

# 3

## Zen Buddhism as the Ideology of the Japanese State: Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron*

*Albert Welter*

Toward a Reappraisal of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron*

Eisai (1141–1215, also known as Yōsai)<sup>1</sup> is a major figure in the Japanese Zen tradition, known for introducing Zen and winning major political support for it in the newly formed Kamakura *bakufu*.<sup>2</sup> In spite of the major role Eisai played in changing the course of Japanese Buddhism and establishing Zen as an independent institution, his accomplishments have been obscured by modern developments affecting Zen ideology. In the modern period, Eisai's work has been generally ignored, and his image tends to languish in relative obscurity. The situation into which Eisai and his principal work, the *Kōzen gokokuron*, have fallen is well summarized by Yanagida Seizan, in his introductory essay to the modern Japanese edition and translation of the *Kōzen gokokuron* text:

It seems that the work entitled *Kōzen gokokuron* has hardly ever been read in earnest. To a remarkably great extent, it has been treated as nothing more than nationalistic propaganda. Such bias is deeply rooted even at present. Frankly speaking, it is hard to find any appeal in this work when it is compared with Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* or Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō*. . . . [And] this exceedingly low opinion that people have is not restricted to the *Kōzen gokokuron* but is directed at Eisai as well. Aside from the bias that the *Kōzen*

*gokokuron* advocates a national Buddhist ideology (*kokka bukkō*), the fact that Eisai sought [government sponsored] robes and titles of recognition for himself, degenerated in his later years to a clerical functionary for the Kamakura *bakufu*, and was nothing more than a construction entrepreneur who envisioned the rebuilding of Tōdaiji and Hōshōji, and so on, completely undermines his image as the founder of a school.<sup>3</sup>

As Yanagida explains, the common perception of the *Kōzen gokokuron* in Japan is that it is a work of “nationalistic propaganda,” unworthy of serious reading.

To the extent that Eisai is known to us at present, it may be more likely as “the father of tea cultivation in Japan”<sup>4</sup> than for any achievements in transferring Zen teaching to Japan. As a Zen master, Eisai’s reputation was seriously tarnished, according to modern interpretation, by his willingness “to compromise . . . by assuming a reconciliatory attitude toward the Tendai and Shingon.”<sup>5</sup> According to this view, Eisai’s compromising, syncretistic attitude is a corruption of the ideals inherent in the “pure” Zen tradition.<sup>6</sup>

Serious problems arise when Eisai is judged from the perspective of “pure” Zen, not least of which is the extent Eisai’s aims coincide with those of the later “pure” Zen tradition. “Pure” Zen is predicated on the notion that Zen is essentially beyond intellectual comprehension, so that any attempt to treat it historically must be preceded by an understanding of Zen “as it is in itself.”<sup>7</sup> In this view, Zen ideally is aloof from the messy world of politics and unsullied by historical circumstances. There is no question that Eisai fairs poorly when subjected to these kinds of criteria. “Pure” Zen cherishes, above all, the defiant masters of the T’ang Zen tradition, who eschewed (at least in legend) political and social contacts in favor of an enlightenment experience, the essential nature of which was deemed ineffable and beyond rational determination. This interpretation leads one to ask whether Eisai has been treated fairly as a historical figure, suggesting that the current perception of the *Kōzen gokokuron* has been determined by a later tradition that emphasized “pure” Zen as the only legitimate expression of Zen teaching and practice.

The current reputation of Eisai stands in marked contrast with the way the Japanese tradition has regarded him. Kokan Shiren awarded Eisai the most prominent place in the *Genkō shakusho*, the collection of Japanese Buddhist biographies completed in 1322, as the first to transmit the Zen teaching of the Rinzai faction to Japan.<sup>8</sup> Eisai also enjoyed a great, if controversial, reputation among his contemporaries. Politically, he had important connections with the Heian court, and he won the respect and patronage of significant figures in the Kamakura *bakufu* government.<sup>9</sup> Religiously, Eisai had been a respected advocate of Tendai esotericism before his conversion to Zen. His monastery in Kyoto, Kenninji, became an active training center for the new Zen move-

ment. Eisai's reputation among his contemporaries was also reflected in his capacity as head of Jufukuji in Kamakura and the support received from the military rulers there, the Hōjō family. The significance of Eisai in religious circles is further reflected in the attraction of prominent students to his reform movement, including no less a person than Dōgen Zenji (1200–1253).

As founder of the Sōtō faction in Japan, Dōgen would later be sharply distinguished as Eisai's sectarian rival, but neither the facts of Dōgen's own life nor his reported statements concerning Eisai substantiate the antipathy between Dōgen and Eisai predicated on later sectarian divisions. Dōgen received early training in Zen at Kenninji, under the direction of Eisai's successor, Myōzen (1184–1225). The example Eisai provided for rigorous training at Kenninji left a lasting impression on Dōgen. In Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō zuimonki*, Eisai's words are invoked to authorize Zen practices and his collection of sermons are remembered as "the most splendid of words." Elsewhere, Dōgen remarks that "Students today would do well to reflect on the excellence of Eisai's attitude" and that "the nobleness of purpose and profundity of Eisai must certainly be remembered."<sup>10</sup> Dōgen's itinerary while on pilgrimage in China with Myōzen, moreover, consciously followed in Eisai's footsteps.

Nevertheless, Eisai's understanding of Zen was based on different assumptions. In order to distinguish these, I will examine features associated with Eisai's Zen reform movement within the context of assumptions common to late Heian and early Kamakura Buddhism. The focus is on the *Kōzen gokokuron*, Eisai's most important work. The aim is to reveal significant aspects of Eisai's thought in light of the context in which it was written and to examine these against precedents upon which the content of the text was based. The study demonstrates how Eisai and his contemporaries shared certain ideas expressed in the *Kōzen gokokuron* that are overlooked or poorly understood at present. This commonality suggests an alternative way to read the text and the possibility of a more balanced appraisal of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron*.<sup>11</sup>

To reassess Eisai and the message of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, this chapter addresses Eisai's motivations from a number of perspectives. It begins with an inquiry into the theoretical conception of the Buddhist state common to medieval Japanese Buddhism and adopted by Eisai by examining aspects of the *Ninnō kyō* (*Sūtra of Benevolent Kings*), a text central to Eisai's theoretical vision. The discussion emphasizes not only the ideological sway that this text had over Eisai, but also how Eisai conceived of the practical implementation of the text's ideological vision in terms of the Ch'an institutions and practices he observed in Sung China. To understand Eisai's attempt to reform the Japanese Buddhist state along the lines suggested by the model of Sung Ch'an, the study examines the *Kōzen gokokuron* in terms of three leading ideas around which Sung Ch'an had been formed: lineage, institutional organization, and conceptions of Ch'an *vis-à-vis* the Buddhist tradition as a whole. This discussion includes a comparison of the "combined practice" (*kenshū*) or the Zen-based

syncretism of the *Kōzen gokokuron* with the influential Sung Ch’an syncretist Yung-ming Yen-shou, whose works exerted broad influence over both Sung Ch’an and Kamakura Zen, notably in the teachings of Dainichi Nōnin and the Daruma faction.<sup>12</sup> This examination concludes with a comparison of how Yen-shou was understood in the *Kōzen gokokuron* and the *Jōtō shōgakuron*, a text associated with Nōnin and the Daruma faction, a leading early contender for the mantle of establishing a separate Zen “school” in Japan. Bringing Yen-shou’s interpretation into the analysis at this juncture shows how different the Ch’an (or Zen) of Nōnin, Eisai, and their contemporaries was from that depicted by modern scholars.

### The Utopian Vision in Medieval Japan: An Examination of the *Ninnō kyō* [*Sūtra of Benevolent Kings*]

Eisai’s argument in the *Kōzen gokokuron* was predicated on widely held assumptions in medieval Japan regarding the role of Buddhism as an essential component of a civilized society. In Japan such notions date from the time of Shōtoku Taishi (574–622), who formally introduced Buddhism as a leading component in the affairs of the country.<sup>13</sup> At this time the Buddhist religion, hitherto dominated by certain clans, was promoted as a unifying force for the Japanese state, newly conceived under Shōtoku’s inspiration.

The importance of Buddhism for affairs of state in Japan was reaffirmed in the Nara (710–794) and Heian periods (794–1185), when three Buddhist scriptures provided the cornerstones of state Buddhist ideology in Japan: the *Myōhō renga kyō* (*Sūtra of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma*, better known simply as the *Hokke kyō*, the *Lotus Sūtra*),<sup>14</sup> the *Konkōmyō kyō* (*Sūtra of the Golden Light*),<sup>15</sup> and the *Ninnō gokoku hannya kyō* (the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra Explaining how Benevolent Kings Protect Their Countries*, or simply, the *Ninnō kyō*).<sup>16</sup> These three scriptures became collectively known in Japan as the “three *sūtras* for the protection of the country” (*chingo kokka no sambukyō*).<sup>17</sup> Eisai’s treatise calling on the rulers of Japan to promote Zen for the protection of the country shared the widely accepted ideological background that these scriptures provided.

Among the three scriptures for the protection of the country just mentioned, the *Ninnō kyō* assumed the most importance for Eisai.<sup>18</sup> This importance is based on Eisai’s admission in the Preface to the *Kōzen gokokuron* that his reason for titling his work *The Promotion of Zen for the Protection of the Country* is that it is consistent with the ideas originally taught by the Dharma King (*hō-ō*), the Buddha, to the Benevolent Kings (*ninnō*).<sup>19</sup> It is also confirmed by the frequency and prominence with which the *Ninnō kyō* is cited by Eisai in the *Kōzen gokokuron*.<sup>20</sup> A review of the *Ninnō kyō* reveals the ideological

assumptions of Eisai's Zen reform program in the *Kōzen gokokuron*, based in the *prajñā* (wisdom) tradition of Mahayāna Buddhism.

Most of the topics addressed in the *Ninnō kyō* are well known to anyone familiar with Mahayāna Buddhism, especially to the *Prajñā-pāramitā* (J. *hannya*; perfection of wisdom) literature. Among them are emptiness, the Tathāgata, the bodhisattva path, the two levels of truths, miraculous events, and so on. The appearance of the benevolent kings (*ninnō*) distinguishes the contents of the *Ninnō kyō*, particularly their concern for establishing secular authority based on Buddhist principles. The message contained in chapter 5, "Protecting One's Country" (*gokoku*), together with that of concluding chapters 7, "Receiving and Upholding [the *Ninnō kyō*]," and 8, "[The Buddha] Entrusts [the *Ninnō kyō* and the Three Treasures: the Buddha, Dharma, and *saṅgha*] to the [Benevolent] Kings," where this concern is most explicitly revealed, draws the content of the *Ninnō kyō* closely to the *Kōzen gokokuron*.<sup>21</sup>

In terms of the message that the *Ninnō kyō* wishes to convey, however, the first four chapters are more than a prelude. They affirm the primary importance that the Buddha Dharma, namely *prajñā*-teaching and those practitioners who are devoted to it, have for the welfare of the state. The first priority of the state, following this logic, is to seek not its own preservation but the preservation of Buddhism. Later the kings learn that the preservation of Buddhism is inextricably bound to the preservation of their own country. This was a powerful message for Buddhist monarchs looking to Mahayāna teaching as a basis and justification for their own rule: spiritual aims and secular interests coincide in support for Buddhism.

In chapter 5 the terms for protecting countries are specified in terms of support for the teachings contained in the *Ninnō kyō* (i.e., *prajñā*-teaching). The Buddha advises that whenever the destruction of a country is imminent, regardless of the cause, the king should sponsor a ritual recitation of the *Ninnō kyō*. In addition, the Buddha recommends that the kings commission daily recitations of the *Ninnō kyō*, as a matter of course, to invoke the assistance of native deities and spirits in protecting their countries. *Ninnō kyō* recitation is also said to be useful for obtaining a number of practical benefits, both material and spiritual, including protection against countless afflictions that plague one during the course of human existence. In short, *Ninnō kyō* recitation is characterized as having unquestionable salutary effects over numerous unseen forces that determine human destiny, particularly the destiny of a ruler and his kingdom. The chapter spells out in concrete terms the methods to be employed by kings to protect their countries, win material and spiritual benefits, and alleviate personal afflictions. It assures kings of the actual benefits to be obtained if they follow ritual procedures focusing on the recitation of the *Ninnō kyō*, and it provides a contrast between the altruistic virtue of the righteous Buddhist monarch and the petty greed of the power-hungry ruler.

The end of chapter 5 is taken up with two exemplary tales that illustrate the chapter's message. The first involves Śakra, who by recourse to the methods just described, was able to repel invading armies seeking his destruction and the destruction of his kingdom. The second relates how the crown prince of a country called Devala conspires to win succession to the throne by offering the heads of a thousand kings in sacrifice to the local god. These means were suggested to the crown prince by a non-Buddhist priest, presumably one dedicated to the local god in question. The prince succeeds in capturing 999 kings and transports them to the shrine of the local god, where they are to be sacrificed. One king shy of his goal, the prince encounters his last prospective victim, a king called Universal Light.

Prior to transporting Universal Light before the local god to be sacrificed, the prince grants the king's last request, which is to supply food and drink to Buddhist monks and pay his final respects to the three Buddhist treasures, the Buddha, Dharma, and *Sanḅha*. When the monks recite the *Ninnō kyō* on the king's behalf, Universal Light is able to extricate himself from harm. Upon his arrival in Devala, Universal Light instructs the other 999 kings how to save themselves through recitation of the verses from the *Ninnō kyō*, just as it was originally uttered by the monks he assembled. The recitation ultimately succeeds in converting the crown prince himself, who confesses his wrong and sends all of the assembled kings back to their homes, instructing them to have Buddhist priests in their kingdoms recite verses from the *Ninnō kyō*.

The point of the story is that without the benefit of Buddhist virtue, the non-Buddhist ruler is consumed by the drive for power. This drive is marked by extreme insensitivity and barbarity. Moreover, in this story, local religious authority sanctioned this barbarity. In opposition, Buddhism is presented as a universal religion of compassion, which, through the teaching of the *Ninnō kyō*, offers rulers a vision of peaceful co-existence predicated on a higher law. In short, the *Ninnō kyō* promotes the cause of Buddhist right over sheer force or might.

The concluding chapters of the *Ninnō kyō* describe further the responsibilities incumbent upon righteous monarchs for implementing the cause of Buddhist virtue in their kingdoms. Chapter 7, "Receiving and Upholding (the *Ninnō kyō*)," reinforces the message presented in chapter 5 and supplements the methods suggested to kings for protecting their countries. The *Ninnō kyō* is described here as "the spiritual source of the mind of buddhas, bodhisattvas, and all sentient beings" and "the father and mother of all kings." It is also referred to as a divine charm, the mirror of heaven and earth, a treasure for driving away demons, for obtaining one's desires, and for protecting a country,<sup>22</sup> descriptions that highlight the *Ninnō kyō*'s utility for both religious and political matters.

A principal feature of the *Ninnō kyō* is the responsibility it places on kings for managing Buddhism and ensuring its continued existence. In return for

the protection that the *Ninnō kyō* offers them and their kingdoms, the kings are responsible for perpetuating the Dharma here on earth. The Buddha tells King Prasenajit, the chief interlocutor among the benevolent kings, that after his (Buddha's) death, when the extinction of the Dharma is imminent, the king should uphold the *Ninnō kyō* and extensively perform Buddhist ceremonies based on it. The security of every king and the happiness of all the people are said to depend completely on this. For this reason, the Buddha continues, the *Ninnō kyō* has been entrusted to the kings of various countries and *not to the Buddhist clergy or faithful*. The preservation of the Buddha Dharma under such circumstances is thus the primary responsibility of the king, not the *saṅgha*.<sup>23</sup>

Chapter 7 also describes in detail the misfortunes that recitation of the *Ninnō kyō* serves to combat. Topping the list are calamities resulting from disruptions in the celestial and natural order.<sup>24</sup> In East Asian countries influenced by the Confucian doctrine that terrestrial power depended on Heaven's mandate, disruptions in the normal patterns of the heavens were viewed as ominous warnings to the ruler. These signs were potentially threatening to the ruler's prestige and position, giving him ample cause to consider them with extreme gravity.<sup>25</sup> To avoid calamities stemming from disruptions in the celestial and natural (including human) order, the *Ninnō kyō* stipulates ritual recitation of its contents according to a prescribed format.<sup>26</sup>

The *Ninnō kyō* closes with chapter 8, "[The Buddha] Entrusts [the *Ninnō kyō* and the Three Treasures] to the [Benevolent] Kings," and a warning reinforcing the responsibility incumbent upon kings for maintaining Buddhism. In particular, it is stated that at such times when the Buddha, Dharma, and *Saṅgha*, as well as the Buddhist faithful, are absent from the world, the *Ninnō kyō* and the three treasures will be entrusted to kings.<sup>27</sup> It is the responsibility of the kings to initiate the path of wisdom (i.e., *prajñā*-teaching) by having members of the Buddhist assembly recite and explain the *Ninnō kyō* to sentient beings. In other words, the kings are responsible for reconstituting Buddhist teaching in the world; the *Ninnō kyō*, representative as it is of *prajñā*-teaching, is to serve as the basis for this reconstitution.

