



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

From prominence to obscurity : a study of the Darumashū : Japan's first Zen school

Breugem, V.M.N.

Citation

Breugem, V. M. N. (2012, May 30). *From prominence to obscurity : a study of the Darumashū : Japan's first Zen school*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19051>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19051>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19051> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Breugem, Vincent Michaël Nicolaas

Title: From prominence to obscurity : a study of the Darumashū : Japan's first Zen school

Issue Date: 2012-05-30

CHAPTER FOUR

DARUMASHŪ ADHERENTS AT TŌNOMINE, HAJAKUJI AND IN THE EARLY SŌTŌ COMMUNITY

In spite of the fame he enjoyed in his own time (or perhaps because of his notoriety) we know little of Dainichibō Nōnin. Data on the students who studied with him are likewise scant. Textual references to Nōnin mention the monks Renchū and Shōben, whom Nōnin dispatched to China to procure Zen certification. We also know of Nōnin's dharma heir Butchibō Kakuan, who established a Darumashū community at the Tendai monastic complex Tōnomine. Kakuan passed on the Darumashū lineage to his chief disciple Kakuzen Ekan, who set up a Darumashū group at Hajakuji in Echizen. Preceded by Koun Ejō 孤雲懷奘 (1198-1280), also a student of Kakuan, Ekan and a group of his followers eventually joined the hatching Sōtō community of Dōgen in Fukakusa, on the fringes of Kyoto. These incoming Darumashū monks played an important role in the development of Dōgen's community, both in its early days in Fukakusa as well as afterward when Dōgen moved to Echizen province and established the Eihei-ji monastery 永平寺. Likewise, some of these monks were key figures in the development of the Sōtō school after Dōgen's death. This chapter examines the careers of these (erstwhile) Darumashū adherents. It does so through the medium of Sōtō literature and, if available, through sources external to the Sōtō tradition. In addition to filtering out quantitative data from Sōtō lore, this chapter will consider sectarian distortions in the source materials and look to what extent these may tell us something about the position of the (former) Darumashū monks within the early Sōtō community.

BUTCHIBŌ KAKUAN

Traditional Sōtō histories mention Butchibō Kakuan 佛地房覺晏 as the first Zen teacher of Koun Ejō, the successor of Dōgen.²⁸³ Biographies of Ejō note that Kakuan was Nōnin's foremost student and dharma heir. Kakuan is repeatedly referred to as "Higashiyama Kakuan" 東山覺晏, indicating that he dwelled and taught in the Eastern Hills area of Kyoto (Higashiyama). Funaoka Makoto theorized that Kakuan made use of an existing network of Tendai hermitages in Higashiyama that had been established by Ryōgen (912-985) and at the time fell under the jurisdiction of Jien.²⁸⁴ At one point, probably after Nōnin's death, Kakuan and a group of his followers moved to Tōnomine 多武峰, the Tendai monastic complex located near Asuka in Yamato province (Nara).

²⁸³ *Eihei-ji sanso gyōgoki* (SSZ, Shiden, vol. 1, p. 4). *Genso Koun Tetsū sandaion gyōjōki* (Ibid, p. 14). *Nichiiki tōjō shosoden* (Ibid, p. 39). *Denkōroku* (T. 2585, 409a20-25).

²⁸⁴ Jien was abbot of the *monzeki* cloister Shōren-in 青蓮院 in Kyoto. In spite of his hostility towards Hōnen's Pure Land movement, Jien provided the controversial Hōnen with shelter at Shōren-in. Similarly, Funaoka speculates, Jien may have arranged some kind of accommodation for Kakuan. In support Funaoka notes that Jien wielded administrative power over the Tendai complex Tōnomine, Kakuan's subsequent place of residence. Funaoka, *Nihon Zenshū no seiritsu*, p. 157.

Tōnomine

According to traditional accounts, Tōnomine was founded by the monk Jō'e 定恵 (643-665) in the seventh century in commemoration of his father, Fujiwara no Kamatari 藤原鎌足 (614-669).²⁸⁵ Initially the cult of Kamatari and the overseeing of the complex were managed by the Hossō clergy of Nara's Kōfukuji. By the ninth century Tōnomine had almost been deserted, but it recovered in the course of the following century when Tendai monks from Enryakuji started to restore buildings. Under the direction of the monk Jishō 実性 (fl. 950) a hall for the practice of the Lotus Samādhi (*hokke sanmai-dō*) and several other new edifices were erected. Around this time one of the temples on Tōnomine – Myōrakuji 妙楽寺 – became a branch temple of the Mudōji 無動寺 on Mount Hiei (Enryakuji), effectively bringing the whole of Tōnomine under Enryakuji control. Tōnomine thrived especially after the arrival in 963 of the Tendai monk Zōga 増賀 (917-1003) from Mount Hiei's Yokawa precinct.

Enryakuji's dominance over Tōnomine elicited strong protests from the Kōfukuji clergy, who saw these developments infringe on their religious, economical and political control of Yamato province.²⁸⁶ In 1081 there occurred the first in a series of violent encounters that would characterise a protracted feud between Kōfukuji and Tōnomine. In 1208 armed forces of the Kimpusenji in Yoshino (instructed by Kōfukuji) attacked Tōnomine and burned it down. In 1227 and 1228 armed forces of Kōfukuji again raided Tōnomine and reduced it to ashes.²⁸⁷ Caught up in these raids Kakuan's monks were left roofless, signaling the end of the Darumashū community on Tōnomine. The disbanding of the Darumashū on Tōnomine, then, occurred due to politico-economic rivalries between Enryakuji and Kōfukuji – the attacks were not specifically targeted at Kakuan's Zen community, as is sometimes suggested.²⁸⁸ As to why Kakuan moved to Tōnomine several factors can be considered:

- The propagation of Zen by Nōnin and Kakuan, especially in the Higashiyama area, was being rivaled by Eisai, who had left Kyushu in 1194 to proselytize in Kyoto. The imperial proscription of Zen in the same year, petitioned by Enryakuji, cast a shadow over the Zen movement. In defense Eisai wrote *Kōzengokokuron* in which he denounced the Darumashū. Eisai's instatement as abbot of the newly founded Kenninji in Kyoto, monitored by Enryakuji, no doubt further eroded Kakuan's position. Located away from Kyoto and less embroiled in these hostilities, Tōnomine represented a viable alternative.
- Tōnomine accommodated in particular monks from Mount Hiei's Yokawa precincts. Kakuan's associations with Yokawa monks may have played a role in the relocation. As a Tendai monk Kakuan was familiar with the religious practices on Tōnomine, which facilitated the entry of the Darumashū group. Takeuchi Michio theorized that Kakuan had

²⁸⁵ Traditional histories of Tōnomine are *Tōnomine ryakki* 多武峰略記, composed in 1197 (DNBZ, *Jishi sōsho*, vol. 2, p. 484-511) and *Tōnomine engi* 多武峰縁起, (DNBZ, *Jishi sōsho*, vol. 2, 4-5). On Tōnomine also see Allan Grapard, "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution," *History of Religions* 23 (1984): pp. 240-265. Watanabe Shujun, "Tōnomine Engi no Tendai," *Eizangakuin kenkyū kiyō* 29 (2007): pp. 1-13. Takeuchi Michio, *Eihei niso Koun Ejō Zenjiden* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1982), pp. 70-72.

²⁸⁶ On this aspect see Mikael S. Adolphson, *The Gates of Power* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000), pp. 88-98 and 144-46.

²⁸⁷ *Hyakurenshō*, Antei 2/4/23, mentions that evil groups from Nara (*nanbu akutō* 南部悪党) burned down over sixty monastic buildings.

²⁸⁸ Steven Heine writes: "The Daruma school, subject to ongoing persucution, including the destruction of its main temples by Tendai mercenaries in 1228, became a kind of underground cult (...). Steven Heine, *Did Dōgen Go to China* (Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 100-101.

already practiced at Tōnomine prior to joining Nōnin and re-entered the mountain sometime after the 1208 Kimpusenji raids.²⁸⁹

- Bernard Faure suggested that the celebrated eccentricity of Tōnomine's revival Zōga may have captivated Zen followers. The Darumashū adepts, whose interest in relics is well-documented (see Chapter Three), may have been intrigued by Zōga's mummified body that was preserved and venerated on Tōnomine.²⁹⁰
- Kakuan may have been drawn to Tōnomine's cult of Vimalakīrti. Tōnomine's cultic nucleus Fujiwara no Kamatari was venerated as a manifestation of Vimalakīrti. The commemoration of Kamatari was observed in the Vimalakīrti ceremony (*Yuima-e* 維摩会), an annual lecture series on the *Vimalakīrti sūtra* (*Yuima-kyō* 維摩經). This prestigious ceremony was customarily held at Kōfukuji, the Hossō stronghold in Nara established by Kamatari's son Fuhito 不比等 (659-720). By order of Emperor Kammu (737-806) the *Yuima-e* had been designated a prerogative of Kōfukuji.²⁹¹ Yet *Tōnomine ryakki* 多武峰略記 (1197) indicates that Vimalakīrti ceremonies were also held at Tōnomine in the years 682, 785, 974 and 975, and scheduled to be performed annually at the Shōryō-in 聖靈院, the hall on Tōnomine that enshrined a statue of Kamatari.²⁹² In the Chan/Zen tradition the *Vimalakīrti sūtra* is widely regarded as a pivotal text. Darumashū materials, too, indicate that Vimalakīrti was held in high esteem, especially for his transliteral view of the precepts.²⁹³
- Recently Yokouchi Hiroto suggested that by the mid-Heian period a stratum of Bodhidharma Zen was already in place at Tōnomine via the activities of Japanese pilgrim monks who had studied in monasteries of the Northern Song.²⁹⁴

Kakuan and the Śūraṅgama sūtra

Sōtō records indicate that Kakuan instructed his students at Tōnomine in the thesis of “seeing the nature and becoming buddha” (*kenshōjōbutsu*) and lectured on the *Śūraṅgama sūtra* (*Shuryōgonkyō* 首楞嚴經).²⁹⁵ The (apocryphal) *Śūraṅgama sūtra* was highly appreciated in the Chan/Zen tradition.²⁹⁶ The sūtra was known in Japan in the Heian period, though apparently not

²⁸⁹ Takeuchi, *Eihei niso Koun Ejō Zenjiden*, p. 73.

²⁹⁰ Faure, *Visions of Power*, p. 172. For Zōga's eccentricities see Paul Groner, *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century* (University of Hawaii Press, 2002), pp. 341-345. *Tōnomine ryakki* (1197) shows that in Kakuan's time Zōga's exploits were still being praised on Tōnomine.

²⁹¹ See Marinus Willem de Visser, *Ancient Buddhism in Japan*, pp. 596-605.

²⁹² *Tōnomine ryakki*, p. 495.

²⁹³ See Translations, Text II, section 4.c (bottom).

²⁹⁴ Yokouchi draws attention to a passage in an *ōjōden* biography of the monk Kyōsen 經蓮 (d. 1093), included in *Tanzan ryakki* 談山略記: “It is recorded that [Venerable Kyōsen] performed the *abhiṣeka* ritual for dharma transmission more than eighty times. He studied the doctrine of Bodhidharma (*Darumashū* 達磨宗) and constantly practiced A-syllable meditation. In addition he persistently applied himself to Vinaya, Hossō, Sanron, Kegon and Tendai.” See Yokouchi Hiroto, “Yamato Tōnomine to Sō Bukkyō: Darumashū no Juyō wo megutte,” in *Kodai Chūsei Nihon no uchinaru Zen*, edited by Nishiyama Mika (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2011), pp. 57-61.

²⁹⁵ *Eiheiji sanso gyōgoki* (SSZ, Shiden, vol. 1, p. 4). *Genso Koun Tetsū sandaison gyōjōki* (Ibid., p. 14). *Nichiiki tōjō shosoden* (Ibid., p. 39). *Denkōroku* (T. 2585, 409a20-25).

²⁹⁶ The *Śūraṅgama sūtra* was purportedly translated from the Sanskrit in 705 by an Indian monk named Polamidi 般刺蜜帝 but is now generally considered a sinitic apocryphon. On Chinese Buddhist apocrypha see Robert E. Buswell (ed.), *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990).

extensively studied.²⁹⁷ This changed in the early Kamakura period with the increase of Japanese monks traveling to China and copies of the text infiltrating Japan. The importance of this sūtra is attested by the publication in Japan of several editions of the text, the first appearing in 1239.²⁹⁸ The text was being studied especially in Tendai circles, also by those who were to become leading figures in the emerging Kamakura schools. Eisai, for instance, was conversant with the sūtra and repeatedly quoted from it. Eisai's student Ryōshin 了心 (n.d.) lectured on the sūtra at Jūfukuji. The Rinzaï monk Enni Ben'en is reported to have made it his daily practice to recite the lengthy *Śūraṅgama* incantation (*Ryōgonkyōju* 楞嚴經呪) that is contained in the sūtra.

