

Article

Sources of Japanese Buddhist Philosophy of Education: Saichō (最澄, 766/7–822) on Study, Reflection, and Cultivation

Ryotaro Kusumoto 

Graduate School of Advanced Integrated Studies in Human Survivability, Kyoto University,
Kyoto 606-8501, Japan; kusumoto.ryotaro.68w@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract: Recent studies on the Buddhist threefold wisdom model and its suggested potentialities have warranted a rediscovery of the model in different historical and cultural contexts. Saichō (最澄, 766/7–822), founder of Japanese Tendai Buddhism, references the three wisdoms in his documents outlining the Tendai monastic education curriculum. Through modification of translation and analysis of related original texts by Saichō, and an interview with the current dean of the Tendai monastic education institution, this paper aims to (1) uncover Sino-Japanese history of expressions of threefold wisdom and Buddhist education, (2) clarify the content of Saichō's curriculum, and (3) examine the role of compassion in said curriculum. This paper argues that the threefold wisdom served as a foundational framework of Saichō's education; he envisioned that his graduates would develop into religious leaders of the nation who would benefit all sentient beings through their own training, preaching the Dharma, and contributing to social work. At the same time, it became clear that compassionate attitudes were considered to be fundamental to all practices of the three wisdoms at Mount Hiei, which makes Saichō's curriculum a captivating case of a theological application of the threefold wisdom.

Keywords: Saichō; threefold wisdom; education; compassion; Tendai School



Citation: Kusumoto, Ryotaro. 2022. Sources of Japanese Buddhist Philosophy of Education: Saichō (最澄, 766/7–822) on Study, Reflection, and Cultivation. *Religions* 13: 624. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13070624>

Academic Editor: Marc-Henri Deroche

Received: 16 April 2022

Accepted: 30 June 2022

Published: 6 July 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Saichō 最澄 (766/7–822), posthumously known as Dengyō Daishi 伝教大師, is popularly known for establishing the Japanese Tendai School of Buddhism and thereby is considered one of the main pillars of Heian Buddhism. The school he founded had a major impact on later Japanese Buddhism and culture, and still thrives today as a living tradition, with its head temple, Enryakuji 延暦寺, nestled at Mount Hiei. Saichō and his school are especially known for their radical split from traditional Nara Buddhist institutions. Paul Groner's (2000) study on Saichō, *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, thoroughly illustrates the institutional difference by focusing on the establishment of the Tendai ordination system and the school's own understanding of the precepts, and thus it has served as a foundational study in the Anglo-American scholarship. Within the book, Groner translates a collection of petitions sent to the Heian court authored by Saichō, known as the *Sange gakushōshiki* 山家学生式. The petitions are seen as concise expressions of Saichō's educational thought and guidelines for the detailed applications of his curriculum (Mori 1971, p. 138). Although Groner extensively translates and discusses the petitions and other related documents, his discussions focus mainly on Saichō's efforts to establish Tendai's own ordination system. Certainly, Groner's contributions to the study of Japanese Tendai and its doctrinal issues are immense. Yet, for our concerns, he has not dealt extensively with the educational component of Saichō's thought. The significance of Saichō's educational thought has been discussed in a number of Japanese literature but has been less observed in English literature; along with Groner, Hazama Jikō (1987, pp. 111–12) introduces us to *Sange gakushōshiki*, but does not discuss its significance further.

Upon exploration of the *Sange gakushōshiki*, we see that Saichō strictly constructed his curriculum based on the threefold wisdom model, a Buddhist model for the development of wisdom. Buddhist traditions have articulated the threefold model of (1) study (or listening), (2) reflection, and (3) cultivation as a “paradigmatic model” that integrates logical reasoning and lived experience; in the recent recontextualization of the model by Deroche (2021b), the potentiality of the model in the context of modern education has been persuasively argued. By rediscovering Saichō’s pedagogical scheme, we resituate the threefold model of wisdom development as a Buddhist philosophy of education, one that dynamically integrates study and practice for the purpose of realizing wisdom and benefiting the common populace.

There are three aims I intend to accomplish in this article: (1) rediscovering and providing a general overview of the historic expression of the threefold wisdom model in Sino-Japanese history, and situating the integrative pedagogy of study and practice as central to Japanese education; (2) illustrating the educational thought of Saichō detailed in *Sange gakushōshiki*, with emphasis on his reference to the threefold development of wisdom; and (3) elucidating the attitudinal role of compassion in the curriculum. By first providing a general overview, I demonstrate the unique nature of Saichō’s holistic curriculum in the context of Japanese history of education in latter sections. Analysis (including some retranslations) of primary sources by Saichō reveals that the three wisdoms were applied as the central educational framework in Saichō’s curriculum, and that compassion for others and for the nation was the fundamental attitude and motivation of practices in the curriculum. Inputs from a personal interview with Kuwatani Yūken 桑谷祐顕, current Dean of Eizan Gakuin (head institution for Tendai monastic education), informs and supports these arguments.

For the texts written in *kanbun* (literary Chinese) of Saichō, I relied on transcriptions published in *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* (DDZ). Although extensive translation of Saichō’s work is done by Groner (2000), I have also added modifications to his translations with the help of modern Japanese translations in Ōkubo (2021), Ando and Sonoda (1991), and Mibu (1967). Ōkubo (2021) and Ando and Sonoda (1991) offer different interpretations of some terms as compared to Groner (2000). Thus, the two works are referred to present alternate versions of the translations.

2. Expressions of the Threefold Wisdom and Pedagogies Integrating Study and Practice in Japanese History of Buddhist Education

2.1. From India to Kamakura Japan, Expressions of the Threefold Wisdom

By exploring some expressions of threefold wisdom in Sino-Japanese history, we trace how the model integrating conceptual knowledge and experiential knowledge has been diffused to Japan. Kapstein (2001), Fiordalis (2018), Anālayo (2021), and Deroche (2021b) each introduce different scriptural references to the threefold wisdom. Deroche (2021b, p. 21), introduces an expression in *Saṅgārava Sutta*, in which the threefold wisdom can be seen in parallel to Buddha Śākyamuni’s description of the “three teachers”. Fiordalis (2018) discusses the three wisdoms that appears in Vasubandhu’s (fl. 4th to 5th century CE) *Abhidharmakośa* (*Treasury of Abhidharma*). In the early Buddhist educations of India, monasteries functioned as educational institutions both for the monastics and for the laypeople. Similarly, monastic education in China became of crucial importance, especially in the first eight centuries of the Common Era in which “the dominant trend of thinking was Buddhism” (Lee 2000, p. 6). The three wisdoms became a central aspect of Mahayānā texts, and in China, they were found especially in the translation of Yogācāra texts (Deroche 2021a, p. 221). These translations were then transmitted to Japan, studied extensively by scholar monks such as those in the Hossō 法相 school. Of course, the reference to the three wisdoms in Chinese texts are not limited to the Yogācāra tradition. Zhiyi 智顓 (538–597), a Chinese Buddhist philosopher known as the *de facto* founder of Chinese Tendai (or “Tiantai”) school (Groner 2000, p. 7), cites the three wisdoms in his commentaries to

the Lotus Sūtra, especially in *The Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra* (PMLS) 妙法蓮華經玄義:

今說一實之道。從聞悟解法身得生。從佛口生。是聞慧中法身生。從法化生。是思慧中法身生。得佛法分。是修慧中法身生。三慧成就是真佛子。

(Zhiyi, PMLS Vol. 6, in Taishō Tripitaka Vol. 33, p. 755b-c)

Now, the path of one-vehicle will be explained. By hearing the teaching, one can understand it and the “body of reality” (*dharmakāya*) will arise. By “arises from the mouth of the Buddha” it means *dharmakāya* will arise in wisdom born from listening. By “being born from the Dharma”, it means *dharmakāya* will arise in wisdom born from reflection. By “earn part of the Dharma”, it means *dharmakāya* will arise in wisdom born from cultivation. When the three wisdoms are achieved, one is a true bodhisattva.

