

THE PURE HEART: A MEDIEVAL JAPANESE BUDDHIST POLITICAL THEORY OF LEGITIMACY

MAXIME MARCOTTE BOUTHILLIER

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN POLITICAL SCIENCE
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, CANADA

August 11th, 2023

©Maxime Marcotte Bouthillier, 2023

Abstract

Due to narratives stemming from the currently-dominant Eurocentric belief-system, contemporary works on legitimacy generally avoid the inclusion of ‘belief’ as a core analytical tool. However, pioneer of social science studies Max Webber clarified in *The Profession and Vocation of Politics* (1919) the necessary relationship between beliefs and legitimacy when he demonstrated that structures of authority/power can never be legitimate based only on their existence alone; rather, they find their legitimacy through the belief system which sustains them. This means that to understand catalyzers of political change – even more so the legitimizing of new political dynamics – political theorists need to set aside their Eurocentric assumptions and start engaging with beliefs seriously again.

Translating and applying an East-Asian commentary methodology to texts written in the Heian 平安 (794-1185) and Kamakura 鎌倉 (1185-1333) era of Japanese history, this work excavates key beliefs that play a central role in discussions surrounding politics. More specifically, this work focuses on passages found in the works of Buddhist authors, namely Eisai 栄西 (1141-1215), Dōgen 道元 (1200-1253), and Nichiren 日蓮 (1222-1282). Ultimately, the goal of this paper is to systematize these passages into a coherent medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy, while clarifying the core beliefs in which this theory is anchored. This work first establishes that the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy places at its core beliefs in the heart (*kokoro* 心), purity (*shōjō* 清淨) and *karma* (gō 業), and proposes political analyses of and solutions to legitimate leadership stemming from such beliefs.

Dedication/Invocation

歸命盡十方、最勝業遍知、色無礙自在、救世大悲者。

及彼身體相、法性真如海、無量功德藏、如實修行等。

為欲令眾生、除疑捨耶執、起大乘正信、佛種不斷故。

*I take refuge in [the Buddha], the greatly Compassionate One, the Saviour of the World,
omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, of most excellent deeds in all the ten directions;*

*And in [the Dharma], the manifestation of his Nature, the Reality, the sea of Suchness, the
boundless storehouse of excellencies;*

[And in the Saṃgha, whose members] truly devote themselves to the practice,

*May all sentient beings be made to discard their doubts, to cast aside their unwholesome
attachments, and to give rise to the proper faith in the Mahāyāna, that the lineage of the buddhas
may not be broken off.*

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank York University's department of Political Science for allowing me to pursue my Doctoral Degree in their institution. Moreover, I would like to acknowledge that York University campuses are located on the traditional territory of many Indigenous Nations. The area known as Toronto has been cared for by the Anishinabek Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, and the Huron-Wendat. It is now home to many First Nation, Inuit and Métis communities. I acknowledge the current treaty holders, the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. This territory is subject of the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, an agreement to peacefully share and care for the Great Lakes region.

Next, I would like to show my appreciation to the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their generous two-year financial support, which allowed me to conduct my research without financial hurdles. Examples of this include ordering rare books from Japan to use as my primary sources when opportunity for travels to Japan were impossible due to the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as spending two years learning to read and translate Classical Japanese.

I would also like to acknowledge the Japan Studies Association of Canada who not only allowed me to present my research progress every year at their annual conference giving me important feedback, but they also provided financial and motivational support by granting me the Klaus Pringsheim Award for four consecutive years.

I extend my thanks to the Tendai Buddhist Institute and the *Samgha* of Jiunzan Tendai Temple 慈雲山天台寺 who welcomed me with open arms, guided me in my practice and faith, and provided me with a supportive space to present and receive feedback on parts of my dissertation.

I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Shannon Bell who has been nothing but extremely encouraging and understanding throughout this whole process, while proving me with critical comments to help solidify my research. I would also like to extend my thanks to Dr. Jay Goulding whose expertise and enthusiasm towards Classical East-Asian thinking and comparative philosophy helped me expand my knowledge of the broader Classical East-Asian

world and find inspiration in my work. Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr. Terry Malley whose expertise on Weber and encouragements helped me adequately frame my research within the context of Weber's political thought while continuing to emphasize the unique value of my work. Moreover, I would like to thank my very good friend and colleague Dr. Maor Levitin whose critical insights and deep questions forced me out of my intellectual comfort zone and, in doing so, participated in making my research more rigorous.

Finally, I am grateful to my family, in-laws and friends, who each have found their own respective ways to support and encourage me. Above all, I am eternally grateful and indebted to my exceptional wife, Shalyn Isaacs, who not only supported, lifted and encouraged me throughout the various ups and downs of this project, but also provided critical comments, read through my multiple drafts suggesting important edits, challenged my thinking and positionality; while continuously showering me with love, acceptance, respect and affection every day. Shalyn, my magnificent love, the successful completion of this dissertation is entirely yours. I am the luckiest man alive to have the privilege to share this journey of life with you, to which this dissertation is but a small chapter.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Dedication/Invocation	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	vi
Introduction	1
Literature Review	8
Methodology	37
Chapter 1: Historical Context	41
Heian to Kamakura	41
The Sun Rises on a New Era: Kamakura	65
The Emergence of Kamakura ‘New Buddhism’s’	78
Summary	83
Chapter 2: The Case of the Pure Heart	85
Data Collection	85
Saigyō 西行	87
Konjaku Monogatari-shū 今昔物語集	93
Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家	100
Summary	107
Chapter 3: Eisai 栄西	109
Context of the Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論	109
Politics	110
The Heart	120
Purity	126
Summary	130
Chapter 4: Dōgen 道元	132
Context of the Shōbōgenzō 正法眼藏	132
Politics	135
The Heart	146
Purity	159
Karma	167
Summary	174
Chapter 5: Nichiren 日蓮	177
Context of the Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論 and the Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安國論	177
Politics	178
The Heart & Purity	193
Summary	200
Chapter 6: The Pure Heart: A Medieval Japanese Buddhist Political Theory of Legitimacy	202
Medieval Japanese Buddhist Political Theory of Legitimacy	203
Contextualization Within Buddhism’s Belief-System	205
Conclusion	212
Thought Experiment	215
End Notes	219
Glossary	240
Bibliography	279

我非生而知之者好古敏以求之者也

*“I was not born with the knowledge I have; I just like to study the ancients and pursue their ideas
with diligence” – Confucius¹*

Introduction

On January 28th 1919, Maximilian Karl Emil Weber – Max Weber – gave the second part of a series of lectures in Munich entitled *Politik als Beruf*, commonly known in English as “Politics as a Vocation”. For now over a century, this lecture has remained the source of multiple teachings in the field of political science, especially for its definition of the state as “that human community which (successfully) lays claim to the *monopoly of legitimate physical violence* within a certain territory”². Nonetheless, one of the most fundamental concept of Weber’s lecture (and the above quote), which he believed was the key to understanding how any institution of power comes into being and sustain itself through time, is very often overlooked. That concept, is legitimacy. It would be unfair, in fact, to claim that legitimacy as a concept is overlooked within the field of political science and social sciences as a whole. To be more precise, what is too often overlooked is not the concept of legitimacy in itself, but instead what Weber understood to be the foundation, the root, the basis for legitimacy: beliefs.

To summarize, Weber proposed three grounds for legitimacy. The first one, traditional rule, is “the authority of the eternal past, of custom, hallowed by the fact that it has held sway from time immemorial and by a habitual predisposition to perverse it”³. The second one, charismatic rule, is “the entirely personal devotion to, and personal trust in, revelations, heroism, or other qualities of leadership in an individual”⁴. The third, legal rule, is obtained “by virtue of belief in the validity of legal ‘statute’ and the appropriate juridical ‘competence’ founded on rationally devised rules”⁵. In one form or another, belief is always at the core of each of Weber’s propositions. Indeed, traditional rule finds its legitimacy in deeply-rooted beliefs encountered within communal practices and narratives that get naturalized – and thus unquestioned – over time (customs); charismatic rule finds its legitimacy in the fact that “devotion to the charisma of the prophet or the war-lord or the exceptional demagogue in the *ekklesia* or parliament means that the leader is personally regarded as someone who is inwardly ‘called’ to the task of leading men, and that the led submit to him, not because of custom or statute, but because they *believe* in him”⁶; and legal rule finds its legitimacy in the belief in the validity of the legal statute or the appropriate competence of its leaders and/or apparatuses. Weber further adds that any leader and its supporting

institutions “can only keep control of his following as long as a *sincere belief* in his person and his cause inspire at least some of the group, probably never in this life even the majority of them”⁷. In other words, legitimacy, in one form or the other, always emerges, anchors, and sustains itself through beliefs. According to Weber’s analysis, beliefs and legitimacy should, and cannot be, separated.

However, it is crucially important to note that Weber did not conceptualize beliefs within the current secularized framework of beliefs as relegated to the realms of religion, spirituality, and superstition. In fact, for Weber, beliefs are the things that are considered “matters-of-fact” (*Versachlichung*) in a particular social context. For instance, Weber observes that “it is one of the conditions of success in this, as in any apparatus subordinate to a leader, that things must be emptied and made into matters-of-fact, and the following must undergo spiritual proletarianisation, in order to achieve 'discipline’”⁸. In Weber’s term, this process is called rationalization, and Weber reminds us that “one may rationalize life from fundamentally different basic points of view and in very different directions”⁹. Simply put, *the legitimacy of any structure of power emerges and sustains itself when beliefs are so deeply anchored and unquestioned by its followers that these beliefs become “matters-of-fact”*. In other words, it happens when beliefs are not perceived to be simply “beliefs” anymore and are rather “just facts”, or just “the way it is”. The contemporary expression for this process is called naturalization.

This point is of major importance because it is well-established that currently-legitimate knowledges, as presented within the discourse of scientific rationality, are strongly anchored within a narrative of “objectivity” and “facts”. Within this discourse, “facts” and “beliefs” are placed as two dualistic opposites: what are perceived to be “facts” are legitimate, what are perceived to be “beliefs” are illegitimate¹⁰. In this sense, Weber reminds us what are currently understood to be “just facts” are simply beliefs that have gone through a process of naturalization within a particular apparatus of power, and these facts/beliefs now form the foundation that further anchors and propagate the legitimization of this apparatus. By erasing the duality of “facts” and “beliefs”, Weber emphasizes the necessity to deeply and seriously engage with the “assumed-to-be-true”, the “matters-of-facts” – i.e. the beliefs – of societies if we hope to have any chance at truly understanding of how particular forms of power have been legitimized while others

delegitimized within different cultural and historical contexts. Weber dedicated the entirety of his short life to doing just that. One important lesson that Weber's theory reminds us is that, it is mandatory to not delegitimize and discredit the "matters-of-facts" of different cultural/historical contexts simply because they are relegated to the negatively-charged category of "beliefs" in our own current frameworks. As David Campbell puts it: "[o]ne must allow the beliefs as a fact, and not deny this fact because one disagrees with it"¹¹.

Although not the main purpose, this last point is one of the multiple goals of my work. Indeed, I wish to offer an indirect albeit important criticism of the current discipline of political science for its lack of serious and meaningful engagement with the topic of beliefs in its theorization of power and legitimacy, and for finding usefulness in the concept only when in alignment with neo-colonial, Eurocentric, white-supremacist agendas. Indeed, the current heavily-secularized discipline of political science, as an enthusiastic participant in the greater scientific modernization project, has purposefully and increasingly turned away from engaging with the matter of beliefs in its theorizations of power. This means that the topic of beliefs has been relegated to other disciplines such as religious studies, anthropology, cultural studies, psychology, and so forth, thus allowing the field of political science to continue surfing the secular-powered wave of scientific rationality and its resulting oppressions. Nevertheless, interest in studying the relationship between beliefs and political power have slowly been resurfacing in recent years. Ironically, this resurgence is happening primarily in connection to two sets of interconnected circumstances: (1) the neo-colonial leaders of the North American and European countries have failed multiple times to impose reforms and/or implement puppet leaders in overseas settings because "these Others" do not have the belief systems to legitimize their newly imposed, external, authority/system; and (2) the rise of the islamophobic narratives of Islamic fundamentalism coupled with the increasing paranoia of terrorism has spurred to the necessity of understanding Islamic religious beliefs for the sake of defending the "West" against it and suppressing it. In sum, it is only after North American and European political interests failed to fructify overseas as a result of "different beliefs", coupled with a fear of "the Other", that political scientists have thought it worthwhile to start thinking about incorporating beliefs in their theorizations again.

Nevertheless, my work does not simply seek to provide a critique of the discipline of political science; rather, I hope that my work can be seen as a broader criticism of the entirety of the current system of beliefs which legitimizes the legacies of colonialism, racism, sexism, patriarchy, capitalism, (neo)liberalism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, and so forth. Indeed, it is important to remind ourselves, based on Weber's observations, that any structures of power – including the ones which result in the axes of oppression present in our current societies – have a network of beliefs at their roots which allow them to be perceived as legitimate by the people that populate and perpetuate it. This implies that any radical change of our current institutions cannot take place as long as the beliefs that sustain them remain unquestioned, unchallenged, and unchanged. Remaining as such only means that the changes that are taking place can only be minor and have limited weight in impacting the core legitimacy of these systems. Practical-oriented changes are always needed to help alleviate the suffering caused by our oppressive institutions in the present. However, if we want to pave the way to a different, oppression-less world for the future, we also need to do the work of delegitimizing the current structures of power. In other words, we need to challenge their core beliefs.

It would be unfair to talk about challenging core belief systems without highlighting the incredible contribution that indigenous, black, brown, latinx, asian, LGBT2Q+, feminists, decolonial, anti-capitalist, etc. authors and artists have produced. I personally am highly indebted to the works of Linda Tuhiwai Smith¹²; Wendy Brown¹³; Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck & Angie Morrill¹⁴; Audra Simpson¹⁵; Maria Lugones¹⁶; Sadia Abbas¹⁷; Jane Bennett¹⁸; Vandana Shiva¹⁹; Andrea Bear Nicholas²⁰; Rauna Kuokkanen²¹; Jennifer Jihye Chun, George Lipsitz & Young Shin²²; Chandra Talpade Mohanty²³; Vivian M. May²⁴; Sirma Bilge²⁵; Rita Dhamoon²⁶; Saba Mahmood²⁷; Nancy Fraser²⁸; Erica Fudge²⁹; and Jakeet Singh³⁰. All of these authors have, in one way or another, contributed to my understanding of the deeply embedded and intersectional nature of the current systems of oppression. Indeed, by dissecting and problematizing the various mechanisms of our current systems, they have given me the opportunity to learn about the extent to which our systems of thought have been naturalized and engrained in our social fabric and psyche. This led to the realization that our attempts at dismantling these systems have not yet been satisfactory precisely because our emancipatory agendas – and especially the people that are in position of power to put forth agendas – are still enmeshed with the same beliefs that legitimizes these systems. The result

is that, consciously or not, most of us still reproduce the same naturalized oppressive dynamics in our proposal for revolutionary projects. Without their contributions, my project would have never found its first stepping stones.

Nevertheless, my work more precisely seeks add to these already powerful voices by providing another voice to the choir: that of Buddhism – particularly medieval Japanese Buddhism. In fact, my own personal journey with studying Buddhism as an academic, and then joining the greater Buddhist community as a practitioner myself, has always been fueled by the radically alternative perspectives and experiences that this extremely rich and deep tradition cultivates. Indeed, through my academic and personal exploration of Buddhism I have come to realize that a lot of the fundamental assumptions that sustain the legitimate structures of power of the (Eurocentric) modern world are oftentimes simply untenable within a Buddhist framework. Even more, the fundamental assumptions of Buddhist thinking are surprisingly often in direct contradiction to the beliefs that sustain our current disruptive ways of living. In fact, the most radical critique and opposition to the currently-naturalized beliefs I have personally ever encountered has come from Buddhism.

Nonetheless, I feel obligated to mention that my goal here is not to convince the reader that they should convert and adopt Buddhism, or that Buddhism is faultless in all its aspects. In fact, the numerous forms of institutionalized Buddhist traditions across times and cultures have also played terrible roles in perpetuating pain, suffering, and destruction on their own terms³¹. Nevertheless, for me, my journey all started from encountering a different view, a different kind of voice. I simply wish that my work can help playing that role for others.

Indeed, the primary goal of my work is *hope*. For this, I ask the reader to let yourself be guided into a world that operates differently than your own. I ask you to allow yourself to experience a glimpse of what it feels like to see the world through different eyes. At the end, I wish that you will appreciate the experience enough to gain hope that the way we currently see things is not the only way; and move on to explore what different alternatives looks like for you.

That being said, thousands of works have been done on Buddhism and the goal here is not to simply repeat the great wealth of knowledge that is already available. However, it is very rare

to encounter a book that specifically deals with presenting a Buddhist *political* theory. Even on the rare occasions where this can happen, I have barely ever encountered a work that specifically seeks to systematize a Buddhist political theory of *legitimacy*. Even in the too-few works that do engage with the topics of Buddhism and legitimacy, the engagement with the matter of *belief* is either completely absent or very superficial. I will be discussing this further in the literature review section.

Overall, my work seeks to answer the following question: *What are the ways in which core beliefs around politics and legitimacy present in Japanese Buddhist texts of the Kamakura era help us establish a medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy?*

In order to do so, I find it useful for the reader to be guided into a step-by-step process that mimics the inductive process of my own data collection and its resulting analyses. More precisely, in Chapter 1 (entitled ‘Historical Context’), I will give a brief overview of the historical context of the transition between the Heian 平安 (794-1185) to the Kamakura 鎌倉 era (1185-1333) of Japanese history with the goal of helping readers develop a basic understanding of the political and social reality of the time when the primary sources were written.

In Chapter 2 (entitled ‘The Case of the Pure Heart’), I will provide my own translations, commentaries, and analyses of passages of classical Japanese texts of various disciplines – folklore, art theory and poetry, etc. – written during the Heian era with the goal of finding which beliefs are present across multiple aspects of ancient Japanese life that survived the political transition to the Kamakura era. This chapter will demonstrate that a key belief that keeps revealing itself through the texts is that of having a pure heart. This belief in a pure heart will be the pivot of my entire work.

In Chapter 3 (‘Eisai 栄西’), 4 (‘Dōgen 道元’), and 5 (‘Nichiren 日蓮’), I will provide my own translation and commentaries of passages from key figures and founders of Buddhist traditions – namely Eisai³² 栄西 (1141-1215), Dōgen³³ 道元 (1200-1253), and Nichiren³⁴ 日蓮 (1222-1282) respectively – with the goal of exploring how the belief in a pure heart/mind is present and understood by each of these authors in their own respective traditions. Moreover, these chapters

will explore other beliefs which orbit around the pure heart/mind – such as purity, karma, rebirth, suffering, enlightenment, disasters, diseases, and more – allowing us to locate this concept within the broader theoretical system of medieval Japanese Buddhism. These chapters will also present passages from each authors where they share their insights on politics and legitimate governance. This will allow us to see how/if the belief in a pure heart plays a role in each authors’ theorizations of politics more specifically.

Chapter 6 (‘The Pure Heart: A Medieval Japanese Buddhist Political Theory of Legitimacy’) will be dedicated to putting together the teachings of Eisai, Dōgen, and Nichiren into one whole coherent system, thus offering the first cross-sectarian medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy in the English language. I will also present to the readers a systematized roadmap of the beliefs surrounding the pure heart which gives this theory its grounding. This will allow the readers to have a clear, systemic representation of the rationalization process surrounding political legitimacy as understood within a medieval Japanese Buddhist worldview.

In the conclusion, I will guide the reader in an exercise which seeks to conceptualize our contemporary realities through the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy. More specifically, having now concretely systematize and presented a medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy based on the pure heart– and the beliefs that orbit around it – what conclusions could we draw about our contemporary circumstances if we were to follow this particular rationalization for ourselves? With this exercise, I wish to intentionally remind the reader that not only is it possible for anyone to start seeing the world differently; but this starting point is, actually, always at our fingertips. However, to do so meaningfully, we still have to be ready to engage on the journey of learning to let go of our Eurocentric, white supremacist, patriarchal, neo-colonial, neo-liberal, capitalist, classist, ableist, heteronormative, modernist, and anthropocentric assumptions and the power imbalances that result from them.

In the end, my work will have hopefully succeeded in helping the readers to let go of their assumptions for a moment by meticulously guiding them through an alternative framework of rationalization and its own respective resulting conclusions. Perhaps readers will also be inspired

to remember that, as the *Rokudai Shōjiki* states: “not forgetting the things of the past; this is called taking care of posterity”³⁵.

Literature Review

As mentioned above, engaging with beliefs as a meaningful tool for analysis when seeking to understand legitimacy is oftentimes absent when looking at the literature which analyses and expands upon Weber’s work. Generally speaking, the Weber-inspired literature can be split into two primary categories. On the one hand, we have scholars who place their efforts in understanding the underlying belief structure which supports a particular religion; those scholars very rarely show interest in integrating their analyses of religious beliefs within a broader discussion of political legitimacy. On the other hand, we have scholars who seek to understand the political developments of particular historical contexts, and oftentimes include a deeper discussion of political legitimacy; those scholars rarely focus on discussing the underlying beliefs at the core of their political analyses and rather opt for a more historical materialist-inspired route. In sum, one group focuses on beliefs but rarely talks about legitimacy, and the other talks about legitimacy but does not (or barely) bring beliefs to the table. This is deeply problematic since, as seen previously, for Weber, legitimacy and beliefs cannot be separated.

For a comprehensive overview of some key aspects of Weber’s contributions, we will start with Bryan Turner’s preface to Karl Löwith’s book (which we will engage with next). This will allow the reader to have a good summary of Weber’s broader thinking, while at the same time highlighting how leaving out Weber’s belief-based theory of legitimacy – as many authors do – is very problematic when trying to make sense of his work and his agenda. In the preface, Turner explains that for Weber as well as for Marx “capitalist society was, from their relatively similar views on ontology, inescapably problematic, but also revolutionary by comparison with the traditional civilizations of both the West world and Asia”³⁶. He further explains that “Weber accepted Nietzsche’s argument that knowledge (‘truth’) is always knowledge from a particular perspective, that is, from the standpoint of a system of values. Because God is dead, there is no

grounding by which one perspective could have legitimacy over other perspectives. 'Truth' is therefore provisional and it is practical in the sense that it is relevant to specific aims and purposes"³⁷. According to Turner, this led to Weber's "conviction that social science cannot be presuppositionless, that value judgment is inevitable, and that the "laws" of history were merely heuristic devices. The result was a devastating critique of the claims made by Marxists that political economy was an exact science which could predict the collapse of capitalism with precision. The 'economic interpretation' of history was merely a one-sided perspective which could be challenged by an equally one-sided spiritual interpretation"³⁸. With this realization, Turner explains Weber's take on the Nietzschean dilemma that "rationalization has destroyed the magic garden of faith and certainty, but it has not produced an alternative set of values which are credible [... This is due to the fact that science itself is not a value system, because it is primarily concerned with means rather than with ends"³⁹. In this sense, "Marxism for Weber involved a further rationalization of life by regulating the market, controlling investment and centralizing authority. Marxism would intensify the negative impact of instrumental rationality on the life-world"⁴⁰. Turner then, using Löwith's analysis, notes how "Weber's own response to the crisis of perspectivism can be found in his discussion of 'personality' and in the 'ethic of responsibility' [... which] has close affinity to Heidegger's view that responsibility and calling are necessary features of an adequate orientation to the daunting contingency of our being-in-the-world"⁴¹. Turner sees this connection in the fact that "although human beings can never fully escape from the iron cage of the rationalized world of bourgeois capitalism, we have a duty to face up to this reality and in the process we become committed to the development of personality [... which] refers to a life-plan or a structure within which the chaotic events of the life-cycle can be located"⁴². Turner further explains that "Weber's view is that authenticity consists in 'facing up to reality' and in making a conscious choice about a life-style which can be rationally defended. Authentic personality involves a certain degree of isolation and separation in order to bring up a reflexive ordering of one's own personal and social reality"⁴³. The issue is that, for Weber, a rational personality is faced in principle by two competing but viable life-strategies: (1) an ethic of ultimate values – one can either stand by one's own values, regarding them as having an absolute authority, and make decisions by reference to these transcendental standards without regard for consequences and implications; and (2) an ethic of responsibility – to organize one's life by reference to responsibility for more limited objectives and

tasks, paying close attention to consequences and implications⁴⁴. Turner points out that “Weber felt that the ethic of absolute ends had been rendered impossible and arcane by secular social changes. A modern person could really only choose an ethic of responsibility, knowing that our values are not absolute but provisional, not universal but local”⁴⁵. Weber’s response to the reality of being pigeonholed into an ethic of responsibility as the only viable choice is expressed in his idea of calling or vocation (*Beruf*) which again retains resonances with Heidegger’s existentialism. Indeed, Turner highlights that “Weber, accepting that secularization was a necessary feature of rationalization, rejected the possibility of a religious vocation as a personal solution to the meaninglessness of a rationalized social order, and accepted instead that an ethic of responsibility was perhaps best expressed through either a vocation in politics or a vocation in science”⁴⁶. Turner thus concludes that “for Weber, there was ultimately no clear escape from the iron cage of specialization and rationalization. Here the only plausible answer was one of stoical resolve”⁴⁷. Turner’s presentation of Weber’s overall perspective is useful in locating Weber’s thought within the broader German intellectual and political context of the time⁴⁸. Nonetheless, it is important to note that although Turner acknowledges that Weber’s solution reaches its conclusion in an ethic of responsibility that is best expressed in a vocation/calling for science or politics, there is no further elaboration of what this vocation of science or politics consists of. This leads Turner to conclude that “the only plausible answer was one of stoical resolve”, which I believe is reductionist and serves the agenda of limiting Weber’s theories potential for societal change. This is especially true when we further explore the content of Weber’s *The Profession and Vocation of Politics*, the audience, and the reasons behind these lectures. Indeed, by Turner choosing to ignore exploring Weber’s theory of legitimacy and beliefs presented in *The Profession and Vocation of Politics*, he is not able to see how by emphasizing how legitimacy emerges and sustains itself through beliefs, Weber is already doing groundwork for radical social change throughout his work, which – he understood – can only truly come about through challenging the legitimacy of the current systems by undermining the core beliefs that perpetuates it and from which it emerges. In order for these naturalized truths to ‘return back’ to the status of beliefs so that can be challenged, we need to break their status as ‘matters-of-facts’ which requires, first, for them to be brought to light, and, second, for them to be thoroughly contextualized through historical analyses. This, is precisely what Weber spent his life trying to do. Furthermore, these lecture targets an audience of

intellectuals, politicians, and military men and therefore place their emphasis on how to live *within* the current system. It is reductionist to conclude that because Weber sought to give his analysis on how to best live *within* the current systems, this must also mean that Weber also cannot see a potential way out of these systems. In fact, I believe that this hope for new and better futures found in Weber's work comes about *precisely* in his beliefs-based theory of legitimacy. Turner, by not meaningfully engaging with Weber's beliefs-based theory of legitimacy, is unfortunately led to conclude that Weber's position is merely pessimistic. Because of this, Turner fails to see how Weber's analysis in *The Profession and Vocation of Politics* leads a very simple, but central conclusion that summarizes almost the totality of Weber's agenda: meaningful, material, radical social change can only happen in tandem with radical change in beliefs-systems.

Following the preface by Turner discussed above, Karl Löwith, in the rest of the book⁴⁹, engages with the topic of beliefs. However, similar to Turner, he forgets to connect their importance to the Weber's theory of legitimacy, which I believe leads him to falsely identify Weber's goals. For example, Löwith states that in Weber's work, "it is therefore the belief of science in objective norms and their scientific demonstrability which Weber fundamentally attacks with the means of science itself and for the sake of scientific 'open-mindedness'"⁵⁰. He further explains that "Weber's 'methodological' treatises spring ultimately from his awareness of this particular situation, that 'after a thousand years of an allegedly or supposedly exclusive orientation toward the magnificent pathos of the Christian ethic, our eyes have become blinded to it'"⁵¹. Löwith also adds the observation that "Weber fought against the belief in objectively worthwhile aims, institutions and concepts as a form of idolatry and superstition. All this in order to preserve the human hero"⁵². In sum, Löwith assessment clarifies Weber's agenda of attacking the naturalized beliefs which orient the modern rational scientific world. However, by not engaging with Weber's theory of legitimacy at all, Löwith is not able to recognize the function beliefs play in relations of power for Weber and therefore cannot give a concrete explanation as to the reasoning behind Weber's choice to attack beliefs rather than other spheres of the social world. This is why Löwith is only able to claim that "the essential positive purpose of Weber's essays in the philosophy of science is the radical demolition of illusions"⁵³. Similar to Turner, without engaging with Weber's theory of legitimacy, Löwith cannot see that the reasons for demolishing those illusions in the first place is because Weber understands those illusions – the results of beliefs

– to be key agents in furthering the dissemination of the legitimacy of particular forms of power he deems to be deeply problematic – i.e. modern rational scientific capitalism. This means that “fighting against objectivity” is not simply for the sake of “preserv[ing] the human hero” or to maintain “scientific open-mindedness” as Löwith claims; rather it is an attempt to uproot the roots of legitimacy of current institutions of power embedded in modern rational scientific thinking.

A scholar that directly engages with Weber’s beliefs-based theory of legitimacy is Andrew Dawson, who clarifies that for “Weber, a state is legitimate to the extent that there exists a widespread belief in its legitimacy leading to its orders enjoying ‘the prestige of being considered binding’ among the citizens it means to rule”⁵⁴. Dawson’s article also provides an important overview of the literature on legitimacy when noting, for example, that “Beethem writes: ‘the misleading Weberian strategy of reporting people’s belief in legitimacy... has been an almost unqualified disaster’, adding that ‘the whole Weberian theory of legitimacy has to be left behind as one of the blindest of blind alleys in the history of social sciences’”⁵⁵. Dawson also explains that “some suggest that [Weber] reduces legitimacy to ‘routine submission to authority’. This would imply that state legitimacy is nothing more than obedience to state authority, and is therefore not conceptually independent from legal compliance”⁵⁶. Still, he reminds us that “Weber maintains that ‘the orientation of action to an order involves a wide variety of motives’, suggesting that there are diverse reasons for obeying the law”⁵⁷, and thus “state legitimacy as conceived in the Weberian tradition cannot be reduced to legal compliance”⁵⁸. Aside from providing useful insights into the literature on legitimacy, Dawson’s article seeks to grasp the relationship between state legitimacy and homicide rate, with state legitimacy understood as confidence in parliament. The results of his cross-national statistical test produced on 86 countries demonstrate that: (1) “countries with higher levels of state legitimacy tend to have lower homicide rates”⁵⁹; (2) “the statistically significant, negative relationship between state legitimacy and the homicide rate at the cross-national level is both consequential and robust across different source of homicide data”⁶⁰; and (3) “the relative importance of state legitimacy exceeds other, well-established explanatory factors of homicide such as ethnic heterogeneity, income inequality, the proportion of the young male population and GDP per capita”⁶¹. From these observations, Dawson thus concludes that “incremental contributions of state legitimacy to the total explained variance is greater than those of income inequality and economic development”, and that “a lack of consensus surrounding state legitimacy

is associated with higher homicide rates”⁶². Moreover, Dawson notes that his research suggests that “in order to decrease homicide, a state must attempt to increase its legitimacy by building trust and confidence between itself and its citizens. This may involve concrete steps of change taken by the state; however the analysis suggests that this would also require a concomitant change in popular dispositions toward the polity – that is, a change in the political culture”⁶³. This means that even though structural changes can take place within the state apparatus itself, without changes in the beliefs/norms of the population taking place simultaneously, state legitimacy will not improve. It is thus possible to observe through Dawson’s research that beliefs in state legitimacy plays a more significant role in impacting social behaviors (in this case, homicide) than other traditionally-used factors of measurements such as race, ethnicity, class, sex, etc. Nevertheless, even though Dawson’s research significantly supports Weber’s theory, he does not provide any insight as to how these beliefs come to be. Indeed, “confidence in parliament” as a unit of analysis does not allow for the readers to understand which particular beliefs generate ‘confidence’ within a particular socio-political context. In other words, Dawson falls closer to the category of scholars who focuses on legitimacy without making significant contribution to the discussion surrounding the structure and history of these legitimacy-generating beliefs. Furthermore, Dawson is a great example of many Weberian scholars who, despite engaging with Weber’s beliefs-based theory of legitimacy more explicitly and directly than most, uses Weber’s work exclusively with the goal of having a better grasp of the present. Indeed, as we shall see below, an important gap within the Weber-inspired scholarship is that whenever meaningful engagement with Weber’s beliefs-based theory of legitimacy is found, it is almost always to seek to understand modern times, but it is never used to seek to understand the past just as Weber himself sought to achieve.

Less sympathetic of the Weberian framework is David Campbell who ascertains that “value-free empirical study of legitimacy is impossible, and that scientific commentaries which purport to have carried it out merely conceal the value-judgements they necessarily contain”⁶⁴. Campbell posits that “[f]or Weber, value-free understanding of beliefs in legitimacy irrespective of their truth is the requisite of the scientific discussion of legitimacy”⁶⁵. Campbell clarifies this when stating that “[w]hen Weber holds that beliefs in legitimacy maintain the stability of an order of domination he by no means wishes to confer any actual legitimacy upon that order. He merely wants to point to the empirical significance of validity”⁶⁶. In other words, Campbell criticizes

Weber's methods – and by extent Weberian scholars – for claiming to analyze beliefs from an 'objective', 'value-free' perspective without realizing that this 'objectiveness' is in itself a product of a particular set of beliefs belonging to modern rational scientific inquiry. In Campbell's words: "Weber continually diminishes the contextual material rationality of traditional orientations by assessing these against a conception of rationality as such identified with capitalist economic rationality"⁶⁷. This unaccounted uncritical positionality of the Weberian researcher leads them to use language such as "they believe that", "they perceive [X] to be true", as well as an extensive use of quotation marks when engaging about beliefs that are different than their own⁶⁸. Campbell claims that this linguistic lapse by Weberian researchers is the locus where it is possible to see their own value judgements. This is because if the researchers themselves held these beliefs to be true, they would not be using such Othering language and would rather claim them as facts. Indeed, not speaking of these beliefs as fact is precisely making a value-judgement on them; that is, from a scientific standpoint, they are not true, or at least they can merely be subjectively true. Campbell moves on to propose that for any engagement with the belief system of Others to be genuine, these beliefs need to be presented within the linguistic conventions from where they originate from and be presented as true. This creates a problematic because it renders the role of the researcher completely useless since the researcher is then forced to merely tautologically repeat the knowledge as it is and is denied any possibility of analysis or criticism whatsoever⁶⁹. In Campbell's own words: "In Weber, critique is lost as dialogue is suppressed"⁷⁰. This is problematized not just from a methodological angle, but also from an ethical one because "[if] actors' beliefs are shown by social explanation to contain mistakes, then these must be criticized by any social science striving for adequacy to its subject matter"⁷¹. Although Campbell's critique is thorough and lengthy, his own work could easily be undermined by his own logic. Indeed, Campbell criticizes Weber for imposing his own internalized rational scientific beliefs – i.e. value-free, objectivity, neutrality, etc. – onto his analysis of others, while he himself criticizes the work of another (Weber) based on the premise that it does not follow the scientific path of finding objective truths because Weber's value-free framework is embedded in only describing provisional, subjective truths. Moreover, Campbell's proposition that actors' beliefs *must* be criticized for a social science to be adequate is also embedded in his own particular unacknowledged uncritical positionality with regards to his own beliefs about the adequacy of what should be deemed proper knowledge

production within the framework of the scientific method. In sum, Campbell's critique contains these two contradictory elements: (1) he rejects Weber's objectivity to not be *true* objectivity because Weber did not overcome his own rational scientific biases, and (2) he does so while not engaging with – and therefore does not overcoming – his own rational scientific biases and making claims of what *true* objectivity should look like. In other words, if, according to Campbell, we should dismiss someone's work because it is stemming from their own unacknowledged uncritical positionalities of what a proper scientific approach should aim to be; then we should reject Campbell's criticism altogether as well. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier when analyzing the work of Turner, Weber already clearly established his epistemological position that “social science cannot be presuppositionless, that value judgment is inevitable”⁷². This means that criticizing Weber's framework for not being aware of his presupposition is actually incredibly misinformed of Weber's own theoretical positions since if Weber did not believe in anyone's capacity to be presuppositionless, why would he claim and seek to be so in the first place? All in all, Campbell's critique shows itself to be more about his desire to posit his own objective-based epistemological superiority over Weber's subjective-based framework, rather than a genuine critique of the framework from within its own respective theoretical boundaries; which, again, is ironically what he criticizes Weber of doing. Campbell's article is interesting not simply because his own logic undermines his own critique, but also because his presuppositions renders him unable to see worth in Weber's analysis aside only from “the presence of the theme of rationalism in Weber's understanding of lay beliefs in legitimacy”⁷³. Indeed, Campbell's unacknowledged – or simply ignored – positions regarding objective truth in science and the duty of the scientist to be critical does not allow him to see the revolutionary potential of a Weberian framework which values and aspires to engage with different beliefs systems while remaining within one's subjective limitations. His critique that “[i]n Weber, critique is lost as dialogue is suppressed”⁷⁴, cannot recognize that when he says “critique is lost” it truly means ‘Eurocentrism does not prevail anymore’; and when he says “dialogue is suppressed” it truly means ‘Eurocentrism is not the universal standard of measurement anymore’. Campbell's Eurocentric narrative is unfortunately incredibly prevalent within academic circles even today and is still used as one of the many mechanisms used to deny any form of meaningful engagement with any perspectives outside of the scientific, Eurocentric, white supremacist standards. In fact, a meaningful engagement with

any non-Eurocentric systems of knowledge production can only come about precisely when not seeking to establish their relevance with European-based forms of knowledge. In fact, presenting different knowledge as it is, without critical-based Eurocentric analyses superposed over it, should not be discarded as simply tautological as Campbell claims; rather, it should be valued and encouraged for its revolutionary potential as opening doors to different ways of being-in-the-world.

Since my work focuses on Japan, it is important to include the ways in which Weber's theories have also been understood and utilized by Japanese scholars. This is especially true since it is generally unknown to Eurocentric academic circles that the field of Weber Studies (*ueba gaku*) ウェーバー学 was fairly prominent in Japan⁷⁵. This led to numerous interesting studies and take on Weber's theorizations as it bloomed within a very particular political context. Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson⁷⁶ describe this process as follows: "The Japanese studies on Weber's comparison of East and West mainly attempted to clarify social structures in the East from the standpoint of historical materialism, and in the studies Weber was usually referred to critically [...] The interest in ethos theory contributed to the tendency to see Weber's theories on religion not as objects for analysis but as matters to be understood subjectively as models for self-improvement"⁷⁷. Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson's article is very useful in giving an overview of the field of Weber Studies in Japan, especially to non-Japanese speakers. They explain that Japanese scholars usually took two positions with regards to Weber's work: the first one dismissed Weber's theories of religion as irrelevant, and the second one sought to adapt Weber's theories to the Japanese context while remaining critical of it⁷⁸. The authors explain that proponents of the second position usually rejected Weber's proposition that the Protestant ethos is the only possible model leading to modernization, and instead sought to examine the relationship of Japan's own modernization and the religious ethos that supported and sustained it⁷⁹. Overall, Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson's work is very helpful in demonstrating the ways in which the influential Japanese scholars who engaged with Weber's work were less preoccupied with seeking to understand their own historical context using his theories, and instead focused almost exclusively on the question of modernity and especially circumstances behind the rapid Japanese modernization throughout the 20th century.

To start, the works of Oguchi Ichi 小口偉一 (1910-1986) is of the ‘second’ position mentioned above, as it supported Weber’s overall theory while remaining critical of his dismissal of magic. Indeed, Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson explain that “Oguchi’s incorporation of Weber’s theory of charisma was dictated by the nature of his ideas on the ‘magical-type society of the masses’ in Japan, the structure of control that developed from this basis, and the authority that justified it”⁸⁰. Indeed, “[Oguchi] treats the existence of magic as a given, and its interest is rather in understanding the special characteristics of the social structure of Asian societies, including Japan, that are very tolerant of magic. In other words, he tried to grasp the special characteristics of a social structure that makes possible the maintenance of magic, from the perspective of social control and the authority that supports that control”⁸¹. Still, like many other Weber-inspired Japanese theorists, Oguchi thought that magic and social progress “are always placed at opposing poles, and he takes the rather optimistic view that the overcoming of magic will inevitably lead to social progress”⁸². Moreover, “Oguchi considered Japan to be a ‘magic-oriented society’ that gave birth to the worship of authority among the masses and led to the support of the emperor system. He labelled Asian society in general as ‘an enchanted garden’ (*jujutsu no sono* 呪術の園)”⁸³. Overall, Oguchi, whose work on Weber started in prewar Japan, used Weber’s work to clarify the characteristics of Japanese religions and was key to introducing Weber to the Japanese context⁸⁴. Oguchi’s agenda of using Weber’s work to assess the structure of Japanese religions in order to analyse their own context provided the foundation of a large amount of authors after him – either as a critiques or supporters. Contrary to many, Oguchi’s work did provide insightful analyses of particular beliefs at the core of Japanese religions, and did relate those beliefs to the legitimization of power as it took place within the Japanese historico-cultural own context. This is well exemplified in his assessment that beliefs in magic were the root for the legitimacy of the imperial system. However, even though Oguchi’s works provide a very insightful analysis of the beliefs in magic and to the creation of social structures that reflects such beliefs within the Japanese context, his work still offers barely any other insights into other beliefs outside of magic that might play a role in the legitimization of political authority. This moves away from Weber’s multifactorial analysis of history and social formations which criticizes reducing such processes to being due to only one cause.

A direct critique of Oguchi's work – but also of a broader tendency in Weber Studies circles – is provided by Shimazono Susumu 島蘭進 (1948-...) who “gives a high appraisal of Weber's position in the sense that Weber presumed a religiously informed ‘ethical reform among the people’ as the background to modernization in the West”⁸⁵. Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson explain that “Shimazono points out that the people who have discussed Japan's modernization from the perspective of Weber's theories ‘have been so attached to the standpoint of modernism that they have believed that the Japanese people languor in an ‘enchanted garden’, and have lost sight of the existence of ‘the current of popular ethical reform’ (*taishūteki rinku shin* 大衆的倫苦新)”⁸⁶. To elaborate, Shimazono states that modernization in Japan contains a “current of popular ethical reform” that is radically different from the West. In fact, Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson explain that “the magical religiosity of the New Religions [*shin shūkyō* 新宗教] and their teachings have been positively appraised by Shimazono as factors aiding modernization in Japan”⁸⁷. More specifically, for Shimazono, magic itself should not be understood as the key element which fuelled the popular ethical reforms behind Japan's modernization; rather he perceives the “vitalistic concept”⁸⁸ (*seimei shugi teki shisō* 生命主義的思想) embedded within the magical-based religiosity of the New Religions to be “something that can act as the foundation for modern and post-modern society”⁸⁹. In this sense, Shimazono rejects the ideas put forth by other scholars such as Ōtsuka (see below) who would see Weber's theories of capitalist development as a model for modernization. Still, Shimazono recognizes the value of Weber's theories in the fact that it presents an understanding for modernization as stemming from religious beliefs and ideals rather than other sources such as the economic reductionism of Marxist theorists. In this way, we can see that Shimazono is one of the scholars which is engaging more directly with Weber's theory of legitimacy, as he seeks to specifically underline which belief(s) is(are) responsible for Japan's own modernization project. In a way, Shimazono's work retains the spirit of Weber's work and even my own. However, just like most Japanese scholars of the Weber-studies circle, his attention is directed towards understanding the role between beliefs and the legitimization of a particular political project within the current times. Unfortunately, Shimazono has not sought to use his work specifically within the goal of seeking how particular beliefs have legitimized particular regimes of power within the Japanese historical context of the past.

In response to Oguchi's and Shimazono's work and their supporters, Yanagawa Keiichi 柳川啓一 (1926-1990), offered a very critical outlook, almost completely rejecting Weber's work. Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson explain that Yanagawa's perspective is anchored in the perspective that "the historical phenomenon of European Protestantism was too readily accepted as a norm [... and] the portrayal of Japanese religions as merely 'magical' was, as a categorization of empirical research, far too simplistic"⁹⁰. Yanagawa concluded that the model for earlier theories in Weber's Sociology of Religion were insufficient when confronted with actual contemporary religious movements that relied on key concepts – "rationalization", "elimination of magic", "secularization", etc. – that he perceived them to be useless analytical tools⁹¹. Indeed, looking at Yanagawa's work, we can see that his interest was in religious social movements contemporary to his time in the hope of finding new insights into the Japanese way of life. This new way of life refers more specifically to the post-war period of rapid economic growth leading to a shift of social life from the village to the town, and the rural community to urban ones. Yanagawa's own interest in local religious movements is embedded in one of his critiques of the Weberian framework, as he observed that "[c]ontrary to the assumption that society was steadily and surely moving in the direction of secularization *cum* rejection of religion, there appear to be signs of a 'return to religion'"⁹². However, Yanagawa also noted that "religious organizations that attempted to become modern, rational, and relevant to contemporary society and that responded to the expectations of religious scholars, continue to stagnate and decline. Instead, the greatest growth is being seen in conservative, doctrinaire, return-to-the-origins fundamentalism; strongly authoritarian movements; secret associations; non-Christian traditions such as exotic Oriental-appearing mysticism; and occult movements"⁹³. For Yanagawa, the Weberian model as present in his work on the Sociology of Religion was "insufficient to explain the phenomena of the 'return to religion' that occurred since the latter part of the 1960s"⁹⁴. In sum, his interest in contemporary social movements, coupled with his critique of Weber's analytical tools, led Yanagawa to almost completely reject Weber's framework of analysis while still remaining inspired by the spirit of Weber's goal. Nevertheless, although his research in small religious communities in Japan and abroad led him to briefly touch upon the power dynamics emerging within these communities, his work still never led him to elaborate a theory regarding the legitimization of power within these groups. Moreover, his rejection of the Weberian framework led him to abandon 'belief' as an

important analytical tool to understand power dynamics embedded in social institutions, and rather chose a more materialist-based approach to understanding group dynamics taking place within religious communities.

Contrary to the previous authors, the works of Ōtsuka Hisao 大塚久雄 (1907-1996) did not offer much criticisms of Weber's work. Quite the opposite, "Ōtsuka went so far as to say that Weber's theory of ascetical Protestantism as a deciding factor in the formation of the spirit of capitalism 'has a basic correctness that is close to perfection'"⁹⁵. Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson state that "[Ōtsuka] argued that criticism of Weber were always off the mark and did nothing to damage the correctness of his theories"⁹⁶. Ōtsuka's work has been incredibly impactful during the intense period of Westernization, industrialization, and modernization of pre- and post-war Japan, since it posited Weber's theories not just as social science theories and frameworks; but rather "as a practical model for achieving modernization"⁹⁷. Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson explain that "one of the reasons that Ōtsuka's influence was so widespread was that he preached Weber's thought as a kind of gospel for Japan's Westernization. This was also the main reason for the distinctive phenomenon in which Weber took on an almost sacrosanct status, as a 'prophet of modernization'"⁹⁸. This is because, Ōtsuka perceived that Weber's ethos theory "could be connected with a theory of human types [*ningen ruikai* 人間類型] that would support Japan's modernization"⁹⁹. Hayashi, Yamanaka and Swanson explain that "Ōtsuka argues that the most important matter for 'the reconstruction of Japanese democracy' is the creation of a 'modern, democratic human type', and that in order for the Japanese people to 'forge' this type, it is necessary 'to accurately and concretely comprehend the modern human type'"¹⁰⁰. This, eventually, led Ōtsuka to a form of "extreme idealization of Western Protestant religion"¹⁰¹ as the template for creating this modern, democratic human type, therefore "setting the stage for the condemnation of magic as an element that had to be rejected"¹⁰². This, the authors explain, is because "[t]o Ōtsuka, 'magic' was clearly something that must be overcome, for the reason that magic is an integral part of the traditionalist ethos, the opposite of the modern human type that Ōtsuka so yearned to have created"¹⁰³. The idea behind this particular reading of Weber's analyses is that since the development of the West has for background a Protestant ethos which created a particular human type that is conducive in leading to the development of modern capitalism, this means that, for

Japan to achieve modernization, it must also generate this human type and thus ‘Protestantify’ their ethics and eliminate magic-based superstitions. This, however, does not mean the condemnation of religion altogether. Indeed, Hayashi, Yamanaka, and Swanson explain that “Ōtsuka took pains to point out that only a religion that is liberated from magic (i.e. Protestantism) can be called a true religion, and he accused religions with magical elements of being like magicians that keep people bound by spells”¹⁰⁴. Ōtsuka’s case is interesting because although his work alludes to the relationship between a particular set of beliefs (protestant, anti-magic, etc.) and the legitimization of particular institutions of power (modern capitalism), he does not explicitly engage with Weber’s beliefs-based theory of legitimacy in itself. This seems to be due to his conviction that Weber’s theories are flawless and therefore do not need any more investigation than what Weber himself already provided. Nevertheless, even more interesting is the way Ōtsuka uses this particular knowledge. Indeed, instead of recognizing the validity of Weber’s finding and using this as his basis to provide a better understanding of the Japanese historical context – like I am doing in this paper – he rather chose to use Weber’s work as a template for Japan to follow to the letter. In this case, it is possible to see that Ōtsuka’s work and that of his followers (called the Ōtsuka Historical School or *Ōtsuka Shigaku* 大塚史学) does not allow us to have a better understanding how particular beliefs have become the source of political legitimacy in the politico-historical context of Japan. It also shows that Ōtsuka seem to have missed – or purposely chose to ignore – Weber’s critique of capitalism as being inherently problematic.

Working on Weber within the Japanese context, Andrew James Jacobs states that “Weber concluded that as long as Confucianism was dominant, East Asian societies would always lack the necessary economic rationality and entrepreneurial spirit that has energized the modern money-based capitalist economies of the Western Anglo-Protestant countries”¹⁰⁵. More specifically, “the Confucian nations, such as Japan, accorded merchants very low status, and frowned upon thrift, even viewing it as hoarding [...] As a result, in such societies, ritual and the goal of self-perfection superseded any desire for individual wealth”¹⁰⁶. Jacobs criticizes this reductionist view of Weber and concludes that “[Weber] ignored the fact that, while China, Japan, and South Korea were all founded upon principles derived from the Analects of Confucius, each had its own uniquely embedded history and culture which greatly influenced the degree and style of Confucianism

which each country adapted to its particular society”¹⁰⁷. Jacobs describes this to be due to the fact that “whereas Chinese Confucianism stressed benevolence, Japanese Confucianism was based upon a trinity of values - loyalty, filial piety, and duty - which did not prohibit money-making and accumulation, as long as merchants remained loyal to their local lord or nation”¹⁰⁸. Once again we can see that although Jacobs’ critique of Weber touches very superficially upon the topic of beliefs by merely naming the difference between some Japanese Confucian beliefs and some Chinese Confucian beliefs, there is no discussion of legitimacy whatsoever in his historical analysis. Not only a deeper analysis of the worldview behind the beliefs he named would have been important, but also connecting these beliefs to the legitimization of the institutions of power within the Japanese context of the time instead of simply connecting it to modern rational capitalism would have helped us understand the Japanese standpoint more clearly. However, Jacobs provides a deeper analysis of such dynamics when turning his attention to more modern times. For example, Jacobs explains that “the Meiji Government (1867-1912) embraced and then instilled in the masses a catch-up nationalist ideology that rested upon three principles: (1) *fukoku kyōhei* 富国強兵 – rich nation and strong army; (2) *banpō taiji* 万邦対峙 – to stand up against all other countries; and (3) *shokusan kōgyō* 殖産興業 – promoting industrial development, and calling for the protection of domestic industry from foreign competition”¹⁰⁹. Jacobs adds that “[i]ncorporating Japan's Shinto traditions of filial piety to ancestors and its shogunal period's devotion to *daimyō* [大名] or feudal lord, the Meiji Government was so successful in inculcating this ideology that it was said that even the small children of Japan were speaking about the need to enrich the country and strengthen the military”¹¹⁰. Jacobs is also a good example of many scholars of Japanese history who, although they bring up beliefs by naming them and sometimes connect them very superficially to the topic of legitimacy, do not do the work of digging deeper into the system of thought from which they emerge to present a holistic perspective. Moreover, similar to Japanese scholars, Jacob’s use of the Weberian framework orients towards explaining the factors behind Japan’s modernization rather than exploring the relationships between beliefs and power in Japan’s historical past.

All authors discussed above are working directly with Weber's work. However, as we have seen, the large majority of the scholarship on Weber falls into three categories: (1) scholars who focus on legitimacy but forget (or ignore) to include beliefs; (2) scholars who focus on beliefs but forget (or ignore) to include legitimacy; and lastly (3) scholars who engage directly (with various degrees of depth) with Weber's beliefs-based theory of legitimacy, but only focus on modern times. As I have demonstrated, since most of Weber's work spurs directly from his theorization of the relationship between beliefs and institutionalized power, ignoring or forgetting to analyze both of these concepts simultaneously has led many scholars to misinterpret Weber's goals and agendas. As shown, this misinterpretation has unfortunately allowed Weber's work to be dragged into all sorts of directions which, when looked at closely, contradicts many of Weber's own fundamental positions. Prophet of modernization, promoter for capitalism, defendant of objectivity, supporter for nationalism, missionary for the 'Protestantification' of the world, advocate for the eradication of enchantment/magic, pessimist; these are all mantles that have unjustly been placed on Weber's shoulders as a consequence. Moreover – and more importantly for my work – a majority of Weber's work was not dedicated merely to understanding the circumstances which led (or not) to the development of rational scientific modern capitalism across cultures. Indeed, it also participated in providing ground-breaking insights into the relationship between core beliefs and power structures of different cultures across time and space. In fact, almost all scholars mentioned above have chosen to focus on the former, barely ever engaging with the latter. In other words, the Weberian framework of seeking to understand the relationship between the core beliefs and the power institutions they legitimize *in a culture's respective historical context*, has almost completely disappeared from Weberian scholarship. As we have seen, whenever a meaningful engagement with Weber's beliefs-based theory of legitimacy is present within Weberian scholarship, it almost always seeks to shine light on these within the context of modern times, but it is never used to seek to understand the past as Weber himself sought to achieve.

Now, a very similar problematic is also taking place within the history-driven branch of the field of Japanese studies. Indeed, because the vast majority of scholars do not explicitly engage with Weber's beliefs-based theory of legitimacy, we can see a similar pattern developing where scholars either (1) talk about legitimacy but forget – or ignore – to include a meaningful connection

with beliefs; or (2) scholars who talk about beliefs but forget – or ignore – to include a meaningful connection with legitimacy.

A good example of the first group of scholars is observable in the work of Gustav Heldt. In his book *The Pursuit of Harmony*¹¹¹, he seeks to understand “the role played by networks of patronage and political influence in the production of poetry”¹¹². To do so, Heldt focuses on the context of the compilation of poetry anthologies and poetry competitions where he finds that “[poetry’s] ritual evocations of past precedent were often directly concerned with naturalizing and legitimizing contemporaneous arrangements for organizing economic and political power”¹¹³. Heldt finds that “the chief significance of early Heian court poetry lay in its affirmation of a cosmologically grounded view of the social order”¹¹⁴ in which the key principle at play is that of “harmonization” (*wa* 和). Heldt explains harmonization as follows: “poets would produce verses whose rhyme schemes and words echoes those of their sovereign, thereby signaling not only their accord with his will but also their fitness to transmit his words throughout the realm as officials representing his authority”¹¹⁵. He explains that “[t]he performative significance of expressing harmony in verse drew on cosmological conceptions that were primarily intended to legitimate political authority”¹¹⁶ which is anchored in “the Confucian concept of ritual rulership as the coordination of human activity with heavenly processes”¹¹⁷. Indeed, “the enactment of harmony between sovereign and a subject [through poetry] was intended to produce a shared sense of community among the court’s multiple members, just as its cosmological corollary of a superior Heaven and inferior Earth were seen to sustain the physical world in its manifold variety”¹¹⁸. In sum, compiling poetry anthologies and poetry competitions sought to reproduce the dynamics of Heaven (macrocosm) and Earth (microcosm). If harmony exists between the words of the sovereign and that of the participants, it demonstrates that the realms of Heaven and Earth are also in harmony, which provides legitimacy both for the sovereign as the representative of Heaven and the participants as the representatives of Earth. In this sense, “[p]oetic harmonization at *sechien* [節宴 banquets] was represented as a means for naturalizing social hierarchies by grounding them in the universe’s fundamental structures”¹¹⁹. Nonetheless, Heldt points out that this perspective on harmony between all phenomena and social harmony is not simply present in Confucian frameworks but also in Daoist thought. Indeed, Heldt posits that “[a]ccording to [the Daoist] model,

all phenomena in the world are conceived of as arising from the balanced interaction of mutually complementary opposites. Similarly, harmony in poetic form was a generative act that produced its social world rather than simply representing it”¹²⁰. As alluded to at the beginning of this paragraph, while Heldt’s work places an obvious emphasis on the topic of political legitimacy understood within the context of Japan’s own historical context, his discussion of beliefs is unfortunately too superficial. Indeed, although Heldt repeats multiple times throughout the book that poetic-based performances “reflect the central aspect of harmony”¹²¹ or “paralleled cosmological ones between Heaven and Earth”¹²², his repetition rarely leads to a deeper discussion on the ways in which harmony and Heaven and Earth are understood within the structure of Confucian or Daoist cosmology. This leads readers to assume that Heldt’s connections must be true simply because he repeats the connections multiple times, but this repetition does not actually provide a better understanding of the beliefs behind these frameworks. This is true not just for the particular beliefs named above, but also for the vast majority of the beliefs that Heldt touches upon in his book. For instance, Heldt’s discussion of *kotodama* (言靈 Word-Spirit) is limited to one passage where he briefly explains that “[k]otodama is described here as an act of citation in which events and phenomena of the Yamato court stretching back to the age of the gods are brought into the present through the reiteration of ancient words and phrases (*furugoto* 古言) that have existed from time immemorial”¹²³. Once again, here the reader is forced to remember a previous concept (*monjō keikoku* 文章経国 writing binding the realm) introduced earlier in the book which touches upon why ‘connection to times immemorial’ is something important within Japanese thinking at the time, but the connection is not explicitly presented by Heldt himself. All and all, these sporadic, unconnected passages which usually satisfy themselves with simply naming and briefly defining one particular belief are not conducive in presenting a systematic understanding of the systems of thought in which these beliefs emerge. This problematic is unfortunately not only found in Heldt’s work, but in a vast majority of Japanese studies scholarship that juggle with the concept of political legitimacy. Even though Heldt absolutely provides a clearer and more direct engagement on the connection between beliefs and political legitimacy than most, and although his work is incredibly insightful in the multiple ways in which poetic performances were interconnected with political dynamics at this time, still, his discussions on the particular beliefs are too superficial, degraded,

sporadic, and unconnected to provide the reader with deep insights into the structure of the beliefs behind political legitimacy in Heian Japan.

Another author which focuses his attention on legitimacy while not engaging deeply with the topic of beliefs is Michèle Mara who explains that “art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences”¹²⁴. Marra explains that, within the Japanese medieval context, “[p]oets struggled to legitimize themselves through an exclusive appropriation of the motif of the ‘Sacred Mirror’ [*shinkyō* 神鏡] – the embodiment of the metaphysical and earthly holy: god and emperor – upon which they wrote a large number of poetic variations in the attempt to legitimize their patron as the only heir to the sun goddess Amaterasu”¹²⁵. He adds that, during the turn of the Kamakura period, “[a] similar process of appropriation took place with the Buddhist interpretation of the Sacred Mirror that aimed at empowering the political structure of Buddhist institutions by creating a new mythology with the symbols of Shintoism in order to legitimate the Buddhist creed as the source of imperial power”¹²⁶. More specifically, this took the form of “prov[ing that] the [Buddhist] temple’s ability to overcome and domesticate those metaphysical forces that Buddhist mythographers had constructed as dangerous and threatening, and served both to shelter the community from supernatural intervention and to provide the social structure with stability and order”¹²⁷. Marra, then moves on to explain that these “series of cultural appropriations – the Buddhist assimilation of imperial symbolism and the shogunal patronage of an aesthetic outgrowth of Buddhist rituals – secured military rulers with a mythology of power that constructed pastoral representations of a harmonious political order. The shogun’s successful presiding over the cosmological process of production and reproduction legitimized his position at the top of secular hierarchies”¹²⁸. This “pattern of appropriation and assimilation tended to recenter the discourse on power without ever challenging the notion of authority. Despite a change in rules and players, the game remained essentially the same”¹²⁹. In sum, although the Kamakura period represented a movement which transferred political power from the Emperor (*Tennō* 天皇) to the Military General (*Shōgun* 将軍), and from *Shintō* (神道) shrines to Buddhist temples, Marra finds that the discourses which legitimize power remained essentially unchanged. This is because *Shintō*’s (and Confucian) narrative of ‘a powerful ruler whose connections to the spiritual realms – due to them

being the descendant on Earth of the Sun Goddess Amaterasu – enables them to conquer supernatural forces of disorder and thus maintain peace’ was only slightly changed in content to ‘a powerful ruler whose connections to the *buddhas* (*butsu* 佛) and *bodhisattvas* (*bosatsu* 菩薩) – due to them have being reborn as rulers and cultivating and spreading Buddhist morality and practices within their territories – enables them to conquer supernatural forces of disorder and thus maintain peace’. Another powerful narratives highlighted by Marra is that of tradition, which he explains as follows: “[a] major goal of courtly structures in times of peace is the creation and preservation of an ‘unadulterated’ tradition [*dentō* 傳統] in order to establish a system of stability upon which to fall back when a crisis arises. If the crisis leads to the formation of rival centers of power, success befalls those who can prove the legitimacy of their actions and present themselves as the unsoiled representatives of tradition”¹³⁰. Marra’s work seeks to locate these discourses of legitimization within works of art (in this case, primarily poetry and theater) produced at different periods of time within Japanese history. Marra concludes similarly to Heldt that “[t]he relationship between ruler/patron and poet fed on a process of mutual legitimation. While poets lent their rhetorical skills to the creation of images of authority for the immediate benefits of sovereigns, the ruler stamped the official seal of approval on his mythographers and their poetic schools”¹³¹. Indeed, art (poetry) and politics were inseparable since “[p]olitical restoration also meant poetic rectification, the establishment of the ‘correct way of poetry’ (*shikishima no tadashiki michi* 敷島の正しき道)”¹³². Still in alignment with Heldt’s findings, Marra explains that the tradition-based narrative of legitimacy was at play between poets’ competition for political patronage when he provides the example of Fujiwara Tamekane 藤原爲兼 (1254-1332) who implied in his work that “the legitimating source of his poetry was even more ancient than Shunzei’s (1114-1204) [...] claiming legitimacy over his rivals as the heir to the tradition of his ancestors Shunzei 俊成 and Teika 定家 (1162-1241)”¹³³. This appeal to tradition as a means of legitimization of one’s art was also present in the works of one of Japanese theatre’s most famous name, Zeami 世阿弥 (1363-1443), as Marra describes that “Zeami fabricated a mythical account of the beginning of his art that concealed the popular roots of *sarugaku* 猿樂, emphasizing instead its religious connotations through linkage with the Indian history of the Buddha’s life”¹³⁴. All in all, we can see that Marra’s work is embedded in the same problematic as the work of Heldt: both authors provide an

exhaustive account of the relationship between art and political legitimacy, but almost never provide an in-depth account of the beliefs at the core of such legitimization. Indeed, although Marra mentions in passing, for example, that political legitimacy was understood in terms of the “overcom[ing] and domesticat[ing] [of] metaphysical forces that Buddhist mythographers had constructed as dangerous and threatening”¹³⁵, he does not provide any elaborate discussion of the beliefs around metaphysical forces within Buddhism nor on the beliefs around overcoming such forces within the tradition. As with Heldt, readers are left with a very superficial account of an entire tradition, without any significant explanations on the complex structure of Buddhist thought where these beliefs are found. The claims around tradition-based legitimacy follows the same pattern as Marra does not explain nor demonstrate where beliefs in the importance of tradition are found. Similar to Heldt, throughout Marra’s book, he contents himself with simply naming the beliefs, sometimes giving a very brief definition, but never takes a significant amount of space to provide for a meaningful, in-depth explanation of the systems of thought within which these beliefs emerge. By doing so, I believe that both Heldt and Marra do not allow the readers to take medieval Japanese thought seriously. Indeed, by not explicitly demonstrating and giving enough credit to the richness and depth of a system of thought, Heldt and Mara both make it easy for readers to dismiss the conclusions on political legitimacy obtainable within the framework of medieval Japanese thought, because readers can too easily dismiss the legitimacy of its rationalization process simply on the basis that it differs from their own beliefs and assumptions. On the contrary, I believe that when providing in-depth descriptions of the connections and intricacies of the various beliefs forming the core of a system of thought, readers are better able to understand how it would be possible to reach such conclusion if someone held such beliefs, even if such system operates in a fundamentally different manner than their own. In other words, although Marra’s work allows for the readers to see how the relationship between art and political legitimacy was playing out in medieval Japan, his lack of meaningful and in-depth engagement with the beliefs behind such legitimization does not enable readers to deeply understand and follow the thought process of a medieval Japanese person.

A very similar problematic is observable in an article by William E. Deal where he seeks to understand how a rhetoric of legitimation based on the *Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra* (known as Lotus Sūtra) was used by aristocrats and religious practitioners during 11th century Japan to

legitimize their own social positions and lifestyles. Deal defines a rhetoric of legitimation as “the use of religious discourse based on an authoritative text in order to legitimate political and social agendas”¹³⁶. He further explains that “[a]uthoritative texts are often treated by the community that prizes them as the benchmark against which human activity, whether religious, social, or political, can be conceived, examined and judged. Such texts authenticate the cosmology by which community defines itself as valid and true”¹³⁷. Moreover, “a community's discourse about the nature of the universe and the behaviors that accord with that view is legitimated when it can be shown to conform to the dictates of the authoritative text. Such legitimations, then are not only about claims to religious authority or knowledge about the universe, but also, and just as importantly, assertions about the way people should behave in the world, the kinds of social and political institutions they should have, how people should act in the ideal, or the correctness of the existing social order”¹³⁸. Deal moves on to argue that “[b]oth ascetics and aristocrats understood the Lotus Sutra to be an authoritative measure of the correctness of their religious, social, and political activity. Both ascetics and aristocrats saw their worldview as valid and true because, they could argue, they were living in accordance with the sacred dictates of the Lotus Sutra”¹³⁹. This is due to the fact that “in the Heian period, it was the Lotus Sutra that served as the general Buddhist ‘handbook’ containing many of the major concepts of the Heian ‘map of the cosmos’. This map charted a conceptual framework that included abstract ideas, modes of religious praxis, imagery, and metaphor that animated poetry, fiction, and other cultural expressions”¹⁴⁰. Deal then analyzes works of literature such as the *Hokke Genki* 法華驗記 (1043) and the *Eiga Monogatari* 榮花物語 (1107) and finds that both texts share three similar assumptions: (1) “the Lotus Sutra is conceived, unequivocally, as the ultimate power of the universe”; (2) “the Lotus Sutra mediates the power of the universe for sentient beings. Human can activate this mediating power through a variety of rituals”; and (3) “a crucial relationship between Lotus Sutra practice and birth in the Pure Land”¹⁴¹. However, “[b]oth the *Hokke Genki* and the *Eiga Monogatari* utilize the Lotus Sutra to argue their particular view of reality. Yet the passages they choose to interpret and the concepts they choose to emphasize often differ from one another”¹⁴². Deal expands on this point highlighting that “[t]he two texts verbalize the ideal cosmologies of the specific groups of people they depict: ascetics in the *Hokke Genki* and aristocrats in the *Eiga Monogatari*. These two institutions assert their identities as legitimate groups with distinctive interpretations of the Lotus Sutra”¹⁴³. More

specifically, on the one hand, in the *Hokke Genki*, “the linking of the ascetics with *bodhisattvas* promotes the idea that *bodhisattvas* and ascetics represent multiple sources of power and authority in the universe. If the ascetics' world is analogous to the world of the *bodhisattvas*, then the sacred is located in the remote mountains where ascetics are said to dwell”¹⁴⁴. On the other hand, in the *Eiga Monogatari*, “[t]he validity of Fujiwara hegemony over the Heian world, both aristocratic and plebeian, and the necessity for maintaining this structure of power and authority, are affirmed by the fundamental assertion that Michinaga [道長 (966-1028)] is analogous to the eternal Buddha described in the Lotus Sutra”¹⁴⁵. Deal concludes that “[t]he cosmologies of the *Hokke Genki* and the *Eiga Monogatari* were not created in order to control others through falsely manufactured legitimations. Rather, they were firmly believed to express, accurately, the truth of the universe as revealed in the Lotus Sutra, both institutions being convinced of the veracity of their perception of the cosmic and human structures inherent in the ultimate reality of this sutra”¹⁴⁶. This last passage is very important as it affirms Deal’s conception of legitimacy alongside Weberian lines as he states that simply using analogies and narrative devices is not sufficient to bring about legitimization; rather, legitimization can only happen if, first, there is belief and conviction that the content of those analogies and narratives are true or matters-of-facts. Nevertheless, Deal still reproduces a similar problematic as found in the works of Heldt and Marra because he does not provide any deep or meaningful explanation of the beliefs/matters-of-facts found within the framework of Buddhist thought contained within Lotus Sūtra. Indeed, Deal places the vast majority of his emphasis on the content of the *Hokke Genki* and the *Eiga Monogatari*, but is then satisfied with only stating they are in alignment with the content of the Lotus Sūtra, without giving any significant space to elaborate on such content. Similar to Heldt and Marra, Deal is convincing in showing how art (in his case literature) was used for the legitimization needs of particular groups by anchoring themselves in the content of the Lotus Sūtra, but the readers are once again unable to meaningfully describe the structure of Buddhist thought which allows for such rationalization in the first place. Still, Deal’s work is important and useful for my work since it more specifically engages with a Buddhist framework while working within Weber’s beliefs-based theory of legitimacy. Unfortunately – and ironically – his Weberian inspiration still did not lead him to focus on describing and/or explaining the Buddhist belief-system of late-Heian Japan, meaning he

ultimately is not be able to provide a satisfactory account of the way legitimization happens within the framework Buddhist thought itself.

One scholar who deviates slightly from this tendency of focusing on legitimacy while relegating discussion on beliefs to the background is Wakabayashi Haruko 若林晴子 (1967-...). In her book, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, Wakabayashi seeks to understand the ways in which “Buddhist institutions defined evil and how they used the rhetoric of evil to justify their own positions and marginalize others”¹⁴⁷. Indeed, Wakabayashi starts her work with taking the time to contextualize some of beliefs/matters-of-facts of medieval Japanese society which her work ground itself in. For example, she explains that “[s]trange phenomena (*kaii* 怪異) were taken seriously by the people of medieval Japan. Rumbling mountains, cracks found in sacred images, the cries of foxes – all are frequently mentioned in the diaries of aristocrats as good or bad omens”¹⁴⁸; that “*Mononoke* (spirits 物氣), which included *tengu* [天狗] in Heian court literature, were thought to be everywhere, causing natural disasters, sickness, and death”¹⁴⁹; and that “*Mononoke* that frequented cities were the vengeful spirits (known as *onryō* 怨靈), of those who had died in agony – usually on the losing side of a political struggle”¹⁵⁰. Wakabayashi adds that “By the Heian period, *tengu* were closely associated with *mononoke* and shared many of their attributes. Like *onryō* and other *mononoke*, *tengu* in medieval Japanese literature caused both public and personal disturbances”. Furthermore, Wakabayashi demonstrates that the advent of Esoteric Buddhism “led to a new understanding of illness: Disease was a curse placed upon one by an enemy, dead or alive, and rituals were needed to dispel the malign spirit lodged into one’s body. Esoteric Buddhism thus emerged as a religion capable of both subduing and creating evil”¹⁵¹. This means that “[s]pirits like *tengu* that were initially outside the Buddhist sphere were now synonymous with a form of evil peculiar to Buddhism: *ma* 魔. The term literally means ‘murder’ or ‘destruction’, and thus initially referred to ‘that which causes death’ and prevents one from practicing good deeds”¹⁵². Wakabayashi further elaborates on this last aspect by explaining that there are four categories of hindrances (*shima* 四魔) for a person seeking to pursue Buddhist practices: (1) delusions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱) refer to the hindrance of delusions which stems from one’s worldly desires or attachment to worldly matters; (2) the five aggregates (jp. *goon* 五陰)

refer to the five aggregates of one's body and mind that cause delusion; (3) death (jp. *shi* 死) refers to the taking away life and thus the possibility of doing good; and finally (4) heavenly demon kings (jp. *ten* 天) refer to the lord of the highest of the six heavens in the realm of desire, he detests the Dharma, or the Law of the Buddha and tempts and hinders humans in their pursuit of the Buddhist Way¹⁵³. Wakabayashi then posits that “[a]lthough they are ‘beyond the fringe’, so to speak, *tengu* are part of the Buddhist cosmology. But relegating them to the margins serves to emphasize the centrality and legitimacy of monks and the Dharma. Subjugating *ma* through the use of the Dharma reinforce the legitimacy of the latter”¹⁵⁴. After her analysis of the work of art known as the *Tengu* Scrolls (*tengu zōshi* 天狗草紙) produced in 1296, Wakabayashi describe the scrolls as “depicting two kinds of *tengu* evil that existed in late Kamakura Buddhist society”: (1) “the corruption within the established [Buddhist] institutions”; and (2) “the evil teachings of the new schools [of Buddhism], which disturbed the very order of the Buddhist world”¹⁵⁵. Wakabayashi then briefly introduces the Buddhist concept of ‘mutual dependence between the Law of the Sovereign and the Law of the Buddha’ (*ōbō buppō sōi* 王法佛法相依) via her own translation of a passage of the Legends of the Founding of Miidera (*miidera engi* 三井寺縁起) which states that “[a]ccording to the words of the Daishi [Enchin], our Buddhist teachings will be transmitted to sovereigns and ministers; if the sovereigns and ministers ever neglect the *Dharma*, the land will deteriorate and the Law of the Sovereign will decline. The deities of heaven will turn their backs and the deities of earth will be furious; disease will spread among the people, and dead bodies will lie in piles all over the street. The inner and the outer will be in confusion, and the distant and the near will be disturbed”¹⁵⁶. Wakabayashi explains that within this *ōbō buppō sōi* discourse “[t]he power of the sovereign comes from the power of the *Dharma* (in this case, that of *Onjōji* 園城寺); to maintain power and prosperity rulers must continue to worship at the temple [of *Onjōji* 園城寺]. If the *Dharma* declines, the power of the sovereign also declines, and the country will become unstable”¹⁵⁷. Wakabayashi then joins together this political theory with the literary depictions of the *tengu* describing how “[d]emons and *tengu* can be overcome with esoteric rituals or protection from gods and bodhisattvas; protection is guaranteed through devotion to Buddhist practices”¹⁵⁸. Wakabayashi concludes her work stating that Buddhist institutions “were responsible for defining and creating the predominant images of evil throughout the period and did so to defend and

legitimize their authority. By identifying their enemies as evil and as disrupters of social order, they were able to condemn and persecute them”¹⁵⁹. As mentioned above, it is obvious that Wakabayashi – contrary to Heldt, Marra, Deal and Brownlee – depicts a clearer picture of the connection between various beliefs present in medieval Japanese culture around spirits, diseases, disasters and Buddhist rituals. However, in opposition to these authors, her discussion of legitimacy is not as clear and well-elaborated. Indeed, Wakabayashi makes the connection appear too straightforward and simplistic: because Buddhist institutions could define and then cure evil, they accumulated political legitimacy. However, simply defining/curing evil is not grounds for legitimacy in itself. As Deal’s Weberian-frameworks reminds us: legitimization can only happen if, first, there is belief/conviction. In this context, this means that there must first be a belief/conviction that curing evil is grounds for legitimacy. Without such belief/conviction being present, the act of curing evil, although useful in itself, would not lead to an increase in political legitimization. To fill this lack of connection, Wakabayashi briefly introduces the important and dominant theory of *ōbō buppō sōi*. In this case, although she does a good job demonstrating that there is a connection between Buddhism’s evil-curing rituals and political legitimacy, Wakabayashi unfortunately does not expand further into a description and/or explanation of the Buddhist belief-system in which this theory find its grounding. Indeed, similar to Marra and Brownlee, although the readers can see that a connection is in fact present, the readers are once again left ill-equipped, not having been given the tools to deeply understand this theory within the rationalization of the medieval Buddhist belief-system.

