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Is Dōgen’s Eiheiji Temple “Mt. T’ien-t’ung East”?: Geo-Ritual Perspectives on the Transition from Chinese Ch’an to Japanese Zen

Steven Heine

The Question of Affinity between Temples

One of the main elements that appear in traditional records of Dōgen’s career is the notion that he established Eiheiji temple in the mid-1240s in the remote, snowy mountains of Echizen (currently Fukui) province based on the model he experienced while training at Mt. T’ien-t’ung in China two decades before. According to the records of Dōgen’s life in the autobiographical musings of the Hōkyōki and the main Sōtō sectarian biography from 1472, the Kenzeiki, he was admonished by his Chinese mentor Ju-ching to remain withdrawn from the corruption of mainstream society in a secluded natural setting. In the Šōbōgenzō “Shohō jissō” fascicle composed during the fall of 1243 shortly after Dōgen moved to Echizen in the seventh month, there is an extended account of one of Ju-ching’s spontaneous midnight sermons accompanied by a detailed description of the halls and platforms of Mt. T’ien-t’ung. Following this, Dōgen refers to his “having crossed innumerable mountains and rivers” to reach the locale where Eiheiji was established.¹

These and additional passages in a variety of sources including the Šōbōgenzō zuimonki and Eihei kōroku are frequently cited by the
Sōtō Zen tradition as examples of how Dōgen fulfilled the goal of patterning the Kamakura era Japanese temple after the Sung dynasty Chinese model. From this standpoint, Dōgen’s pivotal move at the midpoint of his career from his first temple, Kōshōji in Fukakusa near Kyoto, to Echizen was not a matter of defensively running away from obstacles and rivals among the Tendai and Rinzai Zen schools in the capital, as it has often been portrayed by some critics. Rather, the move was a genuine effort to find the appropriate locale to introduce and implement Chinese-style rites and practices.

Reinforcing the image of intimate connections between the Chinese model and Eiheiji is the recent construction at Mt. T’ien-t’ung of a shrine to the memory of Dōgen’s experiences in China. Figure 4.1 below is a diagram showing the layout of the Mt. T’ien-t’ung compound, which indicates the location of the Dōgen shrine to the center right, and figure 4.2 shows the shrine’s memorial tablet, which contains Chinese writing on one side and Japanese on the other side of the stele. In addition, near the port of Ning-po another tablet commemorates the site of Dōgen’s entry into China. There are four meditation halls at Mt T’ien-t’ung, including the one believed to be the site of Dōgen’s enlightenment. The shrine was built in the post-Mao period of liberalization in 1980, primarily to accommodate the influx of tourists from Japan wishing to see the origins of the Sōtō sect, despite the irony that except for Ju-ching and several other prominent Ts’ao-tung abbots, the leadership of the Chinese temple through most of history has been primarily from the Lin-chi school. Therefore, it is only Japanese parishioners (danka-sha), not well aware of the details of the early history of the Chinese temple and the formation of the sect in Japan, who have come to think of Mt. T’ien-t’ung as the exclusive home temple of Ts’ao-tung Ch’an/Sōtō Zen Buddhism.²

This basic historical misconception raises the question, How closely related were the practices at the Chinese and Japanese temples? Was Mt. T’ien-t’ung the chosen model that Eiheiji emulated, such that the latter temple can best be understood in terms of how it set in motion the practices conducted at the former, or are there conflicts and contrasts between the ritual centers that are more relevant for us to consider? The primary aim of this chapter is to compare key elements of religious practice at the temples in the thirteenth century, the time that was so crucial for the process of transmitting Zen from China to Japan. The comparison is examined in terms of geo-ritual perspectives, that is, how the geographical settings of the respective sites seen in light of the overall social environment and cultural context affected the implementation of ritual activities. Such a comparative study must recognize that the thirteenth century needs to be viewed through the filter of the pres-
ent and recent past, since the temples have been rebuilt numerous times, and the records of historical activity and exchanges, aside from Dōgen’s own works, which have been questioned in recent studies, are sparse or nonexistent.\(^3\)

On the one hand, it seems clear, as T. Griffith Foulk points out, that “Dōgen’s mission in life was to establish in Japan the true buddha-dharma that he believed he had encountered in the great monastic centers of Sung China, and especially in the person of his teacher, Ju-ching.”\(^4\) He viewed himself and his dharmic mission as pioneering Sung Chinese rituals for the first

**Figure 4.1. Mt. T’ien-t’ung Temple Diagram**
time in the Japanese setting. In addition to a rigorous approach to zazen meditation, which he experienced while training under Ju-ching, the elements of practice Dōgen introduced cover many of the features of monastic rules contained in the 1103 text, *Ch’an-yüan ch’ing-kuei* (J. *Zen’en shingi*). These include the summer (*ango*) and winter retreats, the delivery of formal (*jödo*) and informal (*shōsan*) sermons on a regular basis often in relation to seasonal and other ceremonies such as Sakyamuni’s birthday, and the role of the chief cook (*tenzo*) plus other administrative positions (*chiji*). To illustrate his approach to ritual practice, Dōgen sprinkled his sermons with generous helpings of kōan.
citations and commentaries culled from the classic collections that he had apparently learned while studying and attending lectures at Mt. Tien-t’ung and other Chinese temples.

Furthermore, Eiheiji was built according to the seven-hall monastic compound construction (shichidō garan) initiated in China, highlighting the function of the Monks Hall for communal meditation and sleeping and the Dharma Hall for public sermons, as well as the Abbot’s Quarters (not included in the list of seven) for private instruction. The seven main halls were more or less required, but the temple complexes were generally much more developed with dozens of buildings spread out over a large compound. The site for T’ien-t’ung is a green uninhabited area at the base of a small mountain, and each hall, positioned right behind the previous hall, is a little higher than the hall in front of it, with about 750 halls and rooms in all.

In many instances, Dōgen claimed to be the first to introduce various Ch’an ritual practices, first at Kōshōji and then at Eiheiji, including the construction of the Monks Hall and the role of the cook, the use of jōdō and shōsan sermons, and celebration of the Buddha’s birthday on the fourth month/eighth

**Figure 4.3.** This diagram shows the key buildings in the temple compound of Mt. T’ien-t’ung juxtaposed with a diagram of Eiheiji, where the compound layout has probably been altered from the Tokugawa era. There are additional buildings on both compounds that are not listed.
day and enlightenment (Rohatsu, 12/8) anniversaries. Yet we know in large part from Dōgen’s own accounts that some of these practices, such as those of the cook, were already established by Eisai at Kenninji temple founded in Kyoto in 1202. Some rituals may have also been in operation at Sennyūji temple founded in Kyoto in 1218 by Shunjō, a Tendai monk who traveled to China and returned to Japan in 1211.

