

Sake and Tea: A Translation of the *Shucharon*¹

Takuya Hino

Abstract

In this article, I will examine Mahayana Buddhist teachings based on the “one mind in two aspects,” focusing on a sixteenth-century Japanese Buddhist writing entitled *Shucharon* 酒茶論 (“*A Debate on Sake and Tea*”). The *Shucharon* contains over two thousand words in Classical Chinese prose. This text illustrates the author Ranshuku 蘭叔 (fl. 16th century) both as a reclusive monk (Kanjin 閑人) and as a bodhisattva (Bosatsu 菩薩). The aim of the text is to ask a question of whether a bodhisattva possesses afflictions (Skt. *kleshas*). The work highlights the idea of exchanging questions and answers (*mondo* 問答). This idea can be part of a practice leading to the awakening of Buddhahood by fully discussing every possible means. In the text, *sake*, as *amṛta* (good medicine), has cause for thirty-six mistakes. Tea, as *tathatā* (suchness) has cause for awakening. Accordingly, *sake* and tea both imply two opposite Buddhist notions. One is regarded as buddha-nature (Skt. *buddha-dhātu*) or suchness (Skt. *tathatā*): the other is regarded as ignorance (Skt. *avidyā*) or afflictions (Skt. *kleshas*). While *sake* and tea can be described as something completely different, these drinks must be interpreted as no separation in the framework of Buddhist notions. The awareness stimulates the virtue of being released from habitual tendencies or dispositions (Skt. *vāsanā*). Being conscious about the duality in non- duality leads to the cognitive principle that one can have the potential to attain the realization of

1 This article is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Laurence D. Huestis.

nothingness (or emptiness). It is in this context that this notion often comes to be debated within the larger framework of “Zen Buddhism.” It is most likely that the text can be best described neither as a pan-East Asian “playful writing” nor as a “vernacular playful writing.” This article includes the first English translation of the *Shucharon* in the appendix. I hope to further explore a new field of research in medieval Japanese literary studies by being approached from the perspective of Japanese Buddhism.

Introduction

The *Shucharon* is a late medieval Japanese Buddhist writing that gives a summary of the early Chinese references about *sake* and tea. Written by Ranshuku Genshū 蘭叔玄秀 at Osshinji 乙津寺 in late spring of the fourth year of Tenshō 天正 (1576), the *Shucharon* is intended to be read by the early modern Japanese Buddhist monks and *samurai* warriors, particularly for the purpose of obtaining religious benefits. The text begins with two old men competing against each other in arguing for relative merits and demerits between *sake* and tea. On the one hand, Bōyūkun 忘憂君 praises the merit of *sake*. On the other hand, Jōhanshi 滌煩子 (alternately, Dekihanshi) talks about the merit of tea. The story continues with the aim of clarifying the Buddhist notion of merit (Skt. *punya*). The two old men refuse to yield to each other. After continuous discussions and exchange of information, Kanjin (author) appears next to the two old men and shows that the debate on the matter does not come to an end. Written in four lines with seven Chinese characters in each line, he explains that there is no superior-inferior relationship. Through his narrative story, he provides guidance for the realization of nothingness (or emptiness). The conversation with the three men, looking back the origin of Japanese *sake* and tea in China, includes the Buddhist notion of the lineage transmission, particularly between China and Japan. The work must be understood in the light of the author’s desire to create an essential link between Japan and the continent, while encroaching on European influence in East Asia. Rather

than defining the text as a “playful writing (*gisho* 戯書)” in late medieval Japan, the *Shucharon* must be described as having a Zen (Chan) Buddhist flavor and implications for dialogic arguments in a manner that is easily accepted by a large audience.

The story of the *Shucharon* strongly exhibits the tracing of lineage to Chinese Chan Buddhism and highlights the following three points: (1) Ranshuku’s extensive knowledge and reading in Chinese old sayings and paradigmatic cases can be seen everywhere in the text, (2) by being spoken through the “anthropomorphized” characters in the text, the author represents Chinese Buddhist proverbs related to customs of drinking *sake* and tea in China, and (3) Ranshuku appears both as Kanjin and as Bosatsu in the end of the text and suggests two explanations. Firstly, he manifests himself as Kanjin and emphasizes the wide spread of (drinking) tea culture in medieval Japan. One, drinking tea, realizes the attainment of Buddhahood. Perhaps even because the *Shucharon* illustrates tea both as *tathātā* (suchness) tea and as Mrgadava tea, the merit of tea is not mentioned in Buddhist scriptures. While the text focuses solely on Chinese old sayings about *sake* and tea, the work draws attention particularly to the fact that Japanese tea is not far behind from Chinese tea. Secondly, Ranshuku manifests himself as Bosatsu and metaphorically portrays both Bōyūkun and Jōhanshi as ignorance (Skt. *avidyā*). He guides them to the accepting of Mahayana Buddhist teachings based on “one mind in two aspects.” He suggests that the best part of Mahayana Buddhism is bodhisattva practice (Skt. *bodhisattva-carya*). He addresses cognitive awareness of duality in non-duality and the path of bodhisattva to attain the realization of nothingness (or emptiness).

The study of the *Shucharon* has been carried out in a same manner, considering that the writing style of the text becomes obvious and typical. One reason for this has been that previous studies began with the confines of Japanese literature. These Japanese literary studies have been previously examined for their literary value and expression of Chinese culture norms and focused mainly on the tracing of the origin of the text. Therefore, few Buddhist doctrinal studies may have been conducted on this study.

The earliest scholarship on the *Shucharon* is conducted mainly by five scholars of Chinese and Japanese studies. Naba Toshisada 那波利貞 introduces the *Shucharon* as a literary work that does not come close to a tenth-century Chinese literary writing *Chajiulun* 茶酒論.² He delivers negative assessment on the *Shucharon* as a literary work. In a similar vein, Fukushima Shunnō 福島俊翁 suggests that, although it is not certain whether or not the *Shucharon* is considered to have been handed down directly from the *Chajiulun*, the *Shucharon* has something in common with the *Chajiulun*.³ In addition, Aoki Masaru 青木正児 asserts that the *Chajiulun* can be described as something like “literary work of playful nature (*gesaku* 戯作).”⁴ He suggests that the *Shucharon* is written with some hints from the *Chajiulun*.