The work of John S. Brownlee escapes both groups of scholarship in that it provides neither an in-depth discussion of legitimacy nor an in-depth discussion of the beliefs at the core of the legitimization process. In this book, Brownlee aims at (re)constructing an ancient and medieval Japanese political thought through piecing together various themes of political theory as they emerge in Japanese historical works produced during the their respective times¹⁶⁰. Brownlee first explains that “the political history of Japan consists of the repeated replacement of one ruling group by another within the structure of the imperial state [...] The tendency was always towards the establishment of multiple power centres without renovating the formal state system or eliminating the earlier established powers”¹⁶¹. Interestingly, Brownlee observes that “such a major

development as the rise of the warriors, the establishment of the *bakufu* [幕府 Shogunate], and the defeat and humiliation of the imperial house produced such little discussion”¹⁶². This, he posits, is because “Japanese thinkers did not want to confront the political events of their time by direct analysis. Instead, we find a continuation of political discussion by means of historical narrative”¹⁶³. Brownlee explains that this development led to the creation of war tales (*gunki monogatari* 軍記物語) as a new form of writing which fulfilled three functions: (1) “they recorded the lives and deeds of the warriors, as they carried out their missions, fought, and died. Simply to narrate what happened is the primary function of all historical writing”¹⁶⁴; (2) “to create a warrior ethos and provide entertainment. They presented the essential values of warrior life by recounting tales of both the valorous and faint-hearted, the victorious and the defeated, keeping alive the ideals, inspiring and encouraging each new generation to live up to the heroes of the past”¹⁶⁵; and, lastly, (3) “to provide legitimation for warrior society and government. War Tales were positive in outlook: they glorified and magnified their subjects, and by literary means they moved their readers to empathy and to acceptance of the warrior presence”¹⁶⁶. Brownlee then looks at the historical writing entitled *Toganoo Myōe Shōnin Denki* (梅尾明恵上人傳記) – a fictional conversation between Buddhist monk Myōe 明恵 (1173-1232) and *bakufu* regent Hōjō Yasutoki 北条 泰時 (1183-1242) – which present two different positions on “the question of whether it is correct to resist the sovereign”¹⁶⁷. Following this, Brownlee looks at the famous work of Tendai 天台 monk Jien 慈円 (1155-1225), the *Gukanshō* 愚管抄, where Brownlee explains that “Jien's most important work is his search of principles [*dōri* 道理] that govern history”¹⁶⁸. Brownlee explains Jien’s conclusion to be that “[a]s time passes and circumstances change, a new Principle come into effect and supersede the existing Principle. What causes the new Principle to arise is not clear, but the fact that a new Principle has come into existence can be read in the events of history”¹⁶⁹. When analyzing the *Toganoo Myōe Shōnin Denki*, Brownlee simply presents translations of the passages contained within the book but does not take the time to elaborate on the content of the fictional conversation while also not providing any explanation of the systems of thought (i.e. Buddhist, Confucian) from which both characters draw their conclusions. Nonetheless, when analyzing the *Gukanshō*, here Brownlee makes a few remarks on the beliefs at play within Jien’s work. For example, he mentions that “[f]rom time beyond memory the reigning Emperor possessed a sacred

mirror [*kagami* 鏡], jewel [*ji* 璽], and sword [*tsurugi* 劍], each of which originated in some mythical event. These regalia [*jingi* 神器] were given by the Sun Goddess to her grandson when he inaugurated the divine imperial rule, and thus they became symbols of imperial sovereignty¹⁷⁰. This myth lead Jien to believe that “the loss of the sword [regalia at the battle of Dannoura Bay] must have meaning beyond a simple human accident”¹⁷¹ which made him write the *Gukanshō* as an attempt “to persuade [the retired emperor] Go-Toba 後鳥羽 (1180-1239) to accept the reality of historical development, of the inevitability and finality of the course of events”¹⁷². Furthermore, Brownlee also asserts that the periodization present in Jien’s work is “based on Buddhist doctrine, that the history of the world is divided into three periods of the law: Pure Law (*shōbō* 正法), lasting 1000 years after the death of the Buddha; Imitation Law (*zōhō* 像法), the next 1000 years; and Latter Law (*mappō* 末法), the next 10 000 years”¹⁷³. Brownlee briefly adds that “the outstanding characteristic of the period of the Latter Law is irreversible decline and deterioration of true religion and all human affairs”¹⁷⁴ and that “[b]elief in the Latter Law was widespread in Japan in the Heian period, and in Jien's time there arose popular religious sects based on the tenet”¹⁷⁵. Lastly, Brownlee mentions in passage that “it was necessary to take account of ominous natural phenomena and vengeful souls, because their existence was universally believed without question. They were facts of life that could not be disregarded on the grounds that they did not fit logically into an explanation of history. Their acceptance by Jien probably caused him no logical discomfort, and certainly brought no criticism”¹⁷⁶. Brownlee’s work is interesting because his agenda and method offers similarity with mine: he excavates passages found in multiple works and tries to piece them together to present what could have been a Japanese political theory. However, Brownlee’s work has two obvious issues pertaining to the relevance to my work and the broader study of Japanese political thought. The first one is that even though he mentions a few times how the works produced in their respective times served the purpose of (de)legitimizing particular institution(s) of power, Brownlee merely mentions that a particular tale legitimizes a particular group, with no further explanation added outside of simply positing that it does. In fact, having a well-defined theoretical framework for explaining legitimization – such as Weber’s belief-based theory of legitimacy – would have helped Brownlee by giving him tools to provide further insights into the ways in which legitimization happens as a result of the tales. This would also have greatly

helped the readers in understanding how this process took place in medieval Japan. This is connected to the second issue because, since Brownlee does not operate within any clear framework pertaining to theories of legitimacy, he is therefore unable to understand the core role that beliefs play in legitimizing authority. The unfortunate result is that Brownlee's discussions of Japanese beliefs is, similar to most Japanese history scholars, too deemphasized, becoming limited to simply naming the beliefs and sometimes accompanied with very superficial descriptions. Indeed, not only is there barely any exploration of the relationship between beliefs and the legitimization processes, but neither is there any further description and/or explanation of the belief systems within which these beliefs are found. This means that – similar to Heldt, Marra, Deal, and to some extent Wakabayashi – Brownlee's work does not enable the readers to clearly follow the thought process of a medieval Japanese person since there is no meaningful description and/or explanation of medieval Japanese belief-systems. Moreover, Brownlee's work also suffers from the same issue as Wakabayashi's, in that his discussion of legitimacy is too superficial to give any important insights into the potential ways conclusions about political legitimacy have been reached and established during their respective times. In sum, Brownlee's work is useful in that it provides various summaries of important points contained within key texts of Japanese history around the topic of political thought, but it lacks the analytical depth to paint a meaningful and systematic picture of how political legitimacy happened and the beliefs that sustained it.

To conclude, whether we look at Western or Japanese Weber scholars, Western or Japanese Weberian-inspired scholars, legitimacy theorists and/or scholars of Japanese history, the literature is vastly permeated by the same issue: the connection between beliefs and legitimacy is never sufficiently explored and emphasized. This is because scholars choose to focus on the former or the latter individually, leaving connections between the two concepts to be either very superficial or simply inexistent. Based on this observation, another tendency noticeable in the literature is that the vast majority of authors choose to focus on legitimacy over beliefs. Interestingly, all but one of the scholars (Andrews) who do so are of European or North-American descent, while the few scholars who tend to place more emphasis on beliefs over legitimacy are of Japanese ancestry. I believe there are justifiable reasons to suspect that Eurocentric, white supremacist and/or patriarchal standards and norms are involved in this pattern. The last tendency observable in the literature is that all Weberian-inspired scholars but one (Deal) have used Weber's theories to try

to understand their own contemporary situations but never to help understand the past. Interestingly enough, no historians of Japan but one (Deal) have used Weber's frameworks to try to understand of the past. In sum, the literature is left with an important gap where Weber's beliefs-based theory of legitimacy almost never constitutes the theoretical grounding for understanding Japanese political legitimacy within the historical context of its own historical past.

Nevertheless, the beauty of Weber's beliefs-based theory of legitimacy is that the importance placed upon deeply engaging with the structure of a particular belief-system (and its resulting rationalization) allows readers to, for a moment, see the world through different eyes than our own. Thus, not only is Weber's framework very insightful in helping us understand the past in a way that limits the imposition of our own constructs upon it, but, even more importantly, his framework simultaneously allows the readers to experience what it feels like to see the world with different eyes, to reach different conclusions, to operate within different frameworks of rationalization, to legitimize different positions than our own, and to experience various forms of being-in-the-world. This is where, I believe, Weber's true revolutionary potential lies; his framework has the potential to foster *hope*. It fosters hope by generating an experience for the reader of what the world could feel like if we engaged with it differently. This, in turn, fosters hope by reminding the reader that things have not always been the way they currently are, meaning that things can change again. Indeed, despite what Eurocentric, white-supremacist, colonial, heteronormative, ableist, sexist, patriarchal, capitalist, etc. histories have been incessantly trying to inculcate in all of us, Weber's framework can help with reminding ourselves that the way we currently are and live is not the only valid and legitimate way. However, in order to do so, we have to open our ear, minds and hearts and engage in the work of challenging our own beliefs/matters-of-fact, preparing the soil so that different ones can blossom.

Methodology

The methodology I will employ for my work is a mixture of two inspirations. First of all, as mentioned above, Weber's beliefs-based theory of legitimacy is the theoretical grounding for

my work. This means that my work assumes Weber's findings about the core function beliefs play in the creation and sustainment of political legitimacy and will thus aim to highlight what belief(s) is(are) present in the written works of the Kamakura period (1185-1333) of Japanese history. In this sense, I do not use Weber's exact methodology as seen in the Sociology of Religion series to conduct my research. That is, I am not trying to understand the relation between belief(s) and the development of capitalism specifically. Rather, I use an adaptation of his methods which still centers belief(s) as the core analytical concept of my work while leaving behind the focus on capitalism. In my case, the goal is to understand how the political legitimacy of the Kamakura government cemented itself within the Japanese social context of its time.

My Weberian inspiration made me look for one or multiple beliefs that would be present across multiple texts of various authors and disciplines (such as poetry, art theory, folklore, historical/political writings, and Buddhist texts), but I was careful to do so without any pre-conceived ideas of what these beliefs would turn out to be. In other words, my data collection was inductive and consisted of letting the documents speak for themselves, letting the ancients express their knowledge in their own words, and relegating my contribution to acting as an intermediary between the ancients and the modern readers. To do so, I have been on a long journey which started when I learned the Japanese language at the University of Montreal for five years during my undergraduate degree. At the end of my undergraduate degree, I took Japanese language and writing classes at Kanazawa University in Japan for four months to help improve my skills. Afterwards, during my doctoral program at York University, I spent two years teaching myself to read classical Japanese, and spent the following three years exclusively translating my primary sources from classical Japanese into modern English. Still, it is important to remember that a key objective of my work is to let the original documents/authors speak for themselves as much as possible. This means that, even though my research methodology aligns with the principles of inductive research, my primary research method was not informed by Eurocentric academic standards; rather, it was inspired by the East-Asian commentary tradition.

Throughout East-Asian history, the tradition of commentaries is exceptionally dominant. What is meant by commentary is that writers would convey the knowledges of the past as they were, transcribing them with barely any modifications, and would simply add commentaries to the

texts for the purpose of clarification, sometimes adding a bit of new information to the passages. Inspired by this method and seeking to honor this extremely rich and still-alive tradition, I have decided to write my work in a similar way to the East-Asian commentary tradition. Thus, most of my work will consist of typing out the original passage in the classical Japanese language, providing my own translations of the passages in English, and providing clarifications and explanations of such passages in my own words. Indeed, since my approach is to let the authors speak for themselves by adding as minimal interpretation of my own as I realistically can, I have chosen to translate the passages in a ‘word-for-word’ format, sometimes making it grammatically awkward when translated into English. Thus, just as in the East-Asian commentary tradition, my commentaries will oftentimes simply express the key content of the passages in my own words, in a way that might make it easier for the English reader to readily understand, while simultaneously trying to keep the authenticity of the original passages as untainted as possible. However, it is important to clarify that, when using such a method, the truth of the content should not be looked for in my interpretative acts, but should rather be sought in the original passages themselves. This is why I believe it to be an absolute necessity to have passages written in their classical Japanese format. Still, because my work consists of excavating multiple passages from multiple authors on multiple subjects, the connections might not always be very explicit. Therefore, the primary role of my commentaries is to try and guide the reader by making those connections more explicit and clear for them.

It is also important to note that, aside from honoring the knowledge production method of the tradition I am working with, emphasizing the East-Asian commentary-based method also serves my political agenda of legitimizing different forms of knowledge production outside of only Eurocentric standards. I hope the readers will find my endeavors successful in making sure that my work helps with the legitimization of East-Asian knowledges not merely in content but also in structure. Moreover, as briefly mentioned above, by putting the emphasis on the truth found in the original authors’ insights and limiting my contributions to commentaries for the sake of merely clarification and connection, I aim to actively move away from the appropriative nature of Eurocentric knowledge production frameworks. Indeed, it is revoltingly not common knowledge enough that multiple strands of philosophy – existentialism, post-modernism, post-structuralism, phenomenology, deconstruction, to name a few – as well as entire disciplines in themselves –

psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, to name a few – have been heavily influenced by and oftentimes have downright stolen an enormous amount of knowledge produced in Asian traditions such as Yoga, Buddhism, Jainism, Daoism, Hinduism, and many more. Thus, by following the East Asian commentary-based tradition which places the emphasis on the authors' original thoughts, I am also intentionally seeking to move away from this outraging proclivity of academics to steal and appropriate. In this sense, my choice of methods is also in alignment with the critical assessments made by various anti-colonial, anti-oppressive feminist scholarship (see authors mentioned in introduction) about the necessity to rethink and restructure our Eurocentric, white-supremacist, colonial, heteronormative, ableist, sexist, patriarchal, capitalist, etc. frameworks of research.

I would like to emphasize again that all of the knowledges found within my work is not my own. They belong to extremely rich, beautiful, deep, and truthful traditions I am seeking to honor by acting as an intermediary between the authors and the readers through my commentaries. Nevertheless, I am aware that my intermediary position necessitates me to constantly navigate between honouring the method of East Asian commentary traditions, maintaining the originality of each authors' contributions in their own respective words and frameworks, while still writing my content in a way that the targeted audience of my work (an English-speaking person) can relate to. I am not in a position to claim whether or not I have been fruitful in fulfilling this balance successfully; I entrust the final judgement to the experiences of my readers.

Chapter 1: Historical Context

Heian to Kamakura

Early Heian

The Heian 平安 (794-1185) period of Japanese history is generally presented as the peak of the Japanese Imperial Court system, where Chinese influences were on the decline and Japanese arts – notably poetry, literature and theatre – flourished. Politically, the early Heian period started with a ‘code-governed state’ (*ritsuryō kokka* 律令國家) in the 8th and 9th centuries and grew into the ‘age of the court’ (*ōchō jidai* 王朝時代)¹⁷⁷ in the 10th and 11th centuries. This represents a transition from a bureaucratic-type system to an aristocratic-type regime. Even with this change, “the members of the Heian court remained officials, even if the administration devoted at least as much, if not more time to the organization of celebrations as to the actual business of government”¹⁷⁸. Hérail explains that “[t]hanks to these ceremonies, the court believed itself capable of fulfilling its mission: assuring the peace and prosperity of the country. The privileged interlocutor of these powers remains the emperor. He was thus the focal point of everything”¹⁷⁹. She also notes that “[t]o describe the emperor as being all-powerful or a law-maker or above the law would be to distort reality. He belongs to an order different from that of power. In Japanese, he is called *akitsu kami* [現神], "visible deity", and his presence somehow makes manifest the protection that the deity's grant to the country: this protection establishes and maintains it. The emperor's influence extends far and wide and, provided his conduct is ethical and he serves the deities in the appropriate manner, it ensure peace and prosperity for his subjects”¹⁸⁰. Nonetheless, “[the] Japanese also found in the political ideas imported from China the one requiring the emperor to surround himself with wise counsellors and to heed their advice. His beneficent influence was thus transmitted through the officials and the large volume of legislative deals above all with them”¹⁸¹.

The *ritsuryō kokka* had two principal organs: (1) the Ministry of State Affairs (*dajōkan* 太政官) who controlled the administration, received reports and requests and drafted imperial

edicts¹⁸²; and (2) the Ministry of Divinities (*jingikan* 神祇官) which kept the list of shrine and their clergy for the entire country, prepared and presented court offerings to the most important shrines and celebrated their rituals¹⁸³. The *jingikan* consisted mainly of low rank officials and performed only very specialized functions such as purification, prayers, offerings, and divination¹⁸⁴. Therefore the true main organ of the state was the *dajōkan* which consisted of three key positions: the Chancellor of the Realm or Prime Minister (*dajōdaijin* 太政大臣), the Minister of the Left (*sadaijin* 左大臣), and the Minister of the Right (*udaijin* 右大臣). The *dajōdaijin* position was almost exclusively honorary and was more often vacant than occupied, whereas the *sadaijin* – identified with the East – and took precedence over the *udaijin* – identified with the West – even though the prerogatives of these two were the same¹⁸⁵. Later on in 989, the Minister of the Interior or Middle (*naidaijin* 内大臣) was permanently established although it was ranked lower than those of the Left and Right. The offices of the *dajōdaijin*, *sadaijin*, *udaijin*, and *naidaijin* formed the Council of Senior Nobles alongside major counsellors (*dainagon* 大納言), middle counsellors (*chūnagon* 中納言) as well as auditors (*sangi* 参議), which had from six to twenty members at different times in its history¹⁸⁶. Generally, “[i]t proposed decisions regarding appointments and promotions of civil and military personnel, local administration, finances, and more generally the management of property, as well as severe sentences of death or exile”¹⁸⁷.

This council had at its disposal two organs with secretariat functions: (1) the Control Board (*benkan* 弁官); and a bureau of ministerial secretaries consulted whenever the council needed lists of precedents. The *benkan* was itself split into two sections also called Left and Right. The Left section had four departments: (1) Court Affairs (*nakatsukasashō* 中務省) primarily for issuing imperial edicts; (2) Regulations Relating to Civil Officials (*shikibushō* 式部省) for the management of careers; (3) Noble Affairs (*jibushō* 治部省) for matters concerning the organization of the families holding titles and ranks, selection of the family head, succession, etc.; and (4) Population (*minbushō* 民部省) mainly for the tax system. The Right section also had four departments: (1) Military Affairs (*hyōbushō* 兵部省); (2) Justice (*gyōbushō* 刑部省); (3) Treasury (*ōkurashō* 大藏省); and (4) Palace Affairs (*kunaishō* 宮内省)¹⁸⁸. Together these created what was called the Eight Departments (*hasshō* 八省). The Eight Departments originally had within their

jurisdiction two services (*shiki* 職) with eight officials, eighteen offices (*ryō* 寮) with six or seven officials, and thirty bureaux (*shi* or *tsukasa* 司) with two or three officials¹⁸⁹.

To access any public post (*kan* 官) within the court system, a person needed to be granted one of the nine possible ranks (*i* 位), each of them subdivided further in multiple levels (*ikai* 位階) totalling thirty. However, it was only officials of the first five ranks (or fourteen levels) who were considered part of the aristocracy due to the fact that it was only them who could receive rice fields corresponding to their ranks, and who could have their sons inherit a special rank to begin their careers with a momentous advantage. Indeed, due to promotions being very slow within the bureaucratic system, the advantage given to the sons of senior nobles was quite significant. Other than through privilege and inheritance, it was possible to be granted a court rank/level based on examinations similar to the Chinese system. Nonetheless, succeeding in the examinations would only allow a person to receive a lower posts outside of the aristocratic ranks, and birth and alliances were, instead, always the most important factor¹⁹⁰.

Hérail mentions that “it is clear that, on the one hand, the emperor and his officials supported, at least in words, the ideal of a benevolent government, whose every action must contribute to the good of the people and that, on the other hand, in order to achieve this ideal they adopted a bureaucratic-type system”¹⁹¹. Nevertheless, she also explains that “the impersonal regulations were often circumvented and that factions and clienteles already played an important role among the officials and in their dealings with the population, especially the local nobles”¹⁹². In addition, “promotion decided solely on the criterion of merit always remained a stated ideal, but was seldom applied. The most conscientious officials even risked being penalized”¹⁹³.

With time, due to the complicated basic procedures and the hierarchy between the various parts of the government apparatuses which caused many delays and errors, various bureaux were closed or merged for the creation of new, more efficient organs. Two of such organs were the Chancellery (*kurōdodokoro* 藏人所) and the Police Bureau (*kebiishichō* 檢非違使庁). The *kurōdodokoro* had about ten members and their role was “to serve the emperor in his daily life and to coordinate the work of the offices and bureaux involved”. The two heads were “tasked with liaising between the emperor and the council of senior nobles. This organ was thus entrusted with

a confidential mission and the officials belonging to it were those who had most occasion to see the emperor and to hope for honourable careers”¹⁹⁴. As per the *kebiishichō*, it ended up eclipsing the Department of Justice and “they not only arrested criminals, but also interrogated and sentenced them [...] They ordered beatings to be carried out and kept prisoners locked up: those accused of crimes as well as those sentenced to hard labour”¹⁹⁵.

Hérail argues that “[t]he bureaucratic methods, the customs dating back to before the 8th century, the regulations relating to promotion that blocked the path to success for newcomers, and the trends towards heredity: all these factors attest to the shift of the institutions towards an aristocratic regime based on personal relationships and the pre-eminence of a few important families”¹⁹⁶. This set the tone for the raise to power of one of the most influential clan in the history of Japan; one who dominated the political landscape of the later Heian period: the Fujiwara 藤原.

The Raise of the Fujiwara

The Fujiwara clan has a long history dating back to Nakatomi Kamatari 中臣鎌足 (614-699), the chief advisor of Emperor Tenji 天智 (626-671), who was given the name Fujiwara on his death bed by this emperor. Kamatari’s son, Fujiwara Fuhito 藤原不比等 (659-720), married one of his daughters to Emperor Monmu 文武 (683-707) and bore a son which became Emperor Shōmu 聖武 (701-756). Emperor Shōmu had for one of his consorts a younger daughter of Fuhito, Empress Kōmyō 光明皇后 (701-760) who eventually gave birth to Empress Kōken 孝謙 (718-770) also known as Empress Shōtoku 称徳. Eventually, Hérail explains that “the influence of Fuhito’s four sons [...] was so great at the court that they succeeded in bringing about the suicide of the last prince of the imperial family holding the highest offices in the council”¹⁹⁷. These developments set forth two important precedents: (1) an emperor who was the son of a Fujiwara daughter; and (2) a Fujiwara daughter elevated to the rank of empress. The spread of the Fujiwara clan branches in the higher ranks of the aristocracy became so vast that “[t]hree centuries later, the number of non-Fujiwara senior nobles was negligible and more than half of the middle-ranking officials belonged to one or other of the Fujiwara branches and their countless line of descendants”¹⁹⁸. Hérail explains that “the Fujiwara were able to gain the ascendancy because of

their superior numbers, the precedents they could draw on, the marriages of their daughters with emperors, and the prestige they derived from the work of their founders Kamatari and Fuhito. They took particular care to ensure that all the empresses were Fujiwara by birth, or in exceptional circumstances imperial princesses, and made certain that the mothers of the crown princes were always Fujiwara daughters”¹⁹⁹. In fact, even if Japan modelled its bureaucratic system on the Chinese model, Japan maintained its tradition of uxorial marriage instead of adopting the paternal system of the Chinese, which gave the maternal grandfather an influence over the education of his daughter’s children. This Japanese tradition is specifically what was exploited by the Fujiwara to dominate the political landscape of the mid-Heian era.

Indeed, in 858 Emperor Montoku 文徳 (827-858) died prematurely and his son, Emperor Seiwa 清和 (850-881), was placed on the throne even though he was only nine years old. This was the first time in Japanese history where an under-age crown prince ascended to the throne. However, not desiring to follow a traditional reign – which would have put an Empress in power until the crown prince comes to age – Emperor Seiwa’s grandfather, Fujiwara Yoshifusa 藤原良房 (804-872), used the uxorial marriage structure to his advantage and appointed himself as protector of his grandson by obtaining the title of regent (*sesshō* 摂政). This was the first time in Japanese history where the position of *sesshō* was obtained by someone who was not of imperial rank, as well as the first time the position was held by someone of the Fujiwara clan. Even though Emperor Seiwa celebrated his coming-of-age a few years later, the strategic move by Yoshifusa clearly established that real political power was in the hand, not of the emperor or his advisers, but rather in the Fujiwara-held position of regent. Indeed, a few years later in 876, Emperor Seiwa abdicated the throne in favor of one his son, Emperor Yōzei 陽成 (869-949) who was only 8 years old. This allowed Yoshifusa’s adopted son and nephew, Fujiwara Motostune 藤原基経 (836-891) to become *sesshō* for the under-aged emperor. The event of Motostune becoming regent for the under-aged Yōzei formally established the system of Fujiwara regency. Hérail explains that “the imperial edict promulgated on this occasion entrusted Motostune with the task of protecting and assisting the young emperor, as well as dealing with government business. This concerned promotions and appointments. The regent thus had the opportunity of establishing a clientele among the officials”²⁰⁰. Furthermore, a few years later Motostune forced Emperor Yōzei to

abdicate due to mental illness which rendered him excessively violent, and instead placed an elderly imperial prince, Emperor Kōkō 光孝 (830-887) on the throne. Mototsune had an agreement with Emperor Kōkō that would enable Mototsune to keep his *sesshō* powers even though Emperor Kōkō was fit to rule and of-age. After Emperor Kōkō's death, Mototsune had an imperial edit issued in his favour that officialized the position of chancellor (*kanpaku* 関白) which essentially fulfills very similar functions to a *sesshō*, but for adult emperors. This position had the privilege of 'unofficial document examination' (*nairan* 内覧) allowing it "to see beforehand all documents submitted to the emperor and all replies issued in the emperor's name"²⁰¹. With this, the maternal grandfathers of emperors now possessed real political decision-making power not only when their grandsons were under-aged, but that power remained during their adult reign as well.

In sum, by manipulating of the uxorial marriage tradition, Fujiwara men used their daughters marriages to Emperors and crown princes to produce Fujiwara-related emperors which allowed them to receive the titles of *sesshō* (when under-aged emperors were on the throne) and *kanpaku* (when adult emperors were on the throne) thus holding the real reins of power throughout the mid-Heian period. This is because, against the holder of the *nairan* privilege in the position of the *sesshō* and/or *kanpaku*, "it was almost impossible for [the emperor] to reject a decision proposed by the man who was his protector and advisor"²⁰². In fact, "[i]f the result was not satisfactory, it was the emperor who felt responsible"²⁰³. Moreover, change from the bureaucratic-system to the Fujiwara-controlled, regent-based, aristocratic system also meant that birth, personal relations, alliances, etc. had more weight over the destiny of officials in the government apparatus. Indeed, aside from nepotism and inheritance, a position within the court was increasingly impossible to obtain. This also means that "[w]hoever held the key to appointments thus had considerable prestige and, by this very fact, had a strong grip on power"²⁰⁴.

Erosion of the Aristocracy and Establishment of 'Cloistered Emperors'

As described above, although in the 9th century it was still possible for men born into families of local nobles to enter the court through examination and/or inheritance, all these openings became progressively closed off during the 10th century. Indeed, the court could barely

be renewed with younger blood or by bringing in outsiders to the system, while simultaneously creating an issue of creeping unemployment. As Hérail posits “[t]he world of the court was thus producing a host of younger sons, individuals without a future; almost all their descendants were condemned to slide down the social scale”²⁰⁵. This situation made these descendants realign their careers towards four possibilities: “monopolizing a branch of knowledge, becoming the client or more modestly the servant of an important personage, joining the armed guard of a provincial governor, or seeking their fortune in the provinces”²⁰⁶.

Pertaining the knowledge specialization, Hérail gives the example of the Kamo 賀茂 and Abe 阿倍 clans who “established themselves as specialists in astronomy and related sciences: the calendar, divination and the interpretation of omens”²⁰⁷. Other examples are the case of the Miyoshi 三善 who dominated mathematics; medicine by the Tanba 丹波 and Wake 和氣; the classics of literature by the Nakahara 仲原 and Kiyohara 清原; and the prestigious discipline of letters or poetry by the Sugawara 菅原, Ōe 大江 and the Fujiwara. Hérail explains that “[t]he specialists in astronomy and medicine, in addition to their official functions, gave private consultations for which they were handsomely rewarded. As for the specialists in the classics or letters, they could earn a living by writing for important personages’ applications for posts or letters of resignation and giving lessons to their sons”²⁰⁸.

With regards to becoming a client or servant of an important person, Hérail states that: “those officials who joined the household of a senior noble as an intendant hoped it would give them protection for their career in the central administration and above all an appointment as a provincial governor. In this way they had the opportunity of making profits, some of which they returned to their patrons in the form of gifts or help with the collection of their revenues”²⁰⁹. Another important aspect to note is that it was custom for the senior nobles to see to the health of their intendants and servants by helping them with medical support, pay for funerals for family members and even protect their children²¹⁰.

As for the case of seeking fortune in the provinces, this comes from the fact that when new provincial governors were appointed they restructured their entourage, leading them to oftentimes hire locally looking for notables from the local offices as well as men acting as their

personal guard. In fact, this was even key to one's success as provincial governor since "those who, not so well protected, had no hope of obtaining another post for quite a long time disbanded their household as soon as they returned to the capital"²¹¹. Whenever their patrons died, disbanded their household, or simply terminated their assignment, the locals would simply seek employment somewhere else. Hérail highlights that "with an average of thirty to fifty men recruited by each provincial governor, the sixty-eight provinces could provide a livelihood for over two thousand five hundred individuals and their families"²¹².

Another way to escape the anxieties provoked by the struggle for public posts, the unemployment problem, and the obligations of court life, was to leave the household (*shukke* 出家) thus becoming a Buddhist Monk. Indeed, it was not rare for monkhood to often be misused for the sake of escaping worldly circumstances (such as conviction, prosecution, political turmoil, etc.) but also as a way to end one's career without officially retiring. This was possible because, within the various ranks of monks within the Buddhist institutions of the time, some of these position allowed the new-joiners to only observe a few basic rules: "they stayed in their homes, changed their dress, shaved their heads, and thus partly escaped from the rituals and obligations of society"²¹³. However, as Hérail points out, it would be reductionist to claim that taking religious vows instead of retirement was only for the sake of escaping the world since doing so "aroused no pity and was favourably viewed by society"²¹⁴. Such is the case of Emperor Kazan 花山 (968-1008), "who ascended the throne aged sixteen, abdicated to become a monk at eighteen, when he realized that, without the support of his maternal family, it was better to renounce the throne [...] However, after a short time, he led anything but a monastic life and returned to live in the capital"²¹⁵. Still, taking religious vows did not always come at the cost of losing political power. For instance, important political figures such as Fujiwara Michinaga 藤原道長 (966-1028) who, after becoming ill took religious vows in 1019 and moved to live at Hōjōji 法成寺, still remained the real head of his family to the extent that his son Fujiwara Yorimichi 藤原頼通 (992-1074), regent to many Emperors, was barely able to make a decision without consulting him²¹⁶. In sum, "joining the Buddhist priesthood allowed aristocrats to save face after a failure. As for young men who were eligible to become senior nobles, but who had to struggle against quite fierce competition for a success which, in any case, was inferior to that of their forebears, provided they were devout

and convinced of the possibility of obtaining Enlightenment [*satori* 悟], they found a refuge in the taking of religious vows, especially if they were unsure of their abilities and lacked influential support”²¹⁷.

As observable from the examples above, the interplay between Buddhist temples and the court was in fact quite extensive. Indeed, it was not rare for emperors, senior nobles and even lesser officials to fund temples, adorn them with statues, and act as their patrons. Some of these temples eventually even became officially recognized which enabled the court to appoint the superiors and/or intendants of such temples. In some cases, sponsoring a Buddhist temple even became a way to display aristocratic wealth and power through making the celebrations, number of participants, offerings, statues, garments, etc. ever more so elaborate and grand. Monks were also regularly summoned to officials’ household to perform rituals for purification, exorcisms, healing, increase in fortune, rain for crops, etc. but also sometimes to place curses on enemies. Pilgrimages to important temples also became increasingly popular for aristocrats in the 11th and 12th centuries. However, despite the enrichment, protection and support of powerful court patrons throughout the era, starting in the 11th century the most important temples sought to distance themselves from the court and establish their independence, one of the first of such being Kōfukuji 興福寺. This independence allowed some temples to even gather their own armies of monk-soldiers (*sōhei* 僧兵). In the 12th century, this situation led to an increase in disputes – sometimes very devastating – not just between the court and Buddhist temples, but also between the various Buddhist establishments.

This erosion of the aristocracy and the raise in power and independence of Buddhist temples, were also coupled with issues in the schemes of the Fujiwara clan who, after the long reigns as *sesshō* and/or *kanpaku* of Fujiwara Michinaga and his son Fujiwara Yorimichi spanning 73 years, were unable to continue producing crown-princes of Fujiwara descent. This led to the ascension to the throne of Emperor Gosanjō 後三条 (1032-1073) in 1068 who was the first Emperor in about 170 years to not have a mother of Fujiwara descent on his father’s side. During his time as crown-prince, Emperor Gosanjō accumulated resentment towards the Fujiwara regency system due to Fujiwara Yorimichi – the *kanpaku* of his time – giving all of his attention and

political support to his elder brother-in-law, Emperor Goreizei 後冷泉天皇 (1025-1068) because he had a Fujiwara mother. However, Emperor Goreizei died at 23 years old, with no imperial sons or daughters, thus allowing Emperor Gosanjō to take the throne. Before Emperor Goreizei's early death, Fujiwara Norimichi 藤原 教通 (993-1075) was appointed *kanpaku*, but did not have any real power now that the new Emperor Gosanjō was not of Fujiwara descent. This loophole, paired with Emperor Gosanjō's dissatisfaction with the Fujiwara regency system which opposed him in his younger years, afforded him the possibility to challenge the power of *kanpaku* Fujiwara Norimichi by creating multiple edicts to weaken the regency institution. Eventually, in 1073, Emperor Gosanjō abdicated in favor of his son, Emperor Shirakawa 白河 (1053-1129). However, desiring to keep control for himself in a similar way and seeking to counterbalance the regency institution, Emperor Gosanjō established the *insei* 院政 system or 'retired/cloistered emperor' system. This system would, in theory, allow him to continue having almost all the decision-making power even after abdicating the imperial position. This is because there were historical precedents in the *ritsuryō* system tracing back to the 7th century of retired emperors/empresses (*dajō tennō* 太上天皇) retaining their power after abdication on which he could refer back to. Nonetheless, Emperor Gosanjō was never able to taste the nectar of power of the *insei* system as he died only five months after giving the throne to his son. Emperor Shirakawa was truly the first emperor who was able to benefit extensively from the *insei* system put forth by his father. Indeed, Emperor Shirakawa ruled for fourteen years as emperor but, in 1087, abdicated in favor of his son, Emperor Horikawa 堀河 (1079-1107). At that time, Retired-Emperor Shirakawa took the title of *dajō tennō* and eventually *daijō hōō* 太上法皇 in 1096 once he took Buddhist vows and became a monk. Through this cloistered emperor system, Retired-Emperor Shirakawa was able to maintain extensive power over the Heian court for forty one years, until his death in 1129.

When Retired-Emperor Shirakawa died in 1129, Emperor Toba 鳥羽 (1103-1156) was on the throne. However, because of the *insei* system, he never truly had power over the Court as long as Retired-Emperor Shirakawa was alive. His death allowed Emperor Toba to abdicate the throne in favor of his son, Emperor Sutoku 崇徳, granting him the title of *dajō tennō*, thus enabling him to rule through the *insei* system until his death in 1156. This system was then continued by Emperor

Goshirakawa 後白河 (1127-1192) who ruled only three years as emperor, but thirty-seven years as retired emperor through the *insei* system. It is important to note here that Goshirakawa was the last true ruler of the Heian period and played an important role in the transition to the Kamakura period which we will discuss below.

The creation and impact of the *insei* system is of major significance to the unfolding of the Heian period and its transition into Kamakura. This is because Japan now had two competing centers of powers oftentimes innovatively called ‘the two courts’: one was the Fujiwara-protected emperors and their imperial court, the other was the cloistered emperors and their own court. This means that new alliances could be formed, and new opportunities for growth were possible outside of the inaccessible traditional court ranks. In sum, the political situation of the mid- to late-Heian period can be characterized by three important factors: (1) the Fujiwara domination through the regency system fell apart; (2) a new form of power took place through the *insei* system; and (3) the social circumstances created by the inaccessibility of court positions forced people to find new ways of making a living outside of focusing on obtaining court ranks.

The Raise of the Taira and the Fall of the Minamoto

During the Heian period, land control disputes intensified and were played out by multiple parties who sometimes had competing interests, but sometimes also worked in tandem. For instance, Buddhist temples and peasants sometimes combined their rice fields to avoid public taxes since official temples had the privilege of tax exemption. The main actors behind land control conflicts were primarily the Imperial house, Buddhist temples, court aristocrats, local nobles, provincial governors, local administrators, and peasants. This conflict was exacerbated by the fact that multiple levels of legal rights were at play: (1) lords (*ryōke* 領家) had a right to revenue and a right to nominate or replace a representative charged with collecting taxes; (2) on-site land officers (*shiki* 職) had the right to police, to administer the land, to collect taxes, to distribute lands, and to insure transportation; and (3) peasants needed to pay taxes and/or do *corvée* to receive the right to cultivate the land, but also had the possibility of becoming *myōshu* 名主, the nominal holder of an allocated rice field (*myōden* 名田). This superposition of rights was accompanied with

clientele connections, where all parties involved had a duty to pay up to their own respective patrons. The intensification of competition for patronage and income, allowed by the rights of multiple parties to collect taxes, led to the rise of an important social strata: the warriors (*bushi* 武士 or *samurai* 侍).

Indeed, the numerous conflicts emerging in the provinces forced the court to take measures. This oftentimes took the form of commissioning a bureaucrat of middle rank who was also a good warrior to put an end to the troubles. Early in the 11th century, the Minamoto 源 (also called Genji 源氏) and Taira 平 (also called Heike 平家) clans – both secondary branches of the Fujiwara clan – often fulfilled these roles due to their specialization in military affairs, which also regularly made people of their clans be appointed to the Police Bureau, sometimes even to provincial offices. It was not rare for warriors succeeding in fulfilling the imperial commission to be granted dominion over a particular domain, a *shōen* 莊園. Such is the case of Minamoto Yoshiie 源義家 (1039-1106) who, after ‘pacifying’ the Northern territories during 1051 to 1062 and winning the war of 1083 to 1087 against the Kiyohara clan, received the title of *chinjufu shōgun* 鎮守府將軍 and the position of Governor of the province of Mutsu (*mutsu kuni no kami* 陸奥國守), both of which allowed him to accumulate a lot of influence in Japan’s eastern territories. However, the court did not appreciate Yoshiie’s growing influence in the provinces and therefore, in 1091 and 1092, ordered the peasants to not give land to Yoshiie anymore while simultaneously deleting the domains he had acquire.

Over the years, Japan developed a system in which the task of administrating the expansion of private property in the provinces was largely given to local warrior-notables. Still, most of them kept very tight links to the court since the court was still the political body responsible for solving legal disputes. Moreover, the dependency of *shōen* on their court patrons for their rights to land and all sorts of exemptions means that a significant power disparity was maintained due to the fact that local administrators could easily be swapped with a more obedient candidate if conflict ever arose. Eventually, the Japanese landscape moved away from more traditional public ownerships and became more and more divided into a variety of private *shōen*, owned by the most privileged

aristocrats and/or Buddhist temples. Still, another set of powerful players were using this *shōen*-based system to their increase their power against the court, the Retired-Emperors.

Firstly, Retired-Emperor Shirakawa sought to expand his support in the provinces through the establishment of his own private estates and numerous clientele connections. To do so, Retired-Emperor Shirakawa relied largely on a branch of the Taira clan led by Taira Masamori 平正盛 (?-1121), leading to the creation of a steady alliance between the two parties that lasted for several decades. Through this alliance, Masamori ended up being granted as much as nine governor positions, which he used to “promote the landed interest of the [Retired] imperial house while also obstructing the *shōen* (or *shōen* plans) of imperial competitors”²¹⁸. After successfully answering multiple commissions to suppress rival interests – one notably against the leader of the Minamoto clan and son of Yoshiie, Minamoto Yoshichika 源義親 (?-1108) – Masamori was awarded a lower junior court rank.

Following this, after the death of both Retired-Emperor Shirakawa and Taira Masamori, the alliance was perpetuated by their two respective successors: Retired-Emperor Toba and Taira Tadamori 平忠盛 (1096-1153). Mass describes that “like father before him, Tadamori became a much-traveled governor, receiving (like his father also) title to nine provinces, all (again, as with his father) in Central and Western Japan. Moreover, Tadamori was active within *shōen*, working in various capacities in private domains around the country”²¹⁹. This made him become an official member of the *insei* system as well as enabled him to grow considerable influence at court. On his death in 1153, the mantle was passed to his son Taira Kiyomori 平清盛 (1118-1181) who successfully continued the work of his father and grandfather.

Eventually, the unequal power dynamics of private ownership of *shōen* in favor of the court started to be shaken up due to two rebellions (*ran* 乱): the Hōgen rebellion (*Hōgen no ran* 保元の乱) of 1156 and the Heiji rebellion (*Heiji no ran* 平治の乱) of 1160.

The first of the two incidents, the Hōgen rebellion was caused by the early death of Emperor Konoe 近衛 (1139-1155). This situation created tensions in succession between two of Retired-Emperor Toba’s sons: crown-prince Sutoku who was supported by Fujiwara Yorinaga 藤

原頼長 (1120-1156), and crown-prince Goshirakawa who was supported by Fujiwara Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097-1164). The title of Emperor ended up being granted to Goshirakawa since he had the support of the Retired-Emperor Toba. However, the death of Retired-Emperor Toba a year later made Sutoku rally troops in an attempt to reclaim the throne he believed was rightfully his. Although Sutoku successfully marched on and captured the capital, Goshirakawa retaliated aided with the powerful forces of Taira Kiyomori and Minamoto Yoshitomo 源義朝 (1123-1160). This victory had multiple ripple effects: the first one is the exile of Sutoku to Sanuki province 讃岐國 thus making Emperor Goshirakawa the undisputed ruler; the second one is the making Kiyomori's Taira and Yoshimoto's Minamoto branches to be the two most powerful *samurai* clans in all of Japan; and the third one was the start of a strong rivalry between Taira Kiyomori and Minamoto Yoshitomo as a result of their gains in power.

This bitter rivalry between Taira Kiyomori and Minamoto Yoshitomo spearheaded the next conflict known as the Heiji rebellion. In 1158, Emperor Goshirakawa abdicated the throne and assumed his role as *dajō tennō*, giving succession to his son Emperor Nijō 二条 (1143-1165). As with previous cases of cloistered emperors, true political power remained in the hands of now Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa even after his abdication. When in 1159 Taira Kiyomori left the capital with his family to go on a pilgrimage, his rival Minamoto Yoshitomo aided by dissatisfied court aristocrat Fujiwara Nobuyori 藤原信頼 (1133-1160), gathered around 500 men to capture and imprison both Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa and Emperor Nijō, while setting their residence on fire. Afterwards, Yoshitomo and Nobuyori's troops pursued one of Emperor Nijō's chief political advisor, Fujiwara Michinori 藤原通憲 (1106-1160), leading to his decapitation. Then, Nobuyori forced Emperor Nijō to appoint him *dajōdaijin* (Chancellor of the Realm or Prime Minister). Kiyomori returned to Kyōto to make peace talks with Yoshitomo and, although they failed, these talks were actually a ruse that allowed both Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa and Emperor Nijō to escape to safety. Once their escape was secured, Emperor Nijō granted permission to attack Yoshimoto's troops which were rapidly defeated and Yoshitomo ended up dying betrayed by one of his retainers while trying to flee the capital. This victory of Kiyomori against his only potential rival secured his position as the head of the most powerful *samurai* clan (Taira) in Kyōto. Nonetheless, after the battle Kiyomori decided to show benevolence and spare Yoshitomo's three

surviving son: Minamoto Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147-1199), Minamoto Noriyori 源範頼 (1150-1193) and Minamoto Yoshitsune 源義経 (1159-1189). This would prove to be the downfall of Kiyomori and the Taira as they would be defeated by the combined forces of these same Minamoto children twenty five years later. Eventually, this will allow Yoritomo to become the first ruler of the new *bakufu* 幕府 government, thus catalyzing the Kamakura era.

Mass reminds us that following the Heiji rebellion in 1160, “the victorious Kiyomori remained a provincial aristocrat, waiting, in effect, to be rewarded by his family’s traditional patron [...] he seems to not have received any particular rights in land, whereas Goshirakawa seized proprietorship from estate owners who had been on the losing side, and confiscated managership from Taira and Minamoto, who had experienced the same fate”²²⁰. Moreover, even if Taira managers have been assigned to various *shōen* as reward for their victory and support of Goshirakawa, these *shōen* were still registered as Imperial estates and did not officially belong to the Taira governors. In other words, Kiyomori’s victory which made him the leader of the most powerful *samurai* clan did not, in fact, lead to an overthrow of the power dynamics between court patron and provincial clients; on the contrary, it strengthened it. Nonetheless, Kiyomori became very skillful in navigating the court system to his advantage, especially by using the rivalry that was building between Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa and Emperor Nijō. Indeed, with the support and patronage of Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa who wanted a strong ally within the high ranks of the court, Kiyomori was quickly promoted to the position of Chief Advisor (*sangi*) to the Ministry of State Affairs (*dajōkan*), Head (*bettō* 別当) of the Outer Palace Guards (*emonfu* 衛門府), and Head of Kyōto’s Police Bureau (*kebiishichō*). Furthermore, Kiyomori, following traditions, married his nine-year old daughter to regent Fujiwara Motozane 藤原元真 (1143-1166) but this latter died two years later. His death allowed Kiyomori to have his daughter inherit a portion of the lands who belonged to the Fujiwara clan. In addition, in 1167, Kiyomori was appointed to the prestigious position of Chancellor of the Realm/Prime Minister (*dajōdaijin*), becoming the first court official from a *samurai* family to ever receive the title. As was the norm, Kiyomori stepped down from the honorary office, but these events only strengthened his political power. As Retired-Chancellor of the Realm, Kiyomori “sought to be recognized as virtually the peer of the

Retired Emperor [...] the social gulf between himself and Go-Shirakawa remained unbridgeable”²²¹.

Still, Kiyomori’s thirst for power did not end there. In fact, “[h]e would seek to insinuate himself into the very cream of the aristocracy by reviving, as it were, his family’s imperial origins”²²². Indeed, as mentioned earlier, the Taira were a sub-branch of the Fujiwara clan who dominated the Imperial court for about 200 years. Not only did his daughter’s previous marriage led his clan acquiring lands traditionally belonging to the Fujiwara; but now Kiyomori managed to trully anchor his clan into the imperial house by marrying another daughter, Taira Tokuko 平徳子 (1155-1214), to Emperor Takakura 高倉 (1161-1181) in 1171. Seven years later, she gave birth to a son that would eventually ascend the throne and become Emperor Antoku 高倉 (1178-1185). In a way, Kiyomori sought to establish the Taira as the new center for court aristocracy, dethroning the Fujiwara’s reign through appropriation of their land as well as fulfilling a regent-like function for his grandson the Emperor – not unlike the Fujiwara.

This flamboyant aristocratic rise of Kiyomori led him to now be able to directly challenge Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa. In the meantime, many events led Retired-Emperor Goshirakara to act promptly against Kiyomori, which he did via confiscating lands that belong to the Taira, their allies and their patrons when conflict arose in the provinces. In retaliation, Kiyomori attacked Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa’s allies and forces. However, Kiyomori’s boldest move came in 1179, when he staged a *coup d’état* by, unprecedentedly putting the retired emperor under house arrest, by forcing the resignation of all who opposed him at court, and by appointing his allies in the vacant positions instead. Even though this basically secured Kiyomori’s and the Taira’s positions at the top of Japan’s socio-political hierarchy, it also had the consequence of generating a tremendous amount of hate and revulsion towards Kiyomori and the Taira clan.

The Raise of the Minamoto and the Fall of the Taira

When Emperor Takakura was forced to abdicate the throne in 1180 and Kiyomori put the mantle of Emperor on his two-year old grandson Emperor Antoku, Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa’s son Prince Mochihito 以仁 – also known as Minamoto Mochimitsu 源以光 (?-

1180) – felt like he was being denied his right to the throne. Remembering the rivalry that followed the Hōgen and then Heiji rebellions – perhaps also aided by the fact that he himself was a Minamoto – Prince Mochihito sent a call to arms to the Minamoto clans scattered in the East with the goal of attempting to overthrow Emperor Antoku and the Taira. The fragmentation of the Minamoto made their response limited and delayed²²³, but one who did answer the call was Minamoto Yorimasa 源頼政 (1106-1180). Prince Mochihito’s call to arms against the Taira and Yorimasa’s response marked the beginning of what became the Genpei War (*Genpei kassen* 源平合戦) lasting from 1180 to 1185.

In response to this, Kiyomori ordered the arrest of Prince Mochihito who fled seeking refuge in the warriors-monks of Miidera temple 三井寺. Unfortunately, the warrior-monks of Miidera were unable to receive support from their main temple of Enryakuji 延暦寺 – the head temple of the Tendai 天台 Buddhist tradition – and the Minamoto forces arrived too late to defend the temple. When Yorimasa arrived with his troupes, all fled south to hide at Byōdōin 平等院 – a villa for famous aristocrats that was converted into a Buddhist temple in 1052. Greatly outnumbered, Yorimasa committed the ritual suicide known as *seppuku* 切腹 – the first (or one of the first) recorded act of *seppuku* committed by a *samurai* facing defeat – and the Taira captured and executed Prince Mochihito. Overall, a little over one month passed between Prince Mochihito’s call to arms and his death at the hands of the Taira. The events of a few Minamoto seeking to overthrow Kiyomori’s Taira government led him to mount a punitive expedition against the remaining Minamoto-affiliated clans. In other words, he wanted to extinguish his old military rival.

It is important here to pause and remember that, following his victory over Minamoto Yoshitomo following the Heiji rebellion of 1060, Kiyomori decided to spare the lives of Yoshitomo’s three sons and sent them into exile. The oldest of the three, Minamoto Yoritomo, was placed under the supervision of Hōjō Tokimasa 北条時政 (1138-1215), the head of the Hōjō 北条 clan which descends from the Taira and were distant relatives of the imperial family. Yoritomo’s adolescence and early adulthood were uneventful in his guardian’s eastern province

of Izu 伊豆. In 1177, Tokimasa's oldest child Hōjō Masako 北条政子 (1156-1225) married Yoritomo against her father's wishes and they had a daughter named Ōhime 大姫 (1178-1197).

Yoritomo did not answer Prince Mochihito's call to arms against the Taira in 1180, but Kiyomori's announcement for a punitive expedition against the Minamoto prompted a reaction in Yoritomo. Indeed, he called for support from the scattered Minamoto clans and their traditional allies, which the Miura 三浦 and Chiba 千葉 clans answered positively. Nevertheless, as Mass indicates: “[t]here was little reason for locals to declare themselves [to Yoritomo] prematurely when it was not yet clear what Yoritomo himself would do. Would he attempt, if attacked, simply to defend himself, or would he seek to organize a regional army capable of going on the offensive?”²²⁴. Eventually, Yoritomo made an unprecedented decision: “to construct a regional military lordship under himself, to be supported by a patronage system whose summit would lie in the provinces”²²⁵. With this plan of seeking to establish himself as the successor to the court's authority in the East, Yoritomo was able to make his first steps towards creating a network of patronage whose ultimate source was himself (or his government) and not the Court. This would allow, for the first time, for concerns of men who were not aristocrats of high ranks to be considered priority.

Setting his plan in motion, Yoritomo's local supporters attacked the resident deputy of the Taira government in Izu province in August 1180. Mass explains that this event is significant for three reasons: (1) this indicated in a direct and official manner that Yoritomo and his followers had declared war on the Taira and the Imperial Court they controlled; (2) this marked a first step towards taking over a province with the goal of establishing his own governmental structure; and (3) it increased the distrust of Kiyomori towards the Hōjō clan²²⁶. Only two days after this successful attack, Yoritomo declared that, based on the authority deriving from Prince Mochihito's decree, he was assuming full governance over the East of Japan. Afterwards, he immediately issued his first decree that, “on [Yoritomo's] own authority [...] Mishima Shrine 三嶋大社 was to exercise governance over a traditional subdistrict”²²⁷. This act meant that Yoritomo officially attached his name to a decree historically only the Court could issue, while simultaneously asserting his prerogatives over the provincial land and tax system. After such unprecedented

demonstration of unregulated authority, Yoritomo made the promise to anyone making an oath of allegiance that he would protect through personal confirmations the lands and offices that enlisted followers claimed as their own. In doing so, Yoritomo had initiated a system that would concentrate local land rights in the hands of a provincial elites, all without any recourse to the authority of the Court. With this, Yoritomo started granting confirmations (such as estate managerships, vice governorships, etc.) and awards (such as distributing *shōen* and subdistricts that have been confiscated) in return for loyalty and willingness to fight if need be. This strategy allowed Yoritomo to distinguish his method of governance from traditional forms since his price for support was exclusively determined in personal terms rather than through the traditional patron-client dynamics surrounding land ownership. Moreover, Yoritomo understood that a key governmental body the court used for controlling the provinces, the provincial headquarters (*kokuga* 國衙), could become a central component of his new authority. Thus, the successful attack on the headquarters in Izu led him to encourage his supporters to attack the resident deputies of their respective provinces and take charge of the administration of their own provinces. In effect, “Yoritomo was encouraging those who were locally entrenched to challenge their jurisdictional superiors, who had been dispatched from the capital”²²⁸.

The events of Yoritomo’s allies taking over the reins of government in their own provinces, coupled with Yoritomo’s distribution of confirmations and rewards was successful to the extent that, at the end of 1180, almost all of the eastern provinces became a Minamoto enclave which the Taira had no hope and capacity to pierce through. However, at this point in time, Yoritomo was more concerned with further cementing his authority as head of the Minamoto clan and ruler of the East than directly facing the Taira forces in military war. Seeking to stabilize his government after such rapid expansion, Yoritomo thought it wise to establish his own governmental center. Yoritomo settled upon the coastal town of Kamakura to establish his headquarters not only because of its strategic emplacement close to the Pacific Ocean and away from Kyōto, but also because worship services could now take place at the historical patron shrine of the Minamoto clan, the Tsurugaoka Hachimangū 鶴岡八幡宮 – a shrine dedicated to a Shintō 神道 deity Hachiman 八幡 later understood to be an avatar (*gongen* 權現) of the Buddhist deities, worshipped equally by farmers and fishermen for agriculture and fishing as well as by warriors for war and archery.

Gradually, the coastal town grew to become a representation of Yoritomo's equally growing powers, and any political decision made by Yoritomo would be issued from this place he would call his capital (*to* 都). Around 1181-1182, Yoritomo's earlier encouragement of rebellion against court-centered local administrators became a pretext for a more generalized spread of violence in the provinces. However, requests for help by governors of the eastern provinces were now increasingly sent to Kamakura rather than Kyōto, thus further affirming and legitimizing Yoritomo's growing position as enforcement officer and keeper of peace instead of the Taira-dominated aristocracy.

In addition, with the passing away of Kiyomori from sickness in March of 1181, the Taira clan was now ruled by his heir, Taira Munemori 平宗盛 (1147-1185). Seeking to test the strength and court support of the new Taira leadership, in August 1181, Kamakura (Yoritomo) proposed to Kyōto (Munenori) an official division of the country where the East (Kantō plus the Chūbu-Hokurikudō regions) would be administered by the Minamoto and the center and West would be administered by the Taira. Munenori rejected Kamakura's offer, as granting Minamoto this official status would mean a revocation of his outlaw status as well as increase his jurisdiction. Still, not everyone at court was pleased with this decision. Ultimately, even with the rejection of the offer, Yoritomo's test enabled him to see that the Taira still held a strong grip on the court.

This cohesion would start to loosen two years later in 1183 in part due to famines striking the country, but primarily because of local resentment building up against the Taira combined with numerous Minamoto victories. Crucially, in June of 1183, the Minamoto armies led by Yoritomo's cousin, Minamoto Yoshinaka 源義仲 (1154-1184) and his uncle Minamoto Yukiie 源行家 (?-1186), defeated a Taira forces at the battle of Kurikara Pass 倶利伽羅峠. Following this loss, the Taira leadership took Emperor Antoku and Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa and fled westward leaving Kyōto empty and up for taking. Similar to the ways of the Taira a few decades earlier, the victorious Yoshinaka and Yukiie took the opportunity to take control of the imperial capital and forced the Court confer to them titles, offices, as well as proprietorship of the domains confiscated from the Taira. However, both of them did not seek Yoritomo's permission in doing so, meaning that credit for the victory was not obtained by Yoritomo armies. This means that Yoshinaka's and

Yoshiie's behaviors was posing a serious threat to Yoritomo's position as leader of the Minamoto clan. Still, Yoritomo did not send his armies to take over control of the Court for himself; rather, he chose send ambassadors and emissaries to represent him in negotiations with the Court to impede upon the growing statuses of Yoshinaka and Yoshiie.

Only four months later, almost everyone in position of authority within the Japanese system saw Yoshinaka as their enemy. This also includes his cousin Yoritomo. Figuring out the best ways to dispose of him, Yoritomo reached out to his younger brothers Yoshitsune and Noriyori – both of whom, we shall remember, were pardoned by Taira Kiyomori after the Heiji rebellion thirty years earlier – and ordered them to kill Yoshinaka. Although, they were successful in chasing him out of the imperial capital and eventually killing him, Yoshiie managed to escape.

During that time, even though Yoritomo was not on the battlefield, he remained very active in the political realm. Indeed, the growth of the Court's resentment towards Yoshinaka, coupled with Yoritomo's strategy of handling political matters through ambassadors who worked in tandem with the court to overthrow Yoshinaka, made the Kamakura institutions appear more and more legitimate and positive to the Court aristocrats. Part of the Court satisfaction came from Yoritomo's proposal to guarantee the integrity of *shōen* in the Kantō and Chūbu-Hokurikudō regions which would restart the flow of rents for the aristocrats who had clients in the regions. Having had a similar project in mind, Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa unprecedentedly issued an imperial decree in August of 1183 authorizing Yoritomo and the Kamakura institutions to discharge major responsibilities on behalf of the nation. Through this decree and other edicts, Yoritomo would not simply become peacemaker (and war-maker) in the Kantō and Chūbu-Hokurikudō regions, he would also start expanding beyond his initial interest in the East.

Mass explains that “[f]rom the very moment of his formal recognition, Yoritomo began to issue edicts of confirmation on behalf of central estate owners. The phenomenon marked a clear reversal of past practice in which institutions at the center had always been the country's ultimate guarantors”²²⁹. Interestingly enough, “[b]y citing, as he did, an edict of the retired emperor, he was acknowledging the authority of the court; but he was also underlining his own authority in the area of national peacekeeping”²³⁰. Indeed, even though Yoritomo had unprecedented power for

someone operating outside of the formal Court institutions, he nonetheless still operated in conjunction with the formal apparatus, thus not completely overruling it.

Gradually, the inability of Kyōto to handle the increase in lawlessness and conflicts across the nation made appeals to the Kamakura government more and more frequent and significant. Yoritomo understood that the potential of his regime stood on its capacity to tame disorder, instill order, as well as adequately respond to appeals for redress. In order to increase the expediency and efficacy of the processes, Yoritomo made an unprecedented bold move and established his own governmental headquarters in Kyōto, here he put his younger brother Yoshitsune in charge. At this point, the Kamakura government was well entrenched into the middle of a network of traditional relationship by simultaneously offering patronage to both warriors and aristocrats alike.

In February 1184, the remainder of the Taira forces gather at the coastal town of Ichi no Tani 一ノ谷. This presented Yoritomo with a great opportunity to finally claim the credit for defeating the Taira (we should remember that credit for the previous victory over the Taira had been held by his cousin Yoshinaka a few years earlier). Thus, Yoritomo once again sent his younger brothers Yoshitsune and Noriyori to take down the Taira encampment. Not only did Yoshitsune and Noriyori succeed, but they did so in dramatic fashion setting the grounds for centuries of tales, poetry and plays to unfold as a result of their military prowess. Still, about 3000 Taira family members and their supporters managed to flee the battle, including Kiyomori's widow, Taira Tokiko 平時子 (1126-1185), and grandson, Emperor Antoku, who had in their possession the three imperial regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) from which Emperors derive their divine powers (and, partly, their legitimacy). These are the grass-cutting sword (*kusanagi no tsurugi* 草薙劍), the eight-hand mirror (*yata no kagami* 八咫鏡) and the eight-foot string of tear-shaped jewels (*yasakani no magatama* 八尺瓊曲玉).

This battle was crucial for Yoritomo in a broader political sense. Indeed, since the Taira's encampment was situated in the Western part of the Japanese main islands, the pursuit of the Taira out West allowed Yoritomo to recruit troops and act in territories outside of his official sphere of jurisdiction which used to be limited to the East. Therefore, the pursuit of the Taira, who Yoritomo labelled as usurpers of the throne and kidnappers of the emperors, could be used as an excellent

pretext to expand his political influence to all of Japan. In fact, a few weeks after the battle of Ichi no Tani, Yoritomo declared himself to be the emergency protector of the entire nation, and asked the Court to restore virtuous rule (*tokusei* 徳政). He also announced his intent to make Yoshitune his army commander in the West following Court approval. Lastly, Yoritomo also announced his patronage of shrines and temples to ensure their renewal and prosperity. All of this means that for as long as the country would remain in its state of emergency, Kyōto and Kamakura would govern the nation jointly. Still, as the year progressed, Yoritomo found himself responding to appeals from various people, in various positions, in various provinces, on various issues. Indeed, Yoritomo's efforts to stabilize the whole country while simultaneously seeking to expand Westward via enlisting adherents was becoming increasingly difficult.

Mass explains that at the start of 1185 “[a] substantial number of courtiers, clerics, and warriors were now engaging in activities previously unknown to them. In that sense, the expectation of appropriate behavior were changing before people's eyes, though no rules for the future had yet been set”²³¹. This means that responses to events were sometimes embedded in confusion and oftentimes were much slower than what would have been the case in previous centuries. These delays helped Yoritomo's armies in their Western expansion and also played an important role in the final, tale-making battle of the Genpei War taking place at Dan no Ura 壇ノ浦 in April 1185. This naval battle led again by Yoshitsune was, in fact, advantageous to the Taira since, even though their numbers were smaller, they had the advantage of fighting on their home territory in addition to understanding the currents of the waters better due to their superior naval skills. However, one of the Taira generals who ended up being captured at the previous battle of Ichi no Tani defected and revealed to the Minamoto the boat on which Kiyomori's widow Tokiko, the six years-old Emperor Antoku, and the three imperial regalia were located. Aided by a sudden shift in water currents in favor of the Minamoto mid-battle, the Minamoto focused their archers on the Emperor's vessel and eventually reached to board it. However, at this point, both Emperor Antoku and Tokiko committed suicide by drowning themselves taking along with them the sacred sword and jewels. The imperial mirror remained on the ship and was recovered, and divers managed to recuperate the sacred jewels; but the sword was never found. Although this marked

the end of the Taira clan and the Genpei War and thus asserted the supremacy of the Minamoto warrior clan, law and order still desperately needed to be restored in the nation.

In this direction, new commissioners of Kamakura were appointed who began issuing documents citing the Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa and “the lord of Kamakura” Yoritomo as near equals. Through these appointments, Yoritomo’s jurisdiction almost doubled (from six to eleven provinces). Still, the post-war period led to an unprecedented number of people who were seeking to return home while some were being expelled of theirs. Also, the fate of the partisans of the Taira who fought alongside or supported them during the war needed to be assessed. Furthermore, another important problem arose for Yoritomo as a result of the success of his younger brother Yoshitsune during the war and the fact that both shared the same blood lineage. The issue was that both of these matters could allow Yoshitsune to contest Yoritomo’s position as head of the Minamoto clan. This fear was further exacerbated by the fact that the court’s and Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa’s patronage of Yoshitsune led Yoshitsune to obtain titles such as Governor of the Iyo province 伊予國, titles to which Yoritomo vividly opposed and nullified. In the end, Yoritomo was unable to terminate his brother’s governorship and instead skillfully appointed a cohort of local supporters to the position of land steward (*jitō* 地頭) to the holdings belonging to people designated as Taira in the Iyo province. Doing so strategically rendered Yoshitsune unable to actually discharge provincial affairs. As a response, Yoshitsune received authorization from Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa to ally with his uncle Yukiie against Yoritomo and fled North-East through Kyōto all the way to Hiraizumi 平泉 in Mutsu province where he had grown up under the protection of the governor Fujiwara Hidehira 藤原秀衡 (1122?-1187).

Upon Hidehira’s death in 1187, his son and heir Fujiwara Yasuhira 藤原泰衡 (1155-1189) swore to his father that he would continue protecting and sheltering Yoshitsune. However, in 1189, after being pressured by Yoritomo, Hidehira betrayed Yoshitsune by sending his own troops to kill him. This led to another dramatic event which became the muse for many tales and plays of the future, where Yoshitsune, instead of surrendering, committed *seppuku* while his friend and retainer, warrior-monk Saitō Musashibō Benkei 西塔武藏坊弁慶 (1155-1189), performed one of

the most notorious last-stand act in history allegedly killing about 300 trained warriors on his own in order to buy enough time for Yoshitsune to commit the ritual *seppuku* appropriately.

During the four years in which the Yoshitsune drama was unfolding, Yoritomo had been given permission by the Court to make appointments for *jitō* and protectors (*shugo* 守護) across Japan's provinces, which he enthusiastically did. In fact, beginning in 1186, *jitō* appointments began issuing from Kamakura in large numbers, meaning that a clear connection was established between official land titles and Yoritomo's government. Still, the unfolding of the Genpei War did not lead to a complete overthrow of the traditional power institutions. Indeed, Mass explains that "one group of provincials [the Minamoto] had defeated another [the Taira] on a large scale, though there were obviously others who had not been drawn into the conflict at all. Moreover, courtier institutions emerged from the war mostly intact, even as their prestige and effectiveness had clearly suffered. At the same time, courtiers and clerics continued to dominate the *shiki* system, the new *jitō* office notwithstanding. In other words, the traditional aristocracy remained the country's all but exclusive landed proprietors, whereas provincial men, as before, managed their estate"²³². Nevertheless, Mass posits that "the sovereignty of Kyōto had now been compromised in two important ways. First, the policing of the countryside continued to require Kamakura's involvement, with appeals for its assistance were still on the increase [...] And second, though the post of *jitō* may have been located in the middle of the hierarchy of rights, Yoritomo's authority over it was not intended to be total. In this way, the seamless and inviolability of the *shiki* system had been breached, a breach that would eventually widen into a chasm. Title to the office of *jitō* would be distributed exclusively by Yoritomo, though within estates, as in the past, owned by aristocrats in the capital"²³³. It is through the growth, innovation, and expansion of this position of *jitō* that Kamakura would become the true wielder of political power, catalyzing the beginning of a new era named after Yoritomo's government location.

The Sun Rises on a New Era: Kamakura

Installment of the Bakufu

Following the events surrounding the death of his brother Yoshitsune at the hand of Yasuhira, Yoritomo launched military campaigns using precedents from the past to justify punitive expeditions (*tsuitō* 追討). A key campaign was sent to the northern regions on February 1189 with the intent of getting rid of the problematic Fujiwara descendants of Hiraizumi, who, not only challenged Yoritomo at the political level, but also sheltered his outlawed brother Yoshitsune. The campaign advanced quickly leading to the occupation of the province in August of the same year. This led Yasuhira to flee further north before being betrayed by one of his retainers and killed in September. With the death of all of the Fujiwara descendants during Yoritomo's campaign, the North was now succeeded by the authority of Kamakura. This enabled Yoritomo to easily appoint numerous *jitō* positions in the Northern regions since the fall of the Fujiwara and the lack of interest of Court for the Northern regions created a power vacuum Yoritomo intended to fill. In November 1189, Yoritomo dispatched long-lasting ally, Ōe Hiromoto 大江広元 (1148-1225), to Kyōto to negotiate Kamakura's future authority over the North, which after a few tries, was granted broad jurisdiction over the public lands of the Northern provinces. This meant that Yoritomo could, without much contest, place his own men in key positions. However, even though both regions were administered by local families, Yoritomo was issuing documents of a type that made sure to indicate he was the dominant authority in these provinces.

In November of 1190, Yoritomo organized a formal state visit to Kyōto which lasted five weeks. This was the first precedent in Japanese history of a formal state visit of such grandeur by a dignitary who was not a foreigner. On the 7th and the 12th of November respectively, Yoritomo was appointed Major Counselor and Great Captain of the Right (*utaishō* 右大将). Coming back to Kamakura a month later, Yoritomo opened his own Chancellery (*mandokoro* 政所) headed by Ōe Hiromoto and started granting edicts in the same form of those that the highest nobility had issued for centuries²³⁴. Through his new positions and the opening of his *mandokoro*, Yoritomo sought to transform his authority from a military leader needing to constantly rally a large number of troops for war into a centralized form of bureaucratic governance using a model of restraint and consistent legal procedures. This was further facilitated by the death of his political opponent, Retired-Emperor Goshirakawa, in 1192, leaving his grandson Emperor Gotoba 後鳥羽天皇 (1180-1239) the only potential political rival to Yoritomo. However, in March of 1192, Emperor

Gotoba bestowed on Yoritomo the rank of Great Commander Subduing Barbarians or *seii taishōgun* 征夷大將軍, making Yoritomo the country's *de facto* dominant political figure while relegating the emperors and their Court to be *de jure* rulers. Therefore, the creation of the Kamakura *mandokoro* coupled with the granting of the title of *shōgun* marked the official beginning of the Kamakura government called *bakufu* 幕府. By the same token, this marked the official beginning of the Kamakura era.

Even though getting rid of the traditional order was out of the question, the Court lost all of the decisive power it held for centuries. This shift in *de facto* political power from the Court to the *bakufu* meant that Kamakura's responsibilities for peacekeeping were now manifold, with Court decrees having to be bolstered by orders from Yoritomo. However, the *bakufu* resources quickly became overwhelmed. Indeed, although Yoritomo had several armies of occupation spread across the nation, there was no network of Kamakura officialdom to provide any backing behind Yoritomo's decrees. Furthermore, aside from an emerging network of *jitō* who did not yet have real authority (since it did not rest on universal standards or procedures), there was no tangible governing structure that would tie the provinces to Kamakura. In such a context, Yoritomo turned towards the Court for help in matters that were unrelated to the *jitō*. For example, earlier in 1186, Yoritomo had already asked the Court to revive the Land Record Office (*kirokujo* 記録所), an imperial office with investigative powers dating back to the 11th century, which would act as a kind of clearing house for complaints that arose out of post-war misconducts. Furthermore, the vacuum of real authority emerging in many provinces prompted Yoritomo to bolster the traditional hierarchies and order sanctions in order to keep control and order. More precisely, Yoritomo declared that the only valid *jitō* would be those whom he designated as properly appointed and that this title could no longer be derived from local sources. Moreover, it would not be permitted for the Court to seek to appoint or dismiss *jitō* positions without Kamakura's approval. In a way, both Kamakura and the Court saw virtue in restoring traditional hierarchies in the provinces to mitigate the post-war violence. Still, for Kamakura's authority over the *jitō* to be absolute, this required a multilevel commitment, which necessitated the help and resources of the Court. In other words, the two systems, the old and the new, were becoming increasingly intertwined.

It seems like Yoritomo understood that the structure of his new authority would find its anchor in the positions of the *jitō*. At first, *jitō* posts would be granted exclusively to people of the Minamoto clan, but not all Minamoto obtain such a post. The first round of *jitō* appointments were given to Minamoto easterners that have been alongside Yoritomo the longest where they received confirmations over homelands and assignments to new areas. With regards to the confirmations, people that had received the title of *gesu* 下司 or *shiki* from the old system were now renamed *jitō* instead. This effectively meant that “estate owners surrendered their most fundamental rights over their former appointees – the powers to judge, to confirm, to discipline, and to dismiss”²³⁵. Over time, new rounds of *jitō* appointments were made beyond the initial Eastern, Kantō area, where easterners were appointed to Central and Western lands previously owned by the Taira and expected to act in accordance with the old managers’ precedents (*senrei* 先例) they were replacing. This confiscation and replacement of officers in regions historically beyond Yoritomo’s zone of influence created a situation where the responsibilities and prerequisites of *jitō* positions across the nation were enjoyed by men assigned exclusively by Kamakura. However, the land owners, aware of the threat posed by Kamakura-appointed *jitō* on their territory, tried their best to keep their estates *jitō*-free which flooded Kamakura with requests from immunities from *jitō* or for *jitō* dismissal. Understanding that particular areas of Japan were less enthusiastic about Kamakura’s new political position, Yoritomo seemed to have followed the flow of his intuition in order to ensure the most support possible for himself. Thus, in some cases, Yoritomo agreed to prohibit *jitō* appointments on certain estates if it would win him praises in more traditional circles. Furthermore, in order for Kamakura to gain positive influence in recalcitrant local areas, Yoritomo needed to have *jitō* who would not cause any problems, meaning that Kamakura needed to also police their own appointees – if deemed appropriate – following complaints by estate owners.

Another important position that flourished after being reimagined by Yoritomo’s government is that of *shugo* or protectors. Due to the increase in post-war violence in the provinces coupled with the necessity to manage and sometimes discipline its own *jitō*, the *bakufu* needed a network of permanent provincial appointees that would be directly tied and loyal to Kamakura. Yoritomo found the perfect candidates in the vassals (*gokenin* 御家人) who pledged allegiance to him throughout the Genpei War. In previous times, the Imperial Guard Service (*ōbanyaku* 塙飯

役) had been performed by provincial contingents of officers called *zaichōkanjin* 在序官人. Although no documents attest to this, scholars have presumed that Yoritomo's new positions allowed him to become head of this service, thus enabling him to choose its members. Gradually, instead of seeking to control the *zaichōkanjin*, Yoritomo simply converted the *ōbanyaku* into the regular responsibility of his *gokenin*. Indeed, Mass explains that “the *ōban'yaku* was no longer a service provided by the resident officialdoms (*zaichōkanjin*) of the individual provinces, but has now become a duty that fell on contingents of *gokenin* from the public and private sectors. In these circumstances, a Bakufu-appointed officer who was different from a civil governor would be required to expedite the service, which now, as we know, might involve intrusions into *shōen*”²³⁶. Eventually, Yoritomo would set the groundworks for the creation of the position of *shugo*, who Mass defines as “a Bakufu officer assigned to a province had been enjoined to take responsibility for coordinating the several states of the *ōban'yaku*, in addition to exercising oversight over certain major crimes”²³⁷. The position of *shugo*, coordinating the actions of the Kamakura *gokenin* populating the *ōbanyaku*, had thus the combined responsibility of criminal jurisdiction and supervision of the palace guards. For such positions, Yoritomo had prioritized advancing individuals of low warrior status who were obliged to depend on the prestige of Yoritomo to perform their duties, as well as men without substantial home base or distinguished provincial ancestries since both would owe their careers to his continuous patronage.

