

The New Buddhism of Kamakura and the Doctrine of Innate Enlightenment

by Ruben L. F. Habito, *Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX*

Recent scholarship in Japanese religions has called attention to the need for a new look at Kamakura Buddhism, to see beyond the inherent limitations of many detailed studies centering on one or other of the religious luminaries that lived during this period but which fail to relate their subject with the other significant movements and figures of the same era, as well as to set in perspective the apologetic strain of sectarian-based treatments of the founders of the major sects that saw their beginnings during this period. This "new look" would aim at a more comprehensive grasp of the period and its significance for the whole of Japanese religious and social history.¹

Shimaji Daitō (1875-1927) had noted as far back as 1926 that the new forms of Buddhism which began during the Kamakura period of Japanese history can be seen against the backdrop of a common matrix deriving from Japan's Middle-Ancient (Chūko) Tendai. Shimaji pointed out the necessity and importance of further research into this particular period in the history of Japanese Buddhism.² More recently, Tamura Yoshirō (1921-1989) and others have succeeded in elucidating a significant element that characterizes this period, a religio-philosophical teaching called *Tendai hongaku shisō*, which we can roughly translate as "the doctrine of innate enlightenment." (See Tada, *et al.*, 1973.)³ In a monumental work that merited the Imperial Prize of the Japan Academy, Tamura pointed out its influence upon the New Buddhism of the Kamakura era (Tamura, 1965).

Since then the term "*hongaku shisō*" has come to common usage, characterizing what is said to be a distinctively Japanese contribution in

the development of Buddhist thought. This is a teaching which denies the dualistic opposition between such polar notions as *samsāra/nirvāṇa*, ordinary being/Buddha, this world/Pure Land, delusive passions/wisdom (or enlightenment), *etc.* (For concise accounts in English, see Tamura, 1984, 1987). It is a doctrinal standpoint that became influential from the late Heian period on and made its impact on subsequent Japanese thought and culture, in literature, arts, *etc.* (Tamura, 1969) Recently it has evoked a controversy among scholars in Japan as to its orthodoxy within the Buddhist tradition.⁴

This article will look at the work of Tamura Yoshirō on the influence of *Tendai hongaku shisō* on the major figures of the New Kamakura Buddhism, as laid out in his work *Kamakura Shin-Bukkyō no Kenkyū*, and offer critical observations and tasks for further investigation.⁵

It must be noted that the founders of the Buddhist movements that saw their beginnings during the Kamakura Period (known as the New Kamakura Buddhism or Shin-Bukkyō, to distinguish these from the "old" or established Buddhism which, of course, continued to predominate and wield its influence on society on this and later periods of Japanese history⁶) had a common background: Hōnen (1132-1212), Shinran (1173-1262), Dōgen (1200-1253) and Nichiren (1222-1282) all received training for a considerable number of years during the early part of their careers at Mt. Hiei, the center of Buddhist learning and activity at the time. This is the basis for the supposition that they were exposed to and at least acquainted with *Tendai hongaku shisō*, elements of which, as

Tamura undertakes to show, are reflected in their own fundamental teaching and writings. Their particular responses to the doctrine mark out the distinctive characteristics of their own Buddhist teaching.

HÖNEN'S RADICAL DUALISM

Hōnen entered Mt. Hiei at the age of fifteen. He studied the Buddhist scriptures assiduously, and received the appellation "Number One in Wisdom" for his erudition that included a mastery of the schools of Nara Buddhism, in addition to the program of studies in the Tendai school offered at Mt. Hiei. Continuing his religious search, at the age of forty-three he came upon a work of Chinese Pure Land Master Shan Tao (*Kuan-Ching-shao*, T. 1753) and was led to a profound religious experience triggered by the expression "The Name of Amida with One Heart, One Mind" found in this text. He then left Mt. Hiei and began to propagate Pure Land Doctrine centered on the recitation of the name of Amida. Finding a base at Yoshimizu in Kyoto, he attained a following among the samurai as well as the lower classes of society at the time. At the age of sixty-six he came out with his major work (*Senjaku-Hongan-Nembutsu-Shū*), setting the foundations for the Pure Land Sect in Japan.

