JAPANESE ZEN
A Symposium

HAGA KŌSHIRŌ & OSAKA KŌRYŪ
KARAKI JUNZŌ, MODERATOR

1. *Early Japanese Zen*

Karaki: The Zen school first seems to have taken clear form in Japan from about the time of Eisai (d. 1215) and Dōgen (d. 1253), but was it that a person like Eisai suddenly appeared, or had there existed the environment or atmosphere—say, on Mt. Hiei—in which an Eisai naturally came forth?

Haga: Surely there was such an environment, from a surprisingly long way back. To trace it back, before Eisai there was Dainichi Nōnin (ca. 1189). Before Dainichi there was the transmission of Kaku'a (b. 1151), but this died out without further development. Before that Chōnen (ca. 983), the famous monk who had gone to the Asian mainland, sought to introduce Zen, but gave up after failing to obtain imperial sanction. Going back still further, in the time of Emperor Saga (r. 810–823), the Empress Danrin (787–851) invited a Chinese Zen monk named I-k'ung (Gikū, ca. 834) to Japan. And earlier still monks like Saichō (d. 822) and Ennin (d. 862) made partial transmissions of the Niu-t'ou (Gozu) line of Zen. Hence Zen was transmitted in bits and pieces from the early Heian period onward, but even though transplanted, the groundwork that could nurture and support it was not yet ready in the Heian period, and all attempts withered away. However, from about the close of the Heian period, such a groundwork had been prepared. This is a rough outline of the historical development. Precisely what that groundwork was is a problem, however.

Osaka: That is the overall situation, but I wonder if we shouldn't consider this aspect. Eisai for the most part studied in Tendai (Ch., T'ien-t'ai). He studied quite widely, but Japanese Tendai was at that time gradually waning. Nevertheless, it traditionally possessed immense power, so Eisai conceived a fervent desire to go to China, thinking it necessary to recommence his studies there, and made the journey. There he met Hōnen's follower Chōgen (d. 1195) and together they climbed Mt. T'ien-t'ai. Eisai further decided to go to India, but after only five months or so he was back in Japan. However, Eisai was determined to become a second Dengyō[1] and to revive Japanese Buddhism, so he returned to China. Heading once again for Mt. T'ien-t'ai, he happened to meet the Zen Master Hsü-an Huai-ch'ang (Kian Eshō, ca. 1191) at Wan-nien-ssu (Bannen-ji), a temple at the foot of the mountain. It was a case of perfect mutual correspondence. Eisai was deeply impressed and practiced morning and evening under Huai-ch'ang for four years. He finally received *inka* (certification) for the Huang-lung (Ōryō) branch of Lin-chi (Rinzai) Zen and for the first time properly transmitted Zen was brought to Japan. After his return to Japan he wrote *Kōzen gokoku ron* (The Propagation of Zen for the Protection of the Country) and promoted Zen, and the Shōgun Minamoto Yoriie (d. 1204) built Kennin-ji for him. This was not, however, a practice hall of pure Zen, but had within its compound a subtemple for Tendai meditation, Shikan-in, and one for esoteric teachings and practices, Shingon-in. On the Shingon side, Eisai became the founder of the Yōjō school of esoteric Buddhism. In the final analysis it seems that Eisai, while aspiring to revive the old Buddhism, became the founder of the new Buddhism of Zen as the result of a variety of conditions.

Karaki: Eisai, like Dōgen a little later, spent time on Mt. Hiei, and he states in *Kōzen gokoku ron* that the Buddhism of the present Mt. Hiei is in terrible shape. The lion has become a lamb. As it is now, Mt. Hiei is hopeless, and so on. It seems that such consciousness was extremely strong. It is probably from this that there arose the desire

[1] The posthumous title given Saichō, founder of the Tendai school in Japan.

to go, not only to China, but all the way to India.

Haga: In the world of Kamakura period (1192–1333) Buddhism as a whole a broad trend of "going back to Shakyamuni" welled up. Not only Eisai, but Myōe Shōnin (d. 1232) among others longed for Shakyamuni with almost a lover's yearning and was determined to go to India. Ultimately these were both expressions of the zeal to re-do Buddhism once more from the very first step and to rebuild it.

II. *Ju-ching (Nyojō, 1163–1228) and Dōgen*

Osaka: The position of Ju-ching is quite different. The phrase "dropping off body and mind" is usually understood to mean breaking completely free and attaining satori, but for the Zen Master Ju-ching, "dropping off body and mind" was zazen, so that to do zazen was already to drop off body and mind. The conclusion came at the start. It is not that one drops off body and mind and then attains satori; rather, Ju-ching deeply believed that if one did zazen, that in itself was, from the very beginning, the essence of dropping off body and mind.

Dōgen's Zen teaches that practice and attainment are non-dual; it further teaches that if you do not practice you will not attain realization, so one must, of course, practice. But Dōgen puts faith in the realm of realization. That attitude is a matter of exceedingly great importance. Dōgen said that if it is perfectly clear that the eyes are horizontal and the nose vertical, then training has ended. Zazen in itself is dropping off body and mind. Ju-ching was a man firm in his conviction of this. As a result, Dōgen had extreme distaste for tags like "the school of Bodhidharma," to say nothing of "the Five Houses" or "the Seven Sects." To refer to schools other than that of Ju-ching, he often uses the words "general storehouse of the Buddha Dharma." Although Ju-ching's lineage in the end took the form of Sōtō Zen, Dōgen disliked being defined with such sectarian labels.

Karaki: In connection with Ju-ching and Dōgen, I recently had a look at the transcript of the panel discussion on Chinese Zen for an earlier volume of this series,[2] and there it is said of Eisai and Dōgen, and

[2] See "*Dialogue*: Chinese Zen" in vol. VIII, no. 2 of this journal.

Daiō Kokushi (d. 1309) and Shōichi Kokushi (d. 1280) as well, that the Japanese Zen monks who went to China during the Sung dynasty (960–1126) seem to have been more able than their Chinese counterparts. What the Chinese monks possessed in only nine parts, they were able to receive in the full ten. I rather hesitate to say this, but in reading *Shōbōgenzō* I wonder exactly what sort of person Ju-ching was. In my opinion, Dōgen, who studied under Ju-ching, somehow outshines his master. I sense that Ju-ching as written of by Dōgen outshines the actual Ju-ching. On the point of "only doing zazen"—*shikan taza*—which was just mentioned, it is recorded in *Hōkyō-ki*[3] that Ju-ching taught that sutra chanting, burning of incense and ritual worship all were unnecessary; one should only do zazen. I have not read Ju-ching's record, but I wonder if he was really a man of *shikan taza*.

