

FUSŌ GOBUSSHIN-RON

『扶桑護佛神論』

:

INTRODUCTION

W.J. Boot

M.M.E. Buijnsters

L. Fusō gobusshin-ron: The text

According to the Nihon Kotenseki Sōgō Mokuroku (NKSM) database, *Fusō gobusshin ron* 扶桑護佛神論 (ID 3902656) was never printed, and only exists in three manuscripts, resp. in the possession of the University of Kyoto, of Ise Jingū, and of one Yamamoto Esshin 山本悦心.¹ There may very well have been other manuscripts of *Gobusshin-ron* around. One indication is a quotation from *Gobusshin-ron* 1:24b- 1:25a, which describes Inbe no Tansai 忌部丹齋 (dates unknown) presenting a copy of "a text by Shōtoku-*taishi*" to Iemitsu. Yoda Sadashizu (Henmui) 依田貞鎮・偏無為 (1681-1764) quotes the passage in his *Taisei-kyō raiyu* 大成經来由, but the wording of the quotation differs considerably from the Kyoto manuscript.² Apparently, Henmui is quoting from a different source. Another indication is given in an article by Mitamura Engyo 三田村鳶魚 (1870-1952), in which he mentions a manuscript of *Gobusshin-ron* in the possession of the Kan'eiji, which he consulted there

¹ A Yamamoto Esshin is mentioned in the catalogue of the National Diet Library; he was active in the Taishō and early Shōwa Periods, doing research in fields germane to Zen and *Taisei-kyō*. We may assume he is deceased. It is unclear what has happened with the manuscript.

² *Taisei-kyō raiyu ki* is reproduced in Kōno Seizō, *Kuji taisei kyō ni kan-suru kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kokugakuin Daigaku, 1953), pp. 109-130; the present quotation on pp. 127-128.

in 1940, but which is not mentioned in the NKSM database.³

Fusō gobusshin ron was written by Chōon Dōkai 潮音道海 (1628-1695); the preface is dated Jōkyō 4 (1687). Our transcription and translation are based on the copy of Kyoto University (no. 1-03 フ 1), which we have to some extent collated with the manuscript of Ise Bunko

Our manuscript consists of three fascicles, bound as one volume.⁴ Fascicle 1 counts 2 (Preface) + 32 double pages; fascicle 2 counts 26 double pages; and fascicle 3 counts 27 double pages. The Preface has six lines per half page, with nine characters per line. The text itself counts eight lines per half page, with seventeen characters per line. The text is in *Kanbun*; *kaeriten*, *okurigana* and *furigana* are added. The text and the occasional headnotes are all in the same hand. It is clearly and consistently written. If not intended as a *kōhon* 稿本 for a publication that never took place, it is at least a professionally made copy. It does, however, contain some mistakes, most of which are corrected in interlinear notes.

A later hand added a punctuation in red ink, and vertical strokes, joining together two or more characters. According to the usual convention, a double stroke through the middle indicates the title of text; a single stroke through the middle indicates a personal name; and a stroke on the right side indicates a geographical name.

The date given at the end of the Preface is Jōkyō 4 (1687). There is a note in red ink next to the date, which says "Till An'ei 4, eighty-nine

³ Mitamura Engyo, "*Taisei-kyō gaku no dentō*," *Dainichi* 大日 (1941, 1), pp. 26-31.

⁴ A thorough description of *Gobusshin-ron*, based on the same manuscript of Kyoto University that we are using, is given by Yazaki Hiroyuki 矢崎浩之; see his "Chōon Dōkai no Razan hihan to sono ito: *Fusō gobusshin ron* wo chūshin ni shite," *Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō* 27 (2010), pp. 36-53.

years have gone by" 至安永四年經八十九年. The most likely implication is that the reader who added the notes in red ink, read the manuscript in An'ei 4 (1775). In the final line on the last page of fasc. 3, another date is given: "Shōtoku 4, Senior of Wood & Ox, Autumn, day of the first decade of the eighth month." We take this to be the date on which the present manuscript was completed. *Ergo*: Chōon completed his manuscript in 1687, a copy was completed in September / October 1714, and it was read in 1775.

There are no other indications of use, and no indications of ownership apart, perhaps, from the two, for us undecipherable seals that we find on the *recto* of the first page of the Preface, under the seal of the library of Kyoto University.

Each fascicle is divided into sections of varying length, the great majority of which commence with a quotation from *Honchō jinja kō* 本朝神社考 ("Examination of the shrines of our realm") by Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657), or from the disquisitions 辨 (*ben*) and essays 論 (*ron*), the commonplace book 隨筆 (*zuihitsu*), and the sundry writings 雜書 (*zassho*) in the *Razan Rin-seisei bunshū* 羅山林先生文集.⁵ The usual introductory phrase is "Rin-shi iwaku" 林氏曰 ("Mr. Hayshi says"). After the quotation, Chōon counters with his criticism. Often, his criticism or counterargument consists of lengthy quotations from *Sendai kuji hongji taisei-kyō* 先代旧事本紀大成經 (*Taisei-kyō*, for short).

⁵ Razan's *Bunshū* and *Shishū* 詩集 count seventy-five fascicles each. All references are to the modern edition, *Razan-sensei bunshū*, *Razan-sensei shishū*, Kyōto Shisekikai, ed., 2+2 vols, Kyoto: Heian Kōko Gakkai, 1921. The book was reprinted by Perikansha (Tokyo: 1979); the text is identical, only the pagination differs.

We have consistently compared the quotations with the texts as given in Razan's *Bunshū*, in *Jinja-kō*, in *Taisei-kyō*,⁶ or in the other works that are cited. The differences between the original texts and the quotations in *Gobusshin-ron* are referred in the notes.

In our manuscript, the first line of a new section begins at the top of the page. Otherwise, the text is written without breaks. There is one exception to this rule, which probably is a mistake on the part of the copyist. On the basis of the contents, we think that on p. 3:7a, line 6, a new section begins, marked by the characters 林氏.

The first fascicle counts seventeen sections.⁷ Sections 1 to 6 all begin with a quotation from *Honchō jinja kō*; they cover pages 1:1a to 1:14b.⁸ Section 7 (pp. 1:14b-1:18a) begins with a quotation from one of Razan's disquisitions. Section 8 (pp. 1:18a-1:21a) begins with a quotation from Razan's *Zuihitsu*. Sections 9 (pp. 1:21a-1:21b), 10 (pp. 1:21b-1:22a), and 11 (pp. 1:22a-1:22b) all begin with quotations from the same disquisition. As they are on the same theme and relatively short, they might possibly have been intended by Chōon as one section. Section 12 (pp. 1:22b-1:24b) also begins with a quotation from one of Razan's disquisitions. Section 13 (pp. 1:24b-1:26a) begins with an apocryphal story, for which no source is indicated. Section 14 (pp. 1:26a-1:27b) begins with the quotation of an entry in the *Zuihitsu*. Sections 15 (pp. 1:27b-1:28b), 16 (pp. 1:28b-1:30b), and 17 (pp. 1:30b-

⁶ For *Taisei-kyō* we use both the edition in *Zoku Shintō taikai. Ronsetsu-hen: Sendai kuji hongī taisei kyō* (4 vols, Ogasawara Haruo, ed., Tokyo: Shintō Taikai Hensankai, 1999), and the copy of the edition of 1679 (partly printed, partly in manuscript) in the possession of Naikaku Bunko, no. WA 15151 // 143-0452, which can be downloaded from the homepage of Naikaku Bunko.

⁷ See Yazaki, "Chōon Dōkai no Razan hihan," pp. 37-39, for a similar table of the various sections and the passages in Razan's works to which they refer.

⁸ Section 1: pp. 1:1a-1:4b; section 2: pp. 1:4b-1:5b; section 3: pp. 1:5b-1:10a; section 4: 1:10a-1:11a; section 5: pp. 1:11a-1:13a; section 6: pp. 1:13a-1:14b.

1:32b) all begin with quotations from one or other of Razan's disquisitions.

