



BRILL

The Zen of Mahāvairocana, Or: Does Bodhidharma’s Nose Preach the Dharma?

Reconsidering the Taxonomy of Zen in Medieval Japan

Stephan Kigensan Licha

Assistant Professor, Divinity School, The University of Chicago,
Chicago IL, USA
lichas@uchicago.edu

Received 13 July 2022 | Accepted 21 May 2023 |

Published online 12 December 2023

Abstract

This paper addresses the relationship between Zen and tantric or esoteric Buddhism in premodern Japan from the point of view of the Buddhas and Buddha bodies considered to be preaching these two traditions. After surveying theories on the *dharmakāya* teaching already present in Chinese Buddhism, it considers the development of this doctrinal notion in the Japanese tantric traditions. The paper demonstrates that this tantric discourse on the Buddha as preacher provided thinkers such as Enni 圓爾 (1202–1280) and Chikotsu Daie 癡兀大慧 (1229–1312) with a framework to integrate Zen into a tantric world. Eventually, and under the influence of embryological motifs circulating widely in medieval Buddhism, Zen practitioners came to establish their own theories on the human as Buddha body. The paper concludes that medieval Zen and medieval tantric Buddhism should be considered sister movements.

Keywords

Enni 圓爾 (1202–1280), Chikotsu Daie 癡兀大慧 (1229–1312) – Zen – esoteric/tantric Buddhism – *hosshin seppō* 法身說法 – embryology – *kōan* 公案 interpretation

1 Introduction

Perhaps more than any other tradition of East Asian Buddhism, the Chan and Zen 禪 traditions pride themselves on possessing a supposedly direct, genealogical link to the Śākyamuni Buddha. While the lineage claims of other Buddhist traditions almost invariably entail supernatural intercession, Chan and Zen accounts of lineage are couched in the naturalistic and quasi-historical language of an unbroken succession of human, or, in the case of the Buddha as founding Zen ancestor, at least seemingly human, bodies endowed with individual biographies.

The Chan traditions' genealogical claims have a complex genealogy of their own, and certainly never were undisputed among the Chinese Buddhist intelligentsia. They did, however, greatly appeal to China's historically minded literati audience, through the support of which Chan rose to become the foremost exponent of elite Buddhism.¹ Yet when the Chan traditions reached Japan and began their transformation into Zen, at least initially the local Buddhist community was underwhelmed by the newly arrived teachings' historical claims. Japanese Buddhist skepticism is perhaps best summed up by the tantric scholarist Raiyu 賴瑜 (1226–1304), who observed that, despite its grandiose rhetoric, in the end Zen was but the facile teaching the perishable transformation body (*keskin* 化身) Śākyamuni Buddha transmitted to that “shallow little man” (*senkin no shōnin* 淺近之小人) Mahākāśyapa, or Makakashō 摩訶迦葉 in Japanese, the first Chan or Zen patriarch.²

In China, controversies concerning Chan's lineage claims had centered on questions of historical accuracy.³ Raiyu's criticism, in contrast, is of a doxographical nature. It draws on one of the most prominent features of Sinitic Buddhism's intellectual heritage, namely its proclivity to classify Buddhist

1 On the formation and success of Chinese Chan lineage constructions, see Morrison 2010. The Chan teacher Qisong 契嵩 (1007–1072), the subject of Morrison's study, engaged in extensive polemics with critics of Chan lineage claims, especially Tiantai 天台 scholarists. He eventually succeeded in having his historiographic treatises and genealogical charts included in the Buddhist canon.

2 See *Kenmitsu mondō shō* 顯密問答鈔 [Record of Questions and Answers on Exoteric and Tantric], Sueki/Takahashi 2016, 498. Another common denomination for Japanese tantric Buddhism is “esoteric” Buddhism. On the vexing relationship between these two terms, see Orzech et al. 2011. I am using the terms “tantric” and “Tantra” in a heuristic manner to highlight the historical, genealogical connections Japanese esoteric Buddhism has to continental traditions both Buddhist and non-Buddhist.

3 Chan's, mostly Tiantai, critics specifically questioned the transmission between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth patriarchs and claimed that Āryasimha, the twenty-fourth patriarch, was murdered by a heathen king before finding an heir. See Fujimoto 1938; also Maraldo 1985.

teachings through complex doctrinal hierarchies and pseudo-historical periodization. These devices had allowed Chinese Buddhists to digest and organize into at least semi-coherent wholes the often contradictory claims forwarded by the overwhelming mass of Indian Buddhist materials that reached China out of chronological order and hence seemingly without rhyme or reason. Unaware of the details of these diverse teachings' historical dependencies and connections, Chinese Buddhists ordered them according to what they considered characteristic doctrinal and pragmatic features. One gauge of a teaching's relative profundity when compared to other teachings was which kind of body available to a Buddha had preached it. The closer this preaching body was to human standard, the coarser and lowly were the teachings it dispensed. To give but one well-known example, the Chinese Tiantai tradition divides Buddhist teachings into four classes, namely, from the lowest to the most refined, the "three baskets" (*sanzang* 三藏) or Hīnayāna, the common (*tong* 通), separate (*bie* 別), and perfect (*yuan* 圓) teachings. Each of these is taught by a Buddha possessed of an increasingly ephemeral body, beginning with the grossly physical human body of the Buddha Śākyamuni and culminating in the universal Dharma body of the Buddha Vairocana (Piluzhena 毘盧遮那).⁴ This standard did not bode well for Chan's or Zen's all-too-human lineage.

In Japan, debates concerning the preaching of the various Buddha bodies reached an urgency and complexity unmatched in China. Doctrinally speaking, the importance of these debates was due to two closely related factors. First, Kūkai 空海 (774–835), the founder of the Shingon 眞言 faction of Japanese tantric Buddhism, claimed that the tantric teachings were actively preached by the most elevated Buddha body, the *dharmakāya* (*hosshin seppō* 法身說法). This claim ran counter the doctrinal intuitions of most East Asian scholastic traditions, including contemporary Japanese ones. It was commonly assumed that the *dharmakāya* could not teach actively and directly due to the fact that it was not endowed with distinguishing perceptual characteristics.

Second, certain imprecisions—or rather: contradictions—in Kūkai's writings as to which body of the Buddha should be considered to be teaching as the *dharmakāya* entangled the various lineages descending from him in a protracted dispute concerning the nature of the primary expositor of the Buddhist teachings (*kyōju ron* 教主論). Also within the Tendai 天台 tradition founded by Kūkai's competitor Saichō 最澄 (767–822) the former's daring claims stirred the cauldron of doctrinal debate. Saichō conceived of his Tendai tradition as a universalist Buddhism that incorporated Lotus, tantric, precept, and Zen teachings. Furthermore, the Lotus teachings came with their own tradition of

4 See Ōkubo 2001, 69–70.

speculation on the nature of the Buddha as preacher. This tradition is based on the eleventh chapter of the *Lotus sūtra*, the root text of continental Tiantai 天台 and Japanese Tendai teachings. In this chapter, a gigantic jeweled pagoda appeared before the assembly to which the Śākyamuni Buddha was expounding the *Lotus*. In response, the Buddha gathered together all of his thousands of emanations, who busily expounded the Dharma throughout the cosmos. The presence of the assembled Buddhas caused the present, impure world of sentient beings to be purified. Finally, Śākyamuni Buddha opened the pagoda. As second Buddha from the distant past, Prabhūtaratna, was revealed to dwell therein. The Śākyamuni Buddha entered the pagoda, and shared the chief seat with the ancient Prabhūtaratna Buddha.⁵ In the Tiantai and Tendai tradition this parable is taken to indicate that the present Śākyamuni Buddha is not a mere human who awoke under a tree, but rather co-substantial with the eternally abiding essence of all Buddhas.

In response to Kūkai's intervention, Japanese Tendai thinkers had to harmonize the Buddhas teaching the *Lotus* with the Buddha preaching the tantric teachings. It was mostly through the efforts of Annen 安然 (841?–915?), the great systematizer of Tendai teachings, that the dispute became frozen in a compromise solution slightly in favor of Mahāvairocana and the tantric teachings.⁶ Annen argued that Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana were of one nature (*dōtai* 同體) and hence equals. However, the structure of his argument, although also drawing on Tiantai *Lotus* thought, in the main was rooted in mandalic thinking, hence giving the edge to Mahāvairocana.

For a number of social, institutional, and doctrinal reasons, from the late classical and early medieval periods onwards the tantric teachings' position at the apex of the Japanese Buddhist edifice became increasingly precarious, putting the "Annenian truce" between Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana back into play.⁷ The transmission and reception of Chan or Zen from the continent was both a product and an integral element of this tumultuous doctrinal climate. As initially this transmission and reception occurred for the greater part within the institutional environs of the Tendai school, the question of how the newly available continental teachings were to be fitted into the Tendai doctrinal superstructure, and hence how Śākyamuni as fountainhead of the Zen lineage was to relate to the tantric sovereign Mahāvairocana, was of crucial importance. In short, although controversies concerning the identity and body

5 See *Miaofa lianhua jing* 妙法蓮華經 [Sūtra of the Lotus of the Subtle Law], T. 262: 9.32b16–33c16.

6 See Ōkubo 2016.

7 See, for instance, Funaoka 1987; Uejima 2010; Taira 1992.

of the Buddha preaching usually are considered characteristic of scholastic, and especially tantric, debates, in fact they provided an important framework within which early Japanese Zen was as much creatively produced as received from the continent.

The Shōichi 聖一 lineage founded by Enni 圓爾 (1202–1280), also known as Ben'en 辨圓, is central to understanding these early debates surrounding the reception of Zen in Japan. Historically speaking, Enni, being the protégé of the regent Kujō Michiie 九条道家 (1193–1252), was one of the most influential teachers of Zen of his generation, and certainly in Kyōto. I here consciously refer to Enni as a “teacher of Zen” rather than simply a “Zen teacher” because he was also an accomplished and respected Tendai tantric adept. Enni had received the tantric (and Zen) lineage of Yōsai⁸ 榮西 (1141–215), the putative founder of Japanese Rinzaï 臨濟 Zen, and the vast bulk of Enni’s writings is devoted to tantric exegesis and practice. Given his background and prominence, Enni was exceedingly well suited to the task of articulating the relation between the tantric and Zen teachings and their respective preachers. Furthermore, Enni’s descendants formed the second largest faction within the *gozan* 五山 establishment of Zen institutions, surpassed in size only by the lineage spawned by Musō Soseki 夢窓疎石 (1275–1351).

In terms of historiography, we have, to put it colloquially, lucked out. Thanks to manuscript findings at the Ōsu Kannon 大須觀音 archives of Shinpukuji 眞福寺 in Nagoya, we now have at our disposal a comparatively large body of writings clarifying how Enni and some of his direct disciples considered the relationship between tantric Buddhism and Zen. This is unlike the case of Yōsai and the early members of his lineage, some of whom were Enni’s teachers. Their views on the matter remain mostly obscure due to a lack of reliable sources.⁹

In the present paper, I will reconstruct some aspects of the early debates concerning the relation between Zen and tantric Buddhism through an investigation of the relationship between Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana. After an overview of theories concerning the notion that the *dharmakāya* can actively preach, I will first show that based on Tendai tantric paradigms Enni, and especially his disciple Chikotsu Daie 癡兀大慧 (1229–1312), considered

8 Yōsai’s name may also be read as “Eisai,” but the oral tradition of his main monastery in Kyōto, Kenninji 建仁寺, suggests “Yōsai,” and I will honor this precedent.

9 The *Shinzen yūshin gi* 眞禪融心義 [Meaning of the Harmony of Mantra and Zen] is sometimes identified as Yōsai’s work, but this is most likely a false attribution. At the risk of oversimplification, this text identifies Zen with the practice of the three mysteries without perceptual characteristics (*musō samitsu* 無相三密), or with the mystery of mind (*imitsu* 意密), also understood as being devoid of perceptual characteristics. See Takayanagi 2010.

Mahāvairocana, not Śākyamuni, to be the true teacher of Zen. This raised the question of how the two teachings were related to a new level of complexity, for if both were taught, ultimately, by the *dharmakāya*, then what distinguished them? I will then show that, building on Enni's precedent, Chikotsu argued that the difference was rooted in the manner in which the two teachings considered the bodies of both practitioner and Buddha. Finally, I will trace the effects of this debate to the later development of Japanese Zen.

