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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 popu-
larly 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 南山道白 (1636–1715), Mujaku Dōchū
無著道忠 (1653–1745), and Hakuin Ekaku 白隠慧鶴 (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 mas-
ters produced, it is hardly conducive to a synthetic view of the com-
plex 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 堕落論) is usually credited to
Tsuji Zennosuke 水美之助 (1877–1955), although his work is not limited to that view. For
alternative perspectives see Tamamuro (1987), Tamamuro and Ōkawa (1979, 1986), and
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. 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 sec-
tarian affiliation than did their seventeenth-century predecessors.

The history of sectarian consciousness in Buddhism obviously did
not begin in the modern age. Although the saṅgha was originally sup-
posed 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 眞野正順 (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 rejec-
tion), 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.

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
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 zencho* [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 *zōngtōng* 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, Ershishi 二十四史,
Baina book 百納本, 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” 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 fuku 反古 (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 viewpoints 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 (Ôbaku) school of Chinese Zen, brought by the seventeenth-century priest Yinyuan Longqi 隱元隆琦 (Jpn. Ingen Ryûki, 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 殷宗 (Chongzhen 崇禎 1610–1644, r. 1627–1644). 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, the temple from

---

4 It should be kept in mind that the Ôbaku 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 sha Ôbaku ha 隠済宗黄檗派 (Ôbaku branch of the Rinzai school). Priests belonging to this tradition, however, called it the Rinzai shōshū 隠済正宗 (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 福州県 (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 应 3),† having accepted the invitation of his predecessor, Yiran Xingrong 逸然性融 (Jpn. Itsunen Shōyü, 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 禅林執弊集 [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 木庵, 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 菲隱 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 principle* [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.


* Fundamental principle (shūshū 宗趣, Skt. siddhānta-naya). This term has a long history, already appearing in the translation of the Lankāvatāra 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, 言説 Skt. deśanā-naya). The term is also used in the preface by Peixiu 裴休 (797–870) to the Chanyuan zhuquan jidu xu 從源諸詣集都序 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 (1593–1661) and Yongjue Yuanxian (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 calumniation 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. 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 (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] 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 shūō 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 Jiyan 湘雨紀年 (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 靈濟正宗) 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 黃清一統萬年, Z 147, p. 10b). In Japan the Shūtōroku 宗統錄, a commentary on the Biyanlu 碧巘録, was published in 1683. The compiler was Ryūkei Shōsen 龍溪神 (1633–1695), 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 shākanroku 窪際論, which charted the Dharma lineage from Sakyamuni 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 恍堂東宿 (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 (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. 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 (1582–1664) (see YOSHIKAWA 1960 and YANAGIDA 1967, 70–74). Qian, a lay practicer, had great respect for a number of contemporary priests, particularly his own master Hanshan Deqing (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, 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 (the third year of Meireki 明暦) (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 翣孫) of Linji, another accuses him of being illegitimate (yiasi 假嗣).

\( \text{(Chuxueji 初學集, p. 86)} \)\(^{13}\)

**Rinzai Reactions to the Founding of Manpuku-ji**

Yinyuan’s arrival soon caused members of both the Rinzai and Sôtô 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 1661\(^ {14}\) signaled that his school would endure. This comprised a particular threat to Japanese Rinzai, since the Ôbaku 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 Myõshin-ji branch was led by Gudõ Tõshoku 愚堂東窓 (1577–1661) and Daigu Sôchiku 大愚宗築 (1584–1669), two of the most eminent Zen authorities of the time. Gudõ and Daigu were engaged in their own attempts to restore the true Dharma (shôbô 正法), having already formed a group in 1606 to consult all living Zen masters (ketsume i hensan 結盟遍参) (TAKENUKI 1989, p. 197). Their central purpose was to promote a “return to the origin” (i.e., Myõshin-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 Ryûkei Shôsen 龍溪性潜 (1602–1670), Tokuõ Myôkô 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 YOSHIMURA (1960, pp. 742–43).

\(^{14}\) The inauguration of Manpuku-ji in 1663 can be considered the beginning of Ôbaku’s official history. See SCHWALLER 1989, p. 5.
Somon (1611–1677); Tokuó and Jikuin later separated from Ryûkei and ceased overt support for Yinyuan (HIRAKUBO 1962, pp. 135–36). The case of Jikuin and his spiritual heir, Mujaku Dôchû, requires particular attention. Jikuin occupied a prominent position, both as the head of Ryûge-in and as the 223rd abbot of Myôshin-ji. Mujaku, his successor at Ryûge-in, was a renowned scholar. 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 Ryûkei, Jikuin remained a lifelong supporter of the Ôbaku branch (KAGAMISHIMA 1960b, p. 198).

In contrast to his master’s position, the stance adopted by Mujaku was resolutely anti-Ôbaku. 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 Shôsôrin ryaku-shingi (T 81, no. 2579), conceived of as a response to Yinyuan’s Ôbaku Codes (Ôbaku shingi) published in 1672, one year before Yinyuan’s death. Mujaku’s zealous study of Ôbaku texts for the purpose of refuting them is evident in his Hakumôroku, which contains annotations on the Ôbaku Codes. 