The position of *shugo* and *jitō* were a unique features of the *bakufu* system of governance all the way through the end of Kamakura. However, even though Yoritomo provided the conceptual basis for the *shugo* system, he is not the one who was able to truly create a true political network of *shugo*. This is because Yoritomo died on January 13th 1199 at the age of 52, seven years after being given the mantle of *shōgun* and two days after taking Buddhist vows. His heir and first son, Minamoto Yoriie 源頼家, thus became the leader of the Minamoto clan at seventeen years old, and was appointed *shōgun* in 1202. This change of *shōgun* brought about fear especially for the *shugo*, since their position were guaranteed on their own personal basis as clients of Yoritomo. The fears were further exacerbated with the purging of three important *shugo* figures due to their misconduct. In fact, the vague nature of the newly created position of *shugo* by Yoritomo shortly before his death left *shugo* with very few guidelines which lead them to overstep

their mandates after the death of Yoritomo. Thus, in November 1202, the *bakufu* vigorously condemned such actions, threatening with dismissal and/or replacement after receiving multiple complaints that the nation's *shugo* were involving themselves too broadly on their respective territories²³⁸. This created the necessity for official institutionalization as well as clear definitions for the position. The issue was about navigating how to propose adding a position what would be equal to a Kyōto-appointed governor but would not usurp their powers. The solution Kamakura envisioned was of simply having the *shugo* assume a modest share of the governor's duties. This would allow for "the best chance of winning approval from reluctant courtiers, but it would also promise to be the least disruptive locally. At the same time, it would stay close to the Bakufu's seeming policy in all things: to delegate only the minimum powers required to discharge duties"²³⁹. The compromise that was reached was that "the buying of chattels are no longer seen in connection with *shugo*, and neither [...] is a generalized jurisdiction over unlawful incursion (*rōzeki* 狼藉). The policing of capital crimes was retained from 1197, and a similar policing of collective acts of major violence (*muhon* 謀反) may now have been added"²⁴⁰. The last one is particularly important since, as Mass explains, "[f]or Kamakura to have the power to declare war on its own enemies meant never having to await an authorization from the court (as in 1189!) to pursue 'rebellious men'. Henceforth, the Bakufu could simply commission its *shugo* to arrest them. This last, if it occurred now, would have established the authority of the *shugo* as being inclusive of the right to muster the *gokenin* in both war and peace"²⁴¹.

Over the course of the Kamakura era, the *shugo* had to be closely watched. Indeed, although invested with jurisdiction over rebels and traitors, they themselves were often accused and chased for these same crimes. Moreover, as time progressed, an irregular physical presence became a standard feature of the *shugo* system, exacerbating the conditions for abuse by unsupervised deputies and agents. In 1222, clarifications over the authority of the *shugo* were announced in the form of authorizing them with a jurisdiction over the guard duty, the pursuit of rebels, and the suppression of murders; they also prohibited unlawful entrance by agents of the *shugo*, and required consultation with local authorities in the investigation of crimes and the arrest of criminals²⁴². Finally, the *bakufu* law code of 1232 stipulated that: "During the age of the *utaishō* [Yoritomo], the [*shugo*'s] duties were defined as imperial guard recruitment and (the control of)

rebels and murderers – these crimes [now] to include night raiding, violent burglary, brigandage, and piracy. In recent years, however, deputies have been appointed to districts and subdistricts, and tributes have been levied on private and public estates. [*Shugo*] are not governors (*kokushi* 國司), yet they interfere in provincial business. They are not *jitō*, yet they seek the profits of the land ... Forthwith, in accordance with practices from the time of the *utaishō* house, the involvement of *shugo* beyond the imperial guard service, rebellion, and murder, is prohibited....”²⁴³. All and all, Mass concludes that the available historical material demonstrate that *shugo* were less commanders of men than they were, in truth, facilitators of lawsuits²⁴⁴. Indeed, even though *shugo* were sometimes responsible for enforcing justice on the ground on behalf of the *bakufu*, the complainants’ petitions always had to be sent to Kamakura first, thus ensuring the *bakufu* would retain its authority in the form of an institution possessing centralized control of justice.

The situation of the *jitō* is different and similar to that of the *shugo* in the sense that although they have been more disruptive of the traditional order than the *shugo*, the original intent of Yoritomo for the role of *jitō* limited their revolutionary capabilities as they would always need to remain under the centralized control of Kamakura. Moreover, *jitō* first inherited a position based on their non-*jitō* predecessors, and the future generations of *jitō* would inherit their positions from their parents. However, since Yoritomo had planned to avoid social unrest as much as possible, this inheritance needed to be anchored in local precedents (*senrei*) of the land where the *jitō* were appointed. In other words, at their inception, *jitō* contributed to sustaining the traditional order in the provinces more than seeking to replace it. This also meant that particular *jitō* received more privileges than others, depending on the precedents of the *gesu* or *shiki* that they inherited in the replacement process. Still, as the Kamakura era unfolded, the *jitō* sought to improve their circumstances by devising strategies to use what they inherited to expand their scope of jurisdiction. For example, in 1223, a *jitō* was challenged by the proprietor of Miri Estate on his jurisdiction (*kendan* 検斷) but the *jitō*, citing precedents of over two-decades old, was able to convince Kamakura to grant him undivided authority as “the estate’s chief of police, as well as its lead prosecutor, its highest judge, and its jailer”²⁴⁵. Multiple other cases involve *jitō* going to court in Kamakura against the *shōen* owner, both sides manipulating precedents in the hope of receiving a

higher share of responsibilities (and privileges) – in the absence of a clear precedent, the advantage was often given to the *jitō*.

Overall, estate proprietors, local residents, the court, and the *bakufu* all had interests in keeping the *jitō* bound by historical precedents as much as possible. This left *jitō* with two options, either they would gain extremely incrementally by delivering good performances; or they would try to push the limit of their authority and test the law. The latter option of course had the effect of putting most of them in Kamakura courtroom but, although no sanctions were possible against proprietor-plaintiffs who knowingly placed false charges, the *jitō* could be punished for doing so. The growing indiscipline of *jitō* throughout the unfolding of the Kamakura era and the desire to not give more power to them by all political bodies involved led to, understandably, a lot of frustrations. These conditions would remain so for the *jitō* throughout the totality of the Kamakura era, who would only see their circumstances changes with the fall of the Kamakura *bakufu* and the advent of the Muromachi 室町 era (1136-1573).

In sum, looking at the political circumstances of the early Kamakura era, we can see that its beginning is embedded in Yoritomo's necessity to establish order in order to maintain hold of his newly acquired power as *shōgun* after defeating the Taira. To do so, although he provided political innovations through the *jitō* and *shugo* systems – which would allow his followers and vassals to be rewarded with political positions outside of the traditional Court system – Yoritomo still realistically needed to work in tandem with the Court's traditional ways to ensure order and peace for his rule. This means that, as Mass argues, “government and society were similarly organized in both the east and west. Public and private estates were also structured internally in the same ways. Thus Yoritomo found that he was able to win adherents everywhere and that all of these men wanted basically the same things: a greater security of tenure over their landed holdings, and a greater degree of autonomy from their own kin”²⁴⁶. In other words, *the traditional socio-political order was not deeply perturbed* even with Yoritomo becoming *shōgun* and the creation of the Kamakura *bakufu*. If anything, in order to preserve peace and order for the sake of the survival of his own regime, *Yoritomo actively participated in restoring and maintaining traditional power dynamics by making sure that the authority of the Court-based land-owners remained intact upon their territories*. Indeed, although it was unprecedented that a separate governmental entity

outside of the Imperial Court had such political power, the ways power was being understood and disseminated through this new apparatus remained almost identical as the ways in which the traditional order functioned. As Mass highlights, “the events of 1185 did not represent the seizure of the Japanese heartland by the country’s fighting men, since Yoritomo and the Bakufu were now present to ensure that that did not happen”²⁴⁷.

Post-Yoritomo and the Rise of the Hōjō

I have briefly touched upon the ways in which Yoritomo’s *jitō* and *shugo* systems evolved following Yoritomo’s death, but the contest for power following his passing deserves to be explored a bit further if we are to have a fuller vision of the socio-political circumstances of the era. As mentioned earlier, Yoritomo was succeeded by his son Yoriie as head of the Minamoto clan in 1199, receiving the title of *shōgun* in 1202. However, the warriors who had been inspired, supported and disciplined by Yoritomo were not willing to submit to the authority of the seventeen years-old Yoriie. Hōjō Tokimasa – Yoritomo ex-guardian during the time of his youth – always played a central role in the administration of the *bakufu* the moment his son-in-law Yoritomo was granted the title of *shōgun*. Still, Tokimasa aspired to more power and, inspired by the Fujiwara precedents of the Heian period who governed through the titles of *sesshō* and *kanpaku*, created the position of regent (*shikken* 執權) to the *shōgun* to which he appointed himself since Yoriie was his grandson. Tokimasa was well aware that the powerful *samurai* clans (*gōzoku* 豪族) who helped Yoritomo to power desired substantial changes in the policies of Kamakura which would allow them to have more weight in political affairs. To remedy the situation, Tokimasa and Yoritomo’s widow Masako – who also always played a central role in the administration of the *bakufu* – put in place in June 1203 a council consisting of the heads of the *gōzoku* families and other experienced bureaucrats from Yoritomo’s administration. The council’s stated aims were to redress the wrongs of the autocratic regime of the Minamoto as well as offer guidance to the *shōgun* – aims which were clearly aligned with the desires of the *gōzoku*.

Nonetheless, the new *shōgun* Yoriie was closer to his own father-in-law Hiki Yoshikazu 比企能員 (?-1203) than to his grandfather Tokimasa, and seem to have held resentment towards

the Hōjō clan in general. The creation of this council simply exacerbated Yoriie's anger towards the Hōjō as he (accurately) believed that this was an attempt to undermine Yoriie's authority. However, Yoriie was seriously ill and, to ensure that power would not be monopolized by the Hōjō, proposed that power be split between his younger brother Minamoto Sanetomo 源実朝 (1192-1219) and his son Minamoto Ichiman 源一幡 (1198-1203) who both would govern separate parts of the nation. Having his son Ichiman inherit a share of power would allow Yoshikazu to become a grandfather regent, thus giving more power to the Hiki clan and keep the Hōjō at bay. However, Yoshikazu and Yoriie planned a coup which would have involved the assassination of Sanetomo, making Ichiman the only remaining Minamoto heir. Masako overheard the conversation and sought to have the Hiki clan accused of treason and executed. Before this was set forth, Tokimasa saw an opportunity and, with a coalition of many *samurai* clans, assassinated Yoshikazu and completely exterminated the rest of the Hiki clan, including his 6 years-old son Ichiman. Yoriie managed to escape to Suzenji temple 修善寺, but was caught and assassinated by Tokimasa not long after in July 1204. With the death of both Yoriie and his son Ichiman, Tokimasa placed Yoritomo's second son Sanetomo on the *shōgun*'s seat, while continuing to rule as *shikken*. Through these events, Tokimasa made Yoriie the scapegoat for Yoritomo's faults and attributed to the Hōjō the role of saviors of the warrior *bakufu*²⁴⁸. However, in the process, Tokimasa lost the important support of his daughter Masako who (accurately) believed that his father was behind the death of her son Yoriie.

Unfortunately for Tokimasa, even though he placed him on the throne and was his *shikken*, the new *shōgun* Sanetomo was very close to Masako and not very interested in ruling. Instead he preferred to place his effort in poetry while letting the Hōjō effectively manage the *bakufu*'s affairs. Following a series of family drama and assassination instigated by Tokimasa, Masako heard rumors that Tokimasa sought to have her last son Sanetomo assassinated and be replaced with one of Tokimasa's allies which would have ensured his complete dominance over the *bakufu*. However, Masako and her brother Hōjō Yoshitoki 北条義時 (1163-1224) – Tokimasa's son and heir – having completely lost trust in their father, put Sanetomo under protective guard in Kamakura and threatened to rebel again their father Tokimasa. Realizing Sanetomo would be unreachable and that he lost the support of his own clan, Tokimasa retired from the position of *shikken* and head of

the Hōjō clan in 1205 and dedicated the last ten years of his life to monkhood. With this, Yoshitoki became the new head of the Hōjō clan and took the position of *shikken*, which he would hold until his death in 1224. The rest of Yoshitoki's reign as *shikken* was quiet and uneventful, until the advent of the Jōkyū rebellion (*jōkyū no ran* 承久の乱) that took place in 1221.

In a nutshell, the Jōkyū rebellion was an attempt to reinstall true decision-making power of the Imperial Court and especially to the emperor. Due to the fact that Sanetomo had been unable to bear children, the *bakufu* had to consider other legitimate options of succession. This probed Masako, in 1218, to try to negotiate with Retired-Emperor Gotoba's wife the possibility of having a son of Retired-Emperor Gotoba becoming *shōgun* via adoption. With the assassination of Sanetomo by his nephew Kugyō 公暁 (1200-1219) coupled with the delay/refusal of Gotoba's response to the adoption proposal, Masako served as the *bakufu*'s real figure of power until a future *shōgun* would be found – in truth, she would always remain at the center of power even after official succession would take place. During this time, Kamakura decided to place Retired-Emperor Gotoba's grandson, Emperor Chūkyō 仲恭 (1218-1234), on the imperial throne at only two years old. Discontent with the circumstances and the constant capacity of the Hōjō-controlled *bakufu* to get the upper hand in political affairs, Retired-Emperor Gotoba staged the Jōkyū rebellion. To do so, Retired-Emperor Gotoba invited potential allies from the East to a festival which would allow him to take note of the *samurai* who are loyal to the Court. Few days after the event, the Court declared the *bakufu* regent Yoshitoki to be an outlaw, thus catalyzing rebellions in the East of Japan. Nonetheless, the forces of Retired-Emperor Gotoba were utterly crushed by Yoshitoki's retaliation and, after failing to acquire help and refuge from the warrior-monks of Mount Hiei, returned to Kyōto and admitted defeat. Following the rebellion which was put down only after two months, Retired-Emperor Gotoba was exiled to the Oki Islands 隱岐諸島, while his son Retired-Emperor Tsuchimikado 土御門 (1169-1231) was exiled to the Tosa province 土佐國 in the West, and his other son Retired-Emperor Juntoku 順徳 (1197-1242) to the city of Sado 佐渡市 in the North. Moreover, Yoshitoki removed Retired-Emperor Gotoba's grandson, Emperor Chūkyō from power – whose reign only lasted for about two months – and instead installed on the throne Chūkyō's first cousin once removed, Emperor Gohorikawa 後堀河 (1212-1234). In doing

so, Kamakura ensured that all of the imperial family descending from Retired-Emperor Gotoba lost their official access to the imperial throne.

Although this placed the Hōjō in a position of *quasi*-total domination of Japan, there was still one issue that needed to be remedied: the *shōgun* succession. Indeed, since the assassination of Sanetomo and the execution of his assassin Kugyō, there were no successors left who were closely related to Minamoto Yoritomo's clan branch. Even though Tokimasa's actions used to openly defy the appropriation of the power by the Minamoto clan, Masako and Yoshitoki both feared that installing a non-Minamoto-related descendant as *shōgun* would look like an overt anti-Minamoto move which would displease the many who inherited their political privileges from Yoritomo's actions and policies. This meant that issues surrounding legitimacy were bound to emerge. Seeking to, first, calm down potential revolts while simultaneously further consolidate their power, Kamakura distributed about 3000 *shōen* obtained as a spoils of war from the Jōkyū rebellion to *samurai* families of the East²⁴⁹. With the tensions quelled a bit, Masako then decided to have one her grand-daughter, Minamoto Yoshiko (1202-1234), marry Kujō Yoritsune 九条頼経 (1218-1256) thus making him connected through marriage to the direct bloodline of the first *shōgun* Minamoto Yoritomo. Yoritsune had already taken the position of *shōgun* in 1225, but this marriage would allow him to further his legitimacy via blood connections. Although the plan was set forth by them, both Yoshitoki and Masako would not see the marriage as both passed away in 1224 and 1225 respectively. Yoshitoki and Masako were succeeded in their position of *shikken* by Hōjō Yasutoki 北条泰時 (1183-1242), son and heir to Yoshitoki, who led the forces of the *bakufu* against the rebellious Retired-Emperor Gotoba during the Jōkyū rebellion.

The strategic move planned by Yoshitoki and Masako to put Yoritsune in power was connected to the fact that the Kujō 九条 clan was one of the five branches of the Fujiwara family. Thus, by merging together the *bakufu* and the Court through the merging together of the Minamoto and Fujiwara bloodlines, it was hoped that questions of legitimacy would be held at bay within both the *bakufu* and the Court. However, a series of death and illnesses among the Hōjō clans, included the death of the *shikken* Yasutoki in 1242 – who was replaced by his son and heir Hōjō Tsunetoki 北条経時 (1224-1246) – enabled Yoritsune to gain considerable influence in the *bakufu*

against a new, inexperienced *shikken*. Eventually, Yoritsune demanded that the political functions to which his position as *shōgun* entitled him be restored, since it was the Hōjō who were, in truth, controlling the entire political apparatus. After some skirmishes, the Hōjō eventually won and forced Yoritsune to step down in favor of his seven-year-old son Kujō Yoritsugu 九条頼嗣 (1239-1252), but this was not enough to satisfy them. Two years later, Kamakura accused Yoritsune of plotting to overthrow the *bakufu* with the support of the rival Miura clan. After sending off Yoritsune to Kyōto, the Hōjō proceeded to wipe out the Miura clan in 1247; and in 1252 deposed of Yoritsugu in the same way as his father²⁵⁰.

All of these events truly anchored the Hōjō as the *de facto* rulers of Japan. Indeed, at this point, they had complete control of the *bakufu* through manipulating the *shōgun*'s position and insuring their regency over them – no doubt having been inspired by the Fujiwara stratagems of the previous Heian period. Still, the Hōjō were unsatisfied with the legitimacy of their regime. This is because “the legitimacy of the Hōjō *shikken* depended on the legitimacy of the shogun. The legitimacy of the latter was hard to explain after the Jōkyū war, the banishment of the ex-emperors, and the installation of an infant emperor chosen by Kamakura”²⁵¹. The final step to settle the matter was instigated when the Hōjō ordered the Court to send down a child crown-prince of the imperial line who, although would be granted the title of *shōgun*, would merely be a puppet of the Hōjō. By doing so, the Hōjō intended to provide “proof that amicable relationships with the court had been re-established”²⁵². Moreover, Steenstrup explains that “[h]ad the Hōjō identified themselves with their source of legitimacy, any newcomer would have felt entitled to set himself up as pretender to the shogunate”²⁵³. Therefore, not only were the Hōjō furthering their legitimacy through an appeal and maintaining of tradition, but they simultaneously ensured that political legitimacy would continue to be able to be claimed only by a very select few whom they control: the imperial bloodline. In any case, the chosen candidate was Imperial Prince Munetaka 宗尊 (1242-1274) who then became the sixth *shōgun* of the Kamakura *bakufu* at the age of ten. This practice of having an imperial descendant be granted the title of *shōgun* – but being puppet of the Hōjō – was maintained for the rest of the existence of the Kamakura *bakufu* until its last *shōgun*, Imperial Prince Morikuni 守邦 (1301-1333), who lost to the forces of Emperor Godaigo 後醍醐 (1288-1339) in his successful attempt to bring the Imperial Court back to power in an event known

as the Kenmu restoration (*kanmu no shinsei* 建武の新政) of 1333. This restoration, which only lasted three years before the *shōgun* institution seized power again in 1336, was the last time the imperial court and the emperor had real political power in Japan up until the Meiji Restoration (*meiji ishin* 明治維新) of 1868. The destruction of the Hōjō-controlled *bakufu* in 1333 marks the end of the Kamakura era which, after the three-year restoration, catalyzed the Muromachi 室町 era (1336-1573).

The Emergence of Kamakura ‘New Buddhisms’

The historical evolution from the Heian to the Kamakura period was not marked only by political anxieties and social changes, but the Japanese people also had to face multiple series of disease epidemics, typhoons, and country-wide famines. Various levels of Japanese society sought to find answers to the numerous troubling events that befell the nation, and Buddhism provided an important framework within which thoughts could mature. However, the two most powerful Japanese traditions of the Heian period, Tendai 天台宗 and Shingon 真言宗, slowly started to lose popular support due to their increasing involvement in land acquisition and management, court affiliations, political manipulations, wars, and so forth²⁵⁴. This paved the way to new popular-oriented, reformist religious movements, spearheaded by the key figures of: Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212) who started the Pure Land tradition (Jōdoshū 淨土宗); Eisai 栄西 (1141-1215) who imported the Rinza school (Rinzaishū 臨濟宗) of Zen 禪 Buddhism from China; Dōgen 道元 (1200-1253) who imported the Sōtō school (Sōtōshū 曹洞宗) of Zen Buddhism from China; and Nichiren 日蓮 (1222-1282) who started the Nichiren tradition (Nichirensū 日蓮宗). All of these figures had been ordained and studied in the Tendai tradition in their youth, but dissatisfied with the teachings and/or the state of the Tendai institutions of their time, embarked on a mission to find ‘true’ Buddhism. A common theme among each of these founders is that all of them narrowed the extensive curriculum of Tendai Buddhism down to a set of a few key practices, that allow a practitioner to reach liberation (*gedatsu* 解脫) and enlightenment (*satori* 悟). The result of their quests have been grouped in two categories, namely those who rely on the power of others to attain

Buddhahood (*tariki* 他力), and those who rely on the powers within oneself (*jiriki* 自力)²⁵⁵ to do so.

The *tariki*-oriented reformists focused on faith (*shin* 信) as the basis for their practices. This normally took the form of cultivating practices which are centered upon placing one's faith in the redemptive powers of a Buddha, a bodhisattva, a chant, a text, a word, etc. When the practices are performed with faith, the respective powers will be granted upon the devotee and help in their liberation. The popular-basis for such practices was strong since the redemptive powers are accessible by anyone regardless of their class, status, sex, or general privilege since all depends upon the faith of the practitioner. Within this faith-based *tariki*-orientation, Hōnen advocated that the practice of recollecting the Buddha (*nenbutsu* 念佛) Amitābha (Amida 阿彌陀) through the faith-filled chanting of his name in the formulation 'Homage to Amitābha Buddha!' (*Namu Amida Butsu* 南無阿彌陀佛), would allow the devotee to be reborn in Amitābha's Pure Land (*jōdo* 淨土) of Ultimate Bliss (*goraku* 極樂) located in the West. There, the reborn devotees will receive the *Dharma* (*hō* 法) directly from Amitābha and thus speed-up their process of becoming buddhas (*butsu* 佛) and/or bodhisattvas (*bosatsu* 菩薩). Within the same *tariki*-orientation is Nichiren who advocated primarily for the recitation of the chant (*daimoku* 題目) 'Homage to the True Dharma Lotus Flower Sūtra!' (*Namu Myōhō Renge Kyō* 南無妙法蓮華經) where the powers of this Sūtra – due to the fact that it contains the true ultimate law permeating the universe – will reduce the negative retributions (*hō* 報) stemming from karmic ties (*gōru* 業累) of the devotees produced in the past and present. Faithfully relying on the power contained within the Sūtra's name will, in turn, help the practitioners on their path to reach unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment (*anokutarasanmyakusanbodai* 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提). In sum, by choosing to build their traditions around one key practice which focuses on placing one's faith in the power of a Buddha or a Sūtra for helping a practitioner along their Buddhist path, both Hōnen and Nichiren sought to make their traditions accessible to Japanese people of diverse backgrounds and capacities.

As for the the *jiriki*-oriented reformists, they based their practices upon the notion of Buddha-nature (*busshō* 佛性) which posits that all beings are already endowed with the nature of Buddhas within themselves. This normally took the form of cultivating practices such as meditation, prayers, asceticism, contemplation, etc. which aims at ‘viewing one’s nature’ (*kenshō* 見性) or awaken to this Buddha-nature all beings already are. Once the practitioner sees or awakens to *busshō*, they attain liberation and are thus buddhas and bodhisattvas. Similar to the *tariki* proponents, the popular-basis for such practices was strong since liberation is accessible by anyone regardless of their class, status, sex, or general privilege due to the fact that all beings simply need to awaken to the power that they fundamentally always-already are. Within this *busshō*-based *jiriki*-orientation, Eisai advocated primarily for strict discipline through the upholding of the Buddhist precepts (*jigai* 持戒), which enables the practitioners to behave in the world in accordance with one’s nature as *busshō*. This results in getting rid of one’s afflictions (*bonnō* 煩惱) and eliminating the three poisons (*sandoku* 三毒) – which are the reasons why beings stay stuck in the cycle of transmigration (*rinne* 輪廻) that is characterized by discontent/suffering (*ku* 苦) – thus attaining liberation. Within the same *jiriki* orientation is Dōgen who advocated primarily for the practice of sitting meditation (*zazen* 坐禪) – and especially ‘just sitting in meditation’ (*shikantaza* 只管打坐) – where practitioners would meditate in the sitting position with no particular object, content or intention; therefore stilling the mind and body. In doing so, the various illusions (*mei* 迷) such as the self (*wa* 我), the body (*shin* 身) and the mind (*shin* 心) drop away (*datsuraku* 脫落) and the *busshō* that was always-already there emerges of its own accord. In sum, by choosing to build their traditions around one key practice which focuses on observing the Buddhist precepts and practicing sitting meditation, Eisai and Dōgen, just like Hōnen and Nichiren, sought to make their traditions accessible to Japanese people of diverse backgrounds and capacities.

For the sake of clarification, some scholarship has labelled these Kamakura traditions as ‘single-practice schools’ (*ichigyō* 一行), but I believe this is misleading. Indeed, as briefly introduced above, even though all of these traditions focus on one particular key practice or concept at the core of their systems, these are by no means the *only* exclusive practices that are

cultivated within these traditions. In this sense, I am in agreement with the few scholars as well as Buddhist practitioners who prefer the use of the term ‘focused-practice schools’ instead of the usually-translated term of ‘single-practice schools’.

That being said, the efforts by all these reformists to establish a strong popular basis through the establishment of their focused-practice schools were not always well received. For instance, after petitions from monks of Nara and Mt. Hiei over two disciples of Hōnen that had been accused of using *nenbutsu* practice for sexual activities, Retired-Emperor Gotoba banned the Pure Land *nenbutsu* practice in 1207 and forced Hōnen and his disciples into exile in the Shikoku 四國 islands²⁵⁶. However this only worked in the favor of Hōnen who had now even more direct contact with the people from the provinces while being farther away from the centers of authority.

Another example comes in the possible persecutions and harsh critiques received by Dōgen from the monks of Mt. Hiei and the rival Rinzai Zen schools upon his return from China around 1227-1228. Although there are no historical records confirming these persecutions²⁵⁷, Dōgen’s growing community eventually used the support of patron Hatano Yoshishige 波多野義重 (?-?) to relocate farther away from Kyōyo into Echizen province 越前国 in 1243. Dōgen built a practice complex there which eventually became Eihei-ji temple 永平寺 in 1246. Similarly to Hōnen, Dōgen’s possible forced relocation would actually allow his tradition to take root and grow in the provinces away from the competing interests of the major centers of power.

Nichiren also had to deal with numerous persecutions and exiles. Firstly, in 1260, Nichiren proposed to the Kamakura *shikken* Hōjō Tokiyori 北条時頼 (1227-1263) reforms to spread his true Buddhism for the sake of achieving peace and put an end to the series of droughts, earthquakes, epidemics, famines, etc. that hit Japan between 1254 to 1260. Afterwards, various Buddhist practitioners of other schools openly challenged him and even tried to assassinate him. Furthermore, his prediction of further calamities to come and foreign invasion also rose anger within the *bakufu* which exiled him to the Izu peninsula 伊豆半島 in 1260. Pardoned in 1263, Nichiren returned to the outskirts of Kamakura only to face another assassination attempt. At that time, between 1266 and 1272, the Mongol leader Kublai Khan sent his emissaries to Kamakura

numerous times demanding that Japan sends tribute and that Japan accepts to become his vassal facing the threat of invasion. Japan refused and mobilized its military, while Nichiren made sure to send letters to the *bakufu* leaders reminding them of his prediction of foreign invasion ten years earlier. Still, his continuous criticism and protest of the Hōjō's politics, of the esoteric (*mikkyō* 密教) practices of Shingon tradition, and of the principles behind the Rinzai tradition, led him to be sentenced to exile again in 1271, this time to the Sado islands 佐渡島. Although he was pardoned once more in 1274 and returned to Kamakura for about a year, Nichiren eventually spent the rest of his life in self-imposed seclusion on Mt. Minobu 身延山 where he focused on producing additional writings where he continued to criticize other schools – this time especially the Tendai tradition for their incorporation of Shingon's *mikkyō* practices in their curriculum. Similar to Hōnen and Dōgen, Nichiren's three exiles allowed him to connect with the people of the provinces and establish very strong basis for support and growth away from the centers of power. However, his much more direct and open confrontation with the political powers of his time made his supporters generally much more harassed and persecuted than the other new traditions.

The case of Eisai is a bit different than the previous three reformists mainly because of his success in getting close to political power in Kamakura. Also, in contrast to the others, Eisai never truly sought to install a new tradition on Japanese soil and, instead, aspired to return to Tendai's true teachings which he believed simply got corrupted with time. Thus, he never renounced his official position as a Tendai monk. To reach his goal, Eisai travelled to Mount Tiāntāi 天台山 in China in 1187 where he was initiated to the teachings of Master Línjì (jp. Rinzai), founder of the of Línjì/Rinzai tradition. Persecuted by the monks of Tendai, Shingon and Pure Land on his return, Eisai ran away from Kyōto but received help from the first *shōgun* Minamoto Yoritomo who supported Eisai in building Japan's first Zen temple, Shōfukuji 聖福寺, in 1195. After Yoritomo's death, Eisai continued to receive support from the *bakufu* though Hōjō Masako (Yoritomo's widow) who asked Eisai to perform the funerary celebrations of Yoritomo's first death anniversary in 1200, in addition to allowing him to build the temples of Jufukuji 寿福寺 in 1199 and Kenninji 建仁寺 in 1202. The latter temple jointly taught the teachings of Tendai, Shingon and Rinzai Zen under the guardianship of the *bakufu*. The established doctrinal foundations, the promotion of a monastic discipline fuelled by the emphasis on observing precepts, the maintaining of the social

status quo, the non-hostility towards the teachings of Tendai and Shingon, and the access to newly-imported Chinese cultural elements all participated in making Rinzai Zen incredibly attractive and welcomed in the higher socio-political spheres of Kamakura²⁵⁸.

Summary

The emergence of the ‘New Buddhisms’ of the Kamakura period is intrinsically intertwined with the new social and political realities of the time. Indeed, the political changes from the Heian to Kamakura saw a shift in real political decision-making power from the emperor and his Court in Kyōto to the *shōgun* and his *bakufu* in Kamakura as a result of the first ever recorded loss of an imperial army in Japanese history. These confusing times led to confrontations between various spheres of Japanese society who were now competing for powers which were previously unobtainable. This was true not just of the newly-empowered *bushi/samurai* class, but also of common people who now had different opportunities to improve their material and social conditions outside of the traditional ranked-based Imperial Court. Still, as I have established above, the necessity of maintaining order for its own survival made the Kamakura government protect and even sometimes revitalize traditional hierarchies and power dynamics, instead of completely usurping them. Indeed, juggling between ‘maintaining the old’ and ‘providing for something new’ was a game the *bakufu* needed to master for its own survival. With time, the *shōgun*’s authority consolidated itself more and more through the political machinations of the Hōjō, but the methods employed by the Hōjō oftentimes participated in increasing societal anxieties rather than appeasing them. In fact, it was fairly commonplace to frame the series of droughts, earthquakes, epidemics, famines, etc. of 1254 to 1260 and the Mongol attempts at invasions of 1274 and 1281 to be direct karmic consequences of the Hōjō’s political manoeuvres²⁵⁹. For the Buddhist-oriented Japanese culture of the Kamakura era, these uncertain and shocking times were understood to be proofs of Japan living in the age of degeneration (*mappō* 末法) which is caused by the decline of the true Dharma and the loss of people’s capacity to reach enlightenment – which was written to happen either 1000 or 2000 years following Śākyamuni Buddha’s (Shakamuni Nyorai 釋迦牟尼如來) death and lasting for about 10 000 years.

It is within these tumultuous circumstances that the ‘New Buddhisms’ of the Kamakura era emerged. The change in political power enabled new competing Buddhist institutions to emerge and thrive since their support and patronage did not depend exclusively upon the Court and/or the emperor anymore – although most of them did end up seeking imperial edicts and/or the *bakufu*’s approval in the hopes of legitimizing their schools. Moreover, the new opportunities created through the slow shifting away from an aristocracy-driven society permitted the emergence of new Buddhist traditions who also moved away from centering their activities primarily on benefiting Court aristocrats, instead spreading their efforts to the various social spheres of Japanese society. Furthermore, similar to the *bakufu*, the founders of the new Buddhist traditions knew that their reformed traditions needed to be anchored in past precedents, leading them to create teachings which needed to balance the old and the new. This means that while some of the reformed schools opted for more explicitly radical approaches (such as Hōnen and Dōgen) and others chose to focus on particular aspects of the Tendai curriculum (such as Eisai and Nichiren), all of the founders were trained Tendai monks who were using a narrative of ‘going back to the True teachings of the Buddha’ when establishing and expanding their own traditions. Lastly, since Japan perceived itself to be living in the age of *mappō* – which is characterized by the decline of the true Buddhist teachings – it was then mandatory to return to the Buddha’s original teachings if Japanese society was to be saved from the turbulent times of the Kamakura era. In sum, whichever Buddhist practices the reformed schools chose to emphasize, whichever approach between *tariki* or *jiriki* they conformed with, whichever support they sought and receive, and whoever they chose to target for their teachings; each new school posited themselves as the remedy to the stormy circumstances of the new political and social realities of the Kamakura era.

Chapter 2: The Case of the Pure Heart

Data Collection

Narrowing which of the vast array of historical documents I would use for my work was not only a challenge in itself, but my inductive approach to research – requiring me to have no pre-established assumptions about what key beliefs lay at the core of the ancient and medieval Japanese culture – made this task even more difficult. Indeed, since my goal is to let the texts/authors speak for themselves and allow the themes and concepts to emerge through my reading and translations, this meant that I could not choose particular texts knowing in advance that they would contain beliefs that would end up being relevant. Furthermore, my hope to find beliefs that would be generalizable to the broader Japanese cultural context led me to select works within different spheres of the Japanese cultural landscape. This combination of two factors made me aspire to translate classical works from multiple authors coming from disciplines such as art theory, poetry, politics, history, Buddhism, diaries, literature and more.

In addition to the vast array of texts I aimed to translate without knowing in advance if any of them would contain any pertinent information, I also wanted to find texts that were written both in the Heian and the Kamakura period. My thought process was that since new historical periods always carry remnants of the past within them moving forward, if I was able to excavate beliefs that are present both in texts of the Heian and the Kamakura period – and across multiple discipline – then it would be very reasonable to claim that these beliefs are generalizable to the broader Japanese cultural context. That is because they would not only transcend disciplinary boundaries but also time periods. It is only when I started translating my first work that I realized that the scale of this initial project would be unrealizable within the time frame of my doctoral degree as this could easily be a life-long journey. Thus, I unfortunately had to make strategic decisions about which author and texts I would use in my work.

After many revisions and deliberations, I narrowed my selection down to six works. For the sake of generalizability, I tried to maintain my initial thought process by translating works written in both the Heian and the Kamakura period, and coming from different disciplinary spheres

of Japanese society. The first three texts I chose were written at different moments during the Heian Period and come from various disciplines – namely poetry, folklore and art theory. These three Heian-era texts serve the purpose of excavating patterns regarding which beliefs reveal themselves to be present in the ancient Japanese societal consciousness. The last three texts were written during the Kamakura period and form the crux of my work. All of these texts are written by the founders of the three of the Buddhist ‘reformist’ traditions briefly introduced in the previous chapter namely Eisai, Dōgen and Nichiren. When engaging with the three Kamakura-era Buddhist texts, I wanted to see if the beliefs excavated within the three Heian-era texts still had an impact on the Japanese worldview during the Kamakura era.

As described in the previous chapter, the historical context of the changes from Heian to Kamakura saw true political decision-making power change from the hands of the traditional aristocratic system of the Imperial Court to the new *bakufu* government headed by the *shōgun*. At first glimpse, researchers would be tempted to think that this new government, oftentimes perceived to be radically different than its predecessor, would need to work out a new belief-system in which their legitimacy would be anchored. This assumption would lead researchers to seek and find which new beliefs emerged during the Kamakura era in response to this new government. However, I clarified in the previous chapter that the *bakufu* of Yoritomo did not, in fact, overthrow the political system and rather sought to carve its place working through it, sometimes even going as far as to revive traditional power dynamics when desirable. Through this I understood that a personal desire to show just how radically different the Kamakura beliefs were from the Heian ones would lead me to select particular beliefs solely based on the fact that they are different, thus defeating my inductive process. Indeed, my goal is to establish which beliefs are central to the Kamakura era’s perspectives of political of legitimacy. The coming into being of new beliefs, although exciting in itself, does not necessarily mean that these new beliefs are particularly central to how political legitimacy was perceived at the time.

With this in mind, when digging for beliefs present in all of the texts, I was primarily looking for two criteria: (1) repetitiveness or consistency and (2) impact. For repetitiveness, it was not only important for the belief to repeat itself within the context of an author’s own work, but also that this belief reappeared within the works of other authors as well. The criteria of

repetitiveness is primarily used to tackle the matter of generalizability. As for the criteria of impact, I was looking to see which beliefs are the ones that are understood to have had greater influence on the outcomes of events. Indeed, a text always contains multiple beliefs within itself, but a text also oftentimes reveals a hierarchy of beliefs in which some are understood to possess more influence over an outcome/behavior than others. Keeping these criteria in mind, I started my translation process with the poems of Saigyō.

Saigyō 西行

Saigyō was born in a wealthy warrior family in 1118 and grew to become a guard to Retired Emperor Toba only to suddenly abandon this life at the age of twenty-two and enter Buddhist monkhood – this process is called *shukke* 出家. The reason for this sudden decision is still debated to this day²⁶⁰, but this mysterious and unexpected change had far-reaching effects on his poetic style. Saigyō lived to experience the major events leading to the Kamakura period such as the Fujiwara-dominated imperial court, the rise and fall of the Taira, the victory of the Minamoto, but passed away in 1190, just short of seeing the official installment of the Kamakura *bakufu* in 1192. Influenced by these tumultuous times – coupled with the lifestyle of a wandering-pilgrim Buddhist poet – allowed him to become the muse of many legends and stories for centuries after his death, cementing his place as “the poet-pilgrim par excellence for later generations”²⁶¹. Noteworthy is the inclusion of Saigyō’s poems in two imperially-commissioned anthologies (*chokusen wakashū* 勅撰和歌集), the *Shika Wakashū* 詞花和歌集 completed in 1154, and the *Shin Kokin Wakashū* 新古今和歌集 completed after Saigyō’s death in 1205. Nevertheless, the poems presented in my work comes from Saigyō’s personal poetry collection, the *Sankashū* 山家集 believed to have started circulating around 1180 (since it does not have any poems written during the last ten years of Saigyō’s life). Saigyō’s *Sankashū* was the first classical Japanese source I translated and the size of it would not have allowed me to translate it in its entirety. Thus I decided to pick a particular section which contains his poetry written during Summer time. My decision to translate this particular section was purely circumstantial as it was Summer time for me when I started

translating his poetry. I will only present here a small selection of the poems which played a key role in the unfolding of my work.

郭公 待つ心のみ 尽くさせて 聲をば惜しむ 五月なりけり²⁶²

*A heart that waits for the Mountain Cuckoo causes one to be exhausted and attached to the cry;
it is the 5th month.*

The verb 惜しむ here can mean three different things: ‘to love deeply’, ‘to feel regret/grudge’ and/or ‘to be attached’. The beauty of this choice of word is that in all of these scenarios it ends up having a similar function when tied to ‘the heart that waits’ (*matsu kokoro* 待つ心). Having a waiting heart means you have something you expect, something you are anxiously waiting for, something you are excited about. Whether you are excited about hearing the sounds of birds, or disappointed as a result of this excitement not being fulfilled, all of it is tied to this feeling of expectation generated by ‘a heart that waits’. This poem also brings about the feeling of ‘being exhausted’ or ‘pushed to the limit’ (尽くす) a negative result of being connected to this state of expectation that is not fulfilled. In other words, regardless of if you experience the feelings of ‘being exhausted’ or ‘being attached’, the root cause of such negative results is the same: a heart that waits.

待つ人の 心を知らば 郭公 たのもしくてや 夜をあかさまし²⁶³

*If we know the heart of a person who waits; it ends up looking forward to the Mountain Cuckoo,
wishing the night brightens.*

Similar to the poem above, this poem also brings forth the topic of the ‘heart of a person who waits’ (待つ人の心). However, even though it is possible to see a similar theme of attachment in the expressions ‘looking forward’ (たのもしくて) and ‘wishing’ (まし), this time the poem does not explicitly present these to be either positive or negative. There are reasons to believe that the sentence ‘wishing the night brightens’ (夜をあかさまし) points towards feelings of hopefulness, in that the end of the night would bring about daytime, where the anticipated Mountain Cuckoo

(郭公) will sing again. Nonetheless, at the core of both poems it is possible to see a similar pattern: the feelings of ‘looking forward’ and ‘wishing’ are the results of the root cause of possessing a heart that waits. In other words, without this kind of heart, attachments – for better or worse – would not arise.

郭公 いかばかりなる 契りにて 心つくさで 人の聞くらん²⁶⁴

*Mountain Cuckoo, how much is it due to bonds that people hear about not pushing their hearts
to the limit?*

This poem is notable for its explicit connection between the heart (*kokoro* 心) and bonds/ties (*chigiri* 契り). Firstly, due to Saigyō’s journey as a wandering monk and the Buddhist-influenced Japanese culture of the time, it is reasonable to assume that he is specifically referring to karmic bonds (*gōbaku* 業縛) which are the results of actions performed in this life as well as in past births that causes a being to be tied to the cycle of transmigration (*rinne* 輪廻) – which is characterized by discontent/suffering (*ku* 苦). The expression ‘pushing one’s heart to the limit’ (心つくす) can mean different things such as ‘exerting oneself’, ‘reaching one’s limit’, ‘carrying something to an extreme’, but interestingly this expression can also mean ‘thoroughly investigating’ or ‘going to the end of’ something, and even ‘mastering’. It is important to note that within Buddhist scriptures (*kyō* 經; skt. *Sūtra* सूत्र), the pairing of words ‘exhaustion’ and ‘karmic bonds’ is often positive since exhausting karmic bonds is precisely what allows for a being to be liberated (*gedatsu* 解脱) from the cycle of transmigration. Also, within the *Sūtras*, ‘to hear’ (*kiku* 聞く) is used in the context of hearing the Buddhist teachings (*hō* 法; skt. *Dharma* धर्म) which is connected to various skillful means (*hōben* 方便) used to guide beings on the path to liberation. When contextualizing this poem within the framework of Buddhist thought, it is possible to interpret the poem as Saigyō interrogating the Mountain Cuckoo regarding the extent to which a being’s inherited karmic bonds makes them hear information that compels them to ‘not push their hearts’ in the direction of liberation. The two poems previously translated allude to the centrality of the heart as the root cause for particular outcomes. This time however, Saigyō challenges this position by questioning

whether the cause for a heart that does not push towards its limit can be found in a being's karmic bonds instead. Nevertheless, although Saigyō's question as to whether or not karmic bonds have an impact on the development of a being's heart remains unanswered here, it still seems that the heart remains a key determinant in one's possibility for liberation.

西にのみ 心ぞかかる あやめ草 この世は仮りの 宿と思へば²⁶⁵

For sure, only a heart in the Western Land / hanging Ayame / happens to think of this world as a temporary dwelling.

This poem contains mainly subtleties. First, the use of the particle *ぞ* which serves the purpose of establishing a break between the first section (西にのみ心) and second section (かかるあやめ草) for the purpose of isolating the latter. This same *ぞ* also has the function of showing the speaker's certainty about the object of the sentence ("For sure..."). Secondly, the second section of the poem (かかるあやめ草) presents an *engo* 縁語 – a rhetorical technique in Japanese poetry that gives mystery, depth and emotion to a poem by associating two or more words that are semantically related and are based on images of everyday vocabulary – in the form of *かかる* and *あやめ*. This refers to the *tango no sekku* 端午の節句 festival that is taking place on the 5th of May where *ayame* flowers (あやめ) are hung (かかる) on building's eaves and door frames to ward off evil spirits. The last section of the poem (この世は仮りの宿と思へば), although separated by the emotionally-charged image of the hanging *ayame* of the Summer Festival, continues the thought started in the first section (西にのみ心) and affirms that this (human) world (この世は) is the dwelling of non-substantiality or simply a temporary dwelling (仮りの宿). Although this last section at first glance seems to be completely disconnected from the second section, Saigyō manages to connect them together by skilful use of the homonym *kari* 仮り (intransient, non-substance) which could also be written *kari* 刈り (to cut, to mow grass) in reference to the *ayame* flowers who need to be cut in order to be hung for the festival. By using an *engo* relating the *ayame* flowers used for the summer festival, in addition to connecting this *engo* to last section through the use of the homophonic pun *kari* 仮り, it is possible Saigyō insinuates

that all these different rituals are pointless because they are all part of the intransient world of desires in which we dwell, and which we much transcend in order to reach the Western Pure Land of Amitābha (西方浄土). Indeed, it is possible that someone who reads the Buddhist teachings could think that the (human) world is simply a temporary dwelling where we all sojourn and where all actions – such as hanging *ayame* flowers – are meaningless. However, it is possible to see a different reading of Saigyō’s poem if we understand it as a critique of the Pure Land tradition’s (浄土宗) teaching that one needs to pray to Amitābha Buddha who, with his infinite compassion, will welcome anyone who wholeheartedly place their faith in him to its Pure Land at the moment of their death. In fact, it is well apparent in many of his poems that *Saigyō* constantly brings about a tension between his love for the beauty of nature and world-renunciation principles advocated by some Buddhist schools of his time – notably the Pure Land tradition. Therefore, it is possible to read the poem with a sarcastic tone which would sound something like: “Obviously, someone who constantly thinks about the Western Pure Land will devalue this world as only a temporary dwelling... but what a shame!”. In my opinion, this interpretation makes the most sense as it aligns with Saigyō internal struggle between reconciling his appreciation for the beauty of the natural world and the world-renunciation tendencies of some Buddhist teachings. Nonetheless, this poem once again places the emphasis on the heart (*kokoro* 心) as the determining factor of the problematic. Indeed, it is precisely because a person is having their heart focused on Amitābha’s Pure Land (西にのみ心) that a person would devalue this world (この世は) as merely intransient (仮り), rather than allowing themselves to see the beauty in this natural intransiency of things. Saigyō seems to allude to the fact that having the ‘right heart’ – in this case a heart that focuses on the beauty of the natural world instead of a heart that focuses on Amitābha’s Pure Land – solves this problematic.

みな人の 心の憂きは 菖蒲草 西に思ひの 引かぬなりけり²⁶⁶

*The melancholy of peoples’ heart / Ayame flowers / for first time I heard that longing for the
West does not draw it towards oneself.*

Much less subtle than the previous one, this poem appears to present a more direct criticism of Pure Land Buddhism where one places their faith in Amitābha Buddha's limitless compassion in order to be reborn in his paradise. Also, similar to the previous poem, the middle section of the poem (菖蒲草) acts as a separation between the first (みな人の心の憂きは) and last section (西に思ひの引かぬなりけり) and uses the image of *ayame* flowers (菖蒲草) to create this cut. This, once again, possibly represents how Saigyō's appreciation of nature acts as the space where he can observe the intransient beauty in all things, moving away from the world-renunciating action of 'longing for the West' (西に思ひ). Similar to the previous poem, Saigyō established a connection between the first and last section via the use of an *engo* and homonym, this time between the word *uki* 憂き (melancholy) and *uki* 泥土 (marshland, swampland). This homonymic pun could be seen as a reinforcement of Saigyō's critique as the melancholy experienced in people who wait for rebirth in the Pure Land transforms this current life into a marshland of melancholy, depression and sadness. The use of the *ayame* Flowers to establish a cut between the two sections highlights how this melancholic longing can be dealt with: by appreciating the current world through one's nearness to nature. Once again, this poem is one of many in which Saigyō brings forth his own struggle between appreciating the moving beauty found in nature and some of the Buddhist traditions of his time which he perceived to advocate for seclusion and distancing from the world. Nevertheless, once more, *kokoro* appears to simultaneously be the issue as well as the solution. Indeed, although the action of longing for the Western Pure Land (西に思ひ) results in the melancholy of the heart (心の憂き) which devalues the current world, one can heal this melancholy via reconnecting to the world by allowing nature to move one's heart once again.

After translating the Summer section of Saigyō's Sankashū, I could notice that a few themes kept reappearing, the most common being: nature, melancholy, and beauty, and Buddhism. Nevertheless, the theme of the heart (*kokoro* 心) played the more impactful role in explaining the outcomes of particular circumstances. His poetry thus nudged me towards paying more attention to how *kokoro* would manifest in the other works I would be translating.

Konjaku Monogatarishū 今昔物語集

The Konjaku Monogatari

shū is an anthology that contains thousands of tales believed to have been written during the late Heian period as some of its content relates to events taking place after 1120. The author is unknown, and only twenty-eight of the original thirty-one volumes survived the test of time. Each of the tales starts with the expression *konjaku* 今昔 (when pronounced using the Sino-Japanese reading of the word) which is often translated as ‘once upon a time’, but a more literal translation would read something like ‘in the old times from now’ or ‘now long ago’. The *monogatari* 物語 is a literary form of classical Japanese literature which consists of extended prose narrative tales closely connected with oral traditions. They almost always consist of fictionalized tales even when they describe historical events, sometimes even resembling epics. The term *shū* 集 in itself means gathering, collection, accumulation, etc., but when used as a suffix in the Japanese literary tradition it means something closer to an anthology or collection – as it gathers together various works from multiple sources into one document. Thus, a literal translation of the title of the work would sound something like a Collection of Tales [starting with] ‘Now Long Ago’. As for the content of the work, it consists primarily of a mixture of Buddhist and popular folklore. The former theme focuses on the development, transmission and spread of Buddhism in India, China and Japan; while the latter theme primarily focuses on describing supernatural or simply bizarre encounters between humans of various social classes with animals and other mystical beings. The work is split in sections that represents such themes: the first section made of five volumes is entitled Tenjiku 天竺 and contains tales of the development of Buddhism in India; the second section made of five volumes is entitled Shintan 震旦 and contains tales of the development and transmission of Buddhism in China; while the last section made of eighteen volumes is entitled Honchō 本朝 and contains tales of the transmission and spread of Buddhism in Japan, as well as numerous short Japanese folklore tales. Now, since translating the totality of this work in itself would be a life-time project, I selected stories categorized as Japanese folklore. It is useful here to restate what I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter: my goal is to find recurrent and impactful themes that emerge in works that have been written across different time periods and disciplinary boundaries. Since these stories do not

necessarily belong to the Buddhist repertoire and would have been considered as secular or common in their times, and since these stories offer a different literary genre in the form of short *monogatari*, they allowed me to cross over not only disciplinary boundaries but also ideological frameworks. I chose to translate stories from the two volumes entitled Reiki 靈鬼 (spirits and demons), as well as Satsuji 雜事 (miscellaneous matters) precisely because they fulfilled both criteria underlined in the previous sentence. Due to the length it would require to include all of the stories in here, I once again will only present two stories which ended up influencing the unfolding of my work the most.

The first story goes as follows:

今昔、桃園と云は今の世尊寺也、本は寺にも無くて有ける時に、西の宮の左の大臣なむ
住給ける。

昔の時に、寝殿の辰巳の母屋の柱に木の節の穴開たりけり。夜に成れば、昔の木の節の
穴より小さき児の手を指出て、人を招く事なむ有ける。大臣此れを聞給て、糸奇異く怪
び驚て、昔の穴の上に経を結付奉たりけれども、尚招ければ、佛を懸奉たりけれども、
招く事尚不止ざりけり。此く様にすれども敢て不止らず。二夜三夜を隔て、夜半許に人
の皆寝ぬる程に必ず招く也けり。

而る間、或る人亦試むと思て、征箭を一筋昔の穴に指入たりければ、昔の征箭の有ける
限は招く事無かりければ、昔の後、箭柄をば抜て征箭の身の限を穴に深く打入れたりけ
れば、昔より後は招く事絶にけり。

此れを思ふに、心不得ぬ事也、定めて者の靈などの爲る事にこそは有けめ。昔れに、征
箭の験、当に佛經に増り奉て恐むやは。然れば、昔の時の人皆此れを聞て、此なむ怪し
び疑ひけるとなむ語り伝へたるとや。²⁶⁷

*Now long ago, what was called the Peach Garden is now Sesonji Temple. Originally there was
not even a temple [there] and the Minister of the Left of Omiya Nishi resided [there].*

During these times, a hole in the joint of the wood had cracked open on a pillar of the Main Hall's Southeast Women's Quarter's. When it became night, from the hole in the joint of the wood, a small infant hand rose out, beckoning and calling people. The Minister heard this and woke up suddenly wondering about the mysterious phenomena. Even though a Sūtra had been attached above the hole, the beckoning and calling still happened; even though buddhas have been hunged [above the whole], the beckoning and calling still did not stop. Although it happened like this, [the circumstances] were put up with but would not stop. [The Minister] stayed away for 2-3 nights, [but] during the middle of the night, every person without fail were beckoned and called during their sleep.

During this time, some person thought about attempting [something] and as a result one arrow was pointed into the hole. At this moment, as a result of the arrow, all of the beckoning and calling ceased. Following this, as a result of the grip of the arrow being released, the entire body of the arrow stroke deep into the hole. Afterwards, the calling and beckoning disappeared.

When thinking about this [story], it is [about] matters that are not unattainable by the heart. It seems that it was [about] the circumstances of changing of the spirit and such of a person, and fixing [themselves]. At this time, [with] the spiritual test of the bow, did the Sūtra provide strength and made [the situation] be handled with care? That being so, when people of these times ended up hearing this, the story indeed narrates that they thought about these strange events and were suspicious of what happened.

The second story goes as follows:

今昔、冷泉院よりは南、東の洞院より東の角は、僧都殿と云ふ極たる悪き所也。然れば、打解て人住む事無かりけり。

而るに、其の冷泉院よりは只北は、左代弁の宰相源の扶義と云ける人の家也。其の左代弁の宰相の舅は、讃岐の守源の是輔と云ける人世。昔れに、昔の家にて見ければ、向の

僧都殿の戌亥の角には大きに高き榎の木有けり、彼れは誰そ時に成れば、寝殿の前より赤き単衣の飛て、彼れの戌亥の榎の木の方様に飛て行て、木の末になむ登ける。

然れば、人此れを見て恐て当りへも不寄ざりけるに、彼の讃岐の守の家に宿直しけり兵世ける男の、此の単の飛行くを見て、「己はしも彼の単衣をば射落してむかし」と云ければ、此れを聞く者共、「更に否不射じ」と諍をして、彼の男を励まし云ければ、男、「必ず射む」と諍ひて、夕暮方に彼の僧都殿に行て、南面る子に和ら上て持居たりける程に、東の方に竹の小し生たりける中より、此れの赤単、例の様にはへ飛て渡けるを、男雁膀を弓に番て強く引て射たりければ、単衣の中を射貫ぬくと思けるに、単衣は、箭立乍ら同様に榎の木の上に登りにけり。昔の箭の当りぬと見る所の土を見ければ、血多く泛たりけり。

男は本の讃岐の守の家に返て、諍つる者共に会て、此の由を語ければ、諍ふ者共極く恐けり。昔の兵は、昔の夜寝死になむ死にけり。然れば、此の諍ふ者共より始めて此れを聞く人皆、「益無き態して死ぬる者かな」となむ云ひ誇ける。

実、人は命に増す物は無きに、由無く猛き心を見えむとて死ぬる、極て益無き事也となむ語り伝へたるとや。²⁶⁸

Now long ago, South from Reizenin, on the East alley from the East of Tōin [was a place] called Sōzuden. It is a place where wickedness had reach its extreme. That being so, the circumstances of people living [there] and overcoming [problems] were nonexistent.

Now, North of the old Reizenin, was the house of a person who was named Minamoto Sukeyoshi, State Councilor to the Secretary of the Left. This state Councilor to the Secretary of the Left's father-in-law was a person named Minamoto Koresuke, of Saneki [province]. At the time, when looking at the house, facing the Northwestern Corner of Sōzuden, there was a tall and large Enoki tree. Is there anyone [that knows] the time when that tree arose? From the front of the Main Hall, a red unlined kimono floated in the air in the Northwest direction towards the Enoki tree and ascended all the way at the top of the tree.

Nonetheless, people were afraid to see this and they did not approach towards it. Doing the night shift at this Saneki house, a man who was a soldier saw this unlined kimono fly away and said

"You know what? I am going to shoot and make this unlined kimono fall!"

- "You will not shoot it at all!" the people who heard this argued with disagreement;

- "I will certainly shoot it!" the man argued [back];

At nightfall, he went to Sōzuden, calmly climbed the drain boards on the South side and sat there waiting for a while. On the East from the inside of a small flourishing bamboo, this unlined red kimono flew across to the other side in the garden. The man took an arrow, strongly drew the bow, and shot [the flying kimono]. He thought he would pierce through the unlined kimono. The unlined kimono, while the arrow was rising up, climbed up the top of the same Enoki tree. At that time, [the man] saw the arrow that hit the target and, when he looked at the place [where] it fell on the ground, a lot of blood had been spilled.

The man returned to the grounds of the Saneki house, met the people who argued with him, told them about the way [things happened], [but] the complaining people were extremely afraid. The soldier that night, died in his sleep. Therefore, within these complaining people, everyone hearing this for the first time indeed blamefully thought "the absurd events are due the spiritual being that died!"

Truthfully, when things who make life better are nonexistent, people die probably just to show an unreasonably brave heart. The story indeed narrates the matters of the exhaustion and nonexistence of merits.

These two stories stood out to me not just for the similarities of their plots, but most importantly for their difference in outcomes. Indeed, both stories have bizarre events taking place in a space where nobody is taking responsibility to fix this mysterious problem. Although not explicitly mentioned or named, because these stories are found in the volume entitled ‘Spirits and Demons’, it is reasonable to assume that the infant hand sticking out of a pillar in the first story and the flying unlined *kimono* of the second story are either both ghosts or are events taking place

due to interventions by supernatural beings of some sort. Regardless of the reason why people are choosing not to fix the situation, one person – in both cases a soldier – decides to take matters in their own hands. To do so, they wait until the proper moment, take an arrow, and shoot the mysterious being. Although both stories allude to the fact that the situation stopped after the soldiers' interventions, none of the stories use any verb that would clarify that the mysterious beings died. However, in the first story, the soldier is praised by the narrator for his action; while in the other, the soldier ends up dying in his sleep and is reprimanded by the narrator for his actions. This begs the question: what is the key element that makes the first soldier be successful and praised in the first story, while the second soldier died and was reprimanded in the second story even though he, also, was successful?

As we can see, the plot of both stories is almost exactly the same, thus the answer cannot be found in the unfolding of the plot itself. The answer also cannot be found in the difference between the reasoning of both soldiers since both of them took it on themselves to solve the problem precisely because nobody was willing to do so. Moreover, the answer cannot be found in the means that the soldiers employed since both of them used the exact same method for solving the problem in shooting an arrow at the being causing mischief. The only notable difference in the two stories is that in the first one, it is not explicitly mentioned that the soldier had the support of the people living in the Minister's residence; while the second story clarifies explicitly that the residents were against his actions. However, to find the answer to this puzzle, readers have to pay close attention to the narrator's conclusions.

In the first story, the narrator first explains that the story is about “matters that are not unattainable for the heart” (心不得ぬ事也) and that the story emphasizes the theme of the “changing of the spirit and such of a person, and fixing [themselves]” (定めて者の靈などの爲る事). In other words, this story is supposed to teach that by fixing oneself and changing one's spirit, one can achieve things that, at first, the heart or mind would believe to be impossible. Very importantly though, the narrator follows these statements by rhetorically asking; “did the *Sūtra* provide strength and made [the situation] be handled with care?” (佛經に増り奉て恐むやは). This passage alludes to this changing of one's spirit, this fixing of

one's self, happening as a result of the *Sūtra* that was hung above the hole in the pillar where the infant hand was coming out. Thus, in this story, it is possible to see that the soldier had his heart be rectified, receiving strength from the *Sūtra* to successfully complete the task and be rewarded, since this task was now accomplished with care.

In the second story however, the narrator explains in the conclusion that “people die probably just to show an unreasonably brave heart” (由無く猛き心を見えむとて死ぬる). They then mention that this story is about “the exhaustion and nonexistence of merits” (極て益無き事也). In Buddhism, merits (*yaku/eki* 益 or *kudoku* 功德) are blessings or positive retributions one receives from performing deeds that are made with a pure heart or faith. The conclusion thus clarified that because the soldier performed an action with an unreasonably brave heart – i.e. he was trying to show-off when he should have been careful – this person exhausted their merits, and therefore ended up receiving a negative retribution in the form of death.

When putting these two conclusions together, the difference in outcomes is clarified: the determining factor is *kokoro*. Indeed, on the one hand, having a proper heart that had been strengthened by a Buddhist *Sūtra* made the soldier perform an action that was wholesome and therefore led to a positive result. On the other hand, having an improper heart that was tainted by arrogance and pride made the soldier perform an action that was unwholesome and therefore led to a negative result. With both stories being almost identical, only one variable was explained to lead to these radically different results; that variable is the heart.

I decided to present these two stories to the readers because they are the easiest stories to contrast and show the extent to which *kokoro* is a central pillar of the Japanese worldview of as it appeared in the tales of the *Konjaku Monogatari*shū. Still, numerous stories in the two volumes I translated have similar narratives in which the heart plays a determining factor in explaining why particular outcomes happened over others²⁶⁹. Nonetheless, after translating Saigyō's poetry where *kokoro* played the most important role in influencing outcomes, as well as translating stories from the *Konjaku Monogatari*shū which offers the same perspective, I was beginning to notice a pattern that fulfilled both of the criteria mentioned in the introduction to this chapter: (1) *kokoro* is a theme that appeared *repeatedly* through multiple documents; and (2) in the cases where *kokoro* appeared,

it consistently was framed as having the biggest *impact* in explanations that seeks to describe the shaping of outcomes.

Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家

Fujiwara Teika was born in 1162 and was the son of the influential poet and court official Fujiwara Shunzei 藤原俊成 (1114-1204) who was commissioned to compile the seventh imperial poetry anthology called the Senzai Wakashū 千載和歌集 in 1183. Inheriting the prestige, techniques, and advices from his admired father, Teika was able to build close connections with high officials of the court, but more importantly he would receive patronage from Retired-Emperor Gotoba. Their close relationship would allow Teika to be appointed as one of the six compilers of the eighth imperial anthology, the Shin Kokin Wakashū 新古今和歌集, commissioned in 1201 and presented to the emperor in 1205 and where 46 of Teika's poems were included²⁷⁰. Teika and Retired-Emperor Gotoba's relationship deteriorated over the years leading to Teika's banishment from the latter's retired court. Part of this deterioration might be attributed to Teika's closeness with the Kamakura *bakufu*, since Teika was selected in 1209 to be the poetry teacher of the young third shogun, Minamoto Sanetomo. Eventually, Retired-Emperor Gotoba's attempt to overthrow the *bakufu*, the Jōkyū War of 1221, failed and he was forced into exile. Following these events, in 1232, Retired Emperor Gohorikawa commissioned Teika to compile, by himself, the ninth imperial anthology, the Shinchokusen Wakashū 新勅撰和歌集. This made Teika become the first person in Japanese history to produce two imperially-commissioned poetry anthologies. Teika would leave behind a tremendous legacy, not just of his poems, his art theory, his guidebooks for poetry writing, and his two compiled imperially-commissioned poetry anthologies; but also in the form of his descendants. Indeed, Teika had twenty-seven children with various women and these descendants would grow into three sub-branches that would compete with each other for success, fame, and for political patronage. In fact, the century following Teika's death in 1241 at the age of 79 years old would become almost completely dominated by this rivalry between his direct descendants.

Since earlier in my work I already engaged with translating and commenting on Saigyō's poems, this time I wanted to provide a different perspective by looking at Teika's art theory rather than his poetry. To do so, I translated three of his main texts where he tackles the topic of poetry composition and general theory of aesthetics. The first text, the Kindai Shūka 近代秀歌, was written in 1209 and was sent to Minamoto Sanetomo to instruct him on how his poems should emulate the great ancient Japanese poets. The second text, the Eika Taigai 詠歌大概, was written between 1216 and contains advice and criticisms for different poetic styles as well as recommends certain classical works for inspiration. The last text, the Maigetsusho 毎月抄, was written in 1219 for a student of Teika²⁷¹ and contains Teika's personal views on not just poetry but also aesthetic principles. Similar to the works analyzed above, I will not include the totality of my translations in this section but will rather emphasize the key passages that had a significant impact in the unfolding of my work.

情は新しきを以て先となし「人のいまだ詠ぜざるの心を求めて、これを詠ぜよ」。²⁷²

Using emotions [that are] fresh, the past becomes nonexistent: "people still do not desire to compose from the heart; this must not be composed!"

The very first sentence of Teika's Eika Taigai alludes to the fact that poetry that is composed without heart is improper, and deplores that his contemporaries do not seek to compose and recite poetry that stems from the heart anymore. Interestingly, the first section of this passage marks a separation between the heart and emotions or passions (情). Indeed, Teika criticizes authors who create poetry exclusively by using whichever fresh or new emotions (情は新しき) emerge at particular moments, because these authors seem to have forgotten about the ways of poetry of the past which is implied to express *kokoro* better. In sum, *kokoro* is not about merely talking about one's emotions as they arise; that is bad poetry. Later in this work, Teika explains that:

常に古歌の景氣を觀念爲て心に染むべし。²⁷³

Usually, resigning oneself to an old poem's scenery can colour one's heart.

and:

和歌に師匠なし。只舊歌を以て師となす。心を古風に染め、詞を先達に習はば、誰人か
これを詠ぜざらんや。²⁷⁴

*In Japanese Poetry, masters are nonexistent. Simply, create with mastery by means of old poems.
If old customs colour the heart, and words/styles are learned from the ancients; what kind of
person does not intent to compose this?*

These two passages offer guidance to the poet with regards to the importance of looking towards the past to help the artist compose good poetry. Teika uses the expression ‘to colour’ (*somu* 染む) the heart (*kokoro* 心) in both passages. The verb *somu* 染む can be translated in multiple ways but refers precisely to the action of ‘dyeing’ as in the expression ‘to dye clothes’. This expression in classical Japanese language can be used in various contexts such as talking about someone who is ‘tainted’ in their judgement, someone who is ‘influenced’ or ‘inspired’ by a particular thing or event, but also the state of ‘fixating’ or ‘being obsessed’ about something or someone. In this sense, we can imagine that a poet’s heart must be completely submerged in the old ways in order to let the colours of the past completely taint their present heart. Teika advises that it is from this space – of having one’s heart coloured by the past – that good poetic composition can manifest. The second passage also uses the expression *kannen su* 觀念爲 which can be translated literally as ‘to perform resignation’ or ‘to abandon’, but can sometimes mean ‘to contemplate’ or ‘to prepare oneself’. When connecting this action of resignation to the first passage commented on earlier, Teika posits that although a poet might be tempted to write poetry based on their emotional urges thinking that it comes from the heart, good poetry actually comes when a poet resists the temptation to write in such states and rather abandons themselves to the old ways. In any case, one theme is recurrent in all of these passages: good poetry comes from the heart. However, Teika reminds his reader that it is not *simply* that it must come from the heart, but that this heart must be dyed with the right colours. This train of thought is expanded further in his most descriptive work, the *Maigetsusho* 毎月抄, where he states that:

さても、この十躰の中に、いづれも有心躰に過ぎて歌の本意と存ずる姿は侍らず。[...] よくよく心を澄まして、その一境に入りふしてこそ稀によまるる事は侍れ。されば、宜しき歌申し候は、歌毎に心の深きのみぞ申しためる。²⁷⁵

Even so, in these 10 forms, there are none that surpasses the form of the 'Existing Heart', having rhythms that manifest the essence a poem. [...] Closely purifying the heart, entering precisely in this one realm; things are rarely composed [like this]. For that reason, when it comes to reciting relatively good poems, it is correctly said that every poem certainly experiences the depth of the heart.

Teika classified poems under ten general categories or forms (*tei* 躰)²⁷⁶, but insists in this passage that the form that can be translated as either 'Existing Heart', 'Having Heart', or 'Being-Heart' (*ushin tei* 有心躰) is unsurpassed as it is the only one that can 'manifest the essence of a poem' (歌の本意と存ずる). This is important because even if all of the other forms have their own respective strengths, the one that is unsurpassed for Teika is the one that has *kokoro*. The title of the form in itself is revealing because, from it, Teika alludes that although all the other forms have their own 'something' only *this* particular form has *kokoro* – which is the key as to why it is unsurpassable. The next sentence is important because Teika brings forth the notion of purifying the heart (心を澄まし) as the way to be able to enter into the realm of 'Existing Heart' where poetry should be composed. Although Teika does not give any particular explanations or guidance as to how a person should purify their heart nor what purity looks like, it may be possible to draw a connection with the previous passages of the Eika Taigai where Teika alluded to the heart needing to be 'coloured' properly in order for good poetry to be produced. Establishing further his position, Teika closes this passage reemphasizing that fact that good poetry necessarily 'shows' or 'experiences' (み) the 'depth of the heart' (心の深き). Later in the treatise, Teika extrapolates saying:

さても、この有心躰は余の九躰にわたりて侍るべし。その故は、幽玄にも心あるべし、長高にもまた侍るべし。残りの躰にもまたかくの如し。げにげにいづれの躰にも、実は心なき歌はわろきにて候。²⁷⁷

Even then, this "Existing Heart" form can span across the remainder of the 9 forms. As a result of this, even [the form of] 'Mystery and Depth' can have heart; even [the form of] "Long and High" too can have [heart]. Even the remaining forms are like this. Indeed, regardless of the form, in truth, a poem without heart is bad.

This disentanglement is important because it clarifies that it is not true that only the 'Existing Heart' form is the only form that has *kokoro*. Rather, 'Existing Heart' the superior form because it encompasses all of other nine forms. Indeed, no matter which form a poet manages to manifest in their work, if any poem does not have *kokoro* at their core, it is a bad poem. Teika adds another layer to his analysis when engaging with the topics of choosing the right words for a poem:

所詮心と詞を兼ねたらむをよき歌と申すべし。心・詞の二つは鳥の左右のつばさの如くなるべきにこそとぞ思ふ給へ侍りける。ただし、心・詞の二つを共に兼ねたらむはいふに及ばず。心の欠けたらむよりは詞のつたなきにこそ侍らめ。²⁷⁸

In the end, when heart and words are appropriately joined together, good poetry can be expressed. It is thought that both heart and words are just like the left and right wings of a bird. However, when it comes to appropriately joining together heart and words, speech is necessary. As for [composing poetry] from a lack of heart; words are appropriately only inferior.

Even though most poets would recognize that words (*kotoba* 詞) are essential to the composition of poetry, Teika posits that good poetry is not simply limited to choosing the right words; this needs to be paired with having *kokoro*. The expression 'just like the left and right wings of a bird' (鳥の左右のつばさの如くなる) in ancient Japan meant a thing needs to have both components in order to operate properly. In this case, a bird can only fly if it has both its left and right wings; just like a poem can only be superior if it has both words and *kokoro*. Still, even though Teika asserts that a poem needs both components in order to be superior, the last sentence seems to be emphasizing the superiority of the heart in this process of composition. Indeed, since words are inferior (詞のつたなき) when *kokoro* is lacking (心の欠けたらむ), this implies that good words cannot emerge at all without *kokoro*. In other words, although both components are necessary for poetry composition according to Teika, *kokoro* is the key factor that determines whether words

can be good or bad, and therefore puts *kokoro* as the central essential pillar to poetry composition. Teika later elaborates on what a superior poem would look, sound and feel like when he states that:

詠吟事極まり案性澄みわたれる中より、今とかくもてあつかふ風情にてはなくて、にはかに傍らより易々としてよみ出だしたる中に、いかにも秀逸は侍るべし。その歌は、まづ心深く、長高く、巧みに、詞の外まで余れるようにて、姿氣高く、詞なべて続け難きがしかもやすらかに聞ゆるやうにて、おもしろく、かすかなる景趣たち添ひて面影ただならず、けしきはさるから心もそぞろかぬ歌にて侍り。それをばわざとよまむとすべからず。稽古だにも入り候へば、自然によみ出ださるる事にて候。²⁷⁹

From exhausting the recitation of poetry out loud and [having one's] within that are perfectly unclouded [with] peacefulness and tranquility – and now, in any event, as a result of the absence of elegant atmosphere that is beyond one's control – when [one's] within that are expressed in composition from one's surroundings happens easily, can the superior form truly exist. Such poems, are very profoundly moving, have magnificent and sublime taste, are clever, seem like they surpass other words, have sophisticated rhythms, words that generally are difficult to connect are understood gently just like that, are delightful, are provided with an unperceived tastefulness and does not have ordinary allusions. Because the form is as such, they are poems where the heart is not restless. [It is said that] composing deliberately such [poems] cannot be done. When entering the pursuit of [the Way of poetry], things find themselves naturally expressed in composition.

In this passage, Teika first posits that the superior form (秀逸) happens when poetic expression starts from within (中より)²⁸⁰. However, for this form to be attained, it is not merely that someone needs to express whatever they feel inside; rather a person's 'within' needs to be perfectly unclouded (澄みわたれる) as well as peaceful and tranquil (案性). Then, from this space of purity, peacefulness and tranquility, a poem of the superior form can be created. This means that the poem would easily (易々) express (よみ出だしたる) the connection between one's surroundings (傍ら) and one's within (中). After describing the various effects and characteristics of this superior

form, Teika explains that compositions of this kind cannot be composed deliberately (それをばわざとよまむとすべからず). In fact, they are compositions that seem to happen naturally and spontaneously (自然によみ出ださるる事) precisely because they are poems where the heart is not restless (心もそぞろかぬ歌). This passage finally provides the reader with a bit of guidance as to what this pure and unclouded heart that is necessary for composing superior poetry might look like for Teika: it is a heart that is peaceful, clear, tranquil, but remains moved by its surroundings. Another interesting and important point expressed in this passage is that the process of poetry composition should be done with ease (易々) as well as naturally (自然に). The expression *shizen ni* (自然に) is a complicated expression to translate because it can mean multiple things. For example, *shizen ni* can mean ‘spontaneously’ which would insinuate that poetic composition should be done ‘in the moment’ and without too much thought going into it; it can also mean ‘of its own accord’ which would imply that poetry should try to emulate how a phenomena un-conceals itself to the world on its own accord without external interference; but it could also mean ‘naturally’ in the sense of being accordance with the laws of nature. It is also important to notice that, in the last the sentence, the actor is ‘things’ (事) rather than the poet. Indeed, the sentence does not say that the poet should write poetry naturally; but rather that things find themselves naturally expressed in composition. A superior poem would therefore focus on the ‘things’ that are the object of a poem, and easily and naturally connect these ‘things’ with the poet’s own inner world, thus connecting the *kokoro* of an object with the *kokoro* of the poet in the process. This is why ‘these are poems where the heart is not restless’ (心もそぞろかぬ歌). Because every space, every word is filled with *kokoro*. This difficult task cannot be achieved simply by means of training, technique, forms, choice of words, or merely following the ancients; it naturally and spontaneously emerges from within the poet once the artist possesses a heart that is unclouded, peaceful and tranquil.