The second fascicle consists of six sections. The first three (pp. 2:1a-10b, pp. 2:10b-12b, p. 2:12b) begin with quotations from *Jinja-kō*.⁹ The fourth (pp. 2:12b-20b) begins with the inscription Razan wrote for the grave of his brother Eiki 永喜 (Hayashi Nobuzumi 信澄, 1585-1638). The final two sections (pp. 2:21a-24a, and pp. 2:24b-26a) are both based on quotations from Razan's *Zuihitsu*.¹⁰

The third fascicle counts nineteen sections. The first (pp. 3:1a-2a) begins with a quotation from one of Razan's essays. The second (pp. 3:2a-3a) is based on one of his miscellaneous writings (*zassho*), though no source is mentioned. The third (pp. 3:3a-4a) is based on one of Razan's disquisitions. The fourth (pp. 3:4a-5a) begins with a statement by Chōon, and then continues with a quotation from one of Razan's miscellaneous writings. Sections five (pp. 3:5a-6a) and six (pp. 3:6a-7a) are based on quotations from various entries in Razan's *Zuihitsu*, while the sections seven (pp. 3:7a-8b), eight (pp. 3:8b-9a), and nine (pp. 3:9a-10a) begin with quotations from three of Razan's disquisitions. Section ten (pp. 3:10a-13a) is based on one of his essays. Numbers eleven (pp. 3:13a-14b), twelve (pp. 3:14b-17a), and thirteen (pp. 3:17a-18a) are again based on his disquisitions. The remainder, sections fourteen till nineteen, are based on quotations from Razan's *Zuihitsu*.¹¹

⁹ Yazaki, "Chōon Dōkai no Razan hihan," p. 38, adds an extra section, running from 2:11b, line 4, till 2:12b, line 2. As it is introduced by the words 又神社考一曰, "Rin-shi" is *not* mentioned, and the section does *not* begin at the top of a new line, we have decided not to treat it as a separate section.

¹⁰ Yazaki, "Chōon Dōkai no Razan hihan," p. 38, again adds an extra section, running from 2:23a, line 2, till the end of 2:23b. Again, we have decided not to follow him, because the passage does *not* begin on a new line and the argument, including the reference to Razan's *Gunsho daisetsu* 軍書題説 (*Bunshū* 62), is a continuation of the preceding text.

¹¹ Section 14: pp. 3:18a-19b; section 15: pp. 3:19b-20b; section 16: pp. 3:21a-22a; section 17: pp.

For an overview of the contents of the various sections, see underneath, "III. The contents."

II. *Fusō gobusshin-ron*: The context

In the Preface, Chōon says that he had occasion to read Hayashi Razan's *Jinja-kō* and *Bunshū* while he was residing in the Fudōji in Kurotaki, i.e., between 1683 and 1687. From what he read, he concluded that Razan, although he was posing as a supporter of Shinto, was in fact undermining it, and that he was also saying unacceptable things about Buddhism. This prompted him to compose *Fusō gobusshin ron.*; this title can be translated as "Treatise of Japan's protective Buddha's and deities."

Razan and his *Jinja-kō* had come to Chōon's attention earlier. In his essay "Kamo sanshin" 賀茂三神 (*Shigetsu yawa* 1), he describes how, in his early manhood 壯歳, he became interested in the three gods of the Kamo shrine in Kyoto. He asked around, but nobody knew; all answered with quotations from *Jinja-kō*, and that did not inspire much confidence: 「只以神社考加茂説相答、故不能無疑念也」. It was only when he read *Sendai kuji hongī*, in the beginning of the Kanbun Period (1661-1673), that he finally knew the details of these deities. Now, this does not prove that he had read *Jinja-kō* in the sixteen-fifties, but it *does* prove that he had conceived a distrust of Razan many years before he wrote *Gobusshin-ron*.

As one reads *Gobusshin-ron*, one gets the impression that one

reason, perhaps the most important reason, Chōon had for writing it was not to criticise Razan, but to make propaganda for *Taisei-kyō*. The extent to which Chōon relies on this text is remarkable, certainly in view of the fact that it had been exposed as a forgery and forbidden by the *bakufu* only a few years before, in 1681.¹² Chōon had been involved at the very least in printing *Taisei-kyō*, and had been punished for that, so he knew about the prohibition. Nevertheless, he is quoting *Taisei-kyō* as an authoritative source and to all appearances he was convinced of the truth of this text. These circumstances would explain, on the one hand, his urge to make propaganda for *Taisei-kyō* and, on the other, the fact that *Gobusshin-ron* was never published.

As he explains in the Preface, Chōon wrote *Gobusshin-ron* because he was peeved by Razan's criticisms of Buddhism and his underhand attempt to give a Neo-Confucian interpretation of Shinto. The work, therefore, fits into the tradition of Buddhist-Confucian polemics that began with *Ju-Butsu mondō* 儒仏問答, a text jointly written by Hayashi Razan and Matsunaga Teitoku 松永貞徳 (1571-1653), that was published sometime near the middle of the seventeenth century.¹³ This tradition continued at least till the end of the eighteenth century, when we find the anonymous *Denchū mondō*,¹⁴ which is part

¹² The date is given and the circumstances are related in the diary of Konoe Motohiro 近衛基熙 (1648-1722), *Motohiro-kō ki* 基熙公記 (ID 1757897), under Enpō 9 (1681)/9/29 (which happened to be the day on which the *nengō* changed to Tenna; Enpō 9 retroactively became Tenna 1). A digital copy of the manuscript in the possession of the Kunaichō Shoryōbu is available through the homepage of the National Institute of Japanese Literature (NIJL); see frames 800-801.

¹³ This text is available in the thoroughly annotated edition; see Ōkuwa Hitoshi 大桑斉, Maeda Ichirō 前田一郎, eds, *Razan, Teitoku Ju-Butsu mondō. Chūkai to kenkyū*, Tokyo: Perikansha, 2006.

¹⁴ See W.J. Boot, "Shunmuki and *Denchū mondō*: Two Instances of Buddhist-Confucian Polemics in the Edo Period," in: Blussé, Leonard & Harriet T. Zurndorfer, eds, *Conflict and Accommodation in Early Modern East Asia. Essays in Honour of Erik Zürcher* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 38-53; id., "Kinsei ni okeru Ju-Butsu ronsō: *Denchū mondō* wo chūshin ni suete," *Kikan Nihon shisōshi* 78 (2011), pp. 88-107.

of the same strand of polemics. Our earlier effort in the field of Buddhist-Confucian polemics, *Jinja-kō bengi* 神社考辨疑 by the Shingon priest Jakuhon 寂本 (1631-1701) also falls within the same tradition. Typical of this tradition is, that every time it is Hayashi Razan who is cast as the enemy of Buddhism and the prejudiced partisan of Confucianism.

In Chōon's oeuvre, the work that comes closest to *Fusō gobusshin ron* is *Fusō sandō ken'yo roku* 扶桑三道權輿錄 (ID 3902689; "Record of the beginning of the Three Ways in Japan"). This text consists of long quotations from *Taisei-kyō*, followed by comments (*hyō* 評) by Chōon.¹⁵ It is a text in two fascicles, bound as one volume. The preface, by Chōon, is dated "Genroku *kinōe inu*, final month of spring, lucky day," which corresponds to March / April 1694, one year before his death. According to the NKSM Database, the text was printed, but no date is given. According to the same database, the text survives in two manuscripts and two printed copies.

We have consulted the manuscript copy in the possession of Naikaku Bunko (signature 17904-193-2; 52 frames), which the library has made available in digitalised form. According to the catalogue, this copy is an autograph. *Okurigana* and *kaeriten* are added, but it does not have a colophon, nor does it show any signs of use such as red dots, marginalia, etc. An investigation of the other three surviving copies might add to these bare facts.

¹⁵ A comparable text, consisting of criticisms of *Shūgi Wa-sho* 集義和書 by Kumazawa Banzan 熊沢蕃山 (1619-1691), is Chōon's *Saija-ron* 摧邪論; see Yazaki, "Chōon Dōkai no Razan hihan," p. 50 (n. 3), and the article, mentioned there, by Yamamoto Shinkō 山本眞巧, "Kumazawa Banzan hihan no sho: *Saija-ron* honkoku to kaidai," *Tamagawa Gakuen Joshi Tanki Daigaku kiyō* 20 (1996).