There are important implications for the model of Buddhist kingship provided in the *Ninnō kyō*. Essentially, the power of the king described here is unambiguous. Although the royal power may be misused in some cases when it is united with the Dharma, and the *Ninnō kyō* is used as a guide, it serves as an indisputable force for good. It is the hallmark, one might say, of the benevolent monarch implementing Buddhist righteousness in the world. The message of the *Ninnō kyō* is particularly appropriate when the decline of the Law (*mappō*) is anticipated, as was the case in late Heian Japan. The *Ninnō kyō* is the prescribed Buddhist antidote for such times.

The *Ninnō kyō* played an extensive role in medieval Chinese and Japanese Buddhism, influencing both state ideology and ritual practices. It constituted an accepted feature of the East Asian Buddhist tradition and commanded a

particularly wide following in medieval Japan. The *Kōzen gokokuron* was written within this context. In the first place, the *Kōzen gokokuron* affirmed the *Ninnō kyō*'s vision for the role of Buddhism within the Japanese Buddhist state. It questioned, however, the way that this role had hitherto been fulfilled, and it proposed that certain reforms were necessary in order for the traditional hegemony of Buddhist ideology and secular authority to be properly conceived and executed. The central feature of this reform was predicated on the assumption that Zen teaching represented the legacy of the Buddha's enlightenment and the true teaching of the Buddha. As a result, only Zen teaching could fulfill the ideological quotient of the true Buddhist state.

The model of Buddhist kingship provided in the *Ninnō kyō* thus reflected the long-held aspirations of the Japanese ruling elite and the Buddhist establishment, affirming the accepted model of how the relationship between the secular establishment and the Buddhist clergy was envisioned. This model, in turn, established the parameters for the reform proposals in the *Kōzen gokokuron*.

### *Ninnō kyō* Ideology and Zen Teaching in the *Kōzen gokokuron*

Treatises with overtly political overtones are a unique feature of Japanese Buddhism. On this point, it is useful to contrast Japan with China. When Buddhism was first introduced, China already had an established civilization with well-defined moral and social principles. In the Chinese context, discussions of Buddhist morality thus tended to conflict with nativist sentiments. A persistent tendency among the Chinese was to regard Buddhism as the ideology of an alien people, essentially distinct from the principles and beliefs governing Chinese civilization. As a result, Buddhist treatises on the value of native Chinese traditions tended to be either positively self-assured in the superiority of Buddhism, or apologetically inclined, in search of harmony between native Chinese and Buddhist teachings.<sup>28</sup> By adopting Chinese Buddhist and Confucian ideologies at the same time, Japan tended to fuse Buddhist and Confucian principles into a single harmonious ideology which formed the basis for Japan's definition of civilization.

Aside from the initial objections of the Mononobe warrior clan and the Nakatomi family of Shinto priests in the sixth century, Buddhism was immune from the wrath of antiforeign temper until the rise of Japanese nativism in the Tokugawa (Edo) period.<sup>29</sup> The reason for this immunity is clear. Until Tokugawa rule, Buddhism was the acknowledged core of Japanese civilization. The common refrain among the Japanese ruling elite who determined the course of Japanese civilization was: "When the Buddhist law flourishes, so does the secular order."<sup>30</sup> Because of this belief and until the rediscovery of Chinese Confucianism along with their "pure" Shinto heritage, Buddhism was not regarded



as a foreign ideology that had either to proclaim its superiority or to apologize for its presence, as was the case in China. As a result, ideological debates in Japan tended to be sectarian, that is, between different factions that shared a common vision, rather than cutting across fundamental ideological boundaries. Since Buddhism was not relegated to a private domain of exclusively spiritual matters but was viewed as the rationale for state policy and the existence of government institutions, many Buddhist sectarian debates were politically inspired.<sup>31</sup> The decline of authority in the late Heian era exacerbated the need for sectarian debate focusing on political concerns.

The end of the Heian era brought political and ideological challenges to the Heian ruling elite. Ideologically, the Heian decline resulted in challenges to the position of the Tendai school as the spiritual and moral authority of the Japanese state. Politically inspired Buddhist treatises calling for reform were a natural development in this environment. Such works represent a period of new competition within Buddhism, with new factions vying for the honor of displacing Mount Hiei as the “Chief Seat of the Buddhist Religion for Ensuring the Security of the Country.”<sup>32</sup>

The most prominent attempt to redefine the Japanese Buddhist state during this period was the *Kōzen gokokuron*. The aim of the work was twofold: to reaffirm the central role of Buddhist ideology as the spiritual and moral core of Japanese civilization, and to challenge the validity of the way this goal was being carried out under the auspices of the Tendai school. The work was set squarely within the context of Tendai reform. Like Luther in sixteenth-century Christendom, Eisai saw Zen not as a revolutionary teaching that would undermine Tendai, but as a reform doctrine that would reestablish Buddhist and Tendai credibility.

The *Kōzen gokokuron* text is divided into a preface and ten sections, concluding with a brief summary. The aim of each section is indicated by its title:

1. Ensuring the Lasting Presence of Buddhist Teaching
2. Protecting the Country (with the Teachings of the Zen School)
3. Resolving the Doubts of the People of the World
4. Verification (Provided by) Virtuous Masters of the Past
5. The Transmission Lineage of the Zen School
6. Scriptural Authorization for Enhancing Faith (in Zen)
7. Outlining Zen Doctrines for Encouraging Zen Practice
8. The Program of Rituals for Protecting the Country at Zen Monasteries
9. Explanations from Great Countries
10. Initiating the Vow to Transfer Merit

Rather than exclude Tendai, Eisai sought to reform it by redefining it in terms of its relation to Zen. In order to understand how Eisai sought to meld Tendai with the Zen tradition, one needs also to understand how Eisai con-

ceived of Zen teaching and how he associated it with *Ninnō kyō* ideology. We can begin by placing Eisai's eventual identification with Zen in the context of his original quest.

When Eisai set out from Japan on his second pilgrimage, his intended destination was not China but India, the homeland of the Buddha and Buddhist teaching.<sup>33</sup> His goal was to personally set foot on the “diamond ground” where the Buddha had attained enlightenment. This plan underscores Eisai's commitment to reform on the pretext that Heian-era decline was rooted in Japan's deviation from correct Buddhist teaching. Only after Eisai's request to continue on to India was denied by Chinese authorities did he focus his attention on the study of Chinese Ch'an.<sup>34</sup> With the possibility of studying authentic Buddhist teaching in the Buddha's homeland thwarted, Eisai turned to a ready alternative: the purported “living” transmission of the Buddha's teaching in the Sung Ch'an masters around him. Sung Ch'an represented a viable alternative to Eisai for a number of reasons.<sup>35</sup> On one level, it is easy to imagine how impressed Eisai must have been with the world of Sung Ch'an, with its grand monasteries, institutional structure, and state support. The stability and prosperity of the Sung world stood in marked contrast to the brutality and chaos into which Japanese civilization had fallen. The revitalization of Mount T'ien-t'ai and its transformation into a Ch'an center during the Sung would have also made a deep impression on Eisai, suggesting the model for reform and revitalization in Japan. The most important influence that Sung Ch'an had on Eisai, however, went beyond these circumstantial factors associated with the splendor of Sung civilization. It was the new synthesis that Zen teaching suggested, integrating crucial aspects of Buddhism for Eisai—Tendai and *prajñā*-teaching, meditation practice and concern for morality, and *Ninnō kyō* ideology—into a single, seamless whole.

Eisai saw Zen teaching in terms that pertained directly to *Ninnō kyō* ideology. In the preface of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, Eisai depicts Zen as the Mind teaching, the essence of enlightenment, and the “actual teaching of the former Buddhas” transmitted through Śākyamuni “from master to disciple via the robe of authentic transmission.”<sup>36</sup> The *Ninnō kyō* conceived itself in comparable terms as “the spiritual source of the mind of buddhas, bodhisattvas, and all sentient beings.”<sup>37</sup> This depiction accounts for Eisai's view of the *Ninnō kyō* as an integral part of the Zen school's Mind teaching.

In terms of Buddhist scriptures, the Mind teaching is revealed in two forms according to Eisai. “Externally, the Mind teaching conforms to the position taken in the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* [J. *Nehan kyō*] that the Buddha-nature, through the aid of the precepts, is always present.”<sup>38</sup> In this regard, Eisai stands staunchly in the Tendai tradition established by the Chinese T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i, who emphasized upholding the Buddhist precepts as the basis from which wisdom arises.<sup>39</sup> This external emphasis on the precepts is joined to an internal perspective, “the view of the *Prajñā sūtra* [J. *Hannya kyō*] that awak-

ening is attained through wisdom.” Taken together, these two perspectives on the Mind teaching indicate the teaching of the Zen school reflecting the trans-sectarian perspective of the inherent harmony between Zen and Buddhist scriptures and doctrines.

The two forms of the Mind teaching referred to by Eisai indicate two meditation traditions that he attempted to harmonize and integrate. One is the Zen teaching of the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* and the T’ien-t’ai school, with its emphasis on the precepts. The other is the Zen teaching of the *Prajñā sūtra* and the Ch’an school, with its emphasis on wisdom.<sup>40</sup> I will later examine Sung precedents for the integration of these two Chinese “Zen” traditions.

The emphasis on morality and the precepts emerges in the first section of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, beginning one of the major bases for Eisai’s argument: monastic reform. According to *Ninnō kyō* teaching, the survival of both Buddhist and secular institutions is predicated on the moral character of a country, typified by the monastic discipline of the Buddhist clergy. This discipline has important consequences regarding the status of Buddhism in society and the role that Buddhism performs in legitimizing state authority. In effect, the behavior of the Buddhist clergy serves as a moral barometer of the country, determining the credibility of Buddhism in the eyes of the state and the country as a whole. By extension, corruption undermines the status of Buddhism and its claim to authority. The Buddhist monastery, whether as the repository of virtue or the beacon of enlightenment, depends on the moral discipline of its members, in this view, for both spiritual and social justification. Practically speaking, the social support given to Buddhism, and ultimately its very existence as a temporal institution, is intricately connected to the moral discipline of its members. In this regard, the opening section of the *Kōzen gokokuron* begins with a quote from the *Sūtra on the Six Perfections* (J. *Roku haramitsu kyō*): “The Buddha said, ‘I preached the rules governing moral training [*vinaya*] so as to ensure the lasting presence of Buddhism [in the world],’”<sup>41</sup> marking the temporal aim of Eisai’s treatise to preserve the existence and integrity of the Buddhist order. This concern for moral reform is the theme of the first section, and continues to appear throughout the treatise.<sup>42</sup> It is also evident from Eisai’s conservative approach toward the Buddhist precepts. In complete defiance of the Japanese Tendai tradition established by Saichō, which established its identity in part by liberating its members from the stricter, more rule-oriented discipline of early Buddhism, Eisai demanded that Zen monks observe the stricter *Hīnayāna* precepts in addition to *Mahayāna* ones. Eisai’s position on monastic reform, moreover, was not a personal, idiosyncratic conception. It specifically reflected the model of Buddhism that Eisai had witnessed in Sung China. In the *Kōzen gokokuron*, this connection is apparent in the following citation from the *Ch’an-yüan ch’ing-kuei* (J. *Zen’en shingi*, “The Regulations for Pure Conduct at Zen Monasteries”), the official record of regulations observed at Ch’an institutions in Sung China:

The ability to spread Buddhist teaching throughout the world of unenlightened people most assuredly rests on strict purity in one's moral training. As a result, observing the Buddhist rules governing moral behavior [*kairitsu*] takes precedence in the practice of Zen and the investigation of the Way. Without the insulation and protection from transgressions and errors [provided by the monastic rules], how will one ever become a Buddha or a patriarch? . . . Through reading and reciting the monastic rules and understanding the benefit they provide, one is well versed in the differences between upholding the rules for moral behavior and violating them, and on what behavior is permissible and impermissible . . . [Monks of the Zen School] rely completely on the sacred utterances issued from the mouth of the golden one, the Buddha; they do not indulge their fancies to follow ordinary fellows.<sup>43</sup>

The political aim of Eisai's reform is expressed directly when he states, "In our country, the Divine Sovereign [the Japanese Emperor] shines in splendor, and the influence of his virtuous wisdom spreads far and wide."<sup>44</sup> Recall that Eisai specifically stipulated the *Kōzen gokokuron*, the "Treatise on the Promotion of Zen for the Protection of the Country," as being consistent with the teaching of the Buddha to the Benevolent Kings (i.e., the *Ninnō kyō*). For Eisai this meant that Zen, as the legitimate interpretation of Buddhist teaching and practice, represented the means through which *Ninnō kyō* ideology could be implemented. The basis for Japan's future glory, Eisai asserted, rested in state sponsorship of Zen teaching.

Much of Eisai's confidence stemmed from his belief in Japan's destiny as one of the preeminent Buddhist kingdoms in the world. Eisai is quick to show how this belief is based on scriptural authority, on the Buddha's assertion recorded in the scriptures that in the future "the most profound teaching of Buddhist wisdom" [*prajñā*] will flourish in the lands to the northeast.<sup>45</sup> For Eisai, "the most profound teaching of Buddhist wisdom" is none other than Zen teaching. The lands to the northeast where this teaching is destined to flourish are China, Korea, and Japan. Since the transmission of Zen teaching to China and Korea has already been accomplished, only the transformation of Japan remained. The clear implication is that Japan's natural destiny as a preeminent Buddhist country can be fulfilled only by the adoption of Zen teaching.<sup>46</sup> The Mind teaching of the Zen school, in conjunction with the vision of the ideal Buddhist state in the *Ninnō kyō*, thus constitutes the basis for Japan's future glory.

The ideology of the *Ninnō kyō* played an important role not only in determining the primary position of Buddhist moral teaching in the affairs of the country but also in determining where primary responsibility lay for carrying out such reforms. Recall in this regard the provision, advanced in the *Ninnō*

*kyō*, that rulers of states—not the Buddhist clergy or faithful—were responsible for managing Buddhism and ensuring its continued existence. The preservation of Buddhism in this conception, it should be remembered, is intricately connected with the ruler's own self-interest in preserving his state. Thus, since the state is primarily a moral order based on Buddhist teaching, the moral integrity of the Buddhist clergy lies at the core of the state's identity.<sup>47</sup>

The declining social and political situation at the end of the Heian era provided Eisai's message with a great sense of urgency. Here too the *Ninnō kyō* served as a primary source of inspiration. On the one hand, recall that the *Ninnō kyō* characterizes itself as "the father and mother of all kings" (i.e., rulers), and as a treasure for driving away demons and protecting a country. More specifically, recall the admonition in the *Ninnō kyō* that it be entrusted to rulers especially at such times when the credibility of Buddhist teaching and the Buddhist clergy have been exhausted. The clear implication is that the *Ninnō kyō* should serve as the ruler's model for reestablishing the authority of Buddhist institutions and the moral character of his country. As a result, there is a strong sense in the *Kōzen gokokuron* that the *Ninnō kyō* speaks directly to the political and moral decay of the time. Witness the following passage from the *Ninnō kyō*:

Oh Great Monarch, when Buddhist teaching has degenerated to the point where its doctrines alone survive but it is no longer practiced [*masse*] . . . , the king and his chief ministers of state will frequently engage in illicit activities [that contravene Buddhist Law]. They will support Buddhist teaching and the community of monks only for their own selfish interests, committing great injustices and all sorts of crimes. In opposition to Buddhist teaching and in opposition to the rules governing moral behavior, they will restrain Buddhist monks as if they were prisoners. When such a time arrives, it will not be long before Buddhist teaching disappears.<sup>48</sup>

In accordance with *Ninnō kyō* teaching, the ruler of the country is best situated to reestablish the credibility of Buddhist teaching and the moral order of the state. Given the political turmoil and competition among claimants to the imperial throne, on one hand, and the rising importance of the military in government affairs and the competition between different warrior families, on the other, the position occupied by any ruler was extremely tenuous. Eisai's response to this state of affairs seems to be reflected in a passage from the *Scripture on the Perfection of Wisdom of the Victorious Ruler (Shō-tennō hannya kyō)*:

Suppose that when a bodhisattva who had studied the Buddhist teaching on wisdom [i.e., the *prajñā*-teaching of the Zen school] became the ruler of the country, mean despicable sorts of people came

to slander and insult him. This ruler would defend himself without making a display of his majesty and authority, saying, "I am the ruler of the country. I rule exclusively by the authority vested in me through the Buddhist teaching [on wisdom]."49

This statement suggests that the *Ninnō kyō* was important to the message of the *Kōzen gokokuron* in two ways. In terms of its overall message, the *Kōzen gokokuron* was conceived within the framework of *Ninnō kyō* ideology. This is its fundamental significance. In terms of the social and political context, the historical situation within which the *Kōzen gokokuron* was created, the passages cited from the *Ninnō kyō* suggested concrete solutions to specific issues. In this latter instance, the *Ninnō kyō* is not unique but fits a general pattern guiding the references to scriptures in the *Kōzen gokokuron*. Because of the overall importance of *Ninnō kyō* ideology for the *Kōzen gokokuron*, however, the references to the *Ninnō kyō* merit special attention.

