

The Daruma-shū, Dōgen, and Sōtō Zen

by BERNARD FAURE

YŌSAI (or Eisai) 榮西, 1141–1215, and Dōgen 道元, 1200–1253, are traditionally considered the first Buddhist monks to have introduced Zen to Japan. Dōgen, in particular, has been lavishly praised as the founder of the Sōtō 曹洞 sect and, more recently, as one of the greatest Japanese thinkers. His role has been reevaluated in postwar scholarship, and numerous studies have examined different aspects of his thought and personality. Such an emphasis on Dōgen's life and thought neglects the ideological purposes behind his accepted image; it obscures, in fact, the history of Japanese Buddhism. Traditions, in Husserl's words, are 'a forgetting of the origin'.

It has become clear in recent years that Dōgen's role cannot be properly understood without taking into account the existence of the so-called Bodhidharma School, or Daruma-shū 達磨宗. This school, allegedly founded by a little-known figure called Dainichi Nōnin 大日能忍, who flourished toward the end of the twelfth century, had reached a wide audience by the beginning of the Kamakura period, and for that reason became increasingly unpopular among the Buddhist establishment.¹ It was perceived as a powerful rival by the Kamakura 'new sects', and more particularly by the Zen and Nichiren schools. This led to a repression that eventually brought an end to the Daruma-shū as a formal school, but this did not eradicate its influence on Japanese Bud-

THE AUTHOR is assistant professor in the Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University.

¹ Following Ōkubo Dōshū 大久保道舟, Japanese scholars refer to it as the Japanese Bodhidharma school (*Nihon Daruma-shū*) to distinguish it from its Chinese counterpart, the *Ta-mo tsung* 達摩宗, that is, the early Ch'an school that had been introduced into Japan during the Nara period and had been kept alive within the Tendai tradition.

However, Nōnin's teaching clearly stemmed

from this tradition, and it does not seem necessary to draw an overly clear-cut distinction between the new movement and the earlier Ch'an school, just as it is unnecessary to specify Japanese Rinzai or Sōtō when referring to the teachings of Dōgen and Yōsai. Implicit in the denomination is the fact that, while the latter's teachings belong to the Ch'an tradition, Nōnin's teachings are divorced from it by their Japanese ideosyncracies.

dhism and culture.² Ishii Shūdō's recent discovery of several works³ connected to Dainichi Nōnin among the Kanazawa Bunko texts edited in 1974, and Takahashi Shūei's almost simultaneous finding of a scroll relating to the transmission of various regalia within the Daruma-shū,⁴ have prompted some scholars to reconsider the role played by this school in Kamakura Buddhism.

The evolution of the Daruma-shū after Nōnin remains rather obscure. Until now, it has received only cursory treatment as a preparatory stage to the formation of the Sōtō school.⁵ A number of Daruma-shū adepts, following Ejō 懷奘, 1198–1280, had collectively joined Dōgen's community, and this new audience strongly affected Dōgen's teachings and sectarian identity as a Sōtō patriarch. The change is drastically reflected in *Shōbōgenzō* 正法眼藏 and its increasing criticism of Ta-hui 大慧, Nōnin's alleged master, extending gradually to the entire Rinzaï tradition.⁶ We may well wonder to what extent Dōgen was influenced by, rather than influenced, his new disciples. In other words, who converted whom is perhaps not so clear as the tradition would have us believe.

Some of these converts never gave up their former allegiance to the Daruma-shū and inherited jointly both lineages. They formed, within Dōgen's com-

² The Daruma-shū seems to have also influenced Japanese poetry, judging from the vogue of the so-called *Daruma-uta* 達磨歌. See Kamo no Chōmei 鴨長明, *Mumyōshō* 無名抄, in Hisamatsu Sen'ichi 久松潜一 & Nishio Minoru 西尾実, ed., NKBT 65, Iwanami, 1961, pp. 102 & 250b.

³ Jōtō *Shōgakuron* 成等正覺論, *Hōmon Taikō* 法門大綱 and *Kenshō Jōbutsuron* 見性成佛論. See *Kanazawa Bunko Shiryō Zensho* 金沢文庫資料全書, Kanagawa Kenritsu Kanazawa Bunko, Yokohama, 1974, 1, pp. 201ff., and Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, 'Busshō Tokkō to Nihon Daruma-shū' 仏照徳光と日本達磨宗, 1 & 2, in *Kanazawa Bunko Kenkyū Kiyō* 金沢文庫研究紀要, 222 & 223 (November & December 1984).

⁴ The scroll belongs to the Shōbōji collection and is titled 'Rokuso Shari, Daie Zenji Kesa: Mokuroku' 六祖舍利, 大慧禪師袈裟目録. See Takahashi Shūei 高橋秀栄, 'Sambōji no Daruma Shūmon to Rokuso Fugen Shari' 三宝寺の達磨宗門と六祖普賢舍利, in *Shūgaku Kenkyū* 宗学研究, 16 (March 1984), pp. 117–22.

⁵ Most of these accounts rely on the seminal research of Washio Junkei 鷺尾順敬, *Nihon Zenshūshi no Kenkyū* 日本禅宗史の研究, Kyōten, 1945, pp. 106–21; and Ōkubo Dōshū, *Dōgen Zenji Den no Kenkyū* 道元禅師伝の研究, Chikuma, 1966, pp. 405–66.

More recently, significant exceptions have

been Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 and Takahashi Shūei.

See Yanagida Seizan, *Rinzai no Kafū* 臨済の家風, Chikuma, 1967, pp. 39ff; 'Kūbyō no Mondai' 空病の問題, in *Bukkyō Shisō* 仏教思想, 7:2 (1982), pp. 757–98; 'Dōgen to Chūgoku Bukkyō' 道元と中国仏教, in *Zen Bunka Kenkyū-jo Kiyō* 禅文化研究所紀要, 3 (March 1984), pp. 7–128; and Yanagida's postface to his critical edition of Yōsai's *Kōzen Gokokuron* 興禅護国論, in Ichikawa Hakugen 市川白弦 et al., ed., *Chūsei Zenke no Shisō* 中世禅家の思想, Iwanami, 1972, pp. 439–86.

Takahashi Shūei, 'Sambōji no Daruma Shūmon to Rokuso Fugen Shari', in *Shūgaku Kenkyū*, 26 (March 1984), pp. 116–21; 'Kamakura Shoki ni okeru Zenshū no Seikaku (jō): Nihon Daruma-shū no Zen no Seikaku' 鎌倉初期における禅宗の性格(上): 日本達磨宗の禅の性格, in *Shūgaku Kenkyū*, 16 (March 1971), pp. 117–22. See also Funaoka Makoto 船岡誠, 'Nihon Zenshūshi ni okeru Daruma-shū no Ichi' 日本禅宗史における達磨宗の位置, in *Shūgaku Kenkyū*, 26 (March 1984), pp. 103–08.

⁶ The most comprehensive account on this question is Carl Bielefeldt, 'Recarving the Dragon: History and Dogma in the Study of Dōgen', in William R. LaFleur, ed., *Dōgen Studies*, University of Hawaii Press, 1985, pp. 21–53.

munity, a specific group, and this led, after Dōgen's death, to the factional dispute known as 'the third-generation controversy', or *sandai sōron* 三代相論. The point to note here is that for a long time this group formed the majority within the Sōtō school. Their influence has been regarded by later orthodox Sōtō scholars as a mere degeneration of the 'pure' Zen advocated by Dōgen. This is a position that can no longer be accepted. In fact, the Daruma-shū and its later Sōtō revival constitute the mainstream of Japanese Zen, a type of Buddhism that had close connections with popular religion and that has been unduly repressed by the 'high culture' of Muromachi and Tokugawa Zen and its scholarly duplication of the post-Meiji period. It is therefore necessary to consider the Sōtō tradition as resulting from a denial of its origins and to shift the emphasis from the leading role of Dōgen, however charismatic he may have been, to his politico-religious and intellectual context.

The present article consists of three parts. First, an account of the Daruma-shū proper and of its doctrine and practice; second, the importance of this school for an adequate understanding of Yōsai's and Dōgen's work; and third, its crucial role in the evolution of the Sōtō school after (and against) Dōgen.

Doctrine and Practice of the Daruma-shū

The name 'Daruma-shū' did not originate with Nōnin, but it is with him that it came to designate a real school.⁷ Nōnin has the following biographical notice in *Honchō Kōsōden* 本朝高僧伝:

The priest Nōnin's *go* was Dainichi. He was the uncle of Kagekiyo, a leader of the Taira family. While young, he attended lecture sessions where he studied the sutras and śāstras. By nature he was attracted to Zen and, polishing his talents, he meditated deeply, eventually attaining enlightenment. He founded Sambōji in Settsu, where he spread Zen widely. Monks and laymen of the Kinki region flocked to him. He was attacked, however, because he had not studied under a master. Therefore, in 1189, he sent his disciples RENCHŪ and Shōben, bearing a letter and gifts, to Sung China, where they offered them to the *dhyāna* master Cho-an [Te-]kuang of A-yü-wang shan, requesting that he acknowledge their master's understanding.⁸

⁷ The term was already used in Japan, and referred, as in China, to the Ch'an school in general. In *Tendai Shingon Nishū Dōishō* 天台真言二宗同異章, 1188, by the Tendai monk Shōshin 証真, for example, we find the following reference:

'Among the four *samādhi* of Tendai, the Daruma-shū represents the "Constantly-sitting *samādhi*" [*jōza-zammai*], the "One-practice *samādhi*" [*ichigyō-zammai*]. . . . As in the T'ang period, many people today adhere to the Daruma-shū.' *Taishō Shinshū*

Daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經 [=T], 74, 2372, p. 420b.

⁸ Cho-an (Fo-chao) Te-kuang, J. Settan (Busshō) Tokkō, 拙庵(仏照)德光, 1121-1203, was one of the disciples of Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲, 1089-1163, the main representative of the so-called *k'an-hua ch'an*, J. *kanna-zen*, 看話禪, 'Zen [based on] examining words'.

Biographies of both men appear in *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai* 仏祖歷代通載, T. 49, 2036, pp. 689c & 694b.

Te-kuang gladly attested to Nōnin's awakening, presented a dharma-robe and name, and a picture of Bodhidharma with a laudatory verse inscribed. Renchū and Shōben had an artist paint a portrait of Te-kuang and asked the master to write a verse in praise. Te-kuang wrote: 'This monk, a true man without face, has upset the heavens and turned back the axis of the earth. Master Jen [Nōnin] stands forth in his eminent enlightenment and has set to flight heretics and demons.'

After his disciples returned to Japan, Nōnin's fame spread far and wide. His chief disciple Kakuan received his sanction and preached Zen widely at a temple in Tōnomine in Yamato. Koun Ejō of Eihei-ji was Kakuan's disciple for a long while. . . . Shōkō of Chinzei visited Nōnin's assembly and studied the essentials of *Tsung-ching lu* with him.

One night Kagekiyo came to visit and Nōnin, rejoicing at the unexpected chance to meet his nephew, sent a disciple to the shop to buy wine. Suspecting that the officials were being informed of his presence, Kagekiyo attacked his uncle with his sword and cut him to death. Other details can be determined by reading other sources about Nōnin.⁹

Thus, the Daruma-shū was constituted as an independent school after the return of Nōnin's disciples from China in 1189. According to certain sources, Nōnin was invited to the imperial palace, and his school was given precedence over the 'eight Buddhist sects'. The date of his death is not known, but we may infer from the fact that Kagekiyo was killed in 1196 that Nōnin died between 1189 and 1196, if the somewhat melodramatic account of his death did not arouse some suspicion regarding its authenticity.

But the importance of Nōnin's school, even after his death, can be seen from Nichiren's criticism in *Kaimokushō* 開目抄, 1272:

Hōnen and Dainichi [Nōnin] both appeared during the Kennin period [1201–1203], and they gave rise to the Nembutsu and Zen sects. Hōnen said, 'Since we have entered the period of the final Dharma, not even one man in a thousand has obtained any benefit from the Lotus Sutra.' Dainichi said, 'The transmission [of truth] is something special, independent of teachings.'