Available sources do not directly link this sūtra with Nōnin. Kakuan and Kakuan's successor Ekan, on the other hand, are both known to have lectured on it. Documents recently presented by Takahashi Shūei moreover reveal that Kakuan not only lectured on the sūtra but also produced a pioneering Sino-Japanese edition of the text.²⁹⁹ Sōtō biographies of Koun Ejō invariably produce a passage describing how Ejō experienced a spiritual insight that was prompted by Kakuan lecturing on the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*. *Eiheiji sanso gyōgōki* 永平寺三祖行業記 (Record of Activities of the Three Patriarchs of Eihei-ji)³⁰⁰ describes the event as follows:

[Ejō] studied under Venerable Kakuan of the Darumashū on Tōnomine and learned about the thesis of “seeing the nature and becoming a buddha.” Having come upon the parable of the kalaviṅka jug in the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*, he realized that emptiness does not come or go, and it became clear to him that consciousness does not arise or perish. At that moment Kakuan pronounced: “Once and for all you attained emancipation from the ignorance that has [accumulated] since beginningless kalpas.”³⁰¹

Similarly, *Denkōroku* reads:

One time there was a discourse on the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*. Having come upon the parable of the kalaviṅka jug, in which it is said that emptiness neither increases by adding emptiness nor decreases by taking out emptiness, [Ejō] had a deep realization. Venerable Butchi [Kakuan] said: “How can it be? The obstructive root of error that has been present since beginningless kalpas has entirely been eliminated! Once and for all you are liberated from suffering.”³⁰²

²⁹⁷ Ishiyamadera 石山寺 preserves an early Heian period copy of a chapter of the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*. The sūtra is also quoted in *Bodaishingishō* 菩提心義抄 by Annen (b. 841), who must have had access to it. See Takahashi Shūei, “Kamakura jidai no sōryō to Shūryōgonkyō,” *Zenken kenkyūjo nenpō* 7 (1996): p. 98.

²⁹⁸ This 1239 edition resulted from the fundraising activities of the monk Ryūen 隆圓 of Chōrakuji 長樂寺, who had vowed to publish the scripture. Other editions appeared in 1278, 1330 and 1339. In *Tsurezuregusa* 徒然草, Yoshida Kenkō 吉田兼好 (ca. 1283- ca. 1352) records having listened to a lecture on the *Śūraṅgama sūtra* by the monk Dōgen 道眼 in Kyoto. Dōgen (not to be confused with Dōgen 道元 the founder of the Sōtō school) traveled to China in 1309 and brought back a set of the Buddhist canon. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-98.

²⁹⁹ These documents contain memos of the Tendai scholar monk Shinkei 心慶 (active 1293-1336). Shinkei notes: “Butchibō [Kakuan] for the first time punctuated (*tensu* 点ス) the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*. [He was a] monk of Mount [Hiei].” *Tensu* here refers to adding lexical markers to a Chinese text to facilitate a Japanese reading. *Ibid.*, pp. 100-102.

³⁰⁰ *Eiheiji sanso gyōgōki* (SSZ, Shiden 1, pp. 1-9) was compiled in the Ōei period (1394-1428) and contains biographies of Dōgen, Ejō and Gikai.

³⁰¹ 參多武峰達磨宗覺晏上人。聞見性成佛之旨。至首楞嚴之頻伽瓶喻。知無空之去來。明無職之生滅。晏即座即記曰。汝無始曠劫之無明。即解脫了也。(*Eiheiji sanso gyōgōki*, p. 4).

³⁰² 有時首楞嚴經ノ談アリ。頻伽瓶喻ノトコロニイタリテ。空ヲイルルニ空増セズ。空ヲトルニ空減ゼズト云ニイタリテ。深ク契處アリ。佛地上人曰ク。イカンガ無始曠劫ヨリコノカタ。罪根惑障悉ク消シ。苦ミミナ解脫シオハルト。(T. 2585, p. 409a20-a27).

The parable of the kalaviṅka jug (*bingahei* 頻伽瓶) appears in chapter two of the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*, which analyzes the five skandhas, the five constituent aggregates of the human being (form, feeling, perception, volition and consciousness).³⁰³ The parable illustrates the empty and unlocalizable nature of the fifth aggregate “consciousness”:

Ananda! It is like a person who picks up a kalaviṅka jug, blocks its two openings, and carries it – filled with emptiness – a thousand *li* far, and then offers it as a gift to another country. You should know that consciousness is just like this. Ananda, it is like empty space: it does not come from one place and enter another. So, Ananda, if emptiness were coming from a place, then the emptiness stored up in that jug would go to another place, while in the country of the jug’s origin there would be less empty space. If, having entered that other place, the jug would be opened and turned upside down, then the emptiness would have to be seen pouring out. You should know therefore that consciousness is illusory. It is neither dependent on conditions nor spontaneous in nature.³⁰⁴

In his study of Ejō, the eminent Sōtō scholar Takeuchi Michiō reads Kakuan’s pre-occupation with the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*, and with this parable in particular, as proof of the heterodox nature of Kakuan’s teaching. According to Takeuchi the parable of the *kalaviṅka* jug points to a form of eternalism that was being propagated in the Buddha’s lifetime by the brahmacārin Śreṇika.³⁰⁵ Takeuchi’s is a Sōtō sectarian reading; it basically reproduces the criticisms on the *Śūraṅgama sūtra* and on the Darumashū that were voiced by Dōgen. Dōgen dismissed the *Śūraṅgama sūtra* as a spurious text (*ikyō* 異經) and implicitly accused the Darumashū of adhering to the so-called Śreṇika heresy (*senni gedō* 先尼外道).³⁰⁶ The Sōtō biographies of Ejō present Ejō’s *Śūraṅgama sūtra*-inspired experience under Kakuan as an inferior prelude to Ejō’s deeper awakening under Dōgen. In this way the Sōtō narratives juxtapose Dōgen’s true Zen to the flawed Zen of the Darumashū. Takeuchi’s evaluation of Kakuan’s teaching perpetuates this ideological move. In the end, all that can be concluded fairly about Kakuan from the Sōtō records is simply that he taught *kenshōjōbutsu* and lectured on the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*. In doing so Kakuan participated in a broader current in the doctrinal landscape of his time.

Kakuan’s last wish

The Darumashū community at Tōnomine scattered out by force of circumstance when the complex was destroyed by armed forces of the Kōfukuji. At this point in time Kakuan’s recorded trail fades. *Honchō kōsōden* (1702) reports that a dying Kakuan instructed Ejō to seek out Dōgen

³⁰³ A kalaviṅka 迦陵頻伽 is a (mythical) bird, frequently mentioned in Buddhist texts. For instance, the *Amituojing* 阿彌陀經 (the shorter *Sukhāvatī-vyūha*, translated by Kumārajīva) lists the kalaviṅka as one of the many-colored birds that live in Amitābha’s Pure Land. The singing of these birds in the Pure Land is said to preach the dharma and to instill in the listener mindfulness of the Buddha, Dharma and Saṃgha (*Amituojing*, T. 366, 347a13-16). The kalaviṅka jug 頻伽瓶 refers to a jug fashioned in the shape of a kalaviṅka bird. On kalaviṅkas see Edward H. Schafer, *The Golden Peaches of Samarkand: A Study of T’ang Exotics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), pp.103-104.

³⁰⁴ 阿難譬如有人取頻伽瓶。塞其兩孔滿中擊空千里遠行用餉他國。識陰當知亦復如是。阿難如是虛空。非彼方來非此方入。如是阿難若彼方來。則本瓶中既貯空去。於本瓶地應少虛空。若此方入開孔倒瓶應見空出是故當知識陰虛妄。本非因緣非自然性 (T. 945, p. 114c07-c13). I consulted existing translations in English of the *Śūraṅgama sūtra*, viz. Charles Luk, *The Śūraṅgama sūtra* (*Leng Yen ching*): Chinese rendering by master Paramiti of Central North India at Chih Chih monastery, Canton, China, A.D.705, commentary (abridged) by Ch’an master Han Shan (1546-1623), translated by upāsaka Lu K’uan Yü (Charles Luk) (London: Rider 1966); and Hsüan Hua, *The Śūraṅgama sūtra: A New Translation* (California: Buddhist Text Translation Society, 2009).

³⁰⁵ Takeuchi, *Eihei nisō Koun Ejō Zenjiden*, p. 80-84.

³⁰⁶ Dōgen’s criticisms of the Darumashū will be taken up in Chapter Eight.

for further guidance, but where and when this would have occurred is not made clear.³⁰⁷ The same notion is replicated in *Teihō Kenzeiki* (Annotated Record of Kenzei), an Edo period edition of a fifteenth century biography of Dōgen, revised and annotated by Menzan Zuihō (1683-1769). According to Menzan’s annotations, Kakuan exhorted his students to join Dōgen. The main reason for this, Menzan claims, was that Kakuan recognized a defect in the Darumashū lineage: the transmission from Fozhao Deguang to Dainichi Nōnin had not been not a personal “face to face transmission” (*menju shihō* 面授嗣法) and was therefore “counterfeit” (*tadashikarazu*).³⁰⁸ It is quite conceivable that Kakuan advised his students to seek out Dōgen. Kakuan’s specific concern as formulated by Menzan, however, has a clear ideological undercurrent. The issue of direct “face-to-face transmission” was central to the reform movement within the Sōtō school that was instigated by Manzan Dōhaku (1636-1715) and perpetuated by Menzan. Dōhaku rejected as unorthodox the then current practice of changing one’s lineage when ascending to a new abbacy (*in’in ekishi*). He also condemned the practice of indirect transmission by means of an intermediary (*daifu*). Dōhaku insisted that orthodox dharma transmission, as Dōgen envisaged it, could occur only once in a lifetime and had to entail a real-life, face-to-face relationship with a teacher.³⁰⁹ Menzan’s account of Kakuan acknowledging the inauthenticity of Nōnin’s indirect dharma transmission clearly serves to highlight this reformist view.

Kakuan’s “Shinyō teishi”

According to *Honchō kōsōden*, Kakuan authored a treatise entitled *Shinyō teishi* 心要提示 (Exposition on the Essentials of Mind). Upon reading this treatise Dōgen is said to have greatly admired it, praising Kakuan as a “clear-eyed man.”³¹⁰ This otherwise unknown treatise was probably a commentary on the *Chuanxin fayao* 傳心法要 (Essentials of the Transmission of Mind), a Chan text that Nōnin is known to have obtained from China (see Chapter Five).

Kakuan’s students

Kakuan resided at Tōnomine for more than twenty years and attracted many students.³¹¹ Amongst these were Ejō, Ekan, Eshō 懷照 and the nun Egi 懷義比丘尼, who would eventually joined Dōgen’s Sōtō community.³¹² The shared character 懷 in their names signifies Kakuan’s “dharma family.”

Little is known about the nun Egi, except that on her request Dōgen gave a formal lecture in memory of her departed mother. One Sōtō text mentions Egi being present in Dōgen’s private quarters at Eihei-ji monastery.³¹³ Egi attended to the ailing Dōgen in the latter days of the master’s life and obviously was part of Dōgen’s inner circle of students.³¹⁴

³⁰⁷ *Honchō kōsōden* (DNBZ 63, pp. 273-4).

³⁰⁸ Kawamura, *Kenzeiki*, pp. 145-46.

³⁰⁹ On this issue and variant views of dharma transmission see William Bodiford, “Dharma Transmission in Sōtō Zen: Manzan Dōhaku’s Reform Movement,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 46/4 (1991): pp. 423-451. On Menzan see David Riggs, “The Zen of Books and Practice: The Life of Menzan Zuihō and His Reformation of Sōtō Zen,” in *Zen Masters*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright (Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 147-181.

³¹⁰ *Honchō kōsōden* (DNBZ, 63, pp. 273-74).

³¹¹ *Eihei-ji sanso gyōgōki* (SSZ, Shiden, vol. 1, p. 4) alludes to fifty students (學徒半百). Keizan’s *Denkōroku* (T. 2528, 409a26) alludes to more than thirty students (學人三十餘輩).

³¹² These names are listed by Menzan in his annotations to the *Kenzeiki*. Kawamura, *Kenzeiki*, pp. 145-46.

³¹³ *Goyuigon kiroku* (SSZ, Shūgen 2, p. 257).

³¹⁴ Ishikawa Rikizan, “Chūsei Bukkyō ni okeru nisō ni tsuite, toku ni shoki Sōtōshū kyōdan wo chūshin to shite (1),” *Komazawa Daigaku Zen kenkyūjo nenpō* 3 (1992), pp. 145-46.

Even less is known about Eshō 懷照. Possibly Eshō is the same person referred to as Eshō 懷昭 in Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* sermon *Ango* 安居 (Summer Retreat), written in 1245, which would mean that she was a member of Dōgen's community at Eihei-ji.³¹⁵ Better documented are the activities of Kakuan's students Koun Ejō and Kakuzen Ekan.

