples and going there to learn to perform actual rituals. At the bare minimum, students can come to the university for a given number of years and be able to obtain the lowest rank of ordination. I think it's fair to say that the Comprehensive Jōdo Research Center functions properly in this capacity.

Ritual

KIKUCHI: So far, in our discussion, we have talked about doctrine and proselytization. However, we also have Buddhist liturgy. How does this fit in?

FUJII: Buddhist liturgy is ritual, like how to properly chant sutras.

KIKUCHI: Is work on the implementation of ritual and proper ritual attire done by groups totally separate from those dealing with questions of proselytization? I think we tend to see Buddhism as being composed of two main pillars: doctrine and practical matters. But you also have liturgy. However, if you had to choose one or the other, is liturgy closer to doctrine, or is it closer to practical matters?

FUJII: It relates to both. Definitely both. Actually conveying the teachings of Buddhism to society is a form of proselytization. In order to proselytize, you need to know how to carry out ritual. You are useless as a monk if you can't. This is why we have liturgical research. Simultaneously, and this is a basic concept, we also have to ask how we go about conveying our school's fundamental teachings. I think this is the same in any school.

KOYAMA: Talking about things within the framework of propagation and proselytization is a very recent development. Within the Shingon school, we refer to our religious rituals as *jisō* 事相. You first have to be able to perform these rituals. It is as if one receives a kind of mystical transmission through performing these rituals and one's religious status grows (*shūkyō tekina sutētasu* 宗教的なステータス) because of this. We have practice and then a [very defined] theoretical structure to explain these practices.

FUJII: But wait, this differs with each school, between exoteric (*kengyō* 顯教) and esoteric Buddhism (*mikkyō* 密教).

KOYAMA: I was explaining esoteric Buddhism.

FUJII: We belong to exoteric Buddhism, so we're completely different. We're a school that works to preach the dharma to the masses. Proselytization and propagation is a basic part of what we do. Like I said before, the problem of how this relates with the idea of renunciation becomes a problem.

ISHII: At Komazawa we no longer have any courses dealing with ritual. The only practice-based course we have is zazen, which we make sectarian students take two years of. The Shūmichō recognizes this as being equivalent to a year of zazen and a year of Buddhist chanting (*shōmyō* 声明) at the *honzan*, and this decreases the amount of time sectarian students have to spend there by half a year.

FUJII: In our case, we want our students to gain academic knowledge at the university and then go to the *honzan* to learn actual practice. One issue that became a problem a while back was the question of hair.

KOYAMA: Right.

FUJII: The Jōdo school is the only denomination that requires full tonsure. We go this far.

ISHII: Oh, really? (Laughter)

FUJII: Look, everyone else just goes with the close-crop. Right? The Jōdo school is full tonsure. We (the university) argued that the transmission of academic knowledge is our responsibility and that the full tonsure had nothing to do with us. Full tonsure, however, is a basic part of training at the *honzan*, so you should follow that custom when you go for training. That's how the matter was resolved.

ISHII: Ultimately, the university is not a place for practical training.

FUJII: However, at Taishō, on the fifth floor, which is the top floor of our library, we built tatami training rooms for each individual school. This is where training takes place.

KOYAMA: We used to do this at our satellite campus in Saitama prefecture.

FUJII: Right. And that is no longer around, so we built these facilities.

KOYAMA: We referred to what we did at the Saitama campus as “monastic training or education” (*sōdō kyōiku* 僧堂教育). Students would cram themselves in there, do the morning sutra recitation, and then do the nightly prayers

(*yugata no inori* 夕方の祈り), and then chant sutras again. We carried out all kinds of instruction there.

FUJII: At Taishō University we also had the priest's dorm. It was compulsory for all students to spend one year there. This dormitory was abolished when we were transformed into a university that catered to a broad range of needs and demands, like those of non-traditional students. However, people still said that monastic education was necessary, so we built the tatami rooms above the library.

