

Zen Buddhism during the Tokugawa Period The Challenge to Go beyond Sectarian Consciousness

Michel MOHR

The transformation of Buddhism during the Tokugawa period has not been sufficiently explored by modern scholars. In this essay I will attempt to sketch an overall view of Tokugawa-period sectarian consciousness as expressed in the relations between the various obediences of what is popularly called “the Zen sect,” namely the Sōtō, Rinzai, and Ōbaku schools. The question of lineage and identity is of central importance here, as this issue is intimately connected with sectarian developments during the Tokugawa period, and thus with the way in which the Japanese sects view themselves today. By examining certain figures and their writings, I will focus on the extent to which Buddhist sectarianism grew stronger during the Tokugawa period.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF ZEN BUDDHISM during the Tokugawa period is a topic that remains insufficiently explored by scholars in both Japan and the West. In Japan there is a growing body of research on single figures, like Manzan Dōhaku 叡山 菴白 (1636–1715), Mujaku Dōchū 無著 菴忠 (1653–1745), and Hakuin Ekaku 白隱 慧鶴 (1686–1769), but most such research focuses on the contributions of these individuals to their respective sects. Although this approach is essential if we are to handle the enormous amount of material that each of these masters produced, it is hardly conducive to a synthetic view of the complex trends of the period. In the West, general studies of Tokugawa thought have tended to concentrate on Neo-Confucianism, with Buddhist movements often viewed as decadent or of merely secondary importance (e.g., MARUYAMA 1974 and OOMS 1985).¹ This interpretation

* This article is a revised version of a paper delivered at the March 1994 Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies in Boston.

¹ The notion of Tokugawa Buddhist decadence (*darakuron* 墮落論) is usually credited to Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 (1877–1955), although his work is not limited to that view. For alternative perspectives see TAMAMURO (1987), TAMAMURO and ŌKUWA (1979, 1986), and WATT (1982, 1984).

of Tokugawa Buddhism is gradually giving way to a richer, more detailed evaluation of the transformations it underwent.

In this essay I will attempt to sketch an overall view of Tokugawa-period sectarian consciousness as expressed in the relations between the various obediences of what is popularly called “the Zen sect,” namely the Sōtō, Rinzai, and Ōbaku schools. The question of lineage and identity is of central importance here, as this issue is intimately connected with sectarian developments during the Tokugawa period, and thus with the way in which the Japanese sects view themselves today.² Although a full consideration of sectarian consciousness as it persists in current religious behavior is beyond the scope of this paper, the matter is deserving of further attention. Today’s Buddhists in Japan appear in many respects to show a stronger awareness of sectarian affiliation than did their seventeenth-century predecessors.

The history of sectarian consciousness in Buddhism obviously did not begin in the modern age. Although the saṃgha was originally supposed to be a harmonious and united whole—so much so that anyone who created dissension among its members was considered guilty of one of the most serious offenses against the vinaya—schisms started appearing in the early Indian communities soon after the death of Śākyamuni. The development of sectarian consciousness in Indian and Chinese Buddhism is widely reviewed in a study by the Japanese scholar Mano Shōjun 真野正順 (1892–1954), but his section on Japanese Buddhism is largely inconclusive and covers the subject only as far as the Kamakura period (MANO 1964).

My focus will be much narrower, concentrating on the extent to which Buddhist sectarianism grew stronger during the Tokugawa period. Although it is hard to generalize on this subject (attitudes towards other sects probably ranged from perfect tolerance to complete rejection), there are nevertheless signs of unprecedented transformations during this period that have had enduring effects on Buddhist self-consciousness. Such changes can also be detected in other areas, such as the traditional arts, where the *iemoto* 家元 (head master) at the top of each school’s hierarchy was accorded increasing importance.³

We find when studying the Tokugawa period that there was nothing like a monolithic school of thought, even within the respective sects;

² Existing surveys of Japanese religion mostly concern the average believer, and there is, to my knowledge, no research describing how the priests or lay people engaged in serious practice consider themselves. Cf. BASABE (1968) and READER (1991). Ian Reader underlines among the general features the “high levels of belonging and low levels of cognitive belief” (p. 9). In other words, this amounts to sectarian awareness.

³ NISHIYAMA (1982) has noted a number of interesting similarities between the religious world and such traditional arts as Kabuki, dance, and *chadō*.

instead we see an incredible variety of positions with regard to the central issues of the day. Much of the basic research in this area remains to be done: a good portion of the period's extant historical material is still hidden in temple archives, and the basic editing work on many documents just started a few years ago. At this point more has been done on the Sōtō side, with the publication of source collections like the *Sōtōshū zensho* 曹洞宗全書 [Complete works of the Sōtō school]; the more impecunious Rinzai school has done little to facilitate access to its own Japanese sources.

A huge gap remains to be overcome—especially in Japanese scholarship—between Buddhist studies per se (most of which deal with the doctrines of the respective sects) and institutional or sociological studies (which are often full of detailed descriptions of little interest to the historian of religions). Tension also exists between the phenomenological and historical approaches in the study of Tokugawa Buddhism, giving rise to fierce arguments among scholars; the tension is rather stimulating, nevertheless, forcing us to recognize that the ground on which we stand is constantly shifting and cannot be grasped through fixed prescriptions, methodologies, or thought processes.

I will in this essay try to emphasize the history of ideas over the history of institutions (though some factual description is unavoidable), using the concept of “sectarian consciousness” as a tool for investigating the extent to which the three Zen traditions of Sōtō, Rinzai, and Ōbaku saw themselves as independent religious denominations. I will not try to reach a definitive conclusion, as the issue is large and would require a cooperative analysis from several different scholarly perspectives. Rather, I will simply introduce a few aspects of sectarian consciousness that are revealed by an overall view of several individual biographies.

Lineage Consciousness in Its Historical Setting

The concept of “sectarian consciousness” is referred to in modern Japanese as *shūtō ishiki* 宗統意識, a closer translation of which might be “lineage consciousness.” The first word, *shūtō*, is a Classical Chinese term pronounced *zongtong* that appears already in the fifth-century *Houhanshu* 後漢書, where it signifies “the lineage of the main [imperial] family” (*honke no keitō* 本家の系統) or “the line of [true] heirs” (*tekitō* 嫡統):

Imperial virtue commands heaven and earth at will, restores the original lineage, praises virtue and rewards merit, and

makes the Nine Generations intimate and harmonious.

(*Houhanshu*, “Guangwu di ji” 光武帝紀, Ershisi shi 二十四史,
Baina book 百衲本, second part of chapter 1 第一下)

In Japan the quest for legitimacy was linked to the imperial line, a trait that apparently dates back to the dawn of history, with the earliest chronicles echoing the strife between the Ise and Izumo traditions of Shinto. Japanese Buddhism, too, developed in close association with the imperial family and its regents. An important turning point in the Buddhist world’s involvement with imperial concerns took place during the time of the Northern and Southern Courts (1336–1392), when Emperor Godaigo 後醍醐 (1288–1339, r. 1318–1339) attempted to reimpose direct imperial rule through the reforms of the Kenmu Restoration. Religious leaders like Daitō Kokushi 大燈國師 (1282–1338) avoided siding with either the northern or southern camps, while such thinkers as Kitabatake Chikafusa 北畠親房 (1293–1354) attempted to legitimize one or the other of the factions. Ashikaga Takauji 足利尊氏 (1305–1358) skillfully exploited this quarreling and seized power; he also became an important benefactor of Zen clergy. The most significant aspect of this turmoil for the purposes of our discussion is that “even though many of Go Daigo’s initiatives were later reversed, the Kenmu Restoration marks the entry of the Zen institution into the religious and political mainstream of medieval Japan, a development that Daitō witnessed and facilitated” (KRAFT 1992, 23).

This early phase of Zen lineage consciousness was strongly affected by developments in China, which the Japanese were kept informed of by the wave of immigrant priests who arrived during the thirteenth century. One influential figure on the continent was Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200), who in his interpretation of the Confucian classics stressed the necessity of recovering the “orthodox tradition” 荀統 (*dao-tong*) transmitted by the sages (DE BARY 1981, pp. 4–6; 1989, pp. 11–20). Reformist tendencies appear to have dominated the political and philosophical thought of the Northern Song dynasty (960–1127), as expressed in the Neo-Confucian ideal of *fugu* 復古 (Jpn. *fukko*), “restoring the ancient order.” This term was later adopted by reformers in Tokugawa Japan.

During the Tokugawa period factors both external and internal forced the Buddhist clergy to redefine its self-image. The external factors included the Bakufu’s increasingly restrictive religious policy as well as the growing influence of Neo-Confucianism, National Learning, and new movements arising from Shinto. Internal pressure was triggered by the emergence within Buddhism of new movements concerned exclusively with the essentials of practice, the monastic

codes, the precepts, and textual study. The crystallization of sectarian identity that occurred during the Tokugawa period may thus be attributed to a distinctive convergence of Bakufu policy and trends arising within the respective schools.

One result was a complex attempt by Zen Buddhism to redefine its place in society, an effort that involved political factors as well as finely nuanced philosophical considerations. The distinctions in the standpoints of the various thinkers concern nuances that render completely inappropriate the convenient labels—“progressive,” “conservative,” etc.—so often used to describe the tendencies of the period. Similarly inappropriate is the application of present-day criteria to the times, which almost invariably results in a complete misinterpretation of Tokugawa power games. Although the ever-present rivalry between the Bakufu and the imperial court was the backdrop in front of which the religious actors moved, to interpret their behavior solely in terms of ideological submission obscures their true intent, given that they had no real alternative.

The Importing of Ming Buddhism to Japan

The distinctive forces that helped shape the times are especially visible in the Japanese reactions to the arrival of the Huangbo (Ōbaku) school of Chinese Zen,⁴ brought by the seventeenth-century priest Yinyuan Longqi 隱元隆琦 (Jpn. Ingen Ryūki, 1592–1673), who claimed to represent the true Rinzai lineage. Let us begin with a brief review of the events on the continent that led to the transmission of the tradition to Japan, since these form a crucial background to the later events.

In the early seventeenth century the Ming dynasty was disintegrating politically. In 1616 it faced a new threat when the Manchus proclaimed their own emperor in the northeast. Beijing fell in 1644, accompanied by the suicide of the last Ming emperor, Yizong 毅宗 (Chongzhen 崇禎 1610–1644, r. 1627–1644).⁵ Manchu rule extended only quite gradually to the south, however. There, in the coastal regions of what is modern Fujian, we find Wanfusi 萬福寺,⁶ the temple from

⁴ It should be kept in mind that the Ōbaku lineage has been recognized as an independent school only since 1876 (ZGD, p. 123d), and that during the Tokugawa it was referred to as the *Rinzai shū Ōbaku ha* 臨濟宗黃檗派 (Ōbaku branch of the Rinzai school). Priests belonging to this tradition, however, called it the *Rinzai shōshū* 臨濟正宗 (True Linji lineage).