Both for the selections from *Taisei-kyo* and for the comments, *Sandō ken'yo roku* should certainly be compared with *Gobusshin-ron*; this is one of our future projects. The text proves, anyway, that until the year before his death, Chōon had still not given up on *Taisei-kyō* and was doing his best to promote the text; and that he could do so with little risk of running awry of the *bakufu*.

III. *Fusō gobusshin-ron*: The contents.

Fascicle 1, Section 1 (pp. 1:1a-1:4b), begins with a discussion, quoted from *Jinja-kō*, between Razan and an unnamed opponent about the story that Crown Prince Shōtoku 聖徳太子 (574-622) was the incarnation of the Chinese Buddhist Master Huisi 慧思 (515-577). Razan is very negative; he cannot *completely* deny the possibility of reincarnation, but fundamentally, the idea cannot be reconciled with Confucian metaphysics. Incarnation is a Buddhist superstition.

Chōon counters his argument in two ways. First, he accuses Razan of inconsistency because he *does* acknowledge the possibility that men (after their death) become ogres (*tengū*), and because he ignores passages in the Chinese histories that confirm reincarnation, while, as a Confucian, he is held to believe them.

Next, he claims that both Buddhism and Shinto acknowledge the existence of the Three Worlds, i.e., acknowledge that reincarnation is a fact. When Confucians like Razan deny reincarnation and teach that to their lords, they are undermining the public order, for it is only through fear of *karma* that the people behaves.

Fascicle 1, Section 2 (pp. 1:4b-1:5b), begins with a very short quotation from *Engi-shiki* 延喜式, through *Jinja-kō*, stating that there are "3,132 greater and smaller shrines in Japan." Chōon chides Razan for using the wrong source. A much older, and therefore much more authoritative source is *Taisei-kyō*, which Chōon emphatically says *Razan has read*. Instead of giving the correct number of shrines, however, Chōon next criticizes Razan for calling the shrine in Ise a *sōbyō* 宗廟, while in *Taisei-kyō* it is called a *sōgū* 宗宮: it is not a mausoleum for a dead ancestor, but the dwelling of a living, ancestral goddess.

Fascicle 1, Section 3 (pp. 1:5b-1:10a), begins with a discussion about the *Mirai-ki* 未来記 ("Records of the future"), quoted from *Jinja-kō*. Razan's interlocutor asks whether this book is, in fact, kept in the Shitennōji. Razan says that he doubts very much, whether this text exists, and also doubts that this text had been written by Shōtoku, *if* it exists, or would be true, *if* it is written by Shōtoku. He also denies the truth of the story, told in *Taihei-ki* 太平記, that back in 1332 (Genkō 2/8/3) Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成 (1294-1336) consulted the text in the Shitennōji.

Chōon counters these doubts by stating that fascicle 69 of *Taisei-kyō*, which was composed by Shōtoku in person, is entitled *Mizen hongī* 未然本紀 ("Basic annals of what has not yet come to pass"), and contains predictions for the next one thousand years, written by Shōtoku on the basis of conversations with the deities Amaterasu and Hachiman. Chōon quotes the Preface of *Mizen hongī*, which details the circumstances under which the text was composed, and thus tries to prove his case.

The Preface states that the text of *Mizen hongji* was presented to Empress Suiko 推古 (554-592-628) by Shōtoku's son. The remainder of the preface mainly consists of conversations between Empress Suiko and Nakatomi no Kamako 中臣鎌子 (= Fujiwara no Kamatari 藤原鎌足, 614-669), who as a young boy had served Shōtoku and attended some of the meetings between him and the two gods. Finally, the empress entrusts the text to Kamatari, who read it and interpreted it to the satisfaction of the empress. Together with all the other fascicles of *Taisei-kyō*, copies of *Mizen hongji* were kept at the Isonomiya in Ise, the Miwa Jinja in Sakurai, and the Shitennōji in Osaka.

Fascicle 1, Section 4 (pp. 1:10a-1:11a), again begins with a discussion between Razan and an unidentified interlocutor, quoted from *Jinja-kō*, about the legend that Shōtoku-*taishi* "mounted a coal-black horse from Kai" and flew to the top of the Fuji. Razan very much doubts the truth of the story, for one, because it is not mentioned in any of the regular sources. It probably is a baseless story, of which you find many in Shōtoku's biographies. As a final thought Razan suggests that Shōtoku's later biographers probably tried to emulate the biographies of the Buddha.

In rebuttal, Chōon says that the story is told in Shōtoku's biography in *Taisei-kyō*,¹⁶ so it must be true. Razan is just too narrow-minded to be able to accept this truth.

Fascicle 1, Section 5 (pp. 1:11a-1:13a), begins with a discussion of another story told about Shōtoku, which was, that he declared that he

¹⁶ As it is, this part of Shōtoku's biography in *Taisei-kyō* is identical with the text in *Denryaku* 傳略, which, therefore, will have been the source used by the compilers of *Taisei-kyō*. Chōon, of course, might have espoused the contrary opinion, but he fails to make this point.

would have no descendants and therefore ordered the workmen building his tumulus to reduce its size. Asked what he thinks of it, Razan answers that the words of the Crown Prince remind him of Christian arguments against the Confucian position that it is unfilial not to have children, and that they are both one-sided - miss the point.

In rebuttal, Chōon gives a lengthy quotation from *Taisei-kyō*, telling the *true* story of Shōtoku's visit to his grave as it was under construction, and of the explanation he gave to his concerned courtiers. Shōtoku told them that he knew it was his *karma* not to have descendants, and that he could not do anything about it. The true biography of Shōtoku is *Seikō hongī* 聖皇本紀 in *Taisei-kyō*, not the *Taishi-den* Razan is quoting.

Fascicle 1, Section 6 (pp. 1:13a-1:14b), discusses Shōtoku-*taishi*'s most famous dictum: "Shinto is the root and trunk, Confucianism is the branches and leaves, and Buddhism is the flowers and fruit." Someone asks Razan what he thinks of it, and Razan says it is rubbish. The words do not come from Shōtoku, but were foisted on him by later Shinto scholars - the Urabe 卜部 and Nakatomi 中臣. The words are also out of character: the Crown Prince was first and foremost a Buddhist, and he made no effort to promote Confucianism.

Chōon first quotes *Seikō hongī*, which gives the exact date of the interview between Emperor Bidatsu 敏達 (538-572-585) and Shōtoku at which Shōtoku produced and explained this metaphor. Chōon improvises somewhat on the simile, and ends by saying that the utter truth of this pronouncement is inaccessible to anyone who has not received the requisite initiations.

Fascicle 1, Section 7 (pp. 1:14b-1:18a), is no longer based on *Jinja-kō*, but on a disquisition in Razan's *Bunshū* entitled *Karaishin no ben* 火雷神辯 ("Disquisition on the god Ho no Ikazuchi").¹⁷ The topic under discussion is the real existence of the gods. It is kindled by Razan's dismissal of the legend that Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845-903) became a god after his death, vented his wrath by killing his opponents at court through lightning, and burnt down several of the palace buildings. Razan, a true Confucian, only believes in logic (*ri* 理).

Chōon adduces proof from *Taisei-kyō* that gods do really exist. He makes his case by quoting an entry under *Yūryaku* 雄略 12/4/27, that describes the capture of the Thunder God. Not only the Thunder God, but all gods of our country, being living gods, have a form, Chōon continues. The reason why Confucians think that gods have no form is, that in China one does not worship living gods, but the souls of the dead.

This brings Chōon to the fate of Izanami, who had to go to the realm of the dead. Here, he introduces a - to our knowledge unique - new type of theology: the theory that gods have three bodies. He calls these the *li* body 理躬, the *qi* body 氣躬, and the *jing* body 精躬, so the inspiration is clearly Neo-Confucian, but there are differences. For one thing, *jing* is not an independent category in Confucian metaphysics, but a quality of *qi*.

Originally, Chōon continues, the gods are their *li* body. As the world is created, they take on their *qi* and *jing* bodies. Eventually, they will return to their *li* body, *unless* they have committed an offence; then they will go to the Nether World. Which brings us to Izanami: What

¹⁷ See Razan *Rin-sensei bunshū* 26.

offence had she committed, that she had to go to the Nether World? Chōon does not answer this question; the section ends with the not very relevant story that the Japanese gods may manifest themselves in various guises: as men, women, objects, as the case may be.