In addition to how the question of whether or not Dōgen was the very first to implement key ritual practices affects an understanding of the extent to which he was influenced by or borrowed from Chinese models, there is the question of how faithful he was to Ch’ān sources. Dōgen maintained, for example, that he brought to Japan a unique approach to the vinaya (precepts) based on administering the simplified sixteen-article precepts, but his claim to have derived this system directly from Ju-ching is dubious since Chinese Ch’ān monasteries uniformly required the full precepts (a combination of the 250 Pratimoksha and 58 Bodhisattva precepts). It seems that since Dōgen himself never received the Pratimoksha precepts, he sought to come up with a rationale for dismissing the need for these. Dōgen also claimed to bring back a ceremony for folding the robe (kesa) that he says he had observed at Chinese temples, although it is not clear that this was ever followed the way he describes it in either China or Japan. Also, Dōgen’s comments of both praise and criticism of Mt. T’ien-t’ung and Kenninji, especially in the Shōbōgenzō zuimonki, are interesting for historical purposes. Yet it seems clear that some of the remarks in which he eulogizes Ju-ching are exaggerated and made primarily for sectarian purposes in legitimizing his new movement in Japan and disputing rival forces aligned with the Lin-chi school.

Further contradicting the argument for a fundamental underlying affinity between temples is the observation that the geographical locations as well as the cultural landscapes they occupied are quite different. Mt. T’ien-t’ung is situated on a relatively small hill in close proximity to a major cosmopolitan port, Ming-chou (currently Ning-po), which is near the then-capital city of Hang-chou. In Ch’ān/Zen discourse, the term “mountain” is often a conceit for a site of spiritual retreat, even if not actually occupying such a geographical setting. Not aligned with the Ch’an school until 1007, or about seven hundred years after its founding, Mt. T’ien-t’ung never was isolated but rather was a part of a conglomeration of Buddhist sites, including other major urban and ex-urban temples in the region. Eiheiji, on the other hand, was set in the deep, reclusive mountains (although not too distant from other important Echizen religious institutions, including the Tendai temple, Heisenji).

More significant than the matter of location are discrepancies concerning ritual activities conducted at the respective temples, especially involving the
connection between lineage affiliation and transmission rites, moral precepts and behavioral etiquette reflected in disciplinary regulations and codes, and clerical and lay assembly convocations. Furthermore, as Ishii Seijun shows, to appreciate the significance of the discrepancies, it is necessary to compare not just specific rites but rather the overall institutional approaches at Eiheiji with the Five Mountains (Wu-shan) network of Chinese Ch’an. The main difference is that the Wu-shan system was a vertical, top-down model supervised and assigned by a government regulatory agency and with strong participation in temple rituals and affairs by a landed gentry from the capital. Eiheiji, on the other hand, was autonomous and unregulated by the government, although based on the patronage of the powerful samurai clan of Hatano Yoshishige, a Kyoto-based retainer who held land in Echizen province, and it involved the inclusion of uneducated lay believers from the countryside. It is also important to see both of these systems in the context of the Kenmitsu system prevalent in Japanese temples at the beginning of the Kamakura era, as well as two Japanese Zen models developed subsequent to Dōgen, the Five Mountains (Gozan) and Rinka styles.

Chinese Ch’an Temples at the Time of Dōgen’s Arrival

Dōgen was the second in a series of Japanese monks who went to China in pursuit of discovering true Buddhism and returned to found Zen temples. His travels from 1223–1227 were sandwiched between the two trips taken by Eisai at the end of the twelfth century, the first for six months in 1168 and the next from 1187–1191, and Enni Benen’s pilgrimage, which began in the mid-1230s. Whereas Eisai and Enni became leaders of the Rinzai school based in Kyoto, Dōgen at the height of his career departed from the capital in the mid-1240s to form a movement in the mountains of northwest Japan that eventually became known as the Sōtō school largely through the evangelical efforts of fourth patriarch Keizan and his long list of followers.

Like Eisai before him, as well as Enni and Shinichi Kakushin among other subsequent Kamakura era pilgrims, Dōgen was first trained as a Tendai novice but forsook this path to study at the Five Mountains temples located near Ming-chou (which can refer either to a larger provincial area or to the port traditionally known as Ching-yüan). Ching-yüan was a port city just east of the Southern Sung capital of Hang-chou (with another important city, Shao-hsing, located in between) in Chekiang province on the eastern seaboard of China. Hang-chou with its multistorey houses was chosen as the capital after Kai-feng, the Northern Sung capital, more for its charm and culture as a site
for the imperial court to perform ritual sacrifices and also for some geographical advantages than because it was considered politically or militarily significant.

Nevertheless, it was the biggest urban center in the world at the time with one million residents, and it earned a reputation for grandeur, according to Patricia Buckley Ebrey and the thirteenth-century traveler from the West she cites:

After the north was lost, the new capital at Hangzhou quickly grew to match or even surpass Kaifeng in population and economic development. Marco Polo described it as without doubt the finest and most splendid city in the world: “Anyone seeing such a multitude would believe it impossible that food could be found to feed them all, and yet on every market day all the market squares are filled with people and with merchants who bring food on carts and boats.”

From Dōgen’s writings, we find that monks and pilgrims from all over China and from Korea and Japan were thronging to the Hang-Ming area, which was connected in turn by canals and waterways as well as overland trade routes to the northwest and southeast of China.

The ancient history of Ming-chou dates back to Hemudu settlements in the fifth millennium BCE, making it one of the oldest continuous cultural locations in China. Marked by a confluence of three rivers merging into a bay near the ocean, Ning-po has been a seaport for two thousand years, although full-fledged urbanization came hundreds of years later, and it remains one of the largest in the world but is now overshadowed by the megalopolis of Shanghai across the bay. By the early centuries CE, Ming-chou was the primary entry to the “Silk Road of the Sea” (Marco Polo embarked from there on his return journey to Italy via the Indian Ocean, just about seventy years after Dōgen’s visit). It was also a place where several early Buddhist temples had been established with styles of practice imported perhaps directly from India, or at least greatly influenced by Indian Buddhism, including the oldest center, Wu-lei temple.

In the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, Ming-chou was a cosmopolitan, dynamic port of call with a rich history of diverse cultural and religious developments as well connections with Japan and Japanese Buddhism in addition to countries throughout the Asia-Pacific region. Because of its close proximity to Japan, there were early interactions during the T’ang, including those by Chinese monks who persisted in making the difficult journey to visit and to bring geomancy and other elements of Chinese society, as well as absorb cultural affinities with the Japanese.
The two main temples Dōgen visited, Mt. T’ien-t’ung and Mt. A-yū-wang located in the foothills of the sub-tropical T’ai-pai Mountains with evergreen foliage, were established by the end of the third century, in 300 and 283, respectively. The latter, named for King Asoka, is said to house one of three main relics of Sakyamuni Buddha found in China, a sarira (crystalline relic found in cremation pyre) maintained on the second floor of the Relics Hall. Both temples did not become considered Public monasteries and assigned to the Ch’an Five Mountains network until the eleventh century (in 1007 and 1008, respectively), the same decade that produced the seminal transmission of the lamp text, the Ching-te chuan-teng lu (J. Keitoku dentōroku), after over seven hundred years of being affiliated with various other schools and lineages.¹⁵

Although ranked one notch higher in the Five Mountains system than Mt. T’ien-t’ung, Mt. A-yū-wang—supposedly, it appeared suddenly out of the ground when a monk looking for a harmonious place discovered the miracle—has been better known for its relic and Indian style of practice than for dedication to Ch’an practice. This evaluation, which can imply a deficiency in Ch’an practice, is suggested in a key passage in the “Busshō” fascicle where Dōgen is quite critical of the temple’s leading monks, who do not seem to exhibit typical Ch’an insight.¹⁶

Furthermore, Mt. T’ien-t’ung was not primarily known as a Ts’ao-tung temple, in that abbacies of Ch’an Public monasteries had a rotation of abbots assigned by a central government agency and were not distinguished by subsect, for example, Ts’ao-tung or Lin-chi. Therefore, while a prominent monk might have an exclusive affiliation or loyalty to a particular school, the temples never did, so that even when Hung-chih put great effort into refurbishing Mt. T’ien-t’ung in the twelfth century, the institution itself did not remain in Ts’ao-tung hands. Its sectarian reputation is primarily directed from a retrospective outlook based on Dōgen’s status in Japan and recent shrines and memorials to Dōgen established at the temple and elsewhere in Ning-po largely to accommodate the Japanese tourist trade and pilgrimages.

