

## The Dōgen Canon

### Dōgen's Pre-*Shōbōgenzō* Writings and the Question of Change in His Later Works

Steven HEINE

*Recent scholarship has focused on the question of whether, and to what extent, Dōgen underwent a significant change in thought and attitudes in his later years. Two main theories have emerged which agree that there was a decisive change although they disagree about its timing and meaning. One view, which I refer to as the Decline Theory, argues that Dōgen entered into a prolonged period of deterioration after he moved from Kyoto to Echizen in 1243 and became increasingly strident in his attacks on rival lineages. The second view, which I refer to as the Renewal Theory, maintains that Dōgen had a spiritual rebirth after returning from a trip to Kamakura in 1248 and emphasized the priority of karmic causality. Both theories, however, tend to ignore or misrepresent the early writings and their relation to the late period. I will propose an alternative Three Periods Theory suggesting that the main change, which occurred with the opening of Daibutsu-ji/Eiheiji in 1245, was a matter of altering the style of instruction rather than the content of ideology. At that point, Dōgen shifted from the informal lectures (jishu) of the Shōbōgenzō, which he stopped delivering, to the formal sermons (jōdō) in the Eihei kōroku, a crucial later text which the other theories overlook. I will also point out that the diversity in literary production as well as the complexity and ambiguity of historical events makes it problematic for the Decline and Renewal theories to construct a view that Dōgen had a single, decisive break with his previous writings.*

[*Hōkyō-ki*] is among the manuscripts left behind by the late master. As I began drafting this, I wondered whether there might be still others that have not been discovered. I am concerned that [the record of] his unlimited achievements may be incomplete, and in my sadness fall 100,000 tears.

Ejō, *Hōkyō-ki* 宝慶記 colophon

If someone asks me [what is the most remarkable thing], I (Eihei abbot) will say, “It is attending *jōdō* sermons on [Eihei-ji’s] Kichijōzan.”

Dōgen, *Eihei kōroku* 永平広録, 6.443

### *On the Relativity of “Early” and “Late” Writings*

KAGAMISHIMA GENRYŪ, FOR OVER THREE decades the dean of textual critics in Dōgen 道元 (1200–1253) studies, has commented that the main topics in current scholarship are the “early” and the “late” writings.<sup>1</sup> The early writings include a series of short texts from the mid-1230s, many of which are composed in *kanbun* 漢文 or Chinese, before Dōgen began working intensively on the informal lectures written in *kana* or Japanese vernacular that are included in the 75-fascicle *Shōbōgenzō* 正法眼藏 [hereafter 75-SH]. The “late” writings, some of which are also in *kanbun*, include the works from the mid-1240s until Dōgen’s death in 1253 that were written at the end of or subsequent to the composition of the 75-SH. The works of these two periods had been somewhat neglected and will probably never take priority over the 75-SH, which has traditionally been the main object of study. But the 75-SH, which began as a collection of disconnected lectures, some of which were apparently continuously revised by Dōgen and recopied by his main disciple, Ejō 懷奘, can now be better understood not as a specialized topic but by being framed in its textual historical context. Since it was not planned as a cohesive book—though perhaps Dōgen came to see it forming a unity (at least that is a topic for debate)—the aims and design of this work should be interpreted by examining its chronological and ideological boundaries in terms of intertextual connections to other writings before, during, and after its composition.

The late writings have recently received considerably more attention than the early ones due to the emergence of two prominent theories which attempt to explain the significance of the 75-SH on the basis of how it was punctuated by Dōgen’s final works. Yet these theories are in fundamental disagreement, not only about interpreting the meaning, but also about defining the content of the late period. What exactly constitutes the late writings, and how are they related to an early period, so defined?

One view, which I will refer to as the Decline Theory, understands the late writings to consist of the last set of fascicles included in the

<sup>1</sup> Kagamishima made this comment in a public address at Komazawa University in Spring 1995; see also KAGAMISHIMA 1994, pp. 5–45. An excellent recent article that explores this issue, especially with regard to the status and significance of the 12-SH, is PUTNEY 1996.

**Table 1. Dōgen's Works in Three Periods and Shift from *Jishu* to *Jōdō***

year	<i>jishu</i> (75-SH) (EK 1-7)	<i>jōdō</i>	Other Writings and Biographical Notes
1231			<i>Bendōwa</i> (doctrinal question-answer style); at An'yō-in in Fukakusa
1233	2		<i>Fukanzazengi</i> (meditation manual); Kannon-dōri or Kōshō-hōrin-ji opened
1234	0		<i>Gakudōyōjinshū</i> (doctrinal essay); Ejō becomes disciple
1235	0		<i>Mana Shōbōgenzō</i> ( <i>Sanbyakusoku</i> ) (collection of 300 koans)
1236	0		<i>Juko</i> (verse comments on 90 koans in EK 9); Kōshō-ji monk's hall opened 10/15
1237	0		<i>Tenzōkyōkun</i> (instructions to cook); <i>Shukke ryaku sahō</i> (on home departure)
1238	1		<i>Shōbōgenzō zuimonki</i> (recorded sayings)
1239	3		<i>Kannon Dōri-in sōdō konryūkanshin-sho</i> (monastic rules); <i>Jūundōshiki</i> (rules)
1240	6	31	<i>Kōshō-ji goroku</i> (EK 1); Hōgo (dharma-talks in EK 8); 12-SH "Kesa kudoku"
1241	9	48	Ekan, Gikai, Giin, Gien, Gijun of Daruma-shū become disciples
1242	16	26	
1243	22	21	
to c. 7/1	(4)		moves to Echizen at Kippō-ji and Yamashibu temples—key to Decline Theory
after (A)	(18)		
1244	10	0	<i>Taidaiiko</i> (rules for inferiors' behavior toward superiors); 12-SH "Hotsubodaishin";
C to 3/9	(10)		construction begun on Daibutsu-ji—key to Three Periods Theory;
after	(0)		Daibutsu-ji opened 7/18
1245	5	15	<i>Bendōhō</i> (detailed instructions on zazen)
1246	1	74	<i>Nihonkoku Echizen Eihei-ji chiji shingi</i> (rules for monastic leaders); Fushukuhampō Daibutsu-ji renamed Eihei-ji 7/10
1247	0	35	
1248	0	52	
B after 3/14	(52)		returns from Kamakura trip begun 8/3, 1247—key to Renewal Theory
1249	0	58	<i>Eihei-ji shuryō shingi</i> (rules for library); <i>Juroku rakan gen-zuiki</i> (revelation of arhats)
1250	0	52	
1251	0	68	
1252	0	51	
1253	0	0	"Hachidainingaku," and editing of other 12-SH texts; <i>Hōkyō-ki</i>
Total	75	531	

Note: A, B, C refer to the Decline, Renewal, and Three Periods theories as per use in Table 2.

75-SH that were composed after 1243 when Dōgen left Kōshō-ji 興聖寺 in Fukakusa, just south of Kyoto, for Eihei-ji 永平寺 on Kichijōzan 吉祥山 in remote Echizen province. Some passages in these texts contain highly-charged attacks on opponents and positions praised or endorsed in the earlier works. The Decline Theory, articulated by Carl BIELEFELDT and Heinrich DUMOULIN based in large part on studies by FURUTA Shōkin, IMAEDA Aishin, MASUTANI Fumio, and YANAGIDA Seizan (all Rinzai scholars), suggests that the descent into partisanship began in 1241 when Dōgen was joined by several former members of the proscribed Daruma-shū sect. This tendency culminated two years later when Dōgen was more or less forced to flee from Kyoto at the time that Rinzai monk Enni Ben'en 圓爾弁圓, who had returned from China in 1241, was awarded the abbacy at the formidable compound of Tōfuku-ji 東福寺 which was built near Kōshō-ji (until then the only Zen temple with a monks' hall and Dharma hall), by the Mt. Hiei Tendai establishment with the support of the Fujiwara family. This theory, which could also be referred to as the Reversal Theory, sees Dōgen giving up on the ideals of universal enlightenment encompassing laypersons and women for the sake of sectarian polemic in a rural monastery isolated from the capital and rival Buddhist schools. Dōgen also began excessively eulogizing his Chinese mentor Ju-ching 如淨 (Jpn. Nyojō) while lambasting Lin-chi 臨濟 (Jpn. Rinzai) and others in opponent lineages. He was particularly harsh concerning the sub-lineage of Ta-hui 大慧 and Te-kuang 德光, who awarded transmission to disciples sent to China by Dainichi Nōnin 大日能忍, the founder of the Daruma-shū 達磨宗, who never left Japan and who was accused by the Tendai church of advocating an experience of natural enlightenment without the need for following the precepts or ethical codes.<sup>2</sup> In his final years, according to the theory, Dōgen dedicated himself to writing strict instructions on monastic rules and rituals which have been collected into the *Eihei shingī* 永平清規 collection while neglecting the concerns of lay followers and women.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> One of the main charges against the sect was that it did not seek out ordination ceremonies at approved precept platforms and did not require its members to receive either the Hinayana or Mahayana precepts. Dōgen struggled with the issue of the importance of the precepts, arguing in *Shōbōgenzō zuimonki* that they are less important than, or are at least encompassed by, the activity of zazen (that is, no precepts are broken while zazen is performed)—a view which may have appealed to Ejō and other Daruma-shū converts—and eventually formulating in the 12-SH “Jukai” fascicle a theory of sixteen precepts (three refuges, three pure precepts, and ten major precepts).

<sup>3</sup> The Decline Theory can be summed up as follows: after Echizen, Dōgen changed his views on lay and women followers, praised Ju-ching and attacked Lin-chi's lineages excessively, and became a weak and divisive leader plagued by uncertainty about the direction of his movement and frustration and depression about its failures.

The second view, which I will refer to as the Renewal Theory, maintains that the 12-fascicle *Shōbōgenzō* [hereafter 12-SH], which includes rewritten versions of fascicles from the 75-SH as well as fascicles newly composed in the 1250s, is the pinnacle of Dōgen's literary achievements. According to the Renewal Theory, expressed most emphatically in the Critical Buddhist methodology of HAKAMAYA Noriaki (a former Sōtō priest), Dōgen experienced a spiritual rebirth when he returned to Eihei-ji early in 1248 from a seven-month mission to Kamakura where he found the dominant Rinzai Zen sect corrupted by its association with the rising warrior class.<sup>4</sup> His subsequent writings are clear and consistent in endorsing the basic Buddhist doctrine of karmic causality and rejecting the antinomian implications endemic to East Asian original enlightenment thought (*hongaku shisō* 本覚思想) which influenced Japanese Tendai as well as Ch'an/Zen philosophy. Of all the various early (Kamakura/Muromachi) editions of the *Shōbōgenzō*, including the 75-fascicle, 60-fascicle and 28-fascicle editions, only the 12-SH, Hakamaya argues, represents the fascicles that were selected by Dōgen himself just prior to his death rather than by posthumous editors. For this theory, Dōgen's best work was characterized by his willingness to take a stand against the substantialist *dhātu-vāda* (that is to say, *ātmavāda*) notion of the universality of enlightenment that is prized by the Decline Theory, and this work is based on a renewed commitment to the ethical imperative inherent in the quest for enlightenment.

### *A Critique of the Decline and Reversal Theories*

On the one hand, the two theories have much in common. Both seek to identify the "pure" Zen master, a status which Dōgen had in Kyoto but lost in Echizen according to the Decline Theory, or attained just

<sup>4</sup> Hakamaya alone endorses the Renewal Theory view: after Kamakura Dōgen changed his approach by rejecting original enlightenment thought and embracing karmic causality, and he rewrote the 75-SH as the 12-SH as the only valid version of the *Shōbōgenzō* to eliminate deficient tendencies in his previous work; see SWANSON 1993; HEINE 1994b; and SUEKI 1995. While most scholars reject this as an extreme position, several have developed a compromise view in reassessing the importance of the 12-SH and the post-Kamakura period; see ISHII Shūdō 1987 and 1990; MIZUNO 1994; and especially MATSUOKA 1995, which has a lengthy chapter on "Shinsei Dōgen—Jūnikanbon *Shōbōgenzō* o megutte" (Dōgen's Rebirth—Concerning the 12-Fascicle *Shōbōgenzō*). Also in MATSUOKA 1996, she offers a strong critique of Hakamaya's position based on textual evidence. One way of looking at the Renewal Theory is that—in contrast to the traditional view which sees Dōgen moving from a Hinayana view in his early "doubt" to a Mahayana position in his theory of Buddha-nature, as well as the Decline Theory which criticizes a shift from a Mahayana position in his emphasis on universality to a Hinayana position in his rejection of this—this theory sees Dōgen shifting to a Hinayana emphasis on causality in a positive sense.

after the trip to Kamakura according to the Renewal Theory. By arguing that there was a single basic change or an irreversible turning point in Dōgen's life, the theories challenge orthodox assumptions, particularly concerning the significance of the 75-SH. The merits of this text generally remain unquestioned in traditional sectarian as well as many secular studies that emphasize Dōgen's unchanging religious vision after his return from China in 1227 based on the doctrine of just-sitting (*shikan-taza* 只管打坐). The Decline Theory maintains that the late 75-SH is rife with inconsistencies and partisan polemics, and the Renewal Theory sees it still struggling with and ever haunted by the influence of original enlightenment thought. Both theories effectively demonstrate that it is necessary to examine Dōgen's ongoing struggle to reconcile conflicting tendencies including: composing in *kanbun* in order to transmit the Ch'an/Zen doctrine he learned in China or in *kana* for the sake of communicating with new groups of less well-educated followers; writing instructions exclusively for monastics or with appeals to laypersons; making connections for patronage and power in Kyoto and Kamakura or longing to remain independent of political complications; and gazing past all polarities to the higher truth of nondual reality or stressing the merit gained from strict adherence to the precepts and other monastic regulations. The theories shift our attention from "text" as a pristine, autonomous statement of doctrine with a fixed, unchallengeable canonicity, to the "context" of how the writing was indelibly molded by historical events and trends from a critical, even irreverent, standpoint that demands constant reevaluation of fixed assumptions.

