

The Creation of the Authority of *Tannishō* in modern period

Nobuya Dake

Ryukoku University

0. Introduction: The Purpose of This Paper

Within this paper, I would like to focus on the issue of the emergence of the authority of the *Tannishō* in modern period. The *Tannishō*, translated as “Lament of Shin Buddhist Doctrine,” is a text declaring that the followers of Shin Buddhism¹ misunderstood the teachings of the founder, Shinran. There is no doubt that the *Tannishō* had immense impact on the hermeneutics of modern Shin Buddhist doctrine. Koyasu (2014) emphasized, “*Tannishō* made a great influence on not only Shin Buddhist scholars, but also modern intellectuals, such as Nishida Kitaro and D.T. Suzuki. Also, we have to recognize that the *Tannishō* was rediscovered and liberated by Kiyozawa Manshi and his followers during the modern period.”² Obviously, this is a remarkable assertion. However, what we have to take into account is these impressions might be vividly created by modern Shin Buddhist scholars themselves, especially the discourse entitled “Rennyō made *Tannishō* forbidden texts and Kiyozawa released” (蓮如禁書清沢解放説). In order to clarify this issue, I would like to take four steps within this paper.

In the first and second sections, I will seek to shed light on two issues for *Tannishō* studies: (a) the philological perspective on the earliest *Tannishō* texts and (b) the issues related to its authorship. In recent studies, it is accepted that the *Tannishō* was written in 1289 by Kawada no Yuien (河田の唯円), a disciple of Shinran. Yet, historically speaking, before it was determined that the author of the *Tannishō* was Yuien, there was an array of arguments related to *Tannishō* authorship. Added to this problem, a critical issue in research of the *Tannishō* is the lack of an original manuscript. Twenty-nine transcription copies (写本) existed, and hence multitudinous arguments developed concerning which *Tannishō* manuscripts should be accepted as resources for *Tannishō* research.

The third and fourth parts will be dedicated to reconsidering the essential role the *Tannishō* played during the modern period (近代). It is widely accepted that the *Tannishō* was a prohibited text (禁書) by Rennyō and continued to be until it was “released” by the Shin

¹ Shin Buddhism is one of the Buddhist branches in Japan based on Pure Land Buddhism teaching. The founder of Shin Buddhism is Shinran(親鸞). (1173-1262)

² Koyasu Nobukuni, *Tannishō no Kindai*, (Kyoto: Hōzōkan,2014)

Buddhist Scholar, Kiyozawa Manshi. These two sections will focus on the meaning of “prohibited text” (禁書) claimed during the modern period.

The analysis of “the creation of the authority of *Tannishō* in the modern period” will offer a first step toward reconsidering the interpretations of Shin Buddhist doctrine during this contemporary period.

1. The Original Manuscripts of the *Tannishō*

Previous studies indicated that there are twenty-nine different original manuscripts with transcriptions of the *Tannishō*.³ In order to provide an essential understanding of these, I would first like to outline types of existing *Tannishō* manuscripts⁴.

1. Rennyō bon (蓮如本) (Rennyō Manuscript) : Kyōtoku 3(享徳 3 年,1454)⁵
 2. Hashi no bō bon (端ノ坊本) (sometimes called Eishō bon) : Eishō 16(永正 16 年,1519)
 3. Hashi no bō betsu bon (端ノ坊別本) (The Fragment of Hashi no bō Manuscript)
 4. Ryūkoku Daigaku bon (龍谷大学本) (Ryūkoku University manuscript)
 5. Gōsetsuji bon (毫摂寺本)(Gōsetsuji manuscript)
 6. Jōrakuji bon (常楽寺本) (Jōrakuji manuscript)
 7. Myōrinbō bon (妙琳坊本) (Myōrinbō manuscript)
 8. Enshōji bon (円照寺本) (Enshōji manuscript)
 9. Kōtokuji bon (光徳寺本) (Kōtokuji manuscript)
 10. Senshōji bon (専精寺本) (Senshōji manuscript)
 - 11 12. Shinkōji bon (真光寺本) (Two Shinkōji manuscripts)
- Three fragments are derived from the Shinkō ji bon (真光寺本)
13. Jitsugo bon (実悟本) (Jitsugo manuscript)
 14. Jōgūji bon (上宮寺本) (Jōgū ji manuscript)
 15. Senfuku ji bon (泉福寺本) (Senfuku ji manuscript)
16. Kishibe Muri zo bon (岸部武利蔵本) (Kishibe Muri zo manuscript)
 17. Jōguji bon(上宮寺本) (Jōguji manuscript)
 18. Myōganji Kyūzo bon(名願寺旧蔵本) : Keian2 (慶安 2 年,1649 年)