(translated by author)¹

Given the diffusion of Yogācāra tradition in Japan and the influential nature of Zhiyi’s teaching to Chinese and Japanese Buddhism—especially in the context of this article, to Saichō—we can see how the model was disseminated to later Japanese Buddhism. At the same time, detailed examination of Zhiyi’s expression of threefold wisdom may be warranted to understand its role in the Tiantai founder’s philosophy.

Buddhism in Japan gained prominence after the Nara Period, when Buddhism was established as a state religion. The six schools of Nara Buddhism² each studied massive numbers of Chinese Buddhist texts, and at the same time conducted various state-sponsored rituals for the protection of the country. Some argue that Japan at this time “remained by and large in a phase of burrowing and assimilating with limited creative reflection and cultivation” (Heisig et al. 2011, p. 7). Nevertheless, this assimilation of knowledge allowed for later creative thought. Philosophical breakthrough came in the early Heian period by Saichō and Kūkai 空海 (774–835). Within the process of establishing the Tendai school, Saichō constructed a formalized educational curriculum based on the three wisdoms, which I will discuss extensively in later sections.

As social turbulence and natural disasters swept across Japan in the turn of the Kamakura period, philosophers believed that such trying times called for more focused practice. Almost all the spiritual traditions from the Kamakura period adopted simplified forms of practice. One example of such turn is that of Pure Land School (Jōdo shū) and True Pure Land School (Jōdo Shinshū). The philosophical starting point for Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212), founder of Japanese Pure Land Buddhism who also studied at Mount Hiei, was the self-realization that he will not be able to develop his Buddha-nature through the traditional “threefold training” (*śīla, samādhi, prajñā*; ethical discipline, concentration, wisdom) (Nagai 1993, p. 134). Thus, he had to rely on the “other power” *tariki* 他力 whom represents the ultimate self, Amida 阿弥陀 (Amitābha). Mirroring the self to Amida by “keeping it in mind” and chanting the name of Amida (*nenbutsu* 念仏) constituted Pure Land main practice. For Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263), the focus became “having complete faith in the ‘other power’ of Amida” (Deal and Ruppert 2015, p. 118). This complete faith was synonymous with having the attitude of listening and reflecting on the “primal vow” *hongan* 本願 of Amida, which vowed to free all sentient beings (Yoshikawa 1975, p. 462). Referring to the “words of truth” of Amida, Shinran advises us in his *Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信証: “Hear and reflect; be careful not to hesitate too long [to have faith]” (Shinran 2003, p. 4).

Faith is empowered by listening (and vice versa), which in turn brings forth the *nenbutsu* which is the practice of cultivation (Yoshikawa 1975); thus, hearing and reflection is unified with practice. Here we can identify the threefold wisdom but with certain primacy attributed to listening, especially for Shinran’s True Pure Land School. The diffusion of threefold wisdom from India to Japan had a prominent impact on

Japanese Buddhist thinkers such as Saichō and Shinran, and such didactical focus on both study and practice is observed even outside of monastic education.

2.2. Training of Arts and Buddhist Education in Edo

If we consider education as methodologies of self-cultivation, we see that Japanese arts also introduce us to another mode of training that does not specifically mention the threefold wisdom, but nevertheless articulates the unification of study (memorization of form) and embodied practice. Nishihira (2012, 2019; Nishihira and Rappleye 2021) introduces us to the ideas of self-cultivation by Zeami Motokiyo 世阿弥元清 (1363–1443), a progenitor of Noh theater and a renowned actor/play-write. The philosophy of training for Zeami, in simple terms, is the training of radical emptiness. There are four states of cultivation in this model. The first is the state of immaturity, in which the student is not yet learned. Next, after some study and mimicry according to the *kata* (mold, form), the set knowledge becomes embodied, and students master the skills according to form. During this phase, students are expected to practice intentionally with self-awareness so as to learn the skills carefully. Once the skills are mastered, however, the students are expected to reflect and acknowledge that they have been “entrapped” in the memorized skills. Therefore, they drop-off and unlearn all intentionality and awareness, thus detaching oneself from the skills. In this state of “no-mind” (*mu-shin* 無心), new kinds of skills, intention, and awareness emerge, which Zeami calls “Double-Eyes” (*niju no ken* 二重の見). What stands out in Zeami’s model is the complete emptying or forgetting of the self. This stands in contrast with the threefold wisdom articulated by Deroche (2021b, p. 25); in the threefold wisdom model, the “retentive function of mindfulness” is held throughout the practices, which allows for conceptual clarity that refine their moment-to-moment experiences. When we cultivate direct perception through practice, conceptual categories still play a central role.

Nevertheless, it is critical to emphasize here that true mastery was achieved only when conscious and conceptual mimicry/memorization and subsequent non-conceptual embodied practice were unified. Similar concepts on memorization of *kata* and embodied practice is prominent throughout Japanese arts, with some arguing that they are a form of cultural pedagogies that illuminate Japanese views on learning (Matsunobu 2011). In the periods after Zeami, especially in the Edo period, education for the masses became more profound. These schools, usually referred to as the *terakoya* 寺子屋 (literally “temple hut”), were born out of extension of Buddhist monasteries’ lay education (Saito 1993, p. 285), but expanded into a more practical form of education system due to societal demands. Thus, 17th to 18th century *terakoya* were not necessarily placed in a temple. The main objective of these schools were to prepare children for their hereditary occupation within the Tokugawa feudal system (Dore 2011, p. 252). Education at the *terakoya* was predominated by teachings of basic skills such as writing, reading, and arithmetic. At the same time, Saito (1993) illustrates how the *terakoya* was very much still heavily influenced by Buddhism. Much of the *terakoya* teachers were monks, and popular textbooks for reading largely included Buddhist materials. Although the pedagogical framework was largely focused on individual study, ethical literacy was also an important aspect of the program, designed to be practiced in everyday life. Lay education during the Tokugawa period was informed by Buddhism, especially in its emphasis on “the indication that practice and study, discipline and education [were] to be unified” (Saito 1993, p. 290).

The subsequent Meiji Restoration in 1868 marked an enormous setback for Buddhism, and especially Buddhist education. In an effort to rediscover the “pure” Japanese elements of Shintō, the Meiji government forcefully disentangled Buddhism from Shintoism (Deal and Ruppert 2015, p. 213). This caused a significant decrease in Buddhist influence, and thus Buddhism was pushed aside. According to Saito (1993, pp. 290–91), Buddhist education during early Meiji period was not able to establish its own didactical position in the new system. At the same time, as a reaction to this new change,

the Japanese Buddhist community in the late 19th to early 20th century underwent a dynamic reform movement. For Buddhism, “the return to its origins and the reform of current conditions were two sides of the same coin” (Okuyama 2008, p. 214); this movement was no exception, for it was driven by a return to the original Sanskrit texts and countless efforts by the Japanese Buddhists to visit China, India, and Tibet. The movement also included adaptation of the Western model of Indian and Buddhist studies. It is in this context that new Buddhist schools such as Tetsugaku-kan 哲学館 (modern day Tōyō University 東洋大学) and Futsū Kyōkō 普通教校 (modern day Ryūkoku University 龍谷大学) were established. Nevertheless, as Saito (1993) points out, Buddhism was not able to penetrate general education since modernization and secularization hit Japanese education.

In this section, I have provided an overview of influential educational thought in Sino-Japanese history. All the examples listed above have either acknowledged the three wisdoms as vital for the development of wisdom or have at least articulated the centrality of education via study (listening) and practice, thus showing the general trend of Japanese Buddhist theories of education. However, none have articulated an official curriculum founded on the three wisdoms, and thus leaves us in search for such example. In the next section, I introduce Saichō’s educational views and his curriculum, which illuminate us to a systematic integration of three wisdoms into a pedagogical system.

3. Saichō’s Curriculum and Its Expression of the Threefold Wisdom

3.1. The Motivation for Writing *Sange Gakushōshiki*

Saichō is best known for his establishment of the Japanese Tendai School on Mount Hiei. The Tendai school and its education on Mount Hiei is equally famous for its profound influence on later sects of Japanese Buddhism, so much so that Hiei is often referred to as the “matrix” of Japanese Buddhism: founders of Kamakura Buddhism such as Hōnen (Jōdo Shū), Shinran (Jōdo Shinshū), Eisai 栄西 (Rinzai School), Dōgen 道元 (Sōtō School), and Nichiren 日蓮 (Nichiren School) all studied in Hiei at some point in their lives. Thus, many Japanese scholars, such as Mibu (1967, p. 1), are led to argue that Saichō’s “extraordinary knowledge and insight, along with his persistent effort . . . had profound influence on Japanese culture in general”. In an effort to rediscover Japan’s traditional educational thought, it is critical to illustrate the character of such influential educational philosophy from its founder. Among many of Saichō’s works, *Sange gakushōshiki* 山家学生式 concisely introduces us to his education and his most detailed description of the curriculum.

The *Sange gakushōshiki* is a series of petitions written between 818 and 819 submitted to the Heian court by Saichō. The three petitions are: *Regulations for Tendai-Hokke School Annually Allotted Students* 天台法華宗年分學生式 (or commonly known as *Rokujiōshiki*, Regulations in Six Articles), *Regulations to Encourage Tendai School Yearly Ordinand Students* 勸奨天台宗年分學生式 (or *Hachijōshiki*, Regulations in Eight Articles), and *Regulations for Tendai-Hokke School Yearly Ordinands and for Those Who Wish to Turn Away from Hīnayāna Teachings Towards Mahāyāna Teachings* 天台法華宗年分度者回小向大式 (or *Shijōshiki*, Regulations in Four Articles). The main concern for Saichō at this time was to obtain permission to ordain Tendai monks with Mahāyāna “Brahma Net Precepts” 梵網戒 instead of the more complex Hīnayāna *Dharmaguptakavinaya* 四分律 at Mount Hiei. The goals for Saichō upon submitting the petitions were twofold: (1) obtaining government approval for rejecting Hīnayāna precepts and studying Mahāyāna precepts, and (2) establishing an educational and legal system which would obviate a need for Hīnayāna precepts (Groner 2000, p. 115–16). These petitions were understandably met with strong resistance from the Buddhist establishments in Nara. Ordaining monks solely with Mahāyāna precepts and establishing a formalized training program in mountains were both unprecedented at the time, not only in Japan but also in China and India (Uehara 1999). *Sange*

gakushōshiki and his later work *Kenkairon* 顯戒論 represent the Tendai founder's persistent effort to win debates against Nara scholar monks and convince the Heian court. At the same time, Saichō's ultimate motivation, as seen in the *Rokujōshiki*, was to educate "bodhisattva monks" and cultivate leaders of the nation who can lead the common populace to awakening of their respective buddha-nature. Japanese Buddhism at the time was heavily tied with the state; under the "regulations for monks and nuns" (*sōniryō*), monks were seen as government bureaucrats who study Buddhist doctrines and perform rituals for the protection and prosperity of the nation (Deal and Ruppert 2015, p. 55). As state Buddhism, more attention was paid to participating in rituals rather than directly teaching the Buddhadharma to ordinary people. In Saichō's view, monks were expected to not only perform rituals for the nation, but to spread the Dharma and work for the common populace. In his petitions, Saichō argued that such religious leaders should be cultivated by following the Mahāyāna precepts and completing the Tendai curriculum on Mount Hiei. Although the petitions called for Tendai's structural independence from Nara Buddhism, it was still determined to operate within state management and commit to the duty of "national Buddhism" (Shinkawa 2008).

3.2. Education for Intermediate Students

The *Sange gakushōshiki* is a clear expression of Saichō's ideal educational system that would develop the "treasure of the nation" based on Mahāyāna precepts. In the petitions, we see that Saichō conceptualized his Buddhist curriculum on the Buddhist threefold wisdom of study, reflection, and cultivation. As we will see later, the foundational understanding of Saichō was that the "study of bodhisattva" can only be completed in the dialectical integration of the three wisdoms. The core descriptions of his curriculum are spread out among his first two petitions; his first, *Rokujōshiki*, was submitted to the Heian court in the fifth month of 818, and after hearing very little back about his petition, he submitted the second, *Hachijōshiki* in the eighth month of 818. *Hachijōshiki* was a more detailed description of the curriculum introduced in his first petition and it is in this second petition in which the threefold wisdom is mentioned.

In the *Hachijōshiki*, we first see that Saichō envisioned a Buddhist curriculum not only for ordained students 得度學生 but also for what he calls the intermediate students 得業學生.

凡天台宗。得業學生。數定一十二人者。六年爲期。一年闕二人。即可補二人。其試得業生者。天台宗學衆。俱集會學堂。試法華。金光明。二部經訓。若六年成業。預試業例。若不成業。不預試業例

(Saichō, DDZ 1, pp. 7–8)

There will be twelve intermediate students, and their period of study will be set at six years. Two student positions will become vacant each year, so two can be supplemented each year. In order to test the intermediate students, Tendai scholar monks will all gather in the study hall and examine the students on their understanding of the Lotus Sūtra and [Golden Light Sūtra] (*Suvarṇaprabhāsa Sūtra*) . . . Once they fulfill the six year requirement, they will be given the qualification to take the exam. If they do not fulfill the requirements, they will not be given the qualification to take the exam. (Groner 2000, p. 131 modified by author)

By the edict of the court, Tendai at this time was allowed two yearly ordained monks (*nenbudōsha*) (Groner 2000, p. 75). Thus, the maximum number of intermediate students were set at twelve, each expected to reach requirements for ordination by the sixth year. More detail is given in *Regulations for Intermediate Students of the Tendai-Lotus Hall on Mount Hiei* (RIS) 比叡山天台法華院得業學生式, a memorial written a week after his submission of *Rokujōshiki*. Although not regarded as part of *Sange*

gakushōshiki, Kiuchi (1975) argues that this memorial makes a pair with *Rokujōshiki*, and should be considered to fully understand the backdrop of *Hachijōshiki*. Saichō states in the memorial that those with aspiration for awakening who are fifteen years or older, and believers who are twenty-five years or younger can become intermediate students (Saichō, DDZ 4, p. 737). Thus, we can see that the prerequisite for becoming a student was strong intention and aspiration, which would be held throughout his studies. This emphasis on aspiration is understandable because Saichō himself entered and trained in Mount Hiei for 12 years, exemplifying himself such strong aspiration and motivation.

3.3. The Curriculum for Ordained Students: Pedagogical Framework of Threefold Wisdom

In the latter article of the *Hachijōshiki*, Saichō goes into the description of the curriculum expected for ordained students. After their initial six years as intermediate students, the curriculum for ordained students were twelve years long. During these twelve years, student-monks could not leave the boundaries of the mountain. Again, Saichō himself spent twelve years in Mount Hiei studying and practicing. It may be that from his own experience, Saichō believed completion of study and training cannot be accomplished in short-term. At the same time, we should also consider that Saichō's curriculum was intended for a selected few: at maximum, there were only 24 ordained students (twelve years, two students per year) and 12 intermediate students. Contrary to the massification of modern education, Saichō's curriculum envisioned a complete and intense holistic education for the few. However, this does not mean that Saichō's curriculum only affected the few, since these students were expected to become teachers for future monks and lay people.

But what was the content of such twelve-year curriculum, and how were the students supposed to study them? In the fourth article of *Hachijōsiki*, Saichō describes:

初六年聞慧爲正。思修爲傍。一日之中。二分內學。一分外學。長講爲行。法施爲業。後六年思修爲正。聞慧爲傍。止觀業。具令修習四種三昧。遮那業。具令修習三部念誦

(Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 8)

For the first six years, ordained students will mainly learn through study and memorization. Reflection and cultivation will be of secondary importance. They will learn Buddhism for two-thirds of the day and learn non-Buddhist subjects for one-third of the day. Extensive lecturing of the sūtras for others will be their training. Preaching of the Dharma will be their activity. In the last six years, students will mainly learn through reflection and cultivation. Study and memorization will be of secondary importance. Those in *shikangō* will thoroughly practice the "four types of samādhis". Those in *shanagō* will thoroughly practice chanting and meditation of the three esoteric texts³.

(translated by author)

This section is at the heart of our discussion not only for its expression of the three wisdoms, but also for its concise description of the general curriculum. The text suggests that there were four general subjects in this curriculum: Buddhist studies, other subjects, extensive lectures, and preaching. Buddhist studies were separated into two selective courses: *shikangō* 止觀業 (*śamatha-vipaśyana*⁴ Course) and *shanagō* 遮那業 (Esoteric Course). The name *shikangō* shows the heavy influence of aforementioned Tiantai master Zhiyi's works, especially his *Makashikan* 魔訶止觀⁵. *Shanagō* is derived from *Vairocana's Perfect Awakening Sūtra* (*Vairocanābhīṣambodhi Sūtra*), or *Dainichi-kyō* 大日經, which was considered a central text to this esoteric course. According to the RIS, those in *shikangō* were expected to study extensively the *Lotus Sūtra* (Sanskrit: *Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra*, Japanese: *Hokke-kyō* 法華經), *Golden Light Sūtra*

(Sanskrit: *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa Sūtra*, Japanese: *Konkoumyō-kyō* 金剛明經), *Humane King Sūtra* (Japanese: *Ninnō-gyō* 仁王經), and other sūtras daily (Saichō, DDZ 4, p. 737). These three texts were popular since the Nara period because of their political importance for state rituals, but Saichō was the first to have combined them as a uniform course of study. From the selection of texts, along with Hazama's (1987, p. 111) labeling of *shikangō* as "Tendai proper", we see that *shikangō* was the main course in the curriculum. *Shanagō* was included because the court edict allowing Tendai school two yearly ordained monks stated that the two monks should be separated into *shikangō* and *shanagō*; this was not in Saichō's original intention when he submitted the proposal to grant him yearly ordinands, and thus some argue that the Esoteric Course was added at the emperor's insistence (Nakao 1973).

"Other subjects" in this context are most often interpreted as study of Chinese classics such as Confucian and Taoist texts, which Saichō himself studied in his youth (Yoshikawa 1970; Groner 2000). The "extensive lectures" *chōkō* 長講 here refers to the lectures and discussions of the central texts by the students themselves. Elsewhere, in the RIS, we see a remark on "extensive turning and lecture" 長転長講 of the core texts for those in *shikangō* (Saichō, DDZ 4, p. 737), in which turning refers to reading aloud the sūtras (Yoshikawa 1970, p. 241). Thus, it is fair to assume that "extensive lecturing" in *Hachijōshiki* also included extensive reading, especially since reading and comprehension are fundamental for lecture and discussion. The importance of "preaching as activity" is understandable given that Saichō himself set out in trips to spread the Dharma, and it was a central aspect of training as a bodhisattva monk. At the same time, the extent at which the preaching was done is questionable since students could not leave the mountain during their study.

The last section of the excerpt refers to the specific training of each course. Those in the Esoteric Course were expected to chant and meditate on the three sūtras they were instructed to study. Those in *shikangō*, on the other hand, were to practice the "four samādhis" 四種三昧. The four samādhis are one of the major meditation systems compiled and presented in *Makashikan* by Zhiyi, and consists of "cultivating samādhi through constant sitting" 常坐三昧, "cultivating samādhi through constant walking" 常行三昧, "cultivating samādhi through part walking and part sitting" 半行半坐三昧, and "cultivating samādhi through neither walking nor sitting" 非行非座三昧. The last practice of "neither walking or sitting" refers to observing the mind not only during formal practices (like walking or sitting) but also during everyday life.

3.4. The Threefold Wisdom as Pedagogical Framework of Curriculum

If the subjects and training represented the curricular contents of Saichō's education, the threefold wisdom mentioned in *Hachijōshiki* represents the pedagogical approach, or the framework of the curriculum. Broad subjects and training methods are tied together in a single thread through the three wisdoms. As a general approach of learning Buddhist studies and Chinese classics, the first six years of the twelve-year curriculum primarily focused on "wisdom born from study" 聞所成慧 (*śrutamayī prajñā*), and the latter focused on "wisdom born from reflection" 思所成慧 (*cintāmayī prajñā*) and "wisdom born from cultivation" 修所成慧 (*bhāvanāmayī prajñā*)⁶. At the same time, this did not equate to complete disregard of contemplation and meditation in the first six years, nor to disregard of study in the latter six years. This leads us to recognize that Saichō understood the threefold wisdom not only as a successive development of wisdom, but also as a dialectical transition; each step is integrated to the next, and at the same time is transcended. An interview by Kuwatani (2021) highlighted this aspect clearly: he argued that in the curriculum at Mount Hiei, wisdom is developed by integrating study into thinking, thinking into practice, and mistaken practices will be clarified and corrected by studying. Therefore, reflection and cultivation in the latter six years of Saichō's curriculum is not devoid of study, but in fact are made clear by the memorized contents. One of Saichō's main arguments, which

caused a huge debate with the Hossō school of Nara Buddhism, was that all beings held buddha-nature and were thus able to attain Buddhahood. Thus, Saichō's education was a formalized curriculum in which he invited anyone with aspiration for awakening to achieve Buddhahood through the threefold wisdom.

By referring to the current studies on threefold wisdom, I have offered an alternative translation of the above section of the *Hachijōshiki* to that by Groner (2000, p. 133). In his book, Groner translated 初六年聞慧爲正 as "For the first six years, they will learn mainly through lectures". While listening to lectures by teachers is a crucial aspect of the first wisdom, we know that heavy emphasis was undoubtedly placed on memorization of the sūtras, for intermediate students were tested on their knowledge of the *Lotus Sūtra* and *Golden Light Sūtra*. Also, because readings of the sūtras were coupled with lectures in other sources, translating *mon'e* 聞慧 as "lectures" seems inadequate. The word "study" in my translation is thus used as an overarching concept that integrates listening to lectures and readings, both for the purpose of memorizing the teachings by heart. Considering other texts of Saichō and recognizing that this step of the threefold wisdom relies heavily on the cognitive faculty of memory (Deroche 2021b), this alternative translation may be closer to what Saichō had in mind. Another aspect of *mon'e* was placing faith in the teachers and sūtras. This was especially true for Tendai, for their main text, *Lotus Sūtra*, was believed to be the "final teaching of the Buddha, complete and sufficient for salvation" (Williams 2009, p. 149). Saichō often referred to the *Lotus Sūtra* as "complete teachings" *engyō* 円教, which would take people to the "direct path" of enlightenment. The faith in this "direct path" is what drives the students to study and train.

Although Saichō does not describe specific instructions for reflection in his petitions, it was a central aspect of the Tendai debate systems. As Groner illustrates, strict debate systems were often stressed and revived throughout the history of the Tendai School (Groner 1995, 2002), with its origins in Saichō. Along with intense reading and memorization of key texts, monks on Mount Hiei "would train for the major examination . . . by participating in a series of lesser debates and tests" (Groner 1995, p. 55). Both memorization and debates were essential aspects of integrating and interpreting Buddhist teachings. Furthermore, the *Hachijōshiki* mentions "extensive lectures" as the students' "training". In these lectures, students lecture on their readings and interpretation of the sūtras, which then are discussed by their peers and teachers. Readings and lectures of the sūtras were expected to be conducted every day. Thus, we can infer that individual reflection/appropriation of teachings and texts was an everyday task for the student monks. Their study of the teachings promotes further understanding, which then is embodied through cultivation. As we have seen, cultivation referred to practicing the four samādhis for *shikangō* and chanting/meditating on the three texts for *shanagō*. The other aspect of practice here was preaching of the Dharma for the common populace. Especially considering how Nara Buddhism "severely lacked" this aspect, Yoshikawa (1970) applauds Saichō for formally including it as part of the curriculum.

Through the translations and descriptions of the *Hachijōshiki*, we have seen that the threefold wisdom played a central role in Saichō's envisioned curriculum. In the Appendix A, I have translated the summary table detailing Saichō's curriculum constructed by Yoshikawa (1970, p. 240) (Table A1). I have also constructed another table which organizes the curriculum in accordance with the threefold wisdom (Table A2). Together, the two tables should illustrate visually what was described in the *Sange gakushōshiki*.

Uehara (1999, p. 63) states that the path toward the ultimate goal of Tendai can be followed by realizing the Buddha-nature. "Ultimate Buddha" knows the ultimate reality of each and every thing and recognizes the self, which has no boundaries with such ultimate reality. It is disclosed to us when we embody wisdom; such wisdom, additionally, is what leads others to realization. Therefore, recognition of the inter-

relation between the self and others is crucial, and thus the two wheels of wisdom and compassion are cultivated. In the *Sange gakushōshiki*, integrated curriculum of the threefold wisdom is presented as the curriculum which develops such realization, one in which benefits “the nation [and] draw sentient beings to the true teachings” (Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 10).

3.5. The Goal of Saichō’s Education: The Treasure of the Nation

The key characteristic of *Sange gakushōshiki* is not just in its detailed illustration of Tendai curriculum. It also illustrates how the graduates of his curriculum were to serve and engage with society. In the *Rokujōshiki*, Saichō states how he envisions his students should act and be of use to the nation; in the first article, he introduces the differentiation among “treasure of the nation” *kokuhō* 國寶, “teacher to the nation” *kokushi* 國師, and “asset to the nation” *kokuyō* 國用:

國寶何物。寶道心也。有道心人。名爲國寶。故古人言。徑寸十枚。非是國寶。照千一隅。此則國寶。古哲又云。能言不能行。國之師也。能行不能言。國之用也。能行能言。國之寶也。三品之內。唯不能言不能行。爲國之賊。
(Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 5)

What is the treasure of the nation? It is our aspiration for the path of enlightenment⁷. Thus those who have this aspiration for awakening are the treasures of the nation. Long ago a man said, “Ten large pearls do not constitute the nation’s treasure, but he who guards his corner and sheds light over a thousand *li*”.⁸ A philosopher of the old said, “He who can speak but not act is a teacher to the nation. He who can act but not speak is an asset to the nation. He who can both act and speak is a treasure to the nation. Aside from these three, he who neither can speak nor act is a traitor to the nation.” (Groner 2000, pp. 116–17 modified by author)

Saichō claimed that after his twelve-year curriculum, three types of monks will emerge, and he differentiated them based on their respective ability to act and speak. Hazama (1987) alternatively translates 能行能言 in Groner (2000, pp. 116–17), “He who can both act and speak” as “those who are good with words and good in deeds”. In this context, we can infer that “speak” meant scholarly mastery and “act” meant mastery of practices and diligent obedience to Mahāyāna precepts. Although obviously “treasure of the nation” is more complete and preferred, the order of which the three are introduced (teacher, asset, treasure) does not necessarily represent the rank of these monks, especially in terms of how they were to be of use to society (Mibu 1967, p. 105). Rather, the distinctions represent how Saichō understood that certain people were suited for certain roles, based on their inclination and ability. If all who have “aspiration for awakening” is treasure of nation (as the first line of the quote above states), then essentially “teachers” and “assets” are also “treasures”. Hazama (1987, p. 111) thus distinguishes those who can both act and speak as “true” treasures. It is also important to note that Saichō compares materialistic and mundane treasures like “large pearls” with people with “aspiration for awakening”. The worth of nations does not rely on the amount of material wealth accumulated but is defined by the quality of persons inhabiting the nation. For Saichō, this quality was the aspiration for enlightenment.

In his interview, Kuwatani (2021) mentioned that although monks before Saichō such as Gyōki 行基 (668–749) preached the Dharma to the common populace and engaged in social works (Deal and Ruppert 2015, p. 63), Saichō was the first to formally establish a system that would allow such monks to be officially appointed in provincial temples. In articles five and six of *Rokujōshiki*, he lists specifically how each should benefit society.

凡兩業學生。一十二年。所修所學。隨業任用。能行能言。常住山中。爲衆之首。爲國之寶。

凡國師國用。依官符旨。差任傳法及國講師。其國講師。一任之內。每年安居法服施料。印便收納當國官舍。國司郡司。相對檢校。將用國裏。修池修溝。耕荒理崩。造橋造船。殖樹殖苧。蒔麻蒔草。穿井引水。利國利人。

(Saichō, DDZ 1, pp. 6–7)

After twelve years, the students of the two courses shall receive appointments in accordance with their achievements in study and practice. Those who can both speak and act shall remain permanently on Mount Hiei to head the order; they are treasures of the nation . . . As is specified in the Chancellor’s directive, the teachers of the nation and those of use to the nation shall spread the Dharma and be appointed as lecturers in the provinces. During their term of office, the provincial lecturers and teachers shall have the robes for their annual summer retreat paid for with funds deposited in the provincial offices. By repairing reservoirs and irrigation ditches, reclaiming uncultivated land, restoring fallen levees, making bridges and boats, planting trees and ramie, sowing hemp and grasses, digging wells and drawing water, they are to benefit the nation and its people.

(Groner 2000, p. 122, modified by author)

This details Saichō’s views on how his monks should spread the Dharma and benefit the common populace with a compassionate attitude. The true “treasure of the nation” leads the religious community on Mount Hiei, while “teacher of the nation” and “asset to the nation” leads the regional lay community. The “lecturers” detailed here was an official position appointed by the *Sōgō* or Office of Monastic Affairs, and at the time their duties were limited to teaching the sūtras (Groner 2000, p. 122n). Saichō thus reimagined the position by making them responsible for social welfare works; additionally, according to Kuwatani (2021), “lecturers” and “assets” of the nation were to fund these social works. Saichō himself has worked throughout his lifetime for the benefit of the common people. For example, between 814 to 816, Saichō traveled to the provinces to the east (modern day Gifu, Gunma, etc.) and to the west (modern day Kyūshū) to lecture, copy sutras, construct temples, and provide social welfare works (Watanabe 1993, pp. 232–33). Such attitudes and action were expected for treasures of the nation, and thus Saichō was determined that the establishment of this curriculum will help protect the country. Saichō’s core argument was that if the *Rokujōshiki* were to be accepted by the court, “sentient beings will be led to the Mahāyāna way through the gate of compassion” (Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 7).

Thus, through the reading of Saichō’s *Rokujōshiki*, we are able to see two aspects of what was expected for graduates of the curriculum. The first was that “true” treasures of the nation should be able to both speak and act. Although for Saichō these personnel were to stay in Mount Hiei to lead the monastic community, this is so because Saichō’s vision for leaders of the nation was that they should be religious leaders. Nevertheless, we see at full length that for Saichō, the overall ability to both learn and act was critical. To this day, Eizan Gakuin upholds “training through both study and practice” *gegyōsōshū* 解行双修 as their central educational identity. The curriculum at Mount Hiei is therefore an example of pedagogy integrating study and practice, but uniquely through the threefold wisdom model. The second aspect that was expected for graduates was the compassionate attitude (or bodhicitta) that drives action for the populace, to serve as the “treasure” who would protect the nation once they graduate. At the same time, compassionate attitudes were also expected for students. In the section below, I demonstrate through references from an interview with Kuwatani Yūken and original texts that these compassionate attitudes were expected to be developed within the curriculum at Mount Hiei.

4. Loving-Kindness and Compassion as Fundamental Attitude for All Practices

Kuwatani Yūken (2021), a Tendai monk and Dean at Eizan Gakuin, argued in his interview that the education at Mount Hiei instructs “how to live in a world where self and ‘others’ co-exists,” and thus “loving-kindness and compassion are necessary for each study and practice”. As a curriculum intended to develop bodhisattva monks, it is natural to observe the primacy Saichō attributed to loving-kindness (*maitrī*) and compassion (*karuṇā*). For example, in the *Rokujōshiki*, Saichō states:

惡事向己。好事與他。忘己利他。慈悲之極。

(Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 5)

[Bodhisattvas] take the bad upon themselves and give the good to others. This is the highest point of loving-kindness and compassion. (translated by author)

Here, as Kagawa (1993, p. 120) states, we can see Saichō’s expression of Mahāyāna views in most simple terms. His regulations for the graduates are thus empowered by such views. The ultimate goal of Tendai teaching is the attainment of Buddhahood by all sentient beings, and thus all practice must be conducted with this attitude in mind.

We see inferences to such compassionate attitude expected for the students in a number of Saichō’s writings, in which I will detail a couple. First, we see in *Kenkairon* how Saichō valued practices in Mount Hiei, and how he believed that they had power to protect the nation in itself:

明知。念誦及轉讀。衛國之良將也。誠願。大日本國天台兩業授菩薩戒。以爲國寶...

摩訶止觀業。置四三昧院。修練止觀行。常爲國轉經。亦爲國講般若。

(Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 121)

Clearly know that chanting and turning of the sutras are good commander for protecting the nation. I sincerely request to ordain the students in both courses of great Japanese Tendai with bodhisattva precepts, making them treasure of the nation. Then, . . . those in *Makashikangō* will practice *śamatha-vipaśyanā* in Four Samādhi Halls, constantly read the sutras for the nation, and provide lectures on wisdom (*prajñā*) for the nation. (translated by author)

While these practices (especially the lectures and preaches) may be directly helpful for the people and the nation, Uehara (2004, p. 132) acknowledges that practices by both *shikangō* and *shanagō* were believed to be the roots of magical powers that can protect the nation. Since these practices are expected to be done *for* the nation, we can expect that the attitudinal dimension of loving-kindness and compassion was held during practices. The primacy of the attitude of compassion in practices are also found in Saichō’s *Ganmon* 願文, or *Vows*, which he penned during his own twelve-year training in Mount Hiei. Describing himself as the “most foolish among the foolish” (DDZ 1, p. 2). Saichō pledged his five vows:

我自未得六根相似位以還不出假(其一)

自未得照理心以還不才藝(其二)

自未得具足淨戒以還不預檀主法會(其三)

自未得般若心以還不著世間人事緣務。除相似位(其四)

三際中間。所修功德。獨不受己身。普回施有識。悉皆令得無上菩提(其五)

(Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 3)

(1) So long as I have not attained the stage where my six faculties are pure, I will not venture out into the world.

(2) So long as I have not attained the mind that illuminates absolute, I will not acquire any special skills or arts (such as medicine, divination, and calligraphy).

(3) So long as I have not kept all of the precepts purely, I will not participate in any lay donor's Buddhist meeting.

(4) So long as I have not attained wisdom (*prajñā*), I will not participate in constraining worldly affairs unless my six faculties are pure and it is to benefit others.

(5) May any merit from my practice in the present⁹ be given not to me, but to all sentient beings so that they may attain supreme enlightenment. (Groner 2000, pp. 28–29 modified by author)

In the fifth vow, we see that Saichō wished that all his merits attained during his training (and beyond) in Mount Hiei be given to all sentient beings. With such a strict promise, it is understandable that Saichō expected the same attitude of his students in the threefold wisdom curriculum. Such spirit seems to live on to this day in Tendai school, as the “word of the year” for 2022 published by Hieizan Enryakuji was *daihimangyō* 大悲万行, or “every action founded on Great Compassion” (Hieizan Enryakuji 2022). At the same time, the vows also present us with the significance of both wisdom and compassion. In the Mahāyāna teachings, “Bodhisattva's deeds and attitude are all sealed with the perfection of *prajñā*” (Williams 2009, p. 56). We see in *Ganmon* a careful balance between self-cultivation and acts of compassion, which corresponds with his way back and forth between retreat and engagement with society. Saichō clearly stressed the importance of cultivating both aspects for his students. Elsewhere, in the RIS, Saichō writes:

大悲之根。今晨可芽。菩提之心。蓋發今日。是故。吾堂法式。夢裏永定。遠期後際。開斯法泉。

(Saichō, DDZ 4, p. 737)

The roots of Great Compassion may begin to grow this morning. The aspiration to attain enlightenment may arise this very day. Thus we must permanently establish regulations for our halls which are in this dream-like world. By forever establishing these regulations, we shall open the sources of the Dharma.

(Groner 2000, p. 127)

Thus, through analysis of Saichō's own text and the supporting personal interview, we can observe that loving-kindness and compassion (or Great Compassion) were placed at the fundamental attitude, motivation, and approach during their own training, and not only when they make their training useful to others. What this implies is that each practice of study, reflection, and cultivation under Tendai's Buddhist education each was supported by these attitudinal dimensions, therefore providing a fascinating insight into the discussions on the threefold wisdom model.

5. Conclusions

The *sange gakushōahiki* is a concise culmination of Saichō's ideas on Buddhist education, especially since it was written in his last years. In his interview, Kuwatani (2021) mentioned that Saichō points us to the “Mahāyāna Bodhisattva way of life” throughout his writings; the threefold curriculum detailed in *Sange gakushōshiki* thus serves as a compass that points to this particular way of life. In their seminal works, Kapstein (2001, p. 14) and Fiordalis (2018, p. 253) have articulated the relationship of the Buddhist threefold wisdom to Pierre Hadot's (2002) “philosophy as a way of life” and “spiritual exercise”. The “formation of the person” and the development of wisdom is attained through a dialectical path of study, reflection, and cultivation. Saichō expresses similar views: (1) memorization and study of scriptures (especially the *Lotus Sūtra*), (2) self-reflection that

illuminates one's own self-understanding which at the same time is challenged through lectures and debates, and (3) cultivation through practices such as the four samādhis are done to deepen and embody the teachings. Additionally, Kuwatani (2021) insisted that wisdom is only attained when study is integrated into thinking and thinking is integrated into practice; the framework prevents mistaken practice as it will be corrected by continuous study. "Training through both study and practice" for enlightenment of all sentient beings is at the heart of Tendai teachings. Kapstein (2001, p. 15) stated that according to Śāntaraksita, the "self-transcending project" of a merging concept and being is "oriented toward that omniscient being who, as the very self of compassion, is oriented to benefit all beings". The parallel is clear, and thus may be characterized as a shared trait of the "Mahāyāna way of life".

This article intended to accomplish three aims: (1) discuss expressions of threefold wisdom and pedagogy of study and practice in Japanese history to uncover Japanese Buddhist education, (2) illustrate an overview of Saichō's curriculum in *Sange gakushōshiki* with emphasis on the threefold wisdom, and (3) analyze and elucidate the role of compassion in the curriculum. Through textual study of Saichō and other related texts, I demonstrated how Saichō placed the threefold wisdom as the fundamental framework of education and developed a curriculum that integrates both study and practice. The interview with Kuwatani (2021) confirmed this argument and also provided a discussion on the role of compassionate attitudes in Saichō's education. Influential Japanese thinkers and pedagogies articulated in Section 2 all stressed both study and practice, but Saichō uniquely integrated them through the threefold wisdom, and established it as an official curriculum for the Japanese Tendai School.

The interview with Kuwatani (2021) also highlighted that even in the modern curriculum at Eizan Gakuin, each step of the threefold wisdom plays a crucial role. Although each component is not necessarily literally emphasized, study, reflection, and cultivation are practiced in an integrated manner; students take classes on Buddhist studies (e.g., Buddhist history, Buddhist culture, and Tendai teachings) and put their understanding into practice through practice-oriented classes (e.g., *śamatha-vipaśyanā*, calligraphy, and preaching), which inform and enhance each other. In other words, the pedagogy of learning the content, relating it to oneself, and embodying the teachings is indeed a living tradition of human formation that breathes in and around Mount Hiei.

This work is a humble contribution to the studies on Saichō and Japanese Tendai school, along with the studies on Buddhist threefold wisdom. Education at Mount Hiei was unique in its own historical context, not only because of Saichō's understanding of precepts but also because of his curricular framework and contents. His Buddhist education of the "bodhisattva monk" inspired countless important Buddhist figures and was thus profoundly influential in Japanese culture. The rediscovery of such education and its central framework of study, reflection, and cultivation contributes fundamental insight into studies on the Japanese Buddhist philosophy of education. The threefold wisdom model, which dynamically integrates study and practice, can inform modern didactical practices. As the Buddhist scholars in Meiji period did, examination into historical sources enlighten us to new possibilities for contemporary contexts; Saichō's expression of threefold wisdom and compassion offers us a practical case of holistic ways of learning that benefits the self and others.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from the interviewee.

Data Availability Statement: The *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* (DDZ) is available online on National Diet Library Online’s digital collection at <https://ndlonline.ndl.go.jp/#/detail/R300000001-100000463732-00> (1 February 2022).

Acknowledgments: Firstly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Marc-Henri Deroche for his patient guidance and supervision. I would also like to express my appreciation to Professor Jeremy Rappleye for his helpful advises. Additionally, I would like to extend my gratitude to Professor Kuwatani Yūken at Eizan Gakuin for providing his deep insight on Tendai and Saichō.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Abbreviation

DDZ: 1912. *Dengyō Daishi zenshū* 傳教大師全集 [Collected Works of Saichō], edited by Tendaishū Shūten Kankōkai 天台宗宗典刊行会 [Tendai Scriptures Publication Association]. Tokyo: Tendaishū Shūten Kankōkai.

Appendix A

Table A1. Table summarizing contents of curriculum (translated from Yoshikawa 1970, p. 240).

| Subjects | Courses | Contents | Allotted Time (Fraction of Day) | Class Type |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|------------|
| Buddhist Studies | <i>Shikangō</i> | Lotus, Golden Light, Humane King, etc. Four Samādhis | 2/3 | Elective |
| | <i>Shanagō</i> | Dainichi-kyō 大日經 (Vairocanābhisambodhi Sūtra), Daikujakumyō-ō-kyō 大孔雀明王經 (Mahāmāyūrī Vidyārājñī sūtra), etc. Chanting/meditating on three texts | | |
| Other Subjects | | Confucianism, Daoism, Way of Ying and Yang, etc. | 1/3 | Mandatory |
| Lectures and Readings | | | Regularly | Mandatory |
| Preaching | | | Regularly | Mandatory |

Table A2. Table organizing the curriculum according to three wisdoms.

| Threefold Wisdom | Buddhist Studies | Fundamental Attitude/Motivation |
|------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Study | “Extensive reading” of sūtras, faith in texts and teachers | Great Compassion |
| Reflection | “Extensive Lecture” and discussion of sūtras | |
| Cultivation | For <i>Shikangō</i> , Four Samādhis; For <i>Shanagō</i> , chanting and meditating on three texts; For all, Preaching the Dharma | |

Notes

¹ With reference to translation to modern Japanese by Sugano (Zhiyi 2018, p. 82)

² Six schools of Nara Buddhism, otherwise known as *Nanbu Rokushū* 南部六宗: (1) *Hossō* 法相宗 (Yogācāra), textual focus on Dharmapāla’s *Vijñaptimātratā siddhi*, which states that reality is mental ideations; (2) *Kegon* 華嚴宗 (Avatamsaka), textual focus on the *Avatamsaka sūtra* which states the interpenetration of all things; (3) *Ritsu* 律宗 (Vinaya), focus on ethical and monastic rules; (4) *Sanron* 三論宗 (Madhyamaka), focus on idea of “emptiness” especially with regard to texts such as Nāgārjūna’s *Madhyamaka Śāstra*; (5) *Kusha* 俱舍宗 (Abhidharmakośa), doctrinal foundations based on Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* which teaches that the “constituent elements of existence” are all interdependently caused; (6) *Jōjitsu* 成実宗 (Satyasiddhi), textual focus on Harivarman’s *Satyasiddhi śāstra*, which denies the existence of mind and matter (Deal and Ruppert 2015, p. 56–57)

- ³ What Saichō referred to here as *sanbu* 三部 is unclear, and has various interpretations. Mibu (1967, p. 120) interprets and translates it as the three divisions of the “Womb Realm”, but Ando and Sonoda (1991, p. 198) and (Ōkubo 2021, p. 205) argue that it could be referring to the three sūtras assigned to the *shanagō* students. Here it is translated as referring to the three texts.
- ⁴ *Śamatha* (calm, peace, tranquility) and *vipaśyanā* (insight) are both practices needed for awakening. According to (Harvey 2015, p. 120), “if *śamatha* is cultivated, the heart/mind (*chitta*) is developed, which leads to the abandonment of attachment/lusting after (*raga*); if *vipaśyanā* is cultivated, wisdom (*prajñā*) is developed, which leads to abandonment of spiritual ignorance (*avidyā*)”.
- ⁵ In his other works, Saichō refers to *śamatha-vipaśyanā* Course as *Makashikangō* 魔訶止観業 (Saichō, DDZ 1, p. 121). *Makashikan* has been fully translated in to English by Paul Swanson (2017).
- ⁶ In the *Hachijōshiki*, they are each written as 聞慧 思慧 修慧.
- ⁷ In Groner’s translation, *dōshin* 道心 is translated as “religious nature”. Referring to Ando and Sonoda (1991, p. 194), which defines *dōshin* as 菩提心 “bodhicitta” or 真実の道を求める心 “mind aspiring for the path of truth”, I have added my own redefinition.
- ⁸ As noted by Groner (2000, p. 116n), there is a long standing debate in the reading of this section. A more traditional reading is “shed light over a corner of the country” *shōuichigū* 照于一隅, but scholars such as Ando and Sonoda (1991, p. 427) and Ōkubo (2021, pp. 196–97) have argued that the handwriting rather shows that “guards his corner and sheds light over thousand li” *shōsenichigū* 照千一隅 is the correct reading. Although Tendai school has made *shōuichigū* as their official reading in 1974 (“*Ichigū wo terasu undō*” 2019, p. 11), there has not been conclusive evidence that supports either readings. I have chosen to translate this section according to Ando and Sonoda’s (1991) reading to offer an alternative reading to Groner’s translation.
- ⁹ In Groner (2000, pp. 28–29), this section is translated as “May any merit from my practice in the past, present and future be given not to me . . . ” The difference here probably relies on the understanding of *sansai chūgen* 三際中間. According to Ando and Sonoda (1991, p. 288), *sansai* means the three world of past, present, and future, and *chūgen* means “middle of”. Therefore, Ando and Sonoda understands this as meaning “present”.

References

- Anālayo, Bhikkhu. 2021. Hearing, Reflection, and Cultivation: Relating the Three Types of Wisdom to Mindfulness. *Religions* 12: 441. [CrossRef]
- Ando, Toshio 安藤俊雄, and Kōyū Sonoda 園田香融. 1991. *Saicho: Kenkairon, Sange gakushoshiki, Hoka Gohen* 最澄: 顕戒論 山家学生式 他五篇 [Saichō: Kenkairon, Sange Gakushōshiki, and Five Other Works]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Deal, William E., and Brian Ruppert. 2015. *A Cultural History of Japanese Buddhism*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Deroche, Marc-Henri. 2021a. Ikikata toshitenō Tetsugaku—“Mon Shi Shū” no Igi to Kanousei 生き方としての哲学—「聞・思・修」の意義と可能性 [Philosophy as a Way of Life: Significance and Potentialities of “Listening, Reflection, and Practice”]. In *実践する総合生存学 [Human Survivability Studies in Practice]*. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press, pp. 207–34.
- Deroche, Marc-Henri. 2021b. Mindful Wisdom: The Path Integrating Memory, Judgment, and Attention. *Asian Philosophy* 31: 19–32. [CrossRef]
- Dore, Ronald P. 2011. *Education in Tokugawa Japan*. Japan: Routledge Library Editions. London: Routledge.
- Fiordalis, David V. 2018. Learning, Reasoning, Cultivating: The Practice of Wisdom in the Treasury of Abhidharma. In *Buddhist Spiritual Practices: Thinking with Pierre Hadot on Buddhism, Philosophy, and the Path*. Edited by David V. Fiordalis. Berkeley: Mangalam Press, pp. 245–89.
- Groner, Paul. 1995. A Medieval Japanese Reading of the Mo-Ho Chih-Kuan: Placing the Kankō Ruijū in Historical Context. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22: 49–81. [CrossRef]
- Groner, Paul. 2000. *The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Groner, Paul. 2002. *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century*. Classics in East Asian Buddhism 15. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Hadot, Pierre. 2002. *What Is Ancient Philosophy? Translated by Michael Chase*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, Peter. 2015. Mindfulness in Theravāda Samatha and Vipassan Meditations, and in Secular Mindfulness. In *Buddhist Foundations of Mindfulness*. Edited by Edo Shonin, William Van Gordon and Nirbhay N. Singh. Mindfulness in Behavioral Health. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 115–37. [CrossRef]
- Hazama, Jikō 俗慈弘. 1987. The Characteristics of Japanese Tendai. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14: 101–12. [CrossRef]
- Heisig, James, Thomas Kasulis, and John Maraldo, eds. 2011. *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Hieizan Enryakuji 比叡山延暦寺. 2022. Reiwa Yonen No Kotoba 令和4年の言葉 [Word of the Year for Reiwa Year 4]. January 1. Available online: <https://www.hieizan.or.jp/kotoba/kotoba-r04> (accessed on 1 February 2022).
- “Ichigū wo terasu undō” 『一隅を照らす運動』 [Shed Light Over the Corner Movement]. 2019. Shiga: Tendai-shu Ichigū wo terasu souhonbu.
- Kagawa, Takao 香川孝雄. 1993. Jōdo-Kyōu Ni Okeru Risōteki Ningen-zō 浄土教における理想的人間像 [Jōdo Buddhism’s View of Ideal Humanity]. In *Bukkyō Kyōiku No Sekai 仏教教育の世界 [The World of Buddhist Education]*. Edited by Akitoshi Saito 齋藤昭俊. Tokyo: Keisuishu, pp. 109–28.
- Kapstein, Matthew. 2001. *Reason’s Traces. Identity and Interpretation in Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Thought*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Kiuchi, Hiroshi 木内央. 1975. Hieizan Tendai-Hokke-in Tokugō Gakushō Shiki ni Tsuite 比叡山天台法華院得業生式について [On the ‘Hieizan Tendai-Hokke-in Tokugō Gakushō Shiki’]. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū)* 23: 859–64. [CrossRef]
- Kuwatani, Yūken 桑谷祐顕. 2021. Personal Interview by Ryotaro Kusumoto. Shiga, Japan, December 21.

- Lee, Thomas H. C. 2000. *Education in Traditional China: A History*. Boston: Brill.
- Matsunobu, Koji 松信浩二. 2011. Creativity of Formulaic Learning: Pedagogy of Imitation and Repetition. In *International Handbook of Creative Learning*. Edited by Julian Sefton-Green, Pat Thomson, Ken Jones and Liora Bresler. London: Routledge, pp. 45–53.
- Mibu, Taishun 壬生台舜. 1967. *Eizan No Shinpū* 叡山の新風 [The Fresh Wind from Mount Hiei]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobou.
- Mori, Kantō 森観壽. 1971. Sange Gakushōshiki No Ichishiken 山家学生式の一私見 [Perspectives on Sange Gakushōshiki]. In *Bukkyō to Kyōiku No Shomondai* 仏教と教育の諸問題 [Issues of Buddhism and Education]. Edited by The Nippon Buddhist Research Association. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, pp. 137–41.
- Nagai, Takamasa 永井隆正. 1993. Hōnen Jōdokyō Ni Okeru Ningen Keiseiron 法然浄土教における人間形成論 [Theories of Human Formation in Hōnen's Pure Land Teachings]. In *Bukkyō Kyōiku No Sekai* 仏教教育の世界 [The World of Buddhist Education]. Tokyo: Keisuisha, pp. 129–51.
- Nakao, Shunpaku 仲尾俊博. 1973. *Nihon Shoki Tendai No Kenkyū* 日本初期天台の研究 [Study on Early Japanese Tendai]. Kyoto: Nagata bunshōdō.
- Nishihira, Tadashi 西平直. 2012. Zeami's Philosophy of Exercise and Expertise. In *Education and the Kyoto School of Philosophy: Pedagogy for Human Transformation*. Edited by Paul Standish and Naoko Saito 斎藤直子. Contemporary Philosophies and Theories in Education. New York: Springer, pp. 147–56. [CrossRef]
- Nishihira, Tadashi 西平直. 2019. *Keiko No Shisō* 稽古の思想 [The Philosophy of Self-Cultivation]. Tokyo: Shunjunsha.
- Nishihira, Tadashi 西平直, and Jeremy Rappleye. 2021. Unlearning as (Japanese) Learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 2021: 1–14. [CrossRef]
- Ōkubo, Ryōshun 大久保良峻. 2021. *Dengyō Daishi Saichō* 伝教大師最澄 [Dengyō Daishi Saichō]. Kyoto: Houzoukan.
- Okuyama, Naoji 奥山直司. 2008. The Tibet Fever among Japanese Buddhists of the Meiji Era. In *Images of Tibet in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Edited by Monica Esposito. Translated by Rolf Giebel. Études Thématiques 22. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. 1, pp. 203–22.
- Saito, Akitoshi 斎藤昭俊. 1993. Nihon Bukkyō No Kyōiku 日本仏教の教育 [Education of Japanese Buddhism]. In *Bukkyō Kyōiku No Sekai* 仏教教育の世界 [The World of Buddhist Education]. Edited by Akitoshi Saito 斎藤昭俊. Tokyo: Keisuisha, pp. 271–316.
- Shinkawa, Tetsuo 新川哲雄. 2008. Saichō Ni Okeru Shūhaishiki No Kakuritsu: Ikkō Daijōji Kōsō No Kentō Kara 最澄における宗派意識の確立: 一向大乘寺構想の検討から [Formation of the Tendai School in Japan by Saicho: Investigating Saicho's Concept for the Temple of Mahāyāna Buddhism]. *Journal of Asian Cultures* 10: 429–45.
- Shinran 親鸞. 2003. *Kyōgyōshinshō: On Teaching, Practice, Faith, and Enlightenment*. Translated by Hisao Inagaki 稲垣久雄. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Swanson, Paul L. 2017. *Clear Serenity, Quiet Insight: T'ien-t'ai Chih-i's Mo-Ho Chih-Kuan*, 3rd ed. 4 vols. Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Uehara, Masafumi 上原雅文. 1999. Sange Gakushōshiki Sōshutsu No Shisōteki Konkō 「山家学生式」創出の思想的根拠 [The Conceptual Basis of Sange Gakushōshiki]. *Kokushikan University Department of Philosophy Bulletin* 3: 60–77.
- Uehara, Masafumi 上原雅文. 2004. *Saichō Saikō* 最澄再考 [Revisiting Saichō]. Tokyo: Perikan-sha.
- Watanabe, Shujun 渡邊守順. 1993. Denkyō Kyōgaku Ni Okeru Kyōiku Shisō 伝教教学における教育思想 [Educational Thought in Saichō's Teachings]. In *Bukkyō Kyōiku No Sekai* 仏教教育の世界 [The World of Buddhist Education]. Edited by Akitoshi Saito 斎藤昭俊. Tokyo: Keisuisha, pp. 227–41.
- Williams, Paul. 2009. *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Yoshikawa, Shoni 吉川正二. 1970. *Saichō No Kyōiku: Sono Ningenkeiseiron Wo Chūshin Toshite* 最澄の教育: その人間形成論を中心として [Saichō on Education: With Central Focus on His Views on Human-Formation]. *Konan Women's College Researches* 3: 231–43.
- Yoshikawa, Shoni 吉川正二. 1975. Shinran No Kyōkateki Shisei 親鸞の教化的姿勢 [Shinran's Educational Attitude]. *Konan Women's College Researches* 11: 459–82.
- Zhiyi 智顛. 2018. *Hokke Gengi* 法華玄義 [Profound Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra]. Translated by Hiroshi Sugano 菅野博史. Tokyo: The Institute of Oriental Philosophy, vol. 2.