ISHII: Indeed, that need does exist, even at Komazawa. Although we are supposed to be dealing with doctrinal and sectarian studies, in reality, we don't. As I said before, though, we do have a voluntary priest's dorm, where very stringent practice is carried out.

WATANABE: It's voluntary?

ISHII: Yes. Students enter voluntarily.

WATANABE: Is it next to the school?

ISHII: Yes, right next to it. We began by teaching students the basics of Sōtō Zen. Students then commute to the university and, as they are involved in both monastic training and academics, we grant them their priest's license.

FUJII: Things have changed.

KOYAMA: Professor Fujii started to bring this up a moment ago. Our university is designed so that when sectarian students enter the university it can be arranged so that they board in a large-scale temple within Tokyo and learn to perform basic rituals before they come to school in the morning. However, none of the students want any part of this. Why is this? Well, a given student, who has grown up living in their own room in his or her own house, doesn't want to be forced to lead a communal life and chant sutras at a set time every morning. The students just can't handle this kind of environment. It just doesn't feel right to their sensibilities. Of course, it would be nice if we could give them their own room within the temple. Anyway, in theory, such a system exists.

ISHII: This is the "at-least-give-me-my-freedom-for-the-four-years-I'm-at-university" mentality.

FUJII: If the purpose of the university is to transmit knowledge, we should make it as easy as possible to educate. In Japanese universities, people are really picky about etiquette and observing rules. If you are teaching Buddhist practice in the summer, it would be nice to turn on the air conditioning. The way it is now, though, we go without turning on the air conditioner, the kids are all sweating,

their legs are falling asleep from sitting *seiza* 正座, and no one is paying attention to the lecture. We've really started to rethink things like this from an educational standpoint. At the same time, you have educators who hold this Buddhist concept of practice (*gyō* 行). This is where things get difficult. How do we go about moving from this idea of practice to one of education? This is a really important question.

WATANABE: The Nichiren school created a priest's dorm at our Kumagaya campus in Saitama. This dorm is designed for first- and second-year students. Students in their last two years then move to a different dorm that is within the confines of a temple compound in Tokyo. Some parents want their children to have their freedom while they are at university and others tell us to strike while the iron is hot. These parents enthusiastically send their children to the priest's dorm. Both patterns exist at Risshō.

KOYAMA: What is most problematic is that motives for becoming ordained are no longer as clear as they once were. When you ask a freshman what their reason for becoming a priest is, you get answers like, "Because my family has a temple," or, "My dad was a priest." What I say to these students is, "You've already decided to become a priest, so not much can be done about that. But what kind of priest do you want to become? Think about that over the next four years." I myself became a priest without any clear motive. Fortunately, thanks to all of the professors I met along the way, I realized that being a priest is of great importance.

WATANABE: A young layperson who has a very clear and faith-based motive for becoming a priest will often be complemented for their passion. At the same time, when you look at things from the bigger picture, there is the tendency for clergy who were raised in a temple to be more inclined to stick with things. Of course, you can't lump all people born and raised in temples together. Each priest, and each member of a temple family, has a different way of dealing with their parish and a different degree of faith. Overall, though, it's fair to say that when a person who has grown up in a religious environment, even if they rebel against the priesthood in their youth, will, if they awaken to the cause, be a very strong force to reckon with.

KOYAMA: I've seen this as well.

FUJII: Take chanting sutras. This isn't something you study; it's something that naturally flows from your mouth.

ISHII: Well, I actually started out as a layperson. (Laughter)

WATANABE: Entering a university today is in no way an entirely free choice for students. High school advisors will often say something like, "Don't go to Risshō

University. The overall level of our high school will be brought down. Go to x University instead.” That’s reality. Becoming a priest is not seen as being a very desirable thing. “Work for a major company. Become a professor at the University of Tokyo. That’s what elite people do.” At the most basic level, the idea that everyone has different abilities and areas in which they excel is not recognized by our society.