³ Tashiro Shunko, “Tannishō no u sono shogyō no fumon to kinshosetsu ni tsuite” (*Bulletin of the Graduate Division of Literature of Dōhō University*, vol.10, 2014)

⁴ Tashiro Shunko, “Tannishō no u sono shogyō no fumon to kinshosetsu ni tsuite” *Bulletin of the Graduate Division of Literature of Dōhō University*, vol.10, 2014, pp.5-6

⁵ Furuta Takehiko, *Tannishō Rennyō Bonno Genpon Jokyo—Ruzai meyasu setsudan wo megutte—*, (*The conditions of Rennyō’s Manuscripts of Tannishō —Focusing on the exiled letter—*), Shigaku Zasshi,715-3, 1966

19. Tatsuno Bunko bon(竜野文庫本) : Shōtoku5 (正徳 5 年,1715 年)
20. Esan Shahon (恵山写本)
21. Erin Kougou bon(慧琳校合本)
- 22.Kogatsuin Bunko Bon (香月院文庫本)
- 23.Sanshu Bunko(三舟文庫)
- 24.Banshu Shinkōji Bon(播州真光寺本)
- 25.Hibiya Toshokan Bon(日比谷図書館本) : Shōwa5 (昭和 5 年,1930 年)
- 26.Renshōji Bon (静岡県蓮生寺蔵 写本) : End of Muromachi (室町末)
- 27.Anpukuji Bon(安福寺本)
- 28.Kōzenji Bon(光善寺本) : 延享 (1744-1748)
- 29.Fukujōji Bon(福乗寺本)

What we have to focus on here are the differences between the original text of the *Tannishō* and the transcripts (hand copies) of the *Tannishō*. Kawada no Yuien (河田の唯円), who is considered the author of the *Tannishō*, died on February 6, 1289. The oldest manuscript of the *Tannishō* that we can find today is either the manuscript attributed to Rennyō bon (蓮如本) in 1454 or the Hashi no bō manuscript (端ノ坊本), which is thought to be written in 1519. Therefore, the earliest extant transcripts of the *Tannishō* were written roughly two hundred years after Yuien died. Because of the lack of resources, it is hard to determine which text is the oldest. Yet, some studies have made assumptions based on philological research. Taya considered the “Hashi no bō manuscript [to be] the oldest of all.”⁶ On the other hand, Furuta declared, “Rennyō’s manuscript is the oldest.”⁷ Assumptions made by such scholars stem from three points of view: (1) an appended letter addressing Shinran’s exile, (2) the variety of supplementary sentences, and (3) differences in postscripts appended to the end of manuscripts.

First, the Rennyō manuscript ends with a colophon signed by Rennyō and includes a remarkable letter addressing Shinran’s exile letter (流罪文) to Echigo (越後) as well as the punishment of four of his disciples (Zenshaku bō, Seigan bō, Juren bō, and Anraku bō). The Hashi no bō manuscript does not contain any letter addressing Shinran’s exile.⁸ Taya thus identifies the Rennyō manuscript as the oldest one.

⁶ Taya Raishun. *Tannishō shinchū* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1944)

⁷ Furuta Takehiko “Tannishō Rennyō bon no Genpon Jōkyō-“Ruzai Meyasu” setsudan wo Megutte” (*Shigaku Zasshi* 75(3), 1966)

⁸ The original exiled letter could see only Rennyō manuscript. The original text is as follows 「後鳥羽院之御宇法然上人他力本願時念佛宗興行ス干時僧侶興福寺敵奉之上御弟子中狼藉 子細アルヨシ无実

Second, it can be seen that phrases were added in both the Hashi no bō manuscript and the Ryukoku University manuscript that differ from the Rennyō Manuscript.