Hōnen's fundamental religious standpoint is characterized by the radical opposition of this world of impermanence and of uncertainty and suffering on the one hand, and the absolute world of the Pure Land on the other, and the single-minded affirmation of the latter based on the rejection and denial of the former. Hōnen situates this absolute world in the next life, and believes that one who recites the name of Amida will be met by Amida himself at one's death and welcomed to the Pure Land (*raigō-shisō*).

This radically dualistic standpoint is seen in the context of the tumultuous age in which Hōnen

lived, with the Hōgen and Heiji uprisings (1156-1159) and the fall of the Heike (1185) together with the consequent socio-economic and political upheavals of the time, in the foreground of consciousness of the people. It was at this time that the Doctrine of the Latter Days of the Dharma (*mappō-shisō*) came into vogue, and became influential in the thinking of the Buddhist followers of the period. Hōnen himself presupposes this doctrine in his own teaching of Pure Land, and proclaims the inefficacy of salvation by any other means than reliance on the salvific power of Amida's vow, assured by the frequent recitation of Amida's name.

Hōnen's teaching of radical dualism and the invocation of the name of Amida as the sole means of salvation can be seen in contrast with other Pure Land thinkers before him. Ryōgen (912-985), Senkan (918-983), Zenyū (909-990), Genshin (942-1017), Kakuin (953-1007), Eikan (1033-1111), and Chinkai (1091-1152), coming from the Tendai tradition, as well as Kakuban (1095-1143) who is counted in the Esoteric tradition, include Pure Land elements in their teachings. In many of the writings of the above, Tamura traces the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment, noting passages affirming the connection between this impermanent world and the Pure Land. (See Tamura, 1965, pp. 475-524.)

With this radical dualism that sets in clear opposition the phenomenal world on the one hand and the Pure Land on the other, Hōnen makes a definitive break from the monistic teachings being transmitted at Mt. Hiei which were influenced by *Tendai hongaku shisō*. Hōnen thus sets himself apart from the established Buddhist circles of his day, and in so doing comes under attack and persecution from religious and secular authorities. The doctrine of innate enlightenment thus had a reactionary effect on Hōnen, accentuating his dualistic standpoint as he separated himself from Tendai's monistic tendencies.

SHINRAN AND THE AFFIRMATION OF THIS-WORLDLY REALITY

As one of Hōnen's loyal disciples, Shinran shared the fate of his master's persecution and exile. Deepening his own religious experience in the process, Shinran arrived at a stance that goes beyond Hōnen and distinguished himself from his mentor in the Pure Land teaching. Shinran's position, of course, merits treatment in greater detail, but the following will simply examine the elements marked out by Tamura as traceable to the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment and raise some questions in this regard.

A central difference between Shinran and his mentor Hōnen given in many standard treatments is in the former's emphasis on *shinjin*⁷, that is, absolute reliance and trust in the "other power" (of Amida's compassion). Another point of difference is Shinran's teaching of the efficacy of even a single invocation of the name uttered with thoroughgoing *shinjin* for the realization of the Pure Land. This is contrasted with Hōnen's encouragement of continued acts of invocation of Amida's name millions of times (*hyaku-man-ben*) in order to be assured of entry into the Pure Land.

But another key difference that ought not to escape attention is the affirmation of this-worldly reality in Shinran, as opposed to Hōnen's rejection of this world for a Pure Land in the next. In other words, Shinran does not share Hōnen's dualistic view that places a definitive break between this world and Pure Land, but assumes a stance that affirms this-worldly reality as the locus of the realization of the Pure Land. This affirmative stance is clearly visible throughout his writings, especially in the mature writings of his eighties.

First, Shinran teaches the possibility of the realization of Pure Land in one *shinjin*-filled invocation of the name of Amida. The attitude of waiting for the Pure Land in the future or after-life (*raigō-shisō*) comes to be problematic from Shinran's point of view. Such a view appears to undercut the dualism between this world and the

next, and leads to a stance described as "the affirmation of worldly reality" (*genjitsu-kōtei*), and further, to the affirmation of the salvation of the most wicked of this world (Tamura, 1970, p. 49). This stance of Shinran, according to Tamura, derives from the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment.