Moreover, Kawaguchi Hisao 川口久雄 illustrates that the contents of the *Shucharon* look very similar to the *Chajiulun*. He asserts that the *Shucharon* must be appeared as “inhuman-battle tales (*iruikassen mono* 異類合戦物)” that creates a new literary genre of “playful writing,” including the *Shuhanron* 酒飯論 (“*A Debate on Sake and Rice*”) and the *Shuheiron* 酒餅論 (“*A Debate on Sake and Rice sakes*”).⁵ Similarly, Furukawa Mizumasa 古川瑞昌 points out that the *Shucharon* has some historical and literary relevance to the *Chajiulun*. He suggests that the *Shucharon* must be classified as “battle tales (*kassen mono* 合戦物)” and comes to affect greatly on later Japanese literary works.⁶ Seen in this light, the earliest modern studies of the *Shucharon* tend to focus primarily on the trace of a literary transmission. They conclude that the *Shucharon* is best described both as a book of tea and as a pan-East Asian “playful writing.” These three scholar’s studies seek to investigate the *Shucharon* through the lens of pan-East

2 The *Chajiulun*, found in the cave temples of Dunhuang, is said to have been written in or around tenth century. Naba Toshisada, *Sadōkotenzenshū dai ni kan* (Kyoto: Tankōshinsha, 1958), 272.

3 Fukushima Shunnō, *Sadōkotenzenshū dai ni kan* (Kyoto: Tankōshinsha, 1958), 270.

4 Aoki Masaru, *Sake no sakana • hōsonshuwa* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989), 129-145.

5 Kawaguchi Hisao, “Wagakuni no ‘Shucharon’ to tonkō shutsudo no ‘Chashuron zoku’” *Kanazawa bunko kenkyū* 14 (3) (1968), 14-17.

6 Furukawa Mizumasa, “Shucharon no keifu” *Fūzoku* 12 (3) (1974), 26-43.

Asian studies.

The focus of the scholar's attention shifting from pan-East Asian to vernacular literary studies develops a different academic theory to explain the *Shucharon* as a Japanese literary genre. The work of Watanabe Morikuni 渡辺守邦 is regarded as the best representative of pioneering research on the study of the *Shucharon*. He systematically categorizes the *Shucharon* as a “vernacular playful writing” and suggests the following three points: (1) the *Shucharon* should be regarded neither as “non-human tales (*iruimono* 異類物)” nor as “debate literature (*ronsōmono* 論争物)” but rather as a different type of literary genre that can be described as “elegant aestheticism and writing poems (*fūryūinji* 風流韻事),” (2) the story of the *Shucharon* has a light rhythm to create associations and activities, and (3) the *Shucharon* is written based on the literary style of the *Baishōron* 梅松論 (“*An argument about Japanese plum and pine*”), composed by Rinzai Zen monk Jinshūsōju 仁岫宗寿 (fl. 16th century) in mid-spring (second month of the lunar calendar) of the fifth year of Daiei 大永 (1525).⁷ Moreover, he asserts that the contents of the *Shucharon* should be considered not to have directly affected on the *Chajiulun* written in the tenth century because no record exists as to the time of introducing the *Chajiulun* to Japan.⁸ Less attention has been paid to the continuity of multi-continental and intercontinental literature. Instead, the tendency provides an opportunity to establish an anthology of Japanese Classic Literature. The later literary sources follow the same conceptual pattern.⁹ More recent scholarship emphasizes hitherto paths for the *Shucharon*. Sanpei Harumi 三瓶はるみ asserts that the *Shucharon* is more relatively

7 Watanabe Morikuni, “Shucharon to sono shūhen” *Ōtsuna joshidaigaku bungakubukiyō* 8 (1976), 53-72.

8 Watanabe, “Shucharon to sono shūhen,” 53-72.

9 *Shinchō kōki kanshu. Shiseki shūran* 19, 44. One story in a seventeenth century chronical record entitled “*Shinchō kōki* 信長公記 (“*Chronicle of Oda Nobunaga*”)” sketches a scene in which Hayashi Yoshichirō 林弥七郎, skillful archer, fought with Hashimoto Ippa 橋本一巴, gunslinger, in the battle of Ukino 浮野. They killed each other. The battle ended in a draw.

tolerant of drinking *sake* than the *Chajiulun*.¹⁰ She concludes that the *Shucharon* does not include the then social and ideological background but is written only for “elegant aestheticism and writing poems.” Hagiwara Sonoko 萩原園子 designates that Kanjin is said to have been seen both as Ranshuku and as referee.¹¹ She asserts that the *Shucharon* combines two literary genres, “playful writing” and “elegant aestheticism and writing poems.”

Considering from the historical point of view, the *Shucharon* was written during the time of turbulence, when Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1543-1582) attempted to exert his authority over political and religious activities. Nobunaga burned down main buildings in the temple compound of Enryakuji 延暦寺. Nobunaga was engaged on ten years of battle with the Honganji 本願寺 adherents. According to the history of Myōshinji 妙心寺, Ranshuku, the fifty-third head monk of Myōshinji, established monastic codes in the seventh month of the sixth year of Tenshō 天正 (1578). The monastic codes were proclaimed throughout head and local temples of Myōshinji, with the official approval of Oba Nobunaga.¹² Ranshuku was allowed to wear a purple Buddhist robe and posthumously given the distinguished Buddhist title of the Zen Master, Shōjōhonnen Zenshi 清浄本然禪師.¹³ It might be considered to have been granted to his great contributions for an intermediary between Kennyo 顯如 (1543-1592) and Nobunaga. The *Shucharon* possibly showed a trilateral relationship among Ranshuku, Kennyo, and Nobunaga. Each person had different causes and conditions.