The country is filled with these two teachings. The scholars of Tendai and Shingon flatter and fear the patrons of Nembutsu and Zen; they are like dogs wagging their tails in front of their masters, like mice afraid of cats.¹⁰

The rivalry between Yōsai and Nōnin became public when Yōsai's teachings, amalgamated with those of the Daruma-shū by the monks of Hieizan, were prohibited by the civil authorities in 1194. Yōsai wrote *Kōzen Gokokuron* 興禪護國論 mainly to distinguish himself from the type of Zen

⁹ *Honchō Kōsōden*, 19, in *Dai-Nihon Bukkyō Zensho* 大日本仏教全書, 63, p. 273.

I have used the translation kindly provided by Philip Yampolsky in a paper first delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, Philadelphia, March 1985, and

titled 'Some Problems in Zen History'.

¹⁰ T. 84, 2689, p. 232b. Nichiren seems to have been obsessed by Hōnen and Nōnin. See *Shōwa Teihon Nichiren Shōnin Ibun* 昭和定本日蓮上人遺文, 423, 607, 615, 778 & 879.

advocated by the Daruma-shū. The controversy between him and Nōnin is echoed in a passage from his biography in *Genkō Shakusho* 元亨釈書, 1322.

Having heard of the popularity of the [Ch'an] school in Sung China, a certain Nōnin sent his disciples there to question the *dhyāna* master Fo-chao [Te-]kuang of A-yü-wang shan. Impressed by the faith of these strangers, [Fo-]chao took pity on them and offered them a Dharma-robe and a picture of Bodhidharma. Nōnin, bragging of these courtesy gifts, began to spread Ch'an teachings. But since he lacked a direct transmission from a master as well as a disciplinary code, the people of the capital scorned him.

When Yōsai began to preach the mind, the nobility and common people alike confused him with Nōnin and wanted to reject him. . . . [Finally] Hieizan monks supported his Zen preaching. Yōsai debated several times with Nōnin on doctrinal matters and eventually defeated him.¹¹

The Zen historiographer Kokan Shiren 虎関師鍊, 1278–1348, author of *Genkō Shakusho*, was obviously prejudiced against Nōnin,¹² and this led him to select Yōsai as the first person to introduce Zen into Japan. This point was noticed by a later Buddhist historiographer, Mangen Shibān 叡元師蠻, 1626–1710, who was the first to add the biographical notice, quoted above, of Nōnin in his *Honchō Kōsōden*. In his prejudice, however, Kokan was not alone, as is apparent from the hostile reactions provoked by the Daruma-shū that culminated in the destruction of Sambōji, Nōnin's temple. The fact that the school had rapidly gained a large following can be inferred from comments made by various authors such as Myōe 明恵¹³ and Kamo no Chōmei 鴨長明.¹⁴

Yōsai's appeal to the bakufu, and the relationships that he was able to establish with the government thanks to his talents as an architect and to his knowledge of esoteric rituals, eventually won both him and his teachings official recognition. In 1202, he obtained support that enabled him to build Kenninji in the center of the capital and to contribute to the rebuilding of Tōdaiji in 1206.¹⁵ In contrast, although Nōnin was apparently awarded a posthumous title, his name and his school soon became emblems of heterodoxy. *Hasshū Kōyō* 八宗綱要 by the Kegon master Gyōnen 凝然, 1240–1321, a work that was to play a major role in Buddhist historiography, men-

¹¹ *Genkō Shakusho* 元亨釈書, in *Dai-Nihon Bukkyō Zensho*, 62, p. 76.

¹² He also favored his own master Enni Ben'en 円爾弁円, 1202–1280, founder of Tōfukuji. On the other hand, he plays down the role of Dōgen.

For Kokan's intellectual background, see David Pollack, 'Kokan Shiren and Musō Soseki: "Chineseness" vs. "Japaneseness" in Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century Japan', in *The Journal of the International*

Association of Buddhist Studies, 7:2 (1984), pp. 143–68.

¹³ *Kyakuhaimeki* 却庵忘記, 1235, in *Myōe Shōnin Shiryō* 明恵上人史料, Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1978, 2, p. 11.

¹⁴ *Mumyōshō*, in NKBT 65, p. 250b.

¹⁵ Delmer M. Brown & Ichirō Ishida, tr., *The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the Gukanshō, An Interpretive History of Japan Written in 1219*, University of California Press, 1979, pp. 174–75.

tions Yōsai but omits Nōnin, and does not even include the Daruma-shū among the twenty-four trends within Japanese Zen.¹⁶

The criticisms of the Daruma-shū by Yōsai and Dōgen had two aspects: criticism of the lineage and criticism of the 'quietist' doctrine, characterized by its denial of both practice and of discipline.¹⁷ The lineage, as will be seen below, was an important issue for the Daruma-shū, which claimed to have inherited the *śārīra*, or relics, of the six patriarchs of Ch'an and of the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra. This fact has been brought to light by the recent discovery of a scroll recording the transmission in Sambōji (apparently reconstructed after Nōnin's death) of these *śārīra* and of the Dharma-robe (*kaṣāya*) of the Ch'an master Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗果, 1089–1163, to which line Nōnin claimed to belong.¹⁸

Another group of Nōnin's disciples, led by Kakuan, had established itself in several temples at Higashiyama in Kyoto, at Tōnomine¹⁹ in Yamato, and at Hajakuji in Echizen. After the raids of the Kōfukuji monks on Tōnomine, 1227–1228, and the departure of Nōnin's followers from Higashiyama, only the Hajakuji community, centered on Ekan 懷鑑, d. 1251, remained in existence. Then, following the example given by their co-disciple Ejō, who had converted to Dōgen in 1234, these members of the Daruma-shū joined Dōgen's community at Kōshōji at Fukakusa on the southern outskirts of Kyoto in the spring of 1242. They were led by Kakuan's successor, Ekan, who seems to have been highly respected by Dōgen, although the latter never showed him, as he had Ejō, the documents of succession received from his master Ju-ching.

This collective conversion changed drastically the nature of Dōgen's teachings and decided the future of the Sōtō sect. Not only was Dōgen's criticism of the Rinzaï tradition a direct result of his desire to convince his new audience of the superiority of his brand of Zen, but his sudden transfer to remote Echizen in 1243, and the subsequent sectarian stiffening of his doctrine, were due in part to the fact that the Daruma-shū had a strong following in that province.

¹⁶ However, the definition of Zen given by Gyōnen relies in fact on the Daruma-shū teachings, and he quotes, for example, the famous dictum criticized by Yōsai: 'Fundamentally there are no passions, from the outset we are enlightened.'

His account also provides the lineage of Northern Ch'an inherited within the Tendai tradition, instead of the orthodox lineage of the Southern School.

¹⁷ Like the criticism of Shen-hui in the case of the Northern School of Ch'an. See Jacques Gernet, *Entretiens du maître de dhyāna Chenhouei du Ho-tsō*, Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris,

1949, 1977, pp. 93ff.

¹⁸ Takahashi, 'Sambōji', and Ishii Shūdō, 'Busshō Tokkō to Nihon Daruma-shū', 1 & 2, in *Kanazawa Bunko Kenkyū Kiyō*, 222 & 223 (November, December 1984).

¹⁹ The Tōnomine cultic center originally belonged to the Hossō school, but passed to Tendai after the arrival of the Tendai monk Zōga 増賀, 917–1003.

It was devastated for the first time by the monks of Kimpusen, then twice in a row by those of Kōfukuji. Kakuan and his disciples lived in Myōrakuji (Gokokuin), of which no trace remains.

Japanese scholars usually consider that the conversion of Nōnin's disciples to Dōgen marked the end of the Daruma-shū. In fact, the Daruma-shū line was preserved by some of its members such as Gikai 義介 and Keizan 瑩山, who eventually became Dōgen's successors. In any case, this group of disciples represented only a part of the Daruma-shū, which continued to exist independently at least until the final destruction of Sambōji during the Ōnin war, 1467–1477.

The doctrine of the Daruma-shū had two main sources. The first is the early Ch'an tradition transmitted on Hieizan within the Tendai tradition; the second is the somewhat different tradition of Lin-chi (Rinzai) Zen, predominant in Sung China and inherited by Nōnin, through his two disciples, from Fo-chao Te-kuang.²⁰ This is the so-called *kanna-zen* 看話禪, a form of Zen based on the maieutic use of koans rather than on seated meditation. Te-kuang's master, Ta-hui, was the author of a koan collection titled *Cheng-fa yen-tsang* (J. *Shōbōgenzō*) 正法眼藏, or 'Treasure of the Essence of the True Dharma', from which Dōgen borrowed the title of his main work.

In his commentary on *Shōbōgenzō*,²¹ Kyōgō 經豪, one of Dōgen's disciples who was strongly antagonistic to the Daruma-shū, mentions that the latter school relied on the so-called *Daruma Sanron* 達磨三論, or 'Three Treatises of Bodhidharma'.²² These works have proven apocryphal, and one of them in particular, *Hasōron* (Ch. *P'o-hsiang lun*) 破相論, happens to be the *Kuan-hsin lun* 觀心論 of the Northern Ch'an master Shen-hsiu 神秀, 606–706. The so-called Northern School, once the predominant trend in early Ch'an, had been defeated and silenced by its 'Southern' rival, allegedly founded by the sixth patriarch Hui-neng 慧能, d. 713, and actually promoted by his disciple Shen-hui 神會. The Southern School subsequently became the Ch'an orthodoxy and produced a number of eminent figures such as Ma-tsu Tao-i 馬祖道一, 709–788, and Lin-chi I-hsüan 臨濟義玄, d. 867, the founder of the Lin-chi (Rinzai) school. But, interestingly enough, it is the Northern Ch'an lineage that was inherited by the Tendai master Saichō 最澄, 767–822, and the brand of Zen that developed on Hieizan remained largely 'pre-classical', that is, predating Ma-tsu and Lin-chi. One of its important features was an attempt at reinterpreting the traditional Buddhist discipline and morality in a purely spiritual sense.

²⁰ Nakao Ryōshin 中尾良信, 'Dainichi Nōnin no Zen' 大日能忍の禪, in *Shūgaku Kenkyū*, 26 (March 1984), pp. 221–35.

²¹ *Shōbōgenzō Shō* 正法眼藏抄, in *Sōtō-shū Zensho Chūkai*, 1, p. 523b.

²² The three treatises are *Kuan-hsin lun* 觀心論 (or *P'o-hsiang lun* 破相論), *Wu-hsing lun* 悟性論, and *Hsüeh-mo lun* 血脈論. See Shiina Kōyū 椎名宏雄, 'Shōshitsu Rokumon to Daruma Daishi Sanron' in *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu Ronshū* 駒沢大学仏教

学部論集, 9 (November 1978), pp. 208–32.

Kuan-hsin lun was well known in Hieizan, judging from *Shinnyokan* 真如觀, a work attributed to Enchin, which was instrumental in the elaboration of the *hongaku* 本覺 theory. See Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀, '“Akusō” no Shinjō to Kamakura Bukkyō' 「悪僧」の心情と鎌倉仏教, in *Bukkyō Shisō Ronshū: Okuda Jiō Sensei Kiju Kinen* 仏教思想論集: 奥田慈応先生喜寿記念, Heirakuji, Kyoto, 1976, pp. 455–69.

This movement, initiated with the notion of *bodhisattva-śīla*, led to a Ch'an definition of the One-Mind Precepts, or *isshinkai* 一心戒, that Saichō and his disciples, in order to become independent from the Hinayanist Vinaya prevalent among the Nara schools, merged with the 'perfect and sudden precepts', or *endonkai* 円頓戒, of the Tendai tradition.