KOUN EJŌ

Amongst those descending the charred mountain of Tōnomine was the future Sōtō prelate Koun Ejō (1198-1280). Traditional biographies report that Ejō took the tonsure under the Tendai monk Ennō Hōin 圓能法印 of the Ōjō-in temple at the Yokawa precincts on Mount Hiei. At twenty-one he ascended Mount Hiei's Mahāyāna platform to receive the bodhisattva precepts. Unfulfilled in his studies of Tendai meditation and Kusha, Jōjitsu, Sanron and Hossō doctrines, Ejō left the mountain and went on to study Pure Land teachings under Shōkū 證空 (1177-1247). Subsequently, he moved to Tōnomine to study under Kakuan of the Darumashū. Finally, Ejō joined Dōgen and eventually succeeded him in the Sōtō Zen lineage.³¹⁶

What prompted Ejō to study Zen with Kakuan on Tōnomine? In addition to Kakuan's prominence as a teacher of Zen and successor of Nōnin, several factors can be considered:³¹⁷

- Ejō was born a Fujiwara. His genealogy thus traced back to Fujiwara progenitor Kamatari, who was deified and worshiped at Tōnomine. The monastic complex therefore had a certain ancestral significance for Ejō.
- As mentioned above, Tōnomine was dominated by Tendai monks of Mount Hiei's Yokawa precinct, where Ejō had also resided.
- Ejō had a strong affinity with Pure Land practices. Ejō's first teacher Ennō was a representative of Tendai Pure Land currents. Ennō is also known to have officiated at ceremonies for the veneration of relics (*sharikō* 舍利講). Ejō's second teacher, the Pure Land monk Shōkū was a direct disciple of Hōnen. Shōkū is said to have practiced sixty-thousand *nenbutsu* recitations every day, along with readings of the three Pure Land sūtras.³¹⁸ He also practiced relic veneration.³¹⁹ Ejō's training under Ennō and Shōkū may have led him to the Zen style of the Darumashū, which was open to relic veneration and *nenbutsu* practice.³²⁰ Ejō's teacher Shōkū would certainly have been aware of the Darumashū and may even have known Nōnin in person: Nōnin, it will be remembered, was involved in fundrasing for the effigy of Amida at the Kenkō-in, Shōkū's temple in Kyoto.

³¹⁵ Ōkubo Dōshū, *Dōgen Zenji den*, p. 275.

³¹⁶ *Eihei-ji sanso gyōgoki* (SSZ, Shiden, vol. 1, pp. 4-6). *Genso Koun Tetsū sandaion gyōjōki* (Ibid., pp. 14-16). *Nichiiki tōjō shosoden* (Ibid., pp. 39-40).

³¹⁷ The following is an expansion of points raised by Takeuchi Michio. Takeuchi, *Eihei niso Koun Ejō Zenjiden*, pp. 74-75.

³¹⁸ Shōkū resided at the Yoshiminedera 善峰寺 near Kyoto and reportedly practiced sixty-thousand *nenbutsu* recitations every day, along with *tendoku* readings of the three Pure Land sūtras. Ishikawa Rikizan, "Ejō Zenji to Dōgen Zenji metsugo no Sōtō kyōdan," in *Eihei-ji-shi* (Fukui-ken Yoshida-gun Eihei-ji-chō: Daihonzan Eihei-ji 1982), p. 172.

³¹⁹ For Shōkū's involvement with relics see Kira Jun, "Gion-nyogo no busshari to Hōnen (1)," pp. 32-35.

³²⁰ Evidence for *nenbutsu* elements in Darumashū communities is presented in Chapters Six and Seven.

- Takeuchi Michio proposed that Ejō's decision to move to Tōnomine was influenced by Ejō's mother who, he theorizes, was a blood relative of Nōnin. This theory is very thin.

Leaving behind a ravaged Tōnomine, Ejō descended to Kyoto and called on Dōgen, who at the time resided at Kenninji.³²¹ Ejō did not immediately become Dōgen's student. This came about years later, in the winter of 1234, when he again looked up Dōgen, now residing at the Kannondori-in in Fukakusa. Most Sōtō biographies hold the idealized notion that during the first meeting at Kenninji, Ejō recognized Dōgen's excellence and resolved to become Dōgen's student. Dōgen, though sympathetic to the idea, is said to have instructed Ejō to wait until the time is ripe. One Edo period Sōtō text offers a variant view, stating that Ejō left Kenninji after Dōgen had disapproved of his views.³²² According to Ishikawa Rikizan this last scenario, which suggests a certain friction between the two monks, is not unlikely: at the time of the first meeting at Kenninji, Ejō (two years senior to Dōgen) had already gone through a varied course of Buddhist studies and was a seasoned adept of Kakuan's *kenshō* Zen. Dōgen's disapproval may have caused Ejō to initially abandon his future master.³²³ In contrast, most Sōtō biographies present the first meeting at Kenninji as the occasion of Ejō's conversion to Dōgen. According to the early Sōtō record *Eiheiji sanso gyōgōki* the first meeting between the two monks turned into a "dharma discourse battle" (*rondan hossen* 論談法戦), ending with Ejō submitting to Dōgen.³²⁴ A description of this "dharma battle" is found in the Sōtō record *Denkōroku* by Keizan Jōkin. According to *Denkōroku*, Dōgen and Ejō initially agreed; but then Dōgen overtook Ejō with his superior understanding:

When they first talked for a few days Ejō's understanding was the same [as Dōgen's]. When they talked about the matter of seeing the nature, the numinous awareness, Ejō cheerfully agreed and, thinking that his own understanding was genuine, he became more and more respectful of Dōgen. But, after a few days, master Dōgen revealed extraordinary understanding. Ejō was startled, but when he was about to make objections [he realized that Dōgen] had a truth that was different and beyond him. Thus he made a new resolve and decided to submit to Dōgen.³²⁵

The Sōtō narratives, in effect, present Ejō's Darumashū views as preliminary, and juxtapose them to Dōgen's superior Sōtō views; Ejō intuitively grasps Dōgen's higher understanding and fully accepts Dōgen as his teacher. In reality, the doctrinal differences between the two monks, which in part were differences between Dōgen and the Darumashū, may have prompted Ejō's departure. Some of these differences come into focus in Dōgen's *Bendōwa* (Talk on Distinguishing the Way) completed in 1231, a few years after Dōgen encountered Ejō. This treatise, structured in a

³²¹ Following Takeuchi Michio scholars place this meeting in 1229. Takeuchi, *Eiheiji niso Koun Ejō Zenjiden*, p. 107.

³²² *Nihon tōjō rentōroku* (SSZ, Shiden 1, p. 232).

³²³ Ishikawa Rikizan, "Ejō Zenji to Dōgen Zenji metsugo no Sōtō kyōdan," p. 172.

³²⁴ Ejō "made up his mind, placed his trust [in Dōgen] and submitted" 歸心信伏. *Eiheiji sanso gyōgōki* (SSZ, Shiden 1, p. 4).

³²⁵ ハジメテ對談セン時。兩三日ハタダ師ノ得處ニオナジシ。見性靈知ノ事ヲ談ズ。時ニ師歡喜シテ違背セズ。ワガ得所實ナリトオモフテ。イヨイヨ敬歎ラクハフ。ヤヤ日數ヲフルニ。元和尚スコブル異解ヲアラハス。時ニ師オドロキテ。ホコサキヲアグルニ。師ノ外ニ義アリ。コトゴトクアヒ似ズ。ユヘニ更ニ發心シテ。伏承セントセシニ。

dialogical format, is thought to recreate Dōgen's discussions with Ejō at Kenninji.³²⁶ Dōgen's criticism of the Darumashū, in *Bendōwa* and other texts, will be examined in Chapter Eight.

Ejō's whereabouts in the roughly five year period between the first and second meeting with Dōgen are unclear. One biography reports that Ejō "took his leave and traveled about in various directions."³²⁷ Ejō, in any event, eventually joined Dōgen at Kōshōji 興正寺 (then called Gokurakuji 極樂寺) and went on to play a prominent role in both the Kōshōji and later Eiheiiji communities. As a secretary he was essential to Dōgen's literary output. He succeeded Dōgen in the Sōtō lineage and became the second abbot of Eiheiiji after Dōgen's death. Ejō seems to have been truly converted to Dōgen, unlike his co-disciple Ekan.

KAKUZEN EKAN

Available data on Kakuzen Ekan 覺禪懷鑑 are for the most part embedded in Sōtō records, particularly in biographies of Gikai and in *Goyuigon kiroku* (Record of Dōgen's Final Admonitions).³²⁸ These records show that Ekan inherited Kakuan's Darumashū lineage, thus becoming a third generation successor to Nōnin. Following the Kōfukuji attacks on Tōnomine, Ekan left the devastated mountain.³²⁹ Moving northward into Echizen province, the region of his birth, Ekan established a Darumashū community at the Tendai temple Hajakuji (Namitsuki-dera 波着寺). At Hajakuji, Ekan ordained a young boy with the name Gikan 義鑑, who would later become well-known as the Sōtō monk Gikai 義介. The ordination at Hajakuji took place in the autumn of 1231, two years after the Kōfukuji attacks on Tōnomine, indicating that the Darumashū community at Hajakuji was established fairly soon after the flight from Tōnomine.

Gikai's biographies indicate that Ekan dispatched his young student to Mount Hiei to receive the bodhisattva precepts.³³⁰ Although writings from within the Darumashū itself (examined later) tend to downplay the value of precepts as moral guidelines, Ekan, evidently, valued the ritual induction into the precepts. Since receiving the precepts at an officially recognized precept platform was a requirement for obtaining the status of a fully ordained monk, this is not wholly surprising. Ekan, I would add, may also have appreciated the idea that the precept tradition of Mount Hiei derived from Bodhidharma.

Sōtō records also report that Ekan made use of the *Śūraṅgama sūtra* and instructed his student Gikai in the principle of "seeing the nature" (*kenshō*). The same combination, it will be remembered, was taught by Kakuan at Tōnomine, suggesting a certain continuity between the

³²⁶ See Takeuchi, *Eihei nishō Koun Ejō Zenji den*, pp. 99-103. Shinkura Kazufumi, "Dōgen to Ejō no rondanhossen ni tsuite," IBK 31/2 (1983): pp. 110-11.

³²⁷ *Nihon tōjō rentōroku* (SSZ, Shiden 1, p. 232). Takeuchi Michio speculates that Ejō returned to Tōnomine to rejoin Kakuan. Takeuchi, *Eihei nishō Koun Ejō Zenjiden*, p. 107.

³²⁸ The earliest biographies of Gikai are found in *Eiheiiji sanso gyōgoki* (SSZ, Shiden 1, p. 6-9) and *Genso Koun Tetsū sandaison gyōjōki* (Ibid., p. 16-19). From the several Edo period Sōtō records I mention the representative *Nichiiki tōjō shosoden* (Ibid., pp. 41-42). *Goyuigon kiroku* is included in *Sōtōshū zensho* (SSZ, *Shūgen* 2, pp. 255-265). The following examination of Ekan benefitted from Nakao Ryōshin, "Ekan monka to Eiheiiji," *Shūgaku kenkyū* 31 (1989): pp. 174-179, Nakao Ryōshin, "Shoki Eiheiiji sōdan no mondaiten," *Zen kenkyūjō kiyo* 18 (1990): pp. 1-21; and Tsugunaga Yoshiteru, "Ekan," in *Dōgen Shisō no Ayumi 1: Kamakura jidai* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1993), pp. 299-309.

³²⁹ Ejō and Ekan apparently went separate ways. Nakao Ryōshin suggested a possible friction between the two monks. Nakao Ryōshin, "Shoki Eiheiiji sōdan no mondaiten," *Zen kenkyūjō kiyo*, 18 (1990): pp. 1-21.

³³⁰ *Eiheiiji sanso gyōgoki* (SSZ, Shiden, vol. 1, p. 6). *Genso Koun Tetsū sandaison gyōjōki* (Ibid., p.16). *Nichiiki tōjō shosoden* (Ibid., pp. 39-40).

training programmes in the Tōnomine and Hajakuji Darumashū communities. Interestingly, Ekan is also reported to have lectured on the three Pure Land sūtras.³³¹

In the spring of 1241, about a decade after their arrival, Ekan and several of his students left Hajakuji and joined Dōgen's Zen community at Kōshōji. In addition to Ekan, this group included Gikan (Gikai), Gien 義演, Giin 義尹, Gijun 義準, Gisen 義荐 and Giun 義運. (note the shared character *gi* 義).³³² As to the motives for the relocation, Ekan was no doubt interested in Dōgen's first hand knowledge of continental Chan and its practices. He may also have been advised to join Dōgen by his Darumashū co-disciple Ejō. Bodiford, in notes that Kōshōji's institutional independence from the Tendai establishment may also have been a factor in Ekan's decision.³³³

Some details on Ekan's days at Kōshōji, and later at Eihei-ji, are recorded in the above mentioned *Goyuigon kiroku* (Record of Dōgen's Final Admonitions). *Goyuigon kiroku* describes events in the early Sōtō school from the viewpoint of Gikai. The work can therefore not be uncritically accepted as recording historical fact. The record favors Gikai and his supporters who, after the deaths of Dōgen and Ejō, were involved in factional rivalries over Dōgen's spiritual legacy and control over Eihei-ji. In this context, *Goyuigon kiroku* presents Gikai as a true representative of Dōgen and his vision.³³⁴ The work is divided in two parts. The first part records conversations between Gikai and Dōgen in the privacy of Dōgen's room; in addition it brushes on events before and after Dōgen's death. The second part is concerned with the proceedings of Gikai's dharma transmission from Ejō.