Osaka: In monks like Dōgen, Daiō and Shōichi Kokushi, there certainly seem to be insights surpassing those of their masters. But Ju-ching appears really to have been of the *shikan taza* lineage.

Karaki: But isn't there a great deal of koan Zen in Ju-ching? There is the opinion that Dōgen accepted Ju-ching emphasizing *shikan taza*. Is this correct? What kind of temple was Mt. T'ien-t'ung? What was the religious atmosphere?

Osaka: Certainly Ju-ching, in his collected sayings, and in his verses and sermons as well, treated many koan. Dōgen's attainment of satori came about in this way. Ju-ching entered the meditation hall and scolded a monk who was sleeping in zazen with the words, "To practice Zen is to drop off body and mind. In spite of this you devote yourself only to sleeping: what is the meaning of this?" Hearing these words, Dōgen suddenly attained great satori. Thus for Dōgen, needless to say, dropping off body and mind and only doing zazen represent a realm of profound experience. Further, Mt. T'ien-t'ung itself was quite ancient. It was founded by the Dharma master I-hsing (Gikō Hōshi, n.d.) in the time of the Chin dynasty Emperor Ching (r. 258–263). The name of the temple changed a number of times, but it was famous as the mountain where Hung-chih (Wanshi, 1091–1157) and Ju-ching

[3] See translation on pp. 102–139.

lived. Ju-ching lived the life of a wandering priest for many years and stayed on Mt. T'ien-t'ung only from the age of sixty-one until his death at sixty-six, so Dōgen was very fortunate to meet him there. Upon meeting Ju-ching, Dōgen received a tremendous awakening, as though he had for the first time attained what he was after.

I wonder if that sort of thinking regarding *shikan taza* wasn't rare in China. Ju-ching was already strongly rejecting practices such as burning incense, ritual worship and sutra chanting. However, there is a slightly self-contradictory aspect here. Although the point is to do zazen, it is not simply sitting; he speaks after all of eliminating the Five Desires and the Five Restraints. When you take the position that even though a man does zazen, if he is possessed of the Five Desires it is not yet true zazen, then inevitably there arises the question of why it is necessary to practice if everyone naturally possesses the true Dharma-nature. Dōgen himself was greatly troubled by this question. This is an idea that arose from the teaching of "original enlightenment"; if Rinzai Zen is to be classified, it places stress rather on the teaching of "acquired enlightenment." I do not know whether it was Bodhidharma himself who said, "Directly pointing at man's mind, seeing into one's nature and becoming a Buddha," but by the time of the Sixth Patriarch, Hui-neng (Enō, d. 713), importance is clearly placed on *kenshō*, seeing into one's nature. In contrast to the Zen of the Sixth Patriarch, and of Bodhidharma also, which makes such an issue of *kenshō*, the Zen of Ju-ching and Dōgen does not lay such stress on it. However, *kenshō* itself embraces something of the thought of both "acquired enlightenment" and "original enlightenment"; in general, in terms of Zen lineages, it is Rinzai Zen that makes an issue of *kenshō* with emphasis on the aspect of "acquired enlightenment." This is a personal view, but "one's nature" is something that does not change; it is original nature. If one looks upon it as the original nature which a thing naturally possesses, and further considers *kenshō* to be its spontaneous manifestation, then it seems to me that *kenshō* in itself is not necessarily to be rejected, even from a position like Dōgen's.

Karaki: I wonder if there is a Chinese work with the temper of mind of *Shōbōgenzō*'s ninety-five fascicles. In those parts where there is a

determined effort to speak logically of things that cannot be put into logic I feel an intense passion. It is an endeavor, addressed to disciples, to instruct by pulling down into the arena of logic matters which on the whole transcend logic. Although in reality it is impossible to transform them in their entirety into logical terms, there is a very strong sense of the effort to make them somehow communicable in words. Does this make *Shōbōgenzō* a work peculiar to Dōgen?

Haga: I am not well-read in Chinese works so it is impossible for me to draw a conclusion, but even comparing *Shōbōgenzō* to works like *Ts'ung-jung-an lu* (*Shōyō-an roku*; The Record of Ts'ung-jung Hermitage), which approaches Dōgen's, it seems to me the tone differs. I wonder if Dōgen's strong individuality isn't at work here.

Karaki: The character *dō* (道 way) of the words *dōtoku* 道得 and *dōjaku* 道著[4] is used with the meaning of "to say." It is as though there were a passion to speak in words of that which transcends words. This is my feeling. Yet if one were to fall back on the Zen saying, "no relying on words or letters," and let it all go, then one could have an end of it. I feel that the special character of Dōgen's Zen lies in these words, *dōtoku* and *dōjaku*. It seems to me that if "doing only zazen" were the point, then without writing ninety-five fascicles, "Do zazen" would have been enough. In spite of this there is a determination to explain completely and logically why it is necessary to do zazen. Isn't *Shōbōgenzō* a book of great singularity?

Osaka: Dōgen wrote *Fukanzazengi* (The Universal Promotion of the Principles of Zazen) with that intention as soon as he returned to Japan. In writing it, he at first urged ordinary people to take up Zen, but as one might expect with the practical problems involved, it did not go at all well. So, thinking to be satisfied with even "one man or half a man"—out of the determination to somehow truly transmit the essence of Zen—he came to speak with that zealousness, in spite of the inherent difficulty. Even if he had addressed his words to the general public, who would have been able to assent?

Haga: Dōgen's expression and development of themes are highly original.

---

[4] In either case, the literal meaning here is "to be able to say a word."

However, it seems to me the style and development of another book from roughly the same period, the *Gukanshō* of Jien (d. 1225), has many points of close resemblance.

Karaki: There are, in style, areas in which they are somewhat alike.