Another related aspect of early Ch'an that was to find its way into the Tendai tradition under the theory of 'inherent awakening', or *hongaku* 本覚, was the principle of non-duality between Buddha and sentient beings, or between *nirvāṇa* and *samsāra*. This principle was expressed in many ways, the best known being the dictum, 'The mind itself is the Buddha.' This dictum provides the title of one of the three sections of *Jōtō Shōgakuron* 成等正覚論, a work recently discovered, with a few others belonging to the Daruma-shū tradition, among the documents of the Kanazawa Bunko.²³

Jōtō Shōgakuron, or 'Treatise on the Attainment of the Bodhisattva Awakening', opens with a reference to the transmission of the Ch'an teachings from the seven Buddhas of the past up to the fiftieth patriarch, Te-kuang 德光. The treatise is divided into three sections: (1) a history of the Ch'an school; (2) a gloss on the dictum, 'The mind itself is the Buddha'; and (3), a section on worldly benefits titled, 'Whatever is searched for is obtained.' The text stresses repeatedly the identity between mind and Buddha, and between sentient beings and Buddha. Most of its contents is typical of early Ch'an.

This doctrine amounts to a kind of antinomianism, and reflects an intellectual or elitist approach to religious experience. It marks a strong departure from traditional Buddhism, which is based on the observance of morality and the practice of meditation. Indeed, it paved the way to a rejection of all practices, including meditation. This conclusion had already been reached by some Ch'an masters during the T'ang dynasty. The two best-known examples are again Ma-tsu and Lin-chi. The former stated, 'The ordinary mind is the way,' and the latter advocated 'men without affairs' whose life is pure spontaneity. This tendency has usually been regarded as the main characteristic of Ch'an despite the fact that, within the Ch'an tradition itself, it was often condemned as lending itself to misinterpretation and leading to what has been called the 'natural heresy'.

But, strangely enough, this theoretical advance was often accompanied by the most traditional practices, and the Daruma-shū was certainly no exception in this respect. The stress on the transmission from master to disciple is already slightly contradictory in light of the metaphysical truth that the mind is Buddha. The importance accorded to the legend of Bodhidharma in the first section of *Jōtō Shōgakuron* seems also like a concession to the needs of

²³ Kanazawa Bunko Shiryō Zensho, 1, pp. 201-07. Also worth mentioning are *Hōmon Taikō* (which bears a striking similarity to

Kōzen Gokokuron and the 'Bendōwa' chapter of *Shōbōgenzō*) and *Kenshō Jōbutsuron* (ibid, pp. 208ff).

the common believers. Bodhidharma, the austere Indian master who went to China to transmit what was to become the Ch'an teaching, is presented as an incarnation of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (Kuan-yin, Kannon 觀音). His legendary meeting with the Liang emperor Wu Ti 武帝, r. 502–549, and his subsequent crossing over the Yang-tze on a reed, his facing a wall for nine years in a cave near the Shao-lin monastery, his dramatic encounter with Hui-k'o, who cuts off his own arm to be accepted as his disciple; his apparent death (like a Taoist immortal who achieves 'deliverance from the corpse', he leaves an empty coffin and a single sandal), and, on his way back to the West, his meeting with the Sung emissary Sung Yün 宋雲 in the Pamir mountains—none of the usual hagiographical details is omitted.²⁴

The first section of *Jōtō Shōgakuron* concludes with the information that Bodhidharma's teaching was first brought to Japan in 1189, that is, upon the return of Nōnin's disciples. It does not make use of the Japanese addition to the Bodhidharma legend concerning his crossing over to or reincarnation in Japan during the reign of Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子. This version of the legend was a product of the Tendai tradition and as such was certainly known to the Daruma-shū adepts. The stress on Bodhidharma is a feature of early Ch'an. In the later tradition, Bodhidharma was superseded by the sixth patriarch Hui-neng. However, this first section of *Jōtō Shōgakuron* ends with the well-known, and apocryphal, verse that earned Hui-neng his rank of sixth patriarch.²⁵

The third section deals with worldly blessings and supranormal powers, or *siddhi*, in the present life. Significantly, the reciting of *Jōtō Shōgakuron* becomes an illocutionary act, and this has far-reaching consequences as to the interpretation of its philosophical content. Nōnin, referred to as 'Great Master [Dai]Nichi', is quoted twice.

The first quotation, itself referring to a work titled *Tsuan-ling chi* 纂靈記,²⁶ tells the story of a man named Wang, who, on his way to hell, comes across a young monk who turns out to be the bodhisattva Ti-tsang, J. Jizō, 地藏. Wang is instructed to recite the following verse: 'If a person wishes to know all the buddhas of the three periods, he must contemplate the nature of the Dharma-dhatu and know that all things are the creation of the mind.' Having passed on this verse, Ti-tsang tells Wang, 'If you can recite it, you will destroy the sufferings of hell.'

²⁴ For further details on the 'founder' of Ch'an, see Bernard Faure, 'Bodhidharma: History and Legend', in Mircea Eliade, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, Free Press, New York, forthcoming, and Faure, 'Bodhidharma as Textual and Religious Paradigm', in *History of Religions*, 25:2 (February 1986), pp. 187–98.

²⁵ Philip B. Yampolsky, tr., *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, Columbia U.P., 1967, pp. 128–34.

²⁶ This Chinese source is quoted also in *Tsung-ching lu* 宗鏡錄 (T. 48, 2016, p. 461b), a work well known to Nōnin and to Zen adepts of the Kamakura period.

Then Wang has to confront Yama, the king of Hell, who asks him, 'What meritorious deeds did you perform while a man?' Wang answers, 'I received and kept the four-phrase verse.' Upon hearing his explanations, Yama releases him as well as all the nearby people who happen to hear the verse. The story receives the following comment:

Clearly, hell is a product of the mind. If you understand this, then hell is empty. Know therefore that if you see this mind, you will be immediately free of suffering. The noble and the base may seek numerous things, but if they aspire to separate from suffering, they will immediately lose their suffering and gain happiness. All this is in no way a temporary expedient. Disasters will be stopped and good fortune quickly invited. The heavy sufferings of hell will at once be removed; how much more so other disasters. Awakening to the ultimate Buddha fruit will at once be obtained, how much more so other *siddhi*. Thus, as the nine transformations of cinnabar turn lead into gold, one word of the ultimate principle turns one who is profane into a saint. When one leaf falls, autumn is all over the world; when one person hears the Law, all become buddhas. . . .²⁷

The text then provides a second quotation from Nōnin:

If you create a name where there is no name, good and bad will arise on the basis of name. If you create a principle where there is no principle, on the basis of principle strife will arise. Illusions do not really exist. Who determines what is good and what is bad? Empty illusions do not exist, what makes them tangible? What makes them empty? There is nothing to gain and nothing to lose.²⁸ With this the buddhas cannot gain *bodhi* nor can sentient beings lose it. If you just awaken to the one mind, all things will become quiescent. If you practice the way outside the mind and think you will gain the way, it will be like the mud ox lowing as it leaps toward heaven, like the stone horse neighing as it plows the waters, like cutting fire in search of water, like carving a horn to get milk. . . .²⁹

The style, as well as the doctrinal content, of these quotations from Nōnin belong to the 'pre-classical' Ch'an genre of doctrinal tracts. There is the same *topoi*, the same metaphors, the same proselytism. For example, in an early Ch'an anthology known as *Ta-mo lun* 達摩論, or 'The Treatise of Bodhidharma', a *dhyāna* master addresses the question of hell in the following terms:

Some, by discrimination in their own mind, create tigers, wolves, lions, poisonous dragons, evil spirits, the generals of the five destinies, King Yama, the ox-head hell-guards, and the sound-of-cold hell. . . . Merely realize that whatever mind discriminates is forms. . . . If you only realize that they are not real, then you will obtain liberation.³⁰

Such is the gist of Ti-tsang's verse quoted by Nōnin: hell is a product of the

²⁷ Kanazawa Bunko Shiryō Zensho, 1, p. 204; translation from Yampolsky, 'Problems'.

²⁸ This passage is from a letter included in *Treatise of Bodhidharma*. See Yanagida

Seizan, ed., *Daruma no Goroku: Ni'nyū Shigyōron* 達摩の語録: 二入四行論, Chikuma, 1969, p. 53.

²⁹ Kanazawa Bunko Shiryō Zensho, p. 204.

³⁰ Yanagida, *Daruma no Goroku*, p. 99.

mind.³¹ But the point here is that the value of the verse derives from its use rather than from its doctrinal content. Indeed, the realization that hell is after all empty cannot prevent Wang from facing King Yama, and it is only upon reciting the verse that he is released. The delusion seems too real to vanish through a simple intellectual realization, or even a spiritual insight. It has to be fought on its own terms. To free oneself from it, a stronger device is needed, and this is why the verse given by Ti-tsang has to be used as a magical formula. This paradox attests the complex syncretistic nature of Nōnin's doctrine, and the possible influence of esoteric Buddhism.³² It also illustrates the way in which the antinomian teachings of Ch'an, when placed in a different context, can be contained and subverted by popular beliefs, resulting in a hybrid genre that seems addressed to different audiences. Thus, the popular use of Ch'an doctrine drastically modified its functioning.

The esotericization of Ch'an can be already seen in the case of the Northern School, whose main representatives had studied under the Tantric masters Śubhakarasiṃha, 637–735, and Vajrabodhi, 669–731. This eclecticism also led early Ch'an to receive some influence from Taoism, and this may be reflected in Nōnin's reference to alchemical transformation of cinnabar into gold. The new Ch'an tradition of the late T'ang and Sung periods rejected such eclecticism. It is also represented in the Daruma-shū tradition, but to a lesser extent, and Nōnin's transmission of the Lin-chi (Rinzai) line of Ch'an seems to have remained largely nominal.

Relics and Regalia

Another feature of the Daruma-shū that seems at first glance paradoxical for a strictly antimonian teaching, is the stress on the transmission of the relics (*śarīra*, J. *shari* 舍利) of the six patriarchs and of the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra (P'u-hsien, Fugen 普賢).³³ The fact that, among these figures, one (Samantabhadra) was a metaphysical bodhisattva, and another (Bodhidharma) an immortal who had left behind him an empty coffin, was apparently never considered a problem. Indeed, parallel to the legends concerning the *śarīra* found after the cremation of the Buddha and of Buddhist saints, there was a long tradition in China of 'materialization' of *śarīra* owing to the preternatural powers acquired through meditation.³⁴

³¹ Incidentally, this may be one of the first apparitions of Ti-tsang (Jizō) in a Zen text, and it reflects the growing popularity of this bodhisattva during the Kamakura period. On this question, see M. W. de Visser, 'The Bodhisattva Ti-tsang (Jizō) in China and Japan', in *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 3:4 (October-December 1914), pp. 326–42.

³² For esoteric elements in Nōnin's teachings at Sambōji, see *Keiran Shūyōshū* 溪

嵐拾葉集 (T. 76, 2410, p. 692b) and *Ryōinketsu* 了因決 (T. 77, 2414, p. 167b).

³³ See Takahashi, '*Sambōji*', pp. 116–20.

³⁴ In the strict sense, the term *śarīra* refers to the ashes or bodily fragments left after the cremation of the Buddha or of a saint. But it will also be used here in the larger sense of 'relics', sacred objects that have belonged to one of these characters.

The first known case is that of K'ang Seng-hui 康僧会, fl. third century, who after many days of intense meditation managed to escape the death penalty by finally producing in the presence of the emperor a single grain of *śarīra*, harder than a diamond. By the T'ang period, together with the development of the cremation ritual, the production of *śarīra* had increased considerably, and a Northern Ch'ang monk such as Hui-an 慧安, d. 708, left after cremation as many as eighty grains of *śarīra* that emitted a five-colored halo.³⁵ One of his co-disciples, Hsüan-tse 玄曠, was immersed in *dhyāna* when 'suddenly each of his eyes emitted a *śarīra* of light rays of five colors.'³⁶ Toward the end of T'ang, there was a positive boom in the production of *śarīra*. The cremation of a monk named Hsi-yüan 希圓 yielded more than seven hundred grains, that of Hsüan-yüeh 玄約 several hundred grains.

