

Fierce Practice, Courageous Spirit, and Spiritual Cultivation: The Rise of Lay Rinzai Zen  
in Modern Japan

by

Rebecca Mendelson

Graduate Program in Religion  
Duke University

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Jaffe, Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Ambros

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hwansoo Kim

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Morgan

\_\_\_\_\_  
Simon Partner

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy in the Graduate Program  
in Religion in the Graduate School  
of Duke University

2020

ABSTRACT

Fierce Practice, Courageous Spirit, and Spiritual Cultivation: The Rise of Lay Rinzai Zen  
in Modern Japan

by

Rebecca Mendelson

Graduate Program in Religion  
Duke University

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Jaffe, Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Ambros

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hwansoo Kim

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Morgan

\_\_\_\_\_  
Simon Partner

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate Program  
in Religion in the Graduate School of  
Duke University

2020

Copyright by  
Rebecca Mendelson  
2020

## **Abstract**

In this dissertation, I examine the development of lay Rinzai Zen in modern Japan, a transformation that entailed a large-scale opening of Zen practices to non-clerics and eventually contributed to Zen's worldwide spread. I detail the historical shift between 1868 and 1945, which saw the emergence of hundreds of lay Zen groups throughout Japan, the proliferation of literature targeting a popular audience, and a new paradigm of practice amidst imperial Japan's changing zeitgeist. Although Rinzai Zen was only one of thirteen Buddhist schools in Japan at the time, lay Rinzai Zen became disproportionately significant through its dissemination among educated, relatively elite young men, and through the success of its popularizers in associating modern lay Rinzai Zen with "traditional" Buddhism and Japanese culture itself.

In order to investigate this phenomenon, I conducted archival research, focusing on the following genres: contemporaneous periodicals and books aimed at a popular Zen audience, and the publications of lay Zen groups, such as their commemorative histories that included detailed activity logs, personal testimonials, and institutional histories. In my analysis, I integrate the dimensions of intellectual and social history (e.g., situating modern lay Rinzai Zen practitioners in imperial Japan) with religious and doctrinal concerns (e.g., situating modern Rinzai Zen in traditional Zen narratives). Although I consider teachers' prescriptions for ideal Zen practice, I emphasize the perspective of ordinary practitioners from a variety of practice contexts in order to examine the nature of Rinzai Zen's popularization in modern Japan: the emergence of lay groups, the religious

practices in which practitioners engaged, the ways in which lay practitioners articulated their motivations, and how such motivations reflected the historical context.

My conclusions include the following: First, the scale of the lay Rinzai movement in modern Japan was far larger than research until this point suggests, in terms of numbers of groups and practitioners and the amount of popular literature. Given the diversity among the emerging Rinzai lay groups, I propose a typology to highlight the groups' qualitative differences, ranging from more "traditional" to more radically divergent from normative Rinzai. Second, I found that even while the lay Zen audience expanded to an unprecedented level in Japan, the average lay Rinzai practitioner was educated and relatively elite; therefore, Rinzai Zen's popularization did not amount to full democratization. Moreover, students and other youth played a sizable and significant role in modern lay Rinzai. Third, I show that despite divergent ideology and rhetoric among modern lay Rinzai Zen groups and figures, a specific pattern of activities became standard among nearly all such groups. This pattern centered on sitting meditation, kōan practice, encountering the master one-on-one, dharma discourses, and practice intensives, with far less emphasis on aspects that have been historically important in Rinzai monastic training, such as ritual, liturgy, manual labor, and literary study in advanced kōan practice. This new lay Rinzai pattern functioned to increase an emphasis on personal experience and kōan practice. Finally, in contrast to idealized notions about pursuing Zen primarily for the sake of enlightenment, most modern lay Rinzai practitioners examined here pursued Zen for this-worldly benefits, such as improved health, improved swordsmanship

abilities, or as a means of strengthening the Japanese nation. Such goals were particularly expressed following 1905, amidst the nationalism and interest in personal cultivation movements that surged after Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War. Moreover, for many practitioners, there was a convergence among lay Rinzai practice, nation-protecting self-cultivation movements, "way of the warrior" rhetoric, and modern Japanese ideals of masculinity: a convergence that likely attracted many practitioners but was inherently at odds with Zen's rhetoric of equality.

## **Dedication**

For my parents, Michele and David

# Contents

Abstract .....	iv
List of Tables .....	xiv
Acknowledgements .....	xv
Conventions of Usage .....	xxi
1. Introduction: Toward a New Japanese Zen Laity .....	1
1.1 Preface: Coming to the Material .....	1
1.2 A New Zen Paradigm: Arguments and Chapter Structure .....	4
1.3 Sources and Methods .....	8
1.4 Literature Review .....	19
1.4.1 Overview .....	19
1.4.2 Modern Rinzai Zen: Institutions and Figures .....	21
1.4.3 Related Lay Groups .....	29
1.4.4 Broader Religious Context: Zen and Beyond .....	35
1.4.5 Buddhist Modernism and Received Narratives .....	36
2. Lay Rinzai Zen Landscapes, 1868–1945 .....	40
2.1 Overview .....	40
2.1.1 The Modernity of Modern Lay Rinzai Zen .....	40
2.1.2 What is Koji Zen? .....	48
2.1.3 Lay Zen Boom: Panorama .....	51
2.2 Proliferating Zen Groups .....	58
2.2.1 Prologue: Group Types and Diversity .....	58



2.2.2 Type I: Engakuji's Kojirin .....	64
2.2.3 Type II: Kōzen Gokokukai .....	68
2.2.4 Type III: Shakamunikai (Śākyamuni Association).....	73
2.2.5 Postscript: Lay Zen Networks in Tokyo and Beyond.....	80
2.3 Factors: Zen Boom.....	83
2.3.1 Dissemination and Access .....	84
2.3.2 <i>Fukyō</i> : Spreading the Teaching .....	88
2.3.3 Lay Zen and Print Culture.....	97
2.4 Conclusion: Democratization or Popularization? .....	103
3. Against the Grain of “No-Good Youth”: The Emergence and Development of University Zen Groups.....	109
3.1 Introduction.....	109
3.2 Portrait of a Phenomenon: The Emergence and Development of University Zen Groups.....	110
3.2.1 Background: Student Zen Boom (Early 1900s).....	110
3.2.2 A Brief History of Engakuji's Affiliate Student Groups (1906 Onward).....	120
3.2.3 Turning Point: Establishing a Lay Grove (1919–1923).....	124
3.2.3.1 1919–1920 Efforts to Establish Kojirin .....	124
3.2.3.2 Establishing a Lay Training Hall: A Succession of Efforts .....	132
3.2.3.3 “Rinzai's Shadow”: A New Home for Laypeople.....	134
3.2.4 After the Great Earthquake: Consolidating Students .....	140
3.2.5 Saiin'an Destroyed, Kojirin Reborn (1926–1928).....	144
3.2.6 Student Zen Before, and During, the Fifteen Years War (1930–1945) .....	151
3.2.7 Postscript: Student Zen, During and After the Fifteen Years War .....	155

3.3 Who Was Sitting in the Zendō? .....	158
3.3.1 Against the Grain of “No-Good” Youth: Ferocious Practitioners .....	158
3.3.2 The “House Wind”: The Ethos of Lay Rinzai Practice .....	163
3.3.3 Demographics and Demographic Change at Engakuji .....	166
3.3.3.1 Scale and Overview .....	166
3.3.3.2 Inscribing the Name Registers .....	168
3.3.3.3 Student Groups and Gender .....	175
3.3.3.3.1 Accommodations for Women .....	181
3.4 Conclusion: Demographic Change; Looking Beyond Engakuji.....	182
4. Accounts of Practice in Modern Lay Rinzai Zen.....	185
4.1 Introduction.....	185
4.1.1 Snapshot: Engakuji Sesshin, 1918 .....	187
4.1.2 Autobiographical Accounts: Further Notes .....	190
4.2 Rinzai Practice and the Laity: What Were Laypeople Doing? .....	192
4.2.1 Initiation: Getting Started .....	192
4.2.2 The Basics: Zazen and Kōan Practice.....	196
4.2.2.1 Zazen Pedagogy .....	203
4.2.2.2 Kōan Practice for Laypeople: Further Notes .....	206
4.2.3 Encountering the Master in <i>Sanzen</i> .....	213
4.2.3.1 <i>Sanzen</i> Diary I (1894): Mōtōrō Yūjirō 元良勇次郎 (1858–1912).....	217
4.2.3.2 <i>Sanzen</i> Diary II (1911–1934): Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎 (1884–1934) .....	223
4.2.4 Teishō and Other Dharma Discourses .....	231

4.2.5 Practice Intensives: Sesshin and Zazenkai .....	239
4.3 Practice Ethos: Real and Ideal .....	246
4.3.1 Life and Death: “Exchanging Swordplay on the Hero’s Battlefield” .....	246
4.3.2 Mirroring the Monks’ Hall: Rules and Etiquette .....	248
4.3.3 Culture of Secrecy.....	251
4.4 Conclusion: Toward a New Paradigm .....	257
5. For Buddhahood, Body, Sword, and Nation: Motivations for Practicing Lay Rinzai Zen in Modern Japan.....	260
5.1 Background .....	262
5.1.1 Zen as Shūyō: A New Paradigm.....	262
5.1.2 Historical Shifts, Historically Contingent Motivations .....	264
5.1.3 Lay Zen Practice: Many Players, Many Goals .....	267
5.2 “Traditional” Zen Motives .....	269
5.2.1 Hakuin and Early Modern Zen Ideals .....	270
5.2.2 Ideal Goals of Zen Practice: Modern Japan .....	276
5.2.3 “Traditional” Zen Motives and Lay Zen: Tsuji Sōmei 辻双明 (1903–1991) .....	281
5.3 Self-Cultivation and Lay Zen.....	290
5.3.1 <i>Shūyō</i> : “‘Spiritual Self-Cultivation’ Had Become the Era’s Slogan” .....	290
5.3.2 Defining <i>Shūyō</i> .....	293
5.3.3 <i>Shūyō</i> and Lay Zen: Historical Context and Genealogy .....	296
5.3.4 Personal Accounts from the “Era of Self-Cultivation” .....	308
5.3.4.1 Institutional Messages.....	309
5.3.4.2 Practitioners’ Accounts .....	312

5.3.5 Rinzai Zen Teachers and <i>Shūyō</i> .....	316
5.3.5.1 Katsumine Daitetsu's <i>Shūyō</i> .....	322
5.4 “The Unity of Sword and Zen”: The Role of Kendō in Modern Lay Rinzai.....	327
5.4.1 Historical and Religious Background .....	328
5.4.1.1 “Traditional” Rinzai and Warrior Zen .....	329
5.4.1.2 Modern Japan's <i>Bushidō</i> Boom .....	330
5.4.1.3 The Rinzai School and “Imperial-Way Zen” .....	333
5.4.2 <i>Kendō</i> as Motivation for Engakuji Practitioners: Accounts .....	336
5.5 Lay Rinzai Zen and Gender: <i>Shūyō</i> , Martial Arts, and Japanese Masculinity ...	340
5.5.1 Religious Context: Rinzai Zen and the “Great Manly Hero” .....	341
5.5.1.1. Kōan Performance and Gender in Rinzai Zen .....	345
5.5.2 Historical Context: Ideals of Masculinity and <i>Bushidō</i> in Modern Japan .....	349
5.5.3 Convergence of Lay Zen, Nation, <i>Shūyō</i> , and Gendered Ideals: Iida Tōin ...	353
5.6 Conclusion .....	355
6. Conclusion: Lay Rinzai in Modern Japan and Beyond .....	358
6.1 Reprise: Summary of Arguments.....	358
6.2 Lay Rinzai Zen in Broader Japanese Context.....	360
6.2.1 Modern Rinzai Zen: Tensions and Critiques .....	361
6.2.1.1 Intellectualized Zen and Academia.....	361
6.2.1.2 Critiquing Modern Kōan Practice: Lay and Monastic .....	366
6.2.2 Meaning of Lay Practice in Modern Japan .....	371
6.3 Japanese Lay Zen in Its Global Context .....	374
6.4 Yet More Future Avenues of Research.....	378

Appendix A: Lay <i>Sesshin</i> Guidelines (Engakuji, 1918) .....	382
Bibliography .....	387
Biography.....	419

## List of Tables

Table 1: Engakuji Lay <i>Sesshin</i> Schedule, Takuboku'en (August 1907) .....	242
Table 2: Shakamunikai <i>Kōshūkai</i> Schedule (June 1927).....	243

## Acknowledgements

The support, wisdom, kindness, and generosity of many people and groups allowed this dissertation to come to fruition. I wish to express my gratitude to the following individuals and organizations, and heartily apologize to those whom I do not mention here by name.

First of all, I extend my deepest thanks to my dissertation advisor, Richard M. Jaffe, who believed in this project for over a decade, who has provided continuous inspiration and a model of scholarship to emulate, and without whose wisdom and support this project would not have gone forth. Thanks to my other dissertation and preliminary exam committee members—Barbara Ambros, Hwansoo Kim, Levi McLaughlin, David Morgan, Simon Partner, and Morgan Pitelka—for the numerous forms of training and guidance they provided over the years and for pushing me to examine and demonstrate the relevance of developments in modern lay Rinzai Zen to its broader contexts: within East Asian Buddhism, the Japanese empire and contemporaneous ideological context, the long view of Japanese religious history, and the study of religious modernity generally. Their feedback has grounded and expanded the horizons of this dissertation and my future scholarly aspirations.

The support, resources, mentorship, and friendship at Duke and in the Triangle's scholarly community is amazing. Special thanks to Carol Rush, Marissa Lane, Holly Rich, and Stephen Chapman for all the ways in which the Graduate Program in Religion and Department of Religious Studies have supported my research and writing. Kris Troost

helped me to become a researcher and—along with the other staff of Duke Libraries—helped me gain access to countless materials and to the Japanese institutions that so generously allowed me to access their materials. Sumi Loundon Kim helped me navigate the role of scholar and Buddhist practitioner. I could not have asked for a better or kinder cohort—friends and colleagues from Duke and UNC—with whom to tackle classical Japanese; delve into our studies of East Asian religions, culture, and history; and experience the vicissitudes of graduate student life. Thanks, in particular, to Mike Quick, Matt Mitchell, Jeff Schroeder, Elena Kravchenko, Seth Ligo, Yasmine Singh, Jeff Nicolaisen, Daniele Lauro, Susannah Duerr, Lisa Perry, Krishni Metivier, Torang Asadi, Tim Smith, Sara Biondi Smith, and Charles Cook. Thanks, too, to all of the scholars who have spoken with me over the years about different facets of this work, including the late Ken Kraft, Christopher Ives, Jolyon Thomas, Janine Sawada, Miriam Levering, and Victor Hori.

In Japan, two communities in particular deserve special thanks for enabling and enriching this research immeasurably: first, the Japanese academic community at Komazawa and beyond taught me how to navigate print materials, welcomed me into their classrooms, shared insights and different ways of approaching the materials, and shared with me the cutting edge of research on modern Japanese Buddhism from numerous angles. At Komazawa, Ishii Seijun and the Zen Studies Institute made my time at Komazawa possible; Ogawa Takashi allowed me to join his rich and stimulating classes, introduced me to classmates who were also Rinzai monastic trainees and who



became my interlocuters, and brought my attention to the university student Zen practitioners; Yamaguchi Hiroe taught me kanbun; and conversations with Ishii Shūdō and Ishii Kōsei deepened my knowledge of Zen past and present. My classmates and carrel-mates—particularly Takei Kengo, Hamano Kengo, Chin-san, Ōtsuka-oshō, and Unezawa-oshō—were generous with their help and friendship. Beyond Komazawa, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi and Kurita Hidehiko illuminated the realm of “*shūyō*” and its intersections with lay Zen, introduced me to the figure of Katsumine Daitetsu, and helped me think through questions and challenges in the mountain of materials that I faced. Thanks also to Moriya Tomoe, who spent many hours speaking to me about matters ranging from Buddhist transnational networks to contemporary Buddhist women; to Jeff Shore and Tom Kirchner, who generously shared their insights into and experiences in the world of modern and contemporary Rinzai Zen.

I am grateful, too, to the opportunities to meet scholars, present my research, and welcome a wide variety of feedback at meetings of the Buddhist Discussion Group (thanks to Charles Muller, Kenneth Tanaka, and group members) and the Nanzan Seminar for the Study of Japanese Religions (special thanks to Okuyama Michiaki, Paul Swanson, Jim Heisig, and the staff and other faculty members of Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture).

The second community deserving special thanks is the Zen practice community, which, in some cases, intersected with the academic world of Zen studies. I cannot thank these members of the Zen community enough for welcoming me into their practice

spaces and the world of lay Zen as it is practiced in Japan today, and for letting me tell the story of the historical roots of their respective practice communities. Thanks, in particular, to Yokota Nanrei-rōshi, Ichidō-oshō, Kumagai-oshō, Benjamin Boas, Matsumoto Yōichi, the late Ōga Ryūkichi, Ōga Toyoko, Inami-san, Someya-san, Yano Sachii, Yano Sōkin-oshō, Yamamoto Ryōkō-roshi, Doi Yukio-sensei, Tamura-sensei, Tokumon-roshi (Enpukuji), Katō-oshō (Kaiseiji), Deguchi-san (Kongōshōji), Horishi-san and the Kageyama Family.

I also extend my deep thanks to the staff of Komazawa University Library, Hanazono University Library, Naritasan Library of Buddhism, University of Tokyo Center for Modern Japanese Legal and Political Documents (Manuscript Division), Ishikawa Takeyoshi Memorial Library. These librarians and archivists helped me gain access to a treasure trove of materials more numerous and richer than I could have imagined, and therefore to tell the story of modern lay Rinzai Zen. A friend who also studies Meiji Japan quoted her mentor: “Gathering Meiji-era documents is like drinking from a firehose.” I certainly found this to be true; my dissertation addresses only a small fraction of the post-1868 lay Rinzai Zen-related material that I found, and I suspect that this will be the work of decades to come.

I could not have done any of this work without the financial support of Duke University, whose Graduate Program in Religion provided me with several years of funding, whose Kearns Endowment Summer Research Fellowships and William R. Poole Summer Research Fellowship allowed me to make research progress over multiple

summers, and whose Bass Instructor of Record Fellowship supported my continued dissertation progress while I taught Duke undergraduates. Additionally, Foreign Language & Area Studies Fellowships (academic-year and summer fellowships), a Nippon Foundation Fellowship, and an Oberlin Alumni Fellowship all supported my modern Japanese language studies that allowed me to do research with primary sources in Japanese; a Fulbright IIE Graduate Research Fellowship supported 15 months of archival research in Japan; and a Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation Dissertation Fellowship in Buddhist Studies supported the writing of this dissertation. Speaking of my Japanese language studies, I am deeply grateful to the Japanese-language faculty (and staff) of Duke, the Middlebury Japanese School, and especially to Satō Ari-sensei and the other amazing teachers of the Inter-University Center in Yokohama.

While I lived in Japan, Rui, Yui, and the Kan family took me under their wings and made clear that I had family in Tokyo. Thanks to all my friends and colleagues including Vera Chirino, Eric Santiago, Justin Stein, Erez Joskovich, Stefan Grace, Kanae Kawamoto, Matt McMullen, Charles Tsunashima, Marta Sanvido, Ori Porath, Dana Mirsalis, and Alice Freeman—for your camaraderie in our respective adventures.

My journey into modern Japanese Zen was launched by two experiences: participating in Antioch’s Buddhist Studies in Japan program as an undergraduate (deep thanks to the late Pat Masters) and my years on staff at the Rochester Zen Center. In a sense, this dissertation is inspired by the life’s work of the Zen Center’s founder, Roshi Philip Kapleau, who brought a piece of modern Japanese lay Zen to North America and

founded the Zen Center. In the days before Roshi Kapleau passed away in 2004 at the age of 91, a stream of the students he had taught over the previous four decades came to visit him. Together, they stirred within me questions about the roots of Japanese Zen in North America that fueled my research of the past decade. I also extend my thanks, and a deep bow, to Roshi Bodhin Kjolhede, Eryl and Wayman Kubicka, John and Chris Pulleyn, Dana Díaz, Sensei Amala Wrightson, Scott Jennings, Tom Roberts, and the Zen Center's sangha.

Finally, it was the love and support of my family and friends that nourished me through these years in myriad ways. Special thanks go to my uncle, Alan Mendelson, who prodded me to take my interest in the roots of North American Zen to graduate school; I am grateful to follow in his path as a religious studies scholar. Thanks to Ellen Kittredge, Emily Scheider, Emmy Komada, Rebekah Rosenfeld, Kat Farley, Mina Lee, Claire Payton, Layla Aldousany, Ann Marshall, Abby Levin, Jane Keptner, Cecily Fuhr, the Gwartzman family, Irene Lazarus, Heather Langan, Estalyn Walcoff, Jenn Horton, Bob Baden, and Rose and Rafe Martin for cheering me on more times than I can count. Thanks to my amazing family—Mom, Jonathan Mendelson, Amanda Ginter, Albert Robbins, Leslie Mendelson, Bronwyn May, Philip May, Joe Penland, and my aunts, uncles, cousins, niece, and nephew—for your love and support. Thanks to my Dad for his love and support from the seen and unseen realms. And thanks, Laurin and Frankie, for a full heart as I wrote these words.

## Conventions of Usage

With regard to university names, as with many Japanese universities, Hitotsubashi University has undergone multiple name changes since its initial founding in 1875. The following names appear in Nyoidan's group histories: Tokyo Higher Commercial School (Tōkyō Kōtō Shōgyō Gakkō, 東京高等商業学校), which the school was called from 1902-1920; and Tokyo University of Commerce (Tōkyō Shōka Daigaku 東京商科大学), by which the university was known for most of the years between 1920 and 1949, when it was renamed to Hitotsubashi. For historical accuracy, I will use the names in accordance with contemporaneous usage (e.g., using "Tokyo University of Commerce" in reference to the group Nyoidan's 1931 publication).

For individuals' names, I follow Japanese naming conventions. In the first occurrence, I state the family name first, followed by the given name. Subsequently, I refer to the individual by their family name. One exception to this usage is Buddhist monastics who have multiple names (e.g., ordination name). In these cases, I use the names by which they are most commonly known (e.g., "Shaku Sōen" or simply "Sōen").

In this dissertation, ages follow Japanese convention in that the person is considered to be of age one at the time of birth. For example, someone born in 1870 would turn thirty years old in 1899.

With regard to short notes appearing in the footnotes, for groups' commemorative publications for which there are multiple editions, I include the publication year, in

addition to the author, abbreviated title, and page number (e.g., Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 200).

This dissertation emphasizes, to the degree possible, accounts by “ordinary” lay Zen practitioners. Due to their non-famous status, biographical information for some of these practitioners is limited. When I have not been able to confirm the reading of these practitioners’ names, I use the reading that is most prominent in common Japanese usage.

Texts from the Taishō canon will be cited in accordance with the following format: T, volume number, text number, page, register, and line number (e.g., T. 2003.48.195a22).

References to entries from Komazawa University’s *Shinpan Zengaku daijiten* 新版禅学大辞典 will be cited using the abbreviation of ZGDJ.

# 1. Introduction: Toward a New Japanese Zen Laity

## 1.1 Preface: Coming to the Material

Over the course of ten days in 2016, people from two different parts of Japan's Zen realm—the university and the monastery—uttered to me a mysterious word when I told them that I studied modern lay Zen: “*tetsu nyoi* 鉄如意,” seeming to signify a Buddhist ceremonial staff, made of iron and shaped like the letter “s.” What I soon learned was that these people—Ogawa Takashi-sensei, one of my wonderful professors at Komazawa University, and Yokota Nanrei-rōshi, the chief abbot of the Kamakura temple Engakuji 円覺寺 (a center of lay Zen in Japan to this day)—were both referring to *Tetsu nyoi*, the name of the commemorative history published by Hitotsubashi University's Zen group, Nyoidan 如意団. Nyoidan, founded in 1906 and named after a sub-temple at Engakuji, was the oldest of the student Zen groups that cropped up in the modern period and were affiliated with Engakuji. Having never seen references to these student groups in the existing literature on lay Zen in modern Japan, I found it curious that both Ogawa-sensei and Nanrei-rōshi were so quick to mention the university students in that context. However, I soon realized that they opened for me a doorway that could help tell the story of Rinzai Zen's popularization—and the Zen boom—in modern Japan.

Through them, I learned that university students constituted a significant demographic of the early twentieth-century lay Zen boom and that the histories produced by their groups provide a vital repository of historical information and accounts of lay Zen practice that exist in few other places. Moreover, I quickly found out through

personal experience that the students' groups connected, in multiple and significant ways, with various Rinzai Zen networks in and beyond the Tokyo-Kamakura center of lay Zen. Ogawa-sensei introduced me to the young Zen priests who were among my classmates, including Ōtsuka-oshō, who helped to lead another such student group, Waseda University's Saiindan 済蔭団. Ōtsuka-oshō also helped to lead meditation sessions held by two of the three groups I had initially sought to emphasize in this study—Kōzen Gokokukai 興禪護国会 and Engakuji's Kojirin 居士林—and invited me to both group's upcoming events; within days, I was doing zazen with both groups, whose membership overlapped considerably.

This overlap among the student groups, Engakuji, and Tokyo-based lay Zen groups like Kōzen Gokokukai was no coincidence. Over the next seventeen months that I spent in Japan doing archival research, I collected all the sources that I could pertaining to the three groups that I initially aimed to emphasize (that is, Kojirin, Kōzen Gokokukai, and Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会), as well as about the broader lay Zen landscape; the sources kept pointing me back to the students. After Nyoidan was formed in 1906, Saiindan formed in 1922, and even more Tokyo-area university Zen groups followed in the mid-1920s. The members of these groups were not the sole actors whom I studied, but they were vitally involved in establishing a dedicated training hall for laypeople at Engakuji in the early 1920s and reconstructing it from the ashes following a fire in 1926. The stories about students in Tokyo and elsewhere continued to crop up in corners of the archives.



Although students' voices are not the only ones informing the story of lay Rinzai Zen in modern Japan that is this dissertation, they are important ones. Part of their importance stems from the students' disproportionate documentation, due, in part, to their groups' formal organization (thus motivated to create an institutional history) and their educational background. In other words, such formally organized university groups would have been more likely to document and produce their own history than would, say, more ad-hoc assemblies or a less educated participant base. For this group of educated students—many of whom were majoring in business, politics, or law—their academic skills were conducive to this process of research and the reflection involved in generating their historical accounts. Beyond the students' disproportionate documentation was the significance of their activities and the accounts themselves, many of which recounted events of over a century ago.

Thus, I dug into the students' testimonials of Zen practice, their activity logs, and their institutional histories in order to learn: what was the appeal of Zen for young people, and what roles did young people play in Rinzai Zen's popularization in the modern period? Stepping back from this question, I wanted to know: what characterized Rinzai Zen's popularization and the transformation of lay Zen in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan? How did groups like Nyoidan emerge and develop? In what religious practices did Nyoidan's members (and other lay Rinzai practitioners) engage, and how were these practices continuous with, or divergent from, Rinzai Zen prior to the Meiji period? How did these lay practitioners articulate their motivations and concerns in their autobiographical accounts, and how did such motivations—and the narration of

these motivations—reflect the practitioners’ historical context and the shifting *zeitgeist* in modern Japan? These are the core questions of this dissertation.

## **1.2 A New Zen Paradigm: Arguments and Chapter Structure**

Stated differently, the primary goals of this dissertation are to provide a brief overview of the lay Rinzai landscape in modern Japan before examining, through the lens of university student Zen groups and other lay practitioners’ accounts, the what, who, how, why, and when of the movement: that is, what the phenomenon of lay Zen groups’ emergence and development entailed, who the practitioners were, why they practiced, and how their motivations for practice connected to historical circumstances. In sum, this amounts to a new paradigm for laypeople who practiced Rinzai Zen in modern Japan.<sup>1</sup>

As I discuss below in further detail, this study builds directly on the work of two scholars in particular: that is, Janine Sawada’s examination of the early and mid-Meiji lay program at Engakuji and how it related to a broad-based, trans-religious interest in personal cultivation during that period, as well as Erez Joskovich’s research on contemporary lay Rinzai group Ningen Zen Kyōdan 人間禪教団 and its modern roots.<sup>2</sup>

With regard to the new lay Zen paradigm in modern Japan, Sawada established, first, that

---

<sup>1</sup> Here, I define the “modern” period as encompassing the Meiji 明治 period (1868–1912), Taishō 大正 period (1912–1926), and early Shōwa period (1926–1989) until 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Janine Tasca Sawada, *Practical Pursuits: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2004); and Erez Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen in Contemporary Japan: The Case of the Ningen Zen Association,” Dissertation, Tel Aviv University, 2013. With regard to Engakuji, Sawada particularly emphasizes the period until the early 1890s. Joskovich’s study is primarily ethnographic and based on the group’s contemporary iteration, although he provides an overview of the group’s roots (also at Engakuji), stretching back to the 1870s.

it featured a new understanding and idealization of *koji* 居士, or “lay-devotees” (in contrast to *zaike* 在家, or the ordinary laity), that involved both Buddhist and Neo-Confucian ideals.<sup>3</sup> According to both Sawada’s and Joskovich’s accounts, this paradigm is further characterized by the notion that these *koji* could achieve awakening in the conventional Zen sense; this notion was embraced by certain Rinzai Zen monastic leaders, such as Engakuji’s Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川 (1816–1892). Given this expanded accessibility to religious advancement, then, there was a broader lay audience, lay initiative to form groups, and in some (rare) cases, laypeople who became sanctioned to teach Zen. Basing his study on the case of Ningen Zen Kyōdan (NZK), Joskovich points out its increased autonomy, “...argu[ing] that the shift of power between lay and monastic has been the major event of lay Zen in the modern period.”<sup>4</sup>

In this dissertation, I largely agree with this framework but propose addenda to these characteristics of the new lay Zen paradigm. First, as I discuss in chapter 2, in the context of the lay Rinzai landscape in modern Japan, the scale of the movement is far larger than research until this point suggests, in terms of numbers of groups, practitioners, and popular literature. Moreover, there is diversity among the Rinzai-type lay groups that

---

<sup>3</sup> In Sawada’s analysis, it was not that “*koji*” (layperson) was an altogether new category in the Meiji period but, rather, that “traditional” ideals newly converged in the person of the *koji*, or “lay-devotee”: that is, “...two East Asian models of human fulfillment, the Confucian gentleman-official and the Buddhist lay bodhisattva, coalesced in a new idealization of the lay practitioner during the mid-Meiji” (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 6). This new category is discussed further in chapter 2.

<sup>4</sup> Joskovich elaborates: “...Although laypeople’s access to monastic training is not new, laypeople claiming independent authority over the Zen teaching is essentially a modern phenomenon” (Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 62).

emerged in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan. For example, they differed in terms of the leaders' interpretations of how Zen was relevant to the modern world; in terms of the degree to which the groups adhered to normative Rinzai Zen doctrine, narratives, and ideals; and in terms of their relationship to institutional Rinzai Zen. I propose a typology to highlight the qualitative differences among the groups that ranged from more "traditional" to more radically divergent from normative Rinzai Zen.<sup>5</sup> For example, on one end of the spectrum was Kojirin, housed on Engakuji property and supervised by Engakuji monastics; and on the other end was Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会, which, to some degree, eschewed the Rinzai monastic establishment and promoted seemingly radical notions of what modern lay Buddhism should entail.

Both chapters 2 and 3 take up the issue that even while the lay Zen audience expanded to an unprecedented level in Japan, the average lay Rinzai practitioner was educated and relatively elite (that is, middle class and above) and, therefore, that the modern "Zen boom" involved a popularization of Rinzai Zen but not democratization. Chapter 3—in which I investigate the emergence and development of university Zen groups—also demonstrates that, as discussed above, the student contingent played a sizable and significant role in modern lay Rinzai Zen. They constituted a prominent contingent and exerting outsized influence, as in the creation of Engakuji's "Layperson Grove" in the early 1920s.

---

<sup>5</sup> These types include the following: groups formally affiliated with Rinzai institutions, groups not formally affiliated but still identified with and oriented toward institutional Rinzai, and autonomous groups that innovate more explicitly. Although some groups' classification might be ambiguous, the framework is helpful for understanding the continuum from more to less traditional.

In chapter 4, I investigate the practitioners' activities and show that even as modern "lay Rinzai" comprised diverse expressions, a specific pattern of activities became standard among dozens, if not hundreds, of lay Rinzai Zen groups and assemblies in the first decades of the twentieth century. Such patterns were typically shared even by groups that diverged in rhetoric and ideology. This pattern centered on *zazen* 坐禪 (sitting meditation) and *kōan* 公案 practice; encountering the master one-on-one (called *sanzen* 参禪 or *dokusan* 独参); dharma discourses (typically called *teishō* 提唱); and practice intensives (*zazenkai* 坐禪会—typically day-long or half-day events—or *sesshin* 接心, longer retreats).<sup>6</sup> Moreover, this pattern functioned to increase an emphasis on personal experience generally and on *kōan* practice in particular, contributing to what I call the "kōanization" of Rinzai Zen (that is, an identification of Rinzai Zen with *kōan* practice) in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Finally, in chapter 5, through the lens of practitioners' personal accounts, I investigate the motivations that they express for initiating and pursuing Zen practice as a layperson. Contrary to idealized notions about pursuing Zen primarily for the sake of enlightenment, and in line with Reader's and Tanabe's appraisal of the centrality of "this-worldly benefits" ("*genze riyaku* 現世利益") in contemporary Japanese religion, most practitioners seemed to pursue Zen not primarily for spiritual enlightenment but, rather, for this-worldly benefits. In line with the "self-cultivation" (*shūyō* 修養) boom that

---

<sup>6</sup> *Kōan* 公案 literally means "public case" and typically refers to accounts of legendary Chan masters and their disciples, which are made the subject of reason-defying inquiries as a way to break into a new level of consciousness.

gathered steam following Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905), many practitioners viewed Zen as a form of “*shūyō*” and pursued it for personal improvement (e.g., of health or character) or as a means of strengthening the Japanese nation, while other students sought to improve their *kendō* 剣道 (“way of the sword”) abilities through Zen practice. These motivations, I demonstrate, are firmly connected to the historical moment in which these practitioners dwelled: tied not only to Japan's burgeoning nationalism but also to modern Japanese ideals of masculinity.

### **1.3 Sources and Methods**

In this study, I aim to bridge the gap between historical and philological studies by integrating the dimensions of intellectual and social history (e.g., situating modern lay Rinzai Zen practitioners in imperial Japan) with religious and doctrinal concerns (e.g., situating modern Rinzai Zen in traditional Zen narratives). I emphasize the perspective of practitioners: that is, how lay Rinzai practitioners came to practice, joined or formed groups, engaged with Zen, and thought about why they were practicing, as well as how all of these aspects changed over time, according to historical circumstance. My sources include many accounts of Zen practice that transpired during the first three decades of the twentieth century; some material reaches back to the beginning of the Meiji period in 1868 (the start of Japan's “modern” period) and some material extends forward through the end of the Fifteen Years War in 1945. I focus on the period roughly between 1900 and 1930 not only because of the plethora of published materials from the period but also because of what this plethora represents: that is, the beginning of what has been called a “Zen boom” in modern Japan. As discussed in chapter 2 and later in this chapter, the

seeds were planted well before 1900, and Rinzai masters such as Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川 (1816–1892), Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹 (1828–1911), Nakahara Nantenbō 中原南天棒 (1839–1925), and Nishiyama Kasan 西山禾山 (1837 or 1838–1917) had been active training laypeople in Rinzai Zen in the prior decades. However, it was in the years following the Russo-Japanese War that the movement gained steam.

I consider practitioners’ perspectives against the broader lay (and monastic) Zen context and occasionally draw upon the prescriptive teachings of the practitioners’ masters and those of their early modern predecessors. However, my foremost aim is to depict lived Zen as practiced by—as much as possible—the “ordinary” practitioner. To capture the physical practices and mindsets of the “ordinary” practitioner is, admittedly, a challenge because a disproportionate number of the known accounts are provided by relatively prominent members of society. (Whether the “ordinary” lay Zen practitioner is actually representative of the modern Japanese masses is a separation question that is considered in chapter 2.)

Still, with some digging in the libraries and archives during my eighteen months of conducting research to discover how modern teachers and lay practitioners reimagined and promoted Rinzai Zen practice, and through the kind generosity of friends, teachers, and interlocutors in Japan’s contemporary lay Zen practice world, I found my way to several genres that help to balance the prescriptions of ideal practice with the

descriptions of actual practice, through diverse lenses.<sup>7</sup> These genres intersect largely with the types of print media described in chapter 2: namely, periodicals and books (e.g., monographs and edited compendia). I also rely heavily on Zen groups' publications, such as the commemorative histories of student groups like Nyoidan—as well as groups like Kōzen Gokokukai and Shakamunikai—that included detailed activity logs, personal testimonials, and institutional histories.

As mentioned in chapter 2, the tremendous abundance of popular Zen literature (and popular Buddhist literature generally) was part and parcel of the modern Zen boom. Print media played a functional role: for example, popular publications prescribed Zen practice and thus spurred and facilitated practice among the laity; and they made arcane classical Rinzai Zen literature more understandable and accessible. Print media also played a descriptive role, providing accounts of Zen practice by monastics and lay practitioners alike, describing events that transpired, and so forth.

For understanding the broader lay Zen landscape, two monthly Zen-centered periodicals were particularly helpful: *Zendō* 禪道 (1910–1923) and *Daijōzen* 大乘禪 (1924–present; *Zendō* is discussed in greater detail in chapter 2).<sup>8</sup> Each issue enumerated upcoming Zen activities (e.g., the following month's *zazenkai* and ceremonies at

---

<sup>7</sup> I collected resources from the vast repositories of Zen-related materials at Komazawa 駒澤 University in Tokyo and Hanazono 花園 University in Kyoto; as well as from other libraries and archives, including Naritasan Library of Buddhism (Naritasan Bukkyō Toshokan 成田山仏教図書館); the University of Tokyo Center for Modern Japanese Legal and Political Documents, Manuscript Division (Meiji Shinbun Zasshi Bunko, Genshiryōbu 明治新聞雑誌文庫・原子量部); and Ishikawa Takeyoshi Memorial Library, Modern Women's Magazines Library (Ishikawa Takeyoshi Kinen Toshokan 石川武美記念図書館).

<sup>8</sup> A full list of periodicals consulted is in the Bibliography.



numerous parish temples, training monasteries, and other venues) and provided reports about notable activities in the recent past. The latter reports frequently came with considerable details, such as dates, times, places, lecture topics, and sometimes the names and numbers of attendees. Such information is invaluable for discerning the range and scope of activities, the players involved, and changes over time. *Zendō* was first published in 1910, and unfortunately there is a dearth of such comprehensive reports in other journals prior to 1910; the degree to which the dearth of reports indicates inactivity versus lack of active reports remains unclear. In any case, some Zen-centered journals that were published earlier than *Zendō*—such as *Zenshū* 禪宗 (1894–1921?), and *Zengaku* 禪學 (1895–?)—did make note of occasional lay-related events that took place.

Hundreds of issues of these periodicals—among several others—became a primary source of inquiry. They reveal not only the practices themselves and the broader picture, but also descriptions of and prescriptions for Zen practice. For example, articles range from edited transcripts of famous masters’ sermons to scholarly expositions of classical Chan (Zen) records; from anecdotes and obituaries of contemporary masters to accounts of practice by ordinary practitioners; and from discussions of the social role of spiritual self-cultivation (e.g., to reform the “degenerate” youth of the day) to discussions on Zen and Japanese culture.

Other primary sources on which I relied include books by masters and practitioners alike, including practitioners who were not in the student population. One notable book contained the diaries of Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎 (1884–1934), a lawyer who practiced Zen seriously for over twenty years; the book was published

posthumously. Shimokawa's book was entitled *Lay Zen*: thus called because of the centrality of his spiritual quest and lay Zen practice in his life and writings.<sup>9</sup> The book includes both diaries (*nisshi* 日誌) in the conventional sense and “*sanzen* records 参禅録”: records of his spiritual life generally and his encounters with the master (and kōan practice) in particular.<sup>10</sup> The diaries offer a detailed, rare, and valuable glimpse into the advanced kōan practice of a dedicated layperson for whom Zen practice remained central for decades.

Before embarking on my research, I had hoped to find my way to the lay groups' original, unpublished materials (and had assumed they existed): for example, name registers, financial records, records of activities, and so forth. At Engakuji, a senior monk kindly tracked down and shared some lay name registers from 1916 and 1917 in which practitioners who were encountering the rōshi for the first time (in *shōken* 相見) inscribed their names, addresses, occupations, ages, and other personal information. Other than this treasure, my quest came up short, in a sense; on the other hand, it was my quest (e.g., asking senior members of the respective groups for historical “materials,” or “*shiryō* 資料”) that led me to innumerable conversations, meetings, more recent materials

---

<sup>9</sup> Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎, *Koji Zen* 居士禅, edited by Matsuoka Yuzuru 松岡譲 (Tokyo: Shimokawa Kōryū 下川光留, 1935). The book was printed in a limited run of five hundred copies, published privately by what seems to be a family member (Shimokawa Kōryū 下川光留).

<sup>10</sup> The term “*sanzenroku* 参禅録” is used in-text to characterize certain entries, but it is not clear whether Shimokawa himself or the editor labeled these entries as such (see, for example, Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 177).

that shed light on the groups' histories, and opportunities to learn about the groups' present.<sup>11</sup>

For example, with Kōzen Gokokukai, this search for historical materials was frustratingly circular and went on for months: after my initial introduction to Kōzen Gokokukai and warm welcome by the group's leader, I proceeded to attend the monthly *zazenkai* 坐禅会 (a morning event of *zazen*, followed by the master's sermon) and, afterward, chat with senior members with whom I became acquainted and who went out of their way to help.<sup>12</sup> With regard to the historical materials, however, every month it seemed that I would be referred to someone different who should know the papers' whereabouts. Eventually—through other connections—I became acquainted with the head priest of Rinshōin 麟祥院, which served as the home to Kōzen Gokokukai from 1914–1935.<sup>13</sup> The relationships that I developed with the priest and his wife, and their kindness and generosity, opened up numerous doors for me with regard to Rinzai Zen, lay and monastic, in the present day and over the past 150 years. However, the priest

---

<sup>11</sup> I learned through this quest of trying to procure historical materials that I had to be more specific, so I moved from asking about “materials” (“*shiryō* 資料”) to asking about “literature and other materials that were written in the modern period”—that is, in the period between 1868 and 1945 (“*kindai ni kakareta bunken ya hoka no shiryō* 近代に書かれた文献や他の資料”).

<sup>12</sup> My research was primarily archival but had an ethnographic dimension—sanctioned by the IRB—in that conversing with the groups' current members was vitally important for shedding light on the groups and its members historically. Following IRB protocol, I interviewed numerous current members and leaders of Kōzen Gokokukai, Kojirin, and Shakamunikai, as well as Rinzai monastics, both to find my way to materials and to learn about the groups' present in order to find my way to appropriate questions about the groups' histories and unseat any assumptions I might have held. Additionally, I participated regularly in meditation sessions held by all three groups between 2016 and 2018.

<sup>13</sup> Kōzen Gokokukai 興禅護国会, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi* 興禅護国会史 (Tokyo: Kōzen Gokokukai, 2002), 15.

confirmed what others I know had suspected: that the temple—in the center of Tokyo—burned during the Fifteen Years War, along with most of its possessions, which may have included Kōzen Gokokukai’s records. Through my efforts to obtain “original records” of the Tokyo-area lay Zen groups, I realized that—whether through destruction of the materials or my own difficulty gaining access (given my outsider status)—such materials may be hard to come by. Thus, the journals and other published materials preserved in Komazawa’s library and in libraries across Japan became even more valuable for my research.

As for the contents of these published materials and why I chose to focus on them in the first place, I have already mentioned some of my reasons for emphasizing the students and their accounts: their prominence (i.e., relatively large numbers) in the realm of modern lay Rinzai, as well as their significance. In terms of students’ prominence, many authors observe the predominance of youth at *zazenkai* and other lay Zen events. For example, layman Iizuka Iwao observed in 1920 that all kinds of people practiced at Engakuji: young and old, Parliament members and government ministers, businessmen and military officers, novelists and painters, teachers and students, rich and poor alike. Of these, Iizuka tells us, young working people and students made up the majority of the lay practitioners at Kojirin at that time.<sup>14</sup>

Of note, too, are the significant roles that students played in their respective groups’ organization and in sustaining their larger umbrella organizations, such as

---

<sup>14</sup> Iizuka Iwao 飯塚巖, *Sanzen no shiori* 参禅のしをり (Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1920), 40.

Engakuji's Kojirin. For most if not all of these student groups, the students served as de facto leaders and organizers, taking initiative in forming their groups, inviting a prominent Rinzai rōshi to serve as the group's master (*shike* 師家), and sustaining their groups. Spiritual leadership generally remained the role of the monastics, with the *shike* serving in teaching capacities and training monks (*unsui* 雲水) leading *zazenkai*; however, students' interest in practicing Zen and their dedication to establishing groups were indispensable components of lay Zen's (and particularly of lay Rinzai's) growth in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan. Students also played key roles in rebuilding their organizations and practice spaces after traumatic events like the 1926 fire at Saiindan that destroyed the laypeople's training hall at Engakuji (discussed below) and the Pacific War. There are also many instances of student members' participating not only in their university Zen groups but also elsewhere: at Engakuji, smaller Zen assemblies like Kōzen Gokokukai in Tokyo, and at practice centers beyond Tokyo. Thus, they illustrate the fluidity and broad networks that constituted lay Zen in early twentieth-century Japan.

Beyond the students' important roles in the broader lay Rinzai landscape, the groups' histories are significant in providing autobiographical accounts—some sparse, some rich—of living, breathing Zen that was newly accessible for lay practitioners. The accounts published in the groups' histories—mostly penned by students or alumni and occasionally by their mentors—more often read as institutional histories than deeply personal accounts. They often express the “what,” or the nuts and bolts of how the groups formed and what their experiences entailed: the events leading up to the organization's

official founding, early interactions with Engakuji priests and abbots, and the circumstances of practicing at Engakuji (for example, the sub-temples at which trainees lodged, receiving a kōan from then-abbot Miyaji Sōkai, the daily schedule, the name of the classical Zen text on which the master lectured, and so forth). Some accounts outline the practitioners' first one-on-one meeting with the master in *sanzen*, the kōan that they were assigned, and anecdotes about the master.

More rarely, accounts describe (or offer clues to understanding) the “how” or “why”: that is, what drew practitioners to Zen and continued fueling their interest in practice. Even more rarely, accounts address the “so what?”: how, ultimately, the practitioners made meaning of the practice in their own lives, and how Zen could offer something unique to modern Japan and the modern world with which they grappled. Thus, many of these students' accounts contrast with the genre of religious testimonials that emphasize the practitioner's conversion, practice, and perhaps even enlightenment, as well as their master's teaching style, practice environment, and sometimes hagiographies of the teacher. This kind of account was more common among very long-term practitioners (and leaders), sometimes found in their autobiographies that were written decades after the authors' “entry” to the Zen path. For these practitioners, Zen practice was central to their lives; and in many of these cases, they had the perspective of decades of experience and making sense of their trajectories. This sort of account is rare—in part because such long-term lay practitioners make up a minority of overall practitioners. Examples include the autobiography of Tsuji Sōmei 辻双明 (1903–1991), who started practicing at Engakuji while he was a university student and went on to practice for

decades, aspiring to ordain (and eventually ordaining); he is discussed in chapter 5. Thus, I have considered a variety of practice accounts and not limited the material strictly to that of the students.

As a side-note, such accounts have always been relatively rare, even after the lay Zen boom, when Rinzai Zen became more popular and accessible than it was previously. The aforementioned lay practitioner Iizuka Iwao, in 1920, commented on the rarity of long-term practitioners: “For *kōji* who now gather at Engaku-ji, there are especially many beginners who practice and eventually penetrate various beginning koan; however, people who penetrate to the bottom [i.e., people who fully understand the Great Matter and are therefore enlightened] are extremely rare.”<sup>15</sup> Here, Iizuka is distinguishing between practitioners who are zealous enough in their practice to have a shallow preliminary awakening experience and those who persist in their practice to the degree that they have experienced enlightenment in a deep and thoroughgoing manner.

One useful lens for framing these differences—both for the student Zen population and modern lay practitioners more broadly—is Winston Davis’s distinction between “clients” and “devotees” in the Japanese religious framework.<sup>16</sup> For example, it

---

<sup>15</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 40.

<sup>16</sup> Winston Davis, *Japanese Religion and Society: Paradigms of Structure and Change* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 24–27. Davis argues that the Japanese religious landscape fosters a mixture of “because” motives, in which the practitioner feels obligated to practice based on benefits received in past, and “in order to” motives, in which the practitioner practices in order to achieve a desired outcome. Within the “in order to” motives, Davis distinguishes between “clients,” who engage in “specific, goal-oriented, ad hoc activities in search of this-worldly benefits” and “devotees,” characterized by enduring relationships and devotion. Jørn Borup, writing about contemporary Rinzai practitioners, notes that “Holmes Welch in the Chinese context also called such loosely related lay adherents ‘occasional Buddhists,’ being

seems that most students start out as “clients”—for example, practicing Zen as a form of “spiritual self-cultivation (“*seishinteki shūyō* 精神的修養”) or as a way to become a better swordsman—and only some of them go on to become long-term practitioners and devotees. Although this distinction can be artificial, the categories are useful because, I would argue, the accounts are qualitatively different from each other and often address different pieces of the story. In a similar fashion, we might also categorize practitioners along a spectrum from “casual” to “serious.”<sup>17</sup> For example, “casual” practice could comprise one-time or occasional attendance at masters’ (or academics’) lectures, one-time or occasional zazen, and/or reading about Zen practice; and “serious” practice could

---

those who ‘used Buddhism in the same way a motorist uses one of the several different brands of gasoline, without any special commitment.’” Borup states: “Unlike the typical *danka* [parishioner] they are not ‘cultural Buddhists,’ as tradition and geographical or social ties do not define and frame their religiosity. On the other hand, though such type of individually defined engagement is typical for postmodern cultures, it is also part of the traditional broad spectrum of being Buddhist or practicing Buddhism” (Jørn Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism: Myōshinji, a Living Religion*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008, 84).

<sup>17</sup> For additional possible categories or terminology for this range of practitioners, see Thomas A. Tweed, “Night-Stand Buddhists and Other Creatures: Sympathizers, Adherents, and the Study of Religion,” in *American Buddhism: Methods and Findings in Recent Scholarship*, edited by Duncan Ryūken Williams and Christopher S. Queen, 71–90 (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 1999); and Helen J. Baroni, *Love, Rōshi: Robert Baker Aitken and His Distant Correspondents* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012). Working from Tweed’s categories of “night-stand Buddhists” and “Buddhist sympathizers,” Baroni clarifies these categories: “I would like to distinguish between sympathizers (including the dabblers), who may do little more than read Buddhist texts and make a few attempts to sit in meditation, and solo practitioners, who practice daily for extended periods of time, self-taught or otherwise, without the benefit of a practicing community or a teacher to support their efforts. This latter group would more aptly be called Zafu Buddhists, since unlike ‘armchair scholars’ or ‘night-stand Buddhists,’ whose practice consists primarily of reading Buddhist literature, these solo practitioners go far beyond reading to practice zazen on their cushions” (Baroni, *Love, Rōshi*, 18). None of these categories, it seems, is apt for the modern Japanese lay practitioners studied here, since “sympathizers” by definition do not identify as Buddhists, most of them practice in groups (and thus are not solo practitioners), and actually meditate (and thus are not night-stand Buddhists).



involve participation in meditation intensives, having one-on-one encounters with—and even becoming a formal disciple of—a rōshi, and doing kōan practice under the rōshi.

Although this binary is over-simplistic, it is helpful for clarifying the quantitative difference between the two extremes (e.g., the difference in time spent in meditation), as well as the qualitative difference: on the level of engaging with practice (e.g., attending a meditation intensive versus reading *Zendō*); pedagogy (e.g., masters speaking of practice goals in terms of understanding the Great Matter versus cultivating the self to serve the nation more effectively); and how practitioners narrate their experiences and the motivations that fuel their practice (e.g., seeking “enlightenment” versus improving swordsmanship). As with Davis’s framework, the casual-serious binary is artificial, as practitioners’ engagement with lay Rinzai shifted over time. For example, many students who were involved with Nyoidan or Saiindan during their university days (e.g., regularly attending meditation intensives) then, following graduation, shifted from “serious” to “casual” practice (or no practice). However, this spectrum can help us navigate the range of lay Zen audiences and their engagement with Rinzai Zen practice, as well as differences among teachers’ communication and pedagogy with the respective groups.

## **1.4 Literature Review**

### **1.4.1 Overview**

From Zen’s depiction as the way to a timeless truth, to a decades-long romanticization, to blistering accusations of Zen masters’ warmongering, the tides of both scholarly and public opinion have turned dramatically within the past century. Considering that even twenty years ago, studies of modern Japanese Buddhism from

Buddhological perspectives were still scarce, the field of post-Meiji Restoration Zen studies—while still spotty—has advanced considerably.<sup>18</sup> In order to have a nuanced understanding of the development of modern Japanese lay Zen, we must understand how Japanese Zen practice, doctrine, rhetoric, identity, and power structures shifted and maintained continuities during and following the Meiji period, both in Rinzai monastic and lay contexts.<sup>19</sup> Scholars have begun to tackle this field, which remains wide open. Below, I contextualize this dissertation within recent scholarly developments in the following areas: modern Rinzai Zen institutions and figures, as well as related lay groups; the broader Japanese religious context, within and beyond the boundaries of Buddhism; and Buddhist modernism and historicization. Note that review of literature in other sub-

---

<sup>18</sup> As of 1998, when the *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* published an issue dedicated to “Meiji Zen,” Japanese Buddhist developments during the early modern and modern periods had largely not been taken seriously by Buddhologists, meaning that there was a major dearth of research on Zen and other sects from the perspectives of doctrine, texts, and practices; see Richard Jaffe and Michel Mohr, “Editors’ Introduction: Meiji Zen,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 1–10. It is worth noting that in two relatively recent assessments of the state of Zen studies—highlighting breakthrough scholarship on Zen and Chan within and outside of Japan and China, both premodern and modern—very few modern materials were covered. See Steven Heine, “A Critical Survey of Works on Zen Since Yampolsky,” *Philosophy East and West* 57, no. 4 (2007): 577–592; and Michel Mohr, “Plowing the Zen Field: Trends Since 1989 and Emerging Perspectives,” *Religion Compass* 6, no. 2 (2012): 113–124.

<sup>19</sup> As mentioned previously, Japan’s “modern” era here refers to the Meiji period (1868–1912), Taishō period (1912–1926), and early Shōwa period (1926–1989), until 1945. Here, I focus largely on materials published since 1998. As a further note, I do not intend to reify problematic categories, such as “Meiji Zen” (implying a radical break from Tokugawa Zen), “Zen studies” as opposed to “Buddhist studies,” Japanese versus Western scholarly approaches to Buddhist studies, lay and monastic, and so forth. For example, Michel Mohr questions the validity of “Zen studies” as a category, as partitioned from Buddhist studies more generally. Mohr determines that such a category can easily gloss over diverse historical contexts by lumping together various “Zens.” He argues that the term “Zen” should be broadened to include: lineages self-identifying as Chan/Zen; “Buddhist forms of cultivation that include a specific emphasis on meditation...[and] “other Asian religious practices aimed at training the mind to be ‘focused on one point’” (Mohr, “Plowing the Zen Field,” 116). However, I use such categories for insofar as they are helpful for delineating broad trends, while recognizing their limitations.

fields related to dissertation content is in the pertinent chapters (for example, Japanese scholars such as Yoshinaga Shin'ichi and Kurita Hidehiko have done remarkable work on modern Japanese self-cultivation movements; their work is reviewed in chapter 5).

To summarize recent methodological trends, there has been an intensified interest in cultural and epistemological critique—which includes questioning Meiji categories, exploring the genealogy of terms, and highly specific contextualization—as well as increased incorporation of other fields' methodologies, such as ethnography and postmodern strategies of deconstruction.<sup>20</sup> These trends reverberate through the studies of Rinzai-related institutions and lay groups whose descriptions follow.

#### **1.4.2 Modern Rinzai Zen: Institutions and Figures**

Here, I turn toward the increasing numbers of detailed studies of “living” orthodox Rinzai Zen institutions and their lay practitioners, reflecting a rising interest in individual case-studies and the specificities of each socio-historical context. Prior to 1998, one of the few scholarly discussions of mid-twentieth-century Rinzai practice could be found in Victor Hori's report, from the perspective of a practitioner, on the social

---

<sup>20</sup> As Robert Sharf pointed out in a 2008 lecture on the state of the Zen studies field, Zen/Chan scholarship since the 1990s has strongly been shaped by genealogical critique, questioning Eurocentric, Protestant, and Orientalist biases, and focused increasingly on material/ritual dimensions, alterity, and genealogy (Robert Sharf, “Sudden/Gradual and the State of the Field,” presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion, Chicago, November 1, 2008). As Mohr points out, Faure's 1991 and 1993 cultural and epistemological critiques of Chan provoked a shift in the field toward critical distance, incorporating deconstructive strategies from fields such as philosophy and sociology (Mohr, “Plowing the Zen Field,” 117). See Bernard Faure, *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991); and Bernard Faure, *Chan Insights and Oversights: An Epistemological Critique of the Chan Tradition* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

organization and ritual context of a contemporary Rinzai monastery.<sup>21</sup> Recently, we have seen a new edition of Ruth Fuller Sasaki's (1892–1967) 1960 writings, "Rinzai Zen Study for Foreigners in Japan."<sup>22</sup> Here, Sasaki—American-born and notable for becoming not only the first foreigner but also the first woman to be priest of a Daitokuji temple—sheds light on Zen practice among lay practitioners at this prominent Rinzai Zen temple complex; as a primary text, this work is very informative.

Additionally, research on two Rinzai Zen head temples—Janine Sawada's work on Engakuji and Jørn Borup's work on Myōshinji—has advanced the field considerably. As mentioned previously, my work builds directly on Janine Sawada's research on Engakuji, which I discuss more extensively below in the context of its Meiji-era abbot, Imakita Kōsen, as well as throughout the dissertation.<sup>23</sup> Sawada investigates not only the Meiji-era monastic training program at Engakuji and the changing roles of and relations between clergy and lay practitioners during this time, but also broader social and political discourse and ideological trends in the late nineteenth century. Borup, on the other hand, presents an ethnographic study that emphasizes details of contemporary religious life, such as the full gamut of practices, education, and rituals, as well as the different (and shifting) categories of male and female religious specialists, priests' wives and sons, and

---

<sup>21</sup> G. Victor Sōgen Hori, "Teaching and Learning in the Rinzai Zen Monastery," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 20, no. 1 (1994): 5–35. Hori's main focus here is on "the connection between ritual formalism and mystical insight" (Hori, "Teaching and Learning," 7). Hori bases this essay on thirteen years' residency in Rinzai monasteries, from 1977–1990; he speaks generally of "the Rinzai Zen monastery," as opposed to any specific one.

<sup>22</sup> Isabel Stirling, *Zen Pioneer: The Life & Works of Ruth Fuller Sasaki* (Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker & Hoard, 2006). See especially 179–246.

<sup>23</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*.

laity.<sup>24</sup> He draws from fieldwork (for example, attending rituals and *zazenkai*, and conducting extensive interviews with clergy and laity), discourse analysis (studying the institution's publications aimed at clergy and laity), and broad surveys. Borup provides an important framework for my study of lay Rinzai activities and for examining lay-clerical relationships, although I am careful not to project contemporary assumptions onto an earlier time period. Sawada's study of early Meiji lay Zen at Engakuji provides crucial a foundation for my study of lay Rinzai Zen; her account ends in the early 1890s, which is (roughly) where my account begins.

Along with the detailed study of institutions, we have seen increasing attention to the biographies and discourse of a small handful of influential Rinzai Zen reformers and other figures. Scholars have analyzed leading figures' rhetoric and activities in several genres: masters' correspondence and treatises, newsletters, popular journals, sect treatises—in other words, published and unpublished; targeting clergy, lay people, and government officials; conveyed orally or intended to be written. I have sought to continue their careful work in order to gain a fuller picture of Meiji-era and twentieth-century Zen in Japan and abroad.

It is no coincidence that many of the figures who have thus far drawn the most attention from Western scholars are those who directly or indirectly played a role in the transplantation of Zen in the West. These include Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 (1860–1919), instrumental in introducing Zen to the West; Sōen's teacher at Engakuji, Imakita Kōsen

---

<sup>24</sup> Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*.

今北洪川 (1816–1892); and one of Sōen’s lay disciples, D. T. Suzuki (1870–1966).<sup>25</sup>

Other Rinzai Zen masters profiled include Imakita’s contemporary, Nakahara Nantenbō 中原南天棒 (1839–1925), and the lesser-known Tōjū Reisō 洞宗令聡 (1854–1916) and his associates in the Mino school within Rinzai Zen’s Inzan lineage.<sup>26</sup>

As discussed throughout the dissertation, Sawada examines the figure and discourse of Engakuji abbot Imakita Kōsen, emblematic in his approach to Zen of the personal cultivation paradigm characteristic of Meiji religiosity. Sawada notes that under Imakita, Engakuji’s monastic training program placed increasing emphasis on practice or experiential learning in order to restore the “original spirit” of Zen (and Japan). The monastics’ elevation of “imaginary ideals” of the past—that is of celibacy and rigorous training centering on the meditation hall—paired with the rising prominence of *koji* Zen led to a reinterpretation of lay-clergy roles and relations.<sup>27</sup> Sawada sheds light on the tensions between monastics and newly-empowered lay practitioners with access to spiritual practice and “capital” that had previously been the prerogative, for the most part, of the monastic community. Although Imakita was not alone among Rinzai masters in his

---

<sup>25</sup> See particularly Michel Mohr, “The Use of Traps and Snares: Shaku Sōen Revisited,” in *Zen Masters*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 183–216 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*; James Edward Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); and Richard M. Jaffe, introduction to Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, edited by Richard M. Jaffe (Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press, 2015), xi-lvi.

<sup>26</sup> Katō Shōshun 加藤正俊, ““A Lineage of Dullards”: Zen Master Tōjū Reisō and His Associates,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 151–165. Katō explains that contemporary Rinzai has two branches, the Inzan 隠山 and Takujū 卓洲; within the Inzan branch are the Bizen school—with many prominent, brilliant masters—and the lesser-known Mino school, whose masters “were virtually unknown in society at large...[and] tended to be taciturn in character” (Katō, “A Lineage of Dullards,” 152). This is discussed further in chapter 4.

<sup>27</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 125.

openness to training lay practitioners, the seeds of lay Zen that he cultivated in early Meiji were crucial to lay Zen's blossoming in the subsequent decades, as my study demonstrates.

Michel Mohr investigates Imakita's contemporary, the uncompromising Rinzai master Nakahara Nantenbō, who oversaw the training of hundreds of lay practitioners in the Tokyo area and who was skeptical about what he perceived as the overly intellectual approach to Zen practice at Engakuji, as discussed in chapter 2.<sup>28</sup> Nantenbō lamented the plight of Rinzai Zen monasticism in early Meiji: "Since the demise of Hakuin, each passing year has seen a degradation of the true style of the patriarchs; all monasteries (*dōjō*) are falling to the depths of desolation."<sup>29</sup> Nantenbō was thus motivated "to accomplish a 'great revolution' in the world of his school," and in 1893, he petitioned the Myōshinji assembly to adopt more stringent requirements for those sanctioned as Rinzai Zen teachers. After the assembly ignored his impassioned plea, Nantenbō turned more strongly toward the project of training lay practitioners, which he—like Imakita Kōsen—viewed as a way to strengthen the "Japanese spirit."

In his chapter on Shaku Sōen, Mohr reassesses Sōen's image and links with militarism through four genres of accounts: autobiography, biography by "disciples and admirers," writings by apologists, and translations of his writings. Mohr notes Sōen's pivotal role linking "the intellectual fermentation taking place in the Engakuji circle"

---

<sup>28</sup> Michel Mohr, "Japanese Zen Schools and the Transition to Meiji: A Plurality of Responses in the Nineteenth Century," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 167–213. See especially 185–188.

<sup>29</sup> Mohr, "Japanese Zen Schools," 195.

under the leadership of his teacher Imakita with the work abroad of Sōen's student, D. T. Suzuki; and he concludes that Sōen may have made "opportunistic choices" but that his "vulnerability...to [his] own time"—and sectarian rhetoric—should not mask his accomplishments.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, Richard Jaffe brings a balanced view to his reappraisal of D. T. Suzuki and his writings, acknowledging Suzuki's flaws while providing crucial socio-historical context and personal context (e.g., through a close reading of Suzuki's personal correspondence).<sup>31</sup> Jaffe, alongside the editors of other volumes in this new series, present not only new translations of Suzuki's work but nuanced analyses of Suzuki's idiosyncratic parlance, massive oeuvre, and the shifts and continuities within Suzuki's thought.<sup>32</sup>

Sawada, Mohr, and Jaffe locate the increasingly nationalist rhetoric of their respective subjects—that is, Imakita, Nantenbō, Shaku Sōen, and D. T. Suzuki—in the context of the larger political discourse in 1890s Japan. Likewise, the nationalistic rhetoric of lay master Hisamatsu Shin'ichi 久松真一 (1889–1980), alongside his crucial role in laicizing Zen in the twentieth century, has been the subject recent research by Christopher Ives.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, one particularly potent theme of late—a significant

---

<sup>30</sup> Mohr, "The Use of Traps and Snares," 203–204.

<sup>31</sup> Jaffe, introduction to *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume I: Zen*.

<sup>32</sup> For Suzuki's Zen-related writings in this multi-volume set, see especially the aforementioned *Volume I: Zen*, as well as Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume III: Comparative Religion*, edited by Jeff Wilson and Moriya Tomoe (Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2016).

<sup>33</sup> For an examination of Hisamatsu's role in laicizing Zen, see especially Christopher Ives, "True Person, Formless Self: Lay Zen Master Hisamatsu Shin'ichi," in *Zen Masters*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 217–238 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). For a discussion of Hisamatsu's nationalism, see Robert H. Sharf, "The Zen of Japanese Nationalism," *History of*



component of the historicization and de-mythologizing of Zen in the modern period—has been the relationship of Zen clergy in imperial Japan to nationalism, imperialism, and wartime violence: a subject that I pick up in chapter 5 when I explore lay Zen practitioners’ relationship to twentieth-century “*bushidō* 武士道” (“way of the warrior”) rhetoric and their interest in practicing Zen for the sake of the nation.<sup>34</sup>

In the context of lay organizations, Hisamatsu is best known for advocating a laicized, trans-sectarian Buddhism that comprised Rinzai-like features, as did his student Akizuki Ryōmin and the master Shaku Jōkō 釈定光 (1884–1949; I discuss Jōkō in chapter 2 in the context of Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会, which Jōkō founded). This manifested in Hisamatsu’s founding the Association for Self-Awakening in 1944, which transitioned into the FAS Society in 1958.<sup>35</sup> Hisamatsu had undergone traditional Rinzai

---

*Religions* 33, no. 1 (1993): 1–43. Hisamatsu’s teachings and associations with his teacher Nishida Kitarō 西田幾多郎 (1870–1945) and the Kyoto school have been the subject of extensive writing. See, for example, a summary of his philosophy in Abe Masao, “Hisamatsu’s Philosophy of Awakening,” translated by Christopher A. Ives, *Eastern Buddhist* 14, no. 1 (1981): 26–42. The same issue of *Eastern Buddhist*—dedicated to Hisamatsu following his death—features other reflections by Hisamatsu’s students.