Haga: While going over and over the same ground, little by little they go deeper. Nishida's philosophy is like this also. It is probably the Japanese methodology of thought. (*Laughter*)

III. *The Buddha Dharma and the Dharma of the State*

Karaki: Dōgen, secluding himself at Eihei-ji in Echizen, strongly insisted that a monk should not become familiar with men in positions of authority, such as rulers and leaders of state, but should pass a lifetime among the deep mountains and still valleys. This he actually practiced himself. But Eisai and those following him, including the monks of the Five Mountains,[5] took pleasure in mixing with leaders of the state and of secular life. For example, even in Eisai's *Kōzen gokoku ron* the nation and the rule of state are taken up. I find the Buddha's teaching and the rule of state to be relatively free of mutual contradiction—or, perhaps, that contradictions at times arise—but I wonder if actually connecting the two isn't one of the peculiarities of Japanese Zen.

Osaka: Dōgen did not particularly connect them.

Karaki: Dōgen was off in the deep mountains and still valleys, but, for example, there is the encounter between Emperor Hanazono (r. 1308–1318) and Daitō Kokushi (d. 1338). Here the Buddha Dharma and the rule of the state are not mutually contradictory; or rather, beyond being non-contradictory, they seem to have a congenial bearing for each other—there is a kind of cooperation.

Osaka: This is because from the beginning Buddhism entered Japan by way of the imperial family. In particular there was the great personage of Prince Shōtoku (d. 622); but also the connections between the Five Mountains of Kyoto and the imperial palace were quite close. In China, however, there was the idea that Buddhists should not pay

[5] The five main Rinzai temples in Kyoto.

homage to rulers. In the case of a great man like Hui-chung (Echu Kokushi, d. 769), Emperor Su-tsung (r. 756–762) grew more and more eager to have him come, and when he went to the palace in a carriage the Emperor himself helped draw it to welcome him; there was this kind of attitude also. And Hui-chung nonchalantly let himself be pulled. Such scenes often occurred in China. To take another example, there was Lan-tsan (Ransan Oshō, n.d.) who—however many times the T'ang Emperor Te-tsung (r. 779–805) summoned him—would not leave his mountain cave. In China, then, there was this way of thinking where one did not consider keeping a person's company simply because he happened to be emperor.

Haga: What was it like in India? In Indian Buddhism, was not the emphasis placed on not keeping the company of rulers?

Osaka: In India, the rank of the religious was still higher than that of the ruling families.

Haga: Not associating at all with rulers in India became, upon reaching China, either associating or not associating. In Japan, partly influenced by the historical circumstances of the rise of Buddhism, the situation then changed so that the Buddha's teaching and the rule of state were non-dual. The highest truth, viewed by the enlightened mind, and the truth of everyday life were unified.

Karaki: Looked at closely, however, sometimes they were together, sometimes separated. In the encounter between Emperor Wu (r. 502–549) and Bodhidharma (d. 532), for example, there was a conflict of wills, and Bodhidharma promptly crossed the Yangtze River and hid himself in Mt. Sung. This is the concealment of nine years' facing a wall in Bodhidharma's Zen. It is keeping his distance from people in power like Wu.

Osaka: It was not concealment.

Haga: I don't think so either. In Emperor Wu's question, "What is the first principle of the holy truth," the "holy truth" is the non-duality of the highest truth and the everyday truth. In response, Bodhidharma answered, "Vast emptiness, and nothing in it to be called holy." However, in this answer, where the "everyday truth" of the affairs of the state or of the world is denied, this non-duality is strongly affirmed.

This has the same meaning as the passage from the *Lotus Sutra*, "The daily business of living does not deviate from the Buddha's teaching." Accepting this, we see that Bodhidharma did not deny the rule of the state or the everyday truth. His departure from Wu's state was based on the perception that Emperor Wu was inadequate to the true transmission of Zen, and his seclusion at Mt. Sung was not a simple denial or flight from the world.

Osaka: In India there is a great deal of negation employed as a method of expression—"the logic of affirmation-negation."[6] I think that in India Zen was contemplative, but when it moved to China, it took on the form of the *mondō*, the Zen dialogue. In the meeting of Bodhidharma with Emperor Wu, immediately there was a mondō, but this mondō was not a success. However, Zen is disinterested, taking the general attitude of not refusing those who come and not running after those who leave. It was a failure, so thinking it useless to stay, Bodhidharma turned and left. Since he went into the mountains it appeared to be concealment, but that is a bit of a distortion. With Bodhidharma sitting perfectly still there—to use a contemporary image—it was as though a big broadcasting station had been built; there seemed to be no connection, but I think he was broadcasting without speech, sending out on a boundless wavelength. In China, before that time, various foundations had been fairly well built up, and there were already people sitting; there was the thought of people like Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu, and the *Prajñāpāramitā sutras*, the *Lotus Sutra*, and the *Vimalakīrti Sutra* had all been translated. So a Zen-like atmosphere gradually developed there, and although there was no instruction given, a path opened up spontaneously. In such a situation Bodhidharma awaited the time when the broadcast would connect.

Karaki: Spontaneously giving off radio signals—that's very interesting. However, when Daitō Kokushi and Emperor Hanazono met, the Emperor said, "Is it not a matter of unthinkability that the Buddha's Dharma should come face-to-face with the dharma of the state?"

[6] A term coined by D. T. Suzuki to characterize the logic found, for example, in the *Diamond Sutra*.

Daitō Kokushi immediately replied, "Is it not a matter of unthinkability that the dharma of the state should come face-to-face with the Buddha Dharma?" What is the "unthinkability"? It is extremely difficult for the dharma of the state and the Buddha Dharma to become united; however, indeed "unthinkably," they are together. Is it this kind of "unthinkability," or is it that by some stroke of fortune the dharma of the state and the Buddha Dharma have accidentally met?

Osaka: It does not mean that they unexpectedly happened to meet. I am not sure of the meaning with which that word was used in the circumstances, but if the dharma of the state rises to the stage of "unthinkability," then it also becomes the Buddha Dharma, and since the Buddha Dharma is originally in the position of "unthinkability," when this happens, the Buddha Dharma and the dharma of the state do not, in their essential nature, differ. At that point—perhaps we can say "of mutual understanding"—the feeling was extremely congenial, and the Emperor bestowed the title *Kokushi* (National Teacher): Kozen Daitō Kokushi.

