

THE JOURNAL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Roger Jackson
Dept. of Religion
Carleton College
Northfield, MN 55057

EDITORS

Peter N. Gregory
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA

Alexander W. Macdonald
Université de Paris X
Nanterre, France

Steven Collins
Concordia University
Montréal, Canada

Ernst Steinkellner
University of Vienna
Wien, Austria

Jikidō Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Robert Thurman
Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA

Volume 12

1989

Number 1

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. Hodgson's Blind Alley? On the So-called Schools of Nepalese Buddhism *by David N. Gellner* 7
2. Truth, Contradiction and Harmony in Medieval Japan: Emperor Hanazono (1297–1348) and Buddhism *by Andrew Goble* 21
3. The Categories of *T'i*, *Hsiang*, and *Yung*: Evidence that Paramārtha Composed the *Awakening of Faith* *by William H. Grosnick* 65
4. Asaṅga's Understanding of Mādhyamika: Notes on the *Shung-chung-lun* *by John P. Keenan* 93
5. Mahāyāna *Vratas* in Newar Buddhism *by Todd L. Lewis* 109
6. The Kathāvatthu Niyāma Debates *by James P. McDermott* 139

II. SHORT PAPERS

1. A Verse from the *Bhadracarīprañidhāna* in a 10th Century Inscription found at Nālandā *by Gregory Schopen* 149
2. A Note on the Opening Formula of Buddhist *Sūtras* *by Jonathan A. Silk* 158

III. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Die Frau im frühen Buddhismus*, by Renata Pitzer-Reyl (Vijitha Rajapakse) 165

2. *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy* by Lambert Schmithausen
(Paul J. Griffiths) 170

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 178

Truth, Contradiction and Harmony in Medieval Japan: Emperor Hanazono (1297–1348) and Buddhism

by *Andrew Goble*

I. Introduction

The thirteenth century witnessed an explosion of Buddhist thought that articulated two quite distinct philosophical approaches. One, represented by the two schools of Zen (Rinzai and Soto), stressed self-discipline and the quest for enlightenment; the other, represented by various popular sects (Pure Land, True Pure Land, Lotus Sect, *Ji* or Timely) articulated the philosophy of salvation through external grace.¹ Both of these developments represented a move outside of the framework within which the traditional schools, with their enormous sacral and secular influence, had contained these philosophies as subsidiary currents within their own teaching traditions. Nonetheless, the “older Buddhism” (as it is often referred to), particularly that of the Tendai school centered at Enryakuji on Mt. Hiei, actually weathered the assault rather well. True, Enryakuji’s defense of its position was sometimes conducted in the basest secular terms (the desecration of Hōnen’s tomb and the attempt to dismember the body and throw the pieces into the Kamo River being perhaps the most graphic example); but the temple complex as a center of theory managed to maintain its overall eclecticism and continued to exercise a strong influence as a viable and integral part of the philosophical world. In other words, Kamakura Buddhism was not monopolized by the newer schools which have traditionally drawn the attention of western scholars.²

The philosophical world of medieval Japan (here the 12th

through 16th centuries, though other periodizations are possible) was a rich and multifaceted one. In the political and ethical realms Chinese thought continued to exercise an extremely strong influence; “native” Shinto thought experienced a strong resurgence; numerous streams of Buddhism (as noted) were in full flow; and in addition there were several widely acknowledged “cultural” concepts—*mappō*, the age of degeneration; *mujō*, the idea of impermanence; and *michi*, the idea and practice of following a particular path through which is revealed universal truths and understanding—which could easily take on lives of their own (this is particularly evident in literature). It is possible, for heuristic purposes, to regard each element on its own, but it is evident that, even should we come across dissonance and contradiction among any of these, they were regarded by medieval Japanese as coexisting without inherent contradiction since it was generally assumed that each represented an equally valid approach to the truths of the world which could be apprehended by humans in their relativity.

While the subtle interweaving of all of these elements in the medieval mind provides immense intellectual fascination, there still remains the question of just how people would apprehend and incorporate a plethora of alternatives. The Buddhist world provided a multiplicity of choice; but how would one respond to this when seeking to discover the essence of Buddha’s teaching and how would one apply these to one’s own beliefs? In contrast to this observation, we might also note that for most people this may not have been an intellectually demanding problem: those outside of the educated elite were essentially unaware of the varying subtleties of doctrine; the aristocracy combined, according to ability and preference, a mixture of ceremony, esoteric ritual, study, and Amidist faith with some facility in order to confront existential religious matters; and it is certainly evident that many clerics, even if they studied widely, did not advance their comprehension of doctrine too far beyond the parameters of the teaching tradition in which they were trained, a state of affairs not enhanced with the emergence of the new schools which, given the strong tradition of factionalism and restriction on the dissemination of knowledge which characterized Japanese intellectual life, served to restrict communication and discussion even further.

On the other hand, it is evident that the majority of the seminal religious figures of the 13th and 14th centuries (Hōnen, Shinran, Nichiren, Dōgen, Muso Soseki, to name a few) had all received extensive textual training—importantly, in the Tendai tradition—from which they had been moved to pursue or emphasize specific elements of the wider corpus in response to what they separately defined as the major religious and philosophical concerns of their age. However, while the writings of these figures may be studied in an effort to understand the development of their thought, the crises or turning points in their growth, there are very few sources available to help us understand how educated individuals incorporated, rejected or modified the religious and philosophical heritage to which they were heir. This is unfortunate since, among other things, it prevents a full understanding of the actual manner in which Buddhist thought came, through individual minds, to exercise its undisputed and enormous influence on medieval Japan. It is possible to recreate these influences through an examination of extant materials, and some recent original and creative work in this area has provided some idea of both the “finger” and the “moon”.³ What I propose to do in this paper is to take some preliminary steps in a complementary area; that is, examine the response to Buddhism—how it came to be studied, what texts were engaged, what was understood from those texts, and what were some resulting intellectual acquisitions—of an articulate intellectual with a deep philosophical interest who is not regarded as a thinker *per se*, but whose activities left an enduring legacy on medieval culture, emperor Hanazono (1297–1348).

II. Hanazono and His Quest

Hanazono's life spanned a period of momentous intellectual, political and social changes which in many areas served as the catalyst for the high point of the medieval age.⁴ He acceded to the Imperial rank in 1308, and remained emperor until 1318 when he was forced to “transfer sovereignty” because of a major succession dispute then wracking the Imperial family. In the last three decades of his life he played a major role in the cultural and literary spheres as he sought answers to pressing existential

and ethical questions. His contributions in these areas were seminal. He was one of the few literary figures of the fourteenth century to react to social changes and seek to produce a new poetic form that would encompass those changes, and thereby attempt to retain for the aristocracy its leadership in the cultural realm; his active patronage of one stream of Rinzai Zen Buddhism, the Otōkan school, played a major role in its early growth, and thus contributed to its later emergence as the leading Rinzai school; and it is to Hanazono that we owe the articulation of what has come to be seen as the prevailing concept of medieval sovereignty.⁵ Hanazono, unlike other medieval figures whose contributions to the period can be more readily identified, did not produce (as far as we are aware) a corpus of literary or religious writings, or something that could be regarded as a seminal work. However, he was a talented, well-connected and prolific poet; as we know, this was an area of endeavor in medieval Japan in which the literary and the religious were inextricably bound.⁶ He has also left us a fascinating diary (1311–1332),⁷ a text that is one of the most complete sources available for the study of the philosophical and psychological development of an individual prior to the 16th century. It is also one of the prime cultural and historical documents of the entire medieval age.

Hanazono's status as emperor (and ex-emperor) enabled him to establish contact with almost all traditions, schools of thought, and with a wide variety of masters, teachers and mentors that was probably without parallel. The assumptions underlying the acquisition and transmission of knowledge—that it ought to be secret, restricted and restrictive, and place stress upon hereditary prerogatives to that knowledge—meant that most people could become directly familiar with only parts of their cultural heritage. By contrast, Hanazono was one of the few medieval Japanese with virtually unrestricted access, should he choose to exercise that prerogative, to almost the entire corpus of knowledge that comprised his intellectual heritage. Hanazono took full advantage of this opportunity. In seeking, in essence, a key to understand himself and the world that would provide him with a sure guide as he passed through life, Hanazono read extensively (over 100 separate works) in Japanese and Chinese historical and literary texts and in Chinese

and Buddhist philosophical works. He pursued more than one area at a time, and was thus simultaneously and constantly subject to a variety of information, traditions and interpretations. I have gone into aspects of this elsewhere,⁸ but it ought to be borne in mind that Buddhism was not the only path he took in order to discover eternally valid truths. Nevertheless, Buddhism was never anything but central to his quest.

More than 40 of the over 100 identifiable works that were read by Hanazono were Buddhist ones.⁹ To name just a few, he perused the *Dainichi kyō* (*Great Sun Sūtra*), the *Hoke kyō* (*The Lotus Sūtra*), the *Saishō kyō* (*Sūtra of the Golden Light*), the *Shin kyō* (*Heart Sūtra*), the works of Kūkai, Chih-i's *Mo-ho-chih-kuan/ Maka shikan* (*Great Calming and Contemplation*), the *Hekiganroku* (*Blue Cliff Record*), the *Chiatai Puteng lu* (*Chiatai Record of the Universal Lamps*), the *Shōsan Jōdō kyō* (*Sūtra in Praise of the Pure Land*), the *Amida kyō* (*Amitābha Sutra*), Hōnen's *Senjaku [hongan nembutsu] shū* (*Collection of Passages [on the Original Vow of Amida]*), and works on Sanskrit and Chinese Buddhist terminology. This is not an unimpressive list. The inclusion of both the classics of Japanese Buddhism and more recent, even contemporary, works suggest that his study was dynamic rather than arcane. But as will become evident, not all of the texts which he read were to exert an equal influence on him. Up to a point of course this is what we would expect when considering the general process of individual intellectual development. In addition to this, however, in Hanazono's case there is an extra point to consider; namely, the fact that as a member of the Imperial family it was incumbent upon him to become normatively familiar with certain basic texts, and the cumulative, unconsciously reinforcing, influence exerted by such writings needs to be balanced by the more conscious influence that derived from texts that Hanazono chose to study for his own personal edification and enlightenment. In short, there were disparate purposes behind Hanazono's study. This also meant that Hanazono pursued several intellectual streams at one and the same time, an ongoing dialogue in which he was constant re-evaluating his understanding and his progress. As valuable and natural as this was to Hanazono, we will pursue his encounter with Buddhism from a more heuristic perspective.

III. The Early Period

Hanazono began formal study of Buddhism in 1313, at the age of 16, when he received instruction in Shingon doctrine and on *sūtras* such as the *Jizō hongan kyō* (*The Sūtra of the Original Vow of Kṣitigarbha*).¹⁰ It is also from this period that Hanazono initiated the daily practices for amassing merit that he was to pursue diligently for the rest of his life. Every morning (except when he was sick) he would, before eating any fish (that is, animal flesh), perform his devotions, which consisted of reading *sūtras* and engaging in chanting and the recitation of mantras; and when he inadvertently ate fish he would abstain from reading the *sūtras*.¹¹ For the first decade or so he skip-read (*tendoku*) the *Lotus Sūtra* and the *Saishōkyō*, and then in the third month of 1322 he transferred his attention to the *Vimalakīrti* (*Yuima*) and *Laṅkāvatāra* (*Ryōga*) *sūtras* because, as he noted, he wanted to try and read the entire corpus (*issaikyō*) of Buddhism.¹² In addition to these specific practices, throughout his life Hanazono participated in the religious observances and events that were a customary part of the ceremonial life of the Imperial sphere, such as readings and lectures on specified *sūtras* (notably the *Saishōkyō*), lectures on various aspects of the Law, debates between representatives of different schools, and expositions by members of particular schools.¹³ While it is not clear precisely what Hanazono (or anyone else for that matter) may have incorporated through this process, his occasional record of the questions addressed gives us some idea of his concerns. Accordingly, we can at the minimum assume that points of doctrine were in this way made familiar to him, as would have been the belief that Buddhism was integral to the continuing existence of both the polity and the nation.