Second, in Shinran's writings we see the elevation of the person of *shinjin* as equal in stature to the buddhas and tathāgatas, and this reaffirms the unity between ordinary living beings and the Buddha (*nyorai-tōdō-setsu*). For example, in the *Letters of Shinran*, we find the following passage, repeated in other places also: "The Buddhas in ten quarters rejoice in the settling of this heart and praise it as being equal to the hearts and minds of all Buddhas. Thus, the person of true *shinjin* is said to be equal to Buddhas. That person is also regarded as being the same as Maitreya, who is destined to become the next Buddha." (*Mattōshō*,⁷ Shin Buddhism Translation Series, 1978)

This is related to Shinran's view placing *shinjin* on the same level as the absolute body of the Buddha (*dharmakāya*), equivalent to suchness, to buddha-nature, which is presented in the *Yuishinshō-mon-i* and the *Ichinen-tanen-mon-i*. "Since it is with this heart and mind of all sentient beings that they entrust themselves to the Vow of the *dharmakāya*-as-compassion, this *shinjin* is none other than Buddha-nature. This buddha-nature is dharma-nature. Dharma-nature is the *dharmakāya*." (*Yuishinshō-mon-i*, SZS 3, p. 171)

In other passages, it is indicated that Amida is this essential body, which is also called suchness, buddha-nature, etc. Thus, the view of the fundamental unity of Amida and ordinary living beings is an element of Shinran's view of the buddha-body (*butsuda-kan*). Such a view of unity that cuts away dualistic oppositions characteristic of Hōnen's teachings, distinguishes Shinran from Hōnen. According to Tamura, this standpoint is another element based on the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment.

The doctrine of the salvation of the wicked or *Akunin-Shōki*, which characterizes Shinran's teaching, is also mentioned by Tamura as an element due to the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment (Tamura, 1965, p. 539). Although this point is only mentioned and not given full development in Tamura's treatment of Shinran, the implication is that it derives from Shinran's view of the thoroughgoing absoluteness of other-power, which is a standpoint that overcomes the dualism of self/other. And this ultimately derives from Shinran's view of the fundamental unity of the Buddha and ordinary beings (*nyorai-tōdō-setsu*), which grounds the salvation of the wicked, in Tamura's schema (p. 527). Thus, the connection with the doctrine of innate enlightenment is made.

The arguments by Tamura for the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment on Shinran are taken up and criticized by Nakanishi Chikai (Nakanishi, 1967).⁸ Nakanishi illustrates Tamura's failure to appreciate Shinran's existential situation centered on a profound awareness of karma (*shukugō*), an awareness which in Nakanishi's viewpoint is the foundation for Shinran's understanding of *shinjin*. To summarize Nakanishi's thesis, Shinran's teaching on *shinjin* and on the unity of ordinary beings with the Buddha is based not so much on a "reversion to non-dualism" that is due to the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment, as Tamura argues, but is based on an existential faith-stance that places absolute efficacy on the primal vow of Amida.

On the whole, Tamura's study on Shinran tries to connect the latter's religious standpoint that presented elements of an affirmation of this-worldly reality, such as the shift of emphasis from the afterlife in Hōnen to the here-and-now event of *shinjin*, the identification of ordinary beings with the Buddha (based on *shinjin*), and the salvation of the most wicked of this world, with a "reversion" (from Hōnen's radical dualism) to a non-dualistic standpoint that derives from the doctrine of innate enlightenment. Nakanishi has pointed out

the tenuous nature of this connection and looks into another dimension to ground Shinran's non-dual standpoint, that is to the latter's existential religious experience that leads to a thorough conversion of one's ego-centered existence by placing oneself totally in the all-embracing compassion of Amida.

Such a religious experience which involves the thorough turn-about ("con-version," Skt. *āśraya-parāvṛtti*) of one's ego-centered existence into a mode of being placed in absolute trust in the efficacious working of Amida's compassion, is the key for understanding Shinran's central message. To overlook the crucial role of such a fundamental experience easily leads to misunderstandings or misrepresentations of Shinran's teaching. For example, as is well known, the doctrine of the salvation of the wicked has easily been misunderstood, even during Shinran's time, as an affirmation of wickedness as such, or as an encouragement to do wicked acts in order to come closer to salvation. Such misunderstandings were the cause of sorrow for Shinran and for his immediate followers, leading these to reiterate Shinran's basic position in the *Tannishō* or *Notes on Lamentations on Heresies*.