From the preceding we can see how Zen teaching suggested a program of reform for Eisai. In Eisai's interpretation, the Zen-based reform program was necessary to realize Japan's destiny as a great Buddhist country. Zen represented moral reform through increased vigilance in following the precepts (*kai*), the essential teaching on Buddhist wisdom (Skt. *prajñā*, J. *hannya*) transmitted through the masters of the Zen school, the meditation traditions (*zen*) of both the T'ien-t'ai/Tendai and Ch'an/Zen schools, and the method to achieve the ideal Buddhist state advocated in the *Ninnō kyō*. In Eisai's interpretation, Zen clearly had the potential to serve as the multidimensional ideology that Japan required, encompassing the political, moral, soteriological, philosophical, and utopian aims of the country. The *Ninnō kyō*, we have seen, played a significant role in establishing the political and utopian aims, as well as the parameters for carrying them out.

### Zen Monastic Ritual and *Ninnō kyō* Ideology

The implications of Eisai's adaptation of *Ninnō kyō* ideology in terms of the practices engaged in at Zen monasteries are drawn in section 8 (The Code of Conduct at Zen Monasteries) of the *Kōzen gokokuron*.<sup>50</sup> Eisai's alleged inspiration for this section is the monastic code used at Sung Ch'an monasteries, the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei* (J. *Zen'en shingi*),<sup>51</sup> as well as works used to guide monastic practice (i.e., *vinaya* rules) in "great Buddhist countries." In effect, the section outlines a plan explaining how the program of activities at Zen monasteries serves the interests of the state. The plan is discussed in two parts. The first part discusses what the program of activities depends on, and the second details the annual rituals to be observed at Zen monasteries.

The most noteworthy feature in Eisai's discussion of activities at Zen mon-

asteries is the emphasis on moral conduct.<sup>52</sup> Strict observance of the monastic code constitutes the basis for the revival of the country conceived in terms of *Ninnō kyō* ideology. When monks are “armed externally with the rules for correct behavior [i.e., the precepts of the small vehicle], creating a field of blessings for human beings and gods, and sustained internally by the great compassion of bodhisattvas [i.e., the precepts of the great vehicle], acting as sympathetic fathers to sentient beings, His Majesty the emperor, the highly esteemed treasures [of the country],<sup>53</sup> and the skilled physicians of the country [i.e., Buddhist monks] rely exclusively on them.” The revival of the country is thus tied to the strict moral conduct of Buddhist monks.

A second feature of note is the rigor of monastic discipline at Zen monasteries. This is presented in terms of the daily and nightly rituals that monks are required to follow. Four sessions (totaling roughly eight hours) are devoted to *zazen* meditation. In comparison, roughly four hours are devoted to sleep. This schedule too is rationalized in terms of *Ninnō kyō* ideology:

Through their constant meditation [*nen-nen*], [the monks] repay the country’s kindness [*koku-on*]. Through their constant activity [*gyōgyō*; a reference to Buddhist practices], [the monks] pray for the enhancement of the [country’s] treasure [i.e., the emperor] [*hōsan*].<sup>54</sup> In truth, [the constant meditation and constant activity of the monks] is the result of the eternal glory of imperial rule [*teigo*] and the perpetual splendor of the *dharma*-transmission lamp [*hōtō*].<sup>55</sup>

Again, the revival of imperial glory is connected to the strict moral discipline of the Zen school.

Other provisions are designed to ensure that the public conduct and dress of Zen monks are in keeping with the traditions established for members of the Buddhist clergy. These provisions confirm an image of the Zen monk as a devoted practitioner, observing strict conduct and moral discipline and commanding public respect in his dress and demeanor. An additional provision stipulates that members of Zen monasteries are *not* self-sufficient but are supplied through the alms of the community. “[Zen] monks do not engage in tilling the fields or rice cultivation, because they have no time to spare from *zazen* meditation.” The point here is that Zen monastic institutions preserve the well-established, reciprocal relationship between the clergy and lay communities; Zen monks do not rely on independent means that might deprive the society at large of a primary source of blessings (i.e., giving alms). This condition also coincides with an image of moral authority that a well-disciplined Zen clergy commands. Eisai’s image of the Zen monastery, it should be noted, contradicts the prevailing view championed in Rinzai orthodoxy that Pai-chang initiated the hallowed principle of self-sufficiency practiced at Zen monasteries.<sup>56</sup>

The annual ritual observances at Zen monasteries, the second part of Eisai’s discussion in section 8, further ensure that Zen fulfills its social obliga-

tions as the official religion of the state. These obligations, on the whole, are directed at a sociopolitical order maintained through moral virtue, which, following the rationale employed in this context, is cultivated through specific ritual observances. The rationale for several of these observances is connected to the preservation of the emperor and the country. It is no accident, moreover, that these observances head the list.

The first are rituals commemorating the emperor's birthday. Buddhist sūtras are recited for a thirty-day period prior to the emperor's birthday to pray that the emperor enjoy "boundless longevity" (*seijū mukyō*). Sūtras specified for recitation at these rituals include most prominently the "four scriptures for protecting the country," the *Dai hannya kyō* (Skt. *Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra*),<sup>57</sup> in addition to the *Myōhō renga kyō*, *Konkōmyō kyō*, and the *Ninnō gokoku hannya kyō* mentioned previously.<sup>58</sup> This establishes, at the outset, the commitment of Zen institutional resources to the traditional Buddhist ideology of the Japanese state in terms that had prevailed in Japan through the Heian era.

The second set of rituals refers to formal ceremonies conducted on six days each month for invoking the buddhas' names and reciting scriptures. At the top of the list of aims that these ceremonies are meant to accomplish is the spread of "the August virtue of His Majesty" (*ōfū*) and the enrichment of imperial rule (*teidō*).<sup>59</sup>

There were also ceremonies held on the last day of each month specifically aimed at repaying the kindness of the emperor. These ceremonies featured lectures on the *Prajñāpāramitā sūtras*. Ceremonies held at mid-month in honor of the previous emperor featured lectures on the *Mahā-parinirvāṇa sūtra*. All of the rituals considered thus far indicate the persistent dedication of Zen monks, as representatives of Buddhist teaching, to dispatch their political obligations to the state (i.e., the emperor).

In addition are ceremonies, held two days each month, designed to enlist the support and protection of native (i.e., non-Buddhist) gods for the Buddhist cause. Since Buddhism was considered the ideology of the state, providing the moral pretext for social and political order, support for Buddhism by regional deities was perceived as having obvious implications for the welfare of the country as a whole.

Other rituals and ceremonies conducted at Zen monasteries were associated with the role that Buddhism played in society. Among these were vegetarian banquets held on memorial days to seek merit on behalf of the deceased. In theory, anyone could sponsor such a banquet, but in practice only elite members of the society commanded the resources necessary to sponsor one, and members of the imperial family were noteworthy sponsors. In addition, provision was made for additional vegetarian banquets at Zen monasteries, sponsored by government officials. The reasons for these are unspecified but are presumably related to the potential efficacy of merit accumulated on such occasions for affairs of state.



The annual rituals and ceremonies served other purposes as well. On the one hand, they address further the concern that Zen monks be morally rigorous in their discipline. In addition, they address the issue of whether the Zen approach is exclusive or syncretic. This issue is resolved in two ways. First, it is resolved through rituals that demonstrate that Zen teaching includes the entire corpus of Buddhist scriptures, and second, through an institutional affirmation of the practices associated with other Buddhist schools, namely Shingon and Tendai. In addition to the meditation hall, Eisai's Zen monastic compound included a Shingon Hall devoted to the performance of Mikkyō ceremonies (to pray for blessings and earn merit for the deceased) and a Cessation and Contemplation (*shikan*) Hall for cultivating Tendai-based meditation practices. According to the activities that he sanctioned, there is no doubt that Eisai came down heavily on the side of syncretism at the practical level as well as the theoretical one. Syncretism also figures prominently in Eisai's adoption of Sung Ch'an precedents.

#### The Nature of Zen Teaching and the Meaning of Zen Practice: Sung Ch'an Precedents for the *Kōzen gokokuron*

By the beginning of the Sung period, Chinese Buddhism was driven by three concerns. The incorporation of these concerns led to a new conception of Buddhism in China championed by dominant lineages or "houses" of Ch'an. The first concern was associated with the question of lineage itself, the importance it assumed in conferring status, and the distinct form that it took in the Ch'an school. The second concern related to Ch'an's self-definition during the Sung period, particularly the relationship between Ch'an teaching and the teaching of other schools of Buddhism. The third concern was the importance of Buddhist practice to Sung Ch'an's self-definition, particularly as it related to moral discipline and the observation of the *vinaya* rules. Each of these concerns is crucial for understanding Eisai's conception of Zen in the *Kōzen gokokuron*. They distance Eisai substantially from the criteria he is usually subjected to by those evaluating his contributions to the development of Zen in Japan.

As the first Japanese master to transmit directly the teaching of the Rinzai (C. Lin-chi) faction to Japan, Eisai is often subjected to the criteria of a supposed "pure" Zen tradition that originated with T'ang dynasty Lin-chi masters. Subjecting Eisai to T'ang Ch'an rhetoric should be avoided for two reasons. First, such an evaluation mistakes the role of lineage in the Ch'an tradition, assuming that it carries an unassailable ideological agenda when in fact its main function is to confer status upon an individual as a legitimate master.<sup>60</sup> Second, it assumes that Lin-chi faction orthodoxy in the Sung period had the same ideological assumptions as the Rinzai faction later on in Japanese history. This

later account of Lin-chi/Rinzai teaching does stem from the canonical literature of the T'ang Ch'an tradition, to be sure. Nevertheless, the compilation of the "recorded sayings" (C. *yülu*, J. *goroku*) upon which the contemporary understanding of Lin-chi/Rinzai ideology is based is almost exclusively a post-T'ang phenomena. At the time of Eisai's visits to China at the end of the twelfth century, it was the Lin-chi lineage that had come to dominate the Ch'an world, not the Lin-chi ideology.<sup>61</sup>

The difference between Eisai's understanding of Zen and what would later become the accepted ideology of the Lin-chi school is suggested in the following example. According to a famous story related in the *Platform Sūtra*, when Emperor Wu asked Bodhidharma whether his lifetime of building temples, giving alms, and making offerings had gained merit for him or not, Bodhidharma rebuked his suggestion. The Sixth Patriarch explained Bodhidharma's rebuke by differentiating the search for blessings (*fu*) from the search for merit (*kung-te*). "Building temples, giving alms, and making offerings are merely the practice of seeking after blessings. . . . Merit is in the *Dharmakāya*, not in the field of blessings."<sup>62</sup> In other words, conventional Buddhist practices aimed at seeking blessings are at best peripheral to Ch'an teaching. The real essence of Ch'an practice lies in "seeing into your own nature" and cultivating a "straight-forward mind." This concept is far removed from the *Ninnō kyō* model of the Buddhist ruler who actively promotes a flourishing Buddhist practice in his realm, centering on the very "practices aimed at seeking blessings" denigrated in the *Platform Sūtra*.

One might argue, however, that the actual effect of the *Platform Sūtra* distinction between merit and virtue was only to separate what is essential in Buddhist practice from what is secondary. In this formulation, meditation is essential because it provides merit, the enlightenment experience of "seeing into your own nature." Other, externally driven practices such as building temples, giving alms, and making offerings, "seeking after blessings," may be regarded as complementary but unessential. It follows that meditation and monastic discipline would constitute the integral components of Ch'an practice, the basis from which the enlightenment experience is realized. Yet, contrary to expectation, it is precisely here that we encounter the famous Ch'an denial of conventional forms of Buddhist meditation and monastic discipline that were the particular hallmarks of Lin-chi-faction rhetoric: "Even for those who keep the rules regarding food and conduct with the care of a man carrying oil so as not to spill a drop, if their Dharma-eye is not clear, they will have to pay up their debts."<sup>63</sup> Lin-chi characterizes his monastery as a place where the monks "neither read sūtras nor learn meditation."<sup>64</sup> This is a far cry from the stern emphasis on monastic discipline and conventional meditation as prerequisite for Buddhist practice advocated by Eisai.

The *Liu-tsu t'an ching* (J. *Rokuzu dankyō*; "Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch") and the *Lin-chi lu* (J. *Rinzai roku*; "Record of Lin-chi"), unassailable

classics according to later tradition of Ch'an teaching, are conspicuous by their absence in the *Kōzen gokokuron*. Nor can one find reference to any of the hallowed masters of the recorded sayings tradition. This absence suggests that Eisai looked elsewhere for his interpretation of Zen in spite of his lineal affiliation. But where should the model for Eisai's Zen be sought, if not in these "classic" works? Eisai's conception of Zen bears the strong imprint of concerns that drove Ch'an in the early Sung period. Although the interpretation of Sung Ch'an by Ta-hui Tsung-kao (1089–1163), a leading master of the Lin-chi faction who emphasized *k'an-hua* and *kung-an*, or kōan-introspection—the terms that came to characterize much of Ch'an teaching and practice—was in place by the time of Eisai's study in China; there is no evidence of its influence in the *Kōzen gokokuron*. In spite of his factional affiliation, Eisai's definition of Zen is indebted to masters who were neither associated with the Lin-chi lineage nor sympathetic to positions that defined Lin-chi ideology.

Prior to the ascendance of the Lin-chi faction in the early Sung, Ch'an was dominated by masters associated with the revival of Buddhism in the Wu-yüeh region.<sup>65</sup> The majority of these masters were descendants of Fa-yen Wen-i. They dominated the temples of Ch'ien-t'ang, the political center of the region that later became the Southern Sung capital of Hang-chou, and were responsible for the revival of Mount T'ien-t'ai as a Buddhist center. The rulers of Wu-yüeh, rather than the clergy, played the leading role in planning the revival.<sup>66</sup> Much of the enterprise of the Wu-yüeh rulers was naturally aimed at restoring Mount T'ien-t'ai, the spiritual center of the region, which had fallen into decay as a result of neglect and destruction in the late T'ang period. It also involved dispatching envoys to Japan and Korea to retrieve lost works of the T'ien-t'ai school. These events, aimed at reviving the past glory of T'ien-t'ai as a center for Buddhism, also influenced the type of Ch'an teaching that flourished in the Wu-yüeh region. This legacy was particularly attractive to Eisai, who saw in Ch'an the remedy for the reform of Japanese Tendai. Eisai's whole presumption of Zen as both the lost source and the fulfillment of Tendai teaching seems predicated on the Wu-yüeh revival of Mount T'ien-t'ai as a Ch'an center. The interpretation of Ch'an developed by Fa-yen lineage monks from this region, rather than Lin-chi orthodoxy, had the greatest influence over Eisai's understanding of Zen.

Concerns about Ch'an lineage, the relation between Ch'an and Buddhist teaching, and the observance of Buddhist discipline ran particularly high in the early Sung period. The resolutions suggested by leading Buddhist masters at this time played an important role in determining the shape of the Ch'an tradition from the Sung period on. In the following, I examine Eisai's positions in the *Kōzen gokokuron* regarding these three concerns against precedents established at the beginning of the Sung period. In particular, Eisai's positions are discussed in reference to resolutions for the concerns suggested in the works of three masters from the Wu-yüeh region: Tao-yüan (Dōgen; fl. c. 1000),

compiler of the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (J. *Keitoku dentōroku*; Ching-te era Record of the Transmission of the Lamp);<sup>67</sup> Yung-ming Yen-shou (J. Eimei Enju; 904–975), compiler of the *Tsung-ching lu* (J. *Sugyō roku*; Records of the Source-Mirror) and *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* (J. *Manzen dōki shu*; Anthology on the Common End of Myriad Good Deeds);<sup>68</sup> and Tsan-ning (J. Sannei; 919–1001), compiler of the *Sung kao-seng chuan* (J. *Sō kōsoden*; Sung Biographies of Eminent Monks) and the *Seng shih-lüeh* (J. *So shiryaku*; Outline History of the Saṅgha).<sup>69</sup> In each of their respective ways, these three masters set precedents that came to characterize Sung Ch'an. These were not the only precedents for Ch'an teaching and practice during the Sung period. Under the later influence of Lin-chi Ch'an masters, Ch'an's interpretation took a decidedly different direction, emphasizing the archetypal Ch'an persona recorded in *kung-an* and *yü-lu* collections. In spite of Eisai's affiliation with the Lin-chi lineage, his understanding of Ch'an bears a marked resemblance to these earlier precedents.<sup>70</sup>

The identification of Buddhist identity in terms of lineal associations was one of the conventions that characterized Sung Buddhism. Lineage association was already an established mark of Buddhist, including Ch'an sectarian, identity by the T'ang, but it did not go without challenge as a means of designating identity. Nonsectarian collections of Buddhist biographies, the *Kao-seng chuan* (Biographies of Eminent Monks) and *Hsü kao-seng chuan* (Biographies of Eminent Monks, Continued), provided the most valued format for interpreting the lives of noteworthy monks prior to the Sung. The early Sung period exhibited ambivalence between two different approaches for recording the biographies of exemplary Buddhist monks. This ambivalence is reflected in the nearly simultaneous appearance of two works: the *Sung kao-seng chuan* (988), which is committed to the established patterns for recording the biographies of monks in Chinese Buddhism, and the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (1004), which became the widely accepted precedent for recording the identities of Ch'an monks in the Sung period.<sup>71</sup> The different approach of each work is reflected conceptually in the way the basic identity of a monk is defined and in the regard for sectarian lineage.