Haga: I think you describe this very accurately. In the reality which in itself is beyond thinking, the Buddha Dharma and the dharma of the state are not separate. We should understand it in this way: looked at from the unthinkable reality itself, they are non-dual; but if you consider them in terms of aspect and function, which are its manifestations, the rule of the state is the rule of the state, the Buddha Dharma the Buddha Dharma, and they are certainly not one. It does not mean that they by accident—unthinkably—have met.

Karaki: To return to Emperor Wu, it is said that he was a sympathizer or a patron of Buddhism, but in the final analysis I think his rule, which was a military one, was at variance with the rule of righteousness and the principles of royalty. In the case of the Japanese court, there was the tradition of *miyabi*—elegance—and culture developed with the court as its center. This court was the wellspring of works like the imperial anthologies of waka, and I think it could even be said that culture was the court. It is odd to speak of Zen as a cultural phenomenon—although perhaps we can call it a culture—but the requisite elements for relating to it existed, I think, in the *miyabi*

elegance of the court.

Osaka: To put what you have just said about Zen being a culture in different words, since Japan has a tradition of elegance with the imperial court as its center, it has a culture centered on noble blood (*chi*). Further, if we consider the word *chi* (血 blood) from the angle of a homophone, then there is also *chi* (智 wisdom or satori), the culture of Zen or Buddhism. These cultures of *chi*—of noble blood and of wisdom—harmonized or synthesized in the court. In a sense, although the cultures are rather different in nature, this very situation lent itself more easily than others to their union.

Karaki: The Muromachi Shōguns—whether we take Yoshimitsu (1358–1408) or Yoshimasa (1435–1490)—supported Zen and personally read Zen material. In the Higashiyama villa, Ginkaku-ji, there are a number of Zen elements, and Zen subjects seem to have been numerous in their collections of scrolls and paintings. What is the connection between the Muromachi Shōgunate and Zen? Or more specifically, rather than simply "connection," I would like to include, for example, the question of how we are to consider the literature of the Five Mountains.

Haga: In the succession of Ashikaga Shōguns, there was, I think, no one who truly understood Zen; no shōgun who went so far as to "see into his own nature." The Shōgunate and the Bakufu accorded importance to Zen monks not as men of religion, but rather as consultants in matters of culture and foreign intercourse. Monks of Musō's lineage served in precisely this way. As the Zen of Musō's lineage is Rinzai Zen, we might expect *kenshō* to be taken as the final goal, but I think we can say with certainty that there was no shōgun who attained *kenshō*. Yoshimitsu, through the urging of Gidō Shūshin (d. 1388), took an interest in Zen, and according to Gidō's diary practiced zazen in the Shitō-an of Saihō-ji. However, in the end, it was a failure. Turning to Gidō, he asked in despair if it was permissible to practice nembutsu. After Gidō died, there was a gradual separation from Zen as religion. As for Yoshimitsu's daily life of religion at the mountain villa at Kitayama, the center of attention was given to Shingon esoteric ritual, with emphasis on incantation and prayer, and Zen survived solely in its cultural aspects. The eighth Shōgun, Yoshimasa, had no

experience with zazen, and in faith he inclined towards nembutsu. Among the Ashikaga Shōguns, the one who was comparatively involved with Zen, and who entered somewhat deeply into it, was Yoshimitsu's successor, Yoshimochi (ca. 1394). Yoshimochi went as far as to speak of the Zen school as "my school of religion," and because of this was subjected to some public criticism: since the Shōgun and the emperor were to protect impartially all eight schools, how could he speak of the Zen school alone as "my school"? There is another indication of Yoshimochi's considerable interest in Zen—the frequently-mentioned "Catching a Catfish with a Gourd" painting. Yoshimochi had the desire to have on the screens of his chambers a constant aid for Zen reflection and so had Josetsu (d. 1428) paint it. But even with Yoshimochi, whether he was able to penetrate the first barrier-gate of *kenshō* is questionable.

Karaki: In the Edo Bakufu, there are relations, for example, like that of Shōgun Iemitsu (d. 1651) and Takuan (d. 1645). Although one must take into consideration the fact that the government seat was separated from Kyoto, it seems to me that, rather than the relations between the Muromachi Shōguns and Zen monks, there comes to be apparent an attempt to make political use of Zen monks—or of Zen itself.

There was the Zen Master Butchō Kokushi (1607–1645), known also by the name Isshi Monshu. I do not know what kind of relation Isshi had with Takuan, but he criticized Takuan, who had gone to Edo. Under Iemitsu's patronage Takuan was given Tōkai-ji in Shinagawa and did not train disciples. Isshi does not say that Takuan was a time-server to the Shōgun, but he does rebuke him in quite strong terms, saying that it is no good to be wandering about to no purpose in Edo. He calls Edo "the world of reputation and profit." Isshi was an offspring of the court. Takuan came from a warrior family.

Haga: Country samurai of Tamba, wasn't it? I can understand the inability to accept Takuan on the part of Isshi, who came from a court family. Still, Takuan was certainly not worldly.

IV. *Propagation and Transmission of the Dharma*

Karaki: Looking at Butchō Kokushi's criticism of Takuan, I sense a great difference between Kyoto and Edo. The situation in Edo resembles an uncongenial relationship with outsiders more than that which had existed between the Kyoto court or the Muromachi Shōguns and Zen monks.

Haga: I think that, after Iemitsu, there were no Tokugawa Shōguns who accorded Zen monks real importance, although on the surface there probably was a show of respect. One thing I would like to touch on in connection with Isshi's being scandalized by Takuan, and his criticism of him, is the relation between propagation and transmission in Zen. In Zen it is said, "One succeeds the wisdom-life of the Buddhas and patriarchs." Immense importance is given to transmission, looking from the position of the master, and to succession, from that of the disciple. To ferret out even "one man or half a man" and make that disciple succeed in the Dharma is the highest responsibility of the master. However, from the viewpoint of "saving sentient beings," it is natural that propagation should also be an important mission. These two—transmission and propagation—are the great works with which the master monks are charged. In this case, it is quite natural that there arise two types of Zen monks—those who emphasize transmission and those who emphasize propagation. Monks like Dōgen and Kanzan (d. 1360), if we consider them in this light, gave greater weight to transmission and considered propagation to be of secondary importance, while, in constrast, monks like Eisai and Musō Kokushi (d. 1351) gave rather the greater weight to propagation.