An affirmation of wickedness as such, or the encouragement of wicked acts (i.e., as being no different from good acts "from the point of view of enlightenment"), was also the result of exaggerated views based on the doctrine of innate enlightenment, and the appearance of such views led to the critiques against *Tendai hongaku shisō* by Hōchibō-shōshin and Dōgen. (See Tamura, 1984)

DŌGEN'S NON-DUALISTIC STANDPOINT

Tamura (1965, pp. 548-574) examines how Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* abounds in expressions that bear close resemblance to themes treated and developed in *Tendai hongaku* writings.

The unity of practice and enlightenment is a basic emphasis of Dōgen in his Zen teaching. "Practice and enlightenment are not one, accord-

ing to the view of non-Buddhists. But in the teaching of Buddhism, practice is itself enlightenment, and because it is practice issuing from enlightenment, even the initial resolve to seek the Way is the embodiment of complete and perfect enlightenment." (Iwanami, I, 65)

This is also a standpoint presented in *Tendai hongaku* writings. For example, "One who knows this (i.e., the tathāgata which is innate enlightenment = *hongaku-nyorai*) is called saint, and one who gets lost in this truth is ordinary being. When one realizes the nondual truth-wisdom and attains the wondrous threefold truth of the essence of no-coming and no-going, there is no birth-death to cast off, one is enlightened as one practices." (Tada, et al., p. 35)

Then on the question of birth-death, Dōgen proclaims that "it is to be realized that birth-death is nirvana itself, and apart from birth-death there is no nirvana" (Iwanami, I, p. 63); "realize only that birth-death is nirvana, and that there is nothing such as birth-death to be cast away, and there is nothing such as nirvana to be yearned for." (Iwanami, III, p. 239). Such an emphasis on the unity of birth-death and nirvana is of course a repeated theme of *Tendai hongaku* writings.

On the notion of time, Dōgen teaches that "when one climbs a mountain or crosses a river, I am, and time is in my self. I already am, and time does not leave. If time is not in the appearance of going and coming, the time of climbing a mountain is the This Time of being time. If time preserves the appearance of going and coming, there is the This Time of being time in my self: this is being time." (Iwanami, I, p. 152) Also, "That which is called Now is the This Time of people. As I think of past, future and present, however it may take in thousands and tens of thousands (of years), all of this is Now, This Time." (Iwanami, I, p. 383)

In the *Makura no Sōshi*, a *Tendai hongaku* document, we find the following passages: "The time of the ancient past, the time of the present, and the time of the future, these are time that is one and

the same (*ittai*). " (NBZ, v. 32, p. 112-3) "There is no distinction between beginning, middle, and end. Why then discuss the ancient past and today?" (NBZ, v. 32, p. 113). "As to the waves of the great ocean, yesterday's waves as well as today's waves are entirely as one and the same. The thoughts of the three worlds (of past, present and future) are but this one thought." (NBZ, v. 32, p. 116)

Throughout Dōgen's works we find a radical re-reading of certain passages from Chinese Buddhist texts that indicate the originality of his religious thought and expression. For example, there is the classic passage affirming the inherent buddha-nature in all living beings ("All living beings in their entirety possess the buddha-nature"), which Dōgen renders as "all living beings and existents in entirety are buddha-nature" (Iwanami, I, p. 315). This reveals Dōgen's inner eye of enlightenment that enables one to see everything, mountains and rivers, sticks and stones, trees and grass, as the pure embodiment of buddha-nature itself. It is this inner eye of enlightenment that penetrates throughout his writings and lies behind such expressions that tend to absolutize everything in existence as a manifestation of the highest truth itself.

Tendai hongaku documents likewise abound in such absolutizations. For example, "All things (dharma) are buddha-dharma." (NBZ, v. 32, p. 108). "In the world of things (dharma) everything is truth manifest, and there is nothing that is not buddha. In facing the sky, the sky is buddha. In facing the great earth, one faces buddha." (NBZ, v. 32, p. 126)

The juxtaposition of passages gives the impression of a close affinity between Dōgen's basic standpoint and *Tendai hongaku* doctrine. However, Dōgen's explicit criticism of the latter marks the dividing line: he is speaking from the standpoint of the inner eye of enlightenment, and as one who continues to live in rigorous discipline and practice never ceasing to polish this inner eye, and for such a one, the absolutistic pronounce-

ments in the writings expounding the doctrine of innate enlightenment present the danger of a mistaken reading that makes one abandon discipline and practice, that leads an individual into the naive presumption that one is already accomplished in buddhahood whether one practices or not. This for Dōgen is a reversion to the egoistic standpoint, the diametric opposite of the world of enlightenment.