Fascicle 1, Section 8 (pp. 1:18a-1:21a), begins with a quotation from Razan's *Zuihitsu*, in which he states that Confucianism and Shinto are one in principle, and that only their practices differ. Secondly, he states that the deterioration ("disappearance") of Shinto is due to the introduction of Buddhism.

Chōon claims that Razan sees Buddhism as heterodox because the Buddhists do not have wives and children, and thus place themselves outside the Five Human Relations. In this, Chōon says, Razan is wrong. First, some of the Confucian saints, too, did not have wives and children. Second, many Buddhist believers do have them. There is no reason to claim that Shinto and Confucianism are orthodox (and identical), and that Buddhism is heterodox (and different). The three are different realisations of the same principle.

Fascicle 1, Sections 9 (pp. 1:21a-1:21b), *10* (pp. 1:21b-1:22a), and *11* (pp. 1:22a-1:22b), are all based on Razan's *Hōjō no ben* 放生辨 ("Disquisition about setting free living beings").¹⁸ All three discuss the perennial problem posed by the Buddhist precept of not-killing. In Section 9, Razan reaches the rather shattering conclusion that "all [animals that] we can beat by force, we may eat." "Does that imply," Chōon asks, "that ogres may eat humans? Just because they are stronger?"

¹⁸ See *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* 26.

The discussion is continued in *Section 10*. Chōon quotes Razan as saying that Fuxi 伏犧 is a Saint, because he taught the people how to catch animals and thus to sustain their lives. Chōon objects to this with the rather irrelevant argument that, if this were the criterion, there would be many more Saints, e.g. Confucius, who gave the fish and birds a sporting chance when he hunted or fished for them, or Mencius, who kept himself well away from the kitchens. The reason Fuxi can be regarded as a Saint is not, according to Chōon, that he taught the people to kill, but that, from sheer compassion, he clothed and fed the people.

The discussion is continued in *Section 11*. Chōon quotes Razan's claim that the Buddhists prohibition of killing 不殺生 is *not at all* identical with the Confucian virtue of Benevolence 仁. As Razan phrases it: the Buddhists fail to see that Benevolence forms a continuum with Filial Piety 孝 and Brotherly Love 悌, and is embedded in the human relations, which the Buddhists deny.

Chōon has a sutra at hand that says in so many words that "filial Piety is the beginning, and is the root of the hundred commandments," so what is the problem? And Shinto, too, has Filial Piety as its root. The Confucians just do not know it; they are "like frogs in a well."

Fascicle 1, Section 12 (pp. 1:22b-1:24b), treats the problem of "authentication through genealogy." Both Buddhism and Confucianism know pseudo-genealogical trees that show the affiliation of disciples and masters, going back all the way to the Buddha or to the ancient kings. In his *Kan kangi Enni mondō no ben* 菅諫議圓爾問答辨 ("Disquisition of the Discussion between Councillor Kan and [the monk] Enni"),¹⁹

¹⁹ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26.

Razan discusses the account of a conversation between the Councillor Sugawara no Tamenaga 為長 (1158-1246) and the monk Enni 円爾 (1202-1280). Enni first explained the affiliation of Buddhist teachers, and then asked Tamenaga about the genealogies of Confucian teachers. Tamenaga just walked out, not deigning to answer him. Razan explains, why.

If one takes the Buddhist premise that only those teachers and teachings are authentic(ated) who, c.q. that, can be pursued back from generation to generation, all the way to the Buddha himself, then the Eight Nara sects are all empty teachings, and Zen stopped in the sixth century, with Simha-bhikṣu. The Confucian genealogy, on the other hand, can be followed back from Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200), through Mencius and Confucius and kings Wu 武王 and Wen 文王, to Shun 舜 and Yao 堯. Moreover, the Confucians have always had the same message, embodied in the *Great Learning*, the Four Books, and the Five Classics.

In response, Chōon says, first, that the Buddhist teachings are transmitted through the sutra's and śāstra's and, second, that there exist different kinds of transmissions. As regards the Zen sect - the fact that it still exists *proves* that its "face-to-face" transmission apparently has not been cut off. He also points out that the Confucians try to imitate the transmission of the Zen Sect in their pseudo-genealogy, the "Transmission of the Way" 道統, and that Razan gives a misleading presentation of the contents of this transmission and of the Confucian teachings that are being transmitted. His Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017-1073) and Zhu Xi are late, mediocre thinkers. Moreover, the emphasis

he puts on the teachings of the *Great Learning* and the Four Books makes him forget other aspects of the Confucian teachings such as the principle of "holding fast to the middle", or the "all-pervading unity" of Confucius.

Fascicle 1, section 13 (pp. 1:24b-1:26a), begins with an apocryphal story intended to "prove" that Razan knew *Taisei-kyō*. A man called Inbe no Tansai presented a book to Shogun Tokugawa Iemitsu 徳川家光 (1604-1651) that, he claimed, had been written by Shōtoku-*taishi*; Iemitsu gave it to Razan for inspection. Razan deemed the book a forgery, so the Shogun returned it to Tansai, who became very angry and burnt it.

Chōon concludes that the book just was over Razan's head. Undaunted by the many differences between the recognized histories *Kujiki*, *Kojiki*, and *Nihon shoki*, Razan follows *Nihon shoki*, although it is the youngest of the three. He should, of course, have followed the oldest, *Taisei-kyō*. Moreover, he writes about Shinto without having received the three times twenty-two secret initiations 灌傳 (*kanden*) into Sōgen 宗源, Saigen 齋元, and Reisō 靈宗 Shintō. Razan should not be allowed to talk about Shinto.

Fascicle 1, section 14 (pp. 1:26a-1:27b), begins with a quotation from the *Zuihitsu*, in which Razan equates the Way of the Gods 神道 with the Way of the King 王道, and claims that both were discarded, once Buddhism began to flourish. Chōon claims, of course, that Razan is mistaken: he trusts Chinese sources more than Japanese sources. Moreover, Razan's own brand of Shinto, the so-called *Ritō shinchi shintō* 理當心地神道 is nothing but foreign Confucianism - first preached by Wani 王仁 during the reign of emperor Ōjin 応神 (Trad. dates 200-

270-310), and at that time refuted by Crown Prince Uji (= Uji no Waki Iratsuko 菟道稚郎子; dates unknown). One cannot possibly maintain that Shinto or the Way of the King were discarded at that time.

What time are we talking about, anyway? The Buddhist and Confucian texts did not become common knowledge before the reign of Suiko, when Shōtoku-*taishi* gave Japanese readings to the Chinese characters. The great priests Saichō 最澄 (767-822) and Kūkai 空海 (774-835) wrote many texts about Shinto, in the tradition of the Urabe clan. None of them made any attempt to discard Shinto.

Fascicle 1, section 15 (pp. 1:27b-1:28b), begins with a complaint by Razan, quoted from his *Genkō shakusho no ben* 亨釋書辯, that there are many more Buddhist texts around than Confucian ones. Chōon points out that there are a number of old historical texts (*Kujiki*, *Kojiki*, *Nihon shoki*, *Engi-shiki*), but that Confucians and Buddhists alike hardly ever read them. On the other hand, everyone reads Buddhist texts. To Razan's other charge, that the Buddhists "stole" the Chinese script in order to write their sutra etc., Chōon quite correctly points out that borrowing a tool is not theft. Razan himself, a Japanese, is using Chinese characters all the time to write his poetry and prose.

Fascicle 1, section 16 (pp. 1:28b-1:30b), takes its cue from *Koretaka no ben* 惟喬辨.²⁰ Razan tells of the rivalry for the throne between two imperial princes, Koretaka 惟喬 and Korehito 惟仁. Both asked a Buddhist priest to pray for his victory. Razan criticizes this unseemly behaviour, saying that priests should not boast of the effectiveness of their prayer.

²⁰ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26.

Chōon mentions a number of Confucian sages (Confucius, the Duke of Zhou) of whom it is recorded that they prayed. Moreover, one of the four tasks Shōtoku-*taishi* imposed on the Buddhists was prayer. In this, of course Chōon is ingenuous. He must have understood that Razan's point was not that priests should not pray, but that they should not vie in praying in order to determine who is the better priest.