2 Teaching Non-Teachings: The *Dharmakāya* Preaching

Today, the notion that “the *dharmakāya* is teaching the Dharma” (*hosshin seppō*) is closely associated with the Japanese tantric tradition. According to the main transmitter of the tantric teachings to Japan, Kūkai, the teaching of the *dharmakāya* is the exclusive domain of the tantric tradition, which distinguishes it from all other Buddhist traditions.¹⁰ In fact, however, the concept of the *dharmakāya* teaching was not only discussed but also affirmed outside the tantric traditions, including in the Chinese Chan tradition. What distinguishes Kūkai's version of this theory is that he suggested that the *dharmakāya* taught actively rather than just providing the support or conditions for teachings. As these disagreements are the background against which the rise of the Zen of Mahāvairocana occurred, I will here sketch the thrust of the debate in China and Japan.

Although debates concerning which body of the Buddha preached the Dharma preceded him,¹¹ it was the Tiantai patriarch Zhiyi 智顛 (538–597) who in his two commentaries on the *Vimalakīrti nirdeśa* [Indications of Vimalakīrti] (C. *Weimo jing* 維摩經 [Sūtra of Vimalakīrti]), the *Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩經文疏 [Textual Commentary on the Sūtra of Vimalakīrti] and the *Weimo jing lueshu* 維摩經略疏 [Abbreviated Commentary on the Sūtra of Vimalakīrti], first used the phrase “the *dharmakāya* teaches the Dharma:”

10 See for example the *Ben kenmitsu nikyō ron* 辨顯密二教論 [Treatise on Distinguishing the Two Teachings of Exoteric and Tantric]: “The teaching (*danwa* 談話) of the *dharmakāya* Buddha is called the secret treasury (*mitsuzō* 密藏),” the last term denoting the tantric teachings. T. 2427: 77.374c24. Recently, the authenticity of the *Ben kenmitsu nikyō ron* has been questioned, but the consensus remains that it is a work of Kūkai. See also the discussion below.

11 Jingyingsi Huiyuan 淨影寺慧遠 (523–592) in his *Dasheng yi zhang* 大乘義章 [Chapters on the Meaning of the Great Vehicle] discusses three variant theories on the question which bodies of the Buddha preach. The second of these theories holds that the *dharmakāya* preaches insofar as it is the source to which all teachings return. See T. 1851: 44.844b14–844c9.

Without explanation and without indication, beyond the letter *dha*¹² there are no letters to explain it. Yet when we speak of [the *dharmakāya*] explaining the Dharma, the *dharmakāya* is the *dharmadhātu* [the totality of the phenomenal realm],¹³ constantly and pervasively benefitting all sentient beings. This is called the *dharmakāya* teaching the Dharma.¹⁴

無說無示過茶無字可說也。而言說法者、法身即法界、常普冥資一切衆生、即是法身說法也。

As this passage makes clear, according to Zhiyi the *dharmakāya* teaches only in the very general sense of permeating the totality of phenomena, not in the sense of offering any specific indication or discursive explanation. As Zhiyi explains in the *Weimo jing lueshu*, “no teaching and yet a teaching, this the *dharmakāya* teaching the Dharma” (無說而說即是法身說法).¹⁵

Despite their doctrinal and metaphysical commitments otherwise being vastly different, Zhiyi’s understanding that the *dharmakāya* can be said to be teaching in the sense of providing the conditions for any specific teaching to arise has been shared by the East Asian Yogācāra tradition. Both Ji 基 (632–682) and Huizhao 慧沼 (648–714), the two outstanding proponents of Yogācāra thought of their time, asserted that the *dharmakāya* can be said to be preaching insofar as it provided the ultimate support for all possible teachings. As Ji observed in his compendium of Mahāyāna thought from a Yogācāra perspective, the *Dasheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章 [Chapters on the Forest of Meanings of the Great Vehicle Dharma Gardens], although the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra* speaks of the *dharmakāya* Buddha preaching the Dharma, this is said only in so far as the *dharmakāya* is the source of teachings, but “in truth it does not have the function of giving rise to explanations on matters of Dharma.”¹⁶ On the same principle, Huizhao asserted that the *dharmakāya*

12 The syllable *dha* is the last syllable of the Sanskrit *arapacana* syllabary. What is “beyond the letter *dha*” is beyond what can be expressed in words.

13 In abhidharmic contexts, the *dharmadhātu* refers to the perceptual realm of the mind organ. Yet as all perceptual objects are potentially perceptual objects for the mind organ, *dharmadhātu* eventually came to mean the totality of perceptual objects or the matrix within which any phenomenon could occur in the first place.

14 *Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩經文疏, X. 338: 18.469a23–469b1.

15 *Weimo jing lueshu* 維摩經略疏, T. 1778: 38.566c3–4.

16 *Dasheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章, T. 1861: 45.358b21–22. The *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra* would come to form one of the central pieces of evidence adduced by Kūkai for his version of *hosshin seppō*. Kokan Shiren 虎關師鍊 (1278–1347), Zen’s most gifted and acerbic polemicist, in turn relied on the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra* to elaborate his own theory of the

preaches insofar as it is the perceptual realm of wisdom.¹⁷ Thus although in placing the accent on the *dharmakāya*'s supportive rather than pervasive aspect the two Yogācāra thinkers differ from Zhiyi, they shared the former's understanding that the *dharmakāya* can be said to be preaching, if only in a secondary, non-literal sense.¹⁸

This was also true of members of the Chan lineages. The *Chuanxin fayao* 傳心法要 [Essentials on the Dharma of Mind Transmission], an important influence on early Japanese Zen commonly attributed to Huangbo Xiyun (?–850) 黃檗希運, explains the *dharmakāya* teaching as follows:

The *dharmakāya* preaching the law cannot be obtained in the sounds of words or the shapes of letters. Inexplicable and unverifiable, it is simply the pervasiveness of its own nature (*zixing xutong* 自性虛通), and that is all. Therefore, it is said [in the *Diamond sūtra*], “There is no explaining the Dharma. This is called explaining the Dharma.”¹⁹

法身說法。不可以言語音聲形相文字而求。無所說無所證。自性虛通而已。故曰。無法可說是名說法。

Just as Zhiyi had done, Huangbo grounds the *dharmakāya*'s teaching in its all-pervasiveness; in so far as it pervades all, including all teachings, the *dharmakāya* can be said to teach. Yet there is more than a whiff of paradox to this claim. If everything is the teaching, then there is no teaching, for there is no way to distinguish the teaching from what is not the teaching. The Chan teacher Yunmen Wenyuan 雲門文偃 (864–949) clearly recognized this:

dharmakāya teaching, according to which the tantric version is actually inferior to Zen's. See Licha 2018.

- 17 *Cheng weishi lun liaoyi deng* 成唯識論了義燈 [Illuminations of the Definitive Meaning of the Treatise Establishing Consciousness-Only], T. 1832: 43.662c16–20.
- 18 Ji and Huizhao invoke arguments similar to Huiyuan to make their case, citing both the principle of “returning meritorious activity to its source” (*tuigong guiben* 推功歸本) and the *Jingang borelun* 金剛般若論 [Treatise on Diamond Wisdom] attributed to Vasubandhu as support. The emphasis on the *dharmakāya* supporting rather than permeating the phenomenal world is in keeping with one of the main differences between Yogācāra and Tiantai metaphysics.
- 19 *Chuanxin fayao* 傳心法要, T. 2012a: 48.382a21–23. For the quote from the *Diamond sūtra*, see *Jingang bore boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經 [Sūtra on Diamond Perfection of Wisdom], T. 235: 8.751c14–15.

Taking up the *dharmakāya* teaching [Yunmen said], “Green, most green, the young bamboo exhaustively is the *dharmakāya*.’ Such a general outline does not yet take up the opportune moment.”²⁰

舉法身說法。青青翠竹盡是法身。未是提綱拈掇時節。

Even if the *dharmakāya* shows itself in its totality in each vivid detail of the phenomenal world, Yunmen appears to suggest, this lacks the specificity that makes a particular teaching useful to a particular person at a specific time, the unique blow or shout of the Chan master that hits home at the moment most opportune to the student’s awakening.

As the above few strokes indicate, the notion that the *dharmakāya* can, in some non-literal sense, teach is widely shared by Chinese Buddhists of all stripes and doctrinal predilections, and hence does not appear to have been a major point of controversy. This changed in Japan due to Kūkai’s claim that the *dharmakāya* Buddha Mahāvairocana, the expositor of the tantric teachings, taught not only in the general or abstract sense outlined above, but also in a more concrete manner. As Kūkai explains at the beginning of the *Ben kenmitsu nikyō ron* 辨顯密二教論:

The Self-Nature and Enjoyment Buddhas for their own enjoyment of the Dharma together with their retinue each teach the gate of the three mysteries. This is called the secret teachings [i.e., the tantric teachings]. This gate of the three mysteries is the realm of the inner wisdom and verification of the *tathāgata*.²¹

自性受用佛自受法樂故與自眷屬各說三密門。謂之密教。此三密門者。所謂如來內證智境界也。

In this brief passage, Kūkai asserts that the *dharmakāya* actively preaches for its own enjoyment its own awakening through the activities of its own body, speech, and mind. This implies that the *dharmakāya* has some kind of form. And indeed, as Kūkai asserts commenting on a passage from the *Lañkāvatāra sūtra*,

20 Yunmen Kuangzhen *chanshi guanglu* 雲門匡真禪師廣錄 [Recorded Sayings of Chan Master Yunmen Kuangzhen], T. 1988: 47:557b12–13.

21 *Ben kenmitsu nikyō ron* 辨顯密二教論, T. 2427: 77:375a2–4.

the shape and form of these two kinds of Dharma body and wisdom body being unitary and equal, they completely pervade the realms of all sentient and insentient beings, and constantly preach the *maṇḍala* teaching of true words in accordance with [the] meaning [of the Buddha's teaching on emptiness].²²

如是法身智身二種色相。平等平等遍滿遍滿。一切衆生界一切非情界。常恒演說真實語如義語曼荼羅法教。

As this passage makes clear, not only did Kūkai suggest that the *dharmakāya* was actively teaching through its body, speech, and mind—rather than passively providing the conditions for teaching, as Chinese Buddhists asserted—but he also accepted the logical consequence of this position, namely that the *dharmakāya* was in some way endowed with form and even with a kind of discourse. Or to put it differently, Kūkai claimed that the *dharmakāya* in some way was endowed with differentiating perceptual characteristics (*usō* 有相), whereas traditional Buddhist doctrine held it to be without (*musō* 無相).

Kūkai's determination of the *dharmakāya* preaching actively, being endowed with form, and even having a kind of speech or discourse, presented a formidable problem for Tendai thinkers. As pointed out above, Saichō had committed his tradition to a universalism that included both the *Lotus* and the tantric teachings, a doctrinal position commonly known as the “unity of perfect [*Lotus*] and tantric” teachings (*enmitsu itchi* 圓密一致). Saichō's stance forced his heirs to figure out in concrete doctrinal detail exactly how *Lotus* and tantric teachings were supposed to relate to each other. In this endeavor, the tantric understanding of the *dharmakāya* teaching as formulated by Kūkai was problematic insofar as the Tiantai doctrinal tradition (as understood in Japan

22 *Himitsu mandarakyō fuhōden* 秘密曼荼羅教付法傳 [Transmissions on the Succession of the Teaching of the Secret Maṇḍala]. Sofū senyōkai 1911, 29. The term *nyōgi go* 如義語 derives, via the *Shi moheyan lun* 釋摩訶衍論 [Explanation of the Mahāyāna Treatise] (T. 1668: 32.606a14–16), from the *Jingang sanmei jing* 金剛三昧經 [Sūtra on the Diamond Samādhi]: “Words in accordance with meaning are removed from the two marks [of true existence and emptiness because] true [existence itself] being emptiness, they are not empty, emptiness [itself] being true [existence], they are not truly [existent]” (*ruyi yu zhe shi kong bukong, kong shi bushi, ri wu erxiang* 如義語者。實空不空。空實不實。離於二相), T. 273: 9.371a17. *Nyōgi go* refers to discourse in accord with truth or reality, and in the context of Shingon doctrine, often to *mantra*. Interestingly, the Shingon scholiast Dōhan 道範 (1178–1252) in his *Shōji jissō gi shō* 聲字實相義抄 used this concept to interpret Zen's claim to transmit mind with mind (*ishin denshin* 以心傳心) and hence to be outside the teachings (*kyōge* 教外). A detailed investigation of Dōhan's views of Zen still remains a desideratum.

at the time) considered the *dharmakāya* to be without perceptual characteristics, or rather, endowed with them only insofar as it was all-pervasive. Building on the work of his predecessors, especially Ennin 圓仁 (794–964), Annen succeeded in establishing a compromise solution through a doctrinal sleight of hand. Just like Zhiyi had done, Annen emphasized the pervasiveness of the *dharmakāya*, yet in his case the *dharmakāya* in question was not some abstract *dharmadhātu* but rather the maṇḍalic sovereign Mahāvairocana, whose substance (*tai* 體) is comprised of the six elements (*rokudai* 六大; earth, water, fire, wind, space, and consciousness). As the first five of these also constitute the phenomenal realm, phenomena themselves become the active teaching of the *dharmakāya*, rather than just the passive conditions of all teachings. As Annen explains in the *Shingonshū kyōji gi* 眞言宗教時義 [Meaning of the Time of Teachings in the Mantra School]:

The essence of the reverberations of the five elements is *mantra*. For this reason, the *māntrika* who directly hears the voice of the wind and the sound of water awakens to and enters into the principle of fundamental non-arising of the syllable *a*. That is the voice of the body of the Dharma.²³

五大響當體是真言也。故眞言人直聞風聲水音即知是法身聲。

According to Annen, phenomenal reality itself thus constitutes a kind of synthetic *mantra*, the totality of which is the self-revelation of Mahāvairocana. To put it differently, not only is phenomenality the general condition on which teachings can arise, as Chinese Buddhist thinkers had understood, but each concrete phenomenon itself is an active indication of the Buddha's awakening.