<sup>34</sup> See particularly Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism”; Brian (Daizen) Victoria, *Zen at War* (New York: Weatherhill, 1997); Brian (Daizen) Victoria, *Zen War Stories* (London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003); Christopher Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen’s Critique and Lingering Questions for Buddhist Ethics* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009); Micah Auerback, “A Closer Look at Zen at War: The Battlefield Chaplaincy of Shaku Sōen in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905),” in *Buddhism and Violence: Militarism and Buddhism in Modern Asia*, edited by Vladimir Tikhonov and Torkel Brekke, 152–71 (New York: Routledge, 2012); and Alice Freeman, “Zen Buddhism in Japan-US Relations, 1941–1973: The Politics of Culture from the Pacific War to the Vietnam War,” Dissertation, Christ Church, University of Oxford, 2016.

<sup>35</sup> For a discussion of FAS Society, see Akizuki Ryōmin, *New Mahāyāna: Buddhism for a Post-Modern World*, translated by James W. Heisig and Paul L. Swanson (Berkeley, CA: Asian

training at Myōshinji but ultimately criticized institutional Rinzai Zen for its excessive emphasis on satori.<sup>36</sup>

In addition to scholarship on the aforementioned figures, some recently published works include translations of these figures' works.<sup>37</sup> Such works include, for example, *New Mahāyāna*, by Rinzai scholar-monk Akizuki Ryōmin 秋月龍珉 (1921–1999), an aspiring Zen “revolutionary” who practiced under several Rinzai Zen teachers, ordained at age fifty, but eventually eschewed institutional Zen; the work includes his assessments of, and experiences with, early twentieth-century Zen reformers like Hisamatsu and Shaku Jōkō.<sup>38</sup> The work also conveys Akizuki's own polemical vision of Mahāyāna Buddhism and indicates his role in the twentieth-century laicization of Rinzai Zen. Indeed, Akizuki insists: “the Buddha Dharma of the future—that is, for the New Mahāyāna—must be a *lay Buddhism*. But simple laicization alone will not do. Unless it also maintains the homelessness of the heart, it will die.”<sup>39</sup> Therefore, Akizuki prioritizes *zazen* and living in the world within his ostensibly trans-sectarian formulation, even at the expense of adherence to the monastic rules and regulations (*vinaya*). Akizuki sought to

---

Humanities Press, 1990), 3, 44. Akizuki notes that “FAS” stands for “Formless self, All humanity, and Superhistorical history” (Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 4).

<sup>36</sup> Ives, “True Person, Formless Self,” 2010.

<sup>37</sup> See, for example, Hisamatsu Shin'ichi, *Critical Sermons of the Zen Tradition: Hisamatsu's Talks on Linji*, translated by Christopher Ives and Tokiwa Gishin (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002). This is a new edition of translated talks by Hisamatsu on the *Record of Linji*, given at a series of retreats at Myōshinji between 1962 and 1964.

<sup>38</sup> For the original work in Japanese, see Akizuki Ryōmin 秋月龍珉, *Shin daijō: Bukkyō no posuto-modan* 新大乘一仏教のポスト-モダン (Tokyo: Suzuki Shuppan 鈴木出版, 1988).

<sup>39</sup> Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 32–33 (emphasis in original).

overthrow the conventional hierarchy that placed clergy above laypeople; his Buddhism “[did] not distinguish between monks and laity.”<sup>40</sup> Akizuki himself was active in lay Zen primarily in the postwar period—that is, later than the period examined in this dissertation. However, he studied with, and was associated with, several of the figures discussed through these pages. Bearing their legacy, Akizuki’s formulations of Zen (and his large body of Zen-related writing for a popular audience) are significant for the study of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Zen, even while his words must be taken as his own formulation.<sup>41</sup>

The scholarship and translations discussed above crucially inform my examination of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century lay Rinzai-style Zen. In particular, they present idealized versions of various formulations of modern Rinzai Zen, which I can juxtapose on the rhetoric, actions, and expressed concerns of the practitioners themselves, who are the main subject of my inquiry.

### 1.4.3 Related Lay Groups

In addition to scholarship on the above-mentioned religious leaders, there has been scant (though increasing) research on modern lay Zen groups. In his 1998 article on the role of teaching assemblies (*kyōkai* 教会) and lay societies (*kessha* 結社) in the

---

<sup>40</sup> Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 46.

<sup>41</sup> In particular, Akizuki was influenced by Shaku Jōkō’s teachings, as Jōkō’s teachings were imparted to Akizuki by Osaka Kōryū 荳坂光龍 (1901–1985). Osaka Kōryū was one of Akizuki’s main teachers and Jōkō’s successor as the leader of Shakamunikai; both Osaka and Jōkō are discussed in chapter 2. Akizuki describes Jōkō as a “religious revolutionary of the Shōwa era” and a rigorous practitioner (Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 3). Like Hisamatsu and Akizuki, Shaku Jōkō was severely critical of institutional Zen, as reflected in his appeal to “kill all the priests and burn all the temples in order to bring Zen back to life” (Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, vii).

development of modern sectarian Buddhism during the Meiji period, Ikeda Eishun 池田英俊 has compiled helpful statistics.<sup>42</sup> Ikeda identifies general characteristics of the teaching assemblies and lay societies—for example, that the groups’ common aims, as set forth in their regulations, were “...to form groups based on faith and establish precise methods for proselytizing”—and he contextualizes the groups’ development within the Meiji state’s division of Buddhism into twelve sects and thirty-seven branches.<sup>43</sup> Interestingly, Ikeda notes that Sōtō groups were by far the most numerous among all sects’ teaching assemblies and lay societies: of 385 such groups formed between 1875 and 1890, 128 were in the Sōtō sect, three were in the Rinzai sect, and one was in the Ōbaku sect.<sup>44</sup> For my research, Ikeda’s quantification is helpful, and the relative dearth of Rinzai Zen teaching assemblies and lay societies in the early Meiji period is notable given that Rinzai Zen seemed to generate far more “Zen assemblies” (*zenkai* 禅会) than did the Sōtō sect by later in the Meiji period.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Ikeda Eishun 池田英俊, “Teaching Assemblies and Lay Societies in the Formation of Modern Sectarian Buddhism,” translated by Clark Chilson, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 11–44. Also see Ikeda’s other groundbreaking works on Meiji Buddhism: namely, Ikeda Eishun, *Meiji Bukkyō kyōkai kesshashi no kenkyū* 明治仏教教会結社史の研究 (Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō, 1994); Ikeda Eishun, *Meiji no shin Bukkyō undō* 明治の新仏教運動 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1976); and Ikeda Eishun, *Meiji no Bukkyō: sono kōdō to shisō* 明治の仏教: その行動と思想 (Tokyo: Hyōronsha 評論社, 1976). Ikeda notes that the growth of these groups peaked during the late 1870s and early 1880s (Ikeda, “Teaching Assemblies,” 25).

<sup>43</sup> Ikeda, “Teaching Assemblies,” 28, 13–14.

<sup>44</sup> Ikeda, “Teaching Assemblies,” 35. Ikeda also notes that the Sōtō sect was among the first (of all Buddhist sects) to spawn teaching assemblies and lay societies.

<sup>45</sup> This is based on observations recorded, and activities reported, in the journal *Zendō* during the 1910s. Note that the “Zen assemblies” (*zenkai*) that are the subject of this dissertation—based on *zazen* and Zen practice—are different from the early Meiji “teaching assemblies” (*kyōkai* 教会) and “lay societies” (*kessha* 結社), which were based, in part, on proselytizing. In chapter 2, I

Until 2019, there were no published studies that quantified the lay Zen boom that is the subject of my study. As I discuss in chapter 2, Kengo Takei has tabulated and performed a quantitative analysis of the lay Zen assemblies (*zenkai* 禅会) that met monthly between 1910 and 1943, as indicated by records of their activities that appeared in the monthly periodicals *Zendō* 禅道 (published between 1910 and 1923) and *Daijōzen* 大乘禅 (published from 1924 to the present) from 1910 onward.<sup>46</sup> These data are invaluable for the task of beginning to quantify the vast phenomenon of lay Rinzai Zen practice in modern Japan, discussed in chapter 2.

Until the last decade, one of the only detailed studies of Rinzai-related Zen groups that emerged in twentieth-century Japan was Robert Sharf’s controversial 1995 article on the Sanbō Kyōdan 三宝教団, a lay Zen organization founded in 1954 by Yasutani Hakuun 安谷白雲 (1885–1973), based on the teachings of Yasutani’s teacher, Harada Sogaku 原田祖岳 (1871–1961), who integrated elements of both Rinzai and Sōtō Zen. As discussed in chapter 6, the Sanbō Kyōdan (now known as Sanbō Zen 三宝禅) is located outside of institutional Sōtō and Rinzai Zen and has been relatively marginalized within Japan, though it has come to wield disproportionately large influence on Zen in

---

discuss some reasons why Rinzai *kyōkai* and *kessha* were scarce; namely, proselytizing was antithetical to Rinzai tradition.

<sup>46</sup> Takei Kengo 武井謙悟, “*Kindai nihon ni okeru zenkai no fukyū ni kansuru kōsatsu: Zendō, Daijō Zen no kiji o chūshin toshite* 近代日本における禅会の普及に関する考察—『禅道』・『大乘禅』の記事を中心として,” *Kindai Bukkyō* 近代仏教, no. 26 (May 2019), 51–74. Takei’s research was based, in part, on collaborative research that he and I did together at Komazawa University between December 2016 and May 2018.

the West.<sup>47</sup> In Sharf's study, he analyzes the group's history and rhetoric and "...argu[es] that the reconfiguration of the notion of Zen practice and *kenshō* by Suzuki and the lay Zen organization, Sanbō Kyōdan, mark a radical, modern break with traditional Zen monastic practice."<sup>48</sup> Sharf challenges the Sanbō Kyōdan reformulation of traditional Zen by contextualizing it within the framework of Japan's New Religious Movements—not arguing explicitly for its classification as a New Religious Movement as such, but highlighting the similarities.<sup>49</sup> Additionally, he contends that the group departs significantly from institutional Zen in that the Sanbōkyōdan leadership was not legitimized from within the institutional hierarchy, given the syncretistic nature of their teachings.<sup>50</sup>

Sharf's study was groundbreaking in approaching modern lay Zen movements in Japan, and it provocatively challenges the categories of "new religious movement" and "established religion." However, in chapter 6, I push back against his depiction of Sanbō

---

<sup>47</sup> Robert H. Sharf, "Sanbōkyōdan: Zen and the Way of the New Religions," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22, no. 3–4 (1995): 417–458.

<sup>48</sup> These are the words of Jaffe and Mohr, describing Sharf's article, in Jaffe and Mohr, "Editors' Introduction: Meiji Zen," 2.

<sup>49</sup> Sharf situates the Sanbōkyōdan alongside Japan's New Religious Movements, given what he discerns as the following shared characteristics: rapid spiritual upward mobility, as indicated by the emphasis on *kenshō* and rapidly moving through a simplified *kōan* curriculum, resulting in a "democratization of enlightenment"; simplification (focusing on *zazen* as the single most important practice and relegating doctrinal study to the periphery); internationalization (as indicated by the great number of Westerners and even Christian clergy among its members and leaders); modernization (i.e., reflecting the Meiji-era reformulation of Zen as "modern," "rational," and elevating "experience" above all else); use of testimonials (i.e., *kenshō* reports, published in the Sanbōkyōdan's newsletters); charismatic authority; antiestablishment rhetoric, decrying the perceived failings of contemporary institutional Zen; and institutional volatility (Sharf, "Sanbōkyōdan," 436–452).

<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, both Harada and Yasutani received dharma transmission in the Sōtō sect, and Harada had completed his Rinzai training under Dokutan Sōsan 毒湛 叟三 (1840–1917; Sharf, "Sanbōkyōdan," 420).

Kyōdan as anomalous. My research demonstrates that the Sanbō Kyōdan emerged from a context that included dozens, if not hundreds, of lay Rinzai and Rinzai-type assemblies and groups with a similar range of emphases.<sup>51</sup> As these groups developed in tandem with their social environment, a new lay Zen paradigm emerged that featured an emphasis on experience and kōan practice, as well as a “set format” of activities that were undertaken by nearly all Rinzai-type groups, even as the groups varied ideologically to some degree.

In terms of detailed studies of twentieth-century lay Rinzai Zen groups, Erez Joskovich has done ethnographic research on Ningen Zen Kyōdan 人間禪教団 (mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation); although Ningen Zen was officially founded in the postwar period, the group had roots in the lay group, Ryōbō-sha 両忘社, whose leader was Imakita Kōsen.<sup>52</sup> As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Joskovich “...argue[s] that the shift of power between lay and monastic has been the major event of lay Zen in the modern period.”<sup>53</sup> For Joskovich, this shift gave rise to a broader “audience,” the perception that laypeople are capable of achieving awakening, greater autonomy of lay Zen organizations, lay Zen practitioners being sanctioned as masters. I agree with

---

<sup>51</sup> Although Sanbō Kyōdan traces its lineage through Sōtō lines, its practices (and ethos, I would argue) align more closely with Rinzai Zen; thus, I consider this a “Rinzai-type” group.

<sup>52</sup> Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen.” Joskovich has also done valuable research into different dimensions of Rinzai (lay and monastic), particularly from a ritual studies perspective. See Erez Joskovich, “Playing the Patriarch: Representation and Transformation in the Zen Sermon,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 85, no. 2 (June 1, 2017): 470–93; Erez Joskovich, “Relying on Words and Letters: Scripture Recitation in the Japanese Rinzai Tradition,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 46, no. 1 (March 22, 2019): 53–78; and Erez Hekigan Joskovich, “The Inexhaustible Lamp of Faith: Faith and Awakening in the Japanese Rinzai Tradition,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 42, no. 2 (2015): 319–38.

<sup>53</sup> Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 62.

Joskovich's overall assessment that these aspects reflect Buddhism's interaction with modernity, and my study unequivocally affirms Joskovich's first three points (i.e., a broader audience, enlightened laypeople, and greater organizational autonomy).

Joskovich's last point here—the ability of Zen practitioners to be sanctioned as masters in their own right, not only to teach but also to transmit the dharma to subsequent generations of teachers—is also provocative and garners more research to determine whether this can be generalized to contemporary Rinzai-type Zen groups in Japan that self-identify as Rinzai and that promote more “traditional” rhetoric and activities, such as *teishō* on kōan collections, *sesshinkai* 摂心会, and *sanzen* 参禅 with a teacher. In the period that I study (until 1945), this was not the case; even Iida Tōin 飯田櫟隠 (1862–1937; discussed throughout the dissertation), who led various *zenkai*, including Kōzen Gokokukai, and spent more of his life as a lay practitioner than other Kōzen Gokokukai masters, eventually chose to ordain as a priest. Since the group's 1893 inception to this day, Kōzen Gokokukai has only had as its leaders Rinzai masters who received dharma transmission from another Rinzai Zen master. Of course, Joskovich is primarily referring to the contemporary period, rather than the pre-1945 period, so a direct comparison with the earlier *zenkai* 禅会 is not warranted. In any case, his research delivers an imperative to trace historically the process of these shifts toward greater autonomy and lay authority, and to determine whether this is a twentieth-century trend across the board.



#### 1.4.4 Broader Religious Context: Zen and Beyond

Recent years have also seen an increase in works challenging conventional chronological and religious categories, including, for example, those of “lay” and “monastic.”<sup>54</sup> Scholars have also produced important studies of Buddhism in the modern period that locate Zen in Buddhism’s broader transformation.<sup>55</sup> Additionally, scholars have produced works on the broader religious context in which modern lay Rinzai was embedded and Zen’s relationship to popular religious elements that had been “written out” of Meiji narratives of Zen.<sup>56</sup> Like Ian Reader and George Tanabe’s 1998 work on this-worldly benefits in contemporary Japanese religion, Sawada, in her 2004 work discussed above, challenges conventional religious boundaries.<sup>57</sup> Her discussion of those concerned with reformulating “authentic” Rinzai Zen—for example, Imakita Kōsen and the Engakuji circle, addressed above—is embedded within a larger study of the appropriation of the neo-Confucian self-cultivation paradigm by seemingly disparate socio-religious groups. Pertinent to the broader religious context, too, is Michel Mohr’s

---

<sup>54</sup> Regarding his research on Myōshinji, Jørn Borup notes that he originally sought to compare lay and monastic Rinzai but that he found this dichotomy too constricting; thus, he broadened his study to examine many gradations and identities on this continuum (Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 4).

<sup>55</sup> See, for example, Hayashi Makoto, Ōtani Eiichi, and Paul L. Swanson, eds., *Modern Buddhism in Japan* (Nagoya, Japan: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, 2014); Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, and Kondō Shuntarō 近藤俊太郎, eds., *Kindai Bukkyō sutadīzu: Bukkyō kara mita mō hitotsu no kindai* 近代仏教スタディーズ: 仏教からみたもうひとつの近代 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2016); and Sueki Fumihiko 末本文美士, Hayashi Makoto 林淳, Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, and Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, eds. *Budda no henbō: kōsakusuru kindai Bukkyō* ブッダの変貌: 交錯する近代仏教 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2014).

<sup>56</sup> Here, recent Japanese scholarship on self-cultivation and healing movements in the modern period are particularly relevant; for a review of this literature, see chapter 5.

<sup>57</sup> Ian Reader and George J. Tanabe, Jr., *Practically Religious: Worldly Benefits and the Common Religion of Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1998); Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*.

work on the Unitarian movement in Japan, connections between Unitarians and Buddhists, and Buddhists' appropriation of "universality" between 1887 and 1922.<sup>58</sup> Likewise, Stephen Covell, in his 2005 work, takes up another broad theme in contemporary Japanese Buddhism: the tension between worldliness and renunciation. While his research focuses on the Tendai sect, he provides not only helpful statistics across sects but also in-depth discussions of tensions between clerical and monastic identity that are deeply relevant to Rinzai Zen.<sup>59</sup> Following all of these scholars, I bring attention to chronological and religious categories in my investigation of practice—and practitioners' multitudinous motivations—in the modern lay Rinzai Zen setting.

#### 1.4.5 Buddhist Modernism and Received Narratives

As Robert Buswell describes in the context of contemporary Sōn practice, Western misconceptions about Zen and Sōn include the notions of the enlightenment experience as be-all-end-all and monks who are "radically bibliophobic."<sup>60</sup> Sometimes

---

<sup>58</sup> Michel Mohr, *Buddhism, Unitarianism, and the Meiji Competition for Universality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014).

<sup>59</sup> Stephen G. Covell, *Japanese Temple Buddhism: Worldliness in a Religion of Renunciation* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005). Regarding statistics, see especially Covell's charts regarding the number of priests, adherents, and temples—broken down into teaching centers, proselytizing centers, and others—for various lineages nationwide (Covell, *Japanese Temple Buddhism*, 5–6); number of female head priests and priests in ten out of Japan's twelve official sects (Covell, *Japanese Temple Buddhism*, 130–131); and sources of temple income (Covell, *Japanese Temple Buddhism*, 144).

<sup>60</sup> Robert E. Buswell, *The Zen Monastic Experience: Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Korea* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992), 217–223. Against these notions, Buswell explains that most Korean monks engage in extensive doctrinal study, including the study of works in Pali and classical Chinese; and regarding the ostensible goal of sudden enlightenment, Buswell observes an "endorsement of discipline over transformation" (Buswell, *The Zen Monastic Experience*, 217–220). Buswell notes that other misconceptions include the notion that Sōn monks necessarily engage in a large amount of manual labor and hold arts and aesthetics in high esteem.

this image is conflated with that of “Suzuki Zen,” associated with a primacy of religious experience, meditation, and enlightenment, rational compatibility with science, and timeless, ahistorical, meta-religiosity. Some recent scholarship has located “Suzuki Zen” in the broader context of “Buddhist modernism,” focusing on Suzuki’s global networks and exchanges with Western philosophers and religionists.<sup>61</sup> Other scholarship has balanced the view of Suzuki’s “Western” influences (e.g., William James’s notion of “religious experience”) with an appreciation for his deep grounding in the Rinzai Zen context: starting from his early training at Engakuji from the 1890s, and continuing with his lifelong emphasis that Zen practice is the most effective way to experience non-duality.<sup>62</sup> These various modes of contextualization thus equip us to sort out “modernist” elements, “indigenous” versus “Western” elements, and normative Chan versus Japanese sectarian apologetic elements within received narratives about Zen.

Suzuki, with his unwavering dedication to translating patriarchal literature, certainly did not espouse the bibliophobia that marks many contemporary practitioners’ notion of Zen (e.g., in the Sanbō Kyōdan). Recent scholarship has also helped to contest this notion: for example, Hori’s introduction to his translation of *jakugo* 着語 or 箸語 (“capping phrases,” often used as checking questions for advanced kōan practitioners, as discussed in chapter 4) illuminates the longtime role of literary assignments in advanced

---

<sup>61</sup> See, for example, David L. McMahan, *The Making of Buddhist Modernism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); and Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism.”

<sup>62</sup> Jaffe, Introduction in *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*.

Rinzai Zen practice; indeed, Hori affirms that “Zen seeks not freedom from language by rejecting it, but freedom in language by mastering it.”<sup>63</sup>

With regard to recent scholarship on Buddhist and Zen modernities, Hans Martin Krämer points out that emphasis on global (and particularly Western) factors shaping modern Buddhism(s) can result in the occlusion of “indigenous” factors like Japanese Buddhist doctrinal concerns.<sup>64</sup> In my analysis, I follow both Krämer and Anne Blackburn—who challenges the Eurocentric framework of “Protestant Buddhism” in the Sri Lankan context—to depict a range of lay Japanese Rinzai Zen responses to modernity.<sup>65</sup> My research shows how on the one hand, Japanese Rinzai Zen reformers echoed their predecessors to establish legitimacy. Such approaches were simultaneously radical (e.g., in that practices such as kōan meditation became broadly accessible outside monastic confines) and conservative—many reformers, for example, insisted that practitioners “return” to the “correct” traditional practices, in the dedicated spirit of their forebears.

On the other hand, reflecting what McMahan calls “detraditionalization”—a hallmark of many forms of modern Buddhism—some reformers deemphasized historically important dimensions of Rinzai Zen practice, such as liturgy, public ritual,

---

<sup>63</sup> Victor Sōgen Hori, *Zen Sand: The Book of Capping Phrases for Kōan Practice* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i, 2003), 89–90.

<sup>64</sup> Hans Martin Krämer, *Shimaji Mokurai and the Reconception of Religion and the Secular in Modern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2015). One such account of Buddhist modernism that relies heavily on Eurocentric accounts is McMahan, *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*.

<sup>65</sup> Anne M. Blackburn, *Locations of Buddhism: Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010).

and literature's role in advanced monastic training. Certain Zen reformers went so far as to decry the value of monasticism in the modern world. This dissertation shows how "kōanization"—that is, the process of how kōan practice came to dominate Rinzai Zen's image and practice, in Japan and abroad—was a key dimension of modern Rinzai Zen, could be seen as a form of "detraditionalization," and was a factor in Rinzai Zen's popularization.

## 2. Lay Rinzai Zen Landscapes, 1868–1945

### 2.1 Overview

#### 2.1.1 The Modernity of Modern Lay Rinzai Zen

An exchange between the legendary Rinzai master Nakahara Nantenbō 中原南天棒 (1839–1925) and a young Zen practitioner raises vital questions about what attracted multitudes of university students and other youth to Zen in the early twentieth century. Here, the practitioner, Yasuda Mitsuyoshi 安田光義—a university student at the time—is dubious that such an antiquated practice as kōan practice—for example, reenacting encounters among ancient Chan masters and their disciples—could possibly be relevant to people in a rapidly modernizing Japan.

Having become Nantenbō’s formal student sometime prior to the winter meditation intensive (*sesshin* 接心) of 1914, Yasuda received from Nantenbō the traditional “*Mu*” kōan, stemming from the words of ninth-century Chan master Zhaozhou Congshen 趙州從諗 (Jp. Jōshū, 778–897).<sup>1</sup> However, Yasuda challenges Nantenbō, demanding to be assigned a more modern—and therefore more relevant—kōan than *Mu*. As Yasuda recounts fourteen years later, the exchange unfolded as follows:<sup>2</sup>

Yasuda: What on earth is *Mu* [*muji* 無字]?

---

<sup>1</sup> “*Mu*” refers to the first case of the *Mumonkan* 無門關 (T45.2005). The kōan famously starts with a brief dialogue: “A monk asked Jōshū, ‘Does a dog have the Buddha nature or not?’ Jōshū said, ‘*Mu*!’.” “*Mu* 無” means “no” or “not”; the Zen student’s job is to become one with Jōshū’s *Mu*, intuitively grasp Jōshū’s intention behind this *Mu*, and thus manifest Jōshū’s enlightenment (and one’s own buddha nature).

<sup>2</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12 (Dec. 1928), 65–68.

Nantenbō: There was an esteemed master in ancient China named Jōshū.  
[Nantenbō proceeded to explain the story behind the Mu kōan.]

Yasuda: I don't need such an antiquated kōan, so please give me a newer, more modern kōan.

Nantenbō: No matter if it's old—no matter what it is—this one is good, I'm telling you.

Yasuda: No, we modern people don't have time to study this monk who lived hundreds of years ago. I want a kōan that exists in the present and bursts with life.

Nantenbō: Does that kind of kōan exist?

Yasuda: If it doesn't, then please make it.

Nantenbō: [You are] an annoying fellow.<sup>3</sup>

In other words, Yasuda is straightforward with Nantenbō about his doubts and unusually audacious in his demands for a practice that is more obviously “modern” than a thousand-year-old encounter dialogue that, regardless of its age, continued being one of the most common kōans that modern masters assigned to beginners (alongside Hakuin's “One Hand Clapping”).<sup>4</sup> It is possible that some of Yasuda's directness came from his

---

<sup>3</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12 (Dec. 1928), 66.

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that these “doubts” are different from the “Great Doubt” that Rinzai practitioners are exhorted to cultivate: in other words, Great Doubt about the discrepancy between one's faith in inherent buddha nature and the ordinary, “unenlightened” experience of dualism between self and other. According to masters like Dahui Zonggao, Great Doubt can be used to fuel Great Determination to practice and attain enlightenment. As I discuss further in chapter 5, Great Doubt (*daigi* 大疑) is considered one of the Three Essentials (*san'yō* 三要) of Rinzai Zen practice, alongside Great Faith and Great Will. Regarding contemporary kōan practices (to be discussed in chapter 4), Victor Hori notes: “In most Rinzai monasteries in Japan, as soon as monks enter, they receive their first kōan, usually the ‘Sound of One Hand’ or ‘Jōshū's (Chao-chou's) Mu’” (G. Victor Sōgen Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō in the Rinzai Zen Curriculum,” in *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 280–315, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000, 288).

familiarity with Nantenbō, given that both of his parents and maternal grandfather knew Nantenbō well. Yasuda may also be highlighting his youthful audacity from his later vantage point.

Regardless, the central point is important: the most visible aspect of Rinzai Zen's modernity in Japan's post-Meiji era was the broadening of its audience to an unprecedented number of laypeople in Japan and abroad. On the other hand, its religious transformation was more subtle, with a shift toward activities that emphasized kōan practice and self-cultivation more than rituals. Even as this shift unfolded in the distinct conditions of modern Japan, most of the self-identified Rinzai groups, masters, and practitioners embraced the ostensible traditionalism of centuries-old kōan practice.

Regarding Zen “tradition,” prominent late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japanese Rinzai reformers, echoing a centuries-long Buddhist rhetorical strategy to establish legitimacy, have almost invariably insisted on the “orthodoxy” of their formulations of Zen: in other words, “returning” to some “true” Buddhism, whether the Zen (or Chan) of Hakuin Ekaku 白隠慧鶴 (1686–1769), century Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089–1168), Linji Yixuan 臨濟義玄 (d. 867), or even the Buddhism of Śākyamuni circa 500 BCE.<sup>5</sup> However, as Erez Joskovich describes in the case of the lay Rinzai

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, Nakahara Nantenbō—mentioned at the beginning of this chapter—was highly idealistic and invoked Rinzai master Hakuin Ekaku (1686–1768), who in turn invoked Sung Dynasty Lin-chi Ch'an (Rinzai Zen) master Ta-hui (Japanese, Dai'e; 1089–1163). Despite the centuries elapsed between Rinzai, Hakuin, and Nantenbō, their shared ideals seem to constitute—for Rinzai—what Michel Mohr describes as a “shrouded continuity” from the Tokugawa to Meiji periods (Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 168). In other words, despite radical changes in Japan's three major Zen schools (Rinzai, Sōtō, and Ōbaku) during this period, there were crucial continuities: “...The privileges monopolized by the clergy licensed them to preserve convictions



organization, Ningen Zen Kyōdan 人間禪教団, Rinzai Zen’s modernization—and particularly the development of lay Rinzai—is “a multi-level process of tradition, adaptation, and innovation.”<sup>6</sup> There are several characteristics of modern Rinzai reforms that are distinct to previous iterations of Zen and which have emerged from the interaction of “traditional” Japanese Zen and the particular nexus of local, national, intra-Asian, and global dynamics of late nineteenth and early-twentieth-century Japan. Such characteristics include but are not limited to popularization of “serious” Rinzai Zen practice among the laity, internationalization, and what I refer to as the “kōanization” of Rinzai Zen.

With regard to Rinzai Zen’s popularization among the laity—the central topic of this dissertation—Rinzai cleric, lay teacher, and firebrand Akizuki Ryōmin 秋月龍珉 (1921–1999) insisted in his *New Mahāyāna: Buddhism for the Post-Modern World* that the only Buddhism is lay Buddhism (following a “true homelessness” of the heart), while eschewing a lay-clerical distinction.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, the widespread reconfiguration of lay-

---

about their respective traditions that appear to be almost immovable if we compare those convictions with their Tokugawa predecessors” (Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 206). This is not to suggest that a monolithic Rinzai Zen existed.

<sup>6</sup> Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 254.

<sup>7</sup> One of Akizuki’s “Five Vows for the Proclamation of a New Mahāyāna” is “to revere the true way of homelessness and bring about a new lay Buddhist way” (Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 44). For Akizuki, “true homelessness” is of the heart, positioning practitioners outside society, from which they can then preach the Dharma (Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 21). Moreover, Akizuki insists that “Mahāyāna Buddhism is necessarily a lay Buddhism”—from its inception, a reaction against elite monks’ sequestering and concerned with the salvation of all beings (Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 155–56). On the other hand, he asserts that ultimately, “though it is called a ‘lay’ Buddhism, it does not distinguish between monks and laity” (Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 46).

clerical relationships is one of the hallmarks of post-Meiji Restoration Japanese Buddhism. As Richard Jaffe shows, this reconfiguration had a variety of consequences: for example, this meant that many clergy took on characteristics formerly associated with the laity (such as marrying and eating meat), while still privileging monastic ideals; and it also contributed to the emergence and development of modern Buddhist movements centered on the laity.<sup>8</sup> Thus, a broad range of lay-centered groups sprung up in Meiji, Taishō, and early Shōwa Japan across Buddhist sects.<sup>9</sup>

As for the modern characteristics of these lay groups, Joskovich highlights the following aspects of Ningen Zen Kyōdan: a broader “audience” than solely the monastic elite, the widespread assumption that laypeople are capable of achieving awakening, lay Zen practitioners being sanctioned as masters, and the group’s institutional autonomy.<sup>10</sup> As mentioned in the introduction, Sawada’s study of Meiji-era lay practice at Engakuji illustrates the laity’s expanded participation at Engakuji, alongside the continuing lay-

---

<sup>8</sup> Richard M. Jaffe, *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), 231–241.

<sup>9</sup> For example, Jaffe points to the “devout lay centrality” of Tanaka Chigaku 田中智學 (1861–1939), who founded the Nichirenist (*nichirenshugi* 日蓮主義) organization Kokuchūkai 国柱会 and inspired the later groups Reiyūkai 霊友会 and Risshō Kōsei Kai 立正佼成会. Tanaka “...call[ed] for complete devotion to the *Lotus Sūtra* while remaining totally immersed in the world.” Further, “no formal clergy existed in the various lay organizations headed by Tanaka, and the laity performed all the ceremonies conducted by the organization, including weddings and funerals (Jaffe, *Neither Monk nor Layman*, 231). In Rinzai Zen, as mentioned in chapter 1, such groups ranged from groups formally affiliated with major Rinzai temples like Engakuji and Myōshinji (see Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, and Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, respectively), to independent Rinzai-affiliated groups like Ningen Zen Kyōdan (see Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen”), to newer Zen movements like the Sanbōkyōdan which are outside mainstream institutional Japanese Buddhism yet have assumed facets of Rinzai praxis and rhetoric as central to their identity (see Sharf, “Sanbōkyōdan”).

<sup>10</sup> Joskovich notes that while there are numerous stories of enlightened lay disciples, reaching back to the Buddha’s disciple Vimalakīrti, they have largely been portrayed as “exceptional” (Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 24, 29–36).

clerical tensions and a persistence of monastic ideals, even as lay practitioners' religious possibilities were broadening.<sup>11</sup> This dissertation argues, moreover, that lay Rinzai Zen's popularization brought forth a new practice paradigm (discussed later in this chapter and in chapter 5) that was remarkably consistent across multitudes of groups springing up in Tokyo and throughout Japan and which entailed, namely, zazen intensives, listening to the master's sermons, and one-on-one encounters with the master.

These activities served to emphasize zazen and kōan work, while downplaying the importance of other dimensions of traditional Rinzai monastic training (i.e., liturgy, ritual, and the literary dimensions of advanced kōan work).<sup>12</sup> This points to the third distinctive characteristic of modern Rinzai Zen that I mentioned: the disproportionate emphasis on kōan practice, even to the extent of equating Rinzai Zen with kōan practice. This “kōanization” of Rinzai Zen can be understood on the level of drawing a sharp distinction between the Rinzai and Sōtō sects, and on the level of reducing or simplifying Rinzai Zen to its meditation practice.<sup>13</sup> Interestingly, this increasing emphasis on kōan practice came about even as various early and mid-twentieth-century Rinzai teachers and other popular

---

<sup>11</sup> See especially Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 144–191.

<sup>12</sup> In particular, Robert Sharf points to the distinctly modern (and Western) attitude toward “experience”—per William James—that privileges meditation practice and downplays the historical roles of ritual and liturgy (see, for example, Robert H. Sharf, “Buddhist Modernism and the Rhetoric of Meditative Experience,” *Numen* 42, no. 3 (October 1995): 228–83).

<sup>13</sup> With regard to the seemingly sharp division in modernity between Rinzai and Sōtō Zen, one major factor was the sectarian narratives that began crystallizing in the Edo period and continued into the modern period, and which drew distinct lines between the different Zen sects. On the other hand, as mentioned throughout this dissertation, there are numerous examples of the boundaries between Sōtō and Rinzai becoming blurred (e.g., in the case of teachers like Iida Tōin and Harada Sogaku, both of whom trained in both lineages).

authors critiqued the contemporary Rinzai Zen world's use of *kōans*, as I address briefly in chapter 6.

These teachers and authors had in common a perception of contemporaneous Rinzai Zen practice as stagnated, over-ritualized, and formulaic, and a criticism of the main culprit: the *kōan* system. In various ways, they advocated reform vis-à-vis the *kōan* system: whether “returning” to the spirit of Hakuin and Linji (e.g., Hisamatsu and D.T. Suzuki), or abandoning the current *kōan* system as-is but adopting a *kōan*-like practice (e.g., for Akizuki, taking up a practice of “*Prajñāparamitā*”—the “perfection of wisdom”—in a *kōan*-like way). However, all of these practitioners still prioritized the experience of enlightenment and, on some level, prioritized the religiosity that could be best nurtured in a monastic setting (especially Suzuki). Thus, their *kōan* critiques and reforms served to reinforce an emphasis on *kōan*.

As an additional characteristic of modern Rinzai Zen, particularly after the 1893 World Parliament of Religions, international missionizing became a central aspect of Japanese Buddhist reformulations, and Rinzai Zen was no exception. As explored extensively, some of the most prominent Meiji Buddhist missionaries were Rinzai clerics or practitioners (e.g., Shaku Sōen and D.T. Suzuki). Western-oriented reformulations and missionizing have been the subject of much scholarship—for example, in the context of Western modernity discourses' influence on Buddhist modernism.<sup>14</sup> Scholars have also

---

<sup>14</sup> In his framework for Buddhist modernism, McMahan relies on Charles Taylor's frameworks (three “discourses of modernity”): “western monotheism” (in the context of Christian tension with the shaping of modern notions of Buddhism); “rationalism and scientific naturalism” (in the context of the European Enlightenment and ambivalence with regard to science); and “Romantic

begun examining the transnational dimension of Zen reforms vis-à-vis the rest of Asia.<sup>15</sup>

Indeed, the rise of the Japanese nation-state and empire was the crucible for lay Rinzai's popularization in modern Japan. For this, the lenses of nationalism and transnationalism are indispensable: for example, tracing the ways in which Rinzai Zen formulations were connected to nationalist rhetoric and the co-opting of Buddhism by the Japanese state.<sup>16</sup>

With regard to the characteristics of modern Rinzai Zen that were unique to the modern era, they have various dimensions or orientations: the explicitly interior or inward-looking orientation (for example, with teachers' and lay practitioners' increased

---

expressivism" (that is, "the literary, artistic, and philosophical movement that arose in part as a critique of the increasing rationalization, mechanization, and desacralization of the western world" through industrialization); see David L. McMahan, *The Making of Buddhist Modernism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 10–11. Also see, for example, Ketelaar's discussion of "strategic Orientalism." Ketelaar describes Buddhists' goals at the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions as, first, missionizing to the West (akin to early Indian Buddhist pilgrims' missions to China), bearing Oriental spiritual wisdom "to an Occidental world drunk with its own material success"; and, secondly, reviving Japanese Buddhism due to their cosmopolitan status and new-found legitimacy from contact with the West (Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs*, 136–137). Along these lines, also see Jørn Borup, "Zen and the Art of Inverting Orientalism: Buddhism, Religious Studies and Interrelated Networks," in *New Approaches to the Study of Religion, Volume 1*, edited by Peter Antes, Armin W. Geertz, and Randi R. Warne, 451–87 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Hwansoo Ilmee Kim, *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877–1912* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2012); and Hwansoo Ilmee Kim, *The Korean Buddhist Empire: A Transnational History, 1910–1945* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2018).

<sup>16</sup> Christopher Ives examines Zen's reformulations to become more "useful" to the state, as in Imperial-Way Zen; see Christopher Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen's Critique and Lingering Questions for Buddhist Ethics* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009). For locating Rinzai reforms in the broader East Asian context, see, for example, Hwansoo Kim, "Seeking the Colonizer's Favors for a Buddhist Vision: The Korean Buddhist Nationalist Paek Yongsŏng's Imje Sŏn Movement and His Relationship with the Japanese Colonizer Abe Mitsuie," *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 14, no. 2 (2014): 171–93. Here, Kim examines the connections between Korean Imje/Linji cleric, reformer, and Buddhist hero Paek Yongsŏng and the Rinzai cleric Abe Mitsuie in the colonial context.

emphasis on kōan work and experience) and the explicitly outward-looking orientation (for example, with priests' emphasis on *fukyō*, both domestically and abroad, in the colonies). Alternatively, we can distinguish between an emphasis on the individual (for example, Zen as a form of self-cultivation, either for enlightenment, health, or other personal benefits) and an emphasis on the broader group (for example, practicing Zen for the sake of the nation).

The dimension of gender in modern Japanese Rinzai Zen functioned both explicitly and implicitly. For example, Iida Tōin's vision of practicing Zen "for the nation" in the 1930s was highly gendered: even as he called for women to practice Zen, he was clear that they practiced in order to strengthen the home—per the Meiji-era "good wife, wise mother" (*ryōsai kenbo* 良妻賢母) ideal that persisted in prewar Japan—in order to contribute to the nation. On the other hand, Rinzai Zen tended to foster hypermasculine modes of expression and homosocial contexts (even as women were clearly practicing under many masters, such as Shaku Sōen), but much of this was left unspoken. In other words, extremely androcentric tropes were embodied and reproduced by male and female lay practitioners alike, often without explicit references to gender (to be discussed in chapter 5).

### **2.1.2 What is Koji Zen?**

Before venturing into modern Japan's lay Zen landscape, it is worth clarifying the terminology. Historically, several terms have been used to denote laypeople in Japan, and they have different nuances. Perhaps the most common term has been "*zaike* 在家,"

which Jørn Borup defines as "laity" or "householder"; it literally means "existing in the

home,” and its opposite is “*shukke* 出家,” or “leaving the home,” the historical designation for monastics in Japan and still used today, despite the blurred boundaries between lay and monastic, as discussed above.<sup>17</sup> In the Rinzai context, lay practitioners are typically known as “*zaike*” or, more often in the Engakuji-related context, “*koji* 居士” (male) and “*zenshi* 禪子” (female).<sup>18</sup> It is worth drawing attention to the androcentrism of this terminology, as “*koji*”—an inherently gendered term—remains the standard in most literature of the Meiji, Taishō, and early Shōwa era.

Janine Sawada investigates Engakuji’s lay community in the late Edo and early Meiji periods, when a new model of lay practitioner emerged. In Sawada’s analysis, “...two East Asian models of human fulfillment, the Confucian gentleman-official and the Buddhist lay bodhisattva, coalesced in a new idealization of the lay practitioner

---

<sup>17</sup> Jørn Borup notes that aside from “*zaike*,” “...other concepts designating this status as lay include *zaizoku* 在俗 (layman), *taishū* 大衆 (general public), or simply *hisō* 非僧 (non-clergy)” (Jørn Borup, “Contemporary Buddhist Priests and Clergy,” in *Handbook of Contemporary Japanese Religions*, edited by Inken Prohl and John Nelson, 107–32, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012, 111 n. 3). I have regularly encountered all of these terms in writings from the modern (1868–1945) context. Elsewhere, Borup notes, in the contemporary Rinzai context, several commonly-used terms that include the character for “*shin* 信,” or belief (which I have seldom encountered in the modern context): “*Shinja* (信者), *shinkōja* (信仰者), *shinto* (信徒) and the identification of the latter with *danto* (檀徒) in the concept *danshinto* (檀信徒) are all concepts expressing the ideal of individual adherents truly engaged in the religious theory and practice of the institution” (Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 82).

<sup>18</sup> In the opinion of Marukawa Shuntan 丸川春潭, a contemporary Ningen Zen Kyōdan leader, the term “*koji*” is distinct to the Engakuji lineage (*Engakuji hōkei* 円覚寺法系); he states that in Japan on a whole, the word “*zaike zen* 在家禪” is more popular. See Marukawa Shuntan 丸川春潭, “*Gendai ni okeru zaikai zen ni tsuite* 現代における在家禪について,” in *Zen 禅*, no. 45 (2014), 2–6. Regarding female practitioners, Sawada notes that “*zenshi*” is used most commonly at Engakuji, but outside of that context, other terms to denote female lay practitioners included “*nyokoji* 女居士” or “*daishi* 大姉” (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 302 n. 45).

during the mid-Meiji.”<sup>19</sup> This lay practitioner was known by the term “*koji*.”<sup>20</sup> The Engakuji abbot Imakita Kōsen, during the late Edo period, addressed lay followers in his influential work, *Zenkai ichiran*, in which he distinguished between committed practitioners (*koji*) and ordinary lay “masses.”<sup>21</sup> As a distinct Meiji phenomenon, the modern *koji* and *zenshi* engaged readily in “voluntarism” or “activism,” which, according to Sawada, comprised a commitment both to Zen practice and to donating resources.<sup>22</sup>

During this time, the roles of both lay practitioners and clergy were reimagined, with lay practitioners becoming “an indispensable third pillar of the Zen community”—they “provided economic sustenance, political connections, social prestige, and a broad, ‘enlightened perspective on developments outside the temple gates.’” Lay practitioners were permitted limited use of Engakuji’s monastic meditation hall, although the monastic ideal was still privileged, and the rare *koji* (namely, Yamaoka Tesshū and Kawajiri Hōkin) were “de facto Rinzai masters,” openly teaching Buddhism as laypeople.<sup>23</sup> Sawada notes that the “shifting boundaries” between clergy and lay practitioners at Engakuji led to tension among the groups, the temporary banishment of laypeople from the monastic

---

<sup>19</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 6.

<sup>20</sup> Sawada recaps the genealogy of “*koji* 居士” (Ch. *jushi*): in short, the the *jushi* 居士 in medieval China originally referred to a “learned or virtuous man—not necessarily a Buddhist—who lived at home without serving in the government”; later, in the Song and Ming eras, the “*jushi*” tended to refer to “a man who pursued the Buddhist path to enlightenment.” In medieval and Tokugawa Japan, in the Zen context, “*koji*” referred to committed male practitioners (e.g., pursuing meditation and kōan training), as distinguished from ordinary laypeople; they were typically of elite status and relatively few in number (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 146–148). For a discussion of this genealogy, also see Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 43.

<sup>21</sup> Sawada notes that “according to [D. T.] Suzuki, the Engakuji abbot maintained that regular Zen practice was suited only to a committed minority of believers,” a view that Suzuki himself seemed to hold (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 148).

<sup>22</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 153.

<sup>23</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 166–171.



meditation hall (c. 1884), and, eventually, to more rigorous discipline for lay practitioners.<sup>24</sup>

From the perspective of an Engakuji lay practitioner, Iizuka Iwao (whose description of lay practice at Engakuji is threaded throughout this dissertation) states that a “*koji*” distinguishes himself from an ordinary lay practitioner (“在家の俗人”—literally, a “secular person inside the home”) in that he works directly with the teacher and practices with a *kōan*.<sup>25</sup> He says: “A lay, secular person can, for the first time, be called a Zen *koji* when he encounters the master and a *kōan* is transmitted.” In other words, to him, serious practice (and *kōan* practice) is inherent to being a “*koji*.”

### 2.1.3 Lay Zen Boom: Panorama

Imakita Kōsen’s contemporary, Rinzai master Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹 (1828–1911), died on the cusp of the new Taishō era (1912–1926), having helped to usher in a new age of popularized Rinzai Zen in modern Japan. In an obituary for Katsumine, the author, Enomoto Shūson 榎本秋村, speaks of the “wind of Zen” (or “Zen style”; *zenpū* 禅風), which weakened following the Meiji Restoration, but which surged in recent years. With regard to how Katsumine “worked tremendously to enhance Tokyo’s “*zenpū* 禅風,” Enomoto notes:

...After the master founded this [lay] group, people who came to listen to that noble character [Katsumine] increased tremendously in number, and [the group] flourished greatly; prominent among

---

<sup>24</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 181–85.

<sup>25</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 14. 「如斯在家の俗人が、師家と相見して公案を與へらるれば、それから始めて禪宗の居士と稱するのである。」

the *koji* were such famous men as Ōishi Masami, Kōno Hironaka, and Hosokawa Junjirō. From Meiji 25 until Meiji 44 [1892–1911]..., the people who gathered [under Katsumine] reached over one thousand.<sup>26</sup> That truly was the start of the rise of the Zen style [*zenfū* 禅風] in Tokyo.<sup>27</sup>

In line with Enomoto's observation, an article entitled "Politicians and Zen Practice" (published in 1908, a few years before Katsumine's death) opens by stating: "In the past two or three years, in Tokyo, zazen has become extremely trendy, and Zen-related writings have been published ceaselessly; we can say that these sales are a good thing."<sup>28</sup> Thus, as the Meiji era drew to a close, Zen practice and literature had taken on new life among the laity, not only in Tokyo but throughout Japan; the number of lay Rinzai Zen-related groups, practitioners, events, and publications increased significantly, particularly after the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>29</sup>

Lay Rinzai movements in Japan attracted a modest but significant following, particularly among the educated elite. Zen's (and Rinzai Zen's) popularization was significant in the sheer number of lay-centered publications, groups, and activities; in its intersections with elite social, political, and military circles from early Meiji onwards (as

---

<sup>26</sup> Literally, one thousand and some hundreds.

<sup>27</sup> Enomoto, "Meiji Zenkai iketsu," 9.

<sup>28</sup> Iisaka Ōyama, "Seikaku no sanzen 政客の参禅," *Tsūzoku Bukkyō shinbun* 通俗仏教新聞, no. 695 (1908), 9. The article focuses largely on famous laymen Ōishi Masami 大石正己 (1855–1935) and Kōno Hironaka 河野廣中 (1849–1923), both of whom were disciples of Katsumine (and mentioned in the latter's obituary) and also associated with other famous Rinzai masters of the modern era.

<sup>29</sup> For an extended, first-hand account of the Meiji-era Zen (and Rinzai) boom, see, for example, the serialized articles on Meiji Zen by the Rinzai monk Imai Fukuzan 今井福山, containing at least thirty-six articles that were published in the Rinzai (Myōshinji-sect) journal *Shōhōrin* 正法輪 between 1927 and 1929. They were entitled "Meiji shoki no zenpū sōdan 明治初期の禅風叢談," or "Collection of Stories: Early Meiji Zen Stories"; the series starts with number 616 (published in 1927) and concludes, it seems, with number 683 (published in 1929).

discussed in the introduction); in the unprecedented degree to which Rinzai practice became accessible to laypeople in large monasteries, small parish temples, and other venues throughout Japan; and in its intersections with surging nationalism and contributions of “Imperial-Way Zen” to the Japanese empire (as discussed in chapter 5). Moreover, the developments within lay Rinzai Zen during this period eventually contributed to Zen’s worldwide spread later in the twentieth century. On the other hand, this lay Zen boom remained modest in the actual scale of groups and practitioners. As mentioned in chapter 3, some sesshin and public dharma talks led by the most famous masters (like Shaku Sōen) drew upwards of eighty or even one hundred participants and attendees; however, attendance more frequently hovered in the twenties and thirties. In other words, lay Rinzai Zen never became a mass movement on the scale of Ledi Sayadaw’s modern rendition of insight meditation in Myanmar (formerly Burma), for a variety of reasons that will be addressed throughout the dissertation.<sup>30</sup>

As discussed in further detail in chapter 3, Engakuji layman Iizuka Iwao, in *Sanzen no shiori*, also provides a glimpse of the broader picture in Taishō-era Japan: stating that Engakuji’s Kojirin offered just one of myriad opportunities for Rinzai Zen practice. Iizuka explains that not only was it often possible to participate as a layperson at Rinzai training halls in Kamakura, Kyoto, and elsewhere (similar to the opportunities that *koji* had at Engakuji), but there were also numerous “Zen assemblies” (*zenkai* 禅会) in the Tokyo area that were structured similarly. In these *zenkai*, which typically met

---

<sup>30</sup> For this account, see Erik Braun, *The Birth of Insight: Meditation, Modern Buddhism, and the Burmese Monk Ledi Sayadaw* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013).

monthly in temples and other sites throughout the city, participants new and old listened sat *zazen*, met privately in *sanzen* with prominent Rinzai Zen masters, and listened to the masters' *teishō* on classical Rinzai texts. A crucial aspect of this veritable Zen boom, Iizuka describes, was the proliferation of publications about practice. He states: "In recent years, there has been a dramatic increase in [the numbers of] laypeople seeking to study Zen; the production and sale of books related [to Zen], as well as the publication of journals, have correspondingly, steadily increased."<sup>31</sup>

Print media were invaluable not only for disseminating Zen teachings and making groups and events known broadly, but also as evidence of the dozens—if not hundreds—of lay Rinzai assemblies meeting in the early decades of the twentieth century. As I discuss later in this chapter, the monthly periodicals *Zendō* 禅道 (published between 1910 and 1923) and *Daijōzen* 大乘禅 (published from 1924 to the present) particularly illuminate the lay Zen activity in early twentieth-century Japan, as each issue contained several pages, at the back, enumerating recent and upcoming Zen activities. Kengo Takei has tabulated and performed a quantitative analysis of the lay Zen assemblies (*zenkai* 禅会) that met monthly, as indicated by records of their activities that appeared in both journals from 1910 onwards.<sup>32</sup> He notes that when *Zendō* was first published in 1910, there were a mere five Rinzai-identified *zenkai*—all in the Tokyo area—that met monthly

---

<sup>31</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 42.

<sup>32</sup> Takei, "Kindai nihon ni okeru zenkai." Takei's research was based, in part, on collaborative research that he and I did together at Komazawa University between December 2016 and May 2018.

(on average).<sup>33</sup> It is not clear whether there truly were only five lay Rinzai assemblies or whether these were the only ones of which *Zendō* editors were aware.<sup>34</sup> Regardless, the ensuing decade saw the number of meetings recorded by *Zendō* increase steadily, averaging over twenty-five monthly Rinzai meetings from 1916 to 1918, with a handful of masters serving as master (*shike* 師家) of multiple groups. Incidentally, the subsequent years saw a drop-off: in 1919 and 1920, the monthly average dropped to under twenty—due partly, no doubt, to the 1919 death of Shaku Sōen, who was the master of several Tokyo-area groups alongside his many other roles (Engakuji abbot; Zen propagator, engaged in “*fukyō katsudō* 布教活動” throughout Japan and abroad; and avid author and editor of Zen-related media for a popular audience).<sup>35</sup>

For the most part, these groups’ masters were well-known rōshi from prominent Rinzai training temples like Engakuji, Kenchōji 建長寺 (also in Kamakura), or Myōshinji 妙心寺 (in Kyoto). As with Shaku Sōen, sometimes the rōshi served as leader

---

<sup>33</sup> Takei, “*Kindai nihon ni okeru zenkai*,” 57. These were all in the Tokyo area; it is not clear whether this small number in *Zendō*’s earliest days was due to the dearth of groups throughout Japan, or the dearth of attention. Editors of *Zendō*—and, later, *Daijō Zen* (1924–present)—did pay increasing attention to Zen assemblies that met throughout Japan (e.g., in the Kyoto region), although they likely had a bias toward the Tokyo area.

<sup>34</sup> For example, Kōzen Gokokukai was ostensibly active at this time, having been founded in 1893, and its history does not indicate that the group lapsed at this time. However, its founder Katsumine Daitetsu (discussed elsewhere in the dissertation) passed away in 1911 and, according to the group’s history, was group leader until his death; so it is possible that the group did not actively meet at the very end of Katsumine’s life. The group’s history also states that the next *shike*, Sugawara Jihō, began serving as such in 1914 (Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 15).

<sup>35</sup> Takei, “*Kindai nihon ni okeru zenkai*,” 57. My own investigation into *Zendō* shows that the vast majority of these groups met in Tokyo, but the figures do include a handful of groups outside Tokyo (e.g., Jikishikai 直指会, a Nagano-prefecture group that Sōen periodically visited).

of more than one group and, moreover, offered teachings or dharma discourses (*kōen* 講演 or *hōwa* 法話) on Zen texts to the public at his own temple. As for who these teachers were, there were many—beyond those well-known in English-language scholarship (e.g., the aforementioned Imakita Kōsen, Shaku Sōen, and Nakahara Nantenbō)—who were open to teaching practitioners either in the formal *zenkai* context or at their respective temples. For example, while Imakita and Sōen were active in the Kantō region, Nishiyama Kasan 西山禾山 (1838–1917) and Takeda Mokurai 竹田黙雷 (1854–1930) were known for teaching the laity in the Kansai region.<sup>36</sup>

As an example of a Rinzai master who actively taught lay students, Katsumine Daitetsu—one-time chief abbot of Nanzenji (1886–1890) and promoter of Daoist-tinged self-cultivation practices (to be discussed in chapter 5)—instructed lay students in Tsuchi 津市, Mie Prefecture, from 1890 until around 1892, when he assented to become priest (*jūshoku*) of Kōonji 廣園寺 and moved to Tokyo.<sup>37</sup> The following year, at the age

---

<sup>36</sup> For example, a blurb pertaining to *koji* in an 1897 issue of *Zengaku* 禅学 lists the following Rinzai masters as teaching laypeople at the time: Nishiyama Kasan (1838–1917), Takeda Mokurai (1854–1930), Mugaku Bun’eki (1819–1898), Tekisui Giboku (1822–1899), Keichū Bundō (1824–1905), Zengai Dōrin (1836–1898), Yūzen Gentatsu (1842–1918), Tankai Genshō (1811–1898), Aozora Kandō (dates unknown), Dokutan Sōsan (1840–1917), Katsumine Daitetsu (1828–1911), Nan’in Zengu (1834–1904), Gazan Jōtei (dates unknown), Nakahara Tōgaku (1841–1909), and Shaku Kōgaku (Shaku Sōen, 1860–1919); see *Zengaku*, vol. 3, no. 4 (1897), 5. 「禾山、無學、滴水、敬沖、禪外、猷禪、潭海、貫道、毒潭、大徹、南隱、峩山、黙雷、東嶽、洪岳」

<sup>37</sup> Katsumine Seikan 勝峰清幹, “Katsumine Rōshi jireki 大徹老師事歴,” *Zendō*, no. 8 (1911), 31–34. It should be noted that different sources provide different dates for Katsumine’s timeline. For example, a different obituary states that he became Kōonji priest in 1891 (Enomoto, “*Meiji Zenkai iketsu*, 9); while Kōzen Gokokukai’s history provides the date of 1892 (Kōzen Gokokukai 興禅護国会, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi* 興禅護国会史, Tokyo: Kōzen Gokokukai, 2002, 16).

of 66, Katsumine founded lay groups at two parish temples: Zedōkai 是道会 at his temple Kōonji (in Hachiōji, Tokyo) and Kōzen Gokokukai at Kōtokuji 廣徳寺 (in Shitaya, in central Tokyo).<sup>38</sup> Although he retired to Mugean 無礙庵 in Dōzaka, Tokyo, in 1900, Katsumine seems to have continued teaching actively until his death in 1911 at the age of 84, instructing over one thousand lay students during his teaching life.<sup>39</sup>

Engakuji was not the only major Rinzai center with a monks' training hall (*sōdō* 僧堂 or *senmon dōjō* 専門道場) to allow laypeople to establish a relationship with a teacher, attend *sanzen* 参禅 (one-on-one encounters with the master), or participate in monastic meditation intensives (*sesshin* 接心) in some capacity. Layman Iizuka Iwao states that although he focuses on Engakuji—his own place of practice—there are similar conditions and opportunities at other Zen temples with monastic training halls, such as Kenchōji in Kamakura.<sup>40</sup> For example, at the Nanzenji 南禅寺 monks' hall in Kyoto, per *Zendō*, there was a seven-day *Rōhatsu sesshin* held in January of 1918, attended by forty monks; additionally, about twenty people from the affiliate *koji* group (*kojiren* 居士連) did *sesshin* in a separate meditation, “without sleep, without rest.”<sup>41</sup>

Early twentieth-century lay Rinzai practitioners sought not only to participate in monastic training opportunities but to have their own, either through the aforementioned

---

<sup>38</sup> Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 16.

<sup>39</sup> Enomoto, “*Meiji Zenkai iketsu*,” 9.

<sup>40</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 45.

<sup>41</sup> *Zendō*, no. 91 (February 1918), 58. As discussed in chapter 4, *Rōhatsu sesshin* 臘八接心 are the retreats held in honor of the Buddha's enlightenment; they are known for being the most severe, often entailing no sleep for the seven-day duration. This particular *sesshin* was held in honor of the previous chief abbot, Toyoda Dokutan 豊田毒湛 (1840–1917).

lay assemblies (*zenkai* 禅会) or even lay-centered training halls (*senmon dōjō*). As I discuss in chapter 3, Tokyo-area laypeople worked for years to create a lay-centered Rinzai training hall. For example, in the first issue of the monthly journal *Zendō* in 1910, the editors reported on efforts that were underway to create such a training hall.<sup>42</sup> At that time, *koji* practicing in the “lay person association” (*kojiren* 居士連) under Rinzai master Nakahara Nantenbō—including the politician Ōishi Masami 大石正巳 (1855–1935), who was involved with a range of lay Zen activities during the period and served for many years as the group leader of lay group Kōzen Gokokukai—were then working to establish the “Imperial Japanese Rinzai Zen Training Hall” (Dainihon Teikoku Rinzai-shū Zengaku Senmon Dōjō 大日本帝国臨濟宗禅学専門道場), which was intended to accommodate laymen and laywomen (and not monastics). It appears the group’s efforts were ultimately unsuccessful, as I discuss further in chapter 3. Around the same time, amidst growing lay activity at Engakuji—particularly among the student population—there were multiple attempts to create a lay-dedicated training hall on temple grounds. Although it took many years, Engakuji’s *koji* finally achieved their goals with the formation of a dedicated “Laypeople’s Grove” (Kojirin 居士林) by the early 1920s.

## **2.2 Proliferating Zen Groups**

### **2.2.1 Prologue: Group Types and Diversity**

As seen in the brief summary above, there was considerable diversity among lay Rinzai Zen groups in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan with regard, for

---

<sup>42</sup> “*Koji no sen’yō dōjō* 居士の専門道場,” *Zendō*, no. 1 (August 1910), 55.



example, to the groups' relationships with Rinzai temples, "traditional" Zen practice, and leadership (for example, whether the leader was monastic or lay). To approach these groups in a more systematic way, I propose a framework of three basic group types, which are roughly on a continuum from more to less traditional, and from greater to lesser Rinzai institutional authority.

First, there were lay groups that were explicitly affiliated with, and on the grounds of, Rinzai training monasteries (e.g., Engakuji's Kojirin). In Engakuji's case, *koji* initiated major changes—such as their building and renovation project circa 1920 to create a training hall at Engakuji specifically for laypeople and to rebuild the training hall following a fire in 1926 that destroyed it. As discussed in chapter 3, to a certain degree, the lay practitioners self-governed; however, monastics administered their retreats, and teaching and authority ultimately resided with the group's monastic master (typically, Engakuji's abbot). Kojirin's practice mirrored Rinzai monastic practice in crucial ways, not only engaging in "traditional" activities (like *sesshin*, largely emulating monastic schedules), but upholding monastic ideals (as discussed in chapter 4). As discussed in chapter 3, Engakuji is distinctive among Rinzai head temples that have monastic training halls (*sōdō* 僧堂, sometimes referred to as "specialized training halls," or *senmon dōjō* 専門道場) for having an on-site, specialized training hall for *koji* and for the scale of its lay practice. However, event postings and accounts in periodicals like *Zendō*, *Daijōzen*, and *Shōhōrin* depict other major Rinzai monasteries as opening their doors to lay practitioners

(e.g., participating in retreats, or *sesshin*, alongside monastics or doing *sanzen* 参禅 with the *rōshi*), at least to some degree.<sup>43</sup>

Secondly, there were groups with a direct relationship to Rinzai temples or monastic leadership, and which promoted practices associated with traditional monastic practice, but which operated autonomously (e.g., Katsumine Daitetsu's Kōzen Gokokukai 興禅護国会). Most of the “*zenkai* 禅会” (Zen assemblies) featured each month in *Zendō* and *Daijōzen* fell into this category. They typically met in smaller parish temples and operated autonomously, with lay organizers approaching prominent Rinzai masters like Shaku Sōen to serve as their master (*shike* 師家). Unlike the first group, however, these groups were typically not wedded to particular Rinzai branches or head temples; the successive masters tended to come from a variety of branches, and in certain cases (e.g., Kōzen Gokokukai), some of these groups even had *koji* leaders.<sup>44</sup> Membership in these

---

<sup>43</sup> These temples include Kenchōji 建長寺 in Kamakura and, in Kyoto, Kenninji 建仁寺, Nanzenji 南禅寺, and Myōshinji 妙心寺. Regarding Myōshinji, Borup notes that in the postwar period, training opportunities for lay practitioners were expanded: “In 1971 a semimonastic dormitory (*zenjuku* 禅塾) for the students at Hanazono University was established, and the same year the Taishū Zendō (Zen Hall for the Common Populace) opened within the *honzan* [本山, or the temple proper]. This was built to meet the requests of the general society being engaged in meditation as spiritual practice on the Buddha way” (Jørn Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism: Myōshinji, a Living Religion*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008, 46). Borup notes further that some of the residents of the *zenjuku* included “priests-to-be” (Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 138). However, neither of these institutions seem to have prewar precedents.

<sup>44</sup> One chief example of a lay master (*shike* 師家) was Iida Tōin, discussed later in this dissertation; he served as *shike* of Kōzen Gokokukai, among other teaching roles. However, his lay status did not endure, as he eventually ordained. With regard to masters' associations with various branches, it is also worth noting that the masters themselves sometimes moved among branches. As discussed later in the chapter, among Kōzen Gokokukai's successive *shike*, many underwent training at Engakuji, Kenchōji, Myōshinji, or a variety of these, and became abbots of these same institutions (or chief abbots of the entire branch). For example, Mineo Daikyū 峰尾大

groups often overlapped with membership and participation in the first category's groups (e.g., many Kōzen Gokokukai's members also participated in lay-related events at Engakuji).

Third, there were groups that were both autonomous and more explicitly reform-minded, and their masters tended to be *kōji* or renegade monks; these groups comprised less conventional but still Rinzai-identified groups, as well as groups that I consider “Rinzai-type” groups that derive practice, rhetoric, and/or genealogy from Rinzai Zen but do not self-identify as Rinzai or whose leaders are not sanctioned by institutional hierarchies. This third category appears to be much smaller than the preceding category (i.e., the majority of *zenkai*).<sup>45</sup> Additionally, the differences between groups of this category and category two (i.e., the majority of *zenkai*) are not always distinct and are somewhat subjective. At the same time, however, these categories help to make sense of the diversity of modern lay Zen movements.

---

休老師 (1860–1954)—who co-led the group with Iida Tōin from 1927–1932—trained at Engakuji for a total of fifteen years, under first Imakita and then Shaku Sōen. He then ran a Rinzai training hall for nearly three decades at Heirinji 平林寺, became chief-abbot of Myōshinji-ha in his late 70s, and was one-time head of the Rinzai sect when—in mid-Meiji—the thirteen Rinzai schools were unified.

<sup>45</sup> This preliminary assessment is based on my review of *Zendō* and *Daijō Zen* (either directly or as summarized in Takei, “*Kindai nihon ni okeru zenkai*”), both of whose editorial boards included many leaders of groups in the first and second category; further data come from *Shōhōrin*, which is a Rinzai sectarian publication and tends to cover groups in category one. Therefore, my data likely skew in this direction; and while groups of categories one and especially two appear to be more prominent and numerous, it is not yet clear how many groups existed that could be considered “Rinzai-type” but veered more radically from “traditional” Rinzai groups in practice, rhetoric, organization, and leadership.

