

「鎌倉五山」の建長寺

前端さん親子

ワイドいしかわ



山中漆器の技で修復された建長寺開山堂の扉
＝山中町湯の出町

山中漆器の技で輝き再び

扉など漆塗り直す

来月の開山忌で披露

禅宗の名刹として知られる神奈川県鎌倉市の建長寺で、創建者「大覚禪師」をまつる開山堂の扉二枚の修復依頼を受けた山中漆器の塗師前田雅峰さん(六三)と秀樹さん(三三)も親子。山中町湯の出町には三十日までに作業を完了した。漆が塗り直された扉は往時の輝きをよみがえらせた。

前田さん親子と建長寺が縁で五年來の交流がある。前田正道(雅峰の父)は茶道師として、同寺が十一月

に七百五十年慶讃大法要を行うのに合わせて修復計画が持ち上がり、全国的にも知名度の高い山中漆器に携わる前田さんに白羽の矢が立った。

今回修復した扉は縦二枚、幅九十センチ。元の漆をすべて取り除いたうえですべて、下地塗りして黒色の漆を塗り、現代風に仕上げた。吉田(前田)の長男の夢を、

禅師の故郷である中国の蜀時代の織物絵も新たに描いた。

前田さんは扉以外に

も、仏像を安置する「須弥壇」を修復した。須弥壇は横二・二枚、奥行き八十八センチ、高さ九十センチで、扉同様に全面的に漆を塗り直した。双方とも八月二十四日に営まれる同寺の開山忌で披露される。

建長寺は十三世紀中ごろに建立された日本最初の本格的な禅宗道場で、鎌倉幕府に招かれた末の高僧大覚禪師が開いた。鎌倉五山の第一位として知られている。

前田さんは「全国的に有名な寺の修復事業にかかわれたことは、山中漆器の技術が評価されたことであり、誇りにしたい」と話している。

Kamakura — The Art of Zen Buddhism

In 1253 the monastery Kenchōji was opened in the city of Kamakura, a small community in eastern Japan. This event, in the view of the present exhibition, marked the true starting point of Japanese Zen Buddhism. Why the importance assigned to Kenchōji and Kamakura, when every Japanese history book tells us that several decades earlier the Rinzai Zen school had been introduced by Minnan Yōsai (Myōan Eisai; 1141–1215), and the Sōtō Zen school by Dōgen (1200–1253)?

Yōsai, a Japanese priest of the Tendai school, left Japan in 1187 to study the teachings of Zen (Chan) Buddhism in Song dynasty China. In 1191 he returned, bearing with him seeds of the tea plant and certification of Dharma transmission in the Rinzai school of Zen. Following a brief stay on the island of Kyūshū he traveled to Kyoto intending to teach Zen, but, meeting with the opposition of the Tendai authorities, continued on to Kamakura, the headquarters of the feudal warrior government known as the Bakufu. There he was warmly received by the shogun Minamoto no Sanetomo (1192–1219) and the shogun's influential mother, Hōjō Masako (1157–1225), under whose patronage he established the Zen temple Jufukuji in the year 1200.

Important as Yōsai was in the history of Japanese Zen, however, his welcome in Kamakura owed not so much to his Zen understanding as to his expertise in the esoteric practices of Tendai Buddhism. He maintained his ties with the Tendai tradition throughout his life, even after becoming abbot of Kenninji, a large temple of mixed Zen-Tendai observance established in Kyoto under the protection of the shogunate in 1202.

Yōsai's successors too played a limited role in securing acceptance of the true Chinese Zen teachings in Japan. Yōsai's disciples Taikō Gyōyō (1163–1241), Myōzen (1184–1225), and Eichō (d. 1247) taught, respectively, the historically important Zen monks Shinchi Kakushin (1207–1298), Enni Ben'en (1202–1280), and Dōgen, but these figures, eminent though they were, remained in many ways on the sidelines of the transmission process. Shinchi Kakushin and Enni Ben'en followed Yōsai in combining the Zen teachings with Tendai esoteric practices, and their lineages failed to form significant currents in the subsequent history of Japanese Zen. Dōgen, who in 1223 traveled to China and studied the Caodong (Sōtō) school of Zen (a tradition different from that of Yōsai), was no more successful than his predecessor in spreading the Zen teachings in Kyoto. In 1243 he removed himself, together with a few disciples, to the temple Eihei-ji in the mountains far north of the capital. Though his lineage eventually developed into the influential Japanese Sōtō

school, for several generations it remained relatively isolated from developments elsewhere in the country.

Another notable figure in early Japanese Zen was Dainichi Nōnin (c. 11th–12th centuries), a self-enlightened monk whose understanding was later recognized by the Chinese Rinzai master Zhuoan Deguang (1121–1203). Nōnin's Nihon Daruma school, active in the region south of Kyoto, was one of the first proponents of the Zen teachings in Japan, but it too was suppressed by the older Buddhist traditions; in the early thirteenth century it was largely absorbed by the Sōtō school and disappeared as an independent tradition.

Despite this early lack of acceptance for Zen, the tradition did in fact possess a long history in Japanese Buddhism, as Yōsai pointed out in his thesis *Kōzen gokokuron* (Propagation of Zen for the Protection of the Nation). Yōsai noted that Zen meditation (known as *zazen*) had been practiced by the eminent Hossō-school monk Dōshō (629–700), who learned of Zen in China from the great Chinese Buddhist translator Xuanzang (600?–664). Upon his return to Japan, Dōshō opened a Zen meditation hall at the temple Gangōji and taught *zazen*.