Yet, as indicated, the theories appear to be in opposition over the meaning and content of the early and late periods. What the Decline Theory considers to be the late writings, or the tail end of the fascicles in the 75-SH, is thought of as part of the early period by the Renewal Theory. The Decline theory, according to DUMOULIN, bemoans an "undeniable downturn" that Dōgen underwent in Echizen when his writings became so marked by "a flaw of temper" toward his rivals that the "weaknesses in Dōgen's written work point to a weakness in leadership as the master advanced in age" (1990, pp. 62, 104). Referring to the same stage in Dōgen's career, the Renewal Theory finds Dōgen finally fulfilling his role as a premier Buddhist thinker and monastic leader by learning to cast aside the elements of thought that tend to violate the doctrine of causality. Thus, the main area of contention is the last ten years or the Echizen period. The Decline Theory maintains that Dōgen continued a downward slide precipitated by the political factors that caused him to leave Kyoto, whereas the Renewal

Theory argues that the first stretch in Echizen was still part of the deficiency of the early Dōgen because it would take five more years and another crisis for his reawakening to take place.

However, these theories based on more or less inverted views about the nature and timing of a decisive change are not so much opposite as they are talking past each other by using in heterological ways similar terminology concerning the early versus the late or purity versus impurity. The contradictions between the theories derive, ironically, from a common tendency to view the early period—defined as the pre-1243 75-SH fascicles by the Decline Theory and as the entire 75-SH by the Renewal Theory—from a retrospective standpoint in light of a mode of evaluation that is intent on setting up a contrast with the late writings. Yet Dōgen's writings from the 1230s are not a monolithic unit with a single systematic message but a very diverse group in literary style and thematic content. They include a meditation manual (*Fukanzazengi* 普勸坐禪儀, 1233); several manuals on monastic rules (*Tenzokyōkun* 典座教訓, 1237, on instructions for the cook, and *Jūundōshiki* 重雲堂式, 1239, on rules for the monks' hall annex); two koan collections (the *Mana* or *Shinji Shōbōgenzō* 真字正法眼藏 also known as the *Shōbōgenzō sanbyakusoku* 三百則 [hereafter MS], 1235, listing three hundred traditional cases, and the ninth volume of the *Eihei kōroku* 永本広録 [hereafter EK], 1236, with verse commentary on ninety cases); a record of Dōgen's sayings, the *Shōbōgenzō zuimonki* 隨聞記 [hereafter SZ], 1238; and several other kinds of doctrinal expositions including *Bendōwa* 辨道話 (1231), *Gakudōyōjinshū* 学道用心集 (1234), and Dharma-talks (*hōgo* 法語) included in EK 8 (1236-41). During this period Dōgen also wrote the first six fascicles of the 75-SH, which the colophons refer to as *jishu* 示衆-style lectures directed to a general, diverse audience. He also delivered the first thirty-one formal sermons recorded in *kanbun* and known as *jōdō* 上堂 (or “ascending the [high seat] in the [Dharma]hall” to address the congregation) that are included in the first volume of the EK (or EK 1). Both of these genres deal extensively with interpreting koan cases cited in the aforementioned collections.

The writings of the 1230s reveal that Dōgen had returned from China in 1227 influenced by two main factors: fundamental ideas on the practice of zazen and the performance of ceremonies based on the Zen monastic code of 1103, the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei* 禪苑清規 (Jpn. *Zen'en shingi*); and several styles of explaining doctrine, particularly commentaries on traditional koan cases (*kosoku-kōan* 古則公安) in verse (*juko* 頌古) and prose (*nenko* 拈古) as well as in formal and informal lecture styles. Dōgen was greatly affected by and probably tried to emulate the recorded sayings (*goroku* 語録) texts of eminent Sung mas-

ters. These include Ts'ao-tung 曹洞 (Jpn. Sōtō) priest Hung-chih 宏智 (Jpn. Wanshi), a predecessor of Ju-ching and compiler of the koans used in the *Ts'ung-jung lu* 從容錄 (Jpn. *Shōyōroku*) who advocated the practice of *mokushō-zen* 默照禪 (silent-illumination Zen), and Lin-chi (Jpn. Rinzai) sect priests Yüan-wu 圓悟 (Jpn. Engo), commentator on the *Pi-yen lu* 碧巖錄 (Jpn. *Hekiganroku*) and teacher of Ta-hui (Jpn. Daie), who was the main exponent of *kanna-zen* 看話禪 (koan-introspection Zen) and critic of Hung-chih's approach. Dōgen's early writings became accelerated and diversified after the opening of Kōshō-ji in 1233 and its monks' hall three years later, which established the temple as a thriving center for the new Zen school. These texts were experiments in developing a cogent method of adapting the Chinese models of theory and practice to a Japanese setting. While some efforts from this period were quickly abandoned others were kept and refined throughout his career. The early works form a literary matrix out of which subsequent genres were developed, particularly the innovative *jishu* style of the 75-SH which is a hybrid formed by combining sustained koan commentary with the informal lecture style of *shōsan* 小參 (lit. "small gatherings")—as opposed to the *daisan* 大參 ("large gatherings"), resembling the *jōdō* style—found in Sung collections.

However, what each of the theories means in referring to early Dōgen is based on presupposed conclusions about the late period, and the result is a pattern of viewing the 75-SH primarily in terms of where it led or how it changed. Although the crafters of the theories are generally sophisticated historians, at times their approaches violate actual sequence or conflate history with a methodological or theological position about what the 75-SH eventually became or never really was. For example, the Decline Theory criticizes late 75-SH fascicles that in some cases were written only one or two years after what it refers to as the early fascicles, which it holds up as a standard beyond reproach. As shown in Table 2, a key point is that approximately 85% of the 75-SH fascicles were written in a period lasting for a little over four years (from 1240 to the third month of 1244, which was the time construction began on Daibutsu-ji 大仏寺 that was opened that summer and renamed Eihei-ji in 1246). Therefore, it is very questionable whether a notion of an early and thus a late 75-SH is at all viable. A division set up between fascicles written just before and just after the Echizen migration can result in a neglect of the lines of continuity linking works composed in such close proximity, as well as the fact that some fascicles were actually recorded and then edited at very different times from their original oral delivery. The Decline Theory often ends up referring to *Bendōwa* (1231) as a prototypical expression of the universalism of the early period, but this stylistically



anamolous text is not part of the 75-SH (although it is included in some versions of the *Shōbōgenzō*, such as the comprehensive 92- and 95-fascicle editions, which are Tokugawa-era constructions).

Similarly, the Renewal Theory tends to distort history when it dismisses the facts that at least two of the fascicles contained in the 12-SH were written during the so-called early period (1240 and 1244 respectively) and that Dōgen continued to edit the 75-SH fascicles (including the second one, “Genjōkōan” 現成公安, from 1233) while he was writing the 12-SH twenty years later, which suggests that he never abandoned interest in this text.

Furthermore, by having fixed notions about what the late Dōgen means for interpreting the 75-SH, the theories tend to overlook other important works from both early and late periods which often express diverse ideas indicating that Dōgen was not one-sidedly pure or impure at any given stage. For example, the Decline Theory does not take into account that Dōgen wrote several monastic rules and ritual texts in the early period and that the *SZ*, a *kana* collection of sermons from 1236–1238 recorded and edited by Ejō, repeatedly supports the priority of monastics over laypersons well before the migration to Echizen. In addition, both theories generally neglect the main feature of Dōgen’s literary production during the entire Echizen period, both before and after the trip to Kamakura: the proliferation, beginning within a year of the opening of Daibutsu-ji/Eiheiji in the summer of 1244, of the *jōdō*-style sermons included in the first seven volumes of the 10-volume *Eihei kōroku* collection. Although the EK has probably not received the attention it deserves, as the single major work of Dōgen’s last nine years, it is absolutely crucial for developing a theory about the late period (ISHII Shūdō 1991 and MATSUOKA 1995, pp. 435–40). The fact is, as is shown in Table 2, that the vast majority (nearly 80%) of *jōdō* sermons were delivered just as the *jishu* lectures were being phased out of Dōgen’s monastic program. The sermons were regulated according to calendar and to some extent topic by the *Ch’an-yüan ch’ing-kuei* and other key textual models, particularly Hung-chih’s recorded sayings, and their delivery became more frequent after Dōgen’s return from Kamakura.

The role of the EK in the Echizen period is presumably troublesome to both theories. In contrast to the Decline Theory, the EK shows Dōgen as a vigorous Zen master in full command of his monastery who was neither antagonistic toward rival schools nor uncaring about the lay community. Also, some passages dealing with karma and causality in the EK run counter to or at least reflect a different orientation than the philosophy expressed in the 12-SH, there-

**Table 2. Concise View of Dōgen's Literary Production**

years	<i>jishu</i> (75-SH)	<i>jōdō</i> (EK 1–7)	other writings
<u>1231–1239</u>	6	31	
before 1236	(2)	(0)	<i>Bendōwa, Fukanzazengi, Sanbyakusoku,</i>
after Kōshō-ji monks' hall opens	(4)	(31)	<i>Gakudōyōjinshū</i> EK 9 ( <i>juko</i> ), <i>Tenzokyōkun</i> , <i>Zuimonki</i> , <i>Juundōshiki</i> , EK 8 ( <i>hōgo</i> )
<u>1240–1244</u> (3/9)	63	95	
at Kōshō-ji	(35)	(95)	EK 1, <i>Gokoku shōbōgi</i> (?)
before Echizen			
<b>A</b> after c. 1243 (7/1)	(28)	(0)	<i>Taidaikō</i>
at Kippō-ji and Yamashibu-dera			
<u>1244</u> (3/10)-53	6	405	
<b>C</b> at Daibutsu-ji/Eiheiji			
before 1245 (3/1)	(0)	(0)	
before Kamakura c.1247	(8/1)	(6)	(124) <i>Bendōhō, Chiji shingi, Fushukuhanpō</i>
<b>B</b> after return c. 1248 (3/1)	(0)	(281)	<i>Kichijōzan Eihei-ji shuryō shingi, Hōkyō-ki,</i> <i>Jūroku rakan genzuiki, "Hachidainingaku,"</i> and other 12-SH texts
Total	75	531	

**A**—the time of Dōgen's move to Echizen, key to the Decline Theory view of escape from sectarian pressures

**B**—Dōgen's return from Kamakura, key to the Renewal Theory view of spiritual rebirth based on causality

**C**—Dōgen's turn from *jishu* to *jōdō* style, key to the Three Periods Theory view of diverse literary genres

Note: Historical development of Dōgen's writings, with special emphasis on the historical formative relation between the *jishu* lectures that form the 75-SH, which were phased out beginning in spring 1244, and the *jōdō* sermons that form the EK vols. 1–7, which were accelerated beginning in 1245. Adapted from several sources, especially ITO 1987; SUGIO 1973; and KAWAMURA 1980.

by challenging the Renewal Theory's view of a monolithic stance once Dōgen underwent a change of heart. While focusing on other aspects of change in Dōgen, however important, both theories have had a blind spot with regard to the question of how the origins of the EK are connected with the rise and fall of the composition of the 75-SH. Yet,

the EK is probably the most reliable indicator of Dōgen's own attitudes in the late period because, like the SZ though for the most part unlike the 75-SH, it includes some personal anecdotes and biographical self-reflections. Therefore, the EK, which has often been viewed as a kind of shadow text, the only importance of which is to flesh out ideas expressed in the 75-SH, should be taken out of its shroud and seen as an autonomous work recorded almost entirely after the 75-SH was completed. Furthermore, when seen in terms of the overall development of the Dōgen canon, the EK, first composed and collected in 1236–1240 but suspended for almost two years between the arrival in Echizen in 1243 and the full establishment of Daibutsu-ji/Eihei-ji in 1245, is not atypical but appears consistent and continuous with the themes and styles from the mid-1230s.

To clarify the discrepancies and inconsistencies between the two theories I will reverse their tendency to discuss the early period based on the late Dōgen by examining the late period in light of the developments in the early writings. From this perspective, the 75-SH should be seen neither as a late text, as the Decline Theory argues, nor as an early text, as suggested by the Renewal Theory. Rather, it occupies a crucial middle period that is rather neatly framed by two nine-year segments in which Dōgen primarily crafted other works, although there is considerable overlapping. Extending from this observation concerning the chronology of composition, I will present the outlines of an alternative theory based on Three Periods: an early, pre-75-SH period (1231–1239), with diverse genres before and after the opening of the monks' hall at Kōshō-ji in 1236; the middle period of the 75-SH composition (1240–1244), minus the post-Echizen subdivision argued by the Decline Theory; and a late, post-75-SH period (1245–1253), with an emphasis on the EK after the opening and naming of Eihei-ji, which are more decisive events than the trip to Kamakura stressed by the Renewal Theory. Dōgen's central concern underlying the points of transition was to establish a full-scale monastic community effectively guided by a highly ritualized approach to meditation practice and doctrinal teachings. The main elements of change in his writing are not based so much on shifts in ideology but reflect attempts to work with different literary genres associated with the growth of Kōshō-ji and Eihei-ji temples (PUTNEY 1996, pp. 513–14).

