

# Anraku Ritsu: Genealogies of the Tendai Vinaya Revival in Early Modern Japan

WILLIAM M. BODIFORD

FOR MOST of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Japanese Tendai 天台 school attempted to enforce an approach to Vinaya orthodoxy that historians have labeled the Anraku Ritsu 安樂律 (Anraku Approach to Clerical Rules). The Anraku Ritsu represented a dramatic departure not just from Tendai traditions but also from the overall historical trend of Buddhist practice and teachings in Japan. More broadly, it seems opposed to the seemingly harmonious fusion of the secular and the sacred that many intellectuals have described as a hallmark of Japanese spirituality.<sup>1</sup>

The rise (and demise) of the Anraku Ritsu deserves our attention because it reveals the close ties between religion and government in premodern Japan—especially between Tendai and the royal (i.e., imperial) family and the military generals (shoguns). The Anraku Ritsu also demonstrates how the ambiguous status of Vinaya scriptures—and their associated rules, ordination procedures, and ordination lineages—provided Buddhists in Japan with almost endless opportunities to reform and reconfigure Buddhist practices and the social roles of the Buddhist clergy in ways unseen elsewhere in Buddhist lands. This article introduces the Anraku Ritsu and its significance. It builds upon and continues my earlier essays on Tendai Buddhism in early modern Japan.<sup>2</sup> First, I will briefly explain the label Anraku Ritsu, and then will explore the significance of previous Tendai teachings that the Anraku Ritsu attempted to overturn. Finally, I will outline a few of the factors that facilitated the rise of the Anraku Ritsu.

<sup>1</sup> See for example Etō 1944, Suzuki 1944, Watsuji 1926, Horie 2009.

<sup>2</sup> See Bodiford 2006, 2006–7, 2013, 2015.

*What is the Anraku Ritsu?*

In Buddhist contexts the term *anraku* 安樂 refers to serene joy or spiritual peace. Although it is found in all kinds of Buddhist scriptures, Japanese Buddhists most likely would recollect it within the context of either Pure Land teachings (where it serves as one of the names for Sukhāvatī, the Pure Land) or Lotus teachings (since it appears in the title of a chapter in the *Lotus Sutra* that describes the joyful practice of a preacher of this sutra). In the context of *ritsu* 律, though, it refers to the name of a temple—the Anrakuin 安樂院—located within the main Tendai monastic complex on Mount Hiei 比叡, which overlooks Lake Biwa 琵琶 and Kyoto.<sup>3</sup> The term *ritsu* basically refers to standards or regulations. In Buddhist contexts it typically translates the Sanskrit term *vinaya* and refers to the discipline and/or rules, especially the monastic standards of moral discipline observed by the Buddhist clergy, and to the scriptures that prescribe those standards. Anrakuin Temple on Mount Hiei served as the center for Vinaya studies and as home to the vanguard of the Vinaya revival movement within the Tendai school.

More specifically, the Anraku Ritsu refers to the new forms of monastic discipline advocated at Anrakuin Temple and promulgated by the leaders of the Tendai school. These reforms imposed the following new procedures: (1) the imposition of a mandatory twelve-year period (*ikki* 一紀) of seclusion on Mount Hiei for all new Tendai clergy; (2) the requirement that at the end of the twelve-year period all clergy must undergo an ordination ritual that included assumption of the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (Dharmaguptaka school; hereafter, *Four-Part Vinaya*);<sup>4</sup> and (3) a subsequent required course of training at Anrakuin Temple regarding correct adherence to Vinaya regulations in order to reinforce this ordination ritual. By the middle of the eighteenth century the practice of incorporating the *Four-Part Vinaya* into Tendai clerical ordinations became well established. Although some Tendai clerics opposed this practice—and they even succeeded in suspending it for about fifteen years (from 1758 to 1772)—observance of the *Four-Part Vinaya* in accordance with the Anraku Ritsu constituted orthodox Tendai teaching for almost one hundred and fifty years until the 1870s.

The existence of a temple devoted to Vinaya studies within the Tendai headquarters of Mount Hiei indicates that the leaders of the Tendai school had turned their backs on their own traditions. Saichō 最澄 (最澄;

<sup>3</sup> Nowadays the temple is known as the Anrakuritsuin 安樂律院.

<sup>4</sup> T nos. 1428–34.

766–822), the founder of the Japanese Tendai school, had argued that his monastic community should consist of a bodhisattva sangha (*bosatsusō* 菩薩僧; i.e., bodhisattva clergy) who reside at exclusively Mahayana temples (*ikkō daijōji* 一向大乘寺) and who rely exclusively on the aspirations of Mahayana morality (*daijōkai* 大乘戒; a.k.a. bodhisattva precepts). With these assertions Saichō took the radical step of rejecting the heretofore accepted orthodoxy in Japan (and in China) of clerical ordination based on the procedures of the *Four-Part Vinaya*.<sup>5</sup> Instead of the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the Vinaya, Saichō proposed that his bodhisattva clergy would conduct ordination rituals in which they would vow only to assume the fifty-eight rules (ten major and forty-eight minor) of the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 (Jp. *Bonmōkyō*; *Brahmā's Net Sutra*).<sup>6</sup> After the year 823—when Tendai ordinations based on newly devised Mahayana procedures for clerical ordination first occurred on Mount Hiei—the Tendai tradition of exclusive Mahayana clergy (who reject the Vinaya) continued uninterrupted for the next eight centuries.

### *The Implications of Saichō's Rejection of the Vinaya*

To fully appreciate the magnitude of the Anraku Ritsu reforms (or reformation), we must also consider the religious and cultural traditions it abandoned. When the Anraku Ritsu tried to undo Saichō's rejection of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, it also turned away from the important implications of that rejection. This was not just a matter of one individual Buddhist teacher having rejected Buddhist orthodoxy. Saichō's posthumous victory in 822—when the Japanese court acquiesced to his demands—and his disciple's subsequent performance of officially authorized Mahayana ordinations—changed the course of Buddhism in Japan. The repercussions of this change can be seen in a wide variety of contexts. At least three of them lurk within the genealogies of the Anraku Ritsu.

First, it created an irreconcilable schism among Japanese Buddhists. Henceforth Japan became home to two separate Buddhist orders. At that time the Buddhist clergy in the official government-sponsored temples (*kanji* 官寺) of the capital Heijōkyō 平城京 (a.k.a. Nara 奈良) were all ordained according to the procedures of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Apart from the Nara clergy ordained according to the Vinaya, there now also existed the Tendai clergy who would be ordained according to their own Mahayana procedures.

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed account, see Groner (1984) 2000.

<sup>6</sup> T no. 1484.

Neither group could recognize the validity of the ordinations performed by the other. Moreover, since the Vinaya rules dictate that seniority among the clergy should be determined according to the date of one's ordination, the individuals within one order could not accept the standing or the seniority of individuals in the other order. This means that they could not live together or participate in the same ceremonies. After Saichō, the Buddhist clergy in Japan would forever be split apart. And this initial division would generate new divisions, eventually giving rise to the many different organizations that constitute present-day Buddhism in Japan.

Second, Saichō helped engender a sectarian consciousness defined not just in social terms but also in spiritual ones. Saichō himself had been ordained according to the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Nonetheless, he denigrated it as teaching the inferior (i.e., *hīnayāna*) practices of auditors (*śrāvaka*) and asserted that its inferior rules cannot be appropriate for followers of the superior (i.e., Mahayana) Buddhism that he would establish in Japan. Over time Buddhists in Japan tended to draw their own particular distinctions between *ritsu* (understood as rules; i.e., *vinaya*) and *kai* 戒 (understood as morality or precepts; i.e., *śīla*). In many cases the former could be denigrated as merely a social norm to restrict one's own baser human instincts, while the latter would be exalted as spiritual aspirations that elevate both oneself and others. The latter would be promoted as a proper Mahayana approach to Buddhism in contrast to the inferior (*hīnayāna*) approach of the former. For this reason, the designation "Anraku Ritsu" seems somewhat self-contradictory insofar as it combines the negative connotations of *ritsu* with a term that is widely associated with the Mahayana aspirations of the Pure Land and/or Lotus Buddhist teachings.

Third, the establishment of Mahayana ordinations helped change the generally accepted conception of the spiritual status of the Buddhist clergy (*sangha*). Because this is a very complex topic, I will discuss it here only in very simple terms. Basically, the orthodox ordination procedures of the Vinaya scriptures involve the assumption of many rules of behavior (e.g., abstinence from all sexual acts) that separate the Buddhist clergy from ordinary human society. In the Vinaya scriptures each rule includes detailed judicial analyses and procedures that define the clergy as a self-governing social organization requiring them to live within clearly defined spaces separate from the biological family ties that normally bind people to one another. In the traditional terminology of East Asian Buddhism, clergy consist of the leavers of home (i.e., family; *shukke* 出家) as opposed to everyone else who resides at home (*zaike* 在家) with their families. The

act of ordination begins with this process of leaving home. The Mahayana ordination rituals that developed in Japan, however, can apply equally to all people (or even animals) without regard to whether they leave home or not. These ordination rituals emphasize the importance of one's spiritual aspirations (the precepts), not one's behavior (the rules). The so-called rules of the *Brahmā Net Sutra* consist of little more than vague moral exhortations without detailed definition or analyses. Over time it gradually became accepted practice for ordinary people who had no intention of entering a temple to participate in ordination rituals simply as a way of strengthening their ties to the buddhas and generating good karmic merit. While the distinction between clergy (in Buddhist robes) and non-clergy (in ordinary clothing) always remained, the promiscuity of Mahayana ordination rituals came to incorporate all kinds of people into the Buddhist fold.

As I have discussed in more detail elsewhere,<sup>7</sup> one can easily discern the different conceptions of the Buddhist clergy in Japan and China by contrasting the scope of the Buddhist hagiographies they produced. The *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釋書, compiled in 1322 by a Japanese Zen monk named Kokan Shiren 虎關師鍊 (1278–1346), for example, contains more than four hundred biographical entries. Kokan followed many of the conventions found in similar hagiographical compilations produced in China generally known as *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (Lives of Eminent Clergy). There is one major difference, though. The Chinese “Lives” consist almost entirely of elite clergy. Biographies of lay people are excluded except for a few exceptions. The exceptions consist of powerful emperors whose pro-Buddhist policies earned them special recognition as protectors of the Dharma (i.e., Buddhism; *gohōsha* 護法者). The biographies in the *Genkō shakusho* also include examples of elite clergy, people such as Saichō. But it also includes many biographies of lay people that one would never see in Chinese Buddhist texts. For example, it has categories for (1) itinerant wanderers (*hōō* 方應) such as fundraisers (*kanjin hijiri* 勧進聖), (2) members of government (*ōshin* 王臣), (3) aristocratic nobles and landed commoners (*shisho* 士庶), (4) nuns and noble daughters (*ninyo* 尼女), and (5) the gods and spirits (*reikai* 靈怪). In fact, biographies for these kinds of lay people and spirits constitute more than 25 percent of the total.

The inclusion of these Japanese lay people shows how in Japan—unlike in China—the Buddhist community worthy of hagiographical treatment came to include ordinary lay people as much as the elite clerical religious

<sup>7</sup> Bodiford 2009, pp. 132–34.

orders. In this regard, it is worth noting that the *Genkō shakusho* also differs from Chinese norms in that it does not include the category of “protectors of Buddhism.” Kokan explains this omission by saying that in Japan no one opposes Buddhism, because in Japan—unlike in China or India—no other religions exist (*mu idō* 無異道).<sup>8</sup> In other words, even the local gods of Japan and celebrants of local shrines who worshipped them—notwithstanding their modern association with Shinto—were Buddhists. Many medieval texts mention how they reinforced their Buddhist identity by receiving ritual ordination with Mahayana (i.e., bodhisattva) precepts.<sup>9</sup> *Shasekishū* 砂石集 (Sand and Pebbles) written in 1283 by the Zen monk Mujū Dōgyō 無住道曉 (a.k.a. Ichien-bō 一圓房; 1226–1312), for example, states that all celebrants (*jinkan* 神官) at the Grand Shrines of Ise routinely observe the ten major bodhisattva precepts of the *Brahmā Net Sutra*.<sup>10</sup> His observation is confirmed by no less a figure than Watarai Yukitada 度會行忠 (1236–1305), one of the systematizers of the shrine lore that subsequently became known as Ise Shintō 伊勢神道. In his *Korō kujitsuden* 古老口實傳 (The Elder’s Authentic Oral Initiations), Watarai explained that all the gods of Japan as well as the Three Jewels of Buddhism teach that the precepts of the *Brahmā Net Sutra* must be afforded the utmost importance.<sup>11</sup>

The proliferation of bodhisattva ordinations contributed to a certain degree of permeability between civil and spiritual spheres of life that greatly facilitated the politicization of Buddhist institutions. Rather than the ruler acting as a “protector of Buddhism,” the institutions of Buddhism assumed the role of protecting the rulers. While all forms of Buddhism contributed to this effort, Tendai came to assume the closest connection with the royal (i.e., imperial) ruling family and its ancestral god, Tenshō Daijin 天照大神 (a.k.a. Amaterasu Ōkami 天照大神). As explained by the court noble Kitabatake Chikafusa 北畠親房 (1293–1354) in his *Jinnō shōtōki* 神皇正統記 (Chronicle of Gods and Sovereigns), Mount Hiei enjoyed special status for its role in protecting the ruling houses (*kokka* 國家) and performing rituals to ensure the health and long life of the heavenly ruler (*tenshi no honmyō* 天子本命).<sup>12</sup> As early as the beginning of the fourteenth century the position of chief (*zasu* 座主) of Mount Hiei came to be the exclusive prerogative of

<sup>8</sup> See *Genkō shakusho*, fasc. 30. Cf. *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書, vol. 101, p. 370b.

<sup>9</sup> Bodiford 2016, Tada 2014.

<sup>10</sup> *Shasekishū*, chap. 1, p. 61.

<sup>11</sup> *Korō kujitsuden*, p. 244.

<sup>12</sup> *Jinnō shōtōki*, pt. 2, p. 112.

clerics who were royal princes (known as *hosshinnō* 法親王) and who had served as abbots of special royal temples (*monzeki* 門跡) on Mount Hiei. In this way, the Buddhist clerics who performed the long-life ritual on behalf of the ruler sometimes would consist of his own children or nephews. Mount Hiei's close connection with the royal court embroiled it in countless political intrigues.

In short, the Tendai tradition of exclusive Mahayana or bodhisattva ordinations had far-reaching implications. It facilitated the rise of Buddhist sectarianism, greater recognition of the Buddhist virtues of ordinary people, and the widespread adoption of Buddhist ordinations by people in many segments of society whether they intended to enter a Buddhist temple or not. It helps explain why Tendai became so successful and influential among Japan's ruling family and aristocrats.

### *The Key Question*

If we view the Tendai practice of exclusive bodhisattva ordinations as a key feature in the development of Buddhism in Japan, as I suggest we should, then how can we explain the subsequent development of the Anraku Ritsu and its advocacy of the so-called inferior (*hīnayāna*) ordinations on Mount Hiei during the early modern period? What prompted such a change?

This question has not been adequately addressed in the extant scholarship. During the early modern period both advocates and critics of the Anraku Ritsu wrote and published many polemical texts. With just a handful of exceptions, their writings have not been reprinted in the various standard collections of Japanese Buddhist literature such as the *Tendaishū zensho* 天台宗全書 (Complete Texts of the Tendai School) or the *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 (Complete Texts of Japanese Buddhism).<sup>13</sup> Many of the texts related to the Anraku Ritsu survive in various archives, but they are not easily accessible to most scholars. For this reason, our knowledge of the Anraku Ritsu remains deficient.<sup>14</sup> We cannot know precisely how Buddhists in early modern Japan debated the possible relationships

<sup>13</sup> *Tendaishū zensho* comprises twenty-five volumes plus thirty-five supplemental volumes (*Zoku Tendaishū zensho* 續天台宗全書) and a catalogue (*Seizoku Tendaishū zensho moku-roku kaidai* 正續天台宗全書目錄解題), and the *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 comprises one hundred and sixty-one volumes.

<sup>14</sup> The most detailed overviews remain those of Ishida ([1957a] 1986) and Fukuda (1954, pp. 687–712). Fukuda, however, emphasizes orthodox or mainstream Tendai thought and minimizes divergent views such as the Anraku Ritsu.



between traditional Vinaya (i.e., the ritual procedures for ordination and behavior followed by most Buddhists outside Japan) and the bodhisattva precepts (i.e., the spiritual aspirations advocated by some Mahayana scriptures). Their debates involved questions such as the nature of morality, the spiritual significance of the ritual procedures (*karma*) for ordination, the relationship between clerical status and salvation, and so forth. These questions motivated both the adoption of the Anraku Ritsu and its opposition. For the time being we must limit our examination of Anraku Ritsu to its genealogy, the social context in which it was born. We can know only that the Anraku Ritsu appeared after profound changes to the fortunes of Japanese Tendai: the loss of its economic foundations, the loss of its spiritual authority, and the appearance of new forms of Buddhist vitality from China.

### *The Destruction and Reconstruction of Buddhism*

On three occasions Buddhist institutions in Japan seem to have lost economic wealth and political power on historic scales. These major events, however, have attracted relatively little scholarly attention. One began after 1947 when the General Headquarters (GHQ) of the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP) implemented a policy of land reform that redistributed about eighty percent of all small agricultural plots in rural areas from landlords to the tenants who actually farmed them.<sup>15</sup> We know that rural Buddhist temples constituted a major segment of this class of landlords, but aside from isolated, anecdotal accounts little has been published regarding how they coped with the loss of income from tenant rents.<sup>16</sup>

Much more severe losses occurred during the years of “discard the buddhas [icons] and condemn the Śākyas [Buddhist clergy]” (*haibutsu kishaku* 廢佛毀釋) following the 1868 separation of gods and buddhas (*shinbutsu bunri* 神佛分離) at the start of the Meiji regime. No one knows with certainty how many Buddhist temples were destroyed, merged, or converted into Shinto institutions. The degree of destruction varied from one region to another in ways that make it difficult to determine nationwide figures. Nonetheless, it is clear that the overall number of temples, resident clergy, and the size of temple precincts fell dramatically.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Dore (1959) 1984, pp. 137–41; Woodard 1972, pp. 184, 201, 227–30.

<sup>16</sup> See Covell 2005, pp. 30–31.

<sup>17</sup> Collcutt 1986, p. 162; Grapard 1984; Ketelaar 1990, pp. 43–77; Yasumaru 1979, pp.



The most severe losses—and the ones directly related to the rise of the Anraku Ritsu—must have occurred during the sixteenth century. Prior to that time Buddhist wealth and power was not dispersed among thousands of small temples, but concentrated within a few major institutions. Large monastic complexes (especially Kōfukuji 興福寺, Mount Hiei, and Tōdaiji 東大寺) owned or controlled large areas of agricultural lands, forests, and mountains. Again, precise numbers do not exist. It is safe to estimate that these major Buddhist institutions controlled as much as twenty to thirty percent of all arable land. By the seventeenth century, however, the land holdings of these same institutions had been reduced to as little as three to four percent of the total. The lands they lost became controlled by the new warrior rulers who rose to power. Consider, for example, the case of Tōdaiji (the Eastern Great Temple of Nara). During previous centuries its power, land holdings, and wealth had been rivaled only by Kōfukuji (also in Nara). Each of them counted among the largest landlords in Japan. After the seventeenth century, however, Tōdaiji controlled lands measured at only about two thousand two hundred *koku* 石 (a unit of annual agricultural productivity). The Tokugawa family (of the shogun), in contrast, controlled lands that measured at least seven million *koku*.<sup>18</sup>

This reversal of Buddhist fortunes resulted from the military and economic policies that several warlords—especially Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–1582), Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1536–1598), and Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 (1542–1616)—implemented over a long period of at least several decades. One dramatic act, though, perfectly encapsulates this long process: in 1571 Oda Nobunaga attacked the Tendai headquarters of Mount Hiei. His armies reportedly burned all the monastic buildings on the mountain along with its neighboring towns, and slaughtered all their inhabitants.<sup>19</sup> Many accounts of this attack repeat the now famous remark by the nobleman Yamashina Tokitsugu 山科言繼 (1507–1579), who wrote in his diary:

---

50–118. Collcutt cites the early modern registers of branch temples (*honmatsuchō* 本末帳) in which prior to 1868 various Buddhist denominations, combined, had registered the existence of more than four hundred thousand temples and sub-temples. By 1872, when the Meiji regime conducted its first census, the government counted only about ninety thousand Buddhist temples (with seventy-six thousand clergy). The 1876 census counted only about seventy-two thousand temples (with twenty thousand clergy).

<sup>18</sup> McMullin 1984, pp. 242–55.

<sup>19</sup> For an English translation of a contemporaneous report on the destruction of Mount Hiei by the Jesuit missionary Luís Fróis (1532–1597), see Cooper (1965, pp. 401–2). Also see Kaneyasu 1981 for modern doubts about the true extent of the destruction.

“This destruction of the Buddha Dharma is inexplicable; how can the king’s Dharma survive?”<sup>20</sup>

Tokitsugu’s pithy question captures the crux of the matter. Nobunaga’s brazen attack on one of the main centers of Buddhist authority signified a reconfiguration of the spiritual landscape. It violated the long-established understanding that the secular law (i.e., the King’s Dharma, *ōbō* 王法) and Buddhism (i.e., the Buddha Dharma, *buppō* 佛法, as embodied by Buddhist institutions), shared a mutual dependence.<sup>21</sup> In other words, they flourish and decline in unison. Tokitsugu therefore interpreted Oda’s attack on Mount Hiei not just as the chastisement of a particular Buddhist institution but also as an attack on the king’s Dharma, embodied by the royal court and aristocratic houses themselves.<sup>22</sup> We can paraphrase his question as: What could possibly justify such an attack? What does it portend for the future?

Many people responded to this question by asserting that Mount Hiei brought this fate onto itself by losing its moral authority. Others focused on the future and advocated the Anraku Ritsu as the best way to restore morality to the mountain. The first point is vividly made by Ōta Gyūichi 太田牛一 (d. ca. 1610), one of Nobunaga’s lieutenants who wrote a chronical of Nobunaga’s life (*Shinchō kō ki* 信長公記). In an account of Nobunaga’s campaign against Mount Hiei, Ōta described the mountain monastery prior to Nobunaga’s attack as a den of depravity:

The monastic community of Mount Hiei should provide [spiritual] protection for the king’s town [i.e., Kyoto], but their physical deportment and their Dharma procedures bore no relationship to those of Buddhist clergy. They felt no shame before the criticisms of [the lord of] the realm (*tenka* 天下) and disregarded the Way of Heaven (*tendō* 天道) without fear. They engaged in sexual debauchery and consumed seafood and fowls. They obsessed over hoarding gold and silver.<sup>23</sup>

Almost every account of Nobunaga’s attack echoes this criticism. It was not just Nobunaga’s own followers who shared this appraisal. More than a

<sup>20</sup> 佛法破滅不可説之、王法可有如何事哉; *Tokitsugu kyō ki* 言繼卿記. As quoted in Tsuji 1947, vol. 7, p. 32; also see McMullin 1984, p. 257.

<sup>21</sup> Kuroda 1996.

<sup>22</sup> McMullin 1984, pp. 257–71.

<sup>23</sup> *Shinchōkō ki*, ch. 4. As quoted in Tsuji 1947, vol. 7, p. 28. For a translation of Ōta’s full account of Nobunaga’s attack, see de Bary 2001, pp. 444–47.

century later, in 1712, Arai Hakuseki 新井白石 (1657–1725)—the Confucian scholar who served as advisor to the government under the Tokugawa shoguns Ienobu 家宣 (1662–1712; r. 1709–1712) and Ietsugu 家繼 (1709–1716; r. 1713–1716)—directly cited the depravity of Mount Hiei as justification for Nobunaga’s suppression of it. He concludes his evaluation of the attack by saying:

While it was a brutal event, it forever eliminated the villainy of Mount Hiei’s clerics. And, in so doing, it constitutes one of the meritorious deeds by the lord of the realm (*tenka*) [i.e., Nobunaga].<sup>24</sup>

As a staunch Confucianist, Hakuseki was no friend of Buddhism. Even so, it seems likely that his appraisal of “the villainy of Mount Hiei” accurately reflected the views of many people in those days.

Even Buddhist leaders seem to have admitted them. Or, at least, they cited the decline in Buddhist morality as their justification for reviving observance of the rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* within Tendai. The person who ordered the revival was a royal prince (the son of the Sovereign Gosai 後西; 1637–1685) and a Buddhist prelate (*hōsshinnō* 法親王) named Kōben 公辨 (1669–1716). In his writings he repeatedly mentions the need to reform Mount Hiei and to restore morality. I will cite two examples, which I give in reverse chronological order.

At the start of 1707 Kōben issued the *Enryakuji jō* 延暦寺條 (Regulations for the Enryakuji Monastery), Enryakuji being the official name of the monastic complex on Mount Hiei, in which he explicitly renounces the “decadent customs” (*heifū* 弊風) of the Tendai clergy. His regulations begin as follows:

Mount Hiei’s Enryakuji cloister is the spiritual shrine that pacifies the realm and is the ancestral home of our Tendai school. In olden days it produced successive generations of eminent and virtuous teachers. Kings, ministers, and high-ranking officials alike venerated Mount Hiei beyond all others. Nonetheless, ever since medieval times its influence has waned. People with faith in the Buddhist Dharma can merely sigh in regret. Now our kingdom enjoys peace and within our shores there is nothing to fear. . . . [But] our decadent customs have not been reformed. Outwardly our inability to inspire the trust of kings and ministers and internally

<sup>24</sup> *Tokushi yoron* 讀史餘論, pt. 3, p. 419.

our inability to sustain the hopes of clerics who come to study truly should be a matter of grave concern.<sup>25</sup>

In other words, Mount Hiei must be reformed before the Tendai school can hope to regain the trust and support of the government and other powerful patrons. In his opening statement Kōben does not explain exactly how he intends to reform Mount Hiei. His accompanying regulations<sup>26</sup> begin by imposing a mandatory twelve-year term (*ikki*) of seclusion on the mountain for all novices. They reveal Kōben's strategy when they praise Tendai clerics who "conform to the rules of long-term training and engage in the 'twofold study' (*kengaku* 兼學) of the 'five categories of [Vinaya] rules' (*gohen kaisha* 五篇開遮) as 'genuinely outstanding' (*shin daijōbu* 眞大丈夫) Buddhists" and as "role models for priestly trainees" (*gakunin mohan* 學人模範). In this passage the term "twofold study" refers to the combined practice of both (*hīnayāna*) Vinaya rules along with the (Mahayana) bodhisatt-va precepts. The Buddhist technical term, "the five categories of rules" is a standard classification for the entire set of rules in the Vinaya, which in East Asia always refers to the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

Kōben also explained the relationship between the reform of Tendai and the revival of Vinaya studies in a set of regulations that he issued fourteen years earlier in 1693: *Anrakuin o kōritsu no ba to nasu rei* 以安樂院爲弘律場令 (Commands to Designate the Anrakuin Temple as a Center for Promoting the Vinaya). In these commands he clearly states that he wants to promote the Vinaya in order to restore morality to Mount Hiei:

To uphold the Buddha Dharma the Vinaya must come first. It is the standard for both monastics and lay people. The great vehicle and the inferior vehicle both flourish because of it. Therefore, when our ancestor Saichō founded this mountain he petitioned the government regarding the three types of temples [i.e., exclusive Mahayana, exclusive Hinayana, and dual practice]. He established the one vehicle [*ekayāna*] precepts in which the ten major and the forty-eight minor precepts [of the *Brahmā Net Sutra*] make one a fully ordained cleric (*daisō* 大僧; Skt. *bhikṣu*) and the perfect and sudden [precepts] of the ten goodnesses (*jūzen* 十善) constitute being a novice (*sokuji* 息慈; Skt. *śrāmaṇera*). Thereupon the sun-

<sup>25</sup> *Tendai kahyō* 天台霞標, pt. 6, sec. 3; vol. 42, p. 92c.

<sup>26</sup> Translated in Bodiford 2006, pp. 317–18.

light of the buddhas shone over Japan and the winds of the teachings fanned court and countryside.

Nonetheless, our ancestors have long departed. Our spiritual abilities have deteriorated, and monastic decorum has declined. The winds of truth have died out. Nowadays those with [spiritual] aspirations must avoid the [main monastic] community, retire to a separate hermitage, and exclusively study the [*Four-Part Vinaya*]. The Anrakuin Temple in Imuro 飯室 Valley was such a place. But in recent ages it lost its rules. Whoever knew this could not but sigh in sadness. Therefore, based on its past practice I now proclaim Anrakuin Temple to be a center for the promotion of the Vinaya. I hope that the morals of the Vinaya will endure for generations without decline. From this point forward, the abbot of the Anrakuin Temple must be someone who upholds the Vinaya. Anyone who lacks morality cannot reside there. These commands shall be proclaimed throughout the mountain so that all will know them.<sup>27</sup>

Note how Kōben carefully couches his command to promote adherence to the rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* as a return to Saichō's original vision. Instead of repudiating or disavowing Saichō, he pledges his allegiance to him.

His commands then present several points with significant doctrinal implications. First, he identifies morality, especially the morality of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, as the starting point of Buddhism. Second, he identifies the founding of Mount Hiei with the moral rules taught by Saichō. Third, he identifies these rules as the one vehicle precepts (*ichijō kai* 一乘戒) of the *Lotus Sutra* in a manner that seems to suggest that the one vehicle encompasses the rules and teachings of both the greater (Mahayana) and lesser (Hinayana) vehicles. The validity of this identification would become a major controversy within Japanese Tendai. Fourth, he avoids mentioning the *Four-Part Vinaya* scriptures by name, but only mentions the moral rules of the Great Vehicle scriptures. Specifically, he cites the "ten goodnesses" (discussed below) as the precepts for novices and cites the fifty-eight precepts (ten grave and forty-eight minor) of the *Brahmā Net Sutra* as the standard for full-fledged clergy. In this way, he seems to imply that the teachings of these Great Vehicle scriptures encompass or entail the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*.

As mentioned above, in his "Regulations for the Enryakuji Monastery" that he issued fourteen years later, Kōben does use language that clearly

<sup>27</sup> *Tendai kahyō*, pt. 4, sec. 4; vol. 41, pp. 409c–10a.

refers to the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. In his earlier command, he did not do so. But even though he does not directly mention the *Four-Part Vinaya* by name, already his language implies a combination of monastic rules from both of the so-called greater and lesser vehicles. In this way he raises the question of how these two kinds of moral rules are to be combined, but he does not provide an answer.

Fifth, Kōben frankly admits that the clergy of Mount Hiei long ago abandoned their moral teachings. The purpose of this order is to regain the moral authority that has been lost. Sixth, he states that the Anrakuin Temple will promote the Vinaya and he commands that anyone who “lacks morality” (*mukaisha* 無戒者) cannot reside at Anrakuin Temple. This notion of lacking morality refers to a Buddhist technical term: the “essence of morality” (*kaitai* 戒體). The essence of morality refers to a kind of spiritual power that one acquires through the process of being ordained according to the proper procedures (*karma*; Jp. *konma* 羯磨) of the Buddhist order. Once again he raises an important question: What is the proper procedure to be used? And once again he provides no answer.

In short, when Kōben established Anrakuin Temple and designated it as a center for promoting Vinaya, his commands raised at least three questions: (1) Do the one vehicle precepts include the rules and teachings of both the great and the inferior vehicles? (2) If so, how are these different kinds of rules to be combined? And (3), what are the proper procedures (*karma*) for obtaining the spiritual essence (*kaitai*) of this combination? Controversies over the correct answers to these three questions roiled through Japanese Tendai until the end of the Tokugawa period.

### *The Beginnings of the Anraku Ritsu*

In addition to the political context in which the Anraku Ritsu appeared, we also should consider new spiritual developments in the Buddhist world of Japan at that time. In 1693 when Kōben commanded Anrakuin Temple to become the center for the study of Vinaya, he also appointed Reikū Kōken 靈空光謙 (1652–1739) to be its abbot and to take charge of its curriculum of Vinaya practice and study. Reikū did not take credit for revitalizing the observance of Vinaya within Japanese Tendai. He gave credit for that achievement to his teacher, Myōryū Jizan 妙立慈山 (1637–1690). Jizan thereby posthumously became the founding patriarch of the Anraku Ritsu revival movement. Reikū composed a biography of Jizan (*Myōryū wajō gyōgōki* 妙立和尚行業記, 1690) in which he describes the beginnings of the Anraku Ritsu as follows.

Reikū states that Jizan first entered Buddhist religious orders in 1653 at Gankeiji 元慶寺 Temple (a.k.a. Kazanji 花山寺) in Kyoto. Fifteen years later in 1668 Jizan suddenly decided that he wanted to become a true religious (i.e., proper *biku* 比丘; Skt. *bhikṣu*) by assuming ordination with the complete two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. At that time, though, he could not find any Buddhist clergy who could conduct the rituals of ordination. He spent the next three-and-a-half years studying the Buddhist scriptures to investigate how he could perform the rituals of self-ordination without a teacher. Finally, in 1672 he performed a self-ordination ceremony (*jisei jugu* 自誓受具) by invoking the presence of the buddhas while assuming vows to adhere to the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Reikū explains that Jizan conducted his self-ordination ceremony in accordance with the *karma* procedures of the *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經 (Jp. *Bosatsu yōraku hongō kyō*; hereafter, *Adornments Sutra*).<sup>28</sup>

Kōken goes on to say that in those days Buddhists in Japan who performed rites of self-ordination normally would follow the *karma* procedures of the *Yujia lun* 瑜伽論 (Jp. *Yugaron*; hereafter, *Yoga Stages*).<sup>29</sup> Because Jizan deviated from this norm, at first other Buddhists severely criticized him. Nonetheless, subsequently the *karma* procedures of the *Adornments Sutra* became the norm for Tendai ordinations whether clergy followed the Anraku Ritsu or not. Kōken does not explain how these two Mahayana scriptures—the *Adornments Sutra* or the *Yoga Stages*—might differ from one another or, much less, why the differences should matter. Subsequent Tendai clergy, such as Keikō Kendō 敬光顯道 (1740–1795), elaborate the differences at length and in great detail.<sup>30</sup> We cannot know how Jizan might have addressed the issues raised by Keikō. Nonetheless, it is worth noting a few of the more prominent textual differences since they highlight the kinds of issues that animated debates over the bodhisattva precepts among Tendai clergy in early modern Japan.

We will focus on doctrinal differences rather than ceremonial ones (i.e., *karma* procedures), since ritual practices are difficult to address in brief and do not always adhere closely to textual accounts. The most obvious doctrinal differences involve the three groups of pure rules (*sanju jōkai* 三聚淨戒), also known as the three groups of bodhisattva rules (*bosatsu sanju kai* 菩薩

<sup>28</sup> T no. 1485.

<sup>29</sup> T no. 1579.

<sup>30</sup> Fujitani 2008a, Fujitani 2008b.



三聚戒). The *Yoga Stages*, being the translation of the *Yogācāra-bhūmi* by Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664), naturally was the scripture used by Eison 叡尊 (1201–1290) when he started the Shingon Vinaya tradition (Shingon Risshū 眞言律宗) of Nara. It explains Mahayana ideals of bodhisattva morality in a manner that can easily be reconciled with the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*.<sup>31</sup> In its chapter on morality (Jiepin 戒品) it identifies the three groups of bodhisattva rules, in order, as: (1) restraints (*ritsugikai* 律儀戒), (2) maintaining wholesome *dharma*s (*shōzenbōkai* 攝善法戒), and (3) benefitting sentient beings (*nyōyaku ujōkai* 饒益有情戒).<sup>32</sup> It then defines the first group as consisting of the rules for each of the seven communities identified in Vinaya scriptures, beginning with those for monks (*bisshu* 苾芻; Skt. *bhikṣu*) and nuns (*bisshuni* 苾芻尼; Skt. *bhikṣuṇī*), and so forth.<sup>33</sup> This explanation explicitly states that the rules and procedures of the Vinaya scriptures also apply to the bodhisattva clergy, and it implies that these Vinaya rules come first. While groups two and three shift from proscriptive restraints to prescriptive exhortations, they mainly describe concrete activities of limited scope. The second group (embracing all wholesome *dharma*s) requires bodhisattvas to perform every manner of physical, verbal, and mental good such as being attentive to venerable elders, caring for the sick, and not being careless.<sup>34</sup> The third group (benefitting sentient beings) prescribes eleven types of helpful activities, such as meritorious actions, rescuing people from dangerous predicaments, giving to the disadvantaged, reforming miscreants, and so forth.<sup>35</sup>

The *Adornments Sutra* used by Jizan explains the three groups of bodhisattva rules in a manner that is much more closely aligned with the teachings of the *Brahmā Net Sutra*, which in some ways it develops and amplifies.<sup>36</sup> It identifies them, in order, as: (1) maintaining wholesome *dharma*s (*shōzenbōkai*), (2) maintaining living beings (*shōshujōkai* 攝衆生戒), and (3) maintaining restraint (*shōritsugikai* 攝律儀戒). Note that the *Adornments Sutra* moves the precepts of restraint to third place, a sequence which can be interpreted as implying that rules of restraint are of less importance than maintaining the wholesome *dharma*s and the living beings. The *Adornments Sutra* identifies maintaining restraints as the ten

<sup>31</sup> Ishida (1957a) 1986, p. 458; Ueda 1976, pp. 59–61.

<sup>32</sup> T no. 1579, 30: 511a.

<sup>33</sup> T no. 1579, 30: 511a.

<sup>34</sup> T no. 1579, 30: 511a–b.

<sup>35</sup> T no. 1579, 30: 511b–c.

<sup>36</sup> Ishida (1957a) 1986, p. 459; Ueda 1976, pp. 52, 61–62.

bodhisattva *pārājika* (*harai* 波羅夷),<sup>37</sup> a Buddhist term for offences that result in expulsion. The same list of ten expulsion offences also appears in the *Brahmā Net Sutra*<sup>38</sup> where it explains the consequences of that scripture's ten major precepts. In this way, the *Adornments Sutra* suggests a very different interpretation of the “maintaining restraints” group of bodhisattva precepts than what would be the case if one relied on the *Yoga Stages*. Instead of the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* (as per the *Yoga Stages*), the *Adornments Sutra* refers clearly and exclusively to the ten major precepts of the *Brahmā Net Sutra*.

The *Adornments Sutra* also uses the terms “major” (*jū* 重) and “minor” (*kyō* 輕) in a couple of sentences that can be interpreted as references to the precepts. Most notably, it states that the “eighty-thousand kinds of clerical decorum all are ‘minor’” (*hachiman igikai jinmyō kyō* 八萬威儀戒盡名輕).<sup>39</sup> “Eighty thousand” refers to any large or infinite number that is beyond comprehension. It basically means “every variety.” This line can be interpreted as saying that all precepts, including the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, consist of minor affairs. Followers of the Anraku Ritsu argued that the two-hundred-and-fifty rules can, therefore, be included in the *Adornment Sutra*'s first group of bodhisattva rules: maintaining wholesome *dharma*s. The scripture defines this group merely as the “eighty-four thousand dharma teachings” (*hachiman shisen hōmon* 八萬四千法門)<sup>40</sup> of the buddhas. In these two contexts, the numbers eighty thousand and eighty-four thousand are synonyms. In short, while the third group of bodhisattva rules (maintaining restraints) identifies the ten major precepts of the *Brahmā Net Sutra* as the essential basis of the bodhisattva clergy, the first group is defined by vague and all-encompassing numbers that can accommodate the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*—but only if one delegates them to the same status as any other of the infinite variety of wholesome Buddhist teachings. If it does not necessarily repudiate the two-hundred-and-fifty rules, at the very most it allows them only a subsidiary role. The precise interpretation of the *Adornments Sutra* remained an unresolved issue of debate among the people who supported or opposed the Anraku Ritsu.

It is important to note once again that both the *Yoga Stages* and the *Adornments Sutra* are Mahayana scriptures that advocate unmistakably

<sup>37</sup> T no. 1485, 24: 1020c and 1022c.

<sup>38</sup> T no. 1484, 24: 1004b–1005a; see Muller 2012, pp. 260–307.

<sup>39</sup> T no. 1485, 24: 1021b.

<sup>40</sup> T no. 1485, 24: 1020c.

Mahayana approaches to issues of morality, restraint, and ordination. Even when the ceremonies of ordination are directed by humans (i.e., Buddhist teachers within an assembly of fellow Buddhist clergy), the actual preceptor always will be buddhas and bodhisattvas whose presence must be invoked through ceremonial and visionary technologies. Likewise, the rules or precepts assumed by the ordinand, or ordinands, will be more aspirational than strictly prescriptive. This approach is especially emphasized by the *Adornments Sutra*, which asserts that all rules, morals, or precepts consist of mind or spirit. Since mind can never end, precepts can never be undone or lost.<sup>41</sup> In other words, the inexhaustible spiritual benefits of ordination are more important than the concrete regulation of behavior (or lapses thereof). Regardless of whether clerics used the *Yoga Stages* or the *Adornments Sutra* as the basis for assuming the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*, ultimately, they did so by means of ceremonial procedures (*karma*) and with spiritual attitudes that a strict reading of the *Four-Part Vinaya* would never admit.

Now we can begin to discern the outlines of the Anraku Ritsu's consecrational program as envisioned in the commands that Kōben quotes above. My summary remains tentative because the complexity of the controversies leaves many details awaiting further research.<sup>42</sup> Kōben had cited Saichō as setting the precedents for his regulations. Although the opponents of the Anraku Ritsu would be loath to admit it, this precedent was not without historical foundation. In 818 when Saichō had petitioned the government with his six articles (*rokujiō* 六條) to establish his own exclusive Mahayana clergy, he had proposed that future Tendai ordinands would become bodhi-sattva novices (*śrāmaṇera*) by assuming the rules known as the "ten goodnesses." Thereafter they would spend twelve years in seclusion on Mount Hiei studying Buddhism. One year later (819) in a subsequent petition in four articles (*shijiō* 四條) Saichō again refers to the twelve years of training in seclusion. In this petition he also states that after the clergy have completed their training they would provisionally assume the rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* (*keju shō ritsugi* 假受小律儀).<sup>43</sup> It is not clear to what (if any) extent these procedures had been followed in the years immediately following Saichō's death. For Kōben and the Anraku

<sup>41</sup> T no. 1485, 24: 1021b.

<sup>42</sup> My current understanding is much indebted to Fujitani (2008a), but his account is based on the writings of Keikō Kendō who opposed the Anraku Ritsu.

<sup>43</sup> Groner (1984) 2000, pp. 118 and 139; also see *Sange gakushō shiki* 山家學生式; T no. 2377, 74: 624a and 624c.

Ritsu, however, they provided ample justification for the reform of early modern Tendai.

In the Anraku Ritsu program new Tendai ordinands first would become bodhisattva novices by assuming the ten bodhisattva rules found in the *Wen-shushili wenjing* 文殊師利問經 (hereafter, *Mañjuśrī's Questions Sutra*).<sup>44</sup> In content, these rules are identical to the ten rules for novices found in the *Four-Part Vinaya*<sup>45</sup> and other Vinaya scriptures.<sup>46</sup> In the Vinaya they are labeled *śrāmaṇera* rules (*shami kai* 沙彌戒), but the *Mañjuśrī's Questions Sutra* refers to them as bodhisattva rules (*bosatsu kai* 菩薩戒). Daoshi 道世 (d. 683), in his Buddhist encyclopedia *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 (Dharma Gardens of Beaded Groves),<sup>47</sup> refers to them as the “ten goodnesses” (*jūzen*) of bodhisattvas. It is this last label by which they became widely known. Daoshi contrasts the ten goodnesses of bodhisattvas with other sets of ten rules of good behavior, which are received from humans (*tainingju* 對人受). In the case of the other rules (including the *śrāmaṇera* rules of the Vinayas), one vows to adhere to the rules for one's entire lifetime (*jingyōju* 盡形壽). In the *Mañjuśrī's Questions Sutra*, however, one vows to adhere to these rules for countless lifetimes (i.e., rebirths) until one attains awakening (*naishi bodai* 乃至菩提) and until one embodies the six *pāramitā* (i.e., perfections; *naishi tōgu roku haramitsu* 乃至當具六波羅蜜). The format of the rules also differs slightly. In the Vinaya formulation one vows merely “not to” (*fu* 不) commit this or that transgression. Each rule in the *Mañjuśrī's Questions Sutra* version includes the additional provision that one also will remain detached (*ri* 離) from any imaginings (*sō* 想) of such acts. No doubt the next twelve years of seclusion on Mount Hiei would help Tendai novices purge pernicious thoughts from their minds.<sup>48</sup>

After completion of their twelve years of seclusion on Mount Hiei mastering Buddhist skills, scriptures, and ceremonies, the Tendai initiates would be ready for ordination as full-fledged religious. We know that the

<sup>44</sup> T no. 468, 14: 496c–497a.

<sup>45</sup> T no. 1428, 22: 810b–c.

<sup>46</sup> Roughly corresponding to: not taking life, not stealing, not engaging in sex, not speaking falsely, not consuming alcohol, not eating after noon, not watching entertainers, not adorning oneself, not using a large bed, and not holding money.

<sup>47</sup> See fasc. 89; T no. 2122, 53: 936c.

<sup>48</sup> I have not yet uncovered any information about the training curriculum during this initial twelve-year period. In 1776 the anti-Anraku cleric Keikō Kendō wrote his *Sange shōtō gakusoku* 山家正統學則 (Curricular Guidelines for the Orthodox Lineage of Mount Hiei Clergy). It conveys no information about actual practices.

ordinations used the *Adornments Sutra*'s procedural acts (*yōraku konma* 瓔珞羯磨), but the precise ritual formulas and sequences are not available in published sources. Based on the terminology used in the *Adornments Sutra* to describe the three groups of pure rules (*sanju jōkai*), one can easily speculate that it could have provided scriptural support for the following sets of vows.<sup>49</sup> First, as mentioned above, maintaining wholesome *dharmas* (*shōzenbōkai*) would include the two-hundred-and-fifty rules (i.e., *dharmas*) of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Second, the *Adornments Sutra* defines “maintaining living beings” (*shōshujōkai*) as “to compassionately give alms and teachings to living beings to enable all of them to attain serene joy” (*jīhi kisha kegyū issai shujō kaitoku anraku* 慈悲喜捨化及一切衆生皆得安樂).<sup>50</sup> In this context “serene joy” (*anraku*) would imply the Buddhist teachings that lead to deliverance. It would certainly entail the ideal precepts (*rikai* 理戒) of the *Lotus Sutra*. Finally, maintaining restraints (*shōritsugikai*) would entail the practical precepts (*jikai* 事戒) of the *Brahmā Net Sutra*, especially its ten major rules. In short, the *Adornments Sutra* provided a framework that would allow Kōben to command adherence to the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* while simultaneously claiming allegiance to Saichō's vision of an exclusive Mahayana clergy.<sup>51</sup>

Now let us return to the story of Myōryū Jizan, the founding patriarch of the Anraku Ritsu. Jizan's biography seems remarkably perfunctory. Its author, his disciple Reikū, provides no details about Jizan's activities before he suddenly decided to seek ordination with the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. According to Reikū, this change of heart had occurred in 1668—fifteen years after Jizan first began his religious life inside a Buddhist temple. How intriguing! What could have occurred during those years (1653–1668) to cause Jizan to seek such a radical change? We cannot know about Jizan's inner struggles, but we can place his change of heart within a larger social and historical milieu.

### *Chinese Buddhism in Japan*

During this crucial fifteen-year period the most remarkable Buddhist teacher in Japan was the Chinese émigré Yinyuan Longqi 隱元隆琦 (1592–1673), known today as Ingen Ryūki (the Japanese pronunciation of the sinographs for his name). Ingen had gained renown not only for his mastery of refined

<sup>49</sup> Ishida (1957a) 1986, p. 459.

<sup>50</sup> T no. 1485, 24: 1020c.

<sup>51</sup> Ishida 1957b.

Chinese literature and cultural arts, but also for his resolute advocacy of fundamental Buddhist morality and adherence to strict rules of monastic decorum.<sup>52</sup> These qualities enabled him to accomplish what no other Buddhist teacher of his age, much less one from China, could hope to achieve. First, at a time when government regulations confined all Chinese people to Nagasaki's Chinese Quarter (*tōjin yashiki* 唐人屋敷), Ingen was permitted to travel to Kyoto and Edo. Second, even though custom prevented personal contact between a royal monarch and a person from overseas, Gomizunoo-hōō 後水尾法王 (1596–1680; r. 1611–1629) performed the Buddhist rites of refuge with Ingen, formally becoming Ingen's disciple. Third, the Shogun Tokugawa Ietsuna 徳川家綱 (1641–1680) granted Ingen two audiences inside Edo Castle. Finally, even though government regulations forbade the construction of new Buddhist temples, the shogun provided Ingen with land and resources to construct a large-scale Buddhist monastery named Manpukuji 萬福寺 in Uji 宇治, just outside of Kyoto.<sup>53</sup>

Many of Ingen's activities overlapped with Jizan's career. In 1658, just five years after Jizan first became a Buddhist religious, Ingen published *Hongjie fayi* 弘戒法儀 (Jp. *Gukaihōgi*; Procedures for Propagating the Vinaya Rules). This book explains Vinaya ordination rituals in the format of a public ceremony that would prove to be enormously popular. In 1662 Ingen constructed Manpukuji, the large monastic complex that attracted endless attention as much for its unfamiliar continental Chinese-style art and architecture as for its well-disciplined and dedicated resident religious community. It symbolized new heights of cultural renewal. In 1663 Ingen officiated at the first three-platform precept ceremony (*sandan kai'e* 三壇戒會). This multi-day ceremony at Manpukuji put the procedures of the *Hongjie fayi* into practice by offering a series of lectures on the spiritual benefits of Buddhist confirmations for lay people and ordination with the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* for clergy. In 1667 Ingen began supervising the printing of the entire canon of Buddhist scriptures (1,654 titles, consisting of 2,101 volumes in 258 cases).<sup>54</sup> This publication not only made the Buddhist scriptures (including Vinaya scriptures) widely available to the non-monastic reading public for the first time in Japanese history, but also gave a tremendous boost to the growth of the printing industry

<sup>52</sup> Baskind 2006, p. 88.

<sup>53</sup> Baskind 2006, p. 65 and p. 65, n. 44; Tamamuro (1971) 1980, p. 221; Wu 2014, p. 75.

<sup>54</sup> Aitani 2009.



and nascent print culture.<sup>55</sup> In 1672 Ingen printed his monastic regulations, the *Ōbaku shingi* 黄檗清規 (Ōbaku Pure Rules), which also emphasize the importance of obedience to the rules of the Vinaya.

Given Ingen's prominence, the close geographical proximity of Gankeiji Temple in Kyoto (where Jizan resided) and Manpukuji Monastery in Uji (less than ten kilometers apart), and the intense attention his activities attracted, it would have been impossible for Jizan not to know of these developments. Ingen's activities to promote the Vinaya regulations reveal much useful information about the contemporary religious climate in which Jizan lived, and they demand closer attention.

In a letter of reply ("Fukuji Yōrin zennin" 復示瑤林善人) addressed to a Japanese Zen religious named Yōrin Sōkon 瑤林宗琨 (d.u.), Ingen explained his reasons for publishing the *Hongjie fayi* as follows:

In the more than thirty years since this old priest first became abbot [in China], all my tonsured disciples would immediately receive the ten *śrāmaṇera* rules [of novices]. Upon attaining age of eligibility, they would ascend the platform to receive full ordination [with two-hundred-and-fifty rules] and the set of three robes and a bowl. But upon arriving here, it ached my heart that no one has heard about these procedures for assuming the rules. Therefore, I published this *Hongjie fayi* account so that everyone who reads it and hears about it will be enticed to enter the Vinaya precincts and proceed through this gateway to the *Brahmā Net* [bodhisattva precepts]. How is it possible for [monastic] assemblies in this land to remember to don their robes and hold their bowls, but [be clerics] only in name and appearance? How can I not feel distress when they go so far as to use their bowls as wine cups!<sup>56</sup>

Yōrin was a Zen master at Myōshinji 妙心寺, one of the most powerful monasteries in Kyoto. Nonetheless, Ingen did not soften his criticisms of the monastic norms of Japan.

Ingen's *Hongjie fayi* provides detailed instructions for performing a three-step ordination ceremony, popularly known as the "three-platform precept assembly" (*sandan kai'e*). According to the daily sequence outlined

<sup>55</sup> Aitani 2007, pp. 239–40; Baroni 2006, pp. 39–54; Munemasa 1990.

<sup>56</sup> *Ōbaku oshō taiwashū* 黄檗和尚太和集, fasc. 2, in IZ vol. 7, pp. 3320–21; cf. Baskind 2006, p. 89.



in Ingen's *Ōbaku shingi* ("Gukai gishiki" 弘戒儀式),<sup>57</sup> the ceremony is performed over eight days. It consists of lectures and convocations, interspersed with a series of precept ceremonies that begin with moral confirmations for lay people and proceed to high ordinations for clerics. On the third day, ordinands ascend the platform to receive a novice initiation based on the ten *śrāmaṇera* rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. On the sixth day, they ascend the platform to receive clerical ordination based on the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. And on the eighth day they ascend the platform for the third time to receive bodhisattva ordinations based on the ten major and forty-eight minor precepts of the *Brahmā Net Sutra*. The text of the *Hongjie fayi* makes a special point of stating that its ceremony for ordination with the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* is based on the *karma* procedures of the *Adornments Sutra*.<sup>58</sup> It does not belabor this point or explain the significance of this scriptural reference. Perhaps it is related to the fact that this ceremony begins by invoking the presence of the buddhas (Vairocana and Śākyamuni, etc.) and bodhisattvas (Mañjuśrī and Maitreya, etc.) who actually administer the ordination. These elements reveal that even though the two-hundred-and-fifty rules come from the *Four-Part Vinaya*, the procedure itself adopts an unmistakably Mahayana format.

Ingen founded Manpukuji in 1662 and began construction in the same year. The warrior government endowed the monastery by donating land estates with an annual income of four hundred *koku*.<sup>59</sup> By 1663 construction had progressed sufficiently for Ingen to perform his first three-platform precept assembly in Japan. According to his biography (*Ōbaku kaisan Fushō kokushi nenpu* 黄檗開山普照國師年譜), large crowds of people came from all directions to observe the ceremony. Many of them were moved to tears by the emotional excitement (*kangeki ryūtei* 感激流涕) of the ceremonies. They lamented how difficult it had been previously to obtain a proper Buddhist ordination in Japan (*kaihō no aigataki koto o tanzuru nari* 嘆戒法之難遭也).<sup>60</sup> Clearly this ceremony was a major public event. It is impossible that any Buddhist living in Kyoto did not know about it. Many of them certainly witnessed it. The biography states that Ingen performed this ceremony on fifteen more occasions at Manpukuji, administering confirmations and ordinations to innumerable converts.

<sup>57</sup> T no. 2607, 87: 769b–770c.

<sup>58</sup> *Hongjie fayi*, sec. 15, p. 60.

<sup>59</sup> Baroni 2000, pp. 51–53.

<sup>60</sup> *Ōbaku kaisan Fushō kokushi nenpu*, IZ vol. 11, pp. 5241–43.

In 1672—the same year that Jizan performed his own self ordination—Ingen printed his *Ōbaku shingi*, a set of regulations to govern daily life and the liturgical calendar at Manpukuji. Chapter 5, “Bongyō” 梵行 (Skt. *brahma-carya*), concerns the importance of “pure practice” (*jōgyō* 淨行), by which it refers to celibacy, abstinence, and moral restraint. Ingen stresses that monastic life begins with a proper clerical ordination. He begins this chapter with these words:

“Bongyō” constitutes the fundamental practice that all Buddhist clergy should practice. “Bon” 梵 refers to “purity.” Anyone who attains clerical status and yet fails to practice purity by lust-ing after painted women and eating fish (etc.) without restraint, is only a bald-headed lay person, a thief of the *kaṣāya* (Buddhist robe). Nothing makes them authentic clergy. Such kinds of pseudo-Buddhists will be punished by the king’s Dharma in this life and upon dying will fall into hell.<sup>61</sup>

In this passage Ingen uses very harsh language. He refers to Buddhist clergy who ignore the moral rules as “bald-headed lay people” (*toku koji* 禿居士) and as “thieves of the Buddhist robe” (*kesa zoku* 袈裟賊). He threatens these kinds of fakes with public humiliation and promises that they will fall into hell (*da nairi* 墮泥犁). Many people, especially Buddhists in Japan, who read these words might naturally assume that Ingen was talking about the clergy on Mount Hiei or the other famous state-sponsored monasteries. As mentioned above, it had become commonplace to decry their moral decline.

Nonetheless, such an assumption could be mistaken. Ingen had habitually used similar kinds of language to criticize the Buddhist clergy of China. Ingen, and his Chinese companions who formed the core community of what was to become the Ōbaku school in Japan, had helped lead a Vinaya revival movement in China. He already talked the talk of a reformer. In China, the Ming court had forbidden Buddhist ordinations for a period of about eighty years, from 1526 to 1609.<sup>62</sup> During this period people still joined the clergy, but fewer and fewer of them had any sense of the rules governing clerical decorum. Many Chinese Buddhist temples came to resemble the communes of ordinary lay people. Men lived together with

<sup>61</sup> T no. 2607, 82: 769a; also see Sakakibara 2001, pp. 13–14.

<sup>62</sup> Wu 2008, pp. 28–30.

wives, raised livestock, and wore ordinary clothes.<sup>63</sup> They quite literally became identical to “bald-headed lay people.”

The revival of the Vinaya in China began when a Buddhist cleric named Guxin Ruxin 古心如馨 (1541–1616) saw a vision of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī on Mount Wutai 五臺 and thereupon entreated the bodhisattva to ordain him with the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya*. Shortly thereafter, in 1609, the Wanli 萬曆 Emperor (1563–1620; r. 1572–1660) commanded Guxin to perform an ordination ceremony at the temple Linggusi 靈谷寺 in Nanjing 南京.<sup>64</sup> The ordination ritual that Guxin performed subsequently became the basis for the so-called three-platform precept assembly described by Ingen in his *Hongjie fayi*. When ordinands invoke the presence of buddhas and bodhisattvas to administer the rites of ordination, they are rehearsing not just formulae from the *Adornments Sutra* but also the episode of Guxin Ruxin and Mañjuśrī on Mount Wutai.<sup>65</sup> In China, the people who formed the Huangbo 黃檗 (Jp. Ōbaku) lineage had referred to themselves as the Orthodox Lineage of Linji (Linji Zhengzong 臨濟正宗). The term “orthodox lineage” conveyed several nuances, including adherence to proper Buddhist rites of ordination.

Could Ingen’s example have inspired Jizan and his new Anraku Ritsu—which referred to itself as the “Orthodox Lineage of Tendai” (Tendai Shōshū 天台正宗)—to base its rites of ordination with the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* on the procedures of the *Adornments Sutra*? Reikū’s biography of Jizan portrays his decision to rely on the *Adornments Sutra* as a radical departure from tradition. Reikū states only that everyone else in Japan (and certainly the followers of Shingon Risshū) relied on the *Yoga Stages*. We now know that Reikū’s assertion does not fully agree with the facts. In China and among Chinese Buddhists in Japan some very prominent people certainly used the *Adornments Sutra* to ordain clergy with the two-hundred-and-fifty rules of the *Four-Part Vinaya* as

<sup>63</sup> Wu 2008, pp. 33–34.

<sup>64</sup> Wu 2008, pp. 30–31. See also *Pini riyong qieyao xiangru ji* 毗尼日用切要香乳記 (fasc. 2; CBETA, X no. 1116, 60: 211b6–11; Z no. 11, 2: 118b16–c3; R 106: 235b16–236a3) and *Zongtong biannian* 宗統編年 (fasc. 30; CBETA, X no. 1600, 86: 290a13–14; Z no. 20, 2B: 229a16–17; R 147: 457a16–17).

<sup>65</sup> The precise wording used by Ingen (*Hongjie fayi*, p. 60) does not appear in the *Adornments Sutra* (or in any other Chinese Buddhist sutra literature). Ingen copied these passages, including the citation of the *Adornments Sutra*, from the *Hong jiefayi* 弘戒法儀 (1623) by Hanyue Fazang 漢月法藏 (1573–1635). See CBETA, X no. 1126, 60: 606b20–24; Z no. 11, 2: 514d8–12; R 106: 1028b8–12.

Mahayana bodhisattva precepts. Anyone who wanted to cling to Saichō's vision of a purely Mahayana clergy could have been tempted to follow their example. Without access to the actual ritual manuals for the Anraku Ritsu precept ceremonies, however, it is impossible to determine the possible textual inspirations for these ceremonies. Our knowledge remains dependent upon the accidental survival of sources and decisions of archivists to grant access (or not).

The Anraku Ritsu mostly ceased in 1872 when Anrakuin Temple on Mount Hiei lost control over its branch temples and their ordination platforms. In 1882 the Meiji government granted the main Anrakuin Temple recognition as an organized legal entity with its own clergy.<sup>66</sup> In 1949 a fire destroyed its main temple buildings (and its library). Today the site of the temple is marked only by a main gate, the large foundation stones for several of its lost buildings, a few small structures, and the tombstones of its patriarchs. A stone pillar stands out front at what once was the boundaries of the temple's precincts. It is inscribed with these words: "Pungent herbs and alcohol are not permitted inside the temple gate" (*fukyo kunshu nyū sanmon* 不許葷酒入山門; i.e., *kunshu, sanmon ni iru o yurusazu* 葷酒、山門に入るを許さず). Similar stone pillars with the same inscription are found in front of many Japanese Buddhist temples across Japan. The words of the inscription do not derive from any Buddhist scriptures, though. They are Ingen's words. In his *Ōbaku shingi* regulations<sup>67</sup> he commands that a stone pillar with this prohibition be erected in front of Manpukuji. The cultural historian Ōba Osamu wrote: "If we may call the period from the Muromachi to early Edo one of Rinzai [i.e., Five Mountain] culture, then the Edo period may be called Ōbaku culture."<sup>68</sup> While signs of that cultural legacy are clearly evidenced in the major accomplishments of Ōbaku adherents, too often the many minor marks it left in surrounding contexts can be overlooked.

This intersection of Chinese and Japanese approaches to Vinaya reform illustrates how issues of Buddhist morality helped shape religious identities and social agendas. In Japan, the lack of clear standards for monastic rules, clerical status, ordination procedures, and ordination lineages generated levels of religious anxiety that demanded periodic episodes of self-examination, reform, and debate. This anxiety then might cool down for a while but would never totally disappear. The result was a vibrant tradition

<sup>66</sup> Fukuda 1954, p. 710.

<sup>67</sup> T no. 2596, 82: 550a.

<sup>68</sup> Ōba 2015, p. 225.

of Vinaya studies, almost as if the spiritual abstractions of Vinaya practice only enhanced its intellectual fascination. Ultimately the opponents of the Anraku Ritsu would prevail in their insistence on an unadulterated, pure Mahayana definition of clerical status, which they could identify exclusively with Saichō's writings. Their vision could not admit the Anraku Ritsu's complexity, heterogeneity, ambiguity, or possible Chinese influence.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

- CBETA Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association. Provider of digital versions of R, T, X, and Z, and the software to search and reproduce them. [http://www.cbeta.org/cbreader/help/index\\_e.htm](http://www.cbeta.org/cbreader/help/index_e.htm).
- IZ *Ingen zenshū: Shinsan kōtei* 隱元全集：新纂校訂. Edited by Hirakubo Akira 平久保章. 12 vols. Tokyo: Kaimei Shoin, 1979.
- R *Wan Xuzangjing: Zangjing shuyuan ban* 卅續藏經：藏經書院版. 150 vols. Taipei: Xinwenfeng Chuban Gongsī, 1994. CBETA digital text version.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35. CBETA digital text version.
- X *Shinsan dainihon zoku zōkyō* 新纂大日本續藏經. Edited by Kawamura Kōshō 河村孝照, Nishi Yoshio 西義雄, and Tamaki Kōshirō 玉城康四郎. 90 vols. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1975–89. CBETA digital text version.
- Z *Dainihon zoku zōkyō* 大日本續藏經. Edited by Maeda Eun 前田慧雲 and Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧. Kyoto: Zōkyō Shoin 藏經書院, 1905–12. CBETA digital text version.

#### REFERENCES

##### Primary Sources

- Dainihon bukkō zensho* 大日本佛教全書. Edited by Bussho Kankōkai 仏書刊行会. 161 vols. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912–22. Revised edition edited by Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木學術財団. 100 vols. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1970–73.
- Genkō shakusho* 元亨釋書. 1322. By Kokan Shiren 虎關師鍊. 30 fascicles. *Electronic Text of the Genkō Shakusho by Kokan Shiren* (GENKOSHA.TXT), edited by Michel Mohr. Kyoto: International Research Institute for Zen Buddhism, Hanazono University, 2001. Digital reprint of edition in *Dainihon bukkō zensho*, vol. 101, pp. 1–375. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1913.
- Hongjie fayi* 弘戒法儀 (Jp. *Gukaihōgi*). 1658. By Yinyuan Longqi 隱元隆琦. Reprint, *Zen-gaku taikai* 禪學大系, vol. 7, Kaihōbu 戒法部, pp. 1–78. Tokyo: Ikkatsusha, 1913.
- Jinnō shōtōki* 神皇正統記. 1343. By Kitabatake Chikafusa 北畠親房. Edited by Iwasa Masashi 岩佐正. *Nihon koten bungaku taikai* 日本古典文學大系, no. 87. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965.

- Korō kujitsuden* 古老口實傳. 1300. By Watarai Yukitada 度會行忠. Edited by Nishikawa Masatami 西川順土. In *Ise Shintō* 伊勢神道, vol. 1, pp. 244–64. *Shintō taikai: Ronsetsu-hen* 神道大系：論説編, no. 5. Tokyo: Seikōsha, 1993.
- Myōryū wajō gyōgōki* 妙立和尚行業記. 1690. By Reikū Kōken 靈空光謙. Printed with imprimatur of Sanmon Anrakuin zōhan 山門安樂院藏版. Kyoto: Baiyō Shoin. Owned by Taishō University Library. Call number 131–59–1.
- Sange shōtō gakusoku* 山家正統學則 (a.k.a. *Taishū gakusoku* 天宗學則). 1776. By Keikō Kendō 敬光顯道. Kokubun Tōhō Bukkyō Sōsho 國文東方佛教叢書, no. 1. *Kinsei bukkyō shūsetsu* 近世佛教集説, edited by Washio Junkyō 鷺尾順敬, vol. 1, pp. 1–72. Tokyo: Tōhō Shoin, 1926.
- Seizoku Tendaishū zensho mokuroku kaidai* 正續天台宗全書目錄解題. Edited by Tendai Shūten Hensanjo 天台宗典編纂所. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2000.
- Shasekishū* 砂石集. 1283. By Mujū Dōgyō 無住道暎. Edited by Watanabe Tsunaya 渡邊綱也. *Nihon koten bungaku taikēi*, no. 85. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1966.
- Tendai kahyō* 天台霞標. 1771. By Konryū Keiyū 金龍敬雄 (1713–1782). 7 parts. Supplements added in 1829 (to pts. 1–2) and 1862 (to pts. 3–7) by Rakei Jihon 羅溪慈本 (1794–1868). Reprinted in *Dainihon bukkyō zensho*. Revised edition edited by Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木學術財団, vols. 41–42. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1970–73.
- Tendaishū zensho* 天台宗全書. 25 volumes. Ōtsu: Tendai Shūten Hensanjo, 1935–37.
- Tokushi yoron* 讀史餘論. 1712. By Arai Hakuseki 新井白石. Reprinted in *Arai Hakuseki* 新井白石, edited by Matsumura Akira 松村明, Bitō Masahide 尾藤正英, and Katō Shūichi 加藤周一. *Nihon shisō taikēi* 日本思想体系, no. 35. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1975.
- Zoku Tendaishū zensho* 續天台宗全書. First series, 15 vols., 1987–99. Second series, 10 vols., 2003–16. Third series, 10 vols., 2018–. Ōtsu: Tendai Shūten Hensanjo.