Slightly later examples of the third group—which were born of the prewar *zenkai* but were formally founded later—include the FAS Society, founded by Hisamatsu Shin'ichi 久松真一 (1889–1980), and the Sanbō Kyōdan, founded by Yasutani Hakuun 安谷白雲 (1885–1973) and Harada Sogaku 原田祖岳 (1871–1961; the latter group is discussed elsewhere). With regard to the FAS Society, in line with the centrality of Engakuji's student population to lay initiatives at Kojirin, the FAS Society started as a university student group at Kyoto University during the war.<sup>46</sup> Jørn Borup summarizes the ways in which FAS Society diverged from “traditional” Rinzai Zen:

Instead of employing monastic hierarchies, they sit in a circle on the floor facing each other; instead of a rōshi giving different kōan and enlightenment certificate to his successors, they are, so to speak, their own masters, using only one “fundamental kōan” created by Hisamatsu.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> “FAS,” an acronym encompassing Hisamatsu's stance and central concerns stands for the following: “Awakening to the *Formless Self*, the depth dimension, the Self as the ground of human existence; Standing on the standpoint of *All Humankind*, the width dimension, human being and the world in its entirety; Creating history *Supra-historically*, the length dimension, awakened human history” (Christopher Ives, *Zen Awakening and Society*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1992, 72; italics in original). According to the group's website, the FAS Society (F • A • S Kyōkai 協会) narrates the group's history in close connect to historical contingencies. Kyoto University students' formation of Gakudō Dōjō 学道道場—whose name was later changed to FAS Society—was a direct reaction to the Pacific War: “The FAS Society traces its origin back to the awareness of the problem that confronted some students at Kyoto University during the Second World War. Dissatisfied with existing philosophies and religions, including Buddhism, they considered it necessary to take the standpoint of the fundamental self-awakening of man which should lead to a renewal of the world. Under the guidance of HISAMATSU Shin'ichi, then associate professor of Buddhist studies at Kyoto University, they established Gakudō Dōjō (“The Locus of Awakening Study and Practice”) on April 8, 1944” (FAS Society, “Introduction to FAS,” <http://www.fas.x0.com/about/aboutuse.html#fas>, retrieved on September 17, 2019).

<sup>47</sup> Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 92. For further discussion of the FAS Society and Hisamatsu, see, for example, Abe, “Hisamatsu's Philosophy of Awakening”; Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*; Akizuki, *Shindaijō*; Hisamatsu, *Critical Sermons of the Zen Tradition*; Ives, “True Person, Formless Self”; and Ives, *Zen Awakening and Society*.

Borup refers to certain groups in this third category—including both FAS Society and Sanbō Kyōdan—as “transsectarian organizations.”<sup>48</sup> I do not entirely disagree with this assessment, as Sanbō Kyōdan straddles both Sōtō and Rinzai Zen (while seeing itself clearly as a legitimate Zen movement), and FAS Society, as described above, discards traditional Rinzai Zen forms and terminology more radically. However, I would broaden this category to encompass groups like Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会, which juxtaposed clearly Rinzai-style practice—similar in form to the groups above, and included alongside the “category two” *zenkai* in *Daijōzen* listings—with more radical ideas (and rhetoric) about monasticism and a universalized Buddhism.

Groups from these three categories may differ with respect to their autonomy, relationship to institutional Rinzai Zen, interpretation of Zen’s relevance in the modern world, and adherence to normative Rinzai Zen doctrine, narratives, and ideals. However, they also share crucial similarities: an emphasis on personal experience and activities that reinforced a focus on *kōan* practice (to be discussed in chapter 4). With the exception of FAS Society, these groups’ activities included the master’s discourse (*teishō*) on classical Zen texts; *kōan* meditation, often in *retreats* (*sesshin*); and one-on-one encounters with the master to demonstrate one’s understanding of the *kōan* (*sanzen*). Below, I provide a brief overview of groups, one from each of the three categories, respectively: Engakuji (its Kojirin and university student groups), Kōzen Gokokukai, and Shakamunikai. The

---

<sup>48</sup> Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 46.

subsequent chapters further elaborate on material related to Engakuji (and, to a limited degree, to pertinent material from other groups).

### 2.2.2 Type I: Engakuji's Kojirin

As discussed in the introduction, Janine Sawada leaves us with a portrait of lay practice at Engakuji from the mid-1870s through the early 1890s. Early Meiji Engakuji was undeniably a hub of lay Rinzai practice, with a relatively small pool of practitioners and, among them, a disproportionately high number of educated elites, including members with significant social and political influence, such as Torio Tokuan 鳥尾得庵 (1848–1905) and Kawajiri Hōkin 川尻寶岑居士 (1843–1910). Sawada notes that Engakuji of the 1870s was politically diverse, to be contrasted with the social conservatism of the 1880s—exemplified by Imakita Kōsen, Torio, and Kawajiri—that was responding to the liberalization and Westernization of the early Meiji era, and which increased throughout the 1880s.<sup>49</sup> Sawada notes, for example, that Engakuji practitioner and politician Torio Tokuan, along with fellow practitioner Yamaoka Tesshū 山岡鐵舟 (1836–1888), founded the Myōdō Kyōkai 明道教會 (“Society for Illuminating the Way”) in 1884; this was a non-sectarian “Buddhist society dedicated to ‘protecting the nation’ (*gokoku* 護国).”<sup>50</sup> With regard to the conservatism of Imakita, Torio, Kawajiri, and others

---

<sup>49</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 211–230.

<sup>50</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 224. Sawada elaborates that Myōdō Kyōkai’s members embraced a didactic mission that was “directed not only against newfangled Western trends, but also against ‘false ideas’ that had long been familiar to Japanese educational elites” (such as Neo-Confucian notions of “the principle of Heaven” and “human nature and principles.” The group’s guest speakers included several Rinzai leaders mentioned throughout this dissertation, including

in the Engakuji circle, Sawada notes that they were ideologically diverse and, on a whole, “enlightened conservatives,” as they “...combined an ‘enlightened openness to selected Westernizing reforms with a strong insistence on the need to protect the integrity of Japanese culture.’”<sup>51</sup>

This portrait of Engakuji also depicts a teacher, Imakita, who was remarkably open to training lay practitioners (both male and female): an openness that led to remarkably expanded access among laypeople to serious Rinzai Zen opportunities. Following Imakita’s death in 1891, his dharma heir, Shaku Sōen, assumed the role of Engakuji’s chief abbot and carried this openness even further, particularly following the aforementioned World’s Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1893. Sōen not only supported *koji*’s training within the temple complex but also actively employed a wide range of activities to disseminate teachings and cultivate popular Zen practice beyond temple walls. These activities included disseminating his own and others’ Zen-related teachings in popular publications, such as the monthly journal *Zendō*, which was published by Zendōkai 禅道会 (Zen Way Association), for which Sōen served as group leader from the journals inception in 1910 until Sōen’s death in 1919.<sup>52</sup> Sōen also served

---

Sakagami Shinjō and Shaku Sōen, along with prominent leaders in Sōtō Zen and other Buddhist sects (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 225).

<sup>51</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 228.

<sup>52</sup> In the journal’s earliest issues, Sōen was listed as “group leader” (*kaichō* 会長); and in the last issues before he passed away, he was listed as “master,” or *shike* 師家. Even in the issue published in October 1919 (the month before he died), there were two articles by him or based on

as master (*shike* 師家) of various lay Zen groups (*zenkai* 禅会) that congregated at Tokyo-area temples and which featured activities ranging from *teishō* to *sanzen* to *sesshin*. Outside of the Tokyo area, Sōen traveled and taught widely throughout Japan; and he spent considerable time abroad, teaching in the West (actively engaged in transnational Buddhist networks from his participation in the 1893 World Parliament of Religions in Chicago onward) and engaging in *fukyo* 布教 in Japan's colonies (to be discussed further below).<sup>53</sup>

It is clear from primary and secondary sources that Shaku Sōen not only was a giant in the world of late Meiji and Taishō lay Zen, but also played a pivotal role in Japanese Zen's internationalization, particularly through his role as D. T. Suzuki's teacher. In this sense, Sōen could be seen as representing Japanese Rinzai Zen's modernization itself. On the other hand, to focus only on Shaku Sōen and Engakuji can obscure the reach of lay Zen in modern Japan: that is, the dramatic proliferation of

---

his talks: “*Teishō* on the Vimalakīrti Sūtra, Part 8” (“*Yuimagyō teishō* 維摩經提唱、八,” *Zendō*, no. 110, 1919, 2–9) and “*Shūyō no hatsu ippo* 修養の初一步” (*Zendō*, no. 110, 1919, 58–64).  
<sup>53</sup> For example, per *Zendō*, Sōen's schedule for the month of January 1919 included the following stints: January 1–3, regular services and ceremonies at Engakuji (“*Gōrei gohōyō* 恆例御法要”); January 10, Tokyo Rinzai-shū Enjōkai 東京臨濟宗圓成會; January 11, 2:00 pm, Women's Dharma Talk Association (Fujin Dōwakai 婦人道話會); January 12, 9:00 am, Zen-Way Association (Zendōkai 禪道會); January 12, 7:00 pm, Dharma talk at Yasuda-kan (Yasuda-kan hōwa 安田館法話); January 13 and 14, 5:00 pm, Shidōkai 至道會; January 15, 16, and 17, 5:00 pm, Meitokukai 明德會; January 18, 7:00 pm, Yokohama Shōrinkai 横浜少林會; January 19, Totsuka Mushōkai 戸塚無聲會; and in late January (at an undetermined date at the time of publication), an event at the Bank of Korea (Chōsen Ginkō 朝鮮銀行). With the exception of Bank of Korea (in Korea), as well as Shōrinkai and Mushōkai (both of which were groups that met in Yokohama), most of the groups mentioned here were Tokyo-based groups of which Sōen was the leader (*Zendō*, no. 101, 1919, 63).



popular Zen publications and of Zen assemblies in the Tokyo-Kamakura area and throughout Japan in the early twentieth century. Moreover, focusing on the lineage of Engakuji's influential abbots and their disciples perpetuates linear narratives and oversimplifies (and distorts) the complex reality of the extensive networks of practitioners within and outside of training monasteries and other temples, as discussed further below.<sup>54</sup>

Thus, the overview provided in chapter 3 of the emergence and development of the Engakuji-affiliated university Zen groups from 1905 onward—alongside the developments of lay Zen more broadly at Engakuji from the late 1890s onward—focuses less on the work of individual teachers and more on the efforts of practitioners, individually and collectively. Through this lens, we will see lay practitioners' growing momentum and initiative through different phases: in the late 1890s, when lay practice at Engakuji was still relatively ad hoc (e.g., staying in various sub-temples while participating in monastic *sesshin*); in the post-Russo-Japanese era (when Nyoidan, the first Engakuji-related university Zen group was founded in 1906, amidst Japan's self-cultivation boom); in the 1910s (when *zenkai* were on the rise throughout Japan); in the 1920s (when students played a significant role in first establishing a lay-centered training hall at Engakuji, then rebuilding it following its destruction in 1926); and beyond.

---

<sup>54</sup> In the context of premodern Chan, John McRae warns against this emphasis and linear narrative, which he calls the “string of pearls fallacy”: in other words, treating premodern transmission of Chan as a linear monolith, traveling from one master to another, with masters neatly succeeding each other like pearls on a single string. See John R. McRae, *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2003), 10.

### 2.2.3 Type II: Kōzen Gokokukai

Before proceeding with a description of Kōzen Gokokukai 興禅護国会 as an example of the second type of lay Zen organization in modern Japan—and the most common—it is worth making a few points. Unlike Engakuji, Kōzen Gokokukai did not have a disproportionate influence on modern Japanese lay Zen. However, it is interesting to consider because of its ordinariness or, in other words, because of the ways in which it is representative of the multiplying lay Rinzai groups of its day. Kōzen Gokokukai was one of dozens of Tokyo-area groups that offered the activities described in chapter 4 (that is, the master’s sermons, one-on-one meetings with the master, and meditation intensives). Moreover, many of its successive leaders were influential and respected in the institutional realm of modern Japanese Rinzai Zen world, holding a variety of traditional Rinzai establishment training and positions while also being interested—and engaged—in propagating lay Zen.<sup>55</sup> Through their diverse lay Zen activities, they were connected with various religious, social, and political networks, in which the group’s prominent lay members were also actively engaged. Thus, looking at the group’s leadership and membership history provides a glimpse into the extensive lay Zen networks that were active during this period.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> For example, as noted below, many were one-time chief abbots of different Rinzai lineages, such as Myōshinji-ha 妙心寺派, Kenchōji-ha 建長寺派, and Engakuji-ha 円覚寺派.

<sup>56</sup> Additionally, the founder of Kōzen Gokokukai, Katsumine Daitetsu, represented two dimensions of modern lay Rinzai: “traditional” Rinzai activities, such as those discussed here, and Zen-style self-cultivation practices (in Katsumine’s case, Daoist-inflected practices). These two dimensions are discussed further in chapter 5.

Katsumine Daitetsu, whose teachings are discussed in greater detail in chapter 5, founded Kōzen Gokokukai in 1893.<sup>57</sup> As group's name suggests, Katsumine directly invoked the 1198 anthology of Eisai 栄西 (1141–1215), *Kōzen Gokokuron* 興禅護国論 (Propagation of Zen for the Protection of the Country), akin to the “*gokoku* 護国” (nation-protection) groups mentioned above in the context of Torio and Yamaoka's group, Myōdōkai, founded nearly a decade prior to Kōzen Gokokukai. In 1992, when the group was celebrating its one-hundredth anniversary, then-master Adachi Daishin 足立大進 (b. 1932) wrote:

Amidst that momentum [of Japan's modernization], Kōzen Gokokukai was established in Meiji 26 [1893], and until today, it has continued intermittently as a Zen organization with a most brilliant history. In that time, the masters and meeting places have changed, but from Meiji through the beginning of Shōwa, a number of leaders from the political and business world have shown up, and from then, many talented people have appeared, one after the other; we must make special mention of their achievement of protecting the nation through Zen, just like the characters [of our name].<sup>58</sup>

Katsumine was in his sixties when he founded Kōzen Gokokukai, after he had retired from his position as Nanzenji *kanchō* and had been focused on teaching lay practitioners for at least two years, in the Ise area and then in Hachiōji, Tokyo. He led the group until his death in 1911 at the age of 84, actively contributing to the late Meiji Zen

---

<sup>57</sup> The information presented on Kōzen Gokokukai is taken from its two commemorative histories unless otherwise specified: Kōzen Gokokukai 興禅護国会, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi* 興禅護国会史 (Tokyo: Kōzen Gokokukai, 1992); and Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002.

<sup>58</sup> Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 1992, 3. Adachi Daishin was also one-time chief abbot of Engakuji. Similarly, the author of the group's history states that in founding the group, Katsumine's “...intention was just as the group's name expresses: to promote Zen and protect the country” (Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 10).

boom in the Tokyo area.<sup>59</sup> As mentioned above, by the late 1890s and into the early 1900s, through the broad activities of Shaku Sōen and other prominent Rinzai monks, Zen groups increasingly congregated outside the confines of temples, often forming of their own initiative and operating relatively autonomously while being led by a Zen priest. Kōzen Gokokukai was one such autonomous, priest-led group.<sup>60</sup> It has been unusual in its longevity, continuously active until today with the exception of hiatuses from 1911–1914, after Katsumine died, and for nearly one year in 1945 and 1946, following war-related destruction of the group’s meeting place.<sup>61</sup>

What shape did Kōzen Gokokukai’s practice actually take during Katsumine’s lifetime? In sum, these practices were adaptations for lay practitioners of “traditional” monastic practices that became standard among modern Zen assemblies: listening to the master’s sermons (*teishō* 提唱) on a classical Zen text like the *Hekiganroku* (*The Blue Cliff Record*), meeting one-on-one with the master to demonstrate one’s understanding of their kōan, and participate in meditation intensives (*sesshinkai* 撰心会). According to the group’s history, during Katsumine’s lifetime, these intensives were held for one week of each month, with the possibility of meeting the master between 6:00 am and 9:00 pm, and *teishō* on the *Hekiganroku* from 2:00–3:00 pm; during *teishō*, the group’s historian

---

<sup>59</sup> For Katsumine’s biographical information (discussed further in chapter 5), see, for example, Enomoto, “*Meiji Zenkai iketsu*”; and Katsumine Seikan, “*Daitetsu Rōshi jireki*.”

<sup>60</sup> The group’s history notes that “...the establishment [of the group] inevitably relied on dedicated monks, but [Katsumine] expanded it, and there were many *koji*” (Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 10). This implies that the group became more autonomous following its founding in 1893.

<sup>61</sup> Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 12.

states, the room was always full.<sup>62</sup> During this and subsequent periods, famous lay members—influential in political, economic, and media spheres—frequented the group’s events.<sup>63</sup>

After Katsumine died in 1911, the group went through a succession of prominent monastic leaders: a veritable “who’s who” of the modern lay Rinzai world, with many of these leaders heading multiple groups.<sup>64</sup> There were six different masters between 1914 (when the group resumed meeting after a lapse) and 1936, when Asahina Sōgen 朝比奈宗源 (1891–1979) became the group’s master for over forty years, overseeing the

---

<sup>62</sup> Interestingly, *zazen* was not mentioned explicitly as an activity here. Most likely, *zazen* took place during the time that the master was available in his quarters for *sanzen* (*sanzen nyūhitsu* 参禅入室).

<sup>63</sup> For example, journalist Nakae Chōmin 中江兆民 (1847–1901) and politician Ōishi Masami 大石正己 (1855–1935) were prominent disciples of Katsumine.

<sup>64</sup> Per the group’s history, after Katsumine, the group’s second master was Sugawara Jihō 菅原時保 (1856–1966), from 1914–1927; he trained at Engakuji under Imakita Kōsen for one year in his twenties and later became chief abbot of the Kenchōji branch of Rinzai. The group’s third master was Miyaji Sōkai 宮路宗海 (1857–1923), who shared leadership duties with Sugawara from 1916–1923; Miyaji trained at Engakuji under Imakita Kōsen for seven years in his twenties and later became chief abbot of the Engakuji branch. The fourth master was Iida Tōin 飯田とう隠 (1862–1937), who co-led the group from 1927–1932 with Mineo Daikyū 峰尾大休 (1860–1954). Mineo Daikyū trained at Engakuji for a total of fifteen years, under first Imakita and then Shaku Sōen; Mineo ran a Rinzai training hall for nearly three decades at Heirinji 平林寺, became chief abbot of the Myōshinji branch in his late seventies, and was one-time head of the Rinzai sect when—in mid-Meiji—the thirteen Rinzai schools were unified. Kōzen Gokokukai’s sixth master was Ōzora Zetsugaku 霄絶学 (1872–1932), who occupied the role for only six months before his death in 1932; he had trained at both Myōshinji and at Engakuji, under Miyaji Sōkai, and ultimately completed his training under Miyaji. The seventh master was Miyata Tōmin 宮田東珉 (1875–1964), who served from 1933–1935; he did most of his training at Myōshinji and received *inka* there; later, he became head of the Kenchōji training hall and eventually succeeded Sugawara Jihō as chief abbot of Kenchōji. Note that Kōzen Gokokukai narratives repeat this linear succession, which is a central feature of Zen and Chan genealogy. This linear narrative is useful for the purpose of understanding the group’s leaders’ rootedness in the Rinzai establishment, connections within the Zen (and broader Japanese) world, and the leaders’ rhetoric. However, it can be misleading to focus only on the leaders rather than on the practitioners, and to focus on the succession and not on the complex networks to which each leader belonged.

group's postwar rebuilding.<sup>65</sup> Most Kōzen Gokokukai *shike* at some point held the highest positions within their respective Rinzai branches; they were thus thoroughly of the Rinzai Zen establishment, and many were connected to Engakuji in particular (a hub of lay Zen in *kindai* Japan).<sup>66</sup>

With regard to the question of nationalism that is evoked by the group's name, when Katsumine decided to name his group Kōzen Gokokukai in 1893, the notion of Japan as a “nation” (in the modern sense of nation-state) was just beginning to emerge, and “nation-protecting” *shūyō* was not yet the phenomenon that it would become. It seems that Katsumine was prescient about the role that Zen would play vis-à-vis the era's burgeoning nationalism, although it is still unclear how deeply nationalist ideology pervaded its members' lives and Zen practice as Japan ramped up its imperialist agenda and Buddhism became more enmeshed in state ideology, particularly from the 1910s through the 1930s. Interestingly, immediately postwar, the group changed its name temporarily in order to “prevent misunderstanding” (誤解を避けて)—until after the Allied occupation of Japan ended—to Shōgakukai 正覚会. Regardless of Katsumine's intention in choosing this name, it certainly came to invoke and evoke what many aspired to: protecting and elevating Japan through religious practice.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Asahina was also the longtime chief abbot of Engakuji and, as mentioned in chapter 3, was vitally involved in rebuilding Kojirin and the university student groups after the war.

<sup>66</sup> A notable exception was the group's fourth *shike*, Iida Tōin, discussed elsewhere. Iida was a physician who became a priest at age sixty after decades of Buddhist practice in both Rinzai and Sōtō Zen, as well as in Japan's esoteric Buddhist schools, Shingon and Tendai.

<sup>67</sup> Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 12–13.

### 2.2.4 Type III: Shakamunikai (Śākyamuni Association)

Like Kōzen Gokokukai, Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会 is still active today, carrying forth their late Meiji- and Taishō-era legacy. The group officially formed in 1920, nearly thirty years after Kōzen Gokokukai formed, just as Engakuji lay practitioners were organizing to create their lay-dedicated training hall at the temple complex. However, Shakamunikai has Meiji-era roots of a different variety than both Engakuji's Kojirin and Kōzen Gokokukai, both of whom shared a religiosity that greatly echoed that of Shaku Sōen and Imakita Kōsen. Shakamunikai's distinctive religiosity and historical developments deserve an in-depth investigation, particularly for the ways in which they express a different dimension of modern lay Zen than expressed by the groups above: called "*zaikai zen* 在家禅" ("in-the-home Zen"); ideologically incorporating teachings from other Buddhist strands (e.g., teachings centered on the "great wisdom" of early Buddhism, as well as on *vinaya* teachings); and eschewing monastic ideals (and, for example, the in-between status of Engakuji's *koji* 居士 community), even while retaining very similar forms of practice to their contemporaneous *zenkai* that were more explicitly aligned with institutional Rinzai Zen. Additionally, although Shakamunikai was originally based in Shizuoka Prefecture and subsequently moved to Tokyo proper, the group's "dharma ancestors" were based primarily in western Japan. Here, I touch on a few key aspects of Shakamunikai's formulation and practice of Zen, as well as strands of

the group's intellectual and religious legacy, as they compare to more “mainstream” lay Zen in early twentieth-century Japan.<sup>68</sup>

Shaku Jōkō 釈定光 (1884–1949)—called a “religious revolutionary of the Shōwa era” by Akizuki Ryōmin (秋月龍珉 1921–1999)—was unequivocally the group's founder.<sup>69</sup> Indeed, Shaku Jōkō is depicted as radical, primarily in his attitude toward clergy: Akizuki Ryōmin quotes Jōkō as saying, “My heart's desire is to burn down every temple and kill every monk.”<sup>70</sup> Targeting lay practitioners, Jōkō promoted a form of Buddhism that reached back to its “original” roots, with these three points (the *Sankōryō* 三綱領) at the core of its mission:

*Mahāprajñāpāramitā* is the primary meaning of the Buddhist Way.  
Inscribe it in your heart of hearts!

Precept, Meditation, Wisdom—these three are the key to attaining  
the Way. Devote yourself to their practice in your heart of hearts!

---

<sup>68</sup> For more on Shakamunikai's history, see especially the group's fifty-year commemorative history: Shakamunikai Shūmukyoku 釈迦牟尼会宗務局, ed., *Shakamunikai gojū nenshi* 釈迦牟尼会五十年史 (Tokyo: Nippon infomeeshon shuppan kyoku, 1970). Also see the group's periodical: Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会, *Zenmi* 禅味 (Tokyo: Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会, 1955–present).

<sup>69</sup> The expression that Akizuki used was “*Shōwa no shūkyō kaikakusha* 昭和の宗教改革者” (Akizuki, *Shin daijō*, iii); this translation comes from Heisig and Swanson (in Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 3). Akizuki Ryōmin was a prolific author and Zen popularizer; he studied under D. T. Suzuki and practiced under several famous Rinzai masters, in addition to Osaka Kōryū 荻坂光龍 (1901–1985), a layperson and Shaku Jōkō's successor as Shakamunikai leader. Although establishment Rinzai monks and scholars alike have expressed ambivalence about the rigor of Akizuki's popular works, his massive oeuvre undoubtedly helped disseminate modern Rinzai in late twentieth-century Japan. Akizuki adopted his formulation of “New Mahāyāna” (*shindaijō* 新大乘) from Osaka Kōryū, and he drew directly from Shaku Jōkō for his explanations of “New Mahāyāna,” as expressed in Akizuki, *Shin daijō*, and Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*.

<sup>70</sup> Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 19.



The fourfold vow of the bodhisattva is our basic vow. Dedicate yourself to it in your heart of hearts!<sup>71</sup>

Jōkō asserted that this was an “original” teaching of Śākyamuni Buddha and thus called the group Śākyamuni Association (Shakamunikai). On the other hand, Jōkō’s emphasis on Prajñā—to the degree that, according to Akizuki, Jōkō wanted to found a Prajñā Sect—may have been novel in a Zen context.<sup>72</sup>

These seemingly novel conceptions of a universalized form of Buddhism were part of a widespread resurgence of interest in the teachings of Śākyamuni Buddha in modern Japan, which Richard Jaffe investigates.<sup>73</sup> Moreover, these notions were part of the religious legacy of Jōkō’s main teacher, Shaku Kaikō 釈戒光 (1871–1928), and the Zen master under whom Kaikō completed his Rinzai training, Nishiyama Kasan 西山禾山 (1838–1917).<sup>74</sup> Given that many of the threads that made Jōkō’s formulation of Buddhism unique among contemporaneous *zenkai* came directly from Kaikō and Kasan, I

---

<sup>71</sup> Akizuki, *New Mahāyāna*, 28; for original Japanese, see Akizuki, *Shin daijō*, 36.

<sup>72</sup> For more on Shakamunikai’s founder, Shaku Jōkō, from the perspective of his successor, see Osaka Kōryū 荳坂光龍, ed., *Seisō Jōkō 聖僧定光* (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1955). Also see Shakamunikai Shūmukyoku, *Shakamunikai gojū nenshi*, 25–34.

<sup>73</sup> See especially Richard M. Jaffe, *Seeking Śākyamuni: South Asia in the Formation of Modern Japanese Buddhism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2019). Also see Richard M. Jaffe, “Buddhist Material Culture, ‘Indianism,’ and the Construction of Pan-Asian Buddhism in Prewar Japan,” *Material Religion* 2, no. 3 (November 2006): 266–92; and Richard M. Jaffe, “Seeking Śākyamuni: Travel and the Reconstruction of Japanese Buddhism,” in *Defining Buddhism(s): A Reader*, 252–80 (London: Equinox Publishing, 2007).

<sup>74</sup> For more on the historical threads underlying Shakamunikai’s form of Zen, as pertains to Nishiyama Kasan, see Tanabe Yukinobu 田鍋幸信, ed., *Nishiyama Kasan: Denki Shiryō 西山禾山: 伝記資料* (Tokyo: Bunchidō Shoten, 1978). Also see, for example, accounts of Kasan’s Zen in a four-part series entitled “Traces of Master Kasan” (“*Kasan-shi no omokage* 禾山師の面影” in the first part and “*Kasan-rōshi no omokage* 禾山老師の面影” subsequently), by his disciple Kōno Gen’yō 河野玄要, that were published in *Zendō* after Kasan’s death (*Zendō*, no. 85, August 1917, 46–55; *Zendō*, no. 86, September 1917, 40–46; *Zendō*, no. 87, October 1917, 53–57; and *Zendō*, no. 88, November 1917, 42–45).

outline these threads below; however, I want to emphasize that these connections among Kasan, Kaikō, and Jōkō do not amount to a linear, monolithic transmission of practices and teachings, and that they should be explored in greater depth.

Both Kasan and Kaikō were known for their embrace of lay disciples during a period that Rinzai training was still rare for laypeople but was gradually becoming more accessible. Nishiyama Kasan (also known as Kasan Genku 禾山玄鼓) was Imakita Kōsen's contemporary (1816–1892) and trained under Myōshinji's Ekkei Shuken 越溪守謙 (1810–1884); Kōsen and Ekkei shared a master, Gisan Zenrai 儀山善来 (1802–1878).<sup>75</sup> While Imakita trained a generation of early Meiji elite *koji* in eastern Japan at Engakuji, Kasan was active teaching “*zaike*” disciples in western Japan; he also visited eastern Japan regularly to teach. It seems that Kasan encapsulated his teachings that were aimed at the laity in his short pamphlet, “*Kinben shigai* 金鞭指街,” in which “wisdom Samādhi” (“*hannya zanmai* 般若三昧”) figures prominently.<sup>76</sup> Kasan's successor Kaikō, as well as Kaikō's successor Jōkō, also emphasized this “wisdom Samādhi” in their teachings. As mentioned in chapter 4, Kasan was known to have created his own kōan,

---

<sup>75</sup> Ekkei was not at Myōshinji the whole time that he was active as a master, but he is best known for being at Myōshinji.

<sup>76</sup> Nishiyama Kasan 西山禾山, *Kinben shigai* 金鞭指街 (Kyoto: Izumo Bunjirō 出雲寺文次郎, 1890). This work is reprinted in Tanabe, *Nishiyama Kasan*, 10–23. According to *Zengaku daijiten*, this is also the title of a fourteen-volume work by Rinzai master Mujaku Dōchū 無著道忠 (1653–1745; ZGDJ, s.v. “金鞭指街,” 238). Per the title information in the reprint of the woodblock edition, the work also seems to be known by “Essential Method for [Attaining] Wisdom *Samādhi* and a Peaceful Mind” (“*Hannya zanmai anjin yōmon* 般若三昧安心要門”).

employing them alongside a standard Rinzai curriculum; his kōans are still used by Shakamunikai practitioners today.<sup>77</sup>

With regard to Shaku Jōkō's master, Shaku Kaikō, a compilation of his biographical and autobiographical material entitled *Shishirin yoei* 獅子林余影 offers some clues regarding the arising and flourishing of Shakamunikai, founded by his disciple, Shaku Jōkō 釈定光 (1884–1949)—and to its seemingly revolutionary nature in early Shōwa Japan. According to this work, Kaikō lived a relatively short life, passing away at the age of 58. However, from the standpoint of the spiritual sustenance (literally, the “dharma milk,” or “*hōnyū* 法乳” that Kaikō offered and transmitted, his life was long indeed.<sup>78</sup> Kaikō's training was diverse; initially, he was a member of Shingon Risshū 真言律宗; only later did he practice Zen under Kasan. Following his *inka shōmei*, Kaikō returned to Unshōji 雲照寺 in Tochigi Prefecture, a Shingon temple at which Jōkō was ordained. It seems that Jōkō, too, trained in Shingon, Ritsu, and Zen under Kaikō. As for Kaikō's lay-centered teachings, he was the leader of the group Dōyūkai 道友会, which had somewhere on the order of seventeen offshoots.<sup>79</sup> Kasan had also had a Zen practice

---

<sup>77</sup> For the kōans that Kasan crafted, see Tanabe, *Nishiyama Kasan*, 71–76, as well as Akizuki Ryōmin's afterward to these kōans (Tanabe, *Nishiyama Kasan*, 77). Also see Akizuki Ryōmin 秋月龍珉, *Kōan: jissenteki Zen nyūmon* 公案: 実践の禪入門 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 2009), 261–335, in which Akizuki explicates the whole kōan system used by Kasan and Ekkei (which, as of this work's original publication date of 1965, was no longer being used in any of the monastic halls in Japan; see Akizuki, *Kōan*, 262).

<sup>78</sup> Hasumi Shunpō 蓮実俊峯, *Shishirin yoei* 獅子林余影 (Nishinasuno-mura, Tochigi: Unshōji, 1929), 1–2.

<sup>79</sup> For accounts of the various groups' activities and chronologies, see Hasumi, *Shishirin yoei*, 286–353.

group (*sanzenkai* 参禅会) called Dōyūkai, though it is not clear whether Kaikō's Dōyūkai was the same group or simply shared the same name. After Kaikō died in 1928, Jōkō assumed leadership of Dōyūkai, which appears to have been absorbed into Shakamunikai. Thus, while more work remains to investigate Kasan's and Kaikō's lay-centered teachings and the practices that their respective groups undertook, it is clear that Shakamunikai—although officially founded in 1920—had lay Zen roots that extended back decades.

As for Shakamunikai itself, from the outset, it seems to have set itself apart from other *zenkai* in its trans-sectarian aspirations, even while the group's events were listed alongside other *zenkai* in *Daijōzen*. For example, a report in the February 1929 issue of *Daijōzen* about Shakamunikai's four-day winter *sesshin*—held earlier that month at the Japan Youth Hall (Nippon Seinenkan 日本青年館) in Tokyo—notes that the group based its practices on the roots of Buddhism, rather than on any Buddhist sect, even while prioritizing the practice of *zazen*.<sup>80</sup>

Incidentally, regarding the Japan Youth Hall, it seems that a considerable proportion of Shakamunikai's members were young people, under Jōkō and especially under Jōkō's successor, Osaka Kōryū (who became the group's master in 1944, prior to Jōkō's death in 1948).<sup>81</sup> Osaka had multiple connections to the youth contingent: for

---

<sup>80</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1929), 101. Also see *Daijō Zen* for *sesshin* and other practice accounts. For example, for reminiscences of Shakamunikai's winter *sesshin* at the Nippon Seinenkan that was held prior to 1928, see *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5., no. 12 (1928), 71–74.

<sup>81</sup> For more on the “lay Zen” (*zaikai zen* 在家禅) of Osaka Kōryū, see Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会, *Zaikai zen no kyoshō osaka kōryū* 在家禅の巨匠荳坂光竜 (Tokyo: Shakamunikai, 1997); Osaka

example, through his own educational attainments and the integration of practice and academic dimensions of Zen for which he became known; through his later role as leader of the university Zen group Nyoidan 如意団 (discussed extensively in the next chapter); and through the fact that Shakamunikai's training hall became Musashino Hannya Dōjō 武蔵野般若道場, in which numerous students lodged.

The question remains: to what degree did Shakamunikai's Zen depart from “traditional” Rinzai Zen? Despite the seemingly radical nature of Jōkō's stance vis-à-vis clerics, and of Kasan's, Kaikō's, and Jōkō's Prajñā teachings for their *zaike* students, Shakamunikai retained strong Rinzai flavor in its practice forms, which centered on *sanzen* with the *rōshi*, *kōan* practice, and *teishō* on classical texts such as the *Hekiganroku*.<sup>82</sup> More investigation must be done on the historical developments of Shakamunikai's practices since the group's inception in 1920, but it appears that—to an extent—the radical rhetoric belies strong continuities with Hakuin-style Rinzai Zen.

---

Kōryū 荳坂光龍, *Zaika no Zen: Osaka Kōryū-shū* 在家の禅 : 荳坂光龍集 (Tokyo: Kyōiku Shinchōsha, 1968); Osaka Kōryū 荳坂光龍, *Zaika Zen nyūmon* 在家禅入門 (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1969); and Akizuki Ryōmin 秋月龍珉, *Zen no hito: watakushi no deatta jinsei no shitachi* 禅の人: 私の出会った人生の師たち (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1982), 173–202. There are also numerous first-hand accounts of Osaka Kōryū in Shakamunikai shūmukyoku, *Shakamunikai gojū nenshi*.

<sup>82</sup> For example, the aforementioned *sesshin* account written in December 1928 mentioned that at a previous *sesshin*, the “*kōhon* 講本”—that is, the text from which the master read during his sermon—was the *Hekiganroku* (*Daijō Zen*, vol. 5., no. 12, 1928, 73).

### 2.2.5 Postscript: Lay Zen Networks in Tokyo and Beyond

Beyond there being a variety of types of lay Rinzai groups, it is clear that the networks of lay Zen leaders and practitioners in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan were both extensive and complex. These networks can be glimpsed by focusing on various “nodes” such as individuals (e.g., group leaders or practitioners about whom some biographical information is known); sites (e.g., large monastic training temples like Engakuji, or smaller parish temples where lay assemblies convened); or groups themselves. Thus, for lay Zen in the modern period, this lens of networks is a more useful lens than the conventional one of lineage, which, as mentioned above, can oversimplify and distort our understanding of complexities.<sup>83</sup> Examples of complexity includes, for example, when a master trains under multiple Zen masters, in multiple Zen schools, in multiple Buddhist traditions, or even in multiple religious traditions.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Janine Sawada, as mentioned in chapter 1, provides an excellent model for the study of lay Zen networks in her analysis of the late nineteenth-century Engakuji circle and its intersections with other political, social, and religious circles (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*). There continued to be close associations between Engakuji and influential actors in the political realm into the twentieth century. See, for example, the *Daijō Zen* article about Shaku Sōen and his student Noda Utarō 野田卯太郎 (1853–1927), who was a politician and known for nationalism-themed poetry (*Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12, December 1928, 84–87).

<sup>84</sup> For example, Mohr points out that “Nantenbō consulted no fewer than twenty-four teachers from both the Inzan and Takujū lineages” (Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 188). The Inzan and Takujū lineages refer to different branches of Rinzai that diverged after the time of Hakuin 白隠慧鶴 (1686–1769); they have different approaches to kōan practice, as described in chapter 4. Also, as discussed elsewhere in this dissertation, examples of training in multiple Buddhist traditions include the example of Shaku Kaikō, who trained in Rinzai, Shingon, and Risshū 律宗 (Vinaya). Examples of teachers who trained in multiple traditions include the lay teacher and dharma heir of Imakita Kōsen, Kawajiri Hōkin 川尻寶岑 (1843–1910), who integrated Rinzai Zen with Sekimon Shingaku 石門心学 (a Neo-Confucian self-cultivation practice that is discussed further in chapter 5).

Lay groups, temples, and individual figures were extremely and increasingly active, especially during the Taishō and early Shōwa periods, and there seems to have been permeability among groups and circles, even while there were documented critiques and differences.<sup>85</sup> As we have seen thus far, leaders were associated with multiple groups; groups were associated with multiple leaders, lineages, and temples; and temples also played host to a variety of events, groups, and leaders. Group membership overlapped with other groups: for example, members of the university student groups originally affiliated with Engakuji, such as Waseda University's Saiindan 済蔭団 and Hitotsubashi University's Nyoidan 如意団, regularly participated in events at Engakuji and other Zen assemblies in Tokyo.<sup>86</sup> Moreover, there were inter-regional flows: for example, Shaku Sōen traveled throughout Japan (and abroad) to give lectures and retreats. There was even permeability among Zen sects: e.g., Iida Tōin (one-time Kōzen Gokokukai leader) had training in lineages of both Rinzai and Sōtō Zen, as did his teacher, Harada Sogaku 原田祖岳 (1871–1861), who went on to co-found Sanbōkyōdan 三宝教団 with Yasutani Hakuun 安谷白雲 (1885–1973), which wielded tremendous influence on the development of Zen in the West.

---

<sup>85</sup> For example, Nakahara Nantenbō was known for critiquing Engakuji-style Zen as being excessively intellectual (Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 188, 191, 194). At the same time, however, there were numerous students who worked at different times with Nantenbō and the “Kamakura Zen” teachers, such as Hiratsuka Raichō, whose first main teacher was Shaku Sōkatsu and who subsequently worked with Nantenbō (discussed further in chapter 4).

<sup>86</sup> The intersections of these groups have continued throughout the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. For example, several senior members of Kōzen Gokokukai today have told me that they were members of university student groups (such as the Waseda or Hitotsubashi group) and have done zazen, on and off for decades, at Engakuji.

Pertaining specifically to Kōzen Gokokukai, the parish temple Rinshōin 麟祥院 in the Bunkyo 文京 ward of Tokyo (near Tokyo University) is one name that has repeatedly resurfaced in early twentieth-century lay Zen-related literature. Rinshōin was Kōzen Gokokukai's meeting site from 1914–1935.<sup>87</sup> The temple also hosted other lay Zen groups and events. For example, 1910 issues of *Zendō* mention that the group Jissenkai 實踐會—incidentally, led by Miyaji Sōkai, who later became *shike* of Kōzengokokuai—met there at times, although it eventually relocated to Hakusan Dōjō 白山道場 (where Kōzen Gokokukai currently meets).<sup>88</sup> As mentioned in chapter 3, the Enjōkai Youth Division (Enjōkai Seinenbu 圓成會青年部), which was led by the priest Nakahara Shūgaku 中原秀嶽 (1878–1928), who was an important early leader for Nyōidan, also met at Rinshōin.<sup>89</sup> Zen-related events for the general public were also held at Rinshōin. For example, a public lecture (*kōen* 講筵), was held there in October 1910 by the group Zendōkai 禪道會 (which published the journal *Zendō*); according to the report the next month in *Zendō*, the event drew over one thousand audience members.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 15.

<sup>88</sup> See, for example, *Zendō*, no. 1 (1910), 54.

<sup>89</sup> See Enjōkai's publication: Nakahara Shūgaku 中原秀嶽, ed., *Ikke goyō* 一華五葉 (Tokyo: Rinzaishū Enjōkai Seinenbu, n.d.). In *Zendō*, there is a report about Enjōkai 圓成會, which may be the event profiled by *Ikke goyō* and therefore help to identify the latter work's publication date in 1910. The report in *Zendō* reads: "As for that group [Enjōkai], under the supervision of Master Nakahara Shūgaku, Rinzaï-sect students [gathered] last month, on the thirteenth day, at Rinshōin in Yushima [Tokyo]; they listened to the fall lecture, and it was a beneficial lecture by [the editor of] this journal; [the event] was extremely successful" (*Zendō*, no. 5, December 1910, 51).

<sup>90</sup> *Zendō*, no. 4 (November 1910), 59. That event featured talks by Shaku Sōen and "Dr. Inoue," who was probably Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944). The event also coincided with a



Beyond the importance of paying attention to regional networks, it is also worth noting (and studying in greater depth) regional differences in lay Zen practice. For example, as mentioned in chapter 4, Akizuki Ryōmin notes that there were regional differences with regard to laypeople's ability to practice kōans and move through the curriculum—in short, that lay practitioners in Kamakura (and eastern Japan) were typically permitted to proceed through the kōan curriculum as laypeople, but that in monasteries in western Japan, masters only permitted laypeople to proceed to a certain point in their practice, and if they wished to continue their kōan practice, they had to ordain as a priest.<sup>91</sup>

### **2.3 Factors: Zen Boom**

One major question of this dissertation (and the coming chapters) is: what spurred lay Rinzai Zen's popularization in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan? In particular, chapter 5 explores a variety of reasons that modern lay practitioners provide for pursuing Zen practice, as well as the ways in which their reasons and motivations connected to historical developments, such as burgeoning nationalism. Such motivations, as will be discussed, range from “traditional” Rinzai motives (per normative teachings) to practicing Zen as a form of “self-cultivation” (*shūyō* 修養) for the sake of the nation.

---

seven-day sesshin at Rinshōin, held by the group Shōgakukai 正學會 (*Zendō*, no. 4, November 1910, 59).

<sup>91</sup> Akizuki, *Zen no hito*, 211–212. I have heard anecdotally from a contemporary Rinzai master that one example (that is, of a Kyoto-area master who required laypeople to ordain before continuing their kōan work) was Takeda Mokurai 武田黙雷 (1854–1930) of Kenninji 建仁寺.

This section, on the other hand, focuses on a range of factors other than individuals' motivations for practicing lay Zen. First, I discuss the dissemination of—and access to—Zen teachings, along with the disseminators: the Rinzai institutions, masters, and popular authors who engaged with the public in a variety of ways. Subsequently, I take a closer look at “*fukyō* 布教”—“spreading the teachings”—and what that meant in a sect that historically eschewed such outreach, relative to other Buddhist schools. Finally, I provide an overview of the significant role that print media had in increasing the public's access to Rinzai Zen teachings and offered laypeople a variety of modes of engagement with those practices and teachings.

### 2.3.1 Dissemination and Access

Before delving into the main modes of dissemination, the disseminators, and expanded access to lay Rinzai, it is worth taking a broader look at the spread of lay Rinzai in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan (and the Japanese empire). Did it involve primarily an organic proliferation of groups, activities, and literature—a “natural” welling up of broad-based interest and attraction, given the era's historical circumstances? Or, on the other end of the extreme, did it arise primarily through active—or even aggressive—outreach, such as in the Nichiren sects?<sup>92</sup> The short answer

---

<sup>92</sup> Sōka Gakkai 創価学会 (Value-Creation Study Association) is an example of a Japanese New Religion and lay Buddhist movement that is derived from Nichiren-shōshū 日蓮正宗 (Orthodox School of Nichiren) and which has engaged vigorously in proselytization methods. Conventionally, Sōka Gakkai's leaders have employed *shakubuku* 折伏 (“break and subdue”—that is, preaching in a confrontative manner) as their main conversion technique, and they have embraced the mission of *kōsen rufu* 広宣流布: that is, spreading the *Lotus Sūtra* during the “latter day of the dharma” (*mappō* 末法) in which people are temporally distant from the Buddha's

is that Rinzai outreach was never as extreme as, say, Nichiren-style outreach and conversion. However, there was certainly expanded access to Rinzai practice and teachings in the modern period, paired with increased outreach on the part of institutions and teachers.

The accessibility of modern lay Rinzai contrasts markedly with that of historic Rinzai monasticism, as discussed in chapter 4. As per tradition, would-be monastic novices who sought to gain admission to a training temple were initially denied entrance, sometimes multiple times; but those who proved their dedication by remaining at the entryway for a period of time, heads bowed, typically were accepted for training.<sup>93</sup> Not only were lay Rinzai practitioners able to avoid such trials, but they were also actively courted by Rinzai masters, who offered them multiple modes of practice that had previously been reserved primarily for monastics. This is not to say that lay practitioners’

---

teaching. See Levi McLaughlin, “Sōka Gakkai in Japan,” in *Handbook of Contemporary Japanese Religions*, edited by John K. Nelson and Inken Prohl, 269–307 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), 271–273.

<sup>93</sup> The latter monastic convention is called *niwazume* 庭詰—meaning literally, “occupying the courtyard”—and was followed in many monastic training halls by *tangazume* 旦過詰 (“occupying the *tanga*,” or the room for overnight lodging), during which the monk or would-be novice did zazen for a determined period in the small *tanga*. These definitions come from Satō Giei and Nishimura Eishin, *Unsui: A Diary of Zen Monastic Life*, edited by Bardwell L. Smith (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1973), 112 and 114. D. T. Suzuki states that *niwazume* typically lasted two or three days (although it lasted a full week in previous generations) and that *tangazume* lasted about three days; see Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk* (Boston: C.E. Tuttle, 1994), 10–11.

treatment and religious opportunities were equal to those of Rinzai monastics, but the chasm between the two groups undeniably narrowed in the modern period.<sup>94</sup>

Expressing this trend of increased accessibility to rigorous training, even on the grounds of a training monastery, an issue of *Zendō* from August 1918 published guidelines for participating in an upcoming layperson's *sesshin* at Engakuji later that month under Shaku Sōen's guidance (these guidelines are discussed further in chapter 4 and appear in Appendix A).<sup>95</sup> The guidelines are notable as they demonstrate how practice at Engakuji was accessible even for beginners and working people; they explicitly welcomed seasoned practitioners and beginners alike, and they established that practitioners were permitted to participate part-time if need be. Not all training monasteries opened their doors to laypeople to the degree that Engakuji did, although numerous Rinzai training hall permitted lay participation (e.g., in monastic *sesshin* 接心) to some degree from the late nineteenth century onward.

For this discussion of disseminating Rinzai teachings and practice, we should also distinguish among various types of disseminators, who were diverse, categorically and individually; in other words, they had diverse goals, missions, and reasons for endeavoring to spread Zen. The most prominent of these were the masters (*shike*)

---

<sup>94</sup> As discussed in chapter 4, there is evidence that religious opportunities such as formal kōan training may have differed for lay and ordained practitioners, and that the respective groups garnered different degrees of esteem in their masters' eyes. Michel Mohr writes of the Rinzai master Nakahara Nantenbō, whose devotion to teaching lay disciples is well documented. However, Mohr notes: "There are a few passages in Nantenbō's writings that suggest the superiority of ordained individuals over laypeople, in particular when he mentions the strength of the resolve demanded of monks as they beg to be accepted into a monastery..." (Mohr, "Japanese Zen Schools," 202).

<sup>95</sup> *Zendō*, no. 97 (August 1918), 59.

themselves—the face of Rinzai teachings and, typically, rōshi from famed Rinzai temples and lineages (e.g., the Daitokuji, Myōshinji, or Engakuji lineages), although there were a few people who became *shike* even as laypeople.<sup>96</sup> These masters taught within the bounds of training temples or at small local branch temples, at which Zen groups (*zenkai* 禅会) assembled. Like Shaku Sōen, some of these *shike* were also actively engaged in *fukyō*, not only in Japan’s major Buddhist centers—that is, the Kamakura-Tokyo and Kyoto areas—but also in rural Japan and in Japan’s colonies overseas, to which activity logs in *Zendō*, *Daijōzen*, and *Shōhōrin* attest.

There were also non-monastic propagators, who influenced audiences through writing, editing, teaching at universities, and lecturing on Buddhist matters and texts at temples (e.g., Engakuji) and *zenkai* 禅会. D. T. Suzuki was the foremost Zen popularizer in this regard, with a massive oeuvre—penned over a period of more than seven decades—that comprised myriad topics within the broad category of Mahāyāna Buddhism.<sup>97</sup> Another type of propagator (of a sort) was university faculty mentors who practiced Zen. For example, at Tokyo Higher Commercial School (later, Hitotsubashi University), faculty members who also practiced Zen, such as Fukuda Tokuzō 福田徳三 (1874–1930), played influential roles—not only as a source of information and

---

<sup>96</sup> As discussed elsewhere, this includes Kawajiri Hōkin, who completed his training under Imakita Kōsen and proceeded to teach in the Sekimon Shingaku context (although not in the same *zenkai* 禅会 context that is the focus of this discussion), and Iida Tōin, who taught widely in *zenkai* even as a layman, though he ultimately ordained as a priest.

<sup>97</sup> For an overview of the scope of Suzuki’s work—as well as the core themes, biographical and historical context, shifts in his work over time, and central roles of Rinzai Zen and nonduality—see especially Jaffe, Introduction in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, xi-lvi.

inspiration for the student Zen practitioners but also in the very founding of the university's Zen group, Nyoidan. Finally, behind many of these individual propagators, monastic and non-monastic, were institutions, which had their own respective sets of concerns (to be discussed further below).

### **2.3.2 *Fukyō*: Spreading the Teaching**

In terms of the spread of lay Rinzai practice among the Japanese populace, it was neither extreme in terms of being primarily top-down (e.g., initiated by big institutions, with a few charismatic leaders at the helm, and/or spurred or supported by political initiatives) or bottom-up (e.g., truly a people's movement, with a broad leadership base and the capacity for ordinary people to participate and even to play important roles). In short, this dissemination sprung from the initiative of a broad variety of agents, for multitudinous reasons, and via many modes of communication.

Defining a few key terms can help with this discussion: first, there is *fukyō* 布教 or “spreading the teachings”; this term seems to be used most frequently by Rinzai priests and institutions and in the context of Japanese colonies. For example, the journal *Shōhōrin*, produced by the Myōshinji branch of Rinzai Zen, reports extensively on priests' “*fukyō katsudō* 布教活動” (propagation activities), particularly in the 1910s and thereafter. One early Meiji term used for propagation was “*senpu* 宣布,” used in the context of “propagating the Great Teaching” (*taikyō senpu* 大教宣布), or disseminating

State Shintō ideology in the Great Promulgation Campaign of the early 1870s.<sup>98</sup> More neutral terms—that is, focusing more on the dissemination itself and less on the disseminators’ action—include *fukyū* 普及 (referring to the “spread” of Zen); *ryūkō* 流行 (referring to Zen’s spread in the sense of being popular, trendy, or faddish); and *minshūka* 民衆化 or *taishūka* 大衆化 (“popularization”).

The propagators’ goals, per their writings, are multitudinous. Common themes include the following: (1) per conventional Zen goals, seeking to aid individuals in coming to enlightenment, both for their own sake (i.e., to end the suffering of sentient beings) and, perhaps, to revive Japanese Zen at a time when—by some reformers’ accounts—monastic practice had become rote); (2) seeking to reach a broader audience through emphasizing various forms of self-cultivation (*shūyō* 修養) for worldly benefits ranging from individual (e.g., improving health) to collective (e.g., strengthening the nation); (3) expanding the number of parishioners or types of parishioner support during a period of financial decline for many temples (due, for example, not only to the post-Meiji Restoration destruction of temples but also to the weakening relationship between

---

<sup>98</sup> This translation comes from Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 195. As mentioned in chapter 4, Janine Sawada examines the tension inherent to Rinzai masters’ engagement in active propagation (*fukyō* 布教), which the Rinzai school (and Zen generally) had previously eschewed (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 122–124). For more on the role of Buddhist clergy in the Great Teaching Campaign (also known as the Great Promulgation Campaign), from 1872 until their withdrawal from the campaign in 1875, also see Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 110–113, and Helen Hardacre, *Shintō and the State, 1868–1988* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), 42–46. The description of early Meiji Rinzai monastics with regard to missionizing contrasts with contemporary descriptions, as Jørn Borup speaks of contemporary Rinzai in the Myōshinji branch: “In general all priests are considered missionaries. As one priest wrote: ‘A priest not propagating the Buddhist dharma is like a flower shop not selling flowers, or a sake shop not selling sake’” (Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 141).

temple and parishioners that became common in the modern era, due to urbanization and other factors); (4) demonstrating Zen's usefulness for the modern world (e.g., through forms of *goyō bukkō* 御用仏教, or “useful Buddhism,” per Christopher Ives, or through disseminating Zen as a bulwark against alienation, mechanization, or other unsavory characteristics of modernization or Westernization); and (5) as part of a Japanese imperial missionary agenda, “reforming” the Buddhism of Korea and other colonies.<sup>99</sup>

In order to understand the role of *fukyō* for propagators and audiences, we must turn to different genres of writings. On one side of the equation is institutional Rinzai Zen and its priests, most explicitly engaged in *fukyō katsudō*. Such activities were profiled increasingly in the journal *Shōhōrin* 正法輪, which was published by Shōhōrin Kyōkai 正法輪協會, an offshoot of the Myōshinji branch of Rinzai Zen and reflecting the concerns of institutional Rinzai Zen.<sup>100</sup> The word “*fukyō*” appears increasingly in *Shōhōrin*, in titles of articles and blurbs at the end of the journal that described teachers' activities and other events in the Zen world. The appearance of the term increased markedly in the years leading up to, and immediately following, 1910. *Zendō* and *Daijō Zen* likewise profile the propagation efforts of numerous prominent Rinzai rōshi in

---

<sup>99</sup> With regard to the latter category, for discussion of Buddhist propagation in Korea, see especially Mark A. Nathan, *From the Mountains to the Cities: A History of Buddhist Propagation in Modern Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018). For examinations of the complex relationships between colonizer and colonized in the Korean context, also see Kim, “Seeking the Colonizer's Favors”; Kim, *Empire of the Dharma*; Kim, *The Korean Buddhist Empire*; and Nam-lin Hur, “Han Yong'un (1879–1944) and Buddhist Reform in Colonial Korea,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): 75–97. For an overview from 2010 of research on religion and the Japanese empire, see Richard M. Jaffe, “Editor's Introduction: Religion and the Japanese Empire,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): 1–7.

<sup>100</sup> *Shōhōrin* was published from 1891 until the present.



Manchuria, Korea, and Taiwan. In general, “*fukyō*” seems to be used more commonly in the context of missions to Japan’s colonies than in the context of instructing Japanese laypeople in Zen practice at the *zenkai* that are discussed throughout this dissertation; however, various Rinzai masters voiced a strong sense of mission in their teaching endeavors. With regard to the latter, Michel Mohr describes the great dedication of the aforementioned Nakahara Nantenbō to teaching laypeople as one means of reviving Zen in post-Meiji Japan.<sup>101</sup>

A very different description of *fukyō* also comes from the propagators’ side, as an individual articulation of a deeply felt mission. As discussed in chapter 5, Tsuji Sōmei 辻双明 (1903–1991), who started practicing with Nyoidan and at Engakuji while studying at Tokyo University of Commerce, practiced as a devout layperson for decades before ordaining and fulfilling his life’s mission to propagate Zen.<sup>102</sup> As expressed in his autobiography, Tsuji yearned from early in his practicing career to intensify his practice; for decades, he felt an acute tension between his “religious aspirations” and his worldly roles (as family man and businessman), even as his main teacher at Engakuji, Furukawa Gyōdō, sought to temper this tension.<sup>103</sup> His mission strengthened after his experiences as

---

<sup>101</sup> Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 197.

<sup>102</sup> For Tsuji’s original autobiography, see Tsuji Sōmei 辻双明, *Zen no michi o tadorikite* 禅の道をたどり来て (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1958). Trevor Leggett selected and translated excerpts from *Zen no michi* that pertained to Zen practice, publishing them in Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen: Samurai, Feudal and Modern* (Rutland, Vt.: C. E. Tuttle), 1993. Elsewhere, I refer to a subsequent version of *Three Ages of Zen*, published in London by The Buddhist Society in 2017.

<sup>103</sup> For example, when Tsuji intensified his practice, going daily to Engakuji, “passing the nights alternately at home and at Engakuji,” Furukawa Gyōdō said, “You come here so often to see me. But are your children well cared for? Even the best medicine should be taken in moderation” (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 95).

a soldier in the Fifteen Years War and the time he spent, postwar, as a prisoner-of-war in Russian labor camps:

It seemed to me that Japan, after losing this war, would have no political or economic power, and the only contribution Japan could make to world culture would be in the field of Buddhism....I resolved then that if I should return, I would devote the remainder of my life to the cause of Buddhism.... “I do not begrudge my body or life for love of the Supreme Way,” says the Lotus Sutra, and indeed, unless there are some who are really to put the meaning of this verse into practice, the Supreme Way might easily die out.<sup>104</sup>

From his later standpoint, from which he wrote his autobiography, he felt better equipped to engage in this central mission—spreading the dharma—as a priest, and this was a prime motivator in his ordination.

For the most part, this dissertation focuses on lived Zen practice, from the perspective of the practitioners. To investigate thoroughly the dimension of *fukyo* will be another study altogether. Remaining questions for future research include the following: what was being spread—teachings, practice, ritual, ideology, or Japanese culture? If the typical modern lay Rinzai Zen group assembled in order to meditate, meet with the master, and hear the master’s exposition on dharma texts or teachings, what did it mean for people simply to respond to outreach or printed teachings simply by attending a talk or reading more? What did “spreading the teachings” mean for different people—for monks and established teachers to embarked on teaching tours (domestically and abroad, mostly in the colonies), and for their audiences “on the ground”? Given that there was a range of lay practitioners—e.g., running the gamut from those who once heard Shaku

---

<sup>104</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 116–117.

Sōen and other famous Rinzai priests give a talk (*kōza*, *hōwa*, or *teishō*), to those who regularly participated in *sesshin* and *sanzen*—did priests target the different audiences in different ways? It appears that Imakita did target these two audiences differently, but further research on his successors and their contemporaries is needed.<sup>105</sup>

Regardless of these open questions and the diversity of motives for “spreading the teachings,” however, it is clear that the one motivation not typically broadcasted was finances: for example, seeking to generate income for a temple, either directly or through cultivating longer-term relationships with prospective new participants or parishioners.

With regard to the economic dimension of disseminating Rinzai Zen teachings and bringing new lay practitioners to the temple, particularly in early Meiji, there are several questions: In lay Rinzai Zen’s earliest incarnations (e.g., Ryōbō-sha, c. 1875), what role did wealth play in prospective members’ interest in participating, on the one hand—e.g., if *zenkai* 禅会 like Ryōbō-sha served as an attractive meeting place for those of wealth and privilege—and leaders’ interest in offering those practice opportunities to the educated and well-heeled, on the other hand? Was broadening Rinzai temples’ parishes a significant motivation for opening “serious” Zen practice to a far broader population than those who previously had access to it, for prominent Rinzai masters who were open to teaching laypeople and for institutions that struggled financially following the loss of *danka* 檀家 income starting in the 1870s?

---

<sup>105</sup> Sawada notes that for the “masses,” Imakita recounted miraculous “karma tales” (*innen banashi* 因縁話) in order to engender faith. In contrast, Imakita encouraged intensive lay practice (e.g., in the forms of *sesshin* and *kōan* work) with his *koji* students (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 148).

At Engakuji, there was precedent for laypeople to play significant roles in financing new construction and providing other invaluable financial support. For example, according to Sawada's account of Engakuji in the early Meiji period, Imakita Kōsen had been very concerned with rebuilding the monastic *zendō*, Shōbōgendō 正法眼堂—more so, in fact, than with promoting Zen among the laity. Sawada describes how wealthy laypeople covered 40 percent of construction costs of this new meditation hall, which was completed in 1883.<sup>106</sup> Thus, at least in the early and mid-Meiji period, there is evidence that some masters cultivated a wealthy donor base—and replenished vital temple funds—by engaging in outreach and offering religious opportunities that were previously inaccessible to laypeople on a broad scale.

It is worth noting that in contrast to such outreach by monastic leaders, serious lay practitioners often took their own initiative when it came to spreading Zen practice, as well as embarking on—and funding—large projects in support of their practice; Sawada calls this “inreach” among lay practitioners, in contrast to “outreach.”<sup>107</sup> As I discuss in the next chapter, layman Iizuka Iwao worked with fellow laypeople and Engakuji

---

<sup>106</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 163–164. Sawada likens the relationship between early Meiji Engakuji and its wealthy patrons to the relationship between Zen temples and patrons during the Kamakura and Ashikaga periods, though she depicts the Meiji-era relationships as “more spontaneous.” Furthermore, she notes Engakuji's other large-scale fundraising efforts in the late 1880s. For example, “in 1885, after a large, expensive commemoration ceremony was held at the temple in honor of its founder, Engakuji established a lay society with the stated goal of enrolling a hundred thousand members and raising 15,000 yen within fifteen years” (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 164).

<sup>107</sup> According to Sawada's account, Imakita Kōsen had taken a relatively passive role with promoting lay Zen. The lay practitioners themselves, on the other hand, took more initiative: “...At Engakuji, the Rinzai lay outreach was more of an ‘inreach’ into the monastery by the *koji* and *zenshi* themselves” (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 162).

monastics in 1919–1920 to renovate Senbutsujō 選仏場—a meditation hall in the temple complex that had fallen into disuse and ruin—to be a lay-dedicated meditation space. He sought to generate enough funds to construct complete accommodations so that laypeople could practice at Engakuji, in their own meditation hall, even outside of *sesshin* or times that it was convenient for the monastics. His fundraising aspirations were modest, but he hoped for all practicing laypeople to contribute, rather than a few wealthy donors from outside. Here, Iizuka estimated that 100 or 150 yen (in any case, under 200 yen) total would be sufficient for achieving the basic repairs to Senbutsujō so that lay practitioners could use it as a meditation hall; and if further funds were raised, they would provide for maintenance, a long-term caretaker, and expanding the facilities. Moreover, Iizuka anticipates, collecting funds in the tremendous sum of 5000 or 10,000 yen would spur a great increase of *koji* and cause Engakuji to thrive.<sup>108</sup> In terms of sustaining funds, newly participating *koji* would contribute to these on a voluntary basis (as with donations for renovating Senbutsujō in the first place.<sup>109</sup> As discussed in chapter 3, Iizuka and his fellow lay practitioners seem to have been partly successful with their fundraising, as the meditation hall renovations were completed by 1920, although the other accommodations that they had sought to fund were not constructed at that time. With other special projects, too—such as rebuilding Engakuji’s lay training hall after it was destroyed in a 1926 fire—donations were solicited from new and seasoned members, as well as from people “sympathetic” to the Zen way.

---

<sup>108</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 38–39.

<sup>109</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 39.

The university Zen groups also funded their own activities, although it is unclear how much they actually expended, given their seemingly modest income. Nyoidan (Tokyo Higher Commercial School's Zen group) had a membership fee, whose maximum—circa the time of Nyoidan's founding in 1906—was about 20 *sen* 錢.<sup>110</sup> To put such membership donations into context, Nyoidan's membership fee at that time was somewhere between the cost of staying overnight at the inns near Engakuji (for laypeople seeking admission to Engakuji) and the donation that new students made to the *rōshi* upon doing *shōken* 相見 for the first time, or *shōkenryō* 相見料 (as discussed in the next chapter).<sup>111</sup>

Waseda University's Saiindan, on the other hand, had neither membership dues nor membership rules since its inception, according to alumnus Iizuka Shinjin; it was funded via subsidies from the Waseda University Student Affairs office and voluntary donations from alumni.<sup>112</sup> Iizuka Shinjin attributed Saiindan's lack of membership dues (and rules about membership) to Zen practitioners' mutual respect and their high regard

---

<sup>110</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan 一橋如意団, ed., *Tetsu nyoi* 鉄如意 (Tokyo: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1931), 240.

<sup>111</sup> Layman Mukyū-an Shujin 無休庵主人 stated that at Engakuji, c. 1900, the nightly cost at the inns ranged from 7–8 *sen* to 20 *sen*; and that *shōkenryō* 相見料 should exceed 50 *sen*; see Mukyū-an Shujin 無休庵主人, *Kamakura sanzen kochū no shōsoku* 鎌倉參禪個中の消息 (Tokyo: Tekka Shoin, 1900), 4. In 1920, Iizuka Iwao stated that *shōkenryō* should be 50 *sen* for students and 1 *yen* (100 *sen*) for others (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 11).

<sup>112</sup> Iizuka Shinjin 飯塚真人, “Daigaku no Zenkai: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan 大学の禅会 早稲田大学済蔭団,” *Zen bunka* 禅文化, no. 43 (1967), 42. It is not clear whether there is any relationship between Iizuka Shinjin—a Waseda college student as of 1967—and Iizuka Iwao, who probably was born well before the twentieth century. Thus far, I have not been able to locate more of Saiindan's early financial records; it is possible that these records—along with the name registers mentioned in the next chapter—were destroyed in the 1926 fire.

for individual autonomy.<sup>113</sup> Even if Iizuka Shinjin's interpretation is idealized and lacks solidity in its historicity, it seems from both Saiindan and Nyoidan alumni that—aside from raising funds for major projects (such as those in the 1920s that are described in the next chapter)—outreach was not a major component of the university Zen groups, and that the limited outreach in which they did engage was based strictly on practical needs, rather than religious dissemination.

### **2.3.3 Lay Zen and Print Culture**

With regard to disseminating Zen teachings, one of the most significant vehicles was modern Japanese print culture. The tremendous abundance of popular Zen literature (and popular Buddhist literature generally) was part and parcel of the modern Zen boom. In this case, print media played a functional role: for example, popular publications prescribed Zen practice and thus spurred and facilitated practice among the laity; and they made arcane classical Rinzai literature more understandable and accessible. Print media also played a descriptive role, providing accounts of Zen practice by monastics and lay practitioners alike, describing events that transpired, and so forth—and thus serve now as invaluable primary source material for understanding modern lay Rinzai Zen as it transformed, in real time.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> For the same reason, Iizuka Shinjin stated, Saiindan had a faculty advisor and a coordinator who was responsible for facilitating introductions and organizing activity, but no other leadership (Iizuka Shinjin, "Daigaku no zenkai," 42).