### *The Early Period*

Our current understanding of Dōgen's early period has been greatly affected by the discovery of lost manuscripts and other developments

in textual criticism in the past fifteen or twenty years. Two main issues have apparently been settled. The first involves the earliest works in the Dōgen canon. It was long thought that Dōgen's writing began in 1227 immediately upon his return from attaining enlightenment in China under Ju-ching. In that year he supposedly composed two major works in *kanbun*, *Fukanzazengi*, a brief but important meditation manual modeled on Tsung-tse's *Tso-ch'an i* 坐禪儀 which is contained in the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*, and *Hōkyō-ki*, Dōgen's record of his conversations with Ju-ching that was posthumously discovered by Ejō. However, the 1227 date seems doubtful for both texts. It is now believed that the earliest edition of *Fukanzazengi*, of which there are several versions, is the 1233 or the Tenpuku edition (BIELEFELDT 1988). Also, *Hōkyō-ki* probably was written near the end of Dōgen's life as he tried to set the record straight about his mentor's teaching some time after the arrival in Japan in 1242 of Ju-ching's recorded sayings, which Dōgen found disappointingly unrepresentative, and perhaps as late as the 1250s (MIZUNO 1981). Therefore, the early period begins with *Bendōwa*, written in 1231 while Dōgen was in residence at An'yō-in temple in Fukakusa after leaving Kennin-ji. This *kana* text consists of two sections, both stressing the priority of *zazen* practice as the only true gate to the Dharma: an introductory essay plus eighteen questions and answers that counter possible objections from or offer critiques of a number of rival or, according to Dōgen, heretical standpoints.

The other important development in textual criticism was the discovery of several complete manuscripts of the 3-volume *Mana Shōbōgenzō*, with each volume containing one hundred *kosoku-kōan*. Rumored for centuries but generally considered spurious despite the existence of several Tokugawa-era commentaries, the middle section of the MS collection was discovered in 1934 at the Kanazawa Bunko Institute and in the 1980s several Muromachi manuscripts were found in various Sōtō temples, finally authenticating the text's status as Dōgen's first major work on koans (KAWAMURA 1986; ISHII Shūdō 1988; and HEINE 1994a). Composed in 1235, the MS is crucial for understanding the role of koans in Dōgen's religious vision throughout his career. It shows how Chinese koan interpretations helped shape the hermeneutic method in his subsequent writings, beginning with the EK 9 verse commentaries in 1236 and continuing with the 75-SH *jishu* lectures in the middle period as well as the *jōdō* sermons in the EK volumes of the late period.

#### THE CASE OF *BENDŌWA*

*Bendōwa*, now considered the first work, is crucial for both of the theo-

ries about change in the later Dōgen which hold this text up from inverted standpoints as the epitome of the ideology of the early *Shōbōgenzō*. For the Decline Theory, it expresses Dōgen's belief in a liberal, pan-Buddhist universalism embracing all people without exception (IMAEDA 1976, pp. 76-90). For the Renewal Theory it is the main example of how original enlightenment thought infiltrated into Dōgen's work in such notions as "original realization" (*honshō* 本証), "original face" (*honrai menmoku* 本来面目) and "original ground" (*honji* 本地) (HAKAMAYA 1989, pp. 327-37). However, despite DUMOULIN's statement that "the short and typical *Bendōwa* book on practice... may be taken as the first foundational section of the *Shōbōgenzō*" (1990, p. 60), this text should not be equated with the early Dōgen for several reasons. First, in the medieval period of Sōtō studies *Bendōwa* was never treated as part of the 75-SH and its question-answer format is quite different from the *jishu*-style lectures. As Dumoulin partially acknowledges, *Bendōwa* was also not included in any of the other major Kamakura/Muromachi editions of the *Shōbōgenzō*, including the 60-, 28-, and 12-fascicle versions, and its inclusion in Tokugawa editions is due mainly to the fact that it is a *kana* work. Still, this may be appear to be begging the question: even if *Bendōwa* is technically independent of the 75-SH, the issue remains whether or not it is representative of an early period of thought that was subsequently compromised, according to the Decline Theory, or unfortunately cultivated, as in the Renewal Theory.

*Bendōwa* does display some distinctive features, but these are not of sufficient import so as to construct a theory of an early Dōgen. On the one hand, it is not at all clear that the message of the text is really so different from subsequent works. *Bendōwa* is primarily dedicated to espousing the benefits of a ritualized form of *zazen* practice, a theme that was never altered or abandoned in Dōgen's exhortative works from *Fukanzazengi* to the SZ, the EK, and other later works such as *Bendōhō* 辨道法 (1245). A major issue for the Decline Theory is that *Bendōwa* seems to endorse a "refreshingly ecumenical," universal outlook embracing laypersons and women, which was later drastically changed (BIELEFELDT 1985, p. 38). However, there are just three of eighteen questions (nos. 12, 14, 15) dealing with this topic, and the role of women is mentioned only in one brief sentence that asserts the equal potentiality of all people to practice *zazen* regardless of whether they are male or female, or of high or lowly social status. The 75-SH "Raihaitokuzui" 礼拝得髓, which is the other main example in support of the role of women, was not written until 1240, already the beginning of a period of change according to the Decline Theory, and this fascicle also suggests, perhaps ironically, that demons, pillars, and

foxes are worthy representatives of the Dharma. If we take Dōgen's references throughout his career to *shukke* 出家 (renunciation, lit. "home departure" in contrast to *zaike* 在家, lay life, lit. "remaining in the home") in the gender-free sense the term implies, it seems that his treatment of nuns may never have changed.

The main point is that *Bendōwa* consistently asserts the need for sustained zazen and while it grants laypersons the ability to practice meditation, this is not necessarily a sanctification of everyday, secular life, which Dōgen consistently criticizes for producing only ephemeral, illusory benefits. Dōgen's aim is to establish the nondual doctrine of the oneness of practice-attainment (*shushō-ittō* 修証一等) in a complex ideological context formed by dealing with several important factors, including: (a) refuting the Mappō theory of the age of degeneracy, which suggests that few or perhaps even no one is capable of self-realization; (b) resolving a debate about the role of the Vinaya by asserting the priority of the Mahayana over Hinayana precepts; and (c) absorbing the influence of Sung Ch'an masters who attempted to train and convert Neo-Confucian scholar-officials (the main example of lay meditation cited in question no. 15 is a Neo-Confucian). Dōgen's position expressed here and elsewhere represents an egalitarian declaration of a universal potentiality that requires constant effort or exertion to be actualized; although everyone is capable of zazen, the monastic lifestyle is clearly more conducive for sustained practice. As Hee Jin KIM suggests, "Dōgen held, from the very beginning to the very end, that monkhood was the ideal possibility or model of the rightly transmitted Buddhism, which transcended both monkhood and laity in their ordinary senses; Dōgen's universe was envisioned in terms of monkish elitism" (1975, p. 53). According to a SZ passage from the mid 1230s, zazen practice forms the basis of all other aspects of religion: "When doing zazen," Dōgen rhetorically asks, "what precepts are not upheld and what merits are not produced?" (DZZ 1990, VII:66). In the 12-SH he argues that monastics will still attain enlightenment even if they violate the precepts. *Bendōwa* is seminal to the extent that Dōgen continued to maintain the view that all could practice zazen as demonstrated by an EK passage (7.498) from the late 1240s celebrating the isolation of Eihei-ji, "Whether they are bright or dull, wise or foolish, [Zen trainees] should dwell in steep mountains and deep valleys (DZZ 1988, IV:82)."

In addition, there are two attitudes which the Decline Theory associates with Dōgen's change in Echizen that are already in evidence in *Bendōwa* and other writings from the early period. First, Dōgen explicitly praises Ju-ching as his mentor in *Bendōwa*, *Gakudōyōjīnshū*, the SZ and the EK, and he cites a Ju-ching verse in the very first 75-SH fascicle,

“Makahannyaharamitsu” (1233). Second, Dōgen undertakes a severe and even scathing rejection of his rivals in Japan, especially the Shingon, Kegon, and Tendai schools as well as nenbutsu practitioners. Although the Decline Theory is correct in pointing out that the explicit criticism of other Zen patriarchs did not emerge until around the time of the Echizen migration, it is also clear that throughout his career Dōgen as the founder of a new Kamakura movement was pre-occupied with issues of sectarian identity and institutional integrity.

Furthermore, in contrast to the Renewal Theory’s claims about the role of original enlightenment ideology in *Bendōwa*, it must be noted that Dōgen never specifically mentions (either to endorse or to refute) *hongaku shisō* in this or any other text. Therefore, any understanding of the impact of the doctrine is based on speculating from literary clues that appear in related terms and ideas. It is true that *Bendōwa*’s use of several “*hon*-words,” as well as the notion that the practice of zazen by one person for a single instant illuminates the entire universe at all times, sound like examples of *hongaku* ideology. Yet, the text also contains the first instance of Dōgen’s criticism of the so-called Senika heresy, which resurfaces in the 75-SH “Sokushinzebutsu” (1239), for endorsing a *dhātu-vāda* way of thinking in asserting that “the body is ephemeral, yet true nature is eternal.” *Bendōwa* also cites traditional Buddhist anecdotes illustrating the function of karmic retribution, including the stories of a hunter who is punished and a prostitute who is redeemed and transformed into a nun, both of which figure prominently in several 12-SH fascicles. It should also be noted that another early text, the 75-SH “Ikkyā myōju” (1239), endorses, however briefly, the doctrine of “not obscuring causality” (*fumai inga* 不昧因果) (DZZ 1991, 1:81), or an affirmation of the inexorability of cause-and-effect, which the Renewal Theory argues did not appear until the 12-SH “Jinshin inga” which comments on Pai-chang’s “wild fox koan.”

On the other hand, even if we concede that certain aspects of *Bendōwa* are unique when compared to subsequent works, it appears that some changes along the lines suggested by the two theories began shortly thereafter and became especially noticeable as soon as the Kōshō-ji monks’ hall opened in 1236. At that point, Dōgen began writing instructions on monastic ritual, including two 75-SH fascicles, “Senjō” and “Senmen” (both 1239), which deal with washing the body. In addition, the SZ, which is from the Kōshō-ji period, contains several passages critical of laypersons. For example, when asked whether laypersons responsible for corruption or conflict can remove their transgressions by confessing or giving offerings to monks, Dōgen

responds by saying that any misfortune arising from the situation “is not the fault of the monastics or of Buddhism but it is the laymen themselves who are in error” (DZZ 1990, VII: 79). Moreover, there are no further references after 1231 to *hon*-words, in either a positive or negative sense, although other features of Tendai *hongaku* imagery are frequently used throughout the *Shōbōgenzō*, including the 75- and the 12-fascicle editions.

#### THE DIVERSITY OF THE EARLY KOAN TEXTS

Because of their retrospective standpoint that overemphasizes the role of *Bendōwa*, the theories tend to obscure a balanced approach to understanding the diverse developments of the early period, including both what Dōgen did and did not produce. It is clear that in the 1230s Dōgen was not yet crafting a large corpus that would eventually be included in the 75-SH—a literary activity that did not really get under way until the next (or middle) period. This appears to be a rather glaring absence in the production from the early period when considered in light of both theories. During this time Dōgen wrote just six fascicles (only three if we regard 1239 a transitional year), and half of these are anomalous, including the two on ritual washing cited above, which are among the lengthiest of all the 75-SH fascicles, in addition to “Genjōkōan,” which was a letter to a layman from Kyūshū.<sup>5</sup> Thus, there was no consistent, let alone systematic, expression of a universalism thesis in an “early” *Shōbōgenzō*.

All but the two fascicles dealing with ritual focus on interpreting koan cases, an indication that one of the main developments in the early period that is overlooked in both theories was the composition of koan texts. The single most important, though somewhat enigmatic, koan text is the MS collection of three hundred cases, which introduces the title *Shōbōgenzō* (Chn. *Cheng-fa yen-tsang*) borrowed from the collection of Ta-hui, who Dōgen later severely criticizes. The MS is a list of traditional cases without commentary, but the majority of the cases in this collection became the basis for extensive prose and verse interpretations in subsequent writings. Now that the authenticity of the text is confirmed, the two main questions that have been addressed in recent scholarship pertain to the influences it reflected and generated: (1) what was the major source from which Dōgen selected his choices from among the various Sung records containing the anecdotes and dialogues that form the basis for almost all koans;

<sup>5</sup> The fact that there are no more letters in Dōgen’s corpus may support the Decline Theory view of an indifference to laypersons, but the absence occurs before Echizen. Ta-hui, on the other hand, specialized in composing letters to lay disciples.



and (2) what was the purpose of the MS, collected in 1235, and its impact on Dōgen's writings that contain koan commentaries?