Let me go back to the research facility question for a moment. The reason that the research centers deal with proselytization and propagation is that the teaching of Buddhism occurs on many different levels at a given temple. If one’s goal is just to somehow run a temple, even if you know nothing about Buddhism, a pleasant manner is enough to get by. However, you get parishioners who aren’t satisfied with this. How, then, do you talk with these people in a logical fashion? How do you evoke emotion? In a very broad social context, this necessity exists and many people are hungry for it.

KOYAMA: It’s definitely true that many people today want to have a knowledge-based or tacit understanding of things. This is why preaching the dharma, either verbally or through the written word, is an area that is receiving a great deal of attention as of late. The Shingon school, however, is categorized as belonging to esoteric Buddhism, and what is most important is not being able to speak with eloquence or put out a temple newsletter, it’s being able to properly perform the *goma* 護摩 fire ritual before Fudō 不動. This practice is what is really needed. People who are ninety or even older, my dad, for example, they don’t care about verbal eloquence on the part of the priest. These people grew up being taught that veneration was enough. In that sense, this recent emphasis on words is in direct opposition to the esoteric Shingon perspective. At the same time, people at the local level really are showing a need for practice-based experience. The easiest example to give is pilgrimage: the *Shikoku henro* 四国遍路 or the *Kannon mairi* 観音参り. On a daily level, the copying of sutras falls into this category as well. People are really looking for a tangible experience. In an esoteric sense, providing this experience is one way of being in contact with society. Of course, individual Shingon priests are also coming up with different ways to communicate our teachings as well.

KIKUCHI: As Professor Watanabe was emphasizing, the Nichiren school has a popular element to it...

WATANABE: Well, maybe I put a little too much emphasis on that aspect! Actually, when you look at the current active Buddhist denominations, they have always had resonance with these popular aspects. Having political support alone was never enough for a continued existence. All denominations, through dealing with these popular aspects, have been able to continue to exist. In this light, all Buddhist universities have a certain common basis.

KIKUCHI: But isn't it fair to say that there was a period in time when many denominations disavowed these popular aspects? There seems to be a trend, both in the denominations themselves and at Buddhist universities, to re-evaluate, to bring these elements back in, and to reform them.

KOYAMA: I'm not sure, but my personal hope is for scholars in sectarian studies and those who deal with intellectual history to pursue a much greater level of knowledge in their specializations. This specialization is what differentiates us from society in general and it's what allows us to have a critical voice. Frankly speaking, even though it's often said that religion has a degree of non-secularity or a renunciatory quality to it, in reality, unless more people who embody these qualities appear, it's difficult to convince society of religion's value. Of course, I realize that this is a difficult question.

FUJII: No. That's Buddhist tradition. When the Buddha begins the "Setting in Motion the Wheel of the Dharma," his five former disciples attempt to pay him no heed, as he has broken the pact in which he pledged that he would continue with his ascetic practices. As the Buddha approaches his former disciples, however, they bow to him. My point is this: the basis of proselytization is not words. It's the body itself. It's often said that Buddhism is understood somatically. Correct? One learns Buddhism with their body. This is where this problem comes into play. We've been talking about esoteric Buddhism and exoteric Buddhism, but, fundamentally, they both are based on practice. That being the case, the question as to how we can develop this practice in a contemporary sense is of vital importance. Professor Koyama talked about how sectarian studies are bogged down and that they are unable to accomplish a whole lot. We need to ask, in response to this, how we can improve the quality of the clergy and, in order to realize this, what sort of programs and facilities we need at our universities.

WATANABE: In terms of what one does at the level of practice, I think a great deal of individual freedom is necessary for things to work. Of course, it's important for sectarian scholars to continue thinking in terms of theory and also to be involved with actual practice, but, when it comes down to it, what can be done at the level of practice is very limited.

FUJII: Those guys are ultimately scholars. And scholars are ultimately pretty useless. Generally speaking, priests will tell you that scholars don't understand the actual situation.

ISHII: Right. I just think a lot of people don't want to listen to what scholars have to say.