<sup>114</sup> Of course, as with any primary source material, these accounts must be seen as such—subjective accounts that are written through the lens of the authors' experiences and perspectives and may be promoting idealized or normative rhetoric or influenced by the trends or exigencies of the time, such as censorship and the pressure to espouse nationalist rhetoric in the 1930s, at least on the surface.

In 1920, Engakuji layman Iizuka Iwao recounted a conversation that he heard at a bookstore, shortly before publishing his book on lay practice at Engakuji. The speaker whom Iizuka overheard outlined three recent phases of trends in popular publications:

As for [books that are] being sold to great crowds, these had been publications related to *shūyō*, and in the middle period, books explaining the ways of health (*kenkōhō* 健康法) were popular, and then, until recent years, [books] indicating the ways of moneymaking reached their heyday. However, I have the feeling that nowadays, [these trends] have gradually died down.<sup>115</sup>

Iizuka affirmed that in the years leading up to 1920, publications relating to self-cultivation, health, and finances had been popular. However, he stated “it goes without saying” that popular media were in a transitional period, and he anticipated a move toward literature fostering deeper transformation—beyond health, wealth, and worldly success—that integrated knowledge (e.g., via academic study) and practice (e.g., through sincere Zen practice).<sup>116</sup>

Regardless of the overall emphasis, the topics and media themselves ranged broadly, and the volume was considerable. Below, I provide an overview of the media and content pertaining most closely to lay Rinzai practice. In short, the two most common media that are extant today are periodicals and books (e.g., monographs and edited compendia); they also include Zen groups’ publications, such as commemorative histories and newsletters. As for the books’ genres, these included—though were not limited—to the following: practice prescriptions from Rinzai masters and popular authors alike; collections of masters’ sermons (*teishō*) or less formal dharma talks; modern

---

<sup>115</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 48.

<sup>116</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 49–50.



interpretations of, or reprinted versions of, kōan collections and other classics; literature on Zen-style self-cultivation (e.g., “Zen and Health,” “Zen and Self-Cultivation,” etc.); hagiographies of masters (both modern, as with Shaku Sōen, and early modern, such as Hakuin); and autobiographies and Zen practice accounts by monastics and laypeople alike. Popular publishers included, for example, Kōyūkan 光融館, which published Iizuka Iwao’s book and many other popular Zen books in the first two decades of the twentieth century, such as books by Katsumine Daitetsu and Shaku Sōen, and Chūō Bukkyōsha 中央仏教社, which published several works by Iida Tōin.<sup>117</sup> Such publishers regularly placed advertisements for new books in journals like *Zendō* and *Daijōzen*. It is difficult to overstate the volume of Zen-related books and journals produced during this time, which attests to lay Rinzai (and Zen) as a relatively common phenomenon in modern Japan.<sup>118</sup>

With regard to such books, dozens of such examples are referenced through the pages of this dissertation. Additional examples—in the genre of practice accounts by Rinzai monastics and lay practitioners—include the autobiographical account by Rinzai monk and author Miyajima Sukeo 宮島資夫 (1886–1951) entitled, *Born into Zen* (*Zen ni*

---

<sup>117</sup> Publication information also suggests that many books were self-published, either by individuals (perhaps patrons) or institutions like temples.

<sup>118</sup> For example, in the Komazawa University 駒澤大学 library alone, there were more than 390 books with the “H190” classification (designating popular Zen literature) published between 1893 and 1945. Here, a few caveats should be made: first, this list is incomplete, as there were some Zen-related books categorized with other classifications (e.g., there may have been self-cultivation-related books that included but were not primarily centered on Zen in the H475 section, which focuses on self-cultivation). Additionally, this list only includes books with Western-style binding (e.g., case binding), whereas Zen-centered books with Japanese-style binding (e.g., edge-stitch binding) were stored elsewhere. Finally, the list includes a few duplicates in instances of reprinting.

*ikuru* 禅に生くる), which was published in 1932.<sup>119</sup> The book is largely a memoir, in which Miyajima describes many facets of life and practice in the monks' hall, through the lens of his experience (e.g., at the temple Tenryūji 天龍寺, where he practiced early on). Topics include lay Zen (in the period prior to his ordination), ordination, *teishō*, *takuhatsu* 托鉢 (Zen-style begging), eating, *sesshin* (including the notorious *Rōhatsu sesshin*), and so forth).<sup>120</sup> He includes many qualitative descriptors such as the necessity, in Zen, of practicing with great courage—although he laments that his own will is weak.<sup>121</sup>

Reflecting a lay perspective, poet Takahashi Shinkichi 高橋新吉 (1901–1987) published his account of Zen, entitled *Miscellaneous Writings About Zen* (*Sanzen zuihitsu* 参禅随筆), in 1958; here, he includes a “*sanzen* record (*sanzenki* 参禅記)” and recounts early practice experiences, such as his work on the “one hand” *kōan*.<sup>122</sup> These include his experiences at Mineo Daikyū's monastic training hall in Tokyo, Heirinji 平林寺, as well

---

<sup>119</sup> Miyajima Sukeo 宮島資夫, *Zen ni ikuru* 禅に生くる (Tokyo: Daikyūkaku 大雄閣, 1932). Note: this was the tenth printing of the book. I have been unable to confirm publication information for the first edition. The earliest edition in CiNii is this edition from 1932.

<sup>120</sup> Similarly, there were many articles published in the periodicals around this time about monks' daily life (*unsui seikatsu* 雲水生活), suggesting a curiosity among lay practitioners to know what this was like. For an example of a book in this genre, see Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, to which I refer throughout this dissertation. It should be noted that Suzuki's account is idealized and likely oversimplified. However, it is valuable as a primary source document (e.g., in reflecting the attributes of monastic life from the perspective of a serious lay practitioner, and for what it reflects about the particular structures of Engakuji monastic life c. 1930, many of which are corroborated by other accounts).

<sup>121</sup> Miyajima, *Zen ni ikuru*, 51. 「...禅家の修業にあつては、更に一層猛然なものがなければならぬとも自分では考へたのである。」

<sup>122</sup> Takahashi Shinkichi 高橋新吉, *Sanzen zuihitsu* 参禅随筆 (Tokyo: Hōbunkan 宝文館, 1958).

as his childhood memories connected to Nishiyama Kasan 西山禾山 (1837 or 1838–1917), who was the *jūshoku* of one of Takahashi’s hometown temples (alongside being a pioneering teacher of laypeople). Takahashi’s work is particularly reminiscent of the “*zuihitsu* 随筆” genre, which, as Rachel DiNitto notes, made a comeback in prewar Japan.<sup>123</sup>

At the same time, there were increasing numbers of periodicals geared toward lay audiences; a partial list of relevant Zen-related periodicals is included with the bibliography to this dissertation. These journals, which were not all published continuously over long periods of time, varied considerably in perspective and target audience. Some were pan-Buddhist (e.g., *Daihōrin* 大法輪, 1934–present), and others were sect-specific (some leaned more heavily toward either the Rinzai or the Sōtō school): Zen-centered journals included the aforementioned *Zendō* 禪道 (1910–1923) and *Daijōzen* 大乘禪 (1924–present), as well as *Zen* 禪 (1900–1901), *Zenshū* 禪宗 (1894–1921), and *Zengaku* 禪學 (1895–1900). While many of these were geared toward a lay audience, other journals were produced by and for clerics, such as the aforementioned *Shōhōrin* 正法輪 (1891–present), associated with the Myōshinji branch of Rinzai Zen.

As mentioned numerous times above, my research on modern lay Rinzai draws most heavily on *Zendō* and *Daijōzen*; here, I discuss the former in more detail. *Zendō*—literally, the “Way of Zen”—was published monthly for roughly thirteen years, from

---

<sup>123</sup> Rachel DiNitto, “Return of the ‘Zuihitsu’: Print Culture, Modern Life, and Heterogeneous Narrative in Prewar Japan,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 64, no. 2 (2004): 251–90.

August of 1910 until August of 1923: thirteen years which saw tremendous growth in the scale of Rinzai-style Zen practice.<sup>124</sup> With Shaku Sōen as president of Zendōkai 禪道會 (the organization that published *Zendō*) and D. T. Suzuki as the journal's managing editor, *Zendō* tended to focus on Rinzai Zen; the majority of activities profiled in *Zendō* were connected directly with Rinzai institutions or with leaders sanctioned by Rinzai institutions. Given Sōen's and Suzuki's relationship with Engakuji, many of the activities and leaders profiled or contributing to *Zendō* also had some relationship with Engakuji or the Kamakura-Tokyo area, particularly in the journal's early years. However, authors also comprised Sōtō priests and Buddhist studies professors; and notices appeared for events beyond Tokyo, such as in Kyoto and, increasingly, elsewhere in Japan.

The journal's goals, as Shaku Sōen describes them in the first issue, centered on supporting Zen practice: first, to illustrate Zen's distinctiveness vis-à-vis other sects; second, to help awaken the "faith-mind" (*shinjin* 信心) in those who do not already have faith, or who mistake Zen for a science or philosophy; third, to Zen practitioners "remedy the ways in which their knowledge and perception are small" or limited; fourth, to show how awakening to one's nature (or "seeing the nature," *kenshō* 見性) stems from great doubt and great faith; and fifth, to help readers apply Zen to their daily lives.<sup>125</sup> Topics and authorship in *Zendō* ranged widely, although many of the names that resurface in the dissertation (e.g., D. T. Suzuki and Tokyo-area Rinzai masters) were also frequent

---

<sup>124</sup> There were a few years that saw eleven, and not twelve, issues of *Zendō*. *Zendō*'s last issue was published just before the Great Kantō earthquake of 1923.

<sup>125</sup> *Zendō*, no. 1 (August 1910), 2–8.

contributors. Articles ranged from edited transcripts of Sōen's sermons (e.g., on the *Hekiganroku* and the Ten Ox-herding Pictures) to scholarly expositions of classical Chan (Zen) records; from anecdotes and obituaries of contemporary masters to accounts of practice by ordinary practitioners; and from discussions of the social role of spiritual self-cultivation (精神修養) to discussions on Zen and Japanese culture.

In addition to talking about Zen practice, *Zendō* also helped readers find their way to practice sites: each issue enumerated upcoming Zen activities (e.g., the following month's *zazenkai* and ceremonies at numerous parish temples, training monasteries, and other venues) and provided reports about notable activities past. The latter reports frequently came with considerable details, such as dates, times, places, lecture topics, and sometimes the names and numbers of attendees. It is therefore easy to imagine that *Zendō* and other publications both reflected and contributed to Zen's growth during this time as another form of "spreading the teachings."

## **2.4 Conclusion: Democratization or Popularization?**

Layman Iizuka Iwao's clear view, accompanying his snapshot of lay practice at Engakuji in 1920, is one of democratized practice: in other words, Japanese people from diverse walks of life practicing Zen together, transcending historical divisions and discrimination based on social class. He observes that at Engakuji, "military personnel, politicians, bureaucrats, and others with social status are not few [in number], but young working people and students make up the majority" of *koji* who come to the temple, stay

at Engakuji's sub-temples, and practice Zen "fervently."<sup>126</sup> Moreover, there are artists and educators, young and old, rich and poor.<sup>127</sup> Iizuka contrasts this Taishō-era Zen world that is relatively devoid of rank—in which a layperson does not ask other *koji* if they are senior practitioners or new practitioners, and there is harmony among people born into different social strata—with previous periods in which discrimination based on one's birth status was "extreme."<sup>128</sup>

Iizuka's description of equal-opportunity practice resonates with Zen doctrinal ideals and the rhetoric of soteriological equality: that is, from the vantage point of ultimate reality, we all have buddha nature and, moreover, are fundamentally capable of realizing this.<sup>129</sup> However, as we know from the history of Buddhism (and Rinzai Zen) in premodern and modern Japan, there can be a considerable gap between doctrinal ideals and practiced reality, particularly when it comes to women and historically marginalized groups. Thus, we must ask two related questions: first, what were the demographics of modern lay Rinzai Zen, and how did they change in the period from 1868 until 1945? Did the audience broaden in line with the ideals expressed by Iizuka and others, coming to include large swaths of society beyond the Tokyo-area social elites? Secondly, to what degree did modern lay Rinzai truly become accessible to, and practiced by, the "masses"?

---

<sup>126</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 40–41.

<sup>127</sup> With regard to gender, Iizuka does not specifically address women's Zen practice at Engakuji, although he refers to aspirations to build a dorm for women in the future. This suggests that there were enough women practicing to warrant such quarters (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 35).

<sup>128</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 27, 40–41.

<sup>129</sup> This "rhetoric of equality" is further discussed in chapter 5. In short, it refers to the common (although not universally held) East Asian Mahāyāna Buddhist notion that that from the ultimate perspective of enlightenment, distinctions such as those based on gender are transcended and are, moreover, irrelevant. By this token, any person can practice and become enlightened.

As discussed above, early Meiji lay Zen at Engakuji—at that time, a relatively small, though expanding, community of practitioners—centered squarely on members of the social and political elite, as Sawada has established. By the Taishō era, the number of lay Rinzai groups, practitioners, and publications had expanded exponentially. With regard to the question of broadening the practitioner base, the short answer is that the lay Rinzai community of practitioners continued to comprise, disproportionately, men and members of the social elite. In other words, those who pursued Rinzai-style Zen practice—participating in half-day or weeklong meditation intensives, pursuing kōan practice under the one-on-one guidance of a rōshi, and so forth—continued to be overwhelmingly male, educated, and of relatively elite socio-economic status (defined here as middle-class or above).

The latter description certainly, and unsurprisingly, applies to the university student contingent, who played clearly prominent and significant roles in lay Rinzai's popularization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>130</sup> We should be cautious in assuming that the student groups' prominence and significance in the modern lay Rinzai movement means that they are representative of all of the lay people who, in modern Japan, were attracted to Rinzai Zen to one degree or another and engaged in one way or another. It is further worth noting that the university student groups that were

---

<sup>130</sup> Their prominence and significance were evident through the groups' own documentation and popular Buddhist journals (which noted the groups' widespread activities), through the initiative that many members took in expanding lay practitioners' opportunities at Engakuji and elsewhere, and through the groups' endurance over time. Regarding the latter point, it is worth noting that the membership of many if not most groups—both student and for the general lay Zen population—ebbed and flowed, and some groups stopped meeting for a time (e.g., after the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923 or after the groups' master died), only to be revived later.

affiliated with Engakuji were not only institutions of higher education—which, inherently, renders their students as part of the educated elite—but also among the most prestigious of Tokyo’s universities: Tokyo Higher Commercial School (now known as Hitotsubashi), Tokyo Imperial University (now Tokyo University) Keiō University, Waseda University, and eventually Gakushūin University. These universities produced graduates who went on to become government leaders and prominent members of other sectors of society, so in a pool of Rinzai Zen practitioners that already tended toward being elite, these students were especially so.

To understand how, and why, such demographic trends continued from early Meiji, onward into Taishō and early Shōwa Japan, we must examine two key historical conditions: first, Buddhist (and Zen) temples’ early Meiji disenfranchisement, and how the dire financial straits that most temples faced prompted some temples to cultivate new donor bases; and, second, the rapid expansion of the middle and upper classes in modern Japan, as new elites (e.g., the growing number of university graduates and other Meiji-era “new middle class” groups examined by David Ambaras such as government officials, educators, and so forth) joined the old elites.<sup>131</sup> Thus, the expansion of the potential donor

---

<sup>131</sup> David R. Ambaras, “Social Knowledge, Cultural Capital, and the New Middle Class in Japan, 1895–1912,” *Journal of Japanese Studies* 24, no. 1 (1998): 1–33. With regard to many Buddhist temples’ early Meiji financial situation, beyond the explicit persecution of *haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈, Buddhist institutions paid a steep price as a result of early Meiji state policy. Having lost state patronage and special status (and privileges), many temples were plunged into poverty. Hardacre posits that more temples were closed in early Meiji due to poverty than directly due to the “abolish Buddhism and destroy Śākyamuni” (*haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈) movement; see Helen Hardacre, *Religion and Society in Nineteenth-Century Japan: A Study of the Southern Kantō Region, Using Late Edo and Early Meiji Gazetteers* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002). For example, when Katsumine Daitetsu served as chief



base—discussed above—coincided with the rise of Zen-style self-cultivation practices, which were generally congruent with the needs of Japan’s new urban intellectuals; Ambaras describes the latter group as being influenced by Western models of education and “inherited traditions that stressed the importance of intellectual and moral cultivation geared to public serve and improvement of people’s lives.”<sup>132</sup> As an additional point of attraction for new members of the middle class, both Zen assemblies (*zenkai* 禅会) and “way of the sword” (*kendō* 剣道) training halls provided opportunities for “performing class status” and thereby gaining social capital by rubbing shoulders with the old elite or others of higher status.<sup>133</sup>

Knowing these historical factors thus helps to illuminate the appeal of lay Zen to Japan’s new urban middle classes (and elites, new and old) in modern Japan—in other words, why lay Rinzai skewed toward people of privilege. Additionally, there are gender factors (such as modern Rinzai Zen’s androcentrism, to be discussed in chapter 5) and religious factors (such as *kōan* practice and Zen’s rigorous training methods, which D. T.

---

abbot of the large Rinzai complex Nanzenji in Kyoto c. 1886–1890, the temple was so impoverished that, reportedly, it was forced to sell its treasures at pawnshops. Katsumine was celebrated for, among other things, restoring those treasures and financial stability (Enomoto, “*Meiji Zenkai iketsu*,” 9).

<sup>132</sup> Ambaras, “Social Knowledge,” 8. Ambaras elucidates central themes common to post-1895 rhetoric on the middle class: for example, “emphasis on knowledge, moderate means, and the ability of a certain group to enlighten and lead through its virtues and lifestyle” (Ambaras, “Social Knowledge,” 8).

<sup>133</sup> Thanks to Jeff Wilson both for coining the concept, “performing class status,” and discussing with me this dimension of lay Rinzai’s popularization.

Suzuki took to be inherently elite) at play.<sup>134</sup> Together, these factors contribute to the limitations of lay Rinzai's popularization in modern Japan and explain how, despite the increased accessibility of Rinzai Zen practice (previously the prerogative of monastics), lay Rinzai became popularized but not fully democratized.

---

<sup>134</sup> For example, D. T. Suzuki at various points addressed the elite dimension of Zen (namely, of kōan Zen or Rinzai Zen). Here, in the context of masters' harsh words with disciples, and the trust required in such a relationship, Suzuki explains: "Wording may be quite frequently strong and impatient, but this is the way with the Zen master, who only wants to attract such souls as do not break down under his training staff. Zen is by no means a democratic religion. It is in essence meant for the elite" (Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, "The Secret Message of Bodhidharma, or the Content of Zen Experience" in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 44). Later, Suzuki expressed similar sentiments: "Naturally, there are not many graduates of the Zendo life, and this is indeed in the very nature of Zen; for Zen is meant for the *élite*, for specially gifted minds, and not for the masses. This has been the case since olden days, but especially it is true in this modern age when democracy is the ruling spirit in all the departments of human life" (Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 114).

### 3. Against the Grain of “No-Good Youth”: The Emergence and Development of University Zen Groups

#### 3.1 Introduction

Much of this chapter is descriptive: depicting the phenomenon of the emergence and development of university student Zen groups affiliated with Engakuji: the groups’ formation and history following the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905), as well as their roles both in the lay community at Engakuji and in the broader “Zen boom” of late Meiji and early Taishō Japan, which was sketched out in the chapter 2. I emphasize two university groups, Hitotsubashi University’s Nyoidan 如意団 and Waseda University’s Saiindan 済蔭団. These groups are the two oldest of Engakuji’s student affiliate groups, and historically among the most active; they have also sustained their groups amidst the ebbs and flows of the twentieth century and are still active today, with carefully documented histories.<sup>1</sup>

The second primary goal of this chapter is to depict the “who”: that is, who was participating in these groups and the degree to which they represented their respective generations. To the extent possible, I examine the demographics (and demographic changes) of the practitioners who practiced with the student groups and at Engakuji more

---

<sup>1</sup> With regard to university names, as with many Japanese universities, Hitotsubashi University has undergone multiple name changes since its initial founding in 1875. The following names appear in Nyoidan’s group histories: Tokyo Higher Commercial School (Tōkyō Kōtō Shōgyō Gakkō, 東京高等商業学校), which the school was called from 1902–1920; and Tokyo University of Commerce (Tōkyō Shōka Daigaku 東京商科大学), by which the university was known for most of the years between 1920 and 1949, when it was renamed to Hitotsubashi. For historical accuracy, I use the names as the students did.

generally: their age, gender, occupation, affiliation (e.g., with a university), hometown, and other background information. The data are fragmentary but, taken together, suggest trends among practitioners that help us understand a number of facets of the modern lay Rinzai practicing community, as well as the social and historical factors that prompted (or were reinforced by) an affinity between lay Rinzai Zen and laypeople of various demographics. The demographic trends also indicate the degree to which lay Rinzai Zen practice was actually popularized: in other words, whether it became a fully democratized mass religious movement, remained the territory of Japan's elite, or transformed into a movement somewhere in between those two extremes.

By painting a portrait of the groups' histories and who was attracted—and motivated to contribute their lifeblood—to lay Zen practice, I lay the groundwork for the next chapter, which sheds light on the groups' main activities and how lay Rinzai Zen practice transformed in the modern period.

## ***3.2 Portrait of a Phenomenon: The Emergence and Development of University Zen Groups***

### **3.2.1 Background: Student Zen Boom (Early 1900s)**

Reflecting the era's Zen boom, one of Nyoidan's early members, Ōta Tetsuzō 太田哲三 gestures to the relationship between “student Zen” and popular culture: “...it was the era when the protagonist in Morita Sōhei's *Smoke* was active, and student Zen (*gakusei Zen* 学生禅) became a kind of fad (*ryūkō* 流行)....”<sup>2</sup> Here, Ōta is suggesting not

---

<sup>2</sup> From “*Shinjō rōshi to watashi* 真浄老師と私 (Shinjō Rōshi and Me),” in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan,

only that Zen had become “faddish” among students—popular, yet perhaps with a transient quality to its appeal—but also that there was a close relationship between Zen and popular culture. The nature of this relationship is not clear, but in referring to Morita—and, by extension, Hiratsuka Raichō (pioneering feminist and Zen practitioner who practiced alongside Nyoidan members circa 1906)—Ōta is implying either that Morita’s novel reflects a popular interest in Zen, or that the novel, with its incendiary content, somehow played a role in Zen’s trendiness. Ōta is not alone in alluding to this relationship between popular literature and the students’ Zen practice world, as alumnus Katsuki Tamotsu 香月保 (who graduated from Tokyo University of Commerce in 1923) also mentions Morita and *Smoke* in the context of Kaizenji—one of Nyoidan’s early practice sites—when Morita’s alter ego visits Raichō there.

How did the doors of Rinzai training open to Japan’s youth and popular culture by the 1910s, when laypeople at Engakuji were scarce (and extremely elite) even thirty years prior to that? Although the youthful demographic may not have been the first characteristic noted about the earliest generation of lay Zen at Engakuji (in the 1870s and 1880s), the elite lay community of that era featured a significant youthful presence

---

*Tetsu nyoī*, 1931, 271. Ōta Tetsuzō graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1911; he should not be confused with Engakuji abbot Ōta Maigan 太田晦巖 (1876–1946), who served as one of Nyoidan’s leaders. Of the genealogy of the term “fad” or “trend” (*ryūkō* 流行) in Meiji-era Japan, see Jason G. Karlin, *Gender and Nation in Meiji Japan: Modernity, Loss, and the Doing of History* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2014), 1–6. Morita Sōhei 森田草平 (1881–1949) was a famous Japanese novelist. His autobiographical novel *Smoke* (*Baien* 煤煙, published in 1909) featured, among other things, an account of his affair with Hiratsuka in 1908 and the scandal of their attempted double-suicide. Hiratsuka, discussed later in this chapter, had practiced Zen alongside Nyoidan members at Kaizenji, one of the group’s main practiced sites.

among both practitioners and leadership. For example, D.T. Suzuki started practicing under Imakita Kōsen in 1891, at the age of twenty-one, and Suzuki's master, Shaku Sōen, was only thirty-two when he first became abbot of Engakuji following Imakita's death in 1892.<sup>3</sup>

As mentioned in chapter 2, the Rinzai lay movement gained steam during the 1890s and earliest years of the twentieth century, with practice at Engakuji expanding and groups like Kōzen Gokokukai emerging in the Tokyo area. Even in those early decades of Japan's lay "Zen boom," young people and students were among the practitioners joining together for *zazenkai* and Zen-related lectures across the Kantō region. At that time, organized events and groups that were designated for young people were far and few between; however, this was changing by the end of the Meiji era, by which point students and youth constituted a visible and significant part of an increasing number of groups, even forming their own groups and organizing student-centered events. In early 1911, an announcement in the monthly periodical *Zendō* entitled "Students' Rinzai Zen" reports on the "flourishing" of Rinzai lay assemblies generally, as well as on students' vigorous participation: vigorous in terms of their great numbers and their fervent striving in practice:

---

<sup>3</sup> Engakuji, ed., *Shaku Sōen to kindai nihon: wakaki Zensō, sekai o kakeru: Shaku Sōen onki hyakunen kinen tokubetsu ten* 釈宗演と近代日本：若き禅僧、世界を駆ける：釈宗演遠諱100年記念特別展 (Kamakura, Japan: Engakuji, 2018), 215. On the other hand, Sōen's youth and precociousness were highly unusual, and the vast majority of Rinzai dharma heirs, sanctioned teachers, and priests at the highest echelon were older—in fact, it was not unusual to see priests becoming chief abbot (*kanchō* 管長) of their respective Rinzai branches in their seventies or eighties. For example, Mineo Daikyū 峰尾大休 (1860–1954)—Sōen's contemporary who also trained under Imakita Kōsen and is discussed further in chapter 5—became *kanchō* of the Myōshinji branch in 1937, at the age of 78 (Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 23).

Recently, with the eminent Rinzai monks Sōen, Sōkatsu, Sōkai, Daikyū, and Shinjō at the center, all of the [various] Zen assemblies are flourishing increasingly; in particular, student Zen practitioners' great number has been rising; at a glance, [we see that] at Zeshō'an, Kenshōkai 見性会 was formed by Tokyo Imperial University students; at Kaizenji, Tesshinkai 徹心会 largely came into being through Tokyo Higher Commercial School [Hitotsubashi] students; at Hakusan Dōjō 白山道場, [in the group] Jissenkai 実践会 and at the lectures held by Zendōkai at Kifukuji 喜福寺 in front of the red gate, too, students make up an extremely large number; some of them also stay on the temple grounds, commuting to school, and fervently striving in their sesshin practice; among Tokyo Imperial University students who practice Zen, the greatest number are in the faculty of medicine, and next [i.e., the second-largest number] are those in the faculty of law; at any rate, even while students usually drift along frivolously, today there are also young people everywhere who are exerting effort in this type of genuine and astonishing spiritual self-cultivation [*shinkyō naru seishinteki shūyō* 真驚なる精神的修養]; we should say confidently that [this situation] is satisfying.<sup>4</sup>

This author's mention of certain teachers—i.e., as the central ones who focused on teaching students and youth—is congruent with contemporaneous sources that indicate these teachers' active Zen dissemination through a variety of means: leading local groups (often numerous), visiting temples to give lectures and *sanzen* (often in other cities), and frequently publishing Zen-related works that were aimed at popular audiences. Moreover, all of the teachers mentioned here were known generally for teaching lay people (not only young lay people) in the Kantō region.

---

<sup>4</sup> “*Gakusei no rinzai Zen* 学生の臨濟禪,” *Zendō*, number 7 (Feb. 1911), 55. “Zeshō'an” is likely a typo; the author probably is referring to Myōshinji branch temple Zeshō'in 是照院 in Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, at which lay-centered events regularly took place. The red gate (*akamon* 赤門) referred to here was built in 1827 and became the main—and emblematic—gate at Tokyo University.

Of this group, Shaku Sōen (1860–1919) was the unsurpassable giant (and, by far, the most famous of the bunch), but the others listed here also contributed greatly to lay Zen (and student lay Zen) in the Tokyo region. For example, Sōen’s dharma heir Shaku Sōkatsu 釈宗活 (1871–1954) had founded the lay group Ryōbō-kai 両忘会 in 1901.<sup>5</sup> Miyaji Sōkai 宮路宗海 (1857–1923) and Mineo Daikyū 峰尾大休 (1860–1954), both of whom had trained under Imakita Kōsen, each served as the master (*shike* 師家) of several Tokyo-area lay groups, including Kōzen Gokokukai.<sup>6</sup> Miyaji Sōkai had also been one of Nyōidan’s leaders, as was Sakagami Shinjō 坂上真浄 (1842–1914), although Shinjō—the oldest of the group mentioned here—passed away suddenly within a decade of the group’s founding.

---

<sup>5</sup> Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 75. As Joskovich shows, Ryōbō-kai took inspiration from the lay group led by Imakita Kōsen, Ryōbō-sha 両忘社, that was active from 1875 until around 1893 (Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 65–66; also see Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 144–165). Ryōbō-kai, whose name changed a couple times (to Ryōbō-kyōkai 両忘協会 in 1925 and to Ryōbōzen-kyōkai 両忘禅協会 following the Pacific War), formally was “terminated” in 1947 but was revived soon thereafter and renamed Ningen Zen Kyōdan 人間禅教団 under the leadership of Shaku Sōkatsu’s successor Tatsuta Eizan 立田英山 (1893–1979; see Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 77–79, 84–85). Like Shaku Sōen, Shaku Sōkatsu had trained under Imakita Kōsen before the latter’s death and had apparently finished his Rinzai training at a very young age. According to Sōkatsu’s dharma heir, Shigetsu Sasaki, “Sokatsu Shaku was barely twenty-nine when he finished his Zen”; see Shigetsu Sasaki Roshi, “On Sokatsu Shaku Roshi,” *Wind Bell*, vol. 8, nos. 1–2 (Fall 1969), 10.

<sup>6</sup> Miyaji Sōkai (1857–1923) had trained under Imakita Kōsen but, amidst controversy (and his role in what Sawada calls a “monastic mutiny”) left Engakuji and completed his training under Ogino Dokuon (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 139; also see Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 190). Eventually Miyaji returned to Engakuji, succeeding Sōen as Engakuji’s chief abbot in 1905 (Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 19). Also see Tamamura Takeji 玉村竹二 and Inoue Zenjō 井上禅定, *Engakuji-shi* 圓覺寺史 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1964), 782. Mineo Daikyū also trained under Imakita Kōsen, and he completed his training under Sōen upon Imakita’s death. According to Kōzen Gokokukai, he received *inka shōmei* from Sōen in 1895, at the age of 36, then later became chief abbot of the Myōshinji branch (at age 78) and chief abbot of the whole Rinzai sect (from ages 82–84; Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002, 23).



With the exception of Shinjō, these masters were roughly in the same generation as one another—born within eleven years of each other—and all trained under Imakita Kōsen at Engakuji. These teachers’ connection is no coincidence, given Imakita’s dedication and pioneering role training lay disciples, and it does not indicate that Engakuji was the sole center of lay Zen. However, the centrality of Engakuji-trained masters in university students’ Zen training and organizations points to Engakuji’s continued significance for lay Rinzai practice in the early decades of the twentieth century, both within and beyond its walls. Layman Iizuka Iwao, whose detailed pamphlet about lay practice at Engakuji provides much insight into lay Rinzai circa 1920, notes that the circumstances for lay practice at Engakuji (the protocol for beginning practice, what sort of practice opportunities exist, how to practice, and so forth) are similar at other Zen temples with a training hall, such as Kamakura’s Kenchōji or certain Kyoto-area temples.<sup>7</sup> However, Iizuka also affirms that “Engakuji is out of the ordinary [vis-à-vis Rinzai training halls] in having established a hall for *koji*.”<sup>8</sup>

Thus, during the years leading up to the 1911 *Zendō* article, the lay practicing community—and the practice opportunities open to them—expanded, not only for students but also for practitioners of varied demographics (to be discussed later in this chapter). At this point, there was not yet a designated training hall for lay people at Engakuji, nor were there many *sesshin* (meditation intensives) just for lay people. This meant that lay practice at Engakuji tended to be somewhat free-flowing: a combination of

---

<sup>7</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 45.

<sup>8</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 6.

formal and informal practice that varied according to the students' initiative, teachers' availability, and institutional willingness. For example, students and other laypeople with significant practice experience occasionally participated in *sesshin* in the monks' hall alongside training monks. For example, a Nyoidan "diary" (*nisshi* 日誌) from 1916 mentions five "fierce ones" (*mōza* 猛者)—that is, university students—who participated in a weeklong *sesshin* in the monks' hall, following a monastic schedule that included a 2:30 am wakeup and 10:00 pm bedtime.<sup>9</sup>

As an alternative to monastic *sesshin*, laypeople requested permission to stay in one of Engakuji's many sub-temples, or *tatchū* 塔頭, while maintaining a schedule of *zazen* and doing *sanzen* (meeting privately with the *rōshi*) when it was offered.<sup>10</sup> Sawada describes the limited, unofficial lay use of the monastic *zendō* at Engakuji in the early Meiji period and how the *tatchū* Shōden'an 正伝庵 became the de facto lay *zendō* during Imakita Kōsen's time as abbot, from 1877 onward, known as Takubokuen 擇木園.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 174–175. This *sesshin* took place from July 20–27, 1916.

<sup>10</sup> For example, Mōtōra Yūjirō 元良勇次郎 (1858–1912) stayed in the *tatchū* Kigen'in 帰源院 during his week practicing at Engakuji in 1894; see Mōtōra Yūjirō 元良勇次郎, "Sanzen nisshi 参禅日誌," in vol. 6 of *Mōtōra Yūjirō Chosakushū* 元良勇次郎著作集 (Tokyo: Kress Shuppan, 2014), 349; originally published as Mōtōra Yūjirō 元良勇次郎, "Sanzen nisshi 参禅日誌," *Nihon shūkyō* 日本宗教, vol. 1, no. 2 (1895): 91–94. Joskovich notes that Shaku Sōkatsu instructed laypeople at Kigen'in in the 1890s (Joskovich, "Laypeople Zen," 73–74). As is discussed in chapter 4 and later in this chapter, primary sources abound with examples of laypeople staying in numerous Engakuji *tatchū* in the early decades of the twentieth century, particularly before laypeople had a designated temple on Engakuji's grounds.

<sup>11</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 161–162. Sawada quotes Imakita Kōsen's biography, which says that the "Tokyo *koji* borrowed Shōden'an, named it Takuboku-en, and applied themselves to Zen practice"; see Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 and Hōjō Tokiyoshi 北条時敬, eds., *Sōryūkutsu nenpu* 蒼竜窟年譜 (Tokyo: Ōkura Yasugorō, 1894), 15.

However, Shōden'an did not serve as the exclusive lay *zendō* in an enduring way, as we will see—in this chapter and the next—through the accounts of numerous laypeople sitting in various Engakuji *tatchū*, such as the following: Kigen'in 帰源院, Nyoi'an 如意庵, Denshūan 傳宗庵, Shōrei'in 松嶺院, Unchō'an 雲頂庵, or Saiin'an 済蔭庵, later known as Kojirin 居士林.

Longtime Engakuji abbot and leader of student groups, Asahina Sōgen 朝比奈宗源 (1891–1979), who “hung up his robe” (that is, started training) at Engakuji's monastic hall in 1917, affirms that laypeople practiced at Engakuji in these different capacities. According to his reminiscence, laypeople piled into the monastic hall during *sesshin*; and during practice periods outside of *sesshin* (*sanrōchū* 参籠中), they followed the same rules and guidelines as present-day Kojirin. During yet other times (that is, neither during monastic *sesshin* nor during lay practice periods), one or two laypeople might be staying (for longer, less formal practice) in various Engakuji sub-temples.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, as per the description above of students “staying on the temple grounds, commuting to school, and fervently striving in their *sesshin* practice,” the accounts of young people practicing during this time indicate both informal and formal practice. For example, Nyoidan alumni like Uhara Yoshitoyo 宇原義豊 (who was born 1885 and graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1911) practiced in multiple spaces:

---

<sup>12</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan 早稲田大学済蔭団, *Saiin: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan Sōritsu 45 shūnen kinenshi* 済蔭: 早稲田大学済蔭団創立四十五周年記念誌 (Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, 1967), 1. Note that “present-day Kojirin” refers to the time Asahina wrote his account—that is, in 1967.

he participated in the monthly sesshin at Kaizenji in Asakusa, Tokyo, and in occasional sesshin in the Engakuji monks' hall (*sōdō* 僧堂); he also did practice intensives in Engakuji's sub-temples (for example, at Denshūan, Takubokuen, and Shōrei'in).<sup>13</sup>

Uhara's classmate, Nyoidan alumnus Mogi Tomokazu 茂木知二, also comments on the free-flowing nature of the group during his time practicing with them in the group's early days:

Nyoidan wasn't a [group] with rigidly defined membership; rather, people became members when joining together for sesshin. Sesshin was held at Engakuji in the summer, and otherwise mainly at Kaizenji; and at the end of the summer at Engakuji, people went to Seikenji; also, other than the monthly [meetings at] Kaizenji, people did Miyaji Sōkai Rōshi's sesshin at Hakusan.<sup>14</sup>

Mogi's account also shows that gaining access to, and practicing in, the monks' hall as a layperson was not guaranteed: initially, he was denied permission to practice Zen in the

---

<sup>13</sup> Uhara recalled: "In Tokyo, at Kaizenji, there was a one-week-long sesshin every month; though during the winter and summer breaks, I went to practice (*sanrō* 参籠) in Engakuji's *tatchū*. I stayed in places like Denshūan, Takubokuen, and Shōrei'in, and also entered the monks' hall" (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 264). Most likely, *sanrō* 参籠—which, historically, has meant visiting, then secluding oneself inside, a temple or shrine in order to pray—encompasses a range of structures and schedules, from semi-formal (e.g., following Kojirin guidelines, per Asahina's explanation) to informal practice intensives (e.g., maintaining one's own zazen schedule while staying in the sub-temple).

<sup>14</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 276. Mogi Tomokazu (1889–1960) graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1912. As mentioned above, Miyaji Sōkai regularly taught lay students in multiple settings; one of these was Hakusan Dōjō 白山道場 at Ryūin'in 龍雲院 in Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo. Hakusan Dōjō was, beside Kōzen Gokokukai, another early lay Rinzai assembly in Tokyo; it was founded by Nan'in Zengū 南隱全愚 Rōshi, 1834–1904, in 1899, according to Hakusan Dōjō's hundredth anniversary commemorative history; see Hakusan Dōjō Jikishinkai 白山道場直心会, *Hakusan Dōjō kaitan hyakunenshi* 白山道場開単百年史 (Tokyo: Hakusan Dōjō Jikishinkai, 2000), 43. Incidentally, Hakusan Dōjō and Kōzen Gokokukai merged under the present *shike*, Engakuji abbot Yokota Nanrei 横田南嶺 Rōshi, when he became *shike* of both groups in 2011.

monks' hall, though eventually he received permission to “go inside the room” of (and therefore do *sanzen* with) the *rōshi*.<sup>15</sup>

Also as indicated in the 1911 *Zendō* article, in addition to participating in the Engakuji monks' sesshin and conducting less formal practice in Engakuji sub-temples, students also sought—and, in some cases, created their own—practice opportunities in the Zen assemblies (*zenkai* 禅会) that were starting to proliferate in and beyond Tokyo. Per the 1911 account, students constituted sizeable proportions of the groups Tesshinkai 徹心会, Jissenkai 実践会, and Kenshōkai 見性会, and even played central roles in Kenshōkai's founding. As with these three groups, a majority of Rinzai *zenkai* that formed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did not meet in large temple complexes that were primarily known for their monks' halls, such as Engakuji and Kenchōji in Kamakura, or Nanzenji and Myōshinji in Kyoto.

Rather, most of these Zen assemblies met at parish temples and were, theoretically, open to any layperson.<sup>16</sup> For example, Nyoidan members practiced at various sites, including the parish temple Kaizenji 海禅寺 in Asakusa, Tokyo, at which Nakahara Shūgaku became the resident priest and Shinjō Rōshi stayed (and gave lectures and *sanzen*) for one week every month; both were shepherds of the earliest generation of student practitioners.<sup>17</sup> Nyoidan members also practiced intensively at the Engakuji-lineage temple Jōchiji 浄智寺 in Kamakura; at the parish temple Tōkaiji 東海寺 in

---

<sup>15</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 277. 「僧堂参禅を断られ」

<sup>16</sup> These parish temples are often called *dannadera* 檀那寺 or *bodaiji* 菩提寺.

<sup>17</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 255.

Shinagawa, Tokyo; and (much) later, at the training hall Hannya Dōjō 般若道場 in Musashino, Tokyo.<sup>18</sup>

### 3.2.2 A Brief History of Engakuji's Affiliate Student Groups (1906 Onward)

The nascent of students' organized practice at Engakuji came in 1906, following the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05), when self-cultivation movements of all stripes gained momentum in Japan (to be discussed in chapter 5). That year, students at Tokyo Higher Commercial School (later, Hitotsubashi University) formally established their group, Nyoidan 如意団. They took their name from the Engakuji sub-temple Nyoidan 如意庵, one of the sites at which the earliest group members practiced Zen together. As the author of the above-quoted passage from *Zendō* noted in 1911, students from Tokyo Higher Commercial School were avid participants in the group Tesshinkai 徹心会 at Kaizenji 海禅寺, where students frequently participated in the week-long sesshin held there every month.<sup>19</sup> This suggests overlap in the membership of Tesshinkai and Nyoidan, and it is just one example of the widespread networks of lay Zen in the Tokyo area.

---

<sup>18</sup> There are diaries (*nisshi* 日誌) from Jōchiji at least from 1914 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 145–150 and 155–172); and diaries from Tōkaiji at least from 1927 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 213–217). The first record of diaries from Kojirin is in 1927 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 219). Notably, Hannya Dōjō became associated with the group Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会 (founded in 1920), discussed in chapter 2; Shakamunikai's second leader, Osaka Kōryū 荻坂光龍 (1901–1985), was one-time leader of Nyoidan.

<sup>19</sup> Tasaki Masayoshi's 田崎仁義 (1880–1976; graduated in 1905) account corroborates this; he stated that “interested people from Tetsudōin 鐵道院 and Nyoidan members assembled a Zen group (*zazenkai* 坐禅会), calling themselves Tesshinkai 徹心会” (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 255). Multiple Nyoidan alumni mentioned the monthly sesshin that were held at Kaizenji during Nyoidan's earliest years. The *shike* for these sesshin was Sakagami Shinjō-rōshi,

Although Nyoidan was officially founded in 1906, its seeds had been planted in 1904, when Hitotsubashi University alumnus and professor Fukuda Tokuzō 福田徳三 (1874–1930; a prominent economist), first went to *sanzen* with Shaku Sōen, and layman Ueno Ken'ichi 上野憲一 went to *sanzen* with then-abbot of Engakuji, Miyaji Sōkai 宮地宗海. Both Fukuda and Ueno, alongside their respective teachers, would become instrumental in the group's founding in 1906.<sup>20</sup> Shortly after Nyoidan was founded, Ueno posted a notice in the university cafeteria. The authors attribute to Ueno's notice the (relative) surge of participation among Tokyo Higher Commercial School students: during that summer break, between June 27 and September 1, a total of at least 32 students practiced at Engakuji (the numbers fluctuating throughout the summer). During that extended period, they stayed at Engakuji's sub-temple Nyoidan, meditated and did *sanzen* 参禅 under Miyaji Sōkai Rōshi<sup>21</sup>, and took part in two *sesshin*.<sup>22</sup> This summer intensive—akin to, although not structured exactly like, monastic *ango*, and held

---

assisted by the priest Nakahara Shūgaku, who was sent to live at Kaizenji. See, for example, Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 262–264.

<sup>20</sup> Many Nyoidan alumni emphasized the central roles played by Fukuda and Ueno. See, for example, the account of Shimada Hiroshi 島田宏 (who graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1908), attributed the founding of Nyoidan in large part to the efforts of Layman Ryōmin Ueno 良民上野居士 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 257). Elsewhere, Ueno's name was written in the reverse (i.e., as Ueno Ryōmin).

<sup>21</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan 一橋如意団, *Tetsu nyoi* 鉄如意 (Tokyo: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1957), 210.

<sup>22</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 57–63. The *sesshin* seem to have been held in tandem with the monks' *sesshin*. Although the lay participants took part in a few events in the monks' hall (e.g., greeting the rōshi in the monks' hall after *sesshin* concluded), the laypeople did *zazen* in the Senbutsujō, not the monks' hall.

according to the students' schedules—set a precedent that would be informally emulated for many years, and that would give rise by the 1920s to an institutionalized, thrice-yearly student sesshin schedule in which students from various universities (and non-student “society members,” or *shakaijin* 社会人) would sit together.

Nyoidan was the first of at least five such university student groups that had close relationships with Engakuji, most of which took their names from Engakuji's other sub-temples. Four more groups formed in the 1920s and one group formed after the war, in 1950. It should be noted that none of these groups were formal offshoots or affiliates of Engakuji, and despite their close relationships with Engakuji and regular practice on Engakuji grounds, at times, masters from other temples and temple branches (e.g., Kenchōji 建長寺) assumed leadership. For instance, regarding the multitude of teachers who nurtured Nyoidan members' Zen practice, alumnus Uhara Yoshitoyo describes the group's “birth parents” as both Sakagami Shinjō 坂上眞淨 (1842–1914) and Nakahara Shūgaku 中原秀嶽 (1878–1928), and he identifies the “parents who reared” the group as Shaku Sōen, Miyaji Sōkai, Furukawa Gyōdō, and Ōta Maigan.<sup>23</sup> Other prominent Tokyo-area masters also guided Nyoidan students in the group's early years, including one-time Kenchōji *kanchō* Sugawara Jihō 菅原時保—who also served as *shike* for multiple

---

<sup>23</sup> Uhara Yoshitoyo 宇原義豊, “*Yo ga Hitotsubashi jidai ni okeru Nyoidan no tsuioku* 余が一橋時代に於ける如意団の追憶,” in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 268. Uhara was born in 1885 and graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1911. According to an account in Saiindan's forty-fifth anniversary commemorative history, Nakahara Shūgaku was *jūshoku* (head priest) of Kaizenji for over twenty years, from 1907 until 1928, the year of his death (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 13).



Tokyo-area lay groups, including Kōzen Gokokukai—and one-time Engakuji chief abbot Hirota Tenshin 廣田天真.<sup>24</sup>

It is abundantly clear from Nyoidan accounts and particularly from name registers at Engakuji that students from many Tokyo-area universities practiced at Engakuji during the 1910s, even though Tokyo Higher Commercial School was the only one with a dedicated Zen group at that time.<sup>25</sup> There were also many young working people in their twenties and thirties and secondary school students as young as seventeen years old. In terms of university students, students from Tokyo Higher Commercial School, Tokyo Imperial University (now Tokyo University), and Waseda University were the most numerous; there were also students from Tokyo College of Law (Tokyo Hōgakuin 東京法学院, now Chūō University), Keiō University (Keiō Gijuku Daigaku 慶應義塾大学), and other universities, as well as teacher training schools. These students participated in *sesshin* (meditation intensives) in the monks' hall and, occasionally, in student- or lay-specific contexts. Many of these same students and young people practiced simultaneously with groups such as those mentioned above (e.g., Jissenkai, Tesshinkai, and Kenshōkai).<sup>26</sup> There were also events for Rinzai Zen-practicing university students

---

<sup>24</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1957, 210–211.

<sup>25</sup> Engakuji 圓覺寺, “Koji shōkenbo: shoshoken 居士相見簿：初相見,” handwritten name register (Kamakura, Japan, 1916–1917). Of the 88 entries in the name register from 1916–1917—for those who were encountering the *rōshi* (that is, doing “*shōken* 相見”) for the first time—the vast majority were in their twenties and thirties.

<sup>26</sup> For example, Hiratsuka Raichō (mentioned earlier this chapter and discussed further below) practiced in a variety of contexts: she started her Zen practice while a university student, practicing under Shaku Sōkatsu until he departed for the United States; at other times, she

across universities and groups—e.g., Enjōkai Youth Division (Enjōkai Seinenbu 圓成會青年部), which met at the Tokyo-area temple Rinshōin and was led by the priest Nakahara Shūgaku 中原秀嶽, who was an important early leader for Nyoidan.<sup>27</sup>

Despite high levels of student activity at Engakuji in the 1910s, it was not until 1922 that the next student group was formed: Waseda University's Saiindan 済蔭団. As noted, several of Waseda's students had already been practicing at Engakuji, and for the first time in spring 1922, they formally joined with Nyoidan to hold sesshin.<sup>28</sup> Shortly thereafter, echoing Nyoidan's naming after the Engakuji sub-temple Nyoian, the group of Waseda students adopted the name of Saiindan from the sub-temple Saiin'an, which would soon become not only the center of student Zen but, moreover, the Laypeople's Grove of Engakuji.

### 3.2.3 Turning Point: Establishing a Lay Grove (1919–1923)

#### 3.2.3.1 1919–1920 Efforts to Establish Kojirin

By the early 1920s, when Saiindan formed, dozens of lay Rinzai groups had emerged throughout Japan. These groups' activities—and the hundreds of Zen-related

---

practiced with Nyoidan and at Kaizenji around the time of Nyoidan's founding; and after Sōkatsu's departure, she worked most closely with Nakahara Nantenbō.

<sup>27</sup> Nakahara Shūgaku, *Ikke goyō*. In *Zendō*, there is a report about Enjōkai 圓成會, which may be the same event profiled by *Ikke goyō* and therefore help to identify the date. The report reads: "As for that group [Enjōkai], under the supervision of Master Nakahara Shūgaku, Rinzai-sect students [gathered] last month, on the thirteenth day, at Rinshōin in Yushima [Tokyo]; they listened to the fall lecture, and it was a beneficial lecture by [the editor of] this journal; [the event] was extremely successful" (*Zendō*, no. 5, December 1910, 51).

<sup>28</sup> Suzuki Shunji (or Toshiji) 鈴木俊司, Nyoidan alumnus (graduated from Tokyo University of Commerce in 1923), recounts this first joint sesshin in Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 15.

publications that also saw light—indicate a fully bustling realm of Zen practice. By this point, not only Tokyo but all of Japan had seen an initial flowering of lay Zen, as discussed in the last chapter. The observation of layman Iizuka Iwao 飯塚巖 (discussed below) in 1920 reflects this trend: “We can see that in recent years, lay people aspiring to study Zen have increased remarkably.”<sup>29</sup> Around this time, lay Zen at Engakuji had reached a turning point: among laypeople, the demand for a dedicated training hall had grown to the extent that between 1920 and 1923, the groundwork was laid, and the training hall actualized.

Although Engakuji had maintained its role as a central hub of lay Zen in Japan since the 1870s, such a dedicated training space did not yet exist there. According to his account that was published in *Zendō* in 1920, Iizuka had worked since the previous year alongside fellow laypeople—including a Nyoidan alumnus—and a handful of Engakuji monastics to manifest laypeople’s dream of a training space that would expand their practice opportunities beyond those currently available.<sup>30</sup> From 1919, they worked vigorously to raise funds to restore an existing, though deteriorated, meditation hall at Engakuji for this purpose (a renovation that was already underway, according to Iizuka).

---

<sup>29</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 42. Although Iizuka’s accounts of lay practice and efforts to establish a training hall for laypeople at Engakuji around 1920 figure prominently in this chapter, Iizuka himself seems to have been an “ordinary” practitioner and modest figure about whom biographical information is not widely available. Here, Iizuka used the word *kenkyū* 研究—to study—which tends to have an academic connotation. Elsewhere, though, he used words like *sankyū* 参究 (ibid., 40)—which points more explicitly to practice (and in the Zen/Chan context, indicates penetrating the *kōan*)—and *sanzen* 参禅, or Zen practice.

<sup>30</sup> Iizuka Iwao 飯塚巖, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen’yō no dōjō o mōketaru shimatsu 鎌倉圓覺寺に居士専用の道場を設けたる仕末,” *Zendō* 禅道, no. 119 (August 1920): 35–43.

They also sought to raise additional funds for further renovation and building projects in the future (for residential accommodations and so forth).<sup>31</sup>

As Iizuka bemoans in his article, before the advent of a dedicated training hall for laypeople, they had had limited practice opportunities. Despite the plethora of extant accounts of lay people seeking permission from Engakuji's priestly administrators to stay overnight in *tatchū* and engage in *zazen* and *sanzen* outside of group practice intensives (*sesshin*), Iizuka's article suggests that for people whose busy professional lives precluded participating in the rigid *sesshin* schedule—either monastic *sesshin* or the occasional *sesshin* held for lay people—it was difficult to practice seriously at Engakuji.<sup>32</sup> The account of Nakano Goyō 中野五葉, the resident priest (*jūshōku*) of Saiin'an prior to Waseda students' formation of Saiindan, corroborates Iizuka's account of the limited practice opportunities. In fact, Nakano goes as far as to say that there was no true "laypeople's grove" ("*kojirin* 居士林") at Engakuji and that Butsunichi'an—one

---

<sup>31</sup> In the above article, Iizuka notes that the Senbutsujō 選佛場 had been Engakuji's sole *zendō* 禅堂 (meditation hall) until the illustrious former abbot, Seisetsu Shūcho (1745–1820, famous for restoring Engakuji) built present-day Shōzoku'in to serve as the monks' hall. By 1920, Senbutsujō had fallen into disrepair, and several laypeople (including Iizuka) sought to raise funds to renovate Senbutsujō for use as a dedicated *zendō* for laypeople. They also sought funds to develop the sub-temple Shōrei'in to serve as laypeople's dedicated accommodations. It appears that they were successful in renovating Senbutsujō. However, it was Saiin'an, and not Shōrei'in, that eventually became laypeople's primary practice and residence site at Engakuji. This was certainly the case from 1928 onward, after the *kendōjō* was transplanted to Engakuji and became Kojirin; and it most likely was the case as early as 1923 or 1924 (as most of Engakuji's temples were destroyed or significantly damaged in the 1923 earthquake, including Shōrei'in; see Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji-shi*, 748).

<sup>32</sup> In the above *Zendō* article, Iizuka suggests that busy people, active in society, have trouble participating in *sesshin*—for example, mistakenly arriving on the wrong day, when there isn't *sesshin* (Iizuka, "Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen'yō no dōjō," 35). On the other hand, in *Sanzen no shiori*, Iizuka states that serious *koji* may seek permission to stay at Engakuji's sub-temples, even when there is not *sesshin* (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 9–10).

of the *tatchū* in which laypeople regularly stayed—was a “*kojirin*” in name only and was essentially no more than a lodging-place (*geshukuya* 下宿屋).<sup>33</sup>

Iizuka, a lay practitioner who seems to have been practicing Zen at Engakuji for some time—as is implied by his personal accounts of *kōan* practice and perspective on lay practice, to be discussed later—was struck by inspiration one evening in 1919 while staying at an inn near Engakuji where *koji* frequently lodged and took meals.<sup>34</sup> Relaxing that evening after a bath, he shared his vision with fellow *koji* and Nyoidan alumnus Shibayama-kun (most likely Shibayama Noboru 柴山昇, class of 1918 at Tokyo Higher Commercial school). Iizuka and Shibayama, seized by a sense of urgency, immediately moved to obtain permission from Engakuji’s head administrator, the Venerable Satō Kokyū 佐藤虎丘. With the backing of Satō—and, implicitly, Engakuji—Iizuka (and possibly others) pitched the plan to fellow laypeople the next day, following a talk at Engakuji by D.T. Suzuki. When speaking of *koji*’s genuine need for a dedicated *zendō*, Iizuka addresses the problematic state of the present (e.g., practice opportunities primarily limited to sesshin, the risk of disturbing the full-time monastic residents, and so forth) and emphasizes the spiritual cost: that is, even though laypeople receive permission to sit ad hoc in the various sub-temples, they are “unable to attain the same taut mental

---

<sup>33</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 4. Nakano is not specific in his timeline, but his account implies that these were the conditions prior to Saiindan’s formation in the spring of 1923.

<sup>34</sup> In his article, Iizuka does not specify the time frame when the initial succession of events took place (i.e., approaching Engakuji administrators then fellow laypeople, making concrete plans, and initiating fundraising). However, these events seem to have taken place within a relatively short period of time—before Sōen fell ill and passed away in November of 1919—so most likely, these initial events took place during the spring or summer of 1919.

state that they could [attain] through sitting in a formal *zendō*.”<sup>35</sup> Creating a dedicated practice space for *koji* was thus vital for their practice, enabling them to engage in Zen training (*shuzen* 修禪) not only during *sesshin* but also on a daily basis—as their work or school schedules allowed—for those able to stay overnight or commute from Kamakura or Tokyo. Iizuka also lamented the current conditions in which *koji* had little or no contact with one another, and he predicted that a dedicated training hall would promote closeness and connections among members of the lay community, both within and outside of temple walls, therefore benefitting their practice, lives, and society more generally.<sup>36</sup>

At that same meeting, and throughout his article in *Zendō*, Iizuka made clear that his choice to stand before dignitaries and other laypeople of higher stations than himself—as “a lowly person with a humble rank”—was for the sake of the dharma, and that truly would be a group effort: for *koji* and by *koji* (with significant support from Engakuji) with communal decision making to the degree possible.<sup>37</sup> Iizuka solicited feedback from his fellow *koji* (e.g., with regard to covering the *tan* with tatami or wooden planks, and with regard to the logistics of collecting) and also emphasized that it would be more meaningful for *koji* to provide these funds—even if each person contributed only

---

<sup>35</sup> Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen’yō no dōjō,” 37.

<sup>36</sup> Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen’yō no dōjō,” 38. According to Iizuka, many *koji* had little to no regular contact with other *koji* at Engakuji, given the practice structure that was in place at the time.

<sup>37</sup> This accords with Sawada’s account of laypeople’s taking initiative at Engakuji in the 1870s, as mentioned above—that is, to use the sub-temple Shōden’an (renamed Takuboku-en) as a place for lay practice (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 162).

one or two yen—than for a wealthy individual or two outside of the sangha to pay for everything.<sup>38</sup>

Iizuka rapidly gained his fellow laypeople's acquiescence. D.T. Suzuki (who was the first to make a donation to the project—in the amount of five yen), and the Viscount Akita Shigesue 秋田重季—a politician and engineer who was staying at Butsunichi'an at the time—also spoke up in support of Iizuka's proposal; their support then spurred several more on-the-spot monetary offerings.<sup>39</sup> Thus the plan proceeded, and its realization gained steam once Iizuka and Shibayama visited Furukawa Gyōdō 古川堯道 (1872–1961), the head of the monks' training hall who was, at that moment, a patient at the Kamakura Hospital. Incidentally, Furukawa—in his vociferous affirmation of the project—invoked the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Zen master Seisetsu Shūcho 誠拙周樗 (1745–1820), commemorated that same year. Seisetsu was the former Engakuji abbot who physically and spiritually restored a deteriorated Engakuji and built it into the robust center of Rinzai monastic training that it was in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan. This anniversary was thus auspicious the significant development that was the building of a dedicated training hall for laypeople at Engakuji, for decades at the vanguard of lay Rinzai in modern Japan.

Subsequently, Iizuka and Shibayama visited the residents of the Engakuji sub-temple Butsunichi'an and the Engakuji branch temple Jōchiji 浄智寺 (nearby in Kamakura), gaining residents' assent via signature (which established their roles as

---

<sup>38</sup> Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen'yō no dōjō,” 39–40.

<sup>39</sup> Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen'yō no dōjō,” 41.

fellow initiators of the endeavor); residents of Zōroku'an visited and gave their signatures; and within a day or two, over thirty people had offered support and donations, which totaled 100 yen.

The venture to create a true Kojirin formally began on August 11, 1919, approved by Furukawa Gyōdō, then-abbot Shaku Sōen, and Satō Kōkyū.<sup>40</sup> The monastics would handle the finances: Furukawa was to be the formal supervisor, and donations were physically collected at the *sōdō*. The plan outlined by Iizuka was simple, involving the following stages: first, renovating the Senbutsujō to be a “splendid *zendō*” (for example, laying wooden planks on the *tan*); and secondly, reconstructing the latrine. Third, if funds allowed at a later date, the adjacent temple, Shōrei'in 松嶺院, would be converted into laymen's accommodations, thus creating a more complete “*kojirin*” (residential training facility for laypeople), in which one *koji* would live full-time. Planners did not establish a fixed time frame and said only that “if it is not done this year, and if it is not done next year, then construction will continue into the following year.”<sup>41</sup>

If realized fully, this project would mark a significant turning point for the development of lay-centered Zen in modern Japan. This “*kojirin* 居士林”—literally, a “laypeople's grove”—would mirror the “*sōrin* 叢林,” or “monastic grove”: a term often used to describe large monastic complexes such as Engakuji. It would be on the grounds

---

<sup>40</sup> Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen'yō no dōjō,” 42.

<sup>41</sup> Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen'yō no dōjō,” 42. Here, my use of “laymen's accommodations” is deliberate, as there were no immediate plans to create accommodations for lay women. On the other hand, in *Sanzen no shiori*, Iizuka does mention that if funds allowed in the future, a women's dormitory could, and should, be constructed (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 35).



of a major Rinzai training temple, approved by those in the temple's highest monastic and administrative ranks. At the same time, this *kojirin* was to be centered on laypeople and their needs, and, importantly, was to be the fruit of laypeople's initiatives and communal fundraising efforts. According to Iizuka, the training hall would be managed as such: "There will be a system of self-regulation under the supervision of the monks' hall or temple [administrators]; sometimes a monk-in-training [*unsui* 雲水] will be sent from the monks' hall and will circulate, offering the *keisaku* 警策 [during zazen]."42

Ultimately, Iizuka and fellow laypeople were partially successful in their efforts; by the time Iizuka published his article in *Zendō* in August of 1920, laypeople were able to use the renovated Senbutsujō as their dedicated *zendō*. However, Iizuka's and others' plans to convert Shōrei'in into a *kojirin* and to build further facilities—thus creating a fully functional training hall ("*senmon dōjō* 専門道場") with a kitchen-residence and other facilities—had not materialized. The reasons for this are unclear; they may have stemmed from funding issues or, more likely, were ripple effects of Shaku Sōen's unexpected death in November of 1919, a few months after the project was initiated. Indeed, Iizuka reports that the project temporarily (and unsurprisingly) halted after Sōen's passing but was resurrected in the spring of 1920, following Furukawa's installation as Engakuji's new chief abbot, resulting in a completed *zendō* in late April of

---

<sup>42</sup> Iizuka, "Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen'yō no dōjō," 42. "*Keisaku*" (pronounced "*kyōsaku*" in Sōtō contexts) literally means "warning stick," although the term is sometimes translated as "encouragement stick." During formal rounds of zazen, a monk will circulate the *zendō* and strike meditators in the fleshy part of the shoulder-upper back area. Ideally, the *keisaku* is used to help the meditator rouse energy for *zazen*, although sometimes it is used in a more punishing way.

1920. Although having the lay-dedicated *zendō* alone did not meet laypeople's needs for a dedicated training space that would allow for structured, intensive Zen practice year-round, it was an important step for creating the latter. Further key moments—ultimately resulting in a full Kojirin—would include Saiindan's creation in 1923 and the 1926 fire that destroyed Saiin'an, out of whose ashes rose Kojirin as we know it today.

### 3.2.3.2 Establishing a Lay Training Hall: A Succession of Efforts

The efforts to establish this training hall for laypeople that Iizuka describes in *Sanzen no shiori* and his *Zendō* article—of which he was a central part—were not the first such efforts in Japan or even at Engakuji. Journals published in 1910—both the inaugural issue of *Zendō* (published in August 1910) and an issue of *Zenshū* 禪宗 (published in July that year)—reported on the opening of a training hall in Tokyo for laypeople, initiated by dedicated practitioners working under the Rinzai master Nakahara Nantenbō. Nantenbō's lineage and approach to Zen diverged from Engakuji-trained masters, but his students and network overlapped with Engakuji's. *Zendō* reports:

[Those practicing in] Nantenbō's lay person association [*kojiren* 居士連]—including Ōishi Masami 大石正己, Okada Kenji 岡田乾兒, Tanaka Shigeru 田中茂, and others—became the initiators of the “Imperial Japanese Rinzai Zen Training Hall,” aiming to accommodate only lay men and lay women;...it should be said that this training hall for laypeople is the first [such] training hall in Japan; moreover, attaching the name of Imperial Japanese Rinzai Zen somehow has the feeling of removing defilements.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> “Koji no sen'yō dōjō 居士の専門道場,” *Zendō*, no. 1 (August 1910), 55. Also see “Koji no sen'yō dōjō 居士の専門道場,” *Zenshū* 禪宗, vol 17, no. 184 (July 1910), 74. Ōishi Masami 大石正己 (1855–1935; also known by his lay name 大典居士) was a prominent politician and decades-long Zen practitioner who, among other accomplishments, served as group leader of

However, it seems that this training hall was not mentioned conspicuously in *Zendō* or other popular Buddhist media outlets thereafter. This suggests that at some point—before it got off the ground or was completed—the efforts of Nantenbō’s students to establish a sustainable training hall for laypeople were ultimately unsuccessful.

At Engakuji, too, there had previously been efforts to establish a lay training facility. When Iizuka expressed to the Nyoidan alumnus Shibayama his intent to create a *kojirin*, Shibayama mentioned that several years previously, various people at Engakuji had attempted to address this need. However, they were unable to implement the plans in the end, resulting in an “unsatisfactory” situation persisting to that day.<sup>44</sup> It is not clear from Shibayama’s account whether that previous initiative came primarily from laypeople or monastics, and Shibayama’s account is vague; however, the Engakuji cleric Satō Kokyū, as an administrator, corroborates Shibayama’s account. According to Satō, Engakuji’s administrators had supported the efforts, but they became difficult to sustain.<sup>45</sup> Perhaps the openness of fellow *koji* and Engakuji administrators to Iizuka and Shibayama’s plans in 1919—and the immediacy of their affirmative response and willingness to act—came, in part, from the previous attempt(s) that had hit a dead end but were, nonetheless, seeds sown.

---

Kōzen Gokokukai for many years. Note that the role Ōishi occupied, *kaichō* 会長, is different from “master,” or *shike* 師家, which was typically only occupied by full dharma heirs.

<sup>44</sup> Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen’yō no dōjō,” 36. Shibayama made these statements unequivocally but did not provide any details.

<sup>45</sup> Satō’s account even suggests that the initiative came from the *honzan* 本山 (the head temple) and therefore its administrators (Iizuka, “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen’yō no dōjō,” 36). 「如斯は却って本山より、依頼致し度程なり併しながら事は創むるに易く存続が至難なり」

More than representing a distinct turning point, the progress made between 1919 and 1923 toward building a dedicated training hall for laypeople at Engakuji points to a broader shift in the Japanese Zen world that had been transpiring for decades and was now evidenced (and reinforced) by the myriad publications on Zen for popular audiences, as well as by the plethora of robustly attended Zen meditation sessions and lectures, not only in the Tokyo-Kamakura area but throughout Japan.<sup>46</sup> In a certain sense, this building and restoration project was a natural outgrowth of practice at Engakuji, initiated by dedicated lay practitioners while being sanctioned by the Engakuji hierarchy. Even more significantly, the project represents a certain shift toward lay-centered practice: offering practice opportunities on a daily basis, not only when the monks were in retreat, and with greater flexibility for those with busy work lives. The project also suggests a slight move toward lay leadership, although monastics continued to hold central roles, not only collecting the funds for the project development but also serving as the central vehicles for conveying Zen teaching, ranging from *keisaku*-wielding monks-in-training to the *rōshi*, at the center of *sanzen* and *teishō*.