When looking at the art theory of Fujiwara Teika, it is easy to see that it emphasizes at multiple occasions *kokoro* as the most important element in the making of poetry. This is similar to the poetry of Saigyō as well as the tales of the Konjaku Monogatarishū where both underlined how the heart is the root cause that can be used to explain particular outcomes. For Teika, this pattern repeats itself as *kokoro* is also understood to be the root cause for the creation of superior

art. Indeed, even though Teika extrapolates on the multiple factors that contribute to good poetry, the various possible forms, the use of ancient poetic forms, and the necessity of carefully choosing words; to successfully achieve all of these factors requires the expression of *kokoro*.

Summary

After six months of translation of various poems, tales, and art theories, three patterns started to clearly shine through from all of these works. The first pattern is the following: *the key is kokoro*. But the key to what exactly? The simple answer is: it depends, but it also does not really matter. Indeed, for Saigyō the heart sometimes is the key to reconnecting to the world and some other time the heart is the key to understanding the cause and solutions to discontent/suffering. For the stories of the Konjaku Monogatarihū, the heart is the key to understand why the same two actions within the same two contexts lead to one having good consequences while the other one bad consequences. Lastly, for the art theory of Fujiwara Teika, the heart is the key to being able to produce superior poetry. In sum, regardless of what the circumstances may be, *kokoro* always ends up being the key.

Still, none of these authors spent time providing in depth information and analysis as to what *kokoro* actually is. This brings me to the second pattern: *there is such a thing as a 'proper' and 'improper' heart*. In Saigyō's poems, a heart that has attachments and longs for particular events and outcomes was problematic, while a heart that is moved by the everyday can bring about healing. In the Konjaku Monogatarihū, a heart filled with arrogance and filled with desire to be perceived as brave led to criticisms and even death, while a righteous heart strengthened by a Buddhist *Sūtra* led to praise and positive outcomes for all. Lastly, for Teika, an agitated heart that lets itself be carried out by the whims of emotion produces inferior poetry, while an unclouded, peaceful and tranquil heart that connects with the *kokoro* of the world produces superior poetry. Thus, although we cannot conclude what a 'perfect' heart would look like based on all these accounts, it is still very clear that an assumption about the fact that *kokoro* can be qualified as good/proper and bad/improper is strongly present in these works.

However there is one last pattern that is a bit more subtle to notice, but it is still extremely important: *the heart can change*. Whether it is via a person's own self-work, whether it is via a Buddhist *Sūtra*, whether it is via your surroundings, whether it is via extensive learning and practice, for better or worse a person is not stuck with the same heart forever. This point is very interesting and important because it oftentimes came attached to expressions around purity or taintedness. The most explicit example found in the passages I selected is in the work of Fujiwara Teika who used the expression *kokoro o sumashi* 心を澄まし, 'to purify the heart', when talking about the ways to attain the form of Existing Heart. The verb *sumasu* or *sumu* can be written with two interchangeable *kanji* 澄 or 清/清. The latter writing is the most common one, and is one of the two *kanji* used in the formation of the noun 'purity' (*shōjō* 清淨/清淨). As mentioned earlier in my commentary on Teika's work, he does not expand on the ways in which a heart can be purified. Nonetheless, this passage is important precisely because it clearly states that *an improper heart can be made proper through a purification process*. This also means that the reverse must also be possible: *a proper heart can be made improper through accumulation of taint*.

In sum, when translating these works which were written on different topics, at different moments in time, and from different disciplines, I was able to observe that the same core beliefs were assumed by all authors: *the result of an outcome is determined by the heart, which can be made proper through purification and improper through taint*. It is with these core beliefs in mind that I started moving my attention to the Buddhist authors at the center of my work. More precisely, I was curious to see if anything surrounding the notion of 'purity' or the 'pure heart' would surface in their discussion of politics and more specifically on the question of political legitimacy.

Chapter 3: Eisai 栄西

Context of the Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論

Since I have already briefly addressed some of the key events of Eisai's life in Chapter 1, I will now focus on the context surrounding the writing of Eisai's Kōzen Gokoku Ron.

Eisai returned to Japan from his second trip to Mount Tiāntāi – the birth place of Tiāntāi/Tendai Buddhism – in China in 1191 where he received official transmission of the Ōryū 黃龍 tradition of the Línjī/Rinzai 臨濟 lineage of Chán/Zen 禪 Buddhism from his master Xuan Huaichang (jp. Koan Eshō) 虛庵懷敞. Setting foot on Japanese soil at the port of Hirado 平戸 in Kyūshū 九州, Eisai did not seek to implement a new tradition under the banner of Rinzai Zen; rather, he focused his attention, first, on copying the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra (jp. Myōhō Renge Kyō 妙法蓮華經) – commonly abbreviated and translated as the Lotus Sutra. After a few months doing so, Eisai started to introduce the Pure Rules of the Zen Tradition (Zen'on Shingi 禪苑清規) with the intent of presenting the Zen tradition as the real *Dharma*. After spending some time in Kyōto spreading this document, Eisai was successful enough to catch the attention of the Tendai monk Ryōben 良鞭 who thought it necessary to warn the abbots on Mt Hiei. This led the leaders of Enryakuji – Tendai's head temple – to successfully persuade the Imperial Court to call for a ban on this new Bodhidharma school (*darumashū* 達磨宗). Even though this ban was not directed at Eisai's Zen tradition specifically, the concern he felt as a result made him write documents and letters where he reminded the Tendai leaders of the central place meditation occupies within Saichō's 最澄 (767-822) – the founder of Japanese Tendai Buddhism – system. However, the strong opposition he faced in the capital made him return to Kyūshū, where he was able to build Japan's first official Rinzai Zen temple, Shōfukuji 聖福寺 in 1195 after receiving patronage from the new *shōgun* Minamoto Yoritomo and his wife Hōjō Masako. For the next three years, Eisai did not only ensure the growth of his religious community, he also carefully prepared a reply to the opposition he faced a few years earlier. This replied came through in 1198 under the title Kōzen Gokoku Ron or 'Treatise on the Protection of the Nation through the Revival of Zen'.

Politics

The first section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries of Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*, selecting excerpts only on the topic of politics. In his first chapter Eisai explains that:

仁王般若波羅蜜經に云く、「...國王大臣、多く非法の行を作し、横に佛法衆僧の与に大非法を作し、諸々の罪過を作し、非法非律にして、比丘を繫縛すること、獄囚の法の如くせん。爾の時に当たりて、法、滅すること久しからず。」²⁸¹

It is said in the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra: "Rulers and Ministers, [they] will carry out many practices and teachings that transgress the Dharma, [they] will selfishly carry out doctrines that transgress the Dharma as well as the Buddhist Law and the many monks, and [they] will carry out various offences; in their transgression of the Dharma and the Law, the binding of monks to the afflictions of this world, will be similar to those of a prisoner. Facing times such as this, the Dharma, [its] extinction will not last long."

A few lines after, he comments:

此れは扶律の禪法に依りて、法をして久住せしむるの義を明かす。²⁸²

This – maintaining the Law by means of Zen Methods – produces the Dharma and reveals the principle that causes [the Dharma's] long dwelling.

The first quotation posits that when rulers of nations (*koku ō* 國王) as well as their ministers (*daijin* 大臣) act in ways that transgress the Buddhist teachings (*hihō* 非法), these teachings (*hō* 法) – which are made to help beings attain liberation from suffering inherent to constant rebirth in the cycle of transmigration – will rapidly go extinct (*metasu* 滅). The second quotation offers the remedy to such a problem, which is found in the propagation of Zen Buddhism – i.e. the proper teachings. However, promoting Zen within the nation does not merely ensure that the proper *Dharma* is going to exist. Indeed:

其の般若とは、禪宗なり。謂く、境内に若し持戒の人有れば、則ち諸天、其の國を守護すと。²⁸³

This [thing called] Discernment; [this] is the Zen Tradition. It is said that within a territory, supposing that there are people of proper conduct, then the various deities, protect such a nation.

In this passage, Eisai posits that a nation (*koku* 國) will be protected (*shugo* 守護) by various deities (*shoten* 諸天) when it is populated by people who behaving properly (*jigai* 持戒). More specifically, ‘behaving properly’ refers to upholding (*ji* 持) the Buddhist precepts’ (*kai* 戒). Now, it is important to note that the original monastic code (*prātimokṣa* प्रतिमोक्ष) of Buddhism – as found in the Theravāda tradition – contained 227 rules of conduct for ordained monks (*biku* 比丘) and 311 for ordained nuns (*bikuni* 比丘尼) which are laid out in a text called *Suttavibhaṅga*. However, the Japanese Mahāyāna Buddhist traditions, following the efforts of Tendai’s founder Saichō, operate using a different ordination platform based on the *Brahmajāla Bodhisattva Śīla Sūtra* (jp. *Bonmō Bosatsu Kai Kyō* 梵網菩薩戒經). This latter text presents ten major or grave precepts²⁸⁴ (*jū jūkai* 十重戒) – also called Bodhisattva precepts (*bosatsu kai* 菩薩戒) – that all ordained monks and nuns most follow, as well as another set of forty-eight minor or light precepts²⁸⁵ (*shijūhachi kyōkai* 四十八輕戒) that help disciples advance on the bodhisattva path. In other words, Eisai specifies that for a nation to be protected, the population must observe the fifty-eight Bodhisattva precepts offered in the *Brahmajāla Bodhisattva Śīla Sūtra*. Moreover, Eisai identifies the Zen tradition as being focused on the matter of Discernment or Wisdom (*hannya* 般若). Discernment is one of the six or ten perfections (*haramita* 波羅蜜多) cultivated by a bodhisattva to reach Buddhahood. It is usually described as an intuitive experience of the truths of reality cultivated via meditative practices. By experiencing reality through Discernment, a being is purified from the various afflictions (*bonnō* 煩惱) which clouds the heart, and can thus attain enlightenment (*satori* 悟). This is key to understanding the relationship between Zen practices and the protection of the nation. Indeed, Zen’s practices purify the heart, a purified heart makes a being engage in proper behavior (i.e. observing the precepts), and engaging in proper behaviour results in receiving

protection from deities. Thus, Zen Buddhism is necessary for the protection of the nation. Eisai emphasizes this connection by citing another passage from this same *Sūtra*:

仁王般若波羅蜜經に云く […] 大王。若し未來世に、諸々の國王の、三宝を受持する者有らば、我れ五大力菩薩をして、住して彼の國を護せしめん。是の五大士、五千の大鬼神王、汝の國中に於いて、大利益を作さん。大王。汝等皆な応に般若波羅蜜を受持すべし。」²⁸⁶

It is said in the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra: “[...] Great Rulers, provided that, during posterity – with regards to the various rulers – if they are beings that uphold the Three Jewels, I will send the five bodhisattvas of great power and, dwelling [there], [they] will cause the protection of that nation. These five great beings, rulers of the 5000 great demons and kami, inside your nations, will appropriately carry out great blessings. Great rulers, all of you must without a doubt uphold the perfection of Discernment.”

In this passage, the connection between upholding the perfection of Discernment (*hannyaharamita* 般若波羅蜜多) and receiving divine protection (*go* 護) for the nation is made even more explicit. Even though Eisai does not mention anything about Zen in this passage, the fact that it was made clear earlier that Zen is all about this perfection of Discernment, alludes to the fact that Zen practices and teachings are necessary for not just protecting the nation but also ensuring that it will receive great blessings (*dairiyaku* 大利益). Eisai later comments that:

禪力に非ずんば、一切の惡、破し難きことを。仍って此の宗を以て、鎮護の大要と爲すのみ。²⁸⁷

If the power of meditation is absent, the destruction of all unwholesomeness is difficult. Therefore by using this tradition [of Zen], the importance of protecting [of the nation] becomes nothing but carried out.

This time, Eisai could not be more explicit: it is by using Zen that the nation will be protected (*chingo* 鎮護). This is because unwholesomeness (*aku* 惡) is destroyed via attaining the perfection

of Discernment, which is accomplished through the power of meditation (*zenriki* 禪力). However, it is not simply Zen's meditative practices that is conducive to receiving protection. Indeed, Eisai explains that:

首楞嚴經に云く [...] 「誦持の衆生、火も焼くこと能はず、水も溺すること能はず。乃至、心、正受を得ん。一切の呪詛、一切の悪星も、悪を起こすこと能はず [...] 設し衆生有りて、散乱の心に於いても、心に念じ口に持せば、是の金剛王、常に随従せん。何に況んや決定菩提心の者をや。阿難。是の娑婆界に、八万四千災變の悪星、二十八の大悪星有り。世に出現する時、能く災異を生ず。此の呪有る地は、悉く皆な消滅せん。²⁸⁸

It is said in the Śūraṅgama Sūtra: [...] "All beings [that do] chanting practices, fire is not even able to burn [them], and water is not even able to drown [them]! Then, the heart appropriately attains true reception. All of the curses, all of the ominous stars; unwholesomeness is not even able to be stirred up! [...] Supposing that all beings - even [the ones] with an unstable and disturbed heart - if [they] recite with their hearts and safeguard with their mouths, these Diamond Kings, [they] will always appropriately follow as they are told. How much more so of beings [with a] fixed and unchanging enlightened-mind! Ānanda²⁸⁹, in this world that we must bear, there are the ominous stars of the 84 000 cataclysms and the 28 great ominous stars. When [they] manifest in this world, [they] unmistakably cause calamities. On the land that possesses this [Sitātapatra Uṣṇīṣa] Dhāraṇī, everything [that is wicked] will appropriately be completely extinguished."

In this passage, Eisai mentions that chanting practices (*juji* 誦持), in this case the chanting of particular incantations (jp. *shu* 呪; skt. *dhāraṇī* धारणी), also allows a practitioners to be granted protection. He specifies that protection will be received from Diamond Kings (*kongō'ō* 金剛王), deities that protect the *Dharma* and its upholders. Just like a diamond, the powers of such deities is impenetrable and no form of unwholesomeness²⁹⁰ (*aku* 悪), even cosmic calamities and cataclysms, can pierce through their barriers. It is further mentioned that all the wickedness found on a land will be completely extinguished (*shōmetsu* 消滅) if the population chant a particular

incantation called the *Sitātapatra Uṣṇīṣa Dhāraṇī* (*hantaraju* 般怛羅呪). However, Eisai's quote of the Śūraṅgama Sūtra clarifies a very crucial point: protection will be received only if practitioners 'recite with their hearts, and safeguard with their mouths' (心に念じ口に持せば), even if they have 'an unstable and disturbed heart' (散乱の心). In other words, the key to receiving protection from the Diamond Kings is not necessarily the chanting practice in itself, but rather whether the practitioner engages with the practice faithfully and wholeheartedly – i.e with the 'right kind of heart'. This connects well to the earlier passages where it was posited that protection is received once a being engages in proper behaviors, which happens once their heart had been rendered unclouded by experiencing Discernment. Indeed, in both cases, the practice in itself is not the central factor that leads to protection for the nation; rather, it is the heart. Although not explicitly stated in these paragraph, it is possible to implicitly deduct from this passage that if the practitioner would engage in the practices with the 'wrong kind of heart', protection would not be granted.

Nevertheless, Eisai's account of politics found in the *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* does not only consist of seeking to convince its reader that Zen Buddhism is the key to help protect the nation, it also contains a few passages that offer a prescriptive account of leaders should behave. For example, Eisai states that:

勝天王般若波羅蜜經に云く、「般若を學する菩薩、若し國王等と作るとき、貧賤の人有り、來たりて罵詈恥辱せん。時に王、威刑を示さずして云ふ、「我れは是れ國王、法、応に治剪すべし」。即ち是の念を作さく、我れ往昔、諸々の佛世尊の前に於いて、大誓願を發す。一切衆生、我れ皆な濟拔して、阿耨菩提を得しめん、と。今、瞋を起こすは、則ち本願に違す。」²⁹¹

It is said in the Deva Rāja Pravara Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra: “The Bodhisattva who practices Discernment, at the time of [their] appointment as ruler and such, perhaps there are people of poor and low status who will turn up and speak abusively [using] shame and insult. Precisely at that time, rulers, without showing their punishing power [will] say: ‘I [am] the ruler of this nation and, [using the] the Dharma, can certainly divide and distribute peace equally’.

Immediately, the following thoughts will take shape [in the ruler's mind]: 'In the distant past I, before the World-Honored Buddha, uttered the Great Vow. [For] the sake of the entirety of all beings, I vowed that I will get rid of suffering and save everything from illusion, and will cause their attainment of the unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment'. At this time, if hatred is stirred up, then [this] does not match the Original Vow.'

The very first sentence of this passage presents an important information: the people that get to be appointed as rulers are actually bodhisattvas – and especially bodhisattvas who practice the perfection of Discernment. This is emphasized later, as the *Sūtra* quoted by Eisai posits that a ruler is actually a being that uttered the Great Vow (*daiseigan* 大誓願) before the World-Honored Buddha (*butsu seison* 佛世尊) in the past. This Great Vow – also called Original Vow (*hongan* 本願) later – is the vow of the bodhisattva who, with their great compassionate heart (*daijishin* 大慈心), vows to remain in the cycle of transmigration solely for the sake of helping getting rid of discontent/suffering and guiding all being towards attaining unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment (*anokubodai* 阿耨菩提) themselves. This passage implies that rulers are granted this position of power as a positive retribution (*hō* 報) stemming from the wholesome *karma* (*zengō* 善業) that has been generated in the past when this vow was uttered in front of the Buddha.

This karmic-based theory of power is important not simply because it presents a framework to explain power dynamics, but it is also especially important because, as the beneficiary of a karmic tie connected to the bodhisattva vow, this means that rulers have the *responsibility* and *duty* to seek to fulfill this vow within their present (re)birth. In other words, a proper and legitimate leader is one who fulfills their responsibility towards the Bodhisattva Vow that is the source of the power and privilege they have inherited. This means that the bodhisattva – and the Bodhisattva Vow – is simultaneously a model for legitimate governance as well as a framework to evaluate legitimate governance. This passage selected by Eisai provides a clear example of how the bodhisattva vow can be used in such a way. It imagines a scenario where people of poor and low status (貧賤の人) would come to the ruler and speak abusively to the ruler using shame and insult (罵詈恥辱せん). In this scenario, if hatred is stirred up (瞋を起こすは) within the ruler's heart,

this does not conform to the bodhisattva who would instead show compassion and seek to alleviate suffering. Simply put, arousing hatred and not compassion is improper governance because it does not conform to the bodhisattva ideal. The passage also adds that in order to alleviate the suffering of the plaintiffs as well as the rest of the population, the ruler would use the *Dharma* to ensure that peace is distributed and divided equally (応に治剪すべし) within the nation. This also comes from the bodhisattva model who uses innumerable skillful means (*hōben* 方便) to teach the *Dharma* to beings of varying capacities to guide them towards enlightenment and liberation. This last point is expanded upon in a later passage, where Eisai states that:

大般涅槃經に云く、「如來、今、無上の正法を以て、諸王・大臣・宰相、及び四部の衆に付囑す。是の諸々の國王、及び四部の衆、応に諸々の學人等を勸励して、増上の戒・定・智慧を得しむべし [...] 是の諸々の國王は罪無し。」²⁹²

It is said in the Mahā Parinirvāṇa Sūtra: “The Tathāgata, today, by means of the unsurpassed proper Dharma, entrusts the Buddhadharma to the various rulers, ministers, and councillors, reaching all throughout the great number of four groups of Buddhist disciples. These various rulers, reaching all throughout the great number of the four groups of Buddhist disciples, certainly end up advising and encouraging the various students of the Buddha way, and must cause the attainment of growth in power by means of the precepts, one-pointed concentration, as well as Knowledge and Discernment [...] Within these various rulers unwholesomeness is nonexistent.”

Eisai comments on this passage, adding:

佛、已に般若と無上の正法とを、諸々の國王に付囑す。君王自ら當に進止すべし。何ぞ奸心の妨げを致すや。²⁹³

The Buddha, undoubtedly entrusted Wisdom and the unsurpassed proper Dharma to various rulers. Rulers must certainly conduct themselves [as such] of their own accord. Why would obstruction by [a person with] cunning and wicked heart be carried out?

The quotation as well as Eisai's commentary emphasize very clearly the responsibility of leaders to disseminate the *Dharma*. In the passage analyzed earlier, we learned that leaders had a responsibility to continue fulfilling the bodhisattva vow because this vow is the source of the positive karmic retribution they have inherited which gives them the power to govern. This time, leaders also have the responsibility to spread the *Dharma* within all four groups of Buddhist disciples (*shibu no shu* 四部の衆) because they have been entrusted (*fuzoku* 付嘱) with the correct *Dharma* (*shōbō* 正法) by the Buddha in a past lifetime. The four group of Buddhist disciples referred to here are monks (*biku* 比丘), nuns (*bikuni* 比丘尼), laymen (*ubasoku* 優婆塞), and laywoman (*ubai* 優婆夷). We can see once again that a karmic-based theory of power is present, as a leader's power privileges are due to events that happened in the past which they currently are the beneficiaries in this lifetime.

Still, it is important to note here that the passage and Eisai's commentary both emphasize that the correct *Dharma* has been entrusted to leaders, not any other being, and this is precisely *why* they are in a position of power. Indeed, leaders are in position of power precisely because this position of power allows them to have the capacity and resources to spread the correct *Dharma* to all practitioners. In other words, if the correct *Dharma* would have been inherited by a being that does not have the power, capacity and/or resources to spread the teachings to all practitioners, then the correct *Dharma* would not be heard and practiced. This would mean that not only would beings not be able understand the source of their discontent/suffering, but they would also not be guided on the path to liberation from that discontent/suffering. However, having the correct *Dharma* entrusted to rulers prevents all of this. It prevents these unfortunate circumstances precisely because their position of power enables them to use their power to spread the *Dharma*, which in turns allows for all beings to be guided towards liberation – which concurs with the bodhisattva ideal.

Nevertheless, this passage does not only provide a template for good governance solely in the form of spreading the Buddhist teachings, is also offers other prescriptions for how a leader should behave towards its followers/subjects. The first aspect is that leaders should 'encourage and advise the various students of the Buddha way' (諸々の學人等を勸励して). The second

aspect is that they ‘should cause the attainment of growth in power (*zōshō* 増上) by means of the precepts, one-pointed concentration (*jō* 定), as well as Knowledge and Discernment (*chie* 智慧)’ for all practitioners. Putting these two together, this means that leaders should have a more active role in the lives of their followers/subjects outside of simply passively spreading the teachings. Indeed, leaders should actively encourage and even advise their followers or subjects, but they should also cause their practices to grow and improve. Now, although there is no clear specification in this passage as to how a leader should go about fulfilling this latter point, I believe this alludes to leaders playing a more active role in teaching their followers/subjects the various Buddhist practices.

The quotation ends by clearly stipulating that rulers who fulfill these criteria are rulers within whom ‘unwholesomeness is nonexistent’ (國王は罪無し). This is important because it shifts the focus away the performance of those actions and reorients it towards the heart of a person that performs them. Eisai adds an important detail regarding this point when he comments that ‘rulers must certainly conduct themselves [as such] of their own accord’ (君王自ら當に進止すべし). The expression *onozukara* 自ら here translated as ‘of their own accord’ also has the meaning of ‘naturally’. In other words, leaders should perform these kinds of actions of their own accord, not because of the strategic repercussions of their performances, but because these actions are the natural manifestation of their wholesome hearts. On the other hand, actions that lead to the obstruction (*samatage* 妨げ) of proper governance – as described above – are manifestation of the cunning and wicked heart (*kanshin* 奸心) of an illegitimate ruler. This point is further emphasized in a latter passage where Eisai posits that:

佛法は必ず常に國王の施行に依って流通せしむべし。是の故に佛、懇懃に國王に付嘱したまふ。又た王の益も復ち莫大なり。²⁹⁴

The Buddhadharma must unmistakably be caused to disseminate as a result Rulers’ enforcement/charity. It is because of this that the Buddha courteously entrusted [the safeguard and spreading of the Buddhadharma] to the rulers. In addition, the rejuvenation of the Rulers’ blessings is also going to be immense!

Once again, Eisai emphasizes that the dissemination of the Buddhist teachings must unmistakably happen via a leader's enforcement (*segyō* 施行). It is common practice across Buddhism's history that Buddhist schools were only allowed to proliferate within a nation after an official Imperial edict would be written that would allow them to do expand legally. This was especially true of new traditions (in this case, Rinzai Zen) which were oftentimes the target of more established and influenced traditions (in this case, Tendai and Shingon) whom they perceived as a political threat. In this case, receiving imperial edict would ensure a certain level of protection to temples of new traditions. Although Eisai clearly appeals to this custom by expressing that the *Buddhadharma* must spread as a result of Rulers' enforcement, the expression *segyō* 施行 used by Eisai can also mean 'charity' and more specifically actions that expresses charity such as 'almsgiving' or 'offerings'. Thus, this passage could also be read to mean that the dissemination of the Buddhist teachings must unmistakably happen a result of a leader's charity. This gives the passages a tone of benevolence, as it is out of a leader's good heart that the *Dharma* gets to be disseminated (albeit through Imperial commands). The last sentence of this passage is also important because it explicitly connects the leaders' behaviors with the established fact that blessings (*yaku* 益) are going to be granted to the nation by buddhas and bodhisattvas if these leaders fulfill their mandate to spread the *Dharma*. Following this train of thought, Eisai adds that:

内、菩薩の大悲を存じて、衆生の慈父と爲る。然れば則ち皇上の重寶、國士の良医、只だ此に在り。因って以て興隆せんと欲す。²⁹⁵

Within, [when] there is the great compassion of a bodhisattva, [a leader] becomes the compassionate father of all beings. When that is the case, there will only be precious treasures for the emperor and excellent healers for distinguished people. Wish that there will be prosperity as a result.

Here Eisai reminds the reader once again that leaders who bring about treasures (*chōhō* 重寶), healing (*ryō'i* 良医) and prosperity (*kōryū* 興隆) for themselves as well as all beings are leaders who, 'within' (*uchi* 内), have 'the great compassion of a bodhisattva' (菩薩の大悲). Thus, what truly makes a leader 'the compassionate father of all beings' (衆生の慈父と爲る) is not found by

merely paying attention to their actions; rather, is in the heart behind these actions where the answer is found.

When examining the passages which discusses politics in Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*, it is possible to denote the interplay between three beliefs: (1) politics is matters of proper governance which itself revolves around the matter of divine protection; (2) leaders karmically inherit their position of power, which also means they have a karmic responsibility to manifest the bodhisattva's heart of great compassion through their actions – i.e. they must guide all beings in liberating themselves from suffering; (3) and divine protection and blessing is granted when leaders actions manifest this heart. This gives us the first glimpse at a medieval Japanese theory of legitimate governance understood within the context of a Buddhist worldview.

After translating Saigyō's poetry, the *Konjaku Monogatari*'s folk tales, and Fujiwara Teika's art theory, I was not able to clearly define and explain the intricate workings of *kokoro* and why it is such an important central aspect of the medieval Japanese understanding of the world. However, the political passages of Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* clearly extends the rationalization of *kokoro* found in the works analyzed in Chapter 2 into the realm of politics. Moreover, these passages gave some insights as to what a 'good heart' would look like for a leader, which focuses around the ideal of the compassionate heart of the bodhisattva. However, it is when we move away from Eisai's discussion of politics that we can find a more meaningful and enlightening engagement with *kokoro*.

The Heart

The second section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries of Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*, selecting excerpts only on the topic of *kokoro*. The first important passage to note is found when Eisai explains the core foundations of Zen Buddhism as follows:

智證大師の諸家教相同異略集に云く、「...禪宗は、金剛般若波羅蜜多經、維摩經を所依と爲し、即心是佛を宗と爲し、心、所著無き業と爲し、諸々法空を義と爲す。²⁹⁶

It is said in the "Collected Summary of the Similarities and Differences in the Particular Teachings of Various Schools" of Chishō Daishi: "...the Zen school, uses as its basis the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra and the Vimalakīrti Nirdeśa Sūtra; it places [at its center] the established truth of 'Oneness of this Heart and the Buddha'; it emphasizes a heart in which karmic attachments are nonexistent; and it emphasizes the teaching of the emptiness of everything.

There are two aspects of this passage that is important to us because they specifically engage with the heart. The first aspect of this passage specifies that Zen places as its center 'the established truth of Oneness of this Heart and the Buddha' (即心是佛を宗と爲し). In a nutshell, the Zen teaching of Oneness of this Heart and the Buddha (*sokushin zebutsu* 即心是佛) posits that the heart of any being and the heart of the Buddha are originally or primordially one. It is precisely because the heart of all beings and the heart of the Buddha are originally one that any being is able to attain Buddhahood. A common way to explain this teaching is as follows: one is always-already a jewel (i.e. Buddha) but this jewel is covered in mud (i.e. illusion, ignorance, etc.), and one needs to remove the layers of mud that accumulated with time to awaken to the truth that they always-already were a jewel in the first place²⁹⁷. This teaching informs us that *kokoro* is the key which relates any being with the Buddha, as any being is always-already Buddha. The second aspect of this passage mentions that the Zen tradition 'emphasizes a heart in which *karmic* attachments are nonexistent' (心、所著無き業と爲し). This not simply tells us that Zen takes the matter of *karma* seriously, but more importantly it tells us that *karma* (*gō* 業) is directly connected with the heart. Part of the goal of Zen practices then, is to guide the practitioner in getting rid the things which they are karmically bound to (*shojaku* 所著) in order to ensure that their heart becomes free of them. The relationship between *karma* and the heart is further emphasized in another passage where Eisai quotes:

法相宗の慈恩の積に云く、「謂く、一念の信、薰習して心に在らば、能く無辺広大の生死を破す。」²⁹⁸

It is said in the Explications of Cīen of the Hossō tradition: “It is said: if, [in] one instant of faith, karmic imprints do not exist in the heart, [it] completely breaks the vast and boundless [cycle of] birth and death.”

Here, the passage used by Eisai posits that when karmic imprints (*kunjū* 薰習) do not exist in the heart (心に在らば), the cycle of birth and death (*shōji* 生死) completely breaks (*hasu* 破す). The cycle of ‘birth and death’ is simply another name for the cycle of transmigration (*rinne* 輪廻) where all beings are ceaselessly reborn. Karmic imprints refers to the traces left in the heart/mind by wholesome actions (*zengō* 善業) or unwholesome actions (*akugō* 悪業) done in past lifetimes which influence the present thoughts and actions of a being. This passage thus reminds the readers that to achieve liberation from this cycle that is characterized by discontent/suffering, a being needs to be able to cut the karmic imprints which taints their heart; and all of this is attained in only one single instant (*ichinen* 一念) of faith (*shin* 信). Within the context of East Asian Buddhist language, *shin* 信 is used to translate the Sanskrit term *Śraddhā* श्रद्धा which is often translated in English as belief and conviction. Although *Śraddhā* does have such connotations, it importantly also emphasizes the notion of trust. For example, within Mahāyāna Buddhism, this took the form of putting one’s trust/faith in the powers of buddhas and bodhisattvas to help save beings from the cycle of transmigration, as well as having trust/faith that a being’s efforts will lead to awakening to their own Buddhahood. Faith, in that sense, does not necessarily require understanding, but it definitely requires trust. This passage then, gives a bit more clarity with regards to the connections between the heart and *karma*. Indeed, it explains that having even one single instant of faith dispels the doubts clouding a being’s heart and thus clears away the past karmic imprints that impede a being’s potential for liberation. This also means that having a heart that remains tainted by past karmic imprints will not allow one to attain cessation of rebirth. Eisai extrapolates on this point stating that:

大乘記心論に云く、「[...] 衆生の其の心精淨なることを要して、乃ち爲に身を現ず。鏡の、垢有れば、色像現ぜず、垢除くときは則ち現ずるが如し。衆生も亦た爾り。心未だ垢を離れざれば、法身現ぜず。垢離るときは則ち現ず。」²⁹⁹

It is said in the Mahāyāna Śraddhotpāda Śāstra: “[...] the event of originating this pure heart is necessary for all beings and, as a result, the body [of the Tathāgata] immediately becomes manifest. When the mirror’s dust exist, physical forms do not manifest; at the time of removing the dust it is like [they] immediately manifest. All beings, too, are similarly as such. When the heart still did not remove the dust, the Dharma-body [of the Tathāgata] does not manifest; at the time of removing the dust [it] immediately appears.”

This well-known Buddhist imagery of dust (*ku* 垢) on a mirror (*kagami* 鏡) likens the process of using Buddhist practices to reach enlightenment to that of getting rid of dust on a mirror. The mirror here is *kokoro*. Buddhist practices guides a being in removing the dust/impurities that taints their hearts with the goal of originating a pure heart (心精淨なる). The passage teaches that it is necessary (*yōshi* 要し) for beings to originate this pure heart within themselves, since it is only through this pure heart that the *Dharma*-body (*hosshin* 法身) of the Buddha can manifest in the clean surface of the mirror/heart and be experienced by the practitioner. The *Dharma*-body of a Buddha is one of the three bodies of a Buddha (*sanshin* 三身), and refers to the unconceivable aspects of a Buddha out of which all Buddhas arise and to which they return after their dissolution. This unconceivable body of a Buddha can only be seen through having an experience of true or absolute reality (*shintai* 眞諦), which is not attainable as long as a being has dust on their mirror/heart which does not enable them to see clearly. This dust is made of the karmic imprints accumulated as a result of actions (jp. *gō* 業; skt. *karma*) performed in past lifetimes which a being has inherited in this present rebirth, as well as the impurities accumulated as a result of actions performed during a being’s present lifetime. The previous passage quoted by Eisai provided a guideline for how to purify oneself of impurities when stating that one single instant of faith was enough to remove the karmic imprints which taints the heart. However, this current passage explicitly states that it is necessary for beings to have a pure heart if they are to be able to reach enlightenment. In other words, whether or not a being is able to attain liberation or not seems to

all be dependent on one key and central factor: the purity of one's heart. However, it seems that faith in itself might not be sufficient to attain this pure heart since Eisai later posits that:

[...] 身心を決択し、戒律を守護し、心水澄淨ならば、炊然として心を見て、念念に諸波羅蜜に相応せん。鈍根小智と雖も、而も持戒清淨ならば、業雲消除し、心月朗然たらん。³⁰⁰

[...] *if [the truth of the] body-heart-mind is followed, if precepts and rules are protected, and if there is a clear heart that reflects like water, then a heart that is said to be naturally burning will appropriately be seen, and, in an instant, the various Perfections will appropriately be conjoined with. Even [with] dull capacities and shallow wisdom, if precept observance is pure as such, clouds of karma will appropriately be eradicated and there will be a clear heart bright as the moon.*

While faith might provide a being with the opportunity to clear off their heart of past and present karmic accumulations and have a blank slate, having this 'clear heart that reflects like water' (心水澄淨なら) – or like a mirror – now allows the practitioner to instantly conjoin with the Six or Ten Perfections of the bodhisattva. However, Eisai also posits here that 'if precept observance is pure as such, clouds of karma will appropriately be eradicated and there will be a clear heart bright as the moon' (而も持戒清淨ならば、業雲消除し、心月朗然たらん). Furthermore, this is true, regardless of the beings' ability or the depth of their wisdom. In other words, both faith and observance of the precepts allow for one's heart to become purified, which are both achievable by any being regardless of their class, status, gender, sex, ability, etc. and even whether they are human or not. Once again, the central place of the heart in achieving progress on the Buddhist path is undeniable. Still, another passage clarifies the role of the heart when Eisai cites:

超日明三昧經に云く、「佛の言く、魔に四事有り。乃至、意止み意断ずれば、魔、則ち降伏す。其の四魔とは、皆な心由り生ず。外より來たるにあらず。」³⁰¹

It is said in the Chāo Rì Míng Sānmèi Jīng: “The Buddha said: there are 4 kinds of Māras. As far as this is concerned, by means of cutting off the Mind and stopping the Mind, the Māras,

[they] are immediately subjugated. As for the Four Māras, the heart originates and causes all of them. [They] are not coming from outside [the heart].”

Eisai comments:

是の故に大乘は、心息めば戒生じ、禪定を得。³⁰²

As a result of this, according to Mahāyāna, when the heart stills, the precepts originates; one-pointed concentration is attained.

In his commentary, Eisai clarifies the relationship between the various steps of Buddhist practice explaining that the first and most foundational step is stilling the heart (心息め). Only after doing so can the precepts originate (戒生じ) eventually leading to the attainment of one-pointed concentration (禪定を得). This concurs with all of the previous passages and simply organizes the path along clearer, hierarchical steps. However, this passage is extremely insightful because, for the first time, it shows that as much as the heart is the most fundamental factor in progressing along the Buddhist path, this same heart is also the only place which generates and perpetuates discontent/suffering as well as general obstacles to the Buddhist path. To clarify, the passage quoted by Eisai speaks of the Four Māras (*shima* 四魔), which are the four forms that the demon king Māra manifest to obstruct Buddhist practitioners and destroy the good roots of the *Dharma*. Because the Four Māras originate in the heart, it means they must be subjugated in the heart too. The activities of Māra within a being's heart means the heart must learn to still itself, which is said to be achieved via cutting off and stopping the Mind (*i* 意). *I* 意 is the *kanji* used to translate the Sanskrit word *Manas* मनस् which is the source of all forms of mental capacities such as consciousness, intellect understanding, cognition, perception, thought, imagine, intention, and so forth. This skill is attained through the various Buddhist practices which guide a being in learning to stop to the activities of *Manas*, which in turns leads to stillness of the heart, which in turn means there is successful subjugation of the Four Māras since they cannot arise within a still heart. With the heart now clear and purified, a being can cultivate the bodhisattva path without obstructions and guide others.

Focusing on the passages which exclusively deals with the topic of *kokoro*, it is clear that the heart occupies a central place in Eisai's Rinzai Zen teachings. Similar to the various texts translated in Chapter 2, the passages of the *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* present the heart as 'the key'. More precisely, the heart is simultaneously the source of enlightenment and liberation as well as the source of obstruction and discontent/suffering. We learned that unwholesome actions are made by beings whose hearts are tainted with impurities and generate karmic imprints which, accumulating on top of inherited karmic imprints from the past, leaves a being stuck in the cycle of transmigration which is characterized by discontent/suffering. On the contrary, wholesome actions are made by beings whose hearts are clear and pure, and reducing karmic imprints makes a being closer to cessation of the cycle of transmigration. Furthermore, Eisai emphasized that faith and precept observance were two ways in which the heart could be purified.

Although the focus on *kokoro* provided very important clarification into understanding what the heart is and how it operates within Eisai's framework, his discussions simultaneously generated another theoretical issue. Indeed, similar to the texts of Saigyō, the *Konjaku Monogatari*, and Fujiwara Teika, discussions of the heart is almost always linked to statements about purity. Still, although it is clear that purifying the heart seems to be the obvious solution to almost all issues, the passages translated thus far do not provide very valuable explanations as to what is meant by purity. Since the theory feels incomplete without further investigating purity, I dove once more in Eisai's work in search for clarifications.

Purity

The third section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries of Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*, selecting excerpts only on the topic of purity. Firstly, Eisai quotes:

天台宗の摩訶止観に云く、「凡夫は耽湎して、賢聖に呵せらる。悪を破するは淨慧に由り、淨慧は淨禪、淨禪は淨戒に由る。」³⁰³

It is said in the Mōhē Zhǐguān of the Tendai Tradition: “Worldly people abandon themselves to indulgences and are scolded harshly by Sages. The destruction of unwholesomeness results from pure discernment; pure discernment from pure meditation; and pure meditation results from pure precepts.”

This passage presents a chain of interrelated events which is initiated by observing pure precepts (*jōkai* 淨戒) and culminates in the destruction of unwholesomeness (*aku* 惡). Although not explicitly stated, the quote seems to imply that since the chain of events is started from purity, then purity is encountered every step of the way. If this is true, this means that the purity of action takes precedent over the action itself in terms of its resulting causes. For example, the existence of pure meditation (*jōzen* 淨禪) suggests that not all meditations (*zen* 禪) are necessarily pure, but also that only pure meditation is the kind of meditation that eventually leads to the destruction of unwholesomeness. This passage is significant because it implies that purity might be the most important factor to consider instead of the action itself. This is further underlined in another passage where Eisai quotes:

大般涅槃經を引きて云く、「尸羅不淨なれば、還りて三途に墮す。禪定智慧、皆な発することを得ず。」³⁰⁴

Pulling from the Mahā Parinirvāṇa Sūtra, it is said: “If the precepts are impure, [one] returns and lapses into to the Three [Woeful] Destinies. One-pointed concentration, knowledge-discernment; the occurring of all [of this] is not attained.”

What could only be deducted from the previous passage is now made clear: purity takes precedence over actions. Indeed, the earlier passage presented a chain of event that started with observing the pure precepts and culminated with the destruction of unwholesomeness; and this passage specifies that if the precepts (*shira* 尸羅) are impure (*fujō* 不淨) a being will fall into the Three Woeful Destinies (*sanzu* 三途) – which roughly corresponds to the lowest three of the possible Six Realms of rebirth of the cycle of transmigration³⁰⁵. Therefore, precept observance in itself is *not* the determining factor as to whether a person grows within the Buddhist path or lapses into the Three

Woeful Destinies; rather it is the purity of the precepts which determines the result. In sum if the precepts are pure, there is progress; if the precepts are not pure, there is lapsing.

This shift away from the action to the purity of the action presents the same mechanism as the earlier discussions regarding *kokoro*. Indeed, all texts from Saigyō's to Eisai's presented the perspective that to understand the outcome of a particular action, we need to focus on the heart that does the action and not merely on the action in itself. The pattern is the same here but, this time, the passages selected by Eisai replaces the heart with purity as the determining factor in explaining particular outcomes. Nonetheless, these passages do not clarify the ways in which purity can be attained. Eisai leaves some cues on this matter quoting:

又た摩訶止觀に云く、「[...] 障道の罪滅して、尸羅清淨なり。三昧現前し、止觀開發す。事戒淨きが故に根本三昧現前し、乃至、即中の戒淨きが故に王三昧現前す。」³⁰⁶

Again, it is said in the Mōhē Zhǐguān: “[...] Freed from the demerit of the obstacles to the [Buddhist] path, the precepts are pure. One-pointed concentration manifest before one’s eyes, and Stillness and Insight develops. As a result of acting the precepts with purity, the roots of one-pointed concentration manifest before one’s eyes; and as a result of the purity of oneness with the precepts, the king of one-pointed concentration manifest before one’s eyes.”

It is easily noticeable, as demonstrated earlier, that the chain of events leading positive outcomes starts by ensuring that the precepts are pure (*shōjō* 清淨). However, the passage quoted by Eisai provides an indication of how such purity is attained in the form of being ‘freed from the demerit of the obstacles to the [Buddhist] path’ (障道の罪滅して). In the Buddhist literature, obstacles to the path (*shōdō* 障道) usually refers to the various delusions (*ji* 痴) beings entertain about reality that prevents them from attaining enlightenment. Entertaining such delusions in one’s heart-mind leads beings to produce unwholesome actions that create negative karmic imprints which will generate negative consequences for oneself and others, thus perpetuating discontent/suffering. Purity, then, is attained when a being is freed from the demerit (*tsumi horoboshi* 罪滅し) that

results from producing unwholesome actions. In other words, a being has to rid themselves of the negative karmic imprints they inherited from past actions which were done with delusion in one's heart-mind. Once the karmic imprints of delusions are cleared up, then a being can observe the precepts with purity. Lastly, Eisai later adds that:

大乘戒・小乗戒は、人の清に在り。但だ大悲利生の清を存ずるのみ。³⁰⁷

The precepts of the Large Vehicle and the Small Vehicle exist in the purity of people. The purity of great compassion benefiting all beings is especially as such.

This short commentary by Eisai clarifies the location of purity (*shō* 清). More specifically, when reading expressions like 'pure precepts', 'pure Discernment' and so forth, it is important to remember that purity is not found in the precepts nor in Discernment in themselves. Indeed, purity is located in the person that produces such actions or states. This suggests that actions or states are themselves merely neutral and it is the purity of the person that produces them which changes these actions or states from being neutral to either positive or negative. This, then, also clarifies how there can be such a thing as precepts that are impure. Moreover, by mentioning that this purity is especially present in people who have great compassion benefitting all beings (*daihi risho* 大悲利生), Eisai connects purity to the heart as the seat of such great compassion.

Diving into Eisai's discussion of purity provided us with short but important insights. The biggest emphasis of these passages was on establishing that the results of actions are influenced by the purity behind the action. This requires us to shift our focus away from looking at the action in itself, and rather look at whether or not the action was made with purity. I noted that this pattern is exactly the same pattern that emerged in all previous texts which demonstrated that *kokoro* is the key to understanding the outcomes of particular actions and not the action itself. Thus, *kokoro* and purity seemed to operate in a similar way. The last two passages clarified this relationship between heart and purity, albeit in an indirect manner. Indeed, Eisai first explained that purity is attained when a being is freed from the karmic imprints of delusion. Since these karmic imprints taint the heart of a being making them perform unwholesome actions, it is reasonable to infer that the 'heart' is what is being cleared up and rendered pure. The last sentence makes the connection

with *kokoro* a bit clearer when Eisai states that purity is present in people that show great compassion which benefits all beings. Even though it is not explicitly stated once again, knowing that this great compassion which benefits others is the manifestation of the enlightened-heart of a bodhisattva, means that purity manifests through this particular heart. Still, Eisai's discussion of purity in the *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* is fairly limited. Indeed, although it allows us to see that purity is much more important than it might seem at first glance, Eisai's discussion still lacks the depth and clarity that was present in his discussion of politics and *kokoro*.

Summary

Translating key passages from the the *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* provides us with important insights into Eisai Buddhist framework on the matter of politics and legitimacy. More specifically, I was able to notice three tendencies: (1) politics is matters of proper governance which itself revolves around the matter of divine protection; (2) leaders karmically inherit their position of power, which also means they have a karmic responsibility to manifest the bodhisattva's heart of great compassion through their actions – i.e. they must to guide all beings in liberating themselves from suffering; (3) and divine protection and blessing is granted when the leaders' actions manifests this heart.

At the core of this framework are two key interconnecting beliefs that kept resurfacing: (1) *karma*, and (2) the pure heart. The *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* does not expand much on the matter of *karma* as a topic in and of itself, but its discussion of *karma* is almost always interconnected with discussion of *kokoro* and especially purity. Generally speaking, the connection between all of these beliefs generate the following rationale: the heart is impure because of *karma*, and one purifies their heart by cultivating Buddhist practices made to remove karmic imprints. Having a pure heart, then, means having a heart that has completely cleared such karmic imprints. In other words, *karma*, purity and *kokoro* are all individual beliefs which form a coherent system.

What is important to remember as we move forward is that these three beliefs – and the system they produce – are central to Eisai's political theory. This is because it is the responsibility

of leaders to do the work of purifying their hearts – as well as teach others how to do so – because having a pure heart makes them produce wholesome actions which, in turn, brings about blessings and protection by buddhas and bodhisattvas for all beings to benefit. For Eisai, this is precisely where legitimacy is found. A legitimate leader is one who embodies the bodhisattva ideal; they must continue to aspire to fulfil the bodhisattva vow – which gave them the power to rule through karmic inheritance. This means that they must continue to constantly purify their hearts through Buddhist teachings and practices because this is precisely what allows them to perform wholesome actions which benefits all beings.

Chapter 4: Dōgen 道元

Context of the Shōbōgenzō 正法眼藏

Since I have already briefly addressed some of the key events of Dōgen's life in Chapter 1, I will now focus on the context surrounding the writing of Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō.

After receiving official transmission of the Cáodòng 曹洞 (jp. Sōtō) lineage of Chán/Zen Buddhism from the thirteenth patriarch Rújìng 如淨 (jp. Tendō Nyōjō) on Mount Tiāntóng 天童 (jp. Tendō), Dōgen returned to Japan in 1227. There, he stayed at Kenninji, one of the Rinzai Zen temples founded by Eisai in 1202 with the support of Hōjō Masako. Dōgen had previously trained at Kenninji under Eisai's successor Myōzen 明全 (?-1225) between 1217 and 1223, and both of them actually left together to go to China in 1223. Unfortunately, Myōzen passed away shortly after Dōgen reached Mount Tiāntóng and Dōgen brought the relics of his old teacher back to the temple where he had been the abbot. Nevertheless, it is traditionally thought that while at Kenninji in 1227-1228, Dōgen wrote the 'General Insights into the Instructions for Sitting Meditation' (Fukan Zazen Gi 普觀坐禪儀)³⁰⁸ which would eventually be used to start teaching and disseminating Zen teachings in Japan³⁰⁹.

At this time, the Kamakura support of Rinzai Zen temples coupled with the spreading of the Pure Land traditions – and especially the True Tradition of the Pure Land (jp. Jōdō Shinshū 淨土真宗) of Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1263) – already had the Tendai abbots on edge. In this context, Dōgen's desire to bring about new teachings certainly increased the unease. This led various Tendai-affiliated temples to start persecuting followers of these new traditions that sought to separate from the control of Enryakuji, even sometimes going as far as threatening, attacking and burning their temples. Because of these tensions, in 1230, Dōgen left the Tendai-dominated Kyōto and settled down in the city of Uji 宇治. There, Dōgen wrote three texts between 1231 and 1233 which will eventually form the first three fascicles of what would later become Dōgen's major work, the Treasury of the True *Dharma* Eye or Shōbōgenzō. He eventually came back closer to

Kyōto in Fukakusa 深草 where he took up residence in a section of a temple complex, the Kannondoriin 觀音導利院, in 1233. Attracting more and more students, Kannondoriin would grow to become Japan's first truly independent³¹⁰ Zen temple, changing its name to Kōshōhōrinji 興聖法林寺, in 1236. The establishment and growth of Dōgen's community after 1233 made him put writing aside for about five years. The writing of the Shōbōgenzō resumed again in 1238, which started one of Dōgen's most productive period, producing forty-three fascicles in just five years.

However, the tensions with the Tendai community and other Rinzai Zen schools continued to grow. Traditional accounts mention that Dōgen and his disciples were heavily persecuted and his temple burned down, but modern scholarship contest these claims due to lack of archeological evidence and historical records³¹¹ written outside of Dōgen's own lineage. Regardless, Dōgen's growing community used the support of patron Hatano Yoshishige to relocate farther away from Kyōyo to the northern province of Echizen in 1243. There, Dōgen lectured and wrote twenty-nine fascicles at Yoshimineji 吉峯寺, the temporary location of his community during the construction of his own temple complex, Daibutsuji 大佛寺, which was completed in 1245. Dōgen lectured and wrote five fascicles between 1245 and 1246, before they decided to change the name of the complex to Eiheiiji 永平寺. During the last eight years of his life, he only wrote three fascicles.

Whether or not this was Dōgen's initial intention, the Shōbōgenzō would turn out to become Dōgen life's work. Indeed, the first fascicle entitled 'Endeavor of the Way' (Bendōwa 辨道話) was written in 1231³¹², while the last fascicle entitled 'Awakening of Eight Great Beings' (Hachi Dainin Gaku 八大人覺) was written in 1253, just eight month before his final breath. Moreover, there also exists twelve fascicles that do not have a dated colophon from Dōgen. Most of them consists of drafts written by Dōgen himself or lectures that his main disciples have transcribed throughout the years. For all of these additional fascicles, Dōgen did not – and, eventually, could not – revise them. This last point is important to mention because it became the source of many contentions following Dōgen's passing. Indeed, Dōgen himself constantly rearranged, revisited, and edited the ninety-six fascicles he wrote during his lifetime; but he never ended up with an official, finished product. It was his disciples who took charge of organizing and

editing his work, which led to what are now known as the four pre-modern versions of the *Shōbōgenzō*: the sixty-fascicles, the seventy-five-fascicles, the twelve fascicles, and the twenty-eight fascicles versions³¹³. These different versions supported the establishment of different sub-branches, each claiming authenticity in their competing claims for inheritance.

Because the *Shōbōgenzō* encompasses almost the entirety of Dōgen's life, it is possible to notice connections between his writings and different episodes of his life. For example, Dōgen's early journey led him to wander in the hopes of spreading the practice of sitting meditation (*zazen* 座禪) to as many people as possible; meaning his early writings have a more explanatory and guiding tone. On the other hand, as his life progressed, he became more and more dedicated to training a few serious Zen students; meaning his later writings have a more focused and diligent tone. Also, some believe that Dōgen's slower production pace during the last year (1244) of construction of the Daibutsuji complex reflects a depressive episode. This is inferred from his harsh critiques of the work of Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089-1163), the most dominant figure of the Línjì/Rinzai tradition of Chán/Zen Buddhism during the Sòng/Sō 宋 dynasty (960-1279).

Still, it is almost impossible to provide a satisfactory summary of the entire content of the *Shōbōgenzō*. My best attempt would be to simply state that it is a poetically written, extensive, explanatory, and diligent work of religious and philosophical thought which emphasizes the importance of Zen meditative practices while simultaneously providing guidelines regarding how to reach enlightenment through them – and what the experience of enlightenment might feel like. I believe it is also important to note that Dōgen himself never claimed to have started his own 'new' tradition called Sōtō Zen. However, the extensive connections to the Cáodòng/Sōtō tradition of Zen Buddhism – which he officially inherited and which permeates the *Shōbōgenzō* – made his posterity attribute to him the title of founder of the Sōtō Zen tradition in Japan.

Politics

The first section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries of Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*, selecting excerpts only on the topic of politics. To start off, in the very first fascicle entitled *Bendōwa*, Dōgen explains that:

國家に眞實の佛法弘通すれば、諸佛諸天ひまなく衛護するがゆゑに、王化太平なり。聖
化太平なれば、佛法そのちからをうるものなり。³¹⁴

Due to widely spreading the true Buddhadharma in the nation, multiple buddhas and multiple devas ceaselessly protect [it] as a result; there is the great peace of the ruler's benevolent influence. Due to there being the great peace of the ruler's benevolent influence, there are things that attain the power of the Buddhadharma.

Dōgen, in a similar way to Eisai, first frames the relationship between Buddhism and politics in terms of protection (*eigo* 衛護). Also in alignment with Eisai is Dōgen's proposition that protection is received from multiple buddhas and deities who grants such protection as a result of a leader widely spreading (*guzū* 弘通) the true (*shinjitsu* 眞實) *Buddhadharma*. Dōgen names this process as 'the great peace of the ruler's benevolent influence' (*ōka taihei* 王化太平). In other words, a benevolent leader is one who brings about great peace and harmony on their nation, which is achieved via receiving blessings and protection from the buddhas, bodhisattvas, and deities who grant them whenever a ruler spreads true Buddhism. A few paragraphs later, Dōgen expands on this point stating that:

佛法を國中に弘通すること、王敕をまつべしといへども、ふたたび靈嶽の遺囑をおもへば、いま百萬億刹に現出せる王公相將、みなともにかたじけなく佛敕をうけて、夙生に佛法を護持する素懷をわすれず、生來せるものなり。その化をしくさかひ、いづれのところか佛國土にあらざらむ。このゆゑに、佛祖の道を流通せむ、かならずしもところをえらび縁をまつべきにあらず、ただ、けふをはじめとおもはむや。³¹⁵

The event of widely spreading the Buddhadharma within the nation, even though [it] must wait for imperial decree – when remembering once more that [during] the testament of Vulture Peak – rulers, officials, counsellors and generals that now find themselves appearing in the 10 million lands, everyone jointly ended up gratefully receiving the Buddha’s teachings and, not forgetting the original wish that protected and preserve Buddhadharma in previous lives, are people that find themselves doing [so] innately. The realms that spread widely this influence [i.e. the teachings], which of these places do not become a Buddha Land? As a result of this, one should disseminate the Way of Buddha ancestors; there is no ‘[you] certainly must wait for conditions and select a place’. Again, why not desire to begin today?

This paragraph starts with an important specification: that spreading the *Buddhadharma* within a nation must happen only after an imperial decree (*ōji* 王勅) has been received. As mentioned earlier in my commentaries on Eisai’s work, it is common practice across Buddhism’s history that traditions were only allowed to proliferate within a nation after an official Imperial decree would be written that would allow them to implement themselves and expand their schools legally. Dōgen here explicitly agrees and encourages the perpetuation of such practice. Dōgen continues by explaining that any people in position of authority within any political apparatus of any nation are people that, in a previous life (*shukushō* 夙生), have made the original wish to protect and preserve (*goji* 護持) the *Buddhadharma* after receiving the Buddha’s teachings (*bucchoku* 佛敕) during one of Śākyamuni’s (the historical Buddha) assemblies on Vulture Peak (*reizan* 靈巖). This offers the same understanding as was found in the writings of Eisai, meaning a karmic-based theory of power in which leaders are in such positions of power because they are the inheritors of wholesome karmic imprints that are the result of a vow made in the past to the Buddha that they should protect and disseminate the *Buddhadharma*.

Similar to Eisai, Dōgen also mentions that leaders should find themselves innately (*shōrai* 生來) desiring to protect the *Buddhadharma*. The expression *shōrai* 生來 is here translated as ‘naturally’, ‘innately’, but a more exact reading would translate it as ‘from birth’. This is very indicative since, within the context of this *karmic* framework, one’s birth in a position of power is the result of a past vow regarding protection of the *Buddhadharma*. This means that a legitimate

leader should find themselves naturally desiring to protect and widely disseminate the *Buddhadharma*, precisely because this desire to protect is the core reason why they have received this particular privileged birth in this lifetime. Thus, this desire to protect is inherited ‘from birth’, and a leader should behave as such ‘innately’. In this sense, Dōgen is not merely describing the ways in which power is distributed. Indeed, he simultaneously is giving prescriptions for how a legitimate leader should rule. Another prescription for proper leadership is given in the last sentence where Dōgen posits that a leader should not wait for the right circumstances or timing to start propagating the *Buddhadharma* and instead should simply begin right away. He also encourages leaders to do so by reminding them that places who protect the *Buddhadharma* always become Buddha Lands (*bukkokudo* 佛國土) – a land where buddhas *can* appear to help beings towards liberation. In the fascicle ‘Continual Practice – Upper [Section]’ (*Gyōji-ue* 行持・上), Dōgen offers more prescriptions for legitimate leadership but, this time, in the form of a historical case:

武宗ののち、書記つひに還俗して即位す。武宗の癡佛法を癡して、宣宗すなはち佛法を中興す。宣宗は即位在位のあひだ、つねに坐禪をこのむ。未即位のとき、父王のくにをはなれて、遠地の谿澗に遊方せしとき、純一に辨道す。即位ののち、晝夜に坐禪すといふ。まことに父王すでに崩御す、兄帝また晏駕す、をひのために打殺せらる。あはれむべき窮子なるがごとし。しかあれども、勵志うつらず辨道功夫す、奇代の勝躑なり、天真の行持なるべし。³¹⁶

After Emperor Wuzong of Tang (814-846), secretary [Li Yi] returned to the laity and ascended to the throne [as Emperor Xuanzong of Tang (810-859)]. Disabling Emperor Wuzong’s persecution of the Buddhadharma, Emperor Xuanzong immediately restored the Buddhadharma. Emperor Xuanzong, during his time on the Imperial throne, always loved sitting meditation. At the time before ascending to the throne, [he] left the country of his ruling father and, at the time when [he] was wandering about in the mountain stream of a distant land, practiced the Way with purity. After ascending to the throne, it is said that [Xuanzong] practiced sitting meditation day and night. Truly, his ruling father passed away, his honorable older brother also passed away, and [he] had been beaten relentlessly as a result of his nephew. [He] was just like the poor son

that one should feel sorry for. Even so, [his] aspiration did not fade and [he] maintained dedication in the practice of the Way; it is undoubtedly an excellent example of strange times; it is undoubtedly the continual and careful practice of true suchness.

By bringing up the historical case of Emperor Xuanzong 宣宗, Dōgen is offering a clear example of an emperor who went out of his way to protect the *Buddhadharma*. Xuanzong's predecessor, Emperor Wuzong 武宗, was a devout Daoist ruler who considered Buddhism a foreign religion that was harmful for society. He was particularly concerned with the tax-exemption status of Buddhist temples which he perceived was a drain on the nation's economy. Over the course of his six year rule, Emperor Wuzong's persecution became more and more radical. At first, Emperor Wuzong forced Buddhist temples to turn over their wealth to the government, while also forcing numerous monks and nuns to return to lay life where they could contribute more meaningfully to society as tax-payers. Eventually, he sought to completely eradicate Buddhism by issuing an edict asking for the all 4600 Chinese Buddhist temples to be destroyed, that the temples' properties be confiscated, that all 260 500 monks and nuns lose their religious status, and that Buddhist imagery and ritual tools be destroyed³¹⁷. Even though Emperor Wuzong nearly succeeded in completely wiping out Buddhism from China's landscape, his death in 846 allowed for Emperor Xuanzong to take over the reins of government and quickly put an end to the persecutions.

However, it is important to note that Dōgen does not use this passage to show that Xuanzong is a proper leader only because of this protection of the *Buddhadharma*. In fact he spends most of this passage emphasizing how Xuanzong was himself a devout practitioner. More specifically, Dōgen praises Xuanzong for his aspiration (*reishi* 勵志) and dedication (*kanfū* 功夫) which did not fade despite the strange times (*kidai* 奇代) he lived in. This, Dōgen points out, is due to two key factors: (1) his 'love for sitting meditation' (坐禪をこのむ); and (2) the fact that he 'practiced the Way with purity' (純一に辨道す). We can once again see the importance of the interplay between the *kokoro* and purity as the two foundational basis for legitimate governance. Indeed, *kokoro* and purity allowed for Xuanzong to remain strong in his faith and practice throughout the persecutions. This, in turn, led him to eventually become Emperor and properly govern the Chinese nation by ensuring the protection and dissemination of the *Buddhadharma*.

Therefore, Dōgen does not offer the rule of Emperor Xuanzong as an example merely because of his actions in protecting and spreading Buddhist teachings. More importantly he uses him as an example to show that doing so must be done as a result of leader's pure heart. Dōgen expands on the relationship between legitimate governance, the heart, and purity in another fascicle entitled 'Valley Sounds, Mountain Forms' (Keisei Sanshoku 谿聲山色), where he states that:

かくのごとく懺悔すれば、かならず佛の冥助あるなり。心念身儀發露白佛すべし、發露のちから罪根をして銷殞せしむるなり。これ一色の正修行なり、正信心なり、正信身なり。³¹⁸

In this way, as a result of asking for repentance, it is said that there unmistakably is undiscernible divine protection from buddhas. It is advised to address the buddhas and confess with a devoted heart and a disciplined body; it is said that the power of confession causes the erasure of unwholesome roots that have been done. This is the one form of proper practice, it is the proper heart of faith, the proper body of faith.

This passage explains that undiscernible divine protection (*myōjo* 冥助) will unmistakably (かならず) be granted to a being that practices repentance (*sange* 懺悔). However, for repentance to be successful, it needs to be done with devoted heart (*shinnen* 心念) heart and a disciplined body (*shingi* 身儀). If repentance is done as such, all unwholesome roots (*zaikon* 罪根) will be erased. Now, unwholesome roots refer to what is 'behind' an action, and is key to understanding the relationship between *karma*, the heart and purity. Remembering our exploration of Eisai's Kōzen Gokoku Ron, we established that for an action to be wholesome, it has to be done with a pure heart and the framework of wholesome roots (*zenkon* 善根) and unwholesome roots explicitly describes what this pure heart consists of. In sum, wholesome roots are found in actions that are devoid of desire (*muton* 無貪), devoid of hatred (*mujin* 無瞋), and/or devoid of delusion (*muchu* 無痴); while unwholesome roots are found in actions tainted by desire (*ton* 貪), hatred (*jin* 瞋), and/or delusion (*chi* 痴). Thus, a heart that is pure means it does not contain any of the three unwholesome roots of desire, hatred and delusion. This, in turn, means that a being's action is going to be wholesome, and therefore it is going to manifest beneficial effects such as, in this case, receiving protection

from the buddhas. Dōgen here reminds his readers that one way to get rid of such unwholesome roots and attain purity – which eventually leads to receiving divine protection – is by devotedly engaging in repentance. Here, even though Dōgen does not explicitly mention it, it is important to remember that receiving divine protection and blessing is key to proper governance. Therefore, it is possible to infer that practicing repentance is something leaders should be actively doing. Another passage found in the fascicle ‘Merits of Leaving the Household’ (Shukke Kudoku 出家功德) emphasizes the importance of protection for leaders:

いまの諸王、轉輪聖王におよぶべからず。いたづらに光陰を貪欲の中にすごして出家せざるは、來世くやしからん。いはんや小國邊地は、王者の名あれども王者の徳なし、貪じてとどまるべからず。出家修道せば、諸天よろこびまぼるべし、龍神うやまひ保護すべし。³¹⁹

The various rulers of current times, cannot be comparable to wheel-turning sage rulers. Because [they] let days and nights pass in vain [caught] in [their] sensory desires and do not leave the household, posterity will be regretful. Even more so on this small nation and remote land, though the rulers have fame, the virtue of rulers is nonexistent; [they] lust insatiably and cannot stay put. As a result of cultivating the way and leaving the household, the various deities joyfully watch over and protect, and the divine serpents reverently safeguard and preserve.

Dōgen offers an explicit critique of the various rulers of his time who cannot compare to wheel-turning sage rulers (*tenrin jōō* 轉輪聖王). In Buddhism, the *Dharma* wheel (*hōrin* 法輪) refers to the innumerable teachings of buddhas and bodhisattvas, and a being who expounds such teachings is said to spin the *Dharma* wheel (*tenbōrin* 轉法輪). In this context, a wheel-turning sage ruler is thus simply a ruler who expounds the Buddhist teachings. Dōgen enumerates many reasons as to why the rulers of his times are not wheel-turning sage rulers, which can be summarized by saying that they do not act in accordance with the Buddhist precepts. However, an emphasis is put on problematizing them not ‘leaving the household’ (*shukke* 出家). Leaving the household is the expression used to describe a person who took ordination, thus becoming a monk or nun after formally receiving the precepts. Since entering monkhood traditionally required a person to leave

their house to live in the monastery or in recluse, to drop their family name, to shave their heads, to renounce worldly possessions, and so forth; it is called ‘leaving the household’. In other words, Dōgen specifically criticized leaders that do not take ordination and thus do not act in accordance with the precepts they would have vowed to fulfil if they did. He mentions two reasons as to why rulers not leaving the household is problematic. The first one mentions that ‘posterity will be regretful’ (來世くやしからん). This is because, as we have seen earlier, following the precepts helps a being purify their hearts, and having a purified hearts means that their actions are going to produce positive retributions in the future. Thus, a leader that, in the present, observes proper behaviour also shows care for future beings who will be the recipients of the positive retributions these wholesome actions will generate. The second reason is that a ruler entering monkhood and following the monastic code means their wholesome actions are going to make the various deities and the divine serpents (*ryūten* 龍神) to grant protection and blessings. Dōgen thus, once again, offers a clear example of how a legitimate leaders would behave; that is, it would leave the household to ensure that all beings in the present and future will receive protection and blessings from the various deities. Doing so also makes them act closer to the ideal of the wheel-turning sage king, who incessantly spins the *Dharma* wheel without obstruction for the sake of all beings. The fascicle ‘Thirty Seven Factors of Enlightenment’ (Sanjūshichihon Bodai Bunpō 三十七品菩提分法) contains another discussion on the topic of leaving the household which offers insights into Dōgen’s vision of power disparity. It explains that:

帝者の僧尼を禮拜するとき、僧尼答拜せず。僧天の出家人を拜するに、比丘比丘尼また
く答拜せず。これ出家の功德すぐれたるゆゑなり。³²⁰

At the times when an emperor pays reverence to monks and nuns, monks and nuns do not pay reverence back. When an assembly of deities pay reverence to people who left the household, monks and nuns again do not pay reverence back. The reason for this is that the merit of home-leaving is surpassing [all others].

This passage is straightforward and states that monks and nuns are superior to emperors (*teisha* 帝者) and even deities. This is because the merit generated by leaving the household surpasses all

others forms of merit. Dōgen unfortunately does not expand further on this point, but it is possible to infer why it might be the case based on the information we have collected so far. As we have seen in the works of Eisai and Dōgen, being reborn as a deity or as an emperor merely reflects the karmic ties a being has inherited from the past actions; but it is far from guaranteed that this being will follow the Buddhist teachings. Instead, they might simply choose to bathe in their inherited privileges and use them to satisfy their worldly desires at the expense of all beings under their responsibility. We also learned that since only wholesome actions made from a heart that has been purified leads to positive retributions, any being, regardless of their rebirths, needs to engage in the process of purification. Once again, being reborn an emperor or a deity does not mean that such beings are producing wholesome actions or are engaging in purification at all. However, monks and nuns do. That is because they are closely following the *Buddhadharma* as a result of having left the household. In other words, leaders who do not take ordination cannot receive reverence because they do not dedicate their lives to upholding and spreading the *Dharma* like monks and nuns do. They therefore cannot generate the amount of merit a legitimate leader *should* generate based on their karmic inheritance.

These two last passages are important because they explicitly presents a framework in which power and legitimacy is established based on the *Dharma* and not on (re)birth. In this case, Dōgen affirms that the standard for evaluating power and legitimacy is the merit that is generated by a living in accordance with *Dharma*, regardless of one's (re)birth or socio-political position. However, it is important to remember that merit is generated as a result of wholesome actions, which have their roots in the heart. This is why, in the fascicle 'Ancient Mirror' (Kokyō 古鏡), Dōgen starts by quoting that:

「日本國、神代より三鏡有り。璽と劍と、而も共に傳來して今に至る。一枚は伊勢大神宮に在り、一枚は紀伊國日前社に在り、一枚は内裏内侍所に在り」。³²¹

“On Japanese Land, since the age of the kami, there exists three mirrors. The seal and the sacred sword are additionally transmitted alongside them, reaching the current times. There is one at the Grand Shrine of Ise, there is one at the Hinokuma Shrine of Kii, and there is one at the household pavilion of the Imperial Palace”.

The first part of this passage quoted by Dōgen narrates a well-known story about Japanese imperial governance. This narrative stems from one of Japan's first written document, the *Nihon Shoki* 日本書記 (720), which states that Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 was sent to earth by his grandmother, the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神. Before sending him to earth, the sun goddess blessed three regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種神器) and gave these to him to bring to earth for protection and support. The three regalia are: (1) the seal (*ji* 璽) known as 'Eight-Foot String of Comma-Shaped Jewels' (*yasakani no magatama* 八尺瓊曲玉) which represents the ruler's virtue of benevolence; (2) the sword (*tsurugi* 劍) known as 'Grass-Cutting Sword' (*kusanagi no tsurugi* 草薙劍) or 'Heavenly Sword Gathering Clouds' (*ame no murakumo no tsurugi* 天叢雲劍) which represents the ruler's virtue of valour; and (3) the mirror (*kagami* 鏡) known as 'Eight-Span Mirror' (*yata no kagami* 八咫鏡) which represents the ruler's virtue of wisdom. Japan's first legendary emperor, Emperor Jinmu 神武, was said to be the great-grandson of Ninigi no Mikoto and he inherited the three regalia from his divine great-grandfather. Due to this, the regalia evolved to become the proof of an Emperor's divine powers as a direct descendant of the sun goddess herself, which in turn participated in legitimizing a future emperor's ascension to the throne. However, it is known that this narrative of legitimacy was not widely accepted by Japan's aristocrats even during ancient and medieval times since many emperors have ascended to the throne without possession of these regalia and competing narratives were used to legitimize their power³²². What is important here is Dōgen commentary:

しかあればすなはち、國家みな鏡を傳持すること、あきらかなり。鏡をえたるは國をえたるなり。人つたふらくは、この三枚の鏡は、神位とおなじく傳來せり、天神より傳來せりと相傳す。しかあれば、百練の銅も陰陽の化成なり。³²³

Indeed then, when the nation transmits and maintains all the mirrors, it is clear. When excelling at mirrors immediately there is excelling at the nation. Regarding the transmission [between] people, these three mirrors, [they] have been transmitted at the same [rank as] the rank of kami; [they] are inherited as [they] have been transmitted from the heavenly kami. Therefore, copper polished one hundred times, too, is a changing of yin and yang.

Surprisingly, Dōgen’s commentary and the passage he quotes proposes that there are actually three mirrors that are being transmitted through imperial succession and not just one. Nonetheless, what is more important here is the connection he makes between these mirrors and governance. Dōgen emphasises two key aspects of this connection: (1) clear-ness (*akiraka* あきらか); and (2) transmission (*denrai* 傳來). The first aspect is closely connected with purity, which Dōgen here presents in the form of polishing (*ren* 練). It is useful here to remember Eisai’s story which likened the process of removing dust on a mirror – i.e. polishing – to that of removing a being’s impurities for the sake of attaining enlightenment. ‘Clear-ness’, in Buddhist texts, is almost always used specifically within this context of removal of impurities. In fact, whether in Classical Japanese, Chinese or Sanskrit languages, ‘purity’ is *always* understood as the ‘clearing off’ of dust, mud, karmic imprints, delusions, and so forth. Clear-ness and purity are, linguistically, inseparable concepts.

That being said, Dōgen mentions in his commentary that clear mirrors means a clear nation; that when leaders excel at making mirrors clear, they also excel at maintaining the nation. This is because leaders are, then, excellent at bringing about purity – or at least ensuring purity is maintained. The second aspect also connects with purity even though its language is less explicit. Important to this discussion is Dōgen’s use of the term rank (*i* 位), which here qualifies the type of mirror that has been transmitted. Remember that the *Nihon Shoki* tell us that the three regalia have been transmitted directly from the sun goddess, which means these mirrors have a heavenly quality or ‘rank’ to them. What Dōgen highlights here is the importance of ensuring that the mirrors maintain that quality or ‘rank’ in their transmission. To do so, these mirrors need stay ‘clear’. If these mirrors were to become polluted, stained, dusty, etc. they would lose their heavenly ‘rank’ to become simple mirrors. If the divine ‘purity’ of such mirrors would be lost, along would be the divine powers they confer to the protector of the nation – i.e. the Emperor. In a sense, this passage could be read as a critique of the earlier-mentioned narrative which states that simply because a leader possesses the three regalia, they are legitimate to rule. Instead, Dōgen emphasizes that maintaining the purity of the mirrors is more important than the action of merely possessing the mirrors. That is because simply having these mirrors is meaningless if their ‘clear-ness’ or

‘heavenly-ness’ is lost during transmission. From this, it is clear that, for Dōgen, purity is more central to matters of politics and legitimacy than merely looking at leader’s possessions.

Even though there are only about fifteen passages which directly and explicitly discusses politics in the hundreds of pages of Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō*, it is easy to see in those scarce passages that Dōgen’s discussion of politics orbit around similar themes of Eisai’s. Most importantly, their work ultimately contain an almost identical belief system. First, both posit that, having inherited a position of power because of their karmic ties tracing back to an original vow made in front of the Buddha in past lifetimes, legitimate leaders are required to perform actions that will generate merit leading to the protection and support of all beings under their responsibility. Both also clarify that protection and blessing is generated from wholesome actions, which means they must have wholesome roots, which themselves are the result of having a pure heart. Thus, it is the duty and responsibility of legitimate rulers to not just disseminate and protect the *Buddhadharma*, but also to continuously engage in purification practices to ensure that they have the proper heart needed for legitimate leadership. Overall, despite religious differences between the two traditions, Dōgen is still incredibly consistent with Eisai when it comes to his theorizations of politics and legitimacy. Indeed, the passages pertaining to politics found in the *Shōbōgenzō* are also permeated with the same belief system that the purity of the heart of a leader – who is in position of leadership because of *karma* – is the key to legitimate governance.

With regards to *kokoro*, Eisai’s *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* primarily focused on explaining how *kokoro* is simultaneously the cause for discontent/suffering as well as the cause for enlightenment. The direction a being will go in either of those path is dependent on how much they have been able to purify their hearts of the karmic imprints they have inherited and generated in this current lifetime. He further added that Zen’s practices are made to help beings achieved exactly that. I now turn my attention to Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō* to explore what is his perspective with regards to *kokoro*.