FUJII: We have to figure out how to meet the needs of these people, to make

them listen. In order to do this, we need to analyze how the world that priests live in differs from the world of those outside of this sphere.

WATANABE: To a certain degree, a given temple has a specific historical background from which it is coming. There is also a very specific group of people who are the main temple supporters. It's necessary to first obtain the understanding of the parishioners in order to implement changes at the local level. Changes at a given temple are also possible when certain changes in society itself occur.

KIKUCHI: Although they have interaction with "normal" students at Buddhist universities, many sectarian students ultimately have to take responsibility for their family's temple. Even though these kids may live normal lives just like other students, they come to the university with the intent of one day becoming a professional member of the clergy. It seems that, even though they have many non-sectarian friends at school, they must feel, and this is probably a mutual feeling, that they are somehow different from one another. Do you see sectarian students dealing with this sort of conflict?

WATANABE: As far as I can tell, this isn't nearly as pronounced as people on the outside assume it is. I think there are more serious problems that these students face. For example, a certain television station once asked to film part of my class. The reporter, who was very young, had also visited one of my student's temples, and when I asked him what he thought of it, he replied, "Can you really call that a temple?" I told him, "Look, there are various kinds of temples! The media in general, just like you, knows nothing at all about the problems that temples are facing! You wrongly assume that all temples have a great deal of wealth. In fact, there are many cases of small temples that slowly grow over time. For many priests, this is the real test that they must overcome!"

One more comment. Students who have grown up in a temple and have parents with a very strong sense of faith tend to develop a similar sense of faith. Of course, there are cases where this isn't true. Anyway, priests who have a deep-seated faith always impress me.

ISHII: I think you get both extremes. On one hand, you have students with this very strong faith. On the other hand, you have students who are ready for their four years of freedom in Tokyo. You get the two extremes.

FUJII: That's why you have students who really want to become a priest's priest and, likewise, students who seem to be trying to become, how should I put this, worse than average.

ISHII: In our case, students have to go to the *honzan* to be ordained. "I'm going

to have to go the *honzan*, so I might as well enjoy myself now.” That’s how it is. (Laughter)

KIKUCHI: We were talking a moment ago about how it is difficult for students who go from being a layperson to an ordained priest to cross the demarcating line between the two. I’d like to hear a little bit more about this.

KOYAMA: I tell students this, “You aren’t a successor of a temple. You are a successor of the Buddha!” It may happen to be that the student I am addressing will go on to become a priest, but that’s really the only difference. “My only hope is for all of you to follow in the Buddha’s footsteps.” That’s what I tell my students when the opportunity presents itself. Another issue that comes up is the question of personal connections and temple networks, which are often very closed. A priest who comes from a small temple in the country is not even going to be recognized by those in the know. This is a really sad thing.

KIKUCHI: Listening to all of you, I get the feeling that you don’t particularly differentiate between students who are from temples and those who aren’t.

FUJII: But students know about us! “That professor is from the x school,” and so forth.

ROWE: One thing I noticed, though, when I was checking out Taishō University’s homepage, is that you don’t specify sectarian affiliation on the faculty list. I take it that this is done on purpose. For example, on Professor Koyama’s page there is no indication of his sectarian affiliation.

KOYAMA: This may not be so central to the discussion, but I happened to mention a certain professor’s sectarian affiliation at a recent tenure meeting. Administration later on told me not to bring up the sectarian affiliation of professors in the future.

FUJII: No kidding?

ISHII: I hate to change the subject, but, in the case of Komazawa, we have a lot of elderly people taking courses in the Buddhist Studies Department. They retire and then, as they already have an undergraduate degree, matriculate as third-year students.

WATANABE: Right, right! That’s what I was going to mention! (Laughter)

ISHII: These “non-traditional” students have a very high level of interest and awareness, and a truly positive influence on our sectarian students. I assume that’s the same at Risshō.

WATANABE: It’s the same. Non-traditional students are very important in this sense.