In considering a person like Takuan, I wonder if he did not place emphasis on propagation. I think this was one reason Isshi, who regarded transmission as primary, found him unacceptable. Inevitably one favors one side or the other. Both transmission and propagation are important, like the two wheels of a cart; between the two it is impossible to discriminate in terms of superiority or importance. But compatibility between the two is difficult, and it is easy to fall into contradiction. Because of this, it seems that monastic Zen down through

the past has inclined in the direction of "propagation for the sake of transmission." A big factor in Zen's separating from the masses and becoming secluded lies here. But is the attitude of propagation for the purpose of ferreting out "one man or half a man" correct? At least, is it the right direction for modern Zen?

Zen, as a school of Mahayana Buddhism, should have as its aim the saving of sentient beings. In saving sentient beings, it is necessary to have the right Dharma, and for this reason proper transmission of the Dharma is important. I wonder if self-reflection along these lines isn't necessary. This is an important point in determining the posture of modern Zen. Or rather, this has been more or less digressed from.

Karaki: In Dōgen there isn't any saving sentient beings. At least that work does not appear on the surface of his writings.

Osaka: It appears as an ideal in *Fukanzazengi*, but when it comes to practical considerations, it is extremely problematical.

Haga: For Dōgen the transmission of the Dharma certainly came before all else. Accordingly, if Dōgen were alive at the time, how would he have viewed Keizan Jōkin (1268–1325), who built Sōji-ji and shifted to propagation and missionary work? Sōtō Zen spread its teaching line widely in Keizan's generation, but Dōgen would have probably criticized him with words like, 'The fellow is mixing with those in power and flattering the worldly.' But for Sōtō Zen as it exists today, the role he played is quite large.

Karaki: Musō wished to study under—was it I-ning I-shan (Ichinei Issan d. 1317)—and as a test for admittance was made to write a poem. At that time there were forty aspirants, and the poems were graded good-average-poor; Musō's was one of the two judged "good." What do you think of testing novices by making them write poems?

Osaka: That practice existed from the time of the Sixth Patriarch Hui-neng. It was applied as a method of testing when the Fifth Patriarch Hung-jen (Gunin, 601–674) decided his successor. Zen, after all, even in its *mondō*, arises in words. The most polished of words, especially in China, are verse, and among different verse forms, the ones used to convey Zen meaning are the hymn and the eulogy. Through reading a man's hymns or eulogies, we can know the scope of his Zen. Considered

in this light, a poem is a kind of literary *mondō*; hence, judging good or bad on the basis of verse is a viable method. In Zen it has become a custom to write a poem at the time of satori, and to leave one at the very point of death, so it is a traditional practice.

Karaki: Nevertheless, in the Five Mountain literature, Musō's lineage is extremely well-represented.

Haga: From the very beginning of the Zen's transmission to Japan there has been an atmosphere of according importance to the written word. This is also the case with I-shan and Musō. At that time, outside of conversation by writing there was no way for the Chinese monks who came to Japan and the Japanese monks to carry on a *mondō*. There are extant fragments of the conversation in writing between Fo-kuang Kuo-shih (Bukkō Kokushi, d. 1286) and Bukkoku Kokushi (Kōhō Kennichi, d. 1316), the founder of Ungan-ji in Nasu. In a case like that, inevitably the excellence of expression became a standard of value. In China also there was an inclination towards literary Zen, so to a certain extent it was unavoidable. Even so, although the verse of the Zen monks of the earlier period is full of the essence of Zen and included genuine gathas, towards the middle of the Muromachi period, the poetry and prose of the Five Mountains degenerated completely. The Five Mountains were enveloped in a fashion which required of all Zen monks the ability to write a sermon in a rhetorical 4–6 verse form. In addition, if a monk used in his writing unusual Zen words or incidents, his reputation went up a step, and before long he could advance to the position of resident priest of a large Zen temple. For this reason the monks of the Five Mountains forgot about zazen and came to devote their energies to literature and learning. This is already degeneration, complete degeneration.

On the other hand, the Zen of the Five Mountains died out quickly; the Dharma died out. I think the Dharma line of Musō Kokushi ended with the third generation. Among Musō Kokushi's disciples there were a number of excellent men, but by the third generation it is doubtful whether we can say his Dharma was succeeded with the same meaning as, for example, Daitō Kokushi's Dharma being succeeded by Kanzan. We know with certainty from Gidō's diary, *Nichiyōkufūshū*, that he

often sat, but in the diaries of later Zen monks, not a single record of zazen appears. (*Laughter*) What is recorded are the visits and banquets of the Shōgun, and their own literary gatherings.

Karaki: But—to intrude with my personal tastes—there is Jakushitsu (d. 1367), who founded Eigen-ji.

Haga: He was a genuine Zen monk.

Karaki: I think his poems, considered as literature, are superb.

Haga: His calligraphy is also good. In addition, the verse and calligraphy of Gūchū Shūkyū (d. 1409), the founder of Buttsū-ji in Aki, are good. However, these men ended as the party out of power. They were, so to speak, heretical. I say "heretical," but the living thread of Japanese Zen has been maintained down to the present through the lines of Daiō—Daitō—Kanzan and of Jakushitsu, which were regarded as heretical. In contrast to this, in the lines of Musō and of Shōichi Kokushi (d. 1280), who mixed with those in power, the Dharma died out quickly. This is something to which contemporary Zen should give very careful consideration.

Osaka: Musō was constantly making visits to the court. This was out of his concern for the country—his good intention to do something to reunite the northern and southern courts. The way to and from the palace ran right past Myōshin-ji, so it seems he often passed its back gate. On the one hand there he was, riding past in a carriage, a figure of luxury. On the other hand, there was Kanzan Kokushi, tending *daikon* (Japanese radish), or carrying a shoulder-pole weighted into a crook. Seeing that figure from within his carriage, Musō himself said that his Buddha Dharma would be replaced by Kanzan's. Anyway, those like Kanzan who tread the earth firmly last to the very end. Of Kanzan's sayings, like "For me, here, there is no birth-and-death," only one or two survive, but his descendents are everywhere.

Karaki: In being able to say that he was outdone by Kanzan lies Musō's greatness.

Osaka: The other day I had a look at Musō's scroll, "There is nothing to work out," and I recalled his famous garden designs. In transcending concentrated reflection, they have an extraordinary freedom.

Karaki: Yes, I feel that. He was a man of penetrating aesthetic sensibility.