Through 1318 Hanazono's contact with Buddhism followed this standard path: no exceptional training, no particular inkling of a desire to inquire more deeply into underlying doctrine, and no recorded contact with the leading figures of the religious world. Hanazono was, after all, quite young, and as Emperor had his days filled with the demands of protocol and ceremony that usually so exhausted sovereigns that they were only too glad to abdicate and enter into a fulfilling retirement. Indeed, as with most young emperors, Hanazono was rarely, if ever,

consulted on decisions that directly affected his life. Normally this was not of major import. However, Hanazono lived in turbulent times, and his period in the Imperial rank was beset with entanglements and dissension—within Hanazono's Jimyō-in branch of the Imperial family, between that branch and the Daikakuji branch of Go-Uda and Go-Daigo, between both branches and the hereditary nobility, and between the Court and the Kamakura *bakufu*—that went far beyond the range of normal political competition, and were ultimately to prove epochal. It cannot have been a particularly enjoyable period for the sensitive and retiring Hanazono, and the train of events which culminated in his forced abdication in 1318 were, despite his efforts to convince himself otherwise, clearly quite traumatic.¹⁴ His diary and some of his poetry immediately thereafter indicate that he was beset by a pronounced mood of pessimism in the depths of which he sought desperately to define his own existence. Some measure of his mood may be gained from the following entry from his diary.¹⁵

Last night my beri-beri broke out once again and today it became increasingly worse . . . Even though I have been taking treatment for the past two or three years, I have not yet noticed that it has been doing any good. For many years I have been afflicted by illness; certainly there is much illness in my body. By nature I am retiring. Though from when I was a young child I have much desired to retire from the world I have not yet been able to accomplish that which is pent up in my breast. What could compare to this for the depth of disappointment? My vitality is exceedingly weak. Since I think that this body will have but a short life, in my heart I think that I will study the *Dharma*, yet my actions and my heart are at odds . . . Nevertheless it would not do to suddenly flee the world. My grieving at the depth of my foolish nature knows no limit. Certainly with the floating existence of evanescence and transience, who lives as long as the pine or the camellia? Even a fish in insufficient water has this impressed upon its liver. Even though my desire to leave lay life deepens with the years, futilely I am drawn into the affairs of the world. Though feelings of shame and remorse arise of themselves, these feelings are not enough to accomplish this [goal]. If my faith was deep, how would worldly matters weary me? It is said that famous retirees from the world whose faith cannot be ground down are to be found in the morning markets. [But]

for someone stupid like myself my resolve is too shallow and pitiful. The dust of the world easily bothers me. Often, because I am ill, I consider fleeing the world, yet my resolve is not up to this. How saddening! The Buddhas and Heaven with their clear vision must wonder what it is that I want to do. The day ends and I have aimlessly accomplished nothing. I relate what is pent up in my heart.

Clearly, Hanazono was a troubled young man lacking much confidence in himself. However, the circumstances of his abdication and his new status as ex-emperor provided him with both the time and the predilection to delve into the broader questions of life. In view of Hanazono's state of mind it comes as no surprise perhaps that he would seek refuge in the teachings of the Buddha, and that he would be receptive to the possibility that his problems could be solved by something outside himself. Just after New Year of 1319 the gloom began to lift:¹⁶

Today at daybreak I had an auspicious dream that I shall achieve rebirth (*ôjô*) [in the Pure Land]. This is the most fundamental desire in my heart. On two occasions in previous years I have had this felicitous dream. And now I have had it yet again. But, does this mean that the time is near? My feelings of joy are without limit. From this day I shall in particular think of the future life (*gose*). This dream I dare not speak about with others, since my joy is so great.

As Hanazono notes, this was not the first time he had had intimations of such a favorable future.¹⁷ But why was it so significant? On one level educated Japanese subscribed to the Buddhist (and Chinese) notion that the distinction between "real" and "unreal" was an ambiguous one; that is, both were equally real (or unreal). Accordingly, dreams provided entirely valid guides to contact with the non-phenomenal world, and to the ordering of one's life. Dreams could provide the rationale or impetus for major changes in one's lifecourse, and indeed records of the dreams of major figures were considered to be quite profound texts.¹⁸ Thus, quite apart from his own particular state of mind, it was entirely natural for Hanazono to give this dream (and others we will encounter) credence. And the following day, having decided to study some "inner texts" (*naiten*), he started

reading one of the most important Amidist works, Genshin's *Ojyōshū* (*Essentials of Rebirth*).¹⁹

Over the course of the next nine months Hanazono acquainted himself with this text, possibly with others as well, and apparently discussed Amidist beliefs with representatives of that sect. As attractive as the promise of salvation must have been, Hanazono became quite disturbed by the broader implications of Amidist thought for the Japanese intellectual and cultural tradition: it was, he realized, unashamedly exclusive in its approach to truth. His reaction to this provides considerable insight; it also suggests that his basic attitude towards the diversity of Buddhist thought, and the importance of intellectual engagement of its doctrines, had been formed by this time:

The *nembutsu* sect which is currently popular is called the *Ikko senshū*. Solely they have abolished all other practices and their only one is the *nembutsu*. Even though the principle of reliance upon external salvation is certainly a most appropriate one, [they hold that] teachings and practices of the Greater and Smaller vehicles, their expedient and their secret teachings (*gonkyō mitsukyō*), their exoteric and the esoteric teachings, are all useless and should be discarded. How sad! How sad! For this reason I am desirous of restoring both sects of Tendai and Shingon. However, I have not yet been able to achieve the meditation practices of the five-fold meditation (*gosō*) or the three esoteric practices (*sanmitsu/tri-guhya*), nor have I yet developed the power for wisdom and concentration [necessary] to pursue the middle path of focused intellect (*shikan chūdō no chijō ryoku*). Consequently for the present I shall make the *nembutsu* my activity for salvation. Meeting with the Amida I shall carry out the depths of the Law. But I will not discard training and devotion entirely, and should I become able to contemplate undistractedly I shall discard the *nembutsu*.

Thus, while Amidism provided one answer to the problems of existence, it did so at the cost of doing violence to a much more fundamental belief, namely, that various teachings were equally valid manifestations of the Buddha's truths, and to reject this notion was, in effect, to invalidate Japan's entire intellectual heritage. Accordingly, Amidism could in this context only be regarded as a temporary spiritual and intellectual prop; and

Hanazono's decision, in broader terms, to limit the immediate possibility of his own salvation marked the first major turning point in his intellectual development. This is not to say that Hanazono rejected *nembutsu* entirely for, as might be expected from Hanazono's disposition to see value in any teaching or school of thought, he still considered *nembutsu* doctrine worthy of study. He also appears to have believed that there had to be something more to *nembutsu* than he had been led to understand, and he suspended judgement while he learned more about the underlying doctrine.

To this end he began instruction under the priest Nyokū, with whom he read Hōnen's *Senjakushū*, and whose learning he came to regard so highly that he felt that the sect might not weather his death successfully.²¹ Over the years he continued to attend lectures on Amidist texts such as the *Kammuryōjūkyō* (*Sūtra of Meditation on Amida Buddha*), and maintained an active interest in debates at court (some of which lasted two or three days) at which Amidist teaching was discussed in some depth by people who were fully versed in doctrine.²² (Parenthetically, one of the more interesting answers in one debate was that women who performed their devotions (*shūgyō*) would be reborn at the highest of the nine levels of the Pure Land.)²³ Hanazono meanwhile continued his Amidist studies under the tutelage of Hondō, who would explain both esoteric and exoteric aspects of Amidism, and on one occasion spent four consecutive days explaining Pure Land *mandala* to him.²⁴ As a result of this study, by mid-1322 Hanazono felt that he now had a good grasp of the full depth of *nembutsu* teaching. In a diary entry from the fifth month of that year Hanazono notes that *nembutsu* teaching is of significance, that in its profoundest teachings it was not all that different from the mainstream of Mahāyāna thought, and that the main problem was that it is understood not in its totality but in a "shallow and abbreviated form" by "base and stupid people."²⁵

Still, study of *nembutsu* appears not to have satisfied Hanazono's quest for an understanding of the truths of Buddhism. No doubt his earlier skepticism about the broader value of the teachings contributed to this; but in addition he had also in early 1319 determined to pursue instruction in the esoteric teachings of Shingon and Tendai.

IV. The Esoteric Path

Late in the first month of 1319 Hanazono received a visit from the priest Jigen, destined to become one of Hanazono's prime tutors over the years, who happened to have with him the *Shittanji ki*, a guide to the Sanskritic *Shittan* (*Siddham*) alphabet used in esoteric Buddhism. This marked the beginning of Hanazono's study of the esoteric, and one month later the two spent several days reading through the text while Jigen discoursed on the elements of Sanskrit. They then moved on to the *Inkyō*, a guide to the pronunciation of Chinese which had been brought to Japan only a century earlier.²⁶ Hanazono appears not to have studied Sanskrit *per se* at any stage but to have limited his inquiry to Sanskrit terminology that he encountered in the course of his study, and over the years Hanazono was to seek Jigen's advice, or be directed to additional relevant guides, on matters Sanskritic whenever he felt the need.²⁷ In this Hanazono was no different from any other student of Buddhism in Japan, since the texts used were those in Chinese translation. (I here except works, primarily in the Pure Land schools, written in Japan for a Japanese popular audience). Still, no serious student could afford not to recognize at least some Sanskrit.

However, Hanazono's interest in "restoring both schools of Tendai and Shingon" was one that he took quite seriously. To that end he felt it incumbent upon himself to become familiar with a wide range of writings. Thus we find Hanazono acquiring (courtesy of a priest from the Shingon headquarters of Mt. Kōya) a number of Kūkai's major writings, such as the *Hizō hōyaku ron* (*The Precious Key to the Secret Treasury*) and the *Sokushin jōbutsu gi* (*Attaining Enlightenment in This Very Existence*).²⁸ We also find him having occasional contact with priests who could explain to him the teachings of the Sanron sect,²⁹ which was somewhat unusual since this sect had died out as a major force in the philosophical world some 150 years earlier and had thereafter sought to preserve itself by advocating a melding of Sanron and Shingon teaching.³⁰ What Hanazono gained from these efforts is, unfortunately, not apparent, in part since they appear not to have been central to his endeavors. Of more import was his resolve to study Chih-i's *Maka shikan*, or *Great Calming and Contemplation*, the work most central to an understanding of

Tendai doctrine.³¹

Hanazono's decision in the fourth month of 1319 to study the *Maka shikan* received a very warm response from the aged Tendai priest Chūgen.³² Chūgen's death a short while later caused a slight interruption to the program, but by the end of the ninth month Hanazono had begun his study with Chūgen's disciple Chūsei. The first recorded meeting between the two involved (unspecified) major points of Tendai teachings and the principle of regarding the myriad *Dharma* with clear intellect. The meeting was a successful one for Hanazono, for Chūsei assured him that what he (Hanazono) regarded as the principle accorded fully with Chūgen's comment that "with respect to the fundamentals of the texts of the Law, firstly distance [yourself] from attachment, then practice the idea that phenomena are not real".³³ It was an auspicious start, and for the next three years Hanazono appears to have looked towards Chūsei, whom he regarded as the most talented of the younger generation of priests and whose expositions on the *Dharma* he considered marvelous, for support.³⁴

Yet Hanazono did not find it easy to work on the *Maka shikan*. Even though on occasion he would "without caring whether it is day or night" reflect on the *Dharma* and read the text, he was still unable to obtain permission from ex-emperor Go-Fushimi (1288–1336), his elder brother and head of the Jimyō-in branch of the Imperial family, to lead a life of retirement, making him pessimistic that he would ever get rid of the attachments to the vulgar world that were impeding his progress.³⁵ In this context it became all the more important to him that his teachers be able to give him satisfactory answers. Unfortunately, he started to find his confidence misplaced.