Chapter 5 : 「いそきさとりをひらきなは」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「いそき**浄土**のさとりをひらきなは」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

「いそき**浄土**のさとりをひらきなは」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Chapter 6 : 「弥陀の御もよほし」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「ひとへに弥陀の御もよほし」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

「ひとへに弥陀の**おん**もよほし」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Chapter 7 : 「およふことなきゆへなりと」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「をよふことなきゆへに**無碍**の一道なりと」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

「およふことなきゆへに**無碍**の一道といへり」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Chapter 9 : 「往生は一定おもひたまふなり」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「往生は一定とおもひたまふ**へき**なり」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

「往生は一定とおもひたまふ**へき**なり」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Chapter 12 : 「往生はいよいよ一定とおもひたまふなり」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「往生はいよいよ一定とおもひたまふ**へき**なり」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

「往生はいよいよ一定と**思**たまふ**へき**なり」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Chapter 15 : 「信心決定の**通故**なり」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「信心決定の**道なる**かゆへなり」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

風聞ニヨリテ罪科ニ処セラル、人数事一法然上人併御弟子七人流罪又 御弟子四人死罪ニオコナハルハ
ナリ聖人ハ 土佐國番田トイフ所へ流罪云々 名藤井元彦男云々生年七十六歳ナリ 親鸞ハ越後國罪名
藤井善信云々 | 生年三十五歳ナリ 浄圓房備後國澄西禅光房伯耆國 好覚房伊豆國行空法本房佐渡國
幸西成覚房善恵房二人同遠流ニ サダマルシカルニ無動寺之善題大僧正 コレヲ申アツカルト云々 遠
流之人々已上八人ナリト云々 被行死罪人々 一番 西意善綽房 二番 性願房 三番 住蓮房 四番
安楽房 二位法印尊長之沙汰也 親鸞僧儀ヲ改メテ俗名ヲ賜フ仍テ僧ニ非ズ俗ニ非ズ 然間ニ、禿ノ字
ヲ以テ姓ト為シテ、奉問ヲ經ヘ被レ了 彼ノ御申シ状干今外記序ニ納ルト云々 流罪以後愚禿親鸞書令
シメ給也 右其聖教者為當流大事聖教也 右於無宿善機無左右不可許之者也 釈蓮如御判」

「信心決定の道なるかゆへなり」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Chapter 16 : 「あさましくさふらう」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「あさましくさふらうなり」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

「あさましくさふらうなり」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Conclusion (後序) : 「それほと業」 (Rennyō Manuscript)

「そくはくの業」 (Hashino bō Manuscript)

「そくはくの業」 (Ryukoku University Manuscript)

Scholars who compared the differences between the above sentences concluded that new phrases were added to the Hashino bō manuscript and Ryukoku University manuscripts, making the Rennyō manuscript the oldest of all manuscripts.

Third, there are differences in the postscripts (後序) appended to the end of the manuscripts. For instance,

Hashi no bō manuscript: 「相論をたたかひかたんがために」

Rennyō manuscript and Gōsetsu ji manuscript: 「相論をたたんがために」

Kōtokuji manuscript, Myorinbō manuscript: 「相論のたたかひかたんがために」

Postscripts are found in all manuscripts and Taya's research concludes that the differences between them can be interpreted in a variety of ways.⁹ Taya claims that the differences need to be considered in terms of grammar and meaning. Indeed, in thinking about its meaning, "たたかひかたん" (*tatakaikatan*) gives the impression that a controversy occurred regarding interpretation of the *Tannishō*. On the contrary, "たたんが" (*tatanga*) simply means to avoid controversy beforehand. Moreover, Taya states the need to elucidate arguments with historical criticism. As mentioned above, the Rennyō manuscript (1454) and Hashi no bō manuscript (1519) were written over 60 years apart. Therefore, the context of the periods when were copied also differed, and we must closely examine the respective socio-historical contexts.

⁹ See Taya Raishun. *Tannishō shinchu* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1944)

2. “Who Composed *Tannishō*?” –The Question of the Authorship–

There is no extant original text of *Tannishō*. Only a copy of an original fragment of the *Tannishō* has been discovered. Although the authorship of *Tannishō* is still uncertain, there are suggestions as to who might have composed it. Historical studies have approached the question of the authorship of *Tannishō* with different conclusions, depending on the period.