Ekan repeatedly appears in the first part of *Goyuigon kiroku*. Dōgen is cited remembering Ekan as "a man with his will set profoundly on the Buddhadharma" (於佛法志深人); "his spirit was endowed with extraordinary determination" (神際有拔群之志氣). Dōgen is further said to have entrusted Ekan with a manual for conferring the bodhisattva precepts (*denju bosatsukai* 伝授菩薩戒作法), thus investing Ekan with the authority and the ritual expertise to pass on the precepts in the Sōtō tradition. Later, after the Sōtō community relocated to Eihei-ji, Dōgen is said to have repeatedly encouraged Ekan to perform the precept ritual, but out of "great trepidation" (*kyōkō* 恐惶) Ekan refrained from doing so. We are also told that Ekan once asked Dōgen for a Sōtō certificate of succession. In response, Dōgen indicates that Ekan is still an "idle fellow" (*kanjin* 閑人), a term that Dōgen here appears to use with irony, probably in reference the "naturalism" associated with the Darumashū (i.e. the notion that awakening is naturally present in everyday acts and hence no concerted effort are needed). Dōgen, nevertheless, assures Ekan that he will in due course receive a certificate. As instructed, Ekan patiently awaits more favorable circumstances, but the years pass by in vain, and Ekan dies in "bitterness" (*urami* 恨) without having received a Sōtō certificate. Reminded by Gikai of this tragedy, Dōgen expresses his regret

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² These names are listed by Menzan Zuihō in the annotated version of the *Kenzeiki*. Kawamura, *Kenzeiki*, pp. 145-46. Possibly the group was larger.

³³³ Bodiford, *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993), p. 225.

³³⁴ The version of *Goyuigon kiroku* included in SSZ was transcribed by Menzan Zuihō in 1752. According to the colophon Menzan transcribed it from a manuscript of Zen master Daichi (1290-1366) at Kōfukuji 広福寺 in Higō province (Kyūshū). A postscript notes that Daichi in turn transcribed it from a manuscript of Kangan Giin (1217-1300). Though the late provenance of the extant manuscript and the possible emanations by Menzan warrant caution, the text is extremely valuable as a historical document. See Ishikawa Rikizan, "Dōgen zenji metsugo no Eihei-ji sōdan ni tsuite: Goyuigon kiroku no shiryōkachi," in *Ejō Zenji kenkyū*, edited by Chūkō Kumagai (Daihonzan Eihei-ji Sozan Kishōkai, 1981), pp. 177-201.

about having “forgotten” (*bōkyaku* 忘却) to transmit the certificate: “It was never my intention that [Ekan] would pass away in vain.”³³⁵

The transmission of precept manuals and succession certificates (*shisho*) are important elements in the Sōtō procedures for dharma transmission. *Goyuigon kiroku* clearly aims to convey the idea that Ekan was bound to accede to Dōgen’s Sōtō lineage, but that this never happened due to unfortunate miscommunication. Nakao Ryōshin is no doubt right in reading this account of Ekan’s unrealized dharma transmission as veiling a tense relationship between Dōgen and Ekan.

³³⁶ Tsugunaga Yoshiteru theorized that a disappointed Ekan eventually re-migrated to Hajakuji, but there is no strong evidence for this.³³⁷

These tensions notwithstanding, it is clear that Ekan occupied a prominent place in the Sōtō community. At Eiheiiji, Ekan served in the key position of head monk (*shuso*). In this capacity Ekan requested Dōgen to deliver a formal lecture (*jōdō* 上堂) in memory of Kakuan, his Darumashū teacher.³³⁸ In this lecture, delivered in 1246, Dōgen praises Ekan’s devotion to his teacher, “wayfarer Kakuan” (Kakuan *dōnin* 覺晏道人). Dōgen strongly emphasizes the mysterious bond between a Zen master and a Zen student – a bond indissoluble even by death – and he suggests that Ekan’s relationship with Kakuan is of that lofty order. In doing so Dōgen foregrounds Ekan’s Darumashū affiliation. After Ekan’s death, in 1251,³³⁹ Dōgen also delivered a memorial lecture for Ekan.³⁴⁰ This lecture was requested by Ekan’s student Gijun. These memorials requests indicate that the Darumashū monks in Dōgen’s community remained self-conscious about their distinct lineage. Seeing that Dōgen rarely delivered *jōdō* lectures on specific request, these memorials indicate a special and privileged position of the Darumashū sub-group in the Sōtō community.³⁴¹ This special position may, at the same time, have hindered Ekan and Gikai in receiving the Sōtō transmission directly from Dōgen.

Hajakuji

Hajakuji, the temple where Ekan and his students dwelled for roughly a decade, was located in Echizen province near Ichijōtani valley 一乗谷, in the area separating the Asuwa river from the Usaka Ōtani valley 宇坂大谷.³⁴² Burned down in the sixteenth century, only ruins and a *torii* gate remain of the temple today.³⁴³

³³⁵ *Goyuigon kiroku* (SSZ, *Shūgen* 2, pp. 255-256). Throughout the entire passage *Goyuigon kiroku* actually talks about “seeing” (*haiken* 拝見) the Sōtō certificate. I take this to imply dharma transmission: as part of the procedures of dharma transmission, a Zen master would allow his chosen dharma successor to see his personal lineage certificate and make a copy of it, with the recipient’s name added to the lineage.

³³⁶ Nakao Ryōshin, “Ekan monka to Eiheiiji,” *Shūgaku kenkyū* 31 (1989): pp. 174-179.

³³⁷ Tsugunaga, “Ekan,” pp. 303-306.

³³⁸ *Eihei kōroku*, vol. 3, nr. 85.

³³⁹ According to *Eiheiiji sanso gyōgōki*, Ekan transmitted his Darumashū documents to Gikai in the spring of Kenchō 3 (1251). According to *Goyuigon kiroku* this transmission took place when Ekan was dying (*shūen no toki* 終焉之時); hence 1251 is believed to be the year of Ekan’s death. A document entitled *Anrakusan Sanpukuji nendaiki* 安楽山産福禪寺年代記, preserved at Jōjūji in Ishikawa prefecture, places Ekan’s death in Kenchō 2 (1250), month 8, day 13. See Tsugunaga Yoshiteru, “Ekan,” p. 300.

³⁴⁰ The lecture was held at Eiheiiji in 1252. *Eihei kōroku*, vol. 7, nr. 507.

³⁴¹ Nakao, “Ekan monka to Eiheiiji,” p. 175. Nakao notes that from the more than five-hundred lectures by Dōgen contained in *Eihei kōroku*, only four were delivered on request, namely the memorials for Kakuan and Ekan, one memorial for the mother of the Darumashū nun Egi, and one lecture requested by a nun named Eshin (unrelated to the Darumashū).

³⁴² Ishikawa Rikizan, “Echizen Hajakuji no yukue,” *Shūgaku kenkyū* 28 (1986), p. 109.

³⁴³ Ishikawa Rikizan, “Ejō Zenji to Dōgen Zenji metsugo no Sōtō kyōdan,” p. 230. The ruins and the *torii* gate are located in the mountains of what is now Fuikui-shi, Jōganji-chō 福井市成願寺町.

Data on Hajakuji in the period of Darumashū occupancy, and in the medieval period in general, are scant. The founding of the temple and the carving of its central image of the Eleven-headed Kannon (Jūichimen Kannon 十一面観音) are traditionally attributed to the monk Taichō 泰澄 (682-767), an ascetic *zenji* who is revered as the founder of several temples in the region. Taichō is especially associated with the cult of the Eleven-headed Kannon and the development of mountain asceticism on Mount Hakusan 白山, which crystallized in the establishment of the Tendai monastic complexes of Heisenji 平泉寺 and Hōgenji 豊原寺.³⁴⁴ In Ekan's time, Hajakuji was a Tendai temple. One medieval source indicates that the temple was known as a centre of Tendai esotericism.³⁴⁵

In view of the temple's proximity to Mount Hakusan and the Heisenji and Hōgenji complexes, it is likely that Hajakuji was part of the Tendai Hakusan temple network. According to Imaeda Aishin, the Hakusan temple network (including Hajakuji) was controlled by Onjōji 遠城寺 (Miidera 三井寺). The Onjōji affiliation of the Hakusan temple network plays an important role in Imaeda's theories regarding Dōgen and his move from Fukakusa to Echizen. Onjōji, the powerful Tendai complex at the foot of Mount Hiei (*jimon* 寺門), maintained a tense relationship with Enryakuji, located on the mountain proper (*sanmon* 山門). The *jimon* and *sanmon* factions repeatedly engaged in armed conflicts. According to Imaeda, Dōgen was attracted to Hakusan and set himself up in Echizen not only with the help of his patron, Hatano Yoshishige 波多野義重, but also through mediation of Onjōji and the former Hajakuji (Darumashū) monks in Dōgen's community.³⁴⁶ As Steve Heine observed, one problem in this theory is that Onjōji control over the Hakusan temple network remains unconfirmed.³⁴⁷ In addition I would say that the presumed link between Hajakuji and Onjōji is problematic in light of the fact that Ekan dispatched his pupil Gikai from Hajakuji to the precept platform of Enryakuji, in order to receive the precepts there. If Hajakuji was under Onjōji control its novice monks were more likely to have been sent to the precept platform of Tōji, as was the customary practice for Onjōji monks in that period.³⁴⁸ Whatever the exact administrative affiliation of Hajakuji may have been, in view of its geographical location and its association with the monk Taichō, it is safe to say that Hajakuji was a Tendai temple embedded in Mount Hakusan religiosity. Leaving aside Imaeda's ideas concerning Dōgen's fascination with Mount Hakusan and Onjōji support for Dōgen's flight, it is indeed very likely that Dōgen's move to Echizen was influenced by Ekan and other Darumashū monks at Kōshōji, who, as natives of Echizen and long-time residents of Hajakuji, possessed valuable local expertise.

The Darumashū monks who practiced under Dōgen at Eiheiji renewed – or more likely, continued to have – contacts with Hajakuji. In *Goyuigon kiroku*, Dōgen is quoted as scolding

³⁴⁴ See Iwai Takaki, "Taichō to Hakusan Echizen shugendō," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 294 (2007): pp. 64-91.

³⁴⁵ Ishikawa cites a document that shows that in 1271 a monk at Hajakuji transcribed a chapter of the Tendai compendium *Asabashō* 阿婆縛抄 that pertained to esoteric consecration rituals (Skt. *abhiseka*) of Mount Hiei. In the Edo period, Hajakuji was re-established at another location as a Shingi-Shingon temple. Ishikawa Rikizan, "Echizen Hajakuji no yukue," pp. 109-110. Menzan Zuihō's (1683-1769) annotated *Kenzeiki* refers to the Hajakuji monks as belonging to the Shingon house 真言家 (Kawamura, *Kenzeiki*, pp. 145-146), which is probably a reflection of the temple's Shingon affiliation in the Edo period.

³⁴⁶ Imaeda Aishin, *Chūsei Zenshūshi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1970), p. 40-44.

³⁴⁷ Steven Heine, *Did Dōgen go to China?* (Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 185.

³⁴⁸ As a result of factional disputes with Enryakuji, Onjōji sought to circumvent the precept platform (*kaidan*) on Mount Hiei (Enryakuji) and arranged for their novices to receive the precepts at the Shingon temple Tōji. This practice started in the first half of the twelfth century and still occurred in 1346. See Matsuō Kenji, *Kamakura Shinbukkō no seiritsu* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998), pp. 151-52.

Gikai for frequently disappearing from Eiheiiji to go off to “other places.”³⁴⁹ It is not hard to imagine that the nearby Hajakuji was one of Gikai’s dens. *Kenzeiki* 健掣記, a fifteenth century biography of Dōgen by the Sōtō monk Kenzei 健掣 (1414-1474), produces a colophon that shows that in 1281, Dōgen’s essay *Bushō* 佛性 (Buddha-nature) was copied at Hajakuji. Kenzei mentions that Hajakuji monks in this period frequently visited the Eiheiiji monastery.³⁵⁰ Evidently there was interaction between the Hajakuji and Eiheiiji communities, which continued after Dōgen’s demise.