10 Sanpei Harumi, “Nicchū no sake ni matsuwaru ronsō nit suite” *Daigakuin kyōiku kaikaku shien program ‘Nihon bunka kenkyū no kokusaiteki jōhōdentatsu skill no ikusei’ katsudō hōkokusho (Heisei jūku nendo kaigai kenshū jugyōhen)* (2008), 372-376.

11 Hagiwara Sonoko, “‘Shucharon’ kō: ‘Hazama no bungaku’ to shitenō ‘Shucharon’” *Seisen gobun* 4 (2014): 2-15.

12 Kawakami Kozan, *Myōshinjiishi jōkan* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku shuppan, 1984), 263.

13 Fukushima, *Sadōkotenzenshū dai ni kan*, 261.

A Debate on Sake and Tea

Over many years, Buddhist scriptures and commentaries have extended scholarly arguments about *sake* itself, not the act of drinking *sake*. According to these textual sources, the word “*sake*” roughly includes two meanings: (1) *amrta* (heavenly *sake*)¹⁴ and (2) moderate (worldly) *sake*.¹⁵ The portrayals in Buddhist texts can be classified as: (1) good “*sake*”¹⁶ and (2) bad “*sake*.”¹⁷ It can be said that Buddhist canons provide the dualistic (or non-dualistic) notion of Buddhist knowledge, which includes joy (Skt. *sukha*) and suffering (Skt. *dukkha*). Buddhist knowledge causes defilement. *Sake*, which can cause both joy and suffering, induces afflictions (Skt. *kleshas*). Therefore, *the Sutra on the utterances of the Buddha* (Skt. *Udānavarge*) explains that *sake* has cause for thirty-six mistakes.¹⁸ In Buddhist tradition, the notion of *sake*, if anything, occupies negative perspectives. The descriptions of *sake* appearing in the *Shucharon* can be at least classified as: (1) *amrta* (heavenly rice water) and (2) *kumis*. Afflictions bring into existence because of the distinction of ignorance. The infinity of ignorance creates afflictions.¹⁹ Ranshuku follows the suggestions of previous work and concludes that, whether it is good or bad, *sake* (ignorance) induces afflictions. While the merit of tea has no reference to Buddhist scriptures, the *Shucharon* is describe not as a book of tea but rather as a book of *sake*.

Takashina Rōsen 高階瓏仙 argues for the significance of the “Prophecy of Enlightenment for Five Hundred Disciples” in the *Lotus Sutra* and argues that *sake* is compared to ignorance (Skt. *avidyā*). He claims that, even if one gets drunk due to his/her ignorance and falls on hard times, he/she will not lose a jewel of Buddha-

14 T2122_53.0307c18.

15 T0721_17.0043a23- T0721_17.0043a24.

16 T0374_12.0393a04- T0374_12.0393a05.

17 T0721_17.0043a20- T0721_17.0043a21.

18 T0212_04.0675b08.

19 T1666_32.0578c01- T1666_32.0578c02.

nature.²⁰ That is, he highlights metaphorical expressions or skillful means (Skt. *upāya*) of absolute truth and reveals the teaching of the *Lotus Sutra* that expands the “one vehicle (Skt. *ekayāna*)” Mahayana Buddhism. More concretely, all sentient beings have the potential to absolutely realize the attainment of Buddhahood. As is the case in drinking matters of the text, whether Buddhism treats of drinking *sake* obviously becomes the main focus of the early modern Japanese Buddhist monks. According to the pursuit of bodhisattva practices, the act of drinking *sake* must be strictly prohibited. If one drinks *sake*, he/she must give up on pursuing the bodhisattva path. In medieval Japanese Buddhism, monastic rules and procedures (Skt. *vinaya*) can be said to have been neglected. This can be rather a matter of his/her precepts (Skt. *śīla*), whether he/she maintains the “self-discipline” of monastic life. The matter explicitly has a great effect on the interpretation of afflictions (Skt. *kleshas*). The scholarly polemics are often mentioned in Buddhist texts. The motif can be applied to an interpretation of the *Shucharon*. The ignorance (Skt. *avidyā*) and afflictions (Skt. *kleshas*), both of which are conditionally caused by drinking *sake*, shed light on the realization of Buddha-nature. In other words, “voice-hearers” (Skt. *śrāvakayāna*) and “cause-awakened ones” (Skt. *pratyekayāna*), both of which can be referred to as “two vehicles” in Japanese Mahayana Buddhism, lead to the initial stage of enlightenment that all sentient beings initiate to realize the attainment of Buddhahood. Subsequently, “two vehicles” imply “one vehicle” in the concept of Japanese Mahayana Buddhism, especially the *Lotus Sutra* teachings.

Again, the important question arises as to whether the bodhisattva can reach Buddhahood before entering Nirvana (Skt. *bodhisattvayāna*). This inquiry develops a fundamental doctrine that establishes the framework for Japanese Mahayana Buddhism. A bodhisattva will attain Buddhahood and lead all sentient beings to attain Buddhahood. It is in this context that the bodhisattva, seeking the path of

20 Takashina Rōsen, “Busshin no jikaku” in *Kōza zen dai san kan zen no rekishi chūgoku* eds by Nishitani Keiji (Chikima shobō: Tokyo, 1963), 308.

enlightenment, has the vow to attain wisdom and compassion for the sake of saving all sentient beings. This is the bodhisattva practice (Skt. *bodhisattva-carya*) that expounds a medieval Buddhist notion capable of amalgamating two vows, “exerting oneself to attain enlightenment” and “bringing benefits to others.” While “self-advancement” focuses solely on gaining religious benefits for oneself, “others’ salvation” relates to the act of benefiting others.²¹ This idea allows to ask further question of whether the bodhisattva’s vow will be obstructive to the pursuit of attaining Buddhahood. To put it simply, it is a question of whether a Bodhisattva possesses afflictions (Skt. *kleshas*). It can be considered that a bodhisattva possesses afflictions. Because the original vow of Mahayana Buddhism is the path of bodhisattva, Mahayana Buddhist practitioners must be mainly centered upon whether they can extinguish afflictions and attain Buddhahood. This idea is, however, thought of as the cause of suffering (Skt. *dukkha*). Having a religious vow centered on oneself brings a result to cling to or hold onto something with solid determination. As long as there is suffering, afflictions (Skt. *kleshas*) are not something that can be extinct. Seeking enlightenment for oneself and delivering benefits to others, both of which can be caused by afflictions, induce aspiration for enlightenment.