In the *Genjōkōan*, he warns: "To practice and realize the myriad things in the universe putting one's self forth is delusion; to practice and realize oneself putting forth the myriad things of the universe is enlightenment. To deeply realize delusion is of the buddhas; to be greatly deluded in enlightenment is of ordinary beings." (Iwanami, I, p. 83)

One can say from the examination of passages indicating affinity that there is a very thin line between Dōgen's standpoint and that of the object of his criticism, in this case the doctrine of innate enlightenment, but a thin line that makes all the difference between delusion and true realization: for Dōgen this is manifested in the attitude toward practice, whereby its neglect would be a clear indication of the reversion to an egoistic standpoint based on delusion.

In Dōgen then, affirmations of non-dualism are to be seen as checked by this vigilance in practice, whereby the proper meaning of the following is to be understood: "Buddha-nature is the adornment after one realizes buddhahood." (Iwanami, II, p. 110); "Although this truth is said to be abundantly present in everyone, it does not become manifest if one does not practice, and one does not attain it if there is no realization." (Iwanami, I, p. 55)

Tamura characterizes this critique by Dōgen as a reversion to a dualistic standpoint, but qualifies this by saying that it is due to Dōgen's characteristic emphasis on the concrete (*jisshō-shugi*) which is to be seen in contrast with the *Tendai hongaku* position of idealistic monism. (1965, p. 567)⁹

NICHIREN'S COMPREHENSIVE VISION BASED ON THE LOTUS SUTRA

The case of Nichiren and his relationship to the doctrine of innate enlightenment presents a problem, as many writings attributed to him are clear expositions of the doctrine itself. The authenticity of these particular writings attributed to Nichiren which explicitly expound *Tendai hongaku* doctrine however, has been called into question (Asai, 1945; Tamura, 1965, pp. 575-651) and these writings are surmised to be compositions of enterprising disciples who wrote after Nichiren's death. To take these works then and to conclude from them that Nichiren taught the doctrine of innate enlightenment would then be to beg the question, and so one must exercise particular care and attention in Nichiren's case, considering issues in textual and historical criticism which could determine the direction of one's findings. One can only say at this stage that there is still much to investigate and consider in this regard, and so the most viable path would be first to confine one's study to those writings that are authenticated as coming from Nichiren's own hand, and proceed from there.

In looking over the authenticated writings of Nichiren, one notices the development and shift of his views from his earliest writing, the *Kaitai-Sokushinjōbutsu-gi*, which is very heavily under the influence of Esoteric teachings and tends to a monistic standpoint, to his later works, wherein he explicitly attacks Esoteric doctrine as erroneous and presents a confrontational stance *vis-a-vis* historical reality from his position as practitioner of the message of the *Lotus Sutra*. One must distinguish then the early Nichiren still under Esoteric and the later and mature Nichiren who comes to full awareness of his mission as prophet of the *Lotus Sutra*, and the dividing line can be set with the Sado exile, wherein he is deepened in his religious experience and confirmed in his mission in the context of persecutions and worldly tribulations. (Tamura, 1965, p. 589)

Thus, we find the early Nichiren employing vocabulary common with writings of the doctrine of innate enlightenment. For example, "when we attain the enlightenment of the Lotus, we realize our body of physical-mental existence of birth-death to be no-birth and no-death. It is the same with the land. This land, with its cows, horses and six realms of beings are all buddhas. Grass and trees, the sun and moon are all the holy sangha. As it says in the sutra, these things dwell in the dharma rank, and the forms of the world are eternally pervading." (NIB, I, 14) "The enlightenment of the *Lotus Sutra* is this: to realize that this land and our body and the body-memorial (*śāriṃ*) of the Tathāgata-Śākyamuni are one." (NIB, I, 15)

It is significant to note that Nichiren's home temple, Kiyozumi, where he first entered monastic orders, began his Buddhist learning, and inaugurated his public mission, is a temple in the *Taimitsu* line, i.e., transmitting Esoteric doctrine in the Tendai tradition, and that early in his training at the age of seventeen he had hand-copied the *Entaragishū*, an early work propounding the doctrine of innate enlightenment. (This hand-copy of Nichiren is extant.) At this stage he remains quite optimistic and fired with his vision of a comprehensive Buddhist teaching that would unite state and society under the Dharma. His vitriolic attacks against the teaching of Hōnen at this stage is said to stem from the irreconcilability of the latter's dualistic position separating this historical world from the idealized Pure Land, for him a mistaken position militating against his own program of a comprehensive Buddhism backed by a monistic standpoint.