Even Taoists tried to outbid Buddhists.³⁷ Thus, in the eleventh century, thousands of *śarīra* grains were found after the cremation of the Taoist master Chang Pai-tuan 張伯端.³⁸ The A-yü-wang monastery, where Nōnin's disciples (or, according to another version, Nōnin himself) supposedly received the *śarīra* of the six patriarchs, had a strong connection with the *śarīra* cult: the monastery was named after King Aśoka (A-yü-wang 阿育王), the Indian monarch who, according to legend, built eighty-four thousand stupas, some of them in China, to house the Buddha's relics. The cult of these relics had grown to such proportions in China that toward the end of T'ang the Confucianist Han Yü 韓愈 was exiled for submitting a memorial to the throne reproaching the emperor for his veneration of a relic of the Buddha's finger.

In Japan, *śarīra* became particularly important within the Tendai and Shingon traditions. When the prince-regent Shōtoku, at the early age of two, turned eastward to invoke the Buddha, *śarīra* are said to have fallen from his hands. The Chinese monk Ganjin 鑑真, 688–763, brought with him to Japan three thousand grains of Buddha's *śarīra*, while Kūkai 空海 obtained eighty. Ennin 円仁 also brought from China three grains of *śarīra* of a bodhisattva and two grains of a *pratyeka-buddha*. By the end of the Heian period, all the major temples held *śarīra* assemblies (*shari-e* 舍利会) and possessed reliquaries (*shari-tō* 舍利塔). Minamoto Sanetomo 源実朝, 1192–1219, sent an emissary to Sung China to ask for a tooth of the Buddha and other *śarīra*, which he

³⁵ *Sung kao-seng chuan* 宋高僧傳 (T. 50, 2061, p. 823c).

³⁶ *Leng-ch'ieh chih-tzu chi* 楞伽師資記 (T. 85, 2837, p. 1283a).

³⁷ Despite the claim of *Genkō Shakusho* that '*śarīra* are specific to Buddhism and are not mentioned in Confucian and Taoist books. . . . I have heard that they result from the impregnations of *śīla*, *samādhi*, and *prajñā*. . . . It is natural that Confucius and Lao-tzu would have lacked them, and that

preachers would have few and *dhyāna* [masters] many. . . .'

Quoted in *Koji Ruiin: Shūkyōbu 1* 古事類苑:宗教部 1, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1977, p. 251.

³⁸ For this example, see *Hōbōgirin*, 6 (1983), p. 581; for the following examples, see '*Shari*', in Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, ed., *Bukkyō Daijiten* 仏教大辞典, Horizon reprint, Taipei, 1977, 3, pp. 2185–88.

then enshrined in Kenninji, the monastery recently founded by Nōnin's rival, Yōsai.

Thus the Daruma-shū's cult of *śarīra* stemmed from a long tradition and had been strongly influenced by Tendai and Shingon rituals. It seems, however, that veneration of *śarīra* came to occupy a predominant position in Daruma-shū practice, and this makes the school's position within the Ch'an tradition unique. To be sure, the stress on the transmission of relics was not a new phenomenon in the Ch'an school, and the struggle for the possession of the patriarchal robe is the best known example. An even more striking case is that of the mummy of the sixth patriarch Hui-neng, still preserved at the Pao-en monastery in Ts'ao-chi (present Kuang-tung).³⁹ Shen-hui relates how a partisan of the rival Northern School unsuccessfully tried to take away the patriarch's head. Another attempt was made by a Korean. According to the Chinese sources, this venture also failed, but the Korean version claims that it was successful, and to this day a reliquary supposedly containing the sixth patriarch's head can still be seen in the Sanggae-sa near the town of Taegu. Relics (and not only *śarīra*, but also dharma-robies and books) came to be considered the religious equivalents of dynastic treasures, tokens of the orthodoxy of the Ch'an transmission. Enlightenment, not to mention mere excellence in doctrine or practice, was not deemed sufficient to ensure the rank of teacher. Regalia were more important, and this is why Nōnin had to send his disciples to China in order to obtain the qualifying items from Te-kuang.

This sacramental tendency, at first glance contradictory to the iconoclastic spirit of Zen, is not, as D. T. Suzuki and his epigones would have us believe, a later and fringe development, for it was already found in early Ch'an. For example, a chronicle such as *Ch'uan fa-pao chi* 伝宝法紀, or 'Record of the Transmission of the Dharma Jewel', presents Bodhidharma, not as a practitioner of seated meditation, but as the patriarch who transmitted the Dharma Jewel.⁴⁰ A similar sacramental overtone appears in Dōgen's criticism of the type of Ch'an prevailing in Sung China.

Let us now turn to the scroll, '*Rokuso Shari, Daie Zenji Kesa: Mokuroku*', recently described by Takahashi Shūei, that relates the transmission of the *śarīra* in Sambōji. It is composed of seventeen entries, most of which concern the enshrinement of the *śarīra* of the six patriarchs and of the Bodhisattva Fugen Kōmyō (P'u-hsien kuang-ming 普賢光明). The first two items, dated 1201, describe the exaltation of a monk named Ren-Amidabutsu Kanjin 蓮阿弥陀仏観真, when, upon worshipping the *śarīra* on the advice of his co-disciple Jōkan 定観, he witnessed the appearance of a new grain. The total number of

³⁹ Paul Demiéville, 'Momies d'Extrême-Orient', in *Choix d'études sinologiques (1920-1970)*, Brill, Leiden, 1973, pp. 152-56.

⁴⁰ Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki no Zenshi I* 初期の禅史I, Chikuma, 1971, pp. 337-46.

grains seems to have been eight, two each of Bodhidharma and Hui-neng, and one each of the four other patriarchs. The third entry, dated 1218, gives a total number of thirty-seven grains (the increase being probably due to fragmentation rather than to any new materialization). It states that these *śarīra* had been brought from China at the time of Nōnin, and were to be transmitted as regalia of the Zen sect. The author of this entry is the same Jōkan, who seems to have played an important role in Sambōji. The next two entries are dated 1230. One is anonymous and records the separate enshrinement of three grains from Fugen and one each from Bodhidharma and Hui-neng. The second is written by a monk named Hansui 範水, and is a pledge to give back to Sambōji one of the thirty-seven grains that he had received, on his thirty-eighth birthday, from a monk named Ichiren-bō 一蓮房.

The sixth entry, dated 1238, records the construction of a *śarīra* hall in Sambōji and testifies to the importance of these relics. The next seven pieces date from the fifteenth century; they show the regular increase in the number of *śarīra* grains and the efforts made by the temple authorities to avoid their dispersion. The next two entries deal, not with the *śarīra*, but with the Dharma-robe (*kaśāya*) of the Ch'an master Ta-hui Tsung-kao, transmitted through his successor Fo-chao Te-kuang 仏照徳光.⁴¹ Interestingly enough, the first of these two entries mentions that the *śarīra* and the robe had been brought from China by Nōnin himself. There is no other evidence that Nōnin ever went to China, and this may be a late story intended to dismiss the lingering criticism that his transmission was not completely orthodox. The last entry records the history of the *śarīra* and of the robe. It states that they were brought to Japan by Nōnin himself after his two disciples had obtained preliminary approbation from Te-kuang. The document ends with the statement that the regalia were transferred to a safer place when Sambōji became threatened by destruction during the Ōnin war, 1467–1477. The terminus ad quem of the document is therefore the second half of the fifteenth century, indicating that the tradition of the Daruma-shū was kept alive long after the end of the Kamakura period.

The transmission of *śarīra* had not taken place in Sambōji alone. Gikai, 1219–1309, a representative of the Hajakuji branch of the Daruma-shū who became Dōgen's disciple and second successor, transmitted the *śarīra* of the Bodhisattva Fugen and of the sixth patriarch Hui-neng⁴² to his disciple Keizan Jōkin 瑩山紹瑾, 1268–1325. Keizan eventually placed them in a reliquary, together with other regalia of the Sōtō sect, in Yōkōji, a monastery founded by him in the Noto Peninsula. Apparently the Hajakuji branch transmitted only one grain of *śarīra* and no Dharma-robe, and this paucity seems to indicate that it was only a collateral branch rather than the mainstream of Daruma-shū.

⁴¹ Te-kuang was not in fact Ta-hui's principal successor.

⁴² Or, according to another version, the

śarīra of the Bodhisattva Fugen transmitted by Hui-neng.

Dialogical Matrix of Yōsai's and Dōgen's Works

Yōsai's *Kōzen Gokokuron*, 1198, and Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* may be read, at one level, as attempts to silence the Daruma-shū. Yōsai's opposition was explicit, but Dōgen, who was trying to convert some Daruma-shū members, chose to criticize their doctrine indirectly. In the process, both authors were influenced by this doctrine, more than they probably would have admitted. If we overlook this unpublicized influence, we are liable to miss the dialogical nature of the works under study.

Yōsai's criticism of the Daruma-shū is found mainly in a chapter of *Kōzen Gokokuron* titled *Sejin Ketsugiron* 世人決疑論, or 'On Solving the Doubts of Worldly People'. It can be summarized under two related headings: the Daruma-shū's doctrine is a typical case of attachment to the false view of emptiness, a heresy often condemned in Mahayana Buddhism; and this attachment leads to a rejection of practice and morality. The two points are clearly stated in the following passage:

Someone asked: 'Some people recklessly call the Daruma-shū the Zen sect. But they [the Daruma-shū adepts] themselves say that there are no precepts to follow, no practices to engage in. From the outset there are no passions; from the beginning we are enlightened. Therefore do not practice, do not follow the precepts; eat when hungry, rest when tired. Why practice *nembutsu*, why give maigre feasts, why curtail eating? How can this be?

Yōsai replied that the adherents of the Daruma-shū are those who are described in the sutras as having a false view of emptiness. One must not speak with them or associate with them, and must keep as far away as possible.⁴³

Yōsai is here simultaneously trying to prove that his advocacy of Zen is in line with the Tendai tradition and that the Daruma-shū, remaining too dependent on this tradition, fails to represent the Ch'an tradition prevailing in Sung China. But rather than criticizing Nōnin on genealogical ground, he resorts to doctrinal arguments. He first quotes Chih-i's criticism of the antinomianism advocated by certain *dhyāna* masters, probably Bodhidharma's disciples:

Question: Some say that this [Zen] school advocates 'non-reliance on the written letter'. This is close to the false view of emptiness and is also similar to [the view of] those with obscure realization. If so, it has been criticized by the Tendai school. For example, a gloss of the [*Mo-ho*] *chih-kuan* concerning the 'contemplation of the inconceivable realm' says, 'This is something the dharma masters reciting the texts do not know.'

It is said in the [*Fa-hua*] *Hsüan-i*: 'If the man who contemplates his mind thinks that his adherence to his mind is correct and that he himself is equal to Buddha, and that he does not need to consult all the sutras and sastras, he will fall into arrogance. This is to hold a torch to burn oneself.' . . . How could the

⁴³ T. 80, 2543, p. 7c; translation from Yam-polsky, 'Problems'. See also Tsunoda Ryusaku & W. T. de Bary, ed., *Sources of*

Japanese Tradition, Columbia U.P., 1958, 1, p. 237.

‘non-reliance on the written letter’ advocated by this Zen school avoid this difficulty?

Answer: This Zen school hates those masters with obscure realization, and abhors those who hold the false view of emptiness. To rely only on the stage of perfection and to cultivate the perfect-and-sudden [teaching], externally with the disciplinary code to abstain from wrong, internally with compassion to benefit others, this is what we call the Zen principle, this is what we call the Buddha Dharma. Those whose meditation is blind and who hold the false view of emptiness do not know the significance of this. Therefore they are bandits in the Buddha Dharma.⁴⁴

To prove his point, Yōsai quotes an impressive number of Buddhist scriptures (among which, *Tsung-ching lu* 宗鏡錄, also quoted by Nōnin), and stresses the importance of Vinaya. On this question of discipline, his teaching is one step back from the *endonkai* theory of the Tendai tradition, while the Daruma-shū position can be seen as the logical conclusion of the Tendai *Bodhisattva-śīla* tradition, inherited from Northern Ch’an through Tao-hsüan (J. Dōsen) 道璿, 702–760.