15 Cf. OBJ, pp. 141a–142b. The date for his birth is the thirty-first day, twelfth month of the fifteenth year of the Keichô era. This corresponds to 12 February 1611. The pronunciation of his religious surname (Dôgô) 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 Enkyô 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) that emerged in ordinary temples during the Meiji period. Interestingly, although Mujaku’s Rinzai codes were published only in 1684, twelve years after their Ôbaku counterpart, the Sôtô school was several years ahead of Ôbaku in issuing a treatise on monastic discipline. This was the Eihei-ji Codes (Eihei shingi), attributed to Dôgen and first printed in 1667 by Kôshô Chidô (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 Gentô Sokuchû (1729–1807, the fiftieth abbot of Eihei-ji, who is revered as its “reviver” [chûko] by keeping the monastic rules that he was able to preserve from the Ôbaku codes].

18 Zenbunka Kenkyûjo (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 Obaku, 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 正法眼藏懺評:

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 教禅一致). 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 Obaku 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 reformative tendencies that occurred in Rinzai during the Tokugawa period, encouraged by Bakufu policies. The effects can also be seen in the work of Mangen Shiban 正源師範 (1626–1710), who compiled two vast biographical collections on the priests of Japan. The Enpō dentôroku 延寶傳燈録, completed in 1678 and

¹⁹ A photographic reproduction of the Shōbōgenzō senpyō is kept at the Zenbunka Kenkyûjo, 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 *Honchô kôsôden* 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 高泉性敦 (Jpn. Kôsen Shôton, 1633–1695). Gaoquan had published the *Fusô zenrin sôbôden* 扶桑禪林僧寶傳 in 1675, followed in 1686 by the *Zoku fusô zenrin sôbôden*.

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 Zen’ai 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 賢厳禪悅 (1618–1696), who had been close to the Chinese Ōbaku immigrants Yinyuan, Muan, and Daozhe Chaoyuan 莊者超元 (Jpn. Dôsha Chôgen, 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 Genshô 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” (*Kaihyô sôsho* 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 (*fûgi* 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 sōshō* 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 sōshō* 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 素持寺 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* 学寮 in Edo: the Sendanrin 柿楓林 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 獨窩玄光 (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 湯舟宗胡 (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 心越興倉 (Jpn. Shin’etsu Kōchū, 1639–1695, also known by his surname Donggao 東皐, Jpn. Tóko). 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 徳川光圀 (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).


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 三代白龍 (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), 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.” 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 天桂傳専 (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), 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 菩住), 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 kōka 永平正法眼藏校讐), but does not seem to appear elsewhere (1983, 247–48).28

Another Rinzai figure who maintained good relations with several of the most influential Sōtō people of his time was Keirin Sōshin, 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 abby 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 源光庵 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 見聞實永記, 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 Sōtōshō 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

---

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 yakuju 具林薫記 by Sekiun Yūsen 石雲英仙 (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 半山和尚廣録 [Sayings] (Sōōshō zensho Goroku 2, p. 656). There is also a short letter in Sōōshō zensho Goroku 3 (p. 217b).

call to purge the influence of Obaku 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 融縁永塚 (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 賛語, 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 Sutra. This text is referred to as the Hannya shingyô shiteisen 般若心經止啼鑰 when attributed to Tenkei, and as the Shin- gyôshô 心經鈔 (and later the Shingyô 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 Soto 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 Obaku priests and Rinzai priests without regard to branch affiliation. Among the many personalities who played important roles in these interactions, the two Soto priests Bannan Eishu 萬安英種 (1591–1654), reviver of Kôshô-ji 興聖寺, and Banjin Dôtan 萬俊斷坦 (1698–1775) must not be overlooked; also important was the above-mentioned Obaku follower Chôon Dôkai.

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 (inshô 印證), and transmission according to temple lineage (garanbô 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" (fuho 附法) merely indicate that charge of a temple has been confided to a certain priest (Katô 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 (jissô 實證) and succession to a master (shijô 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 garanbô succession known as in'in ekishi 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 shuheishû to an explanation of why one “should not change indiscriminately one’s Dharma lineage by choosing a temple.”

It was in the Sôtô 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 Baihô. 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 Dôgen, 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 Sôtô school had not the inertia of Eihei-ji and Sôji-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 Sôtô Zen

---

\(^{32}\) A detailed exposition of the different aspects of “post-awakening” practice can be found in the Shimon mujintô ron 宗門無盡論 by Hakuin’s disciple Tôrei 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 “Shishō” [Succession document], “Menju” [Face to face transmission], and “Juki” [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. 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 Menzan 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 oskō tōmon ejoshū, 正山和尚洞門衣袖集, reprinted in Eihei shōbōgenzō shūsho taisei 永平正法眼藏観書大成, 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 Shõbõgenzõ: “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. (Tõkai itteki shû, pp. 36B–37A)

Since Manzan reconstructs the original Japanese of the Shõbõgenzõ into kanbun, it is important to check if the rendition is faithful to Dõgen’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 Dõgen, however, as he might well have been inspired by the Māhāyānasūtrālāṃkāra (大乘庄严經論), attributed to Asāṅga. 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 Sõtõ Zen, the succession document (shisho 傳書) 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 増悦禪), 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 卓洲慧尊 (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.
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