This mantric logic of all-permeation, transposed into the realm of *maṇḍala*, also allowed Annen to reconcile Mahāvairocana with Śākyamuni. As a member of the *maṇḍala*, Śākyamuni, just as all deities, was of one substance with the *maṇḍala*'s sovereign. As Annen puts it elsewhere in the *Shingonshū kyōji gi*:

The *dharmakāya* without perceptual marks (*musō hosshin* 無相法身) inheres in all the Self-enjoyment, Other-enjoyment, and Transformation bodies; they are not two and not separate.²⁴

無相法身皆住自受他受變化身中無二無別。

23 *Shingonshū kyōji gi* 眞言宗教時義, T. 2396: 75.422a16–17.

24 *Shingonshū kyōji gi*, T. 2396: 75.409c18–19.

More concisely, all Buddhas and their followers are, “the many bodies of the one body of Mahāvairocana” (*Dainichi isschin tashin* 大日一身多身).²⁵ Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana thus are reconciled on Mahāvairocana’s terms.

This is what above I referred to as the “Annenian truce,” the integration of Tendai *Lotus* and tantric teachings within a maṇḍalic framework. From the late classical period onwards, this compromise, together with the tantric teachings on which it was based, came under increasing strain as Tendai masters began to explore, or re-explore, alternative doctrinal patterns and ascetic methodologies. One way of doing so was to turn to aspects of Saichō’s original vision that had been, if not ignored, then at least sidelined, including an only vaguely defined “Zen.” As Funaoka Makoto 船岡誠 has argued, these experimentations with the established but vague category of “Zen” would eventually give rise to institutionally independent Zen schools or lineages through a process of institutionalization (*shūha ka* 宗派化).²⁶ In the beginning, however, and certainly in the Buddhist circles in the capital in which Enni moved, the Zen tradition had to be positioned with regard to the weakening but still dominant *Lotus*/tantric teachings. And that meant to engage anew the question that had prompted Annen to labor towards his compromise, namely the relationship between the Buddhas Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana.

3 The Zen of Mahāvairocana: Zen and Tantra in the Early Shōichi Lineage

In the introduction, I have cited the negative judgment on Zen rendered by the Shingon scholiast Raiyu. Surprisingly, similar attitudes seem to have been prevalent even within the Tendai Yōjō 葉上 lineage founded by Yōsai, who after all is revered as Japanese Zen’s first patriarch. The *Keiran shūyō shū* 溪嵐拾葉集 [Collection of Leaves Gathered from Stormy Ravines], a 14th century encyclopedia of Tendai lore, contains the following record of the views of Kensai 見西 (n.d.), a disciple of Yōsai from whom Enni in 1224 received a full transmission of tantric lore.²⁷

25 *Shingonshū kyōji gi*, T. 2396: 75-383a20.

26 See Funaoka 1987. For a short introduction to Funaoka’s main thesis, see Funaoka 1985. For a brief overview in English, see Stone 2006, 224 and Bodiford 1993, 7–12.

27 *Tōfukuji kaisan Shōichi kokushi nenpu* 東福寺開山聖一國師年譜 [Annual Chronicle of National Master Holy One, Founding Abbot of Tōfukuji] DNBZ 95: 131a.

Next, as for the great intention of the *mantra* teachings, it is not reached by the three disciplines of precepts, concentration, and wisdom, [which instead] the ocean of *dhāraṇī* governs because it is the teaching of the attainment of Buddhahood by the all-pervading body of self[-nature]. Now, although the Zen school might be elevated, it is taught by Śākyamuni, the transformation body.²⁸

次眞言教ノ大意ヲ云者。戒定慧ノ三學ノ所不レ及。陀羅尼藏能ク治レ之。遍一切處ノ自身成佛教ヲ故也。凡禪宗雖ニ是高一。應化ノ釋迦ノ所説也。

Despite his association with the man who is supposed to have founded the Zen tradition in Japan, the Tendai scholiast Kensai essentially offers the same criticism of Zen as did Raiyu, namely that it had been preached by a crudely human Buddha body. Kensai also offers an illuminating simile to illustrate the difference between Zen and tantric teachings. Śākyamuni, Kensai points out, resides towards the outer boundary of the Taizō 胎藏 *maṇḍala*, far from the central dais upon which resides Mahāvairocana.²⁹ We can detect here, I would

28 *Keiran shūyō shū* 溪嵐拾葉集, T. 2410: 76.761a8–10.

29 *Keiran shūyō shū*, T. 2410: 76.761a29–b5. Kensai's account of the relationship between Zen and the Tendai teachings is complex, and a thorough treatment will have to await a separate occasion. I would merely like to note two more interesting aspects. First, in support of his position that Zen's originator, the Buddha Śākyamuni, is inferior to Mahāvairocana, Kensai also cites a doctrinal maxim he ascribes to the Tendai precept lineage (*kaike* 戒家). In the *Brahmā's Net Sūtra* (*Bonmōkyō* 梵網經), a root text of the *bodhisattva* precepts in East Asia, the presiding Buddha Vairocana is depicted as residing on a thousand petaled lotus flower, on each petal of which resides a lesser Śākyamuni. Furthermore, within each petal are again contained ten billion even lesser Śākyamuni Buddhas. According to the doctrinal transmission of the precept lineage referred to by Kensai, the Śākyamuni preaching Zen is one of these base leaf-dwellers. Interestingly, Dōgen 道元 (1200–1253) in his *bodhisattva* precept ritual, the *Busso shōden bosatsukai sahō* 佛祖正傳菩薩戒作法 [Bodhisattva Precept Ritual Correctly Transmitted by the Buddhas and Ancestors], has the preceptor recite precisely this passage from the *Bonmōkyō* as they take their seat, thereby implicitly identifying themselves with the cosmic Vairocana Buddha and consequently elevating the Zen precept transmission to a teaching of the highest Buddha. See Kagamishima 2013, 15: 401. This shows that doctrinal motifs can be manipulated to multiple, indeed contradictory, ends. Second, Kensai also cites a transmission that uses the image of the two Buddha sitting side by side in the Pagoda of Many Jewels discussed above in order to frame the Zen transmission from Śākyamuni to Mahākāśapa. According to this transmission, before the famous episode of the Buddha raising his flower on vulture peak even occurred, Śākyamuni and Mahākāśapa, like the two Buddha of the *Lotus*, entered the pagoda and shared the chief seat. Again, this image is polyvalent. It can either indicate a kind of equality between the *Lotus* and Zen transmissions, or subsume the

argue, a faint echo of the Annenian truce, which sought to defuse the tensions between the teachings of different Buddha bodies by reconciling them in the *maṇḍala*. As we shall now see, Enni sought to undermine the truce's terms by moving Zen beyond the *maṇḍala*.

3.1 *Mind Over Maṇḍala: Enni's Zen as the Mind of Mahāvairocana*

Enni's perhaps most concise discussion of the relationship between Zen and the tantric teachings can be found in his commentary on the *Yuqi jing* 瑜祇經 (J. *Yugikyō*), an apocryphal tantric text known for its sexual imagery. Enni's commentary has been preserved in two renditions, which appear to be notes on the same lecture. The first of these, the *Yugikyō kenmon* 瑜祇經見聞, has sometimes been referred to by its alternative title *Hikyō ketsu* 秘經決. The second, recently discovered version is also known as the *Yugikyō kenmon*. To avoid confusing these two versions of Enni's commentary, I will refer to the previously known version of Enni's lecture as the *Hikyō ketsu*, and to the recently discovered version as the *Yugikyō kenmon*.

In its opening passage, the *Yuqi jing* describes the Buddha seated at the center of the *maṇḍala* within the adamantine palace of luminous mind. In the *Yugikyō kenmon* Enni comments on this "luminosity" as follows:

Luminosity is the virtue of the perceptual mark of mind. It is not the essential nature of mind. Therefore, an ancestral teacher of Zen said, "Exhausting the great earth, this is the light of wisdom. When the light has not yet shone forth, there is neither Buddha nor sentient being." [...] When light and perceptual realm both forgotten, there are neither Buddha nor beings. This is the essential nature of mind. [...] The great intention of the esoteric teachings is to explain that from the luminosity of the virtue of the mark of mind are produced all dharma.³⁰

光明ト者、心ノ相徳也。而ノ非ルニ心ノ体性ニ也。依之一、禪ノ祖師ノ云ク、尽大地、是レ般若ノ光、タリ未ダレ発ヲコラ時キハ、无ク佛モ、无シトニ衆生モ〔…〕光、境、俱ニ亡スル処ニハ、无ク佛、无キレ生。是レ心ノ體性也〔…〕密教ノ大旨ハ、従リニ此ノ心ノ相徳ノ光明ニ能ク生ストニ一切ノ法ヲ説ク也。

latter under the former. The motif of Zen transmission occurring in a pagoda is taken up in later Sōtō Zen esoteric transmissions. See Licha 2016, esp. 193–195. For further discussion of Kensai and Enni, see Licha 2023, 155–156.

30 *Yugikyō kenmon* 瑜祇經見聞 [Lecture Notes on the Yoga Sūtra], Abe/Sueki 2018, 558.

In this passage, Enni makes it clear that the luminosity in which the Buddha resides is but the outward appearance of mind. The essence of mind is a pregnant darkness devoid of Buddhas and beings, perceptions and objects. The fundamental purpose of the esoteric teachings is to use the mind's outward luster to illuminate all dharma. Importantly, Enni uses a quote from the *Recorded Sayings* of the Chan master Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063–1135), the famous compiler of the *Blue Cliff Record*, to illustrate the endarkened nature of mind.³¹ The implication is clear: Zen is the inner mind of the central Buddha, whereas the tantric teachings are founded upon its outer illumination.

The *Hikyō ketsu* confirms this reading. In this version, Enni compares the endarkened nature of mind to the disc of the new moon, which is black without perceptual characteristics (*musō gachirin* 無相月輪). The tantric teachings arise from the first phase of the waxing moon, wherein is established the mantric syllable *a* from which in turn all other teachings arise.³² However, if all teachings are established on the outward illumination of the syllable *a*, the question arises if endarkened mind itself can somehow be communicated. Yes, Enni answers,

[n]ot establishing words and letter, directly pointing at the human mind is just that!³³

不スシテレ立ニ文-字ヲ一、直ニ指スト人心一者、則此也。

Enni's reply to the question whether the mind of the Buddha can be indicted beyond the tantric teachings is to quote two famous Zen slogans. By not establishing letters—which here, it should be noted, refers not to common speech or even scholastic discourse but rather to mantric syllables—Zen directly indicates the mind of Mahāvairocana itself, endarkened awareness beyond even

31 See *Yuanwu Foguo chanshi yulu* 圓悟佛果禪師語錄 [Recorded Sayings of Chan Master Yuanwu Foguo], T. 1997: 47.753a. For further discussion of the passage from the *Yuqi jing*, see Licha 2023, 132–134. For further discussion of Enni and Yuanwu, *ibid.*, 66–77.