The spread of Buddhism in the Hang-Ming area was not based on official government dissemination policies (unlike the T’ang emperor sending Hsüan-tsang to India, for example). Yet, by the time of the Sung, this area had become the center of the Chinese Buddhist world, encompassing such venerable institutions as the Five Mountains temples, another important Ch’an center at Mt. Hsüeh-t’ou, the sacred island of Mt. P’u-t’o considered the earthly abode of Kūan-yin, and the massif of Mt. T’ien-t’ai along with dozens or even hundreds of temples of the T’ien-t’ai school.

Although located on what seems to have been a significant trade route between Fujien and the Hang-Ming area, Mt. T’ien-t’ai today remains an
isolated, sprawling mountain region marked by literally hundreds of peaks and valleys with numerous monasteries strewn all over its slopes. Unlike Mt. T’ien-t’ung located in the hills in close proximity to an urban environment, Mt. T’ien-t’ai, several hours drive to the south, was genuinely remote and pastoral. By the Southern Sung, however, it had lost prominence and its place as the center of the school except as a site of pilgrimage and history. One of the main temples of the massif, Wan-nien ssu, had officially become a major Ch’an temple and was considered a part of the Five Mountain system.

At this stage of their development, the two schools, the T’ien-t’ai (also known as the Teaching or Doctrinal school) and Ch’an (also known as the Meditation school), both supervised by the government and with priests regulated by official ordinations, were quite similar in terms of religious rituals, doctrinal study, and meditation practices. For the elite clergy within these state institutions, the study of T’ien-t’ai doctrine generally required the practice of Ch’an meditation, and to practice Ch’an one needed to have studied T’ien-t’ai. Nevertheless, while both schools were considered Public monasteries, from the end of the eleventh century on, the Ch’an monasteries also referred to as Ten Directions monasteries superseded those of T’ien-t’ai and other movements in terms of prestige and the vigor of institutional growth based on government support and donations.

In addition to the five main temples, the Five Mountains system included ten highly ranked and at least thirty-five regular temples. Furthermore, there were literally dozens or even hundreds of temples located in the proximity of Ming-chou. When Dōgen got off the ship, even though Mt. A-yū-wang is located only about a dozen miles from the port and Mt. T’ien-t’ung about two dozen miles, it may have taken him several weeks to reach T’ien-t’ung because he probably would have stopped one-by-one at some of the temples along the way that had a custom of hosting itinerant monks or “clouds.” Again, this does not indicate considerable distance from the temple. In fact, the cook from nearby Mt. A-yū-wang (admittedly closer to the harbor than Mt. T’ien-t’ung), whom Dōgen met on ship as cited in Tenzokyōkun, planned to return to the temple the evening of their conversation, suggesting that it was within a modest walking distance (for a well-trained monk). Mt. T’ien-t’ung at its peak is said to have housed a community of over a thousand monks, all fed from a single wok supervised by the temple’s chief cook.

A full discussion of Dōgen’s experiences in China have been covered elsewhere and are beyond the scope of this chapter, although the traditional narrative accounts have been increasingly questioned as reliable historiographical sources. One very interesting though often overlooked episode that high-
lights the way Dōgen’s approach to Ch’an rituals has been portrayed in traditional narratives with supernatural implications is the account in the Shōbōgenzō “Busshō” fascicle of a vision of the round full moon at Mt. A-yū-wang temple that appeared while Dōgen was looking at portraits of the thirty-three Ch’an patriarchs. This section of the fascicle follows a lengthy philosophical discussion of an anecdote in the Ching-te ch’uan-teng lu volume 1, in which Nagarjuna manifests as the moon. Dōgen says that “in former days, while traveling as a cloud [or itinerant novice],” he went to Mt. A-yū-wang in the first year of his journey to China (1223); but when he saw the paintings, he did not understand the meaning and nobody was available to explain it. Then he
returned to this site about two years later, during the summer retreat of 1225, apparently a short time after attaining his enlightenment experience under the tutelage of Ju-ching.

One question concerns why Dōgen would have returned to Mt. A-yū-wang during the retreat when it was expected that monks dedicated to an intensive and sacred period of meditation (geango) would not depart their home temple, especially given Dōgen’s struggles in not being allowed to participate in the retreat until the third year of his stay in China. Surely, once Dōgen had taken up training under Ju-ching, he would not be looking to explore other alternatives. A possibility is that the two temples at Mt. T’ien-t’ung and Mt. A-yū-wang located in close proximity would have shared resources, or that the relic was so prominent—Dōgen refers to visiting the “six beautiful sites” of the compound—that he took time to see this for what was probably a second time. In any case, according to “Busshō,” this time he alone among the monks understood the vision, whereas the others either took it too literally or did not see it at all. Dōgen sensed the deficiency of Chinese Ch’an Buddhists, including the temple abbot, Ta-kuang, a relatively unknown figure from the Lin-chi school, for whom there is “no nostrils in their complexion” and “no sword in their laughter.” This episode marks the moment in the traditional account when Dōgen is clear and confident of his spiritual authority and

**Figure 4.5.** Said to be original temple wok now used to cast good-luck coins
superiority. It also serves his partisan agenda a decade and a half after the trip by putting down members of a rival lineage from the vantage point of what he endorsed, retrospectively, in terms of what was relevant to his struggles at the time in Japan.

This account of what transpired in the mid-1220s was written in the early 1240s, around the time Dōgen received from China a copy of Ju-ching’s recorded sayings and began citing his master more extensively while also disparaging rival lineages. A common theory is that Dōgen apparently felt that this version gave an inadequate picture of Ju-ching’s teaching, and he wanted to enhance and revise the image of his mentor. It is interesting to note, however, that a few months before the arrival of the text of the recorded sayings of the teacher, Ju-ching was evoked by Dōgen to reinforce sectarian perspectives. For example, in “Gyōji” (part 2) from 4.5.1242, Dōgen quotes his mentor in a passage that is not found in his recorded sayings as severely criticizing the Lin-chi master Te-kuang in the lineage of the famous Ta-hui, whom Dōgen frequently excoriates:

In former days, I hung my traveling staff at Mt. Ching when the head monk was Fo-chao Te-kuang. In the lecture hall, he said to his disciples, “About Zen Buddhism you should not seek another’s views, but try to realize it for yourselves.” So saying, he paid no attention whatsoever to what happened in the Monks Hall. The junior and senior monks were also unconcerned, and busied themselves with the reception of government officials. He was quite ignorant of the Buddha Dharma, and was instead attached to fame and fortune. If we could, as he says, grasp the Buddha Dharma by ourselves, then why have the sharpest monks gone searching for a true teacher? Really, Te-kuang has never even experienced Zen. Now, in every area we find those who have not awakened their bodhi-seeking mind who are followers of Te-kuang. It is regrettable that the Buddha Dharma is not found among them.20