The difference between the *Sung kao-seng chuan* and *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* approach to biography centers on the essential identity of individual monks and the criteria determining that identity. In the *Sung kao-seng chuan* works, events associated with particular monks were recorded according to standardized categories of "expertise," regardless of sectarian affiliation.<sup>72</sup> The category of "expertise" indicated the essential identity of the monk, the mark of a monk's "eminence." The *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu*, on the other hand, was a sectarian work of the Ch'an school. Its purpose was to promote the lineage of the Fa-yen (J. *Hōgen*) faction over rival factions as the heir to Ch'an mind transmission. Rather than a broad-based nonsectarian approach that recognizes different categories of expertise, the *ch'uan-teng lu* (J. *dentōroku*) approach determined a monk's worth according to narrowly defined sectarian criteria

decided by the Ch'an school.<sup>73</sup> Both approaches influenced Eisai's characterization of Zen in the *Kōzen gokokuron*.

*Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu's* influence on the *Kōzen gokokuron* is most evident in section 5, "The Transmission Lineage of the Zen School," where Eisai aligns himself with the Huang-lung (J. ōryō) line of the Lin-chi (J. Rinzai) faction of Ch'an, substantiating his claim with a detailed record of the transmission lineage of the Ch'an school extending to Eisai himself. In the *Kōzen gokokuron*, the authorization is backed by a formal statement certifying the transmission of the Mind teaching to Eisai from his mentor, Hsü-an Huai-Ch'ang (J. Kian Eshō) of Wan-nien (J. Mannen) Temple on Mount T'ien-t'ai.<sup>74</sup>

The lineage recorded by Eisai in the *Kōzen gokokuron* was a standard one in the Ch'an tradition, consisting of three parts. The first part associated the origins of the Ch'an lineage with the former Buddhas of the distant past, culminating with the "seven Buddhas of the past" which begins with Vipassin (J. Bibashi) and ends with Śākyamuni (J. Shakamon). The second part listed the twenty-eight Indian patriarchs adopted in the Ch'an lineage, from Mahākāśyapa (J. Makakasho) to Bodhidharma (J. Bodaidaruma). The list adopted by Eisai is identical to the one first adopted in the *Pao-lin chuan* (compiled 801).<sup>75</sup> The *Pao-lin chuan* (J. *Hōrinden*; Transmission of the Treasure Grove) lineage of patriarchs was accepted without variation in the important Ch'an works of the Sung period, including Tao-yüan's *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* and Yen-shou's *Tsung-ching lu*.<sup>76</sup> The third part included the list of Chinese patriarchs, from Hui-k'o (J. Eka) through Hui-neng (J. Enō) and Lin-chi (J. Rinzai), founder of the Lin-chi (J. Rinzai) faction, and through the Sung Ch'an master Huang-lung Hui-nan (J. ōryō Enan), founder of the Huang-lung (J. ōryō) branch, and ending with Eisai's teacher Hsü-an Huai-chang, followed by Eisai.

There is no doubt that this certification of transmission represented a crucial component in Eisai's claim as legitimate heir and direct descendant of the Buddha's teaching. In the context of early Kamakura Japan, Eisai's claim countered a similar claim by a contemporary, Dainichi Nōnin (?-1196?), a self-proclaimed representative of the Daruma faction.<sup>77</sup> To bolster his claim, Nōnin sent disciples to China to procure acknowledgment for his status as interpreter of Zen. The Sung Ch'an master Te-kuang (1121-1203), upon receiving a letter and gifts sent by Nōnin, is reported to have "gladly attested to Nōnin's awakening and sent him a Dharma robe, a name, and picture of Bodhidharma with a verse-in-praise inscribed."<sup>78</sup> The direct and personal (i.e., authentic) transmission between master and disciple claimed by Eisai stood in marked contrast to Nōnin's indirect (i.e., inauthentic) transmission.

In this context, Eisai claimed that authentic transmission was a prerequisite for government support of Zen. Eisai contends that the reason the Lin-chi faction is the most prosperous of the five factions of Ch'an in China is that it receives official authorization from the Sung government.<sup>79</sup> This claim suggests that Eisai's promotion of Zen, specifically the Huang-lung branch of the

Lin-chi faction, is closely connected to his support for a similarly inspired government revival of Buddhism in Japan. The Sung Ch'an model suggested that authentic Buddhism was based on direct transmission from master to disciple, a claim that Eisai verifies in his own case.

In spite of Eisai's identification with lineage transmission in the *Kōzen gokokuron*, his sectarian identity was not exclusive. The narrower sectarian approach identifying one exclusively on the basis of lineage was a product of the later Kamakura period and was foreign to Eisai.<sup>80</sup> Eisai, as was seen earlier, recognized the validity of the T'ien-t'ai *ch'an* tradition in addition to that of the Ch'an school. In this regard, Eisai's view of Ch'an is not exclusively tied to Ch'an sectarian identity, but is part of a broader movement within Buddhism encompassing the Ch'an and T'ien-t'ai meditation traditions. This view of Ch'an more closely resembles that of the early Sung *vinaya* master, Tsan-ning, and the Ch'an syncretist, Yen-shou.

Although Tsan-ning was not a member of the Ch'an school, he lived in an age and an area in which Ch'an influence was pervasive. Tsan-ning's view of the Ch'an school is interesting in light of his own position as a high-ranking member of the Sung bureaucracy and a monk trained in the *vinaya*, at a time when Ch'an was establishing itself as the most influential school of Buddhism in China. In addition to similarities in the way Tsan-ning and Eisai understood Ch'an lineage, discussed later, a link between Tsan-ning and the *Kōzen gokokuron* can be drawn in three ways. In the first place, direct citations from Tsan-ning's *Sung kao-seng chuan* appear in the *Kōzen gokokuron*.<sup>81</sup> Furthermore, Tsan-ning and Eisai shared certain temporal goals regarding the restoration and preservation of Buddhism. In the conclusion to the *Seng shih-lüeh*, Tsan-ning provides his reason for writing in terms of "hope for the revival of Buddhism" and "to ensure the lasting presence of the True Law" (*cheng-fa*),<sup>82</sup> phraseology repeated nearly verbatim in the title of section 1 of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, "Ensuring the Lasting Presence of Buddhist Teaching [or Law]." Third, Tsan-ning was a proponent of Buddhist ritual at the Sung court. He advocated that Buddhist institutions and rituals be viewed as legitimate expressions of the Chinese state. He specifically promoted use of *Jen-wang ching* (J. *Ninnō kyō*) inspired rituals by the imperial court.<sup>83</sup> Government support for Ch'an institutions during the Sung was heavily indebted to the case Tsan-ning made for Buddhism at the early Sung court. These links between Tsan-ning and the *Kōzen gokokuron* can also be extended more specifically to the question regarding Ch'an lineage.

Tsan-ning was an avid supporter of Ch'an but sought to incorporate it within the Buddhist tradition as a whole. Tsan-ning viewed Ch'an as the fulfillment of the Buddhist meditation tradition, not as an independent transmission of Buddhist teaching at odds with the traditions that preceded it. His major reservation was with those who promoted Ch'an as an independent movement that excluded other Buddhist teachings and schools. Tsan-ning's

inclination to view Ch'an as the fulfillment of the Buddhist meditation tradition is evident from the way in which he accepts the traditional lineage of the Ch'an school in relation to that of the T'ien-t'ai school.

The fact that Tsan-ning accepts in principle the lineage of the Ch'an school is clear from his comments recorded in the *Sung kao-seng chuan*.<sup>84</sup> There, he runs through the conventional list of Chinese Ch'an patriarchs from Bodhidharma, through Hui-k'o, Seng-ts'an, and Tao-hsin. After Tao-hsin, the lineage divides into two branches, that of Hung-jen and that of Niu-t'ou Fa-jung. Although Hung-jen also produced two branches, that of Shen-hsiu and that of Hui-neng, it was Hui-neng who passed on the robe of transmission and it was his school that flourished thereafter. In contrast to the Ch'an lineage, Tsan-ning also presents the lineage of the T'ien-t'ai school in an abbreviated form: the masters Hui-wen, Hui-ssu, and Chih-i. The T'ien-t'ai masters are credited with furthering Ch'an methods in China (specifically the "three contemplations" of emptiness, provisional existence, and the middle way between these two; and "cessation and contemplation" (*chih-kuan*)) through the Sui dynasty (581-618). The important point here is that T'ien-t'ai is presented in such a way that it represents *ch'an* prior to the Ch'an movement that traced its origins to Bodhidharma. The *ch'an* of the Ch'an school that flourished in the T'ang represents, in Tsan-ning's arrangement, the fulfillment of T'ien-t'ai *ch'an*. Tsan-ning thus affirmed the validity of Fa-yen Ch'an in Wu-yüeh, where Fa-yen Wen-i's disciple, T'ian-t'ai Te-shao, converted Mount T'ien-t'ai into a center for Ch'an training (albeit with a heavy dose of T'ien-t'ai teaching added). The appeal of this situation for Eisai is obvious.

The assumptions underlying Tsan-ning's view of Ch'an parallel those of Eisai in the *Kōzen gokokuron*. This is particularly evident in Eisai's characterization of Tendai in relation to Zen. In the first place, Eisai treats Tendai adaptations of *ch'an* in section 4 of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, just prior to his discussion of Zen school *ch'an* in section 5. This parallels the order with which Tsan-ning treats T'ien-t'ai and Ch'an in the *hsi-ch'an* commentary of the *Sung kao-seng chuan* mentioned previously. Following the Japanese Tendai tradition recorded in the *Isshin-kai* of Saichō, moreover, Eisai maintained that direct contact (i.e., legitimate transmission) occurred between Bodhidharma and Hui-ssu, which became the basis for a lineage of *ch'an* transmission within the T'ien-t'ai school.<sup>85</sup> Doing so allowed Eisai to reconstruct the history of *ch'an* transmission in China in a way that agreed with Tsan-ning yet also went a crucial step further. It asserted that T'ien-t'ai *ch'an* was more than merely *ch'an* prior to the Ch'an movement emanating from Bodhidharma. Since Tsan-ning contended that T'ien-t'ai *ch'an* and the *ch'an* of the Ch'an school could be traced from the same source, the Ch'an master Bodhidharma, this meant that the direct transmission from Bodhidharma was not the exclusive prerogative of the Ch'an school but also included T'ien-t'ai. This was a suitable pretext for one advocating Zen as the basis for Tendai reform.<sup>86</sup>

Two important points in section 4 of the *Kōzen gokokuron* confirm Eisai's interpretation of Zen. The first is the aforementioned proposition that Sung Ch'an represents the legitimate legacy of both Ch'an and T'ien-t'ai teaching and that the essence of this tradition is embodied in the Buddhist practice authorized in the Sung Ch'an monastic code, the *Ch'an-yuan ch'ing-kuei*.<sup>87</sup> In conjunction with the actual lineage in section 5, it established Eisai as legitimate heir to this Sung Ch'an tradition. The second point is reflected directly in Eisai's concluding remarks to the section: "In terms of the main point raised here, the scriptures, monastic rules, and treatises preached by the Buddha throughout the five periods of his teaching career are all essential teachings of the Buddha's *zen*."<sup>88</sup> The point here is that Eisai viewed Zen teaching within the context of the Buddhist tradition as a whole—*zen* is seen as the inspiration for the entire Buddhist tradition and not as an exclusive teaching fundamentally opposed to that tradition. The Buddhist tradition, one should add, is here framed in terms of the interpretation given to it in the T'ien-t'ai *p'an-chiao* (J. *hankyō*) doctrine.<sup>89</sup>

While Eisai's position on Zen within Buddhism parallels that of Tsan-ning, it is more notably framed within principles of Ch'an syncretism associated with Yung-ming Yen-shou. Yen-shou played a leading role in defining Buddhism and the meaning of Buddhist practice in the post-T'ang period. His influence spread to Korea and Japan, as well as China. In this respect alone, Yen-shou cast a wide shadow over the development of the "world of Zen" as Ch'an movements spread throughout East Asia. Although most commonly associated with developments in Chinese Ch'an and Korean Sōn, Yen-shou's influence was strongly felt in early Japanese Zen as well. His model served as an inspiration for Dōgen,<sup>90</sup> and his works were frequently cited in Japanese Buddhist circles.<sup>91</sup> More significantly for the present context, Yen-shou's writings figured directly in the dispute between Eisai and Nōnin's *Daruma-shū* regarding the correct understanding of Zen (discussed here later). As a result, Yen-shou was a central figure in the struggle to define Zen in early Kamakura Japan.

Yen-shou's influence in the *Kōzen gokokuron* is exhibited in two interrelated ways: through specific reference to his writings, and through the general adoption of his ideas. The *Tsung-ching lu* is cited in various contexts in the *Kōzen gokokuron*. In section 3, for example, it is cited in response to concerns that Zen practitioners adhere to a false view of emptiness or an obscure realization, based on their prized independence from words and letters.<sup>92</sup> It is also cited in connection with a question about Zen practitioners' alleged reluctance to follow the monastic rules and conventional Buddhist practices, or to engage in such common practices as the recitation of Buddha names or making offerings to relics.<sup>93</sup> In section 7, "Outlining Zen Doctrines and Encouraging Zen Practice," it is cited as the basis for the first of the three methods consid-



ered, “[viewing Zen] from the perspective of conventional Buddhist teaching” (C. *yüeh-chiao*; J. *yakukyō*).<sup>94</sup> In brief, Eisai relies on Yen-shou to verify that Zen is harmonious with rather than antagonistic toward established Buddhist doctrines and practices.

One work of Yen-shou in which his syncretic tendencies are made abundantly clear is the *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi*.<sup>95</sup> In this work, a wide range of activities are advocated as constituting Buddhist practice: worshipping Buddhas and bodhisattvas; venerating *stūpas*; chanting *sūtras*; preaching the *dharma*; practicing repentance, the *pāramitās*, and the eightfold path; defending orthodoxy; contemplation; practicing the recitation of Buddha names (*nien-fo*); building temples; and even practicing self-immolation.<sup>96</sup> This broad range of Buddhist activities may be linked to the context of an early Sung Buddhist revival that is pluralistic in nature. The problem for Yen-shou was how to justify the inclusion of such diverse practices in one system. The diversity of his “myriad good deeds” (*wan-shan*) did not fit well with the narrower concerns of established Buddhist schools. The focal point around which the myriad good deeds are advocated in the *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* is often connected with the *Fa-hua ching* (J. *Hokkekyō*) and T'ien-t'ai teaching. The *Fa-hua ching* is the principal scripture mentioned in connection with *sūtra* chanting and Dharma lectures. It is the basis for practicing repentance and figures prominently in Yen-shou's contemplation practice as well. It provides the principal inspiration for self-immolation. Yen-shou's much heralded *nien-fo* practice is also based on it.

To justify the pluralistic array of practices, Yen-shou looked to theoretical conceptions common to Buddhism, particularly the T'ien-t'ai and Hua-yen traditions. Significantly, the *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* begins with the claim that all good deeds (*shan*) are ultimately based on (*kuei*) the absolute, true form (*shih-hsiang*) (i.e., the true reality of all forms, true suchness, the ultimate) of fundamental principle (*tsung*). The point here is that extensive and active practice is necessary and that one should not cling foolishly to aimless sitting and thereby obstruct true cultivation. The reason for this precept is provided in the nature of interaction between the abstract and particular as conceived through *li* (noumena) and *shih* (phenomena), central conceptions in the Hua-yen tradition. In addition, Yen-shou draws from a number of theoretical constructions that parallel *li* and *shih*: the real and the expedient, absolute truth and worldly truth, nature and form, substance and function, and emptiness and existence. This parallel also extends to the title of the work. For Yen-shou, the meaning of *wan-shan* (the myriad good deeds) is closely connected to the meaning of *shih* (phenomena) and all of its associated meanings. The meaning of *t'ung-kuei* (the common end), the realm of the absolute, is closely associated with *li* (noumena) and all of its counterparts.