Yōsai also pointed out that *zazen* was one of the central practices advocated by Saichō (766–822), transmitter of the Tendai teachings from China to Japan and founder of the Japanese Tendai school. Saichō espoused the practice of *shishō zanmai*, a system of four types of meditation set forth in the treatise *Mohe zhiqian* (Great Concentration and Insight) by Zhiyi (538–597), the Chinese founder of the Tendai school. Among these four practices was *jōza zanmai* (constant sitting meditation), which in content was none other than *zazen*. In *jōza zanmai* the practitioner sat in the full-lotus position facing a buddha image for a period of ninety days, maintaining a silent state of focused awareness. If fatigue, sleepiness, or sickness made it difficult to continue, the retreatant was permitted to chant the Buddha's name as a form of support.

Yōsai thus claimed that in teaching *zazen* he was simply trying to reintroduce this long-lost practice to Japan. The established traditions, however, were interested not in *zazen* but in the practice of esoteric ritual and the *nenbutsu* (invocation of the Buddha Amida's name). Their resistance was increased by the fact that the Song dynasty Zen promoted by Yōsai was different from that of earlier teachers, constituting an independent school that differentiated itself from other Buddhist schools through its stress on meditation and enlightenment and its use of distinctive teaching devices like koans.

Official attitudes toward Zen started to change with the fifth shogunal regent, Hōjō Tokiyori (1227–1263). Tokiyori invited the Japanese masters Ben'en and Dōgen to Kamakura, apparently in the hope that these eminent monks, recently back from China, would agree to teach traditional Chinese Zen in the city's temples. This plan did not materialize, however — both Dōgen and Ben'en soon left the Bakufu capital and returned to central Japan, Dōgen to found Eihei-ji in Echizen (Fukui prefecture) and Ben'en to establish Tōfuku-ji in Kyoto.

Tokiyori apparently sought in Chinese Zen an ideological basis for a new warrior culture, to counter what he saw as the decadence of Kyoto court society. It was a role for which Zen was in many respects well suited. The Zen masters had a vigor and force that commended them to the Kamakura warriors, and the path they taught stressed discipline and strength of spirit. It was, moreover, a self-reliant path, centered on meditation as a way of transcending the limited ego and awakening to one's innermost nature, thereby fostering a spirit of equanimity even in the face of death. The direct, practical teachings of Zen did not require the doctrinal and ritual sophistication of the Tendai and Shingon schools, nor did followers have to leave the world for the monastery — "everyday mind is the Way," in the words of the great Chinese Zen master Mazu Daoyi (709–788).

With its emphasis on discipline and self-reliant effort, Zen was temperamentally suited to the action-oriented and unsophisticated warriors, who on the battlefield had to rely upon their own skill and courage. The ultimate goal of Zen is, of course, spiritual awakening and the attainment of buddhahood, but the concentration and equanimity fostered by the practice were of great practical use even to unenlightened samurai.

Hastening the acceptance of Zen was the arrival in Kamakura of several eminent Chinese Zen masters, the most prominent being Lanxi Daolong (J. Rankai Dōryū; 1213–1278). Daolong's reasons for coming to Japan are not clear. As it is known that no formal invitation to him had been issued, it is likely that his decision to board a trading vessel at Ningbo in 1246 and sail for Japan was a personal one. With him on the ship was Gettō Chikyō, priest of the Kyoto temple Sennyū-ji of the Ritsu (Vinaya) school, which was closely connected with Zen. After helping Daolong make his way from the port of Hakata to the capital city of Kyoto, Chikyō — aware perhaps of Daolong's desire to teach unadulterated Chinese Zen — recommended that he travel on to Kamakura. Zen in Kyoto, though represented by the monasteries Kennin-ji and Tōfuku-ji, was forced to coexist with the dominant Tendai and Shingon traditions, and thus remained syncretized with esoteric Buddhism. Chikyō realized that Kamakura offered Daolong a better chance of establishing a purer form of Zen practice.

Daolong was warmly received by Tokiyori. The master

first resided at the temples Jufuku-ji and Jōraku-ji, opening at the latter a Zen meditation hall soon filled to overflowing with monks seeking instruction. Tokiyori and Daolong conceived a plan to establish a major monastery at which Chinese Zen observances would be strictly followed. In 1253 this temple, named Kenchō-ji after the name of the era in which it was founded, began operation as the first Rinzaï monastery in Japan run along true Chinese Zen lines.

Daolong's Teachings

What exactly was it that Daolong brought with him from China to Japan? Let us begin with an examination of the organizational structure of Kenchō-ji, as revealed by the architectural features depicted on a late Kamakura-period map of the temple complex (fig. 1).

On the map, the area east of the road leading from the *sanmon* gate to the *butsuden* (buddha hall) is occupied by the *kuin* (kitchen), and the area to the west by the *sōdō* (monks' training hall). This arrangement reflects the monastery's fundamental division into *tōhan* (east assembly) and *seihan* (west assembly) sections.

Monks in the *tōhan* section held the administrative posts known as the *roku chiji* (six administrators), including *tsūsu* (head administrative monk, in charge of overall affairs, duties shared with the similar post *kansu*); *fūsu* ("treasurer," in charge of the monastery's material supplies and financial affairs); *inō* ("duty-monk," in charge of overall supervision of the assembly); *tenzo* ("head cook," in charge of the kitchen); and *shissui* ("maintenance officer," in charge of the physical upkeep and repair of the monastery).