The question about sources is important for understanding the influences Dōgen received in China as well as how he viewed the nature of the transmission to Japan. A key feature of Dōgen's role is that he was the first disseminator of koans in the history of Japanese Zen. Legend reports that Dōgen brought the *Pi-yen lu* to Japan in a version he copied in a single night before his departure from China in 1227, which is known in Japanese as the "one night *Hekiganroku*" (*ichiya Hekiganroku* 一夜碧巖錄), supposedly guided by the deity of Hakusan 百山, the sacred mountain near which Eihei-ji is located. This report is probably not valid historically, although there is a manuscript which some claim to be authentic, but it serves as a symbol of Dōgen's intense involvement in koan studies. Interestingly enough, the MS does not actually contain any koans corresponding to those in the *Hekiganroku* (ISHII 1988, p. 572). Like the compilers of the major Sung collections, the *Pi-yen lu* (1128), the *Ts'ung-jung lu* (Jpn. *Shōyōroku*, 1224) and the *Wu-men-kuan* 無門関 (Jpn. *Mumonkan*, 1228), Dōgen culled koan cases from "transmission of the lamp" writings. According to Kagamishima and Kawamura Kōdō, the primary source for the MS, as for the Chinese koan collections, was the first of the transmission texts, the *Ching-te chuan-teng lu* 景德伝燈錄 (Jpn. *Keitoku dentōroku*, 1004) [hereafter CTL], which is a conservative work that was written on the emperor's commission and consists of hagiographical materials on the entire lineage of patriarchs in a refined, baroque style (KAGAMISHIMA 1994, pp. 61–92). However, Ishii Shūdō and Ishii Seijun argue that the main source was a different transmission of the lamp text, the *Tsung-men tung-yao chi* 宗門統要集 (Jpn. *Shūmon tōyōshū*, c. 1100) [hereafter TYC] (ISHII Shūdō 1988, pp. 532–45 and ISHII Seijun 1987). The TYC, on which the better known *Tsung-men lien-teng hui-yao* 宗門聯燈會要 (Jpn. *Shūmon rentōeyō*, 1166) was patterned, was composed not for official reasons but as a study tool in monastic training. It is a rather unconventional representative of the genre which limits the hagiographical passages to the opening sections and continues for the remainder of the voluminous text with an extensive listing of koans minus either historical background material or philosophical commentary. The TYC was the main transmission text consulted by the Huang-lung 黃龍 (Jpn. *ōryō*) school of the Rinzai sect in which Eisai became the first Japanese patriarch, and it is possible that Dōgen was influenced by this work during the time of his early, pre-China studies at Kennin-ji temple founded by Eisai in Kyoto. The bottom line of the controversy, regardless of how it might be resolved, is that Dōgen inherited a rich, expansive body of traditional koan cases

(*kosoku-kōan*) that was shared by different texts and schools but that also gave rise to diverse and often highly factionalized interpretations and styles of composition.

There is an even more complex dispute, as indicated in Table 3, in regard to the purpose of the MS or why and for whom it was compiled. Kagamishima and Ishii Seijun maintain that Dōgen collected the MS for instructional purposes and that it lacks commentary because it was used in a setting of private, individual teaching sessions so that no written comments were required. It was not until the following years that Dōgen realized that he needed to record his koan interpretations for posterity, either by writing them out prior to oral delivery or by having his remarks transcribed by disciples. According to Kagamishima the MS was intended specifically for Jakuen 寂円, the Chinese monk who had been a fellow disciple of Ju-ching. Jakuen came to Japan as a follower of Dōgen in the early 1230s and probably expected the teaching there to resemble the Sung style. But Ishii Seijun, citing a passage from an EK *hōgo* (Dharma-talk) lecture (8.4) from the mid-1230s, maintains that the MS was not targeting any particular person but was a base for giving instructions on koan learning to a wide variety of followers, including advanced monks, novices and laypersons whose identities are no longer known (ISHII Seijun 1994, pp. 61–62 and DZZ 1988 IV:146–48). On the other hand, Kawamura and Ishii Shūdō see the MS as part of Dōgen's preparations for writing elaborate koan commentarial texts. For Kawamura (as well as TSUNODA Tairyū) the MS can be regarded as a series of notes or memos Dōgen kept in preparing for the *Shōbōgenzō*. But Ishii Shūdō points out that it is also necessary to consider the role of the EK 9's verse comments (*juko*) on koans written just one year after the MS as a bridge linking the MS and the 75-SH texts. Of the ninety cases included in the EK 9, sixty-five appear first in the MS (ISHII Shūdō 1988, pp. 572–76). Following up on the notion of bridge texts, Ishii Seijun also emphasizes that many of the koans cited in the MS and EK 9 appear in the early *jōdō* sermons included in EK 1 (ISHII Seijun 1994, pp. 65–67).

A compromise view combining the insights of the four scholars sees the MS as the beginning of a long process in which Dōgen was crafting a variety of texts appropriate to the different levels and perspectives of his followers. During this period, he was joined by two key disciples, in addition to Jakuen, who would go on to be the main editors and interpreters throughout his career and beyond his lifetime. One was Ejō, the first of the former Daruma-shū members to join him in 1234, whose editing credits include the SZ as well as the 75-SH and 12-SH and part of the EK texts. The other was Senne 詮慧, whose back-

Table 3. MS: Sources and Purposes



ground was in Tendai thought and who edited several of the mid-1230s works including EK 1 and EK 9. After Dōgen's death he became the main commentator on the 75-SH whose works interpreting the text helped give it such a prominent position in the history of Sōtō studies. But it is also important to keep in mind the increasing numbers of disciples who arrived once the Kōshō-ji monks' hall was opened. Although before this time Dōgen might have had time for private tutoring sessions, as Kagamishima and Ishii Seijun suggest, after 1236 he needed to find ways to address larger audiences and looked to the recorded sayings texts of his Sung predecessors, especially Hung-chih, as models.<sup>6</sup> First, he tried his hand at *kanbun* verse comments yet he never wrote *jakugo* commentary, the "capping phrases" or layer of interlinear verses commenting on other prose and poetic comments that are featured in the *Pi-yen lu* and *Ts'ung-jung lu* as well

<sup>6</sup> The *Hung-chih kuang-lu* (Jpn. *Wanshi kōroku*, in T 48:1–121) consists of nine volumes: 1) *jōdō* and *shōsan*; 2) *juko* and *nenko*; 3) *nenko*; 4) *jōdō* and *jishu*; 5) *shōsan*; 6) *hōgo*; 7–9) poetry; see SARAI 1980.

as by leading Rinzai masters in Japan. Again, the absences are telling for Dōgen also never wrote prose commentary (*nenko*) on koans and after the experiment of EK 9 he did not return to the *juko* style. It is possible that Dōgen was not fully confident in his ability to create certain commentarial styles in literary Chinese, although throughout his career he did compose other styles of *kanbun* poetry, contained in EK 10, emphasizing lyrical, natural, and meditative themes. The sermons in EK 1-7 also contain some verse commentaries on the main lectures.

By the late 1230s, the two main influences from Sung sources reflected in Dōgen's works were formal *jōdō* sermons and various kinds of informal general lectures delivered in vernacular (known variously as *shōsan*, the only one mentioned in the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*, and *fusetsu* 普說, *bansan* 晚參, or *jishu* styles). The *jōdō* style, in which the master addresses the congregation from the high seat in the Dharma hall or Buddha hall, was delivered in the daytime according to a strictly prescribed schedule on New Years, new and full moon, Vesak and other ceremonial occasions, including memorials.<sup>7</sup> This kind of sermon was usually fairly brief and often included a demonstrative gesture. For example, among the records of T'ang leaders such as Lin-chi and Te-shan there are many examples of masters striking, shouting at, or slapping disciples, or of precocious disciples performing these acts on their teachers. In the EK, Dōgen sometimes draws circles in the air or throws down his stick or *hossu*. The *jōdō* can also include formal verse comments on koans but in general they do not so much explain or interpret koan cases as allude to their meaning by evoking a key phrase, such as, to cite some of Dōgen's favorites, "mind itself is Buddha" from a Ma-tsu dialogue or the "red-bearded barbarian" from a Pai-chang dialogue. The various informal lecture styles, which also followed a schedule though not as strictly, were often delivered at night in the abbot's quarters or some other convenient place to a select group of either advanced disciples seeking intensive instruction or more introductory students. Lay disciples might be in attendance at either the formal or informal addresses, but it was more likely that wealthy patrons would come to hear the public, ceremonial *jōdō* and that those interested in philosophy would attend the private, pedagogical *jishu*. The informal lecture styles offered a forum for lengthier and more detailed discourses on the intricacies of koan interpretation often featuring paradoxical wordplay and other literary

<sup>7</sup> The *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei* indicates that *jōdō* should take place five times a month, on the first, fifth, tenth, fifteenth, and twenty-fifth, with *shōsan* taking place six times, on the third, eighth, thirteenth, eighteenth, twenty-third, and twenty-eighth. While Dōgen generally stuck to those days, he usually only gave three lectures a month (see ISHII 1994, p. 80-81), and also included some other occasions.

techniques used in a poetic atmosphere, sometimes with the composition of verse. As demonstrated in the recorded sayings of Ta-hui and numerous other Sung masters, the informal sermons often gave the abbot a chance to present in a frank, caustic manner comments that were fiercely critical of rival or erroneous viewpoints, though these generally targeted doctrines and did not identify particular persons.

Although the Decline and Renewal theories do not attempt to track the evolution or assess the variety of Dōgen's literary styles, the main development by the end of the decade was that Dōgen had begun giving both *jōdō* and informal lectures on a fairly regular basis. The latter style took priority over the next five years, after which it was replaced by the former. The majority of colophons refer to the 75-SH fascicles as *jishu*, which literally means making pointers before a general assembly, but this really indicates a hybrid style that is at once consistent with yet somewhat different from the way the term is used in Sung collections for several reasons. First, Dōgen composed in *kana*, which allowed for an additional level of wordplay, comparable to the inter-linear function of *jakugo* 著語 in *kanbun* texts, in commenting on the Japanese pronunciation of Chinese script. Also, by writing thematic essays that used koan cases as illustrative of doctrinal topics rather than the exclusive focus of analysis—thereby inverting the structure of koan collections—Dōgen developed a teaching style that tried to recapture the original, spontaneous flavor of the dialogical exchanges that form the core of most koans. He eliminated hermeneutic, epistemological, or psychological distances between interpreter and the material being interpreted as well as the disciples receiving instruction. This was a style that afforded a direct, dynamic interplay with the sources, neither merely enunciating nor pronouncing judgment on koans but transmitting them with a genuine sense of give-and-take. In so doing, Dōgen entered into the Alice-in-Wonderland-like, upside down, duplicitous world in which insults are praise and slaps are gestures of kindness, and like his Sung predecessors he often deliberately revised or altered the source dialogues with creative, critical comments about what the participants could, should or would have said.

### *The Middle Period*

The middle period begins with the routinization of the delivery of the *jishu* style in 1240 and extends for five or six years until these lectures were terminated by the middle of the decade. During this period Dōgen did not create more koan collections but he continued to use numerous koan cases cited in earlier texts (MS, EK 1, EK 9, SZ) as the basis for interpreting various issues on Zen theory and practice. This

period has long been viewed by sectarian scholars and modern philosophers such as Tanabe Hajime and Nishitani Keiji as the supreme accomplishment that established Dōgen's reputation. According to the Decline Theory, however, the period as a whole was marked by a stark reversal from the universal outlook in Dōgen's early works that was compounded by a tendency toward strident partisan polemic following the Echizen migration. The Decline Theory, by showing how Dōgen singled out specific lineages for harsh criticism while lavishly praising Ju-ching, is a good corrective to apologetic approaches which see the 75-SH only as a pristine, autonomous expression of philosophy unconditioned by the vicissitudes of historical circumstance. Yet, the question remains whether the theory goes too far in charging that Dōgen, "late and sudden[ly]," developed a "startling new doctrine" that is "vexing" because it reveals a formerly eminent Zen master who had slumped into a deep "depression" or even "sinility" that clouded all the words and deeds for the last major segment of his life (BIELEFELDT 1985, pp. 38, 32, 43; DUMOULIN 1990, p. 62; and YANAGIDA 1976, pp. 81–83).

#### HISTORICAL CRITICISMS OF THE DECLINE THEORY

Despite its attempt to stress the role of history over pure abstraction, the Decline Theory is plagued by a problematic approach to historical issues in several respects: 1) a misrepresentation of the chronology of the highly compressed period of the 75-SH writing and an inconsistency about when the late period began in contrast to the early works, which results in 2) a one-sided, selective reading of multilevelled religious texts that also reflects 3) a weddedness to a politicized understanding of the reasons behind the Echizen migration and a tendency to interpolate psychological motives for complex, ambiguous historical situations, leading finally to 4) a failure to recognize or interpret the full range of writings in the late, post-*Shōbōgenzō* corpus.

First, the Decline Theory stumbles in misrepresenting the chronology of the composition of the 75-SH, as indicated in the following comment:

This collection, widely regarded as Dōgen's magnum opus and a masterpiece of religious writing, is often treated as a single work, but it must be remembered that it is not more than a random collection—or more properly, several such collections—of independent texts, and that the composition of these texts, the bulk of which were first presented in the form of lectures, spans a period of some two decades, covering almost the entirety of Dōgen's teaching career.

(BIELEFELDT 1985, p. 28)

Bielefeldt is correct in his assessment of the dispersed and fragmentary nature of the text, but the remark that it is “not more than a random collection” because it spanned “a period of some two decades” is too strong. It is technically true that “Genjōkōan” was revised as late as 1252 and that the final *jishu* lecture contained in the 12-SH, “Hachidainingaku,” was written in 1253 (but this was an anomalous text primarily influenced not by koans but by the *Yuikyōgyō* 遺教經 [T No. 389] which purported to express the last injunctions of the Buddha). However, the implication that there was a lengthy time span encompassing a prolonged early as well as a prolonged late period is vitiated by the fact that sixty-three fascicles of the 75-SH were written between 1240 and spring 1244; as highlighted by Table 4, all but three fascicles (or 4%) are from 1239–1246 and only six were written at Eihei-ji during one year.

Therefore, the following remark by DUMOULIN is also misleading: “(t)he work he did in Kōshō-ji shows Dōgen at the peak of his life. Toward the end of the decade we see signs of a change in the making” (1989, p. 61). The problem here is that the “peak,” which refers to fascicles such as “Raihaitokuzui” which is favorable to women, did not actually occur until 1240–1241 when the “end of the decade... change” would have already taken place.