Next, Chōon complains about Confucian historical compilations of the Song Dynasty and about the *Honchō hennen roku* (= *Honchō tsugan* 本朝通鑑), which Razan compiled on orders of the *bakufu*. The problem with these texts is that they leave out all references to Gods and Buddha's, and do not report extraordinary and mysterious events. If one would really want to compile a national history, one should appoint a committee in which the three religions were all represented, in order to get a balanced account.

Fascicle 1, section 17 (pp. 1:30b-1:32b), is based on Razan's disquisition on Urashima Tarō 浦嶋子辨.²¹ In it, he compares two versions of the story and concludes that neither is reliable. Chōon quotes the "true" version from *Taisei-kyō* (under Yūryaku 22/7/?). Again, as in the preceding section, Chōon's complaint is that in Confucian historiography the extraordinary and miraculous are left out. This makes Razan a stranger to the Japanese tradition - both to the Way of the Gods and to the Kingly Way.

Fascicle 2, Section 1 (pp. 2:1a-2:10b), returns to the topic also touched upon in Fasc. 1, Section 14, namely, that the introduction of Buddhism

²¹ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26.

caused the decline of the Kingly way. This time, Chōon quotes the Preface of *Jinja-kō*, where the stress and chronology are slightly different from the entry in the *Zuihitsu*: in the course of the Nara and Heian Periods, the Kingly Way declined, which provided an opportunity for the Buddhists to introduce their Law, and simultaneously caused Shinto to be discarded in favour of Buddhism. Razan mentions the identification of Japanese gods with Buddha's and Bodhisattva's and the combining of shrines and temples into single complexes as instances of this trend.

In rebuttal, Chōon states that *honji suijaku* was not of Buddhist origin, but was first formulated in an oracle of the God of Miwa, and that the first *gongen* to appear in Japan was Emperor Ankan 安閑 (466-531-536), who after his death manifested himself as Yoshino *Gongen* - an incarnation of Maitreya. Of course, in order to really understand *honji suijaku* 本地垂跡, you need an initiation, which Razan does not have.

The combining of shrines and temples was also the result of an oracle of the gods. No proof is offered, but the argument is made that, if it would not have been through an oracle of the gods, the priests and monks could not possibly be living together. The fact that they do, is evidence in itself. Moreover, it is clear that the gods *prefer* Buddhism to Confucianism. Temples prosper, and Confucian schools do not.

This brings Chōon to the famous pronouncement of Yamato-hime 倭姫. Usually, the phrasing is "avoid the breath of Buddhism," and the warning is supposed to be addressed to the Shinto priests of Ise, but Chōon quotes it from *Taisei-kyō* as: "You, Shinto priests, listen properly to my words. *Avoid even the breath of teachings from other countries and*

of other beliefs that [claim that] souls will ever be exhausted." Chōon remarks that Yamato-*hime* spoke these words in the days of Emperor Yūryaku, at which time Buddhism had not yet arrived in Japan. So, it is impossible that the words were directed against Buddhism. The usual source, *Yamato-hime no mikoto seiki* 倭姫命世紀, one of the *Shintō gobusho* 神道五部書 is a late fabrication, and should not be trusted. Moreover, the words "claim that souls will ever be exhausted" clearly indicate, that the princess was warning against Confucianism.

Chōon also quotes a passage from *Mizen hongji* that warns against "new Confucians," and points out another thing that is wrong with Confucianism: animal sacrifices.²² These, too, were objectionable to the Japanese gods. In order to drive this point home, Chōon quotes a long story from the annals of Emperor Senka 宣化 (467-536-539) in *Taisei-kyō* about the wondrous appearance of a young god, sitting on a huge hound, on Kamichiyama in Ise. In an oracle, Amaterasu identified him as the Great God Jison 兒尊, who had come from the Wushan 五山 in China in order to civilise Japan, as he had earlier civilised China. Later on, Emperor Kinmei 欽明 (509-539-571) wanted to sacrifice to the dog and the god on Kamichiyama. At that time, the young god declared that he did not want meat as sacrifice; this was the beginning of vegetarian sacrifices in Japan. To underscore this point, Chōon also quotes the manifestation of Emperor Ankan, who declares that one of the two things he likes is abstention from meat. He even declares this to be "the Way of Heaven."

²² This prediction is found in the tenth section of *Mizen hongji*, so it refers to the tenth period of one hundred years since the days of Shōtoku, i.e. the seventeenth century. The reference thus is to Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 (1561-1619) and Hayashi Razan.

Amaterasu is also involved in the miracle of the camphor tree, which Chōon describes next; in *Taisei-kyō*, it is dated Kinmei 14/5/1. It is reported to the emperor that there are wondrous lights and mysterious chanting in the Sea of Chinu. The emperor sends someone to investigate, and it turns out that these phenomena are caused by a camphor tree drifting in the sea.

Not wanting to make a mistake, the emperor asks the God of Miwa and Amaterasu for oracles. The God of Miwa advises the emperor to make a Buddha statue out of it. Amaterasu tells that the tree was put there by her. She wanted to draw the emperor's attention to "a true man in the west." He would be able to rectify the situation in Japan, which had greatly deteriorated because the gods of the earth had turned bad, and made the people suffer. The emperor should make a statue of the Buddha out of this tree and worship it. The emperor does so, and even before the statue (two statues, actually) is finished, the epidemics had ceased.

Interestingly, Amaterasu also remarked that, once the statue was finished, she would stop giving oracles, adding that, with the introduction of Buddhism, the Three Laws, i.e. Shinto, Confucianism, and Buddhism, would all be present in Japan and would support the imperial dynasty. As proof, she had erected three stones. The priests soon found these, on the same Kamichiyama where the young god had descended.

There is also a counterpoint running through this section, which espouses the Confucian cause, but the ancient kind of Confucianism, not the new-fangled teachings of the Song. The first instance is the otherwise unknown story of a meeting of Shōtoku-*taishi* with the Duke

of Zhou and Confucius in his Yumedono 夢殿; it is based in Shōtoku's biography in *Taisei-kyō*. At this meeting, Shōtoku says that he wants to spread Confucianism in Japan. Therefore, he wants to found a shrine in Hirano (Yamashiro) where the Duke and Confucius will be worshipped, together with Emperor Nintoku 仁徳 and Crown Prince Uji; the four of them will protect the imperial throne and the Great Way. The local god objects, but Shōtoku orders a monk to conduct a ground-breaking ceremony and get rid of him.

If this story shows that Shōtoku-*taishi* was not anti-Confucian, the final story of the section shows that Shōtoku could also be critical of Buddhism; it is, again, taken from *Taisei-kyō*. On Suiko 28/12/3, the God of Miwa gives an oracle in which he says that terrible things will happen, unless cloisters are built in the shrines of Miwa and Ise, and monks are assigned to both places to recite the *Peacock Sutra*. Empress Suiko consults Shōtoku, who tells her not to bother. The God of Miwa apparently wants to raise the status of his own shrine, and in Ise it is impossible to build a cloister. The shrine in Ise should remain as it was in the age of the gods; neither Confucian nor Buddhist sacrifices can be performed there. And the terrible things the God of Miwa predicted only concern Shōtoku, and him alone.

Final proof that the gods do not like Confucianism is given in the final lines: how else can one explain that Buddhist priests are running the shrines, and not Confucian scholars?

It is a long section, and the materials and arguments are rather haphazardly arranged, but taken together, they add up to a thorough refutation of the Confucian pretension, first voiced by Razan, that

Confucianism and Shinto are one, and that Buddhism is the odd one out. It also lays the basis for Shōtoku's role as the one who combined the Three Teachings.

Fascicle 2, Section 2 (pp. 2:10b-2:12b), also begins with a quotation from *Jinja-kō*. It addresses the question which gods are enshrined in the various shrines in Ise, and in which of them Yamato-hime enshrined Amaterasu. Razan bases his account on the different versions of the myth as told in *Nihon shoki* and in *Kujiki*. The versions differ, which gives Chōon the opportunity to insist that the version presented in *Taisei-kyō* under Yūryaku 23 is the true version. After all, *Taisei-kyō* is older than the two sources Razan quotes. The account in *Taisei-kyō* distinguishes three shrines, which it calls Toyouke-no-miya 豊食宮, Uji-no-miya 菟道宮, and Iso-no-miya 五十宮. In this last shrine, Amaterasu is enshrined, together with Izanagi and Izanami.