Dōgen’s Return to Japan and Establishment of Eiheiji

Once again, an extensive discussion of Dōgen’s return to Japan and years of ritual practice before his eventual move to Eiheiji will not be covered here, but suffice it to say that the nearly two decades were divided into several cycles. These include about two years (1227–1229) of practice in Kenninji temple in
Kyoto and four years (1229–1233) at hermitages in the ex-urban town of Fukakusa. Six years after the return, Dōgen was able to establish his own temple in Fukakusa, Kōshōji, which after a fundraising drive opened a Monks Hall in 1236 derived from the style of Sung Ch’an monasteries. Following a decade (1233–1243) in which he led this temple, or about sixteen years after returning from China, Dōgen and a small band of followers left in the seventh month of 1243 for Echizen province. There is no specific reference, let alone an attempt to explain the reasons for the move in Dōgen’s corpus of writings. Thus, all discussions are speculative and based on piecing together threads of evidence and ideas from pseudo-historical sources that are often unreliable.

A longstanding argument about the reasons behind the move is that Dōgen, as the leader of a new movement, was embroiled in a political conflict with the Tendai establishment on Mt. Hiei and may, in fact, have been driven away from Kyoto or chose to flee rather than stand up to forces beyond his control. The advent of the construction of the impressive compound at Tōfukuji temple, just down the road from Kōshōji, with abbacy awarded to Rinzai priest Enni in 1243, may have forced Dōgen to flee the capital the same year. Sectarian scholars have tried to give this argument a positive spin by portraying Dōgen sympathetically as a heroic victim who eventually rose above his opponents through a withdrawal to a reclusive retreat, in part with the assistance of Hatano’s patronage.

The traditional Sōtō explanation is that the move was motivated by Dōgen’s pure longing to uphold Ju-ching’s injunction to escape the confusion and turmoil of the capital (which is so eloquently described in Chōmei’s Hōjōki of 1212) and remain free from secular corruption by establishing an ideal monastic community in the natural splendor of Echizen. There, he discovered what has been referred to as a mystical axis mundi in the remote mountain forests.21 In support of the emphasis on renunciation from worldly connections, there are several prominent examples of teacher Ju-ching and disciple Dōgen expressing disdain for false-hearted monks, even within the upper echelons of the Buddhist hierarchy, who are prone to give in to temptation, greed, or longing for power rather than a supreme dedication to pursue the Dharma. For instance, both Ju-ching and Dōgen declined the offer to wear the purple robe proffered by imperial authorities at key turning points in their careers. In texts written in Kyoto, Dōgen exhorts Zen practitioners to dwell among the crags and white rocks found only in secluded mountain landscapes in Bendōwa, and in Shōbōgenzō “Sansuikyō,” he suggests that mountain abodes are the natural setting for Zen masters.

According to Hokyoki no. 10, Ju-ching admonishes, “You must first make your dwelling in steep mountains and dark valleys.”22 In a similar passage
recorded in *Kenzeiki*, he instructs, “Do not live near the capital or by rich and powerful persons. Avoid emperors, ministers and generals. Stay in the deep mountains far removed from worldly affairs and devote yourself to the education of young monks, even if you have only one disciple. Do not terminate the transmission I have given you.”  

Apparently following this advice, in *jōdō* sermon 7.498 delivered near the end of his career in 1252, Dōgen asserts:

> Those who are truly endowed with both practice and discernment are called patriarchal teachers. What is called practice is the intimate practice of the patriarchal school. What is called discernment is the discerning understanding of the patriarchal school. The practice and discernment of buddha patriarchs is simply to discern what should be discerned and to practice what should be practiced. The first thing to practice is to cut away all attachments and have no family ties, to abandon social obligations and enter the realm of the unconditioned. Without sojourning in towns, and without being familiar with rulers, enter the mountains and seek the way. From ancient times, noble people who yearn for the way all enter the deep mountains and calmly abide in quiet serenity.

> The patriarch Nagarjuna said, “All zazen practitioners reside in the deep mountains.” You should know that for leaving behind the bustle and turmoil while attaining quiet serenity, there is nothing like the deep mountains. Even if you are foolish, you should abide in the deep mountains, because the foolish abiding in towns will increase their mistakes. Even if you are wise, you should abide in the deep mountains, because the wise abiding in towns will damage their virtue.

> I [Eihei] in my vigorous years searched for the way west of the western ocean [in China], and now in my older years I abide north of the northern mountains. Although I am unworthy, I yearn for the ancient pathways. Without discussing our wisdom or unworthiness, and without discriminating between sharp or dull functioning, we should all abide in the deep mountains and dark valleys.

The affinity shared by Ju-ching, who was not known so much as a philosopher or poet as a strict disciplinarian and charismatic leader, and Dōgen regarding a strict adherence to the teaching is reflected in the calligraphy below, “Uphold nothing beyond the Dharma,” which is held in the Abbot’s Quarters at Mt. T’ien-t’ung:

> In his effort to gain a place for contemplation that was free of secular distractions, Dōgen may also have been inspired by the poetic tradition he had
studied as a child who was brought up with a late-Heian style aristocratic education. Japanese poetry, which was in part derived from Chinese aesthetics grounded in eremitic and reclusive traditions, celebrated the intense sense of privacy and solitude (sabi) that can only be experienced in secluded, natural areas. This was a theme well expressed in Dōgen’s own verse composed in both Japanese and Chinese, as well as in Shōbōgenzō fascicles that evoke the serenity of the natural environment as the ideal backdrop for undisturbed ascetic meditation, including “Keisei sanshoku” and “Baika” (the latter written at Kippōji).

It is possible to imagine that Dōgen felt that only mountain seclusion would provide the unadorned simplicity needed to foster the path to enlightenment. According to one of Dōgen’s Japanese waka poems, he never gave up a sense of longing for the refinement of the capital, whose beauty had an appeal that rivaled Echizen’s:

Miyako ni wa All last night and
Momijji shinuran This morning still,
Okuyama no Snow falling the deepest mountains;
Koyoi mo kesa mo Ah, to the see autumn leaves
Arare furi keri. Scattering in my home.26
Ienaga Saburō explains the Japanese view of nature as a mirror and a model for humans, an experience attained “in a secluded grass-thatched hut in the mountains (yamazato) where secular dust of worldly life does not reach,” and nature has a supremely soteric (kyūsai) value. Similar sentiments are expressed in a kanbun verse from this phase:

> For so long here without worldly attachments,
> I have renounced literature and writing;
> I may be a monk in a mountain temple,
> Yet still, I am moved in seeing gorgeous blossoms
> Scattered by the spring breeze,
> And hearing the warbler’s lovely song—
> Let others judge my meager efforts.  