Although Ranshuku drinks *sake* and tea, he neither choose *sake* nor tea. While he does not make an either-or choice between two things, he does choose both things. That is, it can be described that a is a and b is b. They are incompatible terms.²² He chooses the middle path because all things are nothingness (or emptiness). He dare to choose afflictions that can cause suffering because teachings are nothingness (or emptiness). He seeks enlightenment for oneself because he brings benefits for others. He expounds

21 Takuya Hino, “Ocean of Suffering, Boat of Compassion: A Study of the Fudaraku Tokai and Urashima in Anecdotal (*Setsuwa*) Literature, *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80 (4) 2012, 1071.

22 D.T. Suzuki, *Zen and Japanese culture* (Princeton: Princeton/Bollingen paperbacks, 1973), 285. In case of the notion of *wabi* and *sabi*, D.T. Suzuki asserts that in some ways, *wabi* is *sabi* and *sabi* is *wabi*: they are interchangeable terms.

the realization of nothingness (or emptiness), along with separate explanations for both merit of *sake* and tea, because his afflictions cause aspiration for enlightenment. Because the author Ranshuku is a bodhisattva, he appears as a reclusive monk. He composes the *gāthā* and attains nothingness. As it is called, being a buddha is to reach the state of nothingness.

Conclusion

I hope to have examined a new understanding of the *Shucharon* and the “one vehicle teachings” of the *Lotus Sutra*. The *Shucharon* can be best described as a medieval Japanese Buddhist writing that contains various Buddhist teachings, including dialogic argument, skillful means, “three vehicle teachings,” bodhisattva practice, duality in non-duality, and nothingness (or emptiness). I also focus exclusively on whether humans have the potential to be a bodhisattva. This puzzling question further develops a new perspective of the *Shucharon* and offers a critical analysis of whether a bodhisattva possesses afflictions. In the *Shucharon*, Ranshuku expresses his ignorance and afflictions through metaphorical expressions or skillful means. By having an exhaustive discussion of every possible means, he can realize the awakening of Buddhahood. That is, Kanjin is Bosatsu.

Appendix

*Shucharon*²³ 酒茶論

(*A Debate on Sake and Tea*)

Written by Ranshuku 蘭叔, a Buddhist disciple of Osshinji 乙津寺 of Ichijōgiyō 一條岐陽

The daytime of spring is silent. There is no human voice in four cardinal directions. [My] eyes are filled only with blooming petals. [My ears] are just trained to catch the sounds of birds singing. Then, there is a voice in a lonely valley that nobody visits. Two visitors come to be appeared with footsteps. One man spreads a straw mat in blooming flowers and drinks *sake*. [However,] he does not drink tea. The other spreads a rush mat at the foot of pine tree and drinks tea. [However,] he does not drink *sake*. The two men facing each other create time for spring play. [When someone] asks their names, one spreads a straw mat in blooming flowers and says, “I don’t have my name but call myself Bōyūkun 忘憂君 (the person who forgets trouble and goes in for *sake*).” One spreads a rush mat at the foot of pine tree and says, “I call myself Jōhanshi 滌煩子 (the person who completely washes away troublesome of the world and goes in for tea).” Hence, Bōyūkun speaks to Jōhanshi and says, “The recent common talk is unacceptable. Correspondingly, you talk about the merit of tea. That is, I talk about the merit of *sake*.” Jōhanshi says, “Let us not [talk about that]. Let us not [talk about that]. There can be no need to talk [about that]! Is your *sake* equal to my tea? [It was due to] your *sake* that, while Shakyamuni resided [in this world], Sāgata drank and vomited

23 The *Shucharon* (*A Debate on Sake and Tea*) is revised and annotated in two works: Sōshitsu, eds., *Sadō koten zenshū dai ni kan*, 218-224 and Hanawa Hokiichi, eds., *Gunshoruiju* 19 (Tokyo: Zokugunshoruiju kanseikai, 1960), 864-867. I have also consulted the contemporary Japanese translation by Sōshitsu, eds., *Sadō koten zenshū dai ni kan*, 226-260.

filth. [Sāgata] had no manners to wear a Buddhist robe and practice giving of alms (Skt. *dāna*). [It was due to] causes and conditions that [Sāgata] was given [to abstain from] drinking. In addition, one ogre asked Maudgalyāyana and said, ‘I am inflexible and ignorant (Skt. *avidya*). What sin did I commit to deserve this treatment? [Maudgalyāyana] answered, ‘When you were human, you encouragingly offered alcohol to someone. He was overturned.’ In addition, [Maudgalyāyana] said, ‘*Sake* has [cause for] thirty-six mistakes. [If] one drinks *sake*, he/she will commit all thirty-six mistakes. Accordingly, Shakyamuni profoundly admonished [one not to do] this. Thus, losing [control of] the whole country and ruining oneself were ascribed to *sake*.’ Bōyūkun gets angry and says, “You are a talkative one. It seems like a [talking] parrot cries out green tea and does not fear human beings. [Although] you know a few trivial things, you do not know what is important. Shakyamuni said, ‘*Sake* is nectar (Skt. *amrita*) and good medicine.’ In addition, Vāsavakhattiyā of Pasenadi broke the precepts of not drinking. [Then,] Shakyamuni said, ‘In this way, she broke the precepts and attained very great merit.’ Moreover, [Shakyamuni] said, ‘A bodhisattva gives *sake* to people. According to Buddhist [teachings], there is no mistake. Further, four [great] heavenly kings²⁴ have heavenly rice water (nectar) and name it the flower-*sake*.’ Furthermore, [even when] Asura [regards] the water in the four great oceans as *sake* and drinks this [water], he is not satisfied [with the amount of *sake*]. Conversely, Asura says that it is not *sake*. From four [great] heavenly kings to the world of Asura, all need *sake*. Although innumerable [commentaries] about the merit of *sake* can be often found in the *Tathāgatagarbha Sūtra*, the merit of tea is not still heard. Additionally, six classics [of Confucian tradition] don’t mention tea.” Jōhanshi says, “Manjushri Bodhisattva, [who is said to be] a teacher of the seven Buddhas [of the past],²⁵ drank tea with Wuzhe 無着 (Wuzhe Wenxi 無著文喜: 820-899) in Wutaishan 五臺山.