32 This image is based on the widely shared tantric understanding that as the practitioner progresses, their mind develops into the fullness of awakening as does the moon from new to full. The idea of a moon disk without perceptual characteristic, on the other hand, appears to be a Japanese innovation. *A* is the source of all teachings as it is the first letter of the Sanskrit abugida used, albeit not exclusively, in Japanese tantric Buddhism, and all other letters arise from it. As all possible verbal expressions, and hence all teachings, are combinations of the letters of the Sanskrit abugida, they can all be traced back, and hence can be said to be contained within, the syllable *a*.

33 *Hikyō ketsu* 秘經決 [Deliberations on the Secret Scripture], Abe/Sueki 2016, 479.

tantric means of communication. But how could such a teaching, or rather non-teaching, look like in practice?

A teaching attributed to Enni and recorded in the *Keiran shūyō shū* provides us with some clues. Enni uses the story of the madman Yajñadatta to illustrate the pedagogical approach utilized by different Buddhist traditions. Unable to see his eyebrows, Yajñadatta convinced himself that he had lost his head. Enni discusses four approaches to cure the madman from his mistake, namely those of the provisional and true Mahāyāna, of the tantric teachings, and of Zen. The first two are of no concern in the present context, but the latter two touch on the problem of the distinction between Zen and the tantric teachings.

The Shingon teacher engages Yajñadatta's embodied experience of his immediate surroundings. In a maieutic exercise worthy of Socrates, the Shingon teacher asks Yajñadatta whether he can see, hear, smell, taste, and think. When Yajñadatta answers in the affirmative, the Shingon master enquires what sees, hears, smells, tastes, and thinks? The eye, Yajñadatta replies, the ear, the nose, the tongue, the mind. And where are these organs located, the Shingon master next inquires, and Yajñadatta replies that they are located in the head. "What head was that you were looking for again?" the Shingon master asks, and Yajñadatta understands he never lost his head. Enni calls this tantric pedagogy, "the six perceptual fields preach the Dharma" (*rokujin seppō* 六塵說法). Significantly, Enni closes his discussion of Shingon pedagogy with precisely the quote from Annen concerning the voice of the wind and the sound of water being but the voice of the *dharmakāya* that I have discussed above in the context of Annen's theory of the *dharmakāya* teaching.

To now turn to the Zen approach to Yajñadatta's madness, Zen masters are not interested in Yajñadatta's head at all. They silently point towards the bamboo in the garden, and hearing its rustle, Yajñadatta understands that his head had never been lost to begin with, and that the Zen teachings consequently have nothing to teach.³⁴ Zen's "direct indication," Enni seems to imply, is an immediate, vivid, and liberating encounter with what we might term "uninterpreted phenomena."

At first glance this silent, direct indication of Zen might appear similar to the theories set forth by Zhiyi and criticized for lacking specificity by Yunmen. However, Enni's understanding is subtly different. As quoted above, for thinkers such as Zhiyi the *dharmakāya* as *dharmadhātu* merely provides the general conditions for teachings, and its quasi-teaching hence is "without explanation and without indication." On the other hand, for Enni, who certainly had

34 See *Keiran shūyō shū*, T. 2410: 76.543a7–20. For further discussion of Enni's use of this story, see Licha 2023, 149–151.

read his Annen, phenomena themselves *are* the “direct indication” of the Mahāvairocana Buddha’s mind. Or to put it in Yunmen’s terms, seeing the young bamboo’s greenness *is* the opportune moment. At the same time, Zen’s direct indication also differs from the tantric teachings. Just like Zen, the tantric teachings rely on phenomena to communicate the mind of Mahāvairocana, but unlike Zen, they use what we might term “interpreted phenomena,” that is to say phenomena understood as *mantra* or *maṇḍala*. Whereas in the Zen approach one simply and directly experiences the rustling of bamboo, in the tantric approach the practitioner hears the bamboo’s rustling *as* whisperings of *mantra*.

Despite these doctrinal variations it is easy to see how Enni’s understanding of Zen as the direct indication of Mahāvairocana’s inner endarkenment is deeply indebted to debates concerning the preaching of the *dharmakāya*, and especially Annen’s crucial insight that phenomena themselves are this teaching. However, by making Zen the direct indication of Mahāvairocana’s mind by uninterpreted phenomena, Enni positioned it outside the *maṇḍala*, as it were, and in so doing decisively went beyond the great Tendai master. Yet at the same time, in trying to create a space for Zen beyond established tantric discourses, Enni was in accord with a common tendency apparent in early medieval Tendai doctrinal speculations. As Mizukami Fumiyoshi 水上文義 has shown, in their efforts to unite the two tantric lineages of the Diamond and Womb realms, from the Insei 院政 (1086–1185) period onwards Tendai tantric thinkers had begun to posit a single, transcendent, non-dual Buddha beyond the two Mahāvairocana Buddhas of the Kongō and Taizō *maṇḍala*. Pushing this line of thought even further, Tendai thinkers came to regard this fundamental Buddha as identical to the mind, and even to the physical heart, of sentient beings.³⁵ These doctrinal predilections were also noticeable in Yōsai’s Yōjō lineage, which Enni inherited through his teachers. The desire to go beyond the *maṇḍala* might at least in part explain why Enni read the Zen slogan “directly pointing at the human heart” as referring to the mind of the *dharmakāya* Buddha beyond the first mantric syllable. We will return to the role of the physical heart below when discussing Enni’s disciple’s Chikotsu’s theory of the relationship between the tantric traditions and Zen.

A different tendency in early medieval Tendai thought, this one—closely associated with the rise of Tendai original awakening teachings—sought to go beyond the distinction of *Lotus* and tantric teachings altogether. One text representative of this tendency is the *Kenmitsu ichinyo honbutsu* 顯密一如本佛 [Fundamental Buddha of the Equality of Exoteric and Tantric], a work

35 Mizukami 2017, 103 and 112.

spuriously attributed to the Tendai master Enchin 円珍 (814–891) that likely originated between the late Heian and early Kamakura periods. As the text's title suggests, it seeks to overcome the differences between the *Lotus* and tantric teachings by positing a Buddha more fundamental than the two teachings' respective teachers. Into this fundamental Buddha, the text explains, the two teachings can be dissolved without remainder. The text uses the metaphor of water to make its point. The fundamental, unitary Buddha, it elaborates, relates to the pair of Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana as does the wetness of water to its clearness and muddiness.³⁶ To be Śākyamuni or Mahāvairocana, in other words, is accidental to being Buddha.

Enni's positioning of Zen as the inner mind of Mahāvairocana, although not identical to either of these two tendencies, shares with medieval tantric speculation and the early layers of original awakening teachings a desire to go beyond established doctrinal categories and resolve their tensions in a primordial non-duality. Yet as far as Zen was concerned, this desire for primitive non-differentiation came with a price tag. Two of the slogans most widely associated with Enni's Zen were, "what the thousand sages do not transmit"³⁷ (*senjō fuden* 千聖不傳), and "transcending the Buddhas and surpassing the patriarchs" (*chōbutsu osso* 超佛越祖). While certainly fitting for an understanding of Zen that considers it but the bare encounter with the *dharmakāya* Buddha itself, these phrases seem to imply a certain unease with and even a repudiation of Zen's lineage ideology, and indeed of the very source of its claimed legitimacy, the Indian Buddha. In fact, the Zen lineage, as well as its founder, hardly feature in Enni's discussions of Zen; in establishing the Zen of Mahāvairocana, Enni ended up in erasing Śākyamuni.

Enni appears to have been clear-eyed about the price he paid. In one passage of his sub-commentary on the *Mahāvairocana sūtra* (*C. Dari jing* 大日經, *J. Dainichi kyō*), Enni explains that the absence of perceptual characteristics (*musō* 無相) that pertains to the true understanding of awakening (*bodai jitsugi* 菩提實義), or the inner self-verification of the Buddha, is "without Buddha" (*mubutsu* 無佛). Hence, he continues switching into the Zen idiom, "this is the place Buddhas and patriarchs do not reach; the place of turning upwards [towards awakening] outside the teachings (*kyōge kōjō* 教外向上) that

36 See *Kenmitsu ichinyo honbutsu* 顯密一如本佛, DNBZ 24: 158b.

37 See for instance *Shōichi kokushi goroku* 聖一國師語錄 [Recorded Sayings of National Master Holy One], T. 2544: 80.19b.

is the fundamental principle (*shūshi* 宗旨) of transcending Buddhas and going beyond patriarchs [...].”³⁸

Enni here is riffing on a motive prominent in the exegetical tradition of the *Darījīng* deriving from Yixing 一行 (683–727). According to Yixing, the Buddha’s awakening can be understood from two points of view. The first of these, which Yixing calls “the outward traces of attaining Buddhahood” (*chengfo waiji* 成佛外迹, J. *jōbutsu gejaku*) relates to the Buddha’s heroic displays of awakening designed to guide sentient beings. However, once it comes to the substance of awakening, it is to “fully comprehend that one’s own heart from the very beginning was originally unproduced. This is ‘attaining Buddhahood,’ however in truth there is no awakening and no attainment (*wujue wucheng* 無覺無成, J. *mukaku mujō*).”³⁹ And where there is neither awakening nor attainment of Buddhahood, how could there be a Buddha who awoke under a tree and passed on his legacy with a flower?

3.2 *Flesh Over Mind: Chikotsu’s Zen Non-Physiology*

It was Enni’s student Chikotsu who, building on his teacher’s work, succeeded in reinstating the Śākyamuni Buddha as the preacher of Zen, yet at the price of subjugating him again to Mahāvairocana. Chikotsu touches on the question of the respective preachers of the tantric and Zen teachings as part of his last instructions given to his students while already on his death bed, collected in the *Kanjō hikuketsu* 灌頂秘口決 [Secret Deliberations on Initiation]. In this text, Chikotsu asserts that both tantric teachings and Zen are the teachings of the “*dharmakāya* of self-nature” (*jishō hosshin* 自性法身), yet in different ways. The tantric teachings, Chikotsu explains, are the teaching of the *dharmakāya* “according to the person” (*yakunin* 約人), whereas Zen is the teaching of the *dharmakāya* “according to the teachings.” Chikotsu explains this enigmatic distinction as follows:

The *dharmakāya* according to the teaching is the inferior response [body] Śākya[muni] who can be seen by the deluded and the sages alike. As those with beneficial roots and superior faculties, however, see the *dharmakāya tathāgata* [in or through the response body], it is called the *dharmakāya* according to the teaching. As for what is called the *dharmakāya* in the tantric teachings, as in the palace of inner verification [of Mahāvairocana] there are neither the foolish nor the deluded and it is

38 See *Dainichikyō gishaku kenmon* 大日經義釋見聞 [Lecture Notes on the Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra], Abe/Sueki 2018, 514.

39 *Darījīng shu* 大日經疏 [Commentary on the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra*], T. 1796: 39.646b19–21.

a *dharmakāya* only seen by the sages, it is not seen by the deluded. Hence, within and without together being the *dharmakāya* of self-nature, it is called the *dharmakāya* according to the person.⁴⁰

約法ノ法身ト者、即凡聖俱所ノ見一劣応ノ釈迦ヲ、利根ノ上機ハ而モ見ルカニ法身如来ト一故ニ、云約法ノ々身ト一也。密教所言法身ト者、於テニ内証宮ノ中ニ、都テ无キニ具惑ノ凡夫一、唯一聖所見ノ法身ナルカ故ニ、更非凡夫所見ニ一。内ト外ト俱ニ自性法身ナルカ故ニ、云約人法身ト一也。

Chikotsu here is introducing a distinction between the pragmatic and the content aspects of Buddhist teachings. In terms of content, Zen certainly is the teaching of the *dharmakāya*, yet on the pragmatic level the primary exponent of Zen is the Śākyamuni Buddha, a lowly form of the Buddha who can be seen by both the mundane and by those who have entered the Buddhist supramundane path. Only especially gifted practitioners can glimpse the *dharmakāya* through or on the basis of the coarse body of Śākyamuni. Zen, in short, is the teaching of the *dharmakāya* in terms of content, but not on the pragmatic level. The tantric teachings, on the other hand, are a teaching of the *dharmakāya* in terms of both teaching pragmatics and content, for it is the *dharmakāya* reveling in the joy of his own glorious awakening. Hence it is a teaching of the *dharmakāya* “according to the person” (and “according to the teaching.”)