Yen-shou's syncretism and his promotion of Buddhist pluralism in the *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* is dependent on the theoretical dichotomy of *li* and

*shih*. According to Yen-shou, the relationship between these two aspects of reality is one of identity, but because Buddhist practitioners insist on stressing the *li* side of the equation as the real source of enlightenment, the myriad good deeds or the *shih* side of the equation have fallen into disrepute and tend to be either rejected or neglected. Rather than being seen as disturbances to the realm of Truth, the activity of the myriad good deeds should be regarded as manifestations of one's realization and confirmation of enlightenment attained. In the correct relationship between the theoretical and practical, both are awarded equal emphasis and neither is neglected at the expense of the other. The basis for this relationship is implicit in the structure of reality itself. The equal emphasis accorded theory and practice represents a reflection of the same relationship that exists between the absolute and the myriad good deeds, *li* and *shih*, and so on.

It is clear that Eisai agreed with Yen-shou's approach. Stylistically, the *Kōzen gokokuron* has much in common with the *Tsung-ching lu* and the *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi*. Yen-shou's methodology, outlined in his preface (*hsü*) to the *Tsung-ching lu*, combines three elements: first, establishing the correct teaching (*cheng-tsung*); second, responding to questions to dispel doubts; and third, citing scriptural authority to support one's claim.<sup>97</sup> This methodology is prominent in the *Kōzen gokokuron* as well, where Eisai's indebtedness to Yen-shou's method in the *Tsung-ching lu* is openly acknowledged.<sup>98</sup> The application of Yen-shou's method in the *Kōzen gokokuron* can also be demonstrated as follows. The expressed aim of the *Kōzen gokokuron* is to establish Zen as the correct interpretation of Buddhist teaching (i.e., establishing the correct teaching).<sup>99</sup> The longest section of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, section 3, "Resolving the Doubts of the People of the World," is presented in a question-and-answer format reminiscent of that employed by Yen-shou (i.e., responding to questions to dispel doubts). Even a cursory glance at the *Kōzen gokokuron* reveals the importance of scriptural passages for authorizing the positions taken (i.e., citing scriptural authority to support one's claims).<sup>100</sup>

As we have seen, Eisai's syncretism is indebted in various ways to Sung precedents. What is surprising is not Eisai's indebtedness to Sung Ch'an, but the sources that he relied on most for his understanding. His opposition to an interpretation of Zen as an isolated and independent tradition places him both at odds with Rinzai orthodoxy and in agreement with Sung Ch'an syncretism as championed by monks from Wu-yüeh affiliated with the Fa-yen faction. In Yen-shou's case, the influence on Eisai extended beyond coincidental similarity. Yen-shou's syncretism figured prominently in the battle to define early Kamakura Zen.

The Role of Syncretism in Early Japanese Zen: Yen-shou's  
Influence on Eisai's *Kōzen gokokuron* and the  
*Daruma-shū* of Nōnin

In addition to the general influence of Yen-shou's writings on Sung and Kamakura Buddhism, his writings formed the background for a major dispute in early Kamakura Zen. Ishii Shūdō has called attention to the influence of the *Tsung-ching lu* on the content of *Jōtō shōgakuron* (*Treatise on the Bodhisattva's Attainment of Enlightenment*), an important work of the Japanese Daruma faction, Eisai's main rival for the Zen banner.<sup>101</sup> Ishii has shown clearly the close relationship between large portions of the *Jōtō shōgakuron* and the *Tsung-ching lu*, demonstrating the Daruma faction's dependence on Yen-shou's text. Given the Japanese Daruma faction's reliance on the *Tsung-ching lu*, Eisai's rivalry with Nōnin and the impact Yen-shou had on the *Kōzen gokokuron*, it is important to establish more clearly the relationship between Yen-shou's syncretism and the position adopted by Eisai in the *Kōzen gokokuron*.

The discussion here begins with a review of Ishii's characterization of the issue.<sup>102</sup> As Ishii notes, Yanagida Seizan maintains that in a brief document, the *Mirai ki*,<sup>103</sup> written a year prior to the *Kōzen gokokuron* (in the eighth year of the *Kenkyū* era, 1197), Eisai rejected the claims of Kakua (b. 1142) and Nōnin (?–1196) as transmitters of the Zen school to Japan.<sup>104</sup> Yanagida concludes that Eisai's aim in compiling the *Kōzen gokokuron*, moreover, was to distinguish his position regarding Zen from that of Nōnin and the Daruma faction. According to Yanagida, Eisai's insistence on aligning Sung Ch'an teaching and Sung Buddhist precept practice makes sense in terms of his need to distinguish his aims from those of the Daruma faction, whose own interpretation of Zen emphasized its antinomian character. In accomplishing this purpose, Eisai created another problem. His strict precept practice included following the rules of the Hīnayāna *vinaya*, something that Saichō, the founder of Japanese Tendai, rejected. For political reasons, to establish Tendai independence from the Nara Buddhist schools, Saichō insisted that Mt. Hiei monks follow only the less rigorous bodhisattva precepts.<sup>105</sup> As a result, Eisai found himself maintaining a precarious balance, promoting a strict style of Zen to counter the Daruma faction that challenged the spirit of Saichō's reform and jeopardizing his own Zen as a Tendai reform movement.

How does Eisai's criticism of the Daruma faction square with the fact that both the *Kōzen gokokuron* and the *Jōtō shōgakuron* exhibit strong influence from the seminal figure of Sung Ch'an, Yung-ming Yen-shou? Ishii maintains that although Nōnin and Eisai were both heavily influenced by Yen-shou's syncretism, Nōnin tended toward a "naturalistic, heteretical Zen" (*shizen gedōteki zen*) based on the contention "Mind itself is Buddha" (*sokushin zebutsu*), whereas Eisai interpreted the *Tsung-ching lu* in terms of Yen-shou's moralism based on

adherence to the Buddhist precepts (*jiritsu shūgi*).<sup>106</sup> The former position refers to the Daruma faction's alleged rejection of the precepts and conventional Buddhist practice on the assumption that "from the outset there are no passions; from the beginning we are enlightened."<sup>107</sup> As a result, conventional practice is essentially useless. While stated in a highly condensed form, the main thrust of this position, I might add, is in agreement with later Rinzai Zen orthodoxy. Eisai, on the other hand, is deeply indebted to Yen-shou's conception of Zen as the "Mind school" and to Yen-shou's insistence that the Buddhist precepts and conventional Buddhist methods are necessary prerequisites for and accompaniments to true Zen practice. And, as Ishii points out, this view accounts for Eisai's insistence on the importance of the *Zen'en shingi* in the transmission of Zen teaching and practice to Japan.<sup>108</sup>

Behind Ishii's characterization of Eisai's Zen is the acknowledgment that Eisai's experience in Sung China extended beyond the influence of Yen-shou and the early Sung period. Yen-shou's influence on Eisai was filtered through the Sung Lin-chi (J. Rinzai) lineage interpretation of Ch'an with which Eisai identified. This identity, as was previously mentioned, was formally asserted in section 5 of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, which placed Eisai as a fifty-third-generation heir of the Huang-lung (J. Ōryō) faction of the Lin-chi school, dating from the seven Buddhas of the past. Ishii is correct in asserting that this connection had a great impact on Eisai's understanding of Zen, including his perspective on the Zen-based Buddhist syncretism promoted by Yen-shou. The influence of the Lin-chi faction on Eisai's position in the *Kōzen gokokuron*, however, needs to be assessed carefully.

The normative position of Lin-chi Ch'an is often characterized in terms of four verses attributed to Bodhidharma: "A special transmission outside the teachings" (C. *chiao-wai pieh-ch'üan*; J. *kyōge betsuden*); "Do not establish words and letters" (C. *pu-li wen-tzu*; J. *furū monji*); "Directly point to the human mind" (C. *ch'ih-chih jen-hsin*; J. *jikishi ninshin*); and "See nature and become a Buddha" (C. *chien-hsing ch'eng-fo*; J. *kenshō jōbutsu*). Although the individual use of each of these phrases predates the Sung dynasty, they were not established as a normative set of expressions until well into the Sung.<sup>109</sup> The latter three verses appear in the *Kōzen gokokuron*, where they are attributed to Bodhidharma, and are referred to as the "gateway of Zen" (*zenmon*).<sup>110</sup> The first verse, "A special transmission outside the teachings," is noticeably absent. This omission further aligns Eisai with Tsan-ning and Yen-shou, whose understanding of Ch'an also included the latter three verses but not the first.<sup>111</sup> Together, they represented a Ch'an/Zen tradition that did not identify itself as "a special transmission outside the teachings" and was the prevailing interpretation of Ch'an at the outset of the Sung.

While broad agreement existed between Eisai's Zen syncretism and early Sung Ch'an, there were also differences regarding the actual form such syncretism might take. Section 7 of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, "An Outline of the Prin-

cial Methods for Practicing Zen,” points to the specific form of Eisai’s Zen syncretism.<sup>112</sup> This section classifies Zen teaching into three types. The first is the type, described earlier, associated with Yen-shou and the *Tsung-ching lu*, “[viewing Zen] from the perspective of conventional Buddhist teaching (C. *yüeh-chiao*; J. *yakukyō*).”<sup>113</sup> In this section, Eisai maintains that these methods are aimed at “dull-witted, ordinary people”; nevertheless, they are considered “skillful means for initiating the cultivation [of Zen].”

The second type, “[viewing Zen] from the perspective of Zen” (C. *yüeh-Ch’an*; J. *yakuzen*), is reminiscent of assumptions commonly encountered in the sectarian exclusiveness of the “pure” Zen tradition. Methods here aimed at “the most talented people” are “not confined to words and letters [i.e., the Buddhist textual tradition] and not concerned with mental thought [i.e., conventional meditation practices].” They represent methods of practice that are “free from mental deliberation” and methods of study that “transcend the ways of either common people or sages.”

The third type refers to “[viewing Zen] from the aspect that conventional Buddhist teaching and Zen teaching hold in common” (C. *yüeh tsung-hsiang*; J. *yaku sōsō*).<sup>114</sup> This type points to a higher level of synthesis for Eisai than that represented by Yen-shou. It is based on a common assumption pervading Mahayāna Buddhist thought that anything implicated in name and form has only a provisional existence and is ultimately unreal. This metaphysical reductionism is here applied to whatever one may practice or study, including conventional Buddhist teaching and Zen teaching. In the end all conceptions, even “enlightenment” or *nirvāṇa*, are nothing more than designations for provisionally existing things and are essentially unreal. This is the ultimate standpoint (i.e., that there is no standpoint) of Zen (and for that matter, Buddhist) teaching and practice. In the end, Eisai concludes:

The [teaching of the] Zen school is independent of what is articulated in names and words, independent of mental deliberations and distinctions, incapable of comprehension, and ultimately unobtainable.<sup>115</sup> The so-called “Law of the Buddha” is not a law that can be articulated and is only [provisionally] named the Law of the Buddha.<sup>116</sup> What is currently referred to as Zen marks this as a conspicuous feature of its teaching. Since the above three methods are all [articulated in terms of] provisional names, anyone who claims that Buddhist Zen teaching depends on words and letters and is articulated verbally is actually slandering the Buddha and slandering the Law.<sup>117</sup> Because of this, the patriarch-master [Bodhidharma] referred to the Zen approach [in terms of] “do not rely on words and letters, directly point to the human mind, and see one’s nature and become a Buddha.” Anyone who [tries to understand Buddhism] by grasping names and words is ignorant of the Law, and anyone who [tries to

understand Buddhism] by grasping at the appearances [of names and forms] is even more deluded. [The state that] is inherently immovable, where there is nothing to be obtained, is what is referred to as seeing the Law of the Buddha [in the true Zen approach].<sup>118</sup>

Eisai's syncretism thus rejected the exclusivity of "pure" Zen as an independent teaching apart from scriptural tradition, while accepting the superiority of Zen's interpretation of Buddhism. In other words, Eisai's Zen does not stand in opposition to the Buddhist tradition but represents its fulfillment and crowning achievement. It represents the legitimate, "true," and full understanding of Buddhist teaching, as opposed to the legitimate but partial and incomplete interpretations that preceded it.

Ultimately, the *Kōzen gokokuron* reflects Eisai's experience with Sung Ch'an. This experience, like the characterization of Zen in the *Kōzen gokokuron*, is informed and influenced by, but not confined to, the stamp that Yen-shou placed on post-T'ang Buddhism. In this respect, Eisai's Zen syncretism may be aligned with two of Yen-shou's concerns. The first is that Zen be understood within the broader context of Buddhist teaching; Zen and Buddhist teaching share a fundamental unity in outlook. The second is that Zen practice be firmly based in the Buddhist tradition of moral discipline and that it encompasses conventional Buddhist practices. These two concerns aligning Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron* with Yen-shou's syncretism, moreover, sharply distinguish Eisai's approach from that associated with Dainichi Nōnin and the Daruma faction.

In addition, Eisai's syncretism deviates from that of Yen-shou in significant ways. Rivalry between Eisai and Nōnin and the latter's dependence on Yen-shou made it advantageous for Eisai to provide some distance between his position and Yen-shou's. This may be a contributing factor in Eisai's categorization of Zen teaching in section 7 of the *Kōzen gokokuron* discussed previously, which relegates Yen-shou's understanding of Zen to an inferior status.

Scriptural references reveal doctrinal differences between Eisai and Yen-shou. A review of the sources either cited or referred to by Yen-shou in the *Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* reveals that scriptures and treatises associated with the T'ien-t'ai and Hua-yen schools were the most important influences on his thought.<sup>119</sup> *Prajñā-pāramitā* scriptures constituted a third major influence. A similar tabulation of sources in the *Kōzen gokokuron* reveals that scriptures and treatises associated with the T'ien-t'ai (J. Tendai) school are most frequently cited, followed by *Prajñā-pāramitā* scriptures and scriptures from the *Vinaya* (J. *ritsu*).<sup>120</sup> This fact suggests an important difference between Yen-shou's and Eisai's syncretism. Whereas Yen-shou's syncretism was constructed around T'ien-t'ai and Hua-yen, reflecting the influence of T'ang Buddhist scholasticism, Eisai's syncretism was constructed around Tendai and *prajñā* thought, reflecting the influence of the Japanese Tendai school and the Zen (C. Ch'an)

tradition, particularly of the Sung Lin-chi faction, which Eisai affiliated with *Prajñā-pāramitā* literature. The emphasis on T'ien-t'ai/Tendai is a common feature in both Yen-shou and Eisai's syncretism. The emphasis on Hua-yen doctrine in Yen-shou's syncretism is almost totally absent from the *Kōzen gokokuron*, which instead emphasizes *prajñā* sources.

The *prajñā* tradition was also important for Eisai as an ideology supporting the rulers of a Buddhist state. For Eisai, this ideology was particularly represented by the *Prajñāparāmitā Sūtra*, on *Explaining How Benevolent Kings Protect Their Countries* (*Ninnō gokoku hannya kyō*). The *prajñā* tradition thus provided an essential link for Eisai in connecting both the spiritual and political aims of Zen Buddhism in a single ideological framework.

Ultimately, what we have in the *Kōzen gokokuron* is a philosophy based on the Buddhist nominalism of the *prajñā* tradition, insisting that things exist in name only but not in actuality. This includes the Zen of Bodhidharma and the Chinese Lin-chi masters, whose descendants Eisai associated with in China. Combined with this philosophy is a practice based on the strict moral code of the Buddhist *vinaya* tradition, insisting that *zen* practice and the enlightenment experience are predicated on the observance of the precepts. This is the conservative Zen based on Buddhist principles of moral conduct. For Eisai, strict adherence to the Buddhist precepts is a necessary condition upon which the enlightenment experience (*prajñā*) is based. The following formulation from section 7 of the *Kōzen gokokuron* is inspired by the *Tso-ch'an i* (J. *Zazengi*) section of the *Ch'an-yuan ch'ing-kuei* (J. *Zen'en shingi*):<sup>121</sup>

Any practitioner who wants to cultivate the teaching of the Zen school amounts to a bodhisattva studying *prajñā*. They should . . . be devoted to the cultivation of *samādhi* [and] maintain the wondrous purifying precepts of great bodhisattvas. . . .

The *Sūtra on Perfect Enlightenment* says, "All unobstructed pure wisdom arises from *zen* meditation [C. *ch'an-ting*; J. *zenjō*]." From this we know that to transcend common existence and enter the realm of the sacred, one must engage in [meditation] to quell the conditions [that cause vexations]. It is most urgent that one rely on the power of meditation [in all activities], whether walking, standing, sitting, or lying down. If one wants to realize [the power of] meditation, one must carry out the practice of the *vinaya* [precepts]. Those who carry out *zen* meditation practice in the absence of the stipulated provisions of the *vinaya* precepts have no basis for their practice . . . Therefore, if one wants to realize the method for Zen meditation described here, one will uphold the *vinaya* purely so that one is free of any blemish.<sup>122</sup>

Or, as Eisai states later in the section, "It means that when one enters the ranks of the Thus Come Ones, one practices in the style implicit in their enlighten-

ment and sagely wisdom. This is the form that [the practice of] Zen takes."<sup>123</sup> In this regard, Eisai's position in the *Kōzen gokokuron* stands in marked contrast to the following statements in the *Jōtō shōgakuron*:

Further, the *vinaya* rules are to control the activities of the mind [C. *sheng-hsin*; J. *seishin*]. With the elimination of mental activity [C. *wu-hsin*; J. *mushin*], one transcends [the need for] the *vinaya*.<sup>124</sup> . . . Originally, there are no *vinaya* rules to practice, much less the cultivation of good deeds.<sup>125</sup>

Rather than the experience of *prajñā* being predicated on *vinaya* practice (i.e., wisdom being based on morality), the *Jōtō shōgakuron* passages suggest that the experience of *prajñā* precludes the need for *vinaya* practice (i.e., wisdom being beyond moral considerations). In this regard, Eisai clearly deviates from the Daruma faction of Nōnin and approximates the position advocated by Yen-shou in affirming the salutary effects of conventional Buddhist practice and morality.