But as Nichiren encounters persecution and opposition from established authorities on account of his teaching on the primacy of the *Lotus Sutra* and of his urging the proscription of other Buddhist sects "for the peace of the nation," a more confrontational stance takes prominence, and Nichiren dissociates himself from a monistic position that unqualifiedly affirms all things as manifestation of the Buddha or of true Dharma. As he comes to

deepen his understanding of his mission as a religious reformer based on the implementation of the true Dharma in the social and political spheres of life, and to realize that historical realities stand in stark contrast to such an ideal, the untenability of an unqualified monism becomes manifest, and thus he likewise heaps criticism against the monistic Esoteric doctrine in which he had been nurtured in his early years.

In sum, Tamura points to textual evidence for *Tendai hongaku* influence on early Nichiren, and proposes a set of critical norms for examining the authenticity of many writings still under dispute based on his later break with monism. Tamura's thesis can be summarized as follows: "we must distinguish the early Nichiren, still susceptible to the influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment, and the later Nichiren, tempered by his experiences of persecution and failure and led to a confrontational stance with worldly realities and yet still fired with his mission of social reformation based on the *Lotus Sutra*. In the latter, marked off by the Sado exile, Nichiren moves away from a monistic standpoint, and therefore dissociates himself from the doctrine of innate enlightenment. Any writing attributed to him at this later period which employ *Tendai hongaku* terminology, etc., would then be suspect."

Tamura however tends to make rather simplistic and sweeping statements based on his proposed norms, dismissing outright certain works because they contain this or that term that smacks of the doctrine of innate enlightenment. Thus, instances of esoteric-influenced or monistic-leaning themes in the authenticated writings would present a problem in Tamura's schema. Admitting the usefulness of Tamura's schema as one possible set of norms, nevertheless it seems we would have to apply other principles towards greater precision in understanding the various influences in Nichiren's thought.

The precise influence of the doctrine of innate enlightenment as a background in his thought as it developed in various stages throughout

Nichiren's life remains a question calling for further investigation beyond Tamura's overly simplistic schema. Ienaga (1963) raised related issues.

CONCLUDING SUMMARY: UNDERSTANDING KAMAKURA BUDDHISM

With his work *Kamakura Shin-bukkyō-shisō no Kenkyū*, the late Tamura Yoshirō has made a significant contribution towards a better understanding of a set of ideas that served as a background which influenced the movements in the period which we can call the watershed of Japanese religious history. In this *opus*, after Tamura traces the stages of the development of *Tendai hongaku shisō* and describes its character as absolute monism that is taught, transmitted and propagated at Mt. Hiei, he goes on to examine the founders of the New Buddhist movements of the Kamakura period in terms of their relationship to this doctrine.

First, Hōnen is presented as having reacted against it, "regressing" into a dualism centered on the opposition between this world and the Pure Land.

Shinran is pictured as having overcome Hōnen's dualism due to *Tendai hongaku* influence, and arriving at a True Pure Land standpoint that positively affirms worldly reality, reflected in aspects of his teaching such as the rejection of *raigō-shisō* or the after-death event of meeting with Amida; the *nyorai-tōdō-setsu* or doctrine of equality between buddha and ordinary beings; the *akunin-shōki-setsu* or the affirmation of the primacy of the salvation of the wicked; and *jinen-hōni* or naturality in action. In short, these key aspects that bring out Shinran's originality are attributed by Tamura to *Tendai hongaku* influence.

Dōgen is described as presenting a view in many ways similar to that of the doctrine of innate enlightenment, in his affirmations of non-duality of birth-death and nirvana, in his teaching on being-time, etc., but he criticizes the doctrine of innate enlightenment based on his own emphasis

on the importance of practice. For Tamura this is a "regression" into dualism, as it makes distinctions between delusion and enlightenment, practice and non-practice, etc.