In the ninth month of 1322 Hanazono asked Chūsei to clarify some points that had been raised in recent debates. The answers were less than clear, which led Hanazono to feel that despite Chūsei's being a leading figure, and not someone who was untrained, he had now begun to neglect his training and that his heart was no longer seeking the path it ought. As Hanazono recorded the episode:³⁶

As for the middle contemplation (*chūkan*) [of the threefold contemplation, *sankan*] destroying fundamental ignorance, I

asked and said "The import of Tendai is that three minds equivalent to one (*isshin sankan*) is something which cannot be departed from for even one moment. But what of the term 'middle'?" Chūsei answered and said "From the beginning the import of true teaching (*jitsukyō*) [has been] three minds equivalent to one. But this question is something from distinct doctrine (*bekkyō*)." I thought about this later, and nonetheless as to destroying fundamental ignorance or not, on what can there be any doubts? I looked at this with the ability of true teaching, and this [answer] is already [as much as saying] there are teachings without people. If one holds that there are no people, how can one have the destruction of fundamental ignorance! This is quite dubious. At some later date [I] must dispel this misconception (*himō*) . . .

It should be noted that Chūsei's observation was perhaps an accurate one,³⁷ but Hanazono's dissatisfaction was equally valid since Chūsei did not answer his question. Hanazono's following question, about the merit of written vows, met with an "exceedingly shallow" answer, and left him with a feeling of considerable resentment; and even though he suggested that the unsatisfactoriness of the exchange may have been due to Chūsei's relying upon some secret text (*hitsuzō*), a rationale that Hanazono was to suggest on at least one other similar occasion,³⁸ he could not help but lament that this was the way Buddhism was in recent times. (In fact Hanazono felt this way about many fields of endeavor that he encountered).³⁹

Importantly, however, Hanazono did not believe that the problem lay with the texts, for the Law was itself efficacious (and had just prevented an eclipse of the moon). To Hanazono, the texts and the truth they contained were more enduring than the practitioners themselves, and accordingly even in a degenerate age such as the present, into which he had had the misfortune to be born,⁴⁰ one must believe in it. In fact the *Maka shikan* gave him some comfort in this regard: "The thoughts to which it gives rise are truly wonderful. It says in the text that the elevated and the honored have elevated concentration, while the base and the inferior have inferior concentration. How can scholars of recent times not be base and inferior?"⁴¹

For Hanazono it was clearly an article of faith that an understanding of the truths of Buddhism could not be realized simply through texts, nor simply through practice, nor could one hope

to approach an understanding by assuming that one's life could be conducted without mindful attention to the way in which one's activity melded with a broader, ongoing process. It is possible that Hanazono, as a sovereign, had some advantage over the average person in coming to this point, for Tendai thought in particular had devoted considerable attention to the question of the relationship between the *Dharma of the Law* (*buppō*) and the *Dharma of the King* (*ōbō*), and to the mutually interdependent nature, the essential unity, of the two elements.⁴² Certainly Hanazono was familiar with Jien's *Jichin Kashō musō ki* (*Records of a Dream*), the most recent Japanese *locus classicus* on the question.⁴³ How he might address these various questions is suggested in an extended diary entry from 1323.

Hanazono was informed that a scheduled outing to copy the *Lotus Sūtra*, an act which was designed to amass merit and which, at least as far as Hanazono was concerned, should not be regarded as just something to do, was to be cancelled on the grounds that it would have caused too much trouble to people. The Buddhist rationale put to Hanazono was that good deeds consist in not causing trouble to the populace; that the truth of Buddhism cannot be sought in external objects (such as copying *sūtras*); that to govern the state and nurture the people is the penitence of the sovereign and enlightened lay person; that the practicing of exoteric Buddhist services did not accord with the principle of things; and that it was an evil habit of recent times to conduct Buddhist activities which lay outside the sovereign's *dharma*. If Hanazono had been more cynical he might have noted that those in charge of the scheduling just could not be bothered travelling all day in order to copy a *sūtra*. However, since the matter had been rationalized in Buddhist terms, he felt compelled to question the explanation he had been given. And, since he had only come into contact with the *Lotus Sūtra* in any significant way just over half a year earlier,⁴⁴ the occasion also provided Hanazono with the opportunity to demonstrate (at least to himself) his own progress with the text. Yet again he realized that a full understanding of Buddhism had escaped those around him.⁴⁵

As for myself, from the outset I have not sought the *Dharma* outside of my heart, [yet] I wholly cannot wait for the copying

of the *Lotus Sūtra*. Through the text written out in the copying of the *Lotus Sūtra* one becomes aware of one's Buddha-nature, and through this achieves majestic penance. This is the great import of meditation upon the *Lotus Sūtra*. Accordingly, naturally and without negligence when one plans exoteric practices, one naturally summons faith in the inherency of the Buddha-nature. This further is the usual method of the ordinary person. Thus to hold that there is no Buddha *Dharma* outside of the mind and [on that grounds] not practice devotions, then at what time will the Buddha-nature appear? This is confusion about prior rights and wrongs, and at the same time it does not incline towards eliminating false discrimination. What this means is firstly not to make burdens for people and [only then] perform devotions; and secondly if one wishes to encourage the mind of negligence write up the method of the way and use it as a companion. Certainly to state that it is a bother to people and [thus] not perform practices, this, further, returns to the process of the causation of negligence. Great inconvenience, even though the deed is one which is a root of merit (*zenkon*), is unacceptable. [But] where minor matters are concerned, if one attains great profit then what matter is it? This is something where the *Dharma* and the law of the world are to be weighed very carefully and, on special occasions, decided. First and foremost, the secular law and the truth of Buddhism cannot be two separate things. The *Lotus Sūtra* states that "in both ruling the world and discussing meditation (*jō/samadhi*) all is patterned on the True Teachings (*shōbō*)." The import of this is particularly something of which a sovereign should be cognizant.

Hanazono goes on, using a Zen example (from the *Hekiganroku*) to buttress a Tendai position on the necessity of combining religious with everyday practice, to note that, as Bodhidharma had long ago informed Emperor Wu of the Liang, and despite the belief in Japan in its efficacy, there is no Buddhist merit in simply building temples; rather one has to first acknowledge the importance of Buddhist practice.

The *Lotus Sūtra* as an object of study was brought to Hanazono's attention by Jigen, who had maintained regular contact while Hanazono had been pursuing his instruction with other teachers. Jigen was available to talk generally, to answer questions about points of doctrine, and when necessary to direct him to further texts. It was perhaps at Jigen's suggestion that

Hanazono attended lectures dealing with a commentary to the *Dainichi kyō*, the *Dainichikyō shō*, used in Shingon.⁴⁶ By late 1322 Jigen evidently deemed Hanazono sufficiently advanced that he drew his attention to another commentary, the *Dainichikyō gishaku*, used in Tendai; and a month later provided him with the introductory portions of both this *sūtra* and of the *Lotus Sūtra*. (It might also be noted that Hanazono regularly attended Court lectures (*Hokke hakkō*) on the *Lotus Sūtra* and would continue to do so in the future).⁴⁷ In other words, prior to embarking upon study of the actual scriptural basis of Tendai, Hanazono had spent a period of preparation studying commentaries (including the *Maka shikan*) that familiarized him with the content and significance of those scriptures.

In light of the importance of the *Lotus Sūtra*, it is somewhat surprising that Hanazono makes only two references in his diary to his study of that work. Yet he must have devoted considerable time to reading it, for one of his only two writings on Buddhist texts deals with the *Lotus Sūtra*. This work, the *Commentary on the Chapters of the Lotus (Hokke Honshaku)* is composed of an introduction, and, for each of the 28 chapters, a comment of three to seven lines on its meaning. It is thus not a philosophical work *per se*, but one designed to indicate what Hanazono understood to be the significance of the text, and to attest that the unsurpassable wisdom of its contents makes it extremely valuable. Hanazono's introduction is as follows:⁴⁸

This the *Lotus* is the basic heart of the *Buddhas* of the three periods, the categories of existence of all beings. The five flavors of milk, cream, and butter [curds, butter, and clarified butter] take clarified butter and make it into wonderful medicine. The three carts of sheep, deer and ox meet with a great carriage and correspond to the complete vehicle. As to the meaning of the innate ordinary stage, it indicates the palm of the hand as the distant origin of one's lifespan. As to the truth of encompassing three and returning to one, the correct explanation of skillful devices is in the eye. Hearing this correct path, who dares breed doubts? And those who now tread on the elevated traces of the T'ai peak, further they have lost the path; those who draw from the remaining streams in thorny valleys further stagnate in the muddied watering holes of oxen. Hence even though [they] wait for the words to strike their eye they do not yet know that the

meaning lies in their mind (*kokoro*). Or else, thinking that they are renowned for their immense talents, large numbers have lost the true route of Buddhahood. As for those with elevated scholarly achievement, their attachment to sentience deepens more and more. If one clothes oneself in medicine, illnesses multiply, and here the wondrous techniques of the Bhaiṣajyarāja bodhisattva (*Iō*) are perplexed. How painful! How sad! I for a long time have dyed my mind in the Tendai teachings and in small measure have studied the extant works (*ishō*). Even though my nature is stupid and shallow, at least I know that the truth of complete reality does not emerge in the sentient (*heijō*) mind. Truly, as to this, [I] do not fall into the doctrines that I get from the various teachers, and accordingly it is sufficient to gladden the mind [that exists] in the period of degenerate law after extinction (*metsugo mappō*). Thus I note the essentials of each chapter, and further compose clumsy praise which I add on the left. In any event, those who speak do not know and those who know do not speak. Simply, I dare not stir up transgressions (*tsumi*) in front of the masters.

Confident in the efficacy of practice and study, and of the validity of the teachings themselves, Hanazono continued his pursuit of the esoteric in all its forms. An added dimension to this was provided by his initiation into the world of the *maṇḍala*.