Yen-shou's description of Ch'an as the "Mind Teaching," the essence of all Buddhist teaching, regardless of scriptural, scholastic, or sectarian affiliation, was attractive to all, including Eisai, who viewed Ch'an in connection with conventional Buddhist teaching. The Japanese context out of which Eisai arrived added to this appeal but shaped it in unique ways. What distinguished Eisai's syncretism from Yen-shou's was the way in which the former defined Zen teaching in accordance with the exigencies of his age. Circumstances in Japan determined a definition of Zen compatible with T'ien-t'ai teaching strongly tinged with *mikkyō* (esoteric) rituals.<sup>126</sup> But what distinguished Eisai's definition above all was his identification of Zen teaching with the *prajñā* ideology of the *Ninnō kyō*. It was not enough for Eisai to reform Buddhism by identifying Zen as the culmination of Buddhist teaching, or as a pretext for promoting myriad good deeds. For Eisai, the identification of Zen and the promotion of Buddhist practice were specifically drawn in terms of the *Ninnō kyō*.

In short, Yen-shou's approach acknowledged the legitimacy of Buddhist pluralism and sought to establish a basis for a multitude of Buddhist practices. It was aimed primarily at the private world of the individual practitioner. In Eisai's reform movement the private world of the practitioner was intricately bound to the fate of the country as a whole in a way that was unambiguous. The practitioner's activities were interpreted primarily in terms of their implications for the moral fiber of Japanese society and Japan's political destiny. The social and political dimension into which Zen practice was drawn in the Japanese context derived from the respect that *Ninnō kyō* ideology commanded.<sup>127</sup>



## Eisai's Zen Reform Program: Conventional Buddhism on the Sung-Kamakura Continuum

The *Kōzen gokokuron* promoted Zen as a reform doctrine for Japan. There are two basic assumptions implicit in Eisai's message. The first is that the current state of Buddhism in Japan is corrupt and in need of reform. The second is that the fate of Japan as a country is threatened by the corrupt state into which Buddhism has fallen. Within the context of these assumptions, Eisai's message naturally held important implications for the leaders of the Japanese government and the Heian Buddhist establishment.

Eisai called on the Japanese elite to realize their destiny as the leaders of a great country and enlightened Buddhist civilization. The terms of this ideal were drawn in specific reference to scriptures in the Buddhist canon that served to "protect a country" (*gokoku*). Japanese rulers had long acknowledged the salutary effects of these scriptures. They served as a focal point for services and ceremonies conducted at the imperial court and at Buddhist temples throughout the land, conducted upon imperial request and with government support. Because of Eisai's identification of the Buddhist *prajñā* tradition with Zen teaching, he was particularly drawn to the *Ninnō kyō*, one of the most important scriptures for "protecting a country." Classed among the *prajñā* literature, the *Ninnō kyō* and the ideology that it represented set the parameters within which Eisai's reform program was cast.

A careful examination of the *Kōzen gokokuron* clarifies its reliance on the *Ninnō kyō* and the ideals permeating ancient and medieval Japanese civilization. This raises the question of why the association between the *Kōzen gokokuron* and the *Ninnō kyō*, so central to Eisai's understanding of the role of Zen in Japan, has been overlooked and excused whenever the subject of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron* are raised. Aside from an association with Japanese nationalism, a subject long avoided in the postwar period, the marginalization of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron* may be attributed to the ideology of "pure" Zen that has prevailed in modern Zen interpretation.

Eisai's understanding of Zen was based on different assumptions. In order to distinguish these, the present study suggests an alternative way to read the text and understand its content. It also indicates the direction from which a more balanced appraisal of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron* might come, one more in keeping with the historical circumstances of his life and the actual content of his thought.

The search for the source of misinterpretation of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron* leads one to suggest an association of Zen masters in the respective "golden ages" of Ch'an in China and Zen in Japan. The combination of these "golden ages" evokes what might be termed a "T'ang-Tokugawa alliance." This alliance, based on the common belief that a tradition of T'ang and Tokugawa

Zen masters epitomizes the essence of a “pure” Zen tradition, bears the stamp of modern Rinzai orthodoxy, which considers that the truest heirs of the great T’ang Zen tradition of Hui-neng, Ma-tsu Tao-i, Pai-chang Huai-hai, Huang-po Hsi-yün, Lin-chi I-hsüan, and so on were Tokugawa Rinzai masters such as Bankei (1622–1693) and Hakuin (1685–1768).<sup>128</sup> In this interpretation, Zen irrationalism reigns supreme as the quintessential expression of *satori* (enlightenment).

A general reason precipitating this T’ang-Tokugawa alliance may also be suggested. The alliance was due to more than coincidence or simple recognition of spiritual kinship. It was precipitated in large part by the renewed identity of Zen masters in the Tokugawa period as political outsiders, when the Tokugawa shoguns officially replaced Zen (and for that matter, Buddhism) as the official ideology of the Japanese state with “Sung Learning” (*Sōgaku*), or Neo-Confucianism. According to this interpretation, as the Confucian “Ancient Learning” (*kogaku*) and Shinto “National Learning” (*kokugaku*) schools came to dominate political debate, Zen found its true voice as political outsider, echoing the “pure” Zen of its T’ang predecessors.<sup>129</sup>

The point, finally, is this: the kind of Zen master Eisai has been portrayed as has been determined by notions about Zen that Eisai himself did not adhere to. It is clear that when judged in terms of the criteria stemming from the Tokugawa Rinzai tradition, Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron* have not fared well. This fact suggests important differences separating Eisai from both his legendary T’ang predecessors and the Tokugawa masters who came after him. In short, Eisai held a different set of assumptions. In contrast to the T’ang–Tokugawa alliance of “pure” Zen, the *Kōzen gokokuron* reflects the assumptions of a syncretistic-oriented Zen that can be placed on what might be termed a “Sung-Kamakura continuum.”

This syncretic style of Zen formed the basis for the thought of Yen-shou, the major figure of Ch’an–Buddhist syncretism in the post-T’ang period.<sup>130</sup> We have also seen how the syncretic style of Zen is important for the correct understanding of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron*. Moreover, Yen-shou and Eisai were not isolated cases. The popularity of Zen syncretism is also reflected in the teaching of Enni Ben’en (1201–1280), who has been judged “the pivotal figure in the history of Zen in Japan during the thirteenth century.”<sup>131</sup> Zen syncretism was also the leading teaching in Korean and Vietnamese Zen.<sup>132</sup>

In a search for a more balanced appraisal of Eisai and the *Kōzen gokokuron*, alternate criteria for interpreting Eisai’s message of reform are needed. The emphases of Eisai’s Buddhist reform program in the *Kōzen gokokuron* can be summarized in terms of wisdom (Skt. *prajñā*; J. *hannya*), the quintessential insight of Buddhist teaching, morality (Skt. *śīla-vinaya*; J. *kairitsu*), the monastic discipline on which the Buddhist livelihood is based, and meditation (Skt. *samādhi*; J. *zen*). This formulation comes straight from the common tripartite

division of the Buddha's eightfold path as *śīlā*, *samādhi*, and *prajñā*. It is affirmed specifically by Eisai in the *Kōzen gokokuron*:

The destruction of evil depends on the purification of wisdom. The purification of wisdom depends on the purification of meditation. The purification of meditation depends on the purification of the monastic precepts.<sup>133</sup> The Buddha possesses four kinds of positive methods for winning enlightenment. The first is the monastic precepts [*kai*]. The second is meditation [*zen*]. The third is wisdom [*hannya*]. The fourth is a mind free of impurities [*mujoku shin*].<sup>134</sup>

Among these four, Eisai notes, Zen meditation is the most important because it includes the other three. What this means is that far from being a radical, antiestablishment movement, Zen for Eisai was the banner for reform-minded Buddhist conservatism. This conservatism influenced Eisai's conception of Zen teaching and practice, his acceptance of the Buddhist scriptural tradition, and his promotion of moral discipline. It also presumed that Eisai would take a conciliatory approach in an attempt to win the support of government officials.

In the end, this approach suggests that what has passed under the name of Ch'an or Zen is historically conditioned. The question of which interpretation of Zen is "correct"—"pure" Zen or "syncretic" Zen—is not at issue here. What is at issue is coming to a more contextualized understanding of how Zen was perceived and characterized within the continuum of Sung and Kamakura Buddhist masters. Conceptions of Ch'an and Zen have been shaped differently in diverse historical contexts. Earlier conceptions do not always agree with the criteria imposed by later sectarian tradition. Important figures in the history of Ch'an, Zen, and East Asian Buddhism (like Eisai) tend to be marginalized by the later criteria. This marginalization, in turn, has obscured the real nature of their teachings as well as their true impact. Through an examination of select aspects of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, this essay has shown that only by our adopting the assumptions of the materials in question, rather than imposing our own, can the true ramifications of the tradition of Zen syncretism be properly addressed. Such investigations might well yield striking results for our understanding of Buddhism in the East Asian context and lead to significant reinterpretations of the way it has been traditionally presented.

#### NOTES

1. I would like to thank the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada for supporting research upon which this study is based. The study was initially delivered as a paper at a conference on "Medieval Chan/Zen in Cross-Cultural Perspective" held at Hsi Lai Temple, Los Angeles (1992). An initial report on my re-

search on Yōsai and the *Kōzen gokokuron*, “Buddhist Nationalism and the Origins of Zen in Japan: Toward a Reappraisal of Yōsai and the *Kōzen gokokuron*,” appeared in *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Asian and North African Studies, Contacts Between Culture 4, East Asia: History* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), pp. 356–362. A brief introduction and translation of some sections of the *Kōzen gokokuron* appeared in George J. Tanabe, ed., *Religions of Japan in Practice* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp. 63–70. I would also like to thank Dr. Barbara Sciacchitano for carefully reading the manuscript and for making numerous suggestions to improve its style.

2. The *bakufu*, or “tent government,” refers to the assumption of power by overlords connected with the Hōjō family who established their shogunate in Kamakura in 1185. This is a major turning point in Japanese history, marking the rise of the samurai class and decline of the aristocracy. For a general description, see such sources as G. B. Sansom, *Japan: A Short Cultural History* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, rpt., 62), pp. 270–326.

3. Yanagida Seizan, “Eisai to *Kōzen gokokuron* no kadai,” in *Chūsei zenka no shisō* (*Nihon shisō taikai* 16), ed. Ichikawa Hakugen, Iriya Yoshitaka, and Yanagida Seizan (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1972), p. 439.

4. D. T. Suzuki, *Zen and Japanese Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1959), p. 272. In the Tokugawa era, Zen nationalism was replaced by a growing Japanese interest in Neo-Confucianism, and later a revived Shinto, both of which offered an alternative basis for state ideology. With the unification of Japan under a Shinto banner during the Meiji period and the effects of militant nationalism during the 1930s and 1940s, Eisai’s Zen-based Buddhist nationalism came to be viewed as an anachronism at best. In a climate where the Zen contribution to Japanese artistic and cultural life, the private rather than public arts, was still esteemed, Eisai’s work encouraging the positive aspects of tea drinking, the *Kissa yōjōki*, came to be regarded as his most important contribution.

5. Suzuki, *Zen and Japanese Culture*, p. 62.

6. The subject of “pure” Zen and its impact on modern Zen interpretation have received a lot of recent attention, particularly in relation to the writings of D. T. Suzuki and other writers responsible for shaping the contours of modern Zen. See Robert H. Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism,” in Donald S. Lopez, Jr., ed., *Curators of the Buddha* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 107–160; and Bernard Faure, *Chan Insights and Oversights* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 52–88.

7. The designation “pure” Zen here derives from D. T. Suzuki, “Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih,” *Philosophy East and West* 3/1 (1956): 25–46.

8. *Genkō shakusho* (ch. 2), *Dai nihon bukkyō zensho* 62:75c–77c. Koken Shiren (1278–1346) was a member of the Shōichi branch (after the posthumous title of Enni Ben’en) of the Rinzaï faction. His study included a period at Jufukuji in Kamakura, a temple founded by Eisai in the second year of the Shōji era (1200), two years before the founding of Kenninji in Kyoto.

9. On this, see Martin Collcutt, “The Zen Monastery in Kamakura Society,” in Jeffrey P. Mass, ed., *Court and Bakufu in Japan: Essays in Kamakura History* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 204–206.

10. *Shōbōgenzō zuimonki* I.6, V.6, II.6, and II.2; Reihō Masunaga, trans., *A Primer of Sōtō Zen: A Translation of Dōgen's Shobogenzo Zuimonki* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1971), pp. 10–11, 31, 28, 82.
11. For a full discussion of the current state of our knowledge of Eisai's life and the circumstances surrounding it, see John McRae, "Reconstituting Eisai (1141–1215): The 'combined practice' as an authentic interpretation of the Buddhist tradition," paper presented at the conference "Medieval Chan/Zen in Cross-Cultural Perspective," Hsi Lai Temple, Los Angeles (1992).
12. On Nōnin's role in establishing Zen in Japan, see Bernard Faure, "The Daruma-shū, Dōgen, and Sōtō Zen," *Monumenta Nipponica* 42/1 (1987): 25–55. On the importance of Yen-shou's writings for Nōnin and Eisai's interpretation of Zen, see Ishii Shūdō, "Dainichi Nōnin, the Daruma Sect, and the Origins of Zen in Japan," paper presented at the conference "Medieval Chan/Zen in Cross-Cultural Perspective," Hsi Lai Temple, Los Angeles (1992).
13. The second article of the seventeen-article document (often referred to as the "Seventeen Article Constitution") attributed to Shōtoku Taishi confirms the importance of Buddhist teaching. The Constitution is contained in the *Nihon shoki* and is translated in William Theodore de Bary et al., *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 1 (2001), p. 54; de Bary, *East Asian Civilizations: A Dialogue in Five Stages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 27ff., also discusses the Buddhist sentiment inherent in the largely Confucian tenor of the Shōtoku's document.
14. In Sanskrit, *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*; among several translations of the *Hokke kyō* in Chinese, the one by Kumarajīva in A.D. 406 (T 9, no. 262) is standard.
15. In Sanskrit, *Suvarṇaprabhasottama-sūtra*. Three Chinese translations exist (T 16, nos. 663–65). It was promoted at the court of Emperor Temmu (r. 672–686) on the pretext, asserted in the *sūtra*, that the Four Deva Kings (*shi-tennō*) would protect the ruler who followed its teachings. The complete version, the *Konkōmyō-saishō kyō* (*Golden Light Sutra of the Most Victorious Kings*, no. 665), was translated by I-ching (Japanese, Gijo 635–713) in the early eighth century. I-ching's version included mystic incantations, lacking in earlier versions, which were important to followers of esoteric Buddhist traditions in the Tendai and Shingon schools. It was often recited at major court festivals. In Japan, major commentaries were written on it, including ones by Saichō and Kukai.
16. In Sanskrit, *Karūṇika-raja-sūtra*. Because the original is no longer extant, it is widely considered to be a composition conceived in China; see Kamata Shigeo, ed., *Chūgoku bukkyōshi jiten* (Tokyo, 1981): 307a. Two Chinese "translations" are extant, one by Kumārajīva in 401 (T 8, no. 245), the other by Amoghavajra (C. Pu-k'ung), c. 765 (T 8, no. 246).
17. Numerous commentaries were written on these scriptures by Chinese and Japanese Buddhist masters. The scriptures also provided the basis for numerous court rituals in Japan. On these points, see Inoue Mitsusada, *Nihon kodai no kokka to bukkyō* (*Buddhism and the State in Ancient Japan*) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1971), and M. W. de Visser, *Ancient Buddhism in Japan*, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1935).
18. Regarding the role of the *Ninnō kyō* (C. *Jen-wang ching*) in the Chinese context, see Charles Orzech, *Politics and Transcendent Wisdom: The Scripture for Humane*

*Kings in the Creation of Chinese Buddhism* (Pittsburgh: Pennsylvania University Press, 1998).

19. All references to the *Kōzen gokokuron* are to Yanagida's edition and translation in *Chūsei zenka no shisō* (see note 3), hereafter abbreviated as Yanagida, ed., and Yanagida, trans. I have also consulted the translation of Furuta Shōkin in *Eisai, Nihon no zen goroku 1* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1977), and the *Taishō* edition of the text, T 80, no. 2543.