⁵ See GERNET 1972, pp. 405–409. The religious and political situation in China at that time is well described in HSU 1979.

⁶ Wanfusi stands on Mt Huangbo 黃檗山 in Fujian, southwest of Fuzhou Province 福州府 (ZGD, p. 123b–c).

which stemmed the new Dharma transmission that was to reach Japan.

Yinyuan landed in Japan on the fifth day of the seventh month, 1654 (Shōō 承應 3),⁷ having accepted the invitation of his predecessor, Yiran Xingrong 逸然性融 (Jpn. Itsunen Shōyū, 1601–1668), who was already installed at Kōfuku-ji in Nagasaki (ZGD, p. 588d; ŌTSUKI 1975). Although Yinyuan was not the first priest to have arrived in Japan during the Tokugawa period of national seclusion, he and his much-publicized trip made the deepest impression on the seventeenth-century Japanese. This fact was certainly connected to his later recognition by the Bakufu, which granted him protection and provided land in Uji to build the new Ōbaku temple of Manpuku-ji 萬福寺.

Many unresolved questions surround Yinyuan's decision to cross the sea. As explained in HIRAKUBO (1962, pp. 67–89), the fall of the Ming is not a sufficient explanation. Yinyuan did not leave China with the intention of staying in Japan, since he said to his disciples upon his departure that he planned to return after three years (TAKENUKI 1989, p. 213 and SCHWALLER 1989, p. 18). The *Zenrin shūheishū* 禪林執弊集 [Record of attachment to errors in Zen forests], a polemical text published in 1700 by Keirin Sūshin 桂林崇琛 (1653–1728), proposes another interpretation of the event:

I hear it said that people like Yinyuan 隱元, Muan 木菴, Cefei 即非 and Gaoquan 高泉 are among the most outstanding figures in modern China. Yet the fact that they lightly took up their priests' staffs and wandered to this country has nothing to do with a selfless desire to spread the Dharma. [What actually happened is that] Feiyin 費隱 from Jing shan 徑山 [had a dispute with] the Caodong [monk] Yongjue 永覺 from Gushan 鼓山. They appealed to the authorities [concerning] their dispute about the fundamental principle⁸ [of their respective schools]. Feiyin was humiliated in front of the government court, and for this reason his disciples became discouraged. It is at this point that they accepted the invitation [conveyed] by the trading ships and made the long [journey] all the way to Japan.

⁷ Cf. HIRAKUBO (1962, p. 275) and SCHWALLER (1989, pp. 17–18).

⁸ Fundamental principle (*shūshu* 宗趣, Skt. *siddhānta-naya*). This term has a long history, already appearing in the translation of the *Lañkāvatāra sūtra* 楞伽經 by Śikṣānanda 実叉難陀 (652–710) [T 16, no. 672, 609a17, a21, and a25]. In this early context it refers to the “supreme intent” or “supreme teaching,” as distinguished from the “verbal teaching” (*gonsetsu*, 言說 Skt. *deśanā-naya*). The term is also used in the preface by Peixiu 裴休 (797–870) to the *Chanyuan zhuquan jidu xu* 禪源諸詮集都序 of Zongmi Guifeng 宗密圭峰 (780–841), where it already seems to be associated with the central doctrines specific to each school [T 48, no. 2015, 398c23; *Zen no goroku* 9, p. 4 and note p.11].

The two rival priests mentioned by Keirin are Feiyin Tongrong 費隱通容 (1593–1661) and Yongjue Yuanxian 永覺元賢 (1578–1657). Feiyin was the master of Yinyuan, so that the above assertion, if true, would have severe implications for Yinyuan’s credibility. However, the sarcastic tone adopted by Keirin suggests mere calumny against the Ōbaku movement (see HIRAKUBO 1962, p. 71).

There might, nevertheless, be some truth behind Keirin’s pseudo-history. Towards the end of the Ming, members of the various Chan Buddhist lines began compiling continuations of the biographical “transmissions of the lamp,” which provided them with the opportunity to privilege their respective schools.⁹ The last of the “lamp” anthologies had been the *Zengji xu chuandenglu* 增集續傳燈錄 [Augmented continuation to the transmission of the lamp] (Z 142), published by Linji representatives with a preface dated 1403. The earliest systematic attempt to update its contents was the *Wudeng huiyuan xulüe* 五燈會元續略 [Abridged continuation from the compilation of the source of the five lamps] (Z 138) by the Caodong priest Yuanmen Jingzhu 遠門淨柱 (1601–1654), with a preface dated 1648 (ZGD, p. 354a and YANAGIDA 1967, pp. 70–71). Feiyin, who was in firm opposition to the version presented in this anthology, composed in succession the *Wudeng yantong* 五燈嚴統 [The strict lineage of the five lamps]¹⁰ and the *Wudeng yantong jiehuo pian* 五燈嚴統解惑篇 [Removing doubts about the strict lineage of the five lamps] (Z 139). These works virulently attacked Yuanmen’s work, denying the existence of a Caodong lineage subsequent to Tiantong Rujing 天童如淨 (1162–1227).¹¹

⁹ About this time the word *shūtō* came to be used with increasing frequency by Zen Buddhists in both China and Japan. The term appears, for example, in the title of several books. In China, for example, the *Zongtong biannian* 宗統編年, written by Xiangyu Jiyin 湘雨紀蔭 (n.d.) and published in 1690 (preface dated 1679 [Kangxi 康熙 18]; Z 147 pp. 1–511), defended the “true Linji lineage” (*Linji zhengzong* 臨濟正宗) in disputes with the Caodong sect. One interesting feature of this document is the parallel it draws between imperial lineage and religious lineage; a list of Chan masters is followed by a dynastic chart that concludes with the expression “the Qing court: one lineage of ten thousand years” (*huangqing yitong wannian* 皇清一統萬年, Z 147, p. 10b). In Japan the *Shūtōroku* 宗統錄, a commentary on the *Biyanlu* 碧巖錄, was published in 1683. The compiler was Ryūkei Shōsen 龍溪性潛 (1602–1670), one of the more controversial figures of the time because of his switch from the Myōshin-ji to the Ōbaku line (ZGD, p. 563d and *OBJ*, pp. 380b–84a). Another Ōbaku publication was the *Ōbaku shūkanroku* 黄檗宗鑑錄, which charted the Dharma lineage from Śākyamuni to the current abbot of Manpuku-ji. It was compiled by Gaoquan Xingdun 高泉性敦. (Jpn. Kōsen Shōton [1633–1695]), the fifth abbot, and first published in 1693. In the Rinzai school, the *Shūtō hassoden* 宗統八祖傳, with a postface dated Hōei 寶永 8 (1711), gives the biographies of the Myōshin-ji abbots from Tōyō Eichō 東陽英朝 (1428–1504) to Gudō Tōshoku 愚堂東塾 (1577–1661), the eight abbots not mentioned in the *Shōbōzan roku-soden* 正法山六祖傳 (1640) (see OGISU 1979).

¹⁰ Z 139 (Cf. *OBJ* 316a–b).

¹¹ I have followed ISHII (1987, 565) with regard to Tiantong’s dates.

There is no need to go into the particulars of Feiyin's works. It is sufficient to note here that they led to a lawsuit and then to a conflict with the Caodong priest Juelang Daosheng 覺浪菴盛 (1592–1659), as a result of which the wood blocks for Feiyin's books were burnt. The matter was thus more or less settled on the continent. But, as Yanagida notes, one of Yinyuan's first projects upon his arrival in Japan was the reprinting of his master's forbidden book, which was accomplished in 1657.¹² The hidden agenda implicit in this act suggests a motivation for Yinyuan's trip somehow more plausible than the purely unselfish interpretation accepted by Hirakubo. The incident also provides further evidence that seventeenth-century Zen Buddhism in Japan cannot be fully discussed without taking into account Ming Chinese Buddhism and its Qing-dynasty successor.

The coming of Yinyuan had a significance for modern Japanese religion that added up to far more than the deeds of a single individual. In a sense it can be said that with Yinyuan's disembarkation on Japanese soil Ming Buddhism as a whole set foot on the islands. Yinyuan brought with him the distinctive contradictions and sectarian consciousness that had arisen in China since the Song dynasty. We see something of the confusion and vain polemics that characterized so much of Ming Chan in the sharp critique of the poet Qian Muzhai 錢牧齋 (1582–1664) (see YOSHIKAWA 1960 and YANAGIDA 1967, 70–74). Qian, a lay practitioner, had great respect for a number of contemporary priests, particularly his own master Hanshan Deqing 憨山德清 (1546–1623), but his insider's perspective may have motivated him all the more to denounce the trends of his time, which included a heavy emphasis on factionalism. Qian's viewpoint is eloquently expressed in a letter to Juelang Daosheng:

Ah, pernicious and destructive [tendencies] in Chan practice have reached a climax in recent times. Evil people are rampant in the country of Wu 吳, preaching to the deaf and leading the blind; followers are as numerous as marketgoers.... I denounce and dismiss [these windbags]; if you wonder where they have gone wrong, it's not really hard to discern. [These preachers] pick up hammers and raise whisks [pretending to teach, but their] indiscriminate shouts and stick-waving are mere matters of form; they are like clowns playing their roles. They put on airs when entering the hall and descending from their seat, but their explanations differ not a whit from the harangues of storytellers on the street. In their delusion they

¹² Yinyuan added a postface dated *hinoto tori* 丁酉 (the third year of Meireki 明曆) (Z 139, p. 1043b09).

set up patriarchal lineages (*zongtiao* 宗祧); recklessly they promote branches and factions (*zhipai* 枝派). If one priest claims to be a direct descendant (*disun* 嫡孫) of Linji, another accuses him of being illegitimate (*yiasi* 假嗣).

(*Chuxueji* 初學集, p. 86)¹³

Rinzai Reactions to the Founding of Manpuku-ji

Yinyuan's arrival soon caused members of both the Rinzai and Sōtō sects to define their attitudes by either welcoming or rejecting the new transplant. As long as Yinyuan confined his activities to Nagasaki he could be safely ignored, but the start of construction work on Manpuku-ji in Uji south of Kyoto in 1661¹⁴ signaled that his school would endure. This comprised a particular threat to Japanese Rinzai, since the Ōbaku school claimed to represent the true Rinzai lineage.