The Daruma-shū lineage is in turn discredited by the *Miraiki* 未来記, a ‘prediction’ made by Yōsai concerning the development of Zen in Japan fifty years after his death. This text, allegedly dated 1197 and appended to *Kōzen Gokokuron*, is clearly apocryphal.⁴⁵ It was probably written half a century after Yōsai’s death, to criticize the Daruma-shū faction that was then reviving with Gikai under a Sōtō guise. According to the text, in 1173 Yōsai visited the Ch’an master Fo-hai Hui-yüan 仏海慧遠, 1103–1176, who predicted to him that his dharma would spread in the East fifty years later. Another Ch’an master, Te-kuang, confirmed this to Yōsai. This prediction contains an implicit criticism of both Nōnin and his precursor Kakua 覺阿, b. 1143, who, despite claiming descent from the above-mentioned Ch’an masters, had not been given this legitimizing prediction.

Yōsai represents conservative Buddhism and his adhesion to the new ruling class is no surprise. It is paradoxical that he and Dōgen have been considered the founders of a new sect of Kamakura ‘popular Buddhism’. Dōgen’s criticism is stated most comprehensively in the ‘Bendōwa’ 弁道話 chapter, 1231, of *Shōbōgenzō*, a chapter that bears a striking similarity with the *Sejin Ketsugiron* chapter of *Kōzen Gokokuron*:

Question: Some say, in the Buddha Dharma, if you thoroughly penetrate the meaning of ‘the mind in itself is Buddha,’ even without vocal recitation of scriptures, or bodily practice in the Buddha Way, you will be assured of lacking nothing in the Buddha Dharma. Simply knowing that the Buddha Dharma exists intrinsically in oneself is attainment of the Buddha Way in its totality. It is not

⁴⁴ T. 80, 2543, p. 7c; translation from Yam-polsky, ‘Problems’.

⁴⁵ Yanagida, ‘Dōgen’, pp. 17ff.

to be sought beyond this, in any other person. Is there, then, really any need to trouble oneself with negotiating the Way in zazen?

Answer: Such words are particularly meaningless. . . . Understand that the Buddha Dharma consists, above all, in practice, quitting the view that differentiates between self and others. If the Way were attained by knowing that 'self is buddha,' Śākyamuni long ago would not have undergone the hardships he did in guiding others to enlightenment. . . . It is clear one cannot realize the Buddha Dharma by understanding that one's self is buddha.⁴⁶

Dōgen equates his criticism of the Daruma-shū with that of the Shingon sect, according to which, 'The mind itself is Buddha,' and 'This very body attains buddhahood.' For him, the dictum, 'The mind itself is Buddha' is but 'a reflection in a mirror'. In another passage, he takes up the question of the so-called *senika* heresy (*sennigedō* 先尼外道):

This heresy holds that in one's body there is a spiritual intelligence. As occasions arise, this intelligence readily discriminates likes and dislikes, yes and no; it knows pains and irritation, suffering and pleasure. They all proceed from this spiritual intelligence. However, when the body perishes, this spiritual nature separates from the body and is reborn in another place. Therefore, while it seems to perish here, it has life elsewhere, and thus is ever immutable, never perishing. Such is the view of the Senika heresy.⁴⁷

But, says Dōgen, since in Buddhism mind and body, substance and form, are one, 'why speak of the body perishing and the mind abiding?' He then addresses, like Yōsai, the crucial question of the relevance of Vinaya rules. To the question, 'Is it absolutely necessary for those who devote themselves to zazen to adhere strictly to [Buddhist] precepts?' he answers that 'observing precepts, pure behavior, is a standard of the Zen school, and a characteristic of buddhas and patriarchs.'⁴⁸ He also criticizes the 'combined practice', that is, practice of zazen with practices of mantra and *shikan* 止觀: 'When I was in China, I asked the masters there for their true principle. They answered that they had never heard of any of the patriarchs . . . engaging in such combined practice. Indeed, unless you concentrate on one practice, you cannot attain the one wisdom.'⁴⁹ This goes together with Dōgen's rejection of *kyōzen itchi* 教禪一致 and of all types of syncretism or eclecticism. This is why he dismisses as apocryphal popular scriptures such as *Shou leng-yen ching* 首楞嚴經 and *Yüan-chüeh ching* 圓覺經, or 'Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment'.⁵⁰

But Dōgen also rejects the opposite stress on a 'special transmission outside

⁴⁶ Translation from Norman Waddell & Abe Masao, 'Dōgen's *Bendōwa*', in *The Eastern Buddhist*, 4:1 (May 1971), pp. 151-52.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 146.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 148.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 148.

⁵⁰ Norman Waddell, 'Dōgen's *Hōkyō-ki*:

Part 1', in *The Eastern Buddhist*, 10:2 (October 1977), p. 125.

Popular among Ch'an adepts in the Sung dynasty, this scripture teaches that all obstructions to the right path are ultimately enlightenment. Ibid., p. 132.

the scriptures', or *kyōge betsuden* 教外別伝. He quotes in *Hōkyōki* 宝慶紀, his diary written during his stay in China, a dialogue with his master Ju-ching:

I asked: 'Now priests everywhere speak about the "special transmission outside the scriptures."' This, they declare, is the real meaning in the First Patriarch Bodhidharma's coming from the West. What do they mean?'

Ju-ching taught: 'How could the great Way of the buddhas and patriarchs have anything to do with "inside" or "outside"? . . . The world could not have two Buddha Dharmas.'⁵¹

For Dōgen and Yōsai, as for Nichiren and critics of Zen, the *kyōge betsuden* theory implied a rejection of the fundamental Tendai scripture, the Lotus Sutra. This criticism was not entirely justified in the case of the Daruma-shū, whose advocacy of a 'special transmission' was after all a logical outcome of the *hongaku* theory developed on Hieizan—in the same way as its rejection of the Vinaya rule was an outcome of the Tendai conception of Bodhisattva Precepts.

In 'Bendōwa', Dōgen's criticism is relatively straightforward, although the name of the Daruma-shū is not mentioned. 'Bendōwa' can be considered as Dōgen's manifesto, and its ideas were developed in the rest of *Shōbōgenzō*. This work, written in *kana*, was apparently a response to a *Shōbōgenzō* in Chinese, a collection of three hundred koans (*Sambyakusoku* 三百則)⁵² compiled in 1236 by the Daruma-shū adepts who had joined Dōgen. But Dōgen's fundamental motivation will later disappear under philosophical discourse or poetical images, only to surface at times when sectarian passions take the upper hand. It is as if Dōgen had felt consciously the need to camouflage his real target. The following examples are taken from the chapter 'Genjōkōan' 現成公案, 1233, considered one of the most philosophical and at the same time literary sections of *Shōbōgenzō*:

When a man goes off in a boat and looks back to see the shoreline, he mistakenly thinks the shore is moving. If he keeps his eyes closely on his boat, he realizes it is the boat that is advancing. In like manner, when a person [tries to] discern and affirm the myriad dharmas with a confused conception of [his own] body and mind, he mistakenly thinks his own mind and his own nature are permanent.⁵³

The phenomenological illusion denounced by Dōgen is the belief in the existence of self. Such a self has no ontological reality, it changes constantly, and the apparent changes in its environment hide a fundamental immutability.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Waddell, pp. 118–19.

⁵² This *Shōbōgenzō* was itself modelled on a work of the same title, a collection of some sixty koans compiled by the Ch'an master Ta-hui 大慧. See Yanagida Seizan, 'Kana *Shōbōgenzō no Himitsu: Dōgen to sono Deshi Ejō*' 仮名正法眼蔵の秘密: 道元とその弟子懷奘, in *Tembō* 展望, 210 (June 1976), pp. 44–61.

⁵³ Waddell & Abe, in *The Eastern Buddhist*, 5:2 (October 1972), p. 135.

⁵⁴ The same idea had been expressed by Seng-chao 僧肇 in his treatise *Chao-lun* 肇論, 'The Immutability of Things' (T. 45, 1858, p. 151), from which Dōgen clearly borrows his examples.

Dōgen's assertion that everything has its own Dharma-rank may be read as a criticism of Lin-chi's notion of the 'pure man of no-rank'. By thus reintroducing hierarchy as a palliative to the Mahayana notion of sameness and despite his apparent advocacy of the latter notion, he achieves a strategic containment of the potential excesses of the Ch'an concept of 'transcendental subjectivity' and the 'perfect spontaneity' that derives from it. The social implications of these philosophical statements are obvious. His conception of subjectivity is a denial of the 'false subjectivity' promoted by the Daruma-shū:⁵⁵ 'To learn the Buddha Way is to learn oneself. To learn oneself is to forget oneself. To forget oneself is to be attested by all dharmas, to drop off body and mind of oneself and of others.' Thus, in Dōgen's view, two false conceptions of self reintroduce the 'substantialist' heresy within Buddhist doctrine: the self as transcendent Buddha-Nature; and the self as an expression of the Buddha-Nature immanent to the phenomenal world. And of course, as his disciples well knew, both could be found in the Daruma-shū doctrine. Dōgen concludes the 'Genjōkōan' chapter by quoting a dialogue between the Chinese master Pao-ch'e and one of his disciples:

As Zen master Pao-ch'e of Ma-yu shan was fanning himself, a monk came up and said: 'The nature of the wind is constancy. There is no place it does not reach. Why do you still use a fan?' Pao-ch'e answered: 'You only know the nature of the wind is constancy. You do not know yet the meaning of it reaching every place.' The monk said: 'What is the meaning of "there is no place it does not reach"?' The master only fanned himself. The monk bowed deeply.⁵⁶

This dialogue plays a crucial role in a chapter whose very title, 'Genjōkōan', implies a criticism of koan practice as conceived by the Ch'an masters of the Lin-chi tradition. Dōgen rejects the traditional conception of koans (one that was until recently advocated by D. T. Suzuki), arguing that they are mere remedies for a specific illness, while the truly enlightened master realizes the koan anterior to all koans, the 'actualized' koan, or *genjō kōan*.⁵⁷ The disciple's understanding of the underlying nature of things is rejected as an attachment to an Absolute Principle, a shallow realization that naturally leads to quietism or naturalism.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ For a philosophical interpretation of this question, see Francis H. Cook, 'Dōgen's View of Authentic Selfhood and Its Socio-ethical Implications', in LaFleur, pp. 131-49.

⁵⁶ Waddell & Abe, in *The Eastern Buddhist*, 5:2, pp. 139-40.

⁵⁷ Incidentally, one of the examples that Dōgen gives for Ta-hui's misunderstanding of the koans is the famous *sokushin zebutsu* 即心是仏 that was the basis of the Daruma-shū teaching. For Dōgen, the expression implied the necessity of an intensive practice. It is therefore no coincidence that Pao-ch'e 宝徹, the main protagonist in the above dialogue,

was a disciple of Ma-tsu, to whom is attributed the idea that 'the ordinary mind is the Tao,' which was to lead to the 'naturalist heresy' so severely criticized by Dōgen.

⁵⁸ This concept corresponds also to the *hongaku* theory advocated by the Tendai doctrine. According to a well-known passage of Dōgen's hagiography, it is precisely the problem of the relevance of practice for someone who has understood the notion of *hongaku* that convinced the young Dōgen to leave Hieizan and embark on a long spiritual journey.

Dōgen's criticism of the naturalist heresy, and more precisely of Nōnin's precursor Ta-hui, soon extended to the whole of Sung Ch'an. Dōgen gradually traced it back to Lin-chi himself,⁵⁹ and even to the Platform Sutra's notion of 'seeing one's own nature' (*kenshō* 見性).⁶⁰ In the chapter 'Jishō zammai',⁶¹ Ta-hui is described as an utter failure, while in the chapter 'Bukkyō', Lin-chi is accused of having, in his ignorance, disparaged the canonical teachings.⁶² Dōgen's defense of the scriptures and subsequent rejection of the *kyōge betsuden* theory did not prevent him from rejecting the complementary *kyōzen itchi* theory, much less the *sankyō itchi* 三教一致 ('Harmony of the Three Teachings') or *hongaku* theories.