### 3.2.3.3 “Rinzai’s Shadow”: A New Home for Laypeople

Engakuji’s training hall appears to be the first of its kind for lay Rinzai Zen practitioners in Eastern Japan. However, as discussed above, it took time for Iizuka’s (and countless others’) vision of a fully functioning Zen training hall dedicated to lay

---

<sup>46</sup> For example, Takei Kengo’s tabulation of monthly Zen assemblies, per *Daijō Zen*, provides the following monthly averages: in 1924, an average of over thirty groups throughout Japan meeting monthly (about ten in Tokyo), and by 1927, there were nearly sixty groups throughout Japan meeting monthly, and still about ten in Tokyo (Takei, “Kindai nihon ni okeru Zenkai,” 61).

practitioners—encompassing not only a meditation hall but also a kitchen, latrine, and other physical accommodations for sesshin-goers and short-term trainees alike—to materialize. In fact, student practitioners and the genesis of Saiindan were integral to the full fruition of a lay training hall at Engakuji.

In Iizuka Iwao's construction plans of 1919–1920, planners had named Shōrei'in as the eventual site for laypeople's accommodations. However, the heart of this “laypeople's grove” ended up being the Engakuji sub-temple Saiin'an 済蔭庵—also proximate to Senbutsujō—where Waseda University's Zen group was based upon its founding in 1922, and for which Furukawa Gyōdō Rōshi named the group Saiindan 済蔭団, just as Nyoidan was named for the sub-temple Nyoian. “Saiin,” according to one-time group organizer Iizuka Shinjin 飯塚真人, means “Rinzai's shadow” (臨済の蔭), and it was in the shadow of Rinzai (Chan master Linji Yixuan 臨濟義玄, d. 867) that a new generation of university students and fellow laypeople revitalized Japanese Rinzai Zen for a new era.<sup>47</sup>

The account of Nakano Goyō 中野五葉, the young resident priest of Saiin'an at the time of Saiindan's founding, is illuminating not only with regard to Saiindan's first days but also as a monastic perspective on laypeople's practice opportunities prior to the formation of Saiindan and Kojirin as we know it today; his account also expresses how

---

<sup>47</sup> Iizuka Shinjin, “Daigaku no Zenkai,” 42. Iizuka is a Waseda alumnus and listed here as the group's secretary (“*kanjichō* 幹事長”). It is not clear whether he is related to Iizuka Iwao, who is discussed here extensively in the context of creating a training facility for laypeople at Engakuji circa 1919–1920.

the two institutions arose in conjunction with one another.<sup>48</sup> According to Nakano, there was not another monks' hall (*sōdō*) "under heaven" like Engakuji in terms of the numbers of laymen and laywomen who came to practice. This point is undisputed among those discussing Engakuji's role in modern lay Zen. However, unlike others' accounts, Nakano holds the view that there had not been a "true *kojirin*," or facility for laypeople.<sup>49</sup> He states that although the "*kojirin*" flag was raised at Engakuji's sub-temple Butsunichi'an (where, as we know from the 1916–1917 name registers and Nyoidan's extensive accounts, many laypeople stayed), it was not truly for the sake of Zen practitioners.<sup>50</sup> Butsunichi'an, Nakano says, was essentially a lodging-house with an infirm priest (*oshō*). With the temple deteriorating alongside the priest's health, the voices of people who wanted a "true *kojirin* for the sake of Zen practitioners" grew louder.

Nowhere does Nakano mention the efforts by Iizuka and other laypeople to create a training hall for laypeople circa 1920, which was supported by the temple and for which funds were successfully obtained. Iizuka, on the other hand, had mentioned a priest, "Goyō 五葉," as one of the three main Engakuji clerics who worked to renovate Senbutsujō and create a *kojirin* around 1919 and 1920. This likely was Nakano Goyō, and

---

<sup>48</sup> Nakano Goyō stated that he was 32 years old at the time of Saiindan's founding, which indicates that he was born around 1891, per Japanese age conventions (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 4). For Nakano's full account, see Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 4–8.

<sup>49</sup> Nakano did not specify the time period under discussion, though he implied that these conditions preceded the formation of Saiindan in 1922. He also cited the lack of official sleeping quarters for women.

<sup>50</sup> Here, Nakano was probably referring to physical signage. For example, group *sesshin* photographs from the 1910s onward sometimes featured a banner or placard on which "Laypeople's *Sesshin*," "Student *Sesshin*," or something to that effect was written. See, for example, the "memento photograph" from a 1918 *sesshin* at Engakuji for laypeople, published in *Zendō*, no. 98 (September 1918), frontispiece; this photograph is discussed in the next chapter.

Nakano's earlier efforts may have laid the groundwork for him to take a central role in the next wave of efforts when the opportunity arose in the winter of 1922–1923. As Nakano points out, creating a training hall for laypeople on Engakuji's grounds necessitated, at minimum, a monastic liaison. With the support of dozens of people, Nakano filled this role following a busy practice season that winter.<sup>51</sup> His first step was to find a suitable sub-temple on Engakuji's grounds to use. The fact that this did not end up being Shōrei'in, as per Iizuka's plans, shows that the actual improvements completed earlier—for which Iizuka worked—did not include a full training hall at Shōrei'in or elsewhere.

As for the ideal site, Nyoi'an—already used by Nyoidan students for *sesshin*—was not “geographically appropriate” in Nakano's opinion, nor were the temples Denshū'an or Shōrei'in, but Nakano thought that Saiin'an was. “Negotiations” were made with Saiin'an's current resident, who promptly vacated the temple, enabling the temple's development for use by Waseda students to proceed.<sup>52</sup> Soon thereafter, Nakano was formally appointed as the resident priest of Saiin'an, and he arrived at a stark scene that lacked bare necessities; for example, there was “neither rice nor wheat nor pots in which to cook them.” Nakano engaged in “cleaning samādhi” (*sōji zanmai* 掃除三昧) and put the hermitage in order as best he could. After he made some progress, two students from Waseda (Yasuda Hisao 安田久雄 and Takahashi Eiichi 高橋栄一) came to

---

<sup>51</sup> Nakano did not specify whether these were laypeople or monastics.

<sup>52</sup> This resident was Matsuda Take-no-shimabito 松田竹之島人 (1874–1939).

ask Nakano formally for his help on behalf of other students wishing to practice zazen.<sup>53</sup> Nakano welcomed them to the “new Kojirin” (新居士林), explaining practice customs and etiquette at Engakuji, as well as key aspects of practicing zazen, such as the state of mental awareness that is essential for practice. Before long, in April of 1923, Waseda students joined together with Nyoidan members as well as with other *koji*, both seasoned and newly practicing, for their first weeklong sesshin.<sup>54</sup> It should be noted that by this time, many Waseda students had already been practicing under Furukawa Gyōdō.<sup>55</sup> As discussed below, the lay name registers (*meibo*) at Engakuji from 1916–1917—in which practitioners encountering the *rōshi* for the first time inscribed their name, age, and other personal information—show that Waseda students already constituted a significant proportion of the lay population.

Despite an energized group of practitioners and a banner that physically marked Saiin’an as a Laypeople’s Grove (*kojirin*), however, the temple’s physical conditions were still poor, and it was unable to accommodate large groups of participants comfortably. For example, Nakano describes how the thatched roof had decomposed, leaving holes through which rain poured in, prompting practitioners to use umbrellas indoors and leaving them nowhere to sit. Upon seeing such desolate conditions, Layman Yagyū Tesshin 柳生徹心居士—who is discussed below, and whose generosity would come to play an even greater role in lay practice at Engakuji for generations—contributed

---

<sup>53</sup> Both Yasuda and Takahashi were in Waseda’s graduating class of 1926, according to Saiindan’s commemorative history (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 137).

<sup>54</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 6.

<sup>55</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 42.



funds for significant renovations that were subsequently undertaken. Other lay members offered funds for new floorboards and *shōji* screens. Saiin'an's limited space continued to pose a hurdle for participation; for example, the sleeping conditions for thirty men were "unbearable," as they were crammed into two small rooms whose combined space totaled 14 tatami mats.<sup>56</sup> However, with its improvements and a steadily growing group of practitioners residing there (at least temporarily), Saiin'an was on its way to becoming Tokyo-area laypeople's first Rinzai training hall, replete with practice opportunities that mirrored those of monks in many respects, while maintaining distinction as a training hall that embodied the "unity of Zen and sword (*kenzen itchi* 剣禅一致)" (discussed below).

Nakano's account indicates when he first undertook the mission to convert an existing Engakuji sub-temple into a fully functioning Kojirin, he was not focusing exclusively or even primarily on students. However, Waseda students quickly developed a relationship with Nakano and Saiin'an. Although Nakano was sent soon thereafter to the rural temple Kankōji 関興寺 (in present-day Niigata Prefecture) to serve as its priest—not long after he engaged in "bone-breaking" efforts to create Kojirin, according to his fellow priest—Saiindan's relationship with the temple Saiin'an deepened over the ensuing years, while Saiin'an was also becoming synonymous with Kojirin.

In less than a decade after Saiindan was founded, Saiin'an had become not only the central meeting space for the joint "student retreats" (*gakusei zazenkaï* 学生坐禅会 or *gakusei sesshin* 学生接心) that students from various Tokyo-area universities attended,

---

<sup>56</sup> This amounted to roughly 230 square feet of space.

but also as the center of lay Zen at Engakuji. (Today, the site is known exclusively as “Kojirin.”) Beyond students’ drive to create a practice space for holding *sesshin*, what external factors spurred and enabled Saiin’an’s development as this center?

In sum, lay practitioners at Engakuji attempted at multiple points to create a dedicated training hall that would allow them to practice regularly outside of *sesshin*. Converging with these efforts was the rise of the university student groups, whose members constituted a large proportion of Engakuji’s lay practitioners; and Saiindan’s founding in 1922 spurred Saiin’an’s physical restoration, making it a more suitable venue for *sesshin* and ongoing practice than Engakuji’s other sub-temples. Two more developments in the 1920s further cemented Saiin’an’s central role for laypeople: the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923 (which destroyed or badly damaged most practice sites at Engakuji, but not Saiin’an), and a fire in 1926 that destroyed Saiin’an but ultimately led to its rebirth and reconstruction that stands to this day and was even more lay-centered than its previous incarnations.

### 3.2.4 After the Great Earthquake: Consolidating Students

For its first decade and a half, since its founding in 1906, Nyoidan had met at Nyoi’an, among other venues that included other Engakuji sub-temples, the Tokyo temple Kaizenji 海禪寺, the Kamakura temple Jōchiji 淨智寺, and other sites.<sup>57</sup> However,

---

<sup>57</sup> As Nyoidan’s old logs (*nisshi* 日誌)—reprinted in the Nyoidan’s twenty-fifth anniversary history—attest, the group regularly held *sesshin* and *zazenkai* at the following Engakuji sub-temples: Takuboku’en 擇木園, from 1907 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 63); Denshūan 傳宗庵, from 1908 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 75); Shōrei’in 松嶺院, from 1909 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 84); Nyoi’an 如意庵, from 1910

Nyoidan shifted its main meeting place to Saiin'an after Waseda students formed Saiindan and the two organizations started holding joint retreats from spring 1922, at Saiin'an.<sup>58</sup> Following this development was the institutionalization of student retreats (to occur three times annually) and the formation of other university Zen groups in the 1920s. The first official "student *sesshin*" ("gakusei sesshin 学生接心") took place at Nyoi'an in July 1927. From July 1928 onward, most student retreats took place at Saiin'an (by then, known primarily as Kojirin).

As mentioned above, Nyoidan members also needed a practice site after the 1923 earthquake caused significant damage both to Nyoi'an and Kaizenji, the temple in Asakusa at which the earliest generation of Nyoidan members had done weekly sesshin

---

(Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 89); and Unchōan 雲頂庵, from 1911 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 110). As an example of *sesshin* that took place in other sites, a one-week *sesshin* in 1930 took place in a *kendō* (swordsmanship) training hall in Shakujii 石神井, Tokyo (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 226).

<sup>58</sup> Asahina Sōgen noted that Nyoidan students did zazen at Engakuji far less frequently after Tokyo University of Commerce moved its campus to Kunitachi in Tokyo than beforehand; this move occurred in 1930 (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2; Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1957, 210). After this point, according to Asahina, Saiindan students took a central role among student practitioners at Engakuji. Nyoidan's timeline states: "In spring [of 1922], Waseda's Saiindan is founded; together with Nyoidan, [Saiindan] holds sesshin at Engakuji's Saiin'an" (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1957, 211). Asahina reasoned that the new campus location made it more difficult for students to travel regularly to Kamakura, so Nyoidan established a training hall on campus, after which Nyoidan members purportedly participated less in jointly-held activities at Engakuji. On the other hand, I have not seen the same report among Nyoidan members' accounts, and the Nyoidan diaries indicate that its members maintained steady participation in joint sesshin, so it is not clear whether Asahina's statement is accurate. Nyoidan's earliest diaries contain a long gap in entries between 1919 and 1926, but there are group photographs from the following retreats: April 1920 retreat at Shōrei'in (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 204); either winter 1922 or spring 1923 at Saiin'an (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 205); and December 1924 at Saiin'an (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 206).

and established the “Strenuous Effort Quarters” (discussed further below).<sup>59</sup> In fact, the earthquake and post-earthquake fires caused the destruction not only of Nyoian but also of most other temples in Engakuji’s complex. Against significant odds, Saiin’an survived, thanks to a strong foundation, as did a couple of nearby buildings including the Senbutsujō 選仏場 (used as a *zendō* by the laypeople). According to Asahina Sōgen—eventual Engakuji abbot who, at the time, had just been installed as head priest of the nearby temple Jōchiji 淨智寺—most of Engakuji’s priests were suddenly without a residence. Thus, then-abbot Furukawa Gyōdō ended up residing at Saiin’an until the abbot’s quarters (*inryō* 隠寮) in the monks’ hall was repaired.<sup>60</sup> Yagyū Tesshin also took refuge there after the earthquake, according to Saiin’an’s priest Nakano.<sup>61</sup> After Gyōdō finally returned to his quarters, students and laypeople could once again use Saiin’an. Moreover, Saiin’an’s role as the sole practice site for students and other laity, post-earthquake, prompted groups and individuals to practice together regularly, whereas previously, the groups sometimes practiced separately.

Group photos, name rosters, and reports show that these “student retreats” were open not only to students from colleges and universities beyond those that had their own

---

<sup>59</sup> Nyoidan’s timeline states that Nyoian and Kaizenji both “suffered calamity” (災罹; Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1957, 211). Engakuji’s history states that both the main hall and kitchen-residence of Nyoian (*hondō ken kuri* 本堂兼庫裡) were destroyed in their entirety (Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji-shi*, 748).

<sup>60</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2.

<sup>61</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 7.

Zen groups, as well as to non-students of all ages.<sup>62</sup> For example, as discussed below, photos from the earliest years of the Shōwa period (circa 1928–1931), suggest that like Hiratsuka Raichō circa 1906, there were occasional women participants, even though women were not yet formally admitted to most of the universities with student Zen groups and were therefore, most likely, not formal members of those groups. “Student retreats” were eventually systematized, scheduled around students’ calendars and school breaks. By the 1920s, there were regularly three such retreats each year at Kojirin that were held during the students’ spring, summer, and winter breaks; these were typically held in March, July, and December, respectively.<sup>63</sup> Later, under Asahina Sōgen in the period following the Fifteen Years War, a fourth “student *zazenkai*” was added, to be held in September, at the beginning of the academic year.<sup>64</sup> This institutionalization of student *zazenkai*—centralized by Engakuji administrators—marks, perhaps, a shift away from the individual groups’ autonomy but also means that the *zazenkai* endured even

---

<sup>62</sup> As discussed further below, Engakuji practitioners’ ages c. 1916–1917 ranged from teens to sixties and beyond (Engakuji, “Koji shōkenbo,” 1916–1917).

<sup>63</sup> “Kaki gakusei ō-sesshin 夏期學生大接心,” *Daijō Zen*, vol. 7, no. 8 (August 1930), 100. The author of this article attributed the initial systematization to Furukawa Gyōdō.

<sup>64</sup> According to Asahina’s 1967 account in Saiindan’s history, he added the fourth yearly sesshin after a trip to the US in 1949 mandated postponing the usual July sesshin until September. Students found the September sesshin—at the beginning of the academic year—to be so “effective for putting mind and body in order” that Asahina was inspired to make this September a regular occurrence (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2–3). Note that although September marked the beginning of the academic year at that time, Japan’s academic year typically now begins in April. Eventually, the Engakuji Student Zazenkai organization (円覚寺學生坐禅会) was formed; its central task was to administer the Engakuji-based *zazenkai* throughout the year, even while student members coordinated their respective groups’ activities and occasionally held events at other venues (Iizuka Shinjin, “Daigaku no Zenkai,” 42).

during historical vicissitudes when participation shrunk, such as during the postwar period, when most groups' membership declined, and some groups even went on hiatus.

In the mid-1920s, Nyoidan and Saiindan were joined by three more groups that were closely related to Engakuji.<sup>65</sup> In 1925, Shishinkai 至心会 was founded by students at Tokyo Imperial University (now Tokyo University).<sup>66</sup> 1926 then saw the founding of both Kōjōkai 向上会 and Ittokukai 一徳會 (at Keiō University and Tokyo Liberal Arts and Science University, or Tōkyō Bunrika Daigaku 東京文理科大学, respectively).<sup>67</sup>

Unlike Nyoidan and Saiindan, none of the three latter groups appears to be active today.

### 3.2.5 Saiin'an Destroyed, Kojirin Reborn (1926–1928)

Although Saiin'an had managed to survive the great earthquake of 1923, an accidental late-night fire in March 1926 destroyed the sub-temple in its entirety, leaving student practitioners and other *koji* without a dedicated practice space. However, the students turned this devastating loss into reconstruction efforts that finally bestowed a full

---

<sup>65</sup> These dates all come from Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 15. The groups Shishinkai, Kōjōkai, and Ittokukai (although not their founding dates) are also mentioned in the wooden placard inside current-day Kojirin. That placard—installed in 1928—recounts the story of the 1926 fire, subsequent reconstruction, and reopening in 1928; it makes clear that members of all groups played a role in the reconstruction and reopening, as discussed below. It should be noted that of these groups, only Nyoidan and Saiindan are still active today. These two groups also have the most robust group histories, so information about the other three groups has been pieced together, largely from the accounts of former Nyoidan and Saiindan members.

<sup>66</sup> Shishinkai appears to be institutionally separate from Tokyo University's Zen group, Ryōzenkai 陵禅会, which was founded in 1934 and eventually became affiliated with Ningen Zen Kyōdan. For more information about Ryōzenkai, see Tōkyō Daigaku Ryōzenkai 東京大学陵禅会, *Meian sōsō: Tōkyō Daigaku Ryōzenkai 60 nenshi*, 明暗雙々：東京大学陵禅会六十年史 (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Ryōzenkai Kōenkai, 1995).

<sup>67</sup> Although Tokyo Liberal Arts and Science University was founded as a university in 1929—that is, after the 1928 reconstruction of Saiin'an—it seems that there were previous incarnations of this school as a teacher training college (i.e., *kōshi* 高師).

Kojirin (known as such to this day) upon lay practitioners for generations to come, while also demonstrating the power of students' initiative in Engakuji's lay community more broadly.

According to Nakano Goyō and Asahina Sōgen, the fire had occurred through a “blunder” on the part of Saiin'an's caretaker, Imakita Keidō 今北啓道, an elderly monk who had also taken refuge at Saiin'an after his temple, the nearby Zōrokuan 蔵六庵 (also an Engakuji sub-temple), was crushed in the earthquake.<sup>68</sup> Imakita Keidō's sister—a shamisen player who was apparently also staying at Saiin'an—had been out giving music lessons one night. The elderly woman had lit the lantern in the latrine late at night upon her return but then forgot to extinguish it; after she fell asleep, the flames spread and engulfed the whole temple.<sup>69</sup>

Saiindan's members—bearing a special connection to Saiin'an and keenly motivated to rebuild their practice space as soon as possible—and other student practitioners eventually came up with a solution, which was determined at a mass meeting.<sup>70</sup> Many student members practiced not only Zen but also traditional Japanese swordsmanship (*kendō* 剣道, literally “the way of the sword”), and many practiced at a

---

<sup>68</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2. Iizuka Shinjin 飯塚真人 reports further details: that the fire occurred at 2:30 am on March 28, 1926 (see Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 133).

<sup>69</sup> For Asahina's and Nakano's accounts, see Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2 and 8, respectively. Nakano referred to the fire as the “Shamisen Fire” (given that the priest's sister, a shamisen player, was out giving lessons before the fire). Nakano stated that this nickname was inspired by “Long-Sleeve Kimono Fire” (also known as the Great Fire of Meireki) that destroyed much of Edo in 1657.

<sup>70</sup> At least, Saiindan lore describes Saiindan's members' central roles in this endeavor. For Asahina's account of that meeting, see Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2.

Tokyo training hall (*dōjō* 道場) in the Yagyū school of *kendō*.<sup>71</sup> According to Saiindan lore, these students approached their *kendō* master and director (*kanchō* 館長) of the training hall, Yagyū Motō 柳生基夫, for help (Yagyū Motō was also known by his Buddhist name, Layman Tesshin 徹心). In addition to Layman Tesshin's indirect connection to Engakuji by way of his students who practiced in both places, he had directly contributed to Saiindan's development in the group's early years, according to both Asahina and Nakano.<sup>72</sup> After a post-fire community meeting at Engakuji in which the students and other laypeople joined forces, Layman Tesshin's students asked for a remarkable gift: the *kendō* training hall itself. At the time, Layman Tesshin was on his sickbed, hospitalized and in the midst of two surgeries for stomach cancer; and from his bed in the hospital, he assented.<sup>73</sup>

Thus, the training hall—a one-story building of nearly 2500 square feet called the Yagyū Hekiyōkan 柳生碧榕館—would be physically transported to Kita-Kamakura

---

<sup>71</sup> As is discussed in chapter 5, *kendō* was more central than Zen in the lives of several practitioners and, in fact, had led many to Zen practice in the first place, as they intended to strengthen their *kendō* practice through Zen.

<sup>72</sup> Asahina states that Tesshin Koji was centrally involved in Saiindan's founding (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2). Nakano mentions Tesshin Koji's considerable donations, mentioned above, that provided for such renovations at Saiin'an as roof repair (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 6).

<sup>73</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 133. Asahina also elaborates on Layman Tesshin's medical condition and hospitalizations; according to Asahina, the final decision to donate the *dōjō* was made from Tesshin's hospital sickroom in the presence of Asahina and two others (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2).



from the Ushigome Wakamatsu-chō 牛込若松町 neighborhood of Tokyo.<sup>74</sup> In order to afford this feat financially, students from the various university groups practicing at Engakuji—including Saiindan, Nyoidan, Shishinkai, Ittokukai, and Kōjōkai—embarked on fundraising. They were relatively successful, soliciting funds from alumni and others sympathetic to lay Zen, though they fell short of organizers’ goal by 500 yen, a large sum in that day. According to Asahina, these funds were then provided by a Nyoidan alumnus living in Osaka, industrialist Ataka Yakichi 安宅弥吉 (1873–1949), and the project moved forward.<sup>75</sup>

After a lapse of nearly two years since the fire, laypeople celebrated the re-opening of their training hall in 1928, meditating there anew under Furukawa Gyōdō 古川堯道 Rōshi (1872–1961), who served as a significant leader for the student organizations and other lay practitioners for decades. Unfortunately, Layman Tesshin died in 1927 before seeing the fruits of his generosity. The new training hall’s “Opening Sesshin” (*kaitan ō-sesshin* 開単大接心) took place from March 20–25, 1928, with about thirty participants. A photograph from the opening ceremony on the final day of *sesshin* (March 25) features more than seventy attendees, including monastics and laypeople

---

<sup>74</sup> A scroll hanging within Kojirin today, written in 1928, describes the building’s size as being 70 *tsubo* 坪. One *tsubo* is currently measured at 35.58 square feet, and 70 *tsubo* are estimated to be approximately 2,491 square feet.

<sup>75</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2. Thanks to Richard Jaffe for pointing out that Ataka was a lifelong friend and patron of D. T. Suzuki; Ataka and Suzuki grew up together in Kanagawa.

(distinguished by their clothing), women and men, old and young (the photo includes four children).<sup>76</sup>

The new training hall differed physically from traditional Rinzai training halls, as it was designed for fencing, not meditation.<sup>77</sup> For example, there were no raised platform (*tan* 単) on which to place one's cushion and mat for daytime sitting and nighttime sleeping. However, Kojirin leadership readily adapted for meditation this low, long room with gleaming wooden floors that lay practitioners still use to this day. Kojirin's physical structure also differed from the typical monks' hall in that it consists almost entirely of the *zendō*, whereas the large *sōdō* 僧堂 (monks' hall, in which monastic trainees do zazen, eat, and sleep) or smaller *zendō* 禅堂 occupies just a small part of the traditional Rinzai monastic compound.<sup>78</sup> Although Kojirin ostensibly models its practice on monks'

---

<sup>76</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 219.

<sup>77</sup> For a description of the *zendō* as an “imaginary ideal” for Meiji-era Rinzai monastics, as well as an overview of what the training hall comprised in Edo and Meiji Japan, as well as their Song-era Chan models, see Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 125–29. Sawada notes that until the fifteenth century, “the communal-style monastic hall (*sōdō*), modeled after the Song Chinese structures in which Chan monks had meditated, slept, and eaten their meals, had been the heart of the medieval Japanese Zen monastery.” However, in Rinzai training compounds, these full monastic halls became fewer and fewer, as sub-temples (*tatchū*) were built and the center of training shifted to the teacher's quarters (*hōjō* 方丈). In the Tokugawa period, there was a movement to restore the communal halls to their former status as training centers; and by the Meiji period—particularly in the wake of early Meiji anti-Buddhist persecution—the *zendō* had taken on even more symbolic meaning (as the heart of Rinzai monastic practice) than it already had.

<sup>78</sup> For an explanation of the *shichidō garan* 七堂伽藍, or seven-hall temple—what Collcutt describes as “the irreducible core of the Zen monastery”—see Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan* (Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1981), 183–186. From the fifteenth century, this term described the seven halls—each of which corresponded to a body part, as the entire compound was anthropomorphized—as follows: “the mountain gate (*sanmon* 山門), Buddha hall (*Butsuden* 佛殿), Dharma hall (*hattō* 法堂), kitchen-office (*kuin* 庫院), monks' hall (*sōdō* 僧堂), bathhouse (*yokushitsu* 浴室), and latrine (*tōsu* 東司)” (Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, 184).

practice, this structural difference may have been deliberate, given that Kojirin leadership was able to design the space to be maximally functional for lay people following the fire.<sup>79</sup> In any case, the structural idiosyncrasies—designed for *kendō* and consisting primarily of the *zendō*—serves, first, as a physical embodiment of “the unity of Zen and *kendō*” (*zen ken ichinyo* 禅剣一如). The ostensibly long-term relationship between “Zen and the sword”—which is explored further in chapter 5—was not only promoted rhetorically amidst the early twentieth-century “*bushidō* boom” (e.g., by Nukariya Kaiten) but was also a lived reality of many student Zen practitioners.<sup>80</sup>

Moreover, with the *zendō* as Kojirin’s central focus, the building also symbolizes the Rinzai lay movement’s move away from formal ritual and ceremony and toward practice, experience, and the primacy of *zazen*. For the early Meiji Rinzai monastic community, as Sawada demonstrates, the *zendō* played a crucial role as the symbol of rigorous training. Following 1872, Rinzai Zen clerics had ceased to be characterized by the celibacy, vegetarianism, and home-leaving that had characterized the ideal Buddhist monk of the undefined past.<sup>81</sup> However, these practices could be enacted in the rigorous

---

<sup>79</sup> Given the dearth of detailed pre-1926 records for Kojirin, it is not clear how much the physical structure changed following the fire.

<sup>80</sup> For primary sources promoting this relationship, see, for example, Nukariya Kaiten, *Religion of the Samurai: A Study of Zen Philosophy and Discipline in China and Japan* (London: Luzac & Co., 1913). For analysis of the historical accuracy of the “*bushidō* boom” in modern Japan, see, for example, Oleg Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Bushidō in Modern Japan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); and Oleg Benesch, “Reconsidering Zen, Samurai, and the Martial Arts,” *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 14, no. 17 (September 2016): 1–23.

<sup>81</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 124–125. Sawada also points out that this ideal is “imaginary,” to a degree. For an examination of 1872 as a turning point for monastics (e.g., regarding the decriminalization of clerical marriage) and the Buddhist-state relationship, and for discussion of

setting of Rinzai monastic training and, in particular, the *zendō*.<sup>82</sup> Moreover, Rinzai Zen's ostensible uniqueness and identity stemmed from this rigorous *zendō* training: an emphasis that was not new in the Meiji period but had "intensified" in the fraught post-Restoration environment when monastic morale was low and Buddhists, regardless of the sect to which they belonged, were compelled to demonstrate their relevance and ensure Buddhism's survival. Thus, for Rinzai monastics, the *zendō* was as central to their Buddhist mission and identity as ever—a mission that for some practitioners, as Sawada points out, became patriotic and tied to national interests.<sup>83</sup>

Despite the *zendō*'s symbolic (and practical) importance in modern Japanese Rinzai Zen, however, it remained true that *zazen* and other *zendō* practice were just part of Rinzai monastic training and practice, alongside rituals, liturgy, and the nuts and bolts of running a monastery (e.g., cleaning, gardening, cooking, tending to parishioners, obtaining donations via *takuhatsu*, and engaging in endless administrative tasks). For laypeople, on the other hand, the *zendō* (as well as the *sanzen* room) was most practitioners' sole locale for formal Zen practice and training, complementary to home practice venues and the myriad activities of daily life into which practitioners sought to integrate their practice. Therefore, arguably, the *zendō* took on greater practical

---

the debates and policy pertaining to Buddhist clerical marriage vis-à-vis broader social and legal changes (c. 1872–1937), see Jaffe, *Neither Monk nor Layman*.

<sup>82</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 125–127.

<sup>83</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 127.

importance to laypeople—even as it perhaps had less symbolic significance (in the sense of signifying home-leaving and so forth) than it did for Rinzai clerics.

In other words, as Zen moved out of the monastery in the form of lay Rinzai practice, there was a greatly increased emphasis on zazen and, accordingly, on the relationship between zazen and personal experience. This trend—explored in greater detail in the next chapter—could certainly be seen in the activities of the university students and more broadly in the lay Zen assemblies (*zenkai* 禅会), all of which centered on zazen (in *zazenkai* and *sesshin*), dharma discourses (e.g., *teishō* 提唱, *hōwa* 法話, or *kōen* 公演), and *sanzen* 参禅 (one-on-one encounters with the master to present one’s understanding of the *kōan*).<sup>84</sup> Moreover, this trend was embodied by the Kojirin building and the *zendō*’s prominence therein.

### 3.2.6 Student Zen Before, and During, the Fifteen Years War (1930–1945)

Nearly two decades after the announcement entitled “Students’ Rinzai Zen” was published in a 1911 edition of *Zendō* (as discussed earlier in this chapter), a report—entitled “Student Summer *Sesshin*”—was published in *Daijōzen*.<sup>85</sup> Written in 1930, this report reflects several developments in lay Zen in the preceding decades, since Nyoidan’s inception in 1906. First, it notes that the retreats for Tokyo-area students (especially, but not limited to, members of Nyoidan, Saiindan, Kōjōkai, Shishinkai, and Ittokukai) had

---

<sup>84</sup> Although *sanzen* transpired in the master’s quarters (and therefore not technically in the *zendō*), it took place during zazen and was, in a certain sense, an extension of the *zendō*.

<sup>85</sup> “Kaki gakusei ō-sesshin 夏季學生大接心,” *Daijō Zen*, vol. 7, no. 8 (August 1930), 100.

become regular, taking place during the students' spring, summer, and winter breaks for a total of three retreats annually.<sup>86</sup> However, for the first ten-to-fifteen years of the group's existence (until the late 1910s or early 1920s), there was variability in terms of what they did, how long they practiced, and with whom they practiced.<sup>87</sup> This apparently stabilized in the 1920s under Furukawa Gyōdō, with the formation of additional student groups and jointly-held "student retreats," as discussed earlier.

Secondly, the report emphasizes that these retreats reflect that Zen practice is flourishing; the author notes that the retreats were carried out in a "vigorous" manner, with more than seventy participants on average.<sup>88</sup> Third, the author asserts that participants strive to embody the lifestyle, ethos, and "fervent" (*nesshin* 熱心) efforts of monks-in-training. At the same time, however, the report notes a structure that allows flexibility and therefore increased accessibility to busy members of society (*shakaijin* 社

---

<sup>86</sup> Nyoidan's diaries show that since the group's founding in 1906, Nyoidan members had tended to congregate during these three periods anyway. These diaries (*nisshi* 日誌) are reprinted in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 57–207. For instance, during the period from 1906 to 1920, there are diaries covering a total of thirty different practice periods, ranging from five days to over two months; the majority of the practice periods coincide roughly with student breaks from school.

<sup>87</sup> In Nyoidan's diaries, there is a gap between March 1919 and June 1926, with the exception of four photographs taken between 1920 and 1925 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 204–207). It is not clear whether these records were lost in the 1923 earthquake (which destroyed a couple of Nyoidan's practice sites), 1926 fire at Saiin'an, or in another fashion.

<sup>88</sup> It is not clear whether the *Daijō Zen* author takes this figure from a particular retreat or is estimating the average. We know from Nyoidan's hundredth anniversary commemorative history that students graduating in 1930–1933—that is, Hitotsubashi students who hypothetically could have been participating in *sesshin* in 1930—totaled 77 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 2008, 370–371). Prewar *sesshin* records at Kojirin are no longer extant, so we cannot know the *sesshin* numbers for certain, but it is not a far cry to say that 77 was probably an average figure for the time. A complicating factor for determining participation and interest in *sesshin* is that *sesshin* were necessarily capped for logistical reasons, and it is impossible to know how many people sought to participate but were turned away.

会人)—particularly by allowing participants to attend the retreats part-time, as their schedule allows. Fourth, the report depicts Furukawa Gyōdō as a central figure in this thriving scene, with the thrice-yearly student *sesshin* institutionalized at Kojirin under his leadership.<sup>89</sup>

The report makes clear Furukawa's importance to his students. It was published in *Daijōzen* following the summer sesshin after Furukawa's (first) retirement as abbot of Engakuji in May 1930. For the July sesshin, students were desperate in their attempts to have Furukawa return to lead them. Despite their entreaties via letter, however, Furukawa told them that he had vowed never again to “go beyond Tsu or Hakone again in [his] lifetime”—in other words, he had no intention of resuming his teaching or administrative duties in the Kamakura-Tokyo region.<sup>90</sup> His students responded by collecting the “blood writing” [*kessho* 血書] of student members to deliver to Furukawa in his hometown of Matsue, where he was bedridden due to illness:

Representatives from the student organizations carried the blood writing of twenty-five [student members].<sup>91</sup> These five

---

<sup>89</sup> The article says that the retreats came to be held with such regularity during Furukawa's tenure as chief abbot (*kanchō*) of Engakuji. In fact, Furukawa ended up serving two stints as chief abbot: first from 1920–1930 (as mentioned earlier, he succeeded Sōen after Sōen's death in 1919) and then became chief abbot again in 1935, retiring for good in 1940.

<sup>90</sup> Furukawa had returned to his hometown of Matsue (in Shimane Prefecture). Both Tsu (in Mie Prefecture) and Hakone (in Kanagawa Prefecture) are east of Matsue and west of Kamakura and Tokyo, so the clear meaning is that Furukawa—at the time—did not intend to move back to Kamakura or Tokyo. History proved this hope futile.

<sup>91</sup> It is not clear whether the letter was literally written in the students' blood or whether this is a metaphorical gesture toward the importance with which the students regarded their message. The term used here is *kessho* 血書, defined in Oda's *Bukkyō daijiten* as “writing a sacred text, or sūtra (*kyōmon* 經文) using blood” (Oda, *Bukkyō daijiten*, s.v. “*kessho* 血書,” 398). Mochizuki's *Bukkyō daijiten* provides a nearly identical definition (Mochizuki, *Bukkyō daijiten*, s.v. “*kessho* 血書,” vol. 1, 904).

[representatives] were the committee members from each organization—Fujimoto 藤本, Tanaka 田中, and Yonemura 米村 from Shōdai [Tokyo University of Commerce]; Mukai 向井 from Teidai [Tokyo Imperial University]; and Shitakawa 下川 from Keiō—and carried this blood writing. At the time that they proceeded to Matsue, the Rōshi was confined to bed due to a long illness, but the five committee members presented the blood writing to the Zen master. They were overcome with emotion and simply cried. The Zen master was moved by this earnestness and agreed to go to the capital [Tokyo].

As a result, over seventy laypeople—about half of which were university students and half were non-students who had previously practiced with Furukawa—participated in a week-long *sesshin* during which, “from 3:00 in the morning until 10:00 at night,” they “worked fervently, with exhortations” and practiced “in accordance with the rules of the monks’ hall.”<sup>92</sup>

In this article, it is no coincidence that Furukawa is emphasized, since the narrative centers on him; however, it also points to his significant role in guiding lay students for decades: not only for university students but also for lay practitioners in the Tokyo area generally.<sup>93</sup> As discussed above, Furukawa played a pivotal role in establishing the training hall for laypeople at Engakuji in the early 1920s and rebuilding Kojirin, following the fire, from 1927 to 1928. Overemphasizing certain individual masters like Furukawa carries the risk of shrouding the collective efforts of the myriad leaders (lay and monastic) and practitioners to promote Zen practice in early twentieth-

---

<sup>92</sup> “Kaki gakusei ō-sesshin 夏季學生大接心,” *Daijō Zen*, vol. 7, no. 8 (August 1930), 100. Most of the participants’ names are printed in this article, sorted into the two categories. Among the non-student population, there were at least three people with clearly female names.

<sup>93</sup> For example, Furukawa served as Nyoidan’s main leader from as early as 1913 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1957, 211).



century Japan. At the same time, however, Furukawa clearly followed in the footsteps of his predecessors at Engakuji, Shaku Sōen and Imakita Kōsen—and laid similar groundwork for his dharma successor and eventual Engakuji abbot Asahina Sōgen—by playing a disproportionately significant role in Tokyo-area lay Zen during the interwar period.

### 3.2.7 Postscript: Student Zen, During and After the Fifteen Years War

Participation in the student Zen groups remained vigorous into the 1930s, for the most part. Nyoidan's records show that among Tokyo University of Commerce, the graduating classes between 1932 and 1942 each included, on average, more than 19 students who were members of Nyoidan.<sup>94</sup> However, this level of participation dropped off steeply (and not unsurprisingly) after this, with an average of just over 7 students in the graduating classes between 1943 and 1948, and just 1–3 students in each of the classes that graduated between 1949 and 1955.<sup>95</sup> Records show that student sesshin continued until late in the war, at least intermittently. As late as April 1943, at Engakuji, there was an “all-night sitting to annihilate enemy nations” (“*tekikoku gekimetsu tesshō ōnoza* 敵国撃滅徹宵大野坐”); this was followed by all-night zazen at Tōkaiji 東海寺 that November.<sup>96</sup> However, in September 1943, the Student Mobilization Order was

---

<sup>94</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 2008, 371–374.

<sup>95</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 2008, 374–375.

<sup>96</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1957, 214. This event may have been held in April of 1942, not 1943; the timeline here (and how the events correspond to dates) is not clear.

imposed, and after sesshin was held at Kojirin in March of 1944, lay Zen practice there was formally suspended.<sup>97</sup>

It was during that same period, in the latter days of the war, that the Japanese navy occupied Kojirin.<sup>98</sup> Following the war, Asahina Sōgen—who was chief abbot of Engakuji before, during, and after the war, and shepherded multiple university student groups—worked to reestablish lay (and student) Zen at Engakuji. He notes that immediately postwar, the Kojirin buildings—having been vacated by the navy—was used for several years as a kindergarten at the request of the town of Kamakura.<sup>99</sup> This caused “inconvenience,” but once a new kindergarten was constructed, “Kojirin returned once more to the hands of the students.” However, its condition had greatly deteriorated, and renovations were needed. Once again, the student organizations worked together to raise funds, and a Waseda alumnus who was president of an architectural firm served “selflessly” as contractor, yielding the Kojirin that we know today.<sup>100</sup> Student Zen was resuscitated to the extent that under Asahina, in the years prior to Saiindan’s forty-fifth anniversary in 1967, student *sesshin* participants frequently exceeded one hundred.<sup>101</sup>

Also under Asahina, in 1950, Gakushūin University students formally founded Shōzokukai 正続会; Asahina named the group after the Engakuji sub-temple Shōzoku’in

---

<sup>97</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1957, 214. For more on the “student mobilization” (*gakuto shutsujin* 学徒出陣), see Ben-Ami Shillony, “Universities and Students in Wartime Japan,” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 45, no. 4 (1986): 769–87.

<sup>98</sup> For more information about Kojirin’s use as navy facilities, see Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji-shi*, 757. Asahina Sōgen also discusses this in Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2.

<sup>99</sup> This choice was “not [made] freely” (*fujiyū* 不自由; Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2).

<sup>100</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2.

<sup>101</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 3.

正統院 that was (and is) part of the monks' hall.<sup>102</sup> Gakushūin's group had initially formed in 1947—and was recognized formally in 1948—as a Buddhist study group (*Bukkyō kenkyūkai* 仏教研究会), not explicitly for the purpose of doing zazen. However, members eventually determined that it would be a “zazen club” (*zazenbu* 坐禅部), established a *zendō* on campus, and started actively participating in Engakuji events. Finally in 1950, the group formally became Shōzokukai. According to Gakushūin member Nosaka Jirō 野坂二郎, right after the war, there was no physical home base for the student Zen groups at Engakuji, so students did sesshin in the monks' hall (*sōdō*) alongside monks in training (*unsui*).<sup>103</sup> At that time, *teishō* for the monks took place in Shōzoku'in, so Asahina Sōgen named the group Shōzokukai.

Due to the dearth of materials on Shishinkai, Kōjōkai, and Ittokukai—none of which is still active today—and due to Shōzokukai's relatively late founding, I do not focus on those groups here. It should be noted that Nyoidan, Saiindan, and Shōzokukai are all active today, its members participating in Zen-related activities on campus and at Engakuji.

---

<sup>102</sup> Asahina also mentions new university groups that formed after the Fifteen Years War, including those at Seikei University 成蹊大学, Seijō University 成城大学, and Musashi University 武蔵大学 (in Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 2).

<sup>103</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 17.

### 3.3 Who Was Sitting in the Zendō?

#### 3.3.1 Against the Grain of “No-Good” Youth: Ferocious Practitioners

In the essay, “A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting” (first published in 1900), D. T. Suzuki minces no words in his opening sentence: “In recent days the character of our Japanese youth has become noticeably depraved.”<sup>104</sup> The solution for Suzuki—and for Shaku Sōen, on whose notions this essay was based—was Zen-style quiet sitting. Suzuki was not alone in his concerns about young people’s deterioration of character amidst Japan’s modernization, nor was he alone in prescribing Zen or other forms of self-cultivation practices as a remedy to this society-wide malady.<sup>105</sup> As bemoaned by the author of Katsumine Daitetsu’s obituary, following Katsumine’s death in 1911:

---

<sup>104</sup> Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 2. Richard M. Jaffe notes in his introduction to this essay that Shaku Sōen and Suzuki were listed as coeditors in early editions of the work; Suzuki actually authored the work, based on Sōen’s notions (Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 1). The title of this section is based on the widespread fear—particularly in the first decade of the twentieth century—that Japan’s youth had become “depraved,” as Suzuki articulates. Per David Ambaras: “In Japanese, delinquents were most commonly described after 1900 by terms employing the adjective *furyō*, meaning ‘no-good’”; see David R. Ambaras, *Bad Youth: Juvenile Delinquency and the Politics of Everyday Life in Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 3.

<sup>105</sup> As Jaffe notes in his introduction to aforementioned essay by Suzuki: “The essay was written against the backdrop of widespread concern in Japan that the character of the nation’s youth had declined during the Meiji era (1868–1912) and in the context of the widespread promotion of *seiza* (quiet sitting) as a means for personal cultivation by a variety of religious denominations. As is clear in the article, for Suzuki the best method of quiet sitting was *zazen* practice. Through this simple sitting practice, Suzuki argues, the youth of Japan will obtain emotional stability and moral clarity” (Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 1). Regarding “no-good” youth, see especially Ambaras, *Bad Youth*. Of turn-of-the-century social reformers who were focused on students’ behavior, Ambaras notes: “...the new discourse on student degeneracy took the form of a moral panic about the dangers faced by Japan’s incipient middle class, the backbone of the modern nation and empire, at a time when post-elementary schooling came to constitute the principal pathways to this social position” (Ambaras, *Bad Youth*, 66). For a discussion of national morality (*kokumin dōtoku* 国民道徳) as a solution for “dangerous thought” in the early twentieth century, see Richard M. Reitan, *Making a Moral Society: Ethics and the State in Meiji Japan*,

Gentlemen who have sturdy bodies and strong hearts [*gōkotsu tetchō no shi* 剛骨鐵腸の士], and young men who love their country and lament what is happening in the world, are few; the whole world has become a place of idleness for apathetic/weak men with no willpower. Wouldn't anyone with a heart lament [such a situation]?<sup>106</sup>

The author then goes on to praise the considerable accomplishments of “Meiji-era exemplar of the spiritual world and pioneer of the Buddhist world,” Katsumine Daitetsu (1828–1911; discussed elsewhere in this dissertation), who did his part to remedy the deplorable social situation by teaching over one thousand lay students and founding one of modern Japan's earliest lay Rinzai groups, Kōzen Gokokukai, in 1893.

Against the image of weak-willed, unpatriotic, and amoral youth of late Meiji Japan, the members of Nyoidan—alongside the members of Tokyo Higher Commercial School's other religious and self-cultivation organizations (*shūkyōdan* 宗教団 and *shūyōdan* 修養団)—seem to have been cut of a different cloth. At least, they depicted themselves (and were depicted) in an entirely different light: one of ferocity and great effort (exemplifying “traditional” Rinzai values), and one of patriotism (exemplifying ideal values of that era). Nyoidan alumnus Shimada Hiroshi 島田宏, who was in

---

Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010, 114–151. (Note that Reitan does not focus here on either juveniles or delinquents per se.) For a discussion of Meiji youth and self-cultivation practices, see Wasaki Kōtarō 和崎光太郎, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘hanmon seinen’ no saikentō: 1900 nendai ni okeru ‘seinen’ no hen'yō katei 近代日本における「煩悶青年」の再検討: 1900年代における<青年>の変容過程,” *Nihon no kyōiku shigaku* 55 (2012): 19–31; and Wasaki Kōtarō, *Meiji no ‘seinen’: risshi, shūyō, hanmon* 明治の〈青年〉: 立志・修養・煩悶 (Kyoto: Mineruva Shobō, 2017).

<sup>106</sup> Enomoto, “*Meiji Zenkai iketsu*,” 7.

Nyoidan's first generation of practitioners, speaks of his fellow practitioners' love of school and nation and the "ferocity" for which they strove in their lives and endeavors:

It was a group [of people] who burned the flame of love for their school and country [*aikōshin aikokushin* 愛校心愛国心]. Thus the motto of the time was the word, ferocity [*mōretsu* 猛烈]. That is to say, we practiced [the Way] fiercely but also played fiercely. In daily life, we were fierce like wild beasts, but also [engaged] fiercely in spiritual self-cultivation [*seishinteki shūyō* 精神的修養].<sup>107</sup>

For Nyoidan members, this spiritual self-cultivation meant Zen practice—in particular, attending Zen practice intensives (*sesshin* or *zazenkai*) at one of various sites in Tokyo and Kamakura. Students strove to embody ferocity in practice, whether the practice was formal or informal. On one end the spectrum of formality and structure were *sesshin*, typically lasting between three and seven days. For *sesshin*, either the students practiced alongside the monastics in Engakuji's training hall (*sōdō* 僧堂); alternatively, following the *sōdō* schedule and rules, they held their own *sesshin*, supervised by a monastic (in one of the venues mentioned earlier in this chapter). Of the winter Rōhatsu 臘八 *sesshin*—usually held in December, in honor of the Buddha's awakening, and known for its particular rigors—Nyoidan alumnus Masumoto Yoshitarō 増本芳太郎

---

<sup>107</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 257. Shimada graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1908. 「...所謂愛校心愛国心に燃え立った連中であつた。従つて當時の標語は猛烈と云う言葉であつた。即ち猛烈に修道もするが、猛烈に遊びもする。其の生活状態は野獸的に猛烈だったが、精神修養も亦猛烈であつた。」

affirms that it was especially “fierce” (*mōretsu* 猛烈).<sup>108</sup> Even in less formal practice settings, such as staying in one of Engakuji’s sub-temples for durations of one month or longer during school breaks, students describe great rigor and exertion in their practice. For example, in July 1918, eighteen students at Tokyo Higher Commercial School, alongside a professor from Hokkaidō University, followed the following daily schedule: there was wakeup at 3:00, a lecture by the *rōshi*’s, three opportunities for *sanzen* (one-on-one meetings with the *rōshi*), bedtime at 9:00, and, presumably, many hours of *zazen*.<sup>109</sup> There were also a handful of Nyoidan members who stayed at Kaizenji, in quarters suitably nicknamed by their teacher Shinjō Rōshi: the “Jikyōryō 自疆寮,” or the “Strenuous Effort Quarters.”<sup>110</sup>

This rigorous schedule and “ferocity”—a central ideal in Rinzai Zen, and, here, also tied to practitioners’ love of university and nation—are thus a far reach from the stereotypically disaffected youth of the day. It is difficult to know whether the students’ “ferocious” dispositions led them to Zen practice, or whether Zen practice led to ferocity and dedication. In other words, was this unusual population self-selecting and drawn to practicing Rinzai-style Zen due to pre-existing personality tendencies and/or patriotic

---

<sup>108</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 273. During *Rōhatsu sesshin* in some monasteries, practitioners were (and still are) expected to remain awake—or at least upright—for the full seven days and nights.

<sup>109</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 196. This practice intensive was described as “*sanrō* 参籠,” rather than a formal *sesshin*, so *zazen* may have been informal and therefore not included on the schedule.

<sup>110</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 263. This seems to be a reference to the phrase “君子以自疆不息,” which means “the gentleman [*kunshi*], through his strenuous effort, is not even breathing.” For an account of life in the Strenuous Effort Quarters, see especially the account by Uhara Yoshitoyo, who resided there with a few fellow practitioners (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 260–269).

inclinations; or did the students primarily develop their ferocity and discipline through sustained Zen practice, particularly in sesshin, and through internalizing their teachers' rhetoric and ideals? Nyoidan alumni's accounts often suggest the latter: that is, developing an ethos of ferocity and discipline through Zen practice.

As an example of growing more fierce and committed through the course of Zen practice, early Nyoidan member Ōta Tetsuzō 太田哲三 speaks disparagingly of his “lazy” tendencies and remembers: “My life at Kaizenji was short, and I was well known as a lazy person, so it wasn’t [the case] that I diligently exerted myself [*shōjin* 精進] for the sake of the Way; similarly, even more than having a dharma relationship with Shinjō Rōshi, I had a worldly connection with him.”<sup>111</sup> Despite this self-deprecating portrayal (not unusual in Japanese Zen practitioners’ autobiographical accounts), Ōta later chose to live at Kaizenji alongside his *senpai* Tasaki-kun 田崎君 and Uhara Yoshitoyo 宇原義豊. Ōta thus practiced regularly, at least during Shinjō’s monthly, week-long visits, during which he listened to *teishō* and did *sanzen* with Shinjō.

Others do not explicitly depict a transformation (e.g., from being a “lazy person”) but, nonetheless, describe engaging in fervent practice. In the personal accounts by Nyoidan alumni and other lay practitioners of the era, a common descriptor of practitioners and teachers alike is *nesshin* 熱心 (often translated as “zealous” or “fervent”). For example, Tasaki Masayoshi 田崎仁義 (1880–1976; graduated in 1905)

---

<sup>111</sup> Ōta Tetsuzō 太田哲三, “*Shinjō rōshi to watashi* 真浄老師と私,” in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 269–272. Ōta Tetsuzō graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1911.



describes how he started practicing “fervently” following his summer exams in 1905 and how he “gradually was turned from the world of the abacus to the world of kōan.”<sup>112</sup> Tasaki uses similar language to describe how Nakahara Shūgaku was particularly “fervent” in his efforts to lead the young people and students.<sup>113</sup>

### 3.3.2 The “House Wind”: The Ethos of Lay Rinzai Practice

Thus, like the aforementioned practitioners, many students characterized early twentieth-century lay Zen practice by its ferocity (*mōretsu* 猛烈) or bravery (*yūmō* 勇猛).<sup>114</sup> As I discuss further in chapter 5, ferocity has constituted a central ideal in Rinzai Zen (Linji Chan) since its earliest centuries, as exemplified by Chan master Dahui Zonggao’s “rhetoric of heroism” in twelfth-century Chan.<sup>115</sup> The ideal of ferocity is embodied by the “Great Overpowering Will” (*daifunshi* 大憤志) that is considered one of the “three essentials” (*san’yō* 三要) for Chan practice and enlightenment: great faith, great doubt, and great will or determination.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 254.

<sup>113</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 255.

<sup>114</sup> One common expression in the accounts is “*shōjin yūmō* 精進勇猛,” which the *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* defines as “intense application” or “strenuous effort” (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “精進勇猛,” accessed January 28, 2020).

<sup>115</sup> Miriam Levering coined this phrase in the context of the ideals of Chan master Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (Jp., Daie Sōkō; 1089–1163) and his teacher Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (Jp. Engo Kokugon; 1063–1135); as discussed in chapter 5, this “rhetoric of heroism” is highly gendered. See Miriam Levering, “Lin-Chi (Rinzai) Ch’an and Gender: The Rhetoric of Equality and the Rhetoric of Heroism,” in *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender*, edited by José I. Cabazón, 137–56 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992).

<sup>116</sup> According to Charles Muller’s definition of the “three essentials”: “In the *Linji lu* the three requisites for the attainment of great enlightenment [are]: the great root of faith 大信根, the great ball of doubt 大疑團 (大疑情), and the great overpowering will 大憤志” (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “三要,” retrieved January 28, 2020). Although it is most common for modern

Such ideals have persisted into the early modern and modern period, and ferocity is a common trope in the depiction of individual Zen masters and the ideal ethos. For example, Imakita Kōsen's contemporary, Rinzai master Nakahara Nantenbō 中原南天棒 (1839–1925)—who was also dedicated to teaching lay Zen practitioners in the Meiji period—was known for his fierce and uncompromising style.<sup>117</sup> As another example, Kōzen Gokukai's founder, Katsumine Daitetsu, was occasionally called “Demon Daitetsu” (“Oni Daitetsu 鬼大徹”). Enomoto Shuson, the author of Katsumine's obituary, highlights the characteristic ferocity that Katsumine exhibited while traveling around the Hizen region, giving *teishō* and administered the precepts to followers, and garnering financial support to revive the impoverished Rinzai temple Nanzenji (of which he became the abbot in 1882). The author recounts: “He wielded his will, and when he gave *teishō* on the *Blue Cliff Record*, he smashed the bookstand, and the Demon Daitetsu would show his face.”<sup>118</sup> D.T. Suzuki also describes the prototypical *rōshi* in the context of would-be monastic novices' trials prior to entering training: “It seems as if no soft spots were left in the heart of the Zen master. What he generally doles out to his monks is ‘hot invective

---

Rinzai masters to emphasize the dimension of great doubt, some emphasize all three dimensions. For example, one-time Engakuji abbot and Nyoidan master, Ōta Maigan 太田晦巖 (1876–1946), explicitly reiterates these “three essentials” (*yōken* 要件) of Zen practice as one of the central themes in his essay that appears in Nyoidan's 1931 commemorative history (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 30–31).

<sup>117</sup> See, for example, Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools.”

<sup>118</sup> Enomoto, “*Meiji Zenkai iketsu*,” 9. Hizen 肥前 Province is in the area of present-day Nagasaki and Saga Prefectures. According to the same obituary, Katsumine was successful in this quest, garnering enough donations to rescue Nanzenji's treasures from the pawn shop.

and angry fist-shaking.”<sup>119</sup> We can see, therefore, that ferocity is not only an abstract ideal as articulated by Nyoidan alumnus Shimada (quoted above) but is also viscerally embodied by imposing masters, a quality that many students aspire to embody and which, no doubt, shapes the training atmosphere.

Another flavor of students’ practice also echoes Zen’s premodern ideal of the Zen fool. One-time Saiindan member Iizuka Shinjin 飯塚真人 states the group’s motto as “Be a fool!” (“*Baka ni nare* 馬鹿になれ!”).<sup>120</sup> This invokes another Zen trope: that is, the ideal of the *daigu* 大愚 or “great fool.” The *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* entry for *daigu* notes: “in Chan writings, [the term] is often seen used as a compliment, indicating that the practitioner is above everyday conceptions such as ‘intelligent’ and ‘foolish.’”<sup>121</sup> Moreover, it indicates that the practitioner is not relying on her intellect to perceive the truth. This motto, thus, invites student practitioners to turn away from the cerebral approach inherent to academia and toward the simple—if difficult—practice of being absorbed in their Zen practice (where the instruction is to “think with the belly, not with the head”—to be discussed later). Notably, this trope is far less common among the

---

<sup>119</sup> Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 10. The Japanese term that Suzuki uses is “*nekkatsu to shinken* 熱喝と瞋拳,” a rendering of the compound “熱喝瞋拳”; see Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, *Zendō seikatsu* 禪堂生活, translated by Yokogawa Kenshō 横川顕正 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2018), 44.

<sup>120</sup> Iizuka Shinjin, “Daigaku no Zenkai,” 42. Saiindan’s 1967 name register lists him as a fourth-year student at Waseda University at that time (Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 141). Although Iizuka Shinjin clearly was not a member in the group’s early days, he suggests that this has been a guiding principle since the group’s inception in 1922.

<sup>121</sup> Entry by Stefan Grace, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “大愚,” retrieved October 4, 2019. According to the same entry, the term literally means an “imbecile” or “very stupid person.” Various monks in Korea, China, and Japan—including the monk-poet Ryōkan 良寛 (1758–1831)—have taken this name. This term appears extensively in the Taishō canon.

student practitioners and other intellectuals that Zen practice draws—perhaps because of its seeming opposition to their scholarly pursuits, as well as the degree to which this ideal challenges them to relinquish cherished ways of thinking (which, ideally, any Rinzai practice does).

### 3.3.3 Demographics and Demographic Change at Engakuji

#### 3.3.3.1 Scale and Overview

Who meditated with Nyoidan, Saiindan, and the other student groups, and to what degree did the university students constitute the lay practitioner community at Engakuji? What was the scale of these groups—that is, how many practitioners were members of the groups and regularly took part in their activities? Who were these people (with regard to age, gender, social and geographical background, institutional affiliation and major, and so forth)? What do their demographics suggest about patterns of lay Zen practice more generally?

With regard to scale, authors of Nyoidan’s twenty-fifth anniversary history refer to the group’s five hundred “dharma friends” (*dōyū* 道友): that is, its members over the group’s history until that point.<sup>122</sup> This may not appear to represent a huge number when we consider the entire Tokyo metropolitan area over the course of decades. However, it is

---

<sup>122</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 53. The name register (*meibo* 名簿) in Nyoidan’s hundredth anniversary commemorative history lists 536 former members from the classes of 1894 through 1934 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 2008, 364–372); this confirms that there were likely over five hundred members upon the group’s twenty-fifth anniversary in 1931, taking into account the students matriculating at that time (through the class of 1934). Uncannily, the same commemorative history, published in 2008, lists exactly one thousand members in the group’s entire history, including students matriculating in 2008 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 2008, 364–380).

significant that hundreds of alumni—many of whom went on to run in influential circles and become prominent in their respective fields—had in common the Zen training ground. For these alumni and other lay practitioners, the Zen training ground was not simply an arbitrary site at which people met and mingled, and it was not a social site with “ordinary” interpersonal interactions.<sup>123</sup> Rather, it was a particular site at which “traditional” Japanese Buddhist values were thought to be manifested, and “Zen and the sword” (“*ken to zen* 剣と禅”) converged. Particularly after Kojirin developed into a more robust training facility in the 1920s, it became a place where young people and others could meet and be associated with the “new” and “old” elites (and new middle class) of modern Japan, while working fiercely—and together—in their endeavors to engage in spiritual cultivation, embody Rinzai-style ferocity and heroic masculinity, and contribute to the nation.

With regard to the demographics and scale of university students and other lay Rinzai practitioners at Engakuji in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, the documentary evidence is fragmentary and falls into roughly five categories: (1) the *koji* name registers kept by Engakuji (maintained by the monastic hall, Kojirin, or other temple offices); (2) the name registers maintained by student groups like Nyoidan and Saiindan (typically published in the groups’ commemorative histories); (3) general comments in monographs (like Iizuka’s *Sanzen no shiori*) or journals like *Zendō* and

---

<sup>123</sup> Indeed, as mentioned earlier in the chapter, in the early generations of Engakuji’s lay practice community—with the exception of student groups in the context of their organized activities—seemingly did not often interact or form direct relationships so long as they lacked a designated Kojirin and were scattered among Engakuji’s sub-temples, prior to the formation of Kojirin (c. 1919–1923).

*Daijōzen* (e.g., impressions and observations of lay Zen practice by practitioners, leaders, scholars, or others who came into contact with lay practice); (4) specific reports in the same periodicals about the *zazenkai* (reports that sometimes included the events' specific dates and times, name rosters, number of participants, and name of the Zen text on which the master lectured; and (5) photographs from the sources mentioned above (typically these were group photos that followed *sesshin* or, in the case of Nyoidan, periodic group photos at the university or practice sites).<sup>124</sup>

### 3.3.3.2 Inscribing the Name Registers

The most detailed information about practitioners' backgrounds and demographics comes from the registers in categories (1) and (2): that is, original registers of laypeople encountering the *rōshi* for the first time at Engakuji, and reprinted registers in the students' histories, respectively. I will focus here on information from those categories and will comment sparingly on the final category (photographs), particularly when I discuss gender below. The original name registers (*meibo* 名簿), still used by Zen groups today, contain participants' hand-written inscriptions on the occasion of attending an event, becoming a group member, and so forth. At Engakuji, monastic leaders have maintained name registers for laypeople (*koji* 居士) who have done "*shōken* 相見" for

---

<sup>124</sup> As mentioned in chapter 2, the event-summary section was common to popular Zen journals. In *Zendō*, for example, the titles of this section shifted over time and included the following: "Happenings in the Zen World (*Zenkai shōsoku* 禅界消息)," "Tidings from Kyoto (*Kyōto dayori* 京都だより)," or "The Zen World at a Glance (*Zenkai ichiran* 禅界一覽)." The latter title was a homonym of (and likely pun on) Imakita Kōsen's great work, *Zenkai ichiran* 禅海一瀾, which was very influential in the lay Zen world at that time. For the original, see Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川, *Zenkai ichiran* 禅海一瀾 (Tokyo: Hakujusha, 1987). Also see Shaku Sōen 釋宗演, *Zenkai ichiran kōwa* 禅海一瀾講話 (Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1918), and Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*.

the first time (*hatsu shōken* 初相見). *Shōken* means literally “to see” or “to perceive,” but in the Zen context, it signifies “a formal meeting between a disciple and a Zen master for the purpose of seeking and giving instruction.”<sup>125</sup> After this first encounter, the student could then attend *sanzen* and work on *kōan* with the *rōshi*, so in many cases, doing *shōken* signaled practitioners’ choice to become more serious in one’s Zen practice. These lists do not include all lay participants in *sesshin* or *zazenkai*, and they do not include all applicants for such events, as the events were necessarily capped. However, the *meibo* provide clear indication of “serious,” actively engaged Zen practitioners, detailed personal information for those practitioners, and snapshots of moments in time.<sup>126</sup> Unfortunately, Engakuji’s only surviving lay name registers from the Taishō period and later are from 1916–1917 and from 1943 onward.<sup>127</sup>

In the register from July 1916 through August 1917, there are a total of 86 entries. Most entries provide basic information: the practitioner’s name, age, and address. Often they also include occupation (e.g., student or military personnel) and affiliations (e.g.,

---

<sup>125</sup> Entry by Griffith Foulk, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “相見,” accessed August 29, 2019. This is discussed in chapter 4 in further detail.

<sup>126</sup> Engakuji has such name registers from 1916–1917 and from 1943 onward; see especially Engakuji, “Koji shōkenbo,” 1916–1917; Engakuji, “Koji shōkenkaku 居士相見覺,” handwritten name register (Kamakura, Japan: 1943–1944); and Engakuji, “Kojichō 居士帳,” handwritten name register (Kamakura, Japan: 1944–1958). It is worth noting that there are two pools of people under discussion here: those attending Zen events such as *zazenkai*, *sesshin*, and *teishō*, and those who were accepted as the *rōshi*’s formal students and did *kōan* work. These two groups overlapped but were not necessarily identical and may have had different demographics. This deserves further research.

<sup>127</sup> Current Engakuji leadership speculates that other records have been lost or inadvertently destroyed. For example, we know that some records were destroyed in Saiin’an’s fire of 1926, and we know that most buildings at Engakuji had significant damage (or were destroyed) in the earthquake of 1923.

university name); and above some of the entries—in handwriting other than that of the inscriber—there is the name of an Engakuji *tatchū* written, indicating either that the participant was staying there at the time (e.g., Butsunichi'an 仏日庵 was the most prevalent among such sub-temples), or that the practitioner had a special connection to the temple that may have facilitated the practitioner's becoming the rōshi's official student.<sup>128</sup>

For the practitioners who signed that register, one of the most striking commonalities of their entries is their youth. Seventy practitioners (out of 86) made note of their age, and of those seventy, a whopping 96 percent were under the age of forty, 63% (44 people) were in their twenties, 29% (20 people) were in their thirties, and 4% (3 people) were still in their late teens when they first began practice with the rōshi (i.e., doing *shōken* 相見 with him for the first time and, likely, receiving a kōan).<sup>129</sup> Even in the unlikely event that all of the people who did not include their age were over forty, this would still mean that 78% of all of the laypeople beginning practice with the rōshi were under forty.

With regard to occupation, just under half of the participants (approximately 38) included their occupation and/or affiliation, and most of these (approximately 28) pertained to education: either as teacher (6 people in total) or student (probably 22,

---

<sup>128</sup> For example, the practitioner's family might have been parishioners at that temple. Current Engakuji leadership pointed out that those connections may have facilitated permission to do *shōken* with the rōshi; this suggests that easy access to the rōshi was not necessary a given.