The Bakufu apparently intended this Chinese presence at Uji, near the imperial palace in Kyoto, to be a counterbalance to the Zen temples traditionally close to the court. The situation was more complex, however: in addition to his Bakufu patronage, Yinyuan had also obtained the recognition of the retired emperor Gomizunoo 後水尾 (1596–1680, r. 1611–1629) (KAGAMISHIMA 1958, p. 90; 1978, p. 46). The piece of land chosen for Manpuku-ji had formerly belong to the Konoe 近衛 family, though it had also been used as the site of a secondary residence for Gomizunoo's mother (HIRAKUBO 1962, p. 132).

Following Yinyuan's arrival in Nagasaki, a clear polarization occurred within the main branches of the Rinzai school between opponents and supporters of his cause. The opposition in the Myōshin-ji branch was led by Gudō Tōshoku 愚堂東寔 (1577–1661) and Daigu Sōchiku 大愚宗築 (1584–1669), two of the most eminent Zen authorities of the time. Gudō and Daigu were engaged in their own attempts to restore the true Dharma (*shōbō* 正法), having already formed a group in 1606 to consult all living Zen masters (*ketsumei hensan* 結盟遍參) (TAKENUKI 1989, p. 197). Their central purpose was to promote a "return to the origin" (i.e., Myōshin-ji's founder Kanzan 関山), an undertaking that could hardly be expected to accommodate Yinyuan's claim to represent the true lineage.

The faction supporting Yinyuan initially included Ryūkei Shōsen 龍溪性潛 (1602–1670), Tokūō Myōkō 禿翁妙宏 (1611–1681), and Jikuin

¹³ I have relied in part on YANAGIDA's paraphrase (1967, p. 72). This passage was first cited by YOSHIKAWA (1960, pp. 742–43).

¹⁴ The inauguration of Manpuku-ji in 1663 can be considered the beginning of Ōbaku's official history. See SCHWALLER 1989, p. 5.

Somon 竺印祖門 (1611–1677);¹⁵ Tokuō and Jikuin later separated from Ryūkei and ceased overt support for Yinyuan (HIRAKUBO 1962, pp. 135–36). The case of Jikuin and his spiritual heir, Mujaku Dōchū, requires particular attention. Jikuin occupied a prominent position, both as the head of Ryūge-in 龍華院 and as the 223rd abbot of Myōshin-ji. Mujaku, his successor at Ryūge-in, was a renowned scholar.¹⁶ Jikuin's initial attitude towards Yinyuan was one of active support, and he used his influence to mediate in favor of the Chinese immigrants. Although there was later a cooling off in his relations with Yinyuan, mainly due to his falling out with Ryūkei, Jikuin remained a lifelong supporter of the Ōbaku branch (KAGAMISHIMA 1960b, p. 198).

In contrast to his master's position, the stance adopted by Mujaku was resolutely anti-Ōbaku. The reasons for this stand are many, but they can be traced back to his desire to revive the original form of Rinzai monastic life, and to his consequent distaste for the syncretism characteristic of Ming Buddhism. At the age of thirty-two Mujaku completed his version of the Rinzai monastic codes, the *Shōsōrin ryaku-shingi* 小叢林略清規 (T 81, no. 2579), conceived of as a response to Yinyuan's *Ōbaku Codes* (*Ōbaku shingi* 黃檗清規) published in 1672, one year before Yinyuan's death.¹⁷ Mujaku's zealous study of Ōbaku texts for the purpose of refuting them is evident in his *Hakumōroku* 剥妄錄, which contains annotations on the *Ōbaku Codes*.¹⁸

¹⁵ Cf. *OBJ*, pp. 141a–142b. The date for his birth is the thirty-first day, twelfth month of the fifteenth year of the Keichō 慶長 era. This corresponds to 12 February 1611. The pronunciation of his religious surname (Dōgō 菊号) as “Jikuin” follows *OBJ*, while *APP* has “Chikuin” (1987, p. 157).

¹⁶ *ZGD*, p. 935b, *OBJ*, pp. 345b–346b, YANAGIDA 1966 and 1967, and *APP* 1987, pp. 155–82. The date of Mujaku's death must be corrected in *ZGD*, *OBJ*, and *APP* 1987 (p. 155), while it is given correctly in YANAGIDA 1967 (p. 1). According to *OBJ*, he died on the twenty-third day of the twelfth month of the first year of the Enkyō 延享 era, at the age of 92. This corresponds to 25 January 1745.

¹⁷ It is significant that Mujaku's codes are still in use in Japanese monasteries after more than three centuries, despite the widespread acceptance of meat consumption and marriage (*nikujiki saitai* 肉食妻帯) that emerged in ordinary temples during the Meiji period. Interestingly, although Mujaku's Rinzai codes were published only in 1684, twelve years after their Ōbaku counterpart, the Sōtō school was several years ahead of Ōbaku in issuing a treatise on monastic discipline. This was the *Eihei-ji Codes* (*Eihei shingi* 永平清規), attributed to Dōgen and first printed in 1667 by Kōshō Chidō 光紹智堂 (d. 1670), the thirtieth abbot of Eihei-ji (*ZGD*, pp. 88c and 849b). Another edition, reproduced as T 82, no. 2584, is based on a wood-block edition dated 1794 and includes a preface by Gentō Sokuchū 玄透即中 (1729–1807, the fiftieth abbot of Eihei-ji, who is revered as its “reviver” [*chūkō* 中興]).

¹⁸ Zenbunka Kenkyūjo (Hanazono University) microfilm no. 21–53, p. 14b. On the evolution of monastic codes since the so called *Baizhang Code*, see FOULK 1987.

Despite Mujaku's critique of Ōbaku, he was not someone who generally drew sharp distinctions between the sects. His views on the matter are reflected in the preface he wrote for his *Shōbōgenzō senpyō* 正法眼藏僭評:

I think that [the positions of] the Rinzai and Sōtō schools within the Zen [tradition] are similar to those of Mādhyamika and Yogācāra within classical Buddhism. In Sōtō there is no talk of wonderful awakening, just deep discussions on entry into the principle. In Rinzai, wonderful awakening is all that is discussed, and only when [one is] thoroughly awakened does the subtlety and greatness of [this] Dharma gate appear, of itself and in all limpidity. It is precisely because both houses [schools] complement each other that the Buddha Dharma is perfectly clear.¹⁹

Like most of his contemporaries, Mujaku upholds the view that Zen does not differ from classical Buddhism (*kyōzen itchi* 教禪一致). With his commitment to learning he can thus stress the fundamental unity from which Rinzai and Sōtō derive. On the other hand, this does not prevent him from attacking Sōtō or Ōbaku when their positions oppose what he sees as the authentic Dharma, which for him is virtually equivalent to Myōshin-ji orthodoxy.

In the *Shōbōgenzō senpyō* Mujaku tries in particular to show that the attacks on Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089–1163) and other Rinzai patriarchs that appear in the *Shōbōgenzō* were not the work of Dōgen but were later additions. Mujaku reached this conclusion by comparing three different versions of the text using his pioneering philological method. He decided on the basis of his study that the sixty-chapter *Shōbōgenzō* was the original text, and that the eighty-four-chapter version (the one with the attacks on the Rinzai masters) contained the work of later figures. His conclusions were a convenient way to reconcile Rinzai and Sōtō, although they are viewed as mistaken by modern textual scholars, who cite his lack of access to certain of the relevant documents (KAGAMISHIMA 1960b, p. 200).

Mujaku's erudition is only the most visible result of the resurgence of learning and other reformatory tendencies that occurred in Rinzai during the Tokugawa period, encouraged by Bakufu policies. The effects can also be seen in the work of Mangen Shibān 卍元師蠻 (1626–1710), who compiled two vast biographical collections on the priests of Japan. The *Enpō dentōroku* 延寶傳燈錄, completed in 1678 and

¹⁹ A photographic reproduction of the *Shōbōgenzō senpyō* is kept at the Zenbunka Kenkyūjo, microfilm no. 37–76, p. 1. See also KAGAMISHIMA 1960b, p. 1; KAGAMISHIMA 1961, p. 226; and YANAGIDA 1966, p. 33.

published in 1706, comprised forty-one chapters. Mangen was still not satisfied, however, and subsequently undertook the redaction of the more comprehensive *Honchō kōsōden* 本朝高僧傳 in seventy-five chapters, which he completed in 1702. These works may also have been intended to counterpose the two biographical anthologies written by the Ōbaku priest Gaoquan Xingdun 高泉性澂 (Jpn. Kōsen Shōton, 1633–1695). Gaoquan had published the *Fusō zenrin sōbōden* 扶桑禪林僧寶傳 in 1675, followed in 1686 by the *Zoku fusō zenrin sōbōden*.

The fruits of this early inclination to change in the Rinzai school were later reaped by Hakuin Ekaku and his disciples, who devised their own approach to Zen by reformulating the essentials of practice and revitalizing the monastic institution. When we consider the issue of sectarian relationships in Tokugawa Japan we should not overlook the convergence of Hakuin's line with that of Kogetsu Zenzai 古月禪材 (1667–1751) through the shift of Kogetsu's disciples to Hakuin. Kogetsu, who is noted for his stress on the precepts, inherited the Dharma from Kengan Zen'etsu 賢巖禪悅 (1618–1696), who had been close to the Chinese Ōbaku immigrants Yinyuan, Muan, and Daozhe Chaoyuan 菊者超元 (Jpn. Dōsha Chōgen, 1602–1662)²⁰ (*ZGD*, p. 672c–d, *OBJ*, p. 106a–b, and SCHWALLER 1989, p. 9).²¹

An interesting side effect of this heightened Chinese influence at a time of limited outside contact was increased reflection on the nature of the Japanese national identity. An early example of this type of nationalist response was the *Chichihen* 知・篇 [About knowing shame], published in Nagasaki by Mukai Genshō 向井元升 (1609–1677) in 1655, a year after Yinyuan's arrival. Mukai practiced medicine and advocated his own blend of Confucianism, Shinto, and nativist ideas. He utterly rejects foreign influences, and gives several examples of the disastrous effects of Christianity before its suppression. Buddhism is accused of having facilitated the reception of Christianity: "The coming of the evil *kirishitan* teaching to this country and its misleading of the Japanese people can be traced to the Buddhist Dharma" (*Kaihyō sōsho* ed., p. 12). Mukai moves on to a detailed and critical account of Yinyuan's influence. Though the critique is not completely devoid of respect for Yinyuan, who is referred to by the title "Zen master," it essentially deplores the infatuation of the Japanese for foreign manners and customs (*fūgi* 風儀):

In our country Japan, the Way of Heaven is not transgressed,
the affection of the kami is clear, and the efforts of the people

²⁰ Daozhe's dates follow those given in *OBJ*, p. 263a–b.