Clearly, all these criticisms were destined for an audience that had been sensitized to these themes by the doctrine of the Daruma-shū. And this motivation is no less present when hidden behind rhetorical, philosophical, or poetical formulations. Is it then appropriate to take Dōgen's statements at face value and to forget their ideological and sectarian implications? In a way, Dōgen's path was determined by his relationship with the Daruma-shū, his stakes and his position on the intellectual chessboard of his time. The dynamics of such a game goes beyond his protagonists, for it does not originate with any of them. It is therefore misleading to stress unduly Dōgen's role as the author of *Shōbōgenzō* and the founder of the Sōtō school, or as a charismatic thinker uncontaminated by historical or contextual determination.

To what extent were Yōsai's and Dōgen's criticisms of the Daruma-shū accurate? And, granted their accuracy, to what extent were they orthodox? The words by which Yōsai summarizes the teaching of the Daruma-shū, 'Fundamentally there are no passions, from the outset we are enlightened,' can indeed be found in one of the Daruma-shū tracts of the Kanazawa Library, *Hōmon Taikō* 法門大綱,⁶³ that quotes them as the answer by which Hui-k'o 'obtained the marrow' of Bodhidharma, while the other disciples Tao-yü 道育 and the nun Tsung-ch'ih 惣持 were able only to obtain the skin and the bones.⁶⁴ *Ta-ma lun* also stresses the uselessness of eliminating passions that are fundamentally empty.

⁵⁹ T. 82, 2582, pp. 107c & 108a.

A later commentator, Tenkei Denson 天桂伝尊, dismissed Dōgen's criticism of Ta-hui and Lin-chi as an interpolation that should be corrected or omitted. Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆, *Dōgen Zenji to sono Monryū* 道元禅師とその門流, Seishin, 1961, p. 263.

⁶⁰ This eventually led him to reject the Platform Sutra as a forgery. The *kenshō jōbutsu* theory advocated by Hui-neng in the Platform Sutra and by Shen-hui had been transmitted in the Tendai tradition (for example, in Saichō's 最澄 *Kechimyakufu* 血脈譜 and in *Daruma Daishi Sanron*), and constituted the theme of *Kenshō Jōbutsuron*, one of the Daruma-shū's treatises.

⁶¹ T. 82, 2582, pp. 252-55.

⁶² Ibid., p. 196b.

⁶³ *Kanazawa Bunko Shiryō Zensho*, 1974, p. 211.

⁶⁴ In the chapter 'Raihai Tokuzui' 礼拝得髓 of *Shōbōgenzō* (T. 82, 2582, pp. 33-38), Dōgen argues that there is no difference between the skin, the bones, and the marrow, and that all reflect equally Bodhidharma's teaching. This story appears in fact in a work by Tsung-mi 宗密, *Ch'an-men shih-tzu ch'eng hsi t'u* 禅門師資承襲圖, and was based on a story found in *Li-tai fa-pao chi* 歷代法宝記, ca. 774, in which two disciples of Bodhidharma compare the identity of passions and awakening to that of the hand and the fist.

The theme ‘passions are awakening’ (*bonnō soku bodai* 煩惱即菩提)⁶⁵ also became crucial in the Tendai theory of ‘fundamental awakening’ (*hongaku shisō* 本覚思想). Hui-k’o’s answer is quoted by Saichō in his *Naishō Buppō Sōjō Kechimyakufu* 内証仏法相承血脉譜. It eventually gave a doctrinal basis to the laxism that led to the degeneration of Tendai and to the appearance of the so-called ‘evil monks’ (*akusō* 悪僧) at the end of the Heian period.⁶⁶ A link between the Daruma-shū and these ‘evil monks’ is clearly drawn by Yōsai, although the followers of Nōnin do not seem to have led a dissolute life.⁶⁷ At any rate, the emergence of the Daruma-shū may be interpreted against the background of the arising of a new category of monks, the so-called ‘practitioners’ (*gyōnin* 行人), and their resistance to the clerical establishment of the ‘scholar-monks’ (*gakusō* 学僧).⁶⁸

Thus the type of Ch’an represented by the Daruma-shū had some letters patent of nobility, both in the Ch’an and Tendai traditions. By the same token, it appears that Yōsai’s and Dōgen’s claims to orthodoxy reflect rather their marginality within the ‘classical’ Ch’an tradition. But the very notions of orthodoxy and ‘classical’ tradition should be questioned here. The documents rediscovered at the turn of the century in Tun-huang show that the early Ch’an tradition, like any living tradition, was multivocal and heterogeneous. Its earliest known text, *Ta-mo lun*, contains in germ all the elements that will later give birth to the *kyōzen itchi* and *kyōge betsuden* theories, or to the *kanna-zen* and *mokushō-zen* trends that opposed the Lin-chi and Ts’ao-tung schools during the Sung dynasty. This contradictory, agonistic nature of Ch’an is something structural, and the dynamic tension existing between its various trends can be repressed by an emerging orthodoxy only at the cost of a sclerosis of tradition. Such was indeed the case during the Muromachi and Tokugawa periods, and such is still the case in much of Zen scholarship.

The Sōtō and Daruma-shū Merger

After Dōgen’s death, Eihei-ji was administered by his successor Ejō. When Ejō died in 1280, a controversy over his succession, the so-called ‘third-generation controversy’ (*sandai sōron*), took place between the partisans of Tettsū Gikai

⁶⁵ This notion, borrowed from T’ien-t’ai doctrine, was to lead to the *hongaku* theory in Japanese Tendai. See Tamura Yoshirō 田村芳朗, ‘*Nihon Chūsei Shichō to Tendai Hongaku Shisō*’ 日本中世思潮と天台本覚思想, in *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, 16:2 (March 1968), pp. 80–86.

In Chinese T’ien-t’ai, however, the notion was strongly criticized by Szu-ming Chih-li 四明知礼, 960–1028. According to Yanagida, ‘*Zen Bunka*’, pp. 66ff, Chih-li may have in-

fluenced Yōsai’s criticism of the Daruma-shū.

⁶⁶ See Akamatsu, pp. 460–465.

⁶⁷ Had the Daruma-shū adepts anything to do with the monks criticized in *Tengu Zōshi* 天狗草紙, who ‘did not shave their heads, wore black hats, wandered here and there, and were “highway artists”’? Quoted in Yanagida, ‘*Dōgen*’, p. 15.

⁶⁸ Funaoka, ‘*Nihon Zenshūshi ni okeru Daruma-shū no Ichi*’, pp. 106–08.

徹通義介, 1219–1309,⁶⁹ and those of Gien 義演, d. 1314.⁷⁰ Both were former members of the Daruma-shū, but while Gien had apparently rejected his former affiliation to receive the precepts of the Sōtō line from Ejō, Gikai had preserved the Daruma-shū lineage. Despite this fact, he had been chosen by Ejō to go to China and study the rule and architecture of the Ch'an monasteries. After his return to Japan, he stayed in various Zen institutions in the imperial capital (Kenninji, Tōfukuji) and in Kamakura (Jufukuji, Kenchō-ji) for the same purpose.

The details of the controversy are not well known, but Japanese scholars generally share Ōkubo Dōshū's view of the contention⁷¹ as reflecting the correct reaction of Dōgen's orthodox successors, Gien and Jakuen.⁷² Apparently, the principal ground for discord had to do with the administration of Eihei-ji. In accordance with Ejō's will, Gikai had become the third abbot of the monastery and had introduced various changes in its architecture and administration. The discontent provoked by these measures turned into an open conflict, although the real cause of contention was the legitimate succession of Dōgen as patriarch of the sect.⁷³ Gikai's preservation of the Daruma-shū lineage within the Sōtō tradition was perceived as heterodox and in violation of the uncompromising spirit of Dōgen's teaching, and this led to his eviction from the Eihei-ji community in 1293. Gikai and his followers took refuge in Daijō-ji, a former Tendai temple in Kaga, which was then turned into a Zen monastery. In 1298, Gikai passed the direction of Daijō-ji to his disciple Keizan Jōkin, to whom he entrusted the Daruma-shū tradition. When Gikai died in 1309, Eihei-ji was still administered by Gien. After Gien's death in 1314, his disciple Giun 義雲, 1253–1333, restored to some extent the monastery, which had fallen into a state of disrepair. Thus, until the end of the Muromachi period, the two factions remained completely separated, and only Keizan's branch flourished.

Thanks to Keizan, the Sōtō school is said to have experienced a revival, and his faction outshone the conservative Eihei-ji community. The so-called 'great patriarch' of the Sōtō sect had been born in Echizen and had studied under Ejō and Gikai. In 1313 he founded a new monastery, Yōkō-ji, in the Noto Peninsula, and in 1321 he turned a Tendai establishment, Sōjiji, into a Zen

⁶⁹ Gikai was born in Echizen into the Fujiwara family. He became a novice at Hajakuji with Ekan, and was then ordained on Hieizan. He joined Dōgen at Fukakusa with the rest of Ekan's disciples and was sent by Ejō to China in 1259.

⁷⁰ Bernard Faure, 'Gien', in *Dictionnaire historique du Japon*, Kinokuniya, 1981, 6, pp. 51–53.

⁷¹ Ōkubo, *Dōgen Zenji*, p. 445.

⁷² Jakuen, Chi-yüan, 寂円, 1207–1299, was a disciple of Ju-ching; after the death of his master, he left China to join Dōgen.

⁷³ Gien was claiming to be the direct Dharma-heir of Ejō, and therefore the fifty-third patriarch of the Zen sect. He was older than his rival and had contributed, with Senne 詮慧 and Kyōgō 經豪, to the compilation of *Eihei Kōroku* 永平広録, 'The Recorded Sayings of Dōgen'.

monastery, which was soon recognized by Emperor Go-Daigo 後醍醐, who was at that time looking for new allies in his attempt to overthrow the bakufu administration. It is with Keizan that the Sōtō sect was officially born, but, at the same time, that Dōgen's tradition was actually eclipsed. In 1323 Keizan founded in Yōkōji a sanctuary called Gorō-hō 五老峰 ('Peak of the Five Elders'), where he deposited various regalia of both the Sōtō and the Daruma-shū traditions, writings of Ju-ching, transmission documents of Dōgen and Gikai, *śāstra* of the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra, and his own documents of succession.

This rite has been interpreted by Sōtō scholars as Keizan's way of shedding his Daruma-shū connection in order to avoid the double affiliation that had supposedly afflicted his master Gikai.⁷⁴ However, even if his action did result in an interruption of the Daruma-shū lineage, the fact that Keizan was including himself among the 'five elders' seems to indicate that his initiative carried a more positive meaning and should rather be construed as an act of worship, an attempt at reconciling the two trends by sanctifying them. The Daruma-shū lineage was not interrupted, since the joint Sōtō/Rinzai affiliation was inherited by Keizan's disciples.⁷⁵ The syncretistic spirit of the Daruma-shū was transmitted and took precedence in the later developments of the Sōtō sect over the sectarian spirit inherited from Dōgen.

Ironically, the fundamental change of spirit—from elitism to proselytism, from 'purism' to syncretism, from Indian and Chinese Buddhism to Japanese religion—that derived from Keizan's influence has been simultaneously regarded by Sōtō scholars as both a revival and a degeneration of the tradition begun by Dōgen. These values reflect only the sectarian or ideological prejudices, or at least the ambivalence of their authors. While Keizan's tradition is clearly a radical departure from Dōgen, it allowed the Sōtō sect to preserve the latter's teachings and to achieve the popularity that it still enjoys today and that permits extensive scholarship.

Despite superficial similarities, the thrust of Keizan's Zen differed mainly from Dōgen's in that it incorporated elements from esoteric Buddhism and from the local religious tradition. The esotericization of the Sōtō teachings had

⁷⁴ Suzuki Kakuzen 鈴木格禪, 'Tōhoku "Gorō-hō" Kō' 東北「五老峰」考, in *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu Ronshū*, 32 (March 1974), pp. 73–94; Ishikawa Rikisan 石川力山, 'Daruma-shū no Sōjōbutsu ni tsuite' 達磨宗の相承仏について, in *Shūgaku Kenkyū*, 26 (March 1984), p. 109.

⁷⁵ For example, Gasan Jōseki 峨山紹磧, 1275–1365, and his disciples.