A little earlier in the same text, Chikotsu had already taken up this topic and had elaborated on its doctrinal basis, which we can ultimately trace back to the Tiantai exegesis of the *Lotus sūtra*.⁴¹ In one well-known episode of this text, Mañjuśrī upsets his fellow *bodhisattvas* by declaring that Ryūnyo 龍女, the eight-year-old daughter of the *nāga* king Sāgara, had attained perfect awakening through the power of the *Lotus sūtra*. The other *bodhisattvas* find this hard to believe, given they have before their eyes the example of none other than the Śākyamuni Buddha himself, who had to labor diligently for countless eons before attaining his own awakening. How could a mere slip of a snake have achieved a feat beyond even the Buddha? Immediately the dragon girl appears, and praises the Buddha’s splendidly endowed *dharmakāya*, which illuminates the entire universe. The Tiantai patriarch Zhanran 湛然 (711–782) comments on this episode as demonstrating that, “making their perceptual basis the *tathāgata* [preaching] the three collections [of *sūtra*, *vinaya*, and *abhidharma*;

40 *Kanjō hikuketsu* 灌頂秘口決 [Secret Deliberations on Initiation], Abe/Sueki 2016, 557b–558a.

41 *Kanjō hikuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 552a–b.

i.e. the coarse human-like body of the Buddha], what the four [kinds of people endowed with different perceptual faculties corresponding to the four kinds of teachings in the Tiantai system] see upon this form is not the same.”⁴² In other words, although both the dragon girl and the *bodhisattva* looked at the same perceptual object, the merely human Buddha body, they *saw* different things due to their different spiritual faculties. Hence the dragon girl, who was endowed with the faculties of the perfect teachings (*yuanjiao ji* 圓教機) of the *Lotus*, could perceive the *dharmakāya* where the *bodhisattvas* saw but the all-too-human Śākyamuni. And if even those of the perfect teaching could see the *dharmakāya*, then how, Chikotsu asks, could this not be the case for the more gifted practitioners of the Zen gate? In an example of just how closely entwined *Lotus*, tantric, and Zen teachings were at the time, Chikotsu used concepts derived from Tiantai *Lotus* exegesis to countermand Enni’s erasure of Śākyamuni, an erasure that had been precipitated by Enni’s efforts to expound Zen in tantric terms. But what does the reinstatement of Śākyamuni mean in practice? Or to put it differently, what actually is the teaching of the all-too-human *dharmakāya*?

Chikotsu’s answer is succinct – the *dharmakāya*, he argues, teaches the physical heart organ (*nikudan shin* 肉團心).⁴³ As surprising as it might sound, Chikotsu’s answer merely reflects the Japanese tantric, and especially the post-Annen Tendai tantric, consensus. The identification of the mind with the physical heart results from the tantric preference for concrete, phenomenal instantiations (*ji* 事) over mere principles (*ri* 理). Consequently, the *Dari jing*’s imperative to “know one’s mind as it truly is” (*rushi zhi zixin* 如實知自心) came to be interpreted as “to know the human heart organ as it truly is.” According to the tantric teachings the physical heart consists of eight flaps of flesh (*hachibun nikudan* 八分肉團). Originally folded like a closed flower, in tantric practice they could be cultivated into opening to resemble the central lotus flower at the heart of the Taizō or Womb *maṇḍala*; or rather, they were the petals of the lotus on which Mahāvairocana surrounded by his entourage dwelt. The tantric teachings, in short, conceived of the concrete, physical heart as a (potential) *maṇḍala*.

Whereas the physical heart *qua maṇḍala* is a well-established *topos* in the tantric teachings, Chikotsu’s claim that also Zen, insofar as it is the teaching of the *dharmakāya*, teaches the mind as the physical heart is, as far as I can

42 *Kanjō hikuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 552a. For the Chikotsu’s source, see Zhanran’s *Zhiguan fuxing zhuan hongjue* 止觀輔行傳弘決 [Comprehensive Deliberations on the Transmission of the Auxiliary Practices of Calming and Contemplation], T. 1912: 46.168a19–20.

43 *Kanjō hikuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 552a.

tell, unprecedented.⁴⁴ It derives from Enni's insistence that Zen indicated the endarkened mind of Mahāvairocana. If such is the case, then tantric topology demands it have a physical counterpart. And according to Chikotsu, the difference between Zen and tantric teachings is exactly to be found in how they consider the physical heart as mind:

In the Zen gate, the pound of flesh that is the heart is called a square inch. In the tantric teachings, what is called the pound of flesh that is the heart is the flesh heart with eight parts.⁴⁵

禪門ノ所言一肉團心ト者方寸也。密教所言一肉團心ト者八弁肉團心也。

Zen, Chikotsu explains, considers the mind of awakening simply a slab of meat. The tantric teachings, on the other hand, look beyond the meat to perceive the maṇḍalic nature of the heart's flesh; that is to say, the tantric adept appreciates that its eight flaps could blossom into a lotus flower.

In order to understand how Chikotsu grounds this difference doctrinally, we can turn to another of Chikotsu's texts, namely the *Tōji injindō kuketsu* 東寺印信等口決 [Oral Deliberations on Sigils and Other Matters of the Eastern Temple]. In this text, Chikotsu uses a distinction derived from the *Shi moheyan lun* 釋摩訶衍論 [Explanation of the Mahāyāna Treatise], a commentary on the *Dasheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論 [Awakening of Faith in/of the Great Vehicle] of particular interest to Kūkai. From this text Chikotsu appropriates the distinction between the "gate of awakening" (*ugaku mon* 有覺門) and the "gate without awakening" (*mugaku mon* 無覺門). For our present purposes only, that is to say in the context of clarifying Chikotsu's understanding of the relationship between tantric teachings and Zen, we can treat these two gates as roughly equivalent to the two aspects of Mahāvairocana's awakening discussed previously. The gate of awakening, in other words, is the realm of outer traces, in which Buddhas teach sentient beings, and sentient beings awaken to become Buddhas. The gate without awakening, on the other hand, is the non-dual

44 However, a recently discovered text, the *Shinkon ketsugi shō* 心根決疑章 [Chapter on Resolving Doubts Concerning the Mind Root] composed by Shinchibō Kakuan 心地房覺晏 (n.d.), a member of the so-called Daruma 達磨 Zen movement, likewise is preoccupied with the physicality of the heart organ. I have not yet been able to pursue this text in its entirety, but it does suggest that this theme was widely discussed in early medieval Zen circles. See Tachi 2020.

45 *Kanjō hikuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 558a.

realm in which distinctions such as Buddha and sentient being, awakening and delusion, do not even make sense.

In the *Tōji injindō kuketsu*, Chikotsu defines the “inbornness of the gate without awakening” (*mugaku mon honnu* 無覺門本有) as “directly indicating the physical form and mind of all sentient beings” (*jikishi issai shujō shikishin* 直示一切衆生色心).⁴⁶ In other words, the body and minds of sentient beings are, by virtue of their birth alone, endowed with fundamental non-duality. Zen and the tantric teachings both are based on this innate non-awakening, but in a different manner:

The Zen master says, “As for me, because this inbornness of no awakening is where there are no Buddhas and no sentient beings, there consequently is no explanation of the principles of the Dharma. It is simply said that, ‘mountains are mountains, water is water, a monk is a monk, a worldly person is worldly.’ Willows green and snow white, it is just like that.”

As for the inbornness of no awakening [taught] in the tantric teachings, physical form is the womb [...] That is to say, this [i.e. the Zen point of view] is inbornness of no awakening without Buddha, that [i.e. tantric teachings] are inbornness of no awakening with Buddha.⁴⁷

禪師ノ云ハク、我カ此ノ無覺ノ本有ハ、無佛無衆生ノ当処ナルカ故ニ、更ニ不レ説ニ法義、但云ニ山是山、水是水、僧是僧、俗是俗。青柳白雲モ、亦復如然。密教無覺ノ本有ハ、色ヲハ云胎ニ、心ヲハ云智ニ〔…〕然則、是レハ無佛ノ無覺本有、彼レハ有仏無覺本有ナリ。

Chikotsu here invokes Enni’s distinction of Zen and the tantric teachings as being without and with Buddha, respectively. Zen, the above quote implies, is a form of naturalism, mountains simply as mountains, water simply as water. In such naturalism, there is no need for a specific Buddha, as there are no teachings apart from things themselves, no awakening apart from the natural state. Zen, in other words, is the simple recognition of uninterpreted phenomena as the non-dual mind of the *dharmakāya*. And in so far as the mind to which Zen awakens is the physical heart, Zen is the realization that its “meat is meat.”⁴⁸

But what about the tantric teachings? Here Chikotsu finally comes to the heart of the matter, so to speak: the tantric teachings are concerned with

46 *Tōji injindō kuketsu* 東寺印信等口決, Abe/Sueki 2016, 491a.

47 *Tōji injindō kuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 504ab.

48 See also Licha 2023, 236–240.

the womb; they deal with the gestation of awakening. We do not need to concern ourselves with the details of Chikotsu's embryology. Suffice it to say that it is based on the idea that the process of rebirth parallels the process of awakening.⁴⁹ In practice, this means that the five stages of the development the fetus undergoes in the womb (*tainai goi* 胎内五位) are identified with the five stages of spiritual practice that culminate in the formation of a Buddha body. This is called "naturally attaining awakening" (*jinen jōdō* 自然成道), and what is meant when tantric practitioners speak of the "inbornness of no awakening."⁵⁰ The human body in the womb forms as a Buddha body.

Furthermore, tantric practice itself is patterned on the process of rebirth and awakening. The steps of tantric initiation (*kanjō* 灌頂), Chikotsu explains, correspond to the five phases of fetal development: entering the place of initiation corresponds to entering the womb; covering one's face with a yellow cloth corresponds to being covered by the placenta in the womb, and so forth.⁵¹ In short, while the Zen teachings can discern fundamental awakening inherent in, or perhaps through, the body's natural state, and are thus based in the general meatiness of the physical heart, the tantric teachings understand that the human body *in its concrete physical details* is the Buddha's wisdom body of equality (*byōdō* 平等),⁵² and therefore can discern the human heart as the maṇḍalic lotus flower. Consequently, Zen practice does not bring forth a new Buddha body and in this sense is "without Buddha," whereas the ritual technologies of the tantric teachings actualize the practitioner's Buddha body in the flesh, and hence are "with Buddha."

Finally, the Zen teachings' attachment to naturalism and consequent lack of understanding concerning the human body *qua* Buddha body has a direct impact on the relationship between Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana:

The Zen gate is the highest of the exoteric teachings; because it has exhausted the negative approach of abolishing delusion it has already gone beyond the teachings and therefore calls the square inch of the meat heart the human mind and makes it the source of mind. As it does not yet reach the tantric vehicle, in truth it cannot say that [the physical heart is] the eightfold heart [that is like a lotus]. You should know: Śākyamuni twirling the flower [as he did when transmitting Zen] points

49 *Tōji injindō kuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 497a. See also Dolce 2016.

50 *Tōji injindō kuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 496b.

51 *Kanjō hikuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 522ab.

52 *Tōji injindō kuketsu*, Abe/Sueki 2016, 496b.

at the square inch of meat that is the heart. Dainichi expounding the tantric teachings directly explains the eightfold flesh heart.⁵³

禪門ハ顯教ノ最頂、遮情ノ至極ナルカ故ニ、已超ルカレ教故ニ、以テニ方寸ノ肉團ヲ一、是ヲ名ケニ人心ト一、即為ニ心源一。未及密乘一故、實不言ハ八弁ノ心ト。当レ知一、拈花ノ釈迦ハ正ク指ニニ方寸ノ肉團、演密ノ大日ハ直ニ説クニ八弁ノ肉團ヲ一。

In this fascinating passage, Chikotsu contrasts the flower with which the Śākyamuni Buddha imparted Zen to the first patriarch with the lotus at the heart of the *maṇḍala*. According to this exegesis, Zen surpasses all non-tantric teachings in that it does recognize the physical nature of awakening, which it locates in the heart. Zen does not equal the tantric teachings, however, because it does not understand that this heart of meat itself is a lotus *maṇḍala* in the flesh. The tantric teaching's understanding of the maṇḍalic nature of the body stems from their insight that the process of rebirth and entering the womb is itself the process of awakening, and that both culminate in the production of a Buddha body. The relation of Zen, which is based on the natural human body, to the tantric teachings, which are based on the Buddha body, hence is exactly parallel to the relation between the lowly, all-too-human Śākyamuni and the exalted maṇḍalic sovereign Mahāvairocana. And according to Chikotsu, the crucial point on which this difference rests is the ontogenesis of awakening.

