PAPERS COMMUNICATED

86. *Thought and Act in the Life of the Ideal Leadership as Conceived by Prince Shōtoku.*

By Masaharu ANESAKI, M.I.A.

(Comm. Oct. 12, 1942.)

In considering the life of the ideal leadership as conceived by Prince Shōtoku, we have pointed out as its basis the idea of 人法相即 "congruence between the person and truth"¹⁾. This amounts to realizing the basic unity of thought and act in the life of the ideal leader, Mahāsattva 大士, which is carried out in embracing the righteous law and enfolding others into its communion. The possibility of this "enfolding" 攝受 (*sangraha* or *pratigraha*) rests upon the ultimate continuity of existence and the metaphysical identity of the soul (心 *citta*) throughout all of its manifestations in individual life as well as cosmic. Almost axiomatic are the dicta like "nothing but the soul in the triple world" 三界唯一心, or "all are implied in the soul" 一心具足萬行, though the ways of interpretation and application vary according to the different schools of thought. Stated in a general way, this means that the Buddha-nature is inherent in every being and every one realizes the primordial entity, the Buddha-soul, as much as he embodies that nature in his life. The life in this direction means carrying out the continuity of being in actual work, in enfolding all fellow beings into the communion of truth through one's own spiritual enlightenment and sympathy in the deepest sense. This is the gist of *shōju-shōbō* 攝受正法 "enfolding" as enunciated in the Shōman-gyō, and the Prince's commentary remarks on this thesis cover the ground along the general trend of Buddhist thought as transmitted by his predecessors²⁾. But he frequently shows his critical attitude towards them and also more or less his originality, of which the subject of the present paper is one instance.

He follows the traditional distinction of the ten stages (十地 *daśa-bhūmi*) of the Bodhisattvaship and emphasizes the marked boundary between those above and below the eighth stage. But in one point his statements are distinctly his own, though never deviating from the main current of thought. The point can be summed up in one phrase, 一念備修萬行, which means: an adequate perfection of all acts in every movement of thought³⁾. Let us cite the chief passages.

1) Proc. 18, pp. 156-57.

2) See Proc. 18, p. 157. More about his predecessors and his relation with them will be noted later on.

3) Here the word "thought" is used in a very general sense, "for every form of consciousness indiscriminately," as William James says in his *Psychology* (1, p. 224). The word 念 stands for Sanskrit *smṛti*, which originally means memory but is used in a much wider sense, idea, thought, even intention. A synonym is 心 *citta* which etymologically means thinking but is used for mind and heart, "mind-stuff" or even soul. These two are often interchangeable and that is the case with the Prince's statements here; yet the distinction is that 心 *citta* conveys more metaphysical sense and 念 *smṛti* mainly its functioning, therefore "movement of thought" as rendered here.

八地以上，一念之中備修萬行之心，爲攝受。 (勝 15 b)

The soul of those above the eighth stage performs adequately all acts even in one movement of thought, this (working of the soul) is called "enfolding" 攝受..... Those below the seventh stage are incapable of doing this adequately enough, therefore not entitled to the enfolding (in the full sense).

七地以還亦修萬行，但一念之中不能齊，..... (勝 13 a)

Those below the seventh stage perform all acts, yet being unable to do it equally and comprehensively (齊修) in one movement of thought, they are not entitled to the enfolding.

This does, however, not mean that the boundary line is watertight; but all the stages are continuous, being united in one and the same aim of realizing the Buddha-nature.

七地以下，恒沙諸願，皆入八地以上一念願中。 (勝 16 a)

All the myriads of the vows taken by those below the seventh stage are implicitly present in the vow cherished in one thought of those above the eighth.

To the similar effect, the remark following the second passage cited above says that the desire 欲 or ideal aspiration for the perfect working of "enfolding" is allowed or allotted to those below the seventh. This is said in commenting upon the queen's vow not to forget nor neglect her vows taken for enfolding all beings into righteousness, and the queen herself is believed to be on the seventh stage. Thus the accomplishment of "all in one" is a privilege of the higher Bodhisattvas, but an aspiration and striving for it shall be universal to all genuine followers of Buddha, because the final goal of all consists in realizing the Buddha-soul, as stated above.

Now we can proceed to see what this "All in one" means and how the Prince conceives it. It is certainly a corollary to the fundamental conception of one and the same soul inherent in all beings, and all the predecessors of the Prince enunciate this idea with various emphasis. But the characteristic point is that he is more dynamic and concrete in his conception than his predecessors⁴⁾. He conceives a state of thought or consciousness wherein the intentions and objectives as well as the kinds and functionings of doings are vividly present, all directed towards the universal realization of the Buddha-soul. In other words, the Bodhisattva or Great Being⁵⁾ in this state is aware of the meanings, connections, efficiencies of all his doings in every movement of thought,— "All in one"—in the psychological sense as well as ethical and metaphysical. This is stated in another way:

4) Their conception amounts to the emphasis on "One and all," "*Hēn kai pan*" to take analogy from Greek thought, while the Prince's is "All in one," a subtle but important difference.