A similar position, actually a strong criticism of Dōgen's sectarianism, can be

found in a later Sōtō representative such as Tenkei Denson, 1648–1735. See Kagamishima, pp. 225ff.

Another contemporary Sōtō master, Dokuan Genkō 独庵玄光, 1630–1698, criticizes the excessive formality of the type of transmission advocated by Dōgen. Kagamishima Genryū & Tamaki Kōshirō 玉城康四郎, ed., *Dōgen Zen no Rekishi* 道元禪の歴史, Shunjūsha, 1980, p. 165.

begun with Gikai and was one of the reasons that led the conservative faction of Eihei-ji to question his authority.⁷⁶ But with Keizan, who had since his youth been influenced by popular religion and the *shugendō* 修験道 of the Hakusan branch of Tendai, this trend reached a new level. Dōgen remained until the end an aristocrat from the capital, nurtured with Chinese culture, and not once in his *Shōbōgenzō* does he make any approving reference to Japanese popular beliefs. His rejection of the *sankyō itchi* theory and his acerbic criticism of Taoism show his contempt for these beliefs. In the chapter 'Kie Buppōshō' 帰依仏法僧, 'Taking Refuge in the Three Jewels', he quotes a passage from the Lotus Sutra in which the Buddha says: 'There are many people who, out of fear, take refuge in the deities of mountains, forests, individual trees, gardens, non-Buddhist shrines, and so on. Taking refuge in such deities, however, is of no value whatsoever, for it is impossible to free oneself from pain and sufferings in this way.'⁷⁷

Keizan lived in a completely different religious atmosphere, where Japanese *kami* had to be taken in account for any important event.⁷⁸ This reflects in part the new importance given to laymen by Keizan, who taught that 'reverence toward *danapati* must be like that toward Buddha.' With him the Sōtō doctrine incorporated many elements of esoteric Buddhism (*dhāraṇī*, ritual, etc.) and of the native cults, in particular those surrounding Hakusan, a cultic center for *shugendō* practitioners of the Miidera (Onjōji) branch of Tendai.⁷⁹ When Keizan founded Yōkōji, he took great care to summon the great *kami* Amaterasu, Hakusan Gongen (the tutelary deity of Hakusan), and the myriads of lesser *kami* protecting Japan, as well as gods belonging to the *onmyōdō* 陰陽道 pantheon.⁸⁰ That this is not a mere expediency or compromise with local

⁷⁶ Another co-disciple of Gikai was Giin 義尹, d. 1300, who seems to have been strongly influenced by the *honji suijaku* theory. After returning from his second trip to China, he founded Daijiji in Echigo in 1283, and this institution became the first Sōtō center of ceremonies performed for the bakufu.

⁷⁷ Translation from Yūhō Yokoi, *Zen Master Dōgen*, Weatherhill, New York & Tokyo, 1976, p. 130.

⁷⁸ The same phenomenon was taking place within the Shinshū sect with Zonkaku 存覚, a disciple of Shinran, who advocated in his *Shoshin Honkaishū* 諸神本懐集 a type of *honji-suijaku* syncretism that had been rejected by his master.

Matsui Shōten 松井昭典, 'Sōtō Zen no Dempan Katei ni okeru Shingikan no Hensen ni tsuite: Shoki Kyōdan to Shingi to no Kōshō o Chūshin to shite' 曹洞禅の伝播過程における神祇官の変遷について: 初期教団と神祇との交渉を中

心として, in *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, 17:2 (March 1969), pp. 345-49.

⁷⁹ According to local tradition, in 720 the monk Taichō 泰澄 founded a center on Hakusan by enshrining there the Hakusan Myōri Dai-Gongen, considered to be an avatar of the Bodhisattva Kannon (Avalokiteśvara).

Concerning Keizan's relations with esoteric Buddhism, see Kōchi Eigaku 光地英学, 'Keizan Zenji no Mikkyōteki Hairyō to sono Raiyu' 瑩山禅師の密教的拝領とその来由, in *Shūgaku Kenkyū*, 2 (1960), pp. 42-49; Imaeda Aishin 今枝愛真, 'Keizan Zenji to Rekishiteki Ichi: Hakusan Tendai to no Kankei o Chūshin to shite' 瑩山禅師と歴史的位置: 白山天台との関係を中心として, in *Keizan Zenji no Kenkyū* 瑩山禅師の研究, Sankyō Bijutsu, 1974, pp. 81-99, and Matsui, pp. 346-47.

⁸⁰ *Keizan Oshō Shingi*, T. 82, 2589, p. 437b, and also pp. 444a & 447a. On the impor-

beliefs, as advocates of 'pure' Zen would have us believe, is reflected in *Tōkokuki* 洞谷記, a collection of documents concerning Yōkōji, in which Keizan declares:

In the past, I obtained the fruit of Arhatship during the time of the Buddha Vipāśyin, and died in the Himalayas, north of Mt Sumeru. I became the deity of the Kubara tree, a four-legged animal with a dog's head, an owl's body, the belly and tail of a snake. Although I was a tree-spirit, I had obtained the fruit, and lived thereafter on the Himalayas, together with the fourth Arhat Subinda, in the continent of Uttara-kuru. Owing to these affinities with the northern country, I have now been reborn here as an *ujiko* of Hakusan. . . .

Having obtained the fruit, during five hundred lives, I appeared in the world in order to spread the Dharma and to help sentient beings.

Bodhidharma entered my dream as I was bathing in the pure water that gushed out from the stone, under my seat. I was naked, so he gave me his robe and produced in me the thought of awakening.

Maitreya entered my dream as I had been reborn three times on a blue lotus and took me with him in the sky. The *deva*, playing *gigaku* music, came to welcome him. Maitreya led me to the inner sanctuary of the Tuṣṭita heaven, and helped me reach the stage of non-return.

Śakyamuni entered my dream as I was manifesting my body at the time of the preaching of the Ratnakūṭa Sutra, and I have spent fifty-eight years explaining the three deliverances—from time, mind, and phenomena.⁸¹

Thus the past lives of Keizan, going as far back as the Buddha Vipāśyin, were known to him through a revelatory dream.⁸² The dream is not, as for Dōgen and traditional Ch'an masters, the hallmark of delusion, but a higher reality. This dense visionary atmosphere, characteristic of the 'new' Sōtō school, is closer to popular religion than to orthodox Zen. Keizan's enlightenment is not the result of some intellectual or meditative practice, for it takes place in a dream through his assimilation with Bodhidharma. By defining himself as an *ujiko* of Hakusan, Keizan stresses the importance of the place and of the tutelary deity. This 'logic of place',⁸³ referring to a reality conceived as a mosaic of sacred spaces or 'provinces of meaning', and to enlightenment

tance of the Ying-yang theories (*onmyōdō* 陰陽道) in medieval Japan, see Bernard Frank, *Kata-imi et kata-tagae: Etude sur les Interdits de direction à l'époque Heian*, in *Bulletin de la Maison Franco-japonaise*, 5:2-4 (1958).

⁸¹ Quoted in Yanagida, 'Dōgen', p. 68.

⁸² The transformation of Sōjiji by Keizan was the result of an oracle revealed by Kannon in a dream. See *Kannondō Chūkō Engi* 觀音堂中興緣起, quoted by Imaeda Aishin in *Keizan Zenji no Kenkyū*, Sankyō Bijutsu, 1974, p. 93.

Tōkokuki also records the dream in which the eighth Arhat Vajraputra revealed to

Keizan that the location of Yōkōji was superior to that of Eihei-ji.

On the importance of the arhats in the Sōtō tradition, see M. W. de Visser, 'The Arhats in China and Japan', in *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 9 (1920-1922), pp. 116-44.

⁸³ The meaning intended here is different, in fact quite antithetical, to that of the expression used by the later Nishida Kitarō. See David A. Dilworth, 'Nishida's Final Essay: The Logic of Place and a Religious World-View', in *Philosophy East and West*, 20:4 (October 1970), pp. 355-67.

as a knowledge of sacred geography, is the complete opposite of the notion of 'sudden enlightenment' found in 'pure' Zen, which implies a conception of totality as abstract, transparent space grasped in its totality by the mind. We have here two symbolical or anthropological discourses on space. The first reflects popular conception, the second is a product of high culture, which presents itself as an 'unlocalized' (a-topical or 'u-topian') discourse. In this respect, Keizan is more a product of the indigenous culture represented by the Daruma-shū than a faithful heir to Dōgen's imported 'great tradition'.⁸⁴

Keizan's disciples Meihō Sotetsu 明峰素哲, 1277–1350, and Gasan Jōseki 峨山紹碩, 1275–1365—both adepts of Hakusan Tendai—pursued the popularization of the Sōtō tradition.⁸⁵ With Gasan's successors, the so-called 'five sages', and more particularly Gennō Shinshō 源翁心昭, the regional development of the sect closely followed the pattern of the *shugendō* pilgrimage centers. The penetration of Sōtō doctrine into the popular layers of Japanese society was achieved during the Muromachi period through the spread of formulas written on pieces of paper known as *kirigami* 切紙, in order to obtain worldly benefits, or *genze riyaku* 現世利益. This stress on worldly benefits was, as we have seen, an important feature of the Daruma-shū, while it was constantly rejected with contempt by Dōgen, for whom 'the Buddha Dharma was to be practiced for the sake of the Buddha Dharma.'

Ironically, the *kirigami* often include prayers supposedly addressed by Dōgen to the Buddha-Patriarchs and various local deities connected to the Hakusan Tendai tradition. Their content is a mixture of Sōtō doctrine and of syncretistic (*honji suijaku* 本地垂迹) theories.⁸⁶ Thus, in a *kirigami* dedicated to Hakusan Myōri Daigongen 白山妙理大権現, the name of the avatar, Hakusan Gongen (the 'trace-manifestation', *suijaku*) is compared to the 'universal rank' of Tung-shan's 'five ranks' theory,⁸⁷ while his *honji* name (Myōri) is

⁸⁴ However, Keizan's position (as also Nōnin's in *Jōtō Shōgakuron*) remains ambiguous. See, for example, the explanation he gives to the emperor concerning the 'supranormal powers' of the 'ordinary man' Bodhidharma: 'The Buddha-Patriarchs always have supranormal powers. As to Bodhidharma, though he was born a prince, he was in reality an incarnation of the Bodhisattva Kannon. How could he have not had these powers? However, in Zen, one does not stress such powers. As the layman P'ang said, "To draw water and carry firewood—supranormal power and marvelous activity!"' T. 82, 2589, p. 422.

Keizan also acknowledges, like Nōnin, that hell and paradise do not really exist. T. 82, 2589, p. 423b.

⁸⁵ Matsui, pp. 347–48, and Ishikawa Rikisan, 'Chūsei Zenshū to Shimbutsu Shūgō: Toku ni Sōtō-shū no Chihōteki Tenkai to Kirigami Shiryō o Chūshin ni shite' 中世禪宗と神仏集合:特に曹洞宗の地方的展開と切紙資料を中心にして, in *Nihon Bukkyō* 日本仏教, 60–61 (August 1984), pp. 41–56.

⁸⁶ For details on these theories and their role in Japanese religious syncretism, see Alicia Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation: The Historical Development of the Honji-suijaku Theory*, MN Monograph 31, 1969.

⁸⁷ On which see Alfonso Verdu, 'The Five Ranks Dialectic of the Sōtō-Zen School in the Light of Kuei-feng Tsung-mi's *ariya-shiki* Scheme', in MN 21:1–2 (1966), pp. 125–70.

equated with the 'correct rank'. The prayers addressed by Sōtō monks to the *kami* are justified by the fact that 'in India it was correct to pray to the Buddhas, in T'ang China to the Patriarchs, in Japan to the *kami*.'⁸⁸ Thus, in a *kirigami* dedicated to Sumiyoshi, the god of navigation, the five formulas given are the ones that Dōgen himself had recited, inspired by Sumiyoshi, upon his return from China. Dōgen has here become a medium for a local deity. Sometimes this role is attributed to his master Ju-ching.