24 The four great heavenly kings are Vaiśravaṇa, Virūdhaka, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, and Virūpākṣa.

25 The seven Buddhas of the past are Shakyamuni, Vipashyin, Shikhin, Vishvabhū, Krakucchanda, Kanakamuni, and Kāshyapa.

[Then,] Manjushri [Bodhisattva] held a crystal bowl up and said, ‘This [tea] is to the south.’ In other words, the Manjushri [Bodhisattva] was not [the one and only] Manjushri [Bodhisattva]. Hundred and thousand Manjushri [Bodhisattvas] all had to drink tea. In addition to this, there were Tathātā (suchness) tea and Mrgadava tea. Moreover, wooden labels for herbs said, ‘Many Buddhist monks of Avatamsaka are awakened.’ Although tea has been offered to Buddha from ancient times, *sake* has not been offered. Why [can you say that] Buddhist teachings do not [mention] the merit of tea? As you say, six classics [of Confucian tradition] do not mention tea. It is like the *Li Sao*²⁶ 離騷 (“Encountering Sorrow”) doesn’t mention plum. It cannot be that there are other pure things exceeding tea in the world. If this was discussed with Zen masters, Zhaoshi 趙師 (Jūshin Chanshi 從諗禪師: 778-897) has drunk tea and maintained the year of wood-rat 甲子 for seven hundred years. Fengxue 風穴 (Yazho Chanshi 延沼禪師: 896-973) tasted and praised tea and rectified three rounds of the courtesy. Guishan 滄山 (Guishan Lingyou 滄山靈祐: 771-853) picked tea and knew the function of any body. Xiangyan 香巖 (Zhixian Chanshi 智閑禪師: ?-898) made tea and had the origin of good dreams. Nanquan 南泉 (Puyuan Chashi 普願禪師: 748-835) as well as Luzu 魯祖 (Baoyun Chanshi 寶雲禪師: fl. 8th century), Quzong 歸宗 (Zhichang Chanshi 智常禪師: fl. 8th century), and Shashan 杉山 (Zhijian Chanshi 智堅禪師: fl. 8th century) drank tea. Dongshan 洞山 (Liangjie Chanshi 良价禪師: 807-869) performed the tea [ceremony] for Xuefeng 雪峰 (Yicun Chanshi 義存禪師: 822- 908), Yantou 巖頭 (Quanhou Chanshi 全豁禪師: 828-887), and Qinshan 欽山 (Wensui Chanshi 文邃禪師: fl. 9th century). [It was just like] Jiashan 夾山 (Shanhui Chanshi 善会禪師: 804-881) [said] one small bowl in a bamboo basket. Touzi 投子 (Datong Chanshi 大同禪師: 819-914) [said] three tea bowls after meals. These were all the flourishing ceremonies of the bamboo woods (Zen Buddhist temples). Bōyūkun says, “[As for] my *sake*, the seventh founder Vasumitra took a bowl for *sake* in his own hand and gave it

26 The *Li Sao*, written by Qu Yuan (340-278 BCE) in the 3rd century, is a poem from the book of Chinese poetry, *Chu ci* 楚辭 (“Verses of Chu”).

to the sixth founder Mikkaka. [Then, Vasumitra continued] questions and answers [with Mikkaka]. By following this, Vasumitra had great potential to receive Dharma teachings. [This has been] continuously inherited until today. In addition, Tan Juzhou 曇橘洲 was an outstanding man from Shu [district], who naturally loved drinking *sake*. [People from] all directions called him Jiutan 酒曇. Otherwise, Bajiao quan Chanshi 芭蕉泉禪師 (Dadaoguquan Chanshi 大道谷泉禪師: fl. 8th century), who put a big gourd for *sake* on his cane and carried [it on his shoulder], came and went among the mountains. Mazu 馬祖 (Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一: 709-788) had [a disciple called] a high-ranking Buddhist monk Fubei 浮盃和尚 (fl. 9th century). Huangbo 黃檗 (Huangbo Xiyun Chanshi 黃檗希運禪師: ?-850) is [said to have been called] a heavy drinker. Otherwise, Caoshan 曹山 (Caoshan Benji Chanshi 曹山本寂禪師: 840-901) also [had an episode that he was a man] pretending not to know in spite of drinking heartily of Bai family's good *sake*. Qingfeng 青峰 (Qingmian Chanshi 清免禪師: fl. 9th century) [had an episode that] *sake* [only] knows a man who drinks. Furthermore, a drunk man of the Jin [dynasty] always loved *sake* and was clearly above the world. Therefore, [he was commonly] called the first Bodhidharma. Originally, Buddhist temples also called [*sake*] wisdom's *sake* and solely used this [*sake*]. Previously, you mentioned losing [control of] the whole country and ruining oneself were ascribed to *sake*. I was wondering [if you could say something on] this matter." Jōhanshi says, "Both King Jie 桀 [of Xia 夏] (1728-1675 BCE) and King Zhou 紂 [of Shang 殷] (1105-1046 BCE) abandoned themselves to *sake* and women and lost [control of] the whole country. Two [officials] Xi 羲 and He 和 gave themselves over to drink *sake* and led them to ruin. There was no way this story could be a lie." Bōyūkun says, "That is not true. In the past, [when the legendary] Emperor Yao 堯帝 drank up to one thousand cups of *sake*, the quality of being kind and helpful for others was, that is, transmitted everlastingly. [When] Confucius (Kong Qiu 孔子: 551-479 BCE) drained one hundred cups, the virtue was, that is, full to the four seas. [When] Yi Di 儀狄 made *sake*, King Yu 禹王 [of the Xia dynasty (2070-1600 BCE)] drank this [*sake*]. [When] Du Kang