5) Chitsān, a commentator on the Shōman, of whom we shall see below, distinguishes between Bodhisattva and Mahāsattva, but the Prince never does this. Mahāsattva may be rendered "Super-man."

八地以上，入法流水，念々自知。

(勝 56 a)

Those above the eighth stage are aware of every movement of his thought, since he (or his life) has entered the stream⁶⁾ of law (or truth, *dharma-srotas*). Thus his person (his life) is regarded as spontaneous (無作 *akṛta*) and immeasurable (無量 *apramāṇa*).

These qualifications are supplemented in the following passage by boundless (無邊 *ananta*), unmade (無爲 *asamkṛta*), consummate (無餘 *niravaśeṣa*), the contrary of which marks the life of the ordinary mortal, — captivated, limited, sectional. This means:—The whole soul of the Great Being is so replete with his great purpose of enlightening self together with all beings, that every movement of his thought in living his life of spiritual leadership, in doing his work for spiritual perfection, is perpetually realizing the unity of existence, the presence of all other beings, and that all his work is dedicated to the final goal of the Buddhist perfection. This is the way of “enfolding” all, which is used as an equivalent of, or supplementary to, the Broad Communion (大乘 *Mahāyāna*) and the Training for Perfection (波羅蜜 *Pāramitā*). The passage cited above about the “desire” for “enfolding” says that *Mahāyāna* means “being essentially united with all streams” 冥合衆流, and that *Pāramitā* means “illuminating altogether in the realm beyond marks” 無相彼岸並照. In short, every thought suffused with the idea of all, every act fulfilling the perfection of all, this is the sense of “all in one.”

The “enfolding” in this sense does not exclude vices and illusions but enfolds in its arena the baleful existences as well as the blissful, the souls in the mire as well as in the light, because all are to be led finally up to the realization of the Buddha-nature. This idea also implies that one kind of work for perfection stands in perpetual and intrinsic concatenation with all other kinds for the same purpose. This is said in special reference to the six categories of *Pāramitā*, which are generosity, steadfastness, forbearance, effort, meditation and enlightenment. The point is to emphasize the mutual immanence of all these in each of them, and therefore the mutual enhancement and fulfilment of all through every one of them. The aim in this consideration is the promotion of virtues, but, psychologically speaking, the mutual immanence and promotion of the virtues are of the same stuff as in the mutual interactions between vices, as well as between virtues and vices. Moreover, an intent concentration on the virtues alone is not sufficient for the perfection; but the presence of vices, if directed properly, works to give an illumination on virtues, on their nature and power, and vice versa. Similarly, a mere shunning of vices is not the way of effectively overcoming them. Moreover, laying too much stress upon the contrast between vices and virtues cause rather entangling scrupulosity than open the way free for real promotion of virtues,—

6) This figure of the “stream” and the ideas expressed in that connection remind us strongly of William James’ chapter on the “Stream of Thought,” especially his remarks in pp. 233, 242, 282, 284, though different in intention. The antithesis to the “stream” is given by the Prince as 分別 discrimination (*vikalpa*).

therefore the emphasis upon spontaneity (*akṛta*) as cited above⁷⁾. Thus the Yuima-gyō makes observation on the mutual reactions between the three "poisons"⁸⁾ and the six pāramitās, on which the Prince gives comments and concludes:—

雖現三毒六弊，而不乖三善六度。 (下本 49)

He (great being) manifests the three poisons and the six vices (in his life) and yet never departs (in reality) from the three good and the six Pāramitās.

To this is added a remark:

善由惡起，無善自生，是故塵勞猶爲佛種，何唯於善。 (同 50)

Virtue is aroused through vice; there is no virtue which grows by itself; therefore even the "dirt-troubles" (塵勞 vices, depravities) furnish seeds to Buddhahood, which are not due to virtues alone.