<sup>129</sup> The remaining three people who noted their ages include one person in his forties, one in his fifties, and one in his sixties.



though not all specified the nature of their relationship to the educational institution). In terms of geographic background, these practitioners hailed from throughout Japan, ranging from Miyagi Prefecture to Kumamoto Prefecture. However, the vast majority came from the Tokyo area (including Kanagawa Prefecture), and all of the educational institutions mentioned were in Tokyo or Yokohama. During this period, the school that contributed the most laypeople at Engakuji was Tokyo Imperial University (in particular, the faculty of law and the liberal arts department).<sup>130</sup> This was followed by Waseda, whose group, Saiindan, would be formed a few years later (in 1922). There were also three teachers and a student from the Kanagawa Normal School (for teacher training) in Yokohama, and one student from Keiō University, at which an Engakuji-related Zen group, Kōjōkai 向上会, would form in 1926. Additionally, there was one elementary-school teacher, as well as a few teachers and students who did not specify their institutions. The register also indicates that, in a few cases, the participants were residing in a sub-temple at Engakuji at the point that they inscribed their name.<sup>131</sup>

The student groups' commemorative histories, too, contain valuable information about their members. Among the published histories by student groups, Nyoidan's is the most thorough, providing full name rosters, organized according to graduating class.<sup>132</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> Three practitioners (all age twenty) wrote in the name register that they were students at the Tokyo First Higher School (Tōkyō Daiichi Kōtō Gakkō 東京第一高等学校). This school appears to have become, in later years, the liberal arts division of Tokyo Imperial University.

<sup>131</sup> For instance, two people were living at Kigen'in, one person at Butsunichi'an, and one person at Shōrei'in. Note that these circumstances were different from the group mentioned above for whom temples such as Butsunichi'an were written above their names, suggesting either that they were staying there short-term or that they had a particular relationship with the respective temples.

<sup>132</sup> Saiindan's histories also contain rosters—but only of living members at the time of the

Starting with 1923 graduates—following a reorganization of the university’s structure in 1920—their division at the university is indicated; the students’ precise field of study, however, is not indicated.<sup>133</sup>

Although a full search of the seven hundred (and counting) Nyoidan alumni who were members between 1906 and 1945 is beyond the scope of this study, the histories’ authorship provides some clues about the individuals who were attracted to Zen in early twentieth-century Japan.<sup>134</sup> This group of authors may not be entirely representative of all participants—for example, they may have been asked to contribute reminiscences if they had been particularly active practitioners and/or if they became prominent members of society. Even so, their stories are significant in what they reveal about those groups, such as points of overlap among active, “fervent” practitioners, or an image of the groups as

---

respective histories’ publication; Saiindan’s rosters are discussed further below. As for Shōzokukai’s histories, I was only able to track down the third and fourth journal that the group published (in 1962 and 1963, respectively), but neither of these includes name registers. For more on Shōzokukai, see Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu 学習院大学坐禪部, *Shōzoku: Daisangō* 正續：第三号 (Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu Shōzokukai, 1962); and Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu 学習院大学坐禪部, *Shōzoku: Daiyongō* 正續：第四号 (Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu Shōzokukai, 1963).

<sup>133</sup> There was a notation by most names indicating one of the following divisions: “preparatory course” (*yoka* 予科), “regular course” (*honka* 本科), “specialized division” (*senmonbu* 専門部), or “teacher training school” (*kyōin yōseiyo* 教員養成所).

<sup>134</sup> According to Nyoidan’s hundredth anniversary commemorative history, there were 704 alumni who graduated between 1903 and 1945; one alumnus (Fukuda Tokuzō) who graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1894 (known then simply as Higher Commercial School) and became an early Nyoidan mentor around the time of the group’s founding; and an additional twenty-two alumni who graduated between 1946 and 1948 and could have been active as early as 1945 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 2008, 364–375).

meeting places for modern Japan's "movers and shakers" in economic, political, military, educational, or social realms.

For example, given Tokyo University of Commerce's (formerly Tokyo Higher Commercial School) role in the business and economic realm, it is not surprising that many Nyoidan alumni went on to work prominently in the economic realm. This group included the following: Tasaki Masayoshi 田崎仁義 (1880–1976), who graduated in 1905 and whose publications ranged in topic from economics to "principles of the Imperial Way" (*kōdō genri* 皇道原理); Ōta Tetsuzō 太田哲三 (1889–1970), who graduated in 1911 and became a professor of accounting at Tokyo University of Commerce; Sugimura Kōzō 杉村廣蔵 (1895–1948), who graduated in 1919 and became an economic philosopher; businessman Tanaka Sotoji 田中外次 (1901–1992), who graduated in 1926 and became an executive; and Abe Gen'ichi 阿部源一 (1904–1985), who graduated in 1928 and wrote prolifically about economics. There were other prolific authors, such as Uhara Yoshitoyo 宇原義豊 (b. 1885), who graduated in 1911 and wrote about subjects ranging from business management to his wartime experiences in China's Jiangnan region. Regarding Engakuji practitioners' military connections, among the earliest Nyoidan members was also the prominent naval officer Mogi Tomokazu 茂木知二 (1889–1960), who graduated in 1912.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> Nishida Hiroshi, "*San ni ichi pēji: Meiji 41 ikō kōninkan shukeika shikan* 参拾壱 頁：明治 41 年以降任官主計科士官," accessed February 20, 2020, <http://admiral31.world.coocan.jp/ppy58.htm>.

Unlike Nyoidan's comprehensive name rosters, Saiindan's roster includes only the names and information of living alumni.<sup>136</sup> Unfortunately, Saiindan's earliest records were lost to the 1926 fire, according to Nakano Goyō, Saiin'an's resident priest at the time of the group's founding in 1922.<sup>137</sup> On the other hand, the information provided for each member is more detailed than in Nyoidan's volumes: including, for instance, not only the graduation year but also the graduates' respective divisions while at Waseda.<sup>138</sup> As for the occupations of alumni included here, they are relatively diverse. In accordance with the high number of law school graduates, there were several lawyers and a couple of legal scholars. Saiindan alumni also included the following: journalists (e.g., there were at least three journalists at the *Asahi shinbun*), university professors and high school teachers, a designer, a banker, a Buddhist cleric (priest, or *jūshoku* 住職 of a Yokohama temple), and workers at companies ranging from publishing houses to disaster prevention companies.

---

<sup>136</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 137–141. The category here is “*dan'in* 団員,” or members. It is not clear whether this category is limited to actively participating alumni or whether it reflects all living alumni. Listed here are only seventy-four alumni—the oldest having graduated in 1918—and eleven current Waseda students. The records describing Waseda students' involvement in student retreats and Kojirin indicate that a much higher number participated.

<sup>137</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 8. Of all that was lost in the fire, what Nakano lamented most was the loss of the hand-inscribed name registers and all the feelings that such inscriptions of past members evoked.

<sup>138</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 137–141. The divisions here include: law (法), political science (政), humanities (文), commerce (商), science (理), and education (教), among others (I think that “電” refers to electrical engineering and “建” refers to architecture). By far, the most popular among the 74 alumni listed here were the law division and political science division.

### 3.3.3.3 Student Groups and Gender

Upon reading the name registers and authorship of the students' and other practitioners' accounts, and upon glimpsing the post-*sesshin* photographs in the commemorative histories and in *Zendō*, one thing is clear: the vast majority of laypeople practicing Zen at early twentieth-century Engakuji are male. With the student groups, this tendency is even more extreme: in the twenty-five group photos in Nyoidan's first commemorative history—taken between 1906 and 1931 at various Engakuji sub-temples, Kaizenji, Jōchiji, and other practice locales—there are women featured in only three photographs (from 1928, 1930, and 1931, respectively); at least two of these occasions seem to have been ceremonies or non-*sesshin* gatherings.<sup>139</sup>

In the case of Nyoidan and “student *sesshin*,” the reason for this lack of female participants seems obvious: women were not formally admitted to many of the universities with Engakuji-related Zen groups until 1929 at the earliest.<sup>140</sup> For example, at

---

<sup>139</sup> These are estimates; I did my best to identify gender based on hairstyle and kimono styles. In a photograph from March 25, 1928, commemorating the opening of Kojirin, there were many women in a group of 74 people that included monastics and laypeople, and even some children (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 219). Some women also appeared in a photograph from July 19, 1930, entitled “Tōkyō Mejiro Shūyōdan Daiichi Kōjōsha 東京目白修養團第一向上舎” (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 227). Finally, there was a photograph taken on January 18, 1931, at Maigan-rōshi's Tokyo temple, Tōkaiji 東海寺, that featured approximately four women in a group of 59 people that included several monastics; people seemed to be wearing practice garb (e.g., *hakama*), so it is possible that this photo was taken after a *sesshin* (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 228). With regard to the name rosters, Nyoidan's earliest histories (published in 1931 and 1937, respectively) only contain the names of men, to my knowledge.

<sup>140</sup> This is not to say that women lacked educational opportunities. As I discuss in chapter 5, the Meiji-era feminine ideal of “good wife, wise mother” (*ryōsai kenbo* 良妻賢母) contributed to an emphasis on women's education. However, at least until the early Shōwa period, the majority of such educational opportunities for women were in gender-segregated institutions. For a discussion of these educational opportunities for women in the Meiji era, see Mara Patessio,

Tokyo Liberal Arts and Science University (Tōkyō Bunrika Daigaku 東京文理科大学), women were formally admitted as students from 1929 onward; at Tokyo Imperial University, female auditors were permitted from 1920, and women were formally admitted as students from 1946; at Waseda, female auditors (“*josei no chōkōsei* 女性の聴講生”) were permitted from 1921 onward, and women were formally admitted as students from 1939 onward; and at Keiō and Chūō Universities, women were formally admitted as students from 1946 onward.<sup>141</sup> From this perspective, the lack of women in the student Zen groups’ photos and rosters is not surprising. Moreover, it strongly suggests that despite (some) modern Rinzai masters’ openness to instructing lay women, despite observations—such as Iizuka’s—that the lay community comprised people of all backgrounds and genders, and despite Zen rhetoric of equality (i.e., that from the perspective of ultimate truth, gender differentiation is meaningless), women’s educational opportunities (or the lack thereof) contributed to an already male-dominated arena of lay Rinzai Zen.

On the other hand, this does not tell the whole story. We know of exceptions, such as the feminist pioneer and lay Rinzai practitioner Hiratsuka Raichō’s 平塚らいてう (1886–1971). In her autobiography, she recounts having meditated alongside Nyoidan

---

“Women Getting a ‘University’ Education in Meiji Japan: Discourses, Realities, and Individual Lives” *Japan Forum* 25, no. 4 (2013): 556–81.

<sup>141</sup> Wikipedia, “*Joshi kyōiku* 女子教育” (“Women’s Education”), accessed August 5, 2019, <https://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/女子教育>. I have not yet been able to determine when women were first admitted formally to (and permitted informally to audit courses at) Hitotsubashi University.

members at a Kaizenji sesshin with Sakagami Shinjō around the time of Nyoidan's founding (circa 1906), despite having attended a different school from Nyoidan members.<sup>142</sup> However, they were kept separate from the other meditators, presumably due to their gender: her friend, Kimura Masako 木村政子, and she "...were not allowed to sit with the students, so [they] meditated in a separate room and joined [the students] afterward for Rōshi's talks."<sup>143</sup> It is worth noting that Hiratsuka was an exceptional individual, having actively and unconventionally subverted gender norms from a young age, having been born into the educated elite (her father of samurai descent), and ultimately achieving great influence as a feminist author and activist.<sup>144</sup> She was also exceptional in her Zen practice: she was motivated to spiritual pursuits from an early age, found her way to Zen, experienced *kenshō*, and did *kōan* work assiduously under a succession of Rinzai teachers (including Shaku Sōkatsu, Sakagami Shinjō, and Nakahara Nantenbō). As I discuss in chapter 5, Hiratsuka's motivations for practicing—to

---

<sup>142</sup> For Hiratsuka's discussion of her college years, see Hiratsuka Raichō, *In the Beginning, Woman Was the Sun: The Autobiography of a Japanese Feminist*, translated by Teruko Craig (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 64–139. Hiratsuka attended Japan Women's College (Nihon Joshi Daigakkō 日本女子大学校; now known as Nihon Joshi Daigaku 日本女子大学).

<sup>143</sup> Hiratsuka, *In the Beginning*, 99.

<sup>144</sup> Entering high school in 1898, Hiratsuka faced indoctrination of the "good wife and wise mother" ideal at school, whose "Statement of Guiding Principles" affirmed: "Inasmuch as Heaven and Earth differ in virtue and yin and yang differ in action, the girls at this school are to be educated in conformance with their inborn nature." With her friends, Hiratsuka resolved "...that marriage and family, the vaunted ideal of 'good wife and wise mother,' was not for us. We would find jobs and be independent at all costs." She thus "boycott[ed]" her despised morals class (Hiratsuka, *In the Beginning*, 42–47). Regarding her eventual influence, she sought to help women reclaim their voices and founded a provocative monthly journal for women in 1911 (*Seitō* 青鞿); later, she co-founded the New Women's Association and worked to promote women's inclusion in the public (political) sphere.

understand the “Great Way”—and dedication to kōan practice were unusual among modern lay practitioners, even though they were in line with Rinzai ideals and masters’ exhortations.<sup>145</sup>

Hiratsuka was thus exceptional, both as an individual and Zen practitioner, and not representative of the populace on a whole. However, questions remain: did other women, like Hiratsuka, sit informally with the university student groups that precluded women’s formal membership? How many women actually practiced in Rinzai contexts that formally permitted participants of all genders? Moreover, did women have full access to the opportunities that men did, or, for example, was the sort of gender segregation that Hiratsuka describes (at Kaizenji, circa 1906) persistent? To complicate matters, did Hiratsuka herself have an impact on women’s access to Zen practice at Kaizenji, and did this, in turn, have repercussions on women’s liberation movements in early twentieth-century Japan? Katsuki Tamotsu 香月保—one of the Nyoidan alumni, mentioned in the beginning of the chapter, who alluded to the connection between Zen and popular culture in the context of Morita’s book and Hiratsuka—believes that there is such a connection. He goes as far as to surmise that there is a direct relationship between Kaizenji and the women’s liberation movement with which Hiratsuka was so closely

---

<sup>145</sup> Hiratsuka recounted that while in college, she came to be “...obsessed with the ultimate questions of human existence”: “What is God? What am I? What is truth? How should one live?” Dissatisfied with Western philosophy and religion, she became drawn to Zen one day when she visited her friend (the aforementioned Kimura Masako) in her dorm room. There, Hiratsuka stumbled onto a Neo-Confucian-tinged Rinzai Zen tract, *Zenkai ichiran* (by Engakuji abbot Imakita Kōsen), that read: “Seek the Great Way within yourself. Do not seek it outside of yourself. The wondrous force that wells up within you is none other than the Great Way itself.” Hiratsuka recounts: “Adrift as I was in the world of abstraction, the words were like a direct warning” (Hiratsuka, *In the Beginning*, 76–83).



associated. Katsuki states: “Reflecting historically on the cause-and-effect relationship between Kaizenji and the ‘New Woman’ [*Atarashii onna* 新しい女]..., I think that we absolutely cannot overlook Kaizenji’s position in the history of the women’s liberation movement in modern Japan.”<sup>146</sup>

Answering all of these gender-related questions is beyond the scope of this study, but for now, it is worth mentioning that various authors observed that the numbers of laywomen practicing Rinzai Zen were on the rise throughout Japan. For example, in *Zendō*’s first issue, a brief article notes that in Kyoto, “women’s involvement in Zen practice [*sanzen* 参禅] is flourishing.” The author, calling this a “new phenomenon,” cites the avid role that Kenninji 建仁寺 abbot Takeda Mokurai’s 竹田黙雷 was taking in teaching women.<sup>147</sup>

Also, down the road from Engakuji in Kamakura was the Rinzai monastery Kenchōji 建長寺, where, according to a contributor to *Zendō* in 1920, there were many women who practiced—even more than at Engakuji under Shaku Sōen.<sup>148</sup> Furthermore,

---

<sup>146</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 297.

<sup>147</sup> *Zendō*, no. 1 (August 1910), 55. The author states that these women practitioners included “wives with *marumage* 丸髻 [a hairstyle of married women], young women with *hisashigami* 廂髪 [a hairstyle popular among female students in late Meiji and early Taishō], and proprietresses of brothels [*kashizashiki* 貸座敷]”; and the author profiles a few women in particular, including the “virtuous” wife of a fellow Zen practitioner and the “fervently” dedicated sister of a Zen practitioner (this sister had asked for, and been denied, permission to practice several times before Mokurai assented). The author concludes the article by wondering: “In Kyoto, should [we] establish a special place for women’s Zen? Should we congratulate this new phenomenon of this Zen world?”

<sup>148</sup> “Women’s Zazen (*Onna no zazen* 女の坐禅),” *Zendō*, no. 123 (December 1920), 51. The author notes that Kenchōji’s chief abbot at that time was Sugawara Jihō 菅原時保 (1866–1956). Sugawara—like Mineo Daikyū, Miyaji Sōkai, and other Rinzai masters mentioned here—avidly

the author says that most of the women practicing at Kenchōji were either teachers (*kyōin* 教員) or students (*gakusei* 学生), so it appears that as with male practitioners, education (and class status) as associated with many female Rinzai Zen practitioners.

I also draw attention to the fact that from the 1920s onward, as discussed earlier in this chapter, students from various university Zen groups joined together at Engakuji for the so-called “student *sesshin*,” which were populated mostly but not exclusively by students. Thus, despite the restriction that women faced of not being formal students at the respective universities, and therefore formal members of the university groups, this alone did not prevent women from practicing, as the aforementioned photographs in Nyoidan’s commemorative history attest. However, such women remained moderately to extremely rare. Factors contributing to the continued dearth of women in lay Rinzai Zen were many: this educational dimension; the heroic ideals of masculinity pervading traditional Rinzai Zen and modern Japan (to be discussed in chapter 5); women’s place (or the lack thereof) amidst Rinzai Zen’s persistent ideals of celibacy and monasticism, despite a new modern standard—in practice—among Japanese Buddhist sects of clerical marriage; and, among other factors, the lack of physical accommodations for women at lay training halls, to be addressed next.<sup>149</sup>

---

taught lay students in various Zen assemblies, including Kōzen Gokokukai. The author also mentions that this number of women practicing was on the rise.

<sup>149</sup> Regarding the continued ideals of monasticism and celibacy in the Rinzai sect, Richard Jaffe points out that Rinzai was later than most Japanese Buddhist schools to adopt regulations recognizing clerical marriage; for example, the Myōshinji sect of Rinzai passed such regulations in 1930 (Richard M. Jaffe, *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese*

### 3.3.3.3.1 Accommodations for Women

When Iizuka Iwao describes the efforts of Engakuji's laypeople in 1919 and 1920 to raise funds to restore the *zendō* and build full-fledge training facilities for laypeople, he mentions that one of the needed facilities is a women's dormitory.<sup>150</sup> However, it was not until 1964 that a women's dormitory was actually built at Kojirin. According to Saiindan member Kurosawa Masako 黒沢雅子, a group of laywomen including Kurosawa had resolved the previous year (1963) to build quarters for laywomen. Of course, the traditional sleeping quarters for Zen practitioners was the Zen meditation hall (*zendō* 禅堂). At least during sesshin, laymen did everything in Kojirin's *zendō*—meditating, chanting, eating, and sleeping—thus mirroring the monks' activities in their own training hall (*sōdō* 僧堂). While laywomen were permitted to sit alongside laymen at Kojirin, their sleeping quarters were elsewhere.<sup>151</sup> Thus, until 1964, laywomen participating at Engakuji in *sesshin* or other training periods had stayed overnight in a room in the sub-

---

*Buddhism*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011, 214; originally published in 2001). Jaffe further notes that as late as 1961, when the Myōshinji sect finally revised its constitution to recognize clerical marriage formally, some sect members "...argued that recognition of temple wives would dilute the purity of the Rinzai teachings..." (Jaffe, *Neither Monk Nor Layman*, 2011, 236). Even today, I have heard anecdotally from Japanese women in the Rinzai sect about the widespread persistence of such notions and ideals in the sect.

<sup>150</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 35.

<sup>151</sup> On the other hand, lay women have not necessarily had the same privileges as men to sit in the monastic *zendō* at Engakuji. Even since Kojirin was built, dedicated and experienced laymen have typically gained permission to join the monastic trainees in the monks' hall for sesshin ("sōdō sesshin 僧堂接心"). At today's Engakuji, however, lay women only have partial permission to do so: in other words, they follow the schedule but are not physically permitted to sit in the monks' *zendō*. Thus, they do zazen in the hallway (*gaitan* 外單) outside the *zendō*; the *gaitan* is open to the elements. It is not clear to me whether this has consistently been the case historically.

temple Nyoi'an (of which Nyoidan was the namesake). However, the number of women participating had gradually increased to the point that even Nyoi'an's main hall (*hondō* 本堂) was full, and the situation was unsustainable. Kurosawa and others thus embarked on a fundraising mission to build facilities for women. Within a matter of months, over two thousand people contributed their efforts or funds—in donations as small as one hundred yen—and the dormitory was built within the year.<sup>152</sup>

### **3.4 Conclusion: Demographic Change; Looking Beyond Engakuji**

One goal of this chapter has been to examine the continuing transformation of lay Zen practice at Engakuji, given its continued centrality as a hub of lay Zen in modern Japan, even as venues and opportunities for practice increase dramatically in the early twentieth century. When considering the bigger picture, we see a considerable demographic shift from the Engakuji lay community of the 1870s and 1880s, when it was composed largely of early Meiji elite (politicians, members of the intelligentsia, and other socially influential individuals), to the community of the 1910s and 1920, when it consisted predominantly of students and youth. The name registers from 1916–1917 show that most lay people who practiced at Engakuji in the mid-Taishō period (before Shaku Sōen's death) and who practiced seriously under the *rōshi* (i.e., initiated a relationship via “*shōken* 相見” and embarked on *kōan* practice) were not only young, but they were overwhelmingly male and predominantly students. Thus, the development and

---

<sup>152</sup> Kurosawa Masako 黒沢雅子, “Laywomen's Quarters (*Zenkoryō* 禅子寮),” in Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 114–115.

emergence of the university student groups was a key part of the early twentieth-century growth of Rinzai Zen.

On the one hand, we see evidence of popularization in multiple forms: in the steeply rising numbers of lay Zen participants, not only at Engakuji but also in Zen groups throughout Tokyo and Japan generally (as discussed in chapter 2), as well as in the guidelines for Engakuji *sesshin* that appear in Zen-related journals for popular audiences, clearly open to Zen beginners and flexibly accommodating working people (e.g., allowing them to participate part-time, as their schedules allowed; this will be discussed further in the next chapter). Descriptions of lay practice at Engakuji and elsewhere also speak generally about how “the wind of Zen,” or *zenpū* 禅風, has taken off in Tokyo. Beyond observations of the increased numbers, particularly of young people, authors like Iizuka Iwao also wax on about Zen’s non-discriminating nature and how there are men and women, old and young, students and teachers, politicians and businesspeople, all practice together, and are treated equally by the master(s).

On the other hand, the shift toward youth may not have been all that dramatic, as many of Engakuji’s early elite *koji* (in the 1870s-1890s) were also relatively young. Moreover, the claims of popularization belie the reality that practice continued to be a somewhat elite enterprise. Famous military and political elite, such as Ōishi Masami (1855–1935), continued to be the face of *koji* practice, frequently mentioned in lay Zen

event notices in periodicals like *Zendō* and serving as the groups' lay leaders.<sup>153</sup> And as far as records indicate, the lay population at Engakuji in the 1910s and 1920s seems to be composed predominantly of members of the “elite” or middle-class, with most of the students attending Tokyo's elite universities like Tokyo Imperial University and Waseda University.

The emergence and development of Engakuji-affiliated university student groups, beginning in 1906, is just a part of what transpired between the 1890s and 1910s—that is, lay Rinzai Zen's popularization, particularly among young people. In order to continue to explore the relationship between young people (and lay practitioners generally) and Rinzai Zen in early twentieth-century Japan, and to understand what attracted people to this practice during this historical moment, we will first take a look at what precisely their practices entailed and how Rinzai transformed in the modern period. That is the topic of the next chapter.

---

<sup>153</sup> “Group leader” (*kaichō* 会長) is to be distinguished from the groups' “master” (*shike* 師家), which continued to be prominent Rinzai *rōshi*.

## 4. Accounts of Practice in Modern Lay Rinzai Zen

### 4.1 Introduction

In the last chapter, I described the development and emergence of university Zen groups affiliated with Engakuji, vis-à-vis the flowering of lay Zen at Engakuji as evidenced by the establishment in the 1920s of a full-fledged training hall for laypeople, or “Layperson’s Grove,” which had been decades in the making. Although there had been previous incarnations of this training hall at Engakuji, as well as efforts to establish such a lay Rinzai training hall elsewhere (for example, Nakahara Nantenbō’s students’ efforts in Tokyo circa 1910), the Kojirin of 1923 and afterward represented a new level of lay Rinzai Zen’s popularization and institutionalization in modern Japan, while also indicating the significant role played by youth and students in modern Japanese Rinzai Zen.

The subject of this chapter, then, is the new practice paradigm that I mention in chapter 1. Here, I investigate, through the lens of religious practice, the concrete ways in which modern lay practitioners engaged in Rinzai practice. I will focus on the following topics and activities: how laypeople embarked on practice; their main practices, *zazen* (sitting meditation) and *kōan* practice (i.e., making the “public cases”—typically, accounts of legendary Chan masters and their disciples—the subject of their “life-and-death” inquiries as a way to break into a new level of consciousness); encountering the master one-on-one (called *sanzen* 参禅 or *dokusan* 独参); dharma discourses (typically called *teishō* 提唱, *hōwa* 法話, or *kōen* 講演, based on the specific context and content);

and practice intensives (*zazenkai* 坐禅会—typically day-long or half-day events—or *sesshin* 接心, longer retreats). I also introduce key dimensions of the modern lay Rinzai practice ethos, such as the “battlefield” ethos (which I discuss more extensively in the next chapter), emulating monastic practice, and the culture of secrecy.

In order to convey what modern lay Rinzai practice was like, on the ground, for the ordinary lay practitioner, I focus as much as possible on autobiographical accounts. I integrate these accounts into descriptions of the practical details and, to some degree, teachers’ or popular authors’ prescriptions of ideal Zen practice. A comprehensive examination of each of these activities and the historical changes that they underwent is beyond the scope of this study, and each of these sections will necessarily be limited to an overview. However, by introducing a range of voices from the late Meiji through the early Shōwa period, I elucidate on the contours of lived practice at various points during this extended period, with an emphasis on the period between the mid-1890s and 1930s.

There is one obvious omission in this chapter: an extensive discussion of enlightenment (*kenshō* or *satori*). Particularly in contemporary Rinzai Zen (and Rinzai-adjacent lineages), and particularly in the Western context, enlightenment is seen as inextricable from practicing *zazen*, practicing with *kōans*, encountering the master, and doing retreats. In normative Zen teachings, the aspiration toward enlightenment is assumed to undergird all of these practices. For some modern Japanese practitioners, this is the case. However, as mentioned previously, many other practitioners—particularly in the university student population—have other motivations for Zen practice. Thus, I will occasionally include references to enlightenment in this chapter as necessary but will



reserve the main discussion for the next chapter, which examines lay practitioners' motivations for practice in greater depth, particularly vis-à-vis the historical context and exigencies in early twentieth-century Japan.

#### 4.1.1 Snapshot: Engakuji Sesshin, 1918

From August 16–20, 1918, a five-day *sesshin* for laypeople took place at Engakuji under Shaku Sōen, just over one year before his death. Engakuji's history notes that there were 75 laymen (*koji*) and 26 laywomen (*zenko*) in attendance, and a photograph of participants that appeared in the following month's issue of *Zendō* shows the group formally assembled—some seated, some standing—in front of one of Engakuji's sub-temples.<sup>1</sup> The photograph corroborates Engakuji's account, showing around 119 participants included in the photograph. This group including approximately twenty monks (with shaved heads and dressed in monastic robes, and some wearing a *rakusu* 絡子, or abbreviated monastic robe); one person, who appeared to be lay, holding a *keisaku* 警策; and about twenty-five laywomen (grouped together; mostly dressed in women's

---

<sup>1</sup> For basic details (e.g., date) about the *sesshin*, see Engakuji's history: Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji-shi*, 746. Tamamura's and Inoue's account states that the study hall (*shoin* 書院) and the sub-temple Zōrokuan 藏六庵, served as dormitories for the *koji* and *zenko*, respectively; and that participants used the main hall (Hōjō 方丈) as their *zendō*. Traditionally, the “*hōjō* 方丈” is known as the abbot's quarters (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “方丈,” retrieved February 23, 2020). However, in Engakuji in the modern period, the *hōjō* serves as the main hall, in which, for example, large public events take place. The present *hōjō* can accommodate several hundred people for zazen, dharma talks, and ceremonies. As for the photograph, the caption reads, “Lay Sesshin Memento Photograph (*Koji sesshinkai kinen shashin* 居士接心會記念寫真)”; see *Zendō*, no. 98 (September 1918), frontispiece.

kimono and with women's hairstyles of the day).<sup>2</sup> Laymen were mostly clad in *hakama* 袴 (a traditional clothing item resembling a divided skirt) and white kimono, although there is at least one man wearing a Western-style vested suit and necktie.

The photograph—striking, due both to the size of the crowd and to the relatively high proportion of women—supports descriptions of Engakuji's bustling lay practice and greater inclusivity.<sup>3</sup> One clue into this greater inclusivity is the previous month's edition of the journal *Zendō*, in which guidelines for participating in this *koji sesshinkai* were published (see Appendix A for the full set of guidelines).<sup>4</sup> These guidelines are notable for several reasons. First, they made *sesshin* and practice at Engakuji accessible, even for complete beginners, by stating explicitly that seasoned practitioners and Zen beginners alike were welcome.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the guidelines express flexibility for working laypeople: in addition to those staying overnight at Engakuji and staying for the five full days, participants had the options of either commuting on a daily basis or participating for fewer days—even for a single day.

---

<sup>2</sup> Additionally, there were two people who were grouped with the women but seemed to have shaved heads and monastic robes; it is not clear if they were nuns, monks, or laywomen. It is possible that the layperson holding the *keisaku*, or “warning stick” (typically used by monastic leadership during *zazen* to strike meditators on the upper back in order to rouse energy and thus “encourage” the practitioners) was the lay leader of the group, even though the master was clearly Shaku Sōen.

<sup>3</sup> As mentioned in the last chapter, it is possible that the crowds might have been larger, had there been more accommodation space, as the groups were necessarily limited due to limited physical space in the various temple facilities. On the other hand, this was a relatively large crowd for *sesshin*. Student *sesshin* at Engakuji, for example, tended to comprise smaller groups.

<sup>4</sup> *Zendō*, no. 97 (August 1918), 59.

<sup>5</sup> It is clear that seasoned practitioners were also a target of these guidelines, which requested that participants who already had *zazen* implements (e.g., a meditation cushion) bring them to *sesshin*; they were also asked to bring their copy of the *Rinzairoku*, the text on which the *rōshi* would base his *teishō*.

For beginners, the guidelines demystified aspects of the teacher-student relationship and kōan practice, explaining basic terms and concepts like “*shōken* 相見” (defined here as “the ritual of paying respects to the master and establishing one’s vow as disciple”) and “*sanzen* 参禅” (defined as “entering the master’s room and presenting one’s understanding of the kōan on which one is working”). The guidelines also explain etiquette in the meditation hall and offer basic instructions for *zazen* and *sanzen*. For example, when the bell for *sanzen* sounds, the student quickly enters the master’s room, even if one is in the middle of *zazen* or *kinhin* (walking meditation); and for *sanzen*, the student places their hands palm-to-palm (in *gasshō* 合掌) upon entering and exiting the master’s room and also does prostrations before the master.<sup>6</sup>

On the one hand, the event was remarkable from the perspective of laypeople who—fifty years prior—would not have gathered to do a *zazen* intensive on Engakuji’s grounds. On the other hand, the event’s activities were unremarkable from the standpoint of normalcy among the growing number of lay Rinzai assemblies. In other words, the activities described in the guidelines, ranging from *zazen* (as punctuated by standard bell-ringing) to *sanzen* (replete with ritualized bells and bows), had become standard practice. This chapter explores that new standard, and its formation, in greater depth.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Gasshō* 合掌 means placing hands palm to palm (here, in front of one’s chest) to convey respect. Regarding the prostrations, the guidelines specify that the student first does three prostrations, which symbolize their reverence to the buddhas of the past, present, and future (*sanze shobutsu* 三世諸仏), followed by a single prostration to pay reverence to the master.

### 4.1.2 Autobiographical Accounts: Further Notes

As for the voices that appear in this chapter, I draw from the university students' accounts and groups' diaries, as discussed in chapters 3 and 5. I also draw from autobiographical accounts from the non-student population, such as those published in journals (e.g., psychologist Motora Yūjirō's 元良勇次郎 account of a week practicing at Engakuji in 1894) and monographs (e.g., the personal diaries of Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎 that were published in 1935, following his death in 1934). It is worth noting, for the analysis in this chapter, that the majority of student accounts that appear in the groups' commemorative histories are relatively sparse with regard to detail about what transpired in *sanzen*, their internal experiences during *sesshin*, and other activities; in contrast, those student accounts tend to be richer in detailing the groups' institutional histories and other developments. Thus, I have placed more emphasis on the accounts that are rich in detail about practice, like Motora's and Shimokawa's. Additionally, as mentioned in the introduction, there was a considerable range of seriousness with which lay practitioners engaged with practice. The accounts here reflect that range, from Motora's perspective (that of a relative beginner) to that of Shimokawa (a decades-long practitioner who persisted and proceeded through the kōan collections at a steady clip).<sup>7</sup>

Although personal accounts (published in the journals, anthologies, monographs, and groups' histories) abound with stories of individuals brushing with Zen, as Iizuka

---

<sup>7</sup> Moreover, practitioners' accounts suggest that teachers may have engaged with them differently (for example, articulating teachings in different idioms for different audiences), according to their seriousness; and that practitioners' different goals for practicing Zen may also have correlated with their seriousness, as I explore in chapter 5.

Iwao points out, “people who penetrate to the bottom [of Zen] are extremely rare.”<sup>8</sup> Here, Iizuka is referring to the rarity of practitioners who “fully understand the Great Matter”: that is, those who have had deep enlightenment experiences and, likely, have progressed through the kōan curriculum. Some masters might attribute that rarity, in part, to innate spiritual capacity or sensitivity.<sup>9</sup> However, the bigger issue is the rarity of individuals who are willing to persevere with their Zen practice for years and even decades, willing to relinquish ego and one’s most cherished concepts, and the rarity of individuals who are in a position to attend sesshin and engage in regular *zazen* and *sanzen* with a willing master.<sup>10</sup>

Among the latter rare individuals are D.T. Suzuki, whose long practice at Engakuji—primarily under Shaku Sōen—has been documented, and for whom Rinzai Zen (e.g., Rinzai Zen’s approach to nonduality, the Rinzai school’s tool of kōan practice for grasping this nonduality, and so forth) appeared to be a central foundation for his approach to diverse forms of Buddhism throughout his seventy-plus-year-long writing

---

<sup>8</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 40.

<sup>9</sup> Students’ relative capacities for understanding Buddhist teachings is a common theme among Zen teachers, as in the “four horses” (or *shime* 四馬) metaphor. For example, Dōgen quotes from the classics: “The *Samyuktāgama Sutra* says: The Buddha told the *bhikṣus*, ‘There are four kinds of horses. The first sees the form of a whip, is startled at once, and follows the rider’s will. The second is startled when [the whip] touches its hair, and then it follows the rider’s will. The third is surprised after [the whip] touches its flesh. The fourth wakes up only after [the whip] has penetrated to the bone’”; see Dōgen, *Shōbōgenzō: The True Dharma-Eye Treasury, Vol. 4*, translated by Gudo Wafu Nishijima and Chodo Cross (Berkeley, Calif.: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2008), dBET\_T2582\_Shobogenzo4\_2008\_0.pdf, accessed on February 24, 2020.

<sup>10</sup> Such a position is predicated not only on the practitioner’s financial situation and obligations with regard to work and family (or lack thereof) but also on masters’ openness to training laymen and laywomen.

career, as suggested by Richard Jaffe.<sup>11</sup> Another such individual is Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎 (1884–1934), a lawyer and local politician who practiced Zen seriously for over twenty years under a number of Rinzai masters, from age twenty-seven until his death at the age of fifty-one. We primarily know Shimokawa through his journals that were published posthumously in 1935 upon the one-year anniversary of his death, in a book entitled *Lay Zen*: thus called because of the centrality of his spiritual quest and lay Zen practice in his life and writings.<sup>12</sup> As noted in the book’s afterward, Shimokawa’s *Lay Zen* includes both diaries (*nisshi* 日誌) in the conventional sense—whose contents range from his daily goings-on to musings about life and death—and “*sanzen* records 参禅録.”<sup>13</sup> Given the personal nature of his diaries, it is likely that Shimokawa never intended them to be public; but they offer a rare and valuable glimpse into the advanced kōan practice of a dedicated layperson for whom Zen practice remained central for decades.

## **4.2 Rinzai Practice and the Laity: What Were Laypeople Doing?**

### **4.2.1 Initiation: Getting Started**

A recurring theme in this dissertation is one of the key characteristics of Rinzai’s transformation in the modern period: the increased accessibility to laypeople of practices

---

<sup>11</sup> Jaffe, Introduction in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, xii.

<sup>12</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*. The book was printed in a limited run of five hundred copies, published privately by what seems to be a family member (Shimokawa Kōryū 下川光留).

<sup>13</sup> The term “*sanzenroku* 参禅録” is used in-text to characterize certain entries, but it is not clear whether Shimokawa himself or the editor labeled these entries as such (see, for example, Shimokawa, *Koji zen*, 177).

that had—prior to the Meiji period—primarily been accessible to the monastic elite. Rinzai monasteries, even in the modern period, dictated unspoken entrance rituals for monks who sought admission to the monastic training hall. As per tradition, would-be novices were initially denied entrance, sometimes multiple times; but those who proved their dedication by remaining at the entryway for a period of time, heads bowed, typically were accepted for training.<sup>14</sup> How, on the other hand, did laypeople embark on Rinzai practice?

The advent of organized Zen assemblies, such as Kōzen Gokokukai or the student groups, welcomed all would-be practitioners, regardless of past experience. On the other hand, those wishing to practice at large training monasteries—and meet the rōshi in *shōken* 相見—faced more hurdles.<sup>15</sup> In *Sanzen no shiori*, Iizuka outlines how beginners gained admission to lay practice at Engakuji circa 1920.<sup>16</sup> The ideal process unfolded as follows: a prospective practitioner might arrive at Engakuji, bearing a letter of introduction from an acquaintance who practiced Zen and already had a relationship with the temple. Alternatively, practitioners without a connection would approach the proprietor at either of the two inns outside the temple gate in Kamakura that were known

---

<sup>14</sup> The latter monastic convention is called *niwazume* 庭詰—meaning literally, “occupying the courtyard”—and was followed in many monastic training halls by *tangazume* 旦過詰 (“occupying the *tanga*,” or the room for overnight lodging), during which the monk or would-be novice did zazen for a determined period in the small *tanga*. These definitions come from Satō and Nishimura, *Unsui: A Diary of Zen Monastic Life*, 112 and 114. D. T. Suzuki states that *niwazume* typically lasted two or three days (although it lasted a full week in previous generations) and that *tangazume* lasted about three days (Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 10–11).

<sup>15</sup> Mukyū-an Shujin, speaking in 1900 of practice at Engakuji, says: “In order to do *shōken* with the rōshi, you absolutely need an introduction” (Mukyū-an, *Kamakura sanzen*, 4).

<sup>16</sup> Iizuka Iwao, *Sanzen no shiori*, 7–8.

to accommodate Zen practitioners and had longstanding connections (“*en* 縁”) with Engakuji and its sub-temples.<sup>17</sup> Once implored by the would-be practitioner, the inn proprietor would request lodging at one of these sub-temples, communicating with a resident monk on the beginner’s behalf. The monk might agree to the request the first time; more frequently, however (and echoing the ritual for would-be monastics), he refused the initial request. Subsequently, if the would-be layperson demonstrated determination and sincerity through subsequent request(s), he would likely be successful. Once given permission to stay at the sub-temple, the *kōji* would sleep there but take three meals daily at the inn, in accordance with monastic regulations (and, no doubt, concerns about fire), as cooking one’s own meals in the sub-temples was prohibited at that time.<sup>18</sup>

Next, if the monk was convinced of the would-be *kōji*’s sincere wish to practice, he provided an introductory letter for the practitioner to deliver to the head monk.<sup>19</sup> That head monk, then, examines the practitioner’s motivation (*dōki* 動機) for practicing Zen, since ostensibly, only those with the “sole purpose of practicing Zen” are permitted to

---

<sup>17</sup> These inns, according to Iizuka, are Yanagiya 柳屋 and Yorozya 萬屋; they are both located near Engakuji’s entrance (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 6–7). Mukyū-an Shujin also describes Yanagiya in 1900 as “lodging for travelers” in his account of practice at Engakuji that was published twenty years before Iizuka’s (Mukyū-an, *Kamakura sanzen*, 1).

<sup>18</sup> By 1928, however, it seems that the rules about cooking were relaxed at Kojirin—perhaps due to the inclusion of kitchen facilities once Kojirin was rebuilt after the fire in 1926. The wooden placard in the entrance to Kojirin entitled “Kojirin Rules” (“Kojirin kijō 居士林規定”) includes, as its last guideline, “You should devote yourself to the circumspect use of fire”; see Engakuji 圓覺寺, “Kojirin Kijō 居士林規定,” wooden placard mounted on wall of Kojirin (Kamakura, Japan, 1928).

<sup>19</sup> See *Sanzen no shiori* for explanations of the following: “introduction to the monks’ hall” (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 9–10), “motivations for practicing Zen” (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 10–11), “incense money” (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 11–12), and “encountering the master” (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 12–14).



stay overnight at Engakuji.<sup>20</sup> If the monk deems the practitioner sincere, he prepares the would-be layperson for a similar interview with the master (*shike* 師家), in which the practitioner is to present “incense money” (*kōbokuryō* 香木料) to the master during their first encounter (*shōken* 相見), thus establishing a teacher-student relationship.<sup>21</sup> In their encounter, the master (called *shike* or *rōshi*) also questions the practitioner’s motivation.<sup>22</sup> Subsequently, the master emphasizes the efficacy of Zen practice, instructs the practitioner briefly in *zazen* and *kōan* practice, and assigns a *kōan* to serve as “skillful means to unify the spirit.”

---

<sup>20</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 26. Moreover, such sincere practitioners were expected to do everything—“sitting and acting, coming and going”—with “devout awareness (*keiken no nen* 敬虔の念).”

<sup>21</sup> This teacher-student relationship should, in theory, last a lifetime. With regard to the “incense offering” (*kōbokuryō* 香木料), it appears that this refers to a monetary offering; however, D. T. Suzuki, when describing the “incense offering” (*shōkenkō* 相見香) that a new monk-in-training offers to the *rōshi*, the monk’s offering seems to be of actual incense. Suzuki explains: “In this case, incense-offering is a kind of pledge that this newly-admitted one takes in good faith the present master for his instruction in Zen” (Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 12). In *Sanzen no shiori*, Iizuka explains that students would offer fifty *sen* 錢 (with 100 *sen* equivalent to 1 yen), and non-students would offer one yen; alternatively, this could also be called “encounter money” (*shōkenryō* 相見料) or “entrance money” (*nyūmonryō* 入門料). Twenty years previously, Mukyū-an Shujin 無休庵主人 explains that *shōkenryō* should be at least fifty *sen* (Mukyū-an, *Kamakura sanzen*, 7).

<sup>22</sup> Suzuki’s description of “initiation” for contemporary monastic novices differs from Iizuka’s description of laypeople’s “initiation” with regard to this motivation or intention. Whereas with laypeople, Iizuka suggests that motivation is a key element of establishing a teacher-student relationship with the *rōshi* in their first interview (*shōken* 相見), Suzuki does not explicitly mention motivation as a significant part of this first meeting. For the contemporary monastic novice, the *rōshi* typically asks the novice about “his name, native place, education, etc.”<sup>22</sup> Suzuki contrasts this interchange with anecdotes about the legendary Chan monks of yore (as featured in traditional Zen *kōan*), in which this ostensibly simple questioning would reveal to the master the monks’ state of mind and sometimes even prompted an awakening experience.

#### 4.2.2 The Basics: Zazen and Kōan Practice

Returning to the three pillars of Zen practice, we will first broach *zazen*—part of almost any lay Rinzai event, and the main practice that *koji* and *zenshi* could cultivate on their own—and its partner for most modern Rinzai Zen practitioners, *kōan* practice. Our central questions here are: what is *zazen*, as lay practitioners know and practice it, and what is the role of *kōan* practice in *zazen* for these modern practitioners? According to D.T. Suzuki, “*Kōan* and *zazen* are the two handmaids of Zen; the first is the eye and the second is the foot.”<sup>23</sup> The two practices frequently overlap in Rinzai Zen but should be distinguished. In Rinzai Zen, *zazen* typically refers to the act of seated meditation.<sup>24</sup> *Kōan* practice, on the other hand, is one meditation practice among a handful that may be assigned by the teacher; practitioners work on their assigned *kōan*—melding with the *kōan* and continuing their questioning of the *kōan*—not only during *zazen* but also throughout their daily activities. For Rinzai practitioners, this is the most common meditation practice assigned, although masters—like Katsumine Daitetsu—may also assign breath practices such as counting the breaths (*sūsokukan* 数息観).<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Jaffe quotes this in his introduction to Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 1; it originally comes from Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 110.

<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, the thirteenth-century Japanese Sōtō patriarch, Eihei Dōgen 永平道元 (1200–1253), broadens the scope of “*zazen*” beyond seated meditation: “It is simply the Dharma-gate of repose and bliss, the practice-realization of totally culminated enlightenment. It is the manifestation of ultimate reality”; see Dōgen, “Dōgen’s *Fukanzazengi* and *Shōbōgenzō* *Zazengi*,” translated by Norman Waddell and Masao Abe, *The Eastern Buddhist*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1973), 123.

<sup>25</sup> The practice of “just sitting” without a meditation object (*shikantaza* 只管打坐) is most closely associated with Sōtō Zen, although practitioners in combined Rinzai-Sōtō lineages, such as the Harada-Yasutani line discussed elsewhere in this dissertation, occasionally do *shikantaza* as well.

In “A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting” (*Seiza no susume*), Suzuki is careful to distinguish zazen from Zen-style kōan practice: “When we mention zazen practice, there are those who will conjure up Zen clerics sequestered in the mountains, working on [kōan like] ‘what is your original face?’ However, the ‘zazen practice’ we speak of does not have such a specialized meaning.”<sup>26</sup> For Suzuki and many authors of meditation manuals (discussed further below), zazen means the physical act of sitting quietly in lotus posture, putting one’s attention and power solidly in the lower abdomen, and making the spine erect “like an iron pillar rising up to the heavens.”<sup>27</sup> Although many of Suzuki’s writings emphasize the importance of *satori* for realizing nonduality, in this context, Suzuki prescribes such quiet sitting for the young people of his day, given their need for personal cultivation. He notes zazen’s efficacy for building character, as well as its unique suitability for those who are educated and in the habit of intellectual discernment.<sup>28</sup>

In terms of practitioners’ autobiographical accounts of beginning Zen practice, they do not tend to be detailed about the specifics of what zazen entails on a practical level; in a sense, this is taken for granted. The basics that Suzuki describes here are commensurate with prescriptions for, and descriptions of, Zen practice at Engakuji, where Suzuki trained under Shaku Sōen until Sōen’s death in 1919. We can glean further

---

<sup>26</sup> Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 2–3.

<sup>27</sup> Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 3.

<sup>28</sup> Suzuki suggests that quiet sitting is highly efficacious even without traditional Zen-style kōan, although he suggests that having some kind of kōan-like phrase or mental object on which to focus can be helpful. He goes on to note that kōan practice could actually be counter-indicated for students: “...because, for ordinary youth who are practicing zazen in order to cultivate moral character, zazen practice itself is the immediate purpose, the sort of koan used in Zen study probably would instead cause mental anguish to increase” (Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 4).

details about practice at Engakuji around that time from Iizuka Iwao, whose introductory pamphlet, *Sanzen no shiori*, was published in 1920. In that work, Iizuka provides brief instructions for doing *zazen*, defined here as “sitting and practicing Zen.”<sup>29</sup> Iizuka describes how the practitioner, wearing loose clothing, should be seated on a cushion (*zabuton* 座布団) in lotus or half-lotus position, with hands gathered together atop the surface of the foot and an upright spine, and place power firmly in the lower abdomen.<sup>30</sup> Iizuka notes here that finding a quiet place to do *zazen*—in which one can “calm the spirit” (*seishin o ochitsukeru* 精神を落ちつけて)—is of utmost importance. However, Iizuka, quoting a *kōan* in the *Blue Cliff Record* (*Hekiganroku* 碧巖録), tells readers that “peaceful meditation does not require mountains and rivers.”<sup>31</sup> In other words, he says, it

---

<sup>29</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 16. Iizuka also notes that “Zen” is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit *dhyāna*, which is defined as “meditation or calm abiding” (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “禪那,” accessed September 25, 2019).

<sup>30</sup> This emphasis on the lower abdomen points to Daoist influence and is congruent with many forms of breathing practice that were popular in early twentieth-century Japan, both Zen and non-Zen, as discussed in the next chapter. For example, Kōzen Gokokuikai’s founder, Katsumine Daitetsu, was a Meiji-era Rinzai master whose meditation manual, *Naikanhō*, shared this emphasis; see Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹, *Naikanhō: Kioku chōju oyobi tanryoku zōshin no yōketsu* 内観法: 記憶長寿及胆力増進之要訣 (Tokyo: Seikō Zasshisha, 1908). Also see, for example, Yu-chuan Wu, “Straighten the Back to Sit: Belly-Cultivation Techniques as ‘Modern Health Methods’ in Japan, 1900–1945,” *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry* 40, no. 3 (2016): 450–74. As discussed below, Michel Mohr also draws attention to the distinctiveness of Hakuin’s incorporation of somatic elements into Rinzai practice, such as breathing and breath-counting practices, and as well as an emphasis on vital energy, which were seemingly influenced by Daoist classics; see Michel Mohr, “Emerging from Nonduality: Kōan Practice in the Rinzai Tradition since Hakuin,” in *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, 244–278, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 266.

<sup>31</sup> This comes from Case 43 in the *Hekiganroku*. Here, I am using the Cleary brothers’ translation: Yuanwu, *The Blue Cliff Record*, translated by Thomas Cleary and J. C. Cleary (Boston & London: Shambhala, 2005), 259. This comment is attributed to Master Xin of Huanglong; the translation does not specify whether this is Huanglong Huinan 黃龍慧南 (1002–1069) or someone who resided on Mt. Huanglong, which was named for Huanglong Huinan.

is not necessary to practice only in temples or deep in the mountains; people can practice in their own homes, at their company or at the bank, on ships and on bicycles.<sup>32</sup>

Subsequently, Iizuka describes kōan practice, defining it as “a tool of skillful means to unify the spirit [that involves] entering the realm of no thought and no self.”<sup>33</sup> This reflects what Hori calls an “instrumentalist” approach to kōan practice: that is, viewing “the kōan as nonrational, psychological instrument, and *kenshō* [見性] as the breakthrough to nonrational, noncognitive, pure consciousness.”<sup>34</sup> Iizuka does not explicitly mention enlightenment (*kenshō* or *satori*) here, although this is implied (and, elsewhere, he mentions that many practitioners’ goal in practicing Zen is enlightenment). He provides a few examples of famous kōans—such as Jōshū’s “Mu 無” and Hakuin’s “One Hand Clapping,” both of which were frequently assigned to beginners at Engakuji.<sup>35</sup> Iizuka states that there are over 1700 kōans in Engakuji’s curriculum, implying that for both monastic and lay practitioners, one must “pass through” all of

---

<sup>32</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 20.

<sup>33</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 14. 「無念無想無我の境に入る精神統一方便具である」

<sup>34</sup> G. Victor Sōgen Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō in the Rinzai Zen Curriculum,” in *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 280. Hori critiques the instrumentalist approach primarily because it implies some kind of pure, unmediated experience; and he prefers Dōgen’s “realizational” model of kōan practice: that is, “Dōgen’s notion of the kōan as moment-by-moment actualization of the rationality of enlightenment,” which Hori sees as particularly helpful with regard to one’s longer-term practice and its applications to the practitioner’s life (Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō,” 281–284).

<sup>35</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 14–15. “One Hand Clapping” refers to Hakuin’s kōan, “What is the sound of one hand clapping?” In Japanese, its shorthand is “*sekishu no koe* 赤手の音声” (literally, “the sound of the bare hand”). Victor Hori also notes that most Rinzai novices practice with one of these two kōans initially (Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō,” 288).

these kōans—as assessed by the rōshi in *sanzen* (to be discussed below)—in order to complete one’s training.<sup>36</sup>

Many early twentieth-century lay practitioners who provide accounts of their initial *sanzen* or *shōken* note that they were assigned a kōan immediately upon practicing with the rōshi. This was the case with Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎 (1884–1934; discussed later in this chapter), to whom Mineo Daikyū assigned the “Original Face” kōan.<sup>37</sup> Congruent with Iizuka’s description, among Engakuji’s university student practitioners, Hakuin’s “One Hand Clapping” was frequently assigned to beginners. Tokyo Higher Commercial School alumni who were in Nyoidan’s first generation of practitioners included Shimada Hiroshi 島田宏 (who graduated in 1908), who received “One Hand Clapping” from Miyaji Sōkai, and Uhara Yoshitoyo 宇原義豊 (who graduated in 1911) and Masumoto Yoshitarō 増本芳太郎 (who graduated in 1912), both of whom were assigned that kōan by Sakagami Shinjō.<sup>38</sup> Masumoto recounts: “I received the kōan, ‘One Hand Clapping,’ and suffered with it for one and a half years.”<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 14. As discussed below, there are variations in kōan curriculum according among different Rinzai lineages, and at least in some lineages, there are differences between lay and monastic practitioners in terms of the kōan curriculum with regard to order, which kōans are included, and rigor of assessment (i.e., with regard to the rōshi’s determination of what constitutes “passing” a kōan).

<sup>37</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 57, 62, and 63. Hakuin popularized the “original face” kōan (*honrai no menmoku* 本来の面目) for beginners. In the context of Hakuin’s writings, translator Philip Yampolsky notes that “the ‘original face’ refers to the important koan: ‘Not thinking of good, not thinking of evil, just at this moment, what is your original face before your mother and father were born?’” See Hakuin Ekaku, *The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings*, translated by Philip B. Yampolsky (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971), 38 n. 36.

<sup>38</sup> For Shimada’s account, see Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 257; for Uhara’s account, see Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 265; and for Masumoto’s account, see Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 274. Shimada mentions that with Zen practice (and, by extension,

Indeed, many Rinzai Zen practitioners speak of suffering with, or through, their practice. Common to many practice accounts, for example, are feelings of frustration or dejection—often, but not always, accompanied by renewed determination—when one’s presentation of the kōan is repeatedly rejected by the rōshi in *sanzen* (discussed in the next section) or when one does not break through the assigned kōan.<sup>40</sup> Whether or not one’s practice is characterized by suffering, the ideal kōan practice is encapsulated—for Iizuka—by *kufū nenrō* 工夫拈弄, defined by D.T. Suzuki as “intense seeking.”<sup>41</sup>

Suzuki’s approach to kōan practice accords closely with Iizuka’s description: “According to Suzuki, it was essential for the student to digest the koan with his whole being, not just his intellect, practicing (*kufū suru*) with the koan by using his abdomen rather than his head.”<sup>42</sup> Iizuka describes practice almost identically: he states that unlike other forms of *kufū*, in Zen-style *kufū*, one thinks with the abdomen (*hara* 腹), not the head. Moreover, it is crucial to become one with the kōan (*narikiru* 成り切る) and to be “immovable” when

---

kōan practice), it is not enough to practice it temporarily; rather, it is the work of a lifetime (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 257).

<sup>39</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 274.

<sup>40</sup> For example, Mōtō Yūjirō (discussed later in this chapter) speaks of his dejection after Sōen rejects his presentation of the kōan in *sanzen*: “Again [Sōen] rejected my idea. I had the feeling that I exhausted all my options [*yumioire yatsukiru* 弓折れ矢尽きた]; I was disappointed and disheartened in the extreme. Because of this, a somewhat reactionary feeling welled up, and all day long, I couldn’t practice [*kufū* 工夫]” (Mōtō, “*Sanzen nisshi* 参禅日誌,” 2014, 355).

<sup>41</sup> Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 75. For example, “*kufū bendō* 工夫弁道”—a term used occasionally by modern Zen practitioners to describe practice (and used, for example, by Dōgen)—means “negotiating the Way in intense seeking.”

<sup>42</sup> Jaffe, Introduction in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, li.

delusive thinking bubbles up.<sup>43</sup> As for “*nenrō* 拈弄,” this term can also refer—in the Zen setting—to a written assignment that is part of advanced kōan practice; in this context, Victor Hori defines “*nenrō*” as “deft play.”<sup>44</sup>

However, Iizuka uses “*nenrō*” more in the sense of “fiddling with” or “racking one’s brains”; and to “*kufū nenrō*” he attributes the qualities of ferocity and relentless effort—for example, never abandoning the kōan while eating, sleeping, or engaging in other daily activities. Here, he invokes such classical Zen sayings as “[Practice] as if the top of your head is on fire” and “Make your whole body into a ball of fire and practice.”<sup>45</sup> For example, Shimokawa Yoshitarō, discussed later in this chapter, describes the qualities of “*kufū* 工夫,” which take on a life-or-death significance for him: *kufū* “...is thinking deeply about the things that occur every day. From there, it’s piling on layer upon layer of self-cultivation [*shūyō* 修養]. It’s *shūyō* for stopping one’s will and killing the self; without doing away with the emphasis on oneself, [practice] is useless; if we don’t die,

---

<sup>43</sup> Victor Hori describes “*narikiru*,” or becoming one with the kōan, as vital to kōan practice. Hori notes: “The monk penetrates the kōan not through understanding it but through the constant repeated effort to become one with it.... Finally there comes a moment when the monk realizes that his very seeking the answer to the kōan, and the way he himself is reacting to his inability to penetrate the koan, are themselves the activity of the kōan working within him” (Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō,” 288–289). Likewise, as Philip Kapleau describes in the context of the kōan Mu, “A student must ask himself, ‘What is Mu?’ until the interrogation becomes so intense that he is able to focus his conscious mind only on the word ‘Mu’ while the question ‘What is Mu?’ echoes in his unconscious. Suddenly, in a flash of understanding, he will perceive that Mu is the expressions of the living Buddha-nature, or, put another way: ‘All is one, one is none, none is all’” (Philip Kapleau, “Report From a Zen Monastery: ‘All Is One, One Is None, None Is All,’” *New York Times*, March 6, 1966, *The New York Times Magazine*).

<sup>44</sup> Elsewhere, Hori defines *nenrō* as “a short verse, typically of four lines, in classical Chinese.... The *nenrō* verse is supposed to be free and imaginative, and written in the form of classical Chinese poetry” (Hori, *Zen Sand*, 38).

<sup>45</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 18. 「頭上の炎を拂ふが如くせよ。」 「總身火の玉となりて工夫せよ。」



we cannot live....” For this reason, Shimokawa engages relentlessly with his kōan practice, working on his kōan even while walking in the road.<sup>46</sup>

#### 4.2.2.1 Zazen Pedagogy

In terms of how lay practitioners learned the basics of zazen (for example, the type of simplified practice that Suzuki describes in “A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting”), there were a few main avenues. First, some practitioners came into contact with forms of “quiet sitting” (*seiza* 静坐) that resembled the bare basics of zazen described above (less the emphasis on kōan practice) in self-cultivation practice contexts that were not considered Zen. For example, as discussed in chapter 5, meditation methods such as Okada-style quiet sitting (*Okada-shiki seiza-hō* 岡田式静坐法) had increased in popularity, along with the early twentieth-century “*shūyō* boom.”<sup>47</sup> Shimokawa, discussed in further detail below, had explored Okada-style breathing practices before beginning his Zen practice.<sup>48</sup> His experience with these breathing techniques—along with other factors—may help to explain how quickly he took to Zen and his rapidity in passing through his first kōan; and it is an example of the considerable overlaps between lay Zen and other forms of self-cultivation practices during this period.

---

<sup>46</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 64.

<sup>47</sup> See, for example, Kurita Hidehiko, “Okadashiki seizahō to kokkashugi: Futara Yoshinori o tsūjite 岡田式静坐法と国家主義—二荒芳徳を通じて,” *Ronshū* 論集, no. 37 (2010): 1–24; and Kurita Hidehiko, “Shinshū sōryo to Okadashiki seizahō 真宗僧侶と岡田式静坐法,” *Kindai Bukkyō* 近代仏教, no. 21 (August 2014): 116–44. For an example of Okada’s teachings that were aimed at North Americans, see the short pamphlet: Okada Torajirō, *The Okada Method of Seiza Culture for Mind and Body* (Los Angeles, California: Okada Science Society, 1919).

<sup>48</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 30.

Alternatively, as Iizuka notes, laypeople could receive in-person instruction in *zazen* from a monastic at Engakuji or other events held by the Zen assemblies.<sup>49</sup> This was most common way—and, some would say, the only “proper” way—to learn *zazen*, and accords with the Zen imperative for “mind-to-mind transmission.”<sup>50</sup> For practitioners who left behind accounts of their practice—whether through the student histories, in journals, or in autobiographical monographs—most, if not all, describe their practice stemming from personal encounters with masters, experience with lay Zen assemblies, visits to monasteries, and so forth. In other words, they came into physical contact with Zen and Zen practitioners and physically practiced Zen.

What was the role, then, of popular literature and the written word in communicating the basics of Zen practice to beginners? As discussed in chapter 2, this dimension cannot be ignored, given the unprecedented proliferation of Zen-related print media in the early twentieth century. In terms of manuals or how-to guides for engaging in Zen sitting practice (*zazen kufū* 坐禪工夫), Chan and Zen have a long history of *zazen* manuals via the genre of *zazengi* 坐禪儀, which Norman Waddell and Abe Masao define

---

<sup>49</sup> In this case, students typically received instruction about *zazen* from a lower-ranking monastic than the *rōshi*.

<sup>50</sup> Frequently quoted in Zen is a slogan attributed to Bodhidharma (a legendary figure in the fifth or sixth century who was the “patriarch” of Chan): “A separate transmission outside of scripture [*kyōge betsuden* 教外別伝] / Not founded on words or letters [*furyū monji* 不立文字] / Point directly to one’s mind [*jikishi ninshin* 直指人心] / See one’s nature and become Buddha [*kenshō jōbutsu* 見性成佛]” (translation from Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō,” 296). In other words, Chan, and Zen, esteems mind-to-mind transmission, locating authority “outside the scriptures” and in the master-to-student transmission of Buddhahood itself. In terms of the slogan’s historicity, Albert Welter notes that these slogans were not quoted together until the Song dynasty (960–1279). See Albert Welter, “Mahākāśyapa’s Smile: Silent Transmission and the Kung-an (Kōan) Tradition,” in *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, 75–109, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 79.

as “short, easily memorized texts devoted to the method and significance of zazen practice.”<sup>51</sup> In the modern era, such meditation manuals spelling out the basics for beginners appeared increasingly, some with modernized forms, while classics continued to be invoked, including at monasteries.<sup>52</sup>

In addition to the possibility of reading meditation instructions through the many books available, including both modern renditions and reprints of classics, newcomers

---

<sup>51</sup> Dōgen, “Dōgen’s *Fukanzazengi*,” 115 n. 2. Bielefeldt traces the genealogy of Changlu Zongze’s 長蘆宗蹟 *Zuochan yi* 坐禪儀 (Jp. *Zazengi*), most likely written in the twelfth century as the “earliest known work of its kind in the Ch’an tradition.” Although its history is not entirely clear, Bielefeldt notes that it most likely was composed as part of a monastic code but was written as a meditation tract for both monastics and laypeople; see Carl Bielefeldt, *Dōgen’s Manuals of Zen Meditation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 57–60. Bielefeldt further notes that “...although the Ch’an tradition had managed to survive for some half a millennium without producing a meditation manual, once [Zongze’s *Zuochan yi*] appeared, it seems to have found a ready market and soon spawned a new genre of practical guides to mental cultivation” (Bielefeldt, *Dōgen’s Manuals*, 69). For a full examination of Zongze’s *Zuochan yi* and its influence on Dōgen’s *Fukan zazengi* 普勸坐禪儀—which, Bielefeldt explains, was written partially in reaction to Zongze’s tract—see Bielefeldt, *Dōgen’s Manuals*, 55–77; and Carl Bielefeldt, “Ch’ang-lu Tsung-tse’s *Tso-ch’an i* and the ‘Secret’ of Zen Meditation,” in *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, edited by Peter Gregory (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1986), 129–61. For a version of Changlu’s *Zazengi*, see Thomas F. Cleary, trans., “Chan Master Cijiao of Changlu: Models for Sitting Meditation,” in *Minding Mind: A Course in Basic Meditation* (Boston and London: Shambhala, 1995), 16–19. For example, as a representation of common instructions for zazen as provided in Rinzai monasteries, there is an excerpt from “*Zazengi* 坐禪儀” in Satō and Nishimura, *Unsui: A Diary of Zen Monastic Life*, 53; for the Japanese, see Satō Giei 佐藤義英, *Unsui nikki: e de miru Zen no shugyō seikatsu* 雲水日記: 絵で見る禅の修行生活 (Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo 禅文化研究所, 2015; originally published in 1972). Most likely this “*Zazengi*” is from a version of Changlu’s *Zazengi*, but it is not specified.

<sup>52</sup> It should be noted that dozens of works containing the term “*zazengi*” were published from the Meiji through early Shōwa periods, but the vast majority of these pertained to Dōgen’s *Fukanzazengi*. This suggests that *Fukanzazengi* was more widely available to the average lay practitioner than other works in the *zazengi* genre. See, for example, Harada Sogaku 原田祖岳, *Zazen no shikata: Shin fukan zazengi* 坐禅の仕方: 新普勸坐禅儀 (Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha, 1926); and Iida Tōin 飯田櫟隠, *Fukan zazengi ichikeisō* 普勸坐禅儀一茎草 (Takatsuki, Osaka: Shōrinkutsu Dōjō, 1933). Harada and Iida had training in both Sōtō and Rinzai; clearly, they considered *Fukanzazengi* to be a vital pedagogical tool worth keeping from Sōtō, even as they (especially Harada) reformulated Zen with both Sōtō and Rinzai dimensions.

could learn about zazen via journals like *Zendō*—ideally, though not necessarily, in conjunction with in-person instruction at a temple. For example, prior to the aforementioned sesshin for laypeople at Engakuji in August 1918, the “Lay Sesshin Participation Guidelines” were published in *Zendō*, defining “zazen 坐禪” as follows:

For zazen, spread out a thick zabuton; for full lotus posture, stabilize your right foot on top of your left thigh, and set your left palm on top of your right palm; bring together and curve your thumbs; erect your backbone [so that it is] straight up; then you should gently put your energy (*ki* 気) in the lower abdomen and devote yourself to the kōan that you received from the master; practice and make your mind empty; this is the mental attitude of the student.<sup>53</sup>

These instructions were available to any casual reader of *Zendō*, so, hypothetically, inexperienced but curious meditators might experiment at home. In practice, there does not appear to be evidence that this was the case, despite the considerable number of modern practitioners who speak of D. T. Suzuki’s and others’ written works as influential in spurring their interest in Zen practice.