### Secondary Sources

- Aitani Yoshimitsu 會谷佳光. 2007. “Edo jidai no wakokubon butten no shuppan to Ōbakuban daizōkyō” 江戸時代の和刻本仏典の出版と黄檗版大蔵經. *Nihon kanbungaku kenkyū* 日本漢文学研究 2, pp. 239–64.
- . 2009. “Chūo Kenkyūin Fu Shinen Toshokanzō Ōbakuban daizōkyō mokuroku” 中央研究院傅斯年圖書館藏黃檗版大蔵經目錄. *Tōyō bunko shohō* 東洋文庫書報 41, pp. 35–124.
- Baroni, Helen. 2000. *Obaku Zen: The Third Sect of Zen in Tokugawa Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- . 2006. *Iron Eyes: The Life and Teachings of Obaku Zen Master Tetsugen Doko*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Baskind, James M. 2006. “Ming Buddhism in Edo Japan: The Chinese Founding Masters of the Japanese Obaku School.” PhD dissertation, Yale University.
- Bodiford, William M. 2006. “When Secrecy Ends: The Tokugawa Reformation of Tendai Buddhism and Its Implications.” In *The Culture of Secrecy in Japanese Religion*, edited by Bernhard Scheid and Mark Teeuwen, pp. 309–30. New York: Routledge.
- . 2006–7. “Matara: A Dream King Between Insight and Imagination.” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 16, pp. 233–62.



- . 2009. “The Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan: The Insider’s View.” In *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice*, edited by James A. Benn, Lori Meeks, and James Robson, pp. 125–47. New York: Routledge.
- . 2013. “Myth and Counter Myth in Early Modern Japan.” In *Writing Down the Myths*, edited by Joseph Falaky Nagy, pp. 277–309. *Cursor Mundi* 17. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- . 2015. “Tokugawa jidai ni okeru kairitsu fukkō undō ni tsuite” 徳川時代における戒律復興運動について. *Nihon bukkuyō sōgō kenkyū* 日本仏教総合研究 14, pp. 23–40.
- . 2016. “Chūsei Ise to bukkuyō” 中世伊勢と仏教. In *Ise: Hen’yō suru seichi* 伊勢：変容する聖地, edited by John Breen, pp. 77–91. Tokyo: Shibunkaku.
- Collcutt, Martin. 1986. “Buddhism: The Threat of Eradication.” In *Japan in Transition: From Tokugawa to Meiji*, edited by Marius B. Jansen and Gilbert Rozman, pp. 143–67. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, Michael, ed. 1965. *They Came to Japan: An Anthology of European Reports on Japan, 1543–1640*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Covell, Stephen G. 2005. *Japanese Temple Buddhism: Worldliness in a Religion of Renunciation*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- de Bary, William Theodore, Donald Keene, George Tanabe, and Paul Varley, eds. 2001. *Sources of Japanese Tradition: From Earliest Times to 1600*. Vol. 1. Second edition. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dore, Ronald P. (1959) 1984. *Land Reform in Japan*. Reprint. London: Athlone.
- Etō Sokuō 衛藤即應. 1944. *Shūso toshite no Dōgen zenji* 宗祖としての道元禪師. Reprinted 1949. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. Available online via National Diet Library Digital Collections (Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan Dejitaru Korekushon 国立国会図書館デジタルコレクション): <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1040750>.
- Fujitani Atsuo 藤谷厚生. 2008a. “Keikō Kendō cho ‘Bonmō risshū sōkaisetsu’ no kisokuteki kenkyū” 敬光顕道著「梵網律宗僧戒説」の基礎的研究. *Shitennōji Daigaku kiyō* 四天王寺大学紀要 46, pp. 49–74.
- . 2008b. “Keikō risshi no Bonmō ritsukan ni tsuite” 敬光律師の梵網律観について. *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 116 (vol. 57, no. 1), pp. 227–34.
- Fukuda Gyōei 福田堯穎. 1954. *Tendaigaku gairon* 天台學概論. Tokyo: Bun’ichi Shuppan.
- Grapard, Allan G. 1984. “Japan’s Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shinto and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji (‘Shimbutsu Bunri’) and a Case Study: Tonomine.” *History of Religions* 23, pp. 240–65.
- Groner, Paul. (1984) 2000. *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series. Seoul: Po Chin Chai. Reprint. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Horie Norichika. 2009. “Spirituality and the Spiritual in Japan: Translation and Transformation.” *Journal of Alternative Spiritualities and New Age Studies* 5, pp. 1–15.
- Ishida Mizumaro 石田瑞磨. (1957a) 1986. “Anraku ritsu no funsō” 安樂律の紛争. Reprinted in *Nihon bukkuyō shisō kenkyū* 日本仏教思想研究, vol. 2, pp. 455–82. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- . 1957b. “Kai’e ni tsuite: Anraku ritsu no funsō ni tsūjite” 開會について：安樂律の紛争に通じて. *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 10 (vol. 5, no. 2), pp. 549–52.
- Kaneyasu Yasuaki 兼康保明. 1981. “Oda Nobunaga Hieizan yakiuchi no kōkogakuteki saikentō” 織田信長比叡山焼打ちの考古学的再検討. *Shiga kōkogaku ronsō* 滋賀考古学論叢 1, pp. 57–64.



- Ketelaar, James E. 1990. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kuroda, Toshio. 1996. "The Imperial Law and the Buddhist Law." Translated by Jacqueline I. Stone. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, pp. 271–85.
- McMullin, Neil. 1984. *Buddhism and the State in 16th Century Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Muller, A. Charles, trans. 2012. *Exposition of the Sutra of Brahma's Net*. Collected Works of Korean Buddhism, no. 11. English translation of the *Pōmmanggyōng kojōkki* 梵網經古述記 by Taehyōn 大賢. Seoul: Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism.
- Munemasa Isao 宗政五十緒. 1990. "Bussho no shuppan" 仏書の出版. In *Shomin bukyō* 庶民仏教, edited by Tsuji Nobuo 辻惟雄, pp. 261–70. Zusesu Nihon no Bukkyō 図説日本の仏教, no. 5. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.
- Ōba Osamu. 2015. *Books and Boats: Sino-Japanese Relations in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Translated by Joshua A. Fogel. Portland: Merwin Asia.
- Sakakibara Naoki 榑原直樹. 2001. "Ōbaku shingi jo to bongyōshō daigo o aratamete yomi-naosu" 『黄檗清規』序と梵行章第五を改めて読み直す. *Ōbaku Bunka* 黄檗文華 120, pp. 6–23.
- Suzuki Daisetz 鈴木大拙. 1944. *Nihonteki reisei* 日本の靈性. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha. (Translated by Norman Waddell as *Japanese Spirituality*. Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 1972.)
- Tada Jitsudō 多田實道. 2014. "Ise shintō to kairitsu" 伊勢神道と戒律. *Geirin* 藝林 63, pp. 80–106.
- Tamamuro Fumio 室室文雄. (1971) 1980. *Edo bakufu no shūkyō tōsei* 江戸幕府の宗教統制. *Nihonjin no Kōdō to Shisō* 日本人の行動と思想, no. 16. Tokyo: Hyōronsha.
- Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助. 1947. *Nihon bukyōshi* 日本佛教史. 10 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ueda Tenzui 上田天瑞. 1976. *Kairitsu no shisō to rekishi* 戒律の思想と歴史. Kōyasan: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūsho.
- Watsuji Tetsurō 和辻哲郎. 1926. *Nihon seishin shi kenkyū* 日本精神史研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. Available online via National Diet Library Digital Collections (Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan Dejitaru Korekushon): <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1020621>. Corrected edition (1940) reprinted in *Watsuji tetsurō zenshū* 和辻哲郎全集, edited by Abe Yoshishige 安倍能成 et al., vol. 4, pp. 156–246. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1961. Reprinted 1992. Digital edition 2017, available online from Aozora Bunko 青空文庫: [https://www.aozora.gr.jp/cards/001395/files/49905\\_63366.html](https://www.aozora.gr.jp/cards/001395/files/49905_63366.html).
- Woodard, William P. 1972. *The Allied Occupation of Japan 1945–1952 and Japanese Religions*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wu, Jiang. 2006. "Building a Dharma Transmission Monastery in Seventeenth-Century China: The Case of Mount Huangbo." *East Asian History* 31, pp. 21–52.
- . 2008. *Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-Century China*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2014. "Taikun's Zen Master from China: Yinyuan, the Tokugawa Bakufu, and the Founding of Manpukuji in 1661." *East Asian History* 38, pp. 75–96.
- Yasumaru Yoshio 安丸良夫. 1979. *Kamigami no Meiji ishin: Shinbutsu bunri to haibutsu kishaku* 神々の明治維新：神仏分離と廃仏毀釈. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.