The first candidate concluded to be author was Kakunyo 覚如 (1271–1351), who was the third head of the Hongwanji branch. This theory was first presented in a book entitled, *Shinshū shōetensekishū* 『真宗正依典籍集』 (*The Selected Collection of Classical Shin Buddhism Texts*), written by Kazuo (一雄) in 1624. That volume was later analyzed in many texts, such as *Shinshū rokugaishōgyō mokuroku* 『真宗録外聖教目録』 (*The Catalog of Sacred Text on Shin Buddhism*) (享保 3 年, 1718), written by Chikū (知空 1634-1718) and *Gessen shōgyō mokuroku* 『月筌聖教目録』 (The Catalog of Sacred Texts Organized by Gessen) (享保 14 年, 1729).¹⁰ The strongest evidence presented to assert the authorship of Kakunyo was derived from a quotation in the *Tannishō* indicating that “Shinran does not have even one disciple (親鸞は弟子一人も持たず候¹¹).” Similar lines are found in other Shin Buddhist texts, such as *Gaija Shō* 『改邪抄』 (*Essay Collecting False Faith*)¹² and *Kudenshō* 『口伝抄』 (*Treatises Transmit Orally*).¹³

The second theory is that the author of the *Tannishō* was Nyoshin 如信(1235–1300), the second head priest of the Hongwanji branch. This theory stemmed from an argument in the book, *Kana shōgyō mokuroku* 『仮名聖教目録』 (*The Catalog of Kana Sacred Texts*), written by Ekū (慧空). He also theorized that the *Tannishō* was written by Kakunyo. However, he briefly mentions an alternate possibility, indicating that the author might have been Nyoshin. The book by Ekū is the earliest known regarding this theory. In the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, a text called *Takamiya shōgyō mokuroku* 『高宮聖教目録』 (*Takamiya’s Catalog of Sacred Text*), edited by Shōkai (性海 1644~1727), clearly asserts that the author of *Tannishō*

¹⁰ Harada Tetsuryo, “Tannishō Kenkyu ni okeru Kyougakushiteki Shiten,” (in *Ryukoku Daigaku Bukkyō Buunka Kenkyu Sōsho*, edited by Hayashi Tomoyasu, Yata Ryōsho, 2007) pp.33-34

¹¹ See *Tannishō* chapter.6 「専修念仏のともがらの、わが弟子、ひとの弟子といふ相論の候ふらんこと、もつてのほかの子細なり。親鸞は弟子一人も持たず候。」 (*Jodo Shinshu Seiten, Kyoto: Kyogaku Dendō Center ed. 2007*) p.835

¹² See Kakunyo, *Gaija Shō (Essay Collecting False Faith)*, 「その故は親鸞は弟子一人も持たず、何事を教えて弟子というべきぞや、皆如来の御弟子なれば皆共に同行なり」 (*Jodo Shinshu Seiten, Kyoto: Kyogaku Dendō Center ed. 2007*) p.922

¹³ See Kakunyo, *Kudenshō (Treatises Transmit Orally)* 「それがしはまたく弟子一人も持たず、その故は弥陀の本願をたもたしむる外は何事を教えてか弟子と号せん、弥陀の本願は仏智他力の授けたまうところなり、然ればみなともの同行なり、私の弟子にあらず」 (*Jodo Shinshu Seiten, Kyoto: Kyogaku Dendō Center ed. 2007*) p.881

was Nyoshin. Shortly thereafter, it is clear that Nyoshin's authorship grew to be the prevailing view. In the late 18th century, there were multiple catalogs of lecture (講義録) indicating that the *Tannishō* was Nyoshin's work. However, the scholar who contributed most to this theory was Jinrei (深励) (1749-1817). He gave several lectures on the *Tannishō*, stating that it was written by Nyoshin. In Jinrei's book, *Tannishō kōrinki* 『歎異鈔講林記』 (*The Commentaries of Tannishō*), he asserts this theory by offering three similar passages from the *Treatises Transmit Orally* (口伝抄), written by Kakunyo. According to *Treatises Transmit Orally*, the person who conveyed Shinran's words to Kakunyo was Nyoshin. Hence, the theory claims that it would be chronologically contradictory if Kakunyo authored the *Tannishō* and must instead be Nyoshin. This theory had strong support until around the end of the Edo period.