3.3 *Continuing the Debate: Gōhō on Tantra and Zen*

Before turning to the later development of this motif of an ontogenetical difference between Zen and tantric teachings, I would like to briefly pause and note that the problems with which Enni and Chikotsu wrestled, as well as traces of the strategies through which they sought to resolve them, remained live ones in wider Zen and tantric scholasticism. This can be seen from the famed tantric scholiast Gōhō's 杲寶 (1306–1362) *Kaishin shō* 開心抄 [Notes on Opening the Heart] from 1349. Just like Raiyu, whom I have quoted in the introduction to the present essay, Gōhō based his assessment of Zen as a minor exoteric, as opposed to exalted tantric, teaching on the nature of its progenitor, the Śākyamuni Buddha. As Gōhō observed,

In the exoteric teachings Śākyamuni *tathāgata* makes Mañjuśrī or Kāśyapa succeed to the chief seat. In the tantric teachings, the *dharmakāya*

53 *Bodaishinron tsuimon shōketsu* 菩提心論隨文正決 [Correct Deliberations Following the Text of the *Treatise on the Mind of Awakening*], Sueki/Abe 2017, 461a–b.

tathāgata makes Vajrasattva the one to transmit [the teachings] in the future. [...]

To continue, the Zen lineage takes Śākyamuni as its chief expositor and makes Mahākāśyapa the first successor. Who would not call it an exoteric vehicle?⁵⁴

顯教者釋迦如來以文殊迦葉爲附屬上座。密教者法身如來以金剛薩埵。爲將來傳者。〔…〕然禪家亦以釋尊爲說主。以迦葉爲初祖。誰謂非顯乘耶。

Within Gōhō's overall treatment of Zen as an exoteric teaching, I would like to take up two points, both of which can be seen as continuing concerns we have already encountered in Enni and Chikotsu. These are, first, Zen being a teaching without a Buddha, and second, Zen being what not even the former worthies transmit.

As we have seen above, Chikotsu elaborated on Enni's assertion that Zen was without a Buddha by cross-referencing it with the *Shi moheyān lun's* distinction between the gate of awakening and the gate without awakening. It is this exact position Gōhō cited approvingly in his criticism of the Zen tradition's understanding of its own highest good, the "field of the fundamental portion" (*honbun denchi* 本分田地). Gōhō's implied interlocutor is most likely the Zen master Musō Soseki 夢窓疎石 (1275–1351), who was the founder of the most influential Zen faction within the *gozan* 五山 ("Five Mountains") network. In his *Muchū mondō shū* 夢中問答集 [Collection of Conversations in a Dream], a collection of vernacular exchanges between Musō and his sponsor Ashikaga Tadayoshi 足利直義 (1306–1352), the Zen master stressed the overwhelming importance of realizing for oneself this fundamental ground of mind. With regard to the tantric teachings, Musō explained that all the deities of the *maṇḍala*, including the sovereign Mahāvairocana, reside in and arise from this mind ground, which is, "the subtle principle of suchness, and the support of all Buddhas and *bodhisattva*" (*shinnyo no myōri, oyobi issai no butsu bosatsu no shoe nari* 真如ノ妙理、及ビ一切ノ佛菩薩ノ所依ナリ).⁵⁵ Zen, in other words, insofar as it is the realization of the mind-ground, is the source and support of, and hence exceeds, all other Buddhist teachings.

Gōhō relied on the notion of Zen being without a Buddha in order to frame and thereby undermine Musō's claim. In introducing the problem, Gōhō, taking a leaf out of Chikotsu's playbook, defined Zen in terms of the gate without

54 *Kaishin shō* 開心抄, T. 2450: 77.736b18–21.

55 *Muchū mondō shū* 夢中問答集, Kawase 2000, 177.

awakening taught in the *Shi moheyan lun*. Within this gate, there are neither sentient beings nor fundamental awakening (*hongaku* 本覺), and this is nothing but what in Zen is called the field of the fundamental portion. However, while Zen practitioners claim that this gate without awakening or field of the fundamental portion is superior to the tantric teachings, Gōhō asserts the opposite, declaring, “if [this field of the fundamental portion] is where there are neither Buddhas nor sentient beings, then it is but a provisional means (*hōben* 方弁) to wipe away the outward dust, the beginner’s gate to the Buddha way.” Gōhō next refers to the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 [Treatise on the Great Perfection of Wisdom], an extensive commentary on the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra* traditionally, if controversially, attributed to the Indian Buddhist thinker Nāgārjuna (fl. 2nd–3rd century). According to this text, there are two levels to the model of the two truths, the provisional and the final, foundational to Buddhist thought. On the first level, to postulate the existence of Buddhas and sentient beings is considered the provisional truth, to deny them is considered final truth. On the second level the situation is reversed, the denial of the existence of Buddhas and sentient beings is considered provisional, their affirmation final. Zen, Gōhō points out, insofar as it denies the existence of Buddhas and sentient beings in its *summum bonum*, the mind-ground, is a final truth only according to the lower model; on the higher level it is to be reckoned but a provisional truth. Hence, Gōhō triumphantly concludes, to argue that Zen corresponds to the gate without awakening simply proves its inferiority to the tantric teachings.⁵⁶ The basic assumptions from which Gōhō arrived at this conclusion can be traced back to thinkers such as Enni, who positioned Zen as the inner self-verification of the Mahāvairocana Buddha beyond all perceptual characteristics, a position that forced them to abandon the personage of the Buddha itself.

A second criticism Gōhō puts forward takes up one of the key phrases we saw associated with Enni’s presentation of Zen, namely “what the thousand sages do not transmit,” which Gōhō quotes as “what Buddhas and patriarchs do not transmit” (*busso fuden* 佛祖不傳). According to Gōhō, Zen’s advocates interpret this slogan as follows: just as there is no medicine before the sickness it is supposed to cure, so there are no Buddhist teachings apart from the needs and capacities (*ki* 機) of the sentient beings they are supposed to lead beyond suffering. Only Zen, insofar as it is but the immediate self-knowledge that the Buddha has of its own mind, is not relative to beings’ needs, and hence is not something to be transmitted. Therefore, Gōhō’s Zen propagandist sock puppet concludes, Zen is to be ranked higher than the esoteric teachings, for

56 *Kaishin shō*, T. 2450: 77.742a8–b4.

these, as teachings, are already a secondary approach based on the need to communicate the Buddha-mind to sentient beings.

Gōhō responds to the Zen challenge in a manner reminiscent of the two kinds of *dharmakāya* teaching forwarded by Chikotsu, namely according to the person and according to the teaching. As we have seen, the *dharmakāya* according to the teaching is dependent on sentient beings' capacity to perceive the *dharmakāya* on the basis of, or through, the Buddha's human body. Hence, it is relative to deluded beings, and inferior to the *dharmakāya*'s teaching according to the person, in which only the sages, that is to say the Mahāvairocana Buddha and its retinue, partake. Consequently, the tantric teachings outstrip Zen.

Gōhō developed an argument strikingly similar to Chikotsu's, but took it a step further. Śākyamuni, Gōhō argued, entered the secret palace of the inner verification, and compelled by his compassionate vow then manifested a body in accordance with sentient beings' capacities. The exoteric teachings of Śākyamuni, in other words, are relative to their audience. Mahāvairocana, on the other hand, preaches its own inner verification to its own retinue, which in turn is but a transformation of itself. In this sense, the tantric teachings are, "the perceptual realm of but the Buddha [teaching] and the Buddha [receiving its own teaching]" (*tada hotoke to hotoke no mi no kyōgai* 唯佛與佛境界). Consequently, the tantric teachings are not relative to sentient beings' capabilities in the same way as the exoteric teachings are. Zen, however, is in a more difficult position to justify its claim of being apart from relative capacities. Insofar as it is a teaching of the Buddha Śākyamuni it is, as per the above, a teaching relative to the audience. If now it claims to be apart from the audience's needs and capabilities as "what the Buddhas and patriarchs do not transmit," then, Gōhō concludes, Zen is not so much elevated above other Buddhist teachings as simply lacking in an audience; it is a message nobody can hear—snake oil incapable of curing any sickness.⁵⁷

Enni and Chikotsu made their arguments in a context still dominated by the tantric teachings. When Gōhō penned his criticisms, the situation had changed dramatically. Zen institutions had begun to succeed in accumulating political, economic, and social power sufficient to challenge the established Buddhist institutions. Accordingly, thinkers such as Musō Soseki began to articulate versions of Zen ideology that no longer were dependent on the tantric doctrinal framework, and in fact reversed it: Zen could now be positioned as the source from which even tantric Buddhism drew its meaning. Yet even as this new, independent Zen discourse emerged and was contested in the arena of

57 *Kaishin shō*, T. 2450: 77.739a12–c11.

scholastic debate, it continued to be rooted in motifs and configurations that had already engaged the likes of Enni, not least the question of the relationship between Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana. It is to tracing their involvement in later Zen and tantric materials we now turn.

4 The Ontogenesis of Awakening: The Breath, the Womb, and Bodhidharma's Nose

The diverse forms of embryology found in medieval sources had long been considered variations on a single heretical teaching associated with a supposedly rogue lineage, the infamous Tachikawa ryū 立川流. Recent research has shown that these embryologies, although never without their critics, were fully integrated into the medieval tantric mainstream, and in fact likely originated from circles of elite practitioners charged with performing rites to ensure the safe delivery of courtly, and even imperial, offspring.⁵⁸ Embryological discourses also formed a staple of what has been described as a common pool of esoteric lore available to medieval religious thinkers and practitioners regardless of affiliation, informing Buddhist discourses as much as medieval *kami* 神 theologies and Shugendō 修驗道 asceticism. Considering these recent scholarly discoveries, it comes as little surprise that the relationships between Zen and the tantric teachings continued to be negotiated on the grounds of the womb. In this brief concluding section I will sketch one such embryology as found in a 16th century tantric text and connect it to esoteric transmission materials of the Rinzai Genjū 幻住 faction.

The *Kenkon jinsha shō* 乾坤塵砂鈔 [Excerpts on Dust and Gravel of Heaven and Earth] is a late 16th century text recording a conversation between teacher and student on the relationship between the tantric teachings and Zen. Although its origin and author are unknown, it gives pride of place to the tantric teachings, and hence likely originated within a tantric lineage. The tantric teachings, the text opens,

are the quintessence of Vairocana. These teachings are not the teachings of the [Buddha] manifested in response [to sentient beings' needs], who has only a single lifetime [i.e. Śākyamuni]. They [i.e. the teachings of Vairocana] are the teachings that the previous sages do not transmit (*senso fuden* 先祖不傳), that is to say, the transmission of mind by mind

58 For mischaracterizations of the Tachikawa ryū, see Iyanaga 2002. For sexual practices in medieval tantric lineages, see Dolce 2016.

(*ishin denshin* 以心傳心). In the Zen gate, the intention of the patriarchs is [the meaning of] Bodhidharma coming from the West, the intention of the teachings is *tathāgata zen*.⁵⁹

毘盧遮那ノ骨髓。此教ト者、非ニ一代應化ノ教一。先聖不傳ノ教也。是則、以心傳心ナリ。於禪門一、祖意ト云者、達磨西來ノ意、教意ト者、如來禪也

This captivating passage opens on a familiar gambit, namely to distinguish tantric and Zen teachings according to the Buddha preaching them: tantric teachings are taught by Vairocana, and hence superior to Zen, which is taught by the Buddha Śākyamuni who, in response to the needs of hopelessly deluded sentient beings, had to stoop so low as to appear in a body whose lifespan was exhausted in a mere eight decades.

The text's next move is much more surprising, for it defines the teaching of Mahāvairocana, that is to say the tantric teachings, as what "the previous sages do not transmit," a slogan closely associated with Enni's understanding of Zen. In fact, an oral transmission preserved in the *Keiran shūyō shū* and which appears to be associated with the Yōjō lineage of Yōsai, to which Enni had succeeded, identifies "the true meaning of the mind of awakening" (*bodaishin jitsugi*), that is to say the inner self-verification of Mahāvairocana, with the saying, "the single road of turning upwards which the thousand sages do not transmit" (*kōjō ichirō senjō fuden* 向上一路千聖不傳), another of Enni's favorite Zen sayings.⁶⁰ The second phrase used in the *Kenkon jinsha shō* to categorize the teaching of Vairocana, "to transmit mind by mind," is of course one of the most acclaimed Zen slogans of all. However, the phrase also appears in Kūkai's reply to Saichō's request to borrow some texts, denying the latter on the grounds that some things could not be learned from reading alone but needed a more personal touch.⁶¹ Consequently, Zen and tantric practitioners continued to wrangle over its proper interpretation. That in the *Kenkon jinsha shō* phrases commonly associated with the Zen traditions are used to define the tantric teachings should serve as a reminder that not only did Zen come to be explicated in tantric terms, it also made available a new religious vocabulary from which tantric thinkers (and others) could draw;

59 *Kenkon jinsha shō* 乾坤塵砂鈔, Abe 2020, 28a–b.