#### 4.2.2.2 Kōan Practice for Laypeople: Further Notes

A thorough look at the various dimensions of kōan practice—for example, the ways in which Hakuin Ekaku 白隠慧鶴 (1686–1769) revitalized and systematized kōan practice in eighteenth-century Japan, and changes since that time (particularly during the modern period from roughly 1868–1945, when the kōan practice was popularized); details about Rinzai monasteries’ kōan curricula, as well as the overall role of kōan

---

<sup>53</sup> *Zendō*, no. 97 (August 1918), 59. See Appendix A for the full set of guidelines of which this is part.

practice in Rinzai monastic training and how lay kōan practice differs from monastic kōan practice; and qualitative aspects of the kōan as a spiritual tool and what is entailed in practicing (and “passing through”) a kōan—is deserving of detailed study but beyond the scope of the current investigation. However, I would like to make the following points and refer readers to existing literature on early modern and modern Japanese kōan practice.<sup>54</sup>

With regard to Hakuin’s approach to the kōan system, Michel Mohr draws attention to several distinctive aspects. In addition to the somatic dimension (as mentioned above), Mohr draws attention to the emphasis on “going beyond” (*kōjō* 向上), highlighting *kōjō* as “the pivotal feature of Rinzai practice and doctrine.”<sup>55</sup> For example, Mohr shows how this emphasis contributes to the central importance—for Hakuin—of

---

<sup>54</sup> For more on kōan practice in Japanese Rinzai, see Hori, “Teaching and Learning”; Victor Sōgen Hori, “The Nature of the Rinzai (Linji) Koan Practice,” in *Sitting with Koans*, edited by John Daido Loori, 117–30 (Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2006); Victor Sōgen Hori, “The Steps of Koan Practice,” in *Sitting with Koans*, edited by John Daido Loori, 131–48 (Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2006); Jeff Shore, “Kōan Zen from the Inside,” *Hanazono Daigaku Bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要, no. 28 (1996): 1–52; Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, *Zen no kōan to mondō* 禪の公案と問答, in *Zen no kōza* 禪の講座, Volume 3, edited by Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 and Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽 (Tokyo: Shun’yōdō Shoten, 2004; originally published in 1938); Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, “*Nihon ni okeru kōan Zen no dentō* 日本における公案禪の傳統,” in *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集, Volume 1, 233–302 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980); Asahina Sōgen 朝比奈宗源, “*Zen no kōan* 禪の公案,” in *Zen* 禪, Volume 3, 1–74 (Tokyo: Yuzankaku, 1941); Miura Isshū and Ruth Fuller Sasaki, *Zen Dust: The History of the Koan and Koan Study in Rinzai (Linji) Zen* (Melbourne and Basel: Quirin Press, 2015; originally published in 1966); Itō Kokan 伊藤古鑑, *Kōan zenwa: Zen, satori no mondōshū* 公案禪話: 禪・悟りの問答集 (Tokyo: Daihōrin-kaku, 1976); Itō Kokan, *Zen to kōan* 禪と公案 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1970); and Akizuki, *Kōan*.

<sup>55</sup> Mohr, “Emerging from Nonduality,” 263–64, 266. Mohr notes that this emphasis on *kōjō* is explicit in the works of Hakuin’s disciple Tōrei Enji 東嶺圓慈 (1686–1769) and is implicit in Hakuin’s own works.

“post-awakening practice” (*gogo no shugyō* 悟後修行) and of integrating the experience of nonduality (e.g., through enlightenment) into everyday life, as I also examine in chapter 5.

Mohr also makes two important point: that we cannot assume that kōan practice has remained unchanged since Hakuin’s time, and that despite the fact that all contemporary Rinzai lineages and branches trace themselves back to Hakuin, there is diversity within Rinzai Zen.<sup>56</sup> In terms of diversity of kōan curricula and systems, Victor Hori distinguishes between the Inzan 隱山 lineage of Rinzai Zen (descended from Inzan Ien 隱山惟琰; 1751–1814) and Takujū 卓洲 lineage (descended from Takujū Kosen 卓洲胡僊; 1760–1833), both of which were descended from Hakuin Ekaku. Hori summarizes: “The two teach basically the same body of koan and both consider themselves to be transmitting the Zen of Hakuin. But the Inzan school is thought to be

---

<sup>56</sup> Mohr, “Emerging from Nonduality,” 245. Thanks to Norman Waddell, who referred me to an article by Asahina Sōgen that gestures to an alternative to what we know as “Hakuin Zen”: that of Kogetsu Zen, named for Kogetsu Zenzai, 1667–1751. Kogetsu’s was a lineage of Rinzai Zen that had once overshadowed Hakuin’s lineage, and in which Seisetsu Shūcho—an eminent teacher and former Engakuji abbot who restored Engakuji during his lifetime—had received dharma transmission, but which eventually died out; see Asahina Sōgen 朝比奈宗源, “*Seisetsu Oshō o omou* 誠拙和尚を憶う,” *Zen Bunka* 禅文化 60 (1971), 4–9. Michel Mohr notes elsewhere that the two factions differed with regard to Ōbaku and geographic spheres of influence: “The rather simplistic slogan, ‘Kogetsu in the West and Hakuin in the East,’ epitomizes the competition between the pro-Ōbaku faction (Kogetsu’s followers) and the moderate anti-Ōbaku party (Hakuin’s followers)”; see Michel Mohr, “Hakuin,” in *Buddhist Spirituality, Vol. II: Later China, Korea, Japan, and the Modern World*, edited by Takeuchi Yoshinori, 307–28 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1999; originally published in 1990), 314. Mohr agrees that Seisetsu Shūcho represented the areas of overlap, given his role as successor of Kogetsu but having worked with Hakuin and Hakuin’s disciples. Mohr notes that when Kogetsu—who was older than Hakuin—retired from teaching, many of his students began work with Hakuin, contributing to the “convergence of Kogetsu’s and Hakuin’s dynamism, under the single banner of Hakuin’s movement” (Mohr, “Hakuin,” 314).

sharper and more dynamic in style, while the Takujū school is thought to be more meticulous and low-keyed.”<sup>57</sup> For example, both lineages tend to have a fixed order of kōans, though the Inzan curriculum’s order appears more random than the Takujū lineage’s clearly systematic progression through various kōan collections and stages. Additionally, practitioners in the Takujū lineage must respond to more *sassho* 拶所 (testing questions) and produce more *jakugo* 著語 (capping verses or phrases) than those in the Inzan lineage in order to pass the respective kōans.<sup>58</sup>

Additionally, despite the similarities that broadly characterize kōan curricula in each of the Inzan and Takujū lineages, respectively, there remain divergences on the level of lines within Inzan and Takujū (e.g., Mino and Bizen lines), on the level of branches related to major Rinzai head-temples (e.g., Engakuji-ha, Myōshinji-ha, and so forth), and on the level of individual teachers.<sup>59</sup> For example, Rinzai master Nishiyama Kasan 西山禾山 (1837 or 1838–1917)—who was a leading figure in early lay Zen and, in a sense, the “grandfather” of the lay-centered Śākyamuni Association (whose founder, Shaku Jōkō

---

<sup>57</sup> Hori, “The Steps of Koan Practice,” 133.

<sup>58</sup> Hori, “The Steps of Koan Practice,” 133–134. For an in-depth discussion of *jakugo*, see G. Victor Sōgen Hori, “Zen Kōan Capping Phrase Books: Literary Study and the Insight ‘Not Founded on Words or Letters,’” in *Zen Classics: Formative Texts in the History of Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 171–214 (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); and Hori, *Zen Sand*, 3–90.

<sup>59</sup> Regarding differences within the Inzan branch, Katō Shōshun highlights the differences between the Mino and Bizen lines. The Mino 美濃 line was named for the area where Shōgenji 正眼寺 is located, and its masters were “virtually unknown in society at large, and seemed to prefer it that way”). The Bizen line was named for the old Bizen 備前 province (modern-day Okayama 岡山) in which the temple Sōgenji is located. According to Katō, the Bizen line’s “succession of brilliant masters...were highly influential in the contemporary Buddhist world”; this included, for example, Imakita Kōsen (Katō, “A Lineage of Dullards,” 151–152).

釈定光, trained under Kasan's dharma heir, Shaku Kaikō 釈戒光)—was even known for formulating his own kōans, which are included in Śākyamuni Association's kōan curriculum to this day.<sup>60</sup>

Finally, in terms of how lay practitioners' kōan practice might have been different from those of monastics, there is still much research to be done. Topics to be investigated include the following: whether lay practitioners had access to the same kōan practice opportunities, whether there were differences in how masters treated laypeople in comparison to monks' kōan practice (e.g., whether they were “passed” more or less easily), and whether the curricula were the same.<sup>61</sup> According to Akizuki Ryōmin 秋月龍珉 (1921–1999)—prolific author and Zen popularizer, who studied under D.T. Suzuki and practiced under several of the most famous Rinzai abbots of the early twentieth century—there were regional differences with regard to laypeople's ability to practice kōans and move through the curriculum. Akizuki explains:

In contrast to Kamakura, where “Lay Zen” (*Kōji Zen* 居士禪”) has thrived since the time of [Imakita] Kōsen and Kōgaku (Shaku

---

<sup>60</sup> As mentioned in chapter 2, Nishiyama Kasan was Imakita Kōsen's contemporary. As for the kōans that Kasan crafted, see Tanabe, *Nishiyama Kasan*, 71–76, followed by Akizuki Ryōmin's commentary on these kōans (Tanabe, *Nishiyama Kasan*, 77); as well as Akizuki, *Kōan*, 261–335, in which Akizuki explicates the whole kōan system used by Kasan and Ekkei (which, he notes, is no longer used in any of the monastic halls in Japan today; see Akizuki, *Kōan*, 262).

<sup>61</sup> An early modern example of treating laypeople and monastics differently was Hakuin. Michel Mohr makes note of Hakuin's different treatment of laypeople and monastics in terms of certifying their realization, on the occasion of which Hakuin would present the student with a commemorative painting. Mohr observes: “A marked characteristic of these certifications is that they acknowledge a breakthrough occurring upon meditative work on the ‘sound of a single hand’ kōan. This signifies that the meaning given to such attestations was devised differently for lay persons and for monks. In the case of lay persons, it could be conferred upon realization of kenshō, while for monks it supposed the completion of the whole kōan training” (Mohr, “Hakuin,” 321).



Sōen), it seems that in Kyoto monasteries, it is the case that when [someone] progresses to the point of kōans, after that, [he is told] not to show up any longer as a layperson, and if he is to practice beyond that, he should ordain (*shukke seyo* 出家せよ).<sup>62</sup>

To illustrate his point, Akizuki notes the relative lack of laypeople who completed their training under three generations of Kenchōji masters and received *inka* 印可 (other than Naitō Chōon 内藤潮音). He speculates that beyond the issue of laypeople's status that there may also have been practical reasons for the lack of advanced kōan practitioners who were laypeople: for example, there were far more monastic trainees than in late twentieth-century Japan, so not everyone could attend *sanzen* with the rōshi; and as laypeople were necessarily the last in line for *sanzen*, many simply could not go.

One final point about differences between monastic and lay practitioners is the speed with which practitioners passed through kōans. Erez Joskovich notes that in the case of Ningen Zen Kyōdan 人間禪教団—a contemporary group with roots in the modern period, discussed previously—most members are passed through their first kōan relatively rapidly, in contrast to their monastic counterparts.<sup>63</sup> Anecdotes from multiple lay practitioners' accounts examined here also accord with this trend, although more research should be done.<sup>64</sup> For example, Shimokawa Yoshitarō (discussed below),

---

<sup>62</sup> Akizuki, *Zen no hito*, 211–212. Of Akizuki, establishment Rinzai monks and scholars alike have spoken with ambivalence about the academic solidity of his work. However, it seems that his works are widely read, even among Rinzai monks and scholars, and his massive oeuvre undoubtedly helped disseminate modern Rinzai in late twentieth-century Japan.

<sup>63</sup> Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 213–214.

<sup>64</sup> As Joskovich points out, there were certainly exceptions to this rapidity, and there remained great variations with regard to speed with which practitioners passed through their first kōans, if they passed at all, and variations with regard to the depth of their understanding. For example, D.

working under Mineo Daikyū, passed his first kōan within a few months of beginning Zen practice. Matora Yūjirō (also discussed below) does not explicitly state that he experienced *kenshō* 見性, but his account strongly implies that he passed through his first kōan within days of beginning intensive practice at Engakuji.

Another account of a lay practitioner passing rapidly through his first kōan at Engakuji is that of Tsuchiya Taimu 土屋大夢 (1866–1932), a journalist whose memoir includes an account of his Zen practice at Engakuji in the late 1880s.<sup>65</sup> Tsuchiya undertook Zen practice starting when he was a student—initially in hopes of recovering from beriberi.<sup>66</sup> Given that Shaku Sōen was temporarily away from Engakuji, studying at Keiō University at the time, Tsuchiya received permission from one of the Engakuji priests, named Kimura Junseki 木村潤石, to stay at the sub-temple Butsunichi'an. During his stay, he received the kōan of Hakuin's "one hand," learned zazen from Kimura, and then undertook practice. According to Tsuchiya's account, he understood the kōan

---

T. Suzuki practiced Zen at Engakuji for around five years before experiencing *kenshō*. For descriptions of Suzuki's beginning Zen practice at Engakuji under Imakita Kōsen in 1891 and Suzuki's *kenshō* experience (passing through the *Mu* kōan) in the winter of 1896, see Jaffe, Introduction in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, xx-xxiii.

<sup>65</sup> Tsuchiya Taimu 土屋大夢, *Kioku o tadorite* 記憶を辿りて, edited by Miyazato Tatsushi 宮里立士 and Satō Norihiko 佐藤哲彦 (Tokyo: Kabushiki Kaisha Yumani Shobō, 2012; originally published in 1932). For Tsuchiya's account of his experiences with Zen, see 131–142. Tsuchiya was also known by the name Tsuchiya Motosaku 土屋元作. He does not specify the years in which he was practicing at Engakuji but mentions that Shaku Sōen was studying at Keiō at the time, which Sōen did from March 1885–March 1887 (Engakuji, *Shaku Sōen to kindai nihon*, 214–215).

<sup>66</sup> Tsuchiya recounts that someone recommended trying Zen practice at Engakuji in order to help cure his beriberi. This seems strange, given that many monks have beriberi due to their white rice-based diet, but perhaps the acquaintance thought that the Engakuji monastics could help given their experience with the illness.

within only twenty days of practicing zazen.<sup>67</sup> Once he had passed through this “first gate” (“*daiichi no monkan* 第一の門関”), he was given the *koji* name “Taimu” (大夢), adopted from Zhuangzi.

#### 4.2.3 Encountering the Master in *Sanzen*

Tsuchiya’s account, like many personal accounts of lay Zen practice in the modern era, lacks specific detail about this master-student encounter that constitutes a central pillar of Zen practice. What, then, does *sanzen* 参禅 or *dokusan* 独参 actually comprise?<sup>68</sup> In short, it is a ritualized, one-on-one meeting in which the student presents his or her understanding of Zen (e.g., of the *kōan* on which she is working).<sup>69</sup> The

---

<sup>67</sup> Tsuchiya, *Kioku o tadorite*, 135. Tsuchiya attributes this rapid understanding to his previous study of Chinese classics, such as those of Sōshi 莊子 (Ch. Zhuangzi), the fourth-century Chinese philosopher.

<sup>68</sup> To clarify terminology, the word “*sanzen* 参禅” refers both to Zen practice and to practitioners’ formalized encounters with the *rōshi* to demonstrate their understanding of their *kōan* or other practice. In some practice contexts, the word “*dokusan* 独参” is used instead of—and in the same sense as—*sanzen*. As D. T. Suzuki points out, *dokusan* has the additional implication of being “individual or voluntary *sanzen*” in contrast to *sōsan* 総参, or “general *sanzen*,” in which all participants are required to attend *sanzen*—e.g., sometimes *sōsan* is mandated during sesshin (Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 106). Tsuji Sōmei, discussed further in the next chapter, mentions additional types of encounters with the master, *tsūzan* 通参 and *naizan* 内参: “I was in the special category of what is called *tsūzan*, so that I could often ask for *naizan*, which means an interview outside the normal fixed times. To someone in a situation like myself, Master Gyōdō would cheerfully give interviews” (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 103). However, *tsūsan* and *naisan* do not appear to be commonly used terms in the Rinzai context.

<sup>69</sup> For a postwar perspective, see Philip Kapleau, “The Private Encounter with the Master,” in *Zen: Tradition and Transition*, edited by Kenneth Kraft, 44–69 (New York: Grove Press, 1988). Caution should be used in extending Kapleau’s description uncritically to the Rinzai context of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan, given that he trained in Japan in the 1950s and 1960s under Yasutani Hakuun—whose lineage and training were not strictly Rinzai—then honed his views through his subsequent decades of teaching Americans. However, Kapleau provides both a technical description of the ritual mechanics of *dokusan*, as well as the ethos and purpose, from the teacher’s perspective, that is not only more detailed than descriptions found elsewhere but is also consistent with those of earlier generations of lay Japanese Zen practitioners.

guidelines for the 1918 Engakuji lay sesshin mentioned previously provide four points of instruction about *sanzen* (the full set of guidelines appears in Appendix A). These guidelines state:

If the bell for *sanzen* rings, regardless of whether it is [time for] sitting or *kinhin* [walking meditation], you should quickly enter the [master's] room, and you must not enter the room carelessly or without engaging fully in practice.

Entering the room, do *gasshō* [i.e., place your hands palm to palm], and when you leave, again do *gasshō* in front of your chest; seven feet in front of the master, you should do three prostrations, and in front of the master, do one prostration.<sup>70</sup> Doing three prostrations pays reverence to the buddhas of the three worlds, and doing one prostration pays reverence to the master. Paying obeisance means having the mental state of receiving the Buddha's feet, and you must not ignore that this [paying obeisance] is continuous and secret.<sup>71</sup>

Before the master, when you present your insight and understanding, it is as if you are facing a warrior's battlefield and exchanging swords; without surrendering to the master, you must not be timid.

As for the master's instructions, you should purify your mind and ears and listen attentively; no matter what happens in the room, it is strictly prohibited for anything to leak out.

These short guidelines encapsulate the mechanics, the spirit, and the secrecy of the ritual that is *sanzen*: depicted as, ideally, a spontaneous meeting of enlightened master and disciple, embodying enlightenment itself. Suzuki notes that “ordinarily, this takes place as

---

<sup>70</sup> Here, this could read “seven feet [*shichi shaku* 七尺] in front of the master”—with “foot” as a translation of *shaku* 尺 (a traditional unit of measurement)—or “in front of the master's seven-foot body (七尺之軀),” simply indicating his body (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “七尺,” accessed February 25, 2020).

<sup>71</sup> Here, “receiving the Buddha's feet” (*bussoku o itadaku* 佛足を頂く) seems to come from the expression “bowing one's head to the feet of the Buddha,” or “頂禮佛足” (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “頂禮佛足,” accessed February 25, 2020).

a rule twice a day, but during the great *sesshin* the monks have to see the master at least four times a day.”<sup>72</sup>

Iizuka Iwao’s description of *sanzen* at Engakuji circa 1920 is congruent with the guidelines. In terms of what transpires in the master’s quarters on a practical level, Iizuka notes that there are no limits to what one can present, in words or in actions. Based on the student’s presentation, the *rōshi* then discerns the student’s understanding. Iizuka describes a few ways in which the *rōshi* frequently responds to students’ presentations of their understanding: “That’s not it; sit more solidly and then come back”; “You’re thinking with your head—think with your belly [*hara* 腹]”; or “Become one with the *kōan*.”<sup>73</sup> Almost always, the student’s understanding will be deficient, although bursts of insight (and changes of paradigm) can happen at any point. Regardless of what transpires, however, Iizuka makes its secrecy crystal clear, as per Engakuji’s guidelines: “What happens inside the room is top-secret, and it is absolutely forbidden to disclose it [to others].”<sup>74</sup> (Note that this culture of secrecy within Rinzai Zen is discussed later in the chapter.)

If a student goes to *sanzen* and penetrates his or her assigned *kōan*, the *rōshi* deems this to be *kenshō* 見性 (“seeing the nature”), says Iizuka.<sup>75</sup> Congruent with common descriptions of enlightenment in the Rinzai Zen context, Iizuka explains that this is “passing the first barrier” in Zen and is not the same as a great, thoroughgoing

---

<sup>72</sup> Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 105.

<sup>73</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 22.

<sup>74</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 21.

<sup>75</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 23.

*satori* (“*daigo tettei* 大悟徹底”). In fact, he continues, you will not necessarily have a great, thoroughgoing *satori* even by passing through all 1700 *kōans*. This “seeing the nature” must be integrated with daily life and is just the beginning of “true training” (*honmono no shugyō* 本物の修業).<sup>76</sup> Consistent with the Rinzai Zen ideal of “great overpowering will” (*daifunshi* 大憤志) that is regarded as one of the “three essentials” of practice (as discussed in the next chapter), Iizuka describes the tremendous effort required for penetrating this first barrier, although expending such effort is still no guarantee of realization. Iizuka notes that one may exert such effort and awaken in a single night, as Hakuin’s lay disciple Takanashi Heishirō 高梨平四郎 ostensibly did with no prior Zen practice, or one may practice for ten or fifteen years before attaining a shallow *kenshō* (or none at all).<sup>77</sup>

According to Iizuka, the practitioner should embody such an ethos of fierce determination and effort not only while doing *zazen* and engaging in all daily activities but also—and especially—when entering the *rōshi*’s quarters for *sanzen*. Face to face

---

<sup>76</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 23.

<sup>77</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 24–25. Jeff Shore also presents the story of Heishirō, who appears in Hakuin’s *Rōhatsu Exhortations* (*Rōhatsu jishu* 臘八示衆): “After carving a stone Buddha and placing it near a waterfall, Heishiro suddenly realizes the impermanence of all things while watching bubbles on the surface of a stream. Soon after, he happens to hear someone reading some Zen words aloud, and determines to get to the bottom of things. He locks himself in a small room, and sits erect with eyes wide open for three days and nights. He gains a deep insight but isn’t fully aware of it until he happens to visit Hakuin at someone’s urging. On the way to Hakuin’s temple, Heishiro gains an even deeper insight and, according to Hakuin: ‘Excitedly, he came to my dokusan room and immediately passed several koan.’ Hakuin continues: ‘Now let us remember that Heishiro was just an ordinary man. He knew nothing of Zen nor had he practiced formal *zazen*’” (Shore, “Kōan Zen from the Inside,” 35). Here, Shore is citing Eido Shimano’s translation of Hakuin’s text in Eido Shimano, *Golden Wind: Zen Talks*, edited by Janis Levine (Tokyo: Japan Publications, Inc.), 181–183.

with the rōshi, the student engages in “intense seeking” (“*kufū nenrō* 工夫拈弄”), presenting her views on the kōan that the rōshi had assigned—and on which she is working, day and night—and potentially comes to awakening.<sup>78</sup> The stakes here are awakening; and, ideally, the practitioner should be prepared to relinquish her ego: that is, the deepest notions that she holds about herself and her identity. Thus, with regard to the ethos of ferocious, courageous preparedness needed for facing the master, Iizuka echoes the militaristic language that appears in the guidelines (and which I discuss further in chapter 5): “The rōshi’s quarters are a true dharma battlefield, so for those who wish to enter his room, it is necessary to be prepared like a hero facing the battlefield.”<sup>79</sup>

Such are the descriptions of ideal *sanzen*, but what about individual practitioners’ experiences? Only a minority of contributors to the groups’ respective histories or popular journals discuss kōan practice or *sanzen* in detail; thus, we are limited in understanding precisely what transpired in the *sanzen* room. Below, I discuss the “*sanzen* diaries” of two rare individuals who did write more extensively about their experiences in *sanzen*.

#### 4.2.3.1 Sanzen Diary I (1894): Motora Yūjirō 元良勇次郎 (1858–1912)

In 1895, psychologist and Meiji intellectual Motora Yūjirō published an article entitled “*Sanzen* diary” (参禅日誌), an account of his experiences practicing Zen for one

---

<sup>78</sup> It should be noted that both initial and subsequent awakening experiences are depicted as exceedingly rare; and while the rōshi’s “skillful means” can help the student make the paradigm shift that enlightenment entails—particularly for those with ripe minds—such experiences do not happen exclusively in the rōshi’s quarters.

<sup>79</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 21 「老師の室内は法の實戦場であって、入室せんとする者は、恰も勇士の戦場に臨むが如き覺悟を要し…」

week at Engakuji under Shaku Sōen.<sup>80</sup> In this article, Motora describes—concisely but with significant and rare detail—each of his encounters with Sōen, focusing on his own successive insights, his presentation of these realizations in *sanzen* (both his verbal explanations and his physical responses), and Sōen’s reactions—the majority of which amounted to the reply, “That will not do.” Although his account should not be taken as representative of all practice at Engakuji, his descriptions of his private encounters with Sōen in *sanzen*, twice or thrice daily, offer a rare glimpse into laypeople’s practice opportunities at late nineteenth-century Engakuji, the ways in which kōan were actually practiced there, and the ways in which Shaku Sōen—both at the helm of a traditional Rinzai training hall and at the vanguard of popularized Rinzai Zen in modern Japan—worked with students.

Motora was a self-described Zen novice who lived in Kamakura for a few months during the summer of 1894. Upon visiting Engakuji one day, he resolves to return and search for the “essence of the study of Zen” (“*Zengaku no ōgi* 禅学の奥義”), and he does so a few months later. As per descriptions in chapter 3 of laypeople’s “free-flowing” practice at Engakuji prior to more formalized, standardized lay *sesshin* in the 1910s, and prior to the establishment of a full-fledged practice hall for lay practitioners in the 1920s, Motora stays in the sub-temple Kigen’in 帰源院 during his week at Engakuji.<sup>81</sup> He mentions thirty or forty other practitioners (“*shugyōsha* 修業者”) who came from various

---

<sup>80</sup> Motora, “*Sanzen nisshi* 参禅日誌,” 2014.

<sup>81</sup> Motora, “*Sanzen nisshi*,” 2014, 349–350.



places to do “*angya* 行脚.”<sup>82</sup> In this setup, the lay practitioners stay at the temple, practiced independently (*jikatsu* 自活) during the day, and come together for “quiet sitting and contemplation” (*seiza mokkō* 静坐默考) in the meditation hall (坐禅堂) in the evening.<sup>83</sup> Sōen offers *sanzen* in the mornings and evenings.<sup>84</sup> Mōtōra indicates that usually, *sanzen* encounters last only a matter of seconds, as the students’ states of mind—as expressed in their bodies—were immediately evident to the rōshi.

To Mōtōra, as to many other beginners, Sōen assigns Hakuin’s “One Hand Clapping” kōan.” In *sanzen*, Mōtōra repeatedly brings to Sōen intellectualized, highly reasoned interpretations of and answers to the kōan, particularly on the first couple days; Sōen rejects these presentations continuously. For example, on his first full day, Mōtōra reasons that from the provisional perspective, the “sound of one hand” is just a fleeting quality; but that from the perspective of “essence” (*tai* 体), it is identical to the sound existing before hands are clapped.<sup>85</sup> Subsequently, his presentations become increasingly physical; on his third day, when Sōen asks him, “What is the sound of one hand?” and

---

<sup>82</sup> Mōtōra does not mention his fellow practitioners more than this once, and he does not use the terms “*koji*” or “*zaiki*” to describe fellow practitioners or himself. This does not appear to have been a formal retreat (*sesshin* 接心). Inagaki Hisao defines “*angya* 行脚” as “travelling for the sake of Buddhist practice” (*A Glossary of Zen Terms*, s.v. “*angya* 行脚,” 5).

<sup>83</sup> In terms of the practitioners’ accommodations, the editor of the 2014 version interprets this to mean that they are all staying at Kigen’in (Mōtōra, “*Sanzen nisshi*,” 2014, 350). This “*zazendō*” may have been the *zendō* in the monks’ hall. Iizuka Iwao, in 1920, recounted that for generations, the Senbutsujō 選佛場 had been Engakuji’s only *zendō*. However, since onetime abbot Seisetsu Shūcho built present-day Shōzoku’in to be used as the monks’ hall, Senbutsujō had ceased to be used, leaving Shōzoku’in as the sole *zendō* (Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 33–34).

<sup>84</sup> Additionally, Sōen occasionally offered “special *sanzen*” (*rinji sanzen* 臨時參禅) during Mōtōra’s week at Engakuji, although Mōtōra does not specify what this meant.

<sup>85</sup> Mōtōra, “*Sanzen nisshi*,” 2014, 350–351.

stuck out one hand, Motora responds in turn, sticking out one hand, though he is stymied when Sōen continues, “That is a good answer, but what would you do if someone here, now, had a sword and tried to stab you?”<sup>86</sup> On Motora’s fourth day, Sōen determines that Motora’s “joyful countenance” and assertion (“Even if I disappear into ashes and become the earth, the sound of this hand does not change”) signify that he has fully “entered” the Zen path; Sōen then instructs Motora to take the next step with the kōan, expressing its form.

For his final three days, Motora focuses on the aspects of “completion” (*enman* 円満) and “unity of knowledge and action” (*chikō gōitsu* 知行合一). Sōen rejects various interpretations that Motora brings before him; and on his sixth day, Motora despairs, unable to practice further that day.<sup>87</sup> Finally, on his seventh day, Motora expresses “completion” by sitting upright on his knees, placing his hands in *gasshō*, and bowing silently to Sōen, saying nothing; Sōen tells him to express “completion” standing upright, which Motora does. In his account, Motora describes this exchange as meaning that he has “concluded the matter” of this kōan, which implies *kenshō*—although he does not explicitly say that Sōen confirmed his “seeing the nature” or that Sōen conferred upon him a lay name, which often happens when a student who is a formal disciple first passes through a kōan.<sup>88</sup> However, if Motora truly “saw the nature” (*kenshō* 見性), and if his

---

<sup>86</sup> Motora, “*Sanzen nisshi*,” 2014, 352.

<sup>87</sup> Motora, “*Sanzen nisshi*,” 2014, 355.

<sup>88</sup> Motora, “*Sanzen nisshi*,” 2014, 356. To clarify, Motora does not use the word “*kenshō*” to describe his experience, though he states at the end of his account that he “concluded the matter” of his kōan; and earlier, he conveys that Sōen had found his explanation of the kōan satisfactory

presentation was truly as intellectual as it appears from this article, then it could show that Sōen tolerated intellectual approaches in line with Nantenbō's critique of Engakuji Zen, as discussed elsewhere.

It should be noted that Motora's emphasis and language are primarily psychological and philosophical, emphasizing his realizations during practice (*kufū* 工夫) and experiences in *sanzen*, and using minimal Buddhist terminology.<sup>89</sup> Other than referring to Sōen occasionally as the temple priest (“*jūshoku* 住職”) or the master (“*oshō* 和尚”), he uses secular terms to introduce both Sōen and Imakita (as “Mr.,” of *shi* 氏). He makes one reference to a Zen priest (“*zenke* 禅家”) but does not otherwise mention the Engakuji monastics or monks' hall. The lack of a discussion of monks and the monks' hall is notable, as literature by lay Zen practitioners often alludes to the monastic community, idealizing it as a model for their own lay community. This omission could reflect either Motora's personal stance or, possibly, his lack of interaction with monastics.<sup>90</sup>

---

enough to move onto the next step of expressing the *kōan* (although it is unclear whether or not this means he “passed through” the *kōan*). Motora also uses the verb *satoru* 悟る to describe his realizations, some of which he later understands to be overly theoretical and which were not (all) accepted by Sōen. Also on the topic of Motora's supposed *kenshō*, it is worth noting that he describes “the study of Zen” (禅学) not as ordinary knowledge (知識) or as a technique (技術) but, rather, as “self-knowledge” (自識), which he equates with *kenshō* 見性.

<sup>89</sup> For “experience,” Motora uses both *keiken* 経験 and *taiken* 体験, although he uses the latter more frequently. Sometimes he explicitly frames his descriptions as coming from a psychological perspective (*shinrigaku jō* 心理学上).

<sup>90</sup> It is unlikely that Motora did not interact with monastics during his stay at Engakuji, given their role facilitating *sanzen*, at the very least.

Finally, Motora's takeaways from his experience and summary of the essentials of "the study of Zen (禅学)" are in line with at least some contemporaneous intellectuals. In the end, Motora asserts the following: first, that the "the study of Zen is not mysterious" but, rather, is "rational" (a modern notion promoted by Inoue Enryō 井上円了 and many others).<sup>91</sup> Secondly, he emphasizes that Zen "cannot be taught in words but, rather, is attained through bodily experience (*taiken* 体験)"; this emphasis on experience, according to several scholars, is also characteristic of modernity, in line with fellow psychologist William James and others in Engakuji's circle, such as D. T. Suzuki—although it should be noted that Motora's article precedes the lectures on which James based his *Varieties of Religious Experience* by six years.<sup>92</sup> Third, reflecting both contemporaneous Japanese interest in spiritual cultivation as well as interest in Western philosophy, Motora affirms that Zen's "spiritual training (*seishin tanren* 精神鍛錬)" is highly beneficial and, moreover, is "compatible with pure philosophy and Stoic will (*ishi* 意志)." His final point gleaned from his practice experience is that Zen is "neither

---

<sup>91</sup> For discussion of the centrality of the "rational" in Inoue Enryō's 井上円了 (1858–1919) formulation of modern Buddhism, see, for example, Jason Ānanda Josephson, "When Buddhism Became a 'Religion': Religion and Superstition in the Writings of Inoue Enryō," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33, no. 1 (2006): 143–68.

<sup>92</sup> Robert Sharf and Richard M. Jaffe highlight the role of "religious experience" (*shūkyōteki keiken* 宗教的経験), per William James, in the thought of D. T. Suzuki and his friend, philosopher Nishida Kitarō 西田幾多郎 (1870–1945). Sharf notes: Suzuki's "...emphasis on religious experience, which forms the basis of Suzuki's later approach to everything from Buddhist *prāṇā* (wisdom) to kōan literature, seems to have been directly inspired by the writings of Suzuki's personal friend, Nishida Kitarō" (Sharf, "The Zen of Japanese Nationalism," 20). Jaffe also discusses the resonance, for Suzuki, of James's approach to religious experience (see especially Jaffe, Introduction in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, xiv, xxiii).

knowledge nor a technique but is self-knowledge; therefore [the study of Zen] is called *kenshō* 見性.”

#### 4.2.3.2 Sanzen Diary II (1911–1934): Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎 (1884–1934)

Contrasting with Mōtōra’s one-time *sanzen* diary, and that of a beginner, is Shimokawa’s diaries. Shimokawa Yoshitarō was a lawyer and local politician who began Zen practice when he was nearly thirty and continued for many years, practicing fervently (at least for a time) and making considerable progress on his kōan practice under Mineo Daikyū and a succession of other Rinzai rōshi. He maintained his diaries—which contain ordinary accounts of his non-Zen life as well as his “*sanzen* record” (*sanzenroku* 参禅録)—from age 28 until his death at the age of 51. Presumably, he never intended for these diaries to become public (they were published after his death by a family member), and they reveal an unusually intimate portrait of spiritual practice in the Taishō and early Shōwa eras.

When Shimokawa’s diaries begin in 1911, he is 28 years old and already interested in the spiritual life (*seishin seikatsu* 精神生活).<sup>93</sup> Throughout 1911, Shimokawa repeatedly articulates his need to pursue spiritual cultivation (*shūyō* 修養); he states: “To my current personality, I want to add an immovable mind [*fudōshin* 不動心]; without an immovable mind, I will not be able to accomplish great things.”<sup>94</sup> In this

---

<sup>93</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 6.

<sup>94</sup> Regarding his “need for self-cultivation,” see, for example, Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 17–20. Regarding the “immovable mind” (*fudōshin* 不動心), see Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 17 and 19. 「今の性格の上に不動心を加へたい。不動心がなくては、大事業が出来ない。」

context, he states simply, “The practice of stilled thought. Zazen. Needing to cultivate an immovable mind.”<sup>95</sup> However, at this point, it appears that these are still Shimokawa’s aspirations upon which to embark in the future, rather than actual undertakings.

Such pursuits intensify the next year: the last of the Meiji era and first of the Taishō era. With his first journal entry of January 1, 1912, Shimokawa lays out his goals for both “spiritual self-cultivation” (*seishin shūyō* 精神修養) and “physical training” (*nikutai senren* 肉体鍛錬): for the former, he pledges to cultivate “perfect sincerity, [his] own worth, immovability, and fortitude”; for the latter, he seeks to bathe in cold water and practice abdominal breathing and the way of quiet sitting.<sup>96</sup> Thereafter, he refers to experimenting with Okada-style breathing practices and Christian-style selflessness, while engaging in philosophical conversations with his close friend Satō Teiichi 佐藤禎一, who urges him to try Zen practice in Kamakura.<sup>97</sup>

Just a month after that particular conversation, in June of 1912, tragedy revisits Shimokawa’s life, as Satō dies by suicide.<sup>98</sup> Shimokawa’s loss not only of Satō but, previously, of other close loved ones becomes connected to his spiritual efforts and to the start of his Zen practice, which he begins a few months after Satō’s death. The day after Satō’s death, Shimokawa says: “Thus, I had lost my mother, I had lost my lover, I had

---

<sup>95</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 17. 「静思の工夫。坐禅。不動の心を養ふを要す。」

<sup>96</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 24. 「精神修養 至誠、自量、不動、剛毅。肉体鍛錬 冷水浴、腹式呼吸、静坐法。」

<sup>97</sup> In February 1912, Shimokawa mentions doing Okada-style practices, stating that “quiet sitting isn’t only for the sake of health; it should be training for the mind” (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 30). The conversation with Satō occurs in May 1912 (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 36).

<sup>98</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 38–41. Later, Shimokawa notes that that academic year, a total of three classmates (including Satō) died.

lost my friend. From now on, I will try to be a strong man.”<sup>99</sup> Similarly, Shimokawa reiterates many times thereafter that becoming “strong” is a central motivation for his practice, or *kufū*.<sup>100</sup> Particularly in the early months and years of Shimokawa’s Zen practice, thoughts of Satō resurface repeatedly; and the meaning of life and death remain a central theme to which Shimokawa returns throughout his diaries.<sup>101</sup> Not only does he discuss Satō, suicide, and death explicitly, but his choice of words when describing spiritual practice itself also reflect his preoccupation with life and death. Shimokawa declares: “It’s self-cultivation [*shūyō* 修養] for halting one’s will and killing the self; without doing away with the emphasis on oneself, it’s useless; if we don’t die, we cannot live.”<sup>102</sup>

Unlike many of the Tokyo-area lay Zen practitioners discussed in this dissertation, Shimokawa did not practice at Engakuji or with Engakuji masters. Over the course of his decades of Zen practice, he worked with several prominent Rinzai masters, in different geographical regions, who were known for working with lay students; and his connections suggest well-trodden networks that connect many lay Rinzai practitioners (and masters) of the era. Shimokawa initially began Zen practice under the Rinzai master

---

<sup>99</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 43. 「これで母を失ひ、恋人を失ひ、友人を失った。これよりは強い男になるんだ。」

<sup>100</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 62. He also uses the gendered term *gōki* 剛毅 (translated as “fortitude” or “manliness”) in the context of his aspirations for practice.

<sup>101</sup> See, for example, Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 65; for a later example (in 1919), see Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 281. The author of Shimokawa’s chronology (*nenpu* 年譜) also describes Satō’s death as the “spur” or “opportunity” (*keiki* 契機) for Shimokawa’s Zen practice (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 483).

<sup>102</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 64. 「自分の勝気をとどめて、自分を殺す修養、自分の主張をなくすようにせざれば駄目、死ななければ生きられぬもの也。」

(and one-time Kōzen Gokokukai leader) Daikyū-rōshi at Zeshō'in 是照院 in Tokyo (which served as the home of the *zenkai* Kenshōkai 見性会) in 1912.<sup>103</sup> Shimokawa's other teachers included Nakahara Nantenbō and Iida Tōin; he started practicing with both of them in 1919 at Nantenbō's (and Iida's) home temple, Kaiseiji 海清寺, in Hyōgō prefecture.<sup>104</sup> Notably, Iida Tōin—discussed elsewhere in the dissertation—was a layperson when Shimokawa did *sanzen* with him, although Iida eventually ordained as a priest at the age of sixty. Even more notable, however, is Shimokawa's kōan work with politician and Zen layman Ōishi Masami; Ōishi (a prominent figure in Tokyo-area lay Zen in multiple networks) is one of the few laypeople with apparent permission to teach.

With regard to Shimokawa's background, he was born in Nagano Prefecture. Although the class status of Shimokawa's family is not clear, it is clear that Shimokawa had extensive educational opportunities throughout his youth, culminating in his admission in 1910 to Tokyo Imperial University Faculty of Law—the politics department—from which he graduated in 1915.<sup>105</sup> Moreover, he excelled in his

---

<sup>103</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 57. This kōan, abbreviated as “*honrai no menmoku* 本来の面目,” is frequently used as a first kōan, as mentioned previously.

<sup>104</sup> Shimokawa worked with Nantenbō and Iida Tōin starting from 1919, having received permission from Daikyū to do *shōken* at least with Nantenbō (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 288–300). Additionally, Shimokawa did *shōken* with Sōen in 1917. However, this appears to have been a one-time event in which they discussed “Zen and pragmatism” (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 484). In terms of teachers with whom he worked over a longer period of time, Shimokawa also practiced under Hashimoto Dokusan 橋本獨山 occasionally from 1921 onward (1869–1938; Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 498). Although he worked with various teachers throughout his years of practice, he maintained a relationship with his earliest teacher, Mineo Daikyū, whom he invited to visit him in February of 1934, when Shimokawa's health was failing; they “spoke of the great matter of life and death” (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 491). After Shimokawa passed away less than two weeks later, Daikyū led the funeral service (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 492).

<sup>105</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 482–484.



educational endeavors and traveled throughout Japan from a young age.<sup>106</sup> His social connections also exude relatively high status: his acquaintances included numerous luminaries from modern Japan's political, business, and educational realms: ranging from the Imperial Army General, Fukushima Yasumasa 福島安正大将 (1852–1919), to Japan's one-time Prime Minister Wakatsuki Reijirō 若槻禮次郎 (1866–1949).<sup>107</sup> Thus, whether through the family into which Shimokawa was born, or through his own connections, efforts, and accomplishments, Shimokawa was of the elite: in many ways, representative of the *koji* of early Meiji Japan.

In terms of Shimokawa's accounts of Zen practice per his diaries and "*sanzen* records," they depict, first, a dedicated individual for whom Zen seemed to answer a preexisting yearning. According to his diaries and chronology, his first actual experience of zazen occurs under Mineo Daikyū in October of 1912. Having attended the *zazenkai* with a couple friends, Shimokawa does *shōken* with Daikyū, who assigns Shimokawa his first kōan: "one's original face."<sup>108</sup> Shimokawa takes immediately to zazen and kōan work, returning daily for the next six days for *zazen* (and, most of those days, *sanzen*).

---

<sup>106</sup> For example, in terms of his educational attainments, Shimokawa ranked sixth in his class of 219 students at Tokyo Imperial University (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 483). In terms of his early travels, he sometimes went to sacred sites with his father; and when he was twenty, he followed the trend of embarking on a "zero-sen journey" ("*musen ryokō* 無錢旅行")—with only five yen, he traveled to all thirteen provinces on foot (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 480). These appear to be the thirteen provinces of the East Mountain Circuit (Tōsandō 東山道), which includes his departure point of Mino 美濃.

<sup>107</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 482–483. The author of the afterward, Matsuoka Yuzuru 松岡譲, also lists many more famous people with whom Shimokawa was associated (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 493).

<sup>108</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 57.

From the start, he understands that logic and reasoning is useless with kōan practice, and “vowed deeply in [his] heart” to practice: “I will work so that my mind becomes cool and quiet; I must stop judging the entangling vines.”<sup>109</sup> Attending *sesshin* the next month at Zeshō’in, Shimokawa tells the rōshi in *sanzen* that the original face is right there, in the environment, before his eyes—in the mountains and rivers, wind and earth.<sup>110</sup> The rōshi affirms that this is correct—however, Shimokawa must demonstrate that he is one with all of that. At *sesshin* the next month, it bothers Shimokawa immensely that he still cannot grasp the kōan, and he renews his determination to do so.

In line with one of student Rinzai practitioners’ most oft-used descriptors for the ideal Zen ethos—“ferocity” (*mōretsu* 猛烈), discussed in chapter 3—Shimokawa employs similar terms in expressing his determination. For example, he repeatedly describes his practice efforts in terms of needing to have evermore “courageous spirit” (*yūmōshin* 勇猛心, which shares with *mōretsu* same character for fierce, 猛). He employs such terms particularly early on in his Zen practice, such as during his first *sesshin* (in November 2012).<sup>111</sup> He also uses the term “ferocity” (*mōzen* 猛然) in the context of grappling with with the issue of life and death.<sup>112</sup>

Initially, Shimokawa’s descriptions of *sanzen* are extremely brief—sometimes even just noting whether or not he went to *sanzen*, although he reports on a handful of

---

<sup>109</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 57.

<sup>110</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 62. 「本来の面目は是等眼前の境涯なり。」

<sup>111</sup> For example, Shimokawa uses the term *yūmōshin* 勇猛心 both early in his practice (see Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 63 and 66) and later on (see Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 232). See Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 62–64, for Shimokawa’s full description of *sesshin*.

<sup>112</sup> For an example of his use of “ferocity” (*mōretsu* 猛然), see Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 282.

interchanges with Daikyū-roshi.<sup>113</sup> His remarks are brief even when he passes through his initial kōan in 1913, just three or four months into his Zen practice.<sup>114</sup> In his entry of February 20, 1913, he states simply, “I went to *sanzen* at Hakusan at 3:00. That evening, I had a bad headache and returned home early. That day, I passed through [penetrated] the unresolved question that I had had for months, and I moved to the second kōan. It was Jōshū’s Mu.”<sup>115</sup> Unlike many practitioners’ enlightenment accounts—in which the practitioner commonly attempts to describe the indescribable and communicate a dramatic paradigm shift or strong emotional states (e.g., of liberation that they could not have imagined heretofore)—Shimokawa’s account itself is extremely terse and understated, without explicitly suggesting dramatic emotional states or a new paradigm of consciousness (in the form of “seeing the nature,” or *kenshō*). Likewise, four days later, Shimokawa reports that he penetrated his second kōan (successfully passing the “checking questions,” or *sassho*): “Today’s kōan was ‘Where is Jōshū’s Mu in yourself?’ That, too, I passed through. At that evening’s *sanzen*, [I was given] the phrase, ‘escaping birth and death.’ That, too, I passed through. With that, I finished the Mu kōan and moved to ‘Hakuin’s One Hand’ kōan.”<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> See, for example, Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 66.

<sup>114</sup> These entries are dated February 1913 (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 79).

<sup>115</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 79. Here, Shimokawa refers to Daikyū’s temple Zeshō’in 是照院 (in the Hakusan 白山 area of Tokyo’s Bunkyo ward). 「白山はこの日三時に参禅す。夜は頭痛はげしく早くかへる。此日は数月来の懸案は通過して第二の公案にうつる。趙州の無字也。」

<sup>116</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 80. 「此日の公案は「趙州の無字といひし處を自分は何といふか」ととはる。これも通過。夜の参禅の時は、死生脱得の一句。これも通過。これにて無字の公案は終りて「白隠の隻手」の公案いづ。」

On the other hand, the passages marked “*sanzen* records” (“*sanzenroku* 参禅録”) comprise long numbered lists, with the respective items corresponding to myriad, specific aspects of the kōans on which he was working during the respective practice periods, often sesshin. For example, Shimokawa titles the 48-item list dated February 14, 1916, “Original Face” (“*honrai no menmoku* 本来の面目”); many, although not all, pertain to this kōan.<sup>117</sup> A different list from that same month, dated February 26, 1916, is titled “The 48 Points of Master Hakuin’s One Hand” (“*Hakuin Oshō sekishu yonjū-hachi soku* 白隠和尚隻手四十八則”).<sup>118</sup> Shimokawa maintains these records most actively through 1922, although they go until at least 1926.<sup>119</sup>

In content, Shimokawa’s “*sanzen* records” vary: sometimes just mentioning the kōans through which he passes, or enumerating dozens of “*sassho* 拶所,” or checking questions, with which masters probe their students’ understanding from numerous dimensions, or on numerous, specific points of kōan (most of which are lengthy). For example, pertaining to a Rōhatsu sesshin at Kaiseiji 海清寺 from January 7–13, 1920, Shimokawa mentions his responses to the kōan, Xinghua’s “Hold to the Center”: “The Master directly strikes the student with the stick. The student takes a stooped posture and

---

<sup>117</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 179–190.

<sup>118</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 191–200.

<sup>119</sup> Shimokawa’s diary entries grow quite short after 1926, although he mentions Zen regularly until just before his death in 1934. See Shimokawa, *Koji zen*, 465–470 for his extended reflections on the role of Zen in his life. In terms of his “*sanzen* records,” see, for example, Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 291–297, 301–305, 307–313, 315–317, 322–324, 326–328, 338–340, 360–364, 375–377, 380–381, 392–395, 446.

runs around, in pain, trying to escape the room.”<sup>120</sup> For the next kōan, Guishan’s “Water Buffalo,” Shimokawa’s records read, “Becoming a cow; behavior is running around the room, saying ‘Muuuu’”; this is followed by the note, “becoming cow-nature.”<sup>121</sup>

Thus, these “*sanzen* records” may be similar in certain regards to Hau Hō’ō’s work (to be discussed below), such as in the potential for both works to “give away” the answers to kōan. However, Shimokawa’s account differed in important regards: first, these were private diaries, seemingly not intended for public consumption, and certainly not intended in the spirit of Hau Hō’ō’s work (that is, to critique modern Zen); and secondly, the book had limited distribution and readership, was not for sale, and does not seem to have caused public waves.

#### 4.2.4 Teishō and Other Dharma Discourses

Common to the accounts of Shimokawa and myriad other lay Zen practitioners in the modern era are the master’s discourses—namely, *teishō*. In 1911, in introducing his first of a series of *teishō* to the group Zendōkai 禅道会, Shaku Sōen praised the *teishō* and other dharma-related discussions as producing “remarkable power,” social benefits,

---

<sup>120</sup> This is Case 59 from the collection, *Shūmon kattōshū* 宗門葛藤集, or *Entangling Vines*; the case is known as “興化打中.” For a full translation, see Thomas Yūhō Kirchner, trans., *Entangling Vines: Zen Koans of the Shūmon Kattōshū* (Kyoto: Tenryū-ji Institute for Philosophy and Religion, 2004), 72–73. For this *sesshin*, Shimokawa does not specify who the master is; it is most likely Nantenbō but could also be Iida Tōin. Shimokawa’s comments read: 「興化打中 打中間底 師が直ちに棒を以て學人を打す。學人中腰になりていたいくと室内を逃げまわる。」

<sup>121</sup> Shimokawa, *Koji zen*, 323. The case is known as “瀧山水牯.” 「牛となるモウーと言ひ廻る所作」 and 「牛の性なり」

and recovering from the regrettable condition of the “illustrious training halls” of the past, which, he says, have rotted away. Sōen thus concluded his talk:

...Today, we have regrettably [allowed] these illustrious training halls to rot away. Truthfully, vis-à-vis our Buddhist ancestors, there is no excuse; there is only our great shame. Therefore, from here, we must recover from this corrupted practice and repay our debt of gratitude to our Buddhist ancestors. Perhaps, if people, sects, and temples in Tokyo gather together twice monthly—or even four or five times [monthly]—and meet as we have today, either discussing the Way or explaining the dharma, acting in step with each other, there would be truly remarkable power and a magnificent sight. I think that not only would there be remarkable power and a magnificent sight, but the influence on the minds of worldly people would be immeasurable. Without turning back toward today’s undeveloped state [people], I am facing this Dharma seat and giving *teishō* on Zen’s foremost written work to try to recover from this corrupted practice, and to thank our Buddhist ancestors for their great favors.<sup>122</sup>

As discussed elsewhere in the dissertation, such dharma discourses—in the form of *teishō*, *hōwa*, *kōen*, and other genres—were part of almost all lay-centered Rinzai Zen events such as *zazenkai* and *sesshin* in the modern period. One unique feature of *teishō* in the modern period was that it could be experienced by a broad audience—that is, the “serious” lay practitioners (or others who sought out practice) could hear *teishō* in person at a *zazenkai* or *sesshin*, while any casual reader curious about Zen could read published dharma discourses in journals and monographs. Indeed, *teishō* and other dharma talks were often serialized in journals like *Zendō* and *Daijōzen*.

---

<sup>122</sup> Shaku Sōen, “*Hekigan kaie no shokan* 碧巖開筵の所感” (“Introductory Thoughts on the *Hekiganroku*”), in *Zendō*, no. 7 (February 1911), 5. His talk was reprinted in this issue alongside a new series of *teishō* on the *Hekiganroku*, to which Sōen refers as “Zen’s foremost written work”; the first *teishō*—printed in this issue—focused on the first case of the *Hekiganroku*. The Zen Way Assembly, or *Zendōkai* 禅道会, is the group that produced the journal *Zendō* 禅道 (1910–1923), as mentioned in chapter 2.

As for what *teishō* signifies, as Erez Joskovich points out that its characters “literally [mean] to ‘bring forward’ (*tei* 提) and ‘preach’ (*shō* 唱).”<sup>123</sup> In short, it is a master’s sermon, the most formal of various genres of masters’ teachings, typically centered on classical Chan texts and presented to monastic trainees (and, depending on the context, lay practitioners) in a highly ritualized setting.<sup>124</sup> Elsewhere, Joskovich has investigated the religious significance of the *teishō*, embedded in its ritual context, both per classical prescriptive texts (premodern Chinese and Japanese ritual manuals and monastic regulations alike) and contemporary Rinzai Zen practice settings, both monastic and lay.<sup>125</sup> Noting that *teishō*, in the Rinzai context, are “regarded as profound religious events, and as an essential part of Zen monastic training,” he promotes an understanding, via the lens of performance theory, “...of the sermon as both a symbolic representation of authority, as well as an arena for personal transformation.”<sup>126</sup>

A detailed description of what a *teishō* comprises—as well as how *teishō* were used historically, how this compares to their modern usage, and whether the structure

---

<sup>123</sup> Joskovich, “Laypeople Zen,” 216.

<sup>124</sup> Other overlapping genres include *hōwa* 法話 (“dharma discourses”) or *kōwa* 講話 (“discourse”), often explicitly pertaining to practice matters and without formal structure; and *kōen* 講演 (“lecture” or “discourse”), a broad category that could include both scholarly and religious content. Sometimes “*teishō*” was used interchangeably with these other terms, despite different practical implications.

<sup>125</sup> Joskovich, “Playing the Patriarch.” As an example of *teishō*, Joskovich examines public *teishō* at contemporary Engakuji.

<sup>126</sup> Joskovich, “Playing the Patriarch,” 471–473. Joskovich contrasts the views of D. T. Suzuki and Yanagida Seizan, both of whom “stress the inexpressible essence of the sermon,” with those of Mario Poceski and Griffith Foulk, whose “positivist historical approach” lead them to emphasize the “formal and symbolic function” of the sermon.

varies according to teacher or lineage—is beyond the scope of this study.<sup>127</sup> However, I will take a brief look at the role that *teishō* played for the laity in Japan’s modern period: both in-person, embedded in its ritual context (within and outside of the walls of training monasteries), as well as through the broad dissemination of *teishō* in journals, compendia of masters’ *teishō*, and other writings for a popular audience, decontextualized from ritual.

In terms of *teishō* delivery in a monastic community, Iizuka notes that at Engakuji, circa 1920, “the rōshi gives *teishō* in the monks’ hall at 1:00 in the afternoon—daily during *sesshin*, and otherwise on days 1, 3, 6, and 8. Therefore, you must listen [to these] as much as possible. During the *seikan* 制間 [period], there is a break from *teishō*.”<sup>128</sup> This instruction—for laypeople—signals that *teishō* were open to them regardless of whether *sesshin* was taking place, and it suggests the intermingling of the monastic and lay communities in that context. Engakuji had a relatively long history of opening *teishō* to the laity, stretching back to the late Edo period. Engakuji’s historians state that the temple saw its earliest lay-centered events in the form of *teishō* on the Mumonkan given

---

<sup>127</sup> For a brief historical sketch of the Zen sermon, see Joskovich, “Playing the Patriarch,” 473–476; and for a description of contemporary sermons, see Joskovich, “Playing the Patriarch,” 476–479. As a contemporary example from my own fieldwork, the *teishō* of Engakuji’s current abbot, Yokota Nanrei-rōshi, follows a set structure at Kōzen Gokokukai’s monthly *zazenkai*: first, he reads aloud a case of the *Hekiganroku* in a traditional stylized manner; then he provides a line-by-line extemporaneous exposition. Joskovich agrees that there must still be research done to trace the historical development of Zen sermons in Japan, particularly in the early modern and modern periods.

<sup>128</sup> Iizuka Iwao, *Sanzen no shiori*, 26–27. This refers to calendar days ending in a 1, 3, 6, or 8. “*Seikan*” refers to the approximately 3-month breaks between practice intensives (*seichū* 制中 or *ango* 安居). During the practice intensives, monks stay put and adhere to stricter rules; during *seikan* 制間, on the other hand, rules are somewhat relaxed, and this is the time for monks to initiate or terminate training at a particular monastery (Griffith Foulk, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “安居,” retrieved February 27, 2020).



by the then-abbot Tōkai Shōshun 東海昌峻 that were open to the public in 1963 and 1964.<sup>129</sup> Shaku Sōen, starting in the 1890s, was also well known for opening *teishō* to the laity. Beyond opening monastic *teishō* to the public, Sōen (and other masters) also offered *teishō* as a standard part of lay-centered *zazenkai* and *sesshinkai* at diverse venues, alongside *zazen* and *sanzen*, as will be discussed in the next section.<sup>130</sup>

Decades after hearing *teishō* for the first time—Imakita Kōsen’s *teishō* on Case 42 of *The Blue Cliff Record* in 1891 at Engakuji—D. T. Suzuki vividly recalls it:

It was a solemn business, starting with the monks reciting the Heart Sutra and Musō Kokushi’s last words—“I have three kinds of disciples” and so on—while the Rōshi prostrated himself in front of the statue of the Buddha, and then got up on his chair facing the altar, as though he were addressing the Buddha himself rather than the audience. His attendant brought him the reading stand, and by the time the chanting was finished he was about ready to start his lecture.

One line from the kōan particularly stood out to Suzuki: “Fine snow falling flake by flake. Each flake falls in its own proper place.” Suzuki continues:

This struck me as a strange subject for Zen monks to talk about, but the Rōshi just read the passage without a word of explanation, reading as though he were entranced and absorbed by the words of the text. I was so impressed by this reading, even though I did not understand a word, that I can still see him sitting in his chair with the text in front of him reading “Fine snow falling flake by flake.”<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji-shi*, 615.

<sup>130</sup> For example, there is a blurb at the back of an issue of *Zengaku* 禅学 from 1897, reporting that on the invitation of several laypeople, Shaku Sōen had gone to Gekkeiji 月桂寺 in Tokyo (i.e., an Engakuji branch temple) and gave *teishō* on Hakuin’s *Kaian kokugo* 槐安國語; see *Zengaku* 禅学, vol. 3, no. 4 (1897), 42.

<sup>131</sup> Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki, “Early Memories,” in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 206.

It is noteworthy that Suzuki, an educated young student, “did not understand a word”; this reflects the difficulty of the text: written in *kanbun* 漢文, recited—perhaps—in a stylized manner, extremely dense with allusions to classical Chinese literature, and layered in meaning.<sup>132</sup> His comment that Imakita read directly from the text without extrapolation also stands out, given that it became standard for later Rinzai masters to intersperse their reading of the primary text with their own commentary; it is not clear whether this was typical of Imakita and other masters of his era.

As for the subject of *teishō*, as Sōen suggested in his lecture quoted above, *The Blue Cliff Record* (*Hekiganroku*) was an enormously popular text among Rinzai masters; here, he calls it “Zen’s foremost written work”; typically, one *kōan* from *The Blue Cliff Record* would serve as the basis of each *teishō*, and masters like Sōen commonly moved sequentially through the collection (e.g., with a given Zen group, such as Zendōkai).<sup>133</sup> However, *The Blue Cliff Record* was not the only subject of *teishō*. Early Nyōidan members who practiced circa 1904–1912 mention several other classical Zen texts that

---

<sup>132</sup> Steven Heine identifies several characteristics of *The Blue Cliff Record* that contribute to the text’s unique rhetorical style of “uncertainty” that can function religiously to prompt the practitioner’s awakening experience. According to Heine, the qualities that contribute to an overall experience for the reader or practitioner of “uncertainty” include the following: the commentary by both Xuedou Chongxian 雪竇重顯 (980–1052) and Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063–1135); the ways in which they alternately agree and disagree with each other and with other notable Chan figures (e.g., Dahui or the Tang-era Chan masters who appear in the *kōan*); the interweaving of Buddhist and Zen-specific doctrine with classical Chinese literary allusions and colloquial expression); and ideological inconsistency (e.g., regarding the roles in Zen practice and awakening of language and concepts). See Steven Heine, *Chan Rhetoric of Uncertainty in the Blue Cliff Record: Sharpening a Sword at the Dragon Gate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).

<sup>133</sup> For lay Sōtō assemblies, on the other hand, the *Shūshōgi* 修証義 was the most popular subject of masters’ sermons, per *Zendō* and *Daijō Zen*.

served as *kōhon* 講本 (i.e., fodder for *teishō* or sermons in other forms). These texts included, for example, *sūtras*, such as the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra*; other *kōan* collections, such as *Mumonkan*; the records of eminent masters, such as the *Record of Bukkō* (*Bukkōroku* 仏光録), and other popular Rinzai works, such as Hakuin's *Dokugo shingyō* 毒語心經.<sup>134</sup> Other texts that served as *kōhon* for Zen assemblies meeting in the early twentieth century, per *Zendō* announcements between 1910 and 1923 (listed in the back of most monthly issues), include the following: the work of one-time Engakuji abbot Imakita Kōsen, *Zenkai ichiran* 禅会一瀾 the *Record of Daie* (Ch. Dahui; *Daie goroku* 大慧語錄) and the *Record of Rinzai* (*Rinzai roku* 臨濟錄); Tōrei Enji's Treatise on the Inexhaustible Lamp (*Mujintō ron* 無盡燈論); and the *Kannon Sūtra* (*Kannongyō* 觀音經).

As mentioned previously, we know the content of modern masters' *teishō* through the publication of edited versions of their *teishō*; indeed, print media transformed the accessibility of such teachings for a broad public, while removing *teishō* from their traditional context, described by Joskovich et al. as being transformative through the act of ritual performance. Nearly every issue of *Zendō* featured a *teishō* by Shaku Sōen or other Rinzai Zen masters. For example, in the first thirty issues of *Zendō*, published monthly between 1910 and 1913, twenty-six contained edited *teishō* by Sōen: five *teishō* on the Ox-Herding Pictures (*Jūgyūzu* 十牛圖), and twenty-one on sequential cases in the

---

<sup>134</sup> Shaku Sōen gave *teishō* on the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra* at Shidō'an 至道庵 c. 1914–1919 (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 286); Sakagami Shinjō gave *teishō* on the *Mumonkan* (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 262); and according to Nyoidan alumnus Mogi Tomokazu, Shinjō read from *Dokugo shingyō* and Miyaji Sōkai often read from *Bukkōroku* (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 277).

*Hekiganroku*, starting with the first case. Journals like *Zendō* and *Daijōzen* also featured plentiful advertisements that pointed to a second major avenue of making *teishō* accessible: publishing compendia of *teishō* by individual masters, another enormously popular genre.

The development of *teishō* as a common teaching tool for laypeople in the Meiji period and later must still be studied more; but we can say that they were used differently than in early modern Japan at least because of their broad dissemination and audience. Meiji-era factors that likely contributed to this development included the following: the rise of public speeches (*enzetsu* 演説) as a genre in Meiji Japan; and the role of Rinzai masters—among other Buddhist teachers—as propagators in the Great Teaching Campaign in the early 1870s. Regarding the latter factor, Janine Sawada examines the tension inherent to Rinzai masters’ engagement in active propagation (*fukyō* 布教), which the Rinzai school (and Zen generally) had previously eschewed.<sup>135</sup> She notes that “the oral presentation of Zen teachings by Rinzai priests to large, popular audiences was virtually unknown until the early modern period.” Although there were Edo-era precedents, such as Bankei Yōtaku 盤珪永琢 (1622–1693), “the involvement of monks in public speaking seemed to some Meiji Rinzai leaders inimical to the very identity of their sect.”<sup>136</sup> For this reason, Sawada assesses that in comparison to other Buddhist sects

---

<sup>135</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 122–124. For more on the role of Buddhist clergy in the Great Teaching Campaign (also known as the Great Promulgation Campaign), from 1872 until their withdrawal from the campaign in 1875, also see Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 110–113, and Hardacre, *Shintō and the State*, 42–46.

<sup>136</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 123.

in early Meiji Japan, “Rinzai administrators adopted a rather subdued approach to the dilemmas and debates of the time.” At the same time, however, it is difficult to imagine that the public roles that many Rinzai masters were required to take did not impact their willingness to engage more openly with the public, via offering *teishō* and other dharma talks, to an unprecedented degree.

#### 4.2.5 Practice Intensives: Sesshin and Zazenkai

*Sesshin* (摂心 or 接心), literally meaning “collecting the mind,” refers to a Zen practice intensive.<sup>137</sup> In the Rinzai Zen context, they often last for seven days and involve a rigid schedule—for instance, starting at 3:00 in the morning and ending at 9:00 or 10:00 pm. The days are punctuated by meals, chanting, the master’s *teishō*, and perhaps some manual labor, but mostly revolves around zazen, with *sanzen* typically offered multiple times daily during rounds of zazen. Iizuka Iwao, writing in 1920, describes Engakuji’s monastic sesshin context in which “monastics [*unsui* 雲水] discontinue all daily work and duties, and they do nothing but sit up straight, with right mindfulness, working to empty and illuminate the mind’s eye.”<sup>138</sup> Outside of *sesshin*, Rinzai monastic life comprises many facets beyond zazen—including ritual, liturgy, and manual labor—but *sesshin*’s unequivocal focus is zazen.

---

<sup>137</sup> Sometimes these intensives are called *sesshinkai* 接心会; and often monastics refer to them as “great *sesshin*” (*ō-sesshin* 大接心). There is some variation in sesshin schedules, particularly in the lay context and particularly in the modern period, but “great *sesshin*” typically indicate seven-day-long practice intensives with the strictest rules and permitting the most concentrated practice.

<sup>138</sup> Iizuka Iwao, *Sanzen no shiori*, 36.