As is well known, the *maṇḍala* is central to esoteric ritual, and so it was natural that Hanazono would receive training in this area, specifically in the *Taizōkai* (Womb, Matrix) and *Kongōkai* (Diamond) *maṇḍalas*.⁴⁹ This training was slightly complicated (or enriched) by the fact that the Japanese esoteric tradition contained two major streams, one in Shingon (the Tōmitsu), and one in Tendai (Taimitsu). In addition, each stream was further divided into two branches.⁵⁰ Hanazono received initiation into at least three of these. In 1322 under the guidance of Sōki he was initiated into the dual *maṇḍala* interpretation of the Enchin (Chishō) branch of Taimitsu; his training under Sōki continued, though apparently sporadically, but Hanazono was permitted to participate in the chanting of the most secret *dhāraṇī* of the Miidera stream of Taimitsu. Also in 1322, Hanazono was instructed in the interpretation of the Diamond *maṇḍala* followed by the Ninnaji (Hirosawa) branch of Tōmitsu. Hanazono felt that all of this made him a vessel of the esoteric

Dharma.⁵¹ However, he does not appear to have regarded these first two initiations as of sufficient consequence to elaborate upon them when they occurred, but mentions them in passing when he received what he felt was the more important third initiation from Jigen. It was important not necessarily because of the content of the teaching, but because Jigen had been in frequent contact and, though young, was “most assuredly a vessel of the *Dharma*”.⁵² In mid-1323⁵³ Hanazono commenced the preparatory practices (*kegyō*) required to enter the first of four stages (*shido*) which when completed bring the right to be considered a master. We have little further information until nearly a year later when Hanazono commenced preparation (suitably shortened in duration in consideration of his being a Son of Heaven) for the second stage.⁵⁴

In the following years Jigen, as before, continued to guide Hanazono further in esoteric study. Jigen introduced Hanazono to Tendai six-syllable *dhāraṇī* (such as those relating to Mañjuśrī and Avalokiteśvara [“thousand arm”]), explaining their purpose and efficacy, and incidentally providing Hanazono with the opportunity to see that since the mind is fundamentally not self and not other it ought not be difficult to abide in non-self; Jigen also interpreted Hanazono’s dreams about Fugen and Kannon appearing as one body, and directed him to works written by his *Dharma* predecessors and those which contained “the essence of the *Lotus* and *Great Sun sūtras* and the essentials of the two sects of Shingon and Tendai.”⁵⁵ Some idea of the nature of their contact is suggested by the following diary entry:⁵⁶

For a little while we discussed the *Dharma*, concerning the difference between exoteric and esoteric. We discussed [the passage in the *Dainichi kyō* dealing with the triple formula for wisdom that] “the mind of enlightenment is the cause, its root lies in great compassion, and skillful means are the result.” Consequently the practices of exoteric teachings are to be transcended. We also discussed the fact that current practitioners of Shingon do not know the Truth. The import of attaining enlightenment in this very existence has not yet touched their minds. Thus it is noted in the original text [*Dainichi kyō*?] that the common and stupid do not see the various heavens but gallop around like slaves in a wealthy household. Foolish priests practice the *Dharma* and this must have [some] efficacy.

Hanazono's diary for the next few years is unfortunately not extant, but seems that the relationship between the two began to drop off after 1326; certainly Hanazono's letters to Jigen in the late 1320's suggest that the contact was much less frequent than Hanazono would have liked. Undoubtedly this was in part related to Jigen's rise in the religious hierarchy and to his growing links to Go-Daigo, either of which could have made Jigen less accessible to Hanazono.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, Hanazono did not let this impede his progress, for he acted upon Jigen's advice and delved further into esoteric teaching.

From some time after 1325 until early 1329 Hanazono studied esoteric teachings under priests fully (and hereditarily) versed in one of the exclusive Tendai esoteric streams, the Eshin school lineally descended from Genshin.⁵⁸ How Hanazono first came in contact with the Eshin school and its then head Shinsō, and the frequency of the contact, is unknown; certainly it could not have been accidental, and Jigen, the rising Tendai star, may well have facilitated the enterprise. Hanazono's contact with this school came at a propitious time, for it was coincident with a change in emphasis in Tendai from scholasticism to the doctrine of original enlightenment which, in addition to its philosophical influence on seminal religious figures of the Kamakura period, stressed direct master-to-disciple esoteric transmission (*kuden*, or "oral hermeneutics") of the truth, and in Hanazono's day the Eshin school was at the height of its fortunes. As in so many "secret traditions" the teachings were sufficiently prized, and some physical proof of the secret tradition evidently considered desirable, that the school did acquire a textual basis (the *Itchōsho*) for its doctrines. Hanazono proved an adept pupil, and in the first month of 1329 demonstrated his understanding by presenting Shinsō with what is his second textual work, the *Oral Transmission of the Seven Gates to the Dharma* (*Shichi ka hōmon kuketsu*), in consequence of which Hanazono received the seal of transmission of the esoteric *Dharma*.⁵⁹

The *Seven Gates to the Dharma*, as the title implies, is comprised of seven main sections, titled respectively: "Three Views in a Single Thought"; "The Meaning of Focusing One's Mind on a Single Thought"; "The Great Import of Calming and Contemplation"; "The Deep Meaning of the Lotus (*Hokke*)"; "The Meaning of the Land of Eternally Tranquil Light"; and "The

Lotus (*Renge*) Cause"; plus a brief postscript. The lengthiest section, that dealing with calming and contemplation (*shikan*) is of particular interest, given Hanazono's earlier study of the *Maka shikan* and the centrality in Tendai of the concept of *shikan*. It is additionally noteworthy because in it Hanazono encapsulates his understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of the world, of nature, and of human society. The "Great Import of Calming and Contemplation" is as follows:⁶⁰

This cannot be explained in words; in cannot be gauged by the sentient consciousness. It is something that clearly transcends [divisions of] doctrine and meditation and that far surpasses debates of relative and absolute. It does not look back on the past and [neither] does it look to the future. Consequently it is said that it is impossible for it to have breadth and impossible for it to have height. Hence, the mind of a single thought is beyond speech and thus clear. Within each thought calming and contemplation manifests itself. However, is this the mind? And even so, what are these thoughts? And what is manifest? One does not see the thoughts, and the manifest is not describable. Even though the words handed down from the past do not stop in their traces, they drop into logic and resemble giving rise to wisdom and understanding. In the great void it gives birth to clouds and mist, in the broad oceans it gives rise to waves and billows. But it is without a name. Is this the true core of objects? If a person asks about calming and contemplation it blocks up the ears and is gone. Even great teachers do not give explanations—but is this what is spoken of? But even though thought does not reach it nor words attain it, through innate and unfathomable compassion it imparts nonarising benefit for sentient beings. The flowers of the mountains pass through spring and open the brilliance of the myriad branches, the leaves of the forest pass through autumn and dye the reimbued crimsons. That is, even though the duality of capacity and truth is not seen, each and every one has the essence of appropriate capacity and benefit.

As for doctrinal teachings, there are correct explanations and correct practices; the various teachings of the one age [of the Buddha] and the five periods cannot not constitute correct teachings. But since when one traps fish or rabbits one forgets the traps one used, the great net of the teachings is rent. Relative and absolute are one, practice and interpretation are already not differentiated. Thus thinking about the truth underlying, there

is not the duality of sentient evaluation. There are the three thousand realms and therefore no impediment. Thus it is said fact and principle are interfused, and thus it is termed supreme understanding. At such a time how can there be increase of fact and principle? And since unenlightened man and the Buddha, further, exist, one cannot possibly pass beyond the ground of supreme understanding. The vault above guides, the palanquin below carries. This is the wonderful working of heaven and earth. A lord is a lord, a minister a minister, a father a father, a son a son; externally there is loyalty, internally there is filial piety. This is the wonderful working of human ethics. The peach season creates scenery, the fragrant grasses impart their beauty. This is the wonderful working of trees and plants. The wild geese in autumn depart the cold, sheep and cattle in the evening descend to the villages. This is the wonderful working of birds and animals. Where facts and objects are in accord, do not walk on the path of underlying principle, do not permit sentient disposition.

By 1329, then, after nearly a decade of continuous study, it appears that Hanazono had completed his quest for understanding of the texts, practices and truths of esoteric Buddhism. As some letters to Jigen suggest, this by no means meant that he achieved detailed knowledge of every single point. However, it is evident that he had come to a strongly-grounded, and genuinely acknowledged, understanding of Tendai (and perhaps Shingon) philosophy. Had Hanazono limited his Buddhist inquiry just to this it would still have been a major achievement. However, through the same decade Hanazono had been pursuing a parallel quest for enlightenment in one other school, that of Zen.

V. Hanazono and Zen

Even though Zen had become well-established in Japan by the end of the thirteenth century, Hanazono's contact with this sect did not take on any viable (or even visible) form until 1320, the year after he had begun serious study of esoteric Buddhism and had also effectively rejected *nembutsu* teachings as a vehicle through which he could understand Buddhism. Although there is certainly no evidence from his diary that prior to this Zen

had raised its presence on his intellectual horizon, there is no reason not to take him at his word when he remarks in a diary entry from 1321 that he had had faith in Zen from an early age but, because he had been unable to find a good instructor, “the years had passed fruitlessly.”⁶¹ It is not clear whether Hanazono had tried instructors and had found them wanting or had just been unable to obtain an instructor. Since he would undoubtedly have mentioned the fact if the former had been the case, it is more likely that the reasons are to be found in the latter. While this may strike an odd note in light of Hanazono’s position and his demonstrably eclectic interests, there are ready explanations. In the first place, of the two Zen traditions in Japan (Rinzai and Sōtō), one would have been literally beyond Hanazono’s reach. The Sōtō school had from the beginning eschewed contact with the capital, and its teachers and writings accordingly were not readily available (in fact the one major *lacuna* in Hanazono’s reading was the literature produced by the Dōgen school). In the second place it is impossible to overlook the fact that the rival Daikakuji branch of the Imperial family had been in the forefront of contact with Zen masters and had built up a jealously guarded network of contacts and patronage; by contrast, Jimyō-in leaders such as Fushimi and Go-Fushimi, in whose shadow Hanazono spent his early decades, evinced little interest in Zen. Accordingly it would have been difficult for Hanazono by himself to make contacts in the Zen world.

That this was indeed so is borne out by the manner in which he first had significant contact. Bypassing any formal procedures or inquiries as to the possibility of obtaining a Zen tutor, Hanazono’s friend and intellectual confidant Hino Suketomo, who at the time was contributing so greatly to Hanazono’s study of the Chinese intellectual tradition, took it upon himself one evening to introduce Hanazono privately to a Zen priest. That the introduction came through Suketomo was significant, for Suketomo was one of a group of young intellectuals in the forefront of a movement challenging prevailing social and intellectual values, and he was accordingly much interested in having contact with those with demonstrably new ideas.⁶² The meeting was to prove a major turning point in Hanazono’s life. First, as we shall see, it began the process which led to Hanazono’s attainment of *satori* some years later. Second, it meant that Hanazono’s

contact with Zen would be with a school of Rinzai Zen (the Otōkan school, which had originated with Nampō Jōmin) that most esteemed a spare and intellectually demanding “Sung-style” Zen.⁶³ This attitude melded perfectly with Hanazono’s own great respect for both the Chinese intellectual tradition over the Japanese one, and his preference for studying teachings in their “unadulterated” and original forms. Indeed, so adamant was Hanazono that different schools and traditions should be kept distinct that he once remarked unfavorably upon the fact that some people were, in imitation of the practices of the Sung court, using Zen terminology to explain Confucian concepts.⁶⁴

In any event, early in 1320 Hanazono was brought into contact with Myōgyō (or Gatsurin Dōkō). So taken was Hanazono with the profundity and lucidity of Myōgyō’s interpretations of doctrine (“should he be called a dragon?”) that he spent the entire night discussing Zen.⁶⁵ However, Hanazono’s contact with Myōgyō appears to have been somewhat sporadic for the next year and a half,⁶⁶ perhaps partly because Myōgyō may not have been convinced that Hanazono was prepared to embark upon Zen training. Nevertheless, Hanazono’s quest continued, and began to bear fruit late in 1321 when, in the course of explaining his understanding of the accuracy or inaccuracy of various textual interpretations (Hanazono does not say what texts were involved), Myōgyō indicated that Hanazono’s understanding was correct. Overjoyed that at last he was getting somewhere (“without searching for a bright jewel on my collar I have gained it by myself”), Hanazono averred that⁶⁷

The skill of the Buddha Law and the utmost principle of mental attitude lie solely in this one sect of Zen. The teachings of none of the other sects of the Greater and Lesser Vehicles can compare with it. In particular I fasten my thoughts on its subtle import; in moments of haste and when I stumble [I hold to it].