The current consensus is that the author was likely Shinran's direct disciple, Kawada no Yuien (河田の唯円). Disagreement over the Nyoshin conclusion is already evidenced in Edo texts. In 1782, the book called *Jōdo Shinshū kyōtenshi* 『浄土真宗教典志』 (*The Purpose of Teaching on Shin Buddhism*), Genchi 玄智 (1734-1794) claims, "The author of *Tannishō* is unknown, but might be Yuien." The Yuien theory did not gain prominence until later. In *Tannishō Monki* 『歎異抄聞記』 (*The Record of Hearing Tannishō*), Ryōshō (了祥 1788-1842) began to criticize his master Jinrei's conclusion regarding Nyoshin's authorship. Ryōshō points out issues with the arguments in Jinrei's *San Mon Ichiri* (三文一理)¹⁴ and presents a new theory. For instance, Ryōshō analyzes the *Tannishō's* dialogue between Shinran and Yuien. He also examines the description of the text, concluding Shinran must have been alive when it was written. Ryōshō cites other sources to show Yuien was a direct disciple of Shinran, giving further credence to the Yuien theory. There is no doubt that Jinrei brought a deep understanding to the study of *Tannishō*, yet Ryōshō was more thoroughly grounded in philological studies than his master. However, Ryōshō's early death prevented completion of his *Tannishō Monki* and his theory remained largely unknown at that time. The prevailing view of Nyoshin's authorship remained until *Tannishō kigigaki* was published in 1842. Then, gradually, the theory that *Tannishō* was written by Yuien became roundly accepted as the most likely conclusion.

In short, the proposition of authorship gradually shifted from Kakunyo to Nyoshin and then, from Nyoshin to Yuien. The perception of authorship is significant, and we have to take into account the fact that as the candidates for authorship shifted, the treatment of the

¹⁴ Jinrei states his understanding of *Tannishō*, which claims three interpretations done in *Tannishō* will be included in one truth. Thus this discourse is called "(三文一理)"

manuscript would also change, leading to very different commentarial interpretations of the *Tannishō* through history.

3. Why *Tannishō* was Entitled “Prohibited Text” (禁書) in Modern Period?

As is now well known, the *Tannishō* was described and interpreted in various ways during the Muromachi and Edo period. Yet, a commonly accepted theory in the modern period (近代) was that Rennyo banned reading the *Tannishō* until Kiyozawa Manshi broke the seal to liberate the text and followers.¹⁵ However, according to the first and second sections, it is clear now that the *Tannishō* was lectured on many times in the past. Furthermore, a variety of manuscripts (写本) prove that the *Tannishō* had clearly been inherited and read by Shin Buddhist followers. Previous research¹⁶ shows that *Tannishō* is understood as a “Prohibited Text” because of three reasons:

- (1) An exiled letter printed in the end of the Manuscript of Rennyo bon had a strong impact on Shin Buddhism followers¹⁷
- (2) The number of publications concerned with the *Tannishō* sharply increased after 1897
- (3) The Effect of Kiyozawa Manshi: Kiyozawa’s direct disciples, Soga Ryojin (曾我量深), Chikazumi Jōkan (近角常観) Akegarasu Haya (暁烏敏), Tada Kanae (多田鼎), and Andou Shuichi (安藤州一) wrote commentaries related to the *Tannishō* and they reinforced a discourse that the *Tannishō* was a prohibited text only recently released by Kiyozawa Manshi.¹⁸

Concerning the first possibility, it is doubtful that the existence of Rennyo’s manuscript made *Tannishō* a prohibited text. According to the first chapter, there is no doubt that the Rennyo manuscript ends with a colophon signed by Rennyo and includes a remarkable letter addressing Shinran’s exile (流罪文) to Echigo (越後). However, there are twenty-nine more manuscripts and some of them do not have a colophon signed by Rennyo such as Ryukoku University manuscript. Thus, it is likely that the *Tannishō* was not strictly banned reading during Kamakura(鎌倉) and Muromachi (室町) periods for Shin Buddhist followers.

¹⁵ This theory is entitled “The Theory of Prohibited *Tannishō* by Rennyo” (「歎異抄蓮如禁書説」)

¹⁶ For more details, see Satō Masahide(1989), Harada Tetsuryo(2007), Tashiro Shunkō (2014)

¹⁷ See Rennyo manuscripts 「右斯聖教者為当流大事聖教也/於無宿善無左右不可許之者也/釈蓮如(花押)」

¹⁸ For more details, see Fukushima Kazuhito(1973), Fukushima Eiju(2002), Koyasu(2014)

The second possibility is also hard to confirm since we have many commentaries from the Edo period. The survey done by Fukushima (2002) showed that Jinrei had more than 1200 students in his school.(学寮)¹⁹ Furthermore, Nishida's research (2002) pointed out that Edo commentaries are sometimes revised, and it clearly shows us that the *Tannishō* was not treated as prohibited for a long time.²⁰