杜康 brewed *sake*, Emperor Wu 武 of Wei 魏 (Cao Cao 曹操: 155-220) composed poems [of thirty-one syllables] and said ‘For what reason [do you] understand my concerns? There is the only *sake* of Du Kang.’ Gaozong 高宗 (Wu Ding 武丁: 1250-1192 BCE) rejuvenated the Yin dynasty and obtained malted rice in dream. In addition, pure *sake* was the sacred. Cloudy *sake* was the wisdom. In other words, the way of the sacred and the wisdom was derived from *sake*. Moreover, drinking *sake* after meals is said to have been a moderate *sake*. The commentaries of the ancients said, ‘[Drinking *sake*] without getting drunk and becoming sober are said to have been a moderate *sake*. Accordingly, the way of the middle was also derived from *sake*. Furthermore, the records of the grand historian said, ‘*Sake* was the best of [all] hundred medicines.’ [We could not think] *sake* was not enough.” Jōhanshi says, “Drinking tea began with the Emperor of the Five Grains (*shennong* 神農) and was transmitted to Zhou Gong [Dan] 周公旦 (Dan, Duke of Zhou: fl. 11th century BC) of Lu 魯. There was Yan Ying 晏嬰 (578-500 BCE) of [the state of] Qi 齊. There were Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53-18 BCE) and Sima Xiangru 司馬相如 (179-117 BCE) in the [former] Han [dynasty]. There was Wei Yao 韋曜 (204-273) of the Wu 吳 [dynasty]. There were Liu Kun 劉琨 (271-318) and Zhang Zai 張載 (fl. third century) in the [Western] Jin 晉 [dynasty]. As distant ancestors, there were friends, such as [Lu] Na 陸納 (?-395), Xie An 謝安 (320-385), and Zuo Si 左思 (250-305). They all drank tea. All [the creatures] that came into existence in the world [consisted of] human beings, birds and animals, mountains and rivers, and plants. Among these beings, human beings were the most precious [thing]. [By] investigating [the composition of] one [Chinese] character ‘tea,’ [the character consisted of three different meaning letters combined into one Chinese character]: that is, human beings were between grass and trees. Do you [think that, although] *sake* phrases waterside birds, birds and animals can be equal to human beings?” Bōyūkun says, “Human beings had social standing with distinction of rank. If human beings were between grass and trees, why did they become court nobles and aristocrats? Were they ones who set traps for animals, mow the grass, and picked up

firewood? Especially, sipping tea against flower [arrangement] became a dreary scene. That is, court nobles and aristocrats [should] not amuse [themselves with it]. Li [Bai] 李白 (701-762) and Du [Fu] 杜甫 (712-770) were prominent men of the Tang [dynasty]. They always loved waterside birds and finally became two birds of Kaiyuan 開元. These wings spread over the whole country. That is, you were the only [man] who hid yourselves [in the spot] between grass and trees. Jōhanshi says, “It seemed like a heavy drinker (*xingxing* 猩猩) got drunk and talked a lot. A large baboon (*feifei* 狒狒) disproportionately made people laugh. Although I did not [think that] birds and animals were valuable, [I] followed [what] you said. If this was discussed with birds and animals, my tea sometimes became phoenix tea (*fenghuangtuan* 鳳凰團) and, at other time, became jade-dragon tea (*bilongtuan* 璧龍團). [High-graded] charcoal [shaped like] *qilin* 麒麟 (a dragon shaped like a deer) was used to boil the [tea]. All [the teas] were the chief of birds and animals. At such time, where did waterside birds go to stretch out their wings? If this was discussed with tea utensils, tea utensils were made of gold, silver, jewels, copper, iron, soil, and stone. That is, [I] did not know that the value was [worth] several thousand taels. A dilettante made a superb treasure in secret. If one obtained one of them, his/her fame would be known in the whole world. Were your *sake* vessels [worth] paltry sum of money? Bōyūkun says, “Ah, how narrow minded you are! The tastefulness is calm and peaceful. The value should not be discussed. Precisely, *sake* cups have [three types;] gold cup, silver cup, and white gem cup (*yaoyuchuan* 藥玉船). How precious they are! Moreover, *sake* is good for four seasons. In spring, a banquet is held at Taoli 桃李 (peaches and plums) garden. One is seated on the flowers and captivated by [the beauty of] noon. In summer, bamboo leaf liquor (*zhuyejiu* 竹葉酒) is served. One passes the summer and enjoys the cool. In autumn, [fallen and autumn] leaves are fired [to warm up *sake*] in the forest. In winter, one keeps off the cool in the snow. Gao Shi 高適 (704-765) also said, ‘Drinking *sake* is superior to drinking tea.’” Jōhanshi says, “My tea is not concerned with four seasons. There is no