60 See for instance *Keiran shūyō shū*, T. 2410: 76.542b22–23.

61 See *Shōryōshū* 性靈集 [Collection on the Mysticality of Essence], Sofū senyōkai 1911, 10: 166. Significantly, the text Saichō wanted to borrow as well contains overtly sexual materials.

not only was there a tantric Zen, there also was a “zenic Tantra.” Medieval Zen and medieval tantric teachings, in other words, developed together within a shared discourse, a discourse that integrally included embryology, as we shall now see.

Returning to the relationship between tantric and Zen teachings, the *Kenkon jinsha shō* elaborates on their difference as follows:

In the Zen faction, they do not establish [a teaching on] the intermediary state, they do not extol sentient beings in the intermediary state nor mother and father as the breath of one mind. [Considering the] Dharma realm to be a single truth, [the Zen faction thinks that] emptiness and breath are not two [different] things. [According to them,] the most gifted individuals do not linger in the intermediate state, but directly return to the one true emptiness. [However, according to the tantric teachings,] Buddhas and patriarch have great compassion in the intermediary state, and from it take to the mother’s womb.⁶²

禪家ニハ不レ立ニ中有一、鳥有ノ衆生モ父母等モ、息風一ニ心ト不贊一、法界一實ニシテ空與ト息風、更无二物一。最極ノ善根ノ人倫ハ、不漂鳥有ニ一、直ニ到ニ着ス一實ノ大空ニ一。佛祖ニハ有大悲ノ中有一。從ニ此鳥有ニ託ノ宿ノ母胎ニ一。

Terminological differences notwithstanding, the common concerns connecting this passage to the pioneering efforts of Enni and especially Chikotsu are easy to identify: Zen and the tantric teachings are differentiated along the lines of their concern for the reproduction of Buddha bodies. In Enni and Chikotsu’s terms, according to the *Kenkon jinsha shō* Zen is “without Buddha” as it does not have a teaching on the intermediate stage between rebirths, and hence no embryology. The tantric teachings, on the other hand, are “with Buddha” insofar as they have a teaching on the spiritual mechanics and soteriological significance of “taking to the womb”.

The *Kenkon jinsha shō*’s account of tantric embryology is highly eclectic and occasionally obscure as it describes the process from at least three different points of view. Fortunately, we do not need to preoccupy ourselves with its details. For our purposes it is sufficient to take note of one central motif, namely a complex of ideas associated with essential breath. To greatly simplify the *Kenkon jinsha shō*’s exposition, the basic idea is that breath is closely connected to, or perhaps even identical with, consciousness, as it corresponds not

62 *Kenkon jinsha shō*, Abe 2020, 5a.

to the wind but rather the consciousness element, and hence can be considered the essence of all five physical elements.⁶³ When mother and father give rise to desire during the appropriate season and their respective seeds mix, then the being awaiting rebirth in the intermediary realm discards its subtle body and rides the breath of the mother into the admixture of parental and maternal seeds, thereby completing fertilization.⁶⁴ According to an alternative account of this process, it is the parents' mixed breaths that fulfill this function. The nose or nostrils play an important role in the rebirth consciousness' descent as they provide both the entryway and the endpoints of the passage-way the rebirth consciousness rides into the fertilized seed, which begins at the mother's nostrils and ends in forming the new being's own nostrils, the first feature of the body to differentiate. The new body, in other words, grows from the tip of its nose.

The *Kenkon jinsha shō*'s main point is that the Zen traditions, which focus on Bodhidharma's coming from the West, are not in possession of such teachings on embryology. The masters of the Genjū lineages of the Rinzai faction would have disagreed most strenuously. In his pioneering study of Japanese *kōan* traditions, Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870–1966) published under the heading “perverted Zen” (*hentai zen* 變態禪) a number of early modern *kōan* materials.⁶⁵ Andō Yoshinori has since identified these materials as belonging to the Genjū faction.⁶⁶ Suzuki took exception at these materials' sexual and embryological contents, which he ascribed to tantric Buddhist influence. In these materials, Bodhidharma's famous act of sitting unmoving for nine years staring at a wall is interpreted as the fetus dwelling in the womb, and the robe in which he is covered is interpreted as the placenta. In making such a reading possible, the Indian's prominent nose played an important role. In Kohan Shūshin's 古帆周信 (1570–1641) *Zōroku* 雜錄 [Miscellaneous Records], Bodhidharma in fact acquired an intriguing nickname:

Bodhidharma, as he is the first patriarch on eastern soil [i.e. in China], is called the nose patriarch.⁶⁷

達磨東土ノ初祖ユヘニ鼻祖ト云也。

63 *Kenkon jinsha shō*, Abe 2020, 1b. The intimate connection between breath and (rebirth) consciousness is already found in Chinese sources.

64 *Kenkon jinsha shō*, Abe 2020, 5a.

65 Suzuki 1987, 289–290.

66 Andō 2002, 8.

67 *Zōroku* 雜錄, Suzuki 1987, 290.

Kohan here plays on the idea that the growth of a new life begins from the nose. As Bodhidharma was the beginning of Chinese Chan, he was, metaphorically speaking, its nose. Yet the patriarch's proboscis also has a deeper meaning:

As in-breath and out-breath show the pair of being and nothingness, they are named the wisdom of coming from the west. As the breath enters and leaves [the body] from it, the nose forms first from among the five parts of the body and the six roots. It is the beginning of the six roots.⁶⁸

出入息モ有無ノニツヲ露スナレハ、西来慧ヲ名ノル也。意〔息?〕ノ出入スル故ニ、五體六根ノ内ニテ鼻カ先ニデキタルモノ也。六根ノ初リ也。

Bodhidharma's nose, in other words, guides us to the importance of breath, which is the true meaning of his "coming from the West," a saying, it will be remembered, the *Kenkon jinsha shō* had singled out as representing the essence of Zen. Furthermore, the nourishing breath flowing from the nose connects the patriarchs coming to the growth of the fetus, the nose being the first organ to form in the womb.

Another *kōan* manual of the same Genjū faction finally removes all doubt that Bodhidharma's nose is his passageway into the womb:

The master, inviting [the student to answer], says, "Explain the meaning of the patriarchal master [i.e. Bodhidharma] coming from the west [from the point of view of the] self."

The student says, "The patriarchal master is Bodhidharma. When the human body comes to be in the womb, it comes to be at first from the nose. Insofar as the nose is produced from the lungs, they represent the west. Bodhidharma, being from India in the West, is represented by the nose."⁶⁹

師拶云、自己ニテノ祖師西来意ヲ云へ。學云、祖師ハ達磨ナリ。胎内ニテ人躰ノ出来ル時キ一番ニ鼻カラ出来ル也。鼻ハ肺ノ臟ヨリ生スル程ニ、肺ハ西ニ方ドルゾ。達磨ハ西天竺ノ人ナレバ、鼻ニカタドリテ候。

In the line of association presented in these passages, Bodhidharma merges with the fetus dwelling in the womb by means of the nose, through which the

68 Ibid.

69 Ibid., 291.

vital breath quickens the body. This is the true meaning of the patriarch's coming from the West.

We can see these *kōan* materials as an attempt on the part of Zen masters to counter tantric criticisms of their traditions by providing Bodhidharma's coming from the west with precisely the embryological implications contemporary texts such as the *Kenkon jinsha shō* denied it: Bodhidharma's nose indeed can teach the Dharma of awakening enwombed.⁷⁰

5 Conclusions

Zen's arrival in Japan is often portrayed as a transmission of continental Buddhist culture, practices, and thought to Japan, where they consequently mixed with local Buddhist traditions, resulting in hybrid forms. This might be a correct depiction in some cases, for instance when considering the role of Chinese émigré masters such as Lanxi Daolong 蘭溪道隆 (1213–1278). It is, however, only half the picture, for while it does pay attention to the act and content of *transmission*, it does not take into account the context of *reception*. Japanese Zen, in other words, from the very first was shaped by the complex patterns of doctrinal thought, ascetic practice, and institutional arrangements it was received into. The case of Enni makes this abundantly clear. To use a simile, Enni's Chinese mentors might have spoken in Chan, but Enni listened in Tantric. Enni used Japanese doctrinal discourses such as the teaching of the *dharmakāya* and associated controversies regarding the relationship of Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana to make sense of Chan or Zen teachings and slogans, including central claims to “not establish words and letters” or “directly indicate the human heart/mind.” In so doing, he could highlight aspects of Chan's heritage, such as its engagement with the scholastic debate concerning the preaching of the *dharmakāya*, which in the continental context were perfectly unremarkable but gained new significance in light of Enni's Tendai education. In other words, Enni did not simply combine or concurrently practice Zen and tantric teachings, he understood—and could only understand, I venture to suggest—Zen through the tantric teachings. In so doing, he rendered Zen open to Japanese Buddhist doctrinal speculation, including embryology, a context that would become prominent in the thought of Enni's disciple Chikotsu. Chikotsu in fact was a major influence behind the development of the kind of sexualized and embryological Buddhist teachings that have been shown to be a widely promulgated part of the Buddhist mainstream. In other words, at least one important strand of medieval Japanese Zen, on the one

⁷⁰ For an in-depth discussion of medieval Zen embryology, see Licha, *Esoteric Zen*, 212–244.

hand, and the medieval tantric teachings, one the other, developed together within the very same doctrinal framework, the very same monastic networks, and indeed within the very same texts. Consequently, although today Zen and tantric Buddhism often are seen as clearly separate, during the medieval period they were closely entwined sister movements. And in this sense the embryologies of the Genjū lineages are not the result of a hybridization of Zen but rather the unfolding of a potential that was part of Japanese Zen from its conception.

Abbreviations

- DNBZ = *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*; Bussho kankōkai 1912–1922.
 T. = *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*; Takakusu/Watanabe 1924–1932.
 X. = *Manji shinsan zoku zōkyō* 卍新纂續藏經, via CBETA (www.cbeta.org).

Primary Sources

- Ben kenmitsu nikyō ron* 辨顯密二教論 [Treatise on Distinguishing the Two Teachings of Exoteric and Tantric], 2 fascicles. Attributed to Kūkai 空海 (774–835). T. 2427: 77.347c–381b.
- Bodaishinron tsuimon shōketsu* 菩提心論隨文正決 [Correct Deliberations Following the Text of the Treatise on the Mind of Awakening], 7 fascicles. By Chikotsu Daie 癡兀大慧 (1229–1312), 1303. Abe/Sueki 2017, 5–206.
- Busso shōden bosatsukai sahō* 佛祖正傳菩薩戒作法 [Bodhisattva Precept Ritual Correctly Transmitted by the Buddhas and Ancestors], 1 fascicle. By Dōgen 道元 (1200–1253). Kagamishima 2013, 15: 391–412.
- Cheng weishi lun liaoyi deng* 成唯識論了義燈 [Illuminations of the Definitive Meaning of the Treatise Establishing Consciousness-Only], 13 fascicles. Huizhao 慧沼 (648–714). T. 1832: 43.659a–810b.
- Chuanxin fayao* 傳心法要 [Essentials on the Dharma of Mind Transmission], 1 fascicle. By Huangbo Xiyun (?–850) 黃檗希運. T. 2012a: 48.379b–384a.
- Dainichikyō gishaku kenmon* 大日經義釋見聞 [Exposition of the Commentary on the *Dari jing*], 9 fascicles. By Enni 圓爾 (1202–1280), 1270. Abe/Sueki 2018, 471–508.
- Da Piluzhena chengfo jing shu* 大毘盧遮那成佛經疏 [Commentary on the Mahāvairocana-sūtra], 20 fascicles. By Yixing 一行 (683–727), between 724 and 727. T. 1796: 39.579a–649c.
- Darijing shu* 大日經疏 [Commentary on the *Dari jing*] = *Da Piluzhena chengfo jing shu*.
- Dasheng fayuan yilin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章 [Chapters on the Forest of Meanings in the Grove of the Dharma of the Great Vehicle], 7 fascicles. By (Kui)ji (窺)基 (632–682). T. 1861: 45.245a–374c.