The Decline Theory often cannot make up its mind about when the late period began, and it refers to fascicles written prior to Echizen as either early or late depending on whether or not they reflect a partisan outlook that substantiates the theory of reversal. For example, Bielefeldt cites “Shisho” as a late fascicle even though it was composed in 1241. He also says that “Gyōji,” a fascicle that is relatively free of polemic, was written “as late as 1242,” but on the next page he refers to “Daigo,” which is critical of Lin-chi, as being written “as early as...1242” (BIELEFELDT 1985, pp. 34, 35). The fact is that the late Echizen period—at least as the term is used by the Decline Theory—lasts a total of eight months, from the eighth month in 1243 when the migration was completed to the third month/ninth day in 1244 when construction of Daibutsu-ji began. During this time twenty-eight fascicles, or over one-third of the entire 75-SH corpus, were recorded primarily at the Kippō-ji and Yamashibu-dera temples, temporary rural hermitages where Dōgen and his followers holed up for a long winter hiatus. No more fascicles were written in 1244, and the six fascicles written in the following year or so (five in 1245 and one in 1246) do not exhibit the features that come under criticism. Thus, it is certainly possible to view this brief period as a creative peak, perhaps the greatest in Dōgen’s career, rather than a time of decline. It was also the

**Table 4. 75-Fascicle *Shōbōgenzō***

(fascicle number in parenthesis)

1233 [2]	Makahannyaharamitsu (2), Genjōkōan (1) <sup>①</sup>
1238 [1]	Ikkya myōju (7)
1239 [3]	Sokushinzebutsu (5), Senjō (54), Senmen (50)
1240 [6]	Raihaitokuzui (28), Keiseisanshoku (25), Shoakumakusa (31), Sansuikyō (29), Uji (20), Den'e (32)
1241 [9]	Busso (52), Shisho (39), Shinfukatoku (8), Kokyō (19), Kankin (30), Busshō (3), Gyōbutsuigi (6), Bukkyō [Buddhist Teachings] (34), Jinzū (35)
1242 [16]	Daigo (10), Zazenshin (12), Butsukōjōji (26), Immo (17), Gyōji (16), Kaiinzanmai (13), Juki (21), Kannon (18), Arakan (36), Hakujuishi (40), Kōmyō (15), Shinjingakudō (4), Muchūsetsumu (27), Dōtoku (33), Gabyō (24), Zenki (22) <sup>①</sup>
1243 [22]	Tsuki (23), Kūge (14), Kobusshin (9) <sup>②</sup> , Kattō (38) // <i>Move to Echizen in 7th month</i> // Sangaiyuishin (41), Butsudō (44), Mitsugo (45), Shohōjissō (43), Bukkyō [Buddhist Sutras] (47), Mujōseppō (46), Menjū (51), Hōsshō (48), Baika (53), Jippō (55), Kenbutsu (56) <sup>③</sup> , Hensan (57) <sup>③</sup> , Zazengi (11), Ganzei (58) <sup>③</sup> , Kajō, (59) <sup>③</sup> , Ryūgin (61) <sup>③</sup> , Sesshinsesshō (42), Darani (49)
1244 [10]	Soshiseiraii (62) <sup>④</sup> , Udonge (64), Hotsumujōshin (63), Nyoraizenshin (65), Zanmai-ōzanmai (66), Sanjūshichihon bodai-bunpō (60), Tenbōrin (67), Jishōzanmai (69), Daishugyō (68), Shunjū (37) <sup>④</sup> // <i>Last fascicle by 3/9</i>
1245 [5]	Kokū (70), Ho-u (71), Ango (72), Tashintsū (73), Ōsakusendaba (74)
1246 [1]	Shukke (75)

Note: 1233–1243 (7/1)—at Kōshō-ji; 1243 9 (8/1)–44—at Kippō-ji; 1245–1253—at Daibutsu-ji/Eiheiji

① delivered to laypersons, ② at an outside temple, ③ at Yamashibudera, ④ at a mountain retreat

A breakdown of when the 75-SH fascicles were written to show how this activity was compressed into a few years, with the writing ending completely by 1246. The number in parenthesis after the title indicates the fascicle number, and the number in brackets after the date indicates the total compositions for the given year. Note that the fascicle number at times does and at times does not correspond to the sequence of composition. There may be some minor differences with other comparable lists due to undated or rewritten manuscripts and to variant editions. For a list of the contents of the 12-fascicle *Shōbōgenzō*, see Table 5 below.



period during which Dōgen created the bulk of his Japanese and Chinese poetry collections celebrating the natural splendor of Echizen and particularly Hakusan (HEINE 1997). In any case, just as the Decline Theory is vague about the extent of the early period, it leaves obscure the issue of the duration and termination of the “late” period. The question of why Dōgen abandoned the 75-SH in the mid-1240s and concentrated on the EK *jōdō* sermons goes unnoticed and unaddressed. Furthermore, the Decline Theory does not deal with the fact that Dōgen cites Lin-chi in a very positive way in the 12-SH “Shukke kudoku” (ed. 1255), which was written later than its version of what constitutes the late period. Also in a passage in EK 7.437 from the final years Dōgen argues that “the unsurpassable right transmission of the buddhas and patriarchs is not delimited by a notion of a Zen sect (DZZ 1988, IV: 74).”

This is not to deny, however, that there are some 75-SH passages that seem reprehensible for the way they treat Lin-chi and, especially, Ta-hui; the most egregious example is “Jishōsanmai,” which is disingenuously skeptical about the authenticity of the latter’s transmission. Once again we may appear to be begging the question. If the Decline Theory is basically correct that the *Shōbōgenzō* is increasingly infected by strident polemic as Dōgen’s thought continued to deteriorate, even if it is unclear about the date that the change of heart transpired, then perhaps its only mistake lies in failing to condemn the entire 75-SH or the writings of the middle period both before and after the Echizen migration. However, the theory is undermined by several other aspects of its interpretation. First, it does not take into account that the nature of the *jishu* style, as evidenced by the recorded sayings texts of Ta-hui and other Sung Ch’an masters, fosters the kind of frank repudiation of opponents expressed by Dōgen. At the same time, the Decline Theory sometimes misses the playful, tongue-in-cheek tone of Dōgen’s writing, as in a “Daishugyō” passage which casts doubt on the fox metamorphosis recorded in the “wild fox koan” (*Wu-men-kuan* no. 2) by arguing that if all masters who made mistakes were so transformed, then Lin-chi, Te-Shan, and their followers would surely have been turned into vulpine shapes (DUMOULIN 1990, p. 65).<sup>8</sup>

But the main problem is that the theory tends to be overly selective with the material it considers deficient, often offering a one-sided reading that takes certain passages out of context and exaggerates their importance while suppressing other evidence. For example, the “Butsudō” fascicle is criticized for supporting the Tung-shan lineage

<sup>8</sup> BIELEFELDT 1985, p. 35, refers to this as a “passing gibe.”

leading to the Sōtō sect while refuting lineages stemming from Lin-chi that influenced the rivals Dōgen was trying to dissuade or convert (BIELEFELDT 1985, p. 35). But a close reading reveals that the real aim of the text, consistent with *Bendōwa*, is to show that the existence of true Zen is ontologically prior to fragmented genealogies, and it cites both Tung-shan and Lin-chi in parallel ways to emphasize that neither of the masters stressed the role of sectarian lineages so that designations such as Rinzai-shū or Sōtō-shū are erroneous (DZZ 1991, I:471-88, esp. 477), a notion confirmed by some historical studies of Sung Zen (FOULK 1993). Similarly, the theory criticizes “Shisho” (written, once again, before the migration) for the way it scoffs at Lin-chi but the fascicle really targets his “remote followers” (*onson* 遠孫) who “nowadays” (*ima*) misrepresent their teacher; in other words, it warns against rogue factions rather than Lin-chi himself or his legitimate lineage (DZZ 1991, I:428).


In general, the Decline Theory does not discuss how the passages in question are contained in fascicles that deal with a variety of themes, including the role of language and the meaning of time, and offer diverse messages concerning the question of what constitutes authentic, legitimate Dharma transmission. In “Shisho,” “Menjū” and other fascicles Dōgen is concerned to warn his followers against relying on either false prophets, such as priests not ordained in China, or on the external paraphernalia of religiosity, whether sūtras or relics. Dōgen is intent on declaring that he himself, who returned “empty-handed” (though not empty-headed) from his apprenticeship with Ju-ching, according to EK 1.48 (EK 1.1 in some editions of the text) is a distinctive and genuine Dharma-heir deserving of disciples. This was not necessarily an inappropriate claim given the religious climate in early Kamakura Japan, especially in the countryside, and the way these sentiments echo the teachings of Lin-chi (not to mention the Buddha).

#### ON THE ECHIZEN MIGRATION

This question about the Decline Theory’s view of the sequence and content of texts brings us back to the issue that forms the linchpin of the theory, that is, the question of why Dōgen left Kyoto for Echizen. This event is portrayed as a disappointing, even devastating defeat for the aspiring, ambitious Zen master, who had been on the verge of great success in the capital and was probably accompanied only by a small band of followers and forced to evangelize a reluctant, uneducated rural audience. The Decline Theory has made an extremely valuable contribution in showing that Dōgen’s writing at the time of

the migration was motivated by, or at least cannot be dissociated from, the political factors surrounding the move. But, does this lead to a conclusion that a partisan drive lay at the heart of much of the 75-SH rhetoric? The problem is that the historical events are complex and poorly recorded. Some of the theory's assumptions are undermined by recent research; for example, a political text supposedly penned by Dōgen in 1241 to plead the Sōtō cause before a local official, the *Gokokushōbōgi* 護國正法義, now appears to be either apocryphal or a fiction; there are no extant editions, and it is never referred to in other writings by Dōgen or his biographies, only briefly in external histories (BODIFORD 1993, p. 28). Furthermore, we simply do not know, and we will most likely never discover, what Dōgen or others were thinking. Dōgen may have felt frustration and disillusionment when he first moved—if so, Dumoulin's characterization of his state of depression has merit, although in the end it is nothing more than a psychological interpretation based on inference and speculation. In contrast to this standpoint, however, the only autobiographical reference, an EK passage (2.128), suggests the opposite view that with the founding of Daibutsu-ji/Eihei-ji Dōgen experienced exhilaration and joy at the opportunity to preach the Dharma as he had learned it in China (DZZ 1988, III:72–74).

There are several ways of interpreting the migration. The traditional, sectarian explanation, which can be referred to as the Withdrawal Hypothesis, is that the move was motivated by Dōgen's longing, based on heeding an admonition from his mentor, to escape the corruption and turmoil of the capital (which is so eloquently described in Chōmei's 長明 *Hōjō-ki* 方丈記, 1212) and to establish an ideal monastic community in the natural splendor of Echizen. Yet, sectarian scholars have also long been well aware that Dōgen, as the leader of a new movement, was embroiled in a political conflict with the Tendai establishment on Mt. Hiei and may in fact have been driven away from Kyoto. These scholars portray Dōgen sympathetically as a heroic victim who eventually rose above his opponents, in part through the patronage of Hatano Yoshishige 波多野義重, in whose domain Eihei-ji was built. Whereas the Withdrawal Hypothesis emphasizes the role of Dōgen's personal choice, the Decline Theory's view, which can be referred to as the Desperation Hypothesis, sees Dōgen first embattled and defeated by the triumph of Enni's Rinzaï sect and the imposing structures of Tōfuku-ji and then reduced to an ambivalent, never really comfortable association with his Daruma-shū followers, some of whom may have had mixed loyalties. However, since many of the former members of the controversial Daruma-shū, such as Gikai 義介 who hailed from Echizen, came to Dōgen in 1241 while he was still at



**Map 1.** Locates the Hokuriku region where Sōtō Zen spread after the founding of Eihei-ji in the vicinity of Hakusan, the sacred mountain near Echizen province. Also locates two other important sacred mountains: Hiei-san (Mt. Hiei), the center of Tendai Buddhism, and Sekidōzan in the Noto peninsula.

Kōshō-ji, it is possible that Dōgen was persecuted in Kyoto (if that is the case) because of this connection rather than that he turned to the newcomers' support out of desperation once he fled the capital. At the end of *Bendōwa* Dōgen acknowledges that in his country all Buddhist sects are "subject to Imperial sanction" (DZZ 1993, II:555).


A third view proposed by Imaeda Aishin shifts the focus away from the circumstances surrounding the flight from Kyoto to the question of what attracted Dōgen to the new area. This view, which can be

referred to as the Hakusan Tendai Hypothesis, follows up on the idea that Dōgen already had significant links to Echizen through Hatano and Gikai. First, Imaeda points out that according to traditional biographies, before he ever practiced Zen or experienced his “doubt” about *hongaku shisō* at the Tendai center at Enryaku-ji on Mt. Hiei, Dōgen had studied under abbot Kōin at Onjō-ji (or Miidera), just east of Kyoto, which was the center of another Tendai subsect, the Jimon-ha 寺門派, that had long engaged in intense political and even military conflict with Enryaku-ji’s dominant Sanmon-ha 山門派 (see also COLLCUTT 1981, pp. 52–53). According to Imaeda—and it must be pointed out that this part of his argument does not seem to be sup-

ported or refuted by mainstream scholarship in Kamakura Buddhist studies—the branch of the Tendai church in Hakusan centered at Heisen-ji temple was affiliated with Onjō-ji. Several of the Daruma-shū followers who joined Dōgen at Kōshō-ji studied at Hajaku-ji near Heisen-ji, and may well have passed through Onjō-ji on their way to Fukakusa. Thus, Imaeda maintains that Dōgen moved mainly in order to establish a connection with Hakusan Tendai, which was an alternative institution that provided some relief from problems suffered at the hands of the main church on Mt. Hiei (IMAEDA 1976, pp. 146–54). As shown in Maps 2 and 3, the Hakusan Tendai network, which extended from the northwest region (Hokuriku) to Lake Biwa’s northeast shores, was based at Heisen-ji, the point of embarkation for mountain pilgrimages, which was less than 25 km. from Eihei-ji and even closer to Kippō-ji and Yamashibu-dera. Kichijōzan, renamed by



**Map 2.** A closeup of the Hokuriku region, subdivided into two main areas: the Echizen mountains and the Noto peninsula. Adapted from IMAEDA 1966, p. 181.



**Map 3.** A closeup of the Echizen mountains showing, according to some theories, the geomantic lines linking the peaks in the area, as well as five important temples. Adapted from IMAEDA 1976, p. 147, and IMAEDA 1966, p. 47.


Dōgen from the original name Sanshō after his return from Kamakura, was probably part of the Hakusan network of sacrality.

The Hakusan Tendai Hypothesis is a variation of the Desperation Hypothesis associated with the Decline Theory in arguing that Dōgen went to Echizen primarily out of political weakness. A compromise standpoint, suggested by Satō Shunkō, builds on Imaeda's emphasis on the role of Hakusan but steers the discussion back to the notion of choice. This view, which can be referred to as the Hakusan Shinkō Hypothesis, stresses that in addition to possible affiliations with the Tendai church, and after all it is really not clear where Hakusan Tendai stood in relation to the religious battles in the capital, Dōgen was probably influenced by the entire environment of religiosity of the Hakusan region (or Hakusan *shinkō* 百山信仰), including a wide variety of yamabushi practices and folk beliefs such as geomancy which were gradually absorbed into the Sōtō-shū (SATŌ 1990–1991; BODIFORD 1993, pp. 114–15; FAURE 1993, p. 166, n. 27; and FAURE 1996). For example, as illustrated in Map 4, Satō examines how the

sect spread to Yōkō-ji and Sōji-ji temples, both founded by Keizan in the Noto peninsula along geomantic lines at the base of Sekidōzan, a sacred mountain associated with Hakusan *shinkō*. It is also interesting to note how Hakusan and Sekidōzan stand in a direct line on a 45-degree angle northeast of Mt. Hiei (see Map 1).

It may be, partially in contrast to and partially in support of Imaeda's argument, that there were alliances between the Hakusan Tendai and both factions in the capital. Extending from this, it is possible to consider that Dōgen actually moved to Echizen with the consent (or even at the request) of the Kyoto religious establishment; perhaps an arrangement was worked out such

that Dōgen was assigned or awarded the Hakusan area as a site for evangelization. Satō further analyzes in detail the evolution of the legend in Muromachi era hagiographies that the Hakusan *gongen* 權現 (avatar of Buddha) guided Dōgen's copying of the *ichiya Hekiganroku* just prior to his return from China. The role of Hakusan *shinkō* will undoubtedly be a major topic in future Sōtō studies. For the most part, its impact has been attributed to post-Dōgen leaders, particularly Keizan and his followers who began the rapid expansion of the sect. But the point here is that even if Dōgen was in effect kicked out of Kyoto due to political factors, as the Decline Theory argues, his decision to head for Echizen has proved to be a shrewd maneuver from an institutional standpoint. Furthermore, it appears that at least some of Dōgen's writings in the late period may have been geared to accommodate an audience accustomed to features of Hakusan religiosity, including the cult of arhats (*rakan* 羅漢) and mountain numinosity.



**Map 4.** A closeup of the Noto peninsula where Keizan spread Sōtō Zen in the early 14th century. Adapted from SATŌ 1990–1991: VIII: 30.

*The Late Period*

Like the early but unlike the middle stage, the late period is marked by a diversity in literary production, which falls into several categories: the EK collection of *jōdō* sermons; the 12-SH reworking of the *jishu* lectures; the ES collection of ritual texts; several short texts celebrating the manifestations of Buddhist deities; and the *Hōkyō-ki* remembrances of Ju-ching (if that is considered a late text). Many of these works are finally beginning to get the scholarly attention they deserve, and much of this scholarly activity has been instigated by the Decline and Renewal theories. On the other hand, the theories tend to focus exclusively on a single category of texts without paying attention to the entire production, thereby offering a one-sided view of the period. The Decline Theory leaves the reader with the impression that once Dōgen underwent a deteriorating change upon arriving in Echizen he continued a downward spiral till the end of his life. It suggests that there were no further major developments or alterations, which is not the case, and that the only serious focus was on ritual in the ES collection (another Tokugawa era construction), which is only partially true.<sup>9</sup> The Renewal Theory, which overlooks the significance of texts other than the 12-SH, maintains that the only real change in Dōgen's entire life occurred after the Kamakura mission, a trip which the Decline Theory argues "seems to have come to naught" (BIELEFELDT 1985, p. 53 n. 20).

Both theories do an admirable job in relativizing and contextualizing the importance of the 75-SH. But the Decline Theory fails to raise the question of why one of the great experiments in the history of Japanese letters, even according to its own rather skeptical assessment, came to such an abrupt end—and with it the *partisan attacks*. By avoiding this issue, the Decline Theory does not report that the period of Dōgen's intense criticism of rivals was short-lived and did not occur again. Nor does it indicate that Eihei-ji worship did not neglect lay followers or women (as both monastics, *shukke-sha*, and laypersons, *zaike-sha*), but frequently included villagers along with local officials at precept recitation ceremonies for monks and nuns, during which miraculous apparitions were often said to appear (BODIFORD 1993, p. 32). The theory does not attempt to show that there are several possible explanations for the termination of the 75-SH. It may be, for example, that Dōgen at this stage of his career did not realize how

<sup>9</sup> The ES collection consists of six volumes: Tenzokyōkun (1237), *Bendōhō* (1245), Fushukuhampō (1246), Kichijōzan Eihei-ji shuryō shingi (1249), *Taidaiko* (1244), Nihonkoku Echizen Eihei-ji chiji shingi (1246).



significant his writings would prove for posterity. Or, it could be that he lost the inspiration for the sustained argumentation characteristic of the *jishu* style, or that he became turned off to this kind of presentation because despite certain advantages it brought to the surface a tendency toward hyper-critical rhetoric. We must also consider that Dōgen may have continued to deliver but chose not to record *jishu* lectures because they were intended for a resumption of the one-on-one private instruction begun at Kōshō-ji. Or perhaps there were manuscripts from this period that were lost or destroyed. As Ejō writes in the colophon to the posthumously discovered *Hōkyō-ki*, “As I began drafting this, I wondered whether there might be still other [manuscripts] that have not been discovered. I am concerned that [the record of] his unlimited achievements may be incomplete, and in my sadness fall 100,000 tears” (DZZ 1990, VII: 48).

Perhaps Dōgen himself never considered the 75-SH his main achievement, or perhaps he saw it as a part of a larger goal, such as the collection of one hundred fascicles, which was his fondest wish according to Ejō’s colophon found in one of the manuscripts of “Hachidaingaku” (DZZ 1993, II: 458 and SUGIO 1985). While the Decline Theory conflates the end of the middle with the late period, the Renewal Theory understands that the 75-SH was rooted in a stage of Dōgen’s career from which he went on to a final and perhaps in his mind more decisive period. For the Renewal Theory, the key transition is from the composition of the 75-SH to the 12-SH. According to this theory, the emphasis in the latter text on a strict interpretation of karmic causality as a refutation of *hongaku shisō* must have always been in the back of Dōgen’s mind during his earlier writing, but it did not emerge emphatically as the key element in his philosophical vision until he was disturbed by the fusion of Zen and warrior culture, and consequent rationalization of violence and killing, during his visit to Kamakura.

#### HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE RENEWAL THEORY

However, the Renewal Theory is problematic in its historical research for several reasons. First, the 12-SH, the existence of which was long suspected but not confirmed until 1930, is a difficult text to date. The colophons of nine fascicles, as shown in Table 5, state that they were edited by Ejō two years after Dōgen death but they do not give an indication of when they were first written. Of the five fascicles that represent rewritten versions of texts in other editions of the *Shōbō-genzō*, two were composed some years before Kamakura at the time of the alternate version, including “Kesa kudoku,” a rewritten version of “Den’e,” and “Hotsu bodaishin,” which was presented the same night

**Table 5. 12-Fascicle *Shōbōgenzō***

(dates of composition or editing in parenthesis)

- 1 Shukke kudoku (ed. 1255)<sup>①</sup>
- 2 Jukai (ed. 1255)
- 3 Kesa kudoku (1240)<sup>①</sup>
- 4 Hotsu bodaishin (1244)<sup>①</sup>
- 5 Kuyō shobutsu (ed. 1255)
- 6 Kie buppōsōbō (ed. 1255)
- 7 Jinshin inga (ed. 1255)<sup>①</sup>
- 8 Sanjigo (?)<sup>②</sup>
- 9 Shime (ed. 1255)
- 10 Shizen biku (ed. 1255)
- 11 Ippyakuhachihōmyōmon (n.d.)
- 12 Hachidainingaku (1253)

① reworked version of a 75-SH fascicle, ② reworked version of a fascicle in other *Shōbōgenzō* editions

Note: Contents and dates of composition of the 12-SH: nine fascicles were edited in 1255, two were from the 1240s, one is from 1253, and one is undated. The 95-fascicle edition consists of the 75-SH plus the 12-SH in addition to eight other fascicles: *Bendōwa* (1231), *Hokke-ten-hokke* (1241), *Bodaisatta-shishōbō* (1243), *Shōji* (n.d.), *Yuibutsu-yobutsu* (n.d.), *Beppon* (Supplementary) *Shinfukatoku* (n.d.) *Beppon Butsukōjō-ji* (n.d.), and *Beppon Butsudō* (also known as *Dōshin*, n.d.). The 92-fascicle edition lacks the three supplementary fascicles.

as “Hotsu mujōshin.”<sup>10</sup> But even if we concede that the 12-SH was primarily produced in the post-Kamakura period, there is no evidence that Dōgen made a deliberate decision to select it as the representative *Shōbōgenzō* text.

Also, like the Decline Theory, the Renewal Theory is tied to a particular view of an ambiguous, poorly recorded historical event, the trip to Kamakura. The only writing from this journey is a collection of twelve waka-style Japanese poems, first included in the main traditional biography, the *Kenzei-ki* 建掇記 (1472), along with one Chinese verse and a letter to patron Hatano. The colophon to the *waka* states that

<sup>10</sup> The other rewritten fascicles are: Shukke kudoku from Shukke, Jinshin inga from Daishugyō, and Sanjigo (same title) (HEINE 1994b, p. 51).

the poetry was offered as instruction for the wife of Hōjō Tokiyori (KAWAMURA 1976, p. 87). According to the *Kenzei-ki* and other medieval biographies, Dōgen traveled at the request of the Hōjō to minister to the shōgun, but recent revisionist studies suggest that he really went at the behest of Hatano, who had been called to the new capital for political reasons (NAKASEKO 1979, pp. 382–84). The lone autobiographical reference to the trip is a brief but crucial sermon in EK 3.251 delivered the morning after his return. The passage, which states that Dōgen had been preaching to donors and laypersons, turns out to be rather vague about the reasons for and results of the trip. In the sermon, Dōgen seeks to allay the concerns of the Eihei-ji monks who he feels were probably wondering if he had presented some new, secret doctrine while away for seven months. His response sounds at first like it supports the Renewal Theory because he tells the monks that they will be surprised to hear that he taught the law of karma. He had admonished his Kamakura disciples: “Those who do good for others and renounce all evil action will reap the rewards of cause-and-effect. So cast away tiles and pick up jewels. This is the one matter I, Eihei abbot, clarify, explain, believe, and practice. Followers, you must learn this truth!” (DZZ 1988, III:166–68). Here, Dōgen seems to be explaining that he had experienced a turn, perhaps a fundamental change of heart, toward the philosophy that the Renewal Theory considers to be the trademark of the 12-SH. However, after a pause, Dōgen says to the Echizen monks, “You may laugh to hear my tongue speaking of cause and effect so easily,” and he goes on to make it clear that the injunction about causality was a provisional teaching designed for lay disciples. This actually undermines the Renewal Theory and supports the way the 12-SH has been interpreted by most scholars as an introductory text for novices not yet ready to tackle the more sophisticated philosophy of the 75-SH.<sup>11</sup> Also in EK 6.437, from the same period, Dōgen makes it clear that sustained zazen practice takes priority over the accumulation of merits and demerits through good and evil actions (DZZ 1988, IV: 26–28).

The Renewal Theory tries to shield itself from criticism based on historical studies because it claims to be making a theological argument about “true Buddhism” (*tadashii bukkō* 正しい仏教). From its standpoint, in the final analysis the 12-SH epitomizes a reclamation of

<sup>11</sup> This passage has also been cited to show that Dōgen’s disciples were “furious” with him for preaching to lay followers while abandoning his monks (BODIFORD 1993, pp. 30-31), but this again seems to be an interpolation of psychological reactions which the sources do not actually state. Using typical Zen metaphors, Dōgen says that during his travels the “moon was in the sky, but now the clouds [monks] are happy,” and he concludes by reaffirming his love for the Echizen mountains (that is, Eihei-ji).

the basic, timeless Buddhist teaching about causality, regardless of any questions raised about the chronology or political context of Dōgen's composition. However, the 12-SH is considerably more complex and multifaceted than the one-sided interpretation presented by the theory because the view of karma expressed therein reflects an interface with popular religious conceptions of retribution in the era of degeneracy. Also, many of the fascicles are primarily concerned with the ritual efficacy of key Buddhist symbols, especially the robe, bowl, and stupas. To a large extent the 12-SH is a text about rituals, which may support the Decline Theory's picture of the late period, yet it cannot be reduced to this single dimension either because it contains numerous *hongaku*-like passages that have a resonance with the 75-SH in expressing the notion, for example, that a single instant of wearing or viewing the robe will result in enlightenment. The main point is that neither the 12-SH nor the late period as a whole is exclusively concerned with the doctrine of causality. For example, during the period after Kamakura, in 1249, Dōgen wrote a couple of short texts, *Jūroku rakan genzuiki* 十六羅漢現瑞記 and *Rakan kuyō shikibun* 羅漢供養式文, celebrating the miraculous appearance of supernatural arhats which protect Buddhism while celestial blossoms rained down on the beholders of the visions (DZZ 1990, VII: 286–95). Dōgen states that such visions had been known previously only at Mt. T'ien-t'ai in China, but the popular religious element expressed here also has affinities with Hakusan *shinkō*. Despite its resistance to historical arguments, for the Renewal Theory to press seriously its argument that the 12-SH represents Dōgen's clear and consistent refutation of the Tendai philosophy of original enlightenment, it must deal with the Imaeda/Satō analysis of the impact of Hakusan on the Echizen years.

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JŌDŌ SERMONS

The black hole that remains uninvestigated by both theories is the transitional period of 1245–1246 when Dōgen established Daibutsu-ji/Eiheiji some time before leaving for Kamakura. For the Decline Theory this is an unspecified time of continuing deterioration in its version of the late period, and for the Renewal Theory it is an unspecified extension of the deficient ideology in its version of the early period. However, the time of the opening of the new temple should be treated as a distinctive, creative phase that is crucial for an understanding of the Echizen period. During this time Dōgen wrote ritual texts, including some that are not contained in the ES, as well as several of the final 75-SH fascicle compositions. A more significant development, however, is that after a two-year hiatus surrounding the migration (1243–1245), as shown in Table 6, he began once again to

**Table 6. *Eihei Kōroku* (10 vols.)**

- 1 Kōshō-ji goroku (*jōdō* sermons, nos. 1–126 from 1236–1243, ed. Senne)  
—two-year hiatus during transition to Echizen—
- 2 Daibutsu-ji goroku (nos. 127–84 from 1245–1246, ed. Ejō)
- 3 Eihei-ji goroku (nos. 185–257 from 1246–1248, ed. Ejō)
- 4 Eihei-ji goroku (nos. 258–345 from 1248–1249, ed. Ejō)
- 5 Eihei-ji goroku (nos. 346–413 from 1249–1251, ed. Gien)
- 6 Eihei-ji goroku (nos. 414–70 from 1251, ed. Gien)
- 7 Eihei-ji goroku (nos. 471–531 from 1251–1252, ed. Gien)
- 8 Miscellaneous (20 *shōsan* at Daibutsu-ji/Eihei-ji, ed. Ejō; 14 *hōgo* mainly at Kōshō-ji, ed. Senne; *Fukanzazengi*)
- 9 Kōshō-ji collection (90 *juko* comments on koans, ed. Senne and others)
- 10 Kanbun poetry collections, 1223–1253 (5 *shinsan*; 20 *jisan*; 125 *geju*, ed. Senne and others)

Note: A list of the contents and dates of composition for the EK. The first seven volumes are collections of *jōdō* from Kōshō-ji, Daibutsu-ji and Eihei-ji, and the last three volumes collect various kinds of lectures and poetry.

deliver *jōdō* sermons on a regular basis, averaging about fifty a year until 1252 (apparently illness prevented their delivery in 1253, although there were other other writings in his final year).

The EK sermons, which cite two hundred and ninety-eight koan cases according to Kagamishima, are an outgrowth of the focus on koans in the earlier works, including several cases frequently discussed in the 75-SH, such as Ma-tsu’s “mind itself is buddha,” Pai-chang’s “wild fox” and Chao-chou’s “does a dog have Buddha-nature” (KAGAMISHIMA 1994, p. 70). Many of the EK doctrines are also consistent with previous works, including the view that sitting in zazen is more fundamental than the precepts. There do appear to be changes in the EK around the time of Kamakura but these are stylistic rather than doctrinal. Ishii Shūdō divides the text into two parts: vols. 1–4 edited by Ejō through the Kamakura journey (technically EK 3.251 marks the beginning of the post-Kamakura period), and vols. 5–7 edited by Gien covering the final years. He finds that one change in the last three volumes is that Dōgen is no longer as heavily influenced by Hung-chih’s recorded sayings, which are less frequently cited, but there is not any significant alteration in ideology about zazen, causality or koan interpretation (ISHII Shūdō 1991).

When we consider this dramatic shift to the *jōdō* sermons, it becomes clear that the key point of the late period is not so much an emphasis on rituals to the exclusion of new ideas, as the Decline Theory suggests, or a negation of the old ideas, as the Renewal Theory argues, but *a different ritualization of the way the ideas were presented*. The EK marks the triumph of public, regulated, ritualized instruction over spontaneous, private, individual teaching. Seen from this perspective, the eight months from 1243–1244 in which Dōgen wrote over one-third of the 75-SH fascicles—or the two years, 1242–1244 (3/9), during which he wrote nearly two-thirds—is a transitional stage in which he busied himself and held his community together by giving informal lectures while preparing for his real work, a resumption of the formal sermons begun at Kōshō-ji once he was settled into his new temple.

The start of the late period is heralded in the preface written by Ejō to the second volume of the EK, which announces that “during the following year [after the founding of Daibutsu-ji] Zen monks came in droves to study with Dōgen from all over the country,” apparently in large part to hear him lecture (DZZ 1988, III: 70). There are several important passages which express clearly Dōgen’s own view of the powerful and popular role of *jōdō* sermons. The first example is the second passage in the second volume, EK 2.128 (the sections of the first seven EK volumes are counted consecutively), which reveals Dōgen working through the complex stages of transition from informal to formal lectures and thus provides a good indication of why the *jishu* style was phased out (DZZ 1988, III: 72–74). The passage is especially interesting not because it repudiates *jishu* in favor of *jōdō* but because it highlights the significance of lecturing in general as the key function of a monastic community. It explains Dōgen’s admiration for Ju-ching who was skillful at delivering several styles of informal lectures, including evening sermons (*bansan*), general discourses (*fusetsu*) and provisional lectures (*shōsan*), although it does not mention the *jishu* style specifically. Technically, this passage is not a *jōdō* style because it was delivered in the evening, the typical time for informal lectures; it is one of a handful of evening sermons which appear at the beginning of the EK 2 collection, that is, in the earliest phase of the Daibutsu-ji period.

Dōgen begins EK 2.128 by recalling how master Tzu-ming Chu-yūan, in discussing the meaning of the size of monasteries, cautioned his followers not to equate largeness with the magnitude of the temple or the number of monks. According to Tzu-ming, a temple with many monks who lack determination is really small while a temple

**Table 7. Comparison of Lecture Styles**

	<i>jōdō</i>	<i>jishu</i>
Where	<i>hattō</i> 法堂	<i>hōjō</i> 方丈
When	day	evening
Style	formal	informal
Expression	demonstrative	rhetorical
Length	brief and allusive	extended with details and citations
Audience	monks, with general guests	diverse, for those requiring instruction
Atmosphere	public	private, individual

with a few monks of great determination is really large. This part of the passage could be seen as reflecting a defensive posture; perhaps Dōgen was explaining why he was not attracting many followers. However, that suspicion is undercut by the preface to the second volume as well as the following excerpt from the sermon which makes it clear that this is a statement about the need for selectively identifying quality disciples. Dōgen next contrasts several T'ang masters, all of Rinzai lineages, who preached worthy evening sermons to fewer than twenty monks, with unnamed contemporary leaders who preach meaningless words before hundreds of followers. He then expresses regret that “for many years [in China] there were no evening sermons.” Since the golden age of Zen in the T'ang no one was capable of delivering a lecture with the same vigor until “Ju-ching came to the fore,” which represented “an opportunity that occurs once in a thousand years.” Dōgen praises his mentor, as he had since *Bendōwa*, but here he does not set himself up in opposition to other lineages. He displays a multibranch approach to Zen genealogy and any trace of meanspiritedness or bitterness, if it was ever there, is now gone.<sup>12</sup>

The main feature of Ju-ching's leadership that Dōgen admires was his ability to offer numerous spontaneous, off-the-cuff lectures any time of day that the inspiration struck to an eager band of followers who must have shared in the excitement and charisma of the occasion:

Whether at midnight, in the evening, after meals or at any other time of the day, the drum was beaten to admit monks to the abbot's quarters where [Ju-ching] gave a general discourse (*fusetsu*). Or the drum was beaten to signify a provisional lecture

<sup>12</sup> In EK 4.290, for example, Dōgen says, “In recent years there have not been masters such as Lin-chi and Te-shan anywhere, however much we may look to find them.”

(*shōsan*) and monks entered his quarters. Or after striking a wooden block himself in the monks' hall he gave a general discourse in the hallway (*shōdō*) or in his quarters. Or striking a wooden block in front of the first-ranking trainee's (*shuso*) room he gave a general discourse right there or back in his quarters. This is a superlative model.

Dōgen then declares, "Now I, a Buddha son of Ju-ching, will give the evening lecture. This is the first event of its kind in this country." It is interesting to note that the 75-SH fascicle "Kōmyō" from the six month of 1242 was delivered at two o'clock in the morning and that there is an extended passage in "Shōhōjissō" in which Dōgen recollects an inspiring moment of mystical exaltation during his training in China when he heard the drum sounded in the middle of the night to awaken the disciples to come to Ju-ching's quarters for a sermon which concluded with the saying, "A cuckoo sings, and a mountain-bamboo splits in two" (DZZ 1991, I: 467-68). The EK passage captures a key moment in the shifting of priorities. Dōgen explains the importance of lectures, and of a master capable of delivering them with the appropriate spontaneity and charisma, shortly before settling on the *jōdō* sermon as the main lecture style. But the emphasis on informal lectures must make us wonder whether Dōgen continued this style of instruction during the late period; perhaps discourses in the abbot's quarters were either left unrecorded or lost.

In any case, the significance of the transition to *jōdō* is further expressed in several other EK passages. In EK 5.358 Dōgen proclaims that the "Japanese people are curious about the meaning of the word *jōdō*. I (Eihei abbot) am the first to transmit it" (DZZ 1988, III:230). The most important example occurs in EK 6.443 from 1251 in which Dōgen cites a koan from the *Pi-yen lu* (no. 26) known as Pai-chang's "sitting alone atop Ta-hsiung peak," which was also a favorite of Ju-ching's. Both Dōgen and his mentor show a flair for a creative rewriting of this koan to highlight their respective visions of the essence of Zen practice. In the source case, Pai-chang is asked by a monk, "What is the most remarkable thing [in the world]?", and responds, "It is sitting [or practicing zazen] alone atop Ta-hsiung peak [or Mt. Pai-chang]."<sup>13</sup> This is a bit surprising as Pai-chang is known primarily for his emphasis on rules expressed in the first (and probably apoc-

<sup>13</sup> This saying can be taken to mean that Pai-chang went on retreat to one of the main mountain peaks located behind the temple to practice zazen, or that he is characteristically identifying himself with the name of the mountain and thus saying, in effect, "I sit alone." In the koan in *Pi-yen lu* no. 26, the disciple claims to understand the comment and Pai-chang slaps him.



ryphal) Zen monastic code, the *Ch'an-men kuei-shih* 禪門規式 (Jpn. *Zenmon kishiki*). This text actually stresses the role of the charismatic abbot's sermons that are supposed to be held two times a day, before and after the noonday meal, far more than zazen that is left up to the discretion of the disciple rather than being strictly confined by a uniform schedule (T 51.250c–251b). Ju-ching considers the question and rewrites the response, “It is only to eat rice in a bowl at Ching-tsu-ssu temple on Mt. T'ien-t'ung” (DZZ 1988, IV: 280). Dōgen's mentor shifts the focus from zazen to everyday praxis and from Mt. Pai-chang to his own mountain temple.

Dōgen reflects on this case at least five times in his works. He cites Ju-ching's revision approvingly in two 75-SH fascicles, “Kajō” (1243) and “Ho-u” (1245), but in EK 2.148 from 1245 he rewrites the concluding statement. He brings up the koan in the context of discussing the value of wielding the Zen stick (*shujō*),<sup>14</sup> which metaphorically encompasses all aspects of reality. Dōgen then says, “I would answer by raising high my stick at Daibutsu-ji temple in Japan,” and he puts the stick down and steps off the dais (DZZ 1988, III: 92–94). The progression is continued five years later in EK 5.378 (DZZ 1988, III: 242) when he responds, “I [Eihei abbot] will go to the lecture hall today.” The following year in EK 6.443 Dōgen revises the conclusion once more, this time by saying, “If someone asks me this question, I (Eihei abbot) will respond, “It is attending *jōdō* sermons on Kichijōzan” (DZZ 1988, IV: 30). This is intriguing and demands a rethinking of conventional assumptions about Eihei-ji religiosity in that Dōgen, unlike Pai-chang, is generally known for his emphasis on zazen rather than sermons.