Hanazono’s delight was no doubt enhanced by the fact that his discovery of both teacher and teaching had been his first really independent intellectual foray. Yet for the same reasons Hanazono was diffident about advertising his progress. It was nonetheless another important turning point, and Hanazono was to consider Zen his prime vehicle of understanding and

enlightenment for the rest of his life, if for no other reason that that his discoveries here preceded his progress in Tendai and Shingon.

From this point Hanazono threw himself enthusiastically into his Zen studies, and in the twelfth month encountered his first *kōan* when he and Myōgyō read together the first Case of the *Hekiganroku* (*Blue Cliff Record*). Unfortunately, two weeks later this promising start was cut short when Myōgyō announced plans to visit China. Before leaving, however, Myōgyō bestowed upon Hanazono secret teachings and a robe, signifying at the minimum a willingness to acknowledge Hanazono as a full-fledged disciple. The ceremony was brief, private, and slightly irregular, since the two did not know when they would meet again, and Hanazono felt that if it were made known he would be heavily criticized, if only because most people did not know just how profound Zen teachings were.⁶⁸ The next day, overjoyed, Hanazono wrote to Myōgyō that they would remain close despite being separated by great distance and rough seas, and that his only regret was that he could not personally bestow the title of *kokushi* (National Teacher) on someone who so obviously deserved it.⁶⁹

Myōgyō's departure for China "in search of the Law" no doubt confirmed in Hanazono a belief that "pure" Zen was the only acceptable type, but it also left him without a teacher to guide his efforts. Hanazono's interest did not wane, however, for a few months later he records having a vivid dream in which he met with Kōbō *daishi* (Saichō) and Dengyō *daishi* (Kūkai) and discussed Buddhist texts with them. Oddly, however, the two great priests, the founders of Tendai and Shingon in Japan, gave all their answers in terms of Zen, and bestowed upon him the seal of transmission. Slightly perplexed, since he felt that he had already received the seal from Myōgyō, Hanazono interpreted this to mean that the known exoteric and esoteric teachings had failed to enlighten the world and that true enlightenment would come from Zen.⁷⁰

Some time after this Hanazono acquired his second teacher, Shūhō Myōchō (later Daitō *kokushi*). Like Myōgyō, he belonged to Daiō's stream, and it had perhaps been Myōgyō who recommended Hanazono to his fellow disciple. Myōchō, "a fearless and exceptional man whose teachings were not easily grasped,"⁷¹

was to become one of the most eminent Zen priests of the fourteenth century, and it was with Myōchō that Hanazono's study of Zen began in earnest.⁷² Picking up where Myōgyō had left off, though clearly not believing that Hanazono had already earned the seal of transmission, Daitō guided Hanazono through more detailed study. They would meditate together (sometimes at night with driving rain and thunder as an accompaniment),⁷³ discuss the law, and Hanazono would be tested on his interpretations of teaching drawn from the *Jiatai Record of the Universal Lamps*, the *Mumonkan* and the *Hekiganroku*. Hanazono made rapid progress, and his interpretation of the Tokusan *kōan* of the *Mumonkan* was deemed so good by Myōchō that the latter allowed that Hanazono's grasp of the Great Way was "profound."⁷⁴ Later in 1323 Myōchō gave Hanazono the privilege of an audience with himself and Zekkai Sōtaku, the most senior of Nanpo Jōmin's disciples. The occasion proved to be a mixed success, for while it provided an opportunity for studying the *Hekiganroku*, Hanazono was less than enthusiastic about his exchanges with Sōtaku:⁷⁵

I questioned Sōtaku and asked "What is the great truth of this Buddha Law?" [Sō]taku answered [that it is] "Pearls scattered on the back of a notebook bound in pearls." I further asked and said "Simply is this [answer] the rope or is [the truth] somewhere else?" [Sō]taku said "I cannot depart (*hanarezu*) from what his majesty questions." I thought that this answer was quite contradictory. Some days later I asked [Myō]chō and he said that this was indeed the case.

However, other of Hanazono's encounters were more instructive. While Hanazono rarely records substantive exchanges, the *Chronicle of Daitō Kokushi* has several episodes that give some flavor of the playful respect that appears to have characterized relations between him and Myōchō. One episode will perhaps suffice.⁷⁶

[Hanazono] said to the Master, "I won't ask about the chrysanthemums blooming under the fence, but how about the fall foliage in the forest?" The Master said "Even thousand eyed Kuan-yin is unable to see it." The Emperor gave a shout. Then he said "Where has she gone?" The Master bowed respectfully

and replied "Please observe for yourself." The Emperor said "You must not go through the night but you must arrive there by dawn." The Master indicated his assent . . .

If Hanazono was ever in any doubt about Myōchō's brilliance and insight, his concerns were fully laid to rest in early 1325 when Myōchō, a central figure in one of the most significant religious debates of the fourteenth century, ran intellectual and doctrinal rings around his Tendai opponents in a debate held before Emperor Go-Daigo.⁷⁷ This success of an until-then junior figure immediately catapulted Myōchō to the front ranks of the Zen world, a rise unfortunately assisted by the death of Myōchō's mentor Tsūō Kyōen on the way home from the debate.⁷⁸ This startling coincidence of success and great loss in the Zen world ("Has the period when the Law will be destroyed been reached?") prodded Hanazono to step outside the purely intellectual realm and into the fray of religious patronage: a month later he bestowed upon Myōchō's home temple of Daitokuji the status of Imperial invocatory temple, support which Hanazono was to give also to Myōchō's successors until his own death in 1348, and which he otherwise gave to no other religious institution.⁷⁹ An added impetus, if any were needed, was that it became clear to Hanazono during that same year that the generous support being lavished upon Musō Soseki, another notable Rinzaï priest, by Go-Daigo and the Kamakura *bakufu* was not at all deserved. In Musō's case the broader picture is somewhat more complicated than Hanazono and Myōchō's characterization of him as having only a stiff, bookish understanding of what Zen would suggest, but there is certainly some justification, even allowing for Hanazono's purist perspective, for his concern that the Zen world was populated by inferior intellects that were doing great harm to the Zen tradition.⁸⁰ And it is probably this concern that lay behind Hanazono's untypical willingness to countenance a departure from Zen tradition and support Daitokuji as a "closed" temple, an exclusive preserve of members of Daitō's lineage.⁸¹

At any rate, Hanazono, who occasionally berated himself for his lack of diligence, continued meeting Myōchō and focusing his mind on the *Hekiganroku*, and "the more the Emperor

questioned the Master, the more his ardor intensified."⁸² Finally, probably some time in 1326, Hanazono achieved *satori*. As recorded in the *Chronicle of Daitō Kokushi*⁸³ the seminal exchange proceeded as follows:

The Master composed a statement of the Dharma for the Emperor:

Separated for a million eons, yet not apart for an instant
Face-to-face throughout the day, but not encountered for
a moment

Each person has this truth.

Tell me, in a word, the nature of this truth.

The Emperor wrote his answer directly on the Master's letter: "Last night, just before dawn, the temple pillar answered the master." The Emperor then offered his enlightenment poem to the Master:

The man who endured hardship and pain for 20 years
Does not change his old [life of] wind and smoke when
spring arrives.

Wearing clothes and eating meals are still like this.

Did the great earth ever contain even one speck of dust?

"This is what your disciple has understood. How will you test me Master?" The Master wrote his response directly on the Emperor's letter. "I have already tested you. Look!"

While *satori* does not require any specific period before it can be achieved, that Hanazono (who is generally regarded as having been one of Myōchō's most outstanding disciples)⁸⁴ could reach it after only a few years, during which time he was also actively engaged in a wide variety of pursuits religious and otherwise, is a strong testament to his abilities, and to the seriousness of his pursuit of Zen.

In Zen, then, Hanazono first found answers to his quest for understanding that were philosophically and psychologically satisfying; and, as suggested by his continuing training under Zen teachers (Myōchō until his death in 1337, and Myōchō's successor until Hanazono's death in 1348) Hanazono was to look to Zen and its discipline as his prime (but not sole) vehicle for personal understanding for the rest of his life.

VI. *Using the Acquisitions*

By the end of the 1320's Hanazono had achieved what he and his teachers considered a high level of insight into the truths of Buddhism. Hanazono's subsequent endeavors reflected this acquisition, and Hanazono was able to integrate successfully his understanding into his writings.⁸⁵ As noted earlier, Hanazono was one of a very few literary figures of the fourteenth century who realized the need to produce a new poetic form capable of maintaining, in the face of pronounced social and political changes, the position of the traditional cultural elite as the arbiter of Japan's aesthetic heritage.

Hanazono, like all major poets since at least the time of Fujiwara Shunzei (1114–1204), believed that the writing of poetry was an act of religious devotion; concomitantly, it was impossible for poetry to properly reflect the truths that informed it as a *michi* or realm of endeavor unless the poet understood Buddhist truths.⁸⁶ In his obituary of Kyōgoku Tamekane (1254–1332), one of the towering figures on the medieval literary landscape,⁸⁷ in a passage that suggests just how important Buddhism was to the medieval aesthetic, Hanazono explicitly recognizes the relationship, and the value and purpose of his own studies.⁸⁸

At the time of [Kyōgoku Tamekane's] exile [1315] he entrusted me with ninety lines of poetry . . . At that time I was still young and was not deeply aware of the Way of Poetry. In recent years I have often thought on these teachings (*kuden*), and, further, I have reflected on the deep import of esoteric and exoteric scriptures . . . Ordinary people are not cognizant [of the true principles] . . . In recent years I have met with Shūhō [Myōchō] *shōnin* and have learnt the essentials of the sect; I have had audiences with Shinsō *hōin* and have heard the doctrines of Tendai; I have perused the Five Classics and grasped the Way of Confucius. With this insight I have thought about this Way [of Poetry]. Truly the profound differences between error and correctness [in poetry] are akin to those of Heaven and earth.

With this [understanding], around last year . . . I sent one roll of poems [I had composed] in recent years [to Tamekane, who noted that] "The tone of your poetry is truly marvellous. You've achieved a deep understanding of its principles . . ." With this he certified me [as a master of poetry]. My feelings of joy

were without parallel. I myself feared from the outset that these poems would be of shallow merit, and I had doubts whether their meaning would accord with the import of the esoteric and exoteric scriptures. But now the import of his acknowledgement is that [my work exhibits] the true essence. With this I will learn more and more about the truths of the Buddha Law . . .

Lord Tamemoto [who had brought news of Tamekane's death] related that "Lord Tamekane stated to me that 'Although I knew that His Majesty [Hanazono] had ability in poetry, given that the teachings I had imparted to him at the time of my exile did not touch upon the innermost principles, it is remarkable that he should attain such profound subtlety (*yūsui*).' Tamemoto replied 'Although there is no such thing as a sermon on poetry, his mind and spirit are as one with the *Dharma*. Perhaps it is for this reason.' [Tamekane] replied that 'If this is the case then one can have no doubts [that Hanazono's poetry reflects the true essence, for] there cannot be any sense of distinction between the *Dharma* and poetry.'" When I heard this my faith was strengthened all the more.