In *Fascicle 2, Section 3* (p. 2:12b), Chōon briefly criticises the mistaken identification Razan gives in *Jinja-kō* of the god of the Atago-yama.

Fascicle 2, Section 4 (pp. 2:12b-2:20b), treats burials. Chōon takes his cue from the stele inscription Razan wrote for his brother Eiki. In it, Razan prides himself on having buried his brother according to the Confucian rites, not the Buddhist ones. "Wrong," says Chōon. In the days of Empress Suiko, there was an oracle of the God of Miwa, after which it was decided that in Japan we would bury our dead through the Buddhist ritual. Chōon bases himself, of course, on *Taisei-kyō*.

The reason the empress asked for the oracle was a quarrel she had with a courtier who requested permission to turn his father's grave

into a shrine and to sacrifice to him as a god. The empress bluntly refused, but on second thoughts, she instructed her ministers to ask the god what the correct ritual should be, now that both Confucianism and Buddhism had arrived in Japan. In answer, the God of Miwa stated that the gods shun everything that has to do with death and funerals, because these activities are polluting. Hence, no Shinto priest should occupy himself with those. If you leave it to the Confucians, before long you will have animal sacrifices made at the graves. They, too, do not qualify. The Buddhist monks, however, are exempt from pollution and do not engage in animal sacrifice, so leave it to them. The empress ruled accordingly.

After the long quotation from *Taisei-kyō* 34 concerning Empress Suiko, follows a complete quotation of Section 17 of *Taisei-kyō* 60 (*Reikō hongī* 3). It prescribes the correct ways to handle all aspects of burial and mourning, nicely graded according to social status.

After this quotation, Chōon returns to Hayashi Razan, who, as will be clear by now, with his brother's burial disobeyed both the oracle of the God of Miwa and the laws of Empress Suiko. Yet, he has set a precedent that is followed by many. It is just as bad as refusing to register with a temple in order to get the certificate that proves you are not a Christians, which is another thing Confucians do.

Fascicle 2, Section 5 (pp. 2:21a-2:24a), deals with military matters. It begins with a quotation from Razan's *Zuihitsu*, in which he criticizes the reliance of warriors on superstitious beliefs and Buddhist rituals. Chōon is, of course, dismayed by this attitude of Razan, but also picks on Razan's *Gunsho daisetsu*²³ 軍書題説 ("Introductions to, and

²³ See Razan *Rin-sensei bunshū* 62.

explanations of the military books"). His criticism is addressed at the fact that Razan ignores Japan's own, ancient military rules, and focusses on the Chinese system as brought back by Kibi no Makibi 吉備真備 (695?-775) in the eighth century.

Take, for instance, the epochal battle between Mononobe no Moriya 物部守屋 (d. 587) and the imperial forces led by Soga no Umako 蘇我馬子 (d. 626) and Shōtoku-*taishi*. At this occasion, Shōtoku composed overnight his *Gunryo hongī* 軍旅本紀 (*Taisei-kyō* 67-68), in which he summarized the military system of Japan. He gave this to Umako, together with an image of Bishamon for Umako to put into his hair. Thus, the imperial army won its important victory. *Gunryo hongī*, and not the Seven Military Classics of China should be the basis of the military system of Japan.

Moreover, Razan is inconsistent, for in his *Gunsho daisetsu* he discusses several of the practices which in his *Zuihitsu* he decries as superstitious.

Fascicle 2, Section 6 (pp. 2:24b-2:26a), begins with a short quotation from Razan's *Zuihitsu*, in which he criticizes Emperor Kazan 花山 (968-984-986-1008) for becoming a monk at the age of nineteen. "Badly ensnared by Buddhism," is Razan's verdict. "Nonsense," says Chōon, "he is just following the example of Śākyamuni, who also became a monk at nineteen." And, objectively speaking, it is all for the good of the country that many imperial princes take the vows. If they would all marry and have children, there would not be land enough in the realm to give them fiefs.

Razan had also said in his *Zuihitsu* that he wanted to collect all

the Buddhist books of the empire and burn them. According to Chōon, this ambition puts him on par with such villains as Li Si 李斯 (d. 210 B.C.) of the Qin, or Mononobe no Moriya. He has done enough harm already, through his influence on a number of *daimyō*. His ambition and his words go against the pro-Buddhist stance that every Japanese ruler since Suiko took towards Buddhism. See Tōshōgū-*daigongen* as the latest example - deified through *Ryōbu Shintō*.

Fascicle 3, Section 1 (pp. 3:1a-3:2a), begins with a quotation from Razan's essay "On Sannō-gongen" 山王論,²⁴ in which he discusses the Chinese antecedents of the gods worshipped on the Hieizan and along Lake Biwa. In his answer, Chōon emphasizes that *Sannō shintō* c.q. *Sannō ichijitsu* 一實 *shintō* have existed for many centuries, and that the latter, promoted by Tenkai 天海 (1536-1643), was instrumental in the deification of Tokugawa Ieyasu. What Chōon is taking exception to is Razan's all too easy equation of Japanese gods with Chinese ones.

Fascicle 3, Section 2 (pp. 3:2a-3:3a), is based on Razan's remark that the great Buddha statue of Tōdaiji, made by Emperor Shōmu 聖武 (701-724-756) and restored by Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147-1199), and the great Buddha statue in Kyoto, made by Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1536-1598) and repaired by his son Hideyori 秀頼 (1593-1615), were a waste of money. Chōon responds on two levels. (1) Confucians, too, build temples and cast statues of Confucius. They claim that they do that in order to reward merit and to teach future

²⁴ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 25.

generations. Exactly the same applies to *Buddhist* buildings and statues. (2) Confucians acknowledge only this one life and not the karma accumulating in succeeding incarnations. Even in this one life, however, building halls and casting statues brings great advantages to the people. Why? Because gold and grain will flow down to the people, when the rulers and the powerful patrons build temples and have statues cast.

Fascicle 3, Section 3 (pp. 3:3a-3:4a), again concerns one of the more important anecdotes about Shōtoku-*taishi*, viz. his encounter with Bodhidharma. *Nihon shoki* records that Shōtoku met a starving man at Kataoka, gave him his garment, and spoke with him, but it does *not* say that this starving man was Bodhidharma. Razan maintains that that was a later development in Shōtoku's hagiography.

Chōon, of course, stands up for the truth of *Taisei-kyō* and of *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釈書 (1322), which both make the identification. He hits on one element in the story as told in *Nihon shoki* to prove his case more objectively: when after some time the crown prince had the grave opened, there was no body, but the garment he had given to the man remained. The crown prince put on this garment. This means that he knew that the stranger who had died of starvation possessed special spiritual powers, i.e., had been Bodhidharma.

In *Fascicle 3, Section 4* (pp. 3:4a-3:5a), Chōon outlines Shōtoku-*taishi*'s division of human beings into nine categories. These are (upper three levels) True Ones, Perfected Ones, and Holy Ones, (middle three levels) sages, great men, and good men, and (lower three levels) scribes, narrow-minded men, and evil men. Shōtoku-*taishi* was a True One; Razan was a mere scribe.

Chōon proves the latter by quoting Razan's "Telling the followers of Zen" 告禪徒.²⁵ In this pamphlet, Razan tells how the man who later became Daitō kokushi 大燈國師, when still a beggar, killed and ate his child, and also had his wife share in the meal. Razan uses the story to show how depraved Buddhists are. Chōon denies the truth of the story, and uses the fact that Razan quotes it as proof that he is biased and narrow-minded - a typical scribe.

Fascicle 3, Section 5 (pp. 3:5a-3:6a), quotes from Razan's *Zuihitsu* an anecdote about the Confucian scholar Zhang Shi 張栻 (1133-1180), who was a friend of Zhu Xi. The story is that Zhang refused to discuss the concept of "a unity all-pervading" 一以貫之 with the monk Dahui 大慧 (1089-1163), and challenged him to discuss "Loyalty and Reciprocity" 忠恕, instead. Dahui was lost for words. Chōon remarks that it is very unlikely that Dahui knew nothing of "Loyalty and Reciprocity." He just refused to play up to Zhang's discriminatory assumption that, as a Buddhist, he was unaware of basic Confucian concepts.

Authors' comment: Chōon is off the mark, here. The point rather seems to be that Zhang wanted to teach his Buddhist interlocutor that every-day morals were more important than metaphysical discussions.

In *Fascicle 3, Section 6* (pp. 3:6a-3:7a), the point under discussion is the fundamental unity of Buddhism and Confucianism. The discussion is cast in the form of conflicting interpretations of lines of poetry. Chōon quotes from Razan's *Zuihitsu* the contrast he makes between the (Buddhist) verse "Green bamboo is suchness; the yellow

²⁵ See Razan *Rin-sensei bunshū* 56.

flowers are transcendent wisdom" and the (Confucian) verse "Kites fly, fish jump, and the Way is in them." The first, according to Razan, "seems lofty, but has no substance," while the second shows the principles of really existing things.

Chōon qualifies this as an attempt to divide "the great emptiness" into two halves - one half that is noble, and one, that is vile. According to him, the two verses represent two sides of the same coin: the one describes a state of mind, and the other, a man, and everyone will agree that you cannot have states of mind without having men. Chōon next claims that such Buddhist doctrines as "all observable reality is emptiness, and all emptiness is observable reality" are not essentially different from the Neo-Confucian doctrine that all heavenly principles are present in each single herb and tree. Understanding Confucianism implies understanding Buddhism. Razan, apparently, understands neither, and "just spouts nonsense."

Fascicle 3, Section 7 (pp. 3:7a-3:8b), is not marked as a separate section in our manuscript, but in view of its contents, it should be treated as one; it is certainly not a continuation of the preceding section. It begins with a quotation from Razan's second disquisition on Soga no Umako 蘇馬子辯,²⁶ in which Razan says in so many words that Shōtoku and Soga no Umako murdered Emperor Sushun 崇峻 (r. 587-592). This is an application of a figure of style often used in the *Spring and Autumn Annals*: formulating a truth as if it were a fact. *As a matter of fact*, neither Umako nor Shōtoku murdered Sushun, but Umako inspired the murder, and Shōtoku condoned it. This makes both of them

²⁶ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26.

responsible.

Chōon's first response is that Razan is biased. These two men were responsible for the victory of Buddhism. Razan hates Buddhism, so he blames them for the murder. Furthermore, Sushun was a bad ruler. In Confucian terms, killing him was like killing such tyrants as Jie 桀 and Zhou 桀. Secondly, Chōon accuses Razan of ungratefulness: Shōtoku was the one who made it possible for his countrymen to read Chinese. Where would Razan have been without Shōtoku?

Fascicle 3, Section 8 (pp. 3:8b-3:9a), discusses Razan's contention that Shōmu's wife, Empress Kōmyō 光明 (701-760), only pretended to be a pious Buddhist when she bathed one thousand men, but that, in fact, she was a lascivious woman. Razan, Chōon counters, must have a dirty mind - like Zilu 子路, who took it badly when Confucius visited the adulterous wife of Duke Ling 靈公. The empress did nothing but good, when she built her bathhouse, and her initiative was part and parcel of the general efflorescence of Buddhism in the middle of the eighth century. It showed the power of the Buddha's promise of eventual salvation.

Fascicle 3, Section 9 (pp. 3:9a-3:10a), begins with a short quotation from Razan's "Disquisition on [Individual] Articles 章 in the Constitution in Seventeen Articles" 十七條憲章辨.²⁷ He takes exception to the second article: "Sincerely revere the three treasures." Razan discards the three treasure of the Buddha and those of Laozi, and instead opts for those of Mencius: the land, the people, and government.

²⁷ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26. The usual name of the constitution is 十七條憲法; Razan is being difficult. Cf. "Translation," n. 603. The text of the constitution is given in *Nihon shoki* under Suiko 12/1/1; see *Nihon shoki* vol. 2, pp. 142-146, and W.G. Aston, *Nihongi* vol. 2, pp. 128-133.

For the umpteenth time, Chōon says that Razan is a small-minded man of evil disposition, who is unable to see beyond Confucius and Mencius. Contrary to Shōtoku, neither of these ever ruled a state, and the political system they propagated was suited to China, not to Japan.

Fascicle 3, Section 10 (pp. 3:10a-3:13a), addresses Razan's seeming espousal, in his "Essay on Emperor Jinmu" 神武天皇論,²⁸ of the theory that Japan's imperial house descended from Taibo 太伯, a scion of the house of Zhou. Razan knows he is on thin ice, and concludes the first part of the essay with the words that "it is a matter of high antiquity, and not easy to know." Next, however, he says that the Three Regalia 三種神器 need not necessarily be of heavenly origin, but could have been brought by Taibo.

Chōon treats these suggestions as high treason. Evidently, Razan prefers Confucianism to the Way of the Gods, and regards the Chinese histories as more reliable than the Japanese *Kujiki*, *Kojiki*, and *Nihon shoki*? The latter all three say that the imperial house descends from Amaterasu. Moreover, the dates do not fit. Counting back from 1645, Taibo's supposed arrival in Japan would have taken place 2,866 years ago, but the creation of Japan took place at a much earlier time - something like 2,2 million years ago.²⁹ The same sources also show that the Three Regalia cannot have been brought by Taibo. The mirror already figures in the story of Amaterasu hiding in the cave! Razan's stories are baseless, and in spreading them he shows himself to be an enemy of the gods, the Buddha, and the imperial house.

²⁸ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 25.

²⁹ As in all discussions of Taibo, it is unclear with whom he has to be identified: Jinmu, Ninigi, or Amaterasu.

Fascicle 3, Section 11 (pp. 3:13a-3:14b), is based on Razan's "Disquisition on Emperor Kinmei" 欽明天皇辨.³⁰ Razan dislikes him, because he holds him responsible for the introduction of Buddhism into Japan. Razan compares him, therefore, with Emperor Ming 明 (r. 58-76) of the Later Han Dynasty. Chōon quotes one miracle that occurred under Emperor Ming: when Taoists and Buddhist each put their scriptures into the fire, the Taoist scriptures were burnt, but the Buddhist ones remained unscathed. This miracle was sufficient for the emperor to espouse the cause of Buddhism.

In Japan, too, miracles were associated with the introduction of Buddhism. When under Emperor Kinmei Buddhism was introduced from Paekch'e, he gave a golden Buddha statue to one of the courtiers, Soga no Iname 稻目 (d. 570). When subsequently other courtiers, Mononobe no Okoshi 尾輿 (dates unknown) and Nakatomi no Kamako 鎌真 (dates unknown), tried to melt this statue, they could not; neither could they harm it with a hammer. They then threw the statue into the canal of Naniwa. When they reported back to court, out of the blue it started to thunder, and the lightning set the palace buildings on fire.

Fascicle 3, Section 12 (pp. 3:14b-3:17a) is again based on Razan's "Disquisition on Soga no Umako." According to Razan, Umako killed Emperor Sushun. If he had been a Confucian, he would have known the Five Principles, and would not have killed his lord. Instead, he was a follower of Buddhism, and of Buddhism, Master Cheng 程子 had said that it was closer to Principle than the other heterodox teachings and, for that very reason, dangerous.

³⁰ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 26.

Chōon repeats what he said earlier (see above, Fasc. 3, Section 7): Sushun was a very bad ruler - worse, even, than the Chinese kings Jie and Zhou. These were killed by such recognised sages as King Tang 湯 and King Wu, and nobody ever regarded that as a crime. Contrary to what Cheng's words imply, Buddhism is not a seductive, authority-undermining creed. The one who is defying his superiors is Razan himself, whose lord (Tokugawa Ieyasu) was a devout adherent of Buddhism.

Furthermore, Chōon maintains that the Five Principles 五典 were known in Japan, too, long before the introduction of Confucianism under Emperor Ōjin. The existence of families implies the existence of the Five Human Relations 五倫, and the Five Human Relations imply the existence of the Five Principles or Five Constant Virtues 五常. Their existence is a natural phenomenon; you find them even among the birds and beasts or, in nature, in the Five Agents 五行.