Monks in the *seihan* section were more directly involved in the meditation practice, and held posts known as the *roku chōshū* (six officers): *shuso* ("head monk," in charge of meditation in the meditation hall); *shōki* ("secretary," in charge of handling the various writing tasks associated with monastery correspondence and ritual); *zōsu* ("librarian," in charge of the monastery's sutra collection); *shika* ("guestmaster," in charge of receiving visitors to the monastery); *chiyoku* ("bath-monk," in charge of the monastery bath house); and *chiden* ("sexton," in charge of all matters relating to the upkeep and operation of the buddha hall).

These divisions are further indicated on the Kenchō-ji map by the presence of buildings marked, to the east, *kansuryō* (*kansu* quarters), *tsūsuruyō kyakuden* (*tsūsu* quarters and guesthouse), and *chōsaisho* (kitchen); and, to the west, "Daitetsudō" (the name of the *sōdō* complex), *inōryō* (*inō*'s quarters), and *zendōryō* (head monk's quarters). The fact that the *inō*'s quarters, traditionally on the eastern, administrative side, are here located on the western side is a reflection of the fact that the *inō*'s duties were intimately related to the

activities of the monks' hall.

The various posts were seen not merely as administrative necessities, but as integral parts of the overall Zen training. The job of cook is a representative example of a task inseparable from the practice of Zen. The novelist Mizukami Tsutomu, commenting on Dōgen's treatise *Tenzo kyōkun* (*Instructions to the Cook*), writes, "The most notable feature of this text is Dōgen's emphasis on the fact that cooking is not mere kitchen work, but a task involving a level of thoughtfulness and care that make it the noblest of human occupations."

Another indication of the connection between daily activities and the spiritual goals of Zen is the fact that the codes governing monastic life are known as *shingi*, meaning "pure rules" that aid the monks in their quest for enlightenment. The monastic codes are not the same as the Buddhist vinaya, the traditional disciplinary code that governs the behavior of Buddhist monks and nuns. An interesting example of the divergence is provided by the Zen monastic emphasis on manual labor. Whereas the vinaya forbids gardening and other such work because of the inevitable loss of life involved, the Zen monastic codes actually mandate such labor, both as a means of providing for the monastery's needs and as a way of expressing the insights of meditation in the everyday activities of life. Such "working meditation" is known in Zen as *samu* (work duty).

The strict, active style of Zen practice introduced to Kenchōji by Daolong is reflected in a short treatise of his, the *Hōgo kisoku* (*Dharma Words and Regulations*) (cat. no. 11), a portion of which may be paraphrased as follows:

A horse that runs only when shown the whip is not a good horse; a monk who practices only when admonished is not a good monk. None who live in this pure temple will suffer from hunger or cold. Reflect carefully on this while you are here. If one behaves in a way dismissive of this, the transgression is great indeed. An ancient said, "Though thoroughly versed in the teachings, you cannot realize liberation. Nothing surpasses mastery of the Buddha Way for benefiting all sentient beings." How does one master the Buddha Way? All day you drag around a corpse, laughing, shouting, and getting angry. Asked "Who are you?," those who can answer are few. Annoyed by some little thing, you lose your temper and depart. And this isn't just one or two of you. The purpose of Zen training is to resolve the Great Matter of life-and-death. You must never indulge your feelings and become neglectful, even when resting after the bath.

The final line of this passage refers to the Zen monastic custom of bathing on dates that contain the numbers "4" and "9" — that is, the 4th, 9th, 14th, 19th, 24th, and 29th of

each month. On the 14th and 29th bathing takes place in the morning, and the afternoons are free. Even then, Daolong emphasizes, the monk must not relax his attention to the training. Daolong continues:

Elders and head monks must attend carefully to their training, without regard to the opinions of others. You wear robes and receive the donations of the faithful; if nothing comes of this, when can you repay the debt? From now on even on bath days *zazen* must be practiced in the evening and early morning; those who do not go to the meditation hall but head for their quarters will be punished by expulsion. Those washing their faces after 4:20 AM are subject to a one-*kin* oil fine. Warming oneself by the hearth fire is forbidden between 6 and 10 PM. The hearth fire must be covered after 10:20 PM; opening the fire after this time is punishable by a two-*kin* oil fine. Warming oneself by the fire between 2:20 AM and 3:40 AM is punishable by a two-*kin* oil fine. Talking by the fire or in the *sōdō* is punishable by a one-*kin* oil fine. Speaking while walking and needlessly raising the screens [to the rooms] are punishable by a one-*kin* oil fine. These are several guidelines pertaining to behavior in the *sōdō*. Each monk should obey them and not break the regulations.

The meaning of the "oil fine" referred to in this passage is unclear. According to one explanation it was a form of punishment in which minor offenders were required to sit *zazen* for the length of time it took to burn the stipulated amount of oil (one *kin* is approximately 600 grams); another explanation is that the offenders were fined the amount needed to buy the oil, which was used in the votary lamps placed in front of the buddha images.

On ordinary days four sessions of *zazen* were held, at 4 AM, 10 AM, 4 PM, and 8 PM. On bath days some rest was scheduled, but Daolong did not permit this. One can only speculate on the extent to which Daolong's strict and uncompromising Chinese style of Zen was followed by the Japanese assembly, accustomed as it was to a more relaxed approach.

The Traditional View of Zen and the Arts

The Zen philosopher Hisamatsu Shin'ichi (1889–1980) identified seven basic features of Zen art: 1) *fukinsei* (asymmetry); 2) *kanso* (simplicity); 3) *kokō* (austerity); 4) *jinen* (naturalness); 5) *yūgen* (subtle profundity); 6) *datsuzoku* (freedom from attachment); 7) *seijaku* (tranquility). As examples of Zen influenced art possessing such characteristics, he cited dry-rock garden design, chanoyu (tea ceremony), Noh drama, ink painting, calligraphy, and flower

arrangement. There has been considerable criticism of Hisamatsu's model, however, in the half century since he proposed it.

Hisamatsu's interpretation of garden design, for example, has been sharply critiqued by the late novelist Tachihara Masaaki. Regarding the famous rock garden at Ryōanji, Hisamatsu writes, "Stones, in the final analysis, are manifestations of emptiness, of nothingness... in this garden Zen is exceptionally well expressed." Tachihara's viewpoint is diametrically opposed. Garden-making by Zen monks was a form of amusement, he argues — most gardens were actually laid out by *sansui kawaramono*, laborers from the lowest stratum of society, and it is nonsense to claim that their creations were inspired by the spirit of Zen. How best to arrange the rocks in a garden is a problem of design, not one of spiritual understanding.

Hisamatsu, a tea master himself, unhesitatingly cites *chanoyu* as the representative form of Zen art. Indeed, it was together with Zen Buddhism that the custom of drinking *matcha* (powdered green tea) was imported from China, and tea masters from the time of Sen no Rikyū (1522–1591) have all practiced Zen. However, *wabi-cha* — the simple style of *chanoyu* generally associated with Zen — was developed not by Zen priests but by laypersons like Rikyū. Indeed, even Hisamatsu says that "Zen culture" was a product not of the temples but of secular society.

In Hisamatsu's view the *chashitsu* (rooms for the tea ceremony) are more expressive of the essence of Zen than even Zen temple buildings. How "Zen," though, are the *chashitsu* really? At first glance they may appear to be the ultimate expression of simplicity, but they are in fact quite carefully constructed right down to their finest details, and the materials used are meticulously selected. Tea utensils like teabowls are indeed plain in appearance, but the very appreciation of this rusticity caused an enormous increase in the price of these objects. Thus, plain though they may appear on the surface, they are actually luxury items. The aesthetics of tea were certainly influenced by Zen, but they do not equal Zen. The same may be said of the Noh drama of Zeami (1363–1443).

With regard to graphic art, Hisamatsu cites the work of Hasegawa Tōhaku (1539–1610) as representative of Zen style painting. However, Hasegawa, whose artistic technique and sensibility reached their highest expression in his famous screen painting *Pine Forest*, was a fervent adherent of the Nichiren school of Buddhism. His artistic philosophy was clearly not an expression of Zen spirituality.

Even the much discussed relationship between Zen and ink painting (*suibokuga*) must be reexamined. It was originally thought that ink paintings were entirely the work of Zen monk painters (*gasō*), but recently the prevailing view is that many were done by artists of traditional-style *yamato-e* paintings, who were requested by patrons to produce artwork

similar to that of Chinese painters. One cannot, surely, label as "Zen art" work by professional *yamato-e* artists imitating Chinese models at the behest of clients infatuated with Song dynasty paintings. Nevertheless, such works are identified as such whenever an inscription by a Zen monk appears on them.

Shigajiku — hanging scroll paintings inscribed with Chinese-style poems (*kanshō*), often by Zen monks — were popular in the Muromachi period (1392–1572). In this case too, one wonders how "Zen" the resulting works truly were. By the Muromachi period the Zen school had formed close ties with the ruling classes, and had undergone a considerable degree of secularization. Skill in poetry was the *sine qua non* of social success for contemporary Zen priests, fostering the rise of *gozan bungaku*, a literary tradition centered around a group of Zen temples known as the Gozan (Five Mountains). The result was what might be called the "salonization" of Zen. Priests were increasingly members of the educated elite, and many of their activities should be regarded as literary rather than religious in nature.

Similar issues arise with the art of *bokuseki* (lit. "ink traces," calligraphy by Zen monks). "Handwriting reveals the man," it is said; in the case of Zen, *bokuseki* are usually regarded as expressing a person's state of enlightenment, with the actual brushwork being more important than the content of what is written. The calligraphy of Zen masters, however, is hardly the untraced expression of Zen Mind that it is sometimes represented to be. The above mentioned Lanxi Daolong and the influential Chinese master Wuzhun Shifan (Bujun Shihan; 1177–1249), teacher of Enni Ben'en and several Chinese priests later active in Japan, both studied the calligraphic style of the Southern Song calligraphy master Zhang Jizhi (1186–1263), while Daxiu Zhegnian (Daikyū Shōnen; 1215–1289), founder of Jōchiji in Kamakura, and Yishan Yining (Issan Ichinei; 1247–1315), the third abbot of Nanzenji in Kyoto, took as their model the Tang dynasty calligrapher Yan Zhenqing (709–784). Although their work reveals the vitality, power, and scale of these masters, does it really express their state of enlightenment? With regard to this, Hisamatsu writes:

What makes a painting a Zen painting is not that it was done by a Zen monk; what makes calligraphy Zen calligraphy is not that it presents a Zen saying. Zen painting and Zen calligraphy must express Zen meaning.... Understanding Zen meaning depends upon the attainment of Zen religious experience.

Hisamatsu, in other words, is of the opinion that the understanding of ink painting and *bokuseki* calligraphy as Zen art is dependent upon the attainment of *satori* (referred to elsewhere by Hisamatsu as "grasping Zen Mind").

Although one may justifiably claim that "the spirit of

Zen" or "the state of enlightenment" can only be understood by those who have actually experienced them, the application of such concepts to the artistic realm spreads a veil of ambiguity over the study of Zen art. To be sure, the fundamental standpoint of Zen is that words are inadequate to explain these concepts; the description of Zen as "a special tradition outside the teachings, not dependent on words and letters" is based on a realization of the imperfection of language as a means of transmitting knowledge. Some things simply cannot be expressed in words. Unfortunately, this standpoint gave rise to the notion that inexpressibility itself is a manifestation of the Zen spirit.

In this way, the distinctive features of Zen culture have been defined through such arts as gardening and ink painting, when in fact the relationship between Zen and these arts is far from clear. Even the terminology used tends to be ambiguous. The entire question of Zen culture needs to be reconsidered from a standpoint that does not assign undue weight to ink painting and gardens and is free of the influence of tea and Noh drama

Chinzō Paintings and Sculptures

Never seek buddha outside, Zen teaches — the buddha is found within. Thus Zen does not engage in the type of devotional practices performed in Pure Land Buddhism, which looks to the Buddha Amida for salvation, nor does it adorn its halls in an attempt to symbolically recreate the Pure Land. Still less does it acknowledge the accumulation of merit through the construction of temples or the carving of images. Furthermore, Zen, in its spare use of sculpture and other religious images, stands in stark contrast to the esoteric Buddhist schools, which employ a wide variety of sacred imagery for their elaborate mandalas and rituals. Fundamentally speaking, then, the ideological foundations of Zen are not conducive to the development of religious art.

However, there is in Zen a tradition of receiving, upon completion of one's formal training, the portrait (*chinzō*) or surplice (*kesa*) of one's teacher as evidence of Dharma transmission (*inka shōmei*). These often became cherished temple possessions, as did the portraits and sculptures of eminent priests who were associated with the temple and, in many cases, were buried on the temple grounds. From this there evolved the genre of Zen *chinzō* art. Temples also possessed paintings of such figures as Sakyamuni (the historical Buddha), Bodhidharma (the sixth century Indian monk said to have transmitted Zen to China), and the various bodhisattvas and arhats (enlightened Buddhist sages), as well as collections of flower vases, candlestands, censers, incense containers, and other accoutrements necessary for the performance of ceremonies. Important temples sought the highest quality in such objects, with the result that Song

dynasty temples were filled with artistic masterpieces made of celadon, red lacquer, and bronze.

Recently an interesting and innovative interpretation of the *chinzō* has been proposed by Kano Hiroyuki, art historian at the Kyoto National Museum, who writes as follows regarding the *chinzō* of Shūhō Myōchō (1282–1338), better known as Daitō Kokushi (National Teacher Daitō):

Having heard of the imposing personality of Daitō Kokushi, I was a bit surprised to see that every *chinzō* of Daitō portrays him with knitted brows, in an expression that appears almost anxious. What is imposing about this? I cannot help thinking, though, that in this irritated look of his — a look so different from that of enlightened repose — Daitō was attempting to convey a message. In having himself portrayed in this way, might not Daitō have been telling us to *know* that very self which seeks enlightenment but can never quite attain it? That, perhaps, was Daitō's instruction to us in the images he left behind.

Kano's interpretation is a novel one, free of the usual preconceptions that regard *chinzō* only as expressions of the lofty spirituality and stern Zen persona of their subjects. Let us examine these portraits in a bit more detail.

The ideal in *chinzō* portraiture is to represent not just the physical features of the subject, but to capture something of his personality and spirit as well. The painter or sculptor is, of course, simply an artist and cannot be expected to possess the same spiritual insights as a Zen master. Nevertheless, *chinzō* artists with a sincere desire to convey the inner qualities of their subjects have often succeeded in producing likenesses of striking insight and power. Needless to say, such renditions were possible only when artists could work directly with their subjects; otherwise they had to rely on sketches, which provided them with, at best, a secondhand sense of the masters' spirituality.

Among the extant portraits of Lanxi Daolong, that dated Bun'ei 8 (1271) and inscribed by Daolong himself (cat. no. 7) represents one of the finest examples of the *chinzō* genre. Not only is the physical resemblance superb, but the power it radiates conveys a sense of the master's true inner life. The piece was presented by Daolong to a certain layman Rōnen (thought to be the regent Hōjō Tokimune; 1251–1284), and thus appears not to have been a certificate of Dharma transmission.

Daolong's *Portrait in Walking Meditation (Kinbuzō)* (cat. no. 8) is another excellent depiction of the master, possessing a realism accentuated by the tautness of the brushstrokes. The piece is not quite the equal of the Bun'ei portrait, however, in the sense of vitality it conveys.

The Daolong *chinzō* inscribed by the Chinese master

Lingshi Ruzhi (dates unknown) (cat. no. 92) appears to be a later work. The verse was obtained in 1329, when Taikyo Genju (dates unknown), a Japanese monk in the second generation of Daolong's line, traveled to Yuan dynasty China to seek acknowledgment of his eminent forebear. Lingshi was a successor of Xutang Zhiyu (1185–1269), who was one of the greatest Song dynasty masters and the teacher of the important Japanese master Nanpo Jōmin (Jōmyō; 1235–1309). The portrait contains a number of later additions, but the face is clearly that of the man portrayed in the two above-mentioned *chinzō*. In comparison with the Bun'ei piece the chin is slightly too long and the body a bit too tall, indicating perhaps that the portrait was based on the sketches made for Daolong's statue.

The seated sculpture of Daolong in the possession of the Kenchōji subtemple Seira'an (cat. no. 9) is nearly the equal of the Bun'ei *chinzō* both in its depiction of Daolong's facial features and in the impression of power it conveys. The image possesses a strong sense of presence as well — the master's emaciated ribs stand out, and the numerous folds of the robes are clearly defined. Nevertheless, it lacks a certain true-to-life quality possessed by the Bun'ei portrait.