It is important to consider the third possibility more closely. Fukushima (2002) believes that the discourse asserting, “Rennyō forbade *Tannishō* texts and Kiyozawa released them (蓮如禁書清沢解放説),” was a discourse intentionally created by modern Shin Buddhist scholars.^{21,22} If his statement is true, the next question we have to ask is “Why did Shin Buddhist scholars need to create such a discourse?” In order to consider this issue, I would like to focus on the methodological divergence between 宗義 and 宗学 created in the modern period.

4. The Creation of Authority of *Tannishō* in Modern Period

In the Meiji and Taisho periods, western thought heavily influenced Shinshu doctrine (真宗学). External pressures forced Shin Buddhist scholars to face such thought. As a result, they decided to hold two propositions to protect their orthodoxy. The first discourse for them was the 師資相承の釋義, which elevated the lineage of the doctrine, typically, Honen to Shinran and then to Nyoshin. The second proposition was to give authority to the discourse of the Edo period (先哲伝授の指誨). Edo period doctrine vividly emphasized the relationship between master and disciple in terms of their understanding of the Shin Buddhist creed. According to this theory, one disciple has to proceed master's hermeneutics of Shinran precisely. Consequently, a variety of schools formed in the different Shin Buddhist branches and flourished. Although one famous Shin Buddhist scholars, Kiyozawa Manshi, was in direct opposition to other Shin Buddhist scholars. His statements made a clear distinction between 宗義 and 宗学. He states:

¹⁹ Fukushima Eiju, “*Tannishō kaishaku no 19 seiki*”(in *Edo no Shiso – Shisou shino 19seiki*: Perikansha,2002)

²⁰ Nishida Shinin, *Tannishō ron*, (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2002) pp.606-607

²¹ Terakawa Shunsho states 『歎異抄』という本は、清沢先生が読んでいくまでは、真宗の宗門の中では禁書というような扱いを受けた本だったのです。』(*Tanni no Keifu – Shinshu Kyogaku no Gendaiteki Kadai*–, Jinshin no kai, 1974) p.100

²² Umehara Takeshi states 「じつはこの本(『歎異抄』)が一般の人に知られ始めたのはそれほど古くはない。せいぜい、90年ほど前の事です。明治24(1891年)、明治25年(1892年)ごろ、清沢満之が注目するまでは、ほとんど知られていなかったといってもいいんです。」(*Tannishō to Hongawanji Kyodan*, Shogakukan,1984)

We should make a clear distinction between 宗義(Shugi) and 宗学(Shugaku) ... 宗義 is related to the words of our founder, Shinran, and should not be changed ... On the other hand, 宗学 has to be more progressive. In short, 宗義 is not able to change, but it is inevitable that 宗学 keep deconstructing and reforming again and again. Facing the issue of 宗学, it has to be said it does not matter shallow or deep the academic approach of tenets and its interpretation are, even if Jinrei (深励) and Senmyo (宣明) has a profound understanding of Shin Buddhist teaching ... We have to take them as just one's opinion²³

This statement is an obvious attempt by Kiyozawa to divide 宗義 and 宗学. He agreed with cherishing the lineage of Shinran's doctrine (宗義=師資相承の釋義). On the other hand, he disagreed with the latter statements, which give authority to specific doctrine of the Edo period (宗学=先哲伝授の指誨). As a result, his perspective was in direct opposition to what the aims of sectarian scholars. Consequently, Kiyozawa's thoughts became controversial for the Otani branch and he was excluded from his academic post. He initiated a new group called *Kokodo* (浩々洞) and began the effort called *Seishinshugi* (Cultivating Spirituality Movement) with a variety of talented disciples such as Soga Ryojin, Akegarasu Haya, Chikazumi Jokan, Tada Kanae and Kaneko Daiei. For Kiyozawa's direct disciple, Akegarasu Haya, *Tannishō* played a crucial role in liberating the teachings from sectarian view and initiating new modes to understand Shinran.²⁴ Fukushima (2002) concluded that there is a complete divergence between *Edo Shugaku* (江戸宗学) and Akegarasu's discourse that projects the self-confession through the *Tannishō*.²⁵ It is remarkable that Kiyozawa and Akegarasu provided such strong