### Conclusions

The proclamations of self-importance do not guarantee that the EK is a superior text, and in EK 3.244 Dōgen remarks ironically though without necessarily complaining that despite his giving the first authentic Zen-style sermons in Japan at Eihei-ji in the Echizen mountains, many onlookers denounce him by saying, “Just take a look at that preposterous rube on the mountain whose preaching is merely the talk of “wild fox Zen” (DZZ 1988, III: 162–64). A full assessment of the philosophical and literary quality of the EK has not been undertaken in Dōgen studies and lies beyond the scope of this paper.

<sup>14</sup> Pai-chang was particularly known for carrying a ceremonial fly-whisk (*hossu*), which also figures prominently in the gestures and demonstrations Dōgen uses in his sermons.

But the probable reason that the EK has not generated the kind of scholarly attention that the *Shōbōgenzō* has received is the brief but complex and opaque structure of the sermons. The sermons deal with koans, often cited on special occasions such as holidays or memorials, but by allusion rather than exegesis, evoking key phrases without extensive commentary. The commentary that does appear, which is often after a “long pause” during which there was probably much heated discussion and debate left unrecorded, is often poetic and is also frequently accompanied by demonstrations, gestures, or body language that is recorded but eludes interpretation in textual critical studies.

In other words, the effectiveness and the spontaneity of the *jōdō* style depended on an atmosphere of audience appreciation and participation that is difficult to reconstruct. The EK is not necessarily as important or inventive as the 75-SH from the standpoint of either sectarian practice or contemporary literary or philosophical analysis. But when seen in terms of the early writings, it represents a culminative peak in Dōgen’s career because of the way it integrates prose and poetic koan commentary ritually presented in the monastic calendar. Here, we must distinguish between what is important for understanding the historical context of Dōgen’s career path and what is important in itself and has an enduring legacy. The two theories based on change tend to blur or collapse this distinction, and in so doing the Renewal Theory shifts from the conventional focus on what constitutes the legacy, and the Decline Theory questions or denies that there is such a legacy. However, the Three Periods Theory argues that one should not reduce ideology to history by looking at Dōgen’s works based on biographical issues (*denki* 伝記), but clarify ideology in light of history by looking at his life in light of his canon (*seiten* 聖典). Therefore, an emphasis on the historical role of the EK may ironically lead us back to an appreciation of the intellectual role of the 75-SH. But the 75-SH must be seen in a new way, through lenses cut by encountering the question of why Dōgen at the peak of composing it abandoned this work.

Dōgen’s total literary output is multifaceted and because he adapted different standpoints of doctrine and methods of instruction there are numerous apparent contradictions, not only between periods but within a period or even in a relatively short text.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, there is a fundamental consistency in that the turning points in Dōgen’s

<sup>15</sup> One of the main examples is the 75-SH “Keisei-sanshoku,” which begins with a celebration of naturalism and concludes with a plea for repentance, a topic not dealt with elsewhere in the 75-SH though prevalent in the 12-SH, especially “Sanjigo.”

writing are associated with key developments at his temples, including the Kōshō-ji monks' and lecture hall openings and the construction of Daibutsu-ji and naming of Eihei-ji. The latter events in 1244–1246, which coincide with the abrupt transition from *jishu* to *jōdō* lectures, or from the writing of the 75-SH to the EK, overshadows the changes—move to Echizen in 1243 and trip to Kamakura in 1247—that are stressed in the the Decline and Renewal theories. Yet even this change indicates that Dōgen never abandoned but continued to transform and adapt the roots of his religiosity, especially commentaries on koans influenced by the recorded sayings of Sung masters, including both Lin-chi/Rinzai and Ts'ao-tung/Sōtō lineages. Therefore, the main changes his writings underwent were not so much a matter of either a drastic reversal or a rebirth of ideology as of attempts to work out various literary styles appropriate to the needs of diverse audience sectors, including followers literate in *kanbun* or *kana*, monks and laypersons, general assemblies and private or individual instructees.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

- 12-SH 12-fascicle *Shōbōgenzō*  
 75-SH 75-fascicle *Shōbōgenzō*  
 EK *Eihei kōroku* 永平広録, 10 vols.  
 ES *Eihei shingi* 永平清規, 6 vols.  
 CTL *Ching-te chuan-teng lu* 景德伝燈録 (Jpn. *Keitoku dentōroku*), 30 vols.  
 DZZ *Dōgen zenji zenshū* 道元禪師全集, 7 vols. 1988–1993, Tokyo: Shunjūsha. Vols. I (1991) and II (1993) ed. KAWAMURA Kōdō 河村孝道, vols. III (1988) and IV (1988) ed. KAGAMISHIMA Genryū 鏡鳥元隆, vol. V (1989) ed. SUZUKI Kakuzen 鈴木格禪, et. al., vol. VI (1989) ed. KOSAKA Kiyū 小坂機融 and Suzuki Kakuzen, vol. VII (1990) ed. SUZUKI Kakuzen, et. al.  
 MS *Mana Shōbōgenzō* 真字正法眼藏 (or *Shōbōgenzō sanbyakusoku* 三百則), 300 cases  
 TYC *Tsung-men tung-yao chi* 宗門統要集 (Jpn. *Shūmon tōyōshū*), 30 vols.  
 SZ *Shōbōgenzō zuimonki* 正法眼藏隨聞記, 6 vols.

#### REFERENCES

BIELEFELDT, Carl

- 1985 Recarving the dragon: History and dogma in the study of Dōgen. In *Dōgen Studies*, William R. LaFleur, ed., pp. 21–53. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- 1988 *Dōgen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- BODIFORD, William  
1993 *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- COLLCUTT, Martin  
1981 *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- DUMOULIN, Heinrich  
1990 *Zen Buddhism: A History*, vol. II (Japan). New York: Macmillan.
- FAURE, Bernard  
1991 *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of the Chan/Zen Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.  
1993 *Chan Insights and Oversights: An Epistemological Critique of the Chan Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.  
1996 *Visions of Power: Imagining Medieval Japanese Buddhism*, trans. Phyllis Brooks. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- FOULK, T. Griffith  
1993 Myth, ritual and monastic practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism. In *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory, eds., pp. 177-78. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- FURUTA Shōkin 古田紹欽  
1964 *Nihon bukkhyō shisō shi no shomondai* 日本仏教思想史の諸問題. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- HAKAMAYA Noriaki 袴谷憲昭  
1989 *Hongaku shisō hihan* 本覚思想批判. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.  
1990 *Hihan Bukkyō* 批判仏教. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.  
1992 *Dōgen to Bukkyō: Jūnikanbon Shōbōgenzō no Dōgen* 道元と仏教—十二卷本『正法眼蔵』の道元. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
- HEINE, Steven  
1994a *Dōgen and the Kōan Tradition: A Tale of Two Shōbōgenzō Texts*. Albany: SUNY Press.  
1994b "Critical Buddhism" (*hihan bukkhyō*) and the debate concerning the 75-fascicle and 12-fascicle *Shōbōgenzō* texts. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21/1: 37-72. [updated as "Critical Buddhism and Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*: The debate over the 75-fascicle and 12-fascicle texts" in *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm Over Critical Buddhism*, Jamie Hubbard & Paul L. Swanson, eds., pp. 251-85, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.]  
1997 *Zen Poetry of Dōgen: Verses from the Mountain of Eternal Peace*. Boston: Charles E. Tuttle.

## IMAEDA Aishin 今枝愛真

- 1966 *Zenshū no rekishi* 禪宗の歴史. Nihon Reskishi Shinsho. Tokyo: Shibundō.
- 1976 *Dōgen: Zazen hitosuji no shamon* 道元—坐禪一筋の沙門. NHK Books, 255 Tokyo: Nihon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai.

## ISHII Seijun 石井清純

- 1987 *Eihei kōroku: Kenchō nenkan no jōdō ni tsuite* 永平広録—建長年間の上堂について. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 29: 91–94.
- 1991 *Jūnikanbon Shōbōgenzō honbun no seiritsu jigo ni tsuite* 十二卷本『正法眼藏』本文の成立事後について. *Komazawa daigaku bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 22: 236–60.
- 1994 *Mana Shōbōgenzō no seiritsu kansuru issiken: “Eihei juko,” “Kōshō-ji goroku” to no naiyō taihi o chūshin toshite* 真字『正法眼藏』の成立に関する一私見—『永平頌古』・『興聖寺語録』との内容対比を中心として. *Sōtoshū shūgaku kenkyūjō kiyō* 8: 53–67.

## ISHII Shūdō 石井修道

- 1987 *Sōdai Zenshūshi no kenkyū* 宋代禪宗史の研究. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.
- 1988 *Chūgoku Zenshūshi wa: Mana Shōbōgenzō ni manabu* 中国禪宗史話—真字『正法眼藏』に学ぶ. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjō.
- 1990 Recent trends in Dōgen studies. Albert Welter, trans., *Komazawa daigaku zen kenkyūjō nenpō* 7: 219–64.
- 1991 Saigo no Dōgen—Jūnikanbon *Shōbōgenzō* to *Hōkyō-ki* 最後の道元—十二卷本『正法眼藏』と『宝慶記』. In KAGAMISHIMA and SUZUKI 1991, pp. 319–74.

## ITŌ Shūken 伊藤秀憲

- 1987 *Manabi Jūnikanbon Shōbōgenzō ni tsuite* 学び十二卷本『正法眼藏』について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 36/1: 194–201.

## KAGAMISHIMA Genryū 鏡鳥元隆

- 1983 *Tendō Nyōjō zenji no kenkyū* 天童如淨禪師の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- 1994 *Dōgen zenji to sono shūfū* 道元禪師とその宗風. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

## KAGAMISHIMA Genryū and SUZUKI Kakuzen 鈴木格禪, eds.

- 1991 *Jūnikanbon Shōbōgenzō no shomondai* 十二卷本『正法眼藏』の諸問題. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

## KAWAMURA Kōdō 河村孝道

- 1975 *Eihei kaizan Dōgen zenji gyōjō: Kenzei-ki* 永平開山道元禪師行狀—建擲記. Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten.
- 1980 *Shōbōgenzō* 正法眼藏. In *Dōgen no chosaku* 道元の著作, eds. Kagamishima Genryū and Tamaki Kōshirō 玉城康四郎. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 1–74.
- 1986 *Shōbōgenzō no seiritsu-shiteki no kenkyū* 正法眼藏の成立史的の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

KIM, Hee Jin

1975 *Dōgen Kigen: Mystical Realist*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

MASUTANI Fumio 増谷文雄

1971 *Rinzai to Dōgen* 臨済と道元. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

MATSUOKA Yukako 松岡由香子

1995 *Kobutsu Dōgen no shii* 古仏道元の思惟. Kyoto: Kokusai Zengaku Kenkyūjō.

1996 *Shōbōgenzō jūnikanbon no gendaiteki igi: Hakamaya Noriaki Dōgen to Bukkyō hihan* 『正法眼蔵』十二巻本の現代的意義—袴谷憲昭『道元と仏教』批判. *Zen bunka kenkyūjō kiyō* 22: 89–148.

MATSUMOTO Shirō 松本史朗

1989 *Zen shisō no hihanteki kenkyū* 禅思想の批判的研究. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

MIZUNO Yaoko 水野弥穂子

1980 *Hōkyō-ki* 宝慶記. In *Dōgen no chosaku*, eds. Kagamishima Genryū and Tamaki Kōshirō. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 217–40.

1994 *Jūnikanbon Shōbōgenzō no sekai* 十二巻本『正法眼蔵』の世界. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

NAKASEKO Shōdō 中世古祥道

1979 *Dōgen zenji den kenkyū* 道元師伝研究. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

NARA Yasuaki 奈良康明, ed.,

1992 *Budda kara Dōgen e* ブツダから道元へ. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki.

PUTNEY, David

1996 Some problems in interpretation: The early and late writings of Dōgen. *Philosophy East and West* 46: 497–531.

SAKAI Tokugen 酒井得元

1980 *Eihei koroku* 永平広録. In *Dōgen no chosaku*, Kagamishima Genryū and Tamaki Kōshirō, eds., pp. 75–118. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

SATŌ Shunkō 佐藤俊晃

1990–1991 *Hakusan shinkō to Sōtō-shū kyōdan shi* 百山信仰と曹洞宗教団史. 20 parts. *Sanshō* 556–575.

SUEKI Fumihiko 末木文美士

1995 Two seemingly contradictory aspects of the teaching of innate enlightenment (*hongaku*) in medieval Japan. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22/1–2: 3–16.

SUGIO Gen'yū 杉尾玄有

1973 *Nana-jūgokanbon Shōbōgenzō no kihonteki kōsatsu* 七十五巻本『正法眼蔵』の基本的考察. In *Dōgen zen no shisōteki kenkyū* 道元禅の思想的研究, ed. Kurebayashi Kōdō 榊林皓堂, pp. 545–70. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

1985 *Dōgen Zenji no jiko-tōdatsu no go-shōgai to Shōbōgenzō no shinka:*

Jūnikanbon ni yotte “Ippaku-kan” o omou 道元禪師の自己透脱の御生涯と『正法眼藏』の進化—十二卷本によって「一百卷」を思う, *Shūgaku kenkyū* 7: 7–12.

SWANSON, Paul L

1993 “Zen is not Buddhism”: Recent Japanese critiques of Buddha nature, *Numen* 40/2: 115–49.

TSUNODA Tairyū 角田康隆

1993 *Kana Shōbōgenzō to Mana Shōbōgenzō* 仮字『正法眼藏』と真字『正法眼藏』, *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 24: 143–60.

YANAGIDA Seizan 柳田聖山

1976 *Dōgen to Rinzai* 道元と臨濟, *Risō* 513: 74–89.