TETTSŪ GIKAI

As related above, Gikai (1219-1309) was tonsured by Ekan at Hajakuji and received the bodhisattva precepts on Mount Hiei. In 1241, following his master, Gikai joined Dōgen at Kōshōji.³⁵¹ Here Gikai reportedly gained a spiritual insight while listening to Dōgen lecture. At Eiheiiji, Gikai was appointed to the important monastic position of head cook (*tenzō*). A native of Echizen, Gikai knew how to negotiate the region’s harsh conditions, which made him a highly appreciated member of Dōgen’s community. Gikai did not become Dōgen’s direct dharma heir but received dharma-transmission from Ejō in 1255. Prior to this (circa 1251) Gikai also received the transmission of the Darumashū lineage from Ekan. Between 1259 and 1262 Gikai resided in China, studying Chan ritual and monastic architecture. After his return to Japan, Gikai carried out construction work at Eiheiiji and reorganized the monastery’s ritual schedule. After Ejō’s retirement in 1267, Gikai became Eiheiiji’s third abbot, but a few years later relinquished this post to Gien. Gikai retreated to a hermitage near Eiheiiji, but frequently returned to the monastery to officiate at rituals. After Ejō passed away in 1280, factional disputes arose within the Eiheiiji community between partisans of Gikai, Gien, and the Chinese born Jakuen (i.e. the so-called “third generation controversy”). In what probably amounted to an eviction, Gikai departed from Eiheiiji around 1287.

Gikai subsequently entered Daijōji in Kaga province, which at the time was presided over by Chōkai Ajari 登海阿闍梨, a former resident of Hajakuji. Daijōji was established in 1261 to house a statue of Mahāvairocana, the central Buddha of esotericism, said to have been carved by Taichō, the founder of Hajakuji. Chōkai Ajari, a master of esoteric ritual, was invited from Hajakuji to become Daijōji’s abbot. In 1293 Gikai, who knew Chōkai from his Hajakuji days, assumed Daijōji’s abbacy and turned the temple into a Sōtō centre. In the winter of his life, Gikai passed on the abbacy to his student Keizan Jōkin, to whom he also transmitted the Sōtō lineage. In addition, Gikai entrusted Keizan with the documents and relics that had been transmitted in the Hajakuji Darumashū lineage. Gikai died in 1306.

The continued transmission of the Darumashū

Two brief texts written by Gikai provide some insight into the continued transmission of the Darumashū lineage. One of these texts, written in the winter of 1306 and dubbed *Gikai fuhōjō*,

³⁴⁹ *Goyuigon kiroku* (SSZ, Shūgen 2, pp. 255-56).

³⁵⁰ *Kenzeiki*, p. 102-103. Cited in Ishikawa Rikizan, “Echizen Hajakuji no yukue,” p. 112.

³⁵¹ The following overview of Gikai’s career draws on the Sōtō biographies of Gikai and secondary research, especially Ishikawa, “Ejō Zenji to Dōgen Zenji metsugo no Sōtō kyōdan, pp. 225-254 and Bodiford, *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*, pp. 51-64.

has been examined in Chapter Two. It mentions Nōnin's envoys, the dharma transmission from Fozhao, Nōnin's visit to the Japanese imperial palace, and the bestowal of honorary titles. Gikai also identifies what he actually transmitted to Keizan: a relic of the six patriarchs and Fugen, letters by Nōnin and Fozhao, and a travel journal composed by Nōnin's envoys. In addition, and not unimportantly, Gikai mentions two lineage documents: *Rinzaike shisho* 臨濟家嗣書 (Rinzai House Succession Certificate) and *Soshi sōden kechimyaku* (Bloodline Transmitted by the Patriarch Masters 祖師相傳血脈). Judging from the titles of these documents, the first certified the transmission of the dharma (*denpō* 傳法) and the second certified the transmission of the precepts (*denkai* 傳戒). Gikai instructed Keizan to consider these documents "subsidiary verification" (*jōshō* 助證) to the Sōtō certificate of succession (*shisho* 嗣書) that he had transmitted to Keizan earlier. Gikai, nearing the end of his life, apparently construed the Rinzai (Darumashū) lineage as ancillary to Dōgen's Sōtō lineage.

With regard to the transmission from Gikai to Keizan, William Bodiford remarks: "Keizan only received Gikai's old [Darumashū] documents, not a new succession document made out in his own name. It is incorrect, therefore, to assume that Keizan inherited Gikai's Darumashū lineage."³⁵² This last assertion is debatable. As examined in the previous chapter, records of Nōnin's temple Sambōji indicate that relics of the bodhisattva Fugen were used to designate successors in the Darumashū lineage. It was exactly such a Fugen relic that Gikai received and then passed down to Keizan. In Japan at that time there was, moreover, no codified consensus regarding the minutiae of Zen dharma transmission. For the Darumashū lineage holders, the uninterrupted handing down of Nōnin's "old document" may very well have constituted the very stuff of dharma transmission. It is incorrect, therefore, to assume that Keizan did not inherit Gikai's Darumashū lineage.

In a letter to Keizan, written slightly earlier in 1306 and dubbed *Gikan fuhōjō* (as Gikai signed it with his Darumashū name Gikan 義鑑), Gikai similarly mentions his dual Rinzai (Darumashū)/Sōtō affiliation:

I [Gikai] have studied with two masters and have been entrusted with the certificates of two houses: the Rinzai House 臨濟家 and the Tōzan House 洞山家 (i.e. Sōtō). As for the Rinzai [House], Chan master Fozhao, the foremost student of Dahui, cited the precedent of the continuous dharma-lifespan of the Buddha in this world and transmitted [the dharma] from afar to Venerable Nōnin from Japan, although they never met face to face. Kakuan succeeded Nōnin. My teacher Ekan succeeded Kakuan. I succeeded Ekan. I received master [Ekan's] commands. In addition, I inherited our [Sōtō] House. A propos, when in the summer of Kenchō five (1253) Ekan inquired with late master [Dōgen] about the transmission of a succession certificate (*shisho*), they spoke in detail about the certificate of our [Sōtō] House. At that time Venerable Ejō was also present and can attest to this. See the separate document for details. In the autumn of the same year, when [Dōgen] went to the capital for the last time, he appointed me as Eihei-ji's substitute supervisor and made me solemn promises. See the separate document for details. After master [Dōgen] passed into perfect tranquility, I studied with Eihei-ji's second abbot, Venerable [Ejō], and inherited a certificate of our [Sōtō] House. I preserved it for fifty-two years, from Kenchō *tsuchinoto-u*

³⁵² Bodiford, *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*, p. 241, note 90 (italics mine).

(1255) to Kangen *hinoe-uma* (1306). Last year you inherited it. You must guard it well and widely promulgate [the dharma] for those to come.³⁵³

The “separate document” that is repeatedly referred to by Gikai in this letter is the *Goyuigon kiroku*, or a proto-version of this record.³⁵⁴ Ekan’s talk with Dōgen in the summer of 1253 that is alluded to in *Gikan fuhōjō*, appears in the first entry of *Goyuigon kiroku* under a corresponding date. This entry records a conversation between Dōgen and Gikai, musing over the late Ekan and discussing Gikai’s prospects of becoming Dōgen’s dharma heir. I have already touched upon this entry in the foregoing section on Ekan. The following summary of the entry will therefore contain some overlapping information:

- Dōgen recalls that Ekan, on his deathbed, transmitted the Darumashū lineage to Gikai. Dōgen asks Gikai about the “sacred teachings” (texts) of the Hajakuji. Gikai answers that these texts are for general monastic use; he adds that Ekan transmitted the most important documents to him.
- Dōgen asks if these documents included a manual for the ritual conferral of the bodhisattva precepts. Gikai answers that the manual and the ritual expertise were formally transmitted to him by Ekan. Dōgen approves of this investiture, but then strongly reproaches Gikai for his customary outings away from Eiheiji during which Gikai would carelessly confer these precepts on “unfit vessels” and “idle fellows.”
- Dōgen warns Gikai not to be so careless were he to confer the precepts on behalf of the Sōtō school. Dōgen holds up the case of Ekan, who received Dōgen’s permission to perform the Sōtō precept ritual, but out of great awe refrained from doing so.
- Dōgen asks Gikai about the Rinzai (Darumashū) succession certificate (*shisho*) that was transmitted by Fozhao Deguang (to Nōnin → Kakuan → Ekan). Gikai confirms he received the document from Ekan but adds that it is not called “succession certificate” (*shisho*) but “bloodline transmitted by the patriarch masters” (*soshi sōden kechimyaku*).
- Dōgen explains that succession certificates of the various Chan houses differ in format and he assures Gikai that his *soshi sōden kechimyaku* is a genuine succession certificate. Dōgen then expresses his joy about Gikai’s good fortune of having inherited such a document, but cautions Gikai that this connection to the Rinzai (Darumashū) lineage is only a minor accomplishment: if Gikai wants to fully realize the Buddhadharma he must become a “superior vessel.”

³⁵³ 然予兩師見之、帶兩家書、所謂臨濟家与洞山家也、臨濟者大惠上足佛照（徳光）禪師、引佛在世之主法壽例、雖不見面、遙嗣日本能忍上人、忍嗣覺晏、晏嗣吾師懷鑒、鑒嗣予、々稟師命（懷鑒）、重嗣當家（曹洞）、其由者、建長五年夏、鑒公嗣書相傳事、先師御尋時、當家嗣書事委示之、其時二代（懷煥）和尚同座證知、別稱委、又同秋最後上洛之剋、仰付永平寺之留守、特蒙種々契約、具別稱、先師圓寂後、予參永平二代和尚、即嗣當家書、自建長乙卯（七年）至嘉元丙午（四年）五十二年保持之、先年既予嗣汝畢、宜善保護、弘通來際、抑二代相承、以師嗣書被付事、先蹤所引在口傳、相承作法受付属、先師門人中、独二代而元四年（午丙）八月廿八日、前住大乘寺義鑒示之。*Gikan fuhōjō* (Kagen 4/8/28), *Sōtōshū komonjo*, vol. 2, pp. 408-409. Cited in Washio, *Nihon bukkō bunkashi kenkyū*, p. 129. Ōkubo, *Dōgen Zenjiden*, p. 476-77. Murata, “Kōfuku, Daijōji,” pp. 20-21.

³⁵⁴ Ishikawa, “Goyuigon kiroku no shiryōkachi,” pp.177-201.

- Gikai then reminisces over things that Ekan told him. Ekan had once asked Dōgen for a Sōtō certificate of succession. In response Dōgen implied that Ekan was still an “idle fellow” but he assured Ekan that – in due time – he would receive a Sōtō certificate. As instructed, Ekan patiently waited. But he never received a certificate. Embittered, a dying Ekan instructed Gikai that if he (Gikai) were to inherit a Sōtō certificate from Dōgen, he should dedicate the karmic merits of the event to Ekan.
- Dōgen tells Gikai he remembers this episode, and he expresses his regret about never having transmitted a Sōtō certificate to Ekan. Dōgen confesses he completely forgot about it: Ekan had asked for the certificate only once and thereafter never broached the subject again.
- Dōgen now assures Gikai that – when the time is ripe – Gikai will receive a Sōtō certificate. Dōgen instructs Gikai to wait patiently and in due course indeed dedicate the merits of the transmission to Ekan. At that time, Dōgen adds, Gikai will be able to see for himself how the formats of the Sōtō and the Rinzaï (Darumashu) documents differ.³⁵⁵

Here and elsewhere in *Goyuigon kiroku*, Ekan and Gikai emerge as virtual dharma heirs of Dōgen. Misunderstandings, forgetfulness and death merely prevented what should have been: dharma transmission directly from Dōgen. Suchlike testimonies clearly show the pro-Gikai perspective of the text.

Dōgen, according to *Goyuigon kiroku*, approved of Gikai’s commitment to the Rinzaï (Darumashū) lineage and held out the prospect of transmitting the Sōtō lineage to Gikai as well. As William Bodiford elucidated, the idea of one person holding two lineages sharply contrasts with the lineage exclusivity that characterizes the modern version of Sōtō orthodoxy that was constructed in the Edo period. Prior to the Edo period multiple lineage affiliation was apparently not considered problematic. This, Bodiford explains, is clear from early Sōtō histories that positively appraise the fact that Dōgen himself was a dharma heir of both the Japanese Rinzaï monk Myōzen 明全 (1184-1225) and the Chinese Caodong (Sōtō) master Rujing.³⁵⁶ Dōgen’s approval of Gikai’s Rinzaï (Darumashū) lineage is, I would add, also quite feasible in light of Dōgen’s documented reverence for lineage certificates *an sich*: Dōgen regarded such certificates as esoteric, sacred objects.³⁵⁷ So, in light of his own dual Rinzaï/Sōtō lineage and his deep reverence for certificates, Dōgen’s approval of Gikai’s Rinzaï (Darumashū) lineage is, in itself, credible. Still, the passage in *Goyuigon kiroku* that has Dōgen painstakingly explain that the “bloodline” (*kechimyaku*) document transmitted in the Darumashū is really an authentic “succession certificate” (*shisho*) sounds contrived. In *Gikai fuhōjō*, Gikai identifies two separate

³⁵⁵ *Goyuigon kiroku* (SSZ, *Shūgen* 2, pp. 255-256)

³⁵⁶ Bodiford, *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*, p. 426. Before going to China Dōgen studied Rinzaï Zen at Kenninji under one of Eisai’s students named Butsuju Myōzen 佛樹明全(1183-1225) and received dharma transmission from him. In 1223, Myōzen accompanied Dōgen to China. After three years of monastic practice, mainly at the Tiantong monastery under Wuji Liaopai 無際了派 (1149–1224), Myōzen fell ill and died. Relics collected from Myōzen’s pyre were brought back to Japan by Dōgen. Dōgen also wrote a short eulogy for Myōzen, entitled *Shari sōdenki* 舍利相伝記 (Record of Transmitting Myōzen’s Relics). An english translation of this text is found in Kazuaki Tanahashi (ed.), *Enlightenment Unfolds: The Essential Teachings of Zen Master Dōgen* (Boston & London: Shambhala, 2000), pp. 30-31.