The Heart

The second section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries of Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō, selecting excerpts only on the topic of *kokoro*. To start, Dōgen's fascicle 'Oneness of This Heart and the Buddha' (Sokushin Zebutsu 卽心是佛) mentions that:

いはゆる正傳しきたれる心といふは、「一心一切法、一切法一心なり」。[...] あきらかにしりぬ、心とは山河大地なり、日月星辰なり。しかあれども、この道取するところ、すすめば不足あり、しりぞくればあまれり。山河大地心は山河大地のみなり。さらに波浪なし、風煙なし。日月星辰心は日月星辰のみなり。さらにきりなし、かすみなし。生死去來心は生死去來のみなり。さらに迷なし、悟なし。牆壁瓦礫心は牆壁瓦礫のみなり。さらに泥なし、水なし。四大五蘊心は四大五蘊のみなり。さらに馬なし、猿なし。椅子拂子心は椅子拂子のみなり。さらに竹なし、木なし。³²⁴

A heart that has been spreading authentic transmission generally says: "one-heart of all dharmas, is all dharmas of one-heart." [...] It is certainly clearly understood that, what is called 'heart' is mountains, rivers and the great earth; it is sun, moon and celestial bodies. Even so, the matter of taking this path [is as such]: when progressing there is insufficiency, when withdrawing it overflows. The mountain-, river-, and the great earth-heart, is nothing but mountains, rivers, and the great earth. There are not even waves, there is not even wind dust. The sun-, moon-, and celestial bodies-heart is nothing but sun, moon and celestial bodies. There is not even fog, there is not even haze. The coming-and-going-of-life-and-death-heart is nothing but the coming and going of life and death. There is not even illusion, there is not even awakening. The wall-, tile-, and pebble-heart is nothing but walls, tiles and pebbles. There is not even mud, there is not even water. The Four Great [Elements]-, and the Five Aggregates-heart is nothing but the Four Great [Elements] and the Five Aggregates. There are not even horses, there are not even monkeys. The chair-, and fan-heart is nothing but chair and fan. There is not even bamboo, there is not even wood.

This poetically cryptic passage already offers important new insights as to what *kokoro* is. First of all, it is important to understand that Dōgen’s language does not say that a mountain ‘has’ a heart; rather, it mentions that there ‘is’ mountain-heart. This means that *kokoro* is not an attribute or characteristic a being possesses or not; it is simply as it is. Secondly, Dōgen’s numerous statements are reinforced by the constant usage of the adverbial particle ‘nothing but’ (*nomi* のみ). Thus, when Dōgen posits that there is mountain-heart, he also always specifies that mountain-heart is ‘nothing but’ mountain. In other words, you should not look anywhere else for the mountain-heart than the mountain as it is. The heart of the chair is not found in the fact that there is wood, bamboo, metal, or that it is curved, straight, or has four or twelve legs. You should not look anywhere else for the chair-heart than the chair as it is. Another component that shines through the text comes from the sentence Dōgen quotes, that: “one-heart of all *dharma*s, is all *dharma*s of one-heart”. Before going any further, it is important to clarify is that the word *Dharma* is used in multiple ways in Buddhism. The most common usage is that of ‘teaching’ and especially the Buddhist teachings. Sometimes *Dharma* is used and translated as ‘law’ and especially Buddhist Law, which would approximate the modern usage of terms like ‘natural law’ or the ‘laws of physics’. Since all of these are, fundamentally, simply different teachings stemming from different frameworks, *Dharma* as law and teaching is interchangeable. However, there is another usage of *Dharma* present in Buddhist teachings and it is used to mean phenomenon. The explanation for this is actually found in the quote Dōgen provides: “one-heart of all phenomena, is all phenomena of one-heart”. What this means is that – in the realm of absolute – all phenomena are ultimately one-heart; and this heart is Buddha.

To make the connection that ‘one-heart’ is ‘Buddha’, we need to remember that the name of the fascicle in which this passage is found is entitled ‘Sokushin Zebutsu’ 即心是佛 meaning ‘Oneness of this Heart and the Buddha’. This teaching was already encountered in Eisai’s *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*, when he stated that “the Zen school places [at its center] the established truth of ‘Oneness of this Heart and the Buddha’” (即心是佛を宗と爲し)³²⁵. I commented, then, that the teaching of *sokushin zebutsu* posits that the heart of any being and the heart of the Buddha are originally or primordially one. Therefore, the passage by Dōgen seeks to illuminate this teaching: that all-phenomena is one-heart, and this one-heart is Buddha; thus all-phenomena is Buddha.

With this passage, we come to understand that *kokoro* is not something that a being possesses, such as the various characteristics or qualities that can be named about a being; rather it simply is what a being is. Ultimately, what a being is – i.e. their *kokoro* – is Buddha. Thus: “one-heart of all phenomena, is all phenomena of one-heart”. It is precisely because the heart of all beings and the heart of the Buddha are originally one, that any being is able to attain Buddhahood; they always-already are Buddha. This, as Dōgen reminds us, includes mountains, rivers, chairs, sun, moon, elements, and so forth. Dōgen’s description of *kokoro* inevitably leads to a broader conversation surrounding sentience. Dōgen expands on this connection between *kokoro* and sentience in the fascicle ‘Buddha-Nature’ (Busshō 物性), where he explains that:

いま佛道にいふ一切衆生は、有心者みな衆生なり、心是衆生なるがゆゑに。無心者おなじく衆生なるべし、衆生是心なるがゆゑに。しかあれば、心みなこれ衆生なり、衆生みなこれ有佛性なり。草木國土これ心なり、心なるがゆゑに衆生なり、衆生なるがゆゑに有佛性なり。日月星辰これ心なり、心なるがゆゑに衆生なり、衆生なるがゆゑに有佛性なり。³²⁶

Now, when it comes to ‘all beings’ as called in the Buddha-Way, all those with heart are ‘sentient being’; thus it is ‘this heart is sentient beings’. Those not with heart are appropriately the same as sentient beings, thus it is ‘sentient beings are this heart’. Indeed, all heart is ‘sentient beings’; all sentient beings are ‘with Buddha-Nature’. Grass, trees, land, and earth, these are heart; because these are heart, they are sentient beings; because they are sentient beings, they are with Buddha-Nature. The sun, moon and stars, these are heart; because they are heart, they are sentient beings; because they are sentient beings, they are with Buddha-Nature.

Dōgen’s discussion of *kokoro* here revolves around the expression ‘all (sentient) beings’ (*issai shujo* 一切衆生). In Eurocentric frameworks, the heart is a key component that defines sentience and is directly related to the organ of the heart possessed by a sentient being. Within these frameworks this organ of the heart is what allows a being to be ‘alive’ (sentient) – whether physically, emotionally, spiritually, and so forth – in contrast to other things who are ‘not alive’ (non-sentient). This passage shows that, in Buddhism, *kokoro* is also a defining factor. However,

in this case, sentiency also applies to what Eurocentric frameworks would qualify as non-sentient, namely grass, trees, land, earth, sun, moon and stars. Dōgen proposes that the answer is found when looking at the interplay between *kokoro* and Buddha-Nature (*busshō* 佛性).

As we have seen in the last passage I translated and commented above, it is mandatory to remind ourselves that *kokoro* is not simply a quality that a being possessed, nor the organ of the heart, nor the seat of emotions and so forth; rather, it is what a being is. By Dōgen saying that ‘all those with heart are ‘sentient being’’ (有心者みな衆生なり), it means that everything that exists is, by default, necessarily sentient. He then says that ‘those not with heart are appropriately the same as sentient beings’ (無心者おなじく衆生なるべし) which means that they too, ultimately, are *kokoro* and therefore sentient. In the end, the discrimination between ‘sentient’ and ‘non-sentient’ completely falls apart and it becomes irrelevant to even make this distinction because every single being is *kokoro*. Dōgen expands on this by repeating the same teaching multiple times: ‘because they are heart, they are sentient beings; because they are sentient beings, they are with Buddha-Nature’ (心なるがゆゑに衆生なり、衆生なるがゆゑに有佛性なり). As we have seen in the previous passage, what a being is – i.e. *kokoro* – is Buddha.

Within Mahāyāna Buddhism, the term used to describe being-Buddha or Buddhahood is ‘Buddha-Nature’. Thus, any being that exists necessarily is *kokoro*; and since all *kokoro* is originally the same as Buddha, it means that they are ‘with Buddha-Nature’ (有佛性なり). In a sense, *kokoro* and Buddha-Nature are practically synonymous with each other as they both convey the same teaching: all beings are always-already Buddha and therefore all can and must attain enlightenment and liberation.

In short, discriminating between particular beings (sentient) as worthy or capable of liberation in contrast to others (non-sentient) who are not worthy or capable is thus contrary to the *Dharma*. This is important because whenever we encounter expressions such as ‘to guide all beings towards liberation or enlightenment’ such as in the Primordial Vow of the Bodhisattva, these statements actually refer to *all* beings in their totality. As Dōgen highlights, it also includes grass, trees, land, earth, mountains, chairs, elements, sun, moon and stars, etc. It includes *all* beings precisely because all beings are *kokoro*, meaning they are ‘with Buddha-Nature’. Dōgen presents

additional descriptions for *kokoro* in the fascicle ‘Arousing the Unsurpassed Heart’ (Hotsu Mujō Shin 發無上心) where he comments the following:

震旦初祖曰、「心心如木石。」

いはゆる心は心如なり。盡大地の心なり。このゆゑに自他の心なり。盡大地人および盡十方界の佛祖および天、龍等の心は、これ木石なり。このほかさらに心あらざるなり。³²⁷

The first ancestor of China [Bodhidharma] said, “Heart and mind, thus, trees and walls”.

It is generally said that the heart is ‘thus-heart’. It is the heart of the exhaustible great earth. As a result of this, it is the heart of self and other. Reaching the people of the exhaustible great earth, reaching the Buddha ancestors of the realms of the exhaustible ten directions, the heavens, as well as the heart and mind of divine serpents – these are trees and walls. It is said that other than this, it is absolutely not ‘heart’.

Dōgen comments on this quote from Zen Buddhism’s first patriarch Bodhidharma 菩提達磨 by mentioning, first, that *kokoro* is ‘thus-heart’. ‘Thus’ or ‘such’ (*nyo* 如) is used to translate the Sanskrit word *Tathā* तथा and it refers to absolute reality (*shinnyo* 眞如) or *Tathātā* तथाता, where things, beings, phenomena, etc. are experienced in their ‘thusness’ or ‘suchness’. Attaining enlightenment allows one to fully experience reality in its thusness since the heart is not tainted by the various impurities it has accumulated throughout multiple lifetimes. Before starting his commentary, Dōgen warns his readers that he will be talking about *kokoro* in its absolute sense of ‘thus-heart’ and not in the provisional, tainted sense. The following sentences posit that this ‘thus-heart’ reaches all things ranging from Buddhas, to human beings, to trees and wall. Even though provisional truths created by tainted minds and hearts lead to discrimination between mutually exclusive opposites such as Self (*ji* 自) and Other (*ta* 他), Dōgen reminds us that, in the realm of ultimate truth as experienced by enlightened-beings, all is *kokoro*. Anything other than this ‘thus-heart’, is not *kokoro*.

The acute reader will notice that in this passage, *kokoro* both means ‘heart’ and ‘mind’. Indeed, *kokoro* in East Asian languages does not mean ‘heart’ in the way it is conceptualized within Eurocentric frameworks. Dōgen clarifies the various meanings of *kokoro* in the fascicle ‘Arousing the Enlightened-Mind’ (Hotsu Bodaishin 發菩提心) by quoting that that:

「おほよそ、心三種あり。

一つには質多心、此の方に慮知心と稱ず。

二つには汗栗多心、此の方に草木心と稱ず。

三つには矣栗多心、此の方に積聚清要心と稱ず。」³²⁸

“In total, there are three kinds of hearts:

The first heart is ‘Citta (चित्त)’ – this one is alternatively called the ‘mind of discriminating knowledge’;

The second heart is ‘Hṛd (हृद्)’ – this one is alternatively called the ‘heart of grass and trees’;

The third heart ‘Vṛddha (वृद्ध)’ – this one is alternatively called the ‘heart-mind of coalescing pure essence’”.

To which he comments:

このなかに、菩提心をおこすこと、かならず慮知心をもちゐる。菩提は天竺の音、ここには道といふ。質多は天竺の音、ここには慮知心といふ。この慮知心にあらざれば、菩提心をおこすことあたはず。この慮知をすなはち菩提心とするにはあらず、この慮知心をもて菩提心をおこすなり。菩提心をおこすといふは、おのれいまだわたらざるさきに、一切衆生をわたさんと發願しいとなむなり。そのかたちいやしといふとも、この心をおこせば、すでに、一切衆生の導師なり。³²⁹

In this [quote], the arising of Enlightened-Mind, certainly uses the mind of discriminating knowledge. Bodhi बोधि is an Indian sound, here it is called 'enlightenment' or 'Way'. Citta चित्त is an Indian sound, here it is called 'mind of discriminating knowledge'. As a result of the non-existence of this mind of discriminating knowledge, the arising of Enlightened-Mind is not possible. It is not that this discriminating knowledge immediately produces Enlightened-Mind; rather it is that by means of this mind of discriminating knowledge that the Enlightened-Mind arises. What is called the arising of the Enlightened-Mind, it is to diligently strive towards fulfilling the Vow of intending to make all beings cross over [to the shore of enlightenment] before you will cross over. For example even if this person is called lowly, as a result of arising this heart-mind, undoubtedly, [they] are the guide of all beings.

Dōgen first uses a quote to describe the three ways in which *kokoro* is linguistically used. The first usage complies with the Sanskrit work Citta चित्त, transliterated as *chita* 質多 in Japanese, and translated in English as 'mind'. The quote explains that this first usage refers to the 'mind of discriminating knowledge' (*ryōchishin* 慮知心), meaning a being's intellectual faculty where knowledge is produced out of cognition. The second usage complies with the Sanskrit work Hṛd हृद्, transliterated as *karita* 汗栗多 in Japanese, and translated in English as 'heart'. The quote explains that this second usage refers to the 'heart of grass and tress' (*kusakishin* 草木心), which can mean either the heart organ or a being's existence as we have seen in the passages translated earlier. The third usage complies with the Sanskrit work Vṛddha वृद्ध, transliterated as *irita* 矣栗多 in Japanese, and often translated in English as 'spirit'. The quote explains that this third usage refers to the 'heart-mind of coalescing pure totality' (*shakujuseiyōshin* 積聚清要心), meaning the summary of all aspects of a being condensed into one single pure element. Dōgen does not provide any clarification on this third usage, but my interpretation is that this refers to Buddha-Nature³³⁰.

In his commentary, Dōgen explains that when a being arouses the Enlightened-Mind (jp. *bodaishin* 菩提心; skt. Bodhicitta बोधिचित्त), they do so by means *kokoro* as Citta, or the 'mind of discriminating knowledge'. Discriminating knowledge, in Buddhism, refers to a function of the mind which distinguishes between two things as being opposite or mutually exclusive.

Discrimination or distinction happens because the mind conceptualizes its experiences through the problematic framework of self-nature (*jishō* 自性) instead of the truth of dependant co-origination. Whenever a being realizes that conceptualizing the world through the discriminating framework of self-nature is the source of discontent/suffering for all beings, they arouse the Enlightened (Bodhi)-Mind (Citta); which is the event of the proclamation of the Bodhisattva Vow. Dōgen reminds his readers that this Vow consist of intending to diligently and devotedly work towards alleviating suffering for all beings and not attaining cessation for oneself before all beings have attained cessation for themselves. In other words, without having first awakened to the existence and causes of suffering, a being cannot compassionately strive to alleviate suffering for others. Enlightenment, then, has as its foundation the ‘mind’ because it overcomes the problematics of the ‘mind’. Indeed, without a ‘mind’ to overcome, there could not be an Enlightened-‘Mind’. A few paragraphs later, Dōgen emphasizes that:

あきらかにしるべし、佛祖の學道、かならず菩提心を發悟するをさきとせりといふこと。これすなはち佛祖の常法なり。³³¹

It must be clearly known that, the path of learning of the Buddha ancestors, [it] says without a doubt that the realization of the Enlightened-Mind is being made a priority. These are the invariable dharmas of the buddha ancestors.

With this, it is clear that Dōgen is unequivocal in affirming that *kokoro* is key to Buddhism as a whole. Indeed, every teaching of every Buddha ancestors (*busso* 佛祖) of the entirety of the Mahāyāna tradition orbits around the figure of the bodhisattva; and this fascicle clearly explains that attaining bodhisattvahood as its roots in arousing a particular manifestation of *kokoro* in the form of the Enlightened-Mind. Still, this fascicle also underlined that *kokoro* is more than what simply pertains to matters of the mind. In fact, *kokoro* is also simultaneously the material, provisional manifestation of a being, as well as its absolute manifestation as Buddha-Nature. Indeed, the simultaneous encapsulation of mind, body and Buddha-Nature under the designation of *kokoro* makes it an extensive, all-pervasive and almost omnipresent aspect of Buddhist teachings. Nonetheless, Eisai reminded us that *kokoro* is the key factor for wholesomeness as well as unwholesomeness alike. Since the source of suffering and cessation alike is *kokoro*, numerous

Buddhist teachings focus their attention specifically not just on *kokoro* as a whole, but rather on attaining specific kinds of heart and move away from other kinds of hearts. For example, in the fascicle ‘Paying Reverence and Obtaining the Marrow’ (Rahai Tokuzui 禮拜得髓) Dōgen states that:

髓をうること、法をつたふること、必定して至誠により、信心によるなり。誠心ほかよりきたるあとなし、内よりいづる方なし。³³²

The event of obtaining the marrow – the event of transmitting the Dharma – is inevitably based on devotion; it is based on a heart of faith. There are no traces that comes from anywhere else than a devoted heart, there are no direction that goes out from within [oneself?].

Obtaining the marrow (*nazuki* 髓), is an important expression in the Zen tradition that narrates the event of official *Dharma* transmission from master to disciple. In this case, it specifically refers to the official transmission of the Chán/Zen tradition from the first patriarch Bodhidharma to Huikē 慧可 (487-593), Bodhidharma’s successor and considered the second patriarch of this tradition. Dōgen here highlights that official transmission of the *Dharma* from master to disciple is based on one factor: *kokoro*. However, what matter is not just the existence of *kokoro*, but rather the manifestation of a particular kind of *kokoro*. In this case, Dōgen tells his readers that *Dharma* transmission happens as a result of a devoted heart (*seishin* 誠心), also called a heart of faith (*shinjin* 信心). However, this is far from the only example where the devoted heart is the key factor in determining positive outcomes. Indeed, in the fascicle ‘Arousing the Unsurpassed Heart’ (Hotsu Mujō Shin 發無上心), Dōgen writes:

四大五蘊をめぐらして誠心に修行すれば得道す、草木牆壁をめぐらして誠心に修行せん、得道すべし。³³³

As a result of turning the four great elements and the five aggregates and practicing by means of a devoted heart, there is attainment of the Way. Turning around grass, trees, and walls and practicing by means of a devoted heart; it is only appropriate that there will be attainment of the Way.

In the fascicle ‘’ (Jishō Zanmai 自證三昧), Dōgen writes:

他のために法をととき法を修するは、生生のところに法をきき法をあきらめ、法を證するなり。今生にも法をたのためにとく誠心あれば、自己の得法やすきなり。³³⁴

As for explaining dharmas and practicing dharmas for the sake for others, [this] is hearing dharmas, clarifying dharmas, and awakening dharmas birth after birth. As a result of having a devoted heart that explains dharmas for the sake of others in this lifetime, attaining dharmas for oneself is untroubled.

In the fascicle ‘’ (Kuyō Shobutsu 供養諸佛), Dōgen quotes:

「此の六心を以て、是れ少物なりと雖も、三寶に供養すれば、能く無量無邊の功德を獲しむ。何に況んや其の多からんをや。」³³⁵

“By means of these six hearts, even though they are small things, as a result of making offerings to the Three Jewels, immeasurable and unlimited merits will be obtained. How much more so if there are many of these!”

He comments on this quote saying that:

かくのごとくの供養、かならず誠心に修設すべし。諸佛かならず修しきたりましますところなり。³³⁶

Offerings to the buddhas like this, without fail [they] must be practiced and cultivated by means of a devoted heart. This without fail is a thing that exists as a custom in the practices of the various buddhas.

All of these passages clearly emphasize the central role of *kokoro*. Whether speaking of transmission of teachings, obtaining merits, practicing offerings to the buddhas and bodhisattvas, having one’s path be unobstructed, and even attaining enlightenment; all of these positive results happens as a result of *kokoro*. For Dōgen, for beneficial outcomes to result from a being’s actions,

it is especially important for *kokoro* to be filled with devotion (*shisei* 至誠). However, devotion is not the only shape *kokoro* can take that leads to positive outcomes. For example, in the fascicle ‘Bodhisattvas’ Four Methods of Attracting People Over’ (Bodaisatta Shishōhō 菩提薩埵四攝法), Dōgen mentions that:

愛語といふは、衆生をみるにまづ慈愛の心をおこし、顧愛の言語をほどこすなり。[...] 徳あるはほむべし、徳なきはあはれむべし。愛語をこのむよりは、やうやく愛語を筋長するなり。しかあれば、ひごろしられずみえざる愛語も現前するなり。現在の身命の存ぜらんあひだ、このんで愛語すべし、世世生生にも不退轉ならん。おほよそ暴悪の言語なきなり。怨敵を降伏し、君子を和睦ならしむること、愛語を根本とするなり。むかひて愛語をきくは、おもてをよろこばしめ、こころをたのしくす。むかはずして愛語をきくは、肝に銘じ、魂に銘ず。しるべし、愛語は愛心よりおこる、愛心は慈心を種子とせり。愛語よく廻天のちからあることを學すべきなり、ただ能を賞するのみにあらず。³³⁷

As for what is called loving speech; when seeing all beings, immediately, a heart of loving kindness arises, and there is dissemination of words of loving consideration. [...] If there is virtue, one must compliment; if there is no virtue, one must feel pity. By starting to choose loving speech, little by little there is an expansion of loving speech. Indeed, for many days there will be the manifestation before one’s eyes of loving speech that has never even been known and has never even come to appear before. While the bodily life of this present time seems to continue existing, one must keep choosing and practicing loving speech, world after world, birth after birth, there should be non-regression. There is a complete absence of words of violent disposition. The circumstances that causes the subjugation of enemies and the reconciliation of rulers; the root is in the practice of loving speech. If hearing loving speech while meeting face to face [with someone], [it] causes a face to rejoice, [it] causes a heart to be delighted. If hearing loving speech while not meeting face to face [with someone], [it] is deeply engraved in a heart, [it] is deeply engraved in the spirit. It must be known that, loving speech arises from a loving heart; as for the loving heart, the seed is produced by compassionate heart. The fact that loving speech has the power of completely turning the heavens must be studied and practiced; it is not simply just about rewarding talent.

This lengthy passages is a good indication of how a particular manifestation of *kokoro* generates an ever-unfolding chain of wholesome actions and events benefiting all beings. Here, Dōgen starts by speaking of a heart of loving kindness (*jiai no kokoro* 慈愛の心) that originates naturally simply as a result of seeing all beings. Originating a heart of loving kindness results in the ‘dissemination of words of loving consideration’ (顧愛の言語をほどこす). This means that when a being sees virtue in another being, they should compliment them. However – and most importantly – if a being does not see virtue in another being, they should not reprimand, discriminate, or feel anger; instead, they should feel sorry for and pity this other being. Producing the wholesome action of complimenting or pitying another over the unwholesome action of reprimanding or having envy is what is called ‘loving speech’ (*aigo* 愛語). In loving speech, ‘there is a complete absence of words of violent disposition’ (おほよそ暴悪の言語なきなり). Dōgen elaborates to show that it only takes one event of loving speech for loving speech to continue expanding beyond the boundaries of initial action. Indeed, in the moment where loving speech is being offered, it will make the heart of another being rejoice and be delighted. However, after the event happened, when both beings split to go their own ways, these loving words will stay engraved in the being’s heart and spirit. The result is that the initial recipient of loving speech will then go on to spread words of loving consideration to other beings, and so on. Thus, from one act of loving speech, innumerable act of loving speech can originate. Dōgen goes as far as stating that the ‘circumstances that causes the subjugation of enemies and the reconciliation of rulers; the root is in the practice of loving speech’ (怨敵を降伏し、君子を和睦ならしむること、愛語を根本とするなり). Even more, ‘loving speech has the power of completely turning the heavens’ (愛語よく廻天のちからある). In this sense, loving speech is not simply an action that all beings should do, but it also acts as a prescription for rulers on how to properly rule. Dōgen reminds his readers that choosing and practicing loving speech should not be a single-time event, but rather a choice a being makes ‘world after world, birth after birth’ (世世生生).

Still, just as other wholesome actions which generates positive outcomes, the action of loving speech is first initiated by the proper kind of heart. This is why Dōgen finishes this passage stating that ‘loving speech arises from a loving heart; as for the loving heart, the seed is produced

by compassionate heart' (愛語は愛心よりおこる、愛心は慈心を種子とせり). Even though Dōgen does not explicitly mention it in this passage, it is important to note that this compassionate heart (*jishin* 慈心) refers to the heart of great compassion (*daijishin* 大慈心) of a bodhisattva. This heart of great compassion arises alongside the Enlightened-Mind and is the source of the Original Vow of the bodhisattva who vows to remain in the cycle of transmigration solely for the sake of liberating all beings from discontent/suffering and guide every being towards attaining enlightenment. Indeed, a bodhisattva vows to do so as a result of the origination of a heart of great compassion. Thus, similarly to the earlier discussions surrounding a heart of devotion, Dōgen once again underlines that true loving speech – and all of its positive benefits for all beings – takes place only when a particular kind of heart originates in the first place.

All in all, the numerous passages pertaining to *kokoro* found throughout Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō provide deeper insights than Eisai's Kōzen Gokoku Ron not just regarding what *kokoro* is, but also by more precisely describing the ways in which *kokoro* operates. There are generally three fundamental insights regarding *kokoro* that consistently shone through Dōgen writings.

Firstly, the passages I translated demonstrate that understanding *kokoro* requires us to expand the definition of *kokoro* beyond the meaning of heart as understood in the modern Eurocentric sense of the organ of the heart or the seat of emotions. Instead, *kokoro* is an all-encompassing expression that encapsulate a plethora of meaning ranging from the organ of the heart, emotions, mind, thoughts, spirit, Buddha-Nature, etc. Dōgen also pointed to the teaching of *sokushin zebutsu* to clarify that, in the ultimate sense, *kokoro* is not something that a being possesses, such as the various characteristics or qualities that can be named about a being; rather it simply is what a being is. Ultimately, what a being is – i.e. their *kokoro* – is Buddha.

Secondly, Dōgen emphasized that *kokoro* (as mind) is the means by which a being originates an Enlightened-Mind and a heart of great compassion, which leads to the event of the proclamation of the Bodhisattva Vow. Dōgen also reminded his readers that this Vow consists of intending to diligently and devotedly work towards alleviating suffering for all beings and not attaining cessation for oneself before all beings has attained cessation for themselves.

Lastly, all of Dōgen’s passages are unequivocal in affirming that *kokoro* is, in one way or another, fundamental to (Zen) Buddhism. Similarly to Eisai, Dōgen also affirmed that since the source of discontent/suffering and cessation alike is *kokoro*, numerous Buddhist teachings focus their attention on teaching how to attain specific kinds of heart while and move away from other kinds of hearts. Even though the Shōbōgenzō more specifically focused on the Enlightened-Mind, the heart of devotion or faith, the heart of loving kindness and the heart of great compassion, ultimately all of these passages showed that wholesome actions find their root in the manifestation of particular kinds of *kokoro*. Since wholesome actions are the cause for positive retributions, this means that leaders *must* ensure they generate of the proper kinds of hearts needed for actions to be wholesome because this ensures that positive benefits for oneself and all beings under their leadership will result. In other words, a legitimate leader is one that manifests the right kinds of hearts.

As we have seen in Eisai’s Kōzen Gokoku Ron, expressions such as “the right kinds of hearts”, “the proper heart”, and so forth, are oftentimes directly related with discussions of purity. However, the Kōzen Gokoku Ron unfortunately did not offer a lot of passages which expands what is meant by purity and how it fits into the broader Buddhist framework. This is not the case with Dōgen, who provides numerous and deeper insights into purity and especially purification practices.

Purity

The third section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries of Dōgen’s Shōbōgenzō, selecting excerpts only on the topic of purity. The first passage pertaining to purity I would like to highlight is found in the fascicle ‘Valley Sounds, Mountain Forms’ (Keisei Sanshoku 谿聲山色). I am starting with this passage because of its explicit connection with the previous section on *kokoro*. It posits the following:

又、心も肉も、懈怠にもあり、不信にもあらんには、誠心をもはらして前佛に懺悔すべし。恚麼するとき前佛懺悔の功德力、われをすくひて清淨ならしむ。この功德、よく無礙の淨信精進を生長せしむるなり。淨信一現するとき、自他おなじく轉ぜらるるなり。

その利益、あまねく情非情にかうぶらしむ。³³⁸

Again, in heart and in flesh, even if there is negligence, even if there is no faith, [you] should clear away [your] devoted heart and ask for repentance before the buddhas. At the time of doing so in this way, the meritorious power of asking for repentance before the buddhas saves [you] and causes [you] to be purified. This merit, it is said to cause the good growth of unobstructed vigour and pure faith. At the time when pure faith first manifest, it is said that Self and Other cannot help but find themselves spontaneously falling over equivalently. This benefit, it causes the complete covering of sentient and non-sentient universally.

In the ‘Politics’ section of this chapter, I translated a passage from this same fascicle which explained that repentance uproots all unwholesome roots and leads to receiving protection from buddhas and bodhisattvas. I concluded, then, that repentance is a practice that must be cultivated by leaders since part of their responsibility as leader is precisely to act in ways that makes it possible for their followers/subjects to receive blessing and protection from the buddhas and bodhisattvas. In this current passage, Dōgen expands on this matter by stating that the merit of asking for repentance before buddhas and bodhisattvas leads a practitioner to become purified. This, in turn, causes the growth of unobstructed (*muge* 無礙) vigour (*shōji* or *shōjin* 精進) and pure faith. When pure faith manifests, this enables a being to experience the falling-off (*tenze* 轉ぜ) of the Self and Other of all beings. This falling-off of Self and Other refers to a being’s awakening the truth of dependent co-origination – the destruction of the concept of the self-existence of beings – and therefore the truth that all beings is, ultimately, Buddha-Nature. Knowing that repentance results in receiving blessings and protection and that repentance makes a being become purified, it is reasonable to infer that blessings and protection are granted precisely to beings who have been purified. This would mean that purity is the determining factor as to whether blessings and protection are granted or not. In fact, Dōgen’s passage points to this when stating that merits are received ‘even if there is negligence, even if there is no faith’ (懈怠にもあ

り、不信にもあらんには). In this sense, a being can have strong devotion or they can be weak in their faith and negligent in their practices; still, none of these are the determining factors as to whether merits are going to be received. Indeed, protection and blessings are going to be granted only as a result of attaining purity which, in this example by Dōgen, can be attained via repenting before buddhas and bodhisattvas. The centrality of purity to Buddhism is highlighted further by Dōgen in the fascicle ‘Washing the Face’ (Senmen 洗面) where he emphasizes that:

三毒四倒いまだのぞこほらざれども、清浄の功德たちまちに現前するは佛法なり。³³⁹

Although still desiring to break down the Three Poisons and Four Inversions, instantaneously manifesting before one's eyes the merits of purity is the Buddhadharma.

Here, Dōgen states that the *Buddhadharma* consists specifically of manifesting the merits of purity. In other words, Buddhist teachings guide beings in attaining purity. When purity is attained, various merits manifests which will benefit oneself as well as all beings. Even though a being might still be on the path of learning to rid themselves of the Three Poisons (*sandoku* 三毒) – desire, hatred and delusion – or the Four Inversions (*shitō* 四倒) – mistaking impermanence for permanence, mistaking suffering for happiness, mistaking no-Self with Self, and mistaking impurity for purity – if such being is able to manifest the merits of purity, then this being manifests the *Buddhadharma*. Another passage found in the fascicle ‘Cleansing’ (Senjō 洗浄) offers a similar emphasis when stating:

佛祖の道場かならずこの威儀あり。佛祖道場中人、かならずこの威儀具足あり。これ自己の強爲にあらず、威儀の云爲なり。諸佛の常儀なり、諸祖の家常なり。ただ此界の諸佛のみにあらず、十方の佛儀なり、浄土穢土の佛儀なり。³⁴⁰

In the practice place of Buddha ancestors certainly this conduct [of cleansing] exists. The people within the practice place of Buddha ancestors, [they] certainly are endowed with this conduct.

This does not exist in the forceful actions of the Self; [rather] it is the sayings and doings of conduct. It is the perpetual etiquette of the various buddhas; it is the ordinary custom of various ancestors. Similarly, it is not specifically [the etiquette of] this world's various buddhas; it is the

etiquette of the buddhas of the ten directions; it is the etiquette of the buddhas of Pure Lands and Impure Lands.

Dōgen demonstrates that cleansing (*senjō* 洗淨) is not simply a conduct that people should engage with in their practice spaces. More than that, cleansing is the ‘perpetual etiquette of the various buddhas’ (諸佛の常儀なり) of all realms. Put simply, what buddhas *do* is cleanse. Therefore, purifying or cleansing is not just merely part of the Buddhist teachings; rather, purifying or cleansing is Buddhism. Dōgen furthers his explanation of purity again in the fascicle ‘Washing the Face’ (Senmen 洗面) where he mentions that:

しかあれば、身心を澡浴して香油をぬり、塵穢をのぞくは第一の佛法なり。新淨の衣を著する、ひとつの淨法なり。塵穢を澡浴し、香油を身に塗するに、内外俱淨なるべし。

内外俱淨とき、依報正報、清淨なり。³⁴¹

Thus, washing and cleansing the body-mind – the rubbing perfumed oils and the removal of dust - it is the supreme Buddhadharma. Wearing new and clean garments; it is the one pure Dharma.

When washing and cleansing dust, applying perfumed oil all over the body, both inside and outside appropriately will become pure. At the time of purity of both inside and outside, conditioned retributions and exact retributions become pure.

This is important for two reasons. First of all, once again, Dōgen unmistakably affirms that purity is the *Buddhadharma*. However, this passage also clarifies purity as the deed of ‘washing and cleansing the body-mind’ (身心を澡浴して). I previously clarified that in classical Asian languages, purity is always understood as the removal of dusts, stains, mud, dirtiness, or any form of defilement. Dōgen reflects this when explicitly connecting purity with practices such as rubbing perfumed oils on one’s body (香油をぬり) after taking a bath, removing dust (塵穢をのぞく), or simply wearing new and clean garments (新淨の衣を著する). He also explains that when performing these purifying practices on the material or outside (*soto* 外) world, a being’s psychological and spiritual or inner (*uchi* 内) world is also purified simultaneously. This passage thus opens the door to a discussion regarding the fact that purity might not necessarily be a state

of being that is inherently present in all things, but rather it seems to be a state that is attained as a result of particular actions in which the cleansing of defilements takes place. Secondly, Dōgen – like Eisai – connects his discussion of purity with *karma*. This takes place in the last sentence where he explains that when purity of the inside and outside is attained, conditioned retributions (*ehō* 依報) and exact retributions (*shōhō* 正報) also become pure. Within Buddhist karmic-based frameworks, a being's (re)birth is influenced by the karmic ties and imprints they inherited from actions that have been produced in a past births. The circumstances in which a being is born for their present lifetime such as land, nation, family, environment, etc. are called 'conditioned retributions'; while the specific characteristics of the being itself such as the kind of body, personality, intelligence, etc. are called 'exact retributions'. Therefore, cultivating purifying practices in one's life is not merely for the sake of ensuring that a being's material, psychological and spiritual spheres are untainted. Indeed, they is also serve the purpose of getting rid of one's karmic ties and imprints so a person can further their advancement into the Buddhist path with greater ease in the present as well as future (re)births.

Before exploring further this connection between purity and *karma*, it is important to engage with the first aspect of this passage pertaining to whether purity is a state of being inherent to all things or whether it is the result of particular actions. There are two passages where Dōgen answers this matter straightforwardly. The first one is found in the fascicle 'Cleansing' (*Senjō* 洗淨) and states:

水かならずしも本淨にあらず、本不淨にあらず。身かならずしも本淨にあらず、本不淨にあらず。諸法またかくのごとし。水いまだ清非清にあらず、身いまだ清非清にあらず、諸法またかくのごとし。佛世尊の説、それかくのごとし。しかあれども、水をもて身をきよむるにあらず。佛法によりて佛法を保任するにこの儀あり。これを洗淨と稱ず。³⁴²

In water certainly there is no primordial purity at all, there is no primordial non-purity. In the body certainly there is no primordial purity at all, there is no primordial non-purity. The various dharmas truly are just like this. In water there is no purity and non-purity yet, in the body there is

no purity and non-purity yet; the various dharmas truly are just like this. The teachings of the World-Honored Buddha; it is just like this. Even so, it is not that water is employed to purify the body. Upon fulfilling the duty of Buddhadharma by means of Buddhadharma, [then] this proper etiquette exist. This is called 'cleansing'.

The second passage is found in the fascicle 'Washing the Face' (Senmen 洗面) and expounds:

これすなはちただ水をきたしすすぎてのち、そのあとは清浄なるとのみしるべきにあらず。水なにとして本浄ならん、本不浄ならん。本浄本不浄なりとも、來著のところをして浄不浄ならしむといはず。ただ佛祖の修證を保任するとき、用水洗滌、以水澡浴等の佛法つたはれり。これによりて修證するに、浄を超越し、不浄を透説し、非浄非不浄を説落するなり。³⁴³

After bringing about washing with ordinary water, even if there is cleanliness afterwards there is no absorbing and understanding. How is water primordially pure? How is [it] primordially impure? Even if there is primordial purity and/or primordial non-purity, it is not said that it causes purity or non-purity in the place of arrival. Similarly, at the time of preserving the practice-realization of Buddha ancestors, the Buddhadharma of such things like 'the task of washing with water' and 'washing by means of water' have been transmitted. As a result of this when practice-realization happens, there is the surpassing of purity, there is the passing through of non-purity, and there is the falling off of no purity and no non-purity.

For Dōgen, it is clear that there is no such thing as primordial purity (*honjō* 本浄) or primordial impurity (*honfujō* 本不浄). It is important here to remember that the Buddhist framework of dependent co-origination leading to the truth of emptiness of Self-existence dismisses the thought that all phenomena/beings have any sorts in inherent characteristics, essences, natures, souls, etc. which are the source of the problematic construction beings' Self-ness. This means that nothing can be intrinsically pure or impure; rather purity and impurity are states that beings can become through their actions and interactions with the world. This said, Dōgen engages with the question as to whether water as primordial purity because water is oftentimes used in actions that leads to

cleansing such as taking a bath or washing clothes. He explains that cleansing happens not due to the fact that water is used and is inherently pure, but rather because the etiquette of cleansing of *Buddhadharma* is being made manifest through a being's actions. In other words, it is not that a thing that has inherent purity is used to cleanse something that is inherently impure. Instead, it is about awakening to the Buddha-Nature of yourself and other beings through generating the conduct of buddhas in one's actions with others. Since Dōgen already established that cleansing is what buddhas do, then, cleansing is also what followers of the Buddhist path must do. Put differently, the cleansing practices found in the *Buddhadharma* are skillful means used to help a being realize the truth of Emptiness and Buddha-Nature of all beings, which results in 'the surpassing of purity' (浄を超越し), 'the passing through of non-purity' (不浄を透説し) and 'the falling off of no purity and no non-purity' (非浄非不浄を説落する). Because these skillful means help in guiding all beings towards Enlightenment, it is important that these practices continue to be transmitted as such, which is why the various buddha ancestors – and Eisai and Dōgen – always place purity and purification at the core of their teachings even though the ultimate goal is to let go of such problematic dichotomous categorizations.

Let us now return to important topic of the connection between *karma* and purity. Dōgen extrapolates on this matter again in the fascicle 'Washing the Face' (Senmen 洗面), saying:

いはゆる佛佛祖祖、嫡嫡正傳する正法には、澡浴をもちゐるに、身心内外、五臓六腑、依正二報、法界虚空の内外中間、たちまちに清浄なり。香花をもちゐてきよむるとき、過去、現在、未來、因縁行業、たちまちに清浄なり。³⁴⁴

It is generally said by buddhas and ancestors that, within the correct Dharma that has been authentically transmitted from heir to heir, when complying with washing and cleansing happens, the inside and outside of the body-mind, the five viscera and six internal organs, the two conditioned and exact retributions, the inside, outside and in-betweens of the Dharma realm and vacuity, are instantaneously pure. At the time purifying using incense and flowers the karmic activity of causes and effects of the past, present, and future are instantaneously pure.

The previous two passages pertaining to primordial purity/impurity help shine light on this passage. Indeed, once we realize that washing and cleansing is not about taking something pure (like water) to wash something impure (like dust), it is then possible to understand how washing one's clothes results in purification of the inside, outside and the in-between of the entire *Dharma* realm (*hōkai* 法界). That is because cultivating the buddhas' conduct of cleansing helps in awakening to the truth of Buddha-Nature and Emptiness of all beings which, when realized, makes a being see that the entirety of all beings are not pure or impure, or not Self or Other, or not any other form of dichotomous discrimination anymore. In a way, we can say that the entirety of all beings have thus been 'purified' of their provisional truths and now dwell in ultimate reality. When dwelling in ultimate reality attained through cultivating purifying and cleansing practices, all karmic imprints and ties generated in the past (*kako* 過去), present (*genzai* 現在) and future (*mirai* 未來) also simultaneously fall away; they are purified.

Overall, Dōgen's passages pertaining to the topic of purity provides us with in three important insights: (1) in the ultimate sense, there is no such thing as intrinsic purity/impurity in beings; (2) still, purification practices are provisionally useful as skillful means – which is why they permeate all of Buddhist teachings – and serve the purpose of manifesting the buddhas' conduct of cleansing in a being's actions; (3) doing so guide beings in realizing the truth of Buddha-Nature and Emptiness which, once attained and manifested, allows for all beings to dwell in ultimate reality, free from karmic ties and imprints, because all discriminatory provisional truths (such as purity and impurity) have been destroyed.

To summarize, Dōgen's discussion on purity helps us understand that, in Buddhism, purity is a provisional term used to describe the result of practices which roughly consists of ridding oneself and others of the various unwholesome views, attitudes, behaviours, thoughts, emotions, etc. that permeate beings' lives. The result of these practices, purity, is thus almost synonymous with enlightenment, meaning the untainted experience of ultimate reality as it is. Since unwholesome actions, thoughts, speech, views, etc. are influenced as a result of being's rebirth, purification is thus oftentimes directly connected with cultivating practices for the sake of getting rid of a being's karmic ties and imprints. This connection between purity and *karma* was also one of the main element emphasized in Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*. Indeed, Eisai's text allowed us to

see that purity was fundamental in determining the result of particular actions. The Kōzen Gokoku Ron presented us with the idea that purity is attained when a being is freed from the karmic imprints of delusion. Since these karmic imprints taint the heart of a being making them perform unwholesome actions, it was alluded to that the purifying *kokoro* was necessary.

Fortunately for us, Dōgen’s Shōbōgenzō contains a few passages which explicitly explains the functioning of *karma* in more detail. Because of the necessary link between *kokoro*, purity, and *karma*, I decided to add some passages to this chapter in the hopes that they might bring more clarity to this important connection.

Karma

The fourth section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of a few passages as well as my own commentaries of Dōgen’s Shōbōgenzō, selecting excerpts only on the topic of *karma*. The first passage is found in the fascicle ‘Karma of the Three Periods’ (Sanji Gō 三時業) and stipulates:

世尊のしめしましませんがごときは、善惡の業つくりをはりぬれば、たとひ百千萬劫をふといふとも不亡なり。もし因縁にあへばかならず感得す。しかあれば、惡業は懺悔すれば滅す。また轉重輕受す。善業は隨喜すればいよいよ增長するなり。これを不亡といふなり。その報なきにはあらず。³⁴⁵

Just like expressed by the World-Honored One, the clearing-off of wholesome and unwholesome karma that has been cultivated, even if a hundred one-hundred-thousand eons passes, [it] is imperishable. Only when causes and conditions are encountered, then [the consequences] are obtained without fail. Indeed, unwholesome karma is extinguished as a result of repenting. Once more, ‘feeling the rotation between heaviness and lightness’ happens. [This] is increasing wholesome karma as a result of rejoicing in the welfare and meritorious acts of other. This is what is called ‘imperishable’. It is not that there are no retributions.

The passage starts by mentioning that whenever a being cultivates purifying practices and clear-off their *karma*, this ‘clearing-off’ is imperishable (*fubō* 不亡) ‘even if a hundred one-hundred-thousand eons passes’ (たとひ百千萬劫をふといふとも). Although readers might be tempted to think that ‘imperishable’ here means that whatever has been destroyed can never come back or that the merits of purifying oneself will never go away, Dōgen makes sure to clarify that what is called imperishable is rather the ‘increasing [of] wholesome *karma* as a result of rejoicing in the welfare and meritorious acts of other (善業は随喜すればいよいよ増長する)’. Dōgen unfortunately does not give any additional description on this matter. My interpretation is that when a being’s heart has been purified by clearing-off the *karma* it inherited, this being will not generate unwholesome actions anymore such as jealousy, envy, greed, etc. Because their hearts will be untainted by egotistic desires, they will be able to rejoice when seeing other beings be well or pose wholesome actions. This means that every single wholesome action will now be doubled. On the one hand, a wholesome action is made by one being. On the other hand, a second wholesome action is made by a second being who rejoices in seeing the first being pose a wholesome action. In other words, for each and every wholesome action made by one being, double the amount of wholesomeness is going to be generated. Moreover, because a being’s *kokoro* does not possess any unwholesome roots anymore, this means this being will now only generate wholesome actions. This is what is meant by ‘imperishable’, it is not that a being’s action will not cause any results anymore and is now exempt from karmic laws altogether. More precisely, it is that a being will not regress back into producing unwholesome actions anymore because their *kokoro* is now pure and will only naturally produce wholesome actions themselves as well as accentuate the merits received from the wholesome actions of others.

That being said, an important description of *karma* as understood within Buddhism is found in the sentence ‘[o]nly when causes and conditions are encountered, then [the retributions] are obtained without fail’ (もし因縁にあへばかならず感得す). This alludes to one of the unique features of Buddhist karmic theory in that it provides a perspective which removes the necessity of an actor. In fact, in almost every single ancient framework for explaining causality across the world; an actor was always at its core. For example, in order to explain how a seed would become a fruit, there would have to be some sort of actor which acts upon the seed to make it become a

fruit. This actor could be a god (Deva देव) or a monotheistic God, divine cosmic energy (Śakti शक्ति), potentiality (*dunamis* δύναμις), *Dao* (道), a soul or essence (Ātman आत्मन्), a person, etc. However, in Buddhism, things arise simply a result of the gathering together of the proper causes and conditions. Thus, the seed becoming a fruit is not the result of an entity acting upon the seed to make this transformation take place; rather, it simply happens because numerous conditions are present – such as soil, tree, sun, water, etc. – that allows for the seed to become a fruit. If we apply this causal theory to karmic processes, it would look something like this: when an actor poses an action (*karma*), they plants a ‘seed’ of wholesomeness if the action is made with a heart that has wholesome roots – or a ‘seed’ of unwholesomeness if the action has unwholesome roots. This seed will stay planted and remain a seed until it encounters the proper conditions which will allow it to blossom to become a wholesome fruit to be enjoyed by all beings. However, there is no telling when, where, how or even if the proper conditions are going to be met at all. This process is expanded upon in detail by Dōgen in another lengthy passage found in the same fascicle which explains that:

この三時の業は、善惡にわたるなり。

第一に順現法受業とは、謂く、「若し業を此生に造作し増長して、即ち此生に於て異熟果を受く、是れを順現法受業と名づく」。

いはく、人ありて、あるいは善にもあれ、あるいは惡にもあれ、この生につくりて、すなはちこの生にその報をうくるを、順現報受業といふ。

[...]

第二に順次生受業者、謂く、「若し業を此生に造作し増長して、第二生に異熟果を受くるを、是れを順次生受業と名づく」。

いはく、もし人ありて、この生に五無間業をつくれる、かならず順次生に地獄におつるなり。順次生とは、この生つぎの生なり。

[...]

第三に順後次受業とは、謂く、「若し業を此の生に造作し増長して、第三生に墮し、或いは第四生に墮し、或いは復た此れを過ぎて、百千劫なりと雖も異熟果を受く、是れを順後次受業と名づく。」

いはく、人ありて、この生に、あるいは善にもあれ、あるいは悪にもあれ、造作しをはれりといへども、あるいは第三生、あるいは第四生、乃至百千生のあひだにも、善悪の業を感ずるを、順後次受業となづく。菩薩の三祇劫の功德、おほく順後次受業なり。³⁴⁶

This karma of the three periods, [it] spans over all wholesomeness and unwholesomeness.

The first one is called karma to be made known in the currently existing dharmas, and it is said that ‘suppose that karma accumulates and increases during this lifetime and immediately of the fruits of retributions are received in this life; this is named karma to be made known in the currently existing dharmas.’”

Say that there is a person, on the one hand there is wholesomeness and on the other hand there is unwholesomeness [that have been] cultivated in this life and immediately [this person] receives the retributions in this life; this is called ‘karma to be made known in the currently existing retributions.’

[...]

The second one is called ‘karma to be made known in the coming birth’, and it is said that “suppose that karma accumulates and increases during this lifetime and the fruits of retributions are received in the second life; this is called ‘karma to be made known in the coming birth.’”

Say that there is a person, in this life [they] cultivate the five unceasing actions and in the coming birth they certainly will fall in [the Āvīci] hell. What is called ‘in the coming birth’, [this] means the life after this life.

[...]

The third one is called ‘karma to be made known after the next lapse’, and it is said that “suppose that karma accumulates and increases during this lifetime and [it] causes falling in a third life, then it causes falling in a fourth life, and passing through time again as such, even if it has been one hundred thousand eons the fruits of retributions are received; this is called ‘karma to be made known after the next lapse’”

Say that there is a person, on the one hand there is wholesomeness and on the other hand there is unwholesomeness [that they have been cultivating] in this life, and even if [they] clear up the accumulation, from within the third life, fourth life all the way to one hundred thousand lives, [this] wholesome and unwholesome karma is felt; this is called ‘karma to be made known after the next lapse’. The bodhisattvas’ meritorious deeds [lasting] incalculable eons, are ‘karma to be made known after the next lapse’.

In this important passage, Dōgen uses different quotes and adds his own commentary to describe that the results of one actions can manifest either within a being’s current (re)birth (*jungenpōjugō* 順現法受業), in a being’s next (re)birth (*junjishōjugō* 順次生受業), or in this current (re)birth, as well as the next one, and multiple (re)births afterwards (*jungojijugō* 順後次受業). Dōgen is also careful in specifying that this cause-and-effect principle applies equally to wholesome actions as well as unwholesome actions.

We now need to remind ourselves that, in the previous passage, Dōgen alluded to the fact that when an being poses an action (*karma*), they plant a ‘seed’ of wholesomeness – if the action is made with a heart that has wholesome roots. This seed will stay planted and remain a seed until it encounters the proper conditions which will allow it to blossom to become a wholesome fruit to be enjoyed by all beings. However, there was no information regarding when, where, how or even if this seed would ever become a fruit. This current passage answers some of these questions by stating that these conditions might be met in this lifetime, the next lifetime, or across multiple lifetimes. This means that it is (extremely?) likely that an actor might pose an action in this current (re)birth, but they themselves will never get to experience the retributions from it. Indeed, maybe

the proper conditions for experiencing the positive/negative retributions from their actions will only manifest in one-hundred lifetimes after the death of the original actor; or maybe – if the conditions allow – the positive/negative retributions will manifest in this current lifetime and will be experienced by the original actor. Nonetheless, at the moment of the action itself, there are no guarantee pertaining to *when* the seeds of a being's actions will become a fruit. However, one thing we are certain is that, as Dōgen highlighted in the previous passage, 'when causes and conditions are encountered, then [the retributions] are obtained without fail' (もし因縁にあへばかならず感得す)'.³⁴⁷

Put simply, *an actor is not entitled to the results of their actions*. In fact, the only thing an actor can do is pose wholesome actions in the present knowing that, at some point – i.e. when the proper conditions are met – these will inevitably result in positive retributions that will be enjoyed by other beings³⁴⁷. This also means that a being might experience negative retributions in the present that, unfortunately, have nothing to do with actions they themselves have posed. This is because an actor, in a past lifetime, posed unwholesome actions that now – i.e. because the proper conditions are met in this lifetime – arise negative retributions to be experienced. In others words, in Buddhist karmic theory, an actor's role consists of two aspects: (1) planting seeds via one's actions; and (2) help in fostering the proper conditions for seeds to blossom into fruits. But *actors* themselves are not the reason why seeds become fruits; *conditions* are. With this, it is now easier to understand why, as Eisai and Dōgen emphasized, a legitimate leader is one who: (1) practices and follows the Buddhist teachings themselves by doing wholesome actions from a purified *kokoro*; and (2) helps in fostering the proper conditions for blessings and protection to be received via spreading Buddhism to everyone and purify themselves and their environment. Indeed, this maps perfectly onto the role actors have within Buddhism's karmic-based system.

Keeping this in mind, Dōgen, in the fascicle 'Deep Faith in Cause and Effect' (Shinjin Inga 深信因果) leaves his readers with a warning:

あきらかにしるべし、撥無因果は招殃禍なるべし。³⁴⁸

It must be clearly known that denying the law of cause and effect will invite disaster and misfortune.

Although Dōgen does not expand on what is meant by disaster and misfortune nor on why this is the case, I believe it is possible to deduct why that might be so using the knowledge expounded in the two previous passages. Indeed, it is possible to assume that a being who would deny the law of cause and effect (*hatsumu inga* 撥無因果) – which in itself reflects a lack of faith in the truth of the teachings – would most likely behave in ways that do not account for nor consider the consequences their actions will produce. In addition, denying the laws of cause and effect means that a person also rejects that wholesome actions begets wholesome results, and unwholesome actions begets unwholesome results. Putting these two together, it is easy to see why this would led to reckless and unwholesome behaviours where a being would not take accountability for the negative consequences it produces for themselves as well as for others. This, indeed, would invite disaster and misfortune (*shō'ōga* 招殃禍). On the other hand, having faith in the truth of Buddhist karmic principles means that if a being's action will inevitably produce results in the future, this means it is important for beings to be intentional and mindful of the kinds of actions they pose. As a result – and because of the compassion that understanding karmic laws arouse in beings' hearts – this would make beings ensure they do wholesome actions precisely because they know it will produce positive consequences for themselves and others.

Even though there are only a few passages that directly explains karmic principles in Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*, these three passages are very insightful for understanding this fundamental Buddhist teaching. In sum, Dōgen demonstrated that the law of cause and effect means that a being's actions will inevitably produce consequences, but these will most likely not be experienced by the original actor. Thus, a being has the responsibility to conduct themselves wholesomely to ensure that wholesome results will ensue for themselves (if conditions allow) and for others. Moreover, karmic principles explain that results manifest themselves not because an actor makes them happen, but because the various proper conditions for their emergence are present. This means that beings also have the responsibility to play their part in helping ensuring that the proper conditions are present for wholesome seeds to become wholesome fruits for all to enjoy. Both of these factors – wholesome actions and proper conditions – exists and/or are amplified by the purity of *kokoro*.

Summary

After translating Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō, it is easy to see that Dōgen's insights align with Eisai's regarding all three topics of politics, *kokoro* and purity. However, because of the nature of the Shōbōgenzō in contrast to the Kōzen Gokoku Ron, Dōgen's work gives deeper explanations and descriptions of what things are and how they work.

With regards to the topic of politics both posit that, first, having inherited a position of power because of their karmic ties tracing back to an original vow made in front of the Buddha in past lifetimes, legitimate leaders are required to perform actions that will generate merit leading to the protection and support of all beings under their responsibility. Secondly, both also underline that protection and blessing is generated from wholesome actions, which means they must have wholesome roots, which themselves are the result of having a pure heart. Thus, it is the duty and responsibility of legitimate rulers to not just disseminate and protect the *Buddhadharma*, but also to continuously engage in purification practices to ensure that they have the proper heart needed for legitimate leadership. Overall, the passages pertaining to politics found in the Shōbōgenzō are also permeated with the same belief system found in Eisai's work: the purity of the heart of a leader – who is in position of leadership because of *karma* – is the key to legitimate governance.

With regards to the topic of *kokoro*, all of Dōgen's passages are unequivocal in affirming that *kokoro* is, in one way or another, fundamental to (Zen) Buddhism. Similarly to Eisai, Dōgen also affirmed that since the source of suffering and cessation alike is *kokoro*, numerous Buddhist teachings focus their attention on teaching how to attain specific kinds of heart and move away from other kinds of hearts. However, Dōgen's explanations necessitated us to expand the definition of *kokoro* to understand that *kokoro* is an all-encompassing expression that encapsulates a plethora of meaning ranging from the organ of the heart, emotions, mind, thoughts, spirit, Buddha-Nature, etc. Moreover, Dōgen provided new information regarding the fact that *kokoro* (as mind) is the means by which a being originates an Enlightened-Mind and a heart of great compassion, which leads to the event of the proclamation of the Bodhisattva Vow.

As for the topic of purity, once again both authors agree that purity is attained when a being is freed from karmic imprints and karmic ties. Since karmic imprints taint the heart of beings and make them perform unwholesome actions, it is thus necessary to purify *kokoro* in order for wholesome actions to be performed. Nevertheless, the *Shōbōgenzō* provided a much-needed and deeper exploration of the topic. For example, Dōgen explained that, in Buddhism, purity is a provisional term used to describe the result of practices which roughly consists of ridding oneself and others of the various unwholesome views, attitudes, behaviours, thoughts, emotions, etc. that permeate beings' lives. The result of these practices, purity, is thus almost synonymous with enlightenment, meaning the untainted experience of ultimate reality as it is. Since unwholesome actions, thoughts, speech, views, etc. are influenced as a result of being's rebirth, purification is thus oftentimes directly connected with cultivating practices for the sake of getting rid of a being's karmic ties and imprints. This is why, whether with Eisai or Dōgen, passages pertaining to purity are almost always intertwined with mentions of *karma*.

Although the *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* did not have any passages that directly dealt with the topic of *karma* in itself, I was able to find a few passages in the *Shōbōgenzō* which explicitly focused on this topic to help us expand our understanding of the connection between *kokoro*, purity, and *karma*. In sum, Dōgen demonstrated that the law of cause and effect means that a being's actions will inevitably produce consequences, but these will most likely not be experienced by the original actor. Moreover, he clarified that karmic principles state that results manifest themselves not because an actor makes them happen, but because the various proper conditions for their emergence are present. Both of these factors – wholesome actions and proper conditions – exist and/or are amplified by the purity of *kokoro*. Dōgen also briefly alluded to the fact that denying the laws of cause and effect will bring about disaster.

Merging together the work of the two authors allowed me to see that, fundamentally, both authors share an identical understanding of political legitimacy despite the doctrinal differences of their respective traditions. This understanding can be simplified as follows: a legitimate leader is one who produces wholesome actions that will benefit all beings, and one who uses their power and privileges to help in fostering the proper conditions so that the wholesome actions of others will also blossom into wholesome fruits that benefit all beings. Furthermore, both authors present

a karmic-based framework of power dynamics, where leaders are in position to rule due to inheriting the positive retributions of the Bodhisattva Vow made in the past, meaning they have the responsibility to continue on the path of fulfilling this Vow. In all of these cases, the capacity of a leader to fulfill those things – and therefore be legitimate – rests in the purity of their hearts.

Chapter 5: Nichiren 日蓮

Context of the Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論 and the Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安國論

Since I have already briefly addressed some of the key events of Nichiren's life in Chapter 1, I will now focus on the context surrounding the writing of Nichiren's Shugo Kokka Ron and Risshō Ankoku Ron more specifically.

Nichiren began to study Buddhism at the Tendai temple Seichōji 清澄寺 in 1233 at eleven years old. He received formal ordination in the Tendai tradition at this same temple at the age of sixteen years old. Following this, Nichiren spent the next twenty years of his life travelling to all the major centers of the main Buddhist traditions of the time – namely, Pure Land, Zen, Tendai, Shingon, and the Six Traditions of Nara Buddhism³⁴⁹ – and returned to Seichōji in 1253 to lecture on his findings. In this lecture, Nichiren expressed his desire to bring back Tendai's original teaching by arguing that the tradition should once again rely exclusively on the teachings found in the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra. At the event, Nichiren allegedly criticized the teachings of Seichōji (where he was giving the lecture) for promoting practices not found in the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra, as well as strongly attacked the Amitābha *nenbutsu* practice of Pure Land Buddhism which had gain tremendous popularity in Japan. This initiated a conflict with a local steward who attempted to have Nichiren killed³⁵⁰.

Following this, Nichiren decided to leave and head to Kamakura where, in 1254, he started to disseminate his teachings, give ordination, and even convert Tendai priests to his new tradition of Nichiren Buddhism. However, the years of 1254 and 1260 were extremely harsh and half of the population died from various disasters such as epidemics, earthquakes, fires, droughts, famine, and storms³⁵¹. Moreover, words were spreading regarding the Mongol conquest of China by Genghis Khan (1162-1227) and especially the expansion of the Mongol Empire by his grandson Kublai Khan (1215-1294) who ended up subjugating what is now called Korea in 1258 after about nine

invasion attempts over twenty-seven years. It is during these dire times that Nichiren wrote the Shugo Kokka Ron in 1259, and the Risshō Ankoku Ron in 1260.

Although, not much information is known with regards to Nichiren's initial intention behind the Shugo Kokka Ron, the Risshō Ankoku Ron was submitted directly to the leader of the Kamakura *bakufu*, Hōjō Tokiyori, with the aim of spearheading political and religious reforms. However, Nichiren's critique of the Hōjō regency, his warning of potential foreign invasion, his mention of former Retired-Emperor Gotoba, his critique of Pure Land practices, and his suggestion that Kamakura start spreading correct Buddhism – i.e. Nichiren Buddhism – to stop the disasters was not well received. Not only did the monks and priests of other traditions challenge him to a public debate, but lay followers of these traditions tried to assassinate him in his domicile. Although Nichiren fled Kamakura following these events, the *bakufu* authorities managed to find him, which led to his exile to the Izu peninsula by Hōjō Shigetoki 北条重時 (1198-1261).

I have decided to include both Nichiren's Shugo Kokka Ron and Risshō Ankoku Ron because they are almost identical in content and have numerous identical passages. It is also important to note that both are also similar to Eisai's Kōzen Gokoku Ron in that all are treatises that target directly the political leaders of Kamakura with an underlying aim of establishing each author's respective traditions as the true, correct and proper Buddhism. Moreover, although Eisai's and Nichiren's texts inevitably contain religious teachings, they still are much closer to political treatises than they are to primarily religious or philosophical texts such as Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō.

Politics

The first section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries of Nichiren's Shugo Kokka Ron and Risshō Ankoku Ron, selecting excerpts only on the topic of politics. Nichiren's Shugo Kokka Ron starts its discussion of politics by positing that:

第一に佛法を以て國王大臣並に四眾に付囑することを明さば、仁王經に云く「佛・波斯匿王に告わく、乃至・是の故に諸の國王に付囑して比丘・比丘尼・清信男・清信女に付囑せず何を以ての故に王の威力無きが故に、乃至・此の經の三寶をば諸の國王・四部の弟子に付囑す」。³⁵²

Firstly, regarding the Buddhadharma – and clarifying the topic of the transmission to rulers of Nations and ministers as well as the four groups – the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra says: “The Buddha, addressed King Prasenajit [saying], ‘Then, as a result of this, [dharmas] have been transmitted to the various rulers of Nations and have not been transmitted to monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen. What is the reason? It is because [they] do not have the power of rulers. Then, the three jewels of this Sūtra is transmitted to the various rulers of Nations, [followed by] the disciples of the four kinds [of practitioners].”

Nichiren comments:

仁王經の文の如くならば佛法を以て先ず國王に付囑し次に四眾に及ばず王位に居る君・國を治むる臣は佛法を以て先と爲し國を治む可き也。³⁵³

If it is just like in the words of the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra, the Buddhadharma is first transmitted to rulers of Nations and following this [these rulers] cause [the Dharmas] to reach the four kinds [of practitioners]. Rulers who sits on a throne and ministers who govern a Nation while carrying out the Buddhadharma first – this is [the way to] appropriately govern a Nation.

Nichiren uses a passage of the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra which states that the Buddha transmitted the *Dharma* to leaders but not to monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen. The *Sūtra* explains that leaders are given the teachings first because they have more power, authority, influence (*iryoku* 威力). Agreeing with the quote, Nichiren comments that the path of dissemination of the teachings starts from leaders who initially received the teachings, and then these leaders spread the teachings to the other kinds of practitioners. Following this, Nichiren establishes what the proper conduct for legitimate rule is: leaders need to prioritize behaving according to the *Buddhadharma* as well as fulfil their responsibility to disseminate it widely. This

passage accords with similar statements made by Eisai who also used a *Sūtra* to support the idea that the *Dharma* is first entrusted to leaders, who then disseminates it to the other (lower) levels of society. Therefore, entrusting the *Buddhadharma* to leaders is strategic; it is because leaders have more power and resources which makes them better candidates to spread the teachings with more efficacy and impact. In the *Risshō Ankoku Ron*, Nichiren expands further on the matter of leadership by quoting from the same *Sūtra*, saying:

亦[仁王經に]云く「我今五眼をもて明に三世を見るに一切國王皆は皆過去の世に五百お佛に侍えるに由りて帝王主と爲ることを得たり、是を爲て一切の聖人羅漢而も爲に彼の國土の中に來生して大利益を作さん、若し王の福盡きん時は一切の聖人皆爲に捨て去らん、若し一切の聖人去らん時は七難必ず起らん」。³⁵⁴

Again, it is said [in the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra]: “I, seeing the three periods clearly by means of the five eyes, have attained [the understanding] that all rulers of Nations, in all the periods of the past, as a result of being in service to the five-hundred buddhas, have become emperors, kings, and chiefs. Based on this, all venerable people and even Worthy-Ones will have their future births within these Nations as a result, and great blessings will form. Suppose there is a time when a ruler exhaust [their] merits then all of the venerable people will abandon and leave as a result. Suppose that there is a time when all the venerable people leave, then certainly the sevenfold calamities will occur.”

Previously, we have seen that both Eisai and Dōgen specified that leaders inheriting their positions of power reflects a positive retribution resulting from wholesome actions made in past births – and notably the uttering of the Bodhisattva Vow in front of the Buddha. This karmic-based theory of power dissemination, also states that leaders have the responsibility to follow and disseminate the teachings precisely because they have been placed in a position of power to specifically do so. This passage quoted by Nichiren also presents a karmic-based theory of power dissemination similar to Eisai and Dōgen, however it does not mention the connections specifically to the Bodhisattva Vow. Instead, it posits that people currently in a position of political leadership – i.e. emperors, kings and chiefs (*teiōshu* 帝王主) – are in such a position because ‘in all periods of the

past' (皆過去の世に) they were rulers of Nations who were 'in service to the five-hundred buddhas' (五百お佛に侍える). This also explains why – as mentioned in the passages translated above – leaders are the ones entrusted with the responsibility to spread the Buddhist teachings. Indeed, their service to Buddhism in the past is the reason why they are given positions of leadership again in this present re(birth) and is also the reason why the *Buddhadharma* is transmitted to them specifically. This means that a legitimate leader is one who fulfills their karmic responsibilities towards all beings by making proper use of their karmically-inherited position of power to ensure that Buddhism spreads and flourishes within their respective Nations.

This passage also offers another insights by stating that having leaders who fulfill their responsibilities causes venerable people (*shōnin* 聖人) and even Worthy-Ones³⁵⁵ (*rakan* 羅漢) to have their future (re)births within these leaders' Nations which will, in turn, generate great blessings. On the other hand, if leaders do not fulfill their responsibilities and merits disappear, then such beings will leave the Nation and the sevenfold calamities (*shichinan* 七難) will originate. This segment aligns with information put forth by Dōgen with regards to the operationalisations of *karma*. Indeed, Dōgen helped us understand that within Buddhism's karmic-based system actors have two roles (1) planting seeds via one's actions; and (2) helping fostering the proper conditions for seeds to blossom into fruits. This passage by Nichiren alludes to the latter as it posits that having legitimate leaders makes Nations become proper places where the conditions of having wholesome (re)births are fostered. Having wholesome (re)births – from venerable people to Worthy-Ones – will in turn lead to receiving a lot of benefits since these beings will themselves produce wholesome actions which will generate wholesome results, as well as help in fostering the proper conditions for wholesome seeds planted in past lifetimes to blossom into wholesome fruits in the present. However, if leaders fail to make their Nations be proper places for such wholesome (re)birth to happen, not only will the leaders and their followers/subjects not be able to experience any of this, but worse, all sorts of calamities are going to strike the Nation.

As a matter of fact, this last sentence reflects the core teaching of both Nichiren's Shugo Gokoku Ron and Risshō Ankoku Ron. For the next few pages, I will list in succession all the numerous passages which highlight this teaching and will provide my commentary only at the end

of all of them. Since some passages are exactly the same in both texts, for the sake of saving space I will only mention them once. The first of such passage is found in the Shugo Gokoku Ron and stipulates:

大集經二十八に云く「若し國王有りて我が法を滅せんことを見て捨てて擁護せずんば無量世に於て施戒慧修すとも悉く皆滅失し其の國に三種の不祥の事を出さん、乃至・命終して大地獄に生ぜん」。³⁵⁶

It is said in the section twenty-eight of the Mahā Vaipulya Mahā Saṃnipāta Sūtra: “Suppose that there are rulers of Nations, and I end up seeing that the extinction of Dharma seems to be happening [in their Nation], if [these rulers] do not protect [the Dharma] – even if [they] cultivated almsgiving, the precepts, and wisdom for immeasurable times – all [their meritorious efforts] will be entirely destroyed, the three kinds of ill-omens will come out on this nation; then, [their] lives will end and [they] will be born in the great hells.”

Nichiren comments:

大集經の文の如くならば王臣等・佛道の爲に無量劫之間・頭目等の施を施し八萬戒行を持ち無量の佛法を學ぶと雖も若し國に流布する所の法の邪正を直さざれば國の中に大風・旱魃・大雨之三災起りて萬民を逃脫せしめ王臣定めて三惡に墮せん。³⁵⁷

If it is just like in the words of the Mahā Vaipulya Mahā Saṃnipāta Sūtra, various rulers and ministers, for the sake of the Buddha Way, if even over a period of immeasurable eons, [they] spread to others the almsgivings of the various leaders, even if [they] maintain the observance of eighty thousand precepts, even if [they] study the immeasurable Buddhadharma, if they do not correct the rights and wrongs of the matters of the Dharma that are circulating within the Nation, the three calamities of great winds, drought and great rain will occur in the Nation causing the all the people to flee, and rulers and ministers will certainly fall into the three woeful destinies.

Another passage mentions that:

又金光明經第六に云く「若し人有りて其の國土に於て此の經有りとは雖も未だ嘗て流布せず捨離の心を生じ聽聞せんことを樂はず、亦供養し尊重し讚歎せず、四部の眾の持經之人を見て亦復尊重し乃至供養すること能はず、遂に我等及び餘の眷屬・無量の諸天をして此の甚深の妙法を聞くことを得ざらしめん、甘露の味に背き正法の流れを失ひ威光及び勢力有ることが無く、惡趣を増長し人天を損減し生死の河に墜ちて涅槃の路に乖かん、世尊、我等四王並に諸の眷屬及び藥叉等斯くの如き事を見て其の國土を捨てて擁護の心無からん但我等のみ是の王を捨棄するに非ず亦無量の國土を守護する諸大善神有らんも皆悉く捨去せん既に捨離し已りなば其の國當に種種の災禍有りて國位を喪失すべし、一切の人眾皆善心無けん唯繫縛殺害瞋諍のみ有りて互に相讒諂し枉げて辜無き及ばん、疫病流行し彗星數數出で兩日並び現じ薄蝕恆無く黑白の二虹不祥の相を表はし、星流れ地動き井の内に聲を發し暴雨惡風時節に依らず常に飢饉に遭ひて苗實も成らず、多く他方の怨賊有りて國內を侵掠し人民諸の苦惱を受け土地所樂之處有る事無けん」。³⁵⁸

Again, section six of the Suvarṇa Prabhā Sottama Sūtrendra Rājāḥ says: “Suppose that there is a person, and even if this Sūtra exists in this Nation, [this person] is not circulating it in any way yet. [In this person,] a heart of indifference originates, not desiring to carefully listen [to this Sūtra]. Moreover, [this person] does not do offering services, does not revere, and does not praise [this Sūtra]. When seeing the four kinds [of practitioners] who continuously recite this Sūtra, once again [this person] is not able to revere and praise [them]. In the end, the reaching to us [of the teachings] and the hearing of the deep profoundness of the true teachings for the immeasurable various Devas and the rest of the retinues will cause to not be attained. Parting from the taste of sweet nectar and suddenly losing the stream of the correct Dharma; the dissemination of influence and possession of power is nonexistent. [The number of beings falling into] the woeful destinies increase, [the number of beings falling into the realms of] humans and Devas decrease; [beings] keep falling into the river of birth and death and turn their back on the path of cessation. Glorious Buddha, we, the four great kings – extending to all our various retinues as well as the various demigods – when seeing things like this, [we] will abandon this Nation and [our] hearts of protection will no longer exist. However, it is not only we who abandon this ruler. There will also even be the various great wholesome deities that protects the

innumerable Nations; all will completely go elsewhere. If [we] completely cease and abandon [it], this Nation will unmistakably have all kinds of calamities and the Nation's throne will no doubt be forfeited. In the whole multitude of people, every person will lose their wholesome heart, there will only be discrimination, binding, attachment, killing, harm, anger and quarrel, mutual defamation and flattery will be bent one after another, reaching [even] the sinless; diseases and sickness will spread; comets will come out again and again; two suns will appear in a line; light eclipses [will appear] without consistency; two rainbows of black and white will make apparent the nature of ill-omens; stars will expire; the earth will move; the inside of wells will emit sounds; the season of raging winds and torrential rains will not be relied on; famine will continuously be faced; sprouts of fruits will not even ripen; there will be numerous angry thieves of other lands and [they] will invade and plunder inside the nation; the populace will receive various discontent/suffering and miseries; and the circumstances of having a place where land and soil is pleasant will be nonexistent.

Following this train of thought, Nichiren criticizes the Pure Land tradition saying that:

此の故に諸天・妙法を聞くことを得ず法味を嘗めざれば威光勢力有ること無し、其の四天王並に眷屬・此の國を捨てて日本國守護之善神捨離し已るが故に。³⁵⁹

As a result of [the practice of recalling a Buddha's name of Hōnen's Pure Land tradition which leads to ignoring other Sūtras], the circumstance of hearing the correct Dharma by the various Devas is not attained. As a result of the Dharma flavours not being tasted, there is no possession power and potency. Thus, these four Deva-kings as well as [their] retinues abandoned this nation and the wholesome deities who protect the Japanese Nation abandoned and left [it] as a result.