Dōgen’s Claims for Transmitting Ch’an Rituals

The argument for withdrawal based largely on romantic and visionary imagery inspired by the teachings of Ju-ching at the Mt. T’ien-t’ung location is buttressed by the writings from the Eiheiji period, which indicate that Dōgen saw himself fulfilling his hope of opening a legitimate Sung-style Monks Hall and Dharma Hall in the mountains. There, he was able to carry out the genuine Ch’an approach to monastic leadership, as reflected in formal jōdō sermons delivered in kanbun (Sino-Japanese). Numerous passages from sermons collected in Eihei kōroku proclaim how Dōgen brought ritual elements and patterns from China for the first time in the history of Japanese Buddhism. These include:

- no. 2.138, on introducing the post of chief cook,
- no. 4.319, “On Mt. Kichijō there is a Monks Hall available for the first time for all Japanese to hear of its name, see its shape, enter and sit in it.”
- no. 5.406 (on 12.8.1251), “Japanese ancestors have been holding ceremonies to celebrate the birth of Sakyamuni Buddha and commemorate his death since an earlier era. However, they have not yet received transmission of the annual ceremony to celebrate his enlightenment. I [Eihei] imported Rohatsu (12.8 ritual) twenty years ago and maintained it. It must be transmitted in the future,”
- and no. 8.shōsan.10, “I first transmitted shōsan sermons twenty years ago.”
Furthermore, nearly a dozen sermons over the last few years of delivery are examples of administrative appointments or declarations, as listed in table 4.1 above.

The significance of the role of the delivery of jōdō sermons, first expressed in *Eihei kōroku* no. 2.128 based on Ju-ching’s model, is particularly emphasized in no. 5.358, which declares, “Japanese people are curious about the meaning of the word jōdō. I [Eihei] am the first to transmit jōdō sermons to this country.” 32 Further evidence of the regard with which Dōgen held the role of sermons is indicated in that he refers five times in his writings to the Pai-chang kōan also cited by Ju-ching about the query, “What is the most remarkable thing [in the world]?” In no. 5.378, 33 five years after the original citation in the *Shōbōgenzō* “Kokū” fascicle, Dōgen returns to this case by responding, “I [Eihei] will go to the lecture hall today.”
The following year, 1251, in no. 6.443 Dōgen revises the conclusion once more, this time by saying, “If someone asks me this question, I [Eihei] will respond, ‘It is attending jōdo sermons on Mt. Kichijōzan [the name of the mountain where Eiheiji was built].’” This demands a rethinking of conventional assumptions about Eiheiji religiosity in that Dōgen, unlike Pai-chang, is generally known for his emphasis on zazen rather than sermons. In no. 3.244, Dōgen remarks ironically, though without necessarily complaining, that despite his giving the first authentic Zen-style sermons in Japan at Eiheiji in the Echizen mountains, many onlookers denounce him by saying, “Just take a look at that preposterous rube on the mountain whose preaching is merely the talk of a ‘wild fox Zen.’”

In addition to following the Chinese Ch’an rituals described in the Ch’an-yüan ch’ing-kuei, Dōgen also emulated Ju-ching’s style of ritual with supernatural implications for invoking clear weather by stopping the rains during an extremely wet season, as in Eihei kōroku no. 5.379, “Sermon in Supplication for Clear Skies on 10.6.1250,” quoted at length below.

Last year and this year, through spring, summer, autumn, and winter, below the heavens the rains have fallen without cease. The whole populace laments as the five grains do not ripen. Now elder Eihei, for the sake of saving our land from lamentation, will again make supplications by lifting up this sermon praying for clear skies that was given by his late teacher T’ien-t’ung [Ju-ching] when he resided at Ch’ing-liang temple. What is the reason? What can we do if the Buddha Dharma does not relieve the suffering of human and heavenly beings? Great assembly, do you clearly understand Eihei’s intention?

When my late teacher had not yet given a sermon, all buddhas and patriarchs had not yet given a sermon. When my late teacher gave a sermon, all buddhas of the three times, the patriarchs of the six generations, and all nostrils and the ten thousand eyeballs [of all teachers], at the same time all gave a sermon. They could not have been an hour earlier, or half an hour later. Today’s sermon by Eihei is also like this.

After a pause Dōgen said: Without ceasing, one, two, three raindrops, drop after drop, fall continuously morning to night, transformed into torrents, so that we can do nothing. The winds and waves overflow throughout the mountains, rivers, and the great earth.

[T’ien-t’ung Ju-ching] sneezed once and said, “Before one sneeze of this patch-robed monk is finished, the clouds part and the sun
appears.” He raised his whisk and said, “Great assembly, look here. The bright clear sky swallows the eight directions. If the waters continue to fall as before, all the houses will float away to the country of demons. Make prostrations to Sakyamuni; take refuge in Maitreya. Capable of saving the world from its sufferings, wondrous wisdom power of Avalokitesvara, I call on you.”

Questioning Traditional Accounts

From both the traditional narrative account and the records of Dōgen’s claims for importing and implementing rituals, it would seem fair and appropriate to imagine that Mt. T’ien-t’ung was the model for a remote, reclusive site for Eiheiji, which could be considered an eastward version of the Chinese Ch’an temple. However, considerations of geo-ritual perspectives, that is, how the geographical settings of the respective sites seen in light of social environment and cultural context affect the implementation of ritual activities indicates that although the temples have some common features, the differences and discrepancies in style, over and beyond basic cultural distinctions, are significant and even glaring. The following is a brief discussion of location, institutional history, and styles of practice at the thirteenth-century temples.

A. Location, Location, Location

Mt. T’ien-t’ung is not situated in the secluded mountain forests, as was the case with many Buddhist temples in China. Rather it is, first of all, close to the large cosmopolitan port area of Ning-po, which is in turn in close proximity to then-capital Hang-chou. Second, it is not in the deep, reclusive mountains but at the base of a small hill in the expanse of the T’ai-pai mountain forests. Mt. A-yū-wang is on completely flat ground, so that the term “mountain” in this case is used more as a literary conceit to evoke an atmosphere rather than a description. Both monasteries at that time were surrounded by dozens of other temples throughout the Hang-chou and Ming-chou provinces populated by full-time and part-time residents, who were among the literati and civil servantry. Furthermore, the climate in the area south of Shanghai is considerably warmer and more mild than the Echizen mountains, which is such a challenging environment—according to Dōgen’s prose and poetic writings, the severity of the deep snowfalls was daunting for him at times (yet inspiring)—that it demands a high degree of austerity and commitment to Spartan ideals of training and self-discipline.
B. Sect and Inter-Sect

Whereas Eiheiji has always been a head temple of the Japanese Sōtō sect since its inception and continuing without any slight variance ever since, the situation is quite different in the case of Mt. T’ien-t’ung. The Chinese temple, which had a seven-hundred-year history before becoming affiliated with the Ch’an school in the first decade of the eleventh century, veered back and forth from Lin-chi and Ts’ao-tung connections, depending on who was appointed abbot by the authorities responsible for religious administration. For most of its thousand-year Ch’an history, it has been associated with the Lin-chi stream, though today it is known primarily for Dōgen’s role there, which lends an impression that it is primarily of Ts’ao-tung affiliation. Ju-ching himself is “trans-sectual” in that he had trained at and was abbot of Lin-chi temples and was by no means a strict adherent to one school of thought and refuter of another. It appears that “bad blood” in the Hung-chih versus Ta-hui rivalry just a couple of generations before did not affect the time of Ju-ching’s abbacy. Dōgen’s affection and connection to him was based on his particular style of preaching rather than a sectarian standpoint. Lin-chi abbots served before and after Ju-ching’s leadership.