In *Fascicle 3, Section 13* (pp. 3:17a-3:18a), Chōon lists four cases of criminal behaviour of modern Confucians in order to counter Razan's attempt to vilify Buddhism through accusing the monk Genbō 玄昉 (d. 746) of lascivious behaviour. Two of the people accused by Chōon can be readily identified; they are Kan Tokuan 菅得庵 (1581-1628) and Yamamoto Taijun 山本泰順 (1636-1669). The other two - a certain person who killed a Mr Hotta, and one Ura no Shinpei 浦新兵 from Owari - are less clear. Chōon concludes that Confucians, too, sometimes commit crimes. *Ergo*, Genbō's misbehaviour does not constitute a case against Buddhism as such.

Authors' remark: If Razan had not been long dead, he could have

responded that the only Confucian scholar on the list is Kan Tokuan, who was his friend and colleague; together they had compiled their teacher Fujiwara Seika's *Bunshū*. Tokuan was killed by one of his students. He was not a criminal, but was *made out to be* a criminal by Nakae Tōju 中江藤樹 (1608-1648), who argued that in order to be killed by a student, you *must* have been a very bad man. Of the others, Yamamoto Taijun was not a Confucian, but a writer of popular literature, and the crime for which he was executed had been committed by his father, not by him. If "Mr Hotta" is the *daimyō* Hotta Masatoshi 堀田正俊 (1634-1684), he was not a killer, but a victim. His killer was the *rōjū* Inaba Masayasu 稲葉正休 (1640-1684). Masatoshi has a number of books to his name, but that hardly makes him a Confucian scholar. Ura no Shinpei is completely unknown.

Fascicle 3, Section 14 (pp. 3:18a-3:19b), opposes the gods of Japan to the gods of China. The section begins by a quotation from Razan's *Zuihitsu*,³¹ in which he, first, identifies the three regalia with the Confucian virtues of Benevolence (the *magatama*), Courage (the sword), and Wisdom (the mirror) and, next, claims that the gods are present in the heart. Chōon says that Razan's claims are of Chinese origin. They were originally introduced into Japan by the Korean scholar Wani, and *at that time already* refuted by Crown Prince Uji; a full account can be found in *Taisei-kyō* 44.³²

Crown Prince Uji's rebuttal of Wani (and by implication of Razan) is that they have too shallow a conception of the gods; they

³¹ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 69: *Zuihitsu* 5.

³² *Taisei-kyō* edn of 1679, fasc. 44, frames 34-55; edn *ZST* vol. 3 pp. 122-123.

identify them with Principle 理, which is present in the human heart, but ignore the "affairs and things" 事物 that constitute perceptible reality. In Japan, the country of the gods, gods are perceived as really existing. The example the Crown Prince quotes is Amaterasu. She is not just "Illustrious Virtue" 明德, she is also the sun, which manifests itself every day.

As regards the Three Regalia, Chōon says that one cannot merely see them as symbols of three different virtues, one must also know them *as* the things they are. For that, however, one needs an initiation.

Fascicle 3, Section 15 (pp. 3:19b-3:20b), begins with a quotation from the *Zuihitsu* that shows Razan at his rational best, analysing and discounting a number of magical stories he has selected from Chinese historical sources.³³ Chōon criticizes him because, first, he presumes not to believe the Chinese histories and, second, seems to forget that *The Twenty-four Paragons of Filial Piety* (*Ershisi Xiao* 二十四孝) also contains impossible stories. If these, too, are nonsense, little will remain of the Confucian corpus. The argument is that, as a Confucian, Razan should believe these sources, and that, if he does not, he is a bad Confucian.

Chōon also marshals an argument from the Buddhist side, which says that everything is the product of consciousness. There is evidence enough that shows that, if one concentrates hard enough, one's thoughts *will* affect other things. *Ergo*, magical spells may very well work.

³³ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 70: *Zuihitsu* 6.

Fascicle 3, Section 16 (pp. 3:21a-3:22a), is again concerned with the differences between the accounts in the ancient histories of Japan. This time, Chōon criticizes a section in the *Zuihitsu*, in which Razan identifies the first deity to appear with the Ultimate of Non-Being 無極 of Zhou Dunyi's *Taijitu* 大極圖, and remarks that it is irrelevant whether this deity is called Kunitokotachi no Mikoto or Amanominakanushi no Mikoto.³⁴

Chōon, again, says that Razan should use the oldest, hence: best, source available, *Taisei-kyō*. Had he done so, he would have known that Amenotokotachi no Mikoto came first and Kuninotokotachi no Mikoto, second, just like Heaven precedes Earth. Placing Kuninotokotachi first is illogical. Had he used *Taisei-kyō*, Razan would also have noticed that his source, *Nihon shoki*, mixes up the gods of the next seven generations and does not provide any biographical detail. *Taisei-kyō* does.

Fascicle 3, Section 17 (pp. 3:22a-3:22b), discusses the various schools of Shinto. In his *Zuihitsu*,³⁵ Razan distinguishes *Sōgen Shintō* (of the Nakatomi, Urabe, and Inbe), *Ryōbu* 兩部 *Shintō* (of Saichō and Kūkai), and *Honji sui-jaku Shintō*; these he opposes to his own, superior brand of Shinto, *Ritōshinchi Shintō*. Chōon has his own three-fold division, based on *Taisei-kyō*: *Sōgen*, transmitted by the Urabe; *Saigen*, transmitted by the Inbe; and *Reisō*, transmitted by the Aji 吾道.

In *Fascicle 3, Section 18* (pp. 3:22b-3:23b), Chōon defends *Shōtoku-taishi* against Razan's charge, quoted from the *Zuihitsu*,³⁶ that the Crown Prince, by using the personal pronoun *zhen* 朕 (the royal

³⁴ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 69: *Zuihitsu* 5.

³⁵ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 69: *Zuihitsu* 5.

³⁶ See *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* 66: *Zuihitsu* 2.

"we"), showed himself to be a usurper comparable to Wang Mang 王莽 (45 B.C.-23 A.D.). Quite reasonably, Chōon points out the Shōtoku was a Crown Prince, not a vassal; that Suiko had tried to cede the realm to him; and that, as a regent, he had ruled the realm in peace. Next, he shows that in the oldest sources, the use of *zhen* was not yet restricted to the Son of Heaven. Third, he returns to an argument he used earlier: it was Shōtoku who taught Japan how to read the Chinese characters; all Confucians are in his debt.

In *Fascicle 3, Section 19* (pp. 3:23b-3:25b), Chōon again returns to the Chinese military classics, taking his cue from a discussion in Razan's *Zuihitsu* of the *Liu tao* 六韜.³⁷ Here, Razan claims that it is an apocryphal work, though it might contain a few old lines and phrases. As far as its contents are concerned, it is suited to ancient times, and to China, not to Japan.

Instead of rejoicing, Chōon laments Razan's tendency to call everything he dislikes or disagrees with, a forgery - as he did with *Taisei-kyō*. Chōon, therefore, quite incongruously, sets out to prove that *Liu tao* truly is an ancient classic, going back to the beginning of the Zhou Dynasty. He does this by quoting, from *Shiji* 史記, the story, how Zhang Liang 張良 (d. 168 B.C.) came by a text of *Liu tao*, which he studied, and which enabled him to assist Liu Bang 劉邦 (247-195) in founding the Han Dynasty.

The section, and the book, peter out in a complaint about the traditional order of the Seven Books, that puts *Sunzi* 孫子 and *Wuzi* 吳子 first and second, and *Liu tao*, sixth. *Liu tao* was much older than *Sunzi*

³⁷ See Razan Rin-sensei bunshū 70: *Zuihitsu* 6.

and *Wuzi*; it dated from the beginning of the Zhou, not from the Warring States Period. It also was much more important, having influenced both the founding of the Zhou and the founding of the Han.

Authors' remark: It is a very strange note on which to conclude a book of Buddhist-Confucian polemics. Apparently, Chōon had a personal interest in military lore, which also surfaces in Fascicle 2, Section 5. Of course, one could also assume that he tried to appeal to his most important audience, the *bakufu* and the warriors, but in that case, one would have expected an argument that would appeal more directly to the *bakufu*'s interests.

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0