A passage of the Risshō Ankoku Ron further states that:

大集經に云く「佛法實に隱没せば鬚髮爪皆長く諸法も亦忘失せん當の時虚空の中に大なる聲ありて地を震り、一切皆遍く動かんこと猶水上輪の如くらん・城壁破れ落ち下り屋宇悉く圯れ坼け、樹林の根・枝・葉・華葉・菓・藥盡きん唯淨居天を除きて欲界の一切

處の七味・三精氣損減して餘り有ること無けん解脱の諸の善論當の時一切盡きん所生の華菓の味ひ希少に亦美からず、諸有の井泉池・一切盡く枯涸して土地悉く鹹鹵して割裂して丘澗と成らん、諸山皆燦燃して天龍雨を降さず苗稼も皆枯死し生ずる者皆死し盡き餘草更に生ぜず、土を雨らし皆昏闇に日月も明を現ぜず、四方皆亢旱して數ば諸惡瑞を現じ、十不善業の道・貪瞋癡倍增して衆生父母に於ける之を觀ること獐鹿の如くんらん、衆生及壽命・色力・威樂減じ人天の樂を遠離し皆悉く惡道に墮せん、是くの如き不善業の惡王・惡比丘我が正法を毀壞し天人の道を損減し、諸天善神・王の衆生を悲愍する者此の濁惡の國を棄てて皆悉く餘方に向かはん」。³⁶⁰

It is said in the Mahā Vaipulya Mahā Saṃnipāta Sūtra: "If the Buddhadharma completely fades out; beard, hair and nails will all grow long and all dharmas will even be completely forgotten. At this time, within space there will be growing noises and the earth will shake. All things will move everywhere probably just like waterwheels. Ramparts will be destroyed and fall down, houses will completely break down. The roots, branches, leaves, petal-leaves, fruits and medicines of trees will disappear. Excluding the deities of the pure abodes, the seven tastes of all things of the desire realm and the three energies will diminish and there will be not much things [left]. The various wholesome discourses of liberation, at this time, will all disappear. The taste of fruits and flowers of that which is originated will be rare and not delicious. The various beings of wells, springs, and ponds; all will completely dry up. The earth will be completely salted and it will split to become hills and valleys. The various mountains will all erupt. Devas and divine serpents will not send down rain. Even crops will all wither, the things that are produced [from those crops] all will perish, and grass will not grow much again. Mud will rain down. The sun, moon and even brightness will not appear in all the realm of Tamondhakāra. There will be severe drought everywhere in the four directions. Various ill-omens will repeatedly manifest. The ten unwholesome paths of actions and [the three poisons of] desire, hatred, and delusion will double. [We] will see all beings leaving [their] parents behind just like deers. The life force, physical strength, and sublime joy of all beings will decrease. [They] will be separated from the bliss of humans and Devas. Everything will entirely fall in the woeful destinies. [When there are] bad deeds of unwholesome rulers and monks like this, [they] damage my correct Dharma and the path of heavenly beings declines. The various Devas and wholesome deities who

show compassion toward all beings of the ruler will abandon this Nation of impurity and unwholesomeness - all will go meet [other beings] elsewhere altogether.”

Again, the Risshō Ankoku Ron expounds:

仁王經に云く「國土亂れん時は先ず鬼神亂る鬼神亂るるが故に萬民亂る賊來りて國を劫かし百姓亡喪し臣・君・太子・王子・百官共に是非を生ぜん、天地怪異し二十八宿・星道・日月時失ひ度を失ひ多く賊越ること有らん」。³⁶¹

It is said in the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra: “At times when a Nation is in disorder, first the fierce deities are disturbed. As a result of the fierce deities being disturbed, all the people are disturbed. Enemies will come and threaten the Nation; common people will die and be lost; and ministers, rulers, crown-princes, princes and many government officials all will produce quarrels with each other. Heaven and earth will be strange; the time of the twenty-eight constellations, the path of the stars, and sun and moon will be suddenly lost; frequency will be suddenly lost; and there will often be theft.”

Once more, the Risshō Ankoku Ron posits:

藥師經に云く「若し刹帝利・灌頂王等の災難起らん時所謂人衆疾疫の難・他國侵逼の難・自界叛逆の難・星宿變怪の難・日月薄蝕の難・非時風雨の難・過時不雨の難あらん」。³⁶²

It is said in the Bhaiṣajya Guru Vaiḍūrya Prabhā Rāja Sūtra: “Suppose that there is a time when calamities occur [impacting] warriors and inaugurated rulers, it is generally said that there is the calamity of pestilence of people, the calamity of invasion by other Nations, the calamity of turning against one's own region/realm, the calamity of strange changes in the constellations, the calamity of slight eclipses of the sun and moon, the calamity of untimely winds and rains, and the calamity of long time passing without rains.”

Again, another passage stipulates that:

大集經に云く「若し國王有りて無量世に於て施戒慧を修すとも我が法の滅せんを見て捨てて擁護せずんば是くの如く種ゆる所の無量の善根悉く皆滅失して其の國當に三の不祥の事有るべし、一には穀貴・二には兵革・三には疫病なり、一切善神悉く之を捨離せば其の王教令すとも人隨從せず當に隣國之所侵嬈する所と爲らん、暴火横に起り惡風雨多く暴水増長して人民吹灑し内外の親戚其れ共に謀叛せん、其の王久しからずして當に重病に遇ひ壽終之後・大地獄の中に生ずべし、乃至王の如く夫人・太子・大臣・城主・柱師・郡守・宰官も亦復た是くの如くならん」。³⁶³

It is said in the Mahā Vaipulya Mahā Saṃnipāta Sūtra: “Suppose that there exists a ruler of nations, and even if [he] cultivated almsgiving, the precepts, and Discernment for immeasurable periods, if he sees that the dharmas will go extinct, abandons [them] and does not protect them, just like this, all the places of the seeds of innumerable wholesome roots will be completely ruined and there certainly will be the events of the three ill-omens in this Nation. The first is expensive rice/grains, the second is war, and the third is virulent contagious diseases. If all wholesome deities discard him, even if this ruler teaches, people will not follow. It will become a place that neighbouring Nations will certainly invade. Violent fires will occur unnaturally. Wicked winds and rains will end up increasing and violent waters will make the populace be blown and drifted away. Relatives from inside and outside will commit treason against each other. This ruler will not last long and will certainly be met with serious illness. After the end of [this ruler’s] life, [he] will certainly be born in the Great Hell. Then, just like the ruler, queens, crown-princes, great ministers, castle lords, important teachers, senior provincial officials, and governmental ministers will also attain the same [outcome].”

Finally, Nichiren makes use of one last quote and explains:

仁王經に云く「人佛教を壞らば復た孝子無く六親不和にして天龍も祐けず疾疫惡鬼の日に來て侵害し災怪首尾し連禍縦横し死して地獄・餓鬼・畜生に入らん、若し出で人と爲らば兵奴の果報ならん、響の如く影の如く人の夜書くに火は滅れども字は存ずるが如く、三界の果報も亦復是くの如し」と。³⁶⁴

It is said in the Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra: “If a person harms the buddhas’ teachings, again, he will not have a filial child; he will create disjunction in the six blood relations; the Devas and divine serpents will not even help [them]; the unwholesome demons of pestilence will come and invade everyday; strange disasters will occur continuously; there will be successive calamities in all directions; they will die and enter [the realms] of hell, hungry-ghosts, and animals. Suppose that [they] exit [these realms] and become a human, [they] will have the fruits of retribution of a soldier’s servant. Just like an echo, just like a person’s shadow, just like characters existing as such when writing at nighttime even though the fire is extinguished; the fruits of retributions of the three realms again and again [are] just like this.”

Setting aside the details of this overwhelming list of calamities spread across all these passages, it is possible to identify one key constant: if leaders do not fulfill their responsibilities of identifying, protecting and disseminating the correct teachings while also rectifying the wrong teachings, disaster will ensue. This is true even if leaders have properly cultivated Buddhist practices, with the proper heart, for innumerable lifetimes before. However, aside from a few segments which speak of the direct retributions a being’s actions will generate, it is important to note that most of these passages are not stating that the leaders’ actions are themselves the cause behind such calamities. In fact, it is rather that if the *Buddhadharma* diminishes or goes extinct within the Nations these leaders are responsible for, buddhas, bodhisattvas or all sorts of benevolent divine entities lose their powers to grant blessing and protection. This is why Nichiren – just like Eisai and Dōgen – is explicit in emphasizing that leaders to not merely need to behave properly themselves. More importantly, they have the responsibility of ensuring the thriving, spreading, and growing of the correct *Dharma*. Indeed, leaders have been carefully placed – as a result of karmic processes – in such positions specifically because the power derived from their position allows them to fulfill this specific task. This also means that a leader’s legitimacy orbits around their aptitude at fulfilling this particular task.

However, quickly concluding that leaders derive their legitimacy from proper conduct is a trap. Indeed, all of these passages conceal very important information pertaining to the matter of legitimacy. That is, the legitimacy of a leader is not determined by the actions they pose, but rather by the consequences that manifest as a result of their actions – or lack thereof. As Nichiren

emphasized, even if leaders are performing Buddhist practices and have been doing so in multiple lifetimes before; disaster can still occur. How can that be so? For this, we have to pause and remind ourselves of the operationalization of *karma*. Through Dōgen’s work, I explained that retributions manifest in the world not because actors make them happen, but because the proper mixture of conditions are present which enables particular retributions to manifest. As Nichiren demonstrates, leaders could act in perfect accordance with the *Buddhadharma*, but if the conditions are not proper for wholesome results to manifest, they simply will not manifest. If the proper conditions are not present for wholesome results to manifest, it means that leaders have not succeeded in their responsibility of ensuring that their Nation fosters these proper conditions. In other words, these leaders are not legitimate.

With this, we can see that what ultimately determines the legitimacy of leaders is the retributions that manifest in the world and not the actions of the leaders in and of themselves. Put simply, if the world is good, peaceful, prosperous, healthy, in order, emancipated, etc. this means leaders are legitimate. On the other hand, if the world is hateful, impoverished, oppressive, constantly at war, disordered, continuously facing natural disasters and diseases, etc. this means leaders are not legitimate. This accords with Eisai and Dōgen who also emphasized that – because of Buddhism’s karmic-based frameworks – we need to shift our attention from the action itself to the *result* of the action. As we have seen, a key factor in determining outcomes is *kokoro*; and especially whether *kokoro* is pure or impure. I will engage with this matter in the following section of this chapter. For now, Nichiren’s discussion of politics brings forth an interesting topic that was not significantly explored by Eisai, and barely at all by Dōgen: punishment. On this topic, Nichiren first mentions that:

涅槃經第三に云く「懈怠にして戒を破し正法を毀る者をば國王・大臣・四部之眾應に苦治すべし、善男子、是の諸の國王及び四部之眾は當に罪有るべき下や・不也・世尊・善男子・是の諸の國王及び四部之眾は尚罪有ること無し」。³⁶⁵

It is said in the section three of the Mahā Pari Nirvāṇa Sūtra: “As for the case of a person who [is] negligent, who breaks the precepts, and who breaks the correct Dharma, rulers of nations, great ministers and the four kinds of practitioners should punish in response. Good Sons³⁶⁶, in

this situation will these various rulers of nation as well as the four kinds of practitioners certainly have demerit? It is the opposite, Glorious Buddha! Good sons, as expected, the circumstances of these various rulers of nation as well as the four kinds of practitioners having demerit is nonexistent.”

The quote used by Nichiren is very clear that it is desirable for anyone to punish another being who is negligent (*kedai* 懈怠), who breaks the precepts (戒を破し) or who breaks the correct *Dharma* (正法を毀る). Moreover, punishment or reprimand (*kuji* 苦治) should not only be commanded by leaders of a Nation but also by any kind of Buddhist practitioner, whether monastics or lay. The *Sūtra* used by Nichiren also posits that the people who administer the punishments will not even experience negative retributions, which alludes to the possibility that these actions are not considered unwholesome even though they create discontent/suffering. Nichiren quotes two other passages from the same source to provide some idea of what the punishments can look like. The first passage mentions:

又[涅槃經]に云く「若し善比丘ありて法を壞る者を見て呵責し駈遣し舉處せずんば當に知るべし是の人は佛法の中に怨なり、若し能く駈遣し呵責し舉處せば是我弟子真の聲聞也」。³⁶⁷

Again, it is said [in the Mahā Pari Nirvāṇa Sūtra]: “Suppose that there is a wholesome monk, and when seeing a being who harms the Dharma, if [they] do not criticize, expel and reproach [them], it must be unmistakably understood that this [monk], within the Buddhadharmā, is hostile. If [they] expel, criticize, and reproach adequately, this is a hearer [of the Dharma] and a true disciple of mine.”

The second passage explains that:

涅槃經に云く「我涅槃の後其の方面に隨ひ持戒の比丘有りて威儀具足し正法を護持せば、法を壞ぶる者を見て即ち能く駈遣し呵責し懲治せよ當に知るべし是の人は福を得んこと無量にして稱計す可からず」。³⁶⁸

It is said in the Mahā Pari Nirvāṇa Sūtra: “I, after cessation, following all directions, if there are monks who observe the precepts, [who] are endowed with etiquette and [who] protect and maintain the correct Dharma, when seeing beings who harm the Dharma, [these monks] immediately must expel, criticize and discipline [them]. It should be unmistakably understood that these people produce attainment of fortunes that are innumerable and cannot be measured.”

The punishments that are recommended to administer are thus expulsion (*kuken* 驅遣), critique (*kashaku* 呵責), and discipline (*chōji* 懲治). There are three important components of this passage that are important to highlight. The first one is that it specifies very clearly that the beings who must give the punishments are ones ‘who observe the precepts, [who] are endowed with etiquette and [who] protect and maintain the correct *Dharma*’ (持戒の比丘有りて威儀具足し正法を護持せば). Looking at these criteria, we can see that they refer to beings who closely follow proper conduct themselves or, as the first passage calls them, ‘wholesome monks’ (*zenbiku* 善比丘). Although not explicitly mentioned in the quote, it is reasonable to infer from this that beings who do not themselves follow proper conduct should not administer the punishments onto others. The second component is the usage of the expression *chōji* 懲治 which translates as discipline. This is important because the expression contains the *kanji* 懲 which is used to form the verb *koru* 懲る meaning ‘to learn one’s lesson’, ‘to learn the hard way’ and/or ‘to learn by experience’. Therefore, discipline refers specifically to giving punishments with the intention of reform, so that the person can learn and grow from them. Therefore, the punishments provided by beings to others ‘who harms the *Dharma*’ (法を壊ぶる) should not be carried out because beings are angered or have resentment towards the ones who harm or disrupt the *Dharma*, but because they seek to help reform beings into ones that can have proper conduct. The last component refers to the fact that beings who administer punishments will not simply avoid receiving negative retributions; on the contrary they will even ‘produce fortunes that are innumerable and cannot be measured’ (福を得んこと無量にして稱計す可からず). Worse, if they do not administer punishment, they will even be considered hostile (*on* 怨) towards the *Buddhadharma* themselves.

Although it is clear that the punishments prescribed in Nichiren's quotes mean discontent/suffering is inevitably going to be inflicted onto others, yet these punishments clearly are not unwholesome actions that result in negative retributions; on the contrary these punishments are rather wholesome actions that lead to positive retributions. But how can it be so? To answer this question we have to keep in mind that Buddhism's karmic theory necessitates us to shift our attention away from actions in and of themselves. As we have seen in Eisai and Dōgen's works, the key factor which determines the results of particular actions is whether these actions have wholesome or unwholesome roots behind them. In other words, the answer behind this puzzle is found in *kokoro* – and especially the purity of *kokoro*.

Overall, although Nichiren's passages on politics emphasizes different aspects of the Buddhist teachings than Eisai's and Dōgen's, we can still see that, ultimately, the fundamental structure of their thoughts are all in alignment. For example, even though Nichiren spent considerably more effort emphasizing the numerous catastrophes that can strike a Nation; all authors fundamentally agree that the cause for such disasters lay in the fact that leaders are not legitimate. Moreover, all authors concur that leaders that are not legitimate are leaders that: (1) do not behave in accordance with the *Buddhadharma*; (2) do not identify, protect and disseminate the correct *Dharma*; and, as a result, (3) are not able to foster the proper conditions which allow for the Nation to receive protections and blessings from buddhas, bodhisattvas and other wholesome deities. This last point is presented by all authors as the specific role leaders of a Nation are supposed to fulfill, and therefore where legitimacy is found (or not).

Furthermore, all authors operate within the same Buddhist karmic framework for power dissemination, which posits that beings in position of power have the privilege to be in these positions because of wholesome actions made in past births. However, this privilege also comes with the responsibility and duty of using this power to alleviate people's discontent/suffering by protecting and disseminating Buddhism so that all beings can receive blessings and protection and progress along the Buddhist path towards liberation. The power and resources available to leaders to protect and disseminate the *Buddhadharma* is also understood by all authors to be the reason why the *Dharma* is entrusted specifically to leaders.

In this section on politics, I have alluded two times to the fact that Nichiren's passages propose information that are incomplete without paying close attention to the operationalizations of *kokoro* and purity. However, Nichiren's *Shugo Kokka Ron* and *Risshō Ankoku Ron* do not unfortunately expand on the topic of purity as a separate topic on its own. Still, the knowledge we have accumulated by exploring Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron* and Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* allows us to see connections between purity and *kokoro* that are not apparent if we simply engage with the specific words used in his texts. Because of these close connections and because Nichiren does not explicitly write on the topic of purity in these two works, I have decided to adapt the structure of this chapter by merging these sections into one where I will be dealing with both terms simultaneously.

The Heart & Purity

The second section of this chapter will provide the readers with my translations of various passages as well as my own commentaries on Nichiren's *Shugo Kokka Ron* and *Risshō Ankoku Ron*, selecting excerpts which combine the topics of *kokoro* and purity. The first passage I would like to engage with is one of the lengthier passages found in the section above which speaks of the various calamities that can strike a Nation if leaders do not protect the *Dharma*. This passage is found both in the *Shugo Kokka Ron* and the *Risshō Ankoku Ron* and mentions:

又金光明經第六に云く「若し人有りて其の國土に於て此の經有りて雖も未だ嘗て流布せず捨離の心を生じ聽聞せんことを樂はず、亦供養し尊重し讚歎せず、四部の眾の持經之人を見て亦復尊重し乃至供養すること能はず、遂に我等及び餘の眷屬・無量の諸天をして此の甚深の妙法を聞くことを得ざらしめん、甘露の味に背き正法の流れを失ひ威光及び勢力有ることが無く、惡趣を増長し人天を損減し生死の河に墜ちて涅槃の路に乖かん、世尊、我等四王並に諸の眷屬及び藥叉等斯くの如き事を見て其の國土を捨てて擁護の心無からん但我等のみ是の王を捨棄するに非ず亦無量の國土を守護する諸大善神有らんも皆悉く捨去せん既に捨離し已りなば其の國當に種種の災禍有りて國位を喪失すべ

し、一切の人眾皆善心無けん唯繫縛殺害瞋諍のみ有りて互に相讒諂し枉げて辜無き及ばん、疫病流行し彗星數數出で兩日並び現じ薄蝕恆無く黑白の二虹不祥の相を表はし、星流れ地動き井の内に聲を發し暴雨惡風時節に依らず常に飢饉に遭ひて苗實も成らず、多く他方の怨賊有りて國內を侵掠し人民諸の苦惱を受け土地所樂之處有る事無けん」。³⁶⁹

Again, section six of the Suvarṇa Prabhā Sottama Sūtreन्द्रa Rājāḥ says: “Suppose that there is a person, and even if this Sūtra exists in this Nation, [this person] is not circulating it in any way yet. [In this person,] a heart of indifference originates, not desiring to carefully listen [to this Sūtra]. Moreover, [this person] does not do offering services, does not revere, and does not praise [this Sūtra]. When seeing the four kinds [of practitioners] who continuously recite this Sūtra, once again [this person] is not able to revere and praise [them]. In the end, the reaching to us [of the teachings] and the hearing of the deep profoundness of the true teachings for the immeasurable various Devas and the rest of the retinues will cause to not be attained. Parting from the taste of sweet nectar and suddenly losing the stream of the correct Dharma; the dissemination of influence and possession of power is nonexistent. [The number of beings falling into] the woeful destinies increase, [the number of beings falling into the realms of] humans and Devas decrease; [beings] keep falling into the river of birth and death and turn their back on the path of cessation. Glorious Buddha, we, the four great kings – extending to all our various retinues as well as the various demigods – when seeing things like this, [we] will abandon this Nation and [our] hearts of protection will no longer exist. However, it is not only we who abandon this ruler. There will also even be the various great wholesome deities that protect the innumerable Nations; all will completely go elsewhere. If [we] completely cease and abandon [it], this Nation will unmistakably have all kinds of calamities and the Nation’s throne will no doubt be forfeited. In the whole multitude of people, every person will lose their wholesome heart, there will only be discrimination, binding, attachment, killing, harm, anger and quarrel, mutual defamation and flattery will be bent one after another, reaching [even] the sinless; diseases and sickness will spread; comets will come out again and again; two suns will appear in a line; light eclipses [will appear] without consistency; two rainbows of black and white will make apparent the nature of ill-omens; stars will expire; the earth will move; the inside of wells will emit sounds; the season of raging winds and torrential rains will not be relied on; famine

will continuously be faced; sprouts of fruits will not even ripen; there will be numerous angry thieves of other lands and [they] will invade and plunder inside the nation; the populace will receive various discontent/suffering and miseries; and the circumstances of having a place where land and soil is pleasant will be nonexistent.

I am presenting this passage again because I want to make sure we pay attention to two important components that are easy to lose sight of due to the length and intensity of the rest of the quote. The first one refers to the fact that all of the numerous enumerated calamities and disaster are the end results of a domino-like ripple effect that find their origins in one single cause: the fact that within a being ‘a heart of indifference originates’ (捨離の心を生じ). Having originated this particular heart of indifference (*shari no shin* 捨離の心), this being does not value Buddhist practices and teachings and therefore does not practice themselves as well as does not encourage and support other beings’ practices. As a result, buddhas, bodhisattvas and other entities do not receive the powers they need to be able to protect and bless the Nation; which eventually leads to the unfolding of all the calamities and disasters. Thus, all of this catastrophic unfolding is the result of the wrong kind of *kokoro* having been originated in a being. A second component points to this same dynamic and is found in the sentence: ‘[i]n the whole multitude of people, every person will lose their wholesome heart, there will only be discrimination, binding, attachment, killing, harm, anger and quarrel, mutual defamation and flattery will be bent one after another, reaching [even] the sinless’ (一切の人眾皆善心無けん唯繫縛殺害瞋諍のみ有りて互に相讒諂し枉げて辜無き及ばん). Once again, all the unwholesome actions enumerated in this sentence are the result of beings not having the proper kind of *kokoro*. Interestingly, beings losing their wholesome hearts is due to the fact that the Nation is facing calamities because the deities do not protect it anymore; and the fact that the Nation is facing calamities is itself the result of a being having generated the wrong kind of heart in a heart of indifference. Nichiren reaches this exact same conclusion and unequivocally affirms this, commenting the following:

夫れ四經の文朗かなり萬人誰か疑はん、而る盲瞽之輩迷惑之人妄に邪説を信じて正教を辨えず、故に天下世上・諸佛・衆經に於て捨離之心を生じて擁護之志無し、仍て善神聖人國を捨て所を去る、是を以て惡鬼外道災を成し難を致す。³⁷⁰

The words of these four Sūtras are clear. In the myriad of people, who would doubt [these words]? Still, blind and delusional people irresponsibly have faith in heretical doctrines and do not distinguish the correct teachings. As a result, a heart of indifference towards all Sūtras, all buddhas, and all under heaven and above earth originates and there is no determination or safeguarding [of them]. Therefore, wholesome deities and venerable people abandon the nation and leave this place. Based on this, wicked demons, [people] outside of Way, and calamities take form and misfortunes are caused to arrive.

All in all, both of these passage underlines the undeniable matter-of-fact that all that can go wrong is due to one single factor: *kokoro*. However, as we have seen with Eisai and Dōgen, *kokoro* is not just the source for unwholesomeness, but it is also the source for wholesomeness. This is clearly expressed a passage used both in the Shugo Kokka Ron and Risshō Ankoku Ron and mentions that:

又[涅槃經に]云く「我れ往昔を念ふに閻浮提に於て大國の王と作れり名を仙豫と曰ひき、大乘經典を愛念し敬重し其の心純善に麤惡嫉恚有ること無し、善男子我爾の時に於て心に大乘を重んず波羅門の方等を誹謗するを聞き聞き已りて即時に其の命根を斷ず、善男子是の因縁を以て從是より已來地獄に墮せず」と。³⁷¹

Again, it is said in section twelve of the Mahā Pari Nirvāṇa Sūtra: “I, when recollecting the past, on the continent of Jambudvīpa, took the form of a ruler of great Nations and my name was spoken ‘Senyo’. [I] cherished and venerated the Mahāyāna Sūtras. In this heart of genuine wholesome heart, the existence of coarseness, wickedness, envy, stinginess and greed were nonexistent. Then, Good Sons, I, at that time, was determined to pile up the great vehicle in my heart. Hearing a great number of Brahmins slandering, once finished listening, [I] immediately cut their life-force. Good Sons, by means of these causes and conditions, from there since, [I] have not fallen into hell.”

This passage connects directly to the discussion surrounding punishment found in the previous section of this chapter. Earlier, we saw that although it is clear that administering punishments means discontent/suffering is inevitably going to be inflicted onto others, yet these punishments

were not deemed to be unwholesome actions that result in negative retributions; on the contrary these punishments were rather wholesome actions that lead to positive retributions. I then raised the question, how can it be so? This passage provides the final answer to the puzzle: it is because of *kokoro*. Indeed, it is important to remember that Nichiren's earlier discussion of punishment alluded to the fact that only particular kinds of being should administer punishment. These beings were ones who follow, practice, protect, and disseminate the correct *Dharma*. This current passage tells us that Senyo had a heart of genuine wholesomeness (*junzen* 純善) and therefore did not have any unwholesome qualities. We also learned that Senyo's heart was as such because he cherished (*ainen* 愛念) and venerated (*keichō* 敬重) the Mahāyāna *Sūtras*. The passage then explains that it is precisely because Senyo had this particular kind of *kokoro* that when Senyo cut the Brahmins' (*baramon* 波羅門) life-force (*meikon* 命根) after hearing them slander (*hibō* 誹謗) the *Dharma*, he was granted protection and blessings which made Senyo never experience (re)birth in hell – even though this clearly is a break of the first Major Precept.

Combining the information from the previous passages on punishment together with this one, we can easily see that, once again, the key is *kokoro*. Indeed, if beings do not have a pure heart, they might administer punishment out of anger, hate, greed, vengefulness, and so forth. This would be counter to the purpose of punishment which has the function of rehabilitation and reformation and would simply serve the purpose of satisfying one's egotistic cravings. This means that for the proper function of reformation to be fulfilled, punishments need to be administered by beings that have pure, untainted hearts. As seen above, even punishments that are as severe as death, if they are performed from a pure heart, will actually function as wholesome actions in karmic processes. On the other hand, beneficial gestures such as praying, offerings, helping others, etc. if they are performed with an impure heart, will function as unwholesome actions in karmic processes. Classic examples of this would be if someone would give to the poor in order to bolster their ego or socio-political reputation, or if someone would use the Buddhist teachings for the sake of becoming famous and rich. Although both of these actions appear good at first glimpse, they will ultimately function as unwholesome action – and thus generate negative results – because of the unwholesome roots found within the impure heart behind the action.

While beings are working to purify their hearts through the Buddhist path, there are still ways to help with manifesting wholesome results into the world and help in putting an end to the calamities. There are two passages of the Risshō Ankoku Ron where Nichiren provides guidelines on this matter. The first passage stipulates:

其の詞を盛に彌よ其の旨を談ず、所詮天下泰平國土安穩は君臣の樂ふ所土民の思ふ所也、夫れ國は法に依りて昌え法は人に因りて貴し國亡び人滅せば佛を誰か崇む可き法を誰か信ず可き哉。先ず國家を祈りて須く佛法を立つべし。若し災を消し難を止むるの術有らば聞かんと欲す。³⁷²

These words beyond doubt energetically discuss the established doctrines. 'Peace and tranquility reaching the outmost limits in all under heaven and the Nation' is the thing that is wished for by rulers and ministers, it is the thing that is wished for by the inhabitants of a land. Such Nations flourish by means of the Dharma, the Dharmas are valued by means of people. When Nations collapse and people die, who can treasure the Buddhas? Who can have faith in the Dharma? In any event, there must be praying for the national family and there must be the establishment of the Buddhadharma by all means. Suppose that if there exists a magical skill that will stop calamities and extinguish disasters, [shouldn't you] desire to listen?

The second passage posits:

誠に其の難を顧みて専ら此の言を信ぜば、風和らぎ浪靜かにして不日に豊年ならん、但し人の心は時に隨ひて移り物の性は境に依りて改まる [...] 汝當座に信ずと雖も後定めて永く忘れん、若し先ず國土安んじて現當を祈らんと欲せば速に情慮を迴らし忿で對治を加へよ。³⁷³

If truly looking back at those calamities and wholeheartedly believing those words, winds will be mild, waves will be calm, and within the next few days there will be bountiful harvests. However, the heart of people submits to the times and the innate characteristics of moving things changes as a result of the object of senses [...] Even if you harbour faith in this current occasion, afterwards you will stabilize and forget for a long time. Suppose that, one way or another, if

[you] wish for the Nation to be at peace and will make prayers for the present and future, then consideration will swiftly surround [you]. Hurry, pile up the remedies!

These passages give prescriptions to leaders and population reminding them that all should aspire to attain ‘peace and tranquility reaching the outmost limits in all under heaven and the Nation’ (*shosen tenka taihei kokudo annon* 所詮天下泰平國土安穩). Achieving this requires that the correct *Dharma* be disseminated and fulfilled; fulfilling the correct *Dharma* requires beings to practice it; and practicing the correct *Dharma* requires people to have a space that is conducive and supportive to practice – i.e. a healthy, flourishing, ordered, and blessed Nation. This expresses the interdependent relationship between the Buddhist teachings, the leaders and all beings.

Nevertheless, both of Nichiren’s passages place strong emphasis on faith in the *Buddhadharma*. Indeed, simply ‘wholeheartedly believing the words [of the *Sūtras*] (専ら此の言を信ぜば), already ensures that ‘winds will be mild, waves will be calm, and within the next few days there will be bountiful harvests’ (風和らぎ浪静かにして不日に豊年ならん). However, Nichiren recognizes that faith is something that is oftentimes hard to maintain. That is because Nichiren understand that ‘the heart of people submits to the times and the innate characteristics of moving things changes as a result of the object of senses’ (但し人の心は時に随ひて移り物の性は境に依りて改まる). Once again, we can find *kokoro* at the core of the problem and the solution. Indeed, a heart tainted by the provisional truths of a being’s experiences will always be swayed by the transiency of phenomena, meaning faith will diminish with time as a result. Thus, is important to maintain a strong faith in the ultimate truth of the teachings of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas which, as Dōgen vividly promoted, can be achieved through the manifestation of a pure heart of devotion.

Overall, we can see again that Nichiren’s passages on *kokoro* concurs with the fundamental belief structure found in the works of Eisai and Dōgen. That is: *kokoro* is the key factor that influences the results and outcomes of beings’ actions. This is why any beings, but particularly leaders, have the responsibility to purify their hearts to ensure that their actions are going to result in beneficial outcomes that can benefit all beings.

On that note, although there are no explicit mention of purity in Nichiren's work, it is still possible to see through his discussion of *kokoro* that the narrative of purity is implied. Indeed, we learned through the previous authors that Buddhist frameworks label wholesome *kokoro* as 'pure' and unwholesome *kokoro* as 'impure' or 'tainted'. This is why I believe it is reasonable to argue that Nichiren's advocacy for manifesting wholesome *kokoro* aligns with the general narrative and understanding surrounding purity within Buddhism.

Summary

After translating Nichiren's *Shugo Kokka Ron* and *Risshō Ankoku Ron*, it is easy to see that his insights aligns with Eisai's and Dōgen's regarding all three topics of politics, *kokoro* and purity. For example, Nichiren works: (1) present a karmic-based theory of power dissemination where leaders are granted positions of power as a positive retribution for wholesome actions made in past lifetimes; (2) affirm that this karmic inheritance places a responsibility on them to practice Buddhism and use their power to spread the correct *Dharma* to all beings; and (3) emphasizes the necessary role leaders play in ensuring that the Nation is protected from all sorts of calamities and disasters. One aspect of politics discussed further by Nichiren is that of punishment, which stated that punishment of people who act in opposition to the *Dharma* need to be punished for the sake of reform. This means that punishment must be administered by beings who have a pure hearts, to ensure that these actions are going to generate wholesome results.

This leads us to the topic of *kokoro* and purity, where Nichiren simply reemphasized the key role that a pure heart plays in influencing the outcome of any beings' actions. This means that because *kokoro* is simultaneously the source of discontent/suffering and enlightenment, beings need to ensure that they work towards manifesting wholesome and pure *kokoro*. Even though Nichiren did not expand much on what purity is and how to achieve it, he still mentioned faith in the *Buddhadharma* as a way to safeguard the heart from the falling prey to the inevitable fluctuations of times.

After translating and deeply engaging with all three authors, it has become clear to me that Eisai's, Dōgen's, and Nichiren's works, despite the doctrinal differences between their traditions, operate within one identical framework with regards to political legitimacy. My next chapter is going to serve the purpose of taking their scattered perspectives, and present for the first time in the English language a coherent and systematize medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy.

Chapter 6: The Pure Heart: A Medieval Japanese Buddhist Political Theory of Legitimacy

The previous three chapters presented translations and commentaries on passages found in the texts of Eisai, Dōgen, and Nichiren surrounding the topic of politics, *kokoro*, and purity. These chapters sought to expose the readers to each author's respective perspective on each subject, presenting the data in their original language and contexts. To mimic my own inductive research process, I chose to engage each author's work separately while paying attention to similar themes that surfaced in each text. Although I facilitated connecting each author's perspectives through the use of commentaries, the nature of my data gathering process – which engaged with similar information scattered across different texts – does not provide a clear, coherent, and systematized theory. This chapter will fill this gap by gathering together my data and present the first coherent and systematized medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy in the English language.

In order to balance clarity and succinctness, I will present the information in my own words – i.e. as if these truths came from my own thinking and experience – and will not directly refer to each author's work as I have done in previous chapters. Still, it is important for me to clarify that presenting the information in such a way is simply for the sake of communicating the authors' truths efficiently to my audience. Indeed, it is necessary to remember that I did not produce such truths myself, I merely seek to act as an effective intermediary between the authors' original thoughts and my audience.

Moreover, still with the goal of balancing clarity and succinctness, I will present this theory in two separate sections. The first section will be short and will only solely state the political theory of legitimacy in itself. The second section will then contextualize this political theory of legitimacy within the broader context of medieval Japanese Buddhist thought, by extrapolating further on the main key beliefs of *kokoro*, purity and *karma* in which this theory finds its grounding.

Medieval Japanese Buddhist Political Theory of Legitimacy

The powers that leaders possess are legitimate because they reflect the truth of karmic processes. Indeed, whether it is because of uttering the Original Vow, vowing to protect the *Buddhadharma* or performing beneficial actions in service to buddhas or bodhisattvas in past births; these wholesome actions of the past have now reaped the beneficial result of being born as a leader for this lifetime.

Still, these karmic ties mean leaders must continue to practice, protect, and disseminate the *Buddhadharma* in this lifetime. In fact, it is precisely for this reason that a being is (re)born as a leader. Indeed, since they are the inheritors of *karma* tracing back to the Original Bodhisattva Vow and Śākyamuni Buddha, leaders have more power, influence, resources, etc. than other beings within the human realm. However, the karmic duty and responsibility leaders have towards their karmic lineage – which is the source of the power they have today – necessitates leaders to use their power to continue furthering the wholesome work that has been initiated in past lifetimes. Thus, legitimate leaders are ones who act in accordance with the Original Bodhisattva Vow and cultivate the bodhisattva precepts as laid out in the Brahmajāla Bodhisattva Śīla Sūtra. In other words, they manifest compassion and Discernment, pose wholesome actions that benefit all beings, and help alleviate and guide all beings towards liberation from the discontent/suffering permeating the cycle of transmigration.

Nevertheless, it is well established that for actions to be wholesome, they must be made from a heart that has wholesome roots. Wholesome roots means that a heart has been purified from the taints of the three poisons of desire, hatred, and delusion. These three poisons are inherited at (re)birth through karmic processes and can worsen throughout a being's lifetime. However, each being has the responsibility and capacity to purify their heart by faithfully and energetically cultivating the Buddhist path. It is possible for any being to do so because all beings, ultimately, always-already are Buddha-Nature. It is thus necessary for leaders to faithfully and energetically practice Buddhism to constantly purify their hearts which will ensure that their actions are wholesome. It is mandatory for their actions be wholesome because only wholesome actions will generate positive retributions that can be enjoyed by all beings – and it is their responsibility as

leaders to ensure that their actions generate positive results that benefit all beings. Simply put, legitimate leaders are ones who possess a pure heart.

Nonetheless, the duties of a leader do not merely consist of performing wholesome actions that generate positive retributions. In fact, honouring and furthering their karmic inheritance means they must use their powers to help in fostering conditions where the past and present wholesome actions of others can also blossom into positive retributions. To do so, they must not simply purify their hearts and minds; they must also help in purifying all beings within their nation. For this, leaders are entrusted with the correct *Dharma* which they must actively disseminate, protect, and teach. The powers they inherited from their (re)birth as a leader also means they must administer punishment to beings who spread unwholesome teachings and produce unwholesome actions. However, such punishment must be given from a pure heart of compassion that seeks to reform the tainted heart of the wrongdoer. This means that legitimate leaders are ones who guide all beings in cultivating purification.

But how is it possible to know if leaders' hearts are pure and if they are successful in bringing about purification for others? Ultimately, the answer is found when looking at the results of their actions and moves away from focusing on the actions in themselves. Indeed, the *proper conditions for wholesome results to manifest are met when purity of kokoro is attained*. When such conditions are met, the entire Nation will be granted protection and blessing from buddhas, bodhisattvas, and various wholesome deities. Having received such blessings and protection, beings now have increased capacity and opportunity to deepen their practices and faith and get closer to liberation. Deepening their practices and faith will, in turn, continue to attract more blessings that will, once again, generate innumerable benefits for oneself and others. This will catalyze a cycle of exponential accumulation of positive retributions. However, when purity of *kokoro* is not attained and the proper conditions for wholesome results to manifest are not met, buddhas, bodhisattvas, and wholesome deities will not have the power to grant blessings and protection on the impure Nation. As a result, various personal, circumstantial and environmental difficulties will arise in the present and future that will make it harder for beings to practice and have faith and get closer to liberation. This will, in turn, make beings produce further unwholesome actions that will, once again, result in generating innumerable difficulties for oneself and others.

This will catalyze a cycle of exponential accumulation of negative retributions. In a nutshell, *if positive retributions manifest, it means that actions are wholesome and made with a pure heart; if negative retributions manifest, it means that actions are unwholesome and made with an impure heart.* With that said, legitimate leaders are ones who help in fostering the proper conditions which allow their nations to be granted protection and blessing by buddhas, bodhisattvas, and various wholesome deities.

To summarize, the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy posits that: legitimate leaders are ones who fulfill their karmic responsibility of constantly manifesting purity of *kokoro* within themselves while helping others to do so since this ensures that their (as well as every beings') actions are wholesome. In doing so, leaders (as well as all beings) participate in fostering the proper conditions for the entire nation to enjoy positive retributions and move towards the collective liberation of all beings. These are going to be expedited via the support of buddhas, bodhisattvas, and various wholesome deities who will grant blessing and protection to the entire nation as a result. Thus, the key to understanding political legitimacy for medieval Japanese society is found in the beliefs surrounding the pure heart.

Contextualization Within Buddhism's Belief-System

If I were to pinpoint every single belief implicitly contained within this medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy, I would have to elaborate on the entire core teachings of Mahāyāna Buddhism. To name a few, I would have to expand on the beliefs in buddhas and bodhisattvas, on the entirety of Buddhist cosmology, on the role and operationalization of faith, on the innumerable lists contained within the *Sūtras* – such as the six or ten perfections, the three poisons, the five hindrances, the ten major precepts, the forty-eight minor precepts, the ten or forty stages of the bodhisattva path towards Buddhahood, the four elements, and five aggregates, the seven factors of enlightenment, and much (much!) more – and so forth.

However, I would like to remind the reader that my selection for which beliefs to highlight was based on two criteria: (1) repetitiveness or consistency, and (2) impact. For repetitiveness, it was not only important for a belief to repeat itself within the context of an author's own work, but

also that this belief reappeared within the works of other authors as well. The criteria of repetitiveness is primarily used to tackle the matter generalizability. As for the criteria of impact, I was looking to see which beliefs are the ones that are understood to have greater influence on the outcomes of events. As I just mentioned, a text always contains multiple beliefs within its pages, but a text also oftentimes reveals a hierarchy of beliefs in which some are understood to possess more influence over outcomes than others.

In chapter 2, after translating and analyzing some of Saigyō's poems, stories of the Konjaku Monogatari and Fujiwara Teika's art theory, I realized that belief in *kokoro* was the only belief that fulfilled the criteria of repetitiveness/consistency and impact across all texts. This made me pay particular attention as to whether or not *kokoro* would also make an appearance within Buddhist authors' theorizations of politics. It turns out that not only did *kokoro* make an appearance; but it once again fulfilled both the criteria of repetitiveness/consistency and impact across all three Buddhist authors.

However, even though *kokoro* once more turned out to be a core belief in which the authors' theories were grounded, its function within the political theory of legitimacy can only be understood properly via exploring its interaction with two other key Buddhist beliefs: purity and *karma*. Therefore, in this section, I will first systematize all authors' descriptions and explanations of *kokoro*. I will then clarify the ways in which *kokoro* locates itself within Buddhism's karmic-based framework and its intrinsic connection to purity.

What is Kokoro?

First of all, although I translated *kokoro* as 'heart' throughout my work, it is important to clarify that *kokoro* encompasses more than what heart means within the current dominant Eurocentric belief-system. In my commentaries, I pointed out that *kokoro* refers to the totality of what a being is. In the provisional sense, this means that *kokoro* encapsulates all aspects of a being's existence such as their body, their intellectual faculties, their emotions, their psychology, their spiritual experiences, and so forth. In the ultimate sense, all beings always-already are Buddha; therefore *kokoro* is Buddha-Nature. Since *kokoro* is the basis for sentience and since – in

the ultimate sense – all beings are Buddha-Nature, this means that – in Buddhism – all beings are sentient; there is no discrimination between sentient and non-sentient beings.

This requires a bit more clarification. Indeed, Buddhism posits that beings conceptualize the world through their own experiences which are filtered by their faculties or senses, namely: eyes, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind. Because faculties operate differently in different beings, conceptualizing the world through them only leads to the creation of provisional or relative truths. In contrast, buddhas and bodhisattvas – who have gotten rid of their attachments to the provisional truths produced from these faculties or, sometimes, even transcended these faculties altogether – are able to experience reality as is it, unfiltered, in its purity; this allows them to experience ultimate or absolute truth. This means that within every phenomena/being, two truths are always operating simultaneously: (1) the absolute truth of the phenomena as it is; and (2) the provisional truths created by beings who experience phenomena filtered by their faculties. Any attempt at conceptualizing ultimate truth and expressing it to others – usually through language – means it necessarily becomes provisional since it now becomes mediated by the faculties. This does not mean that provisional truths are useless, however, since such truths are to be used as skillful means to help guide beings towards the ultimate (Buddhahood or bodhisattvahood). In other words, provisional truths are necessary to help guide beings towards attaining enlightenment, but attaining enlightenment enables a being to know that these truths were only provisional and therefore must let go of their attachments to them.

Kokoro, just as any phenomena, exists simultaneously within these two truths: (1) in the provisional sense, it is called mind-body-spirit; and (2) in the ultimate sense, it simply is Buddha-Nature. Since *kokoro* – in the provisional sense – encapsulates all of the six faculties, it is the source of discontent/suffering. That is because suffering/discontent is created as a result of the three poisons of desire, anger and delusion, all of which originate in *kokoro*. However, *kokoro* – in the ultimate sense – is also the source of enlightenment. That is because once a being is able to rid themselves of the three poisons which originated in *kokoro*, they can experience Buddha-Nature and, thus, ultimate reality as it really is. With this, we can see why *kokoro* is not only a core element of the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy, but also a core element of Buddhism in general. Indeed, *kokoro* is simultaneously the cause for suffering/discontent as

well as the solution to it. In other words, whatever happens, it happens because, through and with *kokoro*. As highlighted multiple times through my work: for better or worse, *kokoro* is always the key.

Expanding on this matter, all authors alluded to the fact that *kokoro* can manifest in multiple different ways. Indeed, multiple ‘kinds’ of *kokoro* were named throughout their texts such as a heart of devotion, a heart of loving kindness, an enlightened-heart/mind, a heart of great compassion, a heart of faith, a clear heart, a wholesome heart, a pure heart; but also an indifferent heart, a discriminating heart, an unwholesome heart, an impure heart, and so forth. Even though all of these different kinds of *kokoro* are only provisional denomination, they are useful in that they convey the important teaching that beings must seek to manifest the proper kind of *kokoro*. As mentioned above, that is because manifesting the right kind of heart generates good outcomes (enlightenment and liberation), while manifesting the wrong kind of heart generates negative outcomes (discontent/suffering). However, to better understand how that can be so, we need to further contextualize *kokoro*’s relationship to purity and *karma*.

The Pure Heart and Karma

Any discussion of *kokoro* found in Eisai’s *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*, Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō*, and/or Nichiren’s *Shugo Kokka Ron* and *Risshō Ankoku Ron* was inevitably intertwined with the beliefs surrounding purity and *karma*.

The basis for this discussion is found in the workings of *karma*. First of all, the Sanskrit word *karma* कर्म is oftentimes understood to simply mean ‘action’ or ‘deed’. However, it is more appropriate to understand it to mean ‘what pertains to ‘act’’. The reason for this is that *karma* is not simply speaking of an action or performance in itself; rather, it also encompasses everything that surrounds ‘act’. This means that the term contains implicit connections to its past, present and future. For example, for every single action it is necessary to ask questions such as: what are the causes behind the action?; what will be its effects?; what are the conditions in which actions arise?; and so forth. Indeed, since the truth of dependent co-origination understands that no phenomena arise on their own, it means that an action is always necessarily connected and located within an

interconnected web of cause and effect. *Karma* is *all* of this: the action and the web it finds itself to be part of. However, this web is not merely what is immediate to the action. Indeed, this web is an accumulation of causes and effects that is beginning-less and extends well before and well after the action's or actor's existence.

This web also clarifies how *karma* is connected to rebirth. Indeed, the birth of a present action inherits past traces; this present action generates additional traces which will be added up on top of the traces of the past; and all of these accumulated traces from the past and present will cause a future birth in the form of an effect. Thus, within this framework of dependent co-origination, an action (i.e. *karma*) can be seen as a medium which connects together past, present and future. *Karma* is the central mechanism that ensures continuous (re)birth precisely because actions in the present guarantees the birth of an outcome in the future. Still, since future results contain traces of past and present actions, this means that a present action has the capacity to influence the kinds of results it is going to birth in the future.

This is where purity is introduced. Indeed, since a present action is going to send forward in the future the traces it possesses at the moment the action is performed, it becomes crucial to ensure that present actions have the right kind of traces within them to be sent forward. As mentioned above, the traces contained within a being's actions are going to be determined by the kind of *kokoro* that they are able to manifest at the moment of the action. However – remembering that the structure of *karma* posits that actions are merely one link in a beginning-less chain of causes of effects – for an action to send forth the right kinds of traces, this means that actors have to clear off all of the negative traces of the beginning-less past that they have inherited that currently clouds their hearts. In other words, the clearing off of traces of the past in addition to the clearing off of oneself in the present; this is what is meant by purification. Once a being is able to manifest a *kokoro* that is not tainted by any traces, this is what is meant by purity. Moreover, because it is the source that determines what kind of result is going to arise in the future as a result of present actions, the 'thing' that is being purified is always specifically *kokoro*.

To recapitulate, wholesome actions contains positive traces which a future birth will inherit; while unwholesome actions contains negative traces which a future birth will inherit. The

authors expound that in order to determine what kind of action it is, we have to look at their root. Wholesome roots are found in actions that are devoid of desire, devoid of anger, and/or devoid of delusion; while unwholesome roots are found in actions tainted by desire, anger and/or delusion. Since all of these unwholesome roots are the effects of having a tainted heart or impure heart, the way to ensure that a being's actions are permeated with good roots leading to good results is by following the Buddhist teachings which guide beings in generating a pure heart. This ensures that their actions are permeated with wholesome roots, and therefore will generate positive retributions.

Nonetheless, focusing exclusively on the role a single actor plays into the unfolding of outcomes is also slightly misleading. That is because karmic theory is unique in that it does not place actors at its core, but rather conditions. Indeed, the result of an action will only manifest when the proper conditions are met for it to arise. For example, an actor might pose a wholesome action with a pure heart in this current (re)birth, but the conditions for the result to manifest might only be met in a few (re)births afterwards. Or, an actor might have posed wholesome actions with a pure heart throughout their current lifetime, but the present conditions make all of the unwholesome actions of the past to be currently manifesting instead. In other words, it is likely that an actor will never experience the result of their actions in their current lifetime because there can be no guarantee as to when the proper conditions will be present for the retributions to manifest. Ultimately, an actor is not entitled to the results of their actions. Overall, karmic theory expounds that actors are only *one* of the multiple conditions needed for outcomes to manifest.

If this is the case, then why would people chose to do wholesome actions? The passages from Eisai's, Dōgen's and Nichiren's texts provides two alternatives. Firstly, people who chose to do unwholesome actions do so because their hearts are imbued with the three poisons and dwell in ignorance; but beings who have purified their hearts from the three poisons naturally chose to do wholesome actions on their own accord because they have understanding and Discernment. Secondly, since most beings have not yet been able to purify their hearts and are still swimming in the three poisons, for the time being, they must have faith in the truth of the teachings and in the power of salvation of buddhas and bodhisattvas. Having faith in the truth of both (or even just one) of these makes beings engage in purifying practices without requiring understanding. Even more,

having even one single instant of faith can dispel the doubts clouding a being's *kokoro* and is, in itself, a potent purifying practice.

To summarize, whether it is because a being has reached a very deep understanding of things or because a being has faith in the truth of the teachings and the powers of buddhas and bodhisattvas (or both), the right course of action is always to ensure that a being's actions are going to produce positive outcome. Karmic theory posits that this can only happen as a result of actions that are made with wholesome roots, which requires for *kokoro* to be pure. However, producing wholesome actions in itself is not sufficient to ensure that positive results are going to manifest. That is because actions are only one of the multiple conditions needed for retributions to arise. Thus, it is equally important that beings do the work of helping in fostering the proper conditions for the positive retributions of their actions as well as other beings' actions to arise. In other words, beings need to help and guide each other in purifying *kokoro*, which can only happen via spreading the Buddhist teachings which guides beings in doing exactly that. To simplify, the more purity arises on the planet, the more conditions that allow for blessings, protection, liberation and bliss to arise are created. On the other hand, the more impurity arises on the planet, the more conditions that allow for bad fortune, disasters, oppression, and discontent/suffering to arise are created.

The medieval Japanese Buddhist theory of legitimacy is mapped precisely on this belief-system which, at its core, is anchored in the interactions between the three key beliefs of *kokoro*, purity and *karma*. Indeed, legitimate leaders are ones who – either because of understanding or faith – seek to help in fostering circumstances where all beings under their responsibility – because of *karma* – can experience blessings, protection, liberation and bliss while limiting the possibility that fortune, disasters, oppression and discontent/suffering arises. For this, they must not only cultivate practices to manifest a pure *kokoro* themselves, they must also guide all beings in doing so. In other words, they must protect and actively disseminate the correct *Buddhadharma*.

Conclusion

Following the insight's of Max Weber's regarding the proposition that the legitimacy of any structure of power emerges and sustains itself through the beliefs or "matters-of-facts" of a community/society, I have embarked on a journey of excavating the various matters-of-facts present in the theorizations of politics found in the works of Eisai, Dōgen and Nichiren. These three Japanese Buddhist authors lived and wrote during the Kamakura period and were chosen because they are key figures in the history of Japanese Buddhism due the fact that they established new Buddhist traditions in Japan that would grow to become incredibly influential to this day. Since the Kamakura era has traditionally been presented by historians of Japan as the emergence of a radically new political order, I have sought to find what kinds of beliefs were present in Japanese society during this time period that might play a role in legitimizing and/or deligitimizing this new order.

However, an examination of the political context of this new era allowed for a critique of this traditional framing as I noted that the necessity of maintaining order for its own survival made the new Kamakura government protect and even sometimes revitalized traditional hierarchies and power dynamics, instead of completely usurping them. Similar to the *bakufu*, the founders of the new Buddhist traditions knew that their reformed traditions needed to be anchored in past precedents, leading them to also disseminate practices and teachings which needed to carefully balance the old and the new. Since both the *bakufu* and the new Buddhisms legitimized themselves through an appeal to already-established systems of the past – and the beliefs underpinning them – it was necessary for me to, first, explore what kinds of beliefs appeared to be dominant in the preceding Heian period. To do so, I translated and commented on Saigyō's poetry, two folklore tales of the *Konjaku Monogatari* and Fujiwara Teika's art theory. Through this, I found that the belief surrounding the heart (*kokoro*) was not only consistent in all of the author's work, but it was also the belief which had the most impact. More specifically, this belief posited that the result of an outcome is determined by *kokoro*, which can be made proper through purification and improper through taint.

Keeping this in mind, I started my translation and commentary of numerous passages focusing on the topics of politics found in Eisai's *Kōzen Gokoku Ron*, Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* as well as Nichiren's *Shugo Kokka Ron* and *Risshō Ankoku Ron*. Following this, I was able to see that not only did *kokoro* continue to make an appearance; but it once again fulfilled both the criteria of repetitiveness/consistent and impact across all three Buddhist author's theorization of politics. Moreover, the Buddhist texts provided further explanations of the belief-system surrounding *kokoro* which is intrinsically connected to beliefs in purity and *karma*. I was then able to systematize all of the author's scattered descriptions and explanations and presented the first coherent medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy in the English language. In a nutshell, this theory states that legitimate leaders are ones who fulfill their karmic responsibility of constantly manifesting purity of *kokoro* within themselves while helping others to do so since this ensures that their (as well as every being's) actions are wholesome. In doing so, leaders (as well as all beings) participate in fostering the proper conditions for the entire nation to enjoy positive retributions and move towards the collective liberation of all beings. These are going to be expedited via the support of buddhas, bodhisattvas, and various wholesome deities who will grant blessing and protection to the entire nation. The key to understanding political legitimacy for medieval Japanese society is thus found in the belief surrounding the pure heart.

My work had multiple goals. First of all, I sought to offer a critique of the current discipline of political science and Japanese history for their lack of serious and meaningful engagement with the topic of beliefs in their theorization of power and legitimacy. By centering beliefs as my primary analytical tool, I re-emphasized this crucial but underutilized framework for exploring the ways in which the legitimization of structures and relations of powers happen. Excavating the dominant beliefs present in Heian and Kamakura texts re-opened an important door in understanding *why* relations of power did not change between the two eras; an answer that has not been adequately clarified through the dominant approaches used by most historians of Japan and other political historians.

Secondly, I aimed at providing a broader critique of the entirety of the currently-dominant Eurocentric system of beliefs which legitimizes the legacies of colonialism, racism, sexism, patriarchy, capitalism, (neo)liberalism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, and so forth. To do so,

I added another voice to the fight for anti-oppression and anti-Eurocentricism by providing access to the truths of medieval Japanese Buddhism via my role as a medium between the authors' original texts in their original language and a modern English-speaking audience. This was achieved through the use of the East-Asian commentary tradition as my methodology where truths are located in the original content of a work and not in its added commentaries – meaning I do not take credit for any of the knowledges that surfaced in my work. In fact, applying such methodology to my work and transcribing each passages in their classical Japanese language were not simply a reflection of my conscious effort to move away from the excavating and appropriating tendencies found in the still-present colonial practices of Academia, more importantly, they were for the purpose of honouring and highlighting the truths of the tradition I have the privilege to engage with. I can simply wish my readers will find that I successfully achieved so not simply through the content of my work but also in its form.

Thirdly, and most significantly, the primary goal of my work is *hope*. The ever accelerating globalization of the dominant Eurocentric belief-system through colonial and neo-colonial practices has made it almost impossible to imagine a world outside of its limited conceptual boundaries. As a result, there has been an increase in the feeling of disempowerment and hopelessness that any other radical possible alternatives are within reach and are viable. This also enabled the unconscious reproduction of oppressive power dynamics even in the proposal for emancipatory projects, precisely because the underlying beliefs which legitimize such structures and dynamics are rarely meaningfully deconstructed as a result of being almost completely naturalized. Although privilege unfortunately still plays a crucial role in regulating who has the capacity, resources, and power to be able to engage with various truthful traditions across time and space; I also know that refusing to meaningfully do so while not making accessible such truths are both strong mechanisms that help in further naturalizing the legitimacy that sustains the currently-dominant oppressive status-quo. Thus, my work intentionally sought to use the power derived from my privileges as a white cis-gendered and able man in Academia – which allowed me to conduct this doctoral research and learn Classical Japanese – to help reduce this gap by rendering accessible to an English-speaking audience the truths of medieval Japanese Buddhist authors via my translations and commentaries. Indeed, my work had the important but modest goal of being a stepping stone in opening our hearts and minds to what it could look like to briefly navigate the

world through a different set of eyes: that of medieval Japanese Buddhism. By asking my readers to let themselves be guided into a world that operates differently than their own for a bit, I wish to have been able to help foster hope that different worlds and different visions are never too far away from us. In fact, they have *already* existed in our own historical pasts; some still continuing on – sometimes even thriving – to this day. There are multiple frameworks in which answers (and questions) can be found.

Thought Experiment

Keeping in mind my desire to help in fostering hope that different worlds and visions are not just possible but are, actually, never too far away from us, I would like to guide my readers in putting into practice the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy in their own lives. I will do so by proposing of a few thought experiments in the form of hypothetical scenarios to be explored applying this theory. The goal here is not for me to provide the answers to such questions or to allude to what the correct answers are. Indeed, it is simply to encourage readers and myself to not leave these words to rot in the backdrawers of our minds and, instead, concretely apply this framework to actually guide us in evaluating contemporary circumstances through a belief system (most likely) different than our own.

The first scenario is the following: *What would happen if we stopped basing the legitimacy of contemporary leaders on their actions and rather focused on the heart behind their actions and their outcome?* As we have seen, the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy is embedded in a karmic-based framework which understands that actions and actors are simply one of the many conditions that needs to happen for particular outcomes to manifest. One thing this means is that it requires us to shift our attention away from actions in and of themselves while paying closer attention to the results of such actions instead. However, to understand how particular outcomes come to manifest from a being's actions, we need to remember that the key is found in *kokoro*. Indeed, a pure heart which has wholesome roots will produce actions that transfers this wholesomeness into its future potential result. For example, what if a nation's leaders

pose the action of implementing a policy that would increase energy security for their nation, but the results include a furthering of national financial disparity and eviction of indigenous populations off their ancestral lands? Or, what if the leaders of a company pose the action of increasing vacation days for their employees, but the results include an increase of the oppressive behaviors within company culture? On the other hand, what if the head of family poses the action of limiting access to food supply for its own family members, but the result is increase in food accessibility for members outside of their family? These are all scenarios that forces us to consider the legitimacy of a leader not based on the actions they pose, but rather on the outcomes that result from their actions. Looking at the outcome of their actions is crucial because it offers an indication as to the kind of *kokoro* behind those actions. Ultimately, legitimacy is found precisely in the kind of *kokoro* leaders' manifest, but since this is impossible for common beings to asses directly, we have to turn to the result of their actions to be able to indirectly evaluate it.

Following this train of thought, the second scenario is: *What would happen if we based the legitimacy of leaders on their responsibility towards their karmic pasts – and especially the Bodhisattva Vow?* Since all leaders owe their position of power to the karmic imprints they have inherited from the wholesome actions they have produced in the past, they have a responsibility to continue seeking to perform wholesome actions in their leadership. Moreover, since various *Sūtra* explicitly state that leaders' power is a retribution from their utterance of the Original Vow in a past lifetime, this also means that leaders can be held accountable to this Vow specifically. Here we need to pause and remember that this Vow states that a being will actively alleviate theirs as well as other people's discontent/suffering as well as guide all beings towards liberation. More precisely, it states that a bodhisattva will never attained cessation of suffering themselves before ensuring that all beings have attained cessation first. This Vow naturally happens once a being has aroused the enlightened mind-heart which spontaneously originates through cultivating Discernment and compassion. Holding leaders accountable to their karmic pasts and especially the Bodhisattva Vow to evaluate their legitimacy means that scenarios like these can emerge: what if the leaders of a company employs rude, discriminatory and/or insulting language towards their employees? Or, what if leaders actively engage in the exploitation of other beings for the gains of a few? Or, what if a leader of nation used compassion and discernment to help build and sustain institutions which truly aims at the collective liberation of *all*? These questions all stem from

understanding the responsibility that leaders have towards their karmic imprints as well using the Bodhisattva Vow as a framework to hold leaders accountable through evaluating the legitimacy of their leadership. However, it is important here to remember that a leader could still perform all of these bodhisattva-like actions, but doing them through an impure *kokoro* would result in negative retributions. Once more, evaluating leaders through this framework requires us not to lose ourselves in whether a leader's actions perform liberation, but whether their actions *actually* foster liberation as their *outcome*.

The last scenario I would like to present is the following: *What would happen if we turned to environmental factors to establish whether contemporary leaders are fit to rule or not?* As reiterated in the paragraph above, to evaluate whether or not actions have been made with a pure heart, we need to pay close attention to the result of a being's actions. However, the results of a being's actions are not limited to their immediately perceivable manifestation and are also not restrained exclusively to the human realm. Indeed, a being's actions can have consequences that manifest retributions in the divine realms, the animals' realm, the hellish realms and so forth. This means that, for example, natural disasters, famine, pandemics, etc. are all connected to beings' purity of heart. Since leaders are responsible for guiding all in fostering the proper conditions which allows their followers/subjects to experience safety and growth, leaders thus play a particularly important role in environmental phenomena. More precisely, leaders who do not have a pure heart will foster conditions for negative retributions to manifest; while leaders who have a pure heart will foster conditions for positive retributions to manifest. With this in mind, it is possible to ask questions such as: what if the recent COVID-19 pandemic is one of the negative retributions stemming from the fact that contemporary leaders of nations do not have a pure heart? Or, is the increase in natural disasters as a result of climate change proof that contemporary leaders are illegitimate? An important component of the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy is that it requires us to step outside of our anthropocentric assumptions. What I mean by this is that all material, psychological and spiritual phenomena originate in close connection to beings' inner worlds. This means that these phenomena can (and should) become guiding points to carefully listen to and take into consideration in our evaluations.

With these three scenarios I hope to have been able to guide my readers in applying the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy to evaluate their contemporary circumstances in a more concrete way. With this, not only did I seek to foster hope that seeing the world through a different set of eyes is not simply feasible, but it is also necessary. Moreover, I strongly believe that meaningfully engaging with these scenarios via the medieval Japanese Buddhist political theory of legitimacy helps in cementing Weber's proposition that legitimacy, beliefs and power are necessarily intertwined. Evaluating contemporary circumstances using a radically different belief-system than the currently dominant Eurocentric one enables us to experience the truth that current forms of leadership would be illegitimate if the beliefs that sustain them are inexistent. Indeed, the scenarios I provided clearly demonstrate that following a rationalization process which is anchored in the belief in the pure heart can lead to radically new conclusions with regards to the legitimacy of leaders.

Although my work focused on one example of such framework, it is possible to engage with a multitude of various frameworks that do not sustain the oppressive belief-system of currently-dominant Eurocentric frameworks. As seen in my work, this can happen via exploring historical pasts, but more importantly by meaningfully engaging with numerous communities³⁷⁴ that still thrive outside of these norms today. It is thus imperative, in our path towards collective liberation for all beings, to seriously emphasize beliefs as a central component of our political theorizations and emancipatory political projects again. Refusing to do so for oneself and/or participating in making them inaccessible for others are simply mechanisms which support the oppressive *status quo*. That is because opening our eyes, ears and hearts to truths other than the ones we have been forced to naturalize allows for hope that circumstances can, actually, truly be different. This hope is in itself already revolutionary.

End Notes

- ¹ Chih Chung Tsai. *Confucius: The Analects*. Trans. Brian Bruya. (United-States: Princeton University Press, 2018): 108.
- ² Max Weber. “The Profession and Vocation of Politics” in *Political Writings*. Ed. Peter Lassman & Ronald Speirs. (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 310.
- ³ Weber, “The Profession and Vocation of Politics”, 311.
- ⁴ Weber, “The Profession and Vocation of Politics”, 311.
- ⁵ Weber, “The Profession and Vocation of Politics”, 312.
- ⁶ Weber, “The Profession and Vocation of Politics”, 312.
- ⁷ Weber, “The Profession and Vocation of Politics”, 365.
- ⁸ Weber, “The Profession and Vocation of Politics”, 365.
- ⁹ Max Weber. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons (United Kingdom: Dover Publications, 2003), 77.
- ¹⁰ See: Jeremy Valentine. “The Political”. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23. No. 2-3 (2006): 505-511.
- ¹¹ David Campbell. “Truth Claims and Value-Freedom in the Treatment of Legitimacy: The Case of Weber”. *Journal of Law and Society* 13. No. 2 (1986): 211
- ¹² Linda Tuhiwai Smith. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London & New York: Zed Books Ltd, 1999).
- ¹³ Wendy Brown. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995). Wendy Brown. “American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism and De-Democratization”. *Political Theory* 34 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591706293016>.
- ¹⁴ Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck & Angie Morrill. “Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy”. *Feminist Formations* 25. No. 1 (Spring 2013): 8-34.
- ¹⁵ Audra Simpson. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (United-States: Duke University Press, 2014).
- ¹⁶ María Lugones “Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System”. *Hypatia* 22. No. 1 (Winter 2007): 186-209. Also, María Lugones. “The Coloniality of Gender”. *World & Knowledge Otherwise* (Spring 2008): 1-17.

- ¹⁷ Sadia Abbas. “The Echo Chamber of Freedom: The Muslim Woman and the Pretext of Agency”. *boundary* 2. No. 40:1 (2013): 155-189. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01903659-2072909>.
- ¹⁸ Jane Bennett. *Vibrant Matter: a political ecology of things*. (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2010).
- ¹⁹ Vandana Shiva. “Golden Rice and Neem: Biopatents and the Appropriation of Women’s Environmental Knowledge”. *Women’s Studies Quarterly* 29. No ½ (Spring-Summer 2011): 12-23.
- ²⁰ Andrea Bear Nicholas. “Colonialism and the Struggle for Liberation: The Experience of Maliseet Women”. *U.N.B.L.J* 43 (1994): 223-239.
- ²¹ Rauna Kuokkanen. “Globalization as Racialized, Sexualized Violence: The Case of Indigenous Women”. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10. No. 2 (June 2008): 216-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740801957554>.
- ²² Jennifer Jihye Chun, George Lipsitz and Young Shin. “Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates”. *Signs* 38. No. 4 (2013): 917-940.
- ²³ Chandra Talpade Mohanty. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2003).
- ²⁴ Vivian M. May. *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. (New York and London: Routledge, 2015).
- ²⁵ Sirma Bilge. “Beyond Subordination vs. Resistance: An Intersectional Approach to the Agency of Veiled Muslim Women”. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31. No. 1 (February 2010): 9-28. Also, Sirma Bilge. “Intersectionality Undone: Saving Intersectionality from Feminist Intersectionality Studies”. *Du Bois Review* 10. No. 2 (2013): 405-424.
- ²⁶ Rita Dhamoon. “A Feminist Approach to Decolonizing Anti-Racism: Rethinking Transnationalism, Intersectionality, and Settler Colonialism”. *Feral Feminisms* 4 (Summer 2015): 20-37.
- ²⁷ Saba Mahmood. *The Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- ²⁸ Nancy Fraser. “Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History”. *New Left Review* 56 (March-April 2009): 97-117.
- ²⁹ Erica Fudge. *Animal*. (London: Reaktion Books, 2002).
- ³⁰ Jakeet Singh. “Religious Agency and the Limits of Intersectionality”. *Hypatia* 30. No. 4 (Fall 2015): 657-674.
- ³¹ For example, a helpful discussion on the debates between “Traditional Zen Narratives” and “Historical and Cultural Criticism” surrounding the role Buddhism (in this case Zen) played in imperialism and the critique of its lack of ethical support to tackle meaningful societal changes, can be found in Steven Heine. *Zen Skin, Zen Marrow: Will the Real Buddhism Please Stand Up?* (United-States: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- ³² Eisai 栄西. “Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論”, *Eisai Zenji Shū* 栄西禪師. (Kyōto: Head Temple of Kennin-Ji 大本山建仁寺, 2004): 1-291.

³³ Dōgen 道元. “Shōbō Genzō 正法眼藏”, *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Kabushiki Kaisha Chikuma Shobō 株式会社筑摩書房. (1969): 3-789; and Dōgen 道元. “Fukan Zazen Gi 普勸坐禪儀”, *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Gekan* 道元禪師全集: 下卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Kabushiki Kaisha Chikuma Shobō 株式会社筑摩書房. (1970): 3-5.

³⁴ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安國論”, *Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho Zenshū* 日蓮大聖人御書全集. Ed. Horii Nichikō 堀日亨. (Tōkyō: Sōka Gakkai 創価学会, 2004): 17-35; and Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, *Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho Zenshū* 日蓮大聖人御書全集. Ed. Horii Nichikō 堀日亨. (Tōkyō: Sōka Gakkai 創価学会, 2004): 36-77.

³⁵ *Rokudai Shōjiki*, 87.

³⁶ Bryan Turner. “Preface to the New Edition of Karl Löwith’s Max Weber and Karl Marx”. *Max Weber and Karl Marx*. Ed. Tom Bottomore & William Outhwaite. (New York and London: Routledge, 1993): 7.

³⁷ Turner, “Preface”, 18.

³⁸ Turner, “Preface”, 19.

³⁹ Turner, “Preface”, 19.

⁴⁰ Turner, “Preface”, 20. For a similar critique of the similarity behind capitalist beliefs/assumptions and communist beliefs/assumptions see: James C Scott. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998).

⁴¹ Turner, “Preface”, 20.

⁴² Turner, “Preface”, 20-21.

⁴³ Turner, “Preface”, 21.

⁴⁴ Turner, “Preface”, 21.

⁴⁵ Turner, “Preface”, 21.

⁴⁶ Turner, “Preface”, 21.

⁴⁷ Turner, “Preface”, 23.

⁴⁸ To provide some context, the series of lectures *Science as a Vocation* (1917) and *The Profession and Vocation of Politics* (1919) were delivered at Munich University to the Free Students Union of Bavaria. The latter lecture happened during the German Revolution or November Revolution (*Novemberrevolution*) that followed the end of the First World War. This revolution – which was catalyzed by the Kiel Mutiny and spread to the general German population – resulted in the replacement of the German federal constitutional monarchy headed by Kaiser Wilhelm II with the democratic parliamentary republic known as the Weimar Republic or the German Reich (*Deutsches Reich*) in 1919. At the time, even though a large fragment of the revolutionaries were part of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) of Germany and were inspired by communist and socialist ideals, the SPD chose to not follow the Soviet-style structure of governance and opted rather for a National Assembly that would form the basis of the parliamentary republic. While Weber was critical of this revolution calling it a “bloody carnival” (Weber, “The Profession and Vocation of Politics”, x), he still played a role in the advent of the new republic through his role as advisor to the Confidential

Committee for Constitutional Reform in the German delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 (where the Weimar Constitution was drafted). It is also in 1919 that Weber sought to enter the political arena as a member of the liberal German Democratic Party (DDP), a liberal political party which he co-founded. However, his nomination as candidate was rejected by party officials and his lecture *The Profession and Vocation of Politics* was delivered one month his party being defeated during these elections.

⁴⁹ Karl Löwith. *Max Weber and Karl Marx*. Ed. Tom Bottomore & William Outhwaite. (New York and London: Routledge, 1993).

⁵⁰ Löwith, *Weber and Marx*, 56.

⁵¹ Löwith, *Weber and Marx*, 60.

⁵² Löwith, *Weber and Marx*, 76.

⁵³ Löwith, *Weber and Marx*, 56.

⁵⁴ Andrew Dawson. "The Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide: A Cross-National Analysis". *The Sociology Quarterly* 50. No. 4 (2017): 553.

⁵⁵ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 554.

⁵⁶ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 554.

⁵⁷ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 555.

⁵⁸ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 555.

⁵⁹ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 563-564.

⁶⁰ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 564.

⁶¹ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 565.

⁶² Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 568.

⁶³ Dawson "Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide", 568.

⁶⁴ Campbell, "True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber", 207.

⁶⁵ Campbell, "True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber", 208.

⁶⁶ Campbell, "True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber", 210.

⁶⁷ Campbell, "True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber", 222.

⁶⁸ Campbell, "True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber", 211.

⁶⁹ Campbell, "True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber", 212; 219.

- ⁷⁰ Campbell, “True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber”, 221.
- ⁷¹ Campbell, “True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber”, 221.
- ⁷² Turner, “Preface”, 19.
- ⁷³ Campbell, “True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber”, 222.
- ⁷⁴ Campbell, “True, Value-Freedom, Legitimacy and Weber”, 221.
- ⁷⁵ For further discussion, see: Yasutaka Ichinokawa. “Max Weber in Japan”. *Nenpō Shakaigaku Ronshū* 年報社会学論集 28. (2015): 28-34.
- ⁷⁶ Makoto Hayashi, Hiroshi Yamanaka, and Paul L. Swanson. “The Adaptation of Max Weber’s Theories of Religion in Japan”. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 20. No 2/3 (1993): 207-228.
- ⁷⁷ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 209.
- ⁷⁸ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 225.
- ⁷⁹ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 225.
- ⁸⁰ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 214.
- ⁸¹ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 214.
- ⁸² Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 214.
- ⁸³ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 214-215.
- ⁸⁴ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 213. This context was precisely one of massive industrialization and westernization where Japan perceived themselves as technologically/scientifically inferior to European and American nations and sought to improve themselves to become ‘equals’, sometimes even superior – depending on the discourse.
- ⁸⁵ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 222.
- ⁸⁶ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 222.
- ⁸⁷ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 222-223.
- ⁸⁸ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 223.
- ⁸⁹ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 223.
- ⁹⁰ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 217.
- ⁹¹ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 218.

- ⁹² Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 218.
- ⁹³ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 218.
- ⁹⁴ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 218.
- ⁹⁵ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 210.
- ⁹⁶ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 210.
- ⁹⁷ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 224.
- ⁹⁸ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 224.
- ⁹⁹ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 211.
- ¹⁰⁰ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 211.
- ¹⁰¹ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 224.
- ¹⁰² Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 224.
- ¹⁰³ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 212.
- ¹⁰⁴ Hayashi, Yamanaka & Swanson, “Weber’s Theories in Japan”, 213.
- ¹⁰⁵ Andrew James Jacob. “Max Weber was Right about the Precondition, Just Wrong about Japan: The Japanese Ethic and its Spirit of Capitalism”. *Open Area Studies Journal* 3 (2010): 13.
- ¹⁰⁶ Jacob, “Weber was Right about Preconditions, Wrong about Japan”, 13.
- ¹⁰⁷ Jacob, “Weber was Right about Preconditions, Wrong about Japan”, 26.
- ¹⁰⁸ Jacob, “Weber was Right about Preconditions, Wrong about Japan”, 13.
- ¹⁰⁹ Jacob, “Weber was Right about Preconditions, Wrong about Japan”, 15.
- ¹¹⁰ Jacob, “Weber was Right about Preconditions, Wrong about Japan”, 15.
- ¹¹¹ Gustav Heldt. *The Pursuit of Harmony: Poetry and Power in Early Heian Japan*. (New York: Cornell East Asia Series, 2008).
- ¹¹² Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 5.
- ¹¹³ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 8.
- ¹¹⁴ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 3.
- ¹¹⁵ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 10.

- ¹¹⁶ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 11.
- ¹¹⁷ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 10.
- ¹¹⁸ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 12.
- ¹¹⁹ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 55.
- ¹²⁰ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 35.
- ¹²¹ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 56.
- ¹²² Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 56.
- ¹²³ Heldt, *The Pursuit of Harmony*, 63.
- ¹²⁴ Michèle Marra. *Representations of Power: The Liberatory Politics of Medieval Japan*. (Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993): 2.
- ¹²⁵ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 3.
- ¹²⁶ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 3.
- ¹²⁷ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 3-4.
- ¹²⁸ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 4.
- ¹²⁹ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 4.
- ¹³⁰ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 12.
- ¹³¹ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 9.
- ¹³² Marra, *Representations of Power*, 39.
- ¹³³ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 27.
- ¹³⁴ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 56.
- ¹³⁵ Marra, *Representations of Power*, 3.
- ¹³⁶ William E. Deal. "The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation in Eleventh-Century Japanese Buddhism". *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 20. No. 4 (1993): 261.
- ¹³⁷ Deal, "The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation", 261.
- ¹³⁸ Deal, "The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation", 261.
- ¹³⁹ Deal, "The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation", 261.

- ¹⁴⁰ Deal, “The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation”, 265.
- ¹⁴¹ Deal, “The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation”, 270-271.
- ¹⁴² Deal, “The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation”, 272.
- ¹⁴³ Deal, “The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation”, 272.
- ¹⁴⁴ Deal, “The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation”, 289.
- ¹⁴⁵ Deal, “The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation”, 289.
- ¹⁴⁶ Deal, “The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation”, 292.
- ¹⁴⁷ Haruko Wakabayashi. *The Seven Tengu Scrolls: Evil and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy in Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. (Hawai’i: University of Hawai’i Press, 2012): xvi.
- ¹⁴⁸ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 3.
- ¹⁴⁹ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 3.
- ¹⁵⁰ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 4.
- ¹⁵¹ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 12.
- ¹⁵² Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 13.
- ¹⁵³ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 14.
- ¹⁵⁴ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 31.
- ¹⁵⁵ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 122.
- ¹⁵⁶ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 130.
- ¹⁵⁷ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 131.
- ¹⁵⁸ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 152.
- ¹⁵⁹ Wakabayashi, *The Seven Tengu Scrolls*, 167.
- ¹⁶⁰ John S. Brownlee. *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing: From Kojiki to Tokushi Yoron*. (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991).
- ¹⁶¹ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 60.
- ¹⁶² Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 67.
- ¹⁶³ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 67.

- ¹⁶⁴ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 67.
- ¹⁶⁵ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 67.
- ¹⁶⁶ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 68.
- ¹⁶⁷ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 81.
- ¹⁶⁸ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 98.
- ¹⁶⁹ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 100.
- ¹⁷⁰ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 94.
- ¹⁷¹ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 95.
- ¹⁷² Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 95.
- ¹⁷³ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 96.
- ¹⁷⁴ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 96.
- ¹⁷⁵ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 97.
- ¹⁷⁶ Brownlee, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing*, 101.
- ¹⁷⁷ Francine Hérail. *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan: 10th and 11th Centuries*. Trans. Wendy Cobcroft. (United-States: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013): 1.
- ¹⁷⁸ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 1.
- ¹⁷⁹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 1-2.
- ¹⁸⁰ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 5-6.
- ¹⁸¹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 6.
- ¹⁸² Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 7.
- ¹⁸³ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 6.
- ¹⁸⁴ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 6.
- ¹⁸⁵ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 7.
- ¹⁸⁶ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 7.
- ¹⁸⁷ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 7.

- ¹⁸⁸ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 8.
- ¹⁸⁹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 8.
- ¹⁹⁰ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 12-13.
- ¹⁹¹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 10.
- ¹⁹² Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 11.
- ¹⁹³ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 12.
- ¹⁹⁴ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 14.
- ¹⁹⁵ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 14.
- ¹⁹⁶ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 14.
- ¹⁹⁷ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 15.
- ¹⁹⁸ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 16.
- ¹⁹⁹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 17.
- ²⁰⁰ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 18.
- ²⁰¹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 18.
- ²⁰² Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 24.
- ²⁰³ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 24.
- ²⁰⁴ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 26.
- ²⁰⁵ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 151.
- ²⁰⁶ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 152.
- ²⁰⁷ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 152-153.
- ²⁰⁸ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 153.
- ²⁰⁹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 155.
- ²¹⁰ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 156.
- ²¹¹ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 157.
- ²¹² Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 159.

- ²¹³ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 162.
- ²¹⁴ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 162.
- ²¹⁵ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 163.
- ²¹⁶ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 162.
- ²¹⁷ Hérail, *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan*, 167-168.
- ²¹⁸ Jeffrey P. Mass. *Yoritomo and the Founding of the First Bakufu: The Origins of Dual Government in Japan*. (California: Stanford University Press, 1999): 15.
- ²¹⁹ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 16.
- ²²⁰ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 18.
- ²²¹ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 20.
- ²²² Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 21.
- ²²³ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 67.
- ²²⁴ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 69.
- ²²⁵ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 69.
- ²²⁶ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 71.
- ²²⁷ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 71.
- ²²⁸ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 71.
- ²²⁹ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 87.
- ²³⁰ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 87.
- ²³¹ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 95.
- ²³² Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 129.
- ²³³ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 129-130.
- ²³⁴ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 151.
- ²³⁵ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 175.
- ²³⁶ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 202.

- ²³⁷ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 205.
- ²³⁸ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 209.
- ²³⁹ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 210.
- ²⁴⁰ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 211.
- ²⁴¹ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 211.
- ²⁴² Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 216.
- ²⁴³ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 217.
- ²⁴⁴ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 220.
- ²⁴⁵ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 236.
- ²⁴⁶ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 254.
- ²⁴⁷ Mass, *Yoritomo and the First Bakufu*, 256.
- ²⁴⁸ Carl Steenstrup. *Hōjō Shigetoki (1198-1261) and his Role in the History of Political and Ethical Ideas in Japan*. (London and Malmö: Curzon University Press, 1979): 14.
- ²⁴⁹ Steenstrup, *Hōjō Shigetoki*, 15.
- ²⁵⁰ Steenstrup, *Hōjō Shigetoki*, 18.
- ²⁵¹ Steenstrup, *Hōjō Shigetoki*, 19.
- ²⁵² Steenstrup, *Hōjō Shigetoki*, 21.
- ²⁵³ Steenstrup, *Hōjō Shigetoki*, 23.
- ²⁵⁴ Pierre Souyri. “Le Moyen Âge”. *L’Histoire du Japon: des origines à nos jours*. Ed. Francine Hérail. (Paris: Hermann, 2009): 290.
- ²⁵⁵ Souyri, *Le Moyen Âge*, 291.
- ²⁵⁶ Richard Bowring. *Religious Traditions of Japan: 500-1600*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005): 247.
- ²⁵⁷ William M. Bodiford. *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. (Hawai’i: University of Hawai’i Press, 1993): 23–29.
- ²⁵⁸ Souyri, *Le Moyen Âge*, 298-299.
- ²⁵⁹ Steenstrup, *Hōjō Shigetoki*, 16.

- ²⁶⁰ Jack Stoneman. "Why Did Saigyō Become a Monk? An Archaeology of the Reception of Saigyō's *Shukke*", *Japanese Language and Literature*, 44.2 (2010): 69-118.
- ²⁶¹ Stoneman, "Why Did Saigyō Become a Monk?", 69.
- ²⁶² Saigyō 西行. *Sankashū* 三家集. Ed. Utsugi Genkō 宇津木言行 (Tōkyō: Kadokawa 角川, 2018): 36.
- ²⁶³ Saigyō 西行, *Sankashū* 三家集, 36.
- ²⁶⁴ Saigyō 西行, *Sankashū* 三家集, 37.
- ²⁶⁵ Saigyō 西行, *Sankashū* 三家集, 39.
- ²⁶⁶ Saigyō 西行, *Sankashū* 三家集, 40.
- ²⁶⁷ “Momozono no hashira no ana yori sashiizuru chigo no te, hito wo manekitaru katari 桃園の柱の穴より指し出づる児の手、人を招きたる語”. *Konjaku Monogatari-shū: Honchōbu (Ge)* 今昔物語集: 本朝部 (下). Ed. Ikegami Jun'ichi 池上洵一. (Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 2002): 131-133.
- ²⁶⁸ “Reizenin higashi no tōin no sōzuden no ryō no katari 冷泉院東の洞院の僧都殿の靈の語” *Konjaku Monogatari-shū: Honchōbu (Ge)* 今昔物語集: 本朝部 (下). Ed. Ikegami Jun'ichi 池上洵一. (Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 2002): 133-135.
- ²⁶⁹ Two stories I debated including in here, but decided to take away due to lack of space, are: (1) “Kitsune, onna no katachi ni henjite harima no yasutaka ni ahitaru katari 狐、女の形(かたち)に変じて播磨の安高に値ひたる語”. *Konjaku Monogatari-shū: Honchōbu (Ge)* 今昔物語集: 本朝部 (下). Ed. Ikegami Jun'ichi 池上洵一. (Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 2002): 196-199; and (2) “Otagitera no kane no katari 愛宕寺の鐘の語”. *Konjaku Monogatari-shū: Honchōbu (Ge)* 今昔物語集: 本朝部 (下). Ed. Ikegami Jun'ichi 池上洵一. (Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 2002): 506-508. I would recommend to the interested readers interested in this theme to continue their research starting with these two stories.
- ²⁷⁰ It is interesting to note that the biggest contributors to this anthology was Saigyō, who was a good friend of Teika, with a total of 94 poems being selected from his work.
- ²⁷¹ There is debate as to who this student might be, some scholars claim it is Minamoto Sanetomo again, but some point out that it might be Fujiwara Ieyoshi 藤原家良 (1192-1264).
- ²⁷² Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Eiga Taigai 詠歌大概”. *Uta Ronshū* 歌論集 Ed. Hashimoto Fumio 橋本不美男, Ariyoshi Tamotsu 有吉保 & Fujihira Haro'o 藤平春男. (Tōkyō: Shōgakukan 小学館, 2002): 473.
- ²⁷³ Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Eiga Taigai 詠歌大概”, 475.
- ²⁷⁴ Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Eiga Taigai 詠歌大概”, 475.
- ²⁷⁵ Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Maigetsushō 毎月抄”. *Uta Ronshū* 歌論集 Ed. Hashimoto Fumio 橋本不美男, Ariyoshi Tamotsu 有吉保 & Fujihira Haro'o 藤平春男. (Tōkyō: Shōgakukan 小学館, 2002): 495.

²⁷⁶ The ten forms (*tei* 躰) are named as follows: Mystery and Depth (*yūgen* 幽玄), Potential Suchness of Things (*koto shikaru beki* 事可然躰), Magnificent (*uruwashiki* 麗), Existing Heart (*ushin* 有心), High and Long (*take takaki* 長高), Seeing (*miru* 見), Amusing (*omoshiroki* 面白), Having One-Verse (*hito fushi aru* 有一節躰), Meticulous (*komayakanaru* 濃), and Crushing Demon (*kiratsu* 鬼拉). See: Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Maigetsushō 每月抄”, 494-495.

²⁷⁷ Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Maigetsushō 每月抄”, 497.

²⁷⁸ Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Maigetsushō 每月抄”, 499.

²⁷⁹ Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Maigetsushō 每月抄”, 501.

²⁸⁰ I decided to translate 中 as ‘within’ instead of ‘middle’, because I believe Teika speaks of something that would be similar to our contemporary usage of the word designating a person’s ‘inner world’ (中世), which would refer to various feelings and emotions a person can experience.

²⁸¹ Eisai 栄西. “Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論”, *Eisai Zenji Shū* 栄西禪師集 (Kyōto: Head Temple of Kennin-Ji 大本山建仁寺, 2004): 35.

²⁸² Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 38.

²⁸³ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 40.

²⁸⁴ In a nutshell, the 10 major precepts are: (1) 不殺: Not to Kill; (2) 不盜: Not to Steal; (3) 不淫: Not to Commit Sexual Misconduct; (4) 不妄語: Not to Lie; (5) 不酤酒: Not to Sell Alcohol; (6) 不說四衆過: Not to Speak of the Fault of Others; (7) 不自贊毀他: Not to Equivocate; (8) 不吝惜加毀: Not to be Stingy and Abuse Others; (9) 不嗔心不受悔: Not to Hold Hatred and Refuse Apologies; and (10) 不謗三寶: Not to Denigrate the Three Treasures (i.e. the Community, *Dharma*, and Buddha). For an accessible English Translation, see: *The Brahmā’s Net Sutra*. Translated by Charles Muller and Kenneth K. Tanaka (California: Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai America, 2017): 48-51.

²⁸⁵ In a nutshell, the 48 minor precepts are: (1) 不敬師友: Not to Disrespect Senior Teachers; (2) 不飲酒: Not to Drink Alcohol; (3) 不食肉: Not to Eat Meat; (4) 不食五辛: Not to Eat the Five Pungent Roots; (5) 不教悔罪: Not to Fail to Encourage Others to Repent; (6) 不供給請法: Not to Fail to Request Instruction in the *Dharma* from Visiting Teachers; (7) 不往聽法: Not to Miss a Chance to Attend *Dharma* Lectures; (8) 不心背大乘: Not to Abandon the Large Vehicle and Regress to the Small Vehicle; (9) 不看病: Not to Fail to Care for the Ill; (10) 不畜殺衆生具: Not to Amass Weapons; (11) 不國使: Not to Serve as an Emissary for the Nation; (12) 不販賣: Not to Get Involved in Trafficking; (13) 不謗毀: Not to Make Groundless Accusations; (14) 不放火焚燒: Not to Harm Beings by Setting Fires; (15) 不僻教: Not to Teach Non-Buddhist Teachings; (16) 不爲利倒說: Not to be Parsimonious with Offering Material Wealth or the *Dharma*; (17) 不恃勢乞求: Not to Seek to Gain Political Influence; (18) 不無解作師: Not to Pretend to be an Accomplished Teacher; (19) 不兩舌: Not to Get Involved in Treachery; (20) 不行放救: Not to Fail to Help Both the Living and the Deceased; (21) 不嗔打報仇: Not to be Intolerant of Wrong Done by Others; (22) 不驕慢不請法: Not to Arrogantly Despise your *Dharma* Teacher; (23) 不驕慢僻說: Not to Despise Beginning Practitioners; (24) 不習學佛: Not to Fear the Superior and Follow the Inferior; (25) 不善知衆: Not to Fail to Properly Fulfill Administrative Duties; (26) 不獨受利養: Not to Receive Guests Improperly; (27) 不受別請: Not to Accept Personal Invitations; (28) 不別請僧: Not to Extend Personal Invitations to Monks; (29) 不邪命自活: Not to Engage in Improper Livelihood; (30) 不敬好時: Not to Hurt People While Feigning Intimacy with Them; (31) 不行救贖: Not to be Lax in Rescuing Vulnerable Articles and People from Danger; (32) 不損害衆生: Not to Deviously Confiscate Others’ Property; (33) 不邪業覺觀: Not to Stay Idle in the Face of Wrong Action; (34) 不暫念小乘: Not to Suddenly

Recollect the Lesser Vehicle; (35) 不發願: Not to Fail to Make Vows; (36) 不發誓: Not to Fail to Initiate Vows on your Own; (37) 不冒難遊行: Not to Intentionally Go to Dangerous Places; (38) 不乖尊卑次序: Not to Take your Place Out of Order; (39) 不修福慧: Not to Pursue Personal Gain; (40) 不揀擇受戒: Not to Err in Terms of Who Can Receive the Precepts; (41) 不爲利作師: Not to Seek Disciples for the Wrong Reasons; (42) 不爲惡人說戒: Not to Teach the Precepts to Unsuitable People; (43) 不無慚受施: Not to Intentionally Break the Precepts; (44) 不供養經典: Not to Fail to Revere the *Sūtras* and *Vinaya*; (45) 不化衆生: Not to Fail to Transform All Beings; (46) 不說法不如法: Not to Preach the *Dharma* Using Improper Protocol; (47) 不非法制限: Not to Establish Systems that Undermine the *Dharma*; and (48) 不破法: Not to Undermine the *Dharma* from Within. For an accessible English Translation, see: *The Brahmā's Net Sutra*: 52-73.

²⁸⁶ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 83.

²⁸⁷ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 125.

²⁸⁸ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 45-46.

²⁸⁹ Ānanda (jp. Anan 阿難 or Ananda 阿難陀; skt. आनन्द) was the primary attendant of the historical Buddha Śākyamuni and one of his ten primary disciples. He is often used as an interlocutor in the Buddhist *Sūtras*.

²⁹⁰ I am intentionally choosing to translate *aku* 惡 (skt. अघ Agha) as ‘unwholesome’ or sometimes ‘wicked’ instead of ‘evil’; and *zen* 善 (skt. कुशल Kuśala) as ‘wholesome’ instead of ‘good’. This is in order to avoid generating in the mind of the reader an automatic association with what is assumed to be ‘good’ and ‘evil’ as presented within the context of the currently-dominant Abrahamic religious traditions.

²⁹¹ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 40-41.

²⁹² Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 94.

²⁹³ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 94.

²⁹⁴ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 129.

²⁹⁵ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 247.

²⁹⁶ Eisai 栄西, *Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論*, 97.

²⁹⁷ It is tempting to draw connections between ‘the jewel in the mud’ and the Aristotalian and German idealist concept of *bildung* which posits that education can shape human potential in accordance with *telos*. However, a key difference is that whereas *bildung* proposes a necessarily consistent ‘improving’ or ‘growth’ of reason via the accumulation of knowledge through education; enlightenment to Buddhahood proposes a consistent ‘un-growth’ via the deconstruction and/or abandonment of the finite knowledge that can be accumulated as a result of finite education. In the Buddhist case, a being does not ‘become’ enlightened; a being always-already is enlightened – there is nothing to gain, nothing to improve, nothing to ‘become’. What is necessary is thus the exact opposite: the removal of layers of ignorance – which accumulate as a result of knowledge and education within frameworks that are necessarily finite (i.e. humans) – rather than the accumulation of additional layers. Although there is education involved in training in Buddhist practices, the purpose of such practices is not accumulation as is implied within *bildung*. Instead, the purpose is decumulation.

²⁹⁸ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 223.

²⁹⁹ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 224.

³⁰⁰ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 224.

³⁰¹ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 127.

³⁰² Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 127.

³⁰³ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 125.

³⁰⁴ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 157.

³⁰⁵ The Six Destinies (jp. *rokushu* 六趣) or Six Paths (jp. *rokudō* 六道) are translations of the Sanskrit word षड्गति *Ṣaḍgati*, and refer to the different realms a being that is still within the cycle of transmigration can be reborn into. The realm in which rebirth will occur is going to be determined by a being's karmic ties. These realms are: (1) Hells (jp. *jigoku* 地獄; skt. नरक *Naraka*); (2) Hungry Ghosts (jp. *gaki* 餓鬼; skt. प्रेत *Preta*); (3) Animals (jp. *chikushō* 畜生; skt. तिर्यग्योनि *Tiryagyoni*); (4) Malevolent Spirits (jp. *ashura* 阿修羅; असुर *Asura*); (5) Human (jp. *ningen* 人間; skt. मनुष्य *Manuṣya*); and (6) Deities (jp. *ten* 天; skt. देव *Deva*).

³⁰⁶ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 242.

³⁰⁷ Eisai 栄西, Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論, 247.

³⁰⁸ This traditional historiography is based upon a statement that appears in one of Dōgen's later work written in 1231, but modern scholarship challenges this traditional date of 1227 as other versions of Dōgen's *Fukan Zazen Gi* have been discovered. For example, the version known as the *Tenpuku* manuscript has a colophon stating it was written in 1233; while the version known as the *Vulgate* manuscript is assessed to have been written around 1242 due to its similarity in content to some of Dōgen's later writings. Still, although these documents have been used to challenge the traditional date of 1227, it is also argued that these later versions are simply revisions of his first text written in 1227 and they do not necessarily challenge the possibility that this text could have indeed been written according to the traditional timeline. In fact, this would be consistent with Dōgen's scholarship since he constantly rewrote, revised, and reorganized many of his writings multiple times throughout his life – as exemplified by the *Shōbōgenzō*.

³⁰⁹ For further discussions of some of the philosophical dimensions found in Dōgen's *Fukan Zazen Gi*, see: Jay Goulding. "Japan-West Interculture: Time's Step Back—Dōgen, Watsuji, Kuki and Heidegger". *Japan's World and the World's Japan: Images, Perceptions, and Reactions. Proceedings of the 31st Japan Studies Association of Canada Annual Conference*. Ed. Aya Fujiwara & James White. (2019): 1-26.

³¹⁰ Although Eisai's temples were built earlier, they all remained under Tendai's sphere of influence since Eisai remained a Tendai monk and continued to teach Tendai teachings and practices in his Rinzai Zen Temples. Dōgen's temples are thus the first truly independent Zen temples because they were operating outside of Tendai's political control and did not teach official Tendai teachings and practices.

³¹¹ See: William M. Bodiford. *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. (Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993): 23–29

³¹² The *Bendōwa* fascicle was not traditionally included as part of the *Shōbōgenzō*. It simply was an individual, separate text similar to the *Fukan Zazen Gi*. It was added as the first fascicle of the *Shōbōgenzō* in 1684, which

eventually became the standardized form of the ninety-five fascicle version in 1788. For the sake of simplicity, I decided to follow this standardization.

³¹³ For further discussion on the different versions of the Shōbōgenzō, see: William M. Bodiford. “Textual Genealogies of Dōgen”. *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*. Ed. Steven Heine. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012): 15-41

³¹⁴ Dōgen 道元. “Bendōwa 辨道話”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 742.

³¹⁵ Dōgen 道元. “Bendōwa 辨道話”, 746.

³¹⁶ Dōgen 道元. “Gyōji-ue 行持・上”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 138.

³¹⁷ Edwin O. Reischauer. *Ennin's Travel in Tang China*. (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1955): 253.

³¹⁸ Dōgen 道元. “Keisei Sanshoku 谿聲山色”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 223.

³¹⁹ Dōgen 道元. “Shukke Kudoku 出家功德”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 605.

³²⁰ Dōgen 道元. “Sanjūshichihon Bodai Bunpō 三十七品菩提分法”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 514.

³²¹ Dōgen 道元. “Kokyō 古鏡”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 180.

³²² See: Daniel F Shley. “Royal Succession in Historical Narratives: The Cases of Gotoba and Gohorikawa (Twelfth-Thirteenth Century)”. *Norm, Normabweichung und Praxis des Herrschaftsübergangs in transkultureller Perspektive*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Unipress, 2019): 361-400.

³²³ Dōgen 道元. “Kokyō 古鏡”, 180.

³²⁴ Dōgen 道元. “Sokushin Zebutsu 卽心是佛”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 44.

³²⁵ Eisai 栄西. “Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論”. *Eisai Zenji Shū* 栄西禪師集 (Kyōto: Head Temple of Kennin-Ji 大本山建仁寺, 2004): 97.

³²⁶ Dōgen 道元. “Busshō 佛性”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 27.

³²⁷ Dōgen 道元. “Hotsu Mujō Shin 發無上心”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 525.

³²⁸ Dōgen 道元. “Hotsu Bodai Shin 發菩提心”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 645.

³²⁹ Dōgen 道元. “Hotsu Bodai Shin 發菩提心”, 645.

³³⁰ I have issues with translating *kokoro* as ‘spirit’ because of the assumptions of what spirit means in Eurocentric frameworks dominated by Abrahamic religions. Although spirit is not accurate to me, still, it has been my personal experience that using the trichotomy of mind-body-spirit to describe *kokoro* has been the most effective way to convey the various meanings of the word *kokoro* to people who has grown within Abrahamic-based systems. The Sanskrit word mentioned in the quote, Vṛddha, simply means ‘wise’, ‘old’, ‘aged’, ‘mature’ and does not have any connection to spirit as understood within Abrahamic religions. The Japanese expression *shakujuseiyō* 積聚清要 used to describe Vṛddha in the quote, suggest it would be closer to the concept of ‘essence’ than spirit. However, the assumptions pertaining to essence in Eurocentric frameworks are also problematic because it leads to the belief in beings having Self-Existence (skt. स्वभाव Svabhāva). This is problematic because the Buddha’s enlightenment revolved around the realization that discontent/suffering (skt. दुःख Duḥkha) is caused as a result of conceptualizing beings and phenomena to have Self-Existence. Indeed, the initial teachings of the Buddha was that attaining liberation from discontent/suffering requires one to awaken to the absolute reality that phenomena are fundamentally Empty (skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā), which means that they are empty of Self-Nature. The Buddha expounded that everything is empty of self-nature because everything arises through Dependent Co-Origination (skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda). Thus, no phenomena ever arises ‘by itself’ – i.e. it has no self-existence Therefore, I believe the best translation for this third usage of *kokoro* is neither ‘spirit’ nor ‘essence’ but rather Buddha-Nature (skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu). However, translating it as Buddha-nature only leads to further explanation that can sometimes get overwhelming to people who might be new to Buddhist teachings. This is why, my personal experience has been that using the trichotomy of mind-body-spirit is more useful, at first, to get the message across that *kokoro* is more than simply ‘heart’. However, I would argue that it is important to deconstruct such trichotomy when one becomes more acquainted with Buddhism.

³³¹ Dōgen 道元. “Hotsu Bodai Shin 發菩提心”, 649.

³³² Dōgen 道元. “Rahai Tokuzui 禮拜得髓”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 246.

³³³ Dōgen 道元. “Hotsu Mujō Shin 發無上心”, 529.

³³⁴ Dōgen 道元. “Jishō Zanmai 自證三昧”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 554.

³³⁵ Dōgen 道元. “Kuyō Shobutsu 供養諸佛”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 665. The entirety of the quote reads as follows: “As for hearts that [make] offerings to the buddhas there are six types. First, the Heart that is Unsurpassed in Fields of Merit (पुण्यक्षेत्रानुत्तरचित्तं Puṇyakṣetrānuttaracitta). Within the fields of blessings originates success. Second, the Heart that is Unsurpassed in Blessings (कृतगुणानुत्तरचित्तं Kṛtaguṇānuttaracitta). All wholesome bliss originate as a result of three treasures. Third, the Heart that Births All Beings with Success (जातिसर्वसत्त्वविजयचित्तं Jātisarvasattvavijayacitta). Fourth, the Heart that is Rare to Encounter Like an Uḍumbara Flower (यथाउडुम्बरपुष्पदुर्लभचित्तं Yathāuḍumbarapuṣpadurlabhacitta). Fifth, the Heart that is Alone in its Distinction from the Triple-Thousand-Great-Thousand Worlds (त्रिसाहस्रमहासाहस्रलोकधातुविशेषकैवल्यचित्तं Trisāhasramahāsāhasralokadhātuviśeṣakāivalyacitta). Sixth, the Heart that is Equipped with Reliance on Meaning in All that is Wordly and Transcendental (सर्वलौकिकलोकोत्तरसंपन्नार्थप्रतिसरणचित्तं Sarvalaukikalokottarasampannārthapratīśaraṇacitta). It is generally said that the Tathāgatas, equipped with the *dharma*s of the worldly and the transcendental, [they] skillfully become the supporting basis of all beings; [this] is

called ‘equipped with reliance on meaning’. By means of these six hearts, even though they are small things, as a result of making offerings to the Three Jewels, immeasurable and unlimited merits will be obtained. How much more so if there are many of these!”

³³⁶ Dōgen 道元. “Kuyō Shobutsu 供養諸佛”, 665.

³³⁷ Dōgen 道元. “Bodaisatta Shishōhō 菩提薩埵四攝法”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 766.

³³⁸ Dōgen 道元. “Keisei Sanshoku 谿聲山色”, 222.

³³⁹ Dōgen 道元. “Senmen 洗面”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 426.

³⁴⁰ Dōgen 道元. “Senjō 洗淨”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 473.

³⁴¹ Dōgen 道元. “Senmen 洗面”, 424.

³⁴² Dōgen 道元. “Senjō 洗淨”, 466-467.

³⁴³ Dōgen 道元. “Senmen 洗面”, 425.

³⁴⁴ Dōgen 道元. “Senmen 洗面”, 426.

³⁴⁵ Dōgen 道元. “Sanji Gō 三時業”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 691.

³⁴⁶ Dōgen 道元. “Sanji Gō 三時業”, 683-688.

³⁴⁷ This is why compassion is the key, core value of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Indeed, a being should intentionally and mindfully do wholesome actions while understanding that the positive outcomes of their actions are going to be enjoyed by others and not themselves. Their aspiration to do so is found in the great compassion that arises from understanding that all beings are experiencing discontent/suffering as a result of karmic principles and therefore they should act in a way that helps alleviating this discontent/suffering for all.

³⁴⁸ Dōgen 道元. “Shinjin Inga 深信因果”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. (Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1969): 679.

³⁴⁹ These Six Schools (Rokushū 六宗) are: (1) Hossōshū 法相宗; (2) Jōjitsushū 成實宗; (3) Kegonshū 華嚴宗; (4) Kushashū 俱舍宗; (5) Risshū 律宗; and (6) Sanronshū 三論宗. These schools flourished under the protection and support of Prince Shōtoku’s 聖德 (574-622) government in the 6th and 7th century and were founded in Nara, the political capital of the time. These traditions remained active even during Nichiren’s time, but lost their political influence to the Tendai and Shingon traditions with time.

³⁵⁰ Jacqueline I. Stone. *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999): 243-245.

³⁵¹ Stone, *Original Enlightenment*, 432.

³⁵² Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”. *Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho Zenshū* 日蓮大聖人御書全集. Ed. Hori Nichikō 堀日亨. (Tōkyō: Sōka Gakkai 創価学会, 2004): 58-59.

³⁵³ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 59.

³⁵⁴ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”. *Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho Zenshū* 日蓮大聖人御書全集. Ed. Hori Nichikō 堀日亨. (Tōkyō: Sōka Gakkai 創価学会, 2004): 19.

³⁵⁵ *Rakan* or *Arakan* (阿羅漢) is the Chinese and Japanese transliteration of the word Arhat अर्हत्, which has multiple meanings depending on the etymological reading. (1) *Ara* is connected to *Ari* meaning ‘enemies’ and *Hat* is connected to *Han* meaning ‘to kill’. This makes an Arhat a ‘killer of enemies’. However, in Buddhism, enemies are not actual beings but rather the various afflictions (*bonnō* 煩惱) beings harbour and produces that lead to discontent/suffering (*ku* 苦). (2) *A* is a Sanskrit prefix marking negation and *Rahat* means ‘to be born’. This makes an Arhat ‘unborn’. An Arhat is unborn because they have gotten rid of all of the karmic imprints and ties and are thus liberated from the cycle of transmigration (*rinne* 輪廻). (3) Arhat means ‘worthy’. More specifically, they are worthy of receiving worship or offerings (*kuyō* 供養) because they have attained Buddhahood by destroying all of the various impurities. This is why, buddhas are oftentimes called Arhats. However, Arhat is a title not just reserved to buddhas but for any being who is worthy of receiving worship as a result of them having reached purity of heart and, thus, liberation from discontent/suffering.

³⁵⁶ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 59.

³⁵⁷ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 59.

³⁵⁸ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 59-60.

³⁵⁹ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 61.

³⁶⁰ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 18-19.

³⁶¹ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 19.

³⁶² Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 19.

³⁶³ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 20.

³⁶⁴ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 32.

³⁶⁵ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 62.

³⁶⁶ The expression *Zennanshi* 善男子 (skt. Kulaputra कुलपुत्र) is one of the multiple terms used by the Buddha to address his disciples. I opted for the more literal translation of the *kanji* ‘Good Sons’, but various other terms such as ‘Gentlemen’, ‘Noble Youth’, ‘Son of a Noble Family’, etc. have been used by other translators.

³⁶⁷ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 62-63.

³⁶⁸ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 62.

³⁶⁹ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 59-60.

³⁷⁰ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 20.

³⁷¹ Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”, 61; Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 27.

³⁷² Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 26.

³⁷³ Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”, 31.

³⁷⁴ I believe I would do a disservice to the many communities who uphold their traditional ways of being if I were to name only the few that I can think of at this point in time. However, I have in my heart the multiple Indigenous communities spread accross the world that still live their traditons through stories, books, politics, songs, dances, arts, behaviours and so forth. It is also important to note that ‘Indigenous’, for me, does not correspond to the mainstream forms of Indigeneity historically emphasized within colonial anthropological research (i.e. such as the problematic Native American Indian stereotypes). Rather, I understand ‘Indigenous’ to mean whatever cultural artifacts that have emerged within historical and geographical contexts. Through this understanding it is thus possible to posit that, for example, Buddhism is Indigenous to India, or that Daoism is Indigenous to China, or that Egyptian gods and are Indigenous to Egypt and the broader Mesopotamia area, and so forth. Of course, interractions between multiple communities through time and space make it almost impossible to assert that a particular tradition is exclusive to a particular geographical group or region without any influences from other cultural groups. Nevertheless, broadening the concept of Indigeneity in this way allows for greater representation of the immense variety of Indigenous communities operating within frameworks that are not traditionally understood to be ‘Indigenous’ simply because they do not conform with what Eurocentric frameworks have reduced Indigeneity to look like.

Glossary

abidatsumakosharon 阿毘達磨俱舍論 (skt. अभिधर्मकोश Abhidharmakośa): “The Sheath of Abhidharma” is a key text on the Abhidharma (अभिधर्म) written in Sanskrit by the Indian Buddhist scholar Vasubandhu (jp. *seschin* 世親; skt. वसुबन्धु) in the 4th or 5th century CE. This text was widely respected and used by schools of Buddhism in India, Tibet and East Asia. Over time, the Abhidharmakośa became the main source of Abhidharma and Śrāvakayāna (श्रावकयान) Buddhism for later Mahāyāna Buddhists.

aigo 愛語 (skt. प्रियवचन Priyavacana or प्रियवादिता Priyavādītā): Loving Speech, Loving Words.

ainen 愛念: Cherish, Affect, Strong Feelings of Love.

akiraka 明らか: Clear, Well-Lit, Bright, Evident, Obvious, Wise, Intelligent. Within a Buddhist framework, discussions of clarity is oftentimes directly related to discussions of purity (jp. *shōjō* 清淨/清淨; skt. शुद्धि Śuddhi or विशुद्धि Viśuddhi) because it is precisely when dusts, taints, mud, delusions, etc. have been ‘cleared up’ that a heart (*kokoro* 心) is understood to become pure.

akitsu kami 現神: Visible Deity, Manifesting Deity.

aku 惡 (skt. अघ Agha): Wickedness, Bad, Evil.

Amida 阿彌陀 (skt. अमिताभ Amitābha): A celestial Buddha according to the scriptures of Mahāyāna Buddhism. One of the Five Wisdom/Family Buddha. Amitābha is known for his longevity attribute, magnetising Western attributes of discernment, pure perception and purification of the Five Aggregates with a deep awareness of emptiness of all phenomena. Connected to "West" and "Spring", Amitābha is the principal Buddha in Pure Land Buddhism (Jōdoshū 淨土宗) and dwells in the Western Pure Land called Sukhāvātī (jp. *gokuraku* 極樂 or *anraku* 安樂; skt. सुखावती).

ame no murakumo no tsurugi 天叢雲劍: Heavenly Sword Gathering Clouds. One of the name of the sword (*tsurugi* 劍) as one of the Three Imperial Regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) blessed by the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth according to one of Japan’s first written document the Nihon Shoki 日本書紀. These regalia have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia. This Seal represents the ruler’s value of valour.

Anan 阿難 or Ananda 阿難陀 (skt. आनन्द Ānanda): The primary attendant of the historical Buddha Śākyamuni and one of his ten primary disciples. Among the Buddha's many disciples, Ānanda stood out for having the best memory. Most of the texts of the early Buddhist *Sūtras* are attributed to his recollection of the Buddha's teachings during the First Buddhist Council. For that reason, he is known as the Treasurer of the Dharma. He is often used as an interlocutor in the Buddhist *Sūtras*.

anokutarasanmyakusanbodai 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提 (skt. अनुत्तरसम्यक्संबोधि Anuttarasamyaksambodhi): Unsurpassed, Complete, Proper and Perfect Enlightenment. This is the highest "stage" of enlightenment reached by a Buddha and is often used to distinguish the enlightenment of a Buddha from that of an Arhat (jp. *arakan* 阿羅漢; skt. अर्हत्). Sometimes abbreviated to *anokubodai* 阿耨菩提.

arakan 阿羅漢 or *rakan* 羅漢: (skt. अर्हत् Arhat): Worthy One, Blessed-One, Venerable Being, Unborn, Killer of Enemies. The highest of the 4 types of disciples in Buddhism. There are three meanings to the name depending on the etymological reading: (1) *Ara* is connected to *Ari* meaning 'enemies' and *Hat* is connected to *Han* meaning 'to kill'. This makes an Arhat a 'killer of enemies'. However, in Buddhism, enemies are not actual beings but rather the various afflictions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश Kleśa) beings harbour and generate that lead to discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha); (2) *A* is a Sanskrit prefix marking negation and *Rahat* means 'to be born'. This makes an Arhat 'unborn'. An Arhat is unborn because they have gotten rid of all of the karmic imprints and ties which keeps them in the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra); and (3) *Arhat* means 'worthy'. More specifically, they are worthy of receiving worship or offerings (jp. *kuyō* 供養; skt. Pūja) because they have attained Buddhahood by destroying all of the various impurities. This is why, buddhas are oftentimes called Arhats.

bakufu 幕府: A metonym for the system of government installed in the Kamakura era (1185-1333) which is often characterized as a military dictatorship. The *bakufu* had at its head the *shōgun* 將軍 who was the *de facto* ruler of Japan from 1192 to 1868.

baramon 波羅門 (skt. ब्रह्मिन् Brahmin): Priest, Spiritual Teachers of the Hindu Tradition. Lit. 'One Possessing Sacred Knowledge'. Also refers to 'Priesthood' when using Brahmin as the name of the highest social caste of Hindu society.

benkan 弁官: Control Board. A bureau of ministerial secretaries consulted whenever the Council of Senior Nobles needed lists of precedents.

bettō 别当: Head, Chief. Title of the highest position within a particular political Bureau, Office, etc.

bibasha 毘婆娑 (skt. विभाषा Vibhāṣā): Commentary, compendium, exegetical texts. Produced by scholastics of the Vaibhāṣika (वैभाषिक) tradition of the Aśvadharmā (अभिधर्म). This tradition was

influential in north India. The Vaibhāṣika school was an influential subgroup of the larger Sarvāstivāda (सर्वास्तिवाद) school. They were distinguished from other Sarvāstivāda sub-schools by their orthodox adherence to the doctrines found in the Mahāvibhāṣa (महाविभाष). Vaibhāṣika thought significantly influenced the Buddhist philosophy of all major Mahayana Buddhist schools of thought and also influenced the later forms of Theravāda Abhidhamma.

biku 比丘 (skt. भिक्षु Bhikṣu): Monk. Etymologically speaking, there can be two different interpretation. The first interpretation would translate as ‘[someone who has] cut afflictions’ and refers to a person that has received ordination in the Buddhist precepts (शील Śīla) and therefore have cut (भिद् Bhid) their attachments to the cravings (क्षुद् Kṣud) of worldly life. The second interpretation means ‘[someone who has the] ability to frighten’ and refers to a person who has developed the capacity (क्षम् Kṣam) to frighten (भी Bhī) the demon-king Māra (jp. *marā* 魔羅; skt. मार) and his followers who trouble sentient beings and destroy the good roots of the *Dharma* and the Buddhist path. In both cases, it alludes to a being who is not hindered by the suffering caused by worldly circumstances anymore.

bikuni 比丘尼 (skt. भिक्षुणी Bhikṣuṇī): Nun. Etymologically speaking, there can be two different interpretation. The first interpretation would translate as ‘[someone who has] cut afflictions’ and refers to a person that has received ordination in the Buddhist precepts (शील Śīla) and therefore have cut (भिद् Bhid) their attachments to the cravings (क्षुद् Kṣud) of worldly life. The second interpretation means ‘[someone who has the] ability to frighten’ and refers to a person who has developed the capacity (क्षम् Kṣam) to frighten (भी Bhī) the demon-king Māra (jp. *marā* 魔羅; skt. मार) and his followers who trouble sentient beings and destroy the good roots of the *Dharma* and the Buddhist path. In both cases, it alludes to a being who is not hindered by the suffering caused by worldly circumstances anymore.

Bodaidaruma 菩提達磨 (skt. Bodhidharma बोधिधर्म): Refers to the semi-legendary Indian Buddhist monk who lived during the 5th or 6th century who is said to have practiced and expounded the *Dharma* as Shaolin Monastery. He is traditionally credited as the transmitter of Buddhism to China, and regarded as the first Chinese ancestor and first Patriarch of Zen Buddhism (*zēnshū* 禪宗). Zen’s highly-contested scriptural records identifies Bodhidharma as the 28th Patriarch of Buddhism in an uninterrupted line that extends all the way back to the Śākyamuni himself. Bodhidharma's teachings and practice centered on meditation and the Lankāvatāra Sūtra (jp. Nyū Ryōga Kyō; skt. लङ्कावतारसूत्र).

bodaishin 菩提心 (skt. बोधिचित्त Bodhicitta): Enlightened-Heart, Enlightened-Mind. The heart of the bodhisattva who, out of their heart great compassion (jp. *daijishin* 大慈心; skt. महाकरुणाचित्त Mahākaruṇācitta), vows to remain in the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra) solely for the sake of helping getting rid of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख

Duḥkha), and guide every being towards attaining unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment (jp. *anokutarasanmyakusanbodai* 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提; skt. अनुत्तरसम्यक्संबोधि Anuttarasamyaksambodhi) themselves. Once Bodhicitta is aroused, the Bodhisattva Vow happens naturally and spontaneously.

Bonmō Bosatsu Kai Kyō 梵網菩薩戒經 (skt. ब्रह्मजालबोधिसत्त्वशील Brahmajāla Bodhisattva Śīla Sūtra): Foundational text of the Mahāyāna Buddhist traditions. It presents ten major or grave precepts (*jū jūkai* 十重戒) – also called Bodhisattva precepts (*bosatsu kai* 菩薩戒) – that all ordained monks and nuns most follow, as well as another set of 48 minor precepts (*shijūhachi kyōkai* 四十八輕戒) that help disciples advance on the bodhisattva path. This text is the basis on which the unique ordination platform of Japanese Buddhism was built, and offers different precepts for monastics and the laity than the practitioners of the Theravāda traditions.

bonnō 煩惱 (skt. क्लेश Kleśa): Afflictions, Delusions. Mental states that cloud the mind and manifest in unwholesome actions (jp. *akugō* 惡業; skt. अकुशलकर्म Akuśalakarma). They include states of mind such as anxiety, fear, anger, jealousy, desire, depression, etc. and are the result of the Three Poisons (jp. *sandoku* 三毒/三根/三株; skt. त्रिविष Triviṣa).

bosatsu 菩薩 (skt. बोधिसत्त्व Bodhisattva): Enlightened-Being, Awakened-Being. Bodhisattvas occupy a central place in Mahāyāna Buddhism and generally refers to any being that has aroused an Enlightened-Heart/Mind (jp. *bodaishin* 菩提心; skt. बोधिचित्त Bodhicitta). Arousing this Enlightened-Heart/Mind spontaneously results in the utterance of the Bodhisattva Vow or Original Vow (jp. *hongan* 本願; skt. पूर्वप्रणिधान Pūrvapraṇidhāna) where the Bodhisattva, out of their heart great compassion (jp. *daijishin* 大慈心; skt. महाकरुणाचित्त Mahākaruṇācitta), vows to remain in the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Samsāra) solely for the sake of helping getting rid of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha), and guide every being towards attaining unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment (jp. *anokutarasanmyakusanbodai* 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提; skt. अनुत्तरसम्यक्संबोधि Anuttarasamyaksambodhi) for themselves. A bodhisattva exists solely because beings still need their guidance towards liberation (*gedatsu* 解脫; skt. मोक्ष Mokṣa), and it is the role of the bodhisattva to provide such guidance via the use of skillful means (*hōben* 方便; skt. उपाय Upāya).

bucchoku 佛敕 (skt. बुद्धशासन Buddhaśāsana): Buddha's Teachings, Buddha's Doctrine, Buddha's Discourse, Buddha's Message. Another term for Buddhadharma (jp. *buppō* 佛法; skt. बुद्धधर्म).

bukkokudo 佛國土 (skt. बुद्धक्षेत्र Buddhakṣetra): Buddha Land, Buddha Field.

buppō 佛法 (skt. बुद्धधर्म Buddhadharmā): Buddhist Teachings, Buddhist Law. Sometimes replaces by the term Buddhāśāna (jp. *bucchoku* 佛敕; skt. बुद्धशासन).

bushi 武士: Warrior. Can also refer to the name of a Warrior Caste. Interchangeable with *samurai* 侍, although *samurai* has pejorative connotations attached to it because the *kanji* 侍 is the verb *samurau* 侍う, “to serve”. This means *samurai* refers primarily to their role as “servants” to more powerful political actors.

bushō 佛性 (skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu): Buddha-Nature. Term used in Mahāyāna Buddhism to describe being-Buddha or Buddhahood. Heart (*kokoro* 心) and Buddha-Nature are practically synonymous with each other as they both convey the same teaching of ‘Oneness of this Heart and Buddha (*sokushin zebutsu* 卽心是佛) that: all beings (jp. *issai shujo* 一切衆生; skt. सर्वसत्त्व Sarvasattva) are always-already Buddha and therefore all can and must attain enlightenment (*satori* 悟) and liberation (*gedatsu* 解脫; skt. मोक्ष Mokṣa) from the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra).

butsu 佛 (skt. बुद्ध Buddha): Enlightened-One, Awakened-One. A Buddha is a being who has attained enlightenment (*satori* 悟). Differences exist between the various Buddhist traditions, but most of them agree that a Buddha is not simply a being who has attained enlightenment, but also one who has successfully liberated (*gedatsu* 解脫; skt. मोक्ष Mokṣa) themselves from the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra). In Mahāyāna Buddhism, becoming Buddha is possible for all beings because, primordially, all beings are always-already Buddha-Nature (jp. *bushō* 佛性; skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu). In this sense, becoming Buddha sometimes is explained as simply awakening to what all beings always-already are; which happens once all the various impurities (jp. *ku* 垢; skt. मल Mala) that clouds beings’ hearts (*kokoro* 心) have been removed.

butsudō 佛道 (skt. बुद्धमार्ग Buddhāmārga): Buddhist Path, Buddha Path, Buddha-Way. Refers to the path to enlightenment as taught within the Buddhist scriptures (*kyō* 經; skt. सूत्र Sūtra). Another term for the fourth truth of the Four Noble Truths (jp. *shishōtai* 四聖諦 or *shōtai* 四諦; skt. चतुरार्यसत्य Caturāryasatya) regarding teaching the practices that lead to the cessation (jp. *metsu* 滅; skt. निरोध Nirodha) of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha) for all beings.

chie 智慧 (skt. ज्ञानप्रज्ञ Jñānaprajñā): Knowledge (jp. *chi* 智; skt. ज्ञान Jñāna) and Discernment (jp. *e* 慧 or *hannya* 般若; skt. प्रज्ञा Prajñā). Refers to the combination of two of the 6 or 10 Perfections (jp. *haramita* 波羅蜜多 or *haramitsu* 波羅蜜; skt. पारमिता Pāramitā) practiced by a bodhisattva (jp. *bosatsu* 菩薩; skt. बोधिसत्त्व) to reach Buddhahood.

chingo 鎮護: Protection, Safeguarding.

chinjufu shōgun 鎮守府將軍: Commander in Chief of the Defense of the North. Oftentimes simply abbreviated to *shōgun* 將軍. The *shōgun* was the head of a military-based administration called *bakufu* 幕府, which held the *de facto* political power from the beginning of the Kamakura era (1192) until the end of the Meiji era (1868). The specific title of *chinjufu shōgun* was first conferred to Minamoto Yoshiie 源義家 (1039-1106) who ‘pacified’ the Northern territories during 1051 to 1062 and winning the war of 1083 to 1087 against the Kiyohara 清原 clan.

chigiri 契り (skt. बन्ध Bandha): Tie, Bond. Within the Buddhist literature, it oftentimes refers to karmic bonds/ties (jp. *gōbaku* 業縛; skt. कर्मबन्ध Karmabandha).

chōji 懲治: To Discipline, To Punish. These kinds of actions are made with the intent of reforming an individual.

chokusen wakashū 勅撰和歌集: Imperially-Commissioned Japanese Anthologies of *Waka* 和歌 Poetry.

chūnagon 中納言: Middle Counsellors.

chūtai 中諦: Middle Truth. One of the Three Truths (*santai* 三諦) of Mahāyāna Buddhism and especially Tiantāi/Tendai Buddhism. It refers to the simultaneous existence of both the Absolute Truth (jp. *shintai* or *shintei* 眞諦; skt. परमार्थसत्य Paramārthasatya) and the Provisional (*zokutai* 俗諦 (skt. संवृतिसत्य Saṃvṛtisatya) Truth within each and every moment and phenomena.

Dai Hatsu Nehan Kyō 大般涅槃經 (skt. महापरिनिर्वाणसूत्र Mahā Pari Nirvāṇa Sūtra): Great Complete Cessation Sūtra. Oftentimes abbreviated to *Nehan Kyō* 涅槃經 (skt. निर्वाणसूत्र Nirvāṇa Sūtra): Cessation Sūtra.

Daihōdō Daijikyō 大方等大集經 (skt. महावैपुल्यमहासंनिपातसूत्र Mahā Vaipulya Mahā Saṃnipāta Sūtra): Great Directions, Great Collection Sūtra. Oftentimes abbreviated to *Daijikyō* 大集經 (skt. महासंनिपातसूत्र MahāSaṃnipātaSūtra): Great Collection Sūtra. It is an anthology of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras. The Sūtra was translated into Chinese by Dharmakṣema, beginning in the year 414. The anthology consists of 17 Sūtra across 60 fascicles, but the only extant copy of the entire collection is found in Chinese, though individual Sūtras can be found in Sanskrit and Tibetan.

daijin 大臣 (skt. महामात्र Mahāmātra): Great Minister, Minister.

daijishin 大慈心 (skt. महाकरुणाचित्त Mahākaruṇācitta): Heart of Great Compassion. Refers to the heart of the bodhisattva who, out of their heart great compassion, vows to remain in the cycle of

transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra) solely for the sake of helping getting rid of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha), and guide every being towards attaining unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment (jp. *anokutarasanmyakusanbodai* 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提; skt. अनुत्तरसम्यक्संबोधि Anuttarasamyaksambodhi) themselves. This vow happens naturally and spontaneously at the moment when a being has aroused an enlightened-heart (jp. *bodaishin* 菩提心; skt. बोधिचित्त Bodhicitta).

daijō 大乘 (skt. महायान Mahāyāna). Great Vehicle. Sometimes also called Bodhisattva Vehicle (jp. *bodaijō* 菩提; skt. बोधिसत्त्वयान Bodhisattvayāna). The most popular Buddhist tradition in East Asian Buddhism and often contrasted with the Small Vehicle (jp. *shōjō* 小乘; skt. हीनयान Hīnayāna) by followers of the Mahāyāna tradition.

Daijō Kishin Ron 大乘記信論 or 大乘起信論 (skt. महायानश्रद्धोत्पादशास्त्र Mahāyāna Śraddhotpāda Śāstra): Treatise on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna. Oftentimes abbreviated to *kishinron* 起信論, the Awakening of Faith. It is a foundational text of East Asian Mahāyāna Buddhism attributed to Aśvaghōṣa. This terse and short text systematize the teachings of scattered across numerous Buddhist Sūtras and presents clarification of key concepts as well and describing five practices that aid in the growth of faith (jp. *shin* 信; skt. श्रद्धा Śraddhā).

daimoku 題目: Recitation of a Chant. Often refers specifically to Nichiren Buddhism's practice of chanting "Homage to the True Dharma Lotus Flower Sūtra!" (Namu Myōhō Renge Kyō 南無妙法蓮華經).

dainagon 大納言: Major Counsellors.

daiseigan 大誓願 (skt. महाप्रणिधान Mahāpraṇidhāna): Great Vow. Refers to the vow of the bodhisattva who, out of their heart great compassion (jp. *daijishin* 大慈心; skt. महाकरुणाचित्त Mahākaruṇācitta), vows to remain in the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra) solely for the sake of helping getting rid of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha), and guide every being towards attaining unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment (jp. *anokutarasanmyakusanbodai* 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提; skt. अनुत्तरसम्यक्संबोधि Anuttarasamyaksambodhi) themselves. This vow happens naturally and spontaneously at the moment when a being has aroused an enlightened-heart (jp. *bodaishin* 菩提心; skt. बोधिचित्त Bodhicitta).

dajōdaijin 太政大臣: Chancellor of the Realm, Prime Minister. One of the three main positions in the Ministry of State Affairs (*dajōkan* 太政官). The *dajōdaijin* position was almost exclusively honorary and was more often vacant than occupied.

dajōkan 太政官: Ministry of State Affairs. One of the two principal organs of the Code-Governed State (*ritsuryō kokka* 律令國家) who controlled the administration, received reports and requests and drafted imperial edicts.

darani 陀羅尼/陀鄰尼/陀羅那 or *shu* 呪 (skt. धारणी Dhāraṇī): Incantation, Spell, Magical Formula. Often used for empowerment, protection, fortune, etc.

dō 道 (skt. मार्ग Mārga): Path, Way. The *kanji* 道 can be translated in multiple ways and has been used in numerous contexts within Chinese and Japanese history. Within the context of Buddhist thought specifically, 道 is primarily used to refer to the Buddhist Way (jp. *butsudō* 佛道; skt. बुद्धमार्ग Buddhāmārga) meaning the path to enlightenment as taught within the Buddhist scriptures (*kyō* 經; skt. सूत्र Sūtra). It is the forth truth of the Four Noble Truths (jp. *shishōtai* 四聖諦 or *shōtai* 四諦; skt. चतुरार्यसत्य Caturāryasatya) regarding teaching the practices that lead to the cessation (jp. *metsu* 滅; skt. निरोध Nirodha) of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha) for all beings.

e 慧 or *hannya* 般若 (skt. प्रज्ञा Prajñā): Discernment, Wisdom, Insight. One of the 6 or 10 Perfections (jp. *haramita* 波羅蜜多 or *haramitsu* 波羅蜜; skt. पारमिता Pāramitā) practiced by a bodhisattva (jp. *bosatsu* 菩薩; skt. बोधिसत्त्व) to reach Buddhahood. Discernment usually refers to the intuitive experiencing, through meditation, of the truths of reality such as the Four Noble Truths (jp. *shishōtai* 四聖諦 or *shōtai* 四諦; skt. चतुरार्यसत्य Caturāryasatya), impermanence (jp. *mujō* 無常; skt. अनित्य Anitya), dependent co-origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda), emptiness (jp. *kū* 空; skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā), and so forth. Experiencing reality through *prajñā*, a being is freed from the various afflictions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश Kleśa) and can thus attain enlightenment.

ehō 依報: Conditioned Retributions, Circumstances Retributions, Adjunct Retributions. Refers to the circumstances in which a being is born for their current lifetime such as land, nation, family, environment, etc. It is one of the two types of retributions (jp. *hō* 報; skt. विपाक Vipāka), the other one being exact retributions (*shōhō* 正報).

eigo 衛護: Protection, Safeguard.

emonfu 衛門府: Outer Palace Guards.

en 緣 (skt. प्रत्यय Pratyaya): Effect, Condition. Foundational concept to the Buddhist theory of *karma* (jp. *gō* 業; skt. कर्म) in which a cause (jp. *in* 因; skt. हेतु Hetu) will necessarily produce an effect, and an effect must necessarily have a cause at its origin. The Mahāyāna tradition described 4 types of effects/conditions: (1) Causal Conditions (jp. *in'en* 因緣; skt. हेतुप्रत्यय Hetupratyaya);

(2) Antecedent Equal and Immediate Conditions (jp. *tomuken'nen* 等無間緣; skt. समनन्तरप्रत्यय Samanantarapratyaya); (3) Object Conditions (jp. *shoen'nen* 所緣緣; skt. आलम्बनप्रत्यय Ālambanapratyaya); and (4) Dominant Conditions (jp. *zōjōen* 増上緣; skt. अधिपतिप्रत्यय Adhipatipratyaya). See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

engi 緣起 (skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda): Dependant Co-Origination, Interdependent Arising. Refers to the truth that any phenomena always arise together in a mutually interdependent web of cause (jp. *in* 因; skt. हेतु Hetu) and effect (jp. *en* 緣; skt. प्रत्यय Pratyaya). There are 12 factors or links of dependant co-origination: (1) Ignorance (jp. *mumyō* 無明; skt. अविद्या Avidyā); (2) Constructs (jp. *gyō* 行; skt. संस्कार Saṃskāra - 行); (3) Consciousness (jp. *shiki* 識; skt. विज्ञान Vijñāna); (4) Name and Forms (jp. *myōshiki* 名色; skt. नामरूप Nāmarūpa); (5) Six Sense Organs (jp. *rokusho* 六処 or *rokuyū* 六入; skt. षडायतन Ṣaḍāyatana); (6) Contact (jp. *shoku* 觸 or *soku* 触; skt. स्पर्श Sparśa); (7) Sensation (jp. *ju* 受; skt. वेदना Vedanā); (8) Craving (jp. *katsuai* 渴愛 or *ton'ai* 貪愛; skt. तृष्णा Trṣṇā); (9) Attachment (jp. *shu* 取; skt. उपादान Upādāna); (10) Existence (jp. *u* 有; skt. भाव Bhāva); (11) Birth (jp. *shō* 生; skt. जाति Jāti); and (12) Old age and Death (jp. *rōshi* 老死; skt. जरामरण Jarāmaraṇa). See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

fubō 不亡 (skt. अमृत Amṛta, अमार Amāra or अमरण Amaraṇa): Imperishable, Non-Perishable, Non-Death.

fujō 不淨 (skt. अविमल Avimala, अविषुद्ध Aviṣuddha or अप्रसन्न Aprasanna): Not Pure, Not Clear, Not Clean, Spoiled, Tainted.

fujōshin 不淨心 (skt. अविमलचित्त Avimalacitta, अविषुद्धचित्त Aviṣuddhacitta or अप्रसन्नचित्त Aprasannacitta): Impure Heart, Non-Purified Heart.

gedatsu 解脫 (skt. मोक्ष Mokṣa): Liberation, emancipation, release, deliverance from the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra).

Genpei kassen 源平合戦: Genpei War. Lasted from 1180 to 1185. The war was between the Taira 平 and Minamoto 源 clans and their allies. The Minamoto won the conflict, which resulted in the creation of the *bakufu* 幕府 headed by the *shōgun* 將軍 who was the *de facto* ruler of Japan. The installment of the first *bakufu* at the end of the Genpei War marked the beginning of the Kamakura era (1195).

genzai 現在 (skt. प्रत्युत्पन्नाध्वन् Pratyutpannādhvan): Present. In Buddhist, it refers to the time of a being's current lifetime.

gōbaku 業縛 (skt. कर्मबन्ध Karmabandha): Karmic Bonds. The result of actions performed in this life as well as in past births that causes a being to be tied to the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra) which is characterized by disappointment, discontent, and/or suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha). See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

goji 護持 (skt. अनुपालन Anupālana): Protection, Preserving, Maintaining.

gokenin 御家人: Vassal

gongen 權現: Avatar, Incarnation. Refers to the physical manifestation of a deity. In Japan, this concept was closely tied to the theory of *honji suijaku* 本地垂迹, which posits that Japan's indigenous deities (*kami* 神) are in fact avatars of buddhas and bodhisattvas.

gōru 業累 (skt. कर्मबन्ध Karmabandha): Karmic Tie.

gōzoku 豪族: Warrior Clans.

gō 業 (skt. कर्म Karma): Pertaining to Action, Action, Deed. In its simplest form, *karma* means 'action' or 'deed'. However, it is more appropriate to understand it to mean 'pertaining to action'. The reason for this is that *karma* is not simply focusing on the action or performance in itself, but it also encompasses everything that surrounds an action. This means that the term contains implicit questions such as: what are the causes (jp. *in* 因; skt. हेतु Hetu) behind the action and what will be its effects (jp. *en* 緣; skt. प्रत्यय Pratyaya)?; what are the circumstances (jp. *in'en* 因緣; skt. निदान Nidāna) in which actions arise?; and so forth. Indeed, since the truth of dependent co-origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda) understands that no phenomena arises on their own, it means that an action is always necessarily connected and located within an interconnected web of cause and effect. *Karma* is all of this: the performance and the web. But this web is not merely what is immediate to the action. Indeed, this web is an accumulation of causes and effects that is beginning-less and extends well before and well after the action's or actor's existence. This web is also how *karma* is connected to rebirth (jp. *ōjō* 往生; skt. पुनर्भव Punarbhava). Indeed, the birth of a present action inherits the results of past traces and this present action adds additional traces which will add up to birth into future effects. Thus, within this framework of dependent co-origination, an action (i.e. *karma*) can be seen as a medium which connects together past, present and future, and it is the key element that ensures continuous (re) origination (birth). Still, since future results contains traces of past and present actions, this means that a present action has the capacity to influence the kinds of result it is going to birth in the future. Put simply, wholesome actions (jp. *zengō* 善業; skt. कुशलकर्म Kuśalakarma) contains positive traces which a future birth

will inherit; while unwholesome actions (jp. *akugō* 悪業; skt. अकुशलकर्म *Akuśalakarma*) contains negative traces which a future birth will inherit. Buddhism teaches that in order to determine what kind of action it is, we have to look at their root. Wholesome roots (jp. *zenkon* 善根; skt. कुशलमूल *Kuśalamūla*) are found in actions that are devoid of desire (jp. *muton* 無貪; skt. अराग *Arāga*), devoid of hatred (jp. *mujiin* 無瞋; skt. अद्वेष *Adveṣa*), and/or devoid of delusion (jp. *muchi* 無痴; skt. अमोह *Amoha*); while unwholesome roots (jp. *zaikon* 鼻根; skt. अकुशलमूल *Akuśalamūla*) are found in actions tainted by desire (jp. *ton* 貪; skt. राग *Rāga*), hatred (jp. *jin* 瞋; skt. द्वेष *Dveṣa*), and/or delusion (jp. *chi* 痴; skt. मोह *Moha*). Since all of these unwholesome roots are the effects of having a tainted heart (jp. *jokushin* 濁心; skt. कषायहृदय *Kaṣāyahṛdaya*) or impure heart (jp. *fujōshin* 不淨心; skt. अविषुद्धचित्त *Aviṣuddhacitta*), the way to ensure that a being's actions are permeated with good roots leading to good results is by following the Buddhist teachings which guide beings in generating a pure heart (jp. *jōshin* 淨心; skt. विषुद्धचित्त *Viṣuddhacitta*), thus ensuring that their actions are permeated with wholesome roots.

goraku 極樂 (skt. सुखावती *Sukhāvātī*): Name of the Pure Land Buddha Amida (jp. 阿彌陀; skt. अमिताभ *Amitābha*) Buddha.

goriki 五力 (skt. पञ्चबल *Pañcabala*) Five Powers, Five Strengths. Refers to the various powers that can be cultivative which allow for the mind to remain in right concentration by intercepting the various afflictions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश *Kleśa*) and thus gradually penetrate the profound *Dharma*. They are: (1) Power of Faith (jp. *shin riki* 信力; skt. श्रद्धाबल *Śraddhābala*); (1) Power of Vigour (jp. *shōji riki* 精進力; skt. वीर्यबल *Vīryabala*); (3) Power of Mindfulness (jp. *nen riki* 念力; skt. स्मृतिबल *Smṛtibala*); (4) Power of Concentration (jp. *jō riki* 定力; skt. समाधिबल *Samādhibala*); and (5) Power of Discernment (jp. *e riki* 慧力; skt. प्रज्ञाबल *Prajñābala*).

guchi 愚癡 (skt. मोह *Moha*): Delusion, Ignorance, Folly, Confusion. One of the Three Poisons (jp. *sandoku* 三毒/三根/三株; skt. त्रिविष *Triviṣa*) in Buddhism.

gyō 行: Practice, Cultivation, Learning.

gyōbushō 刑部省: Department of Justice

Hachiman 八幡: A syncretic deity (*kami* 神) belonging to both Japanese indigenous religion (Shintō 神道) and Buddhism. It was the tutelary deity of the Minamoto clan and was worshipped equally by farmers and fishermen for agriculture and fishing as well as by warriors for war and archery.

hannya 般若 or *e* 慧 (skt. प्रज्ञा Prajñā): Discernment, Wisdom, Insight. One of the 6 or 10 Perfections (jp. *haramita* 波羅蜜多 or *haramitsu* 波羅蜜; skt. पारमिता Pāramitā) practiced by a bodhisattva (jp. *bosatsu* 菩薩; skt. बोधिसत्त्व) to reach Buddhahood. Discernment usually refers to the intuitive experiencing, through meditation, of the truths of reality such as the Four Noble Truths (jp. *shishōtai* 四聖諦 or *shōtai* 四諦; skt. चतुरार्यसत्य Caturāryasatya), impermanence (jp. *mujō* 無常; skt. अनित्य Anitya), dependent co-origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Praṭītyasamutpāda), emptiness (jp. *kū* 空; skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā), and so forth. Experiencing reality through prajñā, a being is freed from the various afflictions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश Kleśa) and can thus attain enlightenment.

Hannya Haramita Shin Gyō 般若波羅蜜多心經 (skt. प्रज्ञापारमिताहृदयसूत्र Prajñā Pāramitā Hṛdaya Sūtra): The Heart of the Perfection of Discernment Sūtra. Almost always abbreviated as the Heart Sūtra (jp. Shin Gyō 心經; skt. हृदयसूत्र Hṛdaya Sūtra). The most used and chanted Sūtra in Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is a very short and condensed text that expounds the teachings of the Two Truths (jp. *nitai* 二諦; skt. द्विसत्य Dvīsatya) which itself contains the teachings of the emptiness (jp. *kū* 空; skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā) of all phenomena.

hantaraju 般怛羅呪 (skt. शीतातपत्रउष्णीषधारणी Sitātapatra Uṣṇīṣa Dhāraṇī): White Canopy Dhāraṇī. A Dhāraṇī found in the Śūraṅgama Sūtra.

haramita 波羅蜜多 or *haramitsu* 波羅蜜 (skt. पारमिता Pāramitā): Perfections, Virtues. They are usually numbered as 6 or 10, and are practiced by bodhisattvas (jp. *bosatsu* 菩薩; skt. बोधिसत्त्व) to reach Buddhahood. They are: (1) Generosity (jp. *fuse* 布施; skt. दान Dāna); (2) Precept Observance (jp. *jigai* 持戒; शीलधर Śīladhara); (3) Forbearance (jp. *ninniku* 忍辱; skt. क्षांति Kṣānti); (4) Exertion (jp. *shōjin* 精進; skt. वीर्य Vīrya); (5) One-Pointed Concentration (jp. *zenjō* 禪定; skt. ध्यान Dhyāna); (6) Discernment (jp. *hannya* 般若; skt. प्रज्ञा Prajñā); (7) Skillful Means (jp. *hōben* 方便; skt. उपाय Upāya); (8) Vow (jp. *gan* 願; skt. प्राणिधान Praṇidhāna); (9) Power (jp. *chikara* 力; skt. बल Bala); and (10) Knowledge (jp. *chi* 智; skt. ज्ञान Jñāna).

hasshō 八省: Eight Departments. Refers to the Eight different Departments of the Control Board (*benkan* 弁官), namely: (1) Court Affairs (*nakatsukasashō* 中務省); (2) Regulations Relating to Civil Officials (*shikibushō* 式部省); (3) Noble Affairs (*jibushō* 治部省); (4) Population (*minbushō* 民部省); (5) Military Affairs (*hyōbushō* 兵部省); (6) Justice (*gyōbushō* 刑部省); (7) Treasury (*ōkurashō* 大藏省); and (8) Palace Affairs (*kunaishō* 宮内省).

hatsumu inga 撥無因果 (skt. फलहेत्वपवादिन् Phalahetvapavādin): Denying Cause and Effect, Rejecting Cause and Effect. Refers to not believing in karmic principles. This invites disaster and

misfortune because it makes beings act mindlessly since they show no care for the consequences of their actions.

Heiji no ran 平治の乱: Heiji Rebellion. Took place in 1160 between the forces of Taira 平 and Minamoto 源. This rebellion is important because although the Taira won the conflict, the head of the Taira clan Taira Kiyomori 平清盛 (1118-1181) decided to spare the surviving three sons of his enemy Minamoto Yoshitomo 源義朝 (1123-1160). These three sons were Minamoto Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147-1199), Minamoto Noriyori 源範頼 (1150-1193) and Minamoto Yoshitsune 源義経 (1159-1189). This would prove to be the downfall of Kiyomori and the Taira as they would be defeated by the forces of Minamoto Yoritomo twenty five years later during the events of the Genpei War.

hibō 誹謗 (skt. अपवाद Apavāda, पांसन Pāṃsana or प्रतिक्षेप Pratikṣepa): Slandering, Reviling, Disgracing, Speaking Ill of, Dishonouring, Refuting, Opposing, Contesting, Controverting.

hihō 非法 (skt. अधर्म Adharma): Contrary to the Dharma, In violation/transgression of the Dharma, anti-Dharma.

hō 法 (skt. धर्म Dharma): Teachings of buddhas and bodhisattvas, Law of buddhas and bodhisattvas. Sometimes used to translate the word equivalent to ‘phenomena’. The innumerable teachings of buddhas and bodhisattvas is often referred to as the Dharma Wheel (jp. *hōrin* 法輪; skt. धर्मचक्र Dharmacakra) and a being who expounds such teachings is said to “spin the Dharma Wheel” (jp. *tenbōrin* 轉法輪; skt. धर्मचक्रप्रवर्तन Dharmacakrapravartana).

hō 報 (skt. विपाक Vipāka): Retribution, Consequences, Results. Refers to what will be the result of an action in the future. Retributions can be either positive or negative. This going to be determined by whether a being produces a wholesome (jp. *zengō* 善業; skt. कुशलकर्म Kuśalakarman) or unwholesome action (jp. *akugō* 惡業; skt. अकुशलकर्म Akuśalakarman), which is itself determined by whether a being has wholesome roots (jp. *zenkon* 善根; skt. कुशलमूल Kuśalamūla) or unwholesome roots (jp. *zaikon* 孽根/罪根; skt. अकुशलमूल Akuśalamūla). There are two types of retributions, namely: (1) conditioned retributions (*ehō* 依報); and (2) exact retributions (*shōhō* 正報). Conditioned Retributions refers to the circumstances in which a being is born for their current lifetime such as land, nation, family, environment, etc. Exact retributions refers to the specific characteristics of the being itself such as the kind of body, personality, intelligence, etc.

hōben 方便 (skt. Upāya उपाय): Skillful Means. They are used to guide a being on the path to liberation (*gedatsu* 解脫; skt. मोक्ष Mokṣa) from the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra). Also, one of the 6 or 10 Perfections (jp. *haramita* 波羅蜜多 or *haramitsu* 波羅蜜;

skt. पारमिता Pāramitā) practiced by a bodhisattva (jp. *bosatsu* 菩薩; skt. बोधिसत्त्व) to reach Buddhahood.

Hōgen no ran 保元の乱: Hōgen rebellion. Took place in 1156. The victory of the combined forces of Taira Kiyomori 平清盛 (1118-1181) and Minamoto Yoshitomo 源義朝 (1123-1160) on behalf of Emperor Goshirakawa 後白河 (1127-1192) made the Taira and Minamoto clans become the most powerful *samurai* 侍 clans in all of Japan. Eventually, they would compete for power which led to the events of the Genpei War.

hōkai 法界 (skt. धर्मधातु Dharmadhātu): Dharma Realm, Phenomenal Realm, Truth Realm.

honfujō 本不淨 (skt. प्रकृतिअपरिशुद्ध Prakṛtipariśuddha): Primordial Impurity, Original Impurity, Intrinsic Impurity, Natural Impurity. Refers to the thought that some beings are inherently pure while others are inherently impure (jp. *honjō* 本淨; skt. प्रकृतिपरिशुद्ध Prakṛtipariśuddha). This this thought is problematized in Buddhism because the framework of Dependent Co-Origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda) leading to the truth of Emptiness (jp. *kū* 空; skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā) of Self-Existence (jp. *jishō* 自性; स्वभाव Svabhāva) in all phenomena/beings dismisses the possibility of phenomena/beings having any sort of inherent characteristics, essences, natures, souls, etc. (jp. *wa* 我; skt. आत्मन् Ātman) that results in a the construction of a Self (jp. *ji* 自; skt. स्व Sva).

hongan 本願 (skt. पूर्वप्रणिधान Pūrvapraṇidhāna): Original Vow, Primordial Vow, Fundamental Vow. Usually refers to the vow of the bodhisattva who, out of their heart great compassion (jp. *daijishin* 大慈心; skt. महाकरुणाचित्त Mahākaruṇācitta), vows to remain in the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra) solely for the sake of helping getting rid of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha), and guide every being towards attaining unsurpassed, complete, proper and perfect enlightenment (jp. *anokutarasanmyakusanbodai* 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提; skt. अनुत्तरसम्यक्संबोधि Anuttarasamyaksambodhi) themselves. This vow happens naturally and spontaneously at the moment when a being has aroused an enlightened-heart (jp. *bodaishin* 菩提心; skt. बोधिचित्त Bodhicitta).

honjō 本淨 (skt. प्रकृतिपरिशुद्ध Prakṛtipariśuddha): Primordial Purity, Original Purity, Intrinsic Purity, Natural Purity. Refers to the thought that some beings are inherently pure while others are inherently impure (jp. *honfujō* 本不淨; skt. प्रकृतिअपरिशुद्ध Prakṛtipariśuddha). This this thought is problematized in Buddhism because the framework of Dependent Co-Origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda) leading to the truth of Emptiness (jp. *kū* 空; skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā) of Self-Existence (jp. *jishō* 自性; स्वभाव Svabhāva) in all phenomena/beings dismisses the possibility of phenomena/beings having any sort of inherent characteristics, essences, natures,

souls, etc. (jp. *wa* 我; skt. आत्मन् Ātman) that results in a the construction of a Self (jp. *ji* 自; skt. स्व Sva).

hōrin 法輪 (skt. धर्मचक्र Dharmacakra). Refers to the innumerable teachings of buddhas and bodhisattvas, and a being who expounds such teachings is said to “spin the Dharma Wheel” (jp. *tenbōrin* 轉法輪; skt. धर्मचक्रप्रवर्तन Dharmacakrapravartana). This also forms on of the basis of legitimate governance in Buddhism, as leaders should aspire to be Wheel-Turning Sage Kings (jp. *tenrin jōō* 轉輪聖王; skt. चक्रवर्तिराज Cakravartirāja).

hōshin 報身 (skt. संभोगकाय Saṃbhogakāya): Enjoyment-Body. One of the Three Bodies (jp. *sanshin* 三身; skt. त्रिकाय Trikāya) of a Buddha according to Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is the subtle and limitless bodies of Buddhas and advanced bodhisattvas who manifest in visions or in their Pure Lands where beings can hear and practice the Dharma with ease.

hosshin 法身 (skt. धर्मकाय Dharmakāya): Dharma-Body. One of the Three Bodies (jp. *sanshin* 三身; skt. त्रिकाय Trikāya) of a Buddha according to Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is the unmanifested and inconceivable aspects of a Buddha out of which Buddas arise and to which they return after their dissolution.

hyōbushō 兵部省: Department of Military Affairs.

i 位: Rank. There were 9 possible ranks a person could have that granted them access to public posts (*kan* 官); each of them subdivided further into multiple levels (*ikai* 位階) totalling thirty.

i 意 (skt. मनस् Manas): Mind, Mental Activities, Mental Faculties. Manas is the source of all forms of mental capacities as consciousness, intellect, understanding, cognition, perception, thought, imagine, intention, etc. It is one of the Faculties (jp. *kon* 根; skt. इन्द्रिय Indriya) that give rise to sensations and therefore consciousness. Some focus on 5 or 6 Faculties while others name as much as 22 Faculties encompassing physical, mental, spiritual and supramundane abilities.

ichigyō 一行: Single-Practice. Refers to the New Buddhist traditions installed during the Kamakura era which focused on one particular key practice or concept at the core of their systems.

ikai 位階: Sub-Ranks. There were 9 possible ranks (*i* 位) a person could have that granted them access to public posts (*kan* 官); each of them subdivided further into multiple sub-ranks (*ikai* 位階) totalling thirty.

in 因 (skt. हेतु Hetu): Cause, Origin. Foundational concept to the Buddhist theory of *karma* (jp. *gō* 業; skt. कर्म) in which a cause will necessarily produce an effect (jp. *en* 縁; skt. प्रत्यय Pratyaya),

and an effect must necessarily have a cause at its origin. The Mahāyāna tradition describes 5 types of causes: (1) Corresponding Cause (jp. *sōōin* 相應因; skt. संप्रयुक्तकहेतु Saṃprayuktakahetu); (2) Mutual Causes (jp. *ku'uin* 俱有因; skt. सहभूहेतु Sahabhūhetu); (3) Same-Type Causes (jp. *dōruin* 同類因; skt. सभागहेतु Sabhāgahetu); (4) Omnipresent Causes (jp. *ken'in'in* 牽引因 or *hengyōin* 徧行因; skt. सर्वत्रगहेतु Sarvatragahetu); (5) Ripening Causes (jp. *ijukuin* 異熟因 or *hōin* 報因; skt. विपाकहेतु Vipākahetu). See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

in'en 因緣 or *inga* 因果 (skt. हेतुप्रत्यय Hetupratyaya or हेतुफल Hetuphala): Cause and Effect, Causal Conditions. Foundational concept to the Buddhist theory of *karma* (jp. *gō* 業; skt. कर्म) in which a cause (jp. *in* 因; skt. हेतु Hetu) will necessarily produce an effect (jp. *en* 緣; skt. प्रत्यय Pratyaya), and an effect must necessarily have a cause at its origin. The *kanjis* are sometimes used to translate the word ‘circumstances’ (निदान Nidāna) when describing the circumstances behind the arising of a phenomena or thing. See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

insei 院政: Retired-Cloistered Governance. This political system, in theory, allowed emperors to continue having almost all the decision-making power even after abdicating their imperial position. The conflict and tensions resulting from this political system is central to the unfolding of the Heian era and the beginning of the Kamakura era.

iryoku 威力 (skt. प्रभाव Prabhāva): Power, Political Power, Authority, Influence.

issai shujo 一切衆生 (skt. सर्वसत्त्व Sarvasattva) : All Beings, Every Being. It is important to keep in mind that, within Buddhist taught, all beings are sentient based on the teaching of ‘Oneness of This Heart and the Buddha’ (*sokushin zebutsu* 即心是佛) and Buddha-Nature (jp. *busshō* 佛性; skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu). Thus, whenever we encounter expressions such as ‘to guide all beings towards liberation or enlightenment’ as in the Primordial Vow of the Bodhisattva, such statements actually refer to *all* beings in their totality.

ji 自 (स्व Sva): Self, Self-ness, One’s Own-Self, Nature, Essence. Refers a being’s own Self, nature, innateness, etc. The Buddha’s enlightenment (*satori* 悟) revolved around realizing that discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha) is caused by beings’ attachments to the concept of the Self-Nature, Self-Ness, or Self-Existence (jp. *jishō* 自性; स्वभाव Svabhāva) of phenomena. The resulting teaching was that attaining liberation from discontent/suffering consists in awakenining to the absolute reality that phenonema are fundamentaly Empty (jp. *kū* 空; skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā), which simply means that they are empty of Self-Nature, Self-Ness, or Self-Existence. Everything is empty of self-nature because everything arises through Dependent Co-Origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda), and no phenomena ever arises ‘by itself’ – i.e. it has no self-nature. This means that the barriers between Self and Other (jp. *ta* 他; skt. पर

Para) are destroyed because all things are necessarily interconnected with each other. These are the bases for further teachings such as the ‘Oneness of This Heart and the Buddha’ (*sokushin zebutsu* 即心是佛) and Buddha-Nature (jp. *busshō* 佛性; skt. skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu).

ji 璽: Seal. Usually refers to the Imperial Seal known as ‘Eight-Foot String of Comma-Shaped Jewels’ (*yasakani no magatama* 八尺瓊曲玉) one of the Three Imperial Regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) blessed by the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth according to one of Japan’s first written document the Nihon Shoki 日本書紀. These regalias have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia. This Seal represents the ruler’s value of benevolence.

jiai no kokoro 慈愛の心 (skt. मैत्रीचित्त Maitrīcitta): Heart of Loving Kindness, Heart of Friendliness, Heart of Amicability, Heart of Benevolence.

jibushō 治部省: Department of Noble Affairs

jigai 持戒 (skt. शीलधर Śīladhara): Precept Observance, Observing the Precepts.

jingikan 神祇官: Ministry of Divinities. One of the two principal organs of the code-governed state (*ritsuryō kokka* 律令國家) which kept the list of shrines and their clergy for the entire country, prepared and presented the court offerings to the most important shrines and celebrated the rituals.

jiriki 自力: Self-Power. *Jiriki*-oriented Buddhist reformists of the Kamakura period based their practices upon the notion of Buddha-nature (*busshō* 佛性) which posits that all beings are already endowed with the nature of Buddhas within themselves. This normally took the form of cultivating practices such as meditation, prayers, asceticism, contemplation, etc. which aims at ‘viewing one’s nature’ (*kenshō* 見性) or awaken to this Buddha-nature we all already are. Once the practitioner sees or awakens to *busshō*, they attain liberation and are thus buddhas and bodhisattvas.

jitō 地頭: Land Steward

jō 定 or *sanmai* 三昧 (skt. समाधी Samādhi): One-Pointed Concentration, One-Pointedness of the Mind, Meditative Consciousness. lit. “Bringing Together”. There are multiple kinds of samādhi that can be attained and are way too numerous to list here. However, the commonality between almost all of them is that they refer to a state that is achievable through practice, and especially meditation.

jōdo 淨土: Pure Land(s). Refers to the celestial realms of a buddha or bodhisattva.