separation between day and night. ‘Even in a busy situation, [one acts based on perfect virtue.] Even if one falls, [he/she acts based on perfect virtue.]’ There have been many people preferring tea since ancient times. [They probably said that] Lu Yu 陸羽 (733-804) and Lu Tong 盧同 (790-835) were the first [class tea master]. Lu Tong always created a tea song and a superb piece of poetry. Lu Yu wrote the *Chajing* 茶經 (“*Classic of Tea*”). Incidentally, one who sold tea [leaves created a ceramic shaped] in the form of Lu Yu and put [it into the spot between wood-burning stove and] stovepipe. [They began to] worship it as the deity of tea. *The Chajing* said, ‘The tree is like camelia sinensis (*gualu* 瓜蘆). The leaf is like gardenia (*zhizi* 梔子). The flower is like white rose. The seed is like trachycarpus (*zonglu* 棕櫚). The leaf is like clove (*dingxiang* 丁香). The root is like walnuts (*hutao* 胡桃). The names [of tea] are; the first is *cha* 茶, the second is *jia* 檳, the third is *she* 葭, the fourth is *ming* 茗, and the fifth is *chuan* 筴.’ In addition, there were twenty places that have been selected as taste of [the best] famous mountain water in the whole country. The water of waterfall [in *kangwanggu* 康王谷 valley] of Lushan 廬山 was the first [fountain]. The water [trickling from between] the rocks at Huishansi temple 惠山寺 was the second [fountain]. The water under the stone in Lanxi 蘭溪 [region] of Qizhou 蘄州 province was the third [fountain]. The following sentences were not written. Ordinary water was not used to roast tea at random. Tea was regarded as superior [to other teas]. If the place of [tea] production was discussed, [there were production regions, such as] Rizhu 日注 (alternately, Rizhu 日鑄) peak, Shuangjing 雙井, Yueyuan 岳源, Huikeng 會坑, Jinlishan 金栗山, Penglaidao 蓬萊島, Jianan 建安, Beiyuan 北苑, Jinzhou 金州, Xicheng 西城, Dongwu 東吳, Dongchuan 東川, Shouzhou 壽州, Huoshan 霍山, Changzhou 常州, Yixing 義興, Guzhu 顧渚, Mengshan 蒙山, and Gexianshan 葛仙山. Besides these [places], it could not be counted.” Bōyūkun says, “A *sake* star shines in heaven. A sake fountain comes out from the earth. Human beings are between heaven and earth. There is no one who does not praise *sake*. In the Jin 晉 dynasty (266-420), there were seven sages²⁷ (*qi*

xian 七賢) [of the bamboo grove (*zhulin* 竹林)] and eight recluses²⁸ (*bada* 八達). In the Tang 唐 dynasty (618-907), there were six escapists²⁹ (*liuyi* 六逸) [of the bamboo stream (*zhuxi* 竹溪)] and eight immortals³⁰ (*baxian* 八仙) [of the *sake* cup (*yingzhong* 飲中)]. Otherwise, seventy-two [officials] of the Han dynasty were granted *kumis*. Twenty-four friends of Golden Valley (Jingu 金谷) [held] a cherry blossoms viewing assembly. Liu Xuanshi 劉玄石 [drank] a one-thousand day [*sake* and fell asleep for one thousand days]. Chunyu Kun 淳于髡 [drank] seven or eight *to* 斗 of *sake*.³¹ Yuan Cishan 元次山 (alternately, Yuan Jie 元結: 719/723-772) hid in three *wu* 三吾³² and arbitrarily called [himself] Manlang 漫郎. Ouyang Xiu 歐陽脩 (1007-1072) preserved a *sake* jar and got drunk. He called [himself] a drunk old man (*zuiweng* 醉翁). Wang Ji 王績 (585-644) wrote the *Jiujing* 酒經 (“*Sake Sutra*”). Liu Bolun 劉伯倫 (alternately, Liu Ling 劉伶: 221-300) wrote the *Jiudesong* 酒德頌 (“*Gatha in Praise of Sake’s Merit*”). According to the brief summaries [of the text], ‘One puts his/her head on malted rice and spreads *sake* lees. Without thinking and considering, one feels at ease and gets moderately drunk.’ The merit of *sake* was great. If the sacred place of *sake* was discussed, [it could be thought of as] Lu 魯, Zhao 趙, Qi 齊, and Ge 革. Zhao was strong. Lu was weak. Qi extended all over *qi* 齊. Ge stayed *ge* 鬲. Otherwise, there were two villages, Shangre 上若 and Xiare 下若. There were [two different types

27 The Seven sages were Ruan Ji 阮籍 (210-263), Ji Kang 嵇康 (223-262), Shan Tao 山濤 (205-283), Liu Ling 劉伶 (221-300), Ruan Xian 阮咸 (fl. 3rd century), Xiang Xiu 向秀 (fl. 3rd century), and Wang Rong 王戎 (234-305).

28 The eight recluses were Guangyi 光逸 (fl. 4th century), Humu Fuzhi 胡毋輔之 (270-318), Xie Kun 謝鯤 (fl. 4th century), Ruan Fang 阮放 (fl. 4th century), Bi Zhou 畢卓, Yang Man 羊曼, Huan Yi 桓彝 (fl. 4th century), and Ruan Fu 阮孚等.

29 The escapists were Li Bai 李白 (701-762), Kong Chaofu 孔巢父 (fl. 8th century), Han Zhun 韓準 (fl. 8th century), Pei Zheng 裴政 (fl. 8th century), Zhang Shuming 張叔明 (fl. 8th century), and Tao Mian 陶沔 (fl. 8th century).

30 The eight immortals were He Zhizhang 賀知章 (659-744), Li Jin 李璣 (fl. 8th century), Li Shizhi 李適之 (694-747), Cui Zongzhi 崔宗之 (fl. 8th century), Su Jin 蘇晉 (fl. 8th century), Zhang Xu 張旭 (fl. 8th century), and Jiao Sui 焦遂 (fl. 8th century), and Li Bai.