It is thus clear that Hanazono's poetic inspiration, certainly from the early 1330's, derived in great measure from his extensive study of Buddhism. The fusion of Hanazono's religious understanding and his sense of poetry enable him to interweave image, freshness and Buddhist allegory to craft poems that could be appreciated on more than one level: as an innovative poem, as a religious allegory, or as a work that coherently melds both. While detailed study of Hanazono's poetry—and his more than 130 poems demonstrate that he was a gifted poet—is beyond the scope of this paper, we can usefully touch on some that were composed specifically on Buddhist themes. Hanazono has six poems in the Buddhist poem section of the *Fūgashū*, the Imperial poetry anthology that was compiled under his direction.⁸⁹ One is written in reference to Gatsurin Dōkō; another bewails the decline of the world and Buddhism; one alludes to concepts in the *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*; in two others allusions to *kōan* in the *Hekiganroku* inform the poem.⁹⁰ One of the latter, evocative in its tranquility yet subtle in its allusions, adeptly refers to the "Kyōsei's 'Voice of the Raindrops'" *kōan* to address the Tendai concept that the three truths of void, mediated and provisional reality and the one truth encompassing all are

neither three nor one.⁹¹

The sixth of the poems is an outstanding effort that some scholars regard as one of the most “perfect and precise” of its type. The topic of the poem comes from chapter 23 (The Former Affairs of the Bodhisattva Medicine King) of the *Lotus Sūtra*.⁹²

The sun at dusk
 Fades in brightness from the eaves
 Where swallows twitter;
 And among the willows in the garden
 Blows the green breeze of the spring.⁹³

The story of chapter 23 is that of the Bodhisattva Seen With Joy By All Living Things who, determined to immolate himself as an offering to the Buddha in gratitude for having heard the Buddha preach, spends a lengthy period partaking of the fragrance of all flowers, anointing his body, and bathing in perfumed oil, and then by willpower sets his body ablaze with such brightness that it illuminates all worlds. It is certainly no easy matter to convert this into a simple poem. But, by employing the sun to represent the body of the Bodhisattva, swallows for humans, willows for existence, and the breeze for the Buddha-spirit, Hanazono achieves his purpose: “[j]ust as the poem suggests that the evening scene is more beautiful after the light fades, so, too, allegorically it means that the spirit of the Bodhisattva Seen With Joy By All Living Things is even more beautiful after his body is gone.”⁹⁴

VII. Conclusions

To return to the question of how intellectuals may have apprehended Buddhism in medieval Japan, and bearing in mind that this paper has not sought to comment upon the question of doctrinal understanding (that is, did Hanazono get it right or not, and was there a “right” to get) several points may be noted.

First, at least for Hanazono, it is evident that over time the intellectual quest took precedence over the psychological one, though it is admittedly difficult to separate the two entirely. It

is also evident that a teaching needed to be well-grounded, capable of providing an encompassing explanation of Buddhist truths whose broader relevance could be discerned, and be articulated by teachers who could maintain the intellectual respect of their pupil; after all, study was a dynamic process, the pupil progressively acquiring enhanced interpretative powers and unwilling to accept explanations at face value. Study of Buddhism, in short, entailed far more than mastering what had been handed down.

Second, it is evident that it is (and was) extremely difficult to predict at the outset what course of study might be taken. There were several possible choices of texts, of teachers, and of interpretative traditions. Likewise, more than one path could be taken at the same time for different intellectual purposes. The choice of any teacher, even defining this as a matter of serendipity, was influenced by a range of social and political factors to which the student had to give heed, and this in turn affected both study options and the type of understanding of Buddhist truths that would be acquired. To extend this point further, to state that somebody studied "Buddhism," or that "Buddhism" was important, is, as Professor Pollack's study also demonstrates, by itself an inadequate basis for addressing the question of what "Buddhism" meant to medieval Japanese.

Third, it is nonetheless also apparent that the multivariate nature of Buddhism was accepted, and that no teaching was by itself considered inherently invalid; concomitantly, as Hanazono shows even while discovering his own intellectual medium, it was a basic article of faith that there was no one ultimately preferable path to understanding the Buddha's truths. At the same time it also seems that very strong views could be held regarding the quality of interpretation and the dangers to Buddhism as a system of thought where exponents exhibited inferior understanding. Yet even here evaluations were not necessarily absolute: as Hanazono noted, in an observation which acknowledged that different truths are understood at different stages at the same time that it revealed a high level of insight on his part, there was no such thing as teachings without people. Put briefly, the concept of a multi-faceted and multi-layered philosophical framework was an integral part of the medieval intellect, and it encouraged a rich variety of approaches that

together molded the medieval intellect and aesthetic.

Perhaps a fourth point to make is that research on medieval Buddhism could well examine the Tendai tradition (and the fortunes of "older Buddhism") in more detail; certainly it deserves considerably more attention than it has received to date. Elite patronage assured Zen a strong niche in medieval culture, and popular appeal obviously was crucial to the spread of salvation teachings; both have with good reason been extensively studied. But it is evident from Hanazono's case—and he was not a minor figure in the literary and cultural world—that Tendai teachings, in all their forms, contributed a great deal to the Japanese understanding of "Buddhism." Tendai teachers had unrivaled access to Japan's educated elite, perhaps to the extent of exercising some degree of intellectual hegemony, and it is probable that ultimately, certainly through the mid-fourteenth century, many new developments were filtered through them.

A final point brings us back to Hanazono, and slightly beyond the issues dealt with in this article. His concern to understand Buddhist teaching thoroughly, his willingness to have contact with a wide variety of streams, and the obvious effort he put into the endeavor, sprang from more than just personal spiritual motives. As his understanding evolved, so too did the sophistication of his attitude towards the role of Buddhism in Japanese intellectual life. A major conclusion reached by Hanazono was that the integrative wholeness of Buddhist truth provided the rationale and metaphor for the social and cultural role of the Imperial family itself, a role that, while intimately bound with questions of patronage, vested interest, and doctrinal division (secular manifestations of stages of enlightenment), had at the same time to overcome them and provide an overarching and unified framework (as befits the truly enlightened) for Japan's cultural traditions. This formulation was a major contribution to Japanese thought on its own terms and in what it meant for the Imperial family. With the unsuccessful effort of Hanazono's contemporary Emperor Go-Daigo (1288–1339) to inform a similarly overarching view of the role of the Imperial family with absolute political content as well, it was Hanazono's approach that provided the theoretical justification for the existence of the Imperial family that endured long after its loss of political and economic leadership.

NOTES

** An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Colloquium on Buddhist Thought and Culture at the University of Montevallo, April 28/29, 1988.

1. For an introduction to the dimensions of the topic see: A. Matsunaga & D. Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*, vol. 2 (Los Angeles & Tokyo: Buddhist Books International, 1976); J.H. Foard, "In Search of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 7.4 (1980), 261–291; M. Collcutt, *Five Mountains* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981); K. Kraft, "Zen Master Daitō" (Doctoral Dissertation, Princeton University, 1984); Hee-Jin Kim, *Dōgen Kigen: Mystical Realist* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987); T.J. Kodera, *Dōgen's Formative Years in China* (Boulder: Prajna Press, 1980); H.H. Coates & Ishizuka Ryūgaku, *Hōnen the Buddhist Saint* (Kyoto, 1925); A. Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1965) and "The Life of Shinran Shōnin: Journey to Self Acceptance," *Numen*, 16 (1968), 1–62; L.R. Rodd, *Nichiren: A Biography* (Tempe: University of Arizona Press, 1977); J.H. Foard, "Ippen Shōnin and Popular Buddhism of the Kamakura Period" (Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1977).

2. The entire question of the continuing relevance and vitality of the older sects through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has been unaccountably neglected by Western scholars. For a recent effort to redress the imbalance see R. Morrell, *Early Kamakura Buddhism: A Minority Report* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1987).

3. W. LaFleur, *The Karma of Words* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); D. Pollack, *The Fracture of Meaning* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

4. See A. Goble, "Go-Daigo and the Kemmu Restoration," (Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1987); H.P. Varley, *Imperial Restoration in Medieval Japan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971); M. Collcutt, *Five Mountains*.

5. E. Miner, "The Collective and the Individual: Literary Practice and Its Social Implications," in E. Miner (ed.), *Principles of Classical Japanese Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 50–52; the Otōkan school based at Daitokuji has come to be the pre-eminent Rinzaï stream; Miura Kei'ichi, *Chūsei minshū seikatsu shi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: 1982), 118 ff. has delineated the essential elements of the medieval conception of sovereignty, though he sees it as a formulation of the fifteenth, not the fourteenth, century.

6. For an informative discussion in English see LaFleur, 88 ff. In a related vein see G. Ebersole, "Buddhist Ritual Use of Linked Verse in Medieval Japan," *Eastern Buddhist*, 16.2 (1983), 50–71.

7. *Hanazono tennō shinki* [hereinafter HTS] (Zōhō shiryō taisei, 2 vols, Kyoto, 1965; Shiryō sanshū, 3 vols, Tokyo, 1982–1986).

8. A. Goble, "Chinese Influences in the Emperor Hanazono Diary" (paper read at South Eastern Conference/Association for Asian Studies, annual conference, Charlotte, January 1988), and "Emperor Hanazono (1297–1348):

An Intellectual's Response to Social Change" (paper read at Association for Asian Studies, annual meeting, San Francisco, March 1988). In a related area, see also Wajima Yoshio, "Hanazono tennō no jubutsu bunri ron ni tsuite," *Bukkyō shigaku*, 10.1 (1962), 35–51.

9. Hanazono provides lists of the works he had read through the end of 1325 in *HTS* 1324/12/last, 1325/12/30. However some works noted in the diary (such as the *Bonmōkyō* and the *Senjakushū*) do not appear in these lists.

10. *HTS* 1313/1/6, 1313/5/22, 1313/10/19.

11. *HTS* 1322/5/24, 1322/8/24, 1323/12/16. Hanazono's respect for the works he read was not limited to Buddhism: "When I read this book [the *I-ching*] I wash my hands, do not take off my belt, and do not take off my cap. The reason for this is that it is the work of a sage, a book on the will of Heaven, and [hence] I am respectful." *HTS* 1325/6/17.

12. *HTS* 1322/3/17.

13. For example, *HTS* 1322/8/28 for sūtra readings; 1322/5/3 for lectures; 1322/9/1, 1322/10/10, 1324/3/12, 1324/8/28–9/3 for debates. Many lectures and debates took the form of formal presentations on the *Lotus Sūtra*, the *Hokke hakkō*, that were an important part of Court life. On the growth and variety of the *Hokke hakkō* see W.J. Tanabe, "The Lotus Lectures: *Hokke Hakkō* in the Heian Period," *Monumenta Nipponica*, 39 (1984), 393–407.

14. See A. Goble, "Go-Daigo and the Kemmu Restoration," 31–41; *HTS* 1317/3/3.

15. *HTS* 1319/1/20. See also 1319/9/6, 1319/10/26.

16. *HTS* 1319/1/9.

17. *HTS* 1317/2/19. The other dream may have occurred in 1318, for most of which the diary is not extant.

18. Hanazono's attitude towards dreams was somewhat ambivalent. He noted at one point that they embodied both truth and falsehood and hence should not be given credence (1325/6/17), yet on other occasions (e.g. 1324/12/13, 1325/12/5) he regarded them as quite revealing. Nonetheless, as attested by such prominent religious figures as Jien, Shinran and Mujū Ichien, dreams could mark significant turning points. The entire area of dreams and their significance in this context has barely been addressed by Western scholars; for a brief introduction, see M. Strickmann, "Dreamwork of Psycho-Sinologists," in Brown, C. ed, *Psycho-Sinology* (Lanham, University Press of America, 1988), 25–46.

19. *HTS* 1319/1/10. The *Ojōyōshū* has been translated by A.K. Reischauer, "Genshin's Ojo Yoshu: Collected Essays on Birth into Paradise," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, 2d. series, 7 (1930), 16–97. For a study of the work see A. Andrews, *The Teachings Essential For Rebirth: A Study of Genshin's "Ojōyōshū"* (Tokyo, 1973).

20. *HTS* 1319/9/18. Hanazono's predilection for according greatest value to doctrines that were intellectually demanding is evident throughout the diary and informs a wide variety of comments on practices and people. For example, in his obituary of Saionji Sanekane (*HTS* 1322/9/10 *bekki*) he notes that "by nature [Sanekane] was simple and his literary talents few," and that "at first he studied the *Dharma* [Zen] sect but he did not excel. In his later

years he turned exclusively to the [A]mida [Pure Land]. Diligently he performed *nembutsu*."