Dōgen's posthumous involvement in popular religion can be seen in another story, according to which, on the eve of his return to Japan, he had been able to copy in one night a famous koan collection titled *Pi-yen lu* 碧巖錄, 'Emerald Cliff Record',⁸⁹ with the help of the bodhisattva Daigenshuri 大権修利, a local deity of Che-chiang province and protector of the T'ien-tung monastery.⁹⁰ In the later Sōtō tradition, the name of Daigenshuri was replaced by that of Hakusan Gongen. There also exists a consecration formula dedicated by Dōgen to Hakusan Gongen before his departure to China, but it is clearly a forgery. Dōgen's legend also mentions that he was rescued, during his sea voyage, by the bodhisattva Kannon, but another version mentions a dragon deity, who turns out to be the same Daigenshuri. He introduced himself to Dōgen in the following terms: 'I am a dragon god, known in China as Shōbō Shichirō [that is, Daigenshuri]. I know that you, Master, are returning to your country carrying at your belt the patriarch seal [of the Ts'ao-tung sect]. I will go with you to protect the True Dharma.'

The mixture of these elements borrowed from Sōtō doctrine and popular religion, just as the combination, in the practice of Sōtō monks, of koan and meditation on the one hand and esoteric rituals borrowed from *shugendō* on the other, is characteristic of the dialectics that already prevailed in the Daruma-shū. The charismatic Dōgen serves only as a figurehead. The best illustration of this may be found outside the Sōtō sect in one of the first Japanese 'new religions', the Nyorai-kyō 如来教, where a 'primordial Dōgen' manifested himself, through a medium, as a demiurge and a savior, and criticized the heretical teachings introduced by one of his disciples, the historical Dōgen.⁹¹ This rather peculiar hagiographical development has at least the merit to show the eventual cost of prestige for a 'founder', and the strange

⁸⁸ From a collection of *kirigami* titled *Bukke Ichidaiji Yawa* 仏家一代夜話, and quoted in Ishikawa, 'Chūsei Zenshū', pp. 52–53.

⁸⁹ T. 48, 2003, pp. 139–225. This copy has been preserved at Daijōji in Kanazawa prefecture.

⁹⁰ Daigenshuri has been traditionally paired in Zen monasteries with Bodhiharma, both having supposedly introduced Zen respectively

in Japan and China. He was also a protector of navigation and was assimilated, around Nagasaki, to the deity Ma-tsu 馬祖. Further details in *Hōbōgirin*, 6 (1983), pp. 599–609.

⁹¹ Kenneth W. Parker, 'Okkyōsama: Documentation of the Founding of Nyorai-kyō, Japan's First "New Religion"', unpublished dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1983, pp. 78–80.

alchemy that can transform an aristocrat into a popular hero at the expense of his doctrine and of historical truth. This is merely the other aspect of the denial of origins that made the doctrine of a 'heretic' such as Nōnin become the hidden ground of a tradition that on the surface had forsaken him.

Conclusion

This presentation of the Daruma-shū and of its opponents will hopefully have led some readers to suspect that the traditional history of the emergence of Zen in Japan is not exempt from distortions. The doctrinal controversy that surfaces in Yōsai's and Dōgen's writings, and the subsequent labelling of the Daruma-shū as heterodox, reveal a social conflict within Japanese Buddhism, and within the Zen tradition itself. The long silence of the Daruma-shū was not the sign of an absence, but of its having being silenced by adverse and rival claims. This silence has at last been broken, and a new interpretation is gradually reemerging. Thus, some reassessment of traditional Japanese historiography is already possible. It is now necessary to reexamine the fundamental categories that have until now been uncritically accepted by historians in the field, and more particularly those of sect, tradition, and orthodoxy, and the related notions of 'founder', origins, author, work, and influences. The intricate relationship between the Daruma-shū and the Sōtō-shū provides an excellent example of precisely this kind of conceptual and historiographical re-alignment.

The term *shū*, usually translated as 'sect' or 'school', usually refers to a lineage. The prevalence of this convenient genealogical schema has certainly contributed to mask the complexity of the traditions examined. The acknowledged or alleged influences and the explicit textual references are often superficial and misleading. As historians, we tend too easily to forget that our sources are reflecting the point of view of the 'great tradition', and that the 'influences' they allow us to construct are in many cases ideological products, hiding reality as much as revealing it.

For example, leaving aside the interesting question whether Dōgen, the 'founder' of the Sōtō sect, was a truly enlightened master or just another ambitious monk, the fact is that the tradition that claims to stem from him deviates from his teachings in the process of validating this claim. Even if they have to acknowledge Dōgen's charismatic personality, Buddhist scholars seem at times to forget the basic Mahayana tenet of *anātman*, or lack of self, when they create a kind of personality cult around a thirteenth-century monk. To ask whether the Sōtō tradition emerges with Dōgen or with Keizan may be a chicken-and-egg question. Is it certain that an origin can be assigned so easily to the tradition?

Some will argue that Dōgen is at least clearly the author of *Shōbōgenzō*, the text on which the tradition relies. The impact of this work, which was known

for centuries only to a handful of monks, need not be questioned. But the problem of its authorship remains. This is not to say that the work is apocryphal, although the final version is the result of a collective enterprise, and many of the materials on which it draws were provided by Daruma-shū adherents. But the very concept of authorship may prove inadequate here. The text being a mosaic of quotations, the notion of intersubjectivity may with some profit be replaced by that of intertextuality, and the notion of individual work would thus lose its centrality.⁹² We can even go a step further and speak of ‘intentionality’, in the sense that the recurrence of a certain rhetorical, polemical or proselytizing tone is perhaps more fundamental than textual similarities.

Seen in this light, *Jōtō Shōgakuron*, *Kōzen Gokokuron*, and the ‘Bendōwa’ and ‘Genjōkōan’ chapters of *Shōbōgenzō*, among others, become part of the same field of discourse, squares on a chessboard that had to be filled by one pawn or another. Not that all squares are equal, nor all pawns. But they are all hierarchically interrelated, and no pawn should be considered independent. The rules of the game simultaneously allow for novelty, and yet circumscribe and structure their possible expression. This structural approach of the sectarian phenomenon is certainly more akin to the Buddhist concept of *sūnyatā* than the usual ‘substantialist’ conception, which would probably be seen a reemergence of the *senika* heresy. In any case, the figures of Dōgen and Keizan have probably received enough emphasis as ‘co-founders’ of the Sōtō tradition, and we may want to avoid a similar bias while considering whether Nōnin himself was the ‘founder’ of the Daruma-shū.

Moreover, without explaining away the philosophical or spiritual nature of their works, we should start simultaneously considering these as ideological products whose primary function is to establish limits and define an orthodoxy. They do not innocently express a spiritual profusion, but rather aim, consciously or not, at restraining the proliferation of an unauthorized discourse. This goal was certainly achieved by Yōsai and Dōgen,⁹³ while Nōnin and Keizan were unable or unwilling to completely conceal the ideological contradictions that resulted from the ambiguous social situation as leaders of a more popular movement. Hence the discordance between a teaching that is, at least symbolically, subversive and the ideologically conservative function it comes to serve. Their entire doctrine might even be construed as an attempt at solving these contradictions. In Dominick LaCapra’s words, ‘The question then becomes that of how a text internalizes or resists multiple and at times tensely interacting contexts,’⁹⁴ for example, how *Jōtō Shōgakuron* or Keizan’s

⁹² Julia Kristeva, *Semiotiké*, Seuil, Paris, 1969, p. 107.

⁹³ I continue using these names for the sake of convenience, although they are not referring so much to individual subjectivities as to

discrete textual segments representative of a certain type of discourse.

⁹⁴ Dominick LaCapra, *Rethinking Intellectual History*, Cornell U.P., 1983, p. 311.

text relate to folk culture and ‘elitist’ Buddhism. The type of Zen that prevailed with Keizan and the Daruma-shū was quite different from the ‘pure’ Zen of Dōgen or the ‘literary’ Zen of the *gozan* 五山, or Five Mountains tradition. It is their teachings rather than those of Yōsai and Dōgen that belong, with some qualifications, to the more popular ‘new Buddhism’ of Kamakura. It is only because of their ‘heterodox’ character that they can be deemed representative of Japanese religiosity. What Dōgen and Yōsai shared with other religious leaders of the time was not the popular but the sectarian spirit that was the mark or stigma of their marginality.

Again, the claim to orthodoxy should not be construed as a mere expression of a legitimized authenticity, but rather as an attempt by someone on the periphery to reach the center of power. Thus, there is no pristine purity at the origin of the Zen tradition, and the ‘pure Zen’ advocated by Dōgen and some of his predecessors was perhaps a self-serving ideology. Zen, as a living religious tradition, has always had a syncretistic or combinatory nature. Seen in this light, the Daruma-shū and Keizan seem much less heterodox, and belong in fact to the mainstream of Japanese religion. We have to keep in mind that a tradition such as the Sōtō-shū or Daruma-shū, in the same way as a text or even an individual mind, is, to quote Bakhtin, ‘a heterology, a plurality of voices, a reminiscence and anticipation of past and future discourses; a crossroad and meeting place; it loses therefore its privileged place.’⁹⁵

Thus, orthodoxy itself is fundamentally heterodox, and there is no Ch’an or Zen tradition apart from repeated departures from the tradition. Individuals such as Nōnin, Yōsai, and Keizan are not the source of the tradition, but rather its products, its nodal points, its textual paradigms or points of reemergence. In other words, orthodoxy takes its shape not from its kernel—a lineage—but from its margins, the other trends against which it reacts by rejecting or encompassing them. To account for this complex dialectical relationship, the ‘arborescent’ or tree-shaped schema used in traditional genealogies is obviously insufficient and even misleading. The ‘rhizom’ metaphor⁹⁶ seems more appropriate, and would at least allow scholars to avoid the pitfall of teleological concepts such as ‘origins’, ‘degeneration’, or ‘revival’. By this dissolving the contours of the ‘sect’, a concept definitely too ‘substantialist’, we may be able to provide a more nuanced analysis and to emphasize the various kinds of regrouping—sociological, political, strategical, doctrinal, or geographical.

In the same way, by paying more attention to hybrid genres and focusing on the margins of authorized (that is, attributed to an author) discourses, or on the fissures within and the interstices between apparently monolithic doctrines,

⁹⁵ Tzvetan Todorov, *Mikhail Bakhtine: Le principe dialogique*, Seuil, Paris, 1981, p. 101.

⁹⁶ See Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, *Rhizome: Introduction*, Minuit, Paris, 1976.

we may detect hitherto invisible flows and relations. Sectarian polarization, inherited uncritically by most historians, masks the heterogeneity of doctrinal evolution, and the persistence of social faults and contradictions. It also leads us to overlook the essential character of apparently slight modifications in discursive or religious practices. For instance, as Michel de Certeau has noted, 'By the use of "vulgar" languages, by the importance given to concrete realities, by the primacy of techniques of persuasion on a logic of truth, the discourse must establish new social contracts.'⁹⁷ Thus, only by discerning the tenuous, tangled configuration of 'rhizomatic' influences will we reach an adequate understanding of the role played by the so-called Daruma-shū and Sōtō-shū in the larger framework of Japanese religious tradition. The geographical factor in particular, for example, the intimate connection with the Hakusan cultic centers, would prove extremely important in the case of the medieval Sōtō-shū. Ironically, the recent vitalization of the most intellectual aspects of *Shōbōgenzō*, and the subsequent disaffection of Sōtō scholars with vulgar 'superstitions', are only possible through the perennial popularity of the 'superstitions' themselves.

In the words of Victor Turner, 'Religions persist as cultural systems partly because popular interest and energy are not equally distributed at all times over all their levels and sectors, but at each epoch get focused on one or a few. The rest are not abandoned or obliterated but remain unmanifest . . . until they are quickened again by popular devotions.'⁹⁸ The very notion of genealogical purity upon which the history of Japanese religion has grounded itself belies its credibility through the persistent energy that historical discourse expands in consolidating its borders from the intrusion of vulgar and 'marginal' expressions.

⁹⁷ Michel de Certeau, *L'écriture de l'histoire*, Gallimard, Paris, 1975, p. 227.

⁹⁸ Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and*

Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society, Cornell U.P., 1974, p. 228.