KIKUCHI: We've discussed how all of you, as professors, teach without differentiating between sectarian and non-sectarian students. Personally, I'm a historian, who specializes in Kamakura Buddhism. I assume that all Buddhist universities put a great emphasis on the place of the Buddhism of the Kamakura period. How does the history taught in sectarian studies differ from non-sectarian Japanese history? Moreover, when you teach the history of your own school, in what way are you aware of the histories of other schools?

FUJII: We used to use the *Outline of the Eight Schools* (*Hasshūkōyō* 八宗綱要) as a standard text. We no longer do. When we were students, we learned to clearly rank schools, in the sense of doctrinal classification (*kyōsōhanjaku* 教相判釈). We were taught a specific set of values and, as I was a Jōdo student, I was taught how the Jōdo school is superior. We don't do that anymore.

WATANABE: Although we place a specific emphasis on history, we have a two-tiered approach in which we teach both Nichiren doctrine and history. This two-tiered approach is particularly geared towards first-year students in sectarian studies. It seems to me that this way of teaching is somewhat unique.

FUJII: Well, for, say, the Jōdo school, we teach both Jōdo history and doctrine. This is also the two-tiered approach. It's the same everywhere.

WATANABE: That's because it's difficult to have a grasp of doctrine if you don't teach history. It's difficult to understand the development of doctrine over time if you don't understand this history. On a similar note, historical studies have really progressed in the postwar period. Today, even sectarian studies of a given denomination's history must be on the same level as non-sectarian historical studies or they tend to not be very convincing. I think that the boundaries between general historical studies and sectarian historical studies have really diminished, and at times even crossed over. Even if you are teaching with a very pro-sectarian bias, you still have to be able maintain an objective view or you aren't going to be taken seriously.

KOYAMA: When I begin a normal class I begin in a normal fashion. In the case of the hands-on course, however, I begin with *gasshō* 合掌. I read the *kingyōshiki* 勤行式 and then repeat all of this again at the end of the class. That's because this is a practical course. In the case of the hands-on program, one has to begin by demonstrating how to perform *gasshō* and read sutras. The same professor wouldn't do any of this if they were teaching students in a different program.

ISHII: As one would expect, for a long time, everything at Komazawa was centered on the Sōtō school. In the case of the Zen school, our historical view of things was very much centered on lineage or the dharma transmission. We have completely stopped teaching in this way. When I'm teaching Japanese Zen history, I'll start off

by talking about Funaoka Makoto's 船岡誠 theories of Zen, his ideas about the existence of "Zen masters" in the Nara period. We then move on to Kuroda Toshio's 黒田俊雄 theories, which we use to examine the history of Zen in Japan. We also use Kuroda's theories to look at the entire medieval period and, after this, in order to understand the institutional or organizational history of the Sōtō school, we study the Tokugawa period. I think our faculty is very conscious of historical studies. There is a separate elective lecture course dealing with the specific history of the Sōtō school. Sectarian students either have to take this course or an overview of the history of Japanese Buddhism. There are even students in Zen Studies who take, say, Tibetan Buddhist History. Our curriculum is designed so that students can take courses on various Buddhist histories without being overly focused on a specific historical genre.

Conclusions

ROWE: To conclude, we'd like to hear what each of you considers to be the most important issue that sectarian universities are currently facing and what issues you believe they will face in the future.

ISHII: Well, the issue we are facing right now is that the under-18 population is in decline. This is a problem for the entire university, not just the Buddhist Studies Department. Reforming our entrance exam and curriculum is also a major issue. We have already done some things to change the entrance exam, which will take effect next year. I think we will be able to better meet student needs. What do I mean by student needs? Well, I brought this up a moment ago, but in the case of the Buddhist Studies Program, there's no longer the need to be concerned with just the under-18 population. Instead, the area we want to develop is the over-60 demographic. We are formulating various plans for reforming our department right now to accomplish this.