³⁵⁷ In his *Shisho* (Certificate of Succession), Dōgen describes his ecstatic emotion upon being allowed to see and venerate various certificates of succession, including a certificate from Fozhao Deguang, the formal master of Dainichibō Nōnin. (T. 2582, 70c13).

Rinzai (Darumashū) documents: a *shisho* and a *kechimyaku*. In *Goyuigon kiroku* we hear of only one document: a *kechimyaku* that is declared to be a *shisho*. Perhaps a document got lost. Perhaps there was no proper *shisho* document transmitted in Ekan's lineage. In any case, these conflicting data, and the apologetic convolutions in *Goyuigon kiroku*, tell us that there were unclarities and contentions in the early Sōtō community with regard to the nature and the validity of the Darumashū lineage documents. Gikai's somewhat peculiar idea that the Darumashū documents were to serve as a "subsidiary verification" to the Sōtō certificate no doubt arose to conciliate disagreements over the status of the continued Darumashū tradition within the Sōtō community.

KEIZAN JŌKIN

Gikai's student Keizan Jōkin (1264-1325) must be briefly discussed here. According to his own biographical account in *Tōkokki* (Record of Tōkoku) Keizan, born in Echizen province, entered Eihei-ji as an eight year old boy and received the tonsure from Gikai. When Gikai withdrew to a nearby hermitage, Keizan was placed in the care of Ejō and at eighteen received full monk's ordination. The following year Keizan studied with Jakuen at Hōkyō-ji. At twenty-two he attained awakening upon hearing a sound (*monshō godō* 聞声悟道). At twenty-eight he was appointed supervisor of Jōman-ji 城万寺 in Awa province. The following year he studied at Eihei-ji under its abbot Gien, who sanctioned him to administer the bodhisattva precepts. At thirty-two Keizan rejoined his old master Gikai, who had settled at Daijō-ji in Kaga. Keizan received dharma transmission from Gikai, and at thirty-five succeeded him as the abbot of Daijō-ji. After fifteen years at Daijō-ji, Keizan moved to Tōkoku and entered Yōkō-ji.³⁵⁸

In addition, Keizan established several temples, notably the Sōjiji in Nōtō, which for a long time would overshadow Eihei-ji as the Sōtō school's institutional centre. The flourishing of the Sōtō school owes much to the proselytizing activities of Keizan and his lineage successors. Keizan's wide-ranging conception of Zen, which included elements of Esotericism, Daoism and *kami* worship, enabled Keizan's Sōtō faction to assimilate local traditions and expand through existing pilgrimage sites and temple networks. According to Bernard Faure, Keizan's inclusivism was prefigured in the Zen style of the Darumashū. The eclipsed Darumashū in this way contributed to the growth of the Sōtō school, and so secured the survival of Dōgen's "pure" tradition.³⁵⁹

Peak of the Five Elders

As mentioned earlier, Keizan received from his master Gikai a Darumashū certificate and one relic grain. Along with other objects, Keizan ritually buried this relic and Gikai's certificate into a

³⁵⁸ Keizan's autobiographical account appears in *Tōkokki* (SSZ, Shūgen 2, pp. 504-05). Also see Kawai Taikō, "Tōkokki ni motozuku Keizan ryaku nenpu," *Zen kenkyūjo kiyō* 34 (2006): pp. 197-211; and Faure, *Visions of Power*, p. 31. Edo period biographies of Keizan mention that prior to entering Daijō-ji, Keizan embarked on a pilgrimage and studied with the Rinzai masters Tanshō (1231-1291) and Egyō (1223-1297) in Kyoto and with Muhon Kakushin (1207-1298) in Kii province. These monks were known for their practice of Rinzai Zen and esoteric ritual. Keizan's own writings do not mention these travels. Still, Keizan's penchant for esotericism suggests he may have received some type of esoteric training, possibly from Kakushin or other representatives of the Zen/Esoteric Hōtō faction. See Azuma Ryūshin, *Taiso Keizan Zenji* (Kokushi Kankōkai 1996), pp. 96-107.

³⁵⁹ Faure, "Darumashū," pp. 45-52.

tumulus called *Gorōhō* 五老峰 (Peak of the Five Elders) on the precincts of Yōkōji.³⁶⁰ Japanese scholars mostly interpret this burial as Keizan's formal disassociation from the Darumashū. Bernard Faure presents a more plausible reading. Keizan, Faure notes, not only buried Gikai's Darumashū certificate but also his own Sōtō certificate, a set of Mahāyāna texts, a bone fragment from Dōgen, a text by Dōgen's master Rujing and a sūtra copied in blood by Ejō. So, rather than being some kind of symbolic disassociation from the Darumashū, the internment of these objects must be seen as a glorification the Sōtō/Darumashū legacy that underlied Keizan's status as a Zen patriarch.³⁶¹

A continued transmission of a Darumashū relic?

As will be remembered the relics that circulated in the Darumashū were of dual origin: relic grains of each of the six Chan patriarchs (*rokuso*), plus relic grains deriving from the bodhisattva Samantabhadra (Fugen). It seems that Gikai and Keizan were not aware of (or chose to conflate) this bipartition. In *Gikai fuhōjō*, Gikai oddly refers to the one relic grain that he inherited from Ekan as "*Rokuso Fugen shari*" 六祖普賢舍利. Since the reference is to a single relic grain this can only be feasibly rendered as "the Samantabhadra relic of the six patriarchs (or: sixth patriarch)." This reading is supported in *Tōkokki* in which Keizan similarly speaks of this one relic grain as "the Samantabhadra relic of the six patriarchs (or: sixth patriarch) transmitted in the lineage of Nanyue."³⁶²

Though the writings of Keizan himself indicate that the relic was buried in the Peak of the Five Elders, one Edo period text suggests the existence of an alternative tradition. In this text, entitled *Rokuso Daikan Zenji reige ryakki* 六祖大鑑禪師靈牙略記 (Concise Record of the Sacred Tooth of Chan Master Dajian the Sixth Patriarch), dated 1717, a nameless monk records his visit to Kōfukuji in Higō province (Kyūshū) to examine the relic grain and the original *Gikai fuhōjō* manuscript. After having paraphrased Gikai's account of the relic's transmission from Nōnin to Kakuan, Ekan, Gikai and Keizan successively, the nameless monk writes that the relic was subsequently transmitted to Keizan's student Meihō Sōtetsu (1277-1350), and from Meihō to Gida Daichi (1299-1366), Kōfukuji's founder. The relic is identified as a "sacred tooth" (*reige* 靈牙) of Huineng, the sixth Chan patriarch.³⁶²

KANGAN GIIN

We must also mention Kangan Giin 寒巖義尹 (1217-1300). Giin, said to have been the son of either Emperor Gotoba (1180-1393) or Emperor Juntoku (1197-1242), was a member of the early Sōtō community under Dōgen. He is known especially for his popularization of the Sōtō school in Higō province (Kyūshū) through proselytizing and public construction projects. He also traveled to China to obtain written recognition for the freshly compiled sayings of Zen master Dōgen.

³⁶⁰ See *Tōkokki* (SSZ, Shūgen 2, pp. 513-516). Azuma Ryūshin, *Taiso Keizan Zenji*, pp. 438-455.

³⁶¹ Faure, *Visions of Power*, p. 47.

³⁶² *Rokuso Daikan Zenji reige ryakki* appears as an appendix to *Gida Daichi Zenji itsuge anroku* 祇陀大智禪師逸偈錄 (Casual Verses of Zen Master Gida Daichi), a collection of Daichi's poetry, compiled by Menzan Zuihō. DNS, 6, 27, pp. 613-14.

In his annotations to the *Kenzeiki*, Menzan Zuihō (1683-1769) lists Giin as a member of Ekan's Darumashū group.³⁶³ Another clue to Giin's Darumashū background is the character "gi" in his name, signifying Ekan's students. In addition, there is a reference in a Sōtō source that places Giin's encounter with Dōgen in 1241, the very year that Ekan's Darumashū group joined Dōgen. Nakao Ryōshin questioned Giin's Darumashū affiliation, suggesting that Giin's royal pedigree and high social standing would have made it unlikely for him to choose the peripheral Darumashū over one of the mainstream *kenmitsu* schools.³⁶⁴ Conversely, I would argue that Giin's Darumashū background underscores the dubiousness of Sōtō hagiographic claims to Giin's imperial ancestry.

We should also consider Giin's interest in relics, an aspect of Buddhist practice that was important in the Darumashū but regarded with ambivalence by Dōgen. One Edo period biography reports that Giin, when travelling in China, visited the King Aśoka monastery in Mingzhou and performed eighty-three thousand prostrations in front of its reliquary.³⁶⁵ Though specifics about Giin in the various Sōtō biographies are notoriously garbled,³⁶⁶ Giin's concern with relics is certain. It is known, for instance, that the central icon of Buddha Śākyamuni at the Nyoraiji in Higo province, founded by Giin in 1269, was consecrated by depositing relics in its interior.³⁶⁷ A document in Giin's own hand furthermore shows that he presented a nun named Senshin 沙弥尼 専信 with a relic grain.³⁶⁸ Giin's concern with relics does of course not necessarily derive from his Darumashū roots, still it gives pause for thought.

Noteworthy in this context is also the fact that Giin ordained Gida Daichi. Daichi went on to receive dharma transmission from Keizan's student Meihō Sōtetsu and later founded Kōfukuji in Higō province. As mentioned above, it was at Kōfukuji that the "sacred tooth of the sixth patriarch," together with Gikai's letters to Keizan about the Darumashū lineage were preserved. Daichi's custody of these Darumashū related writings and of the relic with its perceived Darumashū provenance, suggests a continued involvement in the early Sōtō school with the Darumashū tradition, extending well into the fourteenth century.

GEMMYŌ

The monk Gemmyō 玄明, a student of Ekan, is primarily known as the monk who was cast out of Eiheiiji, as recorded in *Kenzeiki*.³⁶⁹ Dōgen, according to this account, journeyed to Kamakura to have audience with the powerful regent Hōjō Tokiyori, who offered Dōgen several plots of land. Dōgen declined the offer but Gemmyō, one of the prominent monks in Dōgen's assembly, defied this decision:

After Venerable Dōgen returned to Echizen, Saimyōji-dono (Hōjō Tokiyori) devoutly donated a two-thousand *koku* plot of land in Echizen, called Rokujō-no-hō, to Eiheiiji. In the

³⁶³ Murakami, *Kenzeiki*, p. 145.

³⁶⁴ Nakao Ryōshin, "Shōki Eiheiiji sōdan no mondaiten," *Zen kenkyūjō kiyō* 18 (1990): pp. 14-20.

³⁶⁵ DNS, *Shiryō kōhon*, 5, 905, p. 142.

³⁶⁶ Bodiford, *Sōtō Zen*, pp. 37-43.

³⁶⁷ Ariki Yoshitaka, "Higō Kangan Giin no zōzō katsudō ni tsuite," *Bijutsushi* 46/2 (1997): pp. 156-173.

³⁶⁸ Bodiford, *Sōtō Zen*, p. 40. *Shari sōden shidai* 舍利相伝次第 (1279), *Kamakura Ibun*, vol. 17, p. 50 (document nr. 12751).