Jōdoshū 淨土宗: Pure Land Tradition. Founded by Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212)

Jōdō Shinshū 浄土真宗: True Tradition of the Pure Land. Founded by Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1263), a disciple of Hōnen 法然 who founded the Pure Land Tradition (Jōdoshū 浄土宗).

jōshin 淨心 (skt. विमलचित्त Vimalacitta, विषुद्धचित्त Viṣuddhacitta or प्रसन्नचित्त Prasannacitta): Pure Heart, Purified Heart.

jū 集 (skt. समुदय Samudaya): Arising, Origination, Birth, Accumulation. The second truth of the Four Noble Truths (jp. *shishōtai* 四聖諦 or *shōtai* 四諦; skt चतुरार्यसत्य Caturāryasatya) regarding the causes for the arising of discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha) for all beings.

juji 誦持: Chanting Practices. Refers to the various forms of chanting practices found in multiple Buddhist traditions such as the chanting of *Sūtras* (jp. *kyō* 經; skt. सूत्र), *Dhāraṇīs* (jp. *darani* 陀羅尼/陀鄰尼/陀羅那; skt. धारणी), *Mantras* (jp. *shingon* 眞言; skt. मन्त्र), and so forth.

jungenpōjugō 順現法受業 (skt. दृष्टधर्मवेदनीयं कर्म Dṛṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃkarma): Karma to be Made Known in the Currently Existing Dharmas. One of the types of Karma of the Three Periods (*sanji gō* 三時業). Refers to the fact that a being will experience the results of their actions in their present lifetime.

jungojijugō 順後次受業 (skt. अपरपर्यायवेदनीयं कर्म Aparapāryāyavedanīyaṃkarma): Karma to be Made Known After the Next Lapse. One of the types of Karma of the Three Periods (*sanji gō* 三時業). Refers to the fact that a being will experience the results of their actions in this current lifetime, the next one, and many multiple lifetimes afterwards.

junjishōjugō 順次生受業 (skt. उपाद्यवेदनीयं कर्म Upapādyavedanīyaṃkarma): Karma to be Made Known in the Coming Birth. One of the types of Karma of the Three Periods (*sanji gō* 三時業). Refers to the fact that a being will experience the results of their actions in their immediate next lifetime.

junzen 純善 (skt. एकान्तकुशल Ekāntakuśala): Genuine Wholesomeness.

kagami 鏡 (skt. आदर्श Ādarśa): Mirror. The imagery of dust (jp. *ku* 垢; skt. मल Mala) on a mirror is a very known Buddhist teaching. It likens the process of using Buddhist practices to reach enlightenment (*satori* 悟) to that of getting rid of dust on a mirror. It can also refer to the ‘Eight-Span Mirror’ (*yata no kagami* 八咫鏡) one of the Three Imperial Regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) blessed by the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth according to one of Japan’s first written document the Nihon Shoki 日本書紀. These regalias have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers

of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia. This mirror represents the ruler's value of wisdom.

kai 戒 or *shira* 尸羅 (skt. शील Śīla): Precepts. The basic monastic code (प्रातिमोक्ष *prātimokṣa*) of the Theravāda Buddhist tradition contains 227 rules of conduct for ordained monks (*biku* 比丘) and 311 for ordained nuns (*bikuni* 比丘尼) as they appear in the text entitled Suttavibhaṅga. However, the Japanese Mahāyāna Buddhist traditions, following the efforts of Tendai's founder Saichō, operate using a different ordination platform based on the Brahmajāla Bodhisattva Śīla Sūtra (jp. Bonmō Bosatsu Kai Kyō 梵網菩薩戒經). This text presents ten major or grave precepts (*jūjūkai* 十重戒) – also called Bodhisattva precepts (*bosatsu kai* 菩薩戒) – that all ordained monks and nuns most follow, as well as another set of 48 minor or lighter precepts (*shijūhachi kyōkai* 四十八輕戒) that help disciples advance on the bodhisattva path.

kako 過去 (skt. अतीताध्वन् Atītādhvan): Past. In Buddhism, it refers to times before a being's current life.

kan 官: Public Post. There were 9 possible ranks (*i* 位) a person could have that granted them access to public posts (*kan* 官); each of them subdivided further into multiple sub-ranks (*ikai* 位階) totalling thirty.

kanfū 功夫: Practice of the Way, Carrying out Religious Discipline.

kanjō 灌頂 (skt. अभिषेक Abhiṣeka): Initiation ritual performed in Esoteric Buddhism (*mikkyō* 密教). The most known format is performed as follows: after the student receives the *samaya* (jp. *sanmaiya* 三昧耶; skt. समय) precepts, the teacher of the esoteric Buddhism assumes the role of the teacher, usually Mahavairocana Buddha (jp. *birushana butsu* 毘盧遮那佛 or *dainichi nyorai* 大日如來; skt. महावैरोचन), while the master and student repeat specific *mantras* (jp. *shingon* 眞言; skt. मन्त्र) in a form of dialogue taken from esoteric Buddhist sutras. The student, who is blindfolded, then throws a flower upon the *maṇḍala* (jp. *mandala* 曼荼羅; skt. मण्डल) that is constructed. Where the flower lands (i.e. on which deity) helps dictate where the student should focus his devotion on the esoteric path. From there, the student's blindfold is removed and a Vajra (jp. *kongō* 金剛 or *bakura* 縛日羅; skt. वज्र) is placed in their hand.

kanpaku 関白: Chancellor. The position of *kanpaku* essentially fulfills very similar functions to a regent (*sesshō* 摂政), but for adult emperors.

kanshin 奸心: A Cunning and Wicked Heart.

kebiishichō 檢非違使庁: Police Bureau.

kashaku 呵責: To Critique, To Berate, To Blame, To Accuse. Sometimes used to mean To Torture, To Maltreat.

kedai 懈怠 (skt. कौसीद्य Kausīdya): Negligence, Laziness, Sloth, Indolence. It is one of the forty conditions that are associated with the mind. It is said that in householder, negligence ruins wealth and merits while in monastics, negligence ruins celestial happiness and the bliss of cessation (jp. *nehan* 涅槃; skt. निर्वाण Nirvāṇa). In either of those situations, one's good name is lost.

keichō 敬重: Veneration, Reverence, High Esteem, Deep Respect.

kendan 検断: Jurisdiction.

kenshō 見性 (skt. दृष्टिस्वभाव Dr̥ṣṭisvabhāva): Viewing One's Nature, Experiencing One's Essence. The framework of Buddha-nature (*busshō* 佛性; skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu) posits that all beings are always-already Buddha. By cultivating practices such as meditation, prayers, asceticism, contemplation, etc. which aims at 'viewing one's nature' (*kenshō* 見性), beings can awaken to this Buddha-nature we all already are.

kidai 奇代: Strange Times.

kirokujo 記録所: Land Record Office.

kokoro 心: Heart, Mind, Buddha-Nature. See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

oku 國: Nation, Country, Land.

kokuga 國衙: Provincial Headquarters

okuō 國王: Rulers of Nations.

okushi 國司: Governor.

Kongō Hannya Haramita Kyō 金剛般若波羅蜜多經 (skt. वज्रच्छेदिकाप्रज्ञापारमितासूत्र Vajracchedikā Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra): Diamond Cutter, Perfection of Discernment Sūtra. Almost always abbreviated as the Diamond Sūtra. It is one of the most influential Mahāyāna Sūtras in East Asia, and it is particularly prominent within the Chan/Zen tradition (*zenshū* 禪宗). The title relies on the power of the Vajra (jp. *kongō* 金剛 or *bakura* 縛曰羅; skt. वज्र) to cut things as a metaphor for the type of wisdom that cuts and shatters illusions to get to ultimate reality.

Konkōmyō Saishō'ō Kyō 金光明最勝王經 (skt. सुवर्णप्रभासोत्तमसूत्रेन्द्रराज Suvarṇa Prabhā Sottama Sūtrendra Rājah): Sovereign King of Sūtra, the Sublime Golden Light. Often abbreviated to

Konkōmyō Kyō 金光明經 (skt. सुवर्णप्रभासोत्तमसूत्र Suvarṇa Prabhā Sottama Sūtra): Sublime Golden Light Sūtra. It is a Mahāyāna Sūtra which teaches the protection of the Nation for the mutual benefit of the Buddhist community and the ruler. Also, it expounds that leaders who do not support Buddhism and do not engage in purification practices will not receive protection and will face many calamities, diseases, disasters, and so forth.

kon 根 (skt. इन्द्रिय Indriya): Faculties, Senses. Buddhism posits that there are 6 Faculties, namely: (1) Eye (jp. *gan* 眼; skt. चक्षुस् Cakṣus); (2) Ear (jp. *ni* 耳; skt. श्रोत्र Śrotra); (3) Nose/Nostril (jp. *bi* 鼻; skt. घ्राण Ghrāṇa) (4) Tongue (jp. *zetsu* 舌; skt. जिह्वा Jihvā); (5) Body (jp. *shin* 身; skt. काय Kāya); and (6) Mind (jp. *i* 意; skt. मनस् Manas). These faculties are the ways through which beings experience the world, which means their experiences do not allow them to see reality just as it is – since their experiences is filtered by their faculties. Conceptualizing of the world through one’s faculties only enables the production of provisional/conventional/relative Truths (jp. *zokutai* 俗諦; skt. संवृतिसत्य Samvṛtisatya), but does not allow for experiencing ultimate/absolute/real truth (jp. *shintai* or *shintei* 眞諦; skt. परमार्थसत्य Paramārthasatya).

kongō’ō 金剛王 (skt. वज्रराज Vajrarāja): Diamond Kings, Thunderbolt Kings, Vajra Kings.

Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論: ‘Treatise on the Protection of the Nation through the Revival of Zen’. Written by Eisai 栄西 in 1198.

ku 苦 (skt. दुःख Duḥkha): Dissapointment, Dissatisfaction, Discontent, Suffering. The primary characteristic of the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra). The first truth of the Four Noble Truths (jp. *shishōtai* 四聖諦 or *shōtai* 四諦; skt चतुरार्यसत्य Caturāryasatya) regarding the existence of discontent/suffering as an inherent and necessary part of the life-experience of any beings.

ku 垢 (skt. मल Mala) : Impurity, Dust, Filth, Dirt. The imagery of dust on a mirror (jp. *kagami* 鏡; skt. आदर्श Ādarśa) is a very known Buddhist teaching that likens the process of using Buddhist practices to reach enlightenment (*satori* 悟) to that of getting rid of dust on a mirror.

kudoku 功德 or *yaku/eki* 益 (skt. पुण्य Puṇya): Merits, rewards, blessings, benefits.

kuji 苦治: To Punish, To Reprimand, To Penalize.

kuken 驅遣: To expel, To Oust, To Eject, To Depose. Lit. “To Send Running/Galloping”.

kunaishō 宮内省: Department of Palace Affairs.

kunjū 薰習 (वासना Vāsanā): Karmic Imprints, Latent Predispositions. It refers to the karmic imprints unconsciously left on the heart/mind by past wholesome actions () or unwholesome actions () which influences the present behavior of a person.

kurōdodokoro 藏人所: Chancellery. The *kurōdodokoro* had about ten members and their role was to serve the emperor in his daily life and to coordinate the work of the offices and bureaux involved. The two heads were tasked with liaising between the emperor and the council of senior nobles. This organ was thus entrusted with a confidential mission and the officials belonging to it were those who had most occasion to see the emperor and to hope for honourable careers.

kusanagi no tsurugi 草薙劍: Grass Cutting Sword. One of the names of the sword (*tsurugi* 劍) as one of the Three Imperial Regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) blessed by the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth according to one of Japan's first written document the Nihon Shoki 日本書記. These regalias have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia. This Seal represents the ruler's value of valour.

kū 空 (skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā): Emptiness. Refers to the truth that any phenomena/thing is empty of self-existence, self-ness or self-nature (jp. *jishō* 自性; skt. स्वभाव Svabhāva) because all phenomena necessarily arise interdependently with each other (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Praṭītyasamutpāda). No phenomena arise on its own disconnected from the web of cause (jp. *in* 因; skt. हेतु Hetu) and effect (jp. *en* 緣; skt. प्रत्यय Pratyaya); therefore no phenomena possesses self-existence.

kuyō 供養 (skt. Pūja): Worship, Offerings.

kyō 經 (skt. सूत्र Sūtra): Scripture, text.

Maka Shikan 摩訶止觀 (ch. Mòhē Zhǐguān). It is a major Buddhist treatise based on lectures given by the Chinese Tiantai patriarch Zhiyi 智顛 (538–597 CE) in 594. These lectures were compiled and edited by Zhiyi's disciple Guanding 灌頂 (561-632) into seven chapters in ten fascicles. Although originally a Chinese text, the Sanskrit rendering of the title would be महाशमथविपश्यना Mahā Śamatha Vipāśyanā. The text focuses on describing in details the ways in which a practitioner can cultivate the great (jp. *maka* 摩訶; skt. महा Mahā) practices of Stilling (jp. *shi* 止; skt. शमथ Śamatha) and Insight (jp. *kan* 觀; skt. विपश्यना Vipāśyanā) for them to attain enlightenment (*satori* 悟) and progress on the bodhisattva path.

Mara 魔羅 (skt. मार Māra): ‘King of the Destruction of Good Works’ or ‘Demon King’. Māra and his followers trouble sentient beings and destroys the good root of the Dharma and the Buddhist path. According to the Mahāyāna tradition, there are four Metaphorical Forms of the Demon King (*yonma* 四魔), namely: (1) Affliction Māra (jp. *bonno ma* 煩惱魔; skt. क्लेशमार Kleśamāra); (2) Aggregate Māra (jp. *in ma* 陰魔; skt. स्कन्धमार Skandhamāra); (3) Death Māra (jp. *shin ma* 死魔; skt. मृत्युमार Mrtyumāra); (4) Divine Māra (jp. *ten ma* 天魔; देवपुत्रमार Devaputramāra). Bodhisattvas are said to have passed beyond the work of Māra because they have destroyed these four manifestations within themselves, and work towards helping sentient beings achieve so for themselves.

mei 迷 (skt. माया Māyā): Illusions, Delusions.

metsu 滅 (skt. निरोध Nirodha): Extinction, annihilation, complete destruction, extinguishment. The third truth of the Four Noble Truths (jp. *shishōtai* 四聖諦 or *shōtai* 四諦; skt. चतुरार्यसत्य Caturāryasatya) regarding the fact that discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha) can end for all beings. The *kanji* 滅 is also sometimes used to translate Nirvāṇa (jp. *nehan* 涅槃; skt. निर्वाण) specifically.

mikkyō 密教 (skt. वज्रयान Vajrayāna): Esoteric Buddhism. Lit. “Dense Teachings”.

minbushō 民部省: Population Bureau.

mirai 未來 (skt. अनगताध्वन् Anāgatādhvan): Future. In Buddhism, it refers to the times after a being’s current life.

muhon 謀反: Major Violence.

muge 無礙 (skt. अप्रतिहत Apratihata): Unobstructed, Unhindered, Without Obstacle, Permeating Everywhere, All-Pervasive, Dynamic Omnipresence. Refers to an important quality attained by beings who have a pure heart. Indeed, their purity means that are unhindered by worldly afflictions and can therefore manifest Buddhahood or bodhisattvahood. As a result of not being obstructed by afflictions and attaining Buddhahood/bodhisattvahood, they have the capacity to make their deeds and being permeate everywhere.

mujō 無常 (skt. अनित्य Anitya): Impermanence, Evanescence, Fleetingness.

myōden 名田: Allocated Rice Field.

Myōhō Renge Kyō 妙法蓮華經 (skt. सद्धर्मपुण्डरीकसूत्र Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra): White Lotus of the True Dharma Sūtra, commonly referred to as the Lotus Sūtra.

myōshu 名主: Nominal Holder of an allocated rice field (*myōden* 名田).

naidaijin 内大臣: Minister of the Interior, Middle Minister.

nairan 内覧: Unofficial Document Examination. One of the privilege and mechanism granted to the Chancellor (*kanpaku* 関白) which allowed them to maintain control over an adult emperor.

nakatsukasashō 中務省: Department of Court Affairs.

Namu Amida Butsu 南無阿彌陀佛 (skt. नमोअमिताभही: Namo Amitābha Hrīḥ): The primary chant of Pure Land Buddhism, but known and used in almost all Japanese Buddhist traditions.

Namu Myōhō Renge Kyō 南無妙法蓮華經 (skt. नमोसद्धर्मपुण्डरीकसूत्र Namo Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra): The main chant of Nichiren Buddhism.

nazuki 髓 (skt. मज्जन् Majjan): Marrow, Pith. ‘Obtaining the marrow’ is an important expression in the Zen tradition that narrates the event of official Dharma transmission from master to disciple. In this case, it specifically refers to the official transmission of the Chán/Zen tradition from the first patriarch Bodhidharma to Huikē 慧可 (487-593), Bodhidharma’s successor and considered the second patriarch of this tradition.

nehan 涅槃 (skt. निर्वाण Nirvāṇa): Cessation, extinction. Refers specifically to the cessation of suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha) by means of attaining liberation (*gedatsu* 解脱; skt. मोक्ष Mokṣa) from the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra). Cessation is attained via cultivating the various practices (*gyō* 行) taught in the Buddhist teachings (jp. *buppō* 佛法; skt. बुद्धधर्म Buddhadharma) which are presented to beings using skillful means (*hōben* 方便; skt. उपाय Upāya). Some school teach that there are four types of cessation (jp. *shi nehan* 四涅槃): (1) With Residue (jp. *uyo* 有餘; skt. सोपधिशेष Sopadhiśeṣa) (2) Without Residue (jp. *muyo* 無餘 or *hatsu* 般; skt. निरुपधिशेष Nirupadhiśeṣa or परि Pari); (3) Self-Nature (jp. *jishō* 自性; स्वभाव Svabhāva) and (4) Non-Abiding (jp. *mushojū* 無所住; skt. अप्रतिष्ठित Apratiṣṭhita). The forth one refers to the type of cessation aspired to in the Mahāyāna tradition as it is attained only by buddhas and bodhisattvas who choose to stay in the cycle of transmigration for the sake of helping all beings to attain Nirvāṇa, but without themselves having a fixed form or place in which they abide in.

nenbutsu 念佛; (skt. बुद्धानुस्मृति Buddhānusmṛti): Recollecting the Buddha(s), Buddha-Mindfulness. Refers to a common Buddhist practice in all Buddhist traditions which involves meditating on the virtues of a Buddha as the meditation or contemplation subject.

Nichirenshū 日蓮宗: Nichiren Buddhist. Founded by Nichiren 日蓮 (1222-1282).

Nin'ō Hannyā Haramita Kyō 仁王般若波羅蜜經 (skt. नरेन्द्रप्रज्ञापारमितासूत्र Narendra Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtra): 'Righteous King Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra'. Is a text that has as its audience people in position of leadership (rulers, monarchs, ministers, prime ministers, etc.) rather than the usual buddhas, bodhisattvas, lay practitioners or monks and nuns. It focuses on reminding the rulers of their responsibility to rule in accordance with the Dharma and the Original Vow of the bodhisattva; and that doing so will bring benefit and protection to the nation and its population

mappō 末法: Latter Age of the Dharma, Age of Degeneration. A time period characterized by the decline of the true Dharma and the loss of people's capacity to reach enlightenment. This was written to happen either 1000 or 2000 years following Śākyamuni Buddha's (Shakamuni Nyorai 釋迦牟尼如來) death and lasting for about 10 000 years.

meikon 命根 (skt. जीवितेन्द्रिय Jīvitendriya): Life-Force, Vitality. Lit. 'Root of Life'. Refers to the thing that is understood to be the basis for life.

Myōhō Renge Kyō 妙法蓮華經 (skt. सद्धर्मपुण्डरीकसूत्र Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra): White Lotus of the True Dharma Sūtra. Often abbreviated to Lotus Sūtra (Hokke Kyō 法華經). It one of the most popular and influential Mahāyāna Sūtra, and the basis on which the Tendai and Tendai-influenced traditions were established. For many East Asian Buddhists since early times, the Lotus Sūtra contains the final teaching of the Buddha, complete and sufficient for liberation (jp. *gedatsu* 解脱; skt. मोक्ष Mokṣa). It also distinguishes itself for its uses of numerous parables which became the muses of various artistic endeavors.

myōjo 冥助: Undiscernable Divine Protection, Invisible Divine Blessing.

ōbanyaku 塙飯役: Imperial Guard Service

ōchō jidai 王朝時代 : Age of the Court. A period of time spanning the 10th and 11th centuries.

ōji 王勅: Imperial Decree, Imperial Law.

ōjin 應身; skt. निर्माणकाय Nirmāṇakāya): Transformation-Body: One of the Three Bodies (jp. *sanshin* 三身; skt. त्रिकाय Trikāya) of a Buddha according to Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is the physical body of a Buddha within time and space such as the historical Buddha Śākyamuni that we know.

ōka taihei 王化太平: The Great Peace of the Ruler's Benevolent Influence.

ōkurashō 大藏省: Department of Treasury.

on 怨 (skt. वैर Vaira): Hostility, Animosity, Spite, Enmity, Resentment, Bitterness, Revenge, Grudge.

onozukara 自ら or 自然ら: Of its own accord, Naturally. Within the context of East Asian thinking, ‘naturally’ oftentimes has the connotation of happening by itself or without outside influence.

rakan 羅漢 or *arakan* 阿羅漢: (skt. अर्हत् Arhat): Worthy One, Blessed-One, Venerable Being, Unborn, Killer of Enemies. The highest of the 4 types of disciples in Buddhism. There are three meanings to the name depending on the etymological reading: (1) *Ara* is connected to *Ari* meaning ‘enemies’ and *Hat* is connected to *Han* meaning ‘to kill’. This makes an Arhat a ‘killer of enemies’. However, in Buddhism, enemies are not actual beings but rather the various afflictions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश Kleśa) beings harbour and generate that leads to discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha); (2) *A* is a Sanskrit prefix marking negation and *Rahat* means ‘to be born’. This makes an Arhat ‘unborn’. An Arhat is unborn because they have gotten rid of all of the karmic imprints and ties which keeps them in the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra); and (3) *Arhat* means ‘worthy’. More specifically, they are worthy of receiving worship or offerings (jp. *kuyō* 供養; skt. Pūja) because they have attained Buddhahood by destroying all of the various impurities. This is why, buddhas are oftentimes called Arhats.

ran 乱: Rebellion, Conflict.

reizan 靈巖 (skt. गृध्रकूट Gṛdhrakūṭa): Vulture Peak. Vulture Peak Mountain is, by tradition, one of several sites frequented by the Buddha and his community of disciples for both training and retreat. It is named so because it resembles a sitting vulture with its wings folded. Its location is frequently mentioned in Buddhist texts in the Pāli Canon of Theravāda Buddhism and in the Mahāyāna Sūtras as the place where the Buddha gave certain sermons. Among the important sermons are the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra (jp. Myōhō Renge Kyō 妙法蓮華經; skt. सद्धर्मपुण्डरीकसूत्र), the Śūraṅgama Sūtra (jp. Shuryōgon Kyō 首楞嚴經; skt. शूर्ङ्गमसूत्र), the Prajñā Pāramitā Hṛdaya Sūtra (jp. Hannya Haramita Shin Gyō 般若波羅蜜多; प्रज्ञापारमिताहृदयसूत्र) as well as many of the other Prajñā Pāramitā Sūtras.

reishi 勵志: Aspiration, Resolve, Encouragement.

ren 練: Polish, Gloss. Often used in Buddhism in the context of polishing mirrors (*kagami* 鏡) as a way to explain enlightenment (*satori* 悟) through the removal of a being’s, thing’s or phenomena’s impurities.

rinne 輪廻 or *shōji* 生死 (skt. संसार Saṃsāra): Cycle of Transmigration. This is characterized by discontent and/or suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha). One remains in the cycle of transmigration as a result of one’s unwholesome actions (jp. *akugō* 惡業; skt. अकुशलकर्म

Akuśalākarma) stemming from the Three Poisons (jp. *sandoku* 三毒/三根/三株; skt. त्रिविष Triviṣa). This cycle contains 6 possible destinations for rebirth (jp. *rokushu* 六趣 or *rokudō* 六道; skt. षड्गति Ṣaḍgati), namely: (1) Hells (jp. *jigoku* 地獄; skt. नरक Naraka); (2) Hungry Ghosts (jp. *gaki* 餓鬼; skt. प्रेत Preta); (3) Animals (jp. *chikushō* 畜生; skt. तिर्यग्योनि Tiryaḡyoni); (4) Malevolent Spirits (jp. *ashura* 阿修羅; असुर Asura); (5) Human (jp. *ningen* 人間; skt. मनुष्य Manuṣya); and (6) Deities (jp. *ten* 天; skt. देव Deva).

Rinzaishū 臨濟宗. A branch of Zen 禪 Buddhism imported from China by Eisai (1141-1215)

ritsuryō kokka 律令國家 : Code-Governed State, Code-Ruled Nation. A system of legal-based governance implemented in Japan in the 7th century and inspired by Confucianism and Chinese Legalism.

rokushu 六趣 or *rokudō* 六道 (skt. षड्गति Ṣaḍgati) : 6 Destinies, 6 Paths. It refers to the 6 realms in which a being that is part of the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra) can be reborn, namely: (1) Hells (jp. *jigoku* 地獄; skt. नरक Naraka); (2) Hungry Ghosts (jp. *gaki* 餓鬼; skt. प्रेत Preta); (3) Animals (jp. *chikushō* 畜生; skt. तिर्यग्योनि Tiryaḡyoni); (4) Malevolent Spirits (jp. *ashura* 阿修羅; असुर Asura); (5) Human (jp. *ningen* 人間; skt. मनुष्य Manuṣya); and (6) Deities (jp. *ten* 天; skt. देव Deva).

rōzeki 狼藉: Unlawful Incursion.

ryō 寮: Political Office.

ryūten 龍神 (skt. नाग Nāga): Divine Serpents, Dragon Deities. Refers to divine or semi-divine race of half-human, half-serpents beings. The Buddhist Sūtra sometimes has them as helpful deities that can grant blessing and protections, but also sometimes as malevolent beings that can hinder a being's progress on the Buddhist path.

sadaijin 左大臣: Minister of the Left. One of the three key positions in the Ministry of State Affairs (*dajōkan* 太政官). The offices of the *dajōdaijin* (太政大臣), *sadaijin* (左大臣), *udaijin* (*udaijin* 右大臣), and *naidaijin* (内大臣) formed the Council of Senior Nobles alongside major counsellors (*dainagon* 大納言), middle counsellors (*chūnagon* 中納言) as well as auditors (*sangi* 参議). The *dajōdaijin* position was almost exclusively honorary and was more often vacant than occupied, whereas the *sadaijin* identified with the East and took precedence over the *udaijin* identified with the West – even though the prerogatives of these two were the same.

saibatsu 濟拔: To get rid of discontent/suffering.

samurai 侍: Warrior, Servant. Interchangeable with *bushi* 武士, although *samurai* has pejorative connotations attached to it because the *kanji* 侍 is the verb *samurau* 侍う, “to serve”. This means *samurai* refers primarily to their role as “servants” to more powerful political actors.

sandoku 三毒/三根/三株 (skt. त्रिविष Triviṣa): The Three Poisons in Buddhism, namely: (1) Desire, Avarice, Greed, (jp. *tonyoku* 貪欲; skt. रग Rāga); (2) Hatred, Antipathy, Anger, Hostility (jp. *shin'i* 嗔恚; skt. द्वेष Dveṣa); and (3) Delusion, Ignorance, Folly, Confusion (jp. *guchi* 愚癡; मोह Moha). The three poisons are the primary causes that keep sentient beings trapped in the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra). These three poisons are said to be the root of all of the other afflictions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश Kleśa). See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

sange 懺悔 (skt. क्षमयति Kṣamayati or देशयति Deśayati): Repentance, Asking for Pardon and Confess. The first *kanji*, *san* 懺, is the transliteration of the Sanskrit word Kṣamayati क्षमयति which means ‘to cause someone or something to endure or bear’ leading one to ask for pardon. The second *kanji*, *ge* 悔, is the transliteration of the Sanskrit word Deśayati देशयति which one of its meaning is ‘to confess’. When put together, the full expression, *sange* 懺悔, would mean something along the lines of ‘to confess and ask for pardon for causing a being to endure discontent/suffering’. However, the Sanskrit texts either use Kṣamayati or Deśayati interchangeably to talk about this same practice, but never as one expression. Only the East Asian transliterations have put these terms together to form one single expression in the form of *sange* 懺悔. Repentance in Buddhism refers to confessing to buddhas and bodhisattvas about the unwholesome actions, thoughts, speech, etc. that a being has done in this life and has karmically inherited from the past; and ask for forgiveness about these actions. If repentance is done with a heart of devotion (jp. *shisei* 至誠; skt. अध्याशय Adhyāśaya) and faith (jp. *shin* 信; skt. श्रद्धा Śraddhā), then buddhas and bodhisattvas can rid a being of their karmic ties (jp. *gōbaku* 業縛 or *gōru* 業累; skt. कर्मबन्ध Karmabandha) and karmic imprints (jp. *kunjū* 薰習; skt. वासना Vāsanā), allowing them to move forward on the Buddhist path having been cleared of such hinderance. Because repentance allows for karmic ties and imprints to be cleared off a being’s heart-mind, repentance is one of the most important practices for attaining purity (jp. *shōjō* 清淨/清淨; skt. शुद्ध Śuddha or विशुद्ध Viśuddha).

sangi 参議: Chief Advisor.

sanji gō 三時業: Karma of the Three Periods. Refers to the three time periods when karmic retributions can be experienced, namely: (1) Karma to be Made Known in the Currently Existing Dharmas (jp. *jungenpōjugō* 順現法受業; skt. दृष्टधर्मवेदनीयकर्म Dr̥ṣṭadharmavedanīyaṃkarma); (2) Karma to be Made Known in the Coming Birth (jp. *junjishōjugō* 順次生受業; skt. उपपाद्यवेदनीयकर्म Upapādyavedanīyaṃkarma); or (3) Karma to be Made Known After the Next Lapse (jp.

jungojijugō 順後次受業; skt. अपरपर्यायदनीयकर्म Aparapāryāyavedanīyaṃkarma). The first type refers to the fact that a being will experience the results of their actions in their present lifetime. The second type refers to the fact that a being will experience the results of their actions in their immediate next lifetime. The third type refers to the fact that a being will experience the results of their actions in this current lifetime, the next one, and many multiple lifetimes afterwards.

sanmai 三昧 or *jō* 定 (skt. समाधी Samādhi): One-Pointed Concentration, One-Pointedness of the Mind, Meditative Consciousness. lit. “Bringing Together”. There are multiple kinds of samādhi that can be attained and are way too numerous to list here. However, the commonality between almost all of them is that they refer to a state that is achievable through practice, and especially meditation.

sanshin or *sanjin* 三身 (skt. त्रिकाय Trikāya): The Three Bodies. Refers to the Mahāyāna teaching on the nature of reality and the nature of Buddhahood. It explains that a Buddha is three bodies: (1) *Dharma*-Body (jp. *hosshin* 法身; skt. धर्मकाय Dharmakāya), that is, the unmanifested and inconceivable aspects of a Buddha out of which Buddhas arise and to which they return after their dissolution; (2) *Enjoyment*-Body (jp. *hōshin* 報身; skt. संभोगकाय Saṃbhogakāya), that is, the subtle and limitless bodies of Buddhas and advanced bodhisattvas who manifest in visions or in their Pure Lands where beings can hear and practice the *Dharma* with ease; and (3) *Transformation*-Body (jp. *ōjin* 應身; skt. निर्माणकाय Nirmāṇakāya), that is, the physical body of a Buddha within time and space such as the historical Buddha Śākyamuni that we know.

sanshu no jingi 三種の神器: Three Imperial Regalia, namely: (1) the seal (*ji* 璽) known as ‘Eight-Foot String of Comma-Shaped Jewels’ (*yasakani no magatama* 八尺瓊曲玉) which represents the ruler’s virtue of benevolence; (2) the sword (*tsurugi* 劍) known as ‘Grass-Cutting Sword’ (*kusanagi no tsurugi* 草薙劍) or ‘Heavenly Sword Gathering Clouds’ (*ame no murakumo no tsurugi* 天叢雲劍) which represents the ruler’s virtue of valour; and (3) the mirror (*kagami* 鏡) known as ‘Eight-Span Mirror’ (*yata no kagami* 八咫鏡) which represents the ruler’s virtue of wisdom. According to one of Japan’s first written document, the *Nihon Shoki* 日本書紀 (720), these regalias were blessed by sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth. These regalias have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia.

sanzu 三途 or *san’akudō* 三惡道 or *san’akushu* 三惡趣 (skt. त्रिदुर्गति Tridurgati or त्र्यपाय Tryapāya): Three Woeful Destinies, Three Unwholesome Paths, Three Tortures. They are called: (1) *Destiny of Fire* (jp. *kazu* 火途); (2) *Destiny of Swords* (jp. *tozu* 刀途); and (3) *Destiny of Blood* (jp. *ketsuzu* 血途) and roughly correspond to the lowest three of the possible Six Realms of rebirth (jp. *rokushu* 六趣 or *rokudō* 六道; skt. षड्गति Ṣaḍgati), namely: (1) *Hells* (jp. *jigoku* 地獄; skt. नरक Naraka);

(2) Hungry Ghosts (jp. *gaki* 餓鬼; skt. प्रेत Preta); and (3) Animals (jp. *chikushō* 畜生; skt. तिर्यग्योनि Tiryagyoni).

shari no shin 捨離の心 or *sharishin* 捨離心 (skt. उपेक्षचित्त Upekṣacitta): Heart of Indifference, Heart that Discards, Heart that Disregards.

satori 悟 (skt. बोधि Bodhi): Enlightenment, Awakening.

segyō 施行: Enforcement, Communicating and Executing Commands, Putting into Law. Expression that also refers to actions that expresses Charity such as Almsgiving or Offerings.

seii taishōgun 征夷大將軍: Great Commander Subduing Barbarians. Oftentimes simply abbreviated to *shōgun* 將軍. The *shōgun* was the head of a military-based administration called *bakufu* 幕府, which held the *de facto* political power from the beginning of the Kamakura era (1192) until the end of the Meiji era (1868).

seishin 誠心 (skt. अध्याशयचित्त Adhyāśayacitta): Devoted Heart, Sincere Heart, Determined Heart, Heart filled with Aspiration.

seishinjō 清信女 or *ubai* 優婆夷 (skt. उपासिका Upāsikā): Laywomen. Refers to female Buddhist practitioners who have not taken refuge in the Buddhist precepts to become nuns.

seishinnan 清信男 or *ubasoku* 優婆塞 (skt. उपासक Upāsaka): Laymen. Refers to male Buddhist practitioners who have not taken refuge in the Buddhist precepts to become monks.

seison 世尊 (skt. भगवत् Bhagavat): World-Honored, Glorious, Illustrious Buddha. The most honorific epithet given to Buddha or bodhisattva.

senjō 洗淨: Cleansing.

senrei 先例: Precedents.

seppuku 切腹: Ritual Suicide. The first recorded act of *seppuku* was performed by Minamoto Yorimasa 源頼政 (1106-1180) at the beginning of the Genpei War.

sesshō 摂政: Regent. Position occupied by maternal grandfathers of emperors which allowed them to make political decisions on behalf of emperors who were not of age to rule. The mechanisms of this position was exploited by the Fujiwara 藤原 clan who used it to control the Imperial Court during the Heian Period (794-1185)

Shakamuni Nyorai 釋迦牟尼如來 (skt. शाक्यमुनितागत Śākyamuni Tathāgata): Another appellation for the historical Buddha also known as Siddhārtha Gautama.

shi or *tsukasa* 司: Political Bureau.

shibu no shu 四部の衆 or 四部の眾 (skt. चतुर्वर्ग Caturvarga): The Four Kinds/Types of Practitioners of Buddhism, namely: (1) Monks (jp. *biku* 比丘; skt. भिक्षु Bhikṣu); (2) Nuns (jp. *bikuni* 比丘尼; skt. भिक्षुणी Bhikṣuṇī); (3) Laymen (jp. *ubasoku* 優婆塞; skt. उपासक Upāsaka); and (4) Laywomen (jp. *ubai* 優婆夷; skt. उपासिका Upāsikā).

shikantaza 只管打坐: Just Sitting in Meditation. A fundamental practice of the Sōtōshū 曹洞 tradition of Zen 禪 Buddhism where practitioners would meditate in sitting position with no particular object, content or intention; therefore stilling the mind and body

shikken 執權: Regent. This position is almost identical to that of *sesshō* 摂政, but for a *shōgun* instead of an emperor.

shiki 職: Services. Also on-site land officers.

shikibushō 式部省: Department of Regulations Relating to Civil Officials.

shima 四魔 (skt. चतुर्मार Caturmāra): The Four Māras, The Four Demons. The four forms that the demon king Māra manifest to obstruct Buddhist practitioners and destroy the good roots of the *Dharma*, namely: (1) Affliction Māra (jp. *bonnō ma* 煩惱魔; skt. क्लेशमार Kleśamāra); (2) Aggregate Māra (jp. *in ma* 陰魔; skt. स्कन्धमार Skandhamāra); (3) Death Māra (jp. *shi ma* 死魔; skt. मृत्युमार Mrtyumāra); (4) Divine Māra (jp. *ten ma* 天魔; skt. देवपुत्रमार Devaputramāra). These Four Māra originate in the practitioners heart, and must therefore be subjugated in the heart which is attained when a being learns to still their heart.

shin 信 (skt. श्रद्धा Śraddhā): Faith, Belief.

Shingonshū 真言宗: One of the major schools of Buddhism in Japan. Known for its focus on esoteric teachings (jp. *mikkyō* 密教; skt. वज्रयान Vajrayāna). Founded by Kūkai 空海 (774-835).

shinjin 信心 (skt. श्रद्धाचित्त Śraddhācitta): Heart of Faith.

shinjin datsuraku 身心脱落: Drop-Away of the Body-Mind, Falling-Off of the Body-Mind.

shinjitsu 眞實 (skt. तत्त्व Tattva): Truth, Reality, Absolute/Ultimate Truth. Used interchangeably with *shintai* or *shintei* 眞諦 (skt. परमार्थसत्य Paramārthasatya). One of the Two (*nitai* 二諦) or Three Truths (*santai* 三諦) of Buddhism. It refers to the truth as experienced by Buddhas and bodhisattvas and consist of the untainted manifestation of reality as it is. It is traditionally contrasted with Provisional/Conventional/Relative Truth (*zokutai* 俗諦; skt. संवृतिसत्य Saṃvṛtisatya) that is experienced by all beings populating the cycle of transmigration that has not attained enlightenment (*satori* 悟). The Third Truth or Middle Truth (*chūtai* 中諦), is specific to Mahāyāna Buddhism and especially to Tiāntāi/Tendai Buddhism, and it refers to the simultaneous existence of both the Real and the Provisional within each and every moment and phenomena.

shin'i 瞋恚 (skt. द्वेष Dveṣa): Hatred, Antipathy, Anger, Hostility. One of the Three Poisons (jp. *sandoku* 三毒/三根/三株; skt. त्रिविष Triviṣa) in Buddhism.

shintai or *shintei* 眞諦 (skt. परमार्थसत्य Paramārthasatya): Real Truth, Absolute Truth, Ultimate Truth. Used interchangeably with *shinjitsu* 眞實 (skt. तत्त्व Tattva). One of the Two (*nitai* 二諦) or Three Truths (*santai* 三諦) of Buddhism. It refers to the truth as experienced by Buddhas and bodhisattvas and consist of the untainted manifestation of reality as it is. It is traditionally contrasted with Provisional/Conventional/Relative Truth (*zokutai* 俗諦; skt. संवृतिसत्य Saṃvṛtisatya) that is experienced by all beings populating the cycle of transmigration that has not attained enlightenment (*satori* 悟). The Third Truth or Middle Truth (*chūtai* 中諦), is specific to Mahāyāna Buddhism and especially to Tiāntāi/Tendai Buddhism, and it refers to the simultaneous existence of both the Real and the Provisional within each and every moment and phenomena.

Shintō 神道: Japanese Indigenous Religion. Labelled as polytheistic and animistic, Shintō revolves around supernatural entities called *kami* 神. *Kamis* are believed to inhabit all things, including forces of nature, prominent landscape locations and also various objects.

shisei 至誠 (skt. अध्याशय Adhyāśaya): Devotion, Determination, Aspiration, Intent, Purpose, Sincerity.

shitō 四倒 (skt. चतुर्विपर्यय Caturviparyaya): Four Inversions, Four Inverted Beliefs; namely: (1) mistaking impermanence for permanence; (2) mistaking suffering for happiness; (3) mistaking no-Self with Self; and (4) mistaking impurity for purity.

Shoke Kyōsō Dōryaku Shū 諸家教相同異略集. “Collected Summary of the Similarities and Differences in the Particular Teachings of Various Schools”. Text written by Enchin 円珍/Chishō Daishi 智證大師 (814–891) a Japanese Buddhist monk who founded of the Jimon 寺門 branch of Tendai Buddhism and Chief Abbot of Miidera 三井寺 at the foot of Mount Hiei 比叡山.

shōdō 障道 (skt. वारण Vāraṇa): Obstacles, Obstructions. Refers specifically to obstructions to the Buddhist Path, meaning the innumerable delusions (jp. *chi* 痴; skt. मोह Moha) beings entertain which prevents beings from achieving enlightenment (jp. *satori* 悟).

shōen 莊園: Domain.

shōgun 將軍: Commander. Abbreviation for variety of *shōgun*-based titles, the most known being *chinjufu shōgun* 鎮守府將軍 and/or *seii taishōgun* 征夷大將軍. The *shōgun* was the head of a military-based administration called *bakufu* 幕府, which held the *de facto* political power from the beginning of the Kamakura era (1192) until the end of the Meiji era (1868).

shōhō 正報: Exact Retributions, Direct Retributions, Correct Retributions. Refers to the specific characteristics that a being inherits for the present rebirth such as the kind of body, personality, intelligence, etc. It is one of the two types of retributions (jp. *hō* 報; skt. विपाक Vipāka), the other one being conditioned retributions (*ehō* 依報).

shōji or *shōjin* 精進 (skt. वीर्य Vīrya): Vigour, Energy, Diligence, Zeal, Devotion, Exertion. One of the 6 or 10 Perfections (jp. *haramita* 波羅蜜多 or *haramitsu* 波羅蜜; skt. पारमिता Pāramitā) practiced by a bodhisattva (jp. *bosatsu* 菩薩; skt. बोधिसत्त्व) to reach Buddhahood. Can also refer to the one of the 5 Powers (jp. *goriki* 五力; skt. पञ्चबल Pañcabala) which allows the mind to remain in right concentration by intercepting the various afflictions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश Kleśa) and thus gradually penetrate the profound *Dharma*.

shōjō 小乘 (skt. हीनयान Hīnayāna): Small Vehicle. A name that encompasses two currents of early Buddhist found in South Asia, namely the Vehicle of Followers (jp. *shōmonjō* 聲聞乘; skt. श्रावकयान Śrāvakayāna) and the Vehicle of Solitary-Awakened Ones (jp. *engakujō* 緣覺乘; skt. प्रत्येकबुद्ध्यान Pratyekabuddhayāna). The pejorative appellation Hīnayāna came from later Mahāyāna practitioners who contrasted their own practices and teachings (as larger/higher than) with the ones of pre other traditions (as smaller/lesser than).

shōjō 清淨/清淨 (skt. शुद्ध Śuddha or विशुद्ध Viśuddha): Purity, Cleanness, Untainted, Devoid of Dust. See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma) for more detail.

shōmetsu 消滅 (skt. प्रणाश Praṇāśa): Extinction, Extinguishment, Disappearance, Vanishing, Termination.

shōnin 聖人 (skt. आर्यपुद्गल Āryapudgala): Venerable People, Noble Person, Sage, Saint, Enlightened Person.

shōrai 生來: Innately, Naturally, By Nature; Ever Since Birth, From Birth.

shosen tenka taihei kokudo annon 所詮天下泰平國土安穩: Peace and tranquility reaching the outmost limits in all under heaven and the Nation.

shukke 出家 (skt. प्रव्रजित Pravrājita) Leaving the Household. Refers to a person who enters the monastic community by receiving the precepts (jp. *kai* 戒; skt. शील Śīla) and becoming a monk (jp. *biku* 比丘; skt. भिक्षु Bhikṣu) or a nun (jp. *bikuni* 比丘尼; skt. भिक्षुणी Bhikṣuṇī). Since entering moonhood requires one to leave their house to live in the monastery or in recluse, to drop their family name, to shave their heads, to renounce worldly possessions, and so forth; it is called ‘Leaving the Household’. The Sanskrit expression

shugo 守護: Protection, Safeguarding.

shukushō 夙生: Previous Life, Previous Lifetime. Lit. “Long-Cherished Birth”.

Shuryōgon Kyō 首楞嚴經 (skt. शूरङ्गमसूत्र Śūraṅgama Sūtra): Heroic March Sūtra. It is Mahāyāna Sūtra that has been especially influential in Chan/Zen Buddhism. Some of the main themes of the Śūraṅgama Sūtra are the worthlessness of the *Dharma* when unaccompanied by *samādhi* (jp. *sanmai* 三昧; skt. समाधी) power, and the importance of precepts (jp. *kai* 戒; skt. शील Śīla) as a foundation for the Buddhist practice. Also stressed is the theme of how one effectively combats delusions (jp. *bonnō* 煩惱; skt. क्लेश Kleśa) that may arise during meditation.

shū 宗 / 旨 (skt. सिद्धान्त Siddhānta): Established Truth, Settled Doctrine. Lit. “Completed Conclusion”. It may be either the result of an argument in which one opinion is refuted and another undeniably established; or the concurrent doctrine of all the authorities on any subject similarly interpreted. It is also used to translate the term ‘Tradition’ or ‘School’ as when talking about the various Buddhist Traditions.

sōhei 僧兵: Monk-Soldiers, Warrior-Monks.

sokushin zebutsu 卽心是佛: The Heart itself is Buddha. Lit. “Oneness of this Heart and the Buddha”. One of the key foundational doctrine of Zen which means that all beings and the Buddha are originally one. Related to the concept of Buddha-Nature (jp. *busshō* 佛性; skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu)

Sōtōshū 曹洞宗: Tradition of Buddhism imported by Dōgen 道元 (1200-1253) from China.

ta 他 (skt. पर Para) : Other, Different, Distant, Adverse. The Buddha’s enlightenment (*satori* 悟) revolved around realizing that discontent/suffering (jp. *ku* 苦; skt. दुःख Duḥkha) is caused by beings’

attachments to the concept of the Self-Nature, Self-Ness, or Self-Existence (jp. *jishō* 自性; स्वभाव Svabhāva) of phenomena. The resulting teaching was that attaining liberation from discontent/suffering consists in awakenining to the absolute reality that phenonema are fundamentally Empty (jp. *kū* 空; skt. शून्यता Śūnyatā), which simply means that they are empty of Self-Nature, Self-Ness, or Self-Existence. Everything is empty of self-nature because everything arises through Dependent Co-Origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda), and no phenomena ever arises ‘by itself’ – i.e. it has no self-nature. This means that the barriers between Self (jp. *ji* 自; स्व Sva) and Other are destroyed because all things are necessarily interconnected with each other. These are the bases for further teachings such as the ‘Oneness of This Heart and the Buddha’ (*sokushin zebutsu* 即心是佛) and Buddha-Nature (jp. *busshō* 佛性; skt. बुद्धधातु Buddhadhātu).

taimitsu 台密: The name given to the esoteric Buddhist practices (jp. *mikkyō* 密教; skt. वज्रयान Vajrayāna) taught within the Tendai tradition specifically.

tariki 他力: The *tariki*-oriented Buddhist reformists focused on faith (jp. *shin* 信; skt. श्रद्धा Śraddhā) as the basis for their practices. This normally took the form of cultivating practices which are centered upon placing one’s faith in the redemptive powers of a Buddha, a bodhisattva, a chant, a text, a word, etc. When the practices are performed with faith, the respective powers will be granted upon the devotee and help in their liberation.

teisha 帝者: Emperor.

ten 天 (skt. देव Deva): Deities, Gods, Celestials, Divine Beings. Within the context of the Japanese and Chinese language, *ten* generally refers to the numerous Heavens and contrasted to the Human realm. In the context of translating Chinese and Japanese Buddhist texts however, *ten* almost always refers to a particular type sentient beings that dwell in the highest of the six realms of rebirth (jp. *rokushu* 六趣 or *rokudō* 六道; skt. षड्गति Ṣaḍgati) and is thus oftentimes translated as gods or deities. The dwelling place of Devas includes various types of beings which can be ranked hierarchically according to the merits (jp. *kudoku* 功德; skt. पुण्य Puṇya) they have accumulated over their lifetimes. The lowest classes of these beings are closer in their nature to human beings than to the higher classes of Deva. Because they are still part of the cycle of transmigration (jp. *rinne* 輪廻; skt. संसार Saṃsāra), Devas can be reborn as humans or fall into the three woeful destinies (jp. *sanzu* 三塗, *sanakudō* 三惡道 or *sanmakushu* 三惡趣; skt. त्रिदुर्गति Tridurgati or त्र्यपाय Tryapāya) once they have exhausted their merits.

tenbōrin 轉法輪 (skt. धर्मचक्रप्रवर्तन Dharmacakrapravartana): Spinning of the Dharma Wheel. The term Dharma Wheel (jp. *hōrin* 法輪; skt. धर्मचक्र Dharmacakra) refers to the innumerable teachings of buddhas and bodhisattvas, and a being who expounds such teachings is said to “spin the Dharma

Wheel”. This also forms on of the basis of legitimate governance in Buddhism, as leaders should be Wheel-Turning Sage Kings (jp. *tenrin jōō* 轉輪聖王; skt. चक्रवर्तिराज Cakravartirāja).

Tendaishū 天台宗: Buddhist tradition imported from China by Saichō 最澄 (767-822).

tenrin jōō 轉輪聖王 (skt. चक्रवर्तिराज Cakravartirāja): Universal Ruler, World Ruler. Lit. “Wheel-Turning Sage Ruler”. In the ancient Vedic traditions, a Cakravartirāja refers to an idealized Universal Ruler. Universal Rulers were called ‘Wheel-Turning’ because the wheels of their chariots would roll everywhere without obstruction – i.e. they and their armies could not be stopped. However, in Buddhism, the concept was adapted from a militarized to a religious and spiritual image of governance because of emergence of the Buddhist term Dharma Wheel (jp. *hōrin* 法輪; skt. धर्मचक्र Dharmacakra). The Dharma Wheel refers to the innumerable teachings of buddhas and bodhisattvas, and a being who expounds such teachings is said to “spin the Dharma Wheel” (jp. *tenbōrin* 轉法輪; skt. धर्मचक्रप्रवर्तन Dharmacakrapravartana). Thus, in Buddhism, a Wheel-Turning Sage Ruler is not an unstoppable military force, but rather a ruler who spins the Dharma Wheel – i.e. who expounds the Buddhist teachings. This Buddhist adaptation of the concept did not always retain the idea that such rulers are Universal, but simply posits that they expound the Dharma without obstruction. However, because of the immeasurable positive retributions (jp. *hō* 報; skt. विपाक Vipāka) all beings receive from a ruler who spins the Dharma for all beings, such rulers *might* – and probably should? – become Universal Rulers.

to 都: Capital, Capital City.

tokusei 德政: Virtuous Rule.

tonyoku 貪欲 (skt. राग Rāga): Desire, Avarice, Greed. One of the Three Poisons (jp. *sandoku* 三毒 /三根/三株; skt. त्रिविष Triviṣa) of Buddhism.

tsuitō 追討: Punitive Expeditions.

tsumi hoborosu 罪滅す (skt. विगतपाप Vigatapāpa): Attonement. Lit. “that which is free from demerit, sin, unwholesomeness, wickedness, etc.”

tsurugi 劍: Sword. Can refer to the ‘Grass-Cutting Sword’ (*kusanagi no tsurugi* 草薙劍) or ‘Heavenly Sword Gathering Clouds’ (*ame no murakumo no tsurugi* 天叢雲劍), one of the Three Imperial Regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) blessed by the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth according to one of Japan’s first written document the Nihon Shoki 日本書記. These regalias have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia. This sword represents the ruler’s value of valour.

ubai 優婆夷 or *seishinjō* 清信女 (skt. उपासिका Upāsikā): Laywomen. Refers to female Buddhist practitioners who have not taken refuge in the Buddhist precepts to become nuns.

ubasoku 優婆塞 or *seishinnan* 清信男 (skt. उपासक Upāsaka): Laymen. Refers to male Buddhist practitioners who have not taken refuge in the Buddhist precepts to become monks.

utaishō 右大将: Great Captain of the Right.

wa 我 (skt. आत्मन् Ātman or स्व Sva): Self, Soul. Buddhism rejects the notion that things have permanent, unchanging Self/Soul. In fact, everything is empty of self-nature because everything arises through Dependent Co-Origination (jp. *engi* 緣起; skt. प्रतीत्यसमुत्पाद Pratītyasamutpāda), and no phenomena ever arises ‘by itself’ – i.e. it has no self-nature.

yaku/eki 益 or *kudoku* 功德 (skt. पुण्य Puṇya): Merits, rewards, blessings, benefits.

Yakusi Rurikō Nyorai Hongan Kudoku Kyō 藥師琉璃光如來本願功德經 (skt. भैषज्यगुरुवैदूर्यप्रभाराजसूत्र Bhaiṣajya Guru Vaidūrya Prabhā Rāja Sūtra): Original Vows and Merits of the Master Of Healing and Tathāgata of Lapis Lazuli Light Sūtra. Often abbreviated to Yakushi Kyō 藥師經 (skt. भैषज्यगुरुसूत्र Bhaiṣajya Guru Sūtra): Master of Healing Sūtra. It is a Mahāyāna text focusing on the merits and 12 Original Vows of Bhaiṣajyaguru, the Buddha of healing and medicine.

yasakani no magatama 八尺瓊曲玉: Eight-Foot String of Comma-Shaped Jewels. Name of the Imperial Seal (*ji* 璽), one of the Three Imperial Regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) blessed by the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth according to one of Japan’s first written document the Nihon Shoki 日本書記. These regalia have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia. This Seal represents the ruler’s value of benevolence.

yata no kagami 八咫鏡: Eight-Span Mirror. Name of the mirror (*kagami* 鏡) as one of the Three Imperial Regalia (*sanshu no jingi* 三種の神器) blessed by the sun goddess Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大御神 and given to his grandson Ninigi no Mikoto 瓊瓊杵尊 when he was sent from heaven to pacify the earth according to one of Japan’s first written document the Nihon Shoki 日本書記. These regalia have been at the core of many debates in ancient and medieval times regarding imperial legitimacy, since the divine powers of the emperors (who are claimed to be descendants of Ninigi no Mikoto) are derived from these regalia. This mirror represents the ruler’s value of wisdom.

yōmyō 幼名: Birth Name. It is not uncommon

Yuima Gyō 維摩經 or Jōmyō Kyō 淨名經 (skt. विमलकीर्तिनिर्देशसूत्र Vimalakīrti Nirdeśa Sūtra): Vimalakīrti's Elucidation Sūtra. Almost always abbreviated to Vimalakīrti Sūtra. It was extremely influential in East Asia, but most likely of considerably less importance in the Indian and Tibetan sub-traditions of Mahāyāna Buddhism. The text revolves around a lay Buddhist meditator named Vimalakīrti who attained a very high degree of enlightenment and who expounds the Dharma to Arhats (jp. *arakan* 阿羅漢; skt. अर्हत्) and bodhisattvas despite himself being only a layman (jp. *ubasoku* 優婆塞; skt. उपासक Upāsaka).

zaichōkanjin 在庁官人: Provincial Contingents of Officers.

zaikon 罪根/鼻根 (skt. अकुशलमूल Akuśalamūla): Unwholesome Roots, Wicked Roots, Bad Roots, Evil Roots. Refers to a negative intention or heart behind an action (jp. *gō* 業; skt. कर्म Karma), making an action an unwholesome action (jp. *akugō* 惡業; skt. अकुशलकर्म Akuśalakarma), which will bear negative retributions (jp. *hō* 報; skt. विपाक Vipāka) in the future. There are generally 3 Unwholesome Roots (jp. *sanzaikon* 三罪根/三鼻根) namely: actions that are tainted by (1) desire (jp. *ton* 貪; skt. राग Rāga); tainted by (2) hatred (jp. *jin* 瞋; skt. द्वेष Dveṣa); and/or tainted by (3) delusion (jp. *chi* 痴; skt. मोह Moha). Opposite of wholesome roots (jp. *zenkon* 善根; skt. कुशलमूल Kuśalamūla). Unwholesome roots are the result of an impure heart. See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma).

zazen 坐禪/座禪: Sitting Meditation.

zenkon 善根 (skt. कुशलमूल Kuśalamūla): Wholesome Roots, Good Roots. Refers to a positive intention or heart behind an action (jp. *gō* 業; skt. कर्म Karma), making an action a wholesome action (jp. *zengō* 善業; skt. कुशलकर्म Kuśalakarma), which will bear positive retributions (jp. *hō* 報; skt. विपाक Vipāka) in the future. There are generally 3 Wholesome Roots (jp. *sanzenkon* 三善根), namely: actions that are (1) devoid of desire (jp. *muton* 無貪; skt. अराग Arāga); (2) devoid of hatred (jp. *mujin* 無瞋; skt. अद्वेष Adveṣa); and (3) devoid of delusion (jp. *muchi* 無痴; skt. अमोह Amoha). Opposite of unwholesome roots (jp. *zaikon* 鼻根; skt. अकुशलमूल Akuśalamūla). Wholesome roots are the result of a pure heart. See discussion of *gō* 業 (skt. कर्म Karma).

zennanshi 善男子 (skt. कुलपुत्र Kulaputra): Good Sons. One of the multiple terms used by the Buddha to address his disciples. I opted for the more literal translation of the *kanji* 'Good Sons', but various other terms such as 'Gentlemen', 'Noble Youth', 'Son of a Noble Family', etc. have been used by other translators.

zokutai 俗諦 (skt. संवृतिसत्य Saṃvṛtisatya): Provisional Truth, Conventional Truth, Relative Truth. One of the Two (*nitai* 二諦) or Three Truths (*santai* 三諦) of Buddhism. It refers to the truth that is experienced by all beings populating the cycle of transmigration that has not attained enlightenment (*satori* 悟). It is traditionally contrasted with Real/Absolute/Ultimate truth (jp. *shintai* or *shintei* 眞諦; skt. परमार्थसत्य Paramārthasatya): which refers to the truth as experienced by Buddhas and bodhisattvas and consist of the untainted manifestation of reality as it is. The Third Truth or Middle Truth (*chūtai* 中諦), is specific to Mahāyāna Buddhism and especially to Tiāntāi/Tendai Buddhism, and it refers to the simultaneous existence of both the Real and the Provisional within each and every moment and phenomena.

zōshō 増上 (skt. औपचयिक Aupacayika): Increase in power/influence, Surpassing, Excelling.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Dōgen 道元. “Bendōwa 辨道話”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 729-746.
- Dōgen 道元. “Bodaisatta Shishōhō 菩提薩埵四攝法”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 764-768.
- Dōgen 道元. “Busshō 佛性”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 14-35.
- Dōgen 道元. “Gyōji-ue 行持・上”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 122-139.
- Dōgen 道元. “Hotsu Bodai Shin 發菩提心”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 645-651.
- Dōgen 道元. “Hotsu Mujō Shin 發無上心”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 525-531.
- Dōgen 道元. “Jishō Zanmai 自證三昧”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 552-560.
- Dōgen 道元. “Keisei Sanshoku 谿聲山色”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 215-223.
- Dōgen 道元. “Kokyō 古鏡”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 175-188.
- Dōgen 道元. “Kuyō Shobutsu 供養諸佛”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 652-666.

- Dōgen 道元. “Rahai Tokuzui 禮拜得髓”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 246-257.
- Dōgen 道元. “Sanji Gō 三時業”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 682-691.
- Dōgen 道元. “Sanjūshichihon Bodai Bunpō 三十七品菩提分法”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 502-518.
- Dōgen 道元. “Senjō 洗淨”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 466-474.
- Dōgen 道元. “Senmen 洗面”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 426-435.
- Dōgen 道元. “Shinjin Inga 深信因果”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 676-681.
- Dōgen 道元. “Shukke Kudoku 出家功德”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 603-618.
- Dōgen 道元. “Sokushin Zebutsu 卽心是佛”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Jōkan* 道元禪師全集: 上卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1969): 42-45.
- Dōgen 道元. “Fukan Zazen Gi 普勸坐禪儀”. *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū: Gekan* 道元禪師全集: 下卷. Ed. Ōkubō Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tōkyō: Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房. (1970): 3-5.
- Eisai 榮西. “Kōzen Gokoku Ron 興禪護國論”, *Eisai Zenji Shū* 榮西禪師集. Kyōto: Head Temple of Kennin-Ji 大本山建仁寺 (2004): 1-291.
- Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Eiga Taigai 詠歌大概”. *Uta Ronshū* 歌論集 Ed. Hashimoto Fumio 橋本不美男, Ariyoshi Tamotsu 有吉保 & Fujihira Haro'o 藤平春男. Tōkyō: Shōgakukan 小学館 (2002): 470-490.
- Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Kindai Shūka 近代秀歌”. *Uta Ronshū* 歌論集 Ed. Hashimoto Fumio 橋本不美男, Ariyoshi Tamotsu 有吉保 & Fujihira Haro'o 藤平春男. Tōkyō: Shōgakukan 小学館 (2002): 447-470.

- Fujiwara Teika 藤原定家. “Maigetsushō 毎月抄”. *Uta Ronshū* 歌論集 Ed. Hashimoto Fumio 橋本不美男, Ariyoshi Tamotsu 有吉保 & Fujihira Haro'o 藤平春男. Tōkyō: Shōgakukan 小学館 (2002): 491-510.
- Kakuban 覺鑊. “Gorin Kuji Myō Himitsu Shaku 五輪九字明秘密釈”. *Kōgyō Daishi Senjutsushū: Jōkan* 興教大師撰述集: 上卷. Ed. Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. Tōkyō: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林 (1989): 177-222.
- Nichiren 日蓮. “Risshō Ankoku Ron 立正安国論”. *Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho Zenshū* 日蓮大聖人御書全集. Ed. Hori Nichikō 堀日亨. Tōkyō: Sōka Gakkai 創価学会 (2004): 17-35.
- Nichiren 日蓮. “Shugo Kokka Ron 守護國家論”. *Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho Zenshū* 日蓮大聖人御書全集. Ed. Hori Nichikō 堀日亨. Tōkyō: Sōka Gakkai 創価学会 (2004): 36-77.
- “Reiki 靈鬼”. *Konjaku Monogatari-shū: Honchōbu (Ge)* 今昔物語集: 本朝部 (下). Ed. Ikegami Jun'ichi 池上洵一. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店 (2002): 129-220.
- Rokudai Shōjiki: Naikaku Bunko Zō* 六代勝事記: 内閣文庫藏. Ed. Yuge Shigeru 弓削繁. Ōsaka: Izumi Shoin 和泉書院. 1984.
- Saigyō 西行. *Sankashū* 三家集. Ed. Utsugi Genkō 宇津木言行. Tōkyō: Kadokawa 角川. 2018.
- “Satsuji 雜事”. *Konjaku Monogatari-shū: Honchōbu (Ge)* 今昔物語集: 本朝部 (下). Ed. Ikegami Jun'ichi 池上洵一. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店 (2002): 453-529.

Secondary Sources

- Abbas, Sadia. “The Echo Chamber of Freedom: The Muslim Woman and the Pretext of Agency”, *boundary 2*, no 40:1 (2013): 155-189. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01903659-2072909>.
- Arvin, Maile, Tuck, Eve & Morrill, Angie. “Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy”, *Feminist Formations* 25, no. 1 (Spring 2013): 8-34.
- Bigle, Sirma. “Beyond Subordination vs. Resistance: An Intersectional Approach to the Agency of Veiled Muslim Women”, *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31, no. 1 (February 2010): 9-28.

- Bilge, Sirma. "Intersectionality Undone: Saving Intersectionality from Feminist Intersectionality Studies", *Du Bois Review* 10, no 2 (2013): 405-424.
- Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: a political ecology of things*. Durham & London: Duke University Press. 2010.
- Bodiford, William M. *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press. 1993.
- Bodiford, William M. "Textual Genealogies of Dōgen". *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*. Ed. Steven Heine. New York: Oxford University Press. (2012): 15-41
- Bowring, Richard. *Religious Traditions of Japan: 500-1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005.
- Brown, Wendy. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 1995.
- Brown, Wendy. "American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism and De-Democratization", *Political Theory* 34 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591706293016>.
- Brownlee, John S. *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing: From Kojiki to Tokushi Yoron*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press. 1991
- Campbell, David. "Truth Claims and Value-Freedom in the Treatment of Legitimacy: The Case of Weber". *Journal of Law and Society* 13. No. 2 (1986): 207-224.
- Chun, Jennifer Jihye, Lipsitz, George and Shin, Young "Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates", *Signs* 38, no. 4 (2013): 917-940.
- Dawson, Andrew. "The Belief in State Legitimacy and Homicide: A Cross-National Analysis". *The Sociology Quarterly* 50. No. 4 (2017): 552-575.
- Deal, William E. "The Lotus Sutra and the Rhetoric of Legitimation in Eleventh-Century Japanese Buddhism". *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 20. No. 4 (1993): 261-295.
- Dhamoon, Rita. "A Feminist Approach to Decolonizing Anti-Racism: Rethinking Transnationalism, Intersectionality, and Settler Colonialism" in *Feral Feminisms* 4 (Summer 2015): 20-37.
- Fudge, Erica. *Animal*. London: Reaktion Books, 2002.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History", *New Left Review* 56 (March-April 2009): 97-117.

- Goulding, Jay. "Japan-West Interculture: Time's Step Back—Dōgen, Watsuji, Kuki and Heidegger". *Japan's World and the World's Japan: Images, Perceptions, and Reactions. Proceedings of the 31st Japan Studies Association of Canada Annual Conference*. Ed. Fujiwara, Aya & White, James (2019): 1-26.
- Hakeda, Yoshito S. *The Awakening of Faith: Attributed to Aśvaghōṣa*. New York: Columbia University Press. 2006.
- Hayashi, Makoto, Yamanaka, Hiroshi & Swanson, Paul L. "The Adaptation of Max Weber's Theories of Religion in Japan". *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 20. No 2/3 (1993): 207-228.
- Heine, Steven. *Zen Skin, Zen Marrow: Will the Real Buddhism Please Stand Up?* United-States: Oxford University Press. 2008.
- Heldt, Gustav. *The Pursuit of Harmony: Poetry and Power in Early Heian Japan*. New York: Cornell East Asia Series. 2008
- Hérail, Francine. *Emperor and Aristocracy in Heian Japan: 10th and 11th Centuries*. Trans. Wendy Cobcroft. United-States: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. 2013.
- Ichinokawa, Yasutaka. "Max Weber in Japan". *Nenpō Shakaigaku Ronshū 年報社会学論集* 28. (2015): 28-34.
- Jacob, Andrew James. "Max Weber was Right about the Precondition, Just Wrong about Japan: The Japanese Ethic and its Spirit of Capitalism". *Open Area Studies Journal* 3 (2010): 12-29
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. "Globalization as Racialized, Sexualized Violence: The Case of Indigenous Women", *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10, no. 2 (June 2008): 216-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740801957554>.
- Löwith, Karl. *Max Weber and Karl Marx*. Ed. Tom Bottomore & William Outhwaite. New York and London: Routledge. 1993.
- Lugones, María. "The Coloniality of Gender", *World & Knowledges Otherwise* (Spring 2008): 1-17.
- Lugones, María. "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System", *Hypatia* 22, no. 1 (Winter 2007): 186-209.
- Mahmood, Saba. *The Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 2005.

- Marra, Michèle. *Representations of Power: The Liberatory Politics of Medieval Japan*. Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press. 1993
- Mass, Jeffrey P. *Yoritomo and the Founding of the First Bakufu: The Origins of Dual Government in Japan*. California: Stanford University Press. 1999
- May, Vivian M. *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. New York and London: Routledge. 2015.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham & London: Duke University Press. 2003.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Trans. Reginald John Hollingdale. London: Penguin Books, 1961.
- Nicholas, Andrea Bear "Colonialism and the Struggle for Liberation: The Experience of Maliseet Women", *U.N.B.L.J* 43 (1994): 223-239.
- Reischauer, Edwin O. *Ennin's Travel in Tang China*. New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1955.
- Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. 1998
- Shiva, Vandana. "Golden Rice and Neem: Biopatents and the Appropriation of Women's Environmental Knowledge", *Women's Studies Quarterly* 29, no 1/2 (Spring-Summer 2011): 12-23.
- Shley, Daniel F. "Royal Succession in Historical Narratives: The Cases of Gotoba and Gohorikawa (Twelfth-Thirteenth Century)". *Norm, Normabweichung und Praxis des Herrschaftsübergangs in transkultureller Perspektive*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Unipress (2019): 361-400.
- Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. United-States: Duke University Press. 2014.
- Singh, Jakeet. "Religious Agency and the Limits of Intersectionality", *Hypatia* 30, no 4 (Fall 2015): 657-674.
- Souyri, Pierre. "Le Moyen Âge". *L'Histoire du Japon: des origines à nos jours*. Ed. Francine Hérail. Paris: Hermann. 2009
- Steenstrup, Carl. *Hōjō Shigetoki (1198-1261) and his Role in the History of Political and Ethical Ideas in Japan*. London and Malmö: Curzon University Press. 1979.

Stone, Jacqueline I. *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. 1999.

Stoneman, Jack. "Why Did Saigyō Become a Monk? An Archaeology of the Reception of Saigyō's Shukke". *Japanese Language and Literature* 44. no. 2 (2010): 69-118.

The Brahmā's Net Sutra. Translated by Charles Muller and Kenneth K. Tanaka (California: Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai America) 2017.

Tsai, Chih Chung 蔡志忠. *Confucius: The Analects*. Translated by Brian Bruya. United-States: Princeton University Press. 2018.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London & New York: Zed Books Ltd. 1999.

Turner, Bryan. "Preface to the New Edition of Karl Löwith's Max Weber and Karl Marx". *Max Weber and Karl Marx*. Ed. Tom Bottomore & William Outhwaite. New York and London: Routledge. 1993: 1-32.

Valentine, Jeremy. "The Political". *Theory, Culture & Society* 23. No. 2-3 (2006): 505-511.

Wakabayashi, Haruko. *The Seven Tengu Scrolls: Evil and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy in Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press. 2012.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. United-States: Dover Publications. 2003.

Weber, Max "The Profession and Vocation of Politics", *Weber Political Writings*. Edited by Peter Lassman & Ronald Speirs. Unites-States: Cambridge University Press (2010): 309-369.