21. HTS 1320/12/16, 1321/3/7. On the latter occasion Hanazono remarked that "Last night Nyokū *shōnin* passed away. Approaching the end he correctly recited the *nembutsu*. He is the person who has contributed to the rise of the *nembutsu* sect. Is it possible that [his death] will be the beginning of the decline of this sect?" Nyokū was frequently involved in Court religious ceremonies: see *Kinpira kōki* (Shiryō sanshū, Tokyo, 1968–69), 1315/5/24. Many of Hanazono's obituaries or comments on the deaths of contemporaries leave little doubt of his sense of what is of most value. Figures in the intellectual and cultural realms (e.g. 1321/6/23, 24 Sugawara Arikane, 1325/intercalary 1/28 Kyōen) are accorded praise and their passing a sense of loss that is generally not extended to political figures of the day (e.g. 1322/9/10 Saionji Sanekane, 1324/6/24 emperor Go-Uda).

22. HTS 1322/5/3–7, 1322/10/10, 1323/9/2.

23. HTS 1325/7/15.

24. HTS 1321/9/21–24, 1321/10/8. It is not clear what *maṇḍala* Hanazono viewed, or whether there was more than one.

25. HTS 1322/5/12.

26. HTS 1319/1/26, 1319/2/28–30, 1319/3/2, 1322/10/2, 3. Jigen, born in 1298, was the son of Tōin Saneyasu and full brother of Tōin Kimikata, both prominent members of the nobility. It is not known when Jigen died, but he was still alive in 1352 when he resigned as Tendai *zasu*.

27. HTS 1322/10/2, 1322/10/3; undated but probably 1331/8 Hanazono jōkō shōsoku (*Shinkan eiga* [Tokyo, 1944], 1:155).

28. HTS 1320/9/14. The works received by Hanazono were the *Ben kenmitsu nikyō ron*, *Sokushin jōbutsugi*, *Jōji jūssōgi*, *Shinkyō hitsuken*, *Hizō hōyaku*, *Sangō shiiki*, and *Unji gi*. For translations of these see Y.S. Hakeda, *Kūkai: Major Works* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972).

29. HTS 1323/7/10, 1325/7/15, 1325/9/2.

30. Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*, 1: 64–75, 2: 274.

31. The *Maka shikan/Mo-ho chih-kuan* of Chih-i (538–597) and the concept of *shikan*—"calming and contemplation" (very lucidly discussed by LaFleur, *The Karma of Words*, 88) or "the immovable mind functioning in wisdom" (Matsunaga, 1:157)—was central to Tendai thought, and through this exercised an enormous influence on Japanese intellects. The full dimensions of this influence have only just begun to be discussed in the West: see LaFleur, 50ff. For an overview of Tendai, see Matsunaga, 1:139–171. On Chih-i's thought see L. Hurvitz, *Chih-i (Melanges Chinois et Bouddhiques)*, 12, 1960–62), especially 183–372, and D. Chappell (ed.), *T'ien-t'ai Buddhism: An Outline of the Fourfold Teachings* (Tokyo, 1983). I have also found it useful to refer to D. B. Stevenson, "The Four Kinds of Samadhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism," in P.N. Gregory (ed.), *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), 45–97; and R.E. Buswell, *The Korean Approach to Zen* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983).

32. HTS 1319/4/7.

33. HTS 1319/9/last.

34. HTS 1320/3/11, 1321/9/7.

35. HTS 1321/10/17, 1322/10/16. Hanazono's desire to be rid of unwanted involvement in the worldly affairs that had so traumatized him is a persistent theme in the diary. It is also evident that others, notably Hanazono's elder brother Go-Fushimi, saw in this preference an abdication of responsibility that on occasion sorely exercised them. For a good example of this see HTS 1323/4/9, 4/11, 4/15; (1323/4/9) Go-Fushimi jōkō shōjō (*Kamakura Ibun* [Takeuchi Rizō ed., Tokyo, 1971–; hereafter *KI*], 36:28375); 1323/4/9 Go-Fushimi jōkō yuzurijō (*KI*, 36:28376).

36. HTS 1322/9/14.

37. D. Chappell (ed.), *T'ien-tai Buddhism: An Outline of the Fourfold Teachings* (Tokyo, 1983), 140–141, note 22, notes that at the level of Distinctive doctrine the three truths of emptiness, provisional existence, and the middle view (or mediated reality, Pollack, 80) are seen as independent, while in the Complete doctrine they are interfused.

38. For example, HTS 1324/9/2.

39. See Goble, "Emperor Hanazono (1297-1348): An Intellectual's Response to Social Change."

40. HTS 1317/3/3.

41. HTS 1322/10/15, 16.

42. Exploration of this important point is beyond the scope of this paper. Kuroda Toshio has addressed this question extensively. For a brief synopsis, see his *Jisha seiryoku* (Tokyo, 1980), 44–47. In this context, it is relevant that Hanazono would refer to them on another occasion. As recorded in the *Chronicle of Daitō Kokushi*, one exchange between Hanazono and Myōchō (see below) was "The Emperor began, 'The Buddha's Law face to face with the King's Law—how inconceivable!' The Master replied 'The King's Law face to face with the Buddha's Law—how inconceivable!'" (translated by Kraft, "Zen Master Daitō," 277).

43. HTS 1321/1/21, 22, and 1324/12/21. Jien's *Record of a Dream* (*Jichin Kashō musō ki*) is discussed in D. Brown & Ishida Ichirō, *The Future and the Past* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 412ff. Also, Akamatsu Toshihide, "Jichin kashō musōki ni tsuite," in his *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1957), 317–335. In noting this I do not mean to suggest that a work such as Jien's had to be read in order for members of the Imperial family to be aware of the doctrine, which was after all a well known one. (See for example Go-Uda's undated posthumous instructions to Daikakuji, in Nakamura Naokatsu ed., *Daikakuji monjo* [Kyoto, 1980], 1:9–18). However, Hanazono's acquaintance with Jien's writing does suggest serious attention to the underlying subtleties.

44. HTS 1322/12/5.

45. HTS 1323/6/26. Hanazono's reference to Bodhidharma is probably taken from the commentary to the first Case in the *Hekiganroku*, "The Highest Meaning of the Holy Truths." See Thomas & J.C. Cleary, *The Blue Cliff Record* (Boulder & London: Shambhala Press, 1977), 1–9.

46. HTS 1320/1/21, 22, 1322/5/11, 1322/10/2, 3; 1319/10/2, 1321/8/7, 1322/7/18.

47. HTS 1322/11/19, 11/28, 12/5, 12/28. See also note 13 above. The basic commentary on the *Great Sun Sūtra*, the *Dainichikyō sho* in 20 fascicles that was used in Shingon, was written by Amoghavajra with supplemental comments by the T'ang monk I-hsing. A 14 fascicle edition of this, the *Dainichikyō gishaku*, was edited by Chih-yen and Wen-ku, and was used in Tendai.

48. For the *Hokke honshaku* see *Ressei Zenshū, Onsenshū*, vol 6 (Tokyo, 1917), 87–103; Iwahashi Koyata, *Hanazono tennō* (Tokyo, 1962), 139–140. For further information on concepts such as the five flavors or encompassing three and returning to one, see Chappell, especially 55–82.

49. For concise discussions, see Minoru Kiyota, *Shingon Buddhism* (Tokyo & Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International, 1983), 81–104; Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*, 1: 184–193; Yamasaki Taikō, *Shingon: Japanese Esoteric Buddhism* (Boston and London: Shambhala Press, 1988), 123–151.

50. Following Iwahashi, *Hanazono tennō*, 136–137.

51. HTS 1323/7/11, 1324/3/25, 1324/6/16.

52. HTS 1323/7/15.

53. HTS 1323/7/11, 7/14, 7/15, 7/18. Also Iwahashi, *Hanazono tennō*, 136–138.

54. HTS 1324/6/16.

55. HTS 1324/8/20, 21, 23, 24, 1325/5/19; 1324/12/21.

56. HTS 1325/8/21.

57. For Hanazono's letters to Jigen through 1331, see *Shinkan eiga*, 1:149–155. Jigen became head (*bettō*) of Kitano shrine in 1328. He was appointed Tendai abbot (*zasu*) by Go-Daigo in 1330/4 (resigning in 1330/11), just after the Imperial progress to Enryakuji and in the middle of the period when Go-Daigo was actively working to build his links with Enryakuji. Jigen's sympathies were sufficiently with the Emperor that he was arrested by the *bakufu* in the wake of Go-Daigo's move against it (the Genkō Incident) in 1331 (HTS 1332/2/6).

58. The information in this section is drawn from Iwasa Miyoko, *Kyōgoku ha waka no kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1987), 100–112. I am indebted to Professor Robert Huey of the University of Hawaii at Manoa for bringing this work to my attention.

59. The work appears in print for the first time in Iwasa, 112–117. Iwasa presents a convincing argument that the work was authored by Hanazono, whereas previous biographers (such as Iwahashi, 140–141, who had been unable to examine the text) have been reluctant to acknowledge that more than the postscript was written by Hanazono. Confirmation of Hanazono's authorship, and that in consequence he was given the seal of esoteric transmission, buttresses Iwahashi's view (Iwahashi, 138), based on a letter from Hanazono to Jigen sent around 1331/8 (*Shinkan eiga*, 1:155), that Hanazono must have received the esoteric transmission prior to that date. Iwahashi implies that the seal was granted by Jigen, and it is of course by no means impossible that Hanazono received the seal from more than one teacher. At any rate it is clear that he did receive it from Shinsō.

60. Iwasa, 113–114.

61. HTS 1321/8/19. Here we must make allowance for the fact that the diary has full year entries prior to this only for 1313 and 1319. Still, the total absence of references to Zen is striking.

62. For Hanazono's fulsome praise of Suketomo's talents see HTS 1319/intercalary 7/4. For a discussion of Suketomo and his times, see Inoue Yoshinobu, "Hino Suketomom shōron," in Kyoto daigaku bungakubu kokushi kenkyushitsu ed., *Akamatsu Toshihide kyōjū taikan kinen kokushi ronshū* (Kyoto, 1972), 581–595; Goble, "Go-Daigo and the Kemmu Restoration," 62–73.

63. Nanpo Jōmin (1235–1308) studied under Rankei Dōryū (Lan-chi Tao-lung, 1213–1278), went to China, and upon his return established his own flourishing school, initially at Sūfukuji in Chikuzen. He was later recognized as a national master with the title Daiō Kokushi. The Zen teachers Hanazono is known to have met were, with one exception, from this lineage: Shūhō Myōchō (1238–1338, Daitō Kokushi); Zekkai Sōtaku (d. 1334); Tsūō Kyōen (1257–1325, Fushō Daikō kokushi), and Kanzan Egen (1277–1360, Musō daishi). The exception is Myōgyō (Gatsurin Dōkō, 1293–1351, posthumously Kenkō Daitō kokushi), Hanazono's first teacher. Myōgyō had initially been a disciple of Kōhō Kennichi (1241–1316) in Kamakura, but after Kōhō's death he went to Kyoto and developed very close ties to Myōchō.

64. See Goble, "Chinese Influences in the Emperor Hanazono Diary." For some of the intellectual tensions involved in the reception of Zen in Japan, see Pollack, *The Fracture of Meaning*, 111–133. For Hanazono's comment see HTS 1322/7/27.

65. HTS 1320/4/28. For biographical information on Myōgyō see Tsuji Zennosuke, *Nihon bukkyōshi, chūsei 2* (Kyoto, 1949), 244–247, and notes 63 above and 69 below.