Haga: Be that as it may, when Buddhism associates with power, it degenerates; this must really be given serious thought.

v. *Zen and its Expression*

Karaki: To raise a matter I have some doubts about: Zen monks have written not only *kana hōgo*—instructive works in vernacular Japanese—but waka also. There are examples even by Dōgen, but in such works the tone is slack. In Dōgen's *Sanshō-dōei-shū* the style is weak. Considering this, I wonder if Zen and Chinese characters are not intimately bound together.

Haga: The Zen monks whose work I am familiar with are Dōgen, Kōhō Kennichi, Musō, and Shōtetsu (d. 1458) of the Tōfuku-ji branch. At least it can be said that, for the Zen monks of the Kamakura-Muromachi period, to be unable to produce a poem in Chinese was felt to be a matter of shame, but this was not so of Japanese poems. There are surely varying reasons for this, but one important cause is that for Zen monks, who had a preference for direct and straightforward expression, the waka, which employs literary devices such as *makura-kotoba* and *kakekotoba*, was unsuitable. In any case, Zen is tightly bound to Chinese characters.

Karaki: That can also be said of the *kana hōgo*. For example, the phrase in Chinese characters *ryū ryoku ka kō* 柳緑花紅 (willow green blossom crimson) is, in Japanese syllabary, *yanagi wa midori de aru, hana wa kurenai de aru* (the willows are green; the blossoms are crimson). In such a case, the expression undergoes a complete change in spirit. Zen is "the direct pointing to man's mind"; it is done at a stroke. I think that this fits Chinese characters extremely well. The expression *san kō sui chō* 山高水長 (mountains high waters long) is quite fine, but in Japanese it loses its distinctive quality altogether.

Haga: I have my doubts about this persistent adherence in Japanese Zen to the Chinese "paradoxes and fine expressions," but for frankness and boldness of expression, and depth of meaning as well, it is difficult to abandon the Chinese. This is because, for example, in "yanagi wa midori *de aru*" (*It is that* the willows are green), the sharpness of feeling

is completely missing.

Karaki: In addition, a character will flash suddenly. I think each single character throws off light. If you add *de aru* or *nari* (is) to it, the light is dimmed.

Haga: It becomes explanation. And Zen, from the beginning, has rejected explanation.

Karaki: Philip Kapleau, in his *Three Pillars of Zen*, translates a number of Zen phrases and poems. Speaking only in the light of the present discussion, I do not find them very satisfactory. For example, *ka ji kō* 花自紅 (blossoms-of-themselves-crimson) is translated "Red flowers naturally bloom red."[7] I think the feeling of Zen is quite different from this sort of English translation.

Osaka: The work can only be done by a person who at once understands—experiences—Zen, and also can freely express himself, a literary master. In particular, words like *mu* or *katsu* have limitless meaning, but when translated, they are defined in one way or another; so even if in the future they gradually find their equivalents in English, in the end there will remain instances where, however one does it, translation will be virtually impossible. In the same way, in old Japanese translations terms that could not be translated were left in the original Sanskrit.

Haga: In the religious group I am connected with there is the feeling that books of *teishō* (Zen sermons) and koan, instead of being left indefinitely in the difficult Chinese, should be put in a form which contemporary people would find a little easier to understand, and I among others have put quite a bit of effort into this. But however you do it, it is no good. You try to bring alive old koans in easily understandable colloquial language, but when you ask whether the Zen student grasps the essence of it—if he has not opened his eyes to the Way, or his spiritual realm has not matured—then he does not understand. If that is the case, why go to all the useless effort? For this reason I have stopped.

Osaka: When Sanskrit was translated into Chinese, there were the

[7] (New York, 1966), p. 310.

"old translations" and the "new translations." The "new translations" made by Hsüan-tsang (Genjō, d. 664) are direct and literal, and the "old translations" by Kumārajiva (ca. 409) are, shall we say, made to be intelligible—the meaning was first clearly grasped and then well-expressed in artful Chinese. Thus the old translations were made at an earlier period, but they still strike us with their aptness.

Karaki: I feel the 31-syllable waka verse form is somehow inappropriate, but that the 17-syllable haiku is well-suited to Zen. I have in mind Bashō (d. 1694). Among Bashō's haiku are some that we can say are Zen, just as they are. For instance, the famous, "The old pond, ah!/ A frog jumps in:/The water's sound," came out of an exchange between Bashō and Zen master Butchō at Kompon-ji in Kashima. At the end of a *mondō* Basho uttered, "A frog jumps in:/ The water's sound," and was highly praised by the Master. It has been said since that this is an absurd, fabricated story. But Butchō and Bashō did occasionally meet and have *mondō*. It cannot be said with certainty that this never happened.

Haga: I think this exchange between Bashō and Butchō should be affirmed. Moreover, in Zen practice, after you have passed a koan in the master's room, you have to bring a *jakugo* (capping phrase) in order to verify it; in this situation a waka is unsuitable but a haiku can be used. I think this is because expression in haiku is close to a Zen-like method of thought and expression.

Karaki: That is true. For example, "A frog jumps in:/ The water's sound" immediately becomes a *jakugo*. But isn't "The old pond, ah!" a problem?

Osaka: Because it becomes a straightforward expression.

Haga: To give an example, as a *jakugo* for "tranquility immovable," there are the Chinese lines, "Along flowing waters, the path to cold mountain/Deep in clouds, the old temple's bell"; but I think Bashō's haiku, "The stillness:/ Into rock penetrates/ The cicada's cry," yields nothing to this.

Karaki: I think that that haiku, as it stands, can be called Zen. In "Into rock penetrates/ The cicada's cry," the entire world becomes one with "The cicada's cry."

Haga: Because his haiku are rooted in his Zen satori.

Karaki: In *Sanzōshi* also, which records Bashō's words, there are statements I think could only have come from Zen; for example, "Abandon your own intentions and delve into the truth," and "Of matters of pine learn from the pine." Or perhaps he heard them from Butchō.

VI. *Zen and Japanese Culture*

Karaki: Shall we move on to the topic of Zen and Japanese culture? Here, as an aspect of culture with a deep relation to Zen, I'd like to take up Noh.