²¹ Further information on the complementarity between the Hakuin and Kogetsu lines can be found in AKIYAMA 1983, pp. 146–53.

are satisfactory. We have been preserved from disgrace precisely because we are not contaminated by foreign customs. (*Kaihyō sōsho* ed., p. 1)

The Japanese monks under Master Yinyuan have all abandoned the priestly ways of their own country and adopted the customs of China. Their behavior is ridiculous, and [they] should be ashamed. I consider it disgraceful that they have without good cause altered the proper lifestyle followed by Japanese priests since times of old. If this is something that Master Yinyuan has encouraged, I can only wonder about his inner intentions. (*Kaihyō sōsho* ed., pp. 24–25)

The Development of Sōtō Reforms

Among the factors that prompted changes in the Sōtō tradition, external elements appear to have been the most decisive.

One such factor was the increased government regulation of Sōtō activity that took place during the Tokugawa period. In contrast to the Middle Ages, when the expansion of the sect in the provinces had been left to the initiative of the respective branches, the Tokugawa period was marked by Bakufu attempts to reinforce its control on Sōtō by centralizing and unifying the temple hierarchy system (*honmatsu seido* 本末制度) (TAKENUKI 1993, pp. 309–19). According to ordinances passed in 1612 and 1615, only the two main temples of Eihei-ji 永平寺 and Sōji-ji 總持寺 were entitled to decide who had the right to wear the “purple robe” (TAKENUKI 1989, p. 204); priests were also to show a thorough acquaintance with the practice and teaching of their school before being permitted to head a temple. In addition, the 1612 declaration stipulated that only priests who had successfully undergone thirty years of practice would be permitted to teach the Dharma (KAGAMISHIMA 1993, p. 4). The severity of the requirements was one factor that encouraged the creation of two Sōtō academies (*gakuryō* 學寮) in Edo: the Sendanrin 梅檀林 on the precincts of Kichijō-ji 吉祥寺, and the Shishikutsu 獅子窟 on the precincts of Seishō-ji 青松寺 (TAKENUKI 1989, p. 204).

The other external factor encouraging reform was the increased contact with Chinese priests that followed the emergence and spread of the Ōbaku tradition. Many of these contacts involved Ōbaku priests other than Yinyuan; one important figure was Daozhe, who had arrived in Nagasaki four years prior to Yinyuan. Among the Sōtō priests most influenced by Ōbaku were Dokuan Genkō 獨菴玄光 (1630–1698) and Manzan Dōhaku, who were to push for reforms in

the Dharma transmission rules of the Sōtō school (we will return to this important issue in the final section of this paper).²² Dokuan spent almost eight years under Daozhe, while Manzan was a good friend of Chōon Dōkai 潮音菊海 (1625–1695), an Ōbaku monk who was a disciple of Muan.²³ Manzan’s teacher, Gesshū Sōko 月舟宗胡 (1618–1696), also maintained friendly ties with Ōbaku. Dokuan and Manzan were influenced by Ōbaku notions of monastic discipline and by Ōbaku criticisms of Dharma transmission abuses, but fundamentally they saw their reform movement as a “restoration of the past” (*fukko undō* 復古運動), that is, as a return to the original position of the Sōtō school. As we shall see, Manzan (though not Dokuan) was particularly inspired by the writings of Dōgen.²⁴

During the reform process Sōtō priests became progressively more divided between the defenders and the adversaries of change. At the same time, the leaders of the respective Sōtō factions had to adopt a position either for or against the novelties brought by the Ōbaku newcomers during the period of assimilation following Yinyuan’s arrival. The two issues were not necessarily connected, and in the course of time various of the positions were reversed (another reason I avoid speaking of “conservative” and “progressive” factions, since the standpoints adopted by the different protagonists can be viewed from both angles; it might also be pointed out that the slogan “restoring the past” is a rather paradoxical expression to denote innovation).

Of interest for our inquiry into sectarian consciousness is the fact

²² Dokuan also had close contacts with another Chinese immigrant, the Caodong priest Xinyue Xingchou 心越興儔 (Jpn. Shin’etsu Kōchū, 1639–1695, also known by his surname Donggao 東皐, Jpn. Tōkō). The fate of the Shouchang (Jpn. Jushō) branch 壽昌派 of the Caodong school brought to Japan by Xinyue, including the protection it received from its powerful patron, Tokugawa Mitsukuni 德川光圀 (1628–1700), forms an interesting episode of this period (see NAGAI 1979 and 1993). The role of Manzan in the Sōtō reforms is now relatively clear, thanks in particular to the work of KAGAMISHIMA (1978, 1986) and BODIFORD (1991).

²³ Concerning Chōon see SCHWALLER 1988. A book on Chōon by the same author is in preparation. For Chōon’s contacts with Manzan see BODIFORD 1991, p. 431.

²⁴ This movement has been greatly idealized in later Sōtō chronicles, with most accounts relying on the *Shūtō fukko shi* 宗統復古志, a document published in 1760 by Manzan’s disciple Sanshū Hakuryū 三洲白龍 (1669–1760). This text is, according to BODIFORD, “a hagiographical history of Manzan’s campaign,” though it is nevertheless “the prime source for studying the reform movement” (1991, p. 424). Despite the value of the *Shūtō fukkoshi*, particularly for its reproduction of some of the correspondence between the reformers and the shogunate’s *Jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行 (Office of Temples and Shrines), it should be complemented by Manzan’s own writings and by a historical examination of the various forces that influenced Manzan and his predecessors. It is also important to examine the writings of those who opposed the reforms of Manzan and his supporters. In this regard the thought of Tenkei Denson 天桂傳尊 (1648–1736), a rather marginal Sōtō thinker, is of great value.

that the early supporters of “restoring the past” were generally well disposed towards Ōbaku, while later proponents gradually adopted a more critical stance (though they shared the same views on Dharma transmission). This attitude of rejection commenced with Sonnō Sōeki 損翁宗益 (1650–1705),²⁵ who harshly criticized Dokuan’s Ōbaku connections, and culminated under his successor, Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683–1769), who made a systematic attempt to obliterate all traces of the Ōbaku legacy (KAGAMISHIMA 1978, p. 69, NAKAO 1993, p. 383).

Also of interest is the influence of certain Rinzai priests opposed to the current infatuation with Ōbaku customs. Let us now turn to a brief examination of this point.

Rinzai and Sōtō Contacts

Earlier we noted the relative open-mindedness that Mujaku Dōchū displayed towards the Sōtō tradition in his preface to the *Shōbōgenzō senpyō*. Mujaku also maintained amicable contacts with several Sōtō priests, particularly Baihō Jikushin 梅峰竺信 (1633–1707), one of Manzan’s closest allies in the “restore the past movement.”²⁶ Mujaku’s direct acquaintance with more than a dozen contemporaneous Sōtō personalities is likewise well established (see SHIBE 1983, p. 249).

Owing to his prodigious study habits, Mujaku was surely thoroughly familiar with Sōtō writings as well, including those connected with the heated Sōtō debate about Dharma succession. This opens the possibility of an intellectual connection between Mujaku and the Sōtō thinker Tenkei Denson 天桂傳尊 (1648–1736), an unorthodox priest opposed to the reform movement of Manzan and Baihō (see note 24). The criticism of Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō* that appears in Mujaku’s *Shōbōgenzō senpyō* reflects in many ways the position taken in Tenkei’s *Shōbōgenzō benchū* 正法眼藏辨註, published in 1729. This suggests that Mujaku might have read the latter work. Although the *Shōbōgenzō senpyō* is thought by some scholars to have predated the *Shōbōgenzō benchū* (Yanagida proposes 1713, the year Mujaku was first appointed abbot of Myōshin-ji),²⁷ the dates for its redaction are not in fact known—

²⁵ For the reading of Sonnō’s surname I have followed NAKANO (1982, p. i) rather than the *ZGD*.

²⁶ Mujaku’s friendly relations with Baihō may have resulted in part from the admiration of Mujaku’s mother for this Sōtō priest (KAGAMISHIMA 1958, p. 85)

²⁷ YANAGIDA holds that the decision to nominate Mujaku as abbot (*shinjū* 晋住), taken in 1713, coincides with his writing of the *Shōbōgenzō senpyō*, while his new mandate (*saijū* 再住) in 1720 coincides with the redaction of the *Ōbaku geki* (1966, p. 40). The *OBJ* speaks only of his second nomination, in 1714, as 314th abbot at the age of 62. These accounts seem contradictory, but can easily be reconciled. Mujaku’s first nomination occurred in 1707, at the

SHIBE notes that the year 1713 is mentioned in the part of Iida's manuscript copy containing corrections to the *Shōbōgenzō* (*Eihei Shōbōgenzō hōka* 永平正法眼藏校譌), but does not seem to appear elsewhere (1983, 247–48).²⁸

Another Rinzaï figure who maintained good relations with several of the most influential Sōtō people of his time was Keirin Sūshin, mentioned above in connection with his remarks on Feiyin in the *Zenrin shūheishū* (see above). In 1693 Keirin became the abbot of Hoshun-in 保春院 in Sendai, and the following year succeeded his master as head of Zuihō-ji 瑞鳳寺 in the same city. As a resident of Sendai he became acquainted with Sonnō Sōeki, who in 1697 had assumed the abbacy of the Sendai temple of Taishin-in 泰心院. Keirin was also the 313th abbot of Myōshin-ji, a position that required him to make occasional brief stays in Kyoto. There he kept up a friendship with Manzan Dōhaku, then in retirement at the small hermitage of Genkō-an 源光菴 in Takagamine 鷹峯 north of the city.