Herein is involved the fundamental question in Buddhism as to the relation between human nature and Buddhahood, but the point at issue here is the emphasis on the correlation between vices and virtues, which makes up one aspect of the Prince's idea of "all in one." This correlation is formulated in the Shōman-gyō in one sentence: 無量煩惱藏所纏如來藏 — The Tathāgata-store is involved in the store of innumerable depravities. Its meaning is illustrated in the Yuima and the Shōman in a figurative statement, that the lotus flower, symbolic of purity, does not grow on high plateau but only in mire and pool, or similarly any seed does not grow in the air but in the soil. Whatever the metaphysical background of this idea may be, the intention of the figure is evidently to say that the Buddha-nature works not to the exclusion of the vicious nature but even in and through the latter. In other words the vicious natures of man, of brutes, of devils, are inherent in the Buddha-nature. These vicious ones are vices when they act apart from the Buddha-nature, just as men are ordinary men because they do not realize the fundamental, all-comprehending Buddha-nature. All inferior natures can be purified and transformed when they are induced to the realization of the intrinsic tie, when they are illuminated by the all-pervading light of the Buddha-soul. Apart from the difficulties involved in this conception, the perennial problem of Buddhism, the position of the Prince's idea of "all in one" can be seen in this light to amount to realizing of the fundamental oneness of all qualities and existences. The characteristic point in him is the dynamic trend of his conception of the world, of life in general, of moral and religious training. This is certainly an outcome of his personal experience of life, both spiritual and practical, not a result of mere speculation or theorizing.

7) This is illustrated, in the Yuima-gyō, by the illustration of meditation, wherein the wilfull effort to keep off agitation works to perturb tranquility. The case is the same in the attempts artificially made to shun insomnia.

8) Or "roots of evil" *akuśala-mūla*, which are greed (*rāga*), fury (*doṣha*) and stupidity (*moha*). These are again analyzed as the five hindrances (障), six dirt (垢), seven fetters (縛), and so forth.

Seen in this way, the Prince's idea under discussion shows us an unmistakable affinity with the Tientai doctrine of 互具 "mutual immanence,"⁹⁾ which played a great part in the Japanese Buddhist thought of the following centuries. Chi-i (智顗 538-597) of Mount Tientai was an elder contemporary of the Prince, but since his writings, in fact utterances, were formulated by his disciples in the last years of his life or after his death, it is very improbable that his ideas were known to the Prince. The geographical situation is also to be taken into account, for Chi-i's abode and influence were first limited to south China, while Japan's contact with China was chiefly in the north¹⁰⁾. Another master to be considered was Huiszu (慧思 514-577), the master of Chi-i, the latter of whom formulated his doctrine much on the basis of his master through his personal contact, mostly in the south, in the South Peak, 衡山 Henshang in Hunan, during the last ten years of the master's life. Though Huiszu's ideas on this point are hardly explicitly stated in his writings, he became known in Japan, chiefly since the middle of the eighth century, as the propounder or forerunner of the Tientai school. Thus, it may not be a mere chance that the Prince was regarded as a rebirth of the master of the South Peak. Though perhaps the legend was not based on a careful examination of the two, their spiritual affinity may have somewhat been felt by pious Buddhists. Another question is whether the Prince knew anything about Huiszu. This is not impossible because the latter was dead about thirty years before the Prince wrote the commentary on the Shōman-gyō; yet it is hardly possible that the acquaintance went so deep that the subtle and profound idea of "all in one" was transmitted through writings from the Chinese master. Moreover, Huiszu is never, in his writings, so explicit in the idea of "all in one" as his disciple Chi-i.

This point brings us to the Prince's indebtedness to his Chinese predecessors. The Prince clearly mentions his indebtedness to Fayūn (法雲 467-529) in the Lotus, and to Sen-Shao (僧肇 384-414) in the Yuima; yet he is never mere followers but shows his originality in several points. Somewhat different is the case in the Shōman-gyō. About a dozen of its commentary are mentioned in the ancient catalogues but none of them prior to the Prince is extant. He cites in his commentary various opinions from his predecessors but mentions them not by the names. On the other hand there is one compiled by a senior contemporary of the Prince, Chitsan (吉藏 549-623), which bears the title 寶窟 "Store of Treasures." This is a collection of commentaries citing a number of the authors, and some of them can be identified with the opinions cited by the Prince. All this shows how he owes to his predecessors, but the important point here is that none of his predecessors, including Chitsan himself, is so definite in the conception of "all in one" as the Prince. They express similar ideas but their statements are general and abstract, and even in commenting on the same pas-

9) Comp. Anesaki, *Nichiren, the Buddhist Prophet*, pp. 153-56. There the term 互具 has been rendered "mutual participation" which is here replaced by "immanence."

10) In fact, Kanjin or Chienchen 鑑真 (754-763 in Japan), who brought Chi-i's writing over to Japan for the first time, came from the south.

sages they never use the phrases like 備修 "accomplishing adequately" or 法流水 "the stream of law." Thus we can safely say that these dynamic ideas are original to the Prince, most probably being an outcome of his personal experience in his spiritual training as well as in his life of a statesman, indeed a philosopher ruler. This last point brings us back to the relation between the *gon* application and the *jitsu* foundation¹¹⁾ in the life and activities of the ideal leader. More about this thesis, with emphasis on the idea of the establishment of the Buddha-realm or Land of Purity, will be treated another time.

11) See Proc. **18**, pp. 155-162.