²³ Kiyozawa Manshi 「夫れ宗義と宗学とは截然其區別あり、…宗義は宗祖の建立に係り、宗学は末学の研究に成る、…故に、宗義は一定不易ならざる可らずと雖ども、宗学は発達変遷あるを妨げず、…宗学なるものは、此宗教を学問の方面より討究するものにして、其解釈の深淺優劣如何に拘はらず、均しく末学の私見たるに過ぎざるなり、香月院深励師の該博精緻を以てするも、円乗院宣明の深遠明確を以てするも、……亦各宗学上の一家見たるに外ならず。」 (See Kiyozawa Manshi. “Kanrenkai wo Ronzu.” *Kyōkai Jigen*, Vol.12, 1897 October 29th)

²⁴ *Tannishō* gave a great impression on modern intellectuals. For example, Nishida Kitaro, D.T Suzuki, Naoe Kinoshita, Kurata Hyakuzo, Miki Kiyoshi, Noma Hiroshi, Maruyama Masao, Ienaga Saburo, Yoshimoto Ryumei. These people are profoundly related with *Tannishō*. Yasumaru Yoshio (2012) states that the chief reason of *Tannishō* attracted such intellectuals in Kindai (近代) are deeply concerned with issues of “The Root of Human Evil (人間悪の根源性)” found in *Tannishō*. Nishida Kitaro's “Pure Experience (純粹経験)” and “Japanese Spirituality (日本的靈性)” are also deeply rooted from *Tannishō*. (See Koyasu(2014))

²⁵ Fukushima Eiju states 「このように暁鳥が江戸宗学に抗しながら『歎異抄』解釈に「自己」を告白しながら語る言説と、深励に代表される江戸宗学の講釈の語りとの違いは、もはや歴然であろう。」 (“*Tannishō kaishaku no 19 seiki*”) p.107

influence regarding interpretations of *Tannishō*. However, what we also have to focus on here is the following passage stated by one of Kiyozawa's disciple, Soga Ryojin:

Because of Ryosho's interpretation, *Tannishō* is sparkling today. This is also because Kougatsuin(香月院) gave the lecture and Ryosho(了祥) was opposed to his idea. Without the lecture of Kogatsuin, Ryosho was not able to oppose to his proposal. Since there were two lectures given by Kogatsuin and Ryosho in the Edo period, those who are sentient beings like us can understand the *Tannishō* today. We must deeply appreciate this truth. ²⁶

This statement clearly tells us that not all Kiyozawa's disciples approved of his discourses. Furthermore, one of the disciples of Kiyozawa, Kaneko Daiei also argued that Edo commentaries provide great guidance to followers of Shin Buddhism.²⁷ At this point, some disciples attempted to draw connections between the interpretations of Edo commentaries and modern interpretations.²⁸ Yet these types of statements were less important for modern intellectuals and have often been ignored.

What Kiyozawa and his disciples attempted was to avoid trapping dogma created in the authority at Edo period. However, ironically, their influential statement made in *Kokodo* led to the making of "The Creation of the Authority of *Tannishō* on this contemporary period." Consequently, it leads to make an argument which claims that *Tannishō* distorts the essential teaching of Shinran.²⁹ Therefore, the first step necessary for future research is to reconsider the relationship between Edo period commentaries of *Tannishō* and the modern period commentaries of *Tannishō*. In doing this, we can relativize "The Creation of the Authority of *Tannishō* in the Modern Period" and it then provides us with a natural foundation to consider contemporary Shin Buddhist doctrine.³⁰

²⁶ Soga Ryojin states 「了祥師あればこそ今日は『歎異抄』が輝いている。これは又、香月院師が講義したから了祥が反対したからで、香月院師の講義がなければ了祥師も反対出来ぬから、この意味で香月院師にも感謝せねばならぬ。お二方の研究あればこそ我等如き愚鈍のものもかかる『歎異抄』を解らせてもらへる訳で、大いに感謝せねばならぬ」 (*Tannishō Chōki*, in Soga Ryojin Senshu vol.6, Yayoi Shobō p.34, 1971, Original text was written in 1947)

²⁷ Kaneko Daiei states 「江戸集学の註釈学に基づく解釈が、我々末学の指針となった」 (Kaneko Daiei. "Kōgatsuin to Takakura Gakuryō." Otani Gakuhō no.24 Vol.6, 1944)

²⁸ Moreover, seen from Nishi Hongwanji branch, there was Umehara Shinryū, who read *Tannishō* on his original way of understanding.