The seated sculpture of Wuxue Zuyuan (1226–1286) in the possession of Engakuji (cat. no. 22), the great Kamakura monastery that he founded, is another exceptionally forceful image. It appears almost alive, with its precisely sculpted head, faithfully rendered wrinkles, dynamic forward-leaning posture, and piercing yet warmhearted gaze. In contrast, Zuyuan's self-inscribed *chinzō* portrait is a poor likeness, lacking life. The sculpture of the master at Uganji in Tochigi prefecture closely resembles that at Engakuji, though the gentler expression bespeaks an older Zuyuan.

Zuyuan's successor Kōhō Kennichi (1241–1316) is most powerfully represented in the seated sculpture preserved at the Kenchōji subtemple Shōtōin (cat. no. 32). In its resemblance to the master, however, the Kōhō sculpture at Uganji may be superior, possessing as it does the sense of refinement one would expect of the master (Kōhō was the son of Emperor Gosaga). The same dignified impression is imparted by the *chinzō* portraits bearing the master's inscription. In all, twelve portraits of Kōhō are known to exist, most of which were made at the request of female believers, and do not appear to have been certificates of Dharma transmission.

Daolong's Japanese successor Yakuō Tokuken (1244–1320) is portrayed in three *chinzō* paintings: two very similar portraits at, respectively, Eiganji in Shiga prefecture (cat. no. 35) and Ryūhōin in Kamakura, and a quite different representation, bearing the master's inscription, at the Nanzenji subtemple Bokugo'an (fig. 2). The *chinzō* genre has many such examples of differences in verisimilitude, most very difficult to account for.

The above-mentioned seated sculptures of Lanxi

Daolong at Kenchōji, Wuxue Zuyuan at Engakuji, and Kōhō Kennichi at Shōtōin seem almost confrontational in the power they project, as though they are challenging the viewer. One does not feel this same sense of challenge from other notable images — for example, the seated sculptures of Shunjōbō Chōgen (1121–1206) at Tōdaiji and Mukan Fumon (1212–1291) at the Tōfukuji subtemple Ryūginan — accurate though these may be in their representation of their subjects (even down to their physical imperfections). The sculptures of Chōgen and Fumon may have been intended primarily as historical records of the masters' appearance, while the seated sculptures of Lanxi, Wuxue, and Kōhō may have had the added purpose of inspiring the monks to emulate their towering predecessors.

The Characteristics of Kamakura Zen

As noted above, the character of Kamakura Zen was deeply influenced by Chinese Chan traditions. One effect was on customs of priestly succession. In Japanese Buddhism the tradition generally has been for the founder of a temple to name a successor from among his own disciples, thus starting a lineage that subsequently remains in control. Chinese Zen, however, did not limit succession for important temples to a single lineage, but instead searched far and wide for the most qualified candidates. This was known as the *jippō jūji sei* (literally, "the from-anywhere-priest-system"). The Kamakura Bakufu applied the *jippō jūji sei* to the entire three-tiered system of official Zen temples that it created: the Five Mountains (*gozan*), Ten Temples (*jissatsu*), and various major monasteries (*shozan*). The only exceptions were Tōfukuji, the family temple of the powerful Fujiwara family, which initially limited succession to the line of Enni Ben'en; and Shōkokuji, which drew most of its early abbots from the line of founder Musō Soseki (1275–1351).

Another way in which Chinese ideas appear to have influenced Japanese Zen, at least initially, concerned attitudes toward the founding priests of temples. In Japanese Zen, temple founders are accorded much more veneration than in Chinese Chan, according to the Japanese Zen historian Tamamura Takeji. This difference is reflected in burial customs. In China, when founders died it was the general custom to inter their remains in a mortuary hall subsequently used for their successors as well, although in the case of particularly eminent abbots special graves — known as *tatou* (J. *tatchū*) — were often built on the temple grounds.

It is revealing, therefore, that the remains of Wuxue Zuyuan, founder of Engakuji, were first interred not there but at the neighboring temple Kenchōji, where he served as the fifth abbot until the time of his death. Engakuji went without a founder's *tatchū* until Wuxue's remains were received from Kenchōji by Musō Soseki, who from 1329

served briefly as Engakuji's abbot. Apparently Chinese attitudes toward temple founders remained in effect at the time of Wuxue. Musō's relocation of Wuxue's *tatchū* to Engakuji is thus symbolic of an important development in the Japanization of Zen. Subsequent to this time the *tatchū* of a founder or eminent monk — usually a sub-temple in itself — was cared for by a member of his lineage, and often served as the lineage center. The Kamakura Bakufu did what it could to halt this practice, but by the time of the Ashikaga shogunate (1336–1573) it was an accepted custom.

One of the main reasons for the strong Chinese influence on Kamakura Zen was, of course, the existence of significant numbers of Chinese monks in the city's temples. The Chinese presence at monasteries like Kenchōji and Engakuji was far greater than at any of the Kyoto Five Mountains, and most likely included not only abbots and other high-ranking priests but ordinary monks as well. It is only natural that this situation would find expression in the culture of Kamakura Zen.

The Zen Culture of Kamakura

Generally speaking, the Buddhist art of the Zen tradition has attracted little attention, with the exception of the *chinzō* portraiture discussed above. One reason for this neglect, as pointed out by historian Miyama Susumu, a pioneer in the study of Zen art, has been the tendency to characterize Zen as a tradition that is dismissive of the need for devotional imagery. Thus exhibitions of Zen artwork have tended to exclude traditional Buddhist art (except for works by the master painter (*eshū*) Minchō (1352–1431), a monk of Tōfukuji. Buddhist sculpture in particular has been virtually ignored.

Turning to the actual situation in Kamakura's Zen temples, however, one finds an abundance of sculpture dating back to the Kamakura and Nanbokuchō periods (13th–14th centuries). Among the temples' main images of worship (*honzon*) are sculptures of Kannon (Avalokitesvara), Jizō (Kṣirigarbha), and the Transcendent (lit. Jewel Crown) Sakyamuni. Other images represent *nakan* (arhats), Zen patriarchs, and such Buddhist tutelary deities as Idate (Skanda) and various temple guardian deities (*garanjin*).

This wealth of sculpture is the defining characteristic of Kamakura Zen culture — thirteenth and fourteenth century sculpture may be found in Kyoto at Tōfukuji, but otherwise is extremely rare in the ancient capital's Zen temples. Let us take a closer look at a number of representative Kamakura works.

Kenchōji's five tutelary *garanjin* deities (cat. no. 123) are identified in the *Zenrin shōki sen* (*Register of Zen Images and Objects*) as Chō Taitei (Zhang Dadi), Daigen Shuri Bosatsu (Daquan Xiuli Pusā), Shōhō Shichirō (Qiaobao Qilang), Jōbo

Hōgan (Zhangbu Panguan), and Kannō Shisha (Ganying Shizhe). It is not clear, however, which of these names corresponds to which of the images. The same document identifies Chō Taitei as the *tsuchishin* (tutelary deity) of the temple Guizongsi, Daikenshuri Bosatsu as that of Mount Ayuwang, and Shōhō Shichirō as that of Mount Zhaobao, all in China. The Daoist *tsuchishin* differ from the Japanese tutelary deities known as *jishushin* in that they are not bound to a particular geographical location, but, like government officials, are able to move from place to place and can advance in rank. The *Rankei Oshō Gyōjō* (*Biography of Lanxi Daolong*) records that Lanxi had a special connection with Chō Taitei, and that it was at Chō's urging that he embarked for Japan. Lanxi vowed that if he ever established a temple in Japan he would install Taitei as the *tsuchishin*.

Daigen Shuri Bosatsu, a *garanjin* at Jufukuji (cat. no. 124), shades his eyes with his right hand as he looks out toward the distance; he is, it is said, gazing east from Mount Ayuwang (located near the Chinese port of Ningbo) to extend his protection to ships at sea. Also serving as guardian deities at Jufukuji, according to the recorded sayings of Daxiu Zhengnian, were the *tsuchishin* Hakusan, Shizan, and Shuri; the present images may be reconstructions of the ones that Daxiu refers to.

This raises an interesting question. At Tōfukuji in Kyoto images of Bonten (Brahma) (fig. 3) and Taishakuten (Indra) (fig. 4) are known to have been enshrined in the *tsuchidō* (guardian deity hall). At present there are in the *butsuden* (buddha hall) images of these two deities from the late Nanbokuchō period (1336–92) that are represented in the seated posture, in the manner of *garanjin*. Moreover, Sennyūji possesses three similar images depicting Bonten, Taishakuten, and a bearded Daoist deity. Could it have been that the Daoist *tsuchishin*, accepted for what they were in Kamakura, were in Kyoto transformed into the more traditional Indian Buddhist tutelary deities Bonten and Taishakuten? One imagines, too, that images similar to those at Kenchōji were installed at Kenninji when Lanxi Daolong served as abbot there (1259–1261), but that their strong Chinese character might not have won acceptance in the capital.

Ink paintings (*suibokuga*) of various manifestations of Kannon (Avalokitesvara) — including Water-Moon Kannon, Kannon Holding a Willow Branch, and Kannon Viewing a Waterfall — are not uncommon in Kyoto, but sculptural representations of these forms of the bodhisattva are limited to eastern Japan. The temple Seijūji in Yokosuka, south of Kamakura, possesses a sculpture of Kannon Viewing a Waterfall (cat. no. 131), seated in a posture of royal ease and leaning slightly on the left hand, with the right knee raised and left leg lowered — a posture typical of Kannon images produced in great quantity in Song dynasty China for enshrinement in stone grottoes and Zen temples. A variation shows the bodhisattva resting the right elbow on the rock and

「鎌倉五山」の建長寺

前端さん親子

ワイドいしかわ

山中漆器の技で輝き再び

扉など漆塗り直す

来月の開山忌で披露

禅宗の名刹として知られる神奈川県鎌倉市の建長寺で、創建者「大覚禪師」をまつる開山堂の扉二枚の修復依頼を受けた山中漆器の漆師崎藤雄さん親子と、漆師さんごも弟子山中町湯の出町は、三十日まで作業を終了した。漆が塗り直された扉は往時の輝きをよみがえらせた。

前端さん親子と建長寺が縁で五年來の交流がある。山中町湯の山中漆器の漆師さん親子は、同寺が十一月



山中漆器の技で修復された建長寺開山堂の扉
＝山中町湯の出町

に七百五十年開山大法要を行うのに合わせて修復計画が持ち上がり、全面的にも知名度の高い山中漆器に携わる前端さんに白羽の矢が立った。

今回修復した扉は鎌二が、幅九十七、元の漆をすべて取り除いたことと、下地塗りし、黒色の漆を施し、現代風に仕上げた。山中町湯の漆師、禪師の故郷である中国の福州時代の漆器絵も新たに描いた。

前端さんは扉以外に

も、仏像を装束する「須弥壇」を修復した。須弥壇は幅二・二、奥行八十八、高さ九十七で、扉同様に全面的に漆を塗り直した。双方とも八月二十四日に廿五、同寺の開山忌で披露される。

建長寺は十二世紀中に建てられた日本最初の木格的な禅宗道場で、鎌倉幕府に招かれた末の高僧大覚禪師が開いた。鎌倉五山の第一位として知られている。

前端さんには「全国的に有名な寺の修復作業にかかわれたことは、山中漆器の技術が評価されたことであり、誇りにしたい」と話している。

extending the left leg, but the overall posture of royal ease is the same.

The origin of this casual style of representation appears to be in Daoism. The Kannon depicted in Kenchōji's White-Robed Kannon painting (cat. no. 148), for example, is the Kannon appearing in the *Kegon kyō* (*Avatamsaka sutra; Flower Ornament Sutra*), as indicated by the presence in the picture of the boy Zenzai Dōji (Sudhana), who in the *Kegon kyō* visits Kannon and fifty-two other mentors in his epic search for enlightenment. The sutra describes Kannon as dwelling deep in the mountains; in China, Daoist sages too dwell deep in the mountains. Hence in Zen — a blend of Buddhist and Daoist thought — there occurred a certain identification of Kannon with Daoist sages, just as in Japan there occurred a fusion of buddhas and bodhisattvas with Shinto gods. One result was that from the late Tang dynasty the bodhisattva, although described in the *Kegon kyō* as sitting in the full-lotus position, came to be depicted in the same royal-ease posture as that used in China to portray Daoist sages.

Other examples of the same relaxed type of Kannon sculpture are found only at temples in the Kamakura area, such as the Water-Moon Kannon (cat. no. 133) and Shō Kannon (Arya Avalokitesvara) at Tōkeiji in Kita-Kamakura, and the images at Hōjōji (cat. no. 132) and Jōkōji in Shizuoka. In Kyoto the *Kegon Kaie Zenchishiki Mandarazu* at Tōdaiji (fig. 5), which depicts Zenzai Dōji's meetings with the fifty-three teachers, portrays Kannon in a manner resembling the Six-Arm Nyoirin Kannon (Cintamani Avalokitesvara) at Daijūji in Aichi prefecture (cat. no. 90), but with only the "contemplation arm" and "ground-touching arm" remaining. No other examples of this type of Kannon are found in the capital area. In this case too, as with the above-mentioned *garanjin*, a Daoist-influenced subject (Kannon in a pose of royal ease) appears to have been represented in Kyoto in a more traditionally Buddhist form (the Six-Arm Nyoirin Kannon). The difference between the respective Zen cultures of Kamakura and Kyoto is evident, with the former showing a more straightforward acceptance of Chinese Zen traditions.

Conclusion

The general image of Zen culture is one of elegant simplicity. This image, however, is based principally on such traditions as chanoyu, Noh, flower arrangement, and bushido (the way of the warrior) — traditions that were strongly influenced by Zen, to be sure, but Zen as interpreted and adapted by laypeople like Sen no Rikyū and Zeami. It is in the Zen temples themselves that the true art of Zen Buddhism is to be found. And even there, it is not in gardens and ink paintings — of which there are few examples predating the fourteenth

century — that true Zen culture lies. Where, then, to seek it? The present exhibition is an attempt to answer that question.

Section 1 of the exhibition presents the *chinzō* portraits and sculptures of Zen masters, together with examples of their calligraphy. We ask the visitor to contemplate them quietly and see just how deep an impression they can leave. This catalogue, too, attempts to present the main works in a way that allows their inner power to reveal itself. What is the source of this indescribable sense of strength? Much has been said about "the spirit of Zen" and "the realm of satori," but in the end all words fail, and intuition is the sole approach to understanding.

Section 2 displays various articles that found their way to Kamakura as a result of the lively exchange between that city and China. Although the present whereabouts of the articles listed in the *Butsunichi'an Catalogue of Temple Property* (*Butsunichi'an kōmotsu mokuroku*) (cat. no. 62) are unknown, articles similar to the ones mentioned have been placed on display. The display "Objects from the Founder's Chest of Engakuji" presents possessions of Wuxue Zuyuan — most of them from China — that have been treasured and safeguarded through the centuries at Engakuji.

Section 3 introduces a number of ink paintings representative of the eastern Japanese style. Among the works displayed are early ink paintings with inscriptions by Wuxue Zuyuan, Yishan Yiming, and Xijian Zitan (1249–1306) dating from the time these masters lived in Kamakura. Also on view are works by Muromachi period Zen monk painters like Kenchōji's Chūan Shinkō (dates unknown) and Kenkō Shōkei (dates unknown), and Engakuji's Josui Sōen (dates unknown).

Section 4 displays a collection of Chinese-style sculptures and paintings of buddhas, bodhisattvas, and sages. All are quite exotic by ordinary Japanese standards, and undoubtedly impressed upon the Kamakura warriors the strong Chinese character of Kenchōji and Engakuji. It is our hope that museum guests may be able to some degree to share the impressions of the samurai of old.

The Zen of Kamakura, birthplace of Japanese Zen, was marked by the color and variety of its Chinese antecedent. From this the Japanese selected and refined those aspects that later came to characterize the elegant simplicity of Kyoto Zen culture. If the present exhibition has helped clarify this process, then it may be judged a success.

Asami Ryusuke
Curator, Tokyo National Museum

Thomas Kirchner (translator)
Associate Researcher, Hanzōno University