³⁶⁹ Ōkubo, *Dōgen zenjiden no kenkyū*, p. 306-308.

end, [Dōgen] did not accept it and turned down the offer. [However], an old monk named Gemmyō, the head monk of Eihei-ji, obtained the certificate of donation. This foolish monk thought the donation of the Rokujō-no-hō to be very prestigious, and full of joy he went around to tell everyone about it. When Master [Dōgen] heard this he said: “Your jubilant mind is dirty inside,” and immediately expelled Gemmyō from the monastery. He cut out Gemmyō’s meditation mat in the monk’s hall, dug out seven *shaku* of earth [from underneath the mat] and threw it all away. Never before had such a thing been seen or heard. It is said that this head monk Gemmyō is a living Arhat. One hundred and thirty years after Venerable founder [Dōgen] passed away, a wandering monk ran into [the Arhat] on Mount Hakone in Izu province. He said: “I am Gemmyō, head monk of Eihei-ji” and then spoke in detail about events that took place in the Venerable founder’s time. Having witnessed [this Arhat] leaning on his bamboo staff, the wandering monk, it is said, came to Eihei-ji and reported this story.³⁷⁰

In Sōtō circles, Dōgen’s refusal to accept the offered property and Gemmyō’s punishment exemplify Dōgen’s ascetic detachment from fame and wealth, and his uncompromising attitude towards unruly monks. Though the image of Gemmyō roaming Japan as an immortal arhat is of course fantastic, the historicity of this monk and his eviction from Eihei-ji are supported by two passages in *Goyuigon kiroku*. One of these passages records a conversation between Ejō and Gikai, reminiscing over admonitions of their late teacher Dōgen:

[Ejō told Gikai]: Among the instructions that late master [Dōgen] used to offered us, he certainly said: “Your root teacher [i.e. Ekan] looked upon you with human eyes and approved of you as his true heir. Ever since he joined my assembly and donned the one-piece robe I stopped hearing about dissolute behavior. Although his companions were many, he was truly a man of the Buddhadharma. His spirit was endowed with extraordinary determination. He was nothing like that Gemmyō and associates. In those days [Gemmyō] was punished [in accordance with] the monastic regulations. It was not so that [Gemmyō] himself had been indiscrete, but he suffered these measures because of certain things. The matter was dealt with in compliance with his master.”³⁷¹

Kenzeiki links the eviction to Gemmyō’s wayward acceptance of a donation of land from Hōjō Tokiyori – a donation that Dōgen had earlier refused. Dōgen’s encounter with Tokiyori in Kamakura, however, is historically suspect and probably a later fabrication.³⁷² This renders the scenario of Gemmyō being banished for accepting Tokiyori’s gift equally doubtful. *Goyuigon kiroku* does not bring up Tokiyori’s donation as a cause for Gemmyō’s expulsion, but vaguely

³⁷⁰ 道元和尚、越前エ御帰之後、西明寺殿為遂願心、越前国之内六条之保ト申ス二千石ノ在所ヲ、永平寺領ニ寄進被申、雖然終ニ不受給之、返進給、永平寺之玄明首座ト申老僧、此寄進狀ノ使ヲセラル、六条保寄進ノ事ハ、愚僧力高名也トテ、歡喜シ衆中ヲフリアルキ給ウ事ヲ、師聞タマイテ、悦喜スル心中キタナシトテ、嚙テ寺ヲ擯出シ給テ、玄明ノ坐禪セシ僧堂床縁ヲキリ、地ヲ七尺ホリ捨給ウ、前代未聞不見ノ事ナリ、此玄明首座ハ、生羅漢ト申シ伝、開山御入滅ノ後、百三十年已後ノ、伊豆国箱根山ニノ行脚ノ僧ニ逢テ、我ハ永平寺之玄明首座也トテ、開山和尚ノ御時代ノ事ヲ委物語ノ、竹杖ニスカリテ立チ給タルヲ見テアリツルト、其行脚ノ僧、永平寺エ来テ物語ノアルト申伝ル也。(Kenzeiki, pp. 63-64) (Kanbun markers omitted).

³⁷¹ 又先師尋常被譽化之上是非之中云。於汝本師有見人眼。然許汝而為嫡嗣。又參我會著直綴以來于今無放逸之聞。又雖其兄弟多。實是佛法者也。其神際有拔羣之志氣。不似彼玄明等。當時依事罰院內例也。於彼身非不覺。或依事物伊羅式。依師方此沙汰 (*Goyuigon kiroku*, SSZ, Shūgen 2, p. 260-61).

³⁷² Dōgen’s visit to Kamakura is, for instance, not recorded in the *bakufu* chronicle *Azuma kagami* though the chronicle does record Tokiyori’s meetings with other Zen monks. For a summary of Yanagida Seizan’s arguments for the fictive nature of Dōgen’s visit to Kamakura see Brian Victoria, *Zen War Stories*, pp. 76-77.

alludes to “certain things” (*jibutsu* 事物) and “dissolute behavior” (*hōitsu* 放逸). In another passage in *Goyuigon kiroku*, Gikai and Ejō recollect this episode:

Gikai said: My fellows in the dharma of former years used to say that the words “in the Buddhadharma, do not produce evil but cultivate virtue” mean that in the Buddhadharma evil is not produced and hence all acts are a cultivation of virtue, and that lifting the arms and moving the legs, all that we do, the arising of dharmas in general, everything is the Buddhadharma. Is this a right view?

Venerable [Ejō] answered: Among our late master’s students there was one group that conceived this false view. For this reason [Dōgen], in his lifetime, cut all ties with them. It is crystal clear that these students were banished because they conceived this false teaching. If you wish to cherish our late master’s Buddhadharma, you must not talk to or sit together with these fellows. This was our late master’s commandment for posterity.³⁷³

Though details remain unclear, the expulsion apparently revolved around Dōgen’s insistence on moral precepts and monastic regulations on the one hand, and antinomian views embraced by a Darumashū splinter party in his assembly on the other. The episode also indicates internal friction within the Darumashū group at Eihei-ji – friction between those accepting Dōgen’s way and those insisting on their old ways. With the banishment of Gemmyō and his companions, followed or not by the dramatic act of cleansing the defiled meditation platform, Dōgen admonished the Eihei-ji assembly, the Darumashū group in particular, to submit to monastic discipline and give up Darumashū views.

GIJUN

Biographical sketches of Gijun appear in several Sōtō records of the Edo period and are very concise. The *Nihon tōjō rentōroku* 日本洞上聯燈錄 (1727) by the Sōtō monk Reinan Shūjo 嶺南秀恕 (1645- 1752) has the following:

Zen master Gijun of Eitoku-ji in Echizen. Like Gikai and Gien he received the tonsure and the precepts from Venerable Ekan. Thereupon he climbed Mount Hiei and thoroughly investigated the scriptures of the Tripiṭaka. Leaving behind [Mount Hiei] he went to the capital and studied with Zen master Dōgen at Kōshō-ji. In one glance [Dōgen] recognized his calibre. He attended to [Dōgen] and often transcribed [Dōgen’s words]. When Dōgen moved to Eihei-ji he had master [Gijun] stay behind [at Kōshō-ji] and entrusted him with the supervision over the temple’s affairs. After Eihei-ji was completed, [Dōgen] appointed him as secretary. One snowy night he visited Dōgen in the monastery’s Mountain Grass Hut and presented him with a poem he had written. Echoing the tenor of this poem Dōgen replied:

*One night you climbed up through the deep snow and asked about the way.
I was moved when at the garden’s edge, buried waist-deep in the snow,
you were grappling with the old case of “[Huīke] cutting off his arm.”*

³⁷³ 義介咨問云。義介先年同一類之法內所談云。於佛法中諸惡莫作諸善奉行故佛法中諸惡元來莫作。故一切行皆修善。所以舉手動足一切所作。凡諸法生起皆佛法也云々。此見正見乎。和尚答云。先師門徒中有起此邪見之一類故。在世之時義絕畢。被於門徒明白也。依立此邪義也。若欲慕先師佛法之輩不可共語同座。是則先師遺戒也。
(*Goyuigon kiroku* SSZ, Shūgen 2, p. 258).

How many know about discarding the wisteria and the snake?

After Dōgen passed away [Gijun] studied under Venerable Ejō and in private received the mind-seal. When Eitoku-in was established master [Gijun] was invited to become its first abbot. In his waning years he lived in seclusion at Kanki-in. He died in a place unknown.³⁷⁴

According to this account, Gijun ordained under Ekan, proceeded to Mount Hiei and moved on to Kōshōji to study under Dōgen. When Dōgen moved to Kōshōji, Gijun initially stayed behind. At Eihei, Gijun served as Dōgen's secretary and studied an "old case." After Dōgen's death, Gijun studied with Ejō and received dharma transmission from him. Later, Gijun moved out of Eihei and relocated to Eitoku-in, and subsequently moved to Kanki-in.

Several elements in the Edo period biographies of Gijun, such as the one translated above, can be traced to earlier Sōtō sources. *Kenzeiki* (1452) mentions Gijun's protracted stay at Kōshōji.³⁷⁵ *Eihei kōroku* 永平廣錄 (Eihei's Extensive Record), a collection of lectures and poems by Dōgen compiled by his students, alludes to Gijun's work as Dōgen's secretary.³⁷⁶ *Eihei kōroku* also alludes to Gijun's personal study under Dōgen, and mentions the snowy exchange of verses:

One snowy night I [Dōgen] was impressed by a verse of twenty-eight characters written by the scribe Jun. Since I was ailing, he took down the following verse for me:

*On a snow-laden night he climbed up to ask about the way,
his body covered and immersed to the waist: heart-rending!
Though cutting off one's head or slicing off one's arm is a wrong way,
one who casts away both the wisteria and the snake is a true master.*³⁷⁷

The Sōtō record *Eihei sanzo gyōgōki*, compiled in the Ōei period (1394-1428) mentions Gijun's dharma transmission from Ejō.³⁷⁸ It also mentions Gijun's retirement to the Eitoku-in and Kanki-in temples. In addition, *Eihei sanzo gyōgōki* also contains an interesting detail about Gijun that is not mentioned in the Edo period biographies:

³⁷⁴ 越前州永徳院義準禪師。同義介義演。師事懷鑑和尚。薙髮納戒。尋上台嶽探蹟三藏。棄去入洛。參元禪師於興聖。一見器之。服侍多載。屬元移永平。師留統院事。後造永平。命掌記室。一夜雪中詣元于山巔艸庵。作偈呈之。元依其韻示曰。訪道登高深雪夜。可憐庭際沒腰時。試看斷臂奮公案。跳脫藤蛇幾箇知。元滅後咨參孤雲和尚。密受心院。某氏創永徳院。延師爲第一祖。暮年退居歡喜院。後不知所終矣。(SSZ, Shiden 1, p. 240).

³⁷⁵ *Kenzeiki* (*Kenzeiki*, p. 52) mentions that Gijun sent a twig of a cinnamon tree from Kōshōji to Eihei. The twig arrived on 7/9/1244, just after the opening ceremonies for Eihei's new Lecture Hall (*hattō* 法堂). If this is reliable, Gijun stayed behind at Kōshōji for at least a year before moving on to Eihei. See Ōkubo Dōshū, *Dōgen Zenjiden no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993) (reprint), p. 242.

³⁷⁶ *Eihei kōroku* includes a memorial to Ekan delivered by Dōgen in 1252 at the request of Gijun, who is referred to as "Jun Shōjō" 準書狀 (scribe Jun) (*Eihei kōroku*, vol. 7, nr. 507). *Eihei kōroku* has been translated into English by Taigen Daniel Leighton and Shohaku Okumura as *Dōgen's Extensive Record: A Translation of Eihei Kōroku* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2004).

³⁷⁷ 雪夜感準記室廿八字病中右筆。訪道登高深雪夜、覆身沒腰可憐時、勿頭斷臂雖邪法、跳脫藤蛇乃正師。(Eihei kōroku, vol. 10, nr. 98). The words "cutting off one's head" in the verse probably refer to the Indian patriarch Nāgārjuna, who is said to have cut off his own head with a blade of grass. The expression "rope (wisteria) and snake" (*tōja* 藤蛇) recalls the instructional Buddhist story of a person mistaking a rope for a snake due to deluded perception.

³⁷⁸ *Eihei sanzo gyōgōki* (SSZ, Shiden 1, p. 5) lists Gijun as a dharma heir of Ejō (*fuhō deshī* 付法弟子).

Gijun resided at Eitoku-in and Kanki-in, but in his later years he slandered the teaching of our school. Therefore master Ejō, after his death, turned himself into a dragon deity and punished him. In the end [Gijun] died, plagued by demons.³⁷⁹

In his later years Gijun apparently “slandered” the Sōtō teachings, causing strong feelings of resentment in Sōtō quarters. To account for this resentment we must consider Gijun’s post-Eiheiji career in more detail.