C. Institutional Structure

Despite differences of instructional structure involving lineage affiliation and of instructional style involving training methods and transmission rites, both temples adhered to the seven-hall monastic compound construction emphasizing the function of the Monks Hall, Dharma Hall (and Abbot’s Quarters), as well as the delivery of formal and informal sermons in relation to seasonal and other ceremonies. However, this was not a simple, uniform style since Mt. T’ien-t’ung had hundreds of buildings, and Mt. A-yü-wang has some of the main buildings on the central axis but dozens of other structures laid out in seemingly random fashion, as in Figure 4.7. Furthermore, there were significant differences in religious practice, with Mt. T’ien-t’ung stressing zazen and precepts more than the use of kōan cases or regimented discipline and chores as found at Eiheiji. The Chinese temple also incorporated relics and esoteric ritual elements, in addition to a different approach to lay rituals, repentance, and ordination ceremonies. However, it was in subsequent generations that the assimilation of indigenous and folklore elements of religiosity made many Sōtō prayer temples (kitō jiin) in Japan even further removed—and for different reasons than in Dōgen’s case—from the ritual style at Mt. T’ien-t’ung.
Comparing Monastic Systems

According to Ishii Seijun, who stresses a systems approach in evaluating the relation between temples, the key is to understand how Dōgen’s temple was distinct from the two established monastic institutional systems at the time. One is the Five Mountains system of Chinese Ch’an in which the appointment and supervision of administrative officers in the monastery was handled by a centralized government agency, the Religious Administrative Office. The other was the Tendai—or, rather, the Kenmitsu (Tendai/Shingon, combining exoteric, or kenjū, and esoteric, or mikkyō elements)—temple system of the late Heian/early Kamakura era, as discussed by Kuroda Toshio and other scholars, in which the Imperial Court supervised and regulated the appointment of the abbot as well as the superior monks. In addition to focusing on the issue of supervision, Ishii emphasizes the relation between the monks who lead the monastery and the lay community that helps support and benefits from their activities. For Ishii, Eiheiji was a “community-based” system following democratic principles, with the self-appointed abbot creating a rotation of administrative functionaries who were very much interactive and attuned to the needs of laypersons.

A main feature of Ishii’s methodology is that Dōgen did not simply try to duplicate the Chinese model, which would have been impossible in any case,
but adjusted it to the Japanese context. Whereas Ch’an Five Mountains was a highly politicized system with economic implications in terms of government control of ordinations and administration, as shown in figure 8, the Kenmitsu system had political implications based on an increasingly outdated economic structure involving fundraising monks (kanjin hijiri), who appealed to lords of manors for financial support. Seeking to avoid the pitfalls of these approaches, Dōgen developed a monastic unit based on the principles of autonomy from government regulation, democracy as well as a noncommercial work ethic in the role of monks and monastic leaders, and lay inclusion, as illustrated in Figure 4.9 showing Ishii’s conception of the intertwining of elements of support and labor at Eiheiji.

There are several main implications of the systems approach. One is that Dōgen apparently did not want to control his administrative appointees, and in his Chiji shingi text on the role of various monastic administrators, he says that they should have their own autonomous council system to deal with any issue that would affect the monastery. When Dōgen visited Sung China, all the monastic administrators were appointed by the Religious Administrative Office, which was a political institution, and he apparently rejected this practice in kōan cases of antistructural monks who lived in the T’ang dynasty,
which marks a different attitude from longstanding custom at Mt. T’ien-t’ung. In Chiji shingi, Dōgen makes the highly innovative move, not found in Chinese Ch’an counterpart texts, of using kōans known for emphasizing antistructure in the context of instructing on the quality of monastic structure. This seems to be his way of asserting that the monks appointed to a role as administrator do not occupy a kind of political position or are not appointed for such reasons, but are selected because they represent the very best of Zen spiritual insight into human nature. In contrast to the way Mt. T’ien-t’ung appointees were regulated by the Religious Administrative Office, which also had the power to certify ordinations, Dōgen held this authority but apparently did not regard his own role as abbot as overwhelmingly important and intended to create a horizontal rather than hierarchical relationship among monks, abbot, administrators, and trainees in the monastery.

A second characteristic of Eiheiji as an independent monastery is that Dōgen tried to differ from the Ch’ān-yüan ch’īng-kuei, in which the supervisor

FIGURE 4.9. Dōgen’s Eiheiji Approach
is considered to lead not only all the monastic work but also matters of the monastic farm and manor (shōen) located outside of the temple. In an effort to be faithful to Pai-chang’s original injunctions about self-sustaining monastic compounds, Dōgen does not refer to work outside temple grounds, such as manor maintenance, but instructs the supervisor only to manage lay helpers for the upkeep of the temple yard and buildings. That is, all reference to external work is eliminated in Dōgen’s commentary, although we have to consider that in actual practice there may have been a manor owned and maintained as a source of income by Eiheiji in Okayama prefecture, as was the case with large Ch’an temples in China.

The third implication of the systems approach is that, while Dōgen’s late period is often seen as a time of cloistered monasticism either because it shows a diminishing of talents or an emphasis on his pursuit of purity, it actually marks a shift away from a clergy for clergy’s sake approach that is characteristic of the Shōbōgenzō, largely completed during the pre-Eiheiji phase of Dōgen’s career. In featuring the role of repentance meetings in which laypersons could make offerings to the Tripitaka, the Buddhist canon collection which Dōgen received from a donation by Hatano, Dōgen tended to equalize their role in relation to clergy, perhaps out of democratic as well as fundraising inclinations. 39 Dōgen reached out beyond the landed gentry and manor lords who were involved with Chinese Ch’an to encompass a much broader base of support. Nevertheless, the participation of laypersons, while gaining merit, could not actually lead to enlightenment or transmission, which was only available to full-fledged monks (who, in Dōgen’s system, received the sixteen-article precepts).

Conclusions

Mt. T’ien-t’ung or Ju-ching as Model

Ishii’s systems approach highlights complex features of Dōgen’s texts and contexts often overlooked by other methods, but it seems necessary to evaluate Dōgen’s standpoint in broader perspectives. The Eiheiji system needs to be contrasted not only with the then-current systems of Ch’an Five Mountains in China and the Kenmitsu temples in Japan but also with two crucial subsequent developments of Japanese Zen during the Ashikaga shogunate of the Muromachi era. The first is the Japanese Five Mountains system, which had eleven main temples and over three hundred branch or minor temples supervised by the shogunate, or bakufu—as in China, the role of civil authorities was paramount. The other is the Rinka system, including Rinzai and Sōtō
temples often based on a charismatic abbot, who stressed either evangelical, cultural, pedagogical or political functions.  

From a long-range historical vantage point, it appears that Dōgen, like other representatives of the new Kamakura Buddhist schools, had severed from the Court, but this meant that the accomplishments of his temple were based on two main factors. One was an affiliation with a daimyō (Hatano) beholden to the Hōjō shogunate, which resembled the later Japanese Five Mountains approach, and the other was the power of his teaching as a charismatic abbot resembling predecessors in the Tendai school as well as successors in the Rinka temple ranks. The fact that his independence was based largely on the support of the Hatano clan is acknowledged yet not fully taken into account in Ishii’s evaluation. It must also be pointed out that the Rinka abbots of Sōtō monasteries generally integrated Dōgen-style sermons on seminal Chinese Ch’an texts with teaching methods that incorporated mikkyō elements. This included an instructional use of kōans based on the transmission of “slips of paper” known as kirigami replete with esoteric diagrams and instructions that were a major part of the shōmono style of commentary.

Therefore, while Dōgen’s writings indicate that he seemed to be aspiring to achieve a community-based approach based on precepts ceremonies, we have no indication one way or the other whether this was actually accomplished in his life, as his time of leadership at Eiheiji was cut short by an early demise. Nevertheless, Ishii’s method shows that in the final analysis of geo-ritual elements, Mt. T’ien-t’ung and Eiheiji temples are quite distinct ritual environments in that they represent distinct monastic institutional systems. Furthermore, an understanding of the ritualism of Eiheiji must take into account a broader comparison involving at least three systems in Japan than with the Chinese model alone.

We can also raise the question of whether the best way of understanding the transition of Zen rituals from China to Japan is by examining the temples. Perhaps the examination should focus on the masters themselves. However, what we know about Ju-ching, as well as the practice at Mt. T’ien-t’ung, almost

### Table 4.2. Comparison of Eiheiji with Four Other Monastic Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monastic System</th>
<th>Style of Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch’an Five Mountains (Wu-shan)</td>
<td>Religious Administrative Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmitsu</td>
<td>Imperial Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiheiji</td>
<td>Daimyō—community (precepts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Five Mountains (Gozan)</td>
<td>Bakufu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinka Monasteries</td>
<td>Abbot—community (evangelical)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all derives from Dōgen and his somewhat biased position in using both Chinese teacher and temple as devices to promote his movement in Japan. Yet, an overly deconstructivist tendency that sees the relativity of perspectives and unreliability of sources does not obscure the fact that Dōgen crossed mountains and rivers to fulfill the goal of importing Zen ritualism.
83. The most famous example of this type of tale is the Ullambana-Sutra, C. Yulanpen jing (T 16, no. 685). For an extensive study of this text and its place in the ghost festival in medieval China, see Stephen F. Teiser, The Ghost Festival in Medieval China (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988). The story tells of one, Maudgalyayana (Mulian), who is instructed by the Buddha on the means necessary to save his departed mother from her fate as a hungry ghost (preta): provide food offerings for the Buddha and Buddhist clergy. The spiritual merit thus received may be transferred by Maudgalyayana to his mother and her suffering alleviated. The implications of this are clear: the incense rite and vegetarian banquet may serve as expressions of filial piety. In a social context where Buddhist salvation is deemed as a filial responsibility, Buddhist rites are harmonious with Confucian principles and may serve as means to express one’s Confucian virtue. The ability to help departed ancestors easily became a requirement to do so. This requirement was strengthened by Buddhist beliefs about what happened to the soul at death.

According to Buddhist belief, the soul passed into an intermediate state of existence upon death lasting between seven and forty-nine days. At the end of each seven-day period, the soul may be reborn, providing that karmic forces are sufficient. At the end of forty-nine days, the soul will be reborn in hell unless otherwise dispatched. The message is clear: it is incumbent upon the living that provision be made for the soul’s future. Failure to do so would amount to a serious breach in filial obligations. On this, see Kenneth Ch’en, The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 53–55.

CHAPTER 4


2. From my notes taken during interviewing the abbots at Mt. T’ien-t’ung and Mt. A-yū-wang, along with local officials from the tourism and religious administrative bureaus in December 2004, there are two main points that stand out. First, the local officials, apparently hearing that there are about ten million Sōtō sect adherents in Japan, inflated the number fourfold, following the style often used in the fanciful counting of Japanese new religious movements, which figure that a follower will bring all the members of his or her nuclear family into the fold. The second point is that the T’ien-t’ung abbot eloquently explained the connection between Ju-ching and Dōgen as being based on a simple, intimate feeling that the teacher had finally found a prize pupil who could carry forth his message and the disciple had located the ideal mentor after struggling to find a teacher. I wrote in my notebook at this point in the conversation, “Dry is why…”


5. *Shōsan* was one style of informal sermon used by Dōgen in *Shōbōgenzō zuimonki* and *Eihei kōroku*, vol. 8, whereas the main style used in the *Shōbōgenzō* was the *jishu* style. Both are in Japanese vernacular rather than Sino-Japanese (*kanbun*).

6. Of the early Japanese Zen temples, Kenchōji in Kamakura was probably the closest to a “pure” seven-hall style. Also, Mt. T’ien-t’ung had an exceptionally large Monks Hall, initially built by Hung-chih in 1132–1134, which was 200 feet in length and 16 zhang (160 feet) in width, with a statue of Manjusri in the center of the hall enshrined as the holy monk; see Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002) pp. 70–71.

7. See, for example, *Tenzokyōkun*, DZZ 5: 2–25.

8. Shunjō, who enjoyed support from the retired emperor Gotoba, the court aristocracy, and the third regent of the Kamakura shogunate, Hōjō Yasutoki, made the temple a center for the practice of the Precepts (Ritsu), Tendai, Zen, and Pure Land teachings. He is generally not considered a leader of Zen per se, but some of the ritual practices he learned from China and implemented in Japan are quite similar to what Eisai, Dōgen, and others brought over.

9. In *Shōbōgenzō* “Senmen”—one of two fascicles on hygiene along with “Senjō”—Dōgen says that the toothbrush was not being used in Chinese monasteries, but other evidence suggests it was in practice at the time; he also credits Ju-ching with starting a new tradition of washing during the third night watch.


11. These figures may have been preceded by a monk named Kakua, who is said to have played a flute when asked in an imperial meeting to expound the tenets of Zen, indicating that he must have received authentic Ch’an training in China in 1171; see Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), pp. 38–39, citing the *Genkō shakusho*.

12. The ranking of the Five Mountains temples was: 1. Mt. Ching-shan Wanshou Ch’an ssu, of Hang-chou; 2. Mt. A-yü-wang-shan Kuang li Ch’an ssu, of Ming-chou; 3. Mt. T’ai-pai-shan T’ien-t’ung Ch’ing-te Ch’an ssu, of Ming-chou; 4. Mt. Pei-shan Ch’ing-te ling-yin Ch’an ssu, of Hang-chou; 5. Mt. Nan-shan Ch’ing-tzu pao en kuang hsiao Ch’an ssu, of Hang-chou. The system actually consisted of some fifty temples in a three-tiered ranking. Japanese temples were influenced by a small handful of Sung Chinese temples with diagrams in the *Gozan jissatsu zu* held at Gikai’s Daijōji temple in Kanazawa and in the *Kenchōji sashizū* based on Mt. T’ien-t’ung, which had an impact on both Sōtō and Rinzai sects. See Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, pp. 175–77.

14. It was a city advanced in printing and developing libraries and in early modern times was the place where the game of Mah jong was developed based on traditional card and board games of chance.

15. The A-yü-wang specimen was supposedly one of 84,000 relics that King Asoka disseminated and is housed in a seven-step stupa about twenty inches high in the reliquary. The other two relics, according to temple sources that indicate that Jiang Zemin visited the A-yü-wang relic in 2002, are a tooth held in a Beijing temple and a finger joint held in Xian (formerly the T'ang capital, Chang-an). Dating the origins of the monasteries as being in the Ch’an order is more complicated than it might seem, because these are the dates that they seem to have been awarded “Public” monastery status, and the assumption is that at the time this designation meant “Ch’an,” although there is some ambiguity that remains in textual and epigraphical evidence. See Morten Schütter, “Vinaya Monasteries, Public Abbacies, and State Control of Buddhism under the Song (960–1279),” in William M. Bodiford, ed., *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2005), pp. 104–5.

16. This fascicle includes a lengthy passage in which Dōgen describes two visits to the temple, first in the summer retreat of 1223 and again two years later during the summer when he was first training under Ju-ching. The passage indicates that Dōgen was very much dissatisfied with the lack of Ch’an insight on the part of the monks, but it is also the case that he was critical of all of the temples he visited, including Mt. T’ien-t’ung until Ju-ching arrived there in 1225. Furthermore, Mt A-yü-wang did not have a seven-hall style monastic layout characteristic of Mt. T’ien-t’ung and some other Ch’an temples.

17. Heine, *Did Dōgen Go to China?*

18. DZZ 1: 31–33.

19. See Nakaseko Shōdō, “Shōbōgenzō ‘Busshō’ kan no rokusshōchi to Minamoto no Sanetomo no shari nokotsu mondai ni tsuite,” in *Dōgen zenji kenyū ronshū* (Fukui City, Japan: Daihonzan Eiheiji, 2002). The passage in “Busshō” refers to visiting “six” sites at the temple, but it is unclear whether this is meant in a literal or metaphorical sense. A key point is that travel from the home temple during the summer retreat was strictly forbidden, as itinerancy (tangaryō) was limited to the nine-month period of “liberation” outside the retreat period. Nakaseko refutes a theory proferred by Sugio Gen’yū that Dōgen went to Mt. A-yü-wang during the summer retreat of 1225 (the year that Hōjō Masako died) to fulfill a memorial mission for the deceased shogun, Sanetomo, who was installed at age eleven in 1203 and assassinated on new year’s day in 1219 on the steps of the Hachiman Jingu shrine in Kamakura. Already stripped of much of his power well before his death, Sanetomo fervently dedicated himself to poetry and cultural activities and apparently always had a dream of going to Mt. A-yü-wang in China to visit the relic and even tried to set sail, but the boat was defective. According to tradition, the monk Kakushin took his remains to the Chinese temple, but Sugio suggests that it was actually Dōgen who later became a teacher for a brief period and administered the bodhisattva precepts to Kakushin in

20. DZZ 1: 197–98. Te-kuang was attacked by Dōgen apparently because he sanctioned the controversial rival Daruma school, which was proscribed by the government in 1193.


22. DZZ 7: 14.


24. “Without sojourning . . . in quiet serenity” echoes the admonitions by Ju-ching, for example, “You must immediately make your dwelling in steep mountains and dark valleys, and nurture the sacred embryo of the buddhas and patriarchs for a long time. You will surely reach the experience of the ancient virtuous ones.” See Takeshi James Kodera, Dōgen’s Formative Years in China (Boulder, CO: Prajna Press, 1980), p. 122.


30. DZZ 3: 274.


32. DZZ 3: 230. Jōdō, literally “ascending the hall,” which are sermons collected in the first seven volumes of the Eihei kōroku, were the standard form of preaching in Sung China. Sermons occurred regularly in the Dharma Hall, during which the rank-and-file monks were standing while the master sat on the high seat on the altar. In the Ch’ān-yüan ch’ing-kuei of 1103, the primary source of Chinese monastic regulations that Dōgen relied on for his Eihei shingi text on monastic rules, the jōdō were supposed to be given on special occasions, as well as six times a month, on the 1st, 5th, 10th, 15th, 20th, and 25th days of the month. Many of the recorded sayings (goroku) of the classical masters include jōdō. Although there might sometimes have been questions and discussions from the monks, in Eihei kōroku, usually only Dōgen’s words were recorded. In this sermon, “After a pause Dōgen said: If you want to know a person from Jiang-nan, go toward where the partridges sing.” This comment relates to a Ch’an saying Dōgen cites elsewhere, “I always remember Jiang-nan in the third month, when the partridges sing and a hundred blossoms open.” Jiang-nan is the area south of the Yangtze River, where many Ch’an temples were located and which functioned as a symbol of spiritual renewal.


34. DZZ 4: 30.

35. DZZ 3: 162–64.
36. This section after the pause, from “Without ceasing, one, two, three raindrops...” until the end of this sermon, is cited from the first volume of the recorded sayings of Ju-ching.

37. According to Collcutt, the seven-hall style, which was “no more than the essential minimum skeleton of the Zen monastery,” may have developed in the Sung and been transferred to Kamakura Japan, but “does not seem to have been applied to Chinese monasteries”; in Five Mountains, p. 186.

38. Kuroda Toshio, Nihon chūsei no shakai to shūkyo (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1990). For other interpretations in the complex issues involved in examining the changes in Buddhism during the Kamakura era, see Matsuo Kenji, Shin Kamakura Bukkyō no tanjō (Tokyo: Kodansha gendai shinscho, 1995); and Kenji Matsuo, “What is Kamakura New Buddhism? Official Monks and Reclusive Monks,” Japanese Journal of Religious Studies 14/1–2 (1997): 179–89. Matsuo tends to support Ishii’s approach but also broadens the context considerably by explaining Dōgen as an example of a “reclusive monk” (tonseisō), along with Hōnen, Shinran, Nichiren, and others, who established orders that catered to the needs of monks and laypersons alike, although in contrast to Ishii, Matsuo also stresses the role of individual salvation in these movements.

39. It should be stressed that the laypersons that Dōgen dealt with at Eiheiji were a far different group than the literati in Sung China, where “The state had lost interest in all but the most illustrious monks and the greatest monasteries. All these factors caused elite Buddhism to focus its efforts on literati and local government officials in order to obtain needed financial and political support,” in Morten Schlütter, “Silent Illumination, Kung-an Introspection, and the Competition for Lay Patronage in Sung Dynasty Ch’an,” in Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, eds., Buddhism in the Sung (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press), p. 137.

Also, one area Dōgen did not attend to was funerals; as Duncan Ryūken Williams points out, Dōgen “did not include funerary procedures in his ritual repertoire, so it was not until the third-generation monk Gikai’s death in 1309 that the first Sōtō Zen funeral was conducted under Chinese Chan monastic regulations. The first Japanese Sōtō Zen monastic regulations, which included a section on how to perform funerals was the Keizan shingi,” in The Other Side of Zen: A Social History of Sōtō Zen Buddhism in Tokugawa Japan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), p. 40.

40. The Rinzai Rinka temples were generally based in Kyoto with a network of countryside temples, such as Daitokuji and Myōshinji, with prominent intellectual/literary abbots such Daitō, Ikkyū, and Bassui, and the Sōtō Rinka temples were generally in rural areas with popular preachers such as Gasan Jōseki, Tsūgen Jakurei, and Gennō Shinshō.