Keirin's ties with the two Sōtō priests are also reflected in their written works. Keirin, for example, wrote the preface to Manzan's *Zen'yotōkō* 禪餘套稿, published in 1714, while Manzan maintained a correspondence with Keirin that has, in part, found its way into Manzan's recorded sayings.²⁹ Sonnō's [*Ōshū Sonnō rōnin*] *Kenmon hōeiki* 見聞寶永記, compiled by his disciple Menzan in 1744, mentions Keirin's full name and his *Zenrin shūheishū*. It is perhaps not mere coincidence that this particular passage, which also contains criticism of Manzan, is missing from the *Zoku Sōtōshū zensho* text.³⁰

Keirin remained friendly with both Manzan and Sonnō, although the positions of the latter two were widely divergent in several important respects. Although Manzan and Sonnō were in agreement on the central issue of Dharma succession, they were, as mentioned above, of quite different opinions when it came to the question of Ōbaku influence. Keirin was close to Sonnō on this issue; ironically, Keirin's

age of 55 (IDA 1986, p. 129). The second occurred in 1713, but went into effect only in 1714 when Mujaku was 62 (IDA 1986, p. 162). A third nomination occurred in 1720 (IDA 1986, p. 187), when he was 68. An important aspect of Mujaku's first nomination is the fact that he succeeded Keirin Sūshin as head of Myōshin-ji.

²⁸ The photographic reproduction at the Zenbunka Kenkyūjo is undated. Shibe proposes that it was compiled after 1719, and most probably around 1725, since the preface contains a quote from the *Sōrin yakujū* 叢林藥樹 by Sekiun Yūsen 石雲融仙 (b. 1677), published in 1719. Sekiun Yūsen was a disciple of Dokuan Genkō (*ZGD*, p.1244a, no. 2).

²⁹ One letter is included in his *Manzan oshō kōroku* 卍山和尚廣錄 [Sayings] (*Sōtōshū zensho: Goroku 2*, p. 656). There is also a short letter in *Sōtōshū zensho: Goroku 3* (p. 217b).

³⁰ It is included in NAKANO 1982 (p. 189). The missing passages in the *Zoku Sōtōshū zensho* (vol. "Hōgo," p. 437) correspond to numbers 86, 87, and 88 in Nakano's edition.

call to purge the influence of Ōbaku found a ready audience in Sonnō and Menzan of the Sōtō school, while his efforts went completely ignored in his own Rinzai school.

The final example of Sōtō-Rinzai exchange I will examine is that between Tenkei Denson and Bankei Yōtaku 盤珪永琢 (1622–1693), both of whom have been regarded as “heretics” in their respective sects. The ties between the two have been examined by many scholars, including SUZUKI (1941, pp. 281–82), KAGAMISHIMA (1961, p. 127), FUJIMOTO (1971, pp. 415–16), FURUTA (1974), and SHIBE (1985 and 1992).

According to the *Tenkei oshō nenpu* 天桂和尚年譜 [Biography of Tenkei], the two men met at least twice, in 1685 and 1686. An additional meeting is mentioned in the *Zeigo* 贅語, edited by Bankei’s disciple Sandō Chijō 山堂智常 (1668–1749), though no date is specified.³¹ The *Zeigo* speaks of Tenkei’s support for Bankei, but since this is an apologetic text written in 1747, more than fifty years after Bankei’s death, it should be treated cautiously.

The teachings of the two masters are similar in several respects, but it is not clear if this is mere coincidence or the result of one master’s influence upon the other. Both masters underwent a period of intense asceticism, followed by a deep realization of the absurdity of their efforts. This led them to negate the kind of severe practice that they themselves had engaged in and to stress the attainability of awareness even in the midst of lay life. This was meant to encourage ordinary people to practice Zen, since reaching a popular audience was a priority for both priests (SHIBE 1992, pp. 111–12).

Even their vocabulary is sometimes similar: Bankei exhorted his followers to realize their “unborn Buddha heart” (*fushō no busshin* 不生の佛心), while Tenkei asked *his* to perceive their “undeluded heart” (*fumei no jishin* 不迷の自心). Both men’s teachings about the attainability of Buddhahood were aimed not only at men but at women as well, as both stressed that no difference existed in their religious potential. Although Tenkei was hardly a champion of equality and sometimes expressed views implying the superiority of males, he believed with regard to realization that “in the absence of delusion itself there is no difference between man and woman” (*mayowanu jitai ni danjo no shabetsu wa nai* 迷ワヌ自體ニ男女ノ差別ハナイ) (*Hokke yōkai fūchōki* 法華要解風調記 5, p. 8; cited in SHIBE 1992, p. 115).

The similarity of Bankei’s and Tenkei’s styles has even given rise to a strange confusion concerning the paternity of a certain commen-

³¹ Included in SUZUKI 1941 (p. 150). See the English translation by WADDELL (1984, p. 142). The dates of Sandō Chijō are those in HASKEL (1984, p. 196), but should be checked as I could find no confirmation in other sources.

tary on the *Heart Sūtra*. This text is referred to as the *Hannya shingyō shiteisen* 般若心經止啼錢 when attributed to Tenkei, and as the *Shingyōshō* 心經鈔 (and later the *Shingyō nensai* 心經燃犀) when credited to Bankei. The philological debate on this question is too complex to be summarized here, but the latest consensus is that the work is Tenkei's (SHIBE 1985, pp. 250–54).

In this section I have examined only a few of the better known contacts between Rinzai and Sōtō priests. Many others obviously existed—YOSHIDA (1993) gives a systematic review of such contacts involving Rinzai priests in nine of the fourteen branches of Rinzai Zen; he also lists contacts between Ōbaku priests and Rinzai priests without regard to branch affiliation. Among the many personalities who played important roles in these interactions, the two Sōtō priests Bannan Eishu 萬安英種 (1591–1654), reviver of Kōshō-ji 興聖寺, and Banjin Dōtan 萬仞荀坦 (1698–1775) must not be overlooked; also important was the above-mentioned Ōbaku follower Chōon Dōkai.

The Issue of Dharma Succession

The nature of sectarian consciousness at any particular time is especially evident in the prevailing attitudes toward Dharma transmission, since it is through the transmission process that the identity and integrity of the lineage is preserved. This is particularly important in view of the fact that during the Tokugawa period the misuse of Dharma-succession practices had become a plague that affected the credibility of the entire Zen Buddhist clergy.

From the Buddhist perspective, of course, the Dharma cannot be transmitted, but only authenticated or acknowledged. Furthermore, there is almost always a hiatus between the existential breakthrough that is the primary purpose of practice and the acknowledgement of this personal authentication by another individual or by an institution. Stated simply, Dharma transmission has been of two principal types: transmission based on spiritual recognition (*inshō* 印證), and transmission according to temple lineage (*garanbō* 伽藍法). Both types are used by the respective Zen schools, although their significance is understood in slightly different ways.

In the Rinzai school the issue of Dharma transmission is essentially subjective, that is, left to the discretion of the master, and the ambiguity of terms such as “successor in the Dharma” (*hassu* 法嗣) has persisted down to the present. According to the context or the circumstances, it can signify either spiritual recognition or inheritance of a temple lineage. Even in the biography of Hakuin the words “entrust the

Dharma” (*fuhō* 附法) merely indicate that charge of a temple has been confided to a certain priest (KATŌ 1985, 33–34). Although this usually implies that the chosen priest is of a certain level of accomplishment, it must be distinguished from the full recognition conferred by a master upon a disciple whom he intends to make his successor. The latter type of recognition sometimes takes the form of written certification (*inka* 印可), but there have been cases of true acknowledgement in which no document has been bestowed. From the Rinzai perspective, true realization (*jissō* 實證) and succession to a master (*shijō* 師承) are two different stages in the course of practice, the latter implying a comprehensive integration of awakening in the activities of everyday life.³²

One of the most controversial transmission practices that emerged in Zen was a form of *garanbō* succession known as *in'in ekishi* 因院易嗣 (changing lineage according to the temple). In *in'in ekishi* a priest would, upon being appointed head of a temple, abandon the Dharma lineage that he had inherited from his real master and adopt the Dharma lineage associated with his new temple, even if he had no previous links with that line whatsoever. In the Rinzai school Keirin was particularly active in denouncing the improper practice of *in'in ekishi*, devoting the second article of his *Zenrin shūheishū* to an explanation of why one “should not change indiscriminately one’s Dharma lineage by choosing a temple.”

It was in the Sōtō school, however, that the problem of lineage change reached crisis proportions and gave rise to a complete remolding of the rules to be observed in Dharma succession. This was the central issue in the reforms led by Manzan and Baihō. By the seventeenth century *in'in ekishi* had long been standard practice in the school; Manzan and the other reformers felt that this was contrary to the teachings of their founder Dōgen, and pushed for rule changes that would require transmission to be based on direct contact between master and disciple, and would restrict succession to a single individual. The issue might have remained only a passionate debate within the confines of the Sōtō school had not the inertia of Eihei-ji and Sōji-ji caused the reformers to appeal directly to the Bakufu. Their complaint finally led to a ruling (*sadamegaki* 定書) in 1703 in favor of the reformers’ position.³³

The transmission debate led to a deep split between those Sōtō Zen

³² A detailed exposition of the different aspects of “post-awakening” practice can be found in the *Shūmon mujintō ron* 宗門無盡燈論 by Hakuin’s disciple Tōrei Enji 東嶺圓慈 (1721–1792). T 81, no. 2575.

³³ BODIFORD gives an account of this ruling, although not a translation (1991, p. 449).

thinkers in favor of changing the transmission customs and those who felt that this would only lead to further degeneracy. It also contributed to increased textual study, since both factions turned to the writings of Dōgen to justify their respective positions (the three chapters of the *Shōbōgenzō* most relevant to the discussion were “Shisho” 嗣書 [Succession document], “Menju” 面授 [Face to face transmission], and “Juki” 授記 [Assurance of awakening]).

Though the Bakufu’s ruling legally settled the question of undue changes in Dharma affiliation, the details of how to determine proper succession were yet to be worked out. The standpoint of Manzan on this issue is often summarized by the laconic formula *go migo shihō* 悟未悟嗣法, which can be translated “To inherit the Dharma, whether awakened [or] not yet awakened.” This expression is one that can easily be misunderstood, and may even appear to contradict the fundamental aim of Buddhist practice. Manzan’s position has, indeed, been characterized as a “devaluation of the enlightenment experience” (BODIFORD 1991, p. 451). Let us consider whether this was really so.

Manzan explains his position in his *Taikyaku zuihitsu* 對客隨筆 [Notes to visitors], published in 1704 after the victory of his faction in the appeal to the Bakufu.³⁴ The work lists eight objections still being made at that time to his reforms, and gives his answers to each of the remonstrations. Here is the sixth question:

Point 6. People say there can be no discussion on the proposition that transmission [must] be based on awakening, [when] the understanding of master and disciple match (*shishi shōken* 師資相見); they further say that in today’s world awakened people are so few that Dharma succession is inauthentic and [priests] change their line according to the temple. I do not understand what they mean by this.