Nichiren is presented in two phases, an early phase still subject to *Tendai hongaku* influence where he makes pronouncements revealing a monistic standpoint, and a later phase rejecting monism and reverting to a standpoint placing historical and social realities as in tension and opposition with the absolute world, a phase precipitated by the failure of his endeavors and the persecution he received from the authorities. The distinction of these two phases is presented by Tamura as a base for a critical norm for considering the authenticity or inauthenticity of many works attributed to Nichiren, in tracing terms of alleged *Tendai hongaku* influence and examining these in the light of the purported period in which they were written.

Tamura's schema attempts to elucidate the philosophic-religious standpoints of the Kamakura founders and examines their particular Buddhist teachings in terms of an interplay of monism-dualism, with the doctrine of innate enlightenment as the reference point on one pole, and the particular founder's attitude toward historical and worldly realities on the other. Such a schema allows for comparison and contrast based on a common framework, and certainly helps in situating these major figures in relation with each other in the light of this framework.

However, such a schema tends to oversimplification, and would gloss over significant factors underlying the particular teachings of the founders which point us back, on the one hand, to their primal religious experience (see for example Nakanishi), and their grappling with and their stance *vis-a-vis* social and historical realities of their time in the light of this primal experience, on the other.

Further investigation into the above Kamakura figures on the relationship of these two aspects, i.e., their primal religious experience, on

the one hand, and their stance *vis-a-vis* social and historical realities, on the other, are called for, to throw greater light on the question of the unique contribution as well as underlying commonality (i.e., as *Buddhist* teaching) of these Kamakura masters. (As one example of an investigation into this relationship between religious experience and stance *vis-a-vis* social and historical realities, see Futaba, 1970.)

More recent studies are shedding further light on the Kamakura period in terms of a socio-religious history, i.e., on the interconnection between the socio-political, economic and cultural elements of the period and the religious ferment and development that left its mark on subsequent phases of Japanese history. Tamura's work provides one point of consideration in elucidating a mode of thinking (the doctrine of innate enlightenment) that was of crucial influence in the religious circles of the era, in mapping out its roots in Buddhist doctrinal history through India and China, and pointing out the distinct contribution of indigenous characteristics in its development and full flowering on Japanese soil.

Tendai hongaku shisō or the doctrine of innate enlightenment, hailed by Tamura as the "climax" or apex in the development of Buddhist thought, is thus referred to by him as a unique Japanese contribution to Buddhism. However, whether it is uniquely Japanese, (or for example, whether it reveals a common tendency with other esoteric traditions in different cultural and geographic contexts), and whether it is indeed Buddhism or an aberration of it, are questions now raised by younger scholars, and are ongoing issues in Japanese academic circles. (Cf. Hakamaya, 1989,¹⁰ 1990, and Matsumoto, 1990)

FOOTNOTE

1. Among recent studies which deserve mention are Ōzumi Kazuo, "Kamakura Bukkyō to sono kakushin undō," *Iwanami Kōza Nihon Reki-shi* 5: *Chūsei*. Iwanami Shoten, 1975; Kuroda

Toshio, *Nihon Chūsei no Kokka to Shūkyō*, Iwanami Shoten, 1975, and *Nihon Chūsei no Shakai to Shūkyō*, Iwanami Shoten, 1990; Takagi Yutaka, *Kamakura Bukkyō-shi Kenkyū*, Iwanami Shoten, 1982; Ōno Tatsunosuke, *Kamakura Shinbukkō Seiritsu-ron*, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1982; Satō Hiroo, *Nihon Chūsei no Kokka to Bukkyō*, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987; Matsuo Kenji, *Kamakura Shinbukkō no Seiritsū — Nyūmon Girei to Soshi Shinwa*, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1988; Sasaki Kaoru, *Chūsei Kokka no Shūkyō Kōzō — Taisei Bukkyō to Taiseigai Bukkyō no Sōkoku*, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1988; Takagi Yutaka, ed., *Ronshū Nihon Bukkyō-shi 4: Kamakura Jidai*, Yūzankaku, 1988.

2. Shimaji Daitō, "Nihon Ko-Tendai Kenkyū no Hitsuyō wo Ronzu," *Shisō*, vol. 60 (1926). Cited in Tamura, 1965, p. 370.

3. An English article of Tamura (1984) translates the term with the awkward "Original Awakening Thought;" "Inherent enlightenment" and "innate awakening" have also been used for *hongaku*.

4. Hakamaya Noriaki, *Hongaku-shisō Hihan*, Daizō Shuppan, 1989, *Hihan Bukkyō*, Daizō Shuppan, 1990, and Matsumoto Shirō, *Engi to Kū: Hongaku-shisō Hihan*, Daizō Shuppan, 1990, are collections of articles by two young scholars critical of various themes of *hongaku shisō* which have provoked discussion and debate in Japanese academic circles. Recently a popular-oriented Buddhist monthly devoted a special issue on this debate, with articles by academics and journalistic writers as well. (See *Agama*, vol. 118, February 1991.)

5. I am personally deeply indebted to the late Professor Tamura, and grateful for the privilege of having been able to attend his seminars on *Tendai hongaku shisō* for several years during the early to mid-seventies at Tokyo University and to have received his personal guidance.

6. I find that the distinction between "new" and "old" is still a viable framework in talking of Kamakura Buddhism, (James H. Foard, "In search

of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, Dec. 1980:7/4,261-291 (notwithstanding) to distinguish the religious movements which originated during this period which came to be significant sociological entities ("sects" in the proper sense) in later periods of Japanese history. Kuroda, 1975 (cf. note 1, above) makes significant points in reevaluating the continuity and prevailing influence of the "old" Buddhism, correcting stereotyped pictures of the "New Buddhism" presented with sectarian biases.

7. Standard English translations use the word "faith," but I follow Hirota (1991) in simply rendering *shinjin* to mean that attitude of entrusting oneself totally to Amida's vow.

8. I am grateful to Dr. Alfred Bloom of the Institute of Buddhist Studies, Berkeley, California, for calling my attention to Nakanishi's paper.

9. Since Tamura's work, a significant study examining the influence of *Tendai hongaku shisō* on Dōgen has been published by Yamauchi Shun'yū, entitled *Dōgen Zen to Tendai Hongaku Hōmon*, Daizō Shuppan, 1985. The inquiry is also taken up by Ikeda Rosan, *Dōgen-gaku no Yōran*, Daizō Shuppan, 1989.

10. Cf. a review by Paul Swanson, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol.17/1, 1990, for an introduction to the discussion generated in Japanese academic circles.

ABBREVIATIONS OF TEXTURAL SOURCES

Iwanami *Shōbōgenzō*, 3 vols. Ed. by Etō Sokuō, Iwanami Bunko, 1942.

NBZ *Dai Nippon Bukkyō Zensho*

NIB *Shōwa Teihon Nichiren Shōnin Ibun* (1952-56)

SZS *Teihon Shinran Shōnin Zenshū* (1969)

(Unless otherwise indicated, I take responsibility for English translations of excerpts from the above sources quoted in this article.)

REFERENCES

- Asai Yōrin. *Nichiren Shōnin Kyōgaku no Kenkyū*. Heirakuji Shoten, 1945.
- Futaba Kenkō. *Shinran no Kenkyū — Shinran ni okeru Shin to Rekishi*. Kyoto: Hyakka-en, 1970.
- Hakamaya Noriaki. *Hongaku-shisō Hihan*. Tokyo: Daizō, 1989.
- _____. *Hihan Bukkyō*. Tokyo: Daizō, 1990.
- Hirota, Dennis. "Breaking the Darkness: Images of Reality in the Shin Buddhist Path," *Japanese Religions*, 16/3 (1991).
- Ienaga Saburō. *Chūsei Bukkyō Shisō-shi Kenkyū*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1963.
- Matsumoto Shirō. *Engi to Kū: Hongaku-shisō Hihan*. Tokyo: Daizō, 1990.
- Nakanishi Chikai. "Shinran ni okeru Hongaku to Jitsuzon no Mondai," *Shinshūgaku* 36 (1967).
- Tada Kōryū, et al. *Tendai Hongaku-ron*. Nihon-Shisō Taikei. Iwanami Shoten, 1973.
- Tamura Yoshirō. *Kamakura Shin-bukkyō shisō no kenkyū*. Heirakuji Shoten, 1965.
- _____. *Nihon bukkyō-shi nyūmon*. Kadokawa sensho, 1969.
- _____. With Umehara Takeshi. *Bukkyō no shisō 5. Zettai no Shinri (Tendai)*. Kadokawa shoten, 1970.
- _____. "Critique of Original Awakening Thought in Shōshin and Dōgen," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 11/2-3 (1984).
- _____. "Japanese Culture and the Tendai Concept of Original Enlightenment," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14/2-3 (1987).