***Ginō den* (Biography of Ginō)**

Data on Gijun’s post-Eiheiji activities are provided in a short biography of Gijun in a compendium of Shingon lineages written by the Shingon monk Enkai Yūbō 円海祐宝 (1656-1727) of the Daigoji. The biography – entitled *Ginō den* 義能伝 in short – refers to Gijun as Ginō 義能, the name by which he is known in the Shingon tradition. According to this text:

Great Priest Ginō was formerly called Gijun. His second name was Myōshin. He came from Echigo. Originally from the Zen school, he relied on Zen master Buppō [Dōgen] and received ordination. He always served [Dōgen] as attendant. He wandered about extensively to study and knocked on the gates of the Five Mountain monasteries in the imperial capital. Then he heard about Kongōzammai-in 金剛三昧院 on Mount Kōya, where a ferocious tiger had created a forest [monastery] for the combined practice of Tendai, Esotericism and Zen. He strapped on his gear, climbed the southern mountain, lifted the diamond door-bolt and paid homage to the historic site of Gyōyū (1163-1241) and Hottō (1207-1298).³⁸⁰

On Mount Kōya, *Ginō den* further relates, Gijun (Ginō) had a meeting with the Shingon master Raiken 頼賢 (1196-1273) of Anyō-in 安養院, a hermitage on the precincts of Kongōzammai-in. In a dialogue about “supreme Zen” (*saijōzen* 最上禪), Raiken tells Gijun that Zen, “the special transmission outside the teachings” (*kyōge betsuden* 教外別傳), is in fact delimited by the teachings. Intrigued by this insight, Gijun becomes Raiken’s student. After having practiced esoteric ritual with Raiken for several years Gijun leaves Mount Kōya, sets up a temple in Echizen, and invites Raiken over to perform rituals for the benefit of the people. In Echizen, Raiken transmits the Shingon (Daigo 醍醐) lineage to Gijun and emphasizes that true Zen is embodied in the tantric wisdom tradition of Shingon (*kongōchōshū* 金剛頂宗). Taking this to heart Gijun applies himself solely to Shingon. Subsequently Gijun moves to Harima province and founds the Muryōjū-in 無量耄寿院.³⁸¹

Though the late provenance of the *Ginō den* warrants some caution, the gist of the account is acceptable and can, to an extent, be verified from other sources: Gijun initially studies with Dōgen. He then leaves for Kyoto and practices Zen at several Zen monasteries. Next he climbs Mount Kōya and studies esoteric ritual with Shingon master Raiken, from whom he receives

³⁷⁹ 準者雖永德歡喜兩院住持。晚年輕蔑宗旨故。師沒後爲龍天所治罰。最後蒙魔擾死。(Ibid., p. 6).

³⁸⁰ 大僧都義能、初稱義準。字明信。越後州人。本禪宗、依弘法禪師而出家、常隨侍者。長及遍參、扣皇都五山之闕。繼開高野山金剛三昧院兼台密禪而獐虎作林、担錫登南山、敲金剛鍵札行勇法灯之遺跡。(Banshū Kako-gun Muryōjū-in kaisan dentō Daisōzu Ginō den 播州賀古郡無量寿院開山伝灯大僧都義能伝, in *Kongōchō mujōshōshū zoku dentō kōroku* 金剛頂無上正宗統伝灯広録 (short title: *Zoku dentō kōroku* 統伝灯広録) by Enkai Yūbō 円海祐宝 (1656-1727). Cited in Satō Shūkō, “Eitoku-in Gijun to Muryōju-in Ginō: Eiheiji Dōgen monka kara no ridatsu wo megutte,” IBK 97/49 (2000): pp. 205-10.

³⁸¹ Ibid.

esoteric transmission (*denpō kanjō* 傳法灌頂).³⁸² Next Gijun establishes himself in Echizen.³⁸³ (Probably at the temples Eitoku-in and Kanki-in, as mentioned in the *Eiheiji sanso gyōgōki*).³⁸⁴ Finally, Gijun enters Muryōjū-in in Harima province, a temple dedicated to Buddha Amida.

Kōngōzammai-in

Gijun's transfer to Mount Kōya's Kōngōzammai-in is not wholly surprising if we consider the history of this temple.³⁸⁵ Kōngōzammai-in was wellknown as a centre for the combined practice of Tendai, Zen and Shingon. The temple was originally established on Mount Kōya as "Zenjō-in" 禪定院 by Hōjō Masako (1156-1225) as a memorial to her late husband Minamoto no Yoritomo, the first Shogun. Masako invited Eisai to conduct the first commemorative rite and appointed Eisai as the temple's founding abbot. Masako had formally become a Buddhist nun after the death of Yoritomo in 1199, receiving the precepts from the Shingon monk Gyōyu 行勇 (1163-1241). Gyōyu served as a ritualist (*kusō* 供僧) at the Hachiman Shrine in Kamakura and maintained strong ties with Hōjō Masako and her son Minamoto no Sanetomo, the third Shogun. When Zen master Eisai came to Kamakura to preside over the Jūfukuji (also established by Hōjō Masako), Gyōyu became Eisai's student. Gyōyu inherited Eisai's Zen lineage and became Jūfukuji's second abbot. After the assassination of Sanetomo in 1219 Gyōyu left Kamakura and retreated to Mount Kōya. On Mount Kōya Hōjō Masako had Zenjōji renovated; in 1223 the temple complex was renamed Kōngōzammai-in and Gyōyu was instated as the first abbot.

Among the many students drawn to Gyōyu's combination of Shingon, Tendai and Zen was the Shingon monk Kakushin (Hōtō Kokushi; 1207-1298). Having practiced Zen with Gyōyu for a while, Kakushin again turned to esotericism, studying with the Shingon monks Dōhan 道範 (1178-1252) and Rendō 蓮道 (n.d.). Kakushin also studied with Ganshō 願性, a former retainer of Minamoto no Sanetomo who, upon his lord's death, had become a monk under Gyōyu. In 1239 Kakushin rejoined Gyōyu when the latter returned to Jūfukuji in Kamakura. After Gyōyu's death in 1241, Kakushin left Jūfukuji and traveled to Kyoto. In 1242 Kakushin joined Dōgen's Zen community at Kōshōji and from Dōgen received the bodhisattva precepts. After further training with other Zen teachers in Kyoto, Kakushin journeyed to China in 1249. In 1254 Kakushin returned to Japan as a confirmed dharma heir of the Chinese Chan master Wumen Huikai (1183-1260). Kakushin returned to Kōngōzammai-in in the same year and was

³⁸² Gijun's transmission from Raiken is recorded in *Denpō kenjō shiji sōjo kechimiyaku* 傳法灌頂資相承血脈. Raiken belonged to the Seigen branch of the Sambō-in lineage 三宝院流, named after Raiken's teacher Seigen 成賢 (1162-1231), the twenty-first abbot of Daigoji. Raiken, also known as Ikyō Shōnin 意教上人, transmitted this lineage (hence called the Ikyō lineage) to several of his students, including Shōdō 証道 (a.k.a. Jitsū 実融; 1247-1339), Jimyō 慈猛 (1212-1277), Gangyō 願行 (d. 1295) and Ginō (Gijun). These four monks are considered the founders of distinct sublineages. The lineage traced back to Ginō is known as the Ginō-ryū 義能流 or Ginō-hō 義能力. Raiken, incidentally, was also initiated in the Sambō-in branch of the "left-handed" Tachikawa-ryū. He transmitted this tradition to Jimyō. See Kōda Yuun, "Ikyō Shōnin denkō (2)," *Mikkyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 13 (1999): pp. 37-63.

³⁸³ Raiken's activities in Echizen and his transmission of esoteric secrets to Ginō are alluded to in a document entitled *Ikyō Shōnin kudensho* 意教上人口傳書 (Record of Venerable Ikyō's Oral Transmissions), preserved in the Kanazawa Bunko collection under the title *Kudenshū* 口傳集.

³⁸⁴ *Ginō den* does not provide a name for Gijun's temple in Echizen. But it mentions that the structure's guardian deity is Seiryū Gongen 清滝権現, a deity strongly associated with the Shingon Sambō-in lineage. Gijun's temple in Echizen, therefore, was in all likelihood a Shingon temple. See Satō Shūkō, "Eitoku-in Gijun," p. 206.

³⁸⁵ The following outline of the history of the Kōmyōzammai-in draws on Nakao Ryōshin, "Taikō Gyōyū ni tsuite," *IBK* 29/2 (1981): pp. 835-36. Nakao Ryōshin, "Komyozammai-in Ryūzen ni tsuite," *IBK* 36/2 (1988): pp. 614-19. Harada Kōdō, "Nihon Sōtoshū no rekishiteki seikaku (2): Dōgen zenji to Ryūzen, Kakushin to no kōshō wo megutte," *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 5 (1972): pp. 1-16.

immediately selected as the temple's chief monk (第一座 *dai-ichiza*) by Kōngōzammai-in's second abbot Ryūzen 隆禪. Later, Kakushin relocated to Saihōji 西方寺 in Kii province and spent most of his days there in seclusion until his death in 1298.

The Kōngōzammai-in on Mount Kōya and its Zen tradition must have been well-known in Sōtō circles. Gijun would certainly have met Kakushin at Kōshōji, when Kakushin practiced there and received the bodhisattva precepts from Dōgen.³⁸⁶ Dōgen himself was well-acquainted with Kōngōzammai-in's second abbot Ryūzen.³⁸⁷ Interaction between the early Sōtō community and Mount Kōya is also suggested in the biography of the Sōtō monk Dōsen 道禪禪師 (d. 1289). Dōsen was ordained as a Shingon monk on Mount Kōya. He practiced A-syllable meditation and studied secret *abhiṣeka* rituals. One day Dōsen had an encounter with Tetsū Gikai of Eihei-ji, who was visiting Mount Kōya (!). Dōsen thereupon moved to Eihei-ji and eventually received the Sōtō dharma from Eihei-ji's abbot Ejō.³⁸⁸

Another intriguing link between the Darumashū monks in Dōgen's Sōtō community and Kōmyōzammai-in may be inferred from a reference in Sōtō records to a Daoist practice known as "embryonic respiration" (*taisoku*, Ch. *taixi* 胎息). According to writings by Dōgen's student Senne 詮慧 (n.d.), followers of the Darumashū practiced a meditation method called embryonic respiration, which they referred to as "a practice from the esoteric repository" (*hizō no ji* 祕藏事).³⁸⁹ A manual for this practice attributed to Bodhidharma, entitled *Putidamo taixi jue* 菩提達磨胎息訣 (Bodhidharma's Secrets of Embryonic Respiration), is known to have circulated precisely in Kōngōzammai-in.³⁹⁰

As will be clear from the above impressions of the history of the Kōmyōzammai-in and the activities of Eisai, Gyōyū, Kakushin, Dōgen, Gikai and Dōsen, Gijun's turn to Shingon came about in a web of direct and indirect lines between Sōtō, Rinzaï and Shingon communities. The Sōtō resentment towards Gijun that is voiced in the *Eihei-ji sanso gyōgōki* was no doubt motivated by Gijun's candid transfer to the Shingon school. Gijun's promulgation of Shingon in Echizen province would not have gone unnoticed at Eihei-ji, which was located in the same region. Some of Gijun's former Eihei-ji comrades may have made similar moves, while others in the unstable Eihei-ji community regarded such activities as a betrayal to Dōgen, who rejected the dual practice of Zen and Shingon.³⁹¹ Gijun's Shingon practices seem to have focused especially on fire offerings dedicated to Buddha Amida (*Amida goma* 阿彌陀護摩).³⁹² The foundation of Gijun's concern with esotericism and his interest in Buddha Amida seem to be prefigured in his early training under Ekan at Hajakuji: as mentioned earlier Hajakuji was known as a centre of esotericism, while Ekan's training program there included the study of the major Amitābha sūtras.

³⁸⁶ Dōgen can also be linked to Saihōji, the temple in Kii province where Kakushin eventually settled. Saihōji had been established by Hōjō Masako and Kakushin's old teacher Ganshō. Dōgen is known to have participated in the temple's opening ceremony in 1227. Harada, "Dōgen zenji to Ryūzen," pp. 1-16. Nakao, "Komyozammai-in Ryūzen ni tsuite," pp. 614-19.

³⁸⁷ Dōgen and Ryūzen studied together in China at the Tiantong monastery. Dōgen often remembered the "Elder Ryū" in his writings. Harada, *Ibid.* Nakao, *Ibid.*

³⁸⁸ *Nōshū Shūrinji Dōsen Zenji* 濃州衆林寺道禪禪師 (*Nihon tōjō rentōroku*. SSZ, Shiden 1, p. 240).

³⁸⁹ *Shōbōgenzō gokikigakisho* 正法眼藏御開書抄. Cited in Takahashi, "Darumashū ni kansuru shiryō 2," p. 27.

³⁹⁰ Ōya Tokujō. "Kamakura jidai no Kōyasan ni taisuru bunkashiteki kansatsu," *Mikkyō kenkyū* 30 (1928), p. 73.

³⁹¹ *Bendōwa* (T. 2582, 20a-b).

³⁹² The Kanazawa Bunko library preserves a fragment of a manual for the esoteric fire offering to Amida, entitled *Amida goma ryaku shiki* 阿彌陀護摩略私記 (Short Personal Account of the Fire Offering to Amida), copied by Ginō in 1263. *Kanazawa Bunko komonjo* 12, Shikigohen 3 (Yokohama: Kanazawa Bunko, 1952-1974), p. 173.