- Dasheng yi zhang* 大乘義章 [Chapters on the Meaning of the Great Vehicle], 26 fascicles. By Jingyingsi Huiyuan 淨影寺慧遠 (523–592). T. 1851: 44.465a–875c.
- Hikyō ketsu* 秘教決 [Dispositions on the Secret Scripture], 1 fascicle. By Enni, 1274. Abe/Sueki 2016, 459–486.
- Himitsu mandarakyō fuhōden* 秘密曼荼羅教付法傳 [Transmissions on the Succession of the Teaching of the Secret Maṇḍala], 2 fascicles. By Kūkai. Sofū senyōkai 1911, 1: 1–49.
- Jingang bore boluomijing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經 [Sūtra on Diamond Perfection of Wisdom], 1 fascicle. Translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413). T. 235: 8.748c–752c.
- Jingang sanmei jing* 金剛三昧經 [Sūtra on the Diamond Samādhi], 8 fascicles. Author unknown. T. 273: 9.365c–374b.
- Kaishin shō* 開心抄 [Notes on Opening the Heart], 3 fascicles. Gōhō 杲宗 (1306–1362), 1349. T. 2450: 77.736a–766b.
- Kanjō hikuketsu* 灌頂秘口決 [Secret Deliberations on Initiation], 3 fascicles. By Chikotsu Daie, ca. 1312. Abe/Sueki 2016, 517–566.
- Keiran shūyō shū* 溪嵐拾葉集 [Collection of Leaves Gathered from Stormy Ravines], 113 fascicles. By Kōshū 光宗 (1276–1350), 1347. T. 2410: 76.503a–888b.
- Kenmitsu ichinyō honbutsu* 顯密一如本佛 [Fundamental Buddha of the Equality of Exoteric and Tantric], 1 fascicle. Author unknown. DNBZ 24: 156–161.
- Kenmitsu mondō shō* 顯密問答鈔 [Record of Questions and Answers on Exoteric and Tantric], 2 fascicles. By Raiyu 賴瑜 (1226–1304), mid 13th century. Abe/Sueki 2016a, 475–509.
- Miaofa lianhua jing* 妙法蓮華經 [Sūtra of the Lotus of the Subtle Law], 7 fascicles. Translated by Kumārajīva. T. 262: 9.1c–62b.
- Muchū mondō shū* 夢中問答集 [Collection of Questions and Answers in a Dream], 3 fascicles. By Musō Soseki 夢窓疎石 (1275–1351), 1344. Kawase 2008.
- Shi moheyan lun* 釋摩訶衍論 [Explanation of the Mahāyāna Treatise], 10 fascicles. Author unknown, 7th/8th century (?). T. 1668: 32.591c–668c.
- Shingonshū kyōji gi* 眞言宗教時義 [The Meaning of Teachings and Periods in the Shingon School], 4 fascicles. By Annen 安然 (841–?), T. 2396: 75.374a–450a.
- Shōichi kokushi goroku* 聖一國師語錄 [Recorded Sayings of National Master Shōichi], 1 fascicle. By Kokan Shiren, 1331. T. 2544: 80.17b–23a.
- Shōryōshū* 性靈集 [Collection on the Mysticality of His Essence], 10 fascicles. By Kūkai, date unknown. Sofū senyōkai 1911, 10: 1–179.
- Tōji injindō kuketsu* 東寺印信等口決, 1 fascicle. By Chikotsu Daie, 1296. Abe/Sueki 2016, 489–512.
- Tōfukuji kaisan Shōichi kokushi nenpu* 東福寺開山聖一國師年譜 [Annual Chronicle of National Master Holy One, Founding Abbot of Tōfukuji], 1 fascicle. By Tetsugyū Enshin 鉄牛圓心 (1254–1326). DNBZ 95: 129–150.

- Weimo jing lueshu* 維摩經略疏 [Abbreviated Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti Sutra*], 10 fascicles. By Zhiyi 智顛 (538–597) and edited by Zhanran 湛然 (711–782). T. 1778: 38.562c–710a.
- Weimo jing wenshu* 維摩經文疏 [Textual Commentary on the *Vimalakīrti Sutra*], 28 fascicles. By Zhiyi. X. 338: 18.462a–703b.
- Yugikyō kenmon* 瑜祇經見聞 [Exposition of the *Yuqi jing*], 1 fascicle. By Enni, 1274. Abe/Sueki 2018, 543–585.
- Yuanwu Foguo chanshi yulu* 圓悟佛果禪師語錄 [Recorded Sayings of Chan Master Yuanwu Foguo], 20 fascicles. By Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063–1135). T. 1997: 47.713b–810c.
- Yunmen Kuangzhen chanshi guanglu* 雲門匡真禪師広録 [Recorded Sayings of Chan Master Yunmen Kuangzhen], 3 fascicles. By Yunmen Wenyan 雲門文偃 (864–949). T. 1988: 47.544c–576c.
- Zhiguan fuxing zhuan hongjue* 止觀輔行傳弘決 [Comprehensive Deliberations on the Transmission of the Auxiliary Practices of Calming and Contemplation], 40 fascicles. By Zhanran 湛然 (711–782). T. 1912: 46.141a–446.
- Zōroku* 雜録, 1 fascicle. By Kohan Shūshin 古帆周信 (1570–1641), date unknown. Partly reproduced in Suzuki 1897, 284–302.

Secondary Sources

- Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎 and Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 (eds), *Kikō zenseki shū zoku* 稀觀禪籍集續 [Collection of Rare Zen Texts, Continued]. Kyoto: Rinsen, 2018.
- Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎 and Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 (eds), *Shōichi ha* 聖一派 [Shōichi Faction]. Kyoto: Rinsen, 2016.
- Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎, *Shūkyō tekisuto bunka isan toshite chūki jūn shōkyō tenseki* 宗教テクスト文化遺産としての地域寺院聖教典籍 [Scriptural Collections of Local Temples as Heritage of Religious Textual Culture], unpublished conference materials, 2020.
- Andō Yoshinori 安藤嘉則, “Chūsei Rinzaishū Genjūha no kōan zen” 中世臨濟宗幻住派の公案禪 [The Kōan Zen of the Medieval Genjū Lineage of the Rinzai School], *Nihon bunka kenkyū* 日本文化研究 [Research on Japanese Culture] 4 (2002), pp. 81–110.
- Bodiford, William, *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i, 1993.
- Dolce, Lucia. “The Embryonic Generation of the Perfect Body: Ritual Embryology from Japanese Tantric Sources,” in *Transforming the Void: Embryological Discourse and Reproductive Imagery in East Asian Religions*, ed. Anna Andreeva and Dominic Steavu. Leiden: Brill, 2016, pp. 253–310.
- Fujimoto Ryōtai 藤本了泰, “Denbō gokoku ron ni tsuite: Chūsei Zenshū to Tendaishū to no sōjōron ronsō” 傳法護國論について——中世禪宗と天台宗との相承論々争 [On

- the Treatise on Transmitting the Dharma and Protecting the Country: The Debate between the Medieval Zen and Tendai Schools on Theories of Transmission], *Shien* 史苑 [History Garden] 11 (1938), pp. 709–728.
- Funaoka Makoto 船岡誠, “Heian jidai no Zensō: Nihon Zenshū seiritsu zenshi” 平安時代の禅僧——日本禅宗成立前史 [Zen Monks of the Heian Period: The Prehistory of the Japanese Zen School’s Establishment], *Sundai shigaku* 駿台史学 [Sundai Studies in History] 63 (1985), pp. 1–34.
- Funaoka Makoto 船岡誠, *Nihon Zenshū no seiritsu* 日本禅宗の成立 [The Establishment of the Japanese Zen School]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1987.
- Iyanaga Nobumi 彌永信美. “Tachikawa-ryū to Shinjō *Juhō yōjin shū* o megutte” 立川流と心定『受法用心集』をめぐって [On the Tachikawa ryū and Shinjō’s *Juhō yōjin shū*], *Nihon bukkyō sōgō kenkyū* 日本仏教総合研究 = *Interdisciplinary Studies in Japanese Buddhism* 2 (2002), pp. 13–31.
- Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆 et al. (eds), *Dōgen Zenji zenshū* 道元禅師全集 [Collected Texts of Zen Master Dōgen]. 17 vols. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 2013.
- Kawase Kazuma 川瀬一馬 (ed), *Muchū mondō shū* 夢中問答集 [Collection of Questions and Answers in a Dream]. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2008.
- Licha, Stephan Kigensan, “Dharma Transmission Rituals in Sōtō Zen Buddhism,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 39 (2016), pp. 171–205.
- Licha, Stephan Kigensan, “Separate Teaching and Separate Transmission: Kokan Shiren’s Zen Polemics,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 45 (2018), pp. 87–124.
- Dolce, Lucia, “The Embryonic Generation of the Perfect Body: Ritual Embryology from Japanese Tantric Sources,” in *Transforming the Void: Embryological Discourse and Reproductive Imagery in East Asian Religions*, ed. Anna Andreeva and Dominic Steavu. Leiden: Brill, 2016, pp. 253–310.
- Maraldo, John C., “Is There Historical Consciousness in Ch’an?,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 12/2–3 (1985), pp. 141–172.
- Mizukami Fumiyoshi 水上文義, *Nihon Tendai kyōgaku ron* 日本天台教學論 [Treatise on the Dogmatics of Japanese Tendai]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2017.
- Morrison, Elizabeth, *The Power of Patriarchs: Qisong and Lineage in Chinese Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Ōkubo Ryōshun 大久保良峻, “Saichō kara Annen he: Shoki Nihon Tendai no konpon-teki tenkai” 最澄から安然へ——初期日本天台の根本的展開 [From Saichō to Annen: Fundamental Development of Early Japanese Tendai], *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 佛教学セミナー [Buddhist Studies Seminar] 103 (2016), pp. 15–45.
- Ōkubo Ryōshun 大久保良峻, “Tendai” 天台 [Tendai], in *Shin hasshū kōyō* 新・八宗綱要 [New Essentials of the Eight Schools], ed. Ōkubo Ryōshun. Tokyo: Hōzōkan, 2001, pp. 53–83.
- Orzech, Charles, Richard K. Payne and Henrik H. Sørensen, “Introduction: Esoteric Buddhism an the Tantras in East Asia: Some Methodological Considerations,” in

- Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, ed. Charles D. Orzech et al. Leiden: Brill, 2011, pp. 3–18.
- Sofu senyōkai 祖風宣揚会 (ed), *Kōbō daishi zenshū* 弘法大師全集 [Collected Works of Kōbō Daishi], 15 vols. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1911.
- Stone, Jacqueline, “Do Kami ever Overlook Pollution?,” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 16 (2006–2007 [2006]), pp. 203–232.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 and Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎 (eds), *Shōichi ha zoku* 聖一派続 [Shōichi Faction, Continued]. Kyoto: Rinsen, 2017.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 and Takahashi Shūei 高橋秀榮 (eds), *Zenkyō kōshō ron* 禪教交渉論 [Discourses on Zen and the Teachings]. Kyoto: Rinsen, 2016.
- Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, “Nihon ni okeru kōan Zen no dentō, ge” 日本における公案 禪の伝統 下 [On the Kōan Zen Tradition in Japan, Final Part], in *Zen shisōshi kenkyū* 禪思想史研究 [Researches in the Intellectual History of Zen], vol. 1. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1987, pp. 284–302.
- Tachi Ryūshi 館隆志, “Shinshutsu shiryō *Shinkon ketsugi shō* no hakken to sono igi” 新出史料『心根決疑章』の発見とその意義 [On the Discovery and Importance of the Newly Available Historical Material Chapter on Resolving Doubts Concerning the Mind Root], *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 = *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 68/2 (2020), pp. 611–618.
- Taira Masayuki 平雅行, *Nihon chūsei no shakai to bukkyō* 日本中世の社会と佛教 [Japanese Medieval Society and Buddhism]. Tokyo: Hanawa, 1992.
- Takayanagi Satsuki 高柳さつき, “Kamakura Rinzaï Zen ni okeru Zenmitsu kankei no shisōteki keifu: Enni, Raiyu, *Shinzen yūshin gi wo tadorinagara*” 鎌倉臨濟禪における禪密関係の思想的系譜——円爾・頼瑜・『真禪融心義』を辿りながら [The Intellectual Genealogy of the Relationship Between Zen and Tantra in Kamakura Rinzaï Zen: Tracing Enni, Raiyu and the *Meaning of the Harmony of Mantra and Zen*], *Zen-gaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 = *Studies in Zen Buddhism* 88 (2010), 27–49.
- Uejima Susumu 上島享, “Bukkyō no Nihonka 佛教の日本化” [The Japanification of Buddhism], in *Nihon bukkyō no ishizue* 日本佛教の礎 [The Foundations of Japanese Buddhism], ed. Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士. Tokyo: Kōsei, 2010, pp. 204–245.