This doesn't relate to the entire school, just our department. It would be difficult for the whole school to develop in this fashion. Anyway, I think that we must continue to develop our identity as a private university while not forgetting that we are also a Sōtō Zen Buddhist school. We also need to figure out how to best meet the needs of general (non-sectarian) students as well. If we become more focused on continuing education, the student body demographic is going to become more diversified and we need to consider how to develop our educational programs and facilities to meet the needs of these students. This is still a question that we don't have a completely clear picture for, but it's going to become very important in the future.

KOYAMA: I think this holds true for us as well. This is also related to economic issues, but we need to determine to what degree we can get non-sectarian students to enter our Buddhist Studies Program. Ultimately, what we see is that by

bringing in more general students there is a great deal of interaction with sectarian students. Also, as we've done with our Hands-On and Buddhist Culture Programs, we're going to have to develop our curriculum from a perspective different from the traditional one taken by sectarian studies. This process of trial and error is what we're dealing with right now. Another major issue that didn't come up to today is what to do with our graduate students. Originally, students entered our graduate program with the intent of becoming scholars. However, today, many families have a greater degree of financial freedom, and students enter our graduate school to simply get an MA, citing that a BA alone isn't sufficient to make it in the world. We have lots of students who stop after their MA. I think it's fairly safe to assume that many students plan on spending a total of six years at our school. Another issue is the necessity for developing priests who will go on to be leaders in the educational sphere as well.

ROWE: Do most sectarian students that go on to graduate school want to become scholars?

KOYAMA: That's correct. At least, I think we have to consciously educate and advise these students as if this were true. It's a problem if we welcome graduate students but have no idea what will happen to them after they graduate. We need to work on raising future scholars. Once this is accomplished, and this is my own hope for the future, I think we have to make doctrinal studies and sectarian studies more compact. I'm always thinking about our basic point of departure. In terms of specialization, doctrinal, and sectarian studies have a great deal of specificity. "Specificity" is a nice way of putting it. Really, it gets pretty esoteric. In this sense, very detailed research can be achieved, but as we discussed a moment ago, in terms of Japanese history and in terms of the history of the sect, the big picture needs to be addressed. When we take into account that each one of us is a member of society, it's necessary to make doctrinal and sectarian studies more compact. What we gain in time and energy by streamlining sectarian studies must be used to develop a curriculum that addresses the broader questions of culture. I also think that future sectarian studies need to deal with the social aspects of things. We must have religious education that facilitates social engagement. Traditional sectarian studies are not enough to accomplish this. We need to make use of religious studies and the social sciences, and develop a curriculum that has a more diversified academic base. Well, this may be wishful thinking on my part, but I hope we can make it an actuality.

WATANABE: I think that each denomination has a slightly different sense of what issues need to be solved, and slightly different ways of expressing these issues. One common problem that we're all aware of is that we can no longer just continue to rely on traditions like doctrinal and sectarian studies. We must also employ religious studies, the social sciences, and other academic sciences in order to allow

for a greater deal of flexibility and compatibility with changes in the modern world. No question about it, this is an unavoidable problem. Aside from this question of ideals, there is also the very serious question of thinking about the future of Buddhist universities. We need to take an honest look at the current state of sectarian universities and their place within the broader state of Japanese higher education. A while back, people in the test-taking industry started emphasizing that universities with a student population less than six thousand would go belly up. This fear was symptomatic of higher education in general, and sectarian schools were no different in trying to find ways to increase their student population. Looking back, a great deal of sweat and tears was poured into the founding of Buddhist universities. Ultimately, this coming-together of organizational willpower, was what formed the basis of these universities. Unlike the early years, today, sectarian universities have become massive organizations and, obviously, a strong financial footing is of great importance. That being noted, we must not forget the spirit behind which these universities were founded.

FUJII: For the most part, I hold the same opinion as Professor Watanabe. I think we need to return to tradition. The supermarket model, where you try and meet everyone's needs and demands, doesn't work. Even if you try to bring in all these students, no one is going to come. The general quality and competitiveness of the school declines when you try and do this. I also really want people to think more about how education should be. We need to develop priests who have the ability to solve problems critically. In classes you have two kinds of coursework, courses where you look for problems and courses based on problem solving. Until now, we've just taught the latter. But we need to consider a curriculum that promotes the ability to problematize. I also don't think that continuously expanding our curriculum is the answer. We truly must consider what we need to do to bring up "real" priests.

WATANABE: I think universities had their own bubble, like the bubble economy. But that's done with and things aren't going to last if we carry on like this.

FUJII: Yes. Actually, I'm retiring this year. In my final lecture I said that religious studies must become applied sectarian studies (*ōyō shūgaku* 応用宗学). In religious studies, say, instead of just trying to analyze things objectively...look, until now, we've operated with a very dualistic mode of thinking at Buddhist universities. But what we need to do away with this dualism and for each individual to become a believer. We need to awaken to a non-dualistic faith. This is exactly what Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870–1966) is saying in *Japanese Spirituality* (*Nihonteki reisei* 日本的靈性). If we don't focus on this truth, we're never going to have genuine priests. I want future educators to create "real" priests, even if this comes at the expense of the financial state of the temples themselves.

WATANABE: It's said that when Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨 (1869–1948) was compiling the *Mochizuki Encyclopedia* (*Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 望月仏教大辞典) he was so dedicated to his work that he financially ruined two temples! (Laughter). That's the kind of priest we need today! Someone who goes so far as to plunge their temple into ruin.

ROWE: That is a great story.

FUJII: It is a great story! We need to move back to tradition. We're in trouble if we don't. Well, that might be our conclusion. (Laughter)

ROWE: I would like to thank you all for making this such a lively and fruitful discussion.

Tables Relating to Sectarian Studies

TABLE 1: Tendaishū appointments by scholarly achievement (*gakureki*)*

Rank	Scholarly achievement
Gonsōjō	PhD with dissertation on Tendai Studies
Daisōjō	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete 24 credit hours in Tendai Studies at a government recognized graduate school 2. As a research student at the sect research center, pass examination based on a written thesis
Gondaisōjō	Complete PhD program with a focus on Tendai Studies at Taishō University
Shōsōjō	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate from Eizan Gakuin graduate program with 44 credit hours in Tendai Studies 2. Complete a masters degree at a government recognized graduate school with at least 24 credit hours in Tendai Studies

*Appointment to rank can be made based on study at a sect university (Taishō University, Eizan Gakuin), sect recognized school (Enryakuji Gakuen, Komae Gakuen), or at an institution for the training of *kyōshi* (literally, doctrinal instructors). However, in addition to scholarly achievement, the necessary experience/practice-based rank (*keireki gyōkai*) must be obtained. Minimally, all priests must complete a two-month retreat on Mt. Hiei at Gyōin. There are also age-based requirements. This chart shows only the first four ranks. Lower ranks require less education. Tendai Shūmuchiō, *Tendaishū no Q&A: Konna toki ni konna tetsuzuki o*. Ōtsu, Shiga Prefecture: Tendai Shūmucho Sōmubu, 1997.

TABLE 2: Bylaws for Sôtôshû Clerical Ranks*

Rank	Requirements
<i>Seikyôshi</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Junior high school graduate and at least 10 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 2. High school graduate and at least 7 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 3. High school Buddhist Studies concentration and at least 6 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 4. Graduate from junior college and at least 6 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 5. Graduate from a junior college recognized within Sôtôshû bylaws and at least 4 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 6. Graduate from university and at least 4 years and 6 months at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 7. Complete the Buddhist Studies program at Komazawa, Aichi Gakuin, Tohoku Fukushi, Tsurumi, or Tomakomai and at least 4 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 8. Graduate from Komazawa Buddhist Studies Department or Aichi Gakuin Humanities Division Department of Religious Studies, and at least 3 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 9. Complete training at special monastery or nunnery. 10. Complete masters degree in Buddhist Studies at the graduate school of Komazawa or in Buddhist Studies or Religious Studies at the graduate school of Aichi Gakuin and at least 2 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 11. Complete doctoral degree in Buddhist Studies at the graduate school of Komazawa or in Buddhist Studies or Religious Studies at the graduate school of Aichi Gakuin and at least 6 months at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery.
<i>Kyôshi</i> First Rank	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Junior high school graduate and at least 6 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 2. High school graduate and at least 4 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 3. High school Buddhist Studies concentration and at least 3 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 4. Graduate from junior college and at least 3 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 5. Graduate from a junior college recognized within Sôtôshû bylaws and at least 2 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 6. Graduate from University and at least 2 years and 6 months at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 7. Complete the Buddhist Studies program at Komazawa, Aichi Gakuin, Tohoku Fukushi, Tsurumi or Tomakomai and at least 2 years at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 8. Graduate from Komazawa Buddhist Studies Department or Aichi Gakuin Humanities Division Department of Religious Studies, and at least 1 year and 6 months at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 9. Complete masters degree in Buddhist Studies at the graduate school of Komazawa or in Buddhist Studies or Religious Studies at the graduate school of Aichi Gakuin and at least 1 year at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery. 10. Obtain candidacy for First Rank and complete 6 special retreats or 6 months at the <i>honzan</i> or other training monastery.

*This table is drawn from Sôtôshû bylaws (Sôtôshû Shûmuchô, *Sôtôshû shûsei: Tsuïroku dai jûyongo*. Tokyo: Sôtôshû Shûmuchô, 2003). Requirements for ranks below *Kyôshi* First Rank have not been translated. They follow the same pattern but require less education and/or less training.

TABLE 3: The Proportion of Students from Temple Families at Buddhist Sectarian Universities and Characteristics of those Universities.*

University	Affiliation	Approx. no. of students	% from temple families	Characteristics
Taishō 大正	Tendaishū, Shingonshū (Buzan and Chizan branches)	4,800	10%	Students from temple families comprise 90% of Buddhist Studies Division. Applicants to the Buddhist Studies Division have decreased.
Kōyasan 高野山	Kōyasan Shingonshū	571	36%	Has the world's only Esoteric Studies Division. Continues to fail to meet enrollment quotas. The Buddhist Studies Division ceased accepting applications in 2003.
Shuchi'in 種智院	The 13 branches of Shingonshū	580	27%	Students from temple families representing all 13 branches are enrolled. Has failed to meet enrollment quotas for several years.
Bukkyō 佛教	Jōdoshū	6,500	3%	Students from temple families comprise 20% of Buddhist Studies Division.
Ryūkoku 龍谷	Jōdo Shinshū—Honganji branch	16,000	2%	The Shinshū Studies and Buddhist Studies Divisions have maintained a rate of 6 applicants to 1 opening for the past several years.
Ōtani 大谷	Jōdo Shinshū—Ōtani branch	4,800	16%	Students from temple families comprise 80% of Shinshū Studies Division and 20% of Buddhist Studies. Number of applicants has remained level.
Hanazono 花園	The 14 branches of Rinzaishū and Ōbakushū	3,000	5%	Students from temple families comprise 50% of International Zen Studies Division.
Komazawa 駒澤	Sōtōshū	15,600	2%	Students from temple families comprise 30% of Zen Studies Division and 20% of Buddhist Studies Division.
Aichi Gakuin 愛知学院	Sōtōshū	13,500	0.5%	Students from temple families comprise 20% of Religious Studies Division.
Risshō 立正	Nichirenshū	13,000	2%	Students from temple families comprise 90% of Sectarian Studies Division and 50% of Buddhist Studies Division.
Minobusan 身延山	Nichirenshū	90	Unknown	Consists solely of the Department of Buddhist Studies. Continues to fail to meet enrollment quotas.

*This table is derived from a chart that appeared in *Jimon kōryū* (August 2003), pp. 42–43.