31 It is approximately 126-144 liters.

32 The three *wu* are *wuxi* 涿溪, *wuting* 吾亭, and *wutai* 嵎台.

of] *sake*: *niaoqi* 鳥祈 of Wucheng 鳥程 [country] and *sangla* 桑落 of Pucheng 蒲城 [country]. The peach gathering at the Orchid Pavilion included tasty *sake* and spirit residing in the ground. Kings, trusted vassals, commanders, and ministers [thought of] *sake* as means to rule a country. Officials, peasant farmers, artisans and craftsmen, and merchants and traders [thought of] *sake* as means to obtain consolation. Widowers, widows, orphans, and childless elderly created a broom to remove cheerless with *sake*. All the heaven and earth provisionally created pervading obstruction [by getting drunk on *sake*]. That is, you did not know where to put your hands and legs. Conceivably, the state official Qu [Yuan] 屈原 (340-278 BCE) of Chu 楚 got sober alone and was banished [to local region]. The official-literati Su [Ziyou] 蘇子由 (alternately, Su Zhe 蘇轍: 1039-1112) of [the Northern] Song 宋 [was regarded as] incompetent because he did not drink [*sake*]. It was due to *sake* that the two people lost their reputation. You got sober alone and did not drink *sake*. Were you ones who were banished [to local region]? Were you ones who [were regarded as] incompetent? Moreover, Yuan Jie 元結 [said that] one who did not drink *sake* was a lightweight. That is, you were also a lightweight.” Jōhanshi says, “My tea is no such thing. From the capital to the southern barbarians, no matter how it was big or small, one who preferred not to drink tea was not human. If this was discussed with my country, according to the *Xiqishiji* 西齋詩記 (alternately, *Xiqihuaji* 西齋話記), Shou Shangren 壽上人 returned from Japan. He was favored with Toganoo 柺尾 mountain tea cultivated in the country and gave thanks poem. According to the brief summaries [of the poem], ‘Fortunately, [I] gained credit with the plum mountain and first tasted Japanese tea.’ In Japan, the Toganoo mountain tea was put in the first [place]. Uji [tea] was second to this [Toganoo mountain tea]. [The Chinese character] *mei* 梅 resembled [the Chinese character] *mei* 柺 in shape. Therefore, [the character] was generally used. In these days, for those who preferred [to drink] tea, the Uji [tea] was put in the first [place]. The Umeo 柺尾 (Toganoo) [mountain tea] was second to this [Uji tea]. According to Japanese proverbs, those who preferred [to drink] tea were the so-called “art connoisseurs.” Furthermore, according

to [Japanese] proverbs, [although] Uji tea contained ‘pure’ sounds, many others contained ‘impure’ sounds. Additionally, Uji tea had other names, such as supremacy, distinction, and extreme. Therefore, even if there were condensed milk and ghee, these drinks were not able to exceed tea. Thus, *sake* was also [applicable to this case].”

There is Kanjin 閑人 (reclusive monk) beside [us]. He appears and says, “Now, there is no fear in the country. There is a way in the country. It is the best season [for the realization of nothingness (or emptiness)]. The two stubborn old men made things happen, though such a thing has not happened. [You] regarded *akasha* (sky) as mouth. [You] regarded *sumeru* as tongue. In this way, perspectives were *asamkhyeya* (innumerable). The merit of *sake* could not be describable. The merit of tea could not be attainable. I have often drunk *sake* and tea. The two drinks, which one is the winner? Which one is the loser? The two old men, please listen to my poem.

There are calm clouds on the pine tree. There is a haze around the flowers.

The two old men facing each other strive for luxury.

I say that the two [drinks] are the most superior of the country.

Sake is *sake*. Tea is tea.

On a day of late spring (third month of the lunar calendar) of the fourth year of Tenshō (1576), the year of fire-rat (*hinoene*, 丙子) *kōfu* 甲阜 (*zuikōsan* 瑞甲山) arbitrarily written by Bairishi 梅里子

Bibliography

Reference Works

- Shiseki Shūran*. Kondō Heijō ed. 33 vols. Sumiya Shobō.
Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō. Takakusu Junjirō and Ono Genmyō, eds. 85 vols. Tōkyō:
Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924-1932.

Secondary Sources

- Aoki, Masaru. *Sake no sakana • hōsonshuwa*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989.
- Furukawa, Mizumasa. “Shucharon no keifu” *Fūzoku* 12 (3) 1974, 26-43.
- Hagiwara, Sonoko. “Shucharon’ kō: ‘Hazama no bungaku’ to shiteno ‘Shucharon’” *Seisen gobun* 4 (2014), 2-15.
- Hino, Takuya. “Ocean of Suffering, Boat of Compassion: A Study of the Fudaraku Tokai and Urashima in Anecdotal (*Setsuwa*) Literature, *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80 (4) 2012, 1049-1076.
- Kawakami, Kozan. *Myōshinjishi jōkan*. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1984.
- Kawaguchi, Hisao. “Wagakuni no ‘Shucharon’ to tonkō shutsudo no ‘Chashuron zoku’” *Kanazawa bunko kenkyū* 14 (3) 1968, 14-17.
- Sanpei, Harumi. “Nicchū no sake ni matsuwari ronsō nit suite” *Daigakuin kyōiku kaikaku shien program ‘Nihon bunka kenkyū no kokusaiteki jōhōdentatsu skill no ikusei’ katsudō hōkusho (Heisei jūku nendo kaigai kenshū jugyōhen)* 2008, 372-376.
- Sen, Sōshitsu. *Sadōkotenzenshū dai ni kan*. Kyoto: Tankōshinsha, 1958.
- Suzuki, Daisetsu. *Zen and Japanese culture*. Princeton: Princeton/Bollingen paperbacks, 1973.

Takuya Hino

- Takashina, Rōsen. “Busshin no jikaku” in *Kōza zen dai san kan zen no rekishi chūgoku* eds by Nishitani Keiji, Tokyo: Chikima shobō, 1963, 307-310.
- Watanabe, Morikuni. “Shucharon to sono shūhen” *Ōtsuma joshidaigaku bungakubukiyō* 8 1976, 53-72.