(*Tōkai itteki shū*, 1704 edition p. 36B)

In his answer Manzan quotes the “Assurance of Awakening” and “Succession Document” chapters of the *Shōbōgenzō*. The section containing the first quote is important enough to examine closely:

The teachings of both Sōtō Zen and Rinzai Zen on the relation between master and disciple hold that transmission after awakening represents spiritual certification by a single master, and that the document of succession is an expression

³⁴ This text is included in *Tōkai itteki shū* 東海一滴集. It also appears in the later *Manzan oshō tōmon ejoshū*, 卍山和尚洞門衣柳集, reprinted in *Eihei shōbōgenzō shūsho taisei* 永平正法眼藏蒐書大成, vol. 20.

of confidence.³⁵ Even if transmission is obtained before awakening, this too represents spiritual certification by a single master, and the document of succession represents an expression of confidence. There are people who are awakened and people who are not yet awakened, but in the Dharma this distinction does not exist. This may be regarded as an expedient teaching, but the fact that there is no talk of “awakened” and “not yet awakened” [shows that] they are manifestations of the same thing. Generally speaking, at the time of Dharma succession there is no need to debate whether awakening has occurred or not—when the necessary conditions appear this extraordinary apprehension takes place in stillness.

Therefore it is said in the “Assurance of Awakening” chapter of the *Shōbōgenzō*: “Do not say that the assurance of awakening must not be given to someone who is not yet awakened. Although ordinarily we are taught that the assurance of awakening should be conferred only when the merits of cultivation are complete and the realization of Buddhahood is complete, this is not the way of the Buddha. It is possible to obtain the assurance of awakening upon hearing a phrase from the scriptures or a word from a master. (*Tōkai itteki shū*, pp. 36B–37A)

Since Manzan reconstructs the original Japanese of the *Shōbōgenzō* into *kanbun*, it is important to check if the rendition is faithful to Dōgen’s text. With the exception of a minor inversion of words, this appears to be the case.³⁶ This perspective on the “assurance of awakening” is not entirely original to Dōgen, however, as he might well have been inspired by the *Māhāyānasūtrālamkāra* (大乘莊嚴經論), attributed to Asaṅga. This Indian text gives a detailed explanation of the various types of “assurance of awakening,” listing fourteen different classes.³⁷ It is interesting to note that the first class is “assurance [given] before producing the thought of bodhi” (*mihosshin juki* 未發心授記). One significant point in this passage is the equivalence Manzan establishes between the assurance of awakening and succession in the Dharma,

³⁵ The expression *biaoxin* 表信 appears in the Chan classics, particularly in the story of the Sixth Patriarch. The patriarch, pursued by a senior monk, lays the robe he has received from the Fifth Patriarch on a rock, saying that “this robe represents confidence” (T 48, no. 2005, p. 295c24). I avoid the word *faith* in the translation, as I feel that *confidence* better conveys the nuance of “trust in the true nature.” In Sōtō Zen, the succession document (*shisho* 嗣書) is regarded as having the same metaphoric meaning (YOSHIDA 1991, p. 98).

³⁶ I have followed MIZUNO (1990, vol. 2, p. 64). The text is identical to T 82, no. 2582, 147b20–b26.

³⁷ T 31, no. 1604, p. 652a18–b10. The Sanskrit equivalent for the Chinese *shouji* 授記 is usually either *vyākaraṇa* or *vyākṛtya*, the former being translated as “prophecy, prediction” (EDGERTON 1953, vol. 2, p. 517a).

adopting Dōgen's radical conception of time as "the taking place (*kyōryaku* 經歷) of all beings" (STAMBAUGH 1990, p. 26).

Thus the position of Manzan and Baihō is by no means a simple negation of the centrality of awakening. Their view must be considered in terms of the characteristic Sōtō Zen notion of the nonduality of cultivation and authentication, a position largely derived from the Tendai doctrine of original enlightenment. If their advocacy of "inheriting the Dharma whether awakened or not yet awakened" led subsequently to a formalistic attitude towards succession in the Sōtō school, this was probably not their intent. Manzan and Baihō's central purpose—one supported, incidentally, by Keirin—was to halt reckless changes of lineage, and the standards that they devised to effect this included *go migo shihō*, anchored in a nondualistic view of awakening.

If, however, one follows ISHITSUKE (1964, p. 259) in his attempt to step down to the relative level where there *is* a distinction between awakened and not awakened, one can cite four different patterns of transmission:

- 1) The master is awakened, the disciple is not.
- 2) Neither the master nor his disciple are awakened.
- 3) Both master and disciple are awakened.
- 4) Neither master nor disciple are awakened, but the disciple later awakens by himself.

Fear of case 2—obviously the worst possibility—is what gave rise to most of the criticism of Manzan and his supporters, although case 3 was undoubtedly the ideal that they were aiming for. Since the actualization of this pattern is a matter of individual experience, it was virtually impossible to institutionalize into a set of regulations and inevitably gave rise to difficulties.

What, then, was the perspective of the Sōtō outsiders Dokuan Genkō and Tenkei Denson? Although both priests agreed on the need to reform the regulations governing Dharma transmission, both were also opposed to certain aspects of Manzan's proposals (Dokuan to Manzan's stress on the importance of Dōgen, Tenkei to Manzan's rejection of *garanbō*). The common ground of their respective positions was the view that realization constituted the prerequisite for any real Dharma succession, and that transmission certificates and horse-hair whisks (*hossu* 拂子) were nothing more than auxiliary symbolic devices. Dokuan even asserted that wisdom-life (*emyō* 慧命), supposedly inherited in the ritual of Dharma succession, was at that time just a word devoid of reality, and that the only persons who kept the torch of wisdom alive were those who awakened without a master:

When I carefully observe the transmission of the robe and the entrusting of the Dharma in the Zen school nowadays, [I see that] the name survives but the reality has long since disappeared. Today, those who inherit the wisdom-life of the Buddhas and patriarchs depend upon awakening by themselves without a master. Even if the name disappears, they are the only ones who inherit the reality.

(“Zokudan” 俗談, *maki no jō* in the *Gohōshū* 護法集, quoted in YOSHIDA 1981, p. 99)

Dokuan’s seemingly pessimistic view is meant to underline the scarcity of true masters in his time. It should not be understood as praise of “those who awaken by themselves without a master”—the next section of Dokuan’s text shows that he considers solitary, unconfirmed awakening as potentially self-deluding. Still, he believes that “awakening without a master” (*mushi jigo* 無師自悟) is preferable to “having a master without awakening” (*ushi mugo* 有師無悟). A stress upon inner attainment and an unyielding rejection of formal compromises are two of the characteristics that Dokuan and Tenkei share.

Returning to the problem of sectarian consciousness, we see that Manzan and his followers, as well as those reformers with different views, were all searching for the best way to ensure the survival of the “wisdom-life of Buddhas and patriarchs,” and not simply trying to promote the Sōtō sect. Each party sought reform in its own way, and the opposition they met was from conservative priests within the establishment of their own school, such as Jōzan Ryōkō 定山良光 (d. 1736). Not only did Manzan (as well as many other of the reformers) maintain good relationships with Rinzai priests, but Dokuan was clearly in favor of a return to the “Chan of the Sixth patriarch” (*Sōkeizen* 曹谿禪), before its division into the Caodong (Sōtō) and Linji (Rinzai) currents (see YOSHIDA 1981, p. 97).

Conclusion

One of the characteristics of seventeenth-century Tokugawa Zen that emerges from our consideration of the figures and movements above is a quite wide diversity of positions, even within the respective sects (surprisingly so for a reputedly moribund tradition). This essay is, of course, nothing more than a preliminary study of the main trends of the period, but even so we can see the outlines of certain general features starting to appear.

Of particular interest for the evolution of sectarian consciousness is the catalyst role played by developments in China. In the first section

we saw the influence of Neo-Confucian thought on the “identity crisis” that affected Chinese and Japanese Buddhism during the seventeenth century; one of the more visible signs of this influence was the terminology (e.g., *shūtō*, *fukko*) used by the Japanese reform movements, especially in the Sōtō school. The arrival of the Ōbaku line—the last main phase in the transmission of Buddhism from China to Japan—was also important, with the immigrant Ōbaku priests conveying certain of the conflicts about lineage and orthodoxy that had rocked the Chinese Linji and Caodong schools. The reception of Ōbaku was largely characterized by a fascination for things foreign; the true implications of the doctrinal debates going on in China were probably understood only by a few educated people.

During the first half of the Tokugawa period external stimuli encouraged the adoption of new attitudes, and the Chinese presence at the Manpuku-ji played an essential role in maintaining these initiatives. The ultimate fate of the Ōbaku tradition is also quite instructive for our review of the emergence of Tokugawa sectarian consciousness. The initial policy of Manpuku-ji was to nominate only Chinese priests for the abbacy, but the discrimination that this implied eventually led to the isolation of the new movement and its gradual weakening. The fascination exerted by this exotic current of Zen declined, and eventually Japanese abbots had to be named. The final turning point in this process came near the end of the Tokugawa, when Ryōchū Nyoryū 良忠如隆 (1793–1868) was appointed thirty-third abbot in 1851. Ryōchū, though formally incorporated into the Ōbaku lineage, was actually a product of the Hakuin’s line, having received certification from Takujū Kosen 卓洲胡僊 (1760–1833) (*ZGD*, p. 995d; *OBJ*, pp. 388a–89a; and MURASE 1982). The monopoly of Hakuin’s successors has continued unbroken since that time, so that the Ōbaku lineage has been de facto absorbed into the Rinzai school.

Likewise, Sōtō orthodoxy grew stronger after Menzan, and few discordant voices have appeared in that lineage since the nineteenth century. Interestingly, though, descendants of Tenkei’s line still exist today (see SHIBE 1992, p. 117).

Most Japanese priests from the main Rinzai and Sōtō lines, like Mujaku, Hakuin, Keirin, Manzan, and Sonnō, showed a propensity to go beyond the borders of their respective sects, unlike their colleagues on the continent. This tendency was even clearer when they cooperated in order to resist the influence of a third party (that is, Ōbaku). The triangular relation between Keirin, Manzan, and Sonnō provides a clear instance of how lineage constraints could be overcome for a specific purpose.

The nature of the exchanges between such individuals as Bankei and Tenkei, Dokuan and Daozhe, and Keirin with Manzan and Sonnō suggests either that their level of sectarian consciousness was still relatively low or that factional consciousness loomed larger than sectarian consciousness. New religious policies adopted by the Bakufu encouraged individuals to define more precisely their own positions and affiliations, but a simultaneous sense of crisis seems to have fostered a feeling of togetherness among Zen Buddhists, who may have placed concerns about the survival of meaningful Buddhist practice above considerations of sect.