Haga: Noh is very deeply related to Zen. It has been established through recent, post-war research that Zeami (d. 1443), who brought Noh to its completed form, practiced under a Sōtō Zen monk named Chikusō Chigon (n.d.). However, it is not clear to what extent Zeami's practice went. I have in mind here the fact that he uses Zen phrases—in the section on "the nine stages" in his writings of transmission he explains the Flower of Mystery with the phrase, "In Silla at midnight the sun is bright," and the Flower of Profundity with, "Snow covers a thousand mountains; why is a solitary peak not white?"—and yet his usage is not necessarily appropriate. On the point of whether he used the expressions with a clear understanding of their meaning or not there remains some doubt. Nevertheless, if you look at passages like that in *Kakyō* on "all movements linked in one mind," then it is also possible to consider Zeami's Zen quite remarkable. In either case, that Zen is at the root of his Noh is beyond question.

Karaki: It is clear that he constantly uses Zen phrases, but what about Noh itself—Noh as it is performed on stage. I think that Zen is in the background there.

Haga: I agree. On this point, the case of Komparu Zenchiku (b. 1405), who practiced Zen quite seriously under Ikkyū (d. 1481), is extremely clear-cut. Zenchiku states: "Noh is the wondrous functioning of that which is originally without subject and object." This is the basic thesis of his Noh theory. "Original no-subject and no-object" is "the absolute before the discrimination of subject and object," or, as is said in Zen, "your original face before your father and mother were

born." This is the fundamental principle of all the arts of Noh, and the actual movements and dance are its aspect, its function. Zenchiku teaches that they are its expression. The connection between "one's original face" and Noh arts is seen to be similar to the connection between Kannon and her thirty-two manifestation-bodies. Through Zenchiku, Zeami's Noh was given greater and greater profundity, so that there can be no question but that the relation between Zen and Noh—considered at the stage of full development—is exceedingly close.

Karaki: What impresses me most on the stage is the natural synchronization of breath. There is no conductor at all and yet the breathing is spontaneously in unison. I think this would be impossible if the spirit of Zen were not in it.

Haga: I agree. However, in contrast to this, the problem of how far one can speak of Zen culture arises with the Five Mountain literature, which is universally included without challenge under the heading of Zen culture. I do not rate the Five Mountain literature very highly.

Karaki: The Five Mountain literature is generally uninteresting, perhaps part of this is its difficulty. Still, if it were interesting it would be read even though difficult. But Natsume Sōseki (d. 1916) liked Zekkai Chūshin's *Shōkenkō*.

Haga: Because up through Zekkai (d. 1405), the writing of Zen monks still held on, with difficulty, to the basic character of Zen literature. And Zekkai himself practiced as a true Zen monk. However, as I briefly mentioned earlier, from the Muromachi period onward the Five Mountain Zen monks only went through the motions of zazen and did not perform genuine Zen practice. It could hardly be expected that true Zen literature would be born of it. The Five Mountain literature can be labeled "Zen literature" up to the end of the Nambokuchō period (1334–92); after that, although it has an important place in the history of Japanese literature in Chinese, as Zen literature the life had gone out of it.

Karaki: The feeling of a pastime—as with the literary meetings mentioned earlier—entered into it. Literature was like a tool of social intercourse.

Haga: That tendency appears from the time of Gidō. Gidō wrote in his diary, "The verse of Zen monks these days does not differ in the

least from the writings on 'flowers, birds, wind and moon' of secular people. This will not do. If it does not express one's own satori, it is not a true Zen poem." Thus time and again he admonished his disciples. The necessity to say this repeatedly is, conversely, proof of the strength of this tendency.

Karaki: To be sure he differs from the Five Mountains, but the verse of Daitō Kokushi is very good. Even in reading it purely as poetry the style is splendid. Daitō's following was full of poets, or of the air of poetry. To give an example befitting the season, in requesting the Master to give *teishō* a disciple first would say, "Yesterday I saw the green of pendent willow; now I find the yellow of falling leaves." There are many such examples.

Haga: At that period, were *mondō* actually performed in the Lecture Hall, without previous arrangement?

Osaka: I think so.

Haga: As the age advanced, it came to be done like a show, with prior arrangement.

Karaki: In Iida Tōin Rōshi's *Kaiankokugo-teishō-roku* (Kamakura, 1954), it is said repeatedly that the *mondō* of Daitō and his followers were not such a mannerism.

Haga: Daitō Kokushi was a genius, being able to write so without having gone to China.

Karaki: Ikkyū is also extremely interesting, violating our common sense. Ikkyu's *Kyōunshū* and *Jikaishū* have yet to receive the attention of a textual critic. In *Kyōunshū* textual errors are quite conspicuous. Also, in reading certain of the pieces included one is made to wonder whether Ikkyū actually wrote them. In *Jikaishū*, *namu-amida-butsu* appears, and quite frequently. There are even places where one wonders if he wasn't a bit insane.

Haga: To a certain extent I feel that also, but Ikkyū was greatly enraged by the world of Zen in his day, and I interpret his air of madness as the way that intense emotion was expressed. It is a bit of an exagerration, but I see Ikkyū's madness as the expression of the tragic conscience of his age. Ikkyū was not simply a man of what is ordinarily considered quick-wit. He was basically a sensitive Zen monk with an extraordinary

purity of heart and a strong sense of justice, and to that extent he felt a great revulsion for his age and the surrounding society. In particular this manifests itself directly against the Zen of the line of Yōsō (d. 1458), which was the mainstream in Daitoku-ji, against the style of Zen of the Five Mountains, and against the politics of the Bakufu. I see Ikkyū's "mad" behavior as the expression of this intense revulsion. This is probably too sympathetic.

There are other prominent priests who appear in the same period as Ikkyū—Rennyo (d. 1499), Nisshin (d. 1528), Shinzei (d. 1495). We can get a sense of Ikkyū fairly easily when we compare him with them. Rennyo had the political capacity to organize the general populace of the times. Nichiren School's "pot-helmeted" Nisshin, unyielding under the suppression of the Bakufu, had fierce fighting spirit. Shinzei, who founded Tendai's nembutsu school, saw the corruption of the secular world, but had just enough latitude to resign himself quietly to it. Ikkyū, however, lacked Rennyo's political ability and Nisshin's fight, and moreover had too much spirit in his blood to resign himself quietly, like Shinzei, to the secular world. I think that, in the end, there was nothing else Ikkyū could do outside of his "mad" behavior, his railing against hypocrisy and sounding the alarm to his age. Ikkyū himself wrote in verse, "An insane man of mad temper raises a mad air"; thus while posing as a madman, within he was boasting, I think, "It is not I who am mad, the world is mad." (*Laughter*)

Karaki: That is something Ikkyū says of himself.

Haga: Let's move on to Hakuin.

Osaka: "Hear the sound of one hand clapping" is the best known koan of Hakuin (d. 1768). As I mentioned earlier, Indian Zen was contemplative and speculative, but shifted towards *mondō* and *kanna* upon moving to China. Even so, in Chinese Buddhism, the classification of the teaching was an extremely important issue, and by saying Buddhism was made up of such and such schools, T'ien-t'ai (Tendai) classified the teaching according to its system, Hua-yen (Kegon) neatly systematized it in its way. In Zen also, when koan were made, there was the attempt to put all of Buddhism into a single phrase. What is the Buddha, what is Bodhidharma's fundamental spirit, why did the

Patriarch come from the West—such words are often used; in this way—though other schools use logic—Zen seeks to speak the entirety of the Buddha's teaching in a single phrase. It is here that Zen's classification of the teaching lies. But, to put it bluntly, in the sense that it implies the notion of classification of the teaching, the odor of "Buddhism" remains. "What is the Buddha?" "Why did the Patriarch come from the West?" and so on.

Hakuin simply put out one hand and said, "Hear this!" This is truly put directly to us, completely apart from all the trappings of "Buddhism." Further, to hear the sound of one hand, our fundamental nature must clearly come forth, so the conclusion comes at that same point. Without using the word "Buddha," without using the word "Zen," we throw ourselves directly into it; it is in the recesses of the mind. Considered in this aspect, it holds the great significance of eliminating all trappings of "Buddhism" and opening up its framework in human nature, in the entirety of daily life. Can we say that Japanese Zen rather tends towards the artistic?

VII. *Zen in Daily Life*

Haga: At the same time it has an everyday quality: the Zen of daily living.

Osaka: It has entered deeply into everyday life, so that with Noh, or with tea ceremony—one's every movement in the tea room is truly permeated with the spirit of "harmony, reverence, purity and tranquility," and this is itself further greatly refined. Zen has its harsh aspects of beating with a stick, or scolding, but in Japan it fastened to daily life, and in particular to the wellsprings of culture. I think the prominent and distinguishing characteristic of Japanese Zen lies here. And for this reason it is extremely widespread.

In China also it spread quite widely as Buddhism, but in the case of Japan, it has become so that the lineages of the expert and accomplished in whatever field of culture have come down along with Zen. Here spontaneously—even if they are not men trained in Zen—there is the working of Zen in the way they think, which leads to the same destination, so the word "Zen-like" is used very widely. If a person

is fully developed—well-rounded—he is said to be like Bodhidharma.

Haga: That it has been well-assimilated into daily life is the distinctive feature of Japanese Zen. In India it was speculative, in China aimed towards actual practice. The feature of actual practice is the same in Japan, but I think it is possible to say that in Japan's case it was assimilated into the daily life of the laity.

Osaka: Hence the topic, the dharma of the state, the Dharma of the Buddha, and the dharma of society. Zen has thoroughly saturated the secular dharma, and in the future there are unlimited possibilities for development. It is here that the extremely difficult problem, mentioned earlier, of the link between the transmission of the Dharma and popularization has its solution. We make special issue of lay Buddhism, but as we delve down into our own daily lives, we find the "wondrous flavor" of Zen. Hence I say that the seed of Zen was sown in India, its flower blossomed in China, and in Japan it bore fruit. It is in the medicine cabinet; the tea we all drink also came from Zen, and the "takuan" pickles[8] we eat—in Japan we savor Zen through an extraordinarily wide range of things. In this room flowers have been arranged, bringing nature in, and if we open the screens here a garden will lie before us; nature is constantly being brought in. Here we harmonize with something artistic and very great. And also very small. I think that in putting a vast world into something small there is the "wondrous flavor" of Zen. Even the ordinary person who knows nothing of Zen understands that much; it is probably one of the characteristics of the East, but I think it has great strength.

Karaki: Zen runs deeply in the transformation into beauty of everyday life. It is impossible to think of our life of taste, from the Kamakura period onward, apart from Zen. This is the case with tea ceremony. Also there is Takuan's *Fudōchishinmyōroku*, a didactic work written for a swordsman of the Yagyū family. That the sword itself—an instrument for killing—should be considered so beautiful a work of art, is certainly strange when you think of it. It is true of tea utensils, and also of paintings and gardens, that Zen's—or perhaps a Zen-related—influ-

[8] Invented by the Zen master Takuan.

ence has certainly not yet died out. It is different for the younger generation now, but I think that Zen has entered deeply into the daily necessities of food, clothing, and shelter, and into the daily arts of Japanese life.

Haga: It is a fact that, up to the present, Zen has played an important part in the formation of Japanese culture. But from now on how useful Zen can be in the creation of new culture is a big problem. It has to be serviceable, but in its present state, will it be able to act in the future as the moving force in the creation of culture that it was in the past? What needs to be done in order to make it that moving force? I think that these are the great questions facing the present world of Zen. Zen does not exist simply so that we can understand the traditional culture of the past; it must have the vitality of positively creating new culture. Further, there is no reason it should not be able to do so. But it is uncertain whether it can generate such vitality as it is in its present state. There must be self-reflection.

Karaki: I approach that problem in this way. Generally speaking, the modern period in the West became before long the modern period in Japan, and its distinctive characteristic is, it seems to me, life, or the desire to enlarge life infinitely. It is out of this that scientific technology and scientific civilization have been built up. Nevertheless, with this alone we have come to an impasse. I think the problem of death, which has been overlooked in modern civilization, will now come forth. In a time of crisis the problem of death always arises, but within the flourishing of passions in today's life, it harbors great dangers. I think that Zen can offer us a response to this problem of death. I do not know whether it will be able to go so far as to take a position with regard to the train, say, or the airplane, or atomic power, but for facing the problem of death as the crux of a view of human life, or the problem of losing life in order to live it, I think provision has been made in Zen.

Translated by Dennis Hirota

---

* The original Japanese text appeared in *Zen no rekishi*: *Nihon*, Kōza Zen IV (Tokyo, 1962), pp. 373–390.