66. The diary records only two meetings between 1320/4/28 and 1321/8/19: 1320/10/12, 1320/10/24.

67. HTS 1321/8/19.

68. HTS 1321/12/11, 12/14, 12/25.

69. (1321/12/26) Hanazono jōkō shōjō (*KI*, 36:27927). Although by the time of Myōgyō's return in 1330 Hanazono was a disciple of Myōchō, the two did remain in contact, and Hanazono gave some support to Myōgyō when the latter was successfully turning Kyoto's Chōfukuji into a Rinzaï temple. Indeed, Hanazono even composed a poem praising Myōgyō. See also 1346/12/25 Hanazono-in shōsoku (*Shinkan eiga*, 1:157. Though *Kamakura ibun*, 36:27928, suggests that this letter should be dated 1321/12/26, I have elected to follow *Shinkan eiga*). In recognition of his work, in 1357 Myōgyō was posthumously granted the national master title of Kenkō Daitō kokushi.

70. HTS 1322/3/10.

71. The *Chronicle of Daitō Kokushi*, entry for 1316, in Kraft, "Zen Master Daitō," 277.

72. HTS 1323/5/23, 1323/9/14, 9/16. Though the first recorded meeting took place on 1323/5/23, Hanazono notes that their discussion was "as before," though he does not give any indication of how long before. For a discussion of the contact between Hanazono and Myōchō, see also Tamamura Takeji, "Hanazono tennō to Daitō kokushi," in his *Nihon zenshūshi ronshū* (Kyoto,

1976), 303–314. For a study of Daitō, see Kraft, “Zen Master Daitō.”

73. HTS 1323/7/19.

74. HTS 1323/10/18, 1323/12/14. Tsuji, *Nihon bukkō shi*, 249, suggests that the *Mumonkan* reference is to number 13, the “Tokusan Carried His Bowls” *kōan*. See also Shibayama Zenkei *Zen Comments on the Mumonkan* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), 99–100.

75. HTS 1323/12/14. “Pearls scattered on the back of a notebook bound in pearls” is more literally “Pearls scattered on the back of a notebook bound in thin purple cloth.” The word for “thin purple cloth” is *shira*, which was also an older term for “pearls.” Accordingly the reply contains a wordplay which I have translated in the text since it gives perhaps a better flavor for a Zen *mondō*. Zekkai Sōtaku (d. 1334) was Nanpo Jōmin’s oldest disciple, and Myōchō’s senior. He began his training at Manjūji in Bungo, then studied under Jōmin at Sūfukuji in Chikuzen until 1306 when he went to Kyoto to become the 7th abbot of Manjūji. He later served as 2nd abbot of Ryūshōji, fourth abbot of Nanzenji, and from early 1333 until his death the following year was head of Jōchiji in Kamakura.

76. Kraft, 282. The exchange is in the *Chronicle of Daitō Kokushi* for the year 1321, but the dating is clearly wrong. The *Chronicle* (Kraft, 277) has another exchange under the year 1316: “On another occasion the Emperor asked the Master, ‘Who is the man who does not accompany the myriad dharmas?’ The Master waved the fan in his hand and said ‘The Imperial wind will fan the earth for a long time.’”

77. Discussed in Kraft, 113–119.

78. Kraft, 117. Kyōen’s death clearly shocked people. As Hanazono notes, revealing an interesting sidelight on conditions of the time, “Some say that he was killed by a robber, others say that he was murdered on the road. It is not known who did it. It is just inexplicable. (I later heard that his being murdered was an empty rumor. He simply died suddenly).” (HTS 1325/int 1/28). Kyōen (1257–1325), another disciple of Nanpo Jōmin, studied at Sūfukuji in Chikuzen, then, like Zekkai Sōtaku, went to Manjūji and later, at Emperor Go-Daigo’s instruction, became eighth abbot of Nanzenji. In his last years he served as Zen master to Go-Daigo, who bestowed upon him the title Fushō Daikō kokushi.

79. 1325/2/29 Hanazono jōkō inzen (*Dai Nihon Komonjo, Daitokuji monjo*, [comp. Tokyo Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo, 14 vols, Tokyo, 1943–1985] 1:12); 1337/8/26 Hanazono jōkō shinkan okibumi (*DNK, Daitokuji monjo*, 1:2). For Hanazono’s continuing contact with Daitokuji and Myōshinji through his patronage of Kanzan Egen (1277–1360), who became Hanazono’s Zen teacher after Myōchō’s death, see Kraft *op. cit.*, especially 107ff., and 1347/7/22 Hanazono jōkō shinkan okibumi (*Shinkan eiga*, 1:162), 1347/7/29 Hanazono jōkō shinkan okibumi (*Shinkan eiga*, 1:163).

80. 1325/10/2, 1325/10/10. The question of Musō Soseki’s (1275–1351) competence has attracted the attention of many commentators, but his crucial role in the institutionalization of the Rinzaï Zen monastic institution is beyond dispute. See Akamatsu Toshihide & Philip Yampolsky, “Muromachi Zen and the Gozan System,” in J.W. Hall & Toyoda Takeshi, *Japan in the Muromachi*

Age, 322–324; Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, 84 ff., 151–165; Pollack, *The Fracture of Meaning*, 111–133.

81. The decision to designate Daitokuji as a closed temple was actually made by Go-Daigo (1334/1/28 Go-Daigo tennō rinji, *DNK, Daitokuji monjo*, 1:15) but Hanazono also accepted the decision (1337/8/26 Hanazono jōkō shinkan okibumi) (*DNK, Daitokuji monjo*, 1:2). For the context of Go-Daigo's patronage, see Goble, "Go-Daigo and the Kemmu Restoration," 112–120, 288–307; Collcutt, 84–97; Kraft, 125–137; Akamatsu & Yampolsky, 324–325.

82. *HTS* 1323/11/1, 11/20, 12/10, 12/14, 1325/2/9, 2/23, 4/29, 7/17, 8/24. Also Kraft, 133–134.

83. The translation is Kraft's, "Zen Master Daitō," 299 and 353 note 50. Also *Shinkan eiga*, 1:158, 159; *DNK, Daitokuji monjo*, 13:3207.

84. Kraft, 111.

85. Hanazono's explicitly political and social views, as noted most succinctly in his *Admonitions to the Crown Prince (Kaitaishi sho)*, written in 1330, will be the subject of a later study.

86. LaFleur, 88ff.

87. See R. Huey, *Kyōgoku Tamekane: Poetry and Politics in Late Kamakura Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989)

88. *HTS* 1332/3/24.

89. The *Fūgashū (FGS)*, compiled around 1347, was the 17th Imperial poetry anthology. Though formally compiled under the direction of Hanazono, who wrote the Chinese and Japanese introductions to the collection, much of the actual work was done by ex-Emperor Kōgon and Reizei Tamehide (d. 1372). I have used the edition of Tsugita Kōshō & Iwasa Miyoko, *Fūgawakashū* (Tokyo, 1974).

90. *FGS*, 2063, 2073, 2051, 2057 & 2067. The latter two contain the *Hekiganroku* references, respectively to cases 46 (see following note) and 100 (the "Haryō's Sword Against Which A Hair is Blown" *kōan*). Both are contained in Sekida, Katsuki, *Two Zen Classics: Mumonkan and Hekiganroku* (New York & Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1977).

91. *FGS*, 2057. For the *Hekiganroku* reference, see Katsuki Sekida, 273–277. R. Brower & E. Miner, *Japanese Court Poetry* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961), 388, provide a translation of this poem, but have attributed it to ex-Emperor Fushimi (1265–1317).

92. See L. Hurvitz, *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), 293–302.

93. *FGS*, 2046. Translated by Brower & Miner, 367. I have drawn heavily on their interpretation. For a slightly different rendering of the poem, see G. Sansom, *A History of Japan: 1334–1615* (London: Cresset Press, 1961), 131. Sansom incorrectly suggests that the poem was included in Tamekane's *Gyokuyōshū* of 1312, leading him to note that Hanazono was "still a youth but older than his years."

94. Brower & Miner, 368.

Proper Names

Chih-i	智顛	Jigen	慈嚴
Chishō	智證	Jimyō-in	持明院
Chūgen	忠源	Kōbō daishi	弘法大師
Chūsei	忠性	Kongōkai	金剛界
Daikakuji	大覺寺	Kūkai	空海
Daiō kokushi	大應國師	Kyōgoku Tamekane	京極爲兼
Daitō kokushi	大燈國師	Miidera	三井寺
Daitō kokushi	大德國師	Musō Soseki	夢窓疎石
Daitokuji	大徳寺	Myōchō	妙超
Dengyō daishi	傳教大師	Myōgyō	妙曉
Dōgen	道元	Nanpo Jōmin	南浦紹明
Enchin	圓珍	Nichiren	日蓮
Enryakuji	延暦寺	Ninnaji	仁和寺
Eshin	惠心	Nyokū	如空
Fujiwara Shunzei	藤原俊成	Ōtōkan	隱燈關
Gatsurin Dōkō	月林灌皎	Rinzai	臨濟
Genshin	源信	Saichō	最澄
Go-Daigo	後醍醐	Sanron	三論
Go-Fushimi	後伏見	Shingon	真言
Go-Uda	後宇多	Shinran	親鸞
Hanazono	花園	Shinsō	心叢
Hieizan	比叡山	Sōki	增基
Hino Suketomo	日野資朝	Sōtō	曹洞
Hirosawa	廣澤	Taimitsu	白密
Hondō	本道	Taizōkai	胎藏界
Honen	法然	Tendai	天台
Ikkō senshū	一向專念	Tōmitsu	東密
Iō	醫王	Tsūō Kyōen	通鈔鏡園
Ji	時	Zekkai Sōtaku	絶塵宗卓
Jien (Jichin)	慈圓 (慈嶺)		

Texts

- Amida kyō 阿弥陀經
 Bommō kyō 梵網經
 Chia-tai pudeng lu 嘉泰普燈錄
 Dainichi kyō 大日經
 Dainichi kyō gishaku 大日經義疏
 Dainichi kyō shō 大日經疏
 Fūgashū 風雅集
 Hekiganroku 碧巖錄
 Hitsuzō hōyaku ron 秘藏宝鑑論
 Hokke kyō 法華經
 Hokke honshaku 法華品釈
 Inkyō 韻鏡
 Itchōshō 一帖抄
 Jichin kashō musō ki 慈鎮和尚夢窓記
 Jizō hongan kyō 地藏本願經
 Kammu ryōjū kyō 觀無量壽經
 Maka shikan 摩訶止觀
 Mo-ho shih-kuan 摩訶止觀
 Mumonkan 無門關
 Ōjō yōshū 往生要集
 Ryōga kyō 楞伽經
 Saishō kyō 最勝王經
 Senjaku (hongan nembutsu) kyō 選択(本願念佛)集
 Shichi ka hōmon kuketsu 七箇法門口決
 Shin kyō 心經
 Shittanji ki 悉曇字記
 Shōsan jōdō kyō 稱讚淨土經
 Yuima kyō 維摩經

Terms

bekkyō	別教	
buppō	佛法	
chūkan	中觀	
gonkyō mitsukyō	權教密教	
gose	後世	
gosō	五相	
hokke hakkō	法華八講	
isshin sankan	一心三觀	
jitsukyō	實教	
jō	定	
kegyō	加行	
kuden	口伝	
mappō	末法	
metsugo mappō	滅後末法	
michi	道	
mujō	無常	
ōbō	王法	
ōjō	往生	
sankan	三觀	
sanmitsu	三密	
satori	悟	
shikan chūdō no chijō ryoku	止觀中道之智定力	
shūgyō	修行	
tendoku	転読	
yondo	四度	
yūsui	幽邃	
zenkon	曹拱	