Still, the necessities of the times may have been disguising an underlying attitude of narrow-mindedness. The establishment of a sort of “orthodoxy” specific to each sect began to materialize as the “foreign” elements were gradually excluded and the notion of a pure lineage became widely recognized. Because of the paucity of clear textual evidence it is difficult to ascertain the exact time of this transformation, but one might locate it as “post-Hakuin” for the Rinzai tradition and “post-Menzan” for the Sōtō tradition. This is not to say that the respective schools up to and including the time of Hakuin and Menzan were free of sectarian militancy. There was, however, an active communication between representatives of Rinzai and Sōtō through the eighteenth century, although from the beginning of the nineteenth century the attitudes of the two sects definitely began to stiffen. Further study of sectarian developments during the late-Tokugawa and Meiji periods is thus a major priority in future Zen Buddhist studies. A necessary part of this study will be the further investigation of the background provided by Ming and Qing China, an effort that will certainly unveil new aspects of the enduring influence of Chinese factors on sectarian awareness in Japan.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, 100 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 et al., eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai and Daizō Shuppan, 1924–1932.
- OBJ *Ōbaku bunka jinmei jiten* 黄檗文化人名辞典, Ōtsuki Mikio 大槻幹郎, Katō Shōshun 加藤正俊, and Hayashi Yukimitsu 林雪光, eds. Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1988.
- Z *Zokuzōkyō* 續藏經, 150 vols. Taipei: Xinwengeng, 1968–1970 (reprinted from the *Dainihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經, Kyoto: Zōkyō Shoin, 1905–1912).

ZGD *Zengaku daijiten* 禪學大辭典, new ed., Zengaku Daijiten Hensan-sho 禪學大辭典編纂所, ed. Tokyo: Taishūkan, 1985.

PRIMARY SOURCES (in chronological order)

Houhanshu 後漢書, “Guangwu di ji” 光武帝紀, Ershisi shi 二十四史, Baina book 百衲本, pp. 2614b–2615a.

Chichihen 知·篇. 3 kan, by Mukai Genshō 向井元升, published in 1655; a copy of the original edition is kept at the Main Library affiliated to Kyoto University (*Fuzoku toshokan* 附屬図書館). It is reprinted in *Kaihyō sōsho* 海表叢書 vol. 1, supervised by Shinmura Izuru 新村出 (1876–1967), pp. 1–117, published by Kōseikaku Sōgyō 更正閣叢行 in 1869 (no place given).

Takkakubun 答客問. 1 kan, by Mumon Genshin 無門原真, composed in 1667.

Mukai nanshin 霧海南針. 1 kan, by Chōon Dōkai, published in 1672, reproduced in *Zenmon hogoshū* 禪門法語集 vol. 3, pp. 145–70.

Fusō zenrin sōbōden 扶桑禪林僧寶傳. 10 kan, by Gaoquan Xingdun 高泉性激, published in 1675, reproduced in *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, vol. 109.

Shūtōroku 宗統錄. 5 satsu, by Ryūkei Shōsen 龍溪性潛, published in 1683, modern ed. by the Ryūkei Zenji Hōsankai 竜溪禪師奉贊會編, entitled *Kundoku shūtōroku* 訓讀 宗統錄. Kyoto 1970: Kichūdō.

Zoku fusō zenrin sōbōden 續扶桑禪林僧寶傳. 3 kan, by Gaoquan Xingdun, published in 1686, reproduced in *Dainihon bukkyō zensho*, vol. 109.

Gohōshū 護法集. 16 kan including the additional part (*zokushū* 續集), by Dokuan Genkō 獨菴玄光, published in 1697, reproduced in *Sōtōshū zensho: Goroku 1* 曹洞宗全書·語錄一.

Tōmon gekitan 洞門劇譚. 1 kan, by Baihō Jikushin 梅峰竺信, published in 1700, reproduced in *Sōtōshū zensho: Shitchū* 曹洞宗全書·室中.

Zenrin shūheishū 禪林執弊集. 2 kan, by Keirin Sūshin, published in 1700.

Shōbōtekiden shishi ikku shū 正法嫡傳獅子一吼集. By Jōzan Ryōkō 定山良光, published in 1702, reproduced in *Sōtōshū zensho: Shitchū*. (A refutation of the *Tōmon gekitan* by Baihō).

Shōbōtekiden shishi ikku shū benkai 正法嫡傳獅子一吼集辨解. 1 kan, by Keirin Sūshin, published in 1704. (A response to Jōzan’s *Shōbōtekiden shishi ikku shū*).

Rinkyū kyakuwa 林丘客話. 2 kan, by Baihō Jikushin, published in 1705, reproduced in *Sōtōshū zensho: Shitchū* (quoted by Mujaku Dōchū in his *Kinben shigai* 金鞭指街 17).

Enpō dentōroku 延寶傳燈錄. 41 kan, by Mangen Shibān 卍元師蠻, compiled in 1678 and published in 1706, reproduced in *Dainihon bukkyō zensho*, vols. 108–109.

- Honchō kōsōden* 本朝高僧傳. 75 kan, by Mangen Shiban, preface dated 1702, published in 1707, reproduced in *Dainihon bukkyō zensho*, vols. 102–103.
- Shūtō hasso den* 宗統八祖傳. 1 kan, ed. by Settan Fūgiku 雪潭風砥, published in 1902 by Shōtakuan 聖澤菴.
- Zen'yōtōkō* 禪餘套稿. 1 kan, by Manzan Dōhaku 卍山菊白, ed. by Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞芳, published in 1714 by the bookstore Ryūshiken 柳枝軒 in Kyoto.
- Zensekishī* 禪籍志. 1 kan, by Shōboku Gitai 聖僕義諦, preface dated 1693, published in 1716, reproduced in *Dainihon bukkyō zensho*, vol. 1, pp. 271–320.
- Ōbaku geki* 黃檗外記. Manuscript, by Mujaku Dōchū, completed in 1720, reproduced in KAGAMISHIMA 1960b, 145–72.
- Zenrin sōga* 禪林甌瓦. 1 kan, by Gimoku Genkai 宜默玄契, published in 1741, reproduced in *Zoku Sōtōshū zensho: Shitchū*.
- Manzan oshō kōroku* 卍山和尚廣錄, 49 kan, ed. by Sanshū Hakuryū 三洲白龍 et al., published in 1740, reproduced in *Sōtōshū zensho: Goroku 2*.
- Ōshū Sonnō rōnin kenmon Hōeiki* 奥州損翁老人見聞寶永記. 1 kan, sayings of Sonnō Sōeki 損翁宗益, ed. by Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞芳, redaction completed in 1744, reproduced in *Zoku Sōtōshū zensho: Hōgo*, vol. 9, pp. 411–45.
- Zenshū shussehan jiki* 禪宗出世班次記. 1 kan, by Mitsun Genkai 密雲彦契, published in 1746, Baiyō Shoin 貝葉書院.
- Shūtō fukko shi* 宗統復古志. 2 kan, orally transmitted by Sanshū Hakuryū 三洲白龍 and written down by Mankai Sōsan 卍海宗珊, published in 1760, reproduced in *Zoku Sōtōshū zensho: Shitchū*, pp. 533–602.

SOURCES WITHOUT DATES

- Chuxueji* 初學集. 110 juan, by Qian Muzhai 錢牧齋 (also known as Qian Qianyi 錢謙益), included in the collection *Shibu sōkan* 四部叢刊 *shūbu* 集部 section no. 1625 (anthology of texts composed on various occasions).
- Shōbōgenzō senpyō* 正法眼藏僧評. Manuscript, by Mujaku Dōchū, reproduced in KAGAMISHIMA 1960b, 1–144; 1961, 226–89.
- Hakumōroku* 剥妄錄. Manuscript, by Mujaku Dōchū, microfilm at the Zenbunka Kenkyūjo (Hanazono University).

REFERENCES CITED

- AKIYAMA Kanji 秋山寛治
1983 *Shamon Hakuin* 沙門白隱. Shizuoka: Published privately by Akiyama Aiko 秋山愛子.

APP, Urs

- 1987 Chan/Zen's greatest encyclopædist Mujaku Dōchū. *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 3: 155–74.

BASABE, Fernando M.

- 1968 *Religious Attitudes of Japanese Men: A Sociological Survey*. Tokyo: Sophia University and Charles E. Tuttle.

BODIFORD, William M.

- 1991 Dharma transmission in Sōtō Zen: Manzan Dōhaku's reform movement. *Monumenta Nipponica* 46: 423–51.
1993 *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

DE BARY, William Theodore

- 1981 *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy and the Learning of the Mind-and-Heart*. New York: Columbia University Press.
1989 *The Message of the Mind in Neo-Confucianism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

EDGERTON, Franklin

- 1953 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. London: Yale University Press. (reprint by Rinsen Book, Kyoto, 1985)

FOULK, Griffith

- 1987 The "Ch'an School" and its place in the Buddhist monastic tradition. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

FUJIMOTO Tsuchishige 藤本槌重

- 1971 *Bankei kokushi no kenkyū* 盤珪国師の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

FURUTA Shōkin 古田紹欽

- 1974 Hannya shingyō no chūshakuhon o megutte: Bankei to Tenkei 般若心經の註釈本をめぐる一盤珪と天桂. *Zenbunka kenkyū kiyō* 禪文化研究紀要 6: 257–64.

GERNET, Jacques

- 1972 *Le Monde Chinois*. Paris: Armand Colin. (second revised ed. 1980)

HASKEL, Peter

- 1984 *Bankei Zen: Translations from the Record of Bankei*. New York: Grove Press.

HIRAKUBO Akira 平久保章

- 1962 *Ingen* 隠元. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan. (revised ed. 1974)

HSU, Sung-peng

- 1979 *A Buddhist Leader in Ming China: The Life and Thought of Hanshan Te-ch'ing, 1546–1623*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

IIDA Rigyō 飯田利行

- 1986 *Gakushō Mujaku Dōchū* 学聖無著荀忠. Kyoto: Zenbunka Kenkyūjo.

ISHII Shūdō 石井修荀

- 1987 *Sōdai zenshūshi no kenkyū* 宋代禪宗史の研究. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan.

ISHITSUKE Shōryū 石附勝龍

- 1964 Shihō ronkō: Baihō oshō no migoshihō kan 嗣法論考—梅峯和尚の未悟嗣法観. *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 12/2: 256–60 (726–30).
- 1967 Edoki ni okeru Sōtōzen no jikaku 江戸期における曹洞禪の自覚. *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 15/2: 350–52 (824–26).