20. Aside from the Preface, the *Ninnō kyō* is referred to in sections 1, 2, 3, and 8 of the *Kōzen gokokuron*.

21. All references to the *Ninnō kyō* in the *Kōzen gokokuron* are drawn from sections 7 and 8 of Kumarajīva's version. The following references are to Kumārajīva's version (T 8, no. 245) unless noted otherwise.

22. T 8: 832c23–26.

23. The *Ninnō kyō* closes with chapter 8, “[The Buddha] Entrusts [the *Ninnō kyō* and the Three Treasures] to the [Benevolent] Kings,” and a warning reinforcing the responsibility incumbent upon kings for maintaining Buddhism. In particular, it states that at such times when the Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha, as well as the Buddhist faithful, are absent from the world, the *Ninnō kyō* and the three treasures will be entrusted to kings. It is the responsibility of the kings to initiate the path of wisdom (i.e., *prajñā*-teaching) by having members of the Buddhist assembly recite and explain the *Ninnō kyō* to sentient beings. In other words, the kings are responsible for reconstituting Buddhist teaching in the world; the *Ninnō kyō*, being representative of *prajñā*-teaching, serves as the basis.

24. In China and other ancient cultures, one frequently encounters the belief that unusual celestial phenomena presage natural disaster. Emperors in particular were concerned about the supposed effects of these phenomena over the fate of their regimes. The alleged effectiveness of ritual recitation of the *Ninnō kyō* greatly enhanced its reputation among secular rulers.

25. In Amoghavajra's version (T. 8: 843b7–11), the Buddha provides the kings with reasons why these calamities occur. Two of the reasons are distinctly Confucian in tone: lack of filial piety, and lack of respect for teachers and elders. A third is Buddhist: the fact that *sramanas* and *brahmans*, kings and ministers of state, fail to practice the True Law (*shōbō*).

26. T. 8: 832c26–833a4. The kings are instructed to make banners, arrange flowers, and light lamps to adorn the *Ninnō kyō*, and to construct boxes and covers made of jade in which to place copies of the text, and a table made of valuable materials on which to place the (evidently nine) boxed and covered copies. When the royal procession travels between locations, the table bearing the copies of the *Ninnō kyō* goes a hundred paces ahead of the procession (to guard against misfortune). After the manner of a Buddha himself, the *Ninnō kyō* is claimed to constantly emit rays of light, protecting the surrounding area for a thousand *li* from calamities and transgressions. While the king is residing at a particular location, he is instructed to place the copies of the *Ninnō kyō* on an elevated dais and to make offerings, scatter flowers, and burn incense, as if he were serving his parents or the god Śakra. Amoghavajra's version also includes a list of mystical incantations, or *dhāraṇī*, to be recited for protection, giving it an esoteric emphasis common to Tantrism.

27. Amoghavajra adds, “who are to establish Buddhism and protect it.”

28. As an example, there are the well-known tracts by Mou-tzu, “Disposing of Error,” and by Hui-yuan, “A Monk Does Not Bow Before a King,” excerpts of which are translated in William Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom, eds., *Sources of Chinese Tradition 1* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 420–429.

29. See Harry D. Harootunian, *Things Seen and Unseen: Discourse and Ideology in Tokugawa Nativism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

30. This phrase, reflecting a common opinion among the Japanese ruling elite, is taken from the “Gorakuji Letter” of Hōjō Shigetoki, translated in Carl Steenstrup, *Hōjō Shigetoki (1198–1261) and His Role in the History of Political and Ethical Ideas in Japan*, Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series, No. 41 (London: Curzon Press, 1979), p. 178.

31. This is illustrated in the founding of the Tendai tradition in Japan. One of the principal issues surrounding the foundation of the Tendai school on Mount Hiei was ordination. In the *Sange gakushohiki* (T 74, nos. 623–625), Saichō (767–822) argued on the basis of doctrine that Tendai monks be exempted from Hīnayāna ordination rites in favor of Mahayāna ones. Saichō’s real motivation, however, was highly political. The purpose was to establish the independence of the Tendai school from the control exerted over it by the Buddhist establishment based in Nara. To this end, Saichō sought, and eventually won, the right to ordain monks on Mount Hiei on the doctrinal pretext that Tendai monks follow the Mahayāna ordination rites. A central proposition in Saichō’s request was that Tendai teaching serve in the capacity of state ideology. One of the means of support for the state that Tendai monks were to provide was daily recitation of scriptures for protecting the country, namely the *Hokke kyō*, the *Konkōmyō kyō*, the *Ninnō kyō*, and the *Shugo-kokkai shu kyō* (T 19, no. 997). The promotion of Tendai Buddhist teaching as the central ideology of the Japanese state was furthered by Saichō in another work, the *Shugo kokkaisho* (*Treatise on Protecting the Country*) (T 74, no. 2362:135–145), and through his designation of Mount Hiei as the “Chief Seat of the Buddhist Religion for Ensuring the Security of the Country (*chingo-kokka no dōjō*).” Eventually the Tendai school became the leading ideological arm of the Japanese state during the Heian period.

32. Dōgen, for example, though usually depicted as shunning anything to do with politics, purportedly wrote an essay entitled *Gokoku shōbōgi* (*Principles of the True Dharma for the Defense of the Country*). Unfortunately, it has not survived, leading some to question whether it ever existed. See William Bodiford, *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993), p. 28. This tendency is reflected most prominently in the chauvinism of Nichiren (1222–1282) and his *Risshō ankoku ron* (*Establishment of the Legitimate Teaching for the Protection of the Country*) (T 84, no. 2688:203–208); translated by Burton Watson et al. in Philip B. Yampolsky, ed., *Selected Writings of Nichiren* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), pp. 11–49.

33. The first was a brief trip in 1168 at the age of 28, while he was still a committed Tendai monk. This trip coincides with his original interest in the tradition of Tendai esotericism. The second trip was taken nearly two decades later, from 1187 to 1191. Eisai’s aspirations at this time were closely connected with his belief that Buddhist teaching was still flourishing in India. On this, see comments in section 9 (Yanagida, ed., p. 119a–b; trans., pp. 86–87).

34. These events are related specifically in section 5 of the *Kōzen gokokuron* text (Yanagida, ed., p. 111b; trans., p. 54), where Eisai states: “I wanted to go on a pilgrimage to India, to the eight sacred sights of the Buddha. . . . At first I went to Lin-an [Hang-chou] and paid a visit to the Military Commissioner to make a request for permission to travel to India. . . . the Commissioner did not grant my request.” This occurred in the fourteenth year of *ch’un-hsi* (1187), during the Southern Sung dynasty (1127–1279), when the north of China and the trade routes between China and India were controlled by the Jurchen (Chin dynasty) and Toba Turks (Hsi-hsia).

35. Throughout the *Kōzen gokokuron*, Zen is presented as both the culmination and essence of Buddhist teaching transmitted through Sung Ch’an masters. In the preface, Eisai states: “By studying [Zen], one discovers the key for understanding all forms of Buddhism. By practicing it, one attains enlightenment in the span of this life” (Yanagida, ed., p. 99a; trans., p. 9).

36. Eisai’s description of this transmission lineage, as well as his claim to be an authentic recipient, are presented in section 5 (Yanagida, ed., pp. 110a–112a; trans., pp. 50–56), and treated in more detail later in this chapter.

37. T 8: 832c23–24.

38. Yanagida, ed., p. 99a. For my translation of the term *furitsu*, I rely on Yanagida’s note, (trans., p. 13) and on Nakamura Hajime, *Bukkyōgo daijiten*: 1176d. According to Yanagida, the meaning of the term derives from the teaching of T’ien-t’ai master Chih-i. Nakamura traces it to the *T’ien-t’ai ssu-chiao i* (T 46:775c).

39. In the discussion of this *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* teaching in section 3 of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, Eisai quotes words attributed to Chih-i in the *T’ien-t’ai* (C. *mo-ho*) *chih-kuan* (T 46:4b17–18): “The destruction of evil depends on the purification of wisdom. The purification of wisdom depends on the purification of *zen* (C. *ch’an*) meditation. The purification of *zen* meditation depends on the purification of the precepts” (Yanagida, ed., p. 106b). It is also cited in Yen-shou’s *Tsung-ching lu* (T 48:433b20–21).

40. For Eisai’s identification of *prajñā*-teaching with the Zen school, see the beginning of section 2 (Yanagida, ed., p. 100b).

41. Yanagida, ed., p. 100a. According to Yanagida (trans., p. 10), the quote is from T 8:868c.

42. This concern is noted specifically in the title to the opening section of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, “Ensuring the Lasting Presence of Buddhist Teaching” (*ryōbō kujū*). The opening quote from the *Sūtra on the Six Perfections* leaves no doubt regarding how the preservation of Buddhism is to be accomplished.

43. Yanagida, ed., p. 100a; Yanagida, trans., p. 11.

44. Yanagida, ed., p. 99a.

45. According to the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā sūtra* (J. *Dai-hannya kyō*), cited in section 1 of the *Kōzen gokokuron* (Yanagida, ed., p. 100b; trans., pp. 12–13):

[The Buddha said]:

Śāriputra, five-hundred years after my passing into *nirvāṇa*, at the beginning of the age when Buddhist teaching has begun to degenerate, this *sūtra* on the most profound teaching of Buddhist wisdom (*prajñā*) will be found in a land to the northeast, where it will greatly enhance the practice of Buddhism. How is it so? All the Buddhas, the Thus Come Ones, together cherish this land and regard it as important; together they concentrate on



protecting it. They ensure that Buddhist teaching will always endure in that land and will not perish.

The passage is from Hsüan-tsang's translation, T 6:539a29–b6.

46. This is clear from Eisai's comments in section 3 (Yanagida, ed., p. 102a; trans., p. 19).

47. In this context, Eisai cites (at the beginning of section 2: "Protecting the Country [with the Teachings of the Zen School]") a passage from the *Ninnō kyō*: "The Buddha has entrusted the Buddhist teaching on wisdom [i.e., the teaching of the Zen School] to all present and future rulers of petty kingdoms; it is considered the treasure for protecting their countries" Yanagida, ed., p. 100b; trans., p. 13. The *Ninnō kyō* passage is found in T 8:832b22–25.

48. Yanagida, ed., p. 100a–b; trans., p. 12 (T 8:833b29–3c). A prominent reflection of the declining political situation at the end of the Heian era that speaks directly to the passage cited here is the incident involving the Tendai Abbot Meiun recorded in *Heike monogatari*. In response to the role played by Tendai warrior-monks in the burning of the imperial palace, retired emperor Go-Shirakawa revoked the status and privileges held by Meiun, imprisoning him and sending him into exile. The incident involves both excesses on the part of the Buddhist clergy (indicating their moral depravity) and illicit behavior on the part of the government toward Buddhist monks (indicating disrespect for Buddhist law). This is but one of many examples from this period typifying the breach of trust between the government and the Buddhist establishment (see Helen Craig McCullough, trans., *The Tale of Heike* [Palo Alto, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1988], pp. 54ff).

49. Yanagida, ed., p. 100b; trans., p. 13 (T 8:689a11–14).

50. Yanagida, ed., pp. 117b–119a; trans., pp. 80–86.

51. Regarding the development of Ch'an monastic codes in China, see T. Griffith Foulk, "The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1987); and Yifa, *The Origins of Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan qinggui* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002).

52. Two emphases of Eisai in this regard are "Receiving the Precepts [ordination]" (*jukai*) and "Guarding [or upholding] the Precepts" (*gokai*), which directly parallel the first two topics treated in the *Ch'an-yuan ch'ing-kuei*.

53. Following Yanagida's reading, trans., p. 81 note on *kōjō*.

54. Reading *hō* "treasure" for *hō* "law," as suggested by Yanagida, trans., p. 82.

55. Yanagida, ed., p. 118a; trans., p. 82.

56. A critique of the place Pai-chang's rules have traditionally been accorded in the Zen tradition is in Foulk, "The 'Ch'an School' and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition."

57. T 8, no. 223.

58. See above and notes 13, 14, and 15.

59. Accompanying these aims are the propagation of Buddhist teaching, benefiting sentient beings, and repaying the kindness of donors.

60. T. Griffith Foulk, "The Ch'an Tsung in Medieval China: School, Lineage, or What?" *The Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies* 8 (1992): 18–31.

61. Some may argue that Lin-chi orthodoxy in the Sung context was predomi-

nant, and there is no disputing the sway it held, exhibited in the numerous Ch'an works edited and promoted by members of the Lin-chi lineage during this period. Yet it is instructive that transmitters of Zen to Japan such as Eisai and Dōgen brought back an understanding that defies Lin-chi Ch'an orthodoxy. The process of planting Zen in Japan was, of course, filled with complexities attributable to the Japanese Buddhist context, and it is not clear the extent to which these exigencies determined the type of Zen interpretation proffered. Some facets of these complexities will be introduced later in the chapter.

62. Philip Yamolsky, trans., *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 155–156.

63. Ruth F. Sasaki, trans., *The Record of Lin-chi* (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 33.

64. Sasaki, *The Record of Lin-chi*, p. 45.

65. The Wu-yüeh kingdom was the most successful of the de facto independent regimes that flourished in China, especially in the south, with the demise of T'ang authority. The hallmark of Wu-yueh culture was its support for Buddhism. See Hatanaka Jōen, "Goetsu no bukkyō—toku ni tendai tokushō to sono shi eimei enju ni tsuite," *Otani daigaku kenkyū nenpō* 7 (1954): 305–365.

66. Abe Chōichi, *Chūgoku zenshūshi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kenbun shuppan, rpt., 1986), pp. 123–210.

67. T 51, no. 2076.

68. T 48, no. 2016, and T 48, no. 2017.

69. T 50, no. 2061; and T 54, no. 2126.

70. The fact that Eisai's interpretation of Zen is closely tied to Wu-yüeh is also reflected in the importance that Buddhist centers in Wu-yüeh played during Eisai's pilgrimages to China, a point considered in more detail later.

71. Jan Yun-hua, "Buddhist Historiography in Sung China," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgandlischen Gesellschaft* 64 (1964): 360–381, and Ishii Shūdō, *Sodai zenshūshi no kenkyū*, ch. 1, "Keitoku dentōroku no rekishiteki seikaku" (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1987): 1–122.

72. The ten categories for attaining eminence in the *Sung kao-seng chuan* are: Translators (*i-ching*), Exegetes (*i-chieh*), Ch'an Practitioners (*hsi-Ch'an*), Vinaya Experts (*ming-lu*), Dharma Protectors (*hu-fa*), Miracle Workers (*kan-t'ung*), Self-Immolators (*i-shen*), Cantors (*tu-ching*), Promoters of Blessings (*hsing-fu*), and Various Categories of Invokers of Virtue (*tsa-k'o sheng-te*). These categories are the same as the ones used in the *Hsü kao-seng chuan* (T 50, no. 2060) and vary only somewhat with those used in the *Kao-seng chuan* (T 50, no. 2059).

73. Although the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* records the biographies of Ch'an masters beginning with the seven Buddhas of the past and including each of the "Five Houses" of Ch'an, it culminates with the lineage of the Fa-yen faction: the biographies of Fa-yen Wen-i, T'ien-t'ai Te-shao, Yung-ming Yen-shou, and their respective disciples (see chs. 24–26).

In theory, the different criteria for assessing a monk's essential worth could (and usually did) exist side-by-side without tension. Most of the famous monks of the Ch'an tradition who were awarded eminence were recognized as "Ch'an Practitioners" (*hsi-Ch'an*) in the *Sung kao-seng chuan*, so the two sets of criteria were by no

means mutually exclusive. In practice, however, there was also room for fundamental disagreement. This is apparent in two ways: in the exclusion of prominent Ch'an masters from any category of eminence, and in the inclusion of Ch'an masters in categories of eminence other than "Ch'an Practitioners." In the T'ang, where Ch'an was but one part of a multifactional Buddhist world, such discrepancies would have been inconsequential. As the situation changed after the T'ang and Ch'an came to assert its dominance over Sung Buddhism, such discrepancies became increasingly intolerable.

Two prominent examples are Yün-men Wen-yuan (864–949) and Yung-ming Yen-shou (904–975). Yün-men, the founder of one of the "Five Houses" of Ch'an, is not mentioned in the *Sung kao-seng chuan*. Yen-shou's biography was recorded in both the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* and the *Sung kao-seng chuan*, but in ways that are not consistent. In the former, Yen-shou is regarded as a Ch'an patriarch in the lineage of the Fa-yen faction, but in the latter his biography was included under the category of "Promoters of Blessings" (*hsing-fu*). Yen-shou was well known to both Tao-yüan and Tsan-ning, so that neither was ignorant of the circumstances surrounding his career. The disagreement exhibited in the case of Yen-shou reflected an underlying tension between the sectarian-based definition of Ch'an adopted by the Ch'an school and the nonsectarian approach adopted by Tsan-ning. This later prompted Hui-hung to openly criticize Tsan-ning in the *Lin-chien lu*: "Tsan-ning compiled the extensive *Sung kao-seng chuan*, utilizing ten categories for the purpose of classification. He placed Exegetes at the top [of the list]. This is laughable. Moreover, he presented Ch'an master Yen-tou Huo as a Practitioner of Asceticism and Ch'an master Chih-chueh [J. Yen-shou] as a Promoter of Blessings. The great teacher Yün-men is chief among monks . . . but surprisingly, [Tsan-ning] does not even mention him" (Taipei ed. of *Zoku zōkyō*; HTC 148:294b).

74. Yanagida, ed., pp. 110a–112a; trans., pp. 50–56.

75. See Yampolsky, *The Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch*: 9, and pp. 47–49. The *Pao-lin chuan* is contained in Yanagida Seizan, ed., *Sōzō ichin Horinden, Dentō gyokuei shū* (Kyoto: Chūbon shuppansha, 1975).

76. T 51, no. 2076:204a–216b, chs. 1–2; T 48, no. 2016:937c–939c ch. 97.

77. On this, see Bernard Faure, "The Daruma-shū, Dōgen and Sōtō Zen," *Monumenta Nipponica* 42/1 (1987): 25–55.

78. Nishi Giyu and Fujimoto Chito, trans., *Honchō kōsōden; Kokuyaku issaikyō*, vol. 89 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1961), pp. 272–273, cited from Philip Yampolsky, "The Development of Japanese Zen," in Kenneth Kraft, ed., *Zen: Tradition and Transition* (New York: Grove Press, 1988), p. 142.

79. Yanagida, ed., p. 112a; trans., p. 56.

80. Faure, "The Daruma-shū, Dōgen and Sōtō Zen," pp. 56–57.

81. See Yanagida, ed., pp. 104b–105a and 108b; trans., pp. 29–30 and 43.

82. T 54:254c14–15.

83. This is most evident in section 56 of the *Seng shih-lüeh* (T 54:253c21–254a21), "Leading the Imperial Carriage with [Jen-wang ching Scripture] Desks" (*chia-t'ou ch'uang-tzu*), but it is also evident in section 39 (p. 247b7–c13), "Buddhist Chapels in the Imperial Palace" (*nei tao-Ch'ang*), and section 57 (p. 254a22–b16), "[Placing] Guardian Deities over the Main Gates of City Walls" (*ch'eng-tu t'ien-wang*).

84. See Tsan-ning's comments regarding *Ch'an* in the *hsi-Ch'an* commentary to the *Sung kao-seng chuan*, ch. 13 (T 50:789b11–790a21), the *Ch'uan Ch'an-kuan fa* and *Pieh-li Ch'an-chu* sections of the *Seng shih-lüeh* (T 54:240a21–b5). The discussion here is based on the author's study, "Zanning and Chan: The Changing Nature of Buddhism in Early Song China," *Journal of Chinese Religions* 23 (1995): 105–140.

85. Eisai cites the *Isshin kai* (T 74:645c18–19) to claim, "In the Chen Dynasty, Ch'an master Nan-yüeh Hui-ssu met the great master Bodhidharma and received instruction from him." He also cites a postscript to *Chih-i*'s *Kuan-hsin lun* (T 46, no. 1920; postscript no longer extant): "The great master of Shao-lin Temple on Mount Sung [i.e., Bodhidharma] transmitted Ch'an teaching to Ch'an master Hui-ssu. The Ch'an master Hui-ssu transmitted this Ch'an teaching to T'ien-t'ai Ch'an master Chih-i."

86. The remainder of Eisai's discussion in section 4 of the *Kōzen gokokuron* affirms historical links between Chinese Ch'an and Japanese Tendai masters, the most important being the claim that Dengyō Daishi (i.e., Saichō) was inducted into the Niu-t'ou (J. Gozu) Ch'an lineage. These links further support Eisai's attempt to join the Zen and Tendai traditions on the basis of supposed connections between masters of both schools. The culminating point in Eisai's discussion is the validation of Sung Ch'an practice as the legitimate form of *Ch'an* practiced by virtuous masters of old. The blueprint for this practice, according to Eisai, is the Sung Ch'an monastic code, the *Ch'an-yüanü ch'ing-kuei* (*Zen'en shingi*). This code, as we have seen, played an important role in Eisai's reform plan. The subject of monastic discipline will be treated in more detail later.

87. *Hsü-tsang ching*, vol. III:438–471; see also Kagamishima Genryū et al., eds., *Yakuch zen'en shingi* (Tokyo: Sōtōshū shūmuchō, 1972).

88. Yanagida, ed., p. 110a; trans., p. 50.

89. According to the T'ien-t'ai school, the Buddha's teaching may be divided into five periods: *Hua-yen* (after the scripture most highly regarded in the Hua-yen school), *A-han* (early Buddhist scriptures), *Fang-teng* (elementary Mahayāna), *Ta p'an-jo* (perfection of wisdom), and *Fa-hua nieh-p'an* (after the scriptures most highly regarded in the T'ien-t'ai school).

90. See Reihō Masunaga, trans., *A Primer of Sōtō Zen*, pp. 13–14. (Dōgen refers to Yen-shou by his honorific name, Chih-hsueh.)

91. See Ishii Shūdō, *Dōgen Zen no seiritsu shiteki kenkyū* (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan-sha, 1991), p. 692.

92. Yanagida, ed., p. 107b; trans., pp. 39–40.

93. Yanagida, ed., p. 108a–b; trans., pp. 41–43.

94. Yanagida, ed., p. 113a; trans., p. 62.

95. T 48, no. 2017. I focus on this work because of my familiarity with it and the manageability of its size. Comments here are based on my study, *The Meaning of Myriad Good Deeds: A Study of Yung-ming Yen-shou and the Wan-shan t'ung-kuei chi* (New York: Peter Lang, 1993).

96. Self-immolation (either *wang-shen* or *i-shen*) is a criterion for inclusion as an "eminent monk" in the *Sung kao-seng chuan* tradition of Buddhist biography.

97. T 48: 417a22–25.

98. See section 7, "An Outline of the Principal Methods for Practicing Zen":

This method [i.e., encouraging the practice of Zen through conventional Buddhist teaching] is that of the *Tsung-ching lu*, in which the important teachings of the three schools [T'ien-t'ai, Hua-yen, and Fa-hsiang] have been collected by citing from sixty scriptures, and the main teachings of the Zen school have been explained by referring to the comments of over three hundred masters. (Yanagida, ed., p. 113a; trans., p. 62)

99. In this regard, note Eisai's comments in the preface of the *Kōzen gokokuron*:

[T]here are those who malign Zen teaching, calling it "the Zen of obscure realization," and those who harbor doubts about it, calling it "the false view of emptiness." Still others claim that it is ill suited to this degenerate age, or that it is not what our country needs . . . These people, while ostensibly upholding the Buddhist Law, are actually destroying the treasure that this Law contains. They reject my position outright, without knowing what I have in mind. Not only are they blocking the entryway to Zen teaching, they are also ruining the work of our great forbear at Mount Hiei, the Tendai master Saichō. It is sad and distressing that my position be so dismissed before ascertaining whether it is correct or not. (Yanagida, ed., p. 99b; trans., p. 9)

100. On this, also note Eisai's comments in the preface to the *Kōzen gokokuron*:

As a result, I have gathered here representative materials from the three branches of Buddhist learning [scriptures, monastic rules, and treatises] to inform those of our age with penetrating minds about Zen teaching, and to record the essential teachings of the one true school of Buddhism for posterity. (ibid.)

101. Ishii Shūdō, *Dōgen Zen no seiritsu shiteki kenkyū* (Daizō shuppan, Shohan edition, 1991), pp. 649ff.

102. Ishii Shūdō, *Dōgen Zen no seiritsu shiteki kenkyū*., pp. 689–693.

103. Appended to the *Kōzen gokokuron*, see Yanagida, ed., p. 122a.

104. Yanagida, op. cit., pp. 470–471.; cited in Ishii, *Dōgen Zen*, p. 689. Eisai's rejection of Kakua and Nōnin follows implicitly from the suggestion that he attributes to Fo-hai (1103–1176) and Fo-chao (1121–1203), Sung Ch'an masters from whom Kakua and Nōnin reputedly received the transmission, that Zen will flourish in Japan only fifty years henceforth. There is some question, however, regarding Eisai's authorship of the *Mirai ki*.

105. Yanagida, op. cit., p. 471; Ishii, *Dōgen Zen*, p. 690.

106. Ishii, *Dōgen Zen*, p. 331.

107. This is based on Eisai's direct criticism of the Daruma faction in section 3 of the *Kōzen gokokuron* (Yanagida, ed., p. 108a; trans., p. 41); the question is translated by Yampolsky, "The Development of Japanese Zen," in Kenneth Kraft, ed., *Zen: Tradition and Transition* (New York: Grove Press, 1988), p. 143:

Some people recklessly refer to the Daruma faction as the Zen school. But these [Daruma adherents] say, "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 we do not practice, do not follow precepts. We

eat when we are hungry, rest when we are tired. Why recite the Buddha's name, why make offerings, why give vegetarian feasts, why curtail eating?" How can this be?

108. Ishii, *Dōgen Zen*, p. 693.

109. The first documented appearance of the four slogans is in the *Tsu-t'ing shih-yüan* (HTC 113:66c), dated 1108.

110. Yanagida, ed., p. 113b; trans., p. 62.

111. Tsan-ning's acceptance of these verses as representative of the Ch'an school is apparent from his discussion in the *Sung kao-seng chuan* (T 50:789b24-c7). Here he concludes, "Bodhidharma was the first to proclaim, directly point to the human mind; see one's nature and become a Buddha; do not establish words and letters," the acceptance of which is implicit in Yen-shou's writings as well.

112. Yanagida, ed., pp. 113a-117b; trans., pp. 62-80.

113. Following Nakamura Hajime (*Bukkyōgo daijiten*: 1375b), the term is associated with T'ien-t'ai school works such as the *Fa-hua wen-chu* (T 34, no. 1718) and the *T'ien-t'ai ssu-chiao i* (T 46, no. 1931). Does this indicate a tendency on Eisai's part to interpret Yen-shou in terms of T'ien-t'ai *Ch'an* as opposed to the *Ch'an* of the Ch'an school?

114. This term appears frequently in works associated with the Hua-yen school (see Nakamura, 877c-d), but it may be more instructive in the case of Eisai and his interpretation of Zen in terms of *prajñā*-teaching to think of it in reference to its appearance in Nagarajuna's *Chung-lun* (T 30:19b27) and *Ta chih-tu lun* (T 25, no. 1509). In the latter (ch. 31), it is stipulated as one of the aspects that characterize all created existence, namely that all things are impermanent (C. *wu-Ch'ang*; J. *mujō*) and are devoid of substantial identifying qualities (C. *wu-wo*; J. *muga*). This is most immediately contrasted with the individuating features that also characterize all created existence, exemplified by "firmness" in the case of earth and "wetness" in the case of water. Moreover, the *Ta chih-tu lun* is quoted directly later on in section 7 of the *Kōzen gokokuron*, according to the great sage Nagarjuna: "Existence also is nonexistent. Nonexistence is also existent. Both existence and nonexistence are nonexistent. Neither existence nor nonexistence are nonexistent. Statements such as this are also nonexistent." And also: "To be free of idle talk; to be free of words and letters—if one is able to contemplate in this manner, this is what is meant as seeing the Buddha."

115. Based on the *Ch'ü-hsin lun* (T 32:576a11-12). Remember that for Eisai, the reputed author, Ma-ming (Skt. Āsvaghoṣa), was a Zen patriarch.

116. Based on the *Chin-kang p'an-jo ching* (Diamond *Sūtra*); T 8:751c27-28.

117. Based on the *Chin-kang p'an-jo ching* (Diamond *Sūtra*); T 8:751c27-28.

118. Yanagida, ed., p. 113a-b; trans., pp. 62-63.

119. See *The Meaning of Myriad Good Deeds*, ch. 5, section 3 (pp. 121-127), "Major Influences: Sources Cited or Referred to in the *WSTKC*." The total number of references to T'ien-t'ai, Hua-yen, and *Prajñāpāramitā* sources are 87, 66, and 48, respectively.

120. These tabulations are based on figures provided by Takagi Yutaka, *Kamakura bukkyōshi kenkyū*, pp. 78-80. By my accounting, 63 citations are associated with the Tendai tradition, 39 with the *Prajñā* tradition, and 21 with the *Vinaya* tradition. Eleven sources relate to Mikkyō, and only 2 to Kegon (C. Hua-yen).

121. HTC III:460c-461a.

122. Yanagida, ed., p. 114a-b; trans., pp. 65-67.

123. Yanagida, ed., p. 114b; trans., p. 68.

124. Cited in Ishii, *Dōgen Zen*, p. 708.

125. Cited in Ishii, *Dōgen Zen*, p. 709.

126. Yen-shou's affinity with T'ien-t'ai tradition, described earlier, is beyond dispute. T'ien-t'ai teaching and practice were major components of his syncretism. His affinity to Mi-chiao (J. Mikkyō), however, is problematic. There is little evidence that it constituted a major source of his teaching, in terms of either doctrines mentioned or sources cited. Esoteric practices, however, do figure prominently in the *Tzu-hsing lu* (HTC III:77-84), a work purporting to list the 108 activities that constituted Yen-shou's regular routine.

127. In this regard, one strong influence on Eisai from the post-Yen-shou Sung tradition that can be affirmed with certainty is the model of Buddhist monastic practice provided in the *Ch'an-yuan ch'ing-kuei* (*Zen'en shingi*). Yen-shou is also associated with a model for Buddhist practice, namely the 108 activities in the *Tzu-hsing lu*, a record of the practices that Yen-shou is said to have regularly engaged in. The *Tzu-hsing lu* was undoubtedly inspirational to the individual practitioner but offered little guidance for organizing Buddhist practices at an institutional level. The *Ch'an-yuan ch'ing-kuei*, in contrast, provided a concrete plan for the institutional function of Buddhism that played an important part in substantiating Eisai's reform program.

128. The comments of Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History*, vol. II (New York: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 310-311, regarding D. T. Suzuki are well worth citing here:

In D. T. Suzuki's efforts to make Zen known in the west, the principal bearers of his new message were, historically speaking, the Chinese patriarchs and masters of the T'ang period. Readers of his early English works were introduced to Hui-neng and the circles of Ma-tsu, Shih-t'ou, and Pai-Ch'ang up to Huang-po and Lin-chi. Suzuki's pioneering on behalf of Japanese Zen is not as well known. Yet even before World War II, his Japanese writings were drawing attention to the extraordinary creativity of Bankei. . . . In the introduction to his English translation of Bankei's sermons, Norman Waddell observes that Suzuki's studies "revealed for the first time in concrete terms the true significance of Bankei's Zen and its high place in the history of Zen thought". Waddell quotes a lengthy passage from Suzuki's Japanese writings that culminates in the recognition that "slightly before Hakuin's time was Bankei, whose 'Unborn Zen' advocated a new and original thought for the first time since Bodhidharma." To be sure, the place that Bankei holds in the history of Zen is an eminent one.

Recall also that D. T. Suzuki was a disciple of Shaku Soen, a Rinzai master of the Hakuin line.

129. Bernard Faure, *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, rpt., 1994), p. 21, seems to contradict this with his statement: "In Japan, . . . Zen tried to present itself as an ideological instrument that could serve the interests of the country. Although scholars

usually look toward the Kamakura figure Eisai (1141–1215) as an example of this development . . . , the work of the Tokugawa Zen master Suzuki Shōsan (1579–1655) is more significant in this respect,” but there is no contradiction in fact. Shōsan’s attempt to reestablish the political and ethical role of Zen in the early Tokugawa was made in a changing ideological environment. Regardless of who is deemed most significant, the works of both Eisai and Shōzan are equally examples of “Zen [trying] to present itself as an ideological instrument that could serve the interests of the country,” but in different historical contexts.

130. Yen-shou’s influence was restricted in the later Chinese Buddhist tradition to a more narrowly conceived Ch’an-Pure Land synthesis, a view still held in modern scholarship. On the inadequacy of this view, see my study on Yen-shou and the *Wan-shan t’ung-kuei chi*, cited previously. Generally speaking, the nature of Yen-shou’s influence over East Asian Buddhism needs to be more carefully addressed.

131. Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History*, p. 24.

132. Regarding Korean Sōn, see Robert E. Buswell, *Tracing Back the Radiance: Chinul’s Way of Korean Zen* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), and *The Zen Monastic Experience: Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Korea* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992). Regarding Vietnamese Thin, see Cuong Tu Nguyen, “Tran Thai Tong and the *Khoa Hu Luc* [Instructions on Emptiness]: A Model of Syncretic Ch’an in 13th-Century Vietnam,” paper presented at the conference “Medieval Chan/Zen in Cross-Cultural Perspective,” Hsi Lai Temple, Los Angeles (1992).

133. Yanagida, ed., p. 106b; trans., p. 36; cited from the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* (T 46: 4b) via the *Tsung-ching lu* (T 48: 433b).

134. Yanagida, ed., p. 120b; trans., p. 92; based on the *Shih-teng kung-te ching* (T 16:803c23–804a3).