Japanese Journal of Religious Studies 33/1: 1–49

Shayne Clarke

Miscellaneous Musings on Mūlasarvāstivāda Monks

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* Revival in Tokugawa Japan

Kūkai's (774–835) curriculum for the education of Shingon monks broke away from Japanese religious orthodoxy by rejecting the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* or *Vinaya in Four Parts* (四分律) traditionally studied in East Asia in favor of another Indian tradition that had only just been introduced into China a century earlier: the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Kūkai's admonitions, however, appear to have fallen on deaf ears, at least until the Tokugawa period. In the Tokugawa period two Shingon scholar-monks—Myōzui 妙瑞 (1696–1764) and Gakunyo 學如 (1716–1773)—turned their attention back to Kūkai, the founder of their tradition. When Myōzui and Gakunyo realised that their lineage had been ignoring Kūkai's instructions on monastic discipline for nearly one thousand years, these monks advocated a revival of Kūkai's monastic curriculum. Revival attempts, however, were to meet with fierce opposition, and a series of monastic debates ensued, debates which continued well into the Meiji period. The present paper is an attempt to survey the sources for this revival movement, tracing the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition down through the Tokugawa and Meiji periods and beyond, reaching the somewhat unexpected conclusion that this monastic tradition is still alive in present-day Japan.

keywords: Ubu – Kūkai – Myōzui – Gakunyo – Eigon – Unshō – *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*

Shayne Clarke is a PhD candidate at the University of California, Los Angeles

Monastic Buddhism in Tokugawa- or Edo-period Japan is usually categorized as degenerate and morally corrupt—a corruption of earlier, and hence purer, forms such as Nara or Heian Buddhism.[1] This theory of degeneration is traceable at least as far back as Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 (1877–1955), one of the foremost historians of Japanese Buddhism. Regardless of its validity, this theory has greatly hampered our investigations into, and understanding of, Tokugawa Buddhism. The trend, however, is slowly beginning to change, and such changes will undoubtedly lead to a much fuller and richer understanding of the history of Japanese Buddhism.[2]

The rhetoric of Buddhist decline or degeneration first appears in Tokugawa-period clerical circles in the form of several monastic reform or restoration movements such as Jizan Myōryū's 慈山妙立 (1637–1690) Anraku ritsu 安樂律 within Tendai, Jiun Onkō's 慈雲飲光 (1718–1804) Shōbō ritsu 正法律 within Shingon, the Shingon ritsu 眞言律 of Jōgon 淨嚴 (1639–1702), Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683–1769) (see Riggs 2002) and Banjin Dōtan's 萬仞道坦 (1698–1775) Zen Precepts 禪戒, and the Koki undō 古規運動 in Sōtōshū 曹洞宗.[3] These movements, unfortunately, have received very little attention outside of Japan,

* I wish to thank Professors William Bodiford and Jonathan Silk for many suggestions which have greatly improved both the content and clarity of the present paper, as have those of the *JJRS* editors, Drs. Paul Swanson and Ben Dorman. I would also like to thank Prof. Gregory Schopen for listening to my miscellaneous musings on this topic when I should have been writing something else. I alone remain responsible for any errors. I gratefully acknowledge financial assistance received from UCLA, particularly a Sasakawa Fellowship administered through the Center for Japanese Studies (UCLA) which made possible a reconnaissance mission to Mt. Kōya and several Japanese archives in September 2005. For help in obtaining materials from Japan I wish to thank Jenny Lee and Toshie Marra (UCLA library), and Prof. Yamagiwa Nobuyuki (Bukkyō University, Kyoto). I also wish to extend my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Rev. Namai Chishō 生井智紹, President of Kōyasan University, for graciously receiving both myself and Prof. Yamagiwa at Mt. Kōya in September 2005, and for facilitating unscheduled trips to a number of institutes on Mt. Kōya at the very shortest of notice. Likewise, Prof. Rev. Asai Shōzen 浅井證善 (formerly Kakuchō 覺超), Director of Shiunryō 紫雲寮, Kōyasan, provided many useful leads that may help us locate further sources for the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival. Unfortunately, at this time we were not able to locate Myōzui's diaries, originally held at Shinbessho, Mt. Kōya. A systematic examination of Shinbessho's holdings remains an urgent desideratum. That the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition is a living tradition on Mt. Kōya even today was highlighted by our meeting with these two Mūlasarvāstivādin monks.

1. See, for convenience, Kishimoto and Wakimoto 1956, 11–13.

2. See, most recently, the remarks in Williams 2006.

3. This list is by no means comprehensive. One could also add the Jōdo ritsu 淨土律 of Reitan 靈潭 (1676–1734) and Kyōshu 敬首 (1683–1748) within the Jōdo tradition, Yinyuan Longqi's (Jp. Ingen Ryūki) 隱元隆琦 (1592–1673) Sandankaie 三檀戒會 in the Japanese Ōbaku 黃檗 lineage, Nichō's 忍澂 (1645–1711) Shasejun 捨世巡 in the Jōdo Shinshū 淨土眞宗 movement, and so forth. Note that Ueda

and even there it would seem that the surface has only barely been scratched. There was, however, another movement during this period which seems to have emerged not explicitly as a reaction to degeneration or moral corruption (although this may be to some degree implicit), but from the recognition that for nigh on a thousand years the last words of the school's founder, Kūkai (774–835), had been ignored.

Kūkai compiled a curriculum of texts to be studied by his lineage. These texts followed the traditional categories of *Sūtra*, *Vinaya*, and *Abhidharma*. *Vinaya* in Japan—and most of East Asia, for that matter—has usually referred to the *Vinaya in Four Parts* 四分律 (Jp. *shibun ritsu*, Ch. *sifen lü*) or *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. Kūkai, however, does not list this monastic code; instead, for reasons which have yet to be satisfactorily addressed, he lists the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (MSV) (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu binaya*, Ch. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* 根本説一切有部毘奈耶).[4] This, however, seems to have been forgotten or ignored until the Tokugawa period.

The Tokugawa era, of course, saw a high degree of governmental regulation and control of Buddhism, and a number of edicts issued by the Bakufu directed the various Buddhist lineages not only to revive their own scholastic traditions, but also to focus on the teachings of their respective founders.[5] It seems possible, and perhaps even likely, that the Tokugawa revival of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* stemmed, at least indirectly, from these government regulations. Efforts to implement the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, however, encountered fierce opposition from within the Shingon tradition itself. This opposition culminated in a heated debate over the significance of Kūkai's inclusion of this *Vinaya* into the Shingon curriculum—a Tokugawa debate which was perhaps never fully resolved, and was to reappear in the Meiji.

The sources for this debate, and the tradition as a whole, appear to have never been systematically collected or analyzed. This is no doubt partly due to the fact that many of the key texts are only extant in single manuscripts held in the archives of private Japanese temples, and other library collections scattered throughout Japan. Many, moreover, appear to have been lost or destroyed.[6] In

---

Reijō traces all Edo revival movements in monastic discipline back to Makio monastery (江戸時代の興律運動はすべて槙尾僧房に由来する) (1976, 25). This needs to be further investigated.

4. On Kūkai's curriculum see notes 67 & 68 below. This has been noted by, among others, GRONER 1990 (285, note 45), and ABÉ 1999 (54 and note 141; Abé's *yūbu* 有部 should be corrected to *ubu*, and his *Sarvāstivāda*—variously misspelt—actually refers to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda*; note that the Japanese tradition often refers to both the *Sarvāstivāda* and *Mūlasarvāstivāda* simply as *ubu* 有部). In addition to the sources cited by Groner, see also UEDA Tenzui 1932, and SHAKU Keihō 1939a on the possible reasons for Kūkai's inclusion of this text.

5. See, for convenience, MASUTANI and UNDŌ 1956, 102 and 106; KISHIMOTO and WAKIMOTO 1956, 11–13. On these ordinances in general, see TAMAMURO 1987, 2–26; TSUJI 1970, vol. 8, 173ff. and 219ff. For the actual text of a number of such ordinances, see ISHII 1981, 20–78.

6. See, for instance, the comments by Inaya regarding a series of fires at Fukuōji (see below).

the following I have attempted to outline this movement by piecing together a number of the extant sources. The coverage is by no means comprehensive, but merely a first attempt to identify a number of the central Mūlasarvāstivādin figures in Tokugawa Japan. I have endeavored to provide as much information about these monks as possible. In part, this is due to the fact that I have found such information—where available—particularly valuable in my own investigations. The identification of a specific monk's lineage and affiliation, his teachers and disciples, for example, often allowed me to trace the tradition to earlier or subsequent generations of monks. As such details may lead to further important discoveries (the identification of a specific temple, for instance, may lead to manuscript finds), I have felt justified in retaining what might otherwise be viewed as excessive detail. I have outlined a number of the major texts and where they might be located, in the hope that they can be preserved, and made accessible for further study.

As this still remains a very preliminary investigation, I have organized the discussion around the life and works of four central figures: Myōzui 妙瑞 (1696–1764), Gakunyo 學如 (1716–1773), Eigon 榮嚴 (1814–1900), and Shaku Unshō 釋雲照 (1827–1909).[7] Myōzui was a Shingon monk and the abbot of Entsūji 圓通寺 on Kōyasan. He appears to have been one of the first to advocate the study of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, and compiled a number of *Vinaya* digests during his itinerant lecturing schedule. In addition to these texts, he also kept a series of diaries that offer detailed insights into the daily schedule of a traveling preacher monk lecturing on the *Lotus Sūtra* in Tokugawa Japan. Gakunyo was a disciple of Myōzui at Entsūji, and seems to have been highly vocal in asserting that the Shingon lineage should use the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Upon his return to Aki 安藝 (modern-day Hiroshima), he officially declared Fukuōji 福王寺 to be a *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* training temple, and seems to have been the first to advocate sole use of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* over the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. Eigon spanned the Tokugawa and Meiji periods, and would seem to be one of the last of the "old school" of Mūlasarvāstivādin monks. His most important contribution, at least for our purposes, was the compilation of a monastic ordinance. Finally, his disciple, Shaku Unshō, was a leading figure in Meiji Buddhism, one whose activities were by no means limited to the religious domain, but also featured prominently in political and educational circles.[8]

The picture that emerges of this movement affords us a unique insight into a community of monks and their attempts to implement the long-forgotten admonitions of their teacher. We see, for instance, the emergence of a commentarial tradition on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*—a tradition that is barely, if

7. There are, of course, many other prominent figures who cannot be dealt with in full here.

8. On Unshō and education see, among others, Saitō 1968. Note that the literature on Unshō, unlike that on other Japanese Mūlasarvāstivādin monks, is extensive.

at all, seen in China.[9] In fact, this is—as far as I know—the only record of a living, thriving Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition that is precisely locatable in time and space in the history of East Asian Buddhism.[10] It is, moreover, a record that sheds light on an often overlooked corner in the history of Japanese Buddhism, and appears to stand in stark contrast to the general view of Tokugawa Buddhism as being degenerate, or morally corrupt.

The rich commentarial tradition suggests that these texts were the object of intense academic study. In addition, however, a number of texts such as local monastic ordinances were also produced, and these point to the implementation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in the daily life of these monastic communities. This, of course, is of particular interest as it tells us how these communities may have operated and functioned in early Tokugawa Japan. The appearance in these indigenous texts of modified rules such as those on lending money on interest, and other commercial activities, suggest the possibility that such activities were more than merely textual ideals, that they were in all probability actually realized.[11] It is too early to know whether or not our record is verifiable from other historical sources, but—as we will see—the reworking of the massive *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* into a series of manageable handbooks appropriate to the local customs and environs presents the very real possibility that this was at least attempted. Moreover, a number of the insights offered are pertinent not only to the history of Buddhism in East Asia, but also suggest answers to questions in the field of Indian Buddhism—questions such as the relationship between the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda.

Myōzui (1696–1764)

One of the foremost figures in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival in Tokugawa Japan was the Shingon monk Myōzui, styled Eshin-bō 惠深房.[12] Myōzui was

9. A full study of the impact of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in China is an urgent desideratum. In this connection, the detailed colophon appended to fascicle one of Yijing's translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Nidāna* (*Taishō* [hereafter T] 1452, 418b–419b) is of particular import. The colophon provides detailed information on names, titles, countries of origin (including, among others, Middle India 中天竺國, East India 東天竺國, Kaśmīra 迦濕彌羅國, and Tukhāra 吐火羅) and duties performed by those who participated in the translation process. It also includes details on a number of Chinese literati also present and involved in the final redaction. For the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*'s possible influences on the development of Chinese literature, see HIRATA 1995.

10. Note, however, BIANCHI 2001 for a nunnery in modern-day China which apparently uses the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (I wish to thank Prof. Stefano Zacchetti [formerly of Tokyo] for alerting me to this publication).

11. On loan contracts and other commercial activities permitted—and even advocated—as a part of institutionalized Buddhist monasticism in India, see SCHOPEN 1994. See also GERNET 1995, 158–66.

12. Secondary sources for Myōzui's biography include MD, vol. 5, s.v. Myōzui; SZ, vol. 43, 368–69; ZSZ, vol. 42, 274–75. For primary sources see, *Kii zokufūdoki* 紀伊續風土記 in ZSZ, vol. 37, 301; *Entsūji ruidai senshi kako meibo* 圓通寺累代先師過去名簿 in ZSZ, vol. 35, 657.

born in Mino-gun 三野群, Sanuki 讃岐, into the Tabuchi 田淵 family.[13] At the age of twelve he received the tonsure and dyed robe from Eryō 慧了 at Itokuin 威徳院, and ascended Mt. Kōya to reside in Hōgon'in 寶巖院.[14] He later moved to the Shōkyokunanbō at Osaka 大坂生玉南坊, then Nyoirinji 如意輪寺, and various other temples. He studied Chūin-ryū 中院流 and Saiin-ryū 西院流 under Eidō 英同 at Hōshōin 寶性院, An-ryū 安流 under Ihō 維寶 (1687–1747) at Shakamon'in 釋迦文院,[15] Kojima-ryū 小嶋流 under Kyōei 教榮 at Minami'in 南院, and Kan-ryū 勸流 under Kenga 賢賀 (1684–1769) of Tōji 東寺. At age forty-eight, in the seventh moon of 1743, he entered Shinbessho 眞別處,[16] and apparently took over the abbotship of Entsūji on the first day of the ninth moon (九月一日辰時進具繼圓通),[17] living there for eighteen years.[18] His passing in his sixty-ninth year is recorded on the fifth day of the twelfth moon, 1764. During his lifetime Myōzui composed more than two hundred fascicles of texts. His biography tells us that from the spring of his thirtieth year until his autumnal years, he traveled around the country teaching and delivering countless lectures.[19] During the course of his lectures Myōzui also compiled at least the following six diaries (Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 2–3):

13. Presumably modern-day Mino-chō 三野町, Mitoyo-gun 三豊郡, Kagawa prefecture. Place names have been converted from the Sino-Japanese *shū* 州 names (e.g., Sanshū 讃州) to Japanese *kuni* 國 names (e.g., Sanuki 讃岐), as these are thought to be more readily identifiable to the Western reader. Where possible I have attempted to identify historical place names with their modern names. This may prove useful if anyone ever continues this investigation. Some of the temples are still standing, and undoubtedly hold records that could throw further light on the present discussion. Note, however, that given the complexities associated with the readings of Japanese proper nouns, the transliterations of place and personal names must remain tentative.

14. Here and throughout I have used Japanese ages as found in the texts cited. No attempt to convert these to Western conventions has been made. For the sake of English style, I have referred to Myōzui's twelfth year, for example, as age twelve, although technically—presuming the sources I cite have not converted these to modern conventions—his twelfth year refers to age eleven.

15. For further details on Ihō, including a portrait, see Mizuhara 1932, 406–13.

16. Shinbessho (see note 115 below) and Entsūji refer to the same monastery.

17. Myōzui is generally regarded as the eighth abbot of Entsūji (see, for example, Ueda Tenzui 1976, 322). In the *Entsūji ruidai senshi kako meibo* 圓通寺累代先師過去名簿 [Entsūji register of succesive generations of previous teachers], however, he is listed as the ninth. The eighth abbot is given as Dōhō 道芳 (style Nyokei-bō 如桂房; family name Nanchi 難知) with no further details. The seventh abbot, Tenshin 天心, however, died on the eighteenth of the fourth moon, 1741. A letter was sent to Myōzui at Nyoirinji 如意輪寺, but while he attained full training in the *Vinaya* the monk Dōhō was asked to help out at Entsūji—thus he is listed as the eighth abbot. ZSZ, vol. 35, 657a: 寛保元年四月十八日命終砌。以遺書附囑寺於如意輪寺妙瑞畢。然妙瑞未入律進具之間。以一派之比丘河州道芳如桂房令扶助圓通寺律法畢.

18. According to a note (別筆) recorded in the *Entsūji ruidai senshi kako meibo*, Myōzui resided at Entsūji for eighteen years, Mitsumon 密門 for twenty-five years, and Ryūkai 龍海 for thirty-three years. Note that this text is also an important source for what appear to be the dates of death for these monks.

19. ZSZ, vol. 35, 657: 凡從丗歲春至終焉秋。開講筵于海内宣揚顯密之奥旨。道俗之化益二利之行願遑不毛舉.

1 *Lotus Lectures Recorded at Isaka, Kishū.*
紀州井坂講演法花記 (second moon, 1746).

2 *Lectures Recorded at Sanshū.*
讃州講演記 (ninth day, second moon, 1747).

3 *Lectures Recorded at Kumedera.*
久米寺講演記 (eleventh moon, 1750).

4 *Lotus Lectures Recorded in Tōbu.*
東武講演法華記 (New Year, 1751).

5 *Hokke egi Lectures Recorded at Inabadō.*
因幡堂講法花會義記 (fourth moon, 1756).

6 *Record of Journey to Yu* [Yushima?], *Tanshū.*
入但州湯記 (third moon, 1758).[20]

To the best of my knowledge, these diaries have never been published, and the only information we have on them is to be found in a short article by Ueda Tenzui (1939a). Ueda was able to directly access these materials at Entsūji, and included a small sampling of quotations and paraphrases in his article. The diaries contain the daily schedule of an itinerant lecturer with entries spanning some thirteen years. They provide information on Myōzui's itinerary upon departure from Entsūji, his lectures, many of which were on the *Lotus Sūtra*, the weather, and his visits to local monks and famous sites between lectures.[21]

In his first diary we are told, for example, that from the first day of the second moon to the seventh day of the fifth moon of 1746, Myōzui lectured on *Hokke rinkan* 法花綸貫 (Ch. *Fahua lunguan*) [The pervading thread of the *Lotus*] at Jippōji 實報寺 in Isaka 井坂 village, Kii 紀伊 (Kishū 紀州).[22] On the fifteenth day of the second moon, a sunny day, he expounded the dharma to a crowd of more than ten thousand men and women—the exact number being uncertain. Two thousand six hundred Lotus *maṇḍala*s (法花曼荼羅), and eight thousand hand-stamps (手判) seem to have been handed out. Since, however, between two to three thousand people did not receive any hand-stamps, Myōzui estimates the crowd to have been around fourteen to fifteen thousand.[23]

20. I have tentatively translated the titles as found in Ueda Tenzui 1939a. The dates appear to denote the first entries of the diaries.

21. The following is based on the remarks, paraphrases, and quotations found in Ueda Tenzui 1939a, which unfortunately now appear to be the only sources available.

22. See BKDJ, s.v. *Hokkekyō rinkan* 法華經綸貫. Note that this text was written by the Ming-dynasty monk Zhixu 智旭 (1599–1655). Here too we catch a glimpse of the breadth of Myōzui's erudition, and the fact that he seems to have kept abreast of Ming-dynasty Chinese sources.

23. Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 3: (二月) 十五日。休。天朗。勸化説法、群衆男女一萬有餘、不知定數、

Myōzui's second diary documents his travels to Sanuki (Sanshū 讃州) (Kagawa prefecture), and seems to begin with entries from the second moon of 1747 detailing his descent from the mountain with an accompanying monk (伴僧) and two *śrāmaṇera*s on the ninth. At Osaka, Myōzui was met by Zuihō 瑞鳳, a seventy-eight-year-old monk who, with an attendant disciple, had come to board the ship and accompany Myōzui on the journey back to his temple Mani'in 摩尼院, in Tadotsu 多度津.[24] The sea voyage from Osaka on the thirteenth met with high winds, and subsequent to their arrival at Tadotsu on the twenty-second, Myōzui began his lectures at Mani'in on the twenty-eighth. The lecture series seems to have focused on *Hizōhōyaku kenkōshō* 祕藏寶鑰見光鈔[25] and *Himitsu hōkun* 秘密法訓.[26] The entry for the fifth day of the third moon suggests that subsequent to his lectures in seven sittings with audiences of some three hundred or so people, Myōzui rested for a day. His lecture series must have been extremely well received—if book sales are any measure of success, that is: his diary records sales of between 240 to 250 sets of the *Kenkōshō* (書林賣見光鈔二百四五十部計).[27]

Edo-period Japan had a particularly rich tradition of publishers and book stores, and the records of many of these are still extant. Nagata Chōbei 永田調兵衛 was a publisher in Kyoto, and in the third of four fascicles of his *Shinzō shoseki mokuroku* 新増書籍目録 [Newly-enlarged book catalogue] of 1754, at least three works of Myōzui are listed.[28] Two of these are the same titles that

---

法花曼荼羅二千六百枚、手判八千、後爲引替、其餘二三千人不取手判、都合一萬四五千計人. Note that the text reproduced in Ueda is in *kanbun* with basic *kaeriten* 返り点 annotations. Here and throughout *kaeriten* have not been reproduced, but punctuation has been added as appropriate.

24. Presumably modern-day Tadotsu-chō 多度津町, Kagawa prefecture.

25. See BKDJ, s.v. *Hizōhōyaku kenkōshō*. This is a commentary compiled by Myōzui on Kūkai's *Hizōhōyaku* 祕藏寶鑰 (T 2426). The text itself is extant in at least three printed editions dating to the Enkyō 延享 era (1744–1748).

26. See BKDJ, s.v. *Himitsu hōkun*. Written in the eleventh moon of 1743. In addition to the relatively inaccessible printed editions of 1744, see ZSZ, vol. 23, 293–354 for a reprint of this text.

27. It is, of course, particularly difficult to judge the veracity of such claims, even if we have little reason to doubt a monk's private diaries—diaries which appear to have been, at least until 1939, just that: private diaries. That such claims are difficult to confirm should not, however, stop us from trying, and the Japanese tradition is, perhaps above all else, rich in detail.

28. The history of printing on Kōyasan would seem to be worth investigation. Since the Kamakura period, Kōyasan was, alongside Kyoto and Nara, one of the most active publishing districts for Buddhist books in Japan (see the Introduction by Wada Mankichi 和田萬吉 in Nakagawa 1981, 4–5). On this topic, see the excellent studies by Mizuhara Gyōei 1932 and 1981a. It would seem that a number of the figures involved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival, their predecessors, contemporaries and successors, also appear in the history of printing on Kōyasan (see Mizuhara 1932, 400–64; and during the Meiji, 467ff.). On a number of printing blocks stored at Entsūji, see Mizuhara 1932, 568–69; Mizuhara mentions two damaged sets (板木二括) of *Vinaya* printing blocks there. See also the graphs plotting the publishing activities on Kōyasan from the Heian to Edo periods, particularly the staggering increase during the Momoyama and Edo periods (Mizuhara 1932, 751–53). Note also Mizuhara's separate study (1931) of the various editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon preserved at Kōyasan.

Myōzui reports lecturing on, one of which he records sales of some 240 to 250 sets, namely, *Himitsu hōkun* and *Hizōhōyaku kenkōshō*.[29]

Myōzui records a number of rest periods from his busy lecturing schedule, but holidays they most certainly were not. On the twenty-ninth of the sixth moon he travelled to Myōō'in 明王院 and Konpira'in 金毘羅院 to examine various Buddhist books and documents (聖教佛書). Staying at the latter temple from the first to the third of the seventh moon, and having examined the texts, he found the temple to contain an immensely rich collection of unique and rare manuscripts (聖教を檢し書寫の聖教に無比の珍書多し).[30] Moreover, not only did he visit textual repositories during his travels, but Myōzui apparently also found time to keep up his own literary activities.

In addition to his diaries, Myōzui compiled two volumes of a digest on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, volumes which appear to exist only as unpublished manuscripts. Again we are indebted to Ueda (1939a) for providing us with the chapter colophons, the only parts to which we have access. The text is known as *Ubu hyōmoku* 有部標目 [The (*Mūla-*)*sarvāstivāda* (*Vinaya*) topical table],[31] and although the exact content is not known, Ueda tells us that it is a catalogue of the contents of the enormous *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. It was apparently composed between 1747 to 1748, the period coinciding with Myōzui's second diary written during his travels around Sanuki, and, it would seem from the colophons, also around Yamato 大和 (Washū 和州). There are eight colophons, one for each of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* texts read by Myōzui on his travels. These colophons, in fact, also provide further details of Myōzui's itinerary which would, if we had access to them, presumably be available in the diaries themselves. At least an approximate idea of the length of Myōzui's *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* compendium, and to a lesser degree its content, however, may be gleaned from the colophons.

29. The editor of Nagata's catalogue is listed as Bunshō 文照 (ESSS, vol. 3, 9 and 91). Abe Ryūichi 阿部隆一, the commentator to the modern photographic reproduction of this work, states (ESSS, vol. 3, 10) that Nagata Chōbei began his business at Shinmachi-iru, Nishikinokōji dōri, Kyoto 京都錦小路通新町入 in the Kanbun 寛文 era (1661–1673), but later on in the Meiwa 明和 era (1764–1772) moved to Nishinotōin Nishi-iru, Hanayachō-dōri 花屋町通西洞院西入, and continued on down to the Meiji period. Later on, Abe tells us, the name was changed to Bunshō-dō 文昌堂, and suggests that the Bunshō of Bunshō-dō 文昌堂 may in fact be this early editor Bunshō 文照, the only difference being the homophonous last character. As a footnote to Abe's discussion I note that Nagata Bunshō-dō is still today an active publisher in Kyoto at the above listed address.

30. I confess my ignorance concerning the textual repositories of these temples. It would be at least interesting to identify and locate these temples, and see if Myōzui's observations still hold. Myōō'in is presumably to be identified with Sōtasan Dōryūji (Myōō'in) 桑多山道隆寺(明王院), the seventy-seventh of Shikoku's eighty-eight pilgrimage temples (Tadotsu-chō, Kagawa prefecture).

31. Ueda Tenzui, our only source for these texts, states that Myōzui catalogued the contents of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* after reading it during his itinerant lecture series (和尚が各地巡講中に有部律の各巻を讀破して其の内容を目録的に標記したもの) (Ueda 1939a, 14).

From the text reproduced in Ueda (1939a) we know that Myōzui read the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Vibhaṅga* (50 fascicles),[32] and wrote a thirty-eight-sheet digest during his spare time while lecturing on *Hizōhōyaku* at Mani'in, Tadotsu, Sanuki. The date given is the first day of the fourth moon, 1747.[33] Similarly he summarized the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha* (20 fasc.) in fifteen sheets during his spare time between spring and summer, 1747, while lecturing on *Hōyaku* at Mani'in, Tadotsu, Byōbugaura, Tado-gun, Sanuki. The date given is the first day of the fourth moon, 1747.[34] Fifteen sheets are devoted to the *Saṅghabhedavastu* (20 fasc.),[35] twenty to the *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya* [*Vibhaṅga*] in 20 fasc.,[36] and nine-and-one-half sheets to the *Ekaśatakarman* in ten fasc.[37] All three of these were read between the twenty-eighth of the second moon and the twenty-fourth of the third moon of 1748, during Myōzui's time spent at a guest house at Futami 二見 and his spare time while lecturing on the Commentary on the *Jūshinbon* 住心品疏 [Commentary on the Chapter of (the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* on phenomena in which) minds abide][38] at Dainichiji 大日寺, Futami village, Uchi-gun, Yamato 大和宇智群二見村.[39] Whilst lecturing at Futami on the Commentary on the *Jūshinbon*, on the third day of the fourth moon, 1748, Myōzui also summarized the *Nidāna* and *Muktaka* (each in five fasc.) into five and six-and-one-half sheets respectively.[40]

This all, of course, raises a number of interesting questions. What else, for instance, did Myōzui—an itinerant Mūlasarvāstivādin monk lecturer in Tokugawa Japan—read in his spare time? What was the impetus to select these particular texts, and what—if anything—does this tell us? Furthermore, what did Myōzui not read? Or at least, what texts are conspicuous in their absence from the above reading list? A number of these questions can, I think, be answered. One text, the absence of which is at least interesting, is the *Nidāna*

32. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye* (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu binaya*) (T 1442).

33. Here and below I reproduce the colophons found in Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 15–16. 延享四年丁卯年四月一日於讃州多度津摩尼院講秘藏寶鑰之餘隙誌之。妙瑞.

34. *Genbensapoduobu lüshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝 (Jp. *Konponsappatabu risshō*) (T 1458). 延享四年丁卯春夏於讃州多度群屏風浦多度津摩尼院不可分別聚落界通授菩薩僧金剛阿闍梨妙瑞講演寶鑰之餘暇披覽標出記之。四月廿八日今日休日.

35. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu posengshi* 根本説一切有部破僧事 (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu hasōji*) (T 1450).

36. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu bichuni pinaiye* 根本説一切有部苾芻尼毘奈耶 (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu bisshuni binaya*) (T 1443). 延享五年戊辰年三月十六日於二見客舍檢尋之.

37. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu baiyi jiemo* 根本説一切有部百一羯磨 (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu hyakuitsu konma*) (T 1453).

38. See BKDJ, s.v. *Dainichikyō jūshinbon-sho* 大日經住心品疏 (2 entries).

39. 延享五年戊辰年二月廿八日於和州宇智群二見村大日寺講住心品疏餘暇拜讀之了。妙瑞.

40. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu nituona mudejia* 根本説一切有部尼陀那目得迦 (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu nidana mokutokuka*) (T 1452). For the identification of the title of the second section of this text, the *Muktaka*, see Clarke 2001. 延享五年戊辰年四月三日於和州二見里講住心品疏之餘隙因周閱而記出標目也。妙瑞誌.

and *Muktaka Uddāna Gāthā*s (1 fasc.).[41] These texts are simply verse digests of the *Nidāna* and *Muktaka* respectively. They function as mnemonic devices or keywords to the many stories found in the *Nidāna* and *Muktaka*. This, however, would seem to be exactly what Myōzui himself was compiling. His text, the *Ubu hyōmoku* is, as far as I can tell, a summary of the key points of a number of *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* texts, texts which include both the *Nidāna* and *Muktaka* catalogued by Myōzui. Although his text has never been published, it is hoped that it may one day surface and a comparison between it and the *Uddāna Gāthā*s may be carried out. What did Myōzui see as the major tenets of these texts? How did he go about digesting enormous volumes to a manageable size? How does this compare with the *Vinayakārikā*, itself a digest of the major sections of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* into only three fascicles—a text which would have been readily accessible to Myōzui?[42] The absence of the *Uddāna Gāthā*s, however, is not the only point of interest in Myōzui's choice of reading.[43]

The last colophon given by Ueda is also telling. The text listed is the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya *Mātṛkā* (10 fasc.) and this text is, according to its title, and according to most modern *Vinaya* scholarship, not Mūlasarvāstivādin at all but Sarvāstivādin.[44] Why would Myōzui have chosen a Sarvāstivādin text to accompany his Mūlasarvāstivādin corpus? If his intent was comparative *Vinaya* work, then surely he would have chosen the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya* (Ch. *Shisong lü* 十誦律) itself, and not this shorter "ancillary" text.[45] In fact, although by no means conclusive, the addition of this text would at least suggest that Myōzui and the other Japanese Mūlasarvāstivādin monks may have considered it to be Mūlasarvāstivādin, and not Sarvāstivādin. If it is Mūlasarvāstivādin, and in fact there are other indications that it might well be so, this would have wide implications for the dating of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, and the relative chronology of the entire Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* corpora (see CLARKE 2004). A cursory examination of this text would suggest that it contains many

41. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye nituona mudejia shesong* 根本説一切有部毘奈耶尼陀那目得迦攝頌 (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu binaya nidana mokutokuka shōju*) (T 1456). For the identification of this text, and T 1457 as *Uddāna Gāthā*s, see CLARKE 2002.

42. *Genbenshuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye song* 根本説一切有部毘奈耶頌 (Jp. *Konponsetsuissaiubu binaya ju*) (T 1459). Note that an incomplete Sanskrit manuscript of this text is to be found amongst the collection brought back by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana.

43. Did Myōzui read the *Kṣudrakavastu* (T 1451), and the *Kṣudrakavastu Uddāna Gāthā* (T 1457), or the other *vastu*s? How about the *Bhikṣu* and *Bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣa*s (T 1454–1455), and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Kārikā* (T 1459)?

44. *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒迦 (Jp. *Sappatabu bini matokurokka*) (T 1441). See, among others, CHUNG 2002 (I wish to thank two of the authors to this volume, Dr. Chung and Dr. Wille, for kindly sending me a copy of this important work).

45. I use the term "ancillary" with much hesitation. This text, like the *Uttaragrantha*, is certainly anything but ancillary. This point—in regard to the *Uttaragrantha*—has been made a number of times by SCHOPEN (see, for example, 2001, 101), and no doubt will be made again.

sections which bear a striking resemblance to the *Uttaragrantha* as preserved in Tibetan. In fact, it is beginning to appear that *Sapoduobu pini modeleqie* 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (T 1441) may even be an early translation of parts of the *Uttaragrantha*, some three hundred years earlier than Yijing's incomplete translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* corpus. This, however, will have to be addressed at a later date.

There is—at least until, if ever, Myōzui's diaries are published—still more of interest to be gleaned from Ueda's brief synopsis. Myōzui was, it would seem, a serious *Vinaya* scholar. Not only did he compile digests of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, but from accounts in his diaries it would appear that he even made use of the rich narratives in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* as didactic examples in his lectures—what was in all likelihood their intended purpose. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* did not serve merely as a repository for *Vinaya* related issues, but it would appear, for example, that Myōzui referred to it during his lectures on the *Hōyaku kenkōshō* 寶鑰見光鈔.[46]

Myōzui's third diary is also of interest as it mentions his travels to Kumedera 久米寺 with his disciple Honsho Mitsumon-bō 本初密門房 (d. 1788);[47] it tells us that Myōzui also served at this temple, and that he lectured on the *Hokkekyō egōki* 法華經慧給記.[48] The fourth diary details Myōzui's trip to Hōshōji 放生寺 in Edo. This trip, obviously, would have been much more arduous than other closer sojourns, but here too the diaries supply us with vivid details concerning the travel arrangements. In the diary entry for the sixth day of the second moon, the day before his departure, we read of his travel provisions, luggage, and accompanying monks. One of the temples visited during this trip was Reiunji 靈雲寺—the Shingon risshū headquarters—(twentieth day of the sixth moon, 1751), and this connection may prove important for us later on. On the sixth day of the seventh moon, Myōzui entered Hōsenji 寶泉寺, and upon expounding the dharma to the laity, some four hundred men and women of high and low station rejoiced and threw coins at him—Myōzui bowed with tears in his eyes.[49] The fifth diary details his trip to Inabadō, Kyoto, and his lectures on, among others, the Ming-dynasty monk Zhixu's 智旭 (1599–1655) *Fahua[jing] huiyi* 法華[經]會義.[50] The final diary listed by Ueda mentions trips to Onsenji 温泉寺 in Tajima 但馬 and Chōrakuji 長樂寺.[51]

46. Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 16: 寶鑰見光鈔の講義には有部律を讀んで居った際とて例話として有部律中の物語を引用したことを鮭鮭記してをる.

47. Mitsumon's greatest literary achievement was perhaps the *Ubu ritsu igyō mondō* 有部律異形問答. This text appears only to have survived in manuscript form at Shinbessho (Ueda Tenzui 1976, 323).

48. Presumably Myōzui's *Hokkekyō jūfudō mondō egōki* 法華經十不同問答慧給記. See BKDJ, s.v.

49. 七月六日。入寶泉寺齋供。爲在家勸化説法、男女貴賤大計四百計人、各隨喜投錢哭泣低頭.

50. Jp. *Hokke*[*kyō*] *egi*. See BKDJ, s.v. *Hokkekyō egi*.

51. Presumably Chōrakuji in modern-day Muraoka-chō 村岡町, Hyōgo prefecture.

Myōzui appears to have been one of the first monks to seriously take up the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in the Tokugawa era, and this seems to have influenced a number of his disciples.[52] Indeed, his student Gakunyo took this one step further by declaring his temple in Aki (Hiroshima) a *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* training temple. This, and his insistence that the Shingon lineage should entirely reject the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* in favor of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, however, was—as we will see—to attract severe criticism.

Gakunyo (1716–1773)

The foremost of Myōzui's students was Engoku Gakunyo 圓極學如 (Kūgan 空眼). Gakunyo was born on the fourteenth day of the eleventh moon of 1716, into the Oki [?] 隱岐 family of Kabe village 可部村, Aki 安藝 (Geishū 藝州) (modern-day Hiroshima). At the age of thirteen he entered Fukuōji 福王寺 and studied under Gakuhan 學範.[53] After travelling for some time he ascended Nanzan 南山 (= Kōyasan) and studied under Myōzui. Before returning to Fukuōji, he is known to have also spent time at Kōmyōji 光明寺 in Kawachi 河内 (Kashū 河州). He passed away on the eleventh day of the fifth moon, 1773, at fifty-eight years of age.[54]

Five texts are attributed to Gakunyo in Ono Genmyō's *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* (BKDJ), and two additional titles are to be found in *Kokusho sōmokuroku* (KS).[55] More recently, however, in lamenting the state of graduation theses from Japan's three Shingon universities, theses in which we are told not only are Edo-period studies scarce, but even primary sources are no longer to be seen, INAYA Yūsen (1987c, 3) suggests someone further investigate Gakunyo's contribution to Japanese monastic history.

Not unlike the approach taken by Ueda in sketching the life and works of Myōzui, Inaya went to Fukuōji to examine the materials first hand. The necessity for Inaya's journey was, no doubt, at least in part due to the fact that the sources have never been published—a problem that continues to plague our examination of the extant sources for the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival.

52. Note, however, that Myōzui is said to have taken up the study of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* on the suggestion of Shingen 眞源 (1689 or 1690–1758) (UEDA Tenzui 1976, 321–22; SHAKU Keihō 1939a, 36). Shingen was also responsible for initially suggesting that Jiun Onkō study Sanskrit, and write a commentary to Yijing's travel record (*Nanhai jigui neifazhuan* 南海寄歸内法傳) (UEDA Tenzui 1976, 321). As far as I know, there is no full-length study of the life and works of Shingen. See, however, the biographical information, and portrait, in MIZUHARA 1932, 415–32.

53. On Fukuōji, see SHIMONO 1986. For local histories, see GEIHAN TSŪSHI KANKŌKAI ed. 1967, vol. 3, 320–21, where it is stated that Fukuōji had some thirty-seven branch temples (末寺). See also vol. 1, 23, for a premodern map of the area, and vol. 5, 325, for an illustration of Fukuōji (also see 504). SHIMONO 1986, 1, states that Fukuōji was referred to as the Kōyasan of the west (西の高野山). See also INAYA 1987a.

54. On Gakunyo see MBDJ, s.v. Gakunyo; INAYA 1987a–c.

55. BKDJ, *Choshabetsu shomei mokuroku* 著者別書名目録, s.v. Gakunyo; KS, vol. 8, s.v. Gakunyo.

Inaya, however, had another reason for visiting Fukuōji, and this is unlike any I am ever likely to encounter. Towards the end of May, 1987, a number of people approached Inaya requesting ordination. Inaya states, however, that he did not feel confident with regard to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, and consequently asked the incumbent abbot of Fukuōji if he might examine Gakunyo's *Shingonritsu mondō* 眞言律問答 [Questions and answers on the practice of the Shingon *Vinaya*] beforehand.[56] Inaya tells us that he paid a visit to Fukuōji not only to thank the incumbent, but also to visit the grave of Gakunyo since the ordination ceremony had gone smoothly.[57] The potential significance of this statement is perhaps easily overlooked, but it would seem possible, at least to me, to understand this as suggesting that the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition in Japan was not limited to the Tokugawa period, or even—as we will see—down to the Meiji era, but it would seem to open up the possibility that it was also alive and well in 1987. Indeed, as Inaya states that the ordination ceremony went smoothly, it is possible that there may well be ordained Mūlasarvāstivādin monks in Japan today. This, however, will need to be confirmed, and is—at least at the moment—no more than a possibility.

Inaya briefly described his visit to Fukuōji, and in summarizing the history of the monastery mentions a number of fires, suggesting that the fourth fire—a lightning strike (雷火) during the incumbency of the present abbot (that is, 1987)—may be responsible for the loss of a great deal of the textual tradition dating back to Gakunyo. Inaya lists some fourteen or so texts attributed to Gakunyo, and although this is certainly not comprehensive, it is at least a start. As some of these are pertinent to our present discussion, it may be useful to briefly introduce a number of them.

Taihin hōgo 對賓法語 [Dharma talk to a guest] takes the form of a catechism and is written not in *kanbun* 漢文 (or "Classical Chinese") as one might expect, but in what Miyasaka Yūshō (1958) refers to as *kanagaki* 仮名書き (a mix of Sino-Japanese closely approximating the colloquial language). Miyasaka tells us that this is one of the most outstanding examples in the Esoteric tradition of *kana* dharma talks (仮名法語) from the middle of the Tokugawa era.[58] It seems

56. Inaya 1987a, 4: 五月下旬、数人の方々より授戒を乞われたが、有部律について自信がなく、広島市可部の金亀山福王寺の御住職、亀尾宥生師に、同寺の先住学如律師の有部律再興の主張書である『真言律問答』の拝見を申し上げた処、心よく許可を頂き、授戒の前夜、披見することが出来、法幸、甚々たる感を深くした. Note that a Mūlasarvāstivādin ordination manual was published subsequent to this ceremony by Inaya (see Inaya 1990). I owe my knowledge of this to the kindness of Prof. Rev. Asai Shōzen.

57. Inaya 1987a, 4: 授戒も無事終わったので、お礼を兼ねて学如律師の墓参のため、福王寺に参拝した.

58. Miyasaka 1958, 31–32. See also pages 34–35 for the works of Jiun Onkō. Note that Jiun Onkō is not to be confused with Jiun, the teacher of Shaku Unshō in the Meiji period. See also Miyasaka 1958, 28ff., for the *kana* works of Jōgon 淨嚴 (1639–1702) and his disciple Rentai 蓮體 (1663–1726). For a biography of the latter, see Yukitake 1916, 159–63; for a more readily accessible reprint of Yukitake, see Miyoshi 1976, 471–75.

that the move from elitist literary forms such as Classical Chinese was perhaps an attempt to take the dharma to the masses, as opposed to keeping it solely as the purview of learned scholar monks. Our text begins with a question and Gakunyo's response:

> A pious man came and asked saying, "Recently I have heard that the Master bestows the Bodhisattva precepts regardless of lay or monastic [status] according to spiritual ability, and also confers [ritual vows for] rebirth in Tuṣita, also exhorts rebirth in Sukhāvatī, sometimes also discusses the doctrine of attainment of Buddhahood in one's present body, down to mantras, nenbutsu, and daimoku, instructs according to people's preferences—I consider this to be extremely imprudent."
>
> 信士來り問て曰、頃日承り候に、師は在家出家を擇ばず、機に隨て菩薩戒を授け、又都率往生をも授け、又極樂往生をも勸め、或は即身成佛の旨をも談じ、眞言念佛題目に至る迄、人の好みの通りに授け給ふよし、此事甚だ輕く存候。[59]

The question continues noting that other sects advocate a single practice, and finally concludes by asking for a response. Gakunyo responds by asking why it is that the Tathāgata expounded 84,000 teachings, and then goes on to explain that the Tathāgata gives medicines in accordance with the illness (應病與藥), and that if there are four hundred and four types of illnesses it is only appropriate that there be an equal number of medicines. There are a number of points that should be made here, and these may bear fruitful investigation. The first is the general genre of *kana hōgo*, and how the text by Gakunyo compares with the works of monks from other schools more renowned for this genre: the Pure Land, Nichiren, and Zen schools.[60] The similarities to this in, for instance, *Vinaya* Master Tainin's 諦忍 (1705–1786) *Shishirin manpitsu* 獅子林漫筆 [Random writings at the Lion's Grove] are perhaps worth noting.[61] Again this is another text which seems to have attracted very little scholarly attention, but what attention it has attracted—the keen eye of Kawaguchi Kōfū—is most certainly of the highest calibre. The preface of the text includes the following (Kawaguchi 1990, 161–62):

> Recently in the grove rain has been incessant, and the four directions are without any sign of people. Unexpectedly, a guest came and pulling out a text from his cloak stated, "This is a new release.[62] It comes from the religious in

59. For the text, see Washio 1929, 73–125. Note that for some reason Inaya (1987b, 4) states that—what I take to be—this text does not exist: 対賓法話 (語) も存在しない (note that Inaya uses a variant character for *hin* 賓). I can only assume that Inaya is here referring to manuscript copies at Fukuōji.

60. Nakamura et al., eds. 1989, s.v. *kana hōgo* 仮名法語, does not even list Shingon works of this genre. See, however, the work of Miyasaka 1958, 1959.

61. On Tainin see the impressive scholarship of Kawaguchi Kōfū (1995).

62. It is possible that this is a pun: *shinkoku* 新刻 "new printing" for *shinkoku* 深刻 "grave, serious."

> Kyoto. That is, it is called *Ryakujutsu Daijōkai gi* [Abridged exposition on the meaning of the precepts of the Great Vehicle], expounded by Shunpō Myōzui of Kōmyōji, Rakuhoku. Although we read this, there are many points which we do not understand. Accordingly, I wish to ask the Master about it."
>
> 頃日林下雨頻ニシテ四望閴寂タリ。偶客来テ懐中ヨリ一書ヲ出シテ曰。是新刻ナリ。京都法類ヨリ到来ス。則チ洛北祥光寺俊鳳妙瑞ノ所述ニシテ名ヲ略述大乗戒義ト号ス。吾儕読之トイヘドモ通ゼザルコト通多シ。[63] 因テ師ニ就イテ問ント欲ス。

In the main text Tainin responds to the questions of his guest and refutes nine points made by Shunpō Myōzui 俊鳳妙瑞 (1714–1787) (not to be confused with Gakunyo's teacher Myōzui 妙瑞).[64] Note, however, that in this text of 1785 Tainin attacks Mitsumon 密門 (a fellow student of Gakunyo under Myōzui), who had previously refuted Tainin's interpretation of a passage in the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 [*Brahmā Net Sūtra*] (Kawaguchi 1989, 250, 261–62).

The second text by Gakunyo that we shall discuss is his *Shingon ritsugyō mondō*. This text, written in 1759, appears to have sparked a major controversy between those who advocated the use of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* and those who continued to use the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* (Ueda Tenzui 1939b).[65] The text is extant—and more importantly, relatively accessible today—and again a useful summary was provided by Ueda Tenzui many years ago.[66] One of the major tenets of this text is that Shingonshū should observe the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, and not the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. The precedent for this is, of course, found in the works of their founder, Kūkai. Gakunyo writes:

> Of the threefold learning, Shingonshū establishes its doctrines based upon the *sūtra*s, and with regard to the study of precepts it employs the *[Mūla-] sarvāstivāda Vinaya*. This has been proclaimed by the High Patriarch in 823.
>
> 真言宗ハ三學ノ中ニ於テ経ニ依テ宗ヲ立テ、戒學ニ於テハ有部律ヲ用ユ、是ハ弘仁十四年高祖奏聞ニ達シ。 (*Shingon ritsugyō mondō*, 1b4–6)

63. Note that in the text reproduced by Kawaguchi 1990, *shite*, *koto*, and *domo* are given in abbreviated variants—these have not been reproduced here, instead they have been "normalized." Note also that *geki* 閴 is given in place of the non-standard equivalent in Kawaguchi.

64. On Shunpō Myōzui, see the biographical material in Kawaguchi 1995, 873–921.

65. Ueda Tenzui's original article (1939b) appears with a number of orthographic changes in 1976, 313–42, and again in 1993, 831–52. Unless otherwise stated I refer to the 1976 edition. See also Ueda Tenzui 1940, 104–35.

66. Note, however, that this was the text that Inaya Yūsen asked the incumbent of Fukuōji for permission to see in 1987. There is a mimeographed edition in our library at UCLA, as part of the Toganoo 栂尾 Collection, a Shingon collection of great historical importance. Note, for instance, that at least thirteen volumes have been reprinted by Hirakawa Shuppan 平河出版 in Japan on the basis of materials held at UCLA. As far as I know, Gakunyo's text is the only *Vinaya*-related text of any importance to our present discussion held in the Toganoo Collection.

Gakunyo, of course, is referring to Kūkai's *Shingonshū shogaku kyō-ritsu-ron mokuroku* 眞言宗所學經律論目録 [Catalogue of *Sūtra*, *Vinaya*, and *Śāstra* (texts) to be studied in Shingonshū; referred to as Catalogue below] written in 823 CE.[67] Kūkai did indeed list the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* and not the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* as an essential part of his curriculum, but Kūkai's admonition seems to have gone largely unheeded for nearly one thousand years.[68] This we know from Gakunyo's comments:

> Until year 9 of Hōreki [1759] there has not been anyone who has studied or practiced the *[Mūla-]sarvāstivāda Vinaya* of the Shingon [tradition].
>
> 真言ノ有部律ハ今寶暦九年マデハ學行ノ人見ヘ侍ラズ。
>
> (*Shingon ritsugyō mondō*, 2b6–7; UEDA Tenzui 1972, 330)

Gakunyo, who was later to declare his temple at Fukuōji a Mūlasarvāstivāda monastery, was clearly not impressed by the fact that Kūkai's curriculum was not being followed. Gakunyo's reaction, however, was to draw severe criticism, and a debate soon ensued over the exact significance of Kūkai's inclusion of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in his Catalogue. The dispute was about which *Vinaya* or mainstream monastic code was to be followed, and not a question of Mahāyāna Bodhisattva precepts. This is clear from Gakunyo's answer:

> With regard to the *Vinaya* there are the Greater and Lesser. The *Vinaya* of the Great Vehicle is not that which is now under discussion. The *Vinaya*s of the Lesser Vehicle are the five *Vinaya*s being the *[Mahā-]sāṃghika Vinaya*, *[Mūla-] sarvāstivāda*, *Vinaya in Four Parts* [= *Dharmaguptaka*], *Vinaya in Five Parts* [= *Mahīśāsaka*], and *Vinaya in Ten Recitations* [= *Sarvāstivāda*].
>
> 律ニハ大小アリ。大乘律ハ今ノ所論ニアラズ。小乘律ハ僧祇律、有部、四分律、五分律、十誦律トテ五部律アリ。 (*Shingon ritsugyō mondō*, 6a6–8)[69]

Gakunyo sums up the problem as follows:

> Obstinately clinging to the *[Vinaya in] Four Parts* and not employing the *[Mūla-]sarvāstivāda [Vinaya]* is not in accordance with the true tenets of the Great Teacher [i.e., Kūkai]. Would not one say it was a great deviation from the academic tenets of Shingon?

67. This text is also known as the *Sangakuroku* 三學録 (Catalogue of [texts of] the three [bodies of] learning).

68. Kūkai lists 175 (some recensions give 172) fascicles (*juan* 卷) of *Vinaya* texts to be studied as part of his curriculum (DNBZ, vol. 96, 13–15; KATSUMATA 1970, vol. 2, 180—there is a problem with the arithmetic). On the dating and other related problems surrounding this text, see the entry in BKDJ, s.v. *Shingonshū shogaku kyō-ritsu-ron mokuroku*, where the number of texts is given as 172.

69. I have punctuated were necessary, and added *dakuten* 濁点 as appropriate. The mimeograph is unpunctuated, and usually does not distinguish between voiced and unvoiced consonants (e.g., *zu* ズ is given as *su* ス).

四分ヲ偏執シ有部ヲ用ヒズンバ大師ノ正宗ニアラズ。真言ノ學則ヲ乱ルトモ云ンカ。

Up until the time of Myōzui the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was used both at Shinbessho, and at the three *Vinaya* training temples 律の三僧房, that is, Yachūji 野中寺 (Onkō 飲光 1718–1804), Makio-zan 槙尾山 (Myōnin 明忍 1576–1610), and Ōtori-zan 大鳥山 (Ekū 惠空, Kaien-bō 快圓房 d. 1712) (Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 16).[70] Myōzui, however, appears to have been responsible for first introducing the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* into the curriculum, but even here it was, at least initially, studied together with the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* (Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 16). It was not until Gakunyo, in fact, that the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was entirely rejected (Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 16). In a text now appended to Gakunyo's *Shingon ritsugyō mondō*, the *Geishū Fukuōji Gakunyo bandai bukei* 藝州福王寺學如畔睇奉啓 [Proclamation by Vandana[71] (Venerable) Gakunyo of Fukuōji, Geishū], addressed to the Chief Abbot (正僧正) of Shinkōin 真光院, and dated the fourth day of the twelfth moon, 1759, Gakunyo states:

Henceforth I declare the temple of Fukuō a place of study and practice of the *[Mūla-]sarvāstivāda Vinaya*.

自今以後福王之寺為有部律学行之處。

(*Geishū Fukuōji Gakunyo bandai bukei*, 34a10–b1)[72]

Gakunyo, however, was not only declaring his temple to be Mūlasarvāstivādin, and in conformity with the teachings of Kūkai, but in effect he was denouncing the other Shingon temples as heretical. The major tenets of Gakunyo's stance as

70. On these three *Vinaya* training temples, see Ueda Tenzui 1976, 317ff. In English, see Watt 1982, 61. Kaien 快圓 is given as the third incumbent at Entsūji (ZSZ, vol. 35, 656). Note also that he appears to have been a teacher of Jōgon 淨嚴 (Ueda Tenzui 1939a, 11; Yukitake 1916, 147 [Ekū 惠空 given as 慧空] = Miyoshi 1976, 460).

71. See MBDJ, s.v. Wanan 和南. Even here we see traces of Gakunyo's reliance on Yijing's 義淨 translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. This transcription (畔睇) of Sanskrit *vandana* appears at least twenty times in Yijing's *Vinaya* corpus, and—as far as I can tell—never in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*.

72. Note that the text seems to read Shinjōin 真乘院, but as this is a (mimeograph of a) handwritten copy by Hase Hōshū 長谷寶秀 (1869–1948) we should perhaps follow his own note dated August 1934, which refers to this as a letter to Shinkōin 真光院. Thus understood. Inaya (1987a, 4) tells us that having received permission from Ninnaji in 1760, Gakunyo established a Ritsuin 律院 (*Vinaya* training temple) at Fukuōji (仁和寺宮の許可を得て宝暦十年 [一七六〇], 有部律の道場 [律院]とした). Hase Hōshū identifies the addressee as Omuro Shinkōin 御室真光院 (colophon, 51a2). Putting the two of these statements together it would appear that the letter was addressed to the headquarters of the Omuro sect at Ninnaji, a large monastic complex of which Shinkōin is still today a part. I am informed that Ninnaji is one of only two monasteries (the other being Kongōbuji) still ordaining according to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (Prof. Rev. Asai Shōzen, oral communication: 20 September 2005; cf. note 137 below).

found in his *Shingon ritsugyō mondō* (and the appendix) may be summarized as follows:[73]

(1) Kūkai implemented a curriculum of *Sūtra*, *Vinaya*, and *Abhidharma* texts, and the *Vinaya* specified was none other than the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Accordingly, adherents of the Shingon tradition should follow this *Vinaya* and not the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*.

2a3–6: 有部律ハ小乗ナレドモ高祖ハ三學ノ録ニ真言宗諸學ト題シタマヘハ真言宗ノ行フ有部ハ密教ト成テ彼ノ小乗人ノ有部律ノ意ト又四分律宗ノ律行ノ意ト雲泥ノ相違アルコトナリ。

6a8–9: 此中律宗ハ四分律ヲ以テ立タリ。真言宗ハ有部律ヲ用。

13a6–7: 大師モ三學ノ録ニ有部律ヲ列テ真言ノ行ナルコトヲ示シ玉ヒ。

(2) Kūkai himself was initiated under, and implemented, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* tradition, as was his disciple Engyō 圓行. This tradition, however, was later discontinued.

(3) The eight patriarchs of the Shingon tradition (starting with Nāgārjuna 龍猛) were ordained as Mūlasarvāstivādins, and thus Kūkai was following the precedent of the other patriarchs (he being the eighth).[74]

10a1–2: サレドモ元祖龍猛有部ヲ行シタマヒ代々祖師此ニ倣テ有部律ヲ本學トシタマヘリ。

(4) The three areas of learning are like a tripod; all three are essential to its stability. Furthermore, as the *Vinaya* is the most subject to lapse, special training centers should be established in order to resurrect and maintain the *Vinaya* tradition. Unlike Risshū, which is founded upon the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* tradition of Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) and Jianzhen 鑑眞 (Jp. Ganjin) (683–763), Shingon is based on a *Sūtra*.

12a3–4 (cf. 14a9): 戒定慧ノ三學ハ鼎ノ三足ニ喩ヘテ一モ闕ヘカラザルコトハ大小顯密佛法ノ通軌ナリ。必ズ具足スベシ。[75]

(5) Monks of the Shingon tradition should, like the other schools, accept official appointments, and wear silk robes, and so forth.[76]

73. The following summary is based on Ueda Tenzui 1976, 330–32. Although Ueda often paraphrases Gakunyo's text, citations are not given. Where possible I have attempted to locate these passages in the original text.

74. Note Gakunyo's text on this in the mimeograph edition by Hase Hōshū: *Shingon hasso ubu jukai mondō* 眞言八祖有部受戒問答.

75. Note that Hase Hōshū's mimeograph has here a variant for *kanae* 鼎.

76. Shaku Keihō suggests that in principle monks should not wear silk robes. The problem, however, is that this prohibition is not seen as *buddhavacana*, but as stemming from Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). In effect, this is a statement about following the *Vinaya*—what is not said in the *Vinaya*—and rejecting the interpretations of individual *Vinaya* masters (Shaku 1940, 55).

29a10–b2: 今有部律行ノ真言比丘ハ官位ニ進テ官地ニ住セバ官位相當ノ衣正絹綿文繻ノ衲直綴素絹ノ類モ着スベキヤ.[77]

(6) Shingonshū and Shingon risshū are fundamentally different. The followers of the three temples connected to Saidaiji 西大寺 (i.e., the three *Vinaya* training temples) have forgotten the true intent of their founder Eizon 叡尊 (1201–1290), only revere the *Vinaya* (*Dharmaguptaka*), and do not practice Shingon—they should be referred to as Risshū, not Shingon risshū.[78]

As one can well imagine, Gakunyo caused quite a stir not only with his insistence on the use of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, but also by criticizing his coreligionists who had been using the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* for many centuries. In response to Gakunyo's *Shingon ritsugyō mondō*, Hōmyō 法明 (1706–1763), the fourth abbot of Reiunji 靈雲寺[79] (present-day Yushima, Tokyo), seems to have responded with a text entitled *Misshū gakuroku dōmon* 密宗學録童問 [Infantile questions on the curriculum of the Esoteric School] (Ueda Tenzui 1976, 329).[80] This text does not appear to have survived, and we owe our knowledge of it, once again, to the sharp eye of Ueda Tenzui who spotted a quotation from it in Ryūkai's 龍海 (Mitsujō-bō 密乘房) (1756–1820) *Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi* 陀羅尼宗所學有部律儀 [(*Mūla-*)*sarvāstivāda Vinaya* decorum to be studied by the Dhāraṇī School].[81]

Ryūkai's text, although not available in a modern edition, would seem to be extant in manuscript form, of which microfilm copies are available through the Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan 国文学研究資料館 in Tokyo. This text is, Ueda tells us, Ryūkai's response to Hōmyō's *Misshū gakuroku dōmon*. The preface to this text also makes the author's position regarding *Vinaya* study quite explicit:

> The Exoteric Masters rely on the *Dharma[-guptaka Vinaya]*; the Esoteric School studies the *[Mūlasarva-]astivāda Vinaya*.

77. Note here that Gakunyo seems to use the standard (i.e., *Dharmaguptaka*) transcription for Sanskrit *bhikṣu*.

78. On Shingon risshū 眞言律宗, see, for now, Saitō and Naruse 1988, 16–17.

79. Reiunji produced a number of well-known scholars such as Keichū 契沖 (1640–1701), author of the *Waji shōranshō* 和字正濫鈔 (see Seeley 1991, 117–25). Jōgon 淨嚴 (1639–1702), of course, was himself an accomplished Sanskrit scholar.

80. For detailed biographical information on Hōmyō, see Yukitake 1916, 186–89 (= Miyoshi 1976, 494–97).

81. I have not yet located this quotation. Note, however, that the text is not listed in Yukitake 1916, or Miyoshi 1976. As much of the opposition to the Mūlasarvāstivādin position came from Reiunji, a close examination of their repositories may well reveal further details. Note, for instance, Miyoshi 1976, s.v. 671 *Shakuben yūroku* 釋辨囿録, which is listed as being held at the National Diet Library, Kōyasan University, and Tōyō University. This listing is more complete than the entries in BKDJ, and Tokuda 1974. *Shakuben yūroku* was written by Chimyō 智明 (1736–1813) in response to Ryūkai's (1756–1820) *Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi* (Ueda Tenzui 1976, 330). See also Miyoshi 1976, s.v. 672 (釋辨囿録講解).

顯家依曇無、密宗學説有。

(*Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 1a8–b1; microfilm folio nos. 495–496)

Ryūkai also asks:

> The various schools rely on the *[Vinaya in] Four Parts*; why may the Shingon School alone [use the *Vinaya* of] another sect? Although recent adherents lecture on the *[Mūla-]sarvāstivāda Vinaya*, and discuss the standards of the Esoteric School, what is the textual authority [for this]?

諸宗依四分、獨眞言宗奚得他部。然近世徒講有部律談密宗軌、有何典據。

(*Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 2b6–7; microfilm folio no. 497)

To this Ryūkai's answer is straightforward: Kūkai's Catalogue and the petition to the emperor in which the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins is declared to be an academic tenet of the Esoteric tradition (答。祕密三學録、及大政官符、明以有部之調伏、為密宗之學則; *Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 2b7–8; microfilm folio no. 497). Ryūkai then goes on to enumerate the *Vinaya* texts given in Kūkai's Catalogue, and explicitly notes that Kūkai lists only [Mūla-]sarvāstivādin texts, and does not mention the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* at all (根本説一切有部毘奈耶等十二部者、皆是薩婆多部律也。此餘不一載四分律等; *Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 4b3–4; microfilm folio no. 499). Ryūkai also asks a number of important questions: Why did the Great Master rely on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*? Furthermore, the High Patriarch originally at twenty-two years of age ascended the platform and received the precepts at Tōdaiji, when did he discard the old and receive the new? (大師何故依有部律。又高祖下二十二歳於東大寺依四分律登壇得戒何日捨故受新; *Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 6a6–7; microfilm folio no. 500). Ryūkai's answer is very long and cannot adequately be dealt with here, but we should note that he reminds us that Kūkai's actions were not without historical precedent: Yijing 義淨 (635–713) also was first ordained under the *Dharmaguptaka*, and later based himself on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (又義淨三藏先受四分後依有部; *Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 10a5; microfilm folio no. 504).

The *Vinaya*s, however, are certainly not the only topic of discussion to be found in Ryūkai's text. There are also discussions of Buddhist sectarian history in India—Mahādeva's five points of controversy, and the division into two groups: Mahāsāṃghika and Sthavira (大天五事不同分為兩部一大衆部二上座部; *Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 23a4–5; microfilm folio no. 517). While their discussion may contribute nothing new to our understanding of Indian Buddhist history, they do provide a veritable mine of information concerning premodern Buddhist studies in Japan. In fact, in what might be more of a reflection of our lack of progress than anything else, we see Ryūkai and his tradition grappling with problems such as the relationship between Sarvāstivāda and

Mūlasarvāstivāda—a sticky problem that we are no closer to solving than was Ryūkai.[82]

The colophon to Ryūkai's text, again, tells us a number of interesting things. The date and place are given as 1791 (Kansei 寛政 3), Spring, third moon, at Matsuoji 松尾寺, Tango 丹後 (written as "Gotan" 後丹).[83] Furthermore, Ryūkai identifies himself as Bhikṣu Ryūkai Mitsujō (苾芻龍海密乘). Here again it is interesting to note the use of Yijing's transcription of Sanskrit *bhikṣu* (苾芻) as opposed to the more common *Dharmaguptaka* equivalent (比丘): Ryūkai would seem to espouse Yijing's translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* even in his signature (*Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, 38a; microfilm folio no. 532). The last thing to note is that the text which has come down to us was published in 1793 by Heian Shorin 平安書林 of Kyoto. The publisher, as is often the case, devotes the last leaf to an advertisement of new publications, and it is here that we also learn of another book, hot off the press (新刻), written by one of Ryūkai's contemporaries, *Vinaya* Master Tōkū 等空 (1745–1816): *Shingonmon shahyōgi* 眞言門遮表義. We also see another book entitled *Gokai hen* 護戒編 [Collection on observance of precepts] in one volume (*Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi*, microfilm folio no. 533).[84] Although admittedly most of the other twenty or so titles listed appear to be predominantly Buddhist works, it would certainly seem that our Mūlasarvāstivādin monks were not alone in their emphasis on monastic discipline during the Tokugawa era.

In response to his insistence on the sole utilization of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, Gakunyo was to face opposition not only from Hōmyō, but also from Sokuzen Jissō 即染實相 of Sennyoji 千如寺.[85] In 1768 Jissō wrote *Kyokushō sōro hen* 旭照霜露編 [Chapters on the morning sun illuminating frost and dew]. What exactly this title refers to I have no idea—I have not yet been able to obtain a copy of the text. Ueda, however, tells us that this text was written as a refutation of Gakunyo's position on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (Ueda Tenzui 1976, 319). This was later to be refuted by Gakunyo who responded with a text entitled *Ben Kyokushō sōro hen* 辨旭照霜露編 [Refutation of chapters on the morning sun illuminating frost and dew]. The debate seems to have been very lively, as can be seen from a number of the passages reproduced by Ueda (1976, 326):

82. On his seventy-eighth birthday (1988) the Japanese Buddhist scholar Iwamoto Yutaka reminded us that the most important puzzle facing students of Indian Buddhist history is the relationship between the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins (Iwamoto 1988, 358).

83. Note that this temple also seems to have been an important center for the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival under Tōkū 等空 (1745–1816). Ueda Tenzui refers to this sect as Matsuoji-ha 松尾寺派, the other two important sects being Fukuōji-ha 福王寺派 and Shinbessho-ha 眞別所派 (see the lineage charts in Ueda Tenzui 1976, 327).

84. No other information is given, but note that BKDJ lists a similar title: *Gokai ron* 護戒論 (*hen* 編 and *ron* 論 could easily be confused) by Jōen 淨圓 (1792).

85. Modern-day Maebara city, Fukuoka.

> I am astonished only at the fact that you do not know the *Vinaya*[s]. Formerly, I have heard the elucidation of monks of the Ōtori [sect], and you have been there studying the *Vinaya* since you were young. It was not planned like this. Already you are lost and in the dark with regard to studies of your own order. How much more so with regard to the propriety (事相) of other founders?
>
> 余驚者唯汝不知律也、曾聞大鳥僧之説、汝少在彼学律、不図如是也、既迷暗己家学、況於他教祖事相乎。

Gakunyo, however, was not criticizing some young monk. Again, in a passage quoted by Ueda—at present the only access we have to this text—Gakunyo states (Ueda Tenzui 1976, 326):

> You have borne the title *bhikṣu* from when you were young and for seventy or eighty years you have studied the *Nanzan Vinaya* tradition, and you do not know this passage!
>
> 汝少負比丘名至七八十歳学南山律不知此文

Here we see that Gakunyo's opponent was a monk of some seventy to eighty years of age, a monk who had been studying the *Vinaya* from early on in his career. The term used here is *biku* 比丘, and this is the standard transcription of Sanskrit *bhikṣu* found in the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, which is itself indirectly referred to by Gakunyo in his comment about the *Nanzan Vinaya* tradition—a reference to the *Nanshan* 南山 *Vinaya* tradition originally founded in China by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). It is also interesting to note the colophon of another text by Jissō, the *Himitsu [ichijō] shira ganzui* 秘密[一乗]尸邏眼髄 [Quintessence of Śīla of the (One Vehicle of the) Esoteric (tradition)] (1767, Meiwa 4). There Jissō signs his manuscript Bhikṣu Sokuzen Jissō, having vowed to accept all rules of training (誓受一切学処芯芻即染実相), but instead of using the standard *Dharmaguptaka* transcription of *bhikṣu* (比丘) Jissō uses the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* transcription, perhaps somewhat provocatively in signing his own name. This is somewhat ironic in a text which indirectly attacks Gakunyo's position on the *Vinaya* in the Shingon tradition.

According to Ueda—as far as I know, the only published source for this text—a number of criticisms were lodged at Gakunyo by Jissō in his *Kyokushō sōro hen* 旭照霜露編 [Chapters on the morning sun illuminating frost and dew]. Jissō's critique, and the stance of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* monks, may be summarized as follows (Ueda Tenzui 1976, 332–34; cf. Shaku Keihō 1940):

(1) In Japan, ever since Jianzhen 鑑眞 (Jp. Ganjin) (683–763) monks of all lineages have been ordained according to the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* at one of the Southern Capital ordination platforms (南都戒壇). There has never been any *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* ordination or any *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* ordination platform.

MSV: the ordination platforms are not limited to ordinations under the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, but may be ascended and used by ordinands who receive ordination according to other *Vinaya* texts.

(2) Kūkai was ordained at the age of twenty-two at the Tōdaiji 東大寺 ordination platform. There is no evidence that he underwent a *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* ordination in China, and arguing that he received the *Dharmaguptaka* ordination but later practised the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is not tenable. In his will (*Goyuikai* 御遺誡, 835) he states that adherents were to be ordained at Tōdaiji; if they were to undergo a *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* ordination such a platform would have to have been made.

MSV: Kūkai had been ordained in the Dharmaguptaka tradition in his twenty-second year. It could not, however, be confirmed that he did not receive a new ordination in China. And even if that was so, there was no problem in practising the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* after being ordained under the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. Furthermore, as there is no problem with various schools using the Tōdaiji ordination platform, there is also no problem in receiving the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* ordination there.

(3) There is no textual evidence supporting the claim that all eight patriarchs were Mūlasarvāstivādins. The only one of the eight for which there is evidence is Amoghavajra 不空金剛 (705–774), and there is contrary evidence supporting Dharmaguptaka lineages for Huiguo 惠果 (746–805) and Kūkai.

MSV: it is clear that Nāgārjuna, Nāgabodhi, Vajrabodhi, and Amoghavajra were all Mūlasarvāstivādin. Huiguo was originally ordained as a Dharmaguptaka monk, but later as a Mūlasarvāstivādin.

(4) None of Kūkai's disciples were ordained in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* tradition—they could not have been as there was no *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* ordination platform. Furthermore, Engyō's ordination in his seventeenth year was problematic as this is younger than the minimum age defined by the *Vinaya*s.

MSV: there are many precedents for the ordination of those under twenty in China and Japan. Engyō was ordained under the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, as were many other disciples. Three masters and seven witnesses are all that is needed, and this would have been fulfilled at the Tōdaiji ordination platform.[86]

86. T 2473, 96a12: 日本圓行阿闍梨…於十七歲受有部具足戒. Note, however, that such situations are actually addressed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* itself. See, for example, T 1442, 853a8–854a5.

(5) Kūkai listed the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in his *Sangakuroku* not for ordination purposes, or practice, but merely for academic purposes—the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* was to be studied in order to learn about the customs of Vajrabodhi and Amoghavajra. There were two views (二意) on this: (1) As regards the texts that Kūkai himself brought back they were collected and classified as the *Sangakuroku*, and not meant to be mixed in with others (高祖みずから請來されしものについて部を聚め類を分かちて三学録とし他を雑えざるなり);[87] (2) the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* was not listed as there was no question that it would not be followed.

MSV: this view is most perverse and preposterous. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is not listed in Kūkai's *Goshōrai mokuroku* 御請來目録 [Catalogue of texts brought back], and there is no reason why [in his curriculum] he would not include the "primary" *Dharmaguptaka* text, and yet include the "secondary" *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. (有部派曰く、この説最も邪曲背理なり、有部律は御請來録にのらず、また正学の四分をのせずして傍学の有部をのするの理なし。)

(6) Rejecting the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* and solely following the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is an attachment to just one text, and this is also a transgression of the first of the four grave prohibitions of Shingon, the rule that one should not reject the True Dharma, and as such is against the dogmas of Shingon. (四分を排して一向に有部によるというは一部に執するものにして、これ真言四重禁第一不応捨正法戒に違するものにして、かえって真言の義に反するものなり。)

MSV: our Shingon does not reflect [false] attachment to a single text. The successive patriarchs and Kūkai himself have utilized the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (歴代祖師、高祖の雅訓によりて有部を用うるにて執具無きが中の有部依用なり。). One who transgresses the ordinance of the founder, obstinately clings to the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*, and does not utilize the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is not a true follower of the Master—such a person is nothing but a heinous offender who corrupts the regulations of the Shingon tradition.

The debate, in fact, seems to be somewhat circular, but—as we have seen—was basically centered on the interpretation of the significance of Kūkai's listing of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in his Catalogue, questions of whether it was to be studied or implemented, and whether this was to be in addition to the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* or in place of it.

In their advocation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, Myōzui and Gakunyo seem to have placed special emphasis on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*

87. Here, of course, we see a conflation of Kūkai's two catalogues: the *Goshōrai mokuroku* 御請來目録 and the *Sangakuroku* 三學録.

Saṃgraha (*Genbensapoduobu lüshe* 根本薩婆多部律攝, Jp. *Konponsappatabu risshō* [T 1458]). This, however, is nothing new, and precedents for the utilization of *Vinaya* handbooks in general, and the *Saṃgraha* in particular, are to be found in China and also India.[88] The text itself is non-canonical, but as it provides a summary of this enormous *Vinaya* at a manageable size, it seems to have been widely read, and as we have seen also lectured on.

There are at least two manuscripts which should be mentioned in this connection. The first is a five-volume work, bound in traditional style, based on the edition of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha* (14 fasc.) as found in the Korean edition of the canon.[89] How many copies were made is not known to me, but there is no reason to suggest that the reproduction itself was particularly rare. Each volume includes what appears to be the colophon from the Korean edition, and this is in fact also confirmed by the title on the cover. The colophon to volume five seems to tell us that the plates used for the reproduction belonged to Fukuōji, in Aki 安藝 (Geishū 藝州) (藝州金龜山福王寺藏版), and that it was printed by Yamamoto Heiroku, Mt. Kōya (主事書林 高野山 山本平六). The date of the publication is unknown, but this publisher is known to have published at least as early as 1688 and as late as 1813.[90] In addition, the text contains a foreword (附言) written by Gakunyo dated 1764 (明和甲申), and colophons found in volumes one, three, and five give the date 1765 (明和二乙酉) for the proof-readings carried out after the collation with the Ming Edition, revisions, and other additions (對厨明本訂正魯魚或修補点或加入諸文再三検合畢). This editorial process apparently was performed at Kisshōji 吉祥寺 on Shibashi-zan 柴水山, in Yamato 大和 (Washū 和州) (Gojō 五條 city, Nara). Perhaps the most important feature of this edition, however, is the copious annotations found in the copy preserved in the library collection of Ryūkoku University. Not only are most pages annotated on the top, middle, and bottom, and not only is the text punctuated with the addition of Sino-Japanese reading aids, but between the leaves many pieces of paper are preserved on which detailed notes and references to other texts are made. Furthermore, the main body of the text also contains many cross-references to passages in, for instance, the *Vinaya Vibhaṅga*, other *Vinaya*s such as the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*, and even non-*Vinaya* texts such as the *Yogacārābhūmi*. Individual words are

88. It should be noted, for instance, that this was the first text that Yijing translated from the *Vinaya* corpus subsequent to his return to China. This would seem to indicate the importance of this text to the monastic tradition known first-hand to Yijing at Nālandā.

89. Fasc. 1–2 (vol. 1), 3–5 (2), 6–8 (3), 9–11 (4), 12–14 (5). This is in fact confirmed by the title on the cover: 翻刻高麗蔵本 (*Reproduction of Korean Edition of the Canon*). Note also that each volume includes what appears to be the colophon from the Korean edition (Cf. KTJG, vol. 24, 128).

90. See, for instance, the library catalogues for Ryūkoku and Tokyo Universities repectively, in which appear a 1688 edition of *Shinjin hongenshō* 身心本元鈔, and an 1813 edition of *Kōyasan saiken daiezu* 高野山細見大繪圖 both published by Yamamoto Heiroku 山本平六. My attempt at establishing dates for Yamamoto is intended as nothing more than a rough indication.

glossed, proper nouns are struck through with a single line to indicate that they are names, while titles of texts are identified as such with two lines. Although some notes have been glued on to the tops of the pages, others are loose but still preserved between the leaves. These annotations present us with a richly detailed glimpse of a living *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* tradition, one which is not only locatable in time and space, but a tradition for which the annotators of these manuscripts can be clearly identified. We see, in short, an early attempt at a comparative approach to *Vinaya* studies. The age of the annotations, however, in no way detracts from their utility as they are often grappling with many of the same problems of interpretation and translation as some of us today—the *Vinaya Saṃgraha* still eagerly awaits translation.

Many of the annotations undoubtedly belong to the hand of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* Master Mitsumon 密門 (d. 1788). In the colophon to volume five, for example, we see the signature of Bhikṣu Mitsumon 苾芻密門 at the end of a note telling us of the revision process, of which he states:

> Furthermore, I have occasionally added punctuation and other [marks] in vermilion on the basis of my examination of the old and new *Vinaya*s and *Śāstra*s [in which] I have found similarities and differences.
> 又依新旧律論考同異出没往々加入之朱点等訖

The extent of the annotations is, in fact, reminiscent of Saeki Kyokuga's 佐伯旭雅 masterpiece, the *Annotated Abhidharmakośa* which de la Vallée Poussin used with such profit: *Kandō Abhidatsuma kusharon* 冠導阿毘達摩倶舎論.[91] In addition there are, in a number of different hands, notes detailing not only where and when this text was used for lecturing purposes, but also the name of the lecturer. The hand-written notes appended to volume five, for instance, record the following lectures on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha*:

Meiwa 3 (1766) Mitsumon (d. 1788)
Meiwa 6 (1769) Mitsumon
Meiwa 7 (1770) Mitsumon
An'ei 4 (1775)
An'ei 6 (1777)
An'ei 8 (1779)

91. See the translator's remarks on Saeki Kyokuga in Pruden's rendition of de la Vallée Poussin's French translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam* (DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN 1988–1990, vol. 1, xxiv–xxviii). Note that the analogy to Saeki Kyokuga's edition of the *Kośa* is not without significance. Although his edition of the *Kośa* is well known, Saeki also annotated in the same fashion a text by the Mūlasarvāstivāda monk Tōkū 等空 (1745–1816) on *Vinaya* terminology: the *Sajimon shiku yōshū* 作持門詞句要集 (Saeki's annotated edition appeared in 1890). It seems highly likely that Kyokuga was, in fact, himself also a Mūlasarvāstivāda monk. For what would seem to be further evidence of this, see the petition (懇請願) to Prince Kuninomiya 久邇宮 dated Meiji 16 (1883) signed by, among others, *bhikṣu*s 苾芻 Unshō 雲照, Kyokuga 旭雅, and Eigon 榮嚴 (KUSANAGI 1913, vol. 1, 89).

Tenmei 1 (1781)

Tenmei 5 (1785) Ehō 懷寶

In addition to this a newly ordained *bhikṣu*, Bhikṣu Tsūzen of no years standing (無歳芯芻通禪), appears in the record, and we also see what seems to be the record of a gift to Bhikṣu Ryōmyō 芯芻靈明 on the second day of the twelfth moon of An'ei 5 (1776). The content of the gift seems to have been a copy of a *prātimokṣa* (戒本) in one fascicle, and a text in fourteen fascicles (perhaps the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha*), on the occasion of the death of Śrāmaṇera Great Dharma Master Zuiga on the second day of the seventh moon of An'ei 4 (1775) (安永乙未年七月二日寂大法師隨雅沙彌菩提).

Library seals are also found in the manuscripts and read *Takanawa Bukkyō Daigaku Daini Bukkyō Chūgaku zōsho* 高輪佛教大學第弐佛教中學藏書 (Takanawa Bukkyō University Second Buddhist Middle School Library Collection), which is the name adopted in 1902 by the Tokyo branch of what is now Ryūkoku University (formerly known as Bukkyō Daigaku, but not to be confused with the present-day university in Kyoto of that name).[92] Furthermore, seals containing the date Meiji 36 (1903) are to be found throughout, and others give May 25, Meiji 36 as the acquisition date, which would suggest that they were then in the process of building up their library collection. This is further confirmed by the stamp *kinen tosho* 紀念圖書 (commemorative book) also dated Meiji 36.

There is one more text which we must mention before moving on: the *Risshō kōroku* 律攝講録. This text is perhaps best described as a series of lecture notes on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha*, and seems to be based on lecture(s) delivered by Gakunyo (学如和尚曾講是書), another lecture notebook by Mitsumon (復別有密門和尚所記者), and another unidentified notebook. This text is also held at Ryūkoku University Library, and is perhaps the Edo-period equivalent of a graduate student's seminar notes. The author has gone through the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha* and glossed difficult or problematic terms; the result of which is three volumes of notes.[93]

Although the impact of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival spearheaded by Gakunyo is difficult to gauge, it is at least interesting to note that Gakunyo's *Shingon ritsugyō mondō* appears in Hashimoto Kaizen's catalogue (1936, 10). The publication date given is Meiji 16 (1883), and the publisher as Kōyasan Daigakurin 高野山大学林, or what today we might call Kōyasan University Press. Unfortunately no price is given, but it tells us that Gakunyo's work was still in print at least as late as 1883.[94]

92. On Takanawa Bukkyō Daigaku, see Mōri 1975, 152; 1973.

93. There are a number of seals on the manuscripts, the first of which reads *Bukkyō Daigaku tosho* 佛教大學圖書 (Library book of Bukkyō [i.e., Ryūkoku] University). Another seal at the back of volume one gives the acquisition date as 30 September 1921 (大正十年九月卅日購入).

94. The absence of a price might in fact itself be rather telling. Hashimoto's catalogue certainly

Eigon (1814–1900)

Eigon[95] was born in 1814 in the village of Aikawa 相川, Awaji 淡路.[96] At the age of thirteen he underwent the tonsure at Jōrakuji 常樂寺 under Kyōei 教榮. He was later ordained (進具)[97] under Ryūchin 隆鎭 (Ninkai-bō 忍鎧房) (1783–1854)[98] the eleventh abbot of Shinbessho, and himself became the thirteenth. He was conferred as *monzeki* 門跡 of Kanshūji 勸修寺 in 1878 by the decree of Prince Yamashinanomiya 山階宮二品親王, and of Ninnaji 仁和寺 in 1884 by Prince Komatsunomiya Akihito 小松宮彰仁, a post which he relinquished to Unshō 雲照 (1827–1909) in 1899.[99]

Perhaps the most important of Eigon's works for our purposes is his *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 密宗所學有部律園清規 [Pure ordinances (for a) *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* complex to be studied by the Esoteric Lineage]. This text is noteworthy for a number of reasons. Asai Kakuchō has noted, for example, that this is the only extant example of a Shingon *shingi* 清規 or monastic ordinance based on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. The relationship between this text and other *shingi* such as Dōgen's 道元 (1200–1253) famous *Eihei shingi* 永平清規 has been briefly touched upon by Asai (1988). What seems not to have been addressed, however, is the relationship to this and *kriyākāra*s or local Buddhist monastic ordinances known to the Indian (and thus also Sri Lankan and Tibetan) traditions.[100] The text—as hopefully will be seen from the sampling of passages given below—would seem to deal with daily monastic life in Tokugawa

---

does supply prices, presumably where known, but many entries list no price. In comparison, however, prices are given for books published by Kōyasan Daigaku Shuppanbu in, for instance, 1927–1930 (Shōwa 2–5) (Hashimoto 1936, 9). One of the earliest prices listed in the catalogue is for Meiji 14 (1881) (Hashimoto 1936, 12). It is also interesting to note that a number of books published by temples actually do list prices (e.g., Ryōtokuin 了德院, Kōmyōin 光明院, Shakadō 釋迦堂, Shinpukuji 眞福寺, Daigoji 醍醐寺 [Hashimoto 1936, 8–19]). Note, however, that as very few books published by Kōyasan Daigakurin are actually listed here, any conclusions drawn from this small data sample must remain tentative at best.

95. I am now pleased to note the appearance of Asai 2005, a monograph-length study on Eigon.

96. For photographs of Eigon, see Kusanagi, 1913, vol. 1, unnumbered plates 3–4. Plate 4, in fact, shows Eigon with his disciple Unshō.

97. Is this what *shingu* means? The entry in MD states that he became the abbot (住持す—or does this simply mean that he resided there?) of Jōrakuji 1838 (里に帰り師跡を継で常樂寺に住侍す). Was he ordained then?

98. Ryūchin 隆鎭 was the author of the *Entsūji ruidai senshi kako meibo* 圓通寺累代先師過去名簿 [Entsūji register of successive generations of previous teachers]. The dates given are from MD, s.v. Ryūchin 隆鎭. I am assuming that this is the same monk; the details given, however, are very brief.

99. For biographical details, see MD, s.v. Eigon; Asai 1987.

100. On *kriyākāra*s, see Schopen 2002, 361–62 and notes 14–16, and the sources cited there. See, in Japanese, Kitsudō 1989, for the situation in modern Sri Lanka. In his translation of the *Varṣāvastu* (T 1425, 1041c3–4) Yijing seems to translate Sanskrit *kriyākāra* variously with *zhiling* 制令 and *zhifa* 制法. Eigon refers to his text as a *sōsei* (Ch. *sengzhi*) 僧制 "Monastic Ordinance" (1b8: 是乃僧制也), and *sengzhi* is very close to, if not a contraction of, the term used by Yijing in his translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.

Japan. This is not, however, an imposed monasticism, not an Indian or Chinese tradition surplanted on to Japanese soil. Here we see Japanese monks compiling their own texts, and interpreting the received (Indian and Chinese) traditions as appropriate to local customs. The Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition was no longer merely an object of academic study, but in fact a living monastic tradition.

The colophon of the extant recension reveals that this text was published in 1884 (Meiji 17) by Wada Daien (?) 和田大圓 of Nishigamo 西賀茂 in Yamashiro 山城 (modern-day Kyoto). After the first three pages in highly cursivized calligraphy, the first of which is the abbrievated title *Uburitsuon shingi* 有部律園清規, we encounter a full page portrait of Eigon followed by a preface.

The first section of the text deals with rules governing the "Three Ropes" (*sankō* 三綱; permanent managerial positions in a monastery) and "Six Threads" (*rokki* 六紀; temporary administrative positions).[101] The Three Ropes are given as Elder (*jōza* 上座) (ten rules), Provost (*jishu* 寺主) (ten rules), and Superintendant (*juji* 授事) (twenty rules).[102] Rule seven for the Elder of the monastery, for instance, reads: At meal times [the Elder] must observe the pace of the junior monks. [He must] eat slowly; he should not eat too fast lest he prevent the junior monks from satisfying themselves.[103] Similarly the section on the Provost lists rules dealing with monastic book-keeping and the use of perpetuities. Rule eight, for instance, states that: If one lends [from] the perpetuity to another he must take goods as a pledge, have a contract made and sealed. Take a good surety, store its documentation in the monastic strongroom and guard it well. Each year at the two seasons one should calculate the interest and record it in full.[104] The fourth rule for the Superintendant reads: Every night when about to go to bed, he ought to inspect the precincts of the monastery for calamities such as the god of fire.[105]

The six revolving administrative posts are given as Master of Ceremonies (*shōdō* 唱導) (ten rules), Official in Charge of Offerings (*tenku* 典供) (twenty rules), Official in Charge of Cleaning (*tensō* 典掃) (six rules), Manager of the

101. *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 4a3–6: 所謂三綱一任永定焉。綱者如網之有綱。所以總理紀目也。三綱一任永定、六紀從大次第巡環五日一交替。紀者是所以別理絲數也.

102. For a brief discussion of these roles, and an explanation of a number of the differences between their interpretations in Japanese and Indian Buddhism, see Asai 1987, 22–26. The *jishu* 寺主, which I translate as "provost," is—as also noted by Asai—in the Indian context the lay patron of the monastery.

103. *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 5a4–5: 七者食事須察下座早晩。徐徐而食。不得太速敢令下座不飽食.

104. *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 6a6–8: 八者貸他無盡財須質物令作券契押印取好敢保其券疏納僧庫能守護每年兩季規求其息一一記載. Cf. Asai 1987, 36–37; Gernet 1995, 158–61; Schopen 1994. Note that the comments in Asai about perpetuities only being found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* need to be revised; see, for convenience, Gernet 1995, 165, for the payment of excess money from the sale of flowers into the Buddha's perpetuity (inexhaustible property) as found in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*.

105. *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 7a5: 四者每夜將寢臥時當檢察寺內祝融之難等.

Canon (*chizō* 知藏) (six rules), Manager of Guests (*chikyaku* 知客) (ten rules), and Manager of Storehouses (*chiko* 知庫) (ten rules). Next follows a section enumerating the thirty Clauses on Ultimate and Conventional Respect (*shinzoku raisetsu* 眞俗禮節). These include rules on laughing and talking loudly in front of the Buddha [image], not placing regular books on the ground, not handling scrolls with dirty hands,[106] turning pages after wetting one's fingers with spittle, and not discussing politics.[107] The next section introduces one hundred rules of deportment for residence within the monastery (住寺威儀). The twenty-second rule reminds the reader that the fences and walls have ears, another rule states that one must not [clean] *sūtra*s or images by blowing the dust off with one's mouth, and another dictates the correct procedure for the disposal in rivers or ponds of paper no longer of any use, but containing Sanskrit or other Buddhist writings.[108] Next we find a set of admonitions regarding behavior in the Monks' Quarters *sōdō shinki* 僧堂箴規. One rule states: One may not read non-Buddhist texts in the dormitory. If it is in order to convert followers of other paths, one may divide the day into three periods studying Buddhist [texts] for two and studying non-Buddhist [texts] for one [of these periods].[109] The next section lists rules of deportment for novices (求寂威儀節度). This is followed by ten articles for a teacher instructing a novice (師教求寂方規), fifty articles for a novice serving his Preceptor (求寂事親教師規儀), and a long series of verses to be recited daily.[110] The text ends with a list of the five virtues (五德), which Asai (1991, 76) identifies as being from the *Zhude futian jing* 諸德福田經 [*Sūtra* on virtues as a field of merit] (T 683), and the ten sets of learning for novices (十數) from the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya*.[111]

106. Asai interprets this as the left hand (1989, 49, n. 9).

107. *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 18b5: 四者不得於佛前戲笑及大聲言語; 19a4–6: 九者…雖尋常書籍不應輒置地…又不得不淨手執卷及默唾於指翻轉書牒; 19b8–20a1: 十五者不可談論國家治亂世間聲利駒隙難繫虛莫消度.

108. *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 24b3: 垣壁皆有耳; 25a6–7: 不得口經上塵土像淨準同; 25b7–8: 故紙若有梵書及佛寶之文字者皆取聚一處應投河池清淨之處.

109. *Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi* 36b4–5: 寮中不可讀外典。儻爲降伏異道日作三時二分學佛一分學外.

110. Asai identifies these as being from the *Avataṃśaka Sūtra* (T 279) (1991, 74).

111. Note also the text by Mōkai (foreword dated 1801). The colophon from the printed edition is dated 1806 (文化三年), and the publisher is given as Zeniya Ribei 錢屋利兵衛 of Kōsho Shorin 弘所書林, Sanjōdōri in Kyoto. Following the prefatory matter, the main text is divided into fourteen chapters, each with a varying number of rules, as follows: (1) various forms of ordinations 諸衆受戒 (forty rules), (2) formation and dissolution of ecclesiastical boundaries 諸界結解 (thirteen rules), (3) acceptance and division of robe and bowl (i.e., property) 衣鉢守分 (fourteen rules), (4) acceptance and purifcation of medicinal fruits 藥果受淨 (seven rules), (5) weighing of gold and silver 處量金銀 (four rules), (6) touching fire and taking formal possession 觸火守持 (four rules), (7) rules on bathing 洗浴方法 (four rules), (8) mealtime decorum 食事軌儀 (nine rules), (9) confession of the six classes of offences including *pārājika*s (see below) 説悔六聚 (eight rules), (10) rules for the appointment of officials to distribute various goods 分物等差 (four rules), (11) the *poṣadha* and recitation of the precepts 長淨説戒 (five rules), (12) the rains' retreats for the five types of religious 五衆安居

Our text concludes with a postscript (跋), dated 1883 (Meiji 16), by the Lesser Bhikṣu Raifu 小苾芻雷斧 (薫盥稽首謹識), who is presumably Gonda Raifu 權田雷斧 (1846–1934) the second President of Taishō University.[112]

Eigon was active as a Mūlasarvāstivāda monk in the closing decades of the Edo period, and the early decades of the Meiji. A detailed study of Eigon, a monk who would have seen Japan begin to modernize before his very own eyes, may prove interesting. Unfortunately, that cannot be attempted here. We must now turn our attention to one of Eigon's disciples.[113]

Shaku Unshō (1827–1909)

Unshō was perhaps one of the most famous disciples of Eigon. He was born as the fourth son of Watanabe Chūzaemon 渡辺忠左衛門 in Izumo 出雲, and entered the religious life at the age of ten under Jiun 慈雲 (not to be confused with Jiun Onkō) at Iwayadera 岩屋寺 (Kusanagi 1913, vol. 1, 1–2). At sixteen he borrowed a copy of *Shami shijiefa bing weiyi jing* 沙彌十戒法並威儀經 [The *sūtra* on deportment and the ten precepts for a *śrāmaṇera*] (T 1471)[114] and reading this—we are told—was his first introduction to the sanctity of Buddhist precepts. At twenty-two years old, the twenty-fifth of the ninth moon, 1848, he undertook the bodhisattva and ten *śrāmaṇera* precepts, and attended a lecture on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha*. In his twenty-ninth year, at Chōeiji 長榮寺 under Tandō 端堂 (the fifth generation successor [嫡孫] to Onkō 飲光) he received the Ten Good Precepts (*jū zenkai* 十善戒), Eight *Uposatha* Precepts (*hassaikai* 八齋戒), and for what would seem to be at least the second time, the ten *śrāmaṇera* precepts (Jp. *shami jikkai* 沙彌十戒). At thirty-four, on the twenty-first day, eighth moon, 1860, he was ordained as a Mahāyāna *bhikṣu* (大乘比

(ten rules), (13) the two types of *pravāraṇā* 二部隨意 (three rules), and (14) miscellaneous 要須雜行 (twenty-six rules). On *pārājika* penance, see Clarke 2000 and 2006.

112. This identification is tentative. On Gonda Raifu, see, among others, Tsunemitsu 1968–1969, vol. 1, 401–10. The colophon carries the title: Assistant Lecturer Gon[da] (Gon shōkōgi 權小講義). I am indebted to Prof. Richard Jaffe (e-mail communication: 4/14/05) for his help in identifying this as a title.

113. It should be noted that Eigon was not alone in his literary activities. His monastic ordinance follows—as has been shown by Asai (1988, 138ff.)—an established Tokugawa Mūlasarvāstivāda precedent, one set by an early advocate of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival: Gakunyo. Asai (1988, 138) lists a text entitled *Kinkisan sōsei narabi ni shinkitō* 金龜山僧制並清規等, and bases his information on Inaya 1987c, 3. Inaya refers to an edition of 1832 preserved at Saikōji 西光寺, Shōdoshima 小豆島, Kagawa prefecture. I have not been able to consult this edition, but note a text entitled *Geishū Kinkisan Fukuōji sōsei* 藝州金龜山福王寺僧制 from Hikone Castle Museum 彦根城博物館 (available through the Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan in Tokyo). This text is dated 1784, but seems to only correspond to a part of the text seen by Inaya (part b [ロ]: *Ippa rinji sōsei* 一派臨時僧制 [Temporary monastic ordinances for one sect]). Note that following this section there is a brief section entitled *Takaosanji sankō o chakunin suru no sho* 高雄山寺擇任三綱之書.

114. It would seem, then, that at least some Japanese Mūlasarvāstivāda monks viewed this text as appropriate for *śrāmaṇera* instruction. This in itself suggests to me that the text may warrant further investigation.

丘) under the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* 四分律 (his Preceptor [戒師] was Tandō 端堂 and his Instructor [教授師] was Ryōmyō 靈明; Kusanagi 1913, vol. 1, 36). The next year, at thirty-five, he was again ordained under the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* at Shinbessho[115] Entsūji 新別處圓通寺 with Eigon 榮嚴 as his Preceptor and Jimei 慈明 as his Instructor.[116] In the next few years he began to study the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. In 1866, incensed with the moral corruption of his fellow monks on Mt. Kōya, Unshō removed himself to the quietude of Shinbessho out of the way of the other monks—this monastery is apparently more than a mile (18 *chō* 丁) away, and separated by eight gulleys (峻坂) (Kusanagi 1913, vol. 1, 39–40). Having descended the mountain he was apparently asked by farmers to perform a rain invocation ritual as they had been experiencing a spell of some forty or so days without rain. Unshō agreed to perform the ritual for seventeen days, and although the villagers became worried when there was still not a raincloud in sight after three days, the rains soon came and the local farmers were so elated that they apparently forgot to worship the Main Image (*honzon* 本尊), instead paying homage to Unshō (Kusanagi 1913, vol. 1, 44). How much of this is true, of course, we have no way of knowing. The biography—or hagiography—to which I have been referring was compiled by one of his disciples, but there can be little doubt that Unshō reached a high degree of public notoriety during the Meiji period. This is, in fact, confirmed by his appearance in popular literature of the time: he is found as a model for moral behavior in Natsume Sōseki's 夏目漱石 (1867–1916) *Wagahai wa neko de aru* [*I am a Cat*].[117]

Between the years 1870 to 1871, Unshō also visited Fukuōji, the temple where Gakunyo had previously revived the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Here Unshō performed the eight-thousand-piece (八千枚ゴマ供) *homa* rite, and lectured on the *Vinaya*, which he was also to do in Awa 阿波 in 1872. The period, we will remember, was the Meiji, and this was a time not only of modernization, but also of Buddhist persecutions. In 1868, the official separation of gods and buddhas had been instigated by the Meiji government, and this had led to the destruction of Buddhist temples and Buddhist images. There was apparently even a move afoot to rename Kōbō Daishi's 弘法大師 Kongōbuji 金剛峯寺 Hironori Jinja 弘法神社 (Hironori being the Japanese "nationalistic" reading of the Sino-Japanese "Kōbō") (Tsunemitsu 1968–1969, vol. 1, 84; Satomichi 1990, 57). The

115. It is interesting to note that Eigon seems to have taken on the name Bessho, presumably from this. Note that the orthorgraphy is not consistent: *shin* is given both as 眞 and 新; *sho* is found as 處 and 所.

116. Eigon (or perhaps Unshō?) apparently did not lightly ordain others. He is reported to only have had one hundred or so disciples (Kusanagi, 1913, vol. 1, 37). Actually the text here just says *wajō* 和尚 (the monk)—it is not clear to whom this refers.

117. Natsume 1938, vol. 1, 249; Kindai Sakka Yōgo Kenkyūkai Kyōiku Gijutsu Kenkyūjo, ed. 1986, vol. 15 (*bekkan* 別巻), 167.

final straw for Unshō, however, seems to have been when the age-old prohibition on clerical marriages and meat-eating was lifted by the regime in 1872. An imperial emissary (勅使) was dispatched to Mt. Kōya informing them of the decriminalization and demanding they lift the prohibition on women on the mountain.[118] This was accepted by the Shingon monks, with apparently one solitary voice of dissent: Unshō. Indignant, Unshō protested, but was informed by the emissary that:

> This has come from the Great Will of the present Emperor. Debating its correctness, one would be guilty of the offence of transgressing an Imperial Decree!
>
> 是れ今上陛下の大御心に出たるものにて、其是非を論ずるは違勅の罪に當たるべし。

To this Unshō replied:

> In the first place our prohibition on women on this mountain is clear in the edicts of successive Emperors. To now abolish this is against the wishes of the successive Emperors. Your Excellency, if as an emissary of the present Emperor, you deign to reproach the insolence of a daft robe[-ed monk], the daft robe[-ed monk] will, as an emissary of the successive Emperors, inquire into the offence of Your Excellency!
>
> 抑も當山の女人禁制は歴代天皇の御詔勅にも顕然たる事實にして、今更に之を撤廃するは、歴代天皇の叡旨にも脊くものなり、閣下　今上陛下の勅使として愚衲の無禮を咎むれば、愚衲は歴代天皇の勅使として閣下の罪を糺さん。
>
> (Kusanagi 1913, vol. 1, 65)

This was enough to have Unshō thrown off Mt. Kōya by members of his own lineage; his coreligionists, Jaffe tells us, "believed him to be a madman endangering the welfare of the school by directly challenging the government" (Jaffe 2001, 141).

Unshō, arguably Japan's most famous Mūlasarvāstivāda monk, was by no means a recluse. He appears to have been in communication with a number of Westerners, and here too we see at least the possibility of non-Japanese sources for the life and activities of this Mūlasarvāstivāda monk. In a letter dated July 5 Meiji 38 (1905), Unshō wrote to Admiral Zinovy Petrovich Rozhestvensky after learning of the Russian defeat at the Battle of Tsushima (Sea of Japan).[119] The let-

118. For a study of women and their role in the history of Mt. Kōya, see Mizuhara 1981b.

119. For further details on the Battle of the Sea of Japan, see Corbett 1994, vol. 2, 240–59. For an outline of the Russian Battle Squadron, see Corbett 1994, vol. 2, 194–95. The Admiral's injuries are confirmed at Corbett 1994, vol. 2, 252: "The Admiral had been wounded again in the head and legs." Pleshakov states that Russian prisioners of war were actually held in Buddhist monasteries in Kyoto (2002, 317).

ter begins with Unshō expressing the great consternation and worry with which he received the news of the Admiral's injuries sustained during the course of the recent naval battle (貴將軍閣下過般海戰の際御負傷の趣き驚愕焦慮の至りに不堪候), and contains a prayer for the Admiral's speedy recovery (貴體速に健康に被復候樣祈祷願出に任せて). It also mentions the *homa* rites performed for one week in front of the Main Image, the Fudō myōō or Acalanātha Image (本尊不動明王寶前護摩供一週間奉修抽誠候に付), and seems to refer to a protective amulet which Unshō sent (御守札贈呈候).[120] Moreover, the text also includes a Buddhist peace message; Unshō writes:

> Civilized men are not only originally all brothers of the Four Seas (that is, the whole world), but in Buddhism it is exhorted that:
>
> All men are our Fathers, all women are our Mothers. In successive rebirths, without fail, we obtain birth from them. Accordingly, the sentient beings of the Six Paths [of transmigration] are all our Fathers and Mothers.
>
> 文明の人士にありては固より四海兄弟なるのみならず、佛教に於ては一切男子是我父。一切女人是我母。 我生生無不從之受生。故六道衆生皆是我父母と教誡せられたり。 (Kusanagi 1913, vol. 2, 403–404)

The quotation is not identified by Unshō, but is undoubtedly taken from the *Brahmā Net Sūtra*, an important text on bodhisattva precepts.[121]

Unshō seems to have also meet with, amongst others, Pfoundes (1890), Edwin Arnold (July, 1892), Ernest M. Bowden (August, 1892), and Dharmapāla (November, 1893).[122] At fifty-six years of age he travelled (移錫) to Tōji 東寺 in Kyoto and petitioned (上奏) to perform the *Goshichinichi mishuho* 後七日御修法.[123] At age fifty-seven he gave a Dharma Talk 法話 at the Palace (御殿) of Prince Kuninomiya Asahiko 久邇宮朝彦 (1824–1891) and was able to finally establish the Assembly of Ten Good [Precepts] (*jūzenkai* 十善會). The prince was asked to serve as the head (上首を仰ぎ), a position which he accepted on 15 November 1883, and Unshō was commissioned by Prince Asahiko as Preceptor of the Assembly of Ten Good [Precepts] (嘱託択十善會戒師).

In 1869 Unshō met with Ugai (?) Tetsujō 徹定 of Jōkokuji 淨國寺 and assisted in the founding of the Organization of United Buddhist Lineages (*shoshū dōtoku kaimei* 諸宗道徳会盟).[124] In 1887 he established a *Vinaya* School (戒律學校) in

120. Unfortunately it seems that much of Admiral Rozhestvensky's correspondence was destroyed during his captivity (personal communication with Prof. Constantine Pleshakov, 19 April 2003).

121. On the *Brahmā Net Sūtra*, see Groner 1990. For the *sūtra*, see T 1484, 1006b10–11.

122. Note that Kusanagi 1913, vol. 2 contains much of Unshō's correspondence. In vol. 3 diaries, writings on precepts, and other miscellaneous writings are to be found in abundance. Unshō's correspondence is particularly invaluable as it provides further evidence of the truly international range of his activities.

123. On this ceremony, see Ruppert 2000.

124. See Ketelaar 1990; Jaffe 2001, 155.

Tokyo, which was later renamed Mejiro Sōen 目白僧園 (Mejiro Monastic Complex) in May of 1890.[125] At the request of one of his main lay sponsors, Aoki Teizō 青木貞三 (1861–1889), Unshō began to translate Buddhist texts into Japanese, which was felt to be more readily accessible than the traditional *kanbun* or Classical Chinese used by monastic specialists (Tsunemitsu 1968–1969, vol. 1, 86). This marked the beginning of the long translation process of the Chinese Buddhist Canon which was to culminate in the *Kokuyaku issaikyō* 國譯一切經 series—a translation process that is now, at least in part, being restarted to make a number of these now relatively inaccessible century-old translations available to modern readers.[126]

In 1890 the Jūzenkai began to publish a journal entitled *Jūzen hōkutsu* 十善寶窟 which seems to have continued up until at least 1942.[127] Although earlier issues are not readily available (at least not outside Japan), an index to the table of contents has been published which affords us a glimpse of the organization's activities. We note, for instance, that at least two texts by *Vinaya* Master Gakunyo (1716–1773) appear, presumably in sections, over issues 25 to 101.[128] The contributors to the journal also include Anesaki [Masaharu?] 姉崎[正治?] (1873–1949), Sawayanagi Seitarō 澤柳政太郎 (1865–1927),[129] Takakusu [Junjirō?] 高楠[順次郎?] (1866–1945), Chandra Mitra, Hase Hōshū 長谷寶秀 (1869–1948), and *Vinaya* Master Ryūō 隆應 (1856–1926).[130]

One contribution by Shaku Ryōkai 釋良海 in 1905, which as Miyake Moritsune has pointed out would seem to be a polemic reference to the Russo-Japanese war, is perhaps worth noting (Miyake 1978, 283). The passage suggests

125. Unshō seems to have been an important figure in early education reforms within Japan. Among his publications are a number on education: *Dainippon kokkyōron* 大日本国教論; *Kokumin kyōiku no hōshin* 国民教育の方針; and *Kyōiku chokugo gige* 教育勅語義解 (Saitō 1979, 16–17).

126. See, for instance, the Gendaigoyaku "Agon kyōten" 現代語訳「阿含経典」 series published by Hirakawa Shuppan (here I wish to thank one of the translators, Prof. Karashima Seishi, for kindly presenting me with volume four of this series). Note also that Kawaguchi Ekai, who was later to travel to Tibet, is said to have commented that as the Chinese canon is difficult for most people to read, a translation into plain Japanese is a desideratum (Tsunemitsu 1968–1969, vol. 2, 206). When planning his trip to Tibet, Kawaguchi met with Shaku Kōzen (Tsunemitsu 1968–1969, vol. 2, 207). On the history of the Chinese canons, in addition to the usual sources, see also the excellent bibliography by Nozawa Yoshimi (1993). Note also Taishō issaikyō kankōkai, ed. 1925, *Hōbō ryūei* 法寶留影.

127. Waseda Chūō library reports holdings up to issue 620 (1942).

128. Gakunyo's *Bonmōkyō bunju gakkai* 梵網經分受學海 appears over issues 24–35 & 40–45; *Taihin hōwa* 對賓法話 in 82, and 84–101. See MSMS, vols. 91–92.

129. Sawayanagi Seitarō seems to have been the chancellor of Kyōto Imperial University, and the first chancellors of both Tōhoku Imperial University and Taishō University. For further details see, among others, Saitō 1979, 128–29.

130. Note that the identification of these individuals is tentative. The tables of content do not always give full names; usually only surnames and titles are given. On Ryūō, and for a portrait, see Mizuhara 1932, 501–504. Note that Ryūō studied, among others, the *Kośa* under Saeki Kyokuga at Sen'yūji 泉涌寺, and **Vinaya* (or perhaps precepts [戒學]) under Unshō.

the use of Buddhist doctrine (the Ten Precepts) in order to promulgate a decidedly nationalistic viewpoint (MIYAKE 1978, 283):

> They brandish brute force and plunder others' territories (theft), massacre the natives (killing of sentient beings), violate the women (illicit sexual activity), break international laws (lies), prevaricate in speech (idle talk), assemble arms and issue seditious communiques to third countries (evil speech), do not observe previously [一反 *ittan*] ratified treaties (double-tongued), give rein to greed which knows no bounds [like] hyenas and wolves (greed), and ultimately having swallowed up Manchuria and having devoured Korea, they are about to turn their clutches (claws and fangs) towards our country. Are they not unquestionably disturbers of the global Ten Good [Precepts]?
>
> 彼は蛮力を振ひ禁りに人の国土を刼め（偸盗）土人を殺戮し（殺生）婦女を辱め（邪婬）国際的条規を破壊し（妄語）言を左右に托して（綺語）兵戈を準備し第三国に反間の通牒を送り（悪口）一反批準の条規を守らず（両舌）豺狼厭くなきの慳貪（慳貪）を逞ふし、遂に満州を呑み朝鮮を食い施して我国に其爪牙を向けんとす、炳に彼は世界的十善の攪乱者にあらずや。

The success of the movement, of course, is difficult to gauge, but one issue of their journal reports some twenty or so branches and seven thousand members (issue 141, p. 46; cited in MIYAKE 1978, 282).[131] Indeed, a systematic study of this organization, including their publications, would seem to be a desideratum.[132]

Perhaps one of Unshō's most famous students was his nephew Shaku Kōzen 釋興然 (1849–1924).[133] Unshō had heard from an Indian visiting Japan that Bodh Gayā was in a state of disrepair. Unshō himself wished to travel to this sacred Buddhist site, but instead sent his young nephew, Kōzen. In preparation for his sojourn, Kōzen met with, amongst others, Nanjō Bun'yū 南条文雄 (1849–1927) who in 1884 had returned home to Japan from his studies under Max Müller (1823–1900). Nanjō, the first Japanese to receive the degree of Doctor of Letters (文学博士) from the Japanese Ministry of Education, gave Kōzen a crash course in Sanskrit before he left. Kōzen arrived in Ceylon in 1886 where he seems to have stayed until his later ordination as a *bhikkhu* in 1890.[134] Kōzen thus became Japan's first Theravāda *bhikkhu* in the 1,300 years since the introduction of Buddhism to Japan (HIGASHIMOTO 1970, 175–76; TSUNEMITSU 1968–1969, vol. 1, 375–76). Kōzen took the name Guṇaratna, and travelled to India

131. Issue 21 (1891) reports the admission of the widow of a French General Louis Bastian (?) (ルエス・バステアン).

132. I have been able to do little more than garner a few quotations from secondary sources, and extrapolate from the widely available tables of content (MSMS, vols. 91–92).

133. Kōzen is read Kōnen by JAFFE 2001 and TSUNEMITSU 1968–1969. HIGASHIMOTO 1970, KUSANAGI 1913, etc., give Kōzen.

134. The doctorate was conferred on the seventh of June, 1888 (TSUNEMITSU 1968–1969, vol. 1, 251).

with one Tokuzawa Chiezō 徳澤知惠藏 (1871–1908) who had stopped in Ceylon on his way to attend the fifteenth convention of Henry Olcott's Theosophical Society in Madras. They were apparently joined by Dharmapāla who was later to found the Mahā Bodhi Society. Unshō had sent one thousand yen to Kōzen, and equal amounts were apparently forthcoming from Siam (Thailand), Ceylon (Sri Lanka), and Burma (Myanmar) in order to facilitate the purchase of the great Stūpa of Bodh Gayā to return it to Buddhist hands. The sale, however, did not eventuate and Kōzen returned to Ceylon. Kōzen, however, was certainly not the last Japanese monk to visit South East Asia. Among others, Shaku Sōen 釋宗演 (1859–1919)—under whom Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870–1966) was later to train—studied for three years in Sri Lanka.[135]

As we have seen the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival in the Tokugawa period had ramifications stretching at least as far down as the Meiji, and possibly farther. In 1884, at a Shingonshū congress, Tōji 東寺 was declared to be an official training monastery (根本道場), and it was further agreed that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* was to be used instead of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*. An official protest, however, was lodged by Shōhen 照遍 (1828–1907) who wished to use the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* (Ueda Reijō 1978a, 19). What eventually became of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in Japan, however, is not entirely clear. Any study wishing to address its later developments, and perhaps even its fate, would surely do well to trace the Jūzenkai, and the Meijiro Sōen established by Unshō. Additionally, developments on Kōyasan itself, and at Fukuōji will obviously need to be taken into consideration. The comments by Inaya Yūsen, however, certainly suggest at least the possibility that the tradition may have existed, in some circles, down to recent times. As we have seen, Inaya expressed hesitation in regard to a request for ordination in 1987 as he did not feel sufficiently confident in the tradition of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. This led him to consult Gakunyo's text of 1759 held at Fukuōji. This, of course, suggests that a *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* tradition was, at least to some degree, still known as recently as 1987. That the—or at least one of the—officiants at this ordination was not at ease with the tradition, that he felt compelled to consult a two-century-old text, a text which he had to travel from Kōyasan to Hiroshima to consult, certainly suggests that the tradition—*if* still living at this time—was by no means flourishing. That the tradition was still alive, however, would also seem to be confirmed by the comments of Asai Kakuchō. Asai states, with regard to the three Mūlasarvāstivāda training temples, that at Shinbessho the *Vinaya* tradition and ordinations therein

135. On Sōen, see Tsunemitsu 1968–1969, vol. 1, 212–22. In fact, Ueda Tenzui (1899–1974), to whom we owe so much of our knowledge of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* revival, himself travelled to Thailand and Burma, and was ordained there in 1943. For a detailed account of his travels and daily life as a *bhikkhu* in Burma for three months, see his *Nanpō Bukkyō shūgakuki* 南方仏教修学記 (1950) reprinted in Ueda Tenzui 1976, 343–435.

continue even down to the present day (1987).[136] This, of course, would seem to warrant further investigation, but it seems highly likely that at least until 1987—and perhaps even still today—the effects of the initial Tokugawa revival of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* were still being very much felt at Kōyasan.[137]

What we have seen was—at least in the Tokugawa period—a living, and thriving monastic community of Japanese monks who identified themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādin. The diaries and digests of Myōzui, for example, provide detailed insights into his lecturing schedule, his own personal reading habits, and his literary activities. They also suggest a Mūlasarvāstivādin sectarian affiliation of at least one text: the *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya *Mātṛkā*. Furthermore, his sermons delivered to large crowds, and his long and arduous travels seem to suggest that at least Myōzui's Buddhism was anything but degenerate or corrupt. Similarly, in the works of Gakunyo we see an attempt to revive the long-forgotten *Vinaya* component of Kūkai's curriculum—an attempt which drew harsh criticism, and resulted in a debate which seems to have continued down to the Meiji, and perhaps even as late as 1939.[138] Gakunyo and his contemporaries produced a richly detailed commentarial tradition on the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, but their contributions were no means limited to exegetical works from the Indian (and by virtue of Yijing, Chinese) tradition. These Mūlasarvāstivādin monks also produced handbooks, and local monastic ordinances, all of which would seem to suggest that they were attempting to implement the tradition as an integral part of their monastic community. The same, of course, holds for Eigon and perhaps to a lesser degree for Unshō. Unshō seems to have been actively engaged in the promotion of the Ten Good Precepts, perhaps an early "engaged Buddhist," and as such his achievements are of a slightly different nature to the strictly monastic enterprises of his predecessors.

All in all, judging from the activities of these Mūlasarvāstivādin monks, it would seem that—at least in some circles—Buddhism was very much alive, and the monks very much active in society. Furthermore, judging from the debates over which *Vinaya* was to be followed, it would seem that *Vinaya* was in no

136. Asai 1987, 19: 寛政十三年、松尾寺龍海の時松尾寺が有部律専行の道場と認められるに至って真別所、福王寺と共に有部の三僧坊と称されるに至った（その内、真別所は現在に至るまで律制並びに授戒が続いている).

137. I am happy to report that, according to Prof. Rev. Asai Shōzen (oral communication: 20 September 2005), the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, at least in terms of ordinations, is still alive at Kongōbuji on Kōyasan and at Ninnaji.

138. Note, for example, the response by Shaku Keihō (1939b) to questions raised by Elder Kitagawa Chikai 北川智海長老 in regard to the Shingon postion on the usage of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* as espoused in Shaku Keihō 1939a. Note that even a cursory examination of the constitutions of a number of these lineages reveals that their officially recognized texts (所依の経典) are those as determined by Kūkai's *Sangakuroku* (the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is thereby legally—constitutions are legal documents—still recognized). See, for example, article three of the constitution (宗憲) of Kōyasan Shingonshū (Miyasaka 1980, 177), and article six of the constitution (宗法) of Shingonshū Chizan-ha (Miyasaka 1980, 224).

way peripheral, but in fact an integral part of the life of the Shingon monastic communities, whether they identified themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādin or Dharmaguptaka. What we have seen, then, would seem to confirm at least one thing. Although discussions of *Vinaya* in the history of Japanese monastic Buddhism usually present only a single voice, a Dharmaguptaka voice, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* was by no means a non-entity. Future studies on the role of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* in Japan will not only enrich our knowledge of Japanese *Vinaya* studies, but will also offer us a much richer and fuller—and perhaps even balanced—understanding of the history of Japanese Buddhism.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

BKDJ *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典, ed. Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙, 11 vols. (1930–1932), with supplements (vols. 12–13) edited by Maruyama Takao 丸山孝雄 (1974–1977), an additional volume 別巻 (vol. 14) entitled *Bukkyō kyōten sōron* 佛教經典總論 by Ono Genmyō (1936), and an author-title index *Choshabetsu shomei mokuroku* 著者別書名目録 (1988). Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan [first 13 vols. recently republished in a one-volume format].

DNBZ *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書, ed. Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団, 100 vols. Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan (1970–1973).

ESSS *Edo jidai shorin shuppan shoseki mokuroku shūsei* 江戸時代書林出版書籍目録集成, ed. Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Fuzoku Kenkyūjo Shidō Bunko 慶応義塾大学附属研究所斯道文庫, 4 vols. Tokyo: Inoue Shobō (1962).

KS *Kokusho sōmokuroku* 国書総目録, ed. Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 9 vols. Revised and supplemented edition. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten (1989–1991).

KTJG *Koryŏ taejanggyŏng* 高麗大藏經. 48 vols. Seoul: Tongguk University (1957–1976).

MBDJ *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典, ed. Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, 10 vols. Enlarged and corrected edition 增訂版. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai (1933–1936).

MD *Mikkyō daijiten* 密教大辭典, ed. Mikkyō Jiten Hensankai 密教辭典編纂會, 6 vols. Kyoto: Hōzōkan (1968–1970).

MSMS *Tōkyō Daigaku Hōgakubu fuzoku Meiji shinbun zasshi bunko shozō zasshi mokuji sōran* 東京大学法学部附属明治新聞雜誌文庫所蔵雜誌目次総覧, 150 vols. Tokyo: Ōzorasha (1993–1998).

SZ *Shingonshū zensho* 眞言宗全書, ed. Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai 眞言宗全書刊行會, 44 vols. Wakayama-ken, Ito-gun, Kōyasan: Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai (1933–1939).

T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭, 100 vols. [vols. 1–55 Shōzō 正藏; vols. 56–85 Zokuzō 續藏; vols. 86–97 Zuzō 圖像; vols. 98–100 Shōwa hōbō sōroku 昭和法寶總録]. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai (1924–1935).

ZSZ *Zoku shingonshū zensho* 續眞言宗全書, ed. Zoku Shingonshū Zensho Hensankai 續眞言宗全書編纂會, 42 vols. Wakayama-ken, Ito-gun, Kōyasan: Zoku Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai (1975–1988).

PRIMARY SOURCES

The following list is intended as a first attempt to identify a number of the main sources for the Mūlasarvāstivāda movement in Tokugawa Japan, and is not intended to be exhaustive. I have indicated, to the best of my knowledge, where these texts are to be located. "Reported" manuscript holdings, however, are just that: reported. These remain unconfirmed and the texts unseen by the present author. The collection, preservation, and publication of these texts remains an urgent desideratum. For texts that I have been able to directly consult, the edition consulted is cited. As these are more or less accessible, more comprehensive holding details have not been given.

Geishū Kinkisan Fukuōji sōsei 藝州金龜山福王寺僧制. 1784 [?]. Gakunyo 學如 [?] (1716–1773). Available from Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan 国文学研究資料館.

Ben Kyokushō sōro hen 弁旭照霜露編. Gakunyo (1716–1773). Reported at Kōyasan University.

Daranishū shogaku ubu ritsugi 陀羅尼宗所学有部律儀. 1793. Ryūkai 龍海 (1756–1820). Microfilm available from Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan.

Entsūji ruidai senshi kako meibo 圓通寺累代先師過去名簿. 1836. Ryūchin 隆鎭 (1783–1854). In ZSZ, vol. 35, 655–58.

Geishū Fukuōji Gakunyo bandai bukei 藝州福王寺學如畔睇奉啓. 1759. Gakunyo (1716–1773). Mimeograph edition (Hase Hōshū 長谷寶秀, ed., Kyoto: Kyōto Senmon Gakkō 京都專門學校, 1934). Available at UCLA (Toganoo Collection).

Himitsu [ichijō] shira ganzui 秘密[一乘]尸邏眼髓. 1767. Jissō 實相. Reported at Kōyasan Kōngōzanmaiin 金剛三昧院, and Kōyasan University.

Inabadō kō hokke egi ki 因幡堂講法花會義記. 1756. Myōzui 妙瑞 (1696–1764). Reported at Entsūji 圓通寺.

Kandō Sajimon shiku yōshū 冠導作持門詞句要集. 1890. Saeki Kyokuga 佐伯旭雅 (1828–1891). Published edition available from Ryūkoku University & digital format from http://kindai.ndl.go.jp/ (accessed 28 January 2006). Microfiche available from National Diet Library.

Kii zokufūdoki Kōyasan 紀伊續風土記高野山. Anon. In ZSZ, vols. 36–40.

Kiryūzu Jōtō shōnin ni tsutsushimite kotaeru 恭答亀龍主常塔上人. Gakunyo (1716–1773). Mimeograph edition (Hase Hōshū, ed., Kyoto: Kyōto Senmon Gakkō, 1934). Available at UCLA (Toganoo Collection).

Kishū isaka kōen hokke ki 紀州井坂講演法花記. 1746. Myōzui (1696–1764). Reported at Entsūji.

Kumedera kōen ki 久米寺講演記. 1750. Myōzui (1696–1764). Reported at Entsūji.

Kyokushō sōro hen 旭照霜露編. 1768. Jissō 實相. Reported at Kōyasan Hōkiin 寶龜院, Kōyasan Kōngōzanmaiin 金剛三昧院, Ryūkoku University, and Kōyasan University.

Misshū gakuroku dōmon 密宗学録童問. Hōmyō 法明 (1706–1763). Reported at Enmeiji 延命寺.

Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi 密宗所学有部律園清規. 1884. Eigon 榮嚴 (1814–1900). Published edition available from Ōtani University & digital format from http://kindai.ndl.go.jp/ (accessed 28 January 2006).

Nyū tanshū yu ki 入但州湯記. 1758. Myōzui (1696–1764). Reported at Entsūji.

Risshō kōroku 律摂講録. Anon. 3 vols. Held at Ryūkoku University.

Sajimon shiku yōshū 作持門詞句要集. 1800. Tōkū 等空 (1745–1816). Reported at Ryūkoku University, and National Diet Library.

Sanshū kōen ki 讃州講演記. 1747. Myōzui (1696–1764). Reported at Entsūji.

Setsuissaiubu risshō 説一切有部律攝. 1764. Gakunyo (1716–1773). Annotated edition of Yijing's 義淨 (635–713) translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṃgraha*. 5 vols. Held at Ryūkoku University.

Shakuben yūroku 釋辨囿録. 1799. Chimyō 智明 (1736–1813). Microfilm available from National Diet Library (microfiche); also reported at Kōyasan University, Kōyasan Kōngōzanmaiin 金剛三昧院, and Tōyō University.

Shingon hasso ubu jukai mondō 眞言八祖有部受戒問答. 1766. Gakunyo (1716–1773). Mimeograph edition (Hase Hōshū, ed., Kyoto: Kyōto Senmon Gakkō, 1934). Available at UCLA (Toganoo Collection).

Shingon ritsugyō mondō 眞言律行問答. 1759. Gakunyo (1716–1773). Mimeograph edition (Hase Hōshū, ed., Kyoto: Kyōto Senmon Gakkō, 1934). Available at UCLA (Toganoo Collection).

Tōbu kōen hokke ki 東武講演法華記. 1751. Myōzui (1696–1764). Reported at Entsūji.

Ubu hyōmoku 有部標目. Myōzui (1696–1764). Reported at Entsūji.

Ubu ritsu igyō mondō 有部律異形問答. Mitsumon 密門 (d. 1788). Reported at Shinbessho.

Ubu zuigyō jutai yōki 有部隨行受體要軌. 1804 (?). Mōkai 猛海. Microfilm available from Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan; 1804 edition reported at Ryūkoku University.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abé Ryūichi

1999 *The Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.

ASAI Kakuchō 浅井覺超

1987 Eigon wajō cho "Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi" ni tsuite: sono ichi 栄厳和上著『密宗所学有部律園清規』について—その一. *Mikkyō gakkaihō* 26: 17–42.

1988 Eigon wajō cho "Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi" ni tsuite: sono ni その二. *Mikkyō gakkaihō* 27: 138–67.

1989 Eigon wajō cho "Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi" ni tsuite: sono san その三. *Mikkyō gakkaihō* 28: 40–59.

1990 Eigon wajō cho "Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi" ni tsuite: sono yon その四. *Mikkyō gakkaihō* 29: 44–68.

1991 Eigon wajō cho "Misshū shogaku uburitsuon shingi" ni tsuite: sono go その五. *Mikkyō gakkaihō* 30: 50–76.

1992 *Shingonshū jikiji sahō kaisetsu* 真言宗食時作法解説. Wakayama, Kōyachō: Kōyasan Shuppansha.

1993 "Shingonshū jikiji sahō kaisetsu" hoi 『真言宗食時作法解説』補遺. *Mikkyō gakkaihō* 32: 50–63.

ASAI Shōzen 浅井證善

2003 *Shingonshū no shingi* 真言宗の清規. Wakayama-ken: Kōyasan Shuppan.

2005 *Bessho Eigon wajō den* 別所栄厳和上伝. Osaka: Tōhō Shuppan.

BIANCHI, Ester

2001 *The Iron Statue Monastery "Tiexiangsi": A Buddhist Nunnery of Tibetan Tradition in Contemporary China*. Firenze: L. S. Olschki.

CHUNG, Jin-il

2002 Sanskrit-Fragmente des sogenannten Daśādhyāya-Vinaya aus Zentralasien eine vorläufige Auflistung. In *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen IV*, ed. Chung, Jin-il, Claus Vogel, and Klaus Wille, 77–104. Vol. 9. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupert.

CLARKE, Shayne

2000 The existence of the supposedly non-existent *Śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī*: A new perspective on *Pārājika* penance. *Bukkyō kenkyū* 29: 149–76.

2001 The *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Muktaka* 根本説一切有部目得迦. *Bukkyō kenkyū* 30: 81–107.

2002 The *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya*: A brief reconnaissance report. In *Sakurabe Hajime hakase kijukinen ronshū: Shoki Bukkyō kara abidaruma e* 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集—初期仏教からアビダルマへ, 45–63. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

2004 *Vinaya Mātṛkā*—Mother of the monastic codes, or just another set of lists? A response to Frauwallner's handling of the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47/2: 77–120.

2006 Monks who have Sex. In Family Matters in Indian Monastic Buddhism. PhD Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Corbett, Julian S.

1994 *Maritime Operations in the Russo-Japanese War, 1904–1905*. 2 vols. Annapolis, Md. and Newport, R.I.: Naval Institute Press and Naval War College Press.

de la Vallée Poussin, Louis

1988–1990 *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam*. 4 vols. English translation by Leo M. Pruden. Berkeley, Calif.: Asian Humanities Press.

Geihan Tsūshi Kankōkai 藝藩通志刊行会, ed.

1967 *Geihan tsūshi* 藝藩通志. 5 vols. Hiroshima: Geihan Tsūshi Kankōkai.

Gernet, Jacques

1995 *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*. Translated by Franciscus Verellen. New York: Columbia University Press.

Groner, Paul

1990 The *Fan-wan ching* and monastic discipline in Japanese Tendai: A study of Annen's *Futsū jubosatsukai kōshaku*. In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Buswell, Robert E., 251–90. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hase Hōshū 長谷寶秀

1997 (1935) Shingon ubu-ritsu ni tsuite 真言有部律について. In *Hase Hōshū zenshū*, ed. Shuchiin Daigaku Mikkyō Shiryō Kenkyūjo 種智院大学密教資料研究所, 135–37. Vol. 1. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Hase Hōshū, ed.

1974 *Jiun sonja zenshū* 慈雲尊者全集. 19 vols. 2nd ed. Kyoto: Shibunkaku.

Hashimoto Kaizen 橋本快全

1936 Meiji, Taishō, Shōwa Shingonshū kankō tosho mokuroku 明治・大正・昭和 眞言宗刊行圖書目録. *Mikkyō kenkyū* 60: 1–38. (Renumbered after 364)

Higashimoto Keiki 東元慶喜

1970 Gunaratana Shaku Kōzen no nanpō sōdan ishoku no jigyō グナラタナ釈興然の南方僧団移植の事業. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 19/1: 174–78.

1990 Waga kuni ni okeru jōzabu Bukkyō kenkyū no kako to shōrai わが国における上座部仏教研究の過去と将来. In *Pāri bunkagaku no sekai: Mizuno Kōgen hakase beiju kinen ronshū* パーリ文化学の世界—水野弘元博士米寿記念論集, ed. Mizuno Kōgen hakase beiju kinenkai 水野弘元博士米寿記念会, 453–66. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

Hirata Shōji 平田昌司

1995 Tōdai shōsetsushi ni okeru *Konponsetsu issaiubu ritsu* 唐代詳説史における根本説一切有部律. *Chūgoku bungakuhō* 50: 44–54.

INAYA Yūsen 稲谷祐宣

1972 Kōyasan Jōren'in Shingen o megutte 高野山成蓮院真源をめぐって. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 21/1: 283–87.

1987a Aki Fukuōji to Gakunyo wajō (1) 安芸福王寺と学如和尚(一). *Kōyasan jihō* 2481 (November 11): 4–5.

1987b Aki Fukuōji to Gakunyo wajō (2): Gakunyo no chosaku ni tsuite 安芸福王寺と学如和尚(二)—学如の著作について. *Kōyasan jihō* 2483 (December 1): 4–5.

1987c Aki Fukuōji to Gakunyo wajō (3): Gakunyo no chosaku ni tsuite 安芸福王寺と学如和尚(三)—学如の著作について. *Kōyasan jihō* 2484 (December 11): 2–3.

INAYA Yūsen, ed.

1990 *Shingonshū jukai sahō sōsho* 真言宗授戒作法叢書. 7 vols. Osaka: Seizansha.

ISHII Ryōsuke 石井良助, ed.

1981 *Tokugawa kinreikō* 徳川禁令考. Vol. 5. Tokyo: Sōbunsha.

ITŌ Hiromi 伊藤宏見

1975 Unshō risshi no shisō to kōdō 雲照律師の思想と行動. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 23/2: 435–38.

IWAMOTO Yutaka 岩本裕

1988 Sarvāstivādin (setsuissaiubu) to Mūlasarvāstivādin (konponsetsuissaiubu): Śroṇakoṭikarṇa no densetsu o tēma ni shite [Sarvāstivādin (説一切有部) と Mūlasarvāstivādin (根本説一切有部)—Śroṇakoṭikarṇaの伝説をテーマにして]. In *Iwamoto Yutaka chosakushū* 岩本裕著作集. Vol. 1, 126–36. Kyoto: Dōhōsha.

JAFFE, Richard M.

2001 *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

KATSUMATA Shunkyō 勝又俊教, ed.

1970 *Kōbō daishi chosaku zenshū* 弘法大師著作全集. Vol. 2. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

KAWAGUCHI Kōfū 川口高風

1989 Tainin risshi no "Bonmōkyō yōge" no shisei to ronsō 諦忍律師の『梵網経要解』の姿勢と論争. *Nihon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 55: 249–65.

1990 Tainin risshi to Shunpō Myōzui to no ronsō (jō) 諦忍律師と俊鳳妙瑞との論争(上). *Zen kenkyūjo kiyō* 18–19: 161–74.

1991 Tainin risshi to Shunpō Myōzui to no ronsō (chū) (中). *Zen kenkyūjo kiyō* 20: 129–62.

1994 Tainin risshi to Shunpō Myōzui to no ronsō (ge) (下). *Zen kenkyūjo kiyō* 23: 63–91.

1995 *Tainin risshi kenkyū* 諦忍律師研究. 2 vols. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Ketelaar, James Edward
1990 *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kindai Sakka Yōgo Kenkyūkai Kyōiku Gijutsu Kenkyūjo 近代作家用語研究会教育技術研究所, ed.
1986 *Natsume Sōseki: Sakuhin ichiran zengo shutsugen dosūhyō* 夏目漱石—作品一覧全語出現度数表. Vol. 15 (*bekkan* 別巻). Sakka yōgo sakuin 作家用語索引. Tokyo: Kyōikusha.

Kishimoto, Hideo, ed.
1956 *Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era*. Translated by John F. Howes. Tokyo: Ōbunsha.

Kishimoto, Hideo, and Tsuneya Wakimoto
1956 Religion during Tokugawa. In Kishimoto, ed., 3–33.

Kitsudō Masahiro 橘堂正弘
1989 Gendai Suriranka no butsudō to kairitsu: Katikāvata seitei no haikei 現代スリランカの仏道と戒律—Katikāvata制定の背景. *Nihon Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* 54: 95–106.

Kusanagi Zengi 草繋全宜
1913 *Shaku Unshō* 釋雲照. 3 vols. Tokyo: Tokukyōkai.

Masutani, Fumio, and Yoshimichi Undō
1956 Buddhism. In Kishimoto, ed., 101–69.

Matsunaga, Daigan, and Alicia Matsunaga
1974 *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*. 2 vols. Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International.

Minowa Kenryō 蓑輪顕量
1999 *Chūsei shoki nanto kairitsu fukkō no kenkyū* 中世初期南都戒律復興の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Miyake Moritsune 三宅守常
1978 Meiji Bukkyō ni okeru jūzenkai no mondai 明治仏教における十善戒の問題. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 26/2: 281–84.

Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝
1958 Mikkyō kana hōgo no shiryō (1) 密教仮名法語の資料(一). *Mikkyō bunka* 41–42: 23–42.
1959 Mikkyō kana hōgo no shiryō (2). *Mikkyō bunka* 43–44: 32–48.

Miyasaka Yūshō, ed.
1980 *Nihon Bukkyō kiso kōza: Shingonshū* 日本仏教基礎講座—真言宗. Vol. 3. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.

Miyoshi Ryūkan 三好龍肝
1976 *Shingon Mikkyō Reiunji-ha kankei bunken kaidai* 真言密教霊雲寺派関係文献解題. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

MIZUHARA Gyōei 水原堯榮

1931 *Kōyasan kenzon zōkyō mokuroku* 高野山見存藏經目録. Vol. 2. Kōyasan gakushi 高野山學志. Tokyo: Morie Shoten.

1932 *Kōyaban no kenkyū* 高野版之研究. Vol. 1. Kōyasan gakushi. Tokyo: Morie Shoten.

1981a Kōyaban no kenkyū 高野版の研究. In NAKAGAWA, 1–74.

1981b Josei to Kōyasan 女性と高野山. In NAKAGAWA, 241–329.

MŌRI Yū 毛利悠

1973 Kyōgaku no imi to yakuwari: Takanawa Bukkyō Daigaku haishi hantai undō o megutte 教学の意味と役割—高輪仏教大学廃止反対運動をめぐって. *Shinshū kenkyūkai kiyō* 4: 17–40.

1975 Honganji kyōdan kindaika no dōkō: Takanawa Bukkyō Daigaku haishi o megutte 本願寺教団近代化の動向—高輪仏教大学廃止をめぐって. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 23/2: 152–53.

NAKAGAWA Zenkyō 中川善教, ed.

1981 *Mizuhara Gyōei zenshū* 水原堯榮全集. Vol. 1. Kyoto: Dōhōsha.

NAKAMURA Hajime 中村元 et al., eds.

1989 *Iwanami Bukkyō jiten* 岩波仏教辞典. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

NATSUME Sōseki 夏目漱石

1938 *Wagahai wa neko de aru* 吾輩は猫である. 2 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

NOZAWA Yoshimi 野沢佳美, ed.

1993 *Daizōkyō kankei kenkyū bunken mokuroku* 大蔵経関係研究文献目録. Risshō daigaku tōyōshi kenkyūshiryō 立正大学東洋史研究資料, 5. Tokyo: Risshō Daigaku Tōyōshi Kenkyūshitsu.

PLESHAKOV, Constantine

2002 *The Tsar's Last Armada: The Epic Journey to the Battle of Tsushima*. New York: Basic Books.

RIGGS, David E.

2002 The Rekindling of a Tradition: Menzan Zuihō and the Reform of Japanese Sōtō Zen in the Tokugawa Era. PhD Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

RUPPERT, Brian

2000 *Jewel in the Ashes: Buddha Relics and Power in Early Medieval Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center and Harvard University Press.

SAITŌ Akitoshi 斎藤昭俊

1968 Shaku Unshō to kyōiku 釈雲照と教育. *Chizan gakuhō* 31: 1–39.

1979 *Bukkyō kyōiku jiten* 仏教教育辞典. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

Saitō Akitoshi and Naruse Yoshinori 成瀬良徳, eds.
1988 *Nihon Bukkyō shūha jiten* 日本仏教宗派事典. Tokyo: Shinjinbutsu Ōraisha.

Satomichi Norio 里道徳雄
1990 Meiji ishin ni okeru Bukkyō: Unshō to Kōsen 明治維新に於ける佛教—雲照と洪川. *Ōkurayama ronshū* 28: 45–81.

Schopen, Gregory
1994 Doing business for the Lord: Lending on interest and written loan contracts in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114: 527–54.
2001 Dead monks and bad debts: Some provisions of a Buddhist monastic inheritance law. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44: 99–148.
2002 Counting the Buddha and the local Spirits in: A monastic ritual of inclusion for the rain retreat. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30: 359–88.
2004 On Buddhist monks and dreadful deities: Some monastic devices for updating the Dharma. In *Gedenkschrift J. W. de Jong* (Studia Philologica Buddhica. Monograph Series XVII), ed. Hara, M., and H. W. Bodewitz, 161–84. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Seeley, Christopher
1991 *A History of Writing in Japan*. Leiden & New York: E.J. Brill.

Shaku Keihō 釋啓峰
1939a "Konponsetsuissaiubu risshō" josetsu 『根本説一切有部律攝』序説. *Mikkyō kenkyū* 69: 18–36.
1939b Tōshōdaiji wajō no shitsugi ni kotaeru (?) 答唐招提寺和尚之質疑. *Mikkyō kenkyū* 71: 56.
1940 Ubu risshō gaisetsu 有部律攝概説. *Mikkyō kenkyū* 72: 48–69.

Shimono Iwata 下野岩太
1986 *Fukuōji sansaku (jō)* 福王寺散策(上). Vol. 10. Kyōdo shiwa 郷土史話. Hiroshima, Asakita-ku, Kabe: n.p.

Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, ed.
1925 *Hōbō ryūei* 法寶留影. Tokyo: Daiyūkaku.

Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄
1987 *Nihon Bukkyōshi: Kinsei* 日本仏教史—近世. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助
1969–1970 *Nihon Bukkyōshi* 日本佛教史. 10 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Tokuda Myōhon 徳田明本
1969 *Risshū gairon* 律宗概論. Kyōto: Hyakkaen.
1974 *Risshū bunken mokuroku* 律宗文献目録. Kyoto: Hyakkaen.

Tsunemitsu Kōnen 常光浩然
1968–1969 *Meiji no Bukkyōsha* 明治の仏教者. 2 vols. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

UEDA Kakujō 上田覺城, ed.
1930–1932 *Shōhen wajō zenshū* 照遍和尚全集. 6 vols. Osaka, Minami Kawachi-gun: Shōhen Wajō Zenshū Kankōkai.

UEDA Reijō 上田霊城
1976 Edo Bukkyō no kairitsu shisō (1) 江戸仏教の戒律思想 (一). *Mikkyō bunka* 115: 24–40.
1977 Edo Bukkyō no kairitsu shisō (2). *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 9: 147–78.
1978a Shōhen wajō: Sono shōgai to shisō 照遍和尚—その生涯と思想. *Mikkyō bunka* 125/3: 1–23.
1978b Shōhen wajō: Sono shōgai to shisō (zoku) (続). *Mikkyō bunka* 126/4: 29–50.

UEDA Tenzui 上田天瑞
1932 Ubu ritsu ni tsuite 有部律について. *Mikkyō kenkyū* 46: 1–24.
1939a Myōzui wajō to ubu ritsu 妙瑞和尚と有部律. *Mikkyō kenkyū* 69: 1–17.
1939b Shingonritsu to sono keitō 眞言律と其の系統. *Nihon Bukkyōgaku kyōkai nenpō* 日本佛教學協會年報 11: 118–43. [Numbering is somewhat confusing: 11th annual issue (第十一年) for the academic year Shōwa 13 (1928) (昭和十三年度) published in Shōwa 14 (1929)]
1940 *Kairitsu shisōshi* 戒律思想史. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
1976 *Kairitsu no shisō to rekishi* 戒律の思想と歴史. Wakayama, Kōyachō: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo.
1993 Shingonritsu to sono keitō 真言律と其の系統. In *Kairitsu no sekai* 戒律の世界, Mori Shōji 森 章司, ed., 831–52. Tokyo: Keisuisha.

WASHIO Junkyō 鷲尾順敬, ed.
1929 *Kokubun tōhō Bukkyō sōsho* 國文東方佛教叢書. Vol. 2. 2nd Series. Tokyo: Tōhō Shoin.

WATT, Paul Brooks
1982 Jiun Sonja (1718–1804): Life and Thought. PhD Dissertation, Columbia University.
1999 Shingon's Jiun Sonja and his "*Vinaya* of the True Dharma." In *Religions of Japan in Practice*, ed. Tanabe, George J. Jr., 71–77. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

WILLIAMS, Duncan Ryūken
2006 Religion in Early Modern Japan. In *Nanzan Guide to Japanese Religions*, ed. Swanson, Paul L., and Clark Chilson, 184–201. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

YUKITAKE Zen'in 行武善胤, comp.
1916 *Reiun sōsho kaidai* 靈雲叢書解題. Tokyo: Heigo Shuppansha.