JAFFE, Richard

- 1991 Ingen and the Threat to the Myōshinjiha. *Komazawa daigaku zen kenkyūsho nenpō* 駒沢大学禅研究所年報 2: 1–35.

KAGAMISHIMA Genryū 鏡島元隆

- 1958 Keirin Sūshin ni tsuite: Kinsei Tōzai kōshō shi no issetsu 桂林崇琛について—近世洞済交渉史の一節. *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 7/1 (13): 85–93. (later included in *Dōgen zenji to sono monryū*, pp. 196–213)
- 1960a Mujaku Dōchū to Tōmon no kōshō 無著 荀忠と洞門の交渉. *Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 8/1 (15): 198–201. (later included in *Dōgen zenji to sono monryū*, pp. 216–23)
- 1961 *Dōgen zenji to sono monryū* 荀元禪師とその門流. Tokyo: Seishin Shobō.
- 1967 Nihon zenshūshi: Sōtōshū 日本禅宗史—曹洞宗. In *Kōza zen* 講座禅 4, *Zen no rekishi: Nihon* 禅の歴史—日本, pp. 89–125. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- 1978 *Manzan, Menzan* 叡山・面山. *Nihon no zengoroku* 日本の禅語録 18. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- 1985 *Dōgen zenji to sono shūhen* 荀元禪師とその周辺. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan.
- 1986 Gesshū to Manzan: Sōtōshū 月舟と叡山・曹洞宗. In *Shūhabetsu Nihon bukkuyō: Hito to oshie* 宗派別日本仏教・人と教え 7, pp. 199–238. Tokyo: Shōgakukan.
- 1993 Sōsetsu 総説. In *Dōgen shisō no ayumi* 荀元思想のあゆみ 3, *Edo jidai* 江戸時代, pp. 3–19. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

KAGAMISHIMA Genryū, ed.

- 1960b *Shōbōgenzō senpyō, Ōbaku geki: Mujaku Dōchū sen* 正法眼藏僧評・黄檗外記—無著 荀忠撰. Tokyo: Komazawa Daigaku Zenshū Jiten Hensansho.

KATŌ Shōshun 加藤正俊

- 1985 *Hakuin oshō nenpu* 白隠和尚年譜. Kyoto: Shibunkaku.

KRAFT, Kenneth

- 1992 *Eloquent Zen: Daitō and Early Japanese Zen*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

MANO Shōjun 真野正順

- 1964 *Bukkyō ni okeru shū kannen no seiritsu* 仏教における宗観念の成立. Tokyo: Risōsha. (posthumous publication of a 1954 Ph.D. dis-

- sertation entitled “Bukkyō ni okeru shūha ishiki no keitai”
 仏教における宗派意識の形態) .
- MARUYAMA Masao
 1974 *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*. Hane Mikiso, trans. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- MIZUNO Yaoko 水野弥穂子, ed.
 1990 *Shōbōgenzō* 正法眼蔵. 4 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- MURASE Genmyō 村瀬玄妙
 1982 *Rinzai no Shōshū bakumon ni okoru* 臨済の正宗槩門に興る.
Zenbunka 禅文化 104: 72–77.
- NAGAI Masashi 永井政之
 1979 Tōkō Shin’etsu kenkyū josetsu 東臯心越研究序説. In *Zenshū no shomondai* 禅宗の諸問題, Imaeda Aishin 今枝愛真, ed., pp. 365–85. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.
- 1981 Dokuan Genkō o meguru shomondai: Sono chūgokuzen rikai ni tsuite 独庵玄光をめぐる諸問題—その中国禅理解について. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 宗学研究 23: 257–72.
- 1993 Sōtōshū Jushōha to sono seisui 曹洞宗寿昌派とその盛衰. In *Dōgen shisō no ayumi* 菊元思想のあゆみ 3, *Edo jidai*, pp. 120–54. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- NAKANO Tōei 中野東英
 1982 Sonnō zenwa: Menzan cho “Ōshū Sonnō rōnin Kenmon hōeiki” san 損翁禅話 一面山著「奥州損翁老人見聞宝永記」賛. Kyoto: Dōhōsha. (first ed. in 1935)
- NAKAO Ryōshin 中尾良信
 1993 Dokuan 独庵. In *Dōgen shisō no ayumi* 3, *Edo jidai*, pp. 383–98. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- NISHIYAMA Matsunosuke 西山松之助
 1982 Iemoto no kenkyū 家元の研究. In *Nishiyama Matsunosuke chosakushū* 西山松之助著作集 1. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- NOGUCHI Zenkyō 野口善敬
 1985 Hiin Tsūyō no Rinzai-zen to sono zassetsu: Mokuchin Dōbin to no tairitsu o megutte 費隠通容の臨済禅とその挫折—木陳菊恣との対立を巡って. *Zengaku kenkyū* 禅学研究 64: 57–81.
- NOSCO Peter, ed.
 1984 *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- OGISU Jundō 荻須純菊
 1979 *Shōbōzan rokusoden kunchū* 正法山六祖伝訓註. Kyoto: Shibunkaku.
- OOMS Herman
 1985 *Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570–1680*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

ŌTSUKI Mikio 大槻幹郎

- 1975 Shoki Ōbaku no gasō: Itsunen Shōyū ni tsuite 初期黄檗の画僧・逸然性融について. *Zenbunka* 78: 66–73.

READER, Ian

- 1991 *Religion in Contemporary Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

SCHWALLER, Dieter

- 1988 Der Text Mukai Nanshin der Japanischen Zen-Mönchs Chōon Dōkai. *Asiatische Studien/ Etudes Asiatiques* 42: 107–19.
 1989 *Der Japanische Ōbaku-Mönch Tetsugen Dōkō: Leben, Denken, Schriften*. Schweizer Asiatische Studien/ Etudes Asiatiques Suisses 9. Bern: Peter Lang.

SHIBE Ken'ichi 志部憲一

- 1982 Shōbōgenzō senpyō no ichikōsatsu 正法眼蔵僭評の一考察. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 24: 72–77.
 1983 Shōbōgenzō senpyō to Edoki shūgaku no kanren 『正法眼蔵僭評』と江戸期宗学の関連. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 25: 246–61.
 1985 Tenkei Denson no chosaku ni tsuite 天桂伝尊の著作について. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 27: 247–70.
 1990 Tenkei Denson no chosaku ni tsuite (2) 天桂伝尊の著作について (二). *Shūgaku kenkyū* 32: 163–68.
 1992 Tenkei Denson to Bankei Yōtaku ni tsuite 天桂伝尊と盤珪永琢について. *Komazawa daigaku zenkenkyūsho nenpō* 3: 103–20.

STAMBAUGH, Joan

- 1990 *Impermanence Is Buddha-nature: Dōgen's Understanding of Temporality*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

SUZUKI Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, ed.

- 1941 Bankei zenji goroku: Fu Gyōgōki 盤珪禪師語録・附行業記. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. (eleventh ed. 1986)

TAKENUKI Genshō 竹貫元勝

- 1979 Kinsei ni okeru Daitoku-ji kyōdan: Enkyō no matsujichō o chūshin to shite 近世における大徳寺教団・延享の末寺帳を中心として. In TAMAMURO and ŌKUWA 1979, pp. 145–175. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.
 1986 Kinsei gozanha kyōdan: Tenmei, Kansei jūin honmatsuchō o chūshin toshite 近世五山派教団—天明・寛政寺院本末帳を中心として. In TAMAMURO and ŌKUWA 1986, pp. 271–303. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.
 1989 *Nihon Zenshūshi* 日本禅宗史. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.
 1993 *Nihon Zenshūshi kenkyū* 日本禅宗史研究. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.

TAKENUKI Genshō, ed.

- 1990 *Kinsei Ōbakushū matsujichō shūsei* 近世黄檗宗末寺帳集成. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.

TAMAMURO Fumio 圭室文雄

1987 *Nihon bukkuyōshi: Kinsei* 日本仏教史・近世. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

TAMAMURO Fumio and ŌKUWA Hitoshi 大桑 齊, eds.

1979 *Kinsei bukkuyō no shomondai* 近世仏教の諸問題. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.

1986 *Ronshū Nihon bukkuyōshi* 論集日本仏教史 7: *Edo jidai* 江戸時代. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.

TORIGOE Bunpō 鳥越文邦

1986 *Hiin zenji to sono cho: Gotōgentō* 費隱禪師と其の著, 五燈嚴統. Ōmuta: Daijizan Enichi Zenji 大慈山慧日禪寺.

WADDELL, Norman

1984 *The Unborn: The Life and Teaching of Zen Master Bankei (1622–1693)*. San Francisco: North Point Press.

WATT, Paul Brooks

1982 *Jiun Sonja (1718–1804): Life and thought*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.

1984 *Jiun Sonja (1718–1804): A Response to Confucianism within the Context of Buddhist Reform*. Peter Nosco, ed., pp. 188–214. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

YANAGIDA Seizan 柳田聖山

1959 *Mujaku oshō no gakumon* 無著和尚の学問. *Zenbunka* 15–16: 81–86.

1966 *Mujaku Dōchū no gakumon* 無著荀忠の学問. *Zengaku kenkyū* 55: 14–55. (later included in *Chokushū Hyakujō shingi sakei: Hoshō yoroku* 敕修百丈清規左鱸・庸峭餘録, pp. 1335–76. Kyoto: Chūbun Shuppan, 1977)

1967 *Chūgoku zenshūshi: sono ichi* 中国禅宗史 — その一. Kyoto: Hanazono Daigaku Gakusei Bukkyō Kenkyūkai.

YOSHIDA Dōkō 吉田荀興

1981 *Dokuan Genkō to Tenkei Denson no shihōkan* 独菴玄光と天桂伝尊の嗣法観. *Shūgaku kenkyū* 23: 95–101.

1993 *Sōtōshū to Rinzaī, Ōbakushū to no kōshō* 曹洞宗と臨濟・黄檗宗との交渉. *Dōgen shisō no ayumi* 3, *Edo jidai*, pp. 155–96. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

YOSHIKAWA Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎

1960 *Koji to shite no Sen Bokusai: Sen Bokusai to bukkuyō* 居士としての錢牧齋—錢牧齋と佛教. In *Fukui hakase shōju kinen: Tōyō shisō ronshū* 福井博士頌壽記念・東洋思想論集, pp. 738–58. Tokyo: Fukui Hakase Shōju Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai.