

## REVIEWS

IKEDA Rosan 池田魯參, *Makashikan kenkyū josetsu* 摩訶止觀研究序說 [Prolegomena to the study of the *Mo ho chih kuan*]. Tōkyō: Daitō Shuppansha, 1986. xi + 348 pp., with an index, ¥8,500.

The book under review<sup>1</sup> has been published as one volume in a series of “academic studies on Zen Buddhism” 學術叢書・禪佛教. According to the author, it was the *Mo ho chih kuan*, taught by Chih-i and compiled by Kuan-ting, which synthesized and systematized Zen (Chin., Ch’an) Buddhism. This is an ambitious work which attempts to shed new light on the *Mo ho chih kuan* and T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan* 止觀 practice as the precursor to the organization and methods of Zen Buddhism. The *Mo ho chih kuan* and T’ien-t’ai practice have been studied in recent years by Japanese scholars such as Sekiguchi Shindai (1954, 1966, 1969, 1974, 1975), Andō Toshio (1968), and Nitta Masaaki (1981). Nevertheless as Ikeda points out in his introduction, “There are not a few works on T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan* practice available, but if one wants to know what this practice truly entails and how one should study these texts, . . . the fact is that there is little to rely on” (p. vi). Ikeda raises the basic question, “How should one read the *Mo ho chih kuan*?” His answer, simply put, is to utilize the commentary and interpretation provided by the sixth T’ien-t’ai patriarch Chan-jan in his two works *Chih kuan i li* 止觀義例 and *Chih kuan ta i* 止觀大意. The reason for this is that “I believe that if Chan-jan’s commentaries are utilized, the incomplete or one-sided readings found in former studies would then be correctly conceived, and only then can an accurate interpretation and understanding of the *Mo ho chih kuan* be achieved” (p. vii). Studies such as this which investigate and clarify the fundamental elements of T’ien-t’ai practice are a welcome addition to the field.

This book consists of four chapters, including the Introduction, as follows:

Introduction. The State of the Topic.

Chapter I. Chan-jan’s Hermeneutics.

1. A reevaluation of Chan-jan’s contribution.

2. The hermeneutics of the *Chih kuan i li*.

Chapter II. The Structure and Content of the *Mo ho chih kuan*.

1. Methods of interpretation in the *Chih kuan ta i*.

2. Problems with the methods of interpretation in the *Chih kuan ta i*.

Chapter III. Topics of T’ien-t’ai *Chih-kuan* Practice.

1. The basic structure of T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan* practice.

2. The procedure and method of T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan* practice.

I would like to introduce and comment on the content of each chapter.

First, the Introduction outlines the relationship between the T’ien-t’ai and Ch’an traditions from a doctrinal perspective, beginning with Hui-ssu and T’ien-t’ai Chih-i through the T’ien-t’ai scholar Chih-hsü 智旭 (1599–1655) of the Ming period. Chih-i carried on his master Hui-ssu’s teaching of the

<sup>1</sup> This review appeared originally in Japanese, and was translated by the editor. See Yamano 1986.

inseparability of doctrine and practice by organizing all known Buddhist teachings and practices into a unified system. Ikeda concludes that the developments in Buddhist meditation during the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. climaxed with the systematization of the T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan* theory and practice. In the T'ang Period (618–907), with the Ch'an tradition flourishing, the Hua-yen scholar Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀 (738–838) promoted the idea that Ch'an practice was superior to T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan*. This attitude became even more marked with the work of the Hua-yen master Tsung-mi 宗密 (780–841). Ikeda points out that "In response to this gradual acceptance and misunderstanding of the inferiority of T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan* practice due to the work of Ch'eng-kuan and Tsung-mi, Chan-jan (711–782) devoted himself to the study of the three major works of T'ien-t'ai (the *Mo ho chih kuan*, *Fa hua hsüan i*, and *Fa hua wen chü*) and thus established the methodology for T'ien-t'ai scholarship" (p. 3). In the Sung period it was Chih-li 知礼 (960–1028) who built on the authority of Chan-jan's work to criticize the Hua-yen and Ch'an traditions and contribute his own brand of T'ien-t'ai scholarship. The give and take between T'ien-t'ai and Ch'an continued even past the time of Chih-li, but when viewed from the broader perspective of history it is clear that the basic criticisms and responses between these two traditions are found in the work of Chan-jan, and that his scholarship was very influential in this area.

Chapter 1 on Chan-jan's hermeneutics follows up on this point. The first section on "a reevaluation of Chan-jan" argues that Chan-jan's work is irreplaceable for a correct understanding of T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan*. The second section on "The hermeneutics of the *Chih kuan i li*" raises the question, "How are we to understand T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan*?" Chan-jan's *Chih kuan i li*, a study of the *Mo ho chih kuan* in seven parts, is examined and heavily annotated. Special attention is given to the "the interpretation of the text 文義消釈," in order to address the question of how the *Mo ho chih kuan* should be read. The last part, a detailed analysis of the meaning of "sudden and gradual" 頓漸 practice and the distinction between "relative and absolute" 相待絕待 is also closely examined from forty-six perspectives. The purpose of this analysis is to answer the question of how the T'ien-t'ai practice of *chih-kuan* is to be understood. This analysis "illustrates various topics associated with the practices of the Ch'an tradition and Hua-yen scholarship" (p. 83).

Chapter 2 consists of an analysis of Chan-jan's *Chih kuan ta i*, using Chan-jan's hermeneutical methods in this text to give an outline of the *Mo ho chih kuan*. The first section on "the methods of interpretation in the *Chih kuan ta i*" is an annotated explanation of this text. Ikeda attempts to show what kind of "Ch'an Buddhism" was systematized in the *Mo ho chih kuan*. For example, the famous "ten modes of contemplation" 十乘觀法 are interpreted as offering one mode for those of superior talent 上根, seven modes for those of mediocre talent 中根, and ten modes for those of inferior talent 下根. These ten modes of contemplation (particularly the single mode for those of superior talent), rather than the ten objects 十境, are the focus of attention. Ikeda attributes this emphasis to Chan-jan's attempt to show that the "perfect and sudden" type of meditation and enlightenment characteristic of Southern Ch'an had long been a central part of T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan* practice (p. 217).

Chapter 3 discusses “topics in the *Mo ho chih kuan* related to Ch’an Buddhism” on the basis of Chan-jan’s interpretation of *chih-kuan*. Special attention is given to the first of the ten modes of contemplation, the contemplation of “the inconceivable” 觀不思議境 as the object of meditation, and on the *skandha-āyatana-dhātu* 陰入界境 as the objects of meditation. Ikeda points out and discusses the central role of the mind in such meditation. According to Chih-i, contemplation of “the inconceivable” is to contemplate the mind itself and its working as beyond conceptual understanding. Ikeda explains this as “a recognition of the threefold truth, all of reality as the unfolding of the three aspects of emptiness, conventional existence, and the Middle. A threefold wisdom 三智 concerning this threefold truth is attained through (T’ien-t’ai’s) threefold contemplation 三觀” (p. 239). In this context Ikeda criticizes Chan-jan’s interpretation of the ten modes of contemplation which assigns various modes to different levels of talent, saying that such distinctions are not useful.

The second section of this chapter, on the “procedure and method of T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan* practice,” picks up various topics with regard to T’ien-t’ai ritual and ceremony. Ikeda asks “Based on these fundamental theories of T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan* practice, how did Chih-i himself, and the members of the organization which he led, actually practice?” (p. 252) The instructions for daily practice found in the first section of the *Kuo ch’ing pai lu* 國清百錄 (T. 46, 793-824) are introduced and analyzed, specifically the ten guidelines or regulations 立制法 for monastic life on Mt. T’ien-t’ai (T. 793b). These are examined as the “regulations” 清規 for practice and daily life at the Kuo ch’ing temple on Mt. T’ien-t’ai. They explain the procedures for *zazen* and confessional worship 禮懺, and also the guidelines for administrative duties 知僧事. “Administrative duties” refers to those who look after the more mundane tasks which are required to allow monks to perform their practices and to take care of the needs and requirements of the supporting public. Ikeda correctly points out that the official assignment of such tasks to a specific monastic official is original with Chih-i and that this is an important development in the history of such Chinese Buddhist regulations.

Ikeda also examines specific practices performed on Mt. T’ien-t’ai such as the ceremonial worship 禮懺法 and the more well-known Four Samādhis 四種三昧. He concludes that the “Samādhi of following one’s thoughts” 隨自意三昧, part of the “neither walking nor sitting Samādhi,” is the basic model for T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan* practice (p. 310), but that nevertheless “the system of the Four Samādhis established by Chih-i became the basis for daily monastic life, and there was no sense of arranging these types of practice into levels or making value judgements as to their superiority or inferiority” (p. 317). Therefore the later developments of emphasizing one aspect of these practices, such as just sitting in meditation (*zazen* 坐禪) or chanting the name of the Buddha (*nenbutsu* 念佛) are one-sided interpretations counter to the intent of the Four Samādhi systematization. Finally, Ikeda examines the practice of *zazen* from the perspective of T’ien-t’ai *chih-kuan*, concentrating on Chih-i’s earlier work, the *Tz’u ti ch’an mên* 次第禪門 (T. 46, 475-548), concluding that the methods of *zazen* defined by Chih-i in his early work were

maintained unchanged throughout his life (p. 326).

I have attempted to summarize and comment briefly on the content of this book. In this work we find a perceptive and detailed analysis of the fundamentals of T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan* practice, utilizing Chan-jan's scholarship and hermeneutical method to answer the question, "How should one read the *Mo ho chih kuan*?" One can only hope that the same kind of incisive study of T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan* practice be done on the basis and from the perspective of Chih-li's scholarship.

#### REFERENCES

ANDŌ Toshio 安藤俊雄

- 1968 *Tendaigaku-Konpon shisō to sono tenkai* 天台学—根本思想とその展開 [Tendai studies—It's basic thought and development]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

IKEDA Rosan 池田魯参

- 1982 *Kokusei hyakuroku no kenkyū* 国清百録の研究 [Studies on the *Kuo ch'ing pai lu*]. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan.

NITTA Masaaki 新田雅章

- 1981 *Tendai jissōron no kenkyū* 天台実相論の研究 [Studies on T'ien-t'ai theories of reality]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

SEKIGUCHI Shindai 関真大

- 1954 *Tendai shōshikan no kenkyū* 天台小止観の研究 [Studies on the *T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih kuan*]. Tokyo: Risōsha.
- 1966 *Makashikan* 摩訶止観 [The *Mo ho chih kuan*], three volumes. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko.
- 1969 *Tendai shikan no kenkyū* 天台止観の研究 [Studies on T'ien-t'ai *chih-kuan* practice]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- 1974 *Tendai shōshikan* 天台小止観 [The *T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih kuan*]. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko.
- 1975 *Shikan no kenkyū* 止観の研究 [Studies on *chih-kuan* practice]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

YAMANO Toshirō 山野俊郎

- 1986 Review of Ikeda Rosan, *Makashikan kenkyū josetsu. Bukkyōgaku seminar* 仏教学セミナー 44:78-84.

YAMANO Toshirō  
Ōtani University