²⁹ For example, Yamaori Tetsuo states that there is a total difference between what *Kyōgōshinshō* and *Tannishō* described (See. Yamaori Tetsuo, *Aku to ōjo – Shinran wo Uragiru Tannishō*, Chuō Kōronsha, 2000)

³⁰ University of California Berkeley, Ryūkoku University and Otani University launched the New English translation series of the *Tannishō* Commentarial Material in Edo period. These types of

5. Conclusion

In this short paper, I attempted to tackle how the authority of *Tannishō* developed. The first issue considered was the lack of an original manuscript and issues of authorship. Resources clearly show that the *Tannishō* was repeatedly revised and copied by Shin Buddhist followers.

Secondly, we have to take into account that during the Edo period, almost all scholars believed that Nyoshin, the Second Head of Hongwaji, was the author. Thus, *Tannishō* was taken as a sacred and important text for that sectarian institution. In addition, there are a variety of lectures during this period and we have records of notes taken by student attendees. Therefore, it is hard to say that reading the *Tannishō* was prohibited during the Edo period.

Finally, I consider the meaning of “Prohibited Text” stated during the Meiji and Taisho periods. From the perspective of philological studies, as is stated by Fukushima (2002) and Koyasu (2014), the idea of “歎異抄蓮如禁書、清沢解放説” was a discourse intentionally created by modern Shin Buddhist scholars. However, we also must admit that there is a lineage of ideas that attempted to draw connections between Edo period of understanding and the contemporary period, particularly exemplified in Soga Ryojin and Kaneko Daiei. Therefore, I believe that reconsidering the lineage of *Tannishō*'s interpretation during the Edo period directly leads us to reconsideration of Shin Buddhist thoughts during this contemporary period.

project will give a foundation for reconsider the Shin Buddhist doctrine in this contemporary era.

Work cited

- Kiyozawa Manshi. “Kanrenkai wo Ronzu.” *Kyōkai Jigen*, Vol.12, October 29th, 1897
- Kaneko Daiei. “Kōgatsuin to Takakura Gakuryo.” Otani Gakuhō no.24 Vol.6, 1944
- Taya Raishun. *Tannishō shinchū* ; Kyoto: Hōzōkan,1944
- Soga Ryojin. *Tannishō Chōki* in *Soga Ryojin Senshu vol.6* ; Kyoto: Yayoi Shobō, 1947
- Furuta Takehiko “Tannishō Rennyō bon no Genpon Jōkyō-“Ruzai Meyasu” setsudan wo Megutte”
Shigaku Zasshi 75(3),1966
- Fukushima Kazuhito. *Kindai Nihon no Shinran- Sono Shisou Shi* ; Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1973
- Terakawa Shunsho. *Tanni no Keifu—Shin Shu Kyo Gaku no Gendai teki Kadai—*
;Kyoto:Jinshin no kai, 1974
- Umehara Takeshi. *Tannishō to Hongawanji Kyodan*, Shogakukan,1984
- Sato Masahide. *Tannishō Ronchū*: Tokyo:Aotosha, 1989
- Yamaori Tetsuo. *Aku to Ojo—Shinran wo Uragiru Tannishō*, Chuō Kouronsha,2000
- Fukushima Eiju, “Tannishō kaishaku no 19 seiki” in *Edo no Shiso—Shisou shino 19seiki*:
Perikansha,2002
- Nishida Shinin. *Tannishō Ron* :Kyoto; Hōzōkan, 2002
- Jodo Shinshu Seiten ed. *Jodo Shinshu Seiten Zensho2. Shuso hen*; Kyoto: Kyogaku Dendō
Center ed. 2007
- Harada Tetsuryo. “*Tannishō Kenkyū ni okeru Kyogakushiteki Shiten.*” In *Tannishō no
Kyogakushiteki Kenkyū*, edited by Hayashi Chikou, Yata Ryōsho,
Ryukoku Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyū Sōsho, 2007
- Koyasu Nobuhiro. *Tannishō no kindai* ;Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2014
- Tashiro Shunko, “Tannishō no u sono shogyō no fumon to kinshosetsu ni tsuite” *Bulletin of the
Graduate Divison of Literature of Dōhō University*, vol.10, 2014