Although not exactly equalizing, monastic *sesshin* in the modern period—when laypeople were permitted to participate—became a unifying ground for laypeople and monastics. They physically sat together, abided by the same strict rules, and dedicated themselves to *zazen* (and, ideally, to the endeavor of awakening). For example, at Engakuji, *sesshin* is the one period in which laypeople have occasionally been permitted to do *zazen* in the monks’ hall (*sōdō* 僧堂) alongside monastics.<sup>139</sup> For monastic *sesshin*, both Iizuka and Suzuki describe Engakuji’s annual *sesshin* schedule. During each of the two annual ninety-day training periods, there would be three week-long “great *sesshin* (*ō-sesshin* 大接心).”<sup>140</sup> Additionally, the week-long *Rōhatsu sesshin* 臘八接心 was in December, in honor of the Buddha’s enlightenment; *Rōhatsu sesshin* were, and are, known to have more rigorous structure than the other “great *sesshin*,” in accordance with their religious significance.<sup>141</sup> Additionally, Engakuji’s monastic community held

---

<sup>139</sup> As mentioned in chapter 3, even at Engakuji, *koji* did not automatically receive permission to participate in monastic *sesshin*; this has typically been determined on a case-by-case basis. Moreover, also as mentioned in chapter 3, laywomen—even those who are granted permission to participate in monastic *sesshin*—have sometimes been required to meditate not in the actual *zendō* but in the *gaitan* 外單 (the perimeter of the *zendō*, physically located outside).

<sup>140</sup> See Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 36–37, and Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 105–106. For a summary of the typical Rinzai *sesshin* goings-on, also see Satō and Nishimura, *Unsui: A Diary of Zen Monastic Life*; and Satō, *Unsui nikki*. These ninety-day practice periods were called *ango* 安居 or *seichū* 制中, and they were typically held from May–August and November–February. *Sesshin* would be held beginning, middle, and end of each *ango*.

<sup>141</sup> For example, in his account of Zen practice, poet Takahashi Shinkichi (1901–1987; mentioned in chapter 2) describes not sleeping during *Rōhatsu sesshin* and highlights the ferocity of Zen practice and of *Rōhatsu sesshin* in particular. These conditions are standard in many Rinzai monasteries. See Takahashi, *Sanzen zuihitsu*, 24–26.

monthly sesshin of shorter duration.<sup>142</sup> Iizuka notes that *sesshin*—and, generally, communal *zazen* in the *zendō*—is particularly beneficial for beginning *koji*, who have the “tendency to fall into sluggishness” and are unable to attain a “taut” (*kinchō* 緊張) mental state when sitting alone.<sup>143</sup>

Although Iizuka here is referring to monastic sesshin, such benefits for laypeople could be experienced beyond monastic walls via the lay-centered *sesshin* and *zazenkai* 坐禅会 (“zazen assemblies”) that were associated with the dozens of Zen assemblies springing up in and beyond Tokyo. Unlike *sesshin*, which usually lasted between three and seven days, *zazenkai* typically lasted for a half day (or even just a few hours), often comprising a truncated combination of *zazen*, a master’s *teishō*, and perhaps *sanzen* with the master (at least for established students).

Regarding lay-centered *sesshin*, as discussed in the last chapter, several Nyoidan members participated in the monthly sesshin at Kaizenji, led by Sakagami Shinjō around the time of the group’s founding in 1906. With regard to the daily schedules during the lay Zen assemblies’ *sesshin*, these were often based on monastic sesshin but did vary somewhat among groups, and according to site and circumstance.<sup>144</sup> One of Nyoidan’s

---

<sup>142</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 36. Iizuka used the term “*tsuki narabi sesshin* 月並接心”; it is not clear specifically what he means here. In some monasteries, *sesshin* that are not “*ō-sesshin*” are of shorter duration and have more relaxed schedules (e.g., with less *zazen*).

<sup>143</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 36–37. D.T. Suzuki seems to indicate that this desirably “taut” atmosphere in the monastic hall during *sesshin* is actually one of great tension: “While a great sesshin is going on, there is a general tension of nerves all around” (Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 111).

<sup>144</sup> The range of what “*sesshin*” meant to laypeople, on a practical level, must be examined in greater detail. For instance, there are announcements of “sesshin,” held by lay Rinzai assemblies

earliest diaries—from the Engakuji sub-temple Takuboku'en—recounts the period from June 26 through August 9, 1907.<sup>145</sup> Toward the end of this period, from August 1–7, there was a seven-day “late summer great sesshin” (夏末大接心) for students (laypeople) in which participants maintained the following schedule:<sup>146</sup>

**Table 1: Engakuji Lay *Sesshin* Schedule, Takuboku'en (August 1907)**

Time	Activity	Further Notes
4:00 am	wake-up, then sanzen	
5:00 am	breakfast	
6:00–8:00 am	zazen in Senbutsujō 選佛場	
8:00 am	teishō	
11:00 am	lunch	
12:00–2:30 pm	zazen in Senbutsujō 選佛場	During this time, there is sanzen from 1:00 pm.
5:00 pm	dinner	
6:00–10:00	zazen (in zendō 禅堂)	During this time, there is sanzen from 7:00 pm.

Although zazen is mentioned here, it is not mentioned in many of Nyoidan's other early *sesshin* diaries. In those cases, it is not clear whether zazen was held formally during the interludes or whether—given participants' lay status and that this was not a monastic *sesshin*—practitioners did zazen informally, following their own rhythms, akin to the “*sanrō* 参籠” practice that many Nyoidan members mention.

---

(*zenkai* 禅会), that mention only *teishō* and *sanzen* (e.g., daily for seven days). We should not assume that all such events necessarily had the same schedule as monastic *sesshin*.

<sup>145</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 63–70. The fact that these diaries cover such an extended period (i.e., around six weeks) means that we have glimpses into daily practice rhythms in addition to those of “great *sesshin*.”

<sup>146</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 69.



As an example of a *sesshin*-adjacent intensive with a different schedule, the lay group Shakamunikai held a *kōshūkai* 講習会—resembling *sesshin* but integrating more study (e.g., including a lecture in addition to the *teishō*)—in June 1927. A participant notes the following daily schedule:<sup>147</sup>

**Table 2: Shakamunikai *Kōshūkai* Schedule (June 1927)**

Time	Activity
4:00 am	wake-up
4:30–6:00 am	<i>zazen</i>
6:00 am	breakfast
7:00–8:00 am	<i>teishō</i>
9:00–10:00 am	<i>zazen</i>
11:00 am	lunch
1:00–3:00 pm	break (休憩)
3:00–4:00 pm	lecture ( <i>kōgi</i> 講義)
5:00 pm	dinner
6:00–8:00 pm	<i>zazen</i>
9:00 pm	bedtime

As for the qualitative dimensions of *sesshin*, brief descriptions have been sprinkled throughout the dissertation, but I shall mention a couple more here, both about Rōhatsu *sesshin* under masters of an older generation (both of whom are discussed elsewhere in this dissertation): Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹 (1828–1911) and Nakahara Nantenbō 中原南天棒(1839–1925).<sup>148</sup> First, Hamachi Hachirō 濱地八郎 (1864–1955)

---

<sup>147</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 4, no. 7 (July 1927), 58–62. This was held at the group’s rural center in Shizuoka Prefecture, Fuji Hannyā Dōjō 不二般若道場.

<sup>148</sup> For another layperson’s account of *sesshin* at Engakuji, see, for example, Nagao Sōshi 長尾宗軾, *Banbutsu mina tatakao* 万物皆戦ふ (Tokyo: Hitorisha, 1923), 229–245. For a layperson’s description of a primarily monastic *sesshin*, see *Daijō Zen*, vol. 7, no. 6 (June 1930), 79–82; this account—along with an account in the same issue by a monastic administrator (*Daijō Zen*, vo. 7,

describes, in 1928, events of thirty years prior, when Katsumine gave Rōhatsu sesshin in Hachiōji, when he was young.<sup>149</sup> That *sesshin* left a great impression on him, particularly in its severity (*genkaku* 厳格).<sup>150</sup> He states that going to *dokusan* 独参 was mandatory, and participants were not allowed to sleep or rest. In *dokusan*, Hamachi frequently was silent; he attributes this to his previous habit of studying the *Diamond Sūtra* (*Kongō-kyō* 金剛經) and hearing regularly from a Sōtō master about Dōgen’s *Fukanzazengi*. In response, Katsumine said, “Your zazen is [like] the lid of a pot, and it’s useless).<sup>151</sup> The next time there was *dokusan*, he burst into the *dokusan* room, about to strike the master. However, Katsumine was not sitting in his usual spot; and from the other side of the room, Hamachi heard the master shout, “Fool!” (“*Baka* 馬鹿!”), the master’s great laughter. In the end, even though he was still an “empty pot,” he remembered the great benefits of that Rōhatsu *sesshin* and felt gratitude.

---

no. 6, 1930, 36–40)—describes a *sesshin* from May 9–13, 1930, at Shōju’an 正受庵, the training hall of Hakuin’s one-time master, Shōju 正受. The latter *sesshin* was led by Kōzuki Tesshū 神月徹宗 (1879–1937) from Enpukuji 円福寺. Both accounts note that there were twenty monastic participants, but it is not clear whether there were *koji* participants aside from the author.

<sup>149</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12 (Dec. 1928), 64–65. If Hamachi’s date estimates are accurate, this *sesshin* would have taken place in the late 1890s. It is worth noting that Hamachi provides his account from the perspective of “Layman” (*koji* 居士); it seems that he is speaking of himself in third person, but it is possible that he is referring to someone else (he only says “I,” or *ore* 俺, once in the account).

<sup>150</sup> Hamachi also has detailed reminiscences about the *keisaku*, the food (featuring miso soup and pickles), drinking sweet rice wine (*amazake* 甘酒) at night, and using the same eating implements all week.

<sup>151</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12 (Dec. 1928), 64. 「御前のは鍋蓋坐禅だから駄目だ。」

Gratitude is also a theme in the account of lay practitioner Yasuda Mitsuyoshi 安田光義, who practiced under the notoriously fierce Nakahara Nantenbō and entitled his account, “My Experiences Being Made to Sit in the Snow” (“*Setchū ni suwara sareta keiken* 雪中に坐らされた経験”).<sup>152</sup> From the vantage point of 1928, he described the events of January 1914, when he was a university student and attended Rōhatsu sesshin with Nantenbō at Kaiseiji 海清寺 during his winter break.<sup>153</sup> His family had various connections to Nantenbō; for example, “Nantenbō Rōshi was famous for being a heavy drinker, and apparently, when he was a training monk (*unsui*), he would often go to drink at my grandfather’s house.”<sup>154</sup> At some point prior to that sesshin, he did *shōken* 相見 with Nantenbō in Tokyo and received a kōan, though he initial was not serious in his practice.<sup>155</sup>

Yasuda arrived for sesshin, which eventually bustled with activity—forty lay practitioners who were there night and day, and as many as sixty during the day. He recounts: “One day, after three or four days had passed in sesshin, it was around 8:00 in the evening. The zendō was cold. From the windows, flung open wide, snow actively entered. I was practicing Mu with all my might (*isshō kenmei* 一生懸命), but...I could

---

<sup>152</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12 (Dec. 1928), 65–68.

<sup>153</sup> Kaiseiji is in Hyōgo Prefecture; it is Nantenbō’s home temple, where he was head priest (*jūshoku* 住職). This was approximately five years before Shimokawa (discussed earlier in the chapter) started practicing with Nantenbō at Kaiseiji, in September 1919 (Shimokawa, *Koji Zen*, 288).

<sup>154</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12 (Dec. 1928), 66.

<sup>155</sup> In chapter 2, I mention an encounter from this same story in which a young Yasuda presses Nantenbō for “a kōan that is [living] in the present and bursts with life and energy” as opposed to the “antiquated kōan” that he was assigned (i.e., Jōshū’s Mu). See *Daijō Zen*, vol. 5, no. 12, Dec. 1928, 66.

not solve it.” Yasuda describes the tremendous pressure he felt, sitting before the rōshi in *sanzen*, in silence, stuck with his kōan. Nantenbō told him to keep sitting all night long, but when Yasuda tried to return to the meditation hall, he “was seized by a bald-headed giant, the *keisaku*-wielding monk.” The monk refused to let him pass—to re-enter the meditation hall—and the tension escalates to a brawl, with another two monks joining the side of the “bald-headed giant.”

The brawl migrated outside, and in the end, the monastic trio physically threw Yasuda into the cemetery. Left without other options, he ended up doing zazen right there, in the snow, deep into the night. His misery and struggle of the initial hours in the snow gave way to something transcendent, a feeling of “buddha-energy.” Eventually, a monk sent by Nantenbō came to rescue him, and he returned to the meditation hall. Later, he “...surmised that at Rōshi’s instigation, the monks had created a drama and put [him] up to it.” However, that memorable night—a “tremendous endeavor” for Yasuda, who had had a privileged upbringing—ended up being more valuable to him than his kōan work: “Now, I am more grateful to that one occasion of zazen than to shallowly passing through a hundred kōans.”

### ***4.3 Practice Ethos: Real and Ideal***

#### **4.3.1 Life and Death: “Exchanging Swordplay on the Hero’s Battlefield”**

Based on extant accounts, I would contend that lay Rinzai practitioners’ shared ethos, particularly after the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, was characterized by ferocity (*mōretsu* 猛烈), more than anything else. As discussed in

chapter 3, lay Rinzaï's student practitioners tended to defy the stereotypes of their contemporaries in this regard, whether they were drawn to Rinzaï Zen because of pre-existing ferocity or whether they sought to cultivate courage and ferocity through Zen practice. And as I discuss in chapter 5, this ethos was connected to multiple dimensions of lay Rinzaï Zen's religious and historical context, ranging from the "rhetoric of heroism" exemplified by Chan master Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089–1163), to the *kendō* 剣道 ("way of the sword") and nation-protecting self-cultivation (*shūyō* 修養) that many lay Zen practitioners also pursued, to the burgeoning "*bushidō* boom" and nationalism of early twentieth-century Japan. This "battlefield ethos" was not shared by every practicing individual; nonetheless, it was common ground even among those practicing for different reasons (as discussed in the next chapter).

Thus, I will not discuss this dimension further here except to draw attention to how this ideal "battlefield ethos" was reiterated even by Engakuji, in the *sesshin* guidelines issued prior to the lay sesshin of August 1918. Addressing "*sanzen*" (in the sense of meeting the master one-on-one), the guidelines read: "Before the master, when presenting your understanding [of the *kōan*], be as though you are facing a hero's battlefield and exchanging swordplay; you must absolutely not yield to the master or be timid."<sup>156</sup> In other words, when face to face with the master and expressing one's insight (or lack thereof), the student should assume a warrior's ethos. This means not only

---

<sup>156</sup> "Koji sesshinkai sankai kokoro'e 居士接心會參會心得," in *Zendō*, no. 97 (August 1918), 59. 「師の前に就て見解を呈する時は恰も勇士の戦陣に臨み両刃相交ゆるの時にして決して師に譲らず臆念すること勿れ。」

cutting down distracted thoughts with a sword but also being fierce and resolute, of unified mind, and courageous in the face of death (of the ego) and in facing a master who has penetrating insight and sometimes harsh techniques.<sup>157</sup> Out of fifteen total points in the guidelines—most of which addressed the nuts and bolts of *sesshin* practice—this was the only point of instruction addressing the qualitative dimension of practice; therefore, the instruction to cultivate a militaristic ethos is all the more notable.<sup>158</sup>

#### 4.3.2 Mirroring the Monks' Hall: Rules and Etiquette

Although not all modern lay Rinzai practitioners have idealized monasticism or sought to embody monastic ideals, for many people, *sesshin*—particularly on the grounds of a monastery—has offered a slice of monastic life and an opportunity to embody such ideals. Here, I will briefly address the degree to which laypeople's practice actually mirrored monastic practice, from the perspective of formal rules and etiquette.

Contemporary Kojirin practitioners re-tell the narrative that Kojirin models its practice and rules on those of the monks' training hall. Indeed, the Kojirin rules (*kojirin kijō* 居士林規定) that remain posted on a wooden placard inside the Kojirin entrance—inscribed

---

<sup>157</sup> In Zen, enlightenment was often seen as a form of death—that is, death of the ego and ideas held about oneself.

<sup>158</sup> Both Iizuka Iwao and Tsuji Sōmei—who were practitioners at Engakuji around the time that these guidelines were issued—echoed this sentiment. In 1920, Iizuka asserts that for someone heading into the master's quarters, it was “necessary to have the preparedness of a hero facing the battlefield” because the quarters were the “dharma battlefield” (*hō no jissenjō* 法の実戦場”; Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 21). Likewise, Tsuji Sōmei—who is discussed further in chapter 5 and who started practicing under Furukawa Gyōdō at Engakuji in 1925—says of *sanzen*: “At the interview, the disciple confronts his master man-to-man, presenting his answer to the koan riddle for the master's judgment and engaging in question-and-answer with him. The interview is also termed *hossen*, or spiritual warfare. It is the most important and solemn occasion in Zen training” (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 101).

and installed in 1928—directly invoke the monks’ rules, stating that *koji* are to follow the same rules as the monks in the kitchen, dining hall, and bathhouse. While Kojirin’s rules do echo monastic rules in many regards, the first point to be noticed is that quantitatively, with a total of eighteen points and written on a single placard, they comprise just a fraction of all of the monastic rules (which, at Engakuji, have comprised fourteen different sets of rules).<sup>159</sup> Thus, they represent a very simplified version of the guidelines that govern each aspect of the lives and training of monastic trainees.

---

<sup>159</sup> I extend thanks to one of the senior monks at Engakuji, Kumagai Ippō Oshō, who shared with me fourteen sets of rules (*kijō* 規定) that have been employed by Engakuji’s monastic community, past and present, and are still inscribed on placards throughout the temple complex. There are at least three historically important sets of rules that are no longer read aloud: Rules for the Monastic Training Hall (*Sōdō kijō* 僧堂規定), which are the oldest monastic rules at Engakuji, still hang in the monks’ hall, and were probably affixed when the monks’ hall opened; Rules for the Hermitages (*Shoan’ya kijō* 諸庵屋規定), which were added by one-time abbot Seisetsu Shūcho; and Reformed Rules (*Kairyō kijō* 改良規定), written by Imakita Kōsen. For the text of the first two sets listed here (i.e., the oldest set and Seisetsu’s set), see Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji-shi*, 427–428 and 420, respectively. Sets of rules that are currently read aloud by monastic trainees include the following: Model [Rules] (*Kikan* 龜鑑), which the *rōshi* reads aloud prior to the *sesshin* that opens a new ninety-day training period; Rules for the Official Quarters (*Jōjū kijō* 常住規定), which the head of the general office (*shika* 知客) reads aloud prior to the *sesshin* that opens a new ninety-day training period; Rules for Daily Use (*Nichiyō kisoku* 日用規則) and Rules in the Rear Entrance (*Kōmon kijō* 後門規定), both of which the attendant monk (*jiisha* 侍者) reads aloud to monks prior to the *sesshin* that opens a new ninety-day training period; Enjūdō (Hall of Extending Life) Rules (*Enjūdō kijō* 延寿堂規定, referring to the monks’ infirmary), which the attendant monk reads prior to *Rōhatsu sesshin*; and Announcing the Break Between Training Periods (*Seikan kokuhō* 制間告報), read by the head of the general office on the last evening of the ninety-day training period. Five final sets of rules that are no longer read aloud include the following: Rules for the Cook (*Tenzo kijō* 典座規定); Rules for the Hall Prefect Quarters (*Chitenryō kijō* 知殿寮規定); Rules for the Tanga (*Tanga kijō* 旦過規定, referring to the quarters for itinerant monks); Bathhouse Rules (*Yokushitsu kijō* 浴室規定); and Rules [for the Infirmary] (simply called *Kijō* 規定). For translations of similar sets of rules, see Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 148–154. Suzuki’s work is based on monastic practice at Engakuji, but it is not clear whether he translated directly from the Engakuji placards.

The Kojirin rules cover many bases, stating the blanket rule that the consequence of violating the rules (or otherwise hindering the intensive practice at Kojirin or Engakuji proper) is being mandated to leave the premises immediately. Several rules govern the relationship between the lay practitioners and monastic community, designating authority: for example, one must ask the supervisor (*shuji* 主事) before entering and exiting Kojirin, one must ask the, and—not unsurprisingly—a monastic administrator determines whether one may participate in the *sōdō sesshin* alongside the monks. With regard to harmonious cohabitation and practice with the monks and one’s elders, the rules state that although laypeople are permitted to sit alongside monks during sesshin, speaking is not permitted; and when meeting elders or fellow practitioners, one should show proper respect. New practitioners should ask questions of their *senpai* 先輩 (that is, senior practitioners), rather than “giving free reign to rough behavior.”

With regard to practice, the rules clarify that only people with the sincere dedication to practice Zen are permitted to stay on the premises, and they speak to the spirit in which one should practice, echoing normative Rinzai Zen teachings. For example, one guideline reads:

If you want to investigate this Way, you should surely arouse a mind of great faith, hold a great doubt mass, and arouse fierce determination; day and night, practice the Way of Zen; sit single-mindedly in meditation, and work assiduously in the practice of right mindfulness.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup> Engakuji, “*Kojirin kijō*.”



Similarly, throughout the guidelines, mindfulness in conduct and the importance of self-regulation are emphasized: one's going and coming should be quiet; shoes should be placed in an orderly manner; people should not "recklessly gather around the fireplace and engage in useless chitchat"; walking outside, one should not carelessly swing the arms about; and one should neither scatter books or lie down when reading. In terms of creating a conducive practice space, the guidelines further state that the *keisaku* 警策 ("warning stick") is to be used as an "instrument of awakening," regardless of whether one is sleepy or not; and they encourage actively using one's surroundings for practice: for example, exercising and therefore purifying the mind when cleaning, and "treasur[ing] the [monastery's] items used daily, making them as if they were one's own eye." In short, Kojirin's rules do echo the monastic rules, even though they represent a very simplified version of them.

#### 4.3.3 Culture of Secrecy

One challenge of discerning precisely how kōan practice within Rinzai Zen—both monastic and lay practice—may have shifted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is the ostensible secrecy of what proceeds between master and disciple during *sanzen* inside the master's quarters ("inside the room," or *shitsunai* 室内). Even in 1918, in the aforementioned guidelines that were published in *Zendō* before sesshin took place

at Engakuji, the final instruction concludes: “No matter what happens in the [master’s] room, it is strictly prohibited to leak anything to others.”<sup>161</sup>

Although this image of Rinzai Zen’s *sanzen* secrecy may be overblown in popular culture, there were practical reasons for masters to urge their disciples to adhere to this secrecy, as well as a long history of monks challenging this secrecy (or potentially violating the secrecy by recording answers to *kōan*). In contemporary Rinzai Zen contexts, there are several reasons that practitioners and masters provide for being tight-lipped about what transpires in *dokusan* or *sanzen*. These include misunderstanding, or comparison and competition with fellow practitioners, making *kōan* practice into an achievement-based ladder that one climbs. Moreover, sharing such details has the dangerous potential to make *kōan* practice into a simple ritual, devoid of meaning—for example, if people perform others’ “solutions” rather than expressing their own understanding.

The latter concern does not belong only to the contemporary Rinzai Zen world. As Juhn Ahn discusses, Hakuin’s (1686–1769) grave concerns about the decline of Japanese Buddhism, as expressed in his *Sokkōroku kaienfusetsu* 息耕録開筵普説, may have arisen in part due to such practices by contemporaneous students:

As for the various practices modern-day students have fallen into, such as writing down idea, nonsensical speculations they hear from their deadbeat teachers, or copying notes that others have made, pasting such notes as cribs in the margins of Zen texts, glibly passing information of this kind around to others, embellished for

---

<sup>161</sup> *Zendō*, no. 97 (August 1918), 59. 「室内のことは何事に因らず決して他に漏すことを厳禁す。」

good measure with arbitrary observations of their own—need I mention how useless those pastimes are?<sup>162</sup>

Ahn locates Hakuin’s concern amidst centuries of similar practices, dating back to the time of Engakuji’s founder, Wuxue Zuyuan 無學祖元 (1226–1286), and Musō Soseki 夢窓疎石 (1275–1351), and continuing into the early modern period with the contemporaries of the Ōbaku monk Chōon Dōkai 潮音道海 (1628–1695).<sup>163</sup> Ahn also points out that Hakuin may have been critiquing the Rinzai practice of *missan Zen* 密参, translated variously as “secret instructions” or the “Zen of meticulous instructions,” parallel to the Sōtō genres of *monsan* 門参 and *shōmono* 抄物.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>162</sup> Hakuin Ekaku, *The Essential Teachings of Zen Master Hakuin: A Translation of the Sokkō-Roku Kaien-Fusetsu*, translated by Norman Waddell (Boston, MA: Shambhala, 1994), 20.

<sup>163</sup> Juhn Ahn writes: “Wuxue, we are told, was surprised and quite amused to discover that his fellow brethren in Japan were in the habit of keeping notebooks (*sasshi* 冊子) full of phrases drawn from various sources, which they did not hesitate to memorize and cite during their interview with the master.” As for Musō, he “...complains that students were fond of the practice of looking for ‘substitute responses’ (*daigo* 代語) and ‘supplemental sayings’ (*betsugo* 別語), that is, stereotyped answers to koans in their notebooks (*sasshi*).” Chōon “...similarly reports that the practice of collecting ‘plain words’ (*heiwa* 平話) and capping phrases (*jakugo*), arranging them in the fixed sequence of ‘*hekizen* 壁前, *hekigan* 壁巖, and *hekigo* 壁後,’ and keeping these phrase collections in special pouches or boxes known as *ankenbukuro* 行券袋 or *missanbako* 密参箱 has been going on for over two hundred years in both Rinzai and Sōtō circles” (Juhn Young Ahn, “Malady of Meditation: A Prolegomenon to the Study of Illness and Zen,” dissertation, University of California-Berkeley, 2007, 238–239).

<sup>164</sup> Ahn, *Malady of Meditation*, 238–241. Ahn follows Michel Mohr’s “*sanzen minutieux*” in using the translation of the “Zen of meticulous instructions” (Ahn, *Malady of Meditation*, 238 n. 90); see Michel Mohr, *Traité Sur l’inépuisable Lampe Du Zen: Tōrei (1721-1792) et Sa Vision de l’éveil* (Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1997), 466 n. 645. According to Bernard Faure, “the term *missanchō* [密参帳] is an abbreviation for *shitchū himitsu sanzen* (‘secret *sanzen* within the chamber’)”; see Bernard Faure, “From Bodhidharma to Daruma: The Hidden Life of a Zen Patriarch,” *Japan Review*, no. 23 (2011), 55 n. 26. For more on *missanzen* and *missanchō*, see Suzuki, “Nihon ni okeru kōan Zen.”

Aside from these genres, there is the genre of enlightenment accounts (modern and premodern), which sometimes include the goings-on in the *sanzen* room, if not in a systematic way. Biographical Zen records abound with such anecdotes, particularly those of legendary masters. For example, the illustrious Rinzai master Hakuin Ekaku (1686–1769), often held up as a model for practice, describes his multiple awakening experiences and post-satori realizations in his autobiography, *Wild Ivy* (as discussed in chapter 5). Kōans themselves often encompass pithy allusions to legendary masters’ awakening experiences. Enlightenment accounts from the modern period include those of D.T. Suzuki (who first mentions his *kenshō* experience in private letters to his friend Nishida Kitarō, and much later discusses it in his interview with Carmen Blacker) and Hiratsuka Raichō (whose account appears in her autobiography, published upon her death in 1971), both around the turn of the century.<sup>165</sup>

Although such accounts (premodern and modern) vary, they tend to share in common the following characteristics: noting pivotal events leading up to the experience, the practitioner’s practice (e.g., the *Mu* kōan), and the aftermath of the moment of enlightenment (e.g., new perceptions of the world, such as the sense of shedding all fetters or entering a new paradigm), perhaps expressed poetically. There are also many

---

<sup>165</sup> For Suzuki’s description of his *kenshō* experience at Engakuji in the winter of 1896—following four hard years of practicing under Sōen with the *Mu* kōan, and about one year before that of practicing under Imakita Kōsen with the “one hand clapping” kōan—see his essay, “Early Memories,” in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 209–210. Jaffe, in the same volume, also translates Suzuki’s letter to Nishida Kitarō, dated 1902, in which Suzuki describes the same experience (in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, xxiii). For Hiratsuka’s autobiographical description of her *kenshō* experience, see Hiratsuka, *In the Beginning*, 92–94.

common tropes in these accounts, such as a life-and-death struggle to become one with the kōan and see through it, or and the tension between verbal narrative and the sense of an ineffable experience.

Most of these accounts, however, do not violate Rinzai norms, such as the expectation of secrecy of what precisely happens “in the room” (*shitsunai* 室内)—e.g., the disciple’s specific presentation of the kōan, the teachers’ “checking questions” (*sassho* 拶所), or the student’s responses to those questions. Likewise, most of the accounts examined in this dissertation—with the exception of Matora’s and Shimokawa’s accounts—are relatively sparse in the context of presenting one’s understanding of the kōan to the master in *sanzen* and do not include any of this content.

As described above, Matora Yūjirō breached this *sanzen* room secrecy by publishing his account in 1895, revealing not only his thoughts and impressions during his week practicing at Engakuji, but also details of his kōan demonstrations and Shaku Sōen’s responses to those demonstrations. Matora’s article caused consternation in the Zen community of 1895, spurring at least three articles in journals—all published that same year—critiquing his article and the choice to publish it.<sup>166</sup> Beyond the breach itself,

---

<sup>166</sup> “Matora hakase no ‘Sanzen nisshi’ ni taisuru hihiyō 元良博士の『参禅日誌』に対する批評,” in *Zengaku*, vol. 1, no. 6 (November 1895), 43–47; “Matora hakase no sanzen nisshi ni taisuru Ōuchi Seiran Koji no danwa 元良博士の参禅日誌に対する大内青巒居士の談話,” in *Bukkyō* 仏教, no. 106 (1895), 105–106; and “Matora-shi no Sanzen nisshi o yomite Zen ni kansuru gashokai o nobau 元良氏の参禅日誌を読みて禅に関する我所壊を述ふ,” in *Rokugō zasshi* 六合雑誌, no. 177 (1895), 29–33.

Motora drew criticism for broadcasting an understanding of Zen that was immature, in his peers' eyes.<sup>167</sup>

However much consternation this caused within, and even beyond, Engakuji circles, Motora's revelation of his one week's *sanzen* with Sōen pales in comparison to the revelation less than two decades later, when author Hau Hō'ō 破有法王 overtly rebelled against Rinzai tradition (and modern Rinzai Zen itself) by publishing a collection of "answers" to kōan in his *Gendai sōji zen hyōron* 現代相似禪評論 ("A Critique of Present-day Pseudo-Zen").<sup>168</sup> I also touch on Hau Hō'ō's work in chapter 6, in the context of modern critiques of Rinzai Zen (particularly the kōan system), but for now it is worth noting these exposés, in the context of the traditional culture of secrecy and the popularization of Rinzai and kōan Zen. As noted previously, Shimokawa most likely did not intend for the detailed "*sanzen* records" in his diaries to become public, although family members and friends decided to make them public in 1935.

---

<sup>167</sup> As Richard Jaffe notes, D. T. Suzuki critiqued Motora in a letter to Yamamoto Ryōkichi dated December 20, 1895: "Suzuki states that Motora Yūjirō's so-called great satori (*daigo*) was nothing more than a minor insight" (Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1*, 214 n. 86). It should be noted that Motora does not actually use the term "*daigo* 大悟" in his article, nor does he explicitly state that he attained "*kenshō* 見性." However, he uses the verb "*satoru* 悟る" ("to attain enlightenment" or "to perceive") throughout his account, as early as his first night at Engakuji (Motora, "*Sanzen nisshi*," 2014, 350), and even when describing his interpretations of his kōan that Sōen dismisses as excessively intellectual. Moreover, he implies that he had *kenshō* when stating, "I concluded the matter of the sound of one hand" (Motora, "*Sanzen nisshi*," 2014, 356).

<sup>168</sup> Hau Hō'ō 破有法王, *Gendai sōji Zen hyōron* 現代相似禪評論 (Tokyo: Taiheiyō Shuppan, 1971; originally published in 1916). The first half of this work was translated as Hau Hō'ō, *The Sound of the One Hand: 281 Zen Koans with Answers*, translated by Yoel Hoffmann (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975). Hau Hō'ō 破有法王 was a pseudonym for Tominaga Shūho 富永秀甫.

#### 4.4 Conclusion: Toward a New Paradigm

Nearly fifty years after the lay *sesshin* discussed in the beginning of this chapter was held at Engakuji, American Zen master Philip Kapleau published his landmark book, *The Three Pillars of Zen*, in 1965. The material is based on Kapleau's thirteen years' training in Japan, primarily under Yasutani Hakuun 安谷白雲 (1885–1973); when it initially published, the book offered English-language audiences unprecedented insight into Japanese Zen practice. Unlike the historically or philosophically oriented texts on Japanese Zen that had been previously available in English, Kapleau based his presentation of Zen on practice, and his book ultimately served as a how-to manual for generations of Zen practitioners worldwide.<sup>169</sup> For Kapleau and his teachers in the Sanbōkyōdan lineage, these “three pillars” of Zen training were teaching (embodied in masters' *teishō*, or lectures); practice (embodied in *zazen*); and enlightenment (manifested in *dokusan*, or the encounter with the master).<sup>170</sup> One of the core arguments of this dissertation is that these activities became Zen's three pillars during the Meiji and

---

<sup>169</sup> Kapleau's book was published during the postwar American Zen boom, during what Michel Mohr calls the “Fascination Phase” of Zen studies (1958–1988), which directly followed the “Discovery Phase” (1893–1957; see Mohr, “Plowing the Zen Field,” 120). Arguably, popular literature was then dominated by “Suzuki Zen,” as discussed in chapter 1. As Jaffe points out, the practice of Rinzai Zen undergirded Suzuki's massive oeuvre (Jaffe, Introduction in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, xii). However, even while Suzuki promoted the notions of direct experience and the importance of *satori* for realization of nonduality, his writings were more abstract than easily, practically implementable. For more on Kapleau's impact on Zen in the US, see, for example, Kenneth Kraft, ed., *Zen Teaching, Zen Practice: Philip Kapleau and The Three Pillars of Zen* (New York: Weatherhill, 2000).

<sup>170</sup> Kapleau, “The Private Encounter with the Master,” 44. As mentioned elsewhere, the Sanbōkyōdan 三宝教団 (now known as Sanbō Zen 三宝禅), was founded by two Tokyo-area teachers, Harada Sogaku and Yasutani Hakuun. The group was unconventional in combining elements of both Sōtō and Rinzai Zen—reflecting Harada's and Yasutani's training in both schools' practices—but resembled contemporaneous Zen assemblies in many other ways.

Taishō periods, becoming standard among dozens, if not hundreds, of twentieth-century groups and taken for granted as the core of Japanese Zen practice to this day.<sup>171</sup> In other words, these patterns of practice were relatively consistent across Rinzai-type groups and emerged hand-in-hand with lay Zen's popularization, featuring elements both continuous with and divergent from Edo-period Rinzai Zen. Generally, these lay Zen activities were increasingly systematized over time, as seen in individual groups (e.g., as per Engakuji's systematization of student retreats by around 1930) and the common patterns that became standard for lay Rinzai-type lay groups nationwide. Moreover, as this set format was replicated among untold numbers of groups in the ensuing decades, it increased and reinforced the emphasis on personal experience, kōan practice, and enlightenment: a disproportionate emphasis that was distinctly modern (to be discussed further in the conclusion).

As mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, modern Japanese lay Rinzai groups differed with respect to their autonomy, relationship to institutional Rinzai Zen, interpretation of Zen's relevance in the modern world, and adherence to normative Rinzai doctrine, narratives, and ideals. There was also some variation in group activities as groups themselves went through periods of dynamism and breaks, as teachers taught actively and groups went through transitions after a leader passed away, and as historical

---

<sup>171</sup> Most Rinzai and Rinzai-type groups today—around the world—center on these activities. This includes lay Rinzai groups in Japan, such as the contemporary incarnations of Kojirin, Kōzen Gokokukai, and Shakamunikai. On the other hand, as many authors point out, contemporary Japanese Zen temples that offer meditation programs represent a small minority of Zen temples overall—in Sōtō, Rinzai, and Ōbaku. See, for example, T. Griffith Foulk, “The Zen Institution in Modern Japan,” in *Zen: Tradition and Transition*, edited by Kenneth Kraft, 157–77 (New York: Grove Press, 1988); and Covell, *Japanese Temple Buddhism*.



vicissitudes converged with popular interest in “spiritual self-cultivation” (*seishinteki shūyō* 精神的修養) practices like Zen (e.g., after the Russo-Japanese War) or with exigencies such as the “student mobilization” (*gakuto dōin* 学徒動員) that was mandated in 1943.

However, most of these groups—regardless of ideological or practical differences, and both for university students and other lay practitioners—shared certain crucial similarities: an emphasis on personal experience, practice (*jissen* 実践) generally, and activities that reinforced a focus on kōan practice. For university students as well as for the numerous Rinzai-type lay Zen groups whose activities were profiled in *Zendō*, *Daijōzen*, and other periodicals, there were many commonalities in the activities described. In short, the activities centered on zazen, kōan practice, and working with a master, as discussed above.

The sources thus state clearly that modern Rinzai Zen involved a shift away from certain dimensions of monastic training (ritual, liturgy, and the literary study involved in advanced kōan work) and toward *zazen* (in *zazenkai* and *sesshin*), listening to *teishō*, and doing *sanzen* with the master. This shift in activities and emphasis—in addition to the language used in accounts—suggest that Rinzai Zen’s (relative) popularization in modern Japan involved an increasing emphasis on personal experience.

## 5. For Buddhahood, Body, Sword, and Nation: Motivations for Practicing Lay Rinzai Zen in Modern Japan

My aim in this chapter is to follow the previous two chapters—which provide an overview of the emergence and development of student Zen groups in early twentieth-century lay Rinzai Zen, as well as the core practices that they (and other lay Rinzai practitioners) embraced—by examining the motivations that fueled many of these practitioners, the ethos that characterized their practice and how they articulated their concerns, and how such motivations and ethos connected to practitioners’ social and historical context. At its core, this chapter is about why laypeople were attracted to Buddhism—and Rinzai Zen in particular—during this particular period in history and how their concerns shaped lay Rinzai developments. Following the early Meiji anti-Buddhist persecution, when many Buddhists sought to reformulate Buddhism for a modern age (compatible with science, cosmopolitan, and so forth), Rinzai masters made accessible certain components of traditional monastic practice to the laity on an unprecedented level, while also underscoring—and idealizing—the “traditional” dimensions of such practice. Indeed, Zen boomed, and transformed, amidst Japan’s rapid modernization, its shifting zeitgeist, its intensifying rhetoric about Japan as a “nation” (*kokka*) on the world’s stage, and its citizens’ concerns about moral deterioration and Japan’s youth.

Like the previous chapter, this chapter focuses on the voices of practitioners themselves, highlighting and interrogating their reasons for practicing lay Rinzai Zen.

First, I provide an overview of the ideal motivations for, and end-goals of, Rinzai Zen practice as articulated in the early modern period (particularly by Hakuin Ekaku), given the role of this legacy in modern masters' and practitioners' formulations of Zen. I then, as much as possible, draw from a similar set of accounts as in previous chapters, analyzing how students and other lay practitioners articulate their motivations for practicing. Subsequently, I juxtapose these articulations against two more groups of voices: those of their Zen teachers (Rinzai masters) and the institutional messages about religious or spiritual practice that university administrators conveyed to students.

In terms of modern practitioners' concerns and motivations for practicing Zen, I particularly highlight two central themes that constantly resurface in the accounts of student Zen practitioners (and of other laypeople) as central motivations for beginning Zen practice: *shūyō* 修養 (self-cultivation) and *kendō* 剣道 (the "way of the sword," or traditional Japanese swordsmanship). These two themes cannot be equated, as *kendō* is a martial art, and *shūyō* is a religious category that comprises a range of motivations, typically connected to goals on an individual level (e.g., moral/ethical cultivation, health, social and financial success), with or without bigger end-goals (e.g., improving social well-being and strengthening Japan as a nation). However, it is helpful to examine motivations through these two lenses as they—individually and together—help us to understand modern lay Zen's appeal and popularization at this particular moment in history, and they shed light on the interconnected realms of modern Buddhism, popular interest in self-cultivation practices across religious boundaries, burgeoning nationalism, and the gender dimensions of modern Japanese nationhood and identity. Indeed, these

dimensions—that is, constructions of Buddhist practice as *shūyō*, the relationship between Zen and the sword, and modern Japanese masculinity—are all interconnected, with the modern Japanese nation at the center of this matrix.

## **5.1 Background**

### **5.1.1 Zen as Shūyō: A New Paradigm**

As I discuss in the introduction, one characteristic of lay Rinzai’s modern paradigm is Zen’s intersection with “*shūyō*”: that is, the expansion of interest in lay Rinzai was related significantly to popular interest in self-cultivation movements, particularly those related to health and healing and strengthening the nation. One fruitful trend of Japanese religious studies in the past two decades has been an increased attention to broader paradigms and epistemes, beyond the (imagined) boundaries of any particular religious tradition.<sup>1</sup> My work continues in this vein by interrogating the relationship between modern lay Zen and popular interest in self-cultivation movements in post-1868 Japan, research on which has seen great strides in the past fifteen years, particularly among such Japanese scholars as Yoshinaga Shin’ichi and Kurita Hidehiko, who shed light both on individual self-cultivation practices that bore some relationship to Zen—

---

<sup>1</sup> A key contemporary example is Reader and Tanabe’s *Practically Religious*, in which the authors argue compellingly that *genze riyaku* (translated as “this-worldly benefits” or “practical benefits”) is a trans-religious episteme in contemporary Japan. Premodern examples include Jacqueline I. Stone’s examination of “original enlightenment thought” (*hongaku shisō* 本覚思想) as a medieval episteme in Jacqueline I. Stone, *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1999); and Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli’s examination of the evolving relationship between buddhas and *kami* as another underlying religious paradigm in medieval Japan in Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli, *Buddhas and Kami in Japan: Honji Suijaku as a Combinatory Paradigm* (London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

such as the Sōtō priest Hara Tanzan’s formulation of *wakubyō dōgenron* 惑病同源論, or the “equiprimordiality of delusion and illness” (discussed further below), or Okada Torajirō’s *seizahō* 静坐法, or quiet sitting—and on the genealogy of the concept of “self-cultivation” itself, whose ideals, meanings, and practical emphases shifted in tandem with key social and historical developments. This chapter relies on their work to uncover how “spiritual self-cultivation” (*seishinteki shūyō* 精神的修養) was not simply a buzzword but was, rather, shorthand for a broad trend that flourished within and outside of conventional religious boundaries, including those of Rinzai Zen.

For this examination of the development of lay Zen in the modern period, Janine Sawada’s analysis of a broad, trans-religious emphasis on practicality during the Bakumatsu and early Meiji periods is particularly useful. As discussed in the introduction to this dissertation, Sawada’s investigation transcends religious boundaries as she explores the common “mental grammar” of the Neo-Confucian self-cultivation paradigm and the ways in which it was appropriated by various socioreligious groups during this period, given the increasing calls for practicality in educational, religious, and social realms. Examining various ways in which lay Zen practitioners encountered and interacted with the self-cultivation discourse, Sawada argues that Engakuji’s lay program was successful in large part due to its accommodation to both traditional notions of self-

cultivation (per Neo-Confucianism and Zen) and “modern” demand for utilitarian means.<sup>2</sup>

### 5.1.2 Historical Shifts, Historically Contingent Motivations

Throughout this chapter, I will be discussing the ways in which many lay Zen practitioners’ motivations for practice—and how they articulated these reasons and concerns—were related to major historical developments and shifted over time accordingly, particularly in the period between 1905 and the early 1930s. The accounts discussed in this chapter (and in the last two) feature descriptions of practice during the following periods, all of which represent distinct stages in the development of lay Zen and key moments in the unfolding of modern Japanese history: (1) circa 1904–1906 and shortly thereafter, (2) in the late 1910s, and (3) the late 1920s and early-to-mid-1930s. The first period is notable, historically, for Japan’s victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905) and the postwar surge of nationalism and popular interest in self-cultivation practices that followed it; and notable, in the Zen realm, for an increase both in the number of lay groups and Zen-related publications. As discussed in the previous chapter, students at Tokyo Higher Commercial School founded their group, Nyoidan, in 1906, as the first of the Engakuji-centered university student groups, amidst the plethora of self-cultivation organizations (e.g., *shūyōdantai* 修養団体) that their classmates were forming

---

<sup>2</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*. Sawada also demonstrates that the Neo-Confucian self-cultivation paradigm was continuous across the Bakumatsu-Meiji boundary of 1868; here, she pushes back against the notion that 1868 was a moment of dramatic rupture.

contemporaneously.<sup>3</sup> As I discuss further below, Nyoidan alumni actively connect the their group's founding to the patriotic sentiment behind—and the “ferocity” (*mōretsu* 猛烈) of—their contemporaries' endeavors.

The second period whose accounts are prominent here—that is, the late 1910s and early 1920s—included highs and lows for Japanese society broadly as well as in the lay Zen world. On the one hand, there were instances of social tumult that directly affected practitioners (e.g., with the Rice Riots in 1918, discussed in one practice account) and the disorder and devastation of the Great Kantō Earthquake of 1923, which destroyed many of laypeople's practice sites. At the same time, the early and mid-1920s represented a time of relative peace, democracy, and the flowering of culture, particularly in metropolitan areas like Tokyo, where most student practitioners at Engakuji (and other practitioners whose accounts are examined here) lived. This period also saw significant transitions at Engakuji, with Shaku Sōen's death in 1919—amounting to a loss not only of a figurehead of lay Zen but also, temporarily, of leadership of the numerous groups that Sōen led—alongside the creation of a lay-centered training hall circa 1920 and the blossoming of lay Zen groups more broadly, as summarized in chapters 2 and 3.

The third period represented by the accounts in this chapter (from the late 1920s through the mid-1930s) brought the development of “Imperial-Way Zen” alongside the development and crystallization of imperial ideology and the rise of fascism. As elucidated by Robert Sharf and Christopher Ives, such forms of Zen were bolstered and

---

<sup>3</sup> Also as mentioned in chapter 3, their mentor, Fukuda Tokuzō, had started practicing at Engakuji under Shaku Sōen in 1904, the year that the war began.

mobilized by the government; while numerous teachers who focused on teaching the laity—such as Iida Tōin, discussed below—actively participated in this rhetoric. Such developments are highlighted in the *kendō* section of this chapter.

With regard to changes over time of Zen practitioners' concerns—and what those specific concerns entailed (*shūyō*, *kendō* practice, etc.)—it is worth drawing attention to the fact that many of the practitioners' accounts studied here were written decades after the events in question (e.g., coming to practice at Engakuji or becoming a member of Nyoidan or Saiindan). This means that we are seeing not only the lens of retrospect but also circumstances, unique to interwar or postwar Japan, that likely shaped people's narrations on multiple levels. As discussed by the aforementioned scholars, nationalist rhetoric among Zen leaders (and in the general populace) became increasingly common in the early decades of the twentieth century and peaked in the 1930s, which was when the first two editions of *Tetsu nyoi* were published (1931 and 1937, respectively).<sup>4</sup> Amidst an environment of censorship and scrutiny—faced by all Japanese citizens and by religious organizations in particular—there was considerable pressure to espouse this rhetoric, at least on the surface. It is hard to imagine that such ideology, rhetoric, and external pressure would not impact practitioners' narratives, and we must take this

---

<sup>4</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, and Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1937. This will be discussed further below. For nuanced discussions of this rhetoric and ideology and the pressures that Zen priests faced to espouse them, see especially Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen*, and Mohr, "The Use of Traps and Snares." Also see Sharf, "The Zen of Japanese Nationalism"; Victoria, *Zen at War*; Victoria, *Zen-War Stories*; and Jaffe's Introduction in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D. T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*.



context into consideration when analyzing the accounts, the events that they describe, and how descriptions changed over time.

### 5.1.3 Lay Zen Practice: Many Players, Many Goals

Just as modern Japanese Zen propagators had diverse reasons for spreading Zen (as discussed in chapter 2), practitioners also provided diverse reasons for beginning and continuing Zen practice, expressing these in their practice accounts both implicitly and explicitly. As mentioned in the introduction, particularly in earlier generations of English-language writings on Japanese Rinzai Zen—in popular literature and even in scholarship—our received narratives commonly depict the ideal goal of Zen practice in terms of enlightenment or realization, invoking early modern ideals such as those of Hakuin. Moreover, Rinzai practitioners were typically thought to realize enlightenment through wrestling with kōans. Some practitioners discussed here did articulate their practice goals in such conventional Zen tropes; however, they were rare among the laity and even rarer in the student population of practitioners.

More commonly, modern Japanese lay practitioners of Rinzai Zen practiced in line with many other Japanese religious traditions in the modern period: that is, to attain practical or “this-worldly benefits” (*genze riyaku*).<sup>5</sup> Per the students’ accounts, the most common reason for practicing Zen was to pursue “spiritual self-cultivation” (*seishinteki*

---

<sup>5</sup> See Reader and Tanabe, *Practically Religious*. Reader and Tanabe argue that *genze riyaku* is not only central to Buddhist, Shintō, and popular religious practices but also can be seen as Japan’s “common religion” across religious boundaries, at the core of Japanese religiosity. In this paradigm, the religious, spiritual, ethical, material, and economic dimensions are thoroughly interconnected.

*shūyō* 精神的修養”), in line with the era’s *shūyō* boom: that is, a burgeoning interest in self-cultivation practices that drew from many different traditions.<sup>6</sup> Even in the Zen and Zen-adjacent contexts, *shūyō* offered individual benefits such as improved health, social success, and peace of mind.<sup>7</sup> More importantly, for many practitioners (and institutions promoting *shūyō*), *shūyō* provided means to contribute to, and strengthen, the Japanese nation; many laypeople in the late Meiji period and onward clearly associate the start of their Zen practice with the flourishing of such *shūyō* organizations and their broader social benefits.<sup>8</sup>

For others, Rinzai Zen was a way to improve one’s *kendō* 剣道 (“way of the sword”) skills (and in the 1930s and early 1940s, perhaps, a way to develop one’s literal battle skills). Among university student Zen practitioners, *kendō* was popular, and many explicitly stated this as their goal for practice. As discussed in chapter 3, for lay Zen students at Engakuji who also practiced *kendō*, these two worlds physically converged

---

<sup>6</sup> As Sawada and Hardacre demonstrate, Neo-Confucianism exerted a particularly strong influence on the self-cultivation paradigm that emerged in Bakumatsu and early Meiji Japan; see Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*; and Helen Hardacre, *Kurozumikyō and the New Religions of Japan* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986). However, the flavors and types of *shūyō* grew ever more diverse (and grew increasingly oriented toward healing and the physical body), particularly in the Taishō period. As discussed below, elements from various traditions came together in diverse permutations, not all of which were overtly “religious.” Such traditions include Buddhism, Daoism, new religious movements, and other forms of Asian popular religions, in addition to Christianity, theosophy, and forms of Western esotericism.

<sup>7</sup> A keyword in many accounts is “*an* 安”; it most often occurs in the compounds for “peace” (“*anshin* 安心”) and “equilibrium” or “steadiness” (“*antei* 安定”). See, for example, Iida Tōin 飯田 檀隠, *Tōin Zenwashū* 檀隠禅話集 (Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha, 1930), 148–157.

<sup>8</sup> I consider “Zen-adjacent” to refer to practices that are likely (or clearly) derived from Zen contexts but do not use Zen or Buddhist vocabulary, do not take place in the temple context, are integrated with practices from other religious traditions, or otherwise diverge from “traditional” Zen practice, doctrine, and ritual.

after 1928, when the *kendō* training hall of a Tokyo master was physically transported to Engakuji and became Kojirin, persisting as such to this day.

## 5.2 “Traditional” Zen Motives

Great is the matter of birth and death  
Life slips quickly by  
Time waits for no one  
Wake up! Wake up!  
Don't waste a moment!<sup>9</sup>

This admonishment to practice is inscribed on the wooden block (*han* 板) hanging outside of the *zendō* at the Rochester Zen Center; before each formal zazen session, a senior practitioner strikes the block in the prescribed manner, rousing meditators to bring urgency to their practice. The Japanese characters from which this verse came are inscribed on *han* in Zen temples throughout Japan, in both Sōtō and Rinzai contexts. At Engakuji's monks' hall, for example, these characters are wearing away after countless thousands of strikes. These words represent a shared sentiment: to practice Zen in order to awaken during our fleeting lives (or, in Sōtō, to manifest that awakening). Zen and Chan literature abounds with similar admonishments, unequivocally depicting this as the

---

<sup>9</sup> This is also on the title page of Rochester Zen Center, *Chants & Recitations* (Rochester, NY: Rochester Zen Center, 2005). The Rochester Zen Center's translation of the original Japanese (生死事大、無常迅速、各宜醒覺、慎勿放逸) is somewhat liberal, including two verses in its interpretation of the second phrase, “*mujō jinsoku*” (“life slips quickly by / time waits for no one”). There are diverse translations of the verse into English. For example, Griffith Foulk translates the verse as follows: “The matter of birth and death is great / Impermanence is swift / All be mindful of this / Take care not to waste time” (entry for “*han no ge* 版偈,” *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, retrieved February 6, 2020).

idea ethos with which to infuse practice, and as the ideal end-goal of practice.<sup>10</sup> This section examines the ideal role of “motivation” (*dōki* 動機) and the ideal end goals of Zen practice, according to Rinzai masters and Zen popularizers alike, in order to better understand the degree to which lay practitioners in modern Japan accord with this ideal.

### 5.2.1 Hakuin and Early Modern Zen Ideals

Even into the modern period, early modern ideals of the end goals of Zen practice, per the Rinzai master Hakuin Ekaku, pervaded masters’ teachings, popular literature, Zen services, and the aspirations of a small number of lay practitioners. In short, Hakuin’s depiction of zazen in his “*Zazen wasan* 坐禪和讃,” or “Chant in Praise of Zazen,” clearly expresses what are, for him, the ideal goals of Zen meditation and practice: namely, that “from the very beginning all beings are Buddhas”; that zazen is the way to “turn inward and prove our True-nature,” thus escaping the endless cycle of birth and death; and that zazen is the basis of the Buddhist Noble Eightfold path and its three divisions of meditation (*samādhi*), wisdom (*prajñā*), and morality (*śīla*). Two verses from the “*Zazen wasan*” encapsulate the latter two points:

The cause of our sorrow is ego delusion.

---

<sup>10</sup> To be sure, this is a highly idealized depiction of Zen and Chan practice, which scholars have challenged and nuanced through, for example, illuminating the historical contexts in which Chan and Zen developed. See, for example, McRae, *Seeing through Zen*, and Morten Schlütter, *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-Dynasty China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008). Still, we need not look far to see the abundance of such admonishments in the masters’ records or subsequent literature. See, for example, Zonggao, *The Letters of Chan Master Dahui Pujue*, translated by Jeffrey L. Broughton and Elise Yoko Watanabe (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), and Hakuin Ekaku, *Wild Ivy: The Spiritual Autobiography of Zen Master Hakuin*, translated by Norman Waddell (Boston & London: Shambhala, 2001; originally published in 1999). *Wild Ivy* is discussed below.

From dark path to dark path we've wandered in darkness.  
How can we be free from birth and death?  
The gateway to freedom is zazen samadhi—  
beyond exaltation, beyond all our praises,  
the pure Mahayana.

Upholding the precepts,  
repentance and giving,  
the countless good deeds,  
and the way of right living  
all come from zazen.<sup>11</sup>

And Hakuin concludes, from the standpoint of enlightenment:

What is there outside us,  
what is there we lack?  
Nirvana is openly shown to our eyes.  
This earth where we stand is the pure lotus land,  
and this very body—the body of Buddha.<sup>12</sup>

In own Zen practice, Hakuin was vigorous in his pursuit from the start, as he recounts in his autobiography, *Wild Ivy*:

On the day I first committed myself to a life of Zen practice, I pledged to summon all the faith and courage at my command and dedicate myself with steadfast resolve to the pursuit of the Buddha Way. I embarked on a regimen of rigorous austerities, which I continued for several years, pushing myself relentlessly. Then one night, everything suddenly fell away, and I crossed the threshold into enlightenment.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> These passages come from the translation in Rochester Zen Center, *Chants & Recitations*, 34–35. The Rochester Zen Center follows practices established by Harada Sogaku and Yasutani Hakuin and brought to the US by Philip Kapleau, who trained with Harada and Yasutani for a total of thirteen years and was sanctioned by Yasutani to teach; these practices came from the Sanbō Kyōdan school (now Sanbō Zen), although Kapleau did not receive full transmission in that lineage. Kapleau's Zen and Sanbō Zen comprise elements from both Soto and Rinzai, reflecting the dual training of Harada and Yasutani; however, Hakuin, his ethos, and his approach to kōan Zen is still central to both lineages, as they are in traditional Rinzai Zen.

<sup>12</sup> Rochester Zen Center, *Chants & Recitations*, 35.

<sup>13</sup> Hakuin, *Wild Ivy*, 87.

He is clear that *kenshō* is a necessary first step, but he upholds “post-enlightenment practice,” as critically important. He instructs readers:

Upon attaining satori, if you continue to devote yourself to your practice single-mindedly, extracting the poison fangs and talons of the Dharma cave, tearing the vicious, life-robbing talismans into shreds, combing through texts of all kinds, Buddhist and non-Buddhist alike, accumulating a great store of Dharma wealth, whipping forward the wheel of the Four Universal Vows, pledging yourself to benefit and save all sentient beings while striving every minute of your life to practice the great Dharma giving, and having nothing—nothing—to do with fame or profit in any shape or form—you will then be a true and legitimate descendant of the Buddha patriarchs. It's a greater reward than gaining rebirth as a human or a god.<sup>14</sup>

Hakuin not only prescribes this to students but also describes its truth in his own life.

After his enlightenment experience, Hakuin began practice with Shōju Rōjin 正受老人 (1642–1721; also known as Dōkyō Etan 道鏡慧端), and his dedication to penetrate the Great Matter of Birth and Death through koans reached a new level:

A great surge of spirit rose up inside me, stiffening my resolve. I chewed on those koans day and night. Attacking them from the front. Gnawing at them from the sides. But not the first glimmer of understanding came. Tearful and dejected, I sobbed out a vow: “I call upon the evil kings of the ten directions and all the other leaders of the heavenly host of demons. If after seven days I fail to bore through one of these koans, come quickly and snatch my life away.”<sup>15</sup>

For Hakuin, enlightenment is paramount, and kōans are an indispensable tool in this pursuit; however, he makes it clear that practicing only with kōans—and with the rigor that he describes in his early practice life—can be detrimental to practitioners and to

---

<sup>14</sup> Hakuin, *Wild Ivy*, 35.

<sup>15</sup> Hakuin, *Wild Ivy*, 32.

the pursuit of this goal. Soon after his early enlightenment experience, “Zen sickness” befell Hakuin; he healed himself only through the Daoist-inflected “Introspective Meditation” practices described in *Yasenkanna* that he ostensibly learned from the hermit Hakuyū (discussed later in this chapter).<sup>16</sup> He attributes to “Introspective Meditation” (*naikan no hō* 内観の法 or *naikanhō* 内観法) not only curing of these ailments within three years of practice but also his good health, even into his eighties (when he composed *Wild Ivy*). Moreover, he suggests that his numerous experiences of “great satori” during the same time period were, in part, due to these practices and their complementarity with kōan practice. Thus, he sets a precedent for Rinzai monastics to incorporate such practices into their training, even when it is not officially prescribed by institutions.

Although much could be—and has been—said about Hakuin’s role in modern Rinzai Zen, I would like to make a few points in particular.<sup>17</sup> First, all modern Rinzai groups and lineages are in the Hakuin lineage of Zen, as others have died out, and most groups and masters that, or whom I study explicitly identify themselves as such.<sup>18</sup> There

---

<sup>16</sup> For a description of Hakuin’s “Zen sickness” (*zen no byō* 禅の病) and remedies, see Ahn, “Malady of Meditation,” 299–334.

<sup>17</sup> We should be cautious in equating Hakuin’s articulations (and prescriptions for practice) with modern masters’ invocations of Hakuin in their own teachings. Additionally, we should not assume that Hakuin’s practice in eighteenth-century Japan (e.g., of *zazen*, *kōans*, and *sanzen*) was identical to Rinzai practice in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Japan. The changes in kōan practice since Hakuin’s time are difficult to research due to the secretive nature of kōan practice and dearth of documentation, but they deserve further study.

<sup>18</sup> From there, Hakuin’s lineage splits into the Takujū and Inzan schools, and these schools have practical differences with respect to the kōan curricula that they use. These schools are named for Rinzai monks Takujū Kosen 卓洲胡僊 (1760–1833) and Inzan Ien 隱山惟琰 (1751–1814), respectively; both were dharma heirs of Hakuin’s disciple, Gasan Jitō 峨山慈棹 (1727–1797). However, it is much more common for modern Rinzai masters to refer to Hakuin than to the

are two sub-points here: one, that Hakuin, as a Rinzai reformer, is a larger-than-life figurehead and source of inspiration for generations of practitioners who followed him; and two, that many teachers and practitioners conflate Rinzai Zen, kōan Zen, and “Hakuin Zen,” as Hakuin did systematize, and revitalize, kōan practice that increasingly came to be identified with Rinzai Zen itself. (The latter point is one of my arguments in this dissertation: that is, of the “koanization” of Rinzai Zen in the modern period.) On the other hand, this emphasis on “Rinzai” Zen can obscure the degree to which Hakuin played an important role for people outside of the traditional Rinzai establishment, such as Harada Sogaku and Iida Tōin, their disciples, and other practitioners who undertook both Rinzai and Sōtō training.<sup>19</sup>

In terms of how Hakuin’s teachings appeared in the modern period, modern masters invoked him frequently in various ways and through various media. For example, in Zen-centered periodicals like *Zendō* and *Daijōzen*, in addition to broader journals like *Daihōrin*, Hakuin was one of the main recurring figures; discussions of both Hakuin and his works were frequent and wide-ranging. In particular, print media saw a great amount of commentary on Hakuin’s “*Zazen wasan* 坐禪和讃,” or “Chant in Praise of Zazen,”

---

Takujū and Inzan schools. See Hori, “The Steps of Koan Practice,” 133–134, for a brief overview of the differences between the Takujū and Inzan schools.

<sup>19</sup> On this point, I have heard anecdotally from contemporary Rinzai priests about the prevalence of combined Rinzai and Soto approaches to Zen in early twentieth-century Japan, even in the respective monastic training communities. This is deserving of further study.



mentioned above.<sup>20</sup> The range of material on “*Zazen wasan*”—in both journals and monographs—also testifies to its popularity as a topic of dharma talks by Zen masters. Also, just as the “*Zazen wasan* 坐禪和讃” is chanted today during sesshin and *zazenkai*—particularly before the Rōshi’s teishō—in groups ranging from Kōzen Gokokuikai and Engakuji to the Rochester Zen Center, there is also indication that it was chanted in *kindai* Japan (although more research must be done into how precisely it was used). For example, in Nyoidan’s twenty-fifth-anniversary history, the “*Zazen wasan*” was included as one of the group’s five most important chants that members regularly intoned, alongside the *Heart Sūtra* (*Hannya Haramita*; Skt. *Prajñā Pāramita*).<sup>21</sup> This testifies to the ideals in “*Zazen wasan* 坐禪和讃” being ever-present in the Rinzai practice context, even when Hakuin himself is not explicitly invoked.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, the early twentieth century also saw a resurgence of interest in Hakuin’s *Yasenkanna* (and the

---

<sup>20</sup> For late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century examples, see, for example: Shaku Sōen, *Zazen wasan zokuge* 坐禪和讃俗解 (Tokyo: Keisei Shoin, 1898); Shaku Sōen, *Zazen wasan kōwa* 坐禪和讃講話 (Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1912; this may be a reprint of *Zazen wasan zokuge*); Hakuin and Shaku Dokutan 釈毒潭, *Hakuin zenji no gongyō* 白隠禪師の言行 (Tokyo: Ōshima Seishindō 大島誠進堂, 1915); Iida Tōin, “白隠禪師選述「坐禪和讃」鼓吹,” in *Sanzen hitsuwa* 参禅秘話 (Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha, 1931), 216–225; and Harada Sogaku, *Shōshū kokushi hakuin zenji zazen san kōwa* 正宗国師白隠禪師坐禪讃講話 (Tokyo: Shōshin Dōaikai, 1931). The latter was later reprinted in numerous editions, most recently as *Hakuin Zenji zazen san kōwa* 白隠禪師坐禪讃講話 (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 2009). Mid- and late twentieth-century examples include Ōmori Sōgen, *Sanzen nyūmon* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1972), Yamada Mumon, *Zazen wasan kōwa* (Kyōto: Myōshinjiha Shūmu Honjo Hanazonokai Honbu, 1960), and Shibayama Zenkei, *Hakuin Zenji Zazen wasan zenwa* 白隠禪師坐禪和讃禪話 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1974). It remains a common topic of contemporary Rinzai masters as well; see, for example, Kōno Taitsū 河野太通, *Hakuin zenji zazen wasan o yomu* 白隠禪師坐禪和讃を読む (Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha, 1989). Note that this list is not exhaustive by any means.

<sup>21</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 374–376.

<sup>22</sup> For example, in the aforementioned Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, the “*Zazen wasan* 坐禪和讃” is not attributed to Hakuin (or to anyone in particular).

Daoist-inflected physical healing practices prescribed in the work) in the context of the modern *shūyō* boom, as I will discuss later in this chapter.<sup>23</sup>

In a sense, the different facets of Hakuin’s Zen as exemplified by “*Zazen wasan*” and *Yasenkanna* speak to different threads of modern lay Zen practitioners’ motivations for Zen practice, ranging from the conventional goal of enlightenment to the goal of improving physical health. From another standpoint, Hakuin’s own ideals may be contrasted with much of what was going on in modern lay Zen in the sense that a majority of practitioners—it seems—were pursuing Zen for practical benefits, while only a small handful of practitioners (like Tsuji Sōmei, discussed below) invoked Hakuin actively and frequently and embodied certain aspects of Hakuin’s ideals (even while reflecting their own modern circumstances). However, despite the very small numbers of modern lay practitioners who embodied these ideals, the ideals themselves were an integral part of modern masters’ teachings and the lay Rinzai practice context.

### 5.2.2 Ideal Goals of Zen Practice: Modern Japan

With regard to the ideal goals of Zen practice in modern Japan, D. T. Suzuki is unequivocal and consistent—throughout his 76-year-long publishing history that comprised a wide variety of Buddhist subjects, as well as certain shifts of vantage

---

<sup>23</sup> As Yoshinaga Shin’ichi notes, there was a resurgence of interest in extending-life discourse from the early modern period, such as Hakuin’s teachings per *Yasenkanna*; see Yoshinaga Shin’ichi, Introduction in *Kingendai Nihon no minkan seishin ryōhō: okaruto enerugī no shosō* 近現代日本の民間精神療法: 不可視なエネルギーの諸相, edited by Kurita Hidehiko 栗田英彦, Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, and Tsukada Hotaka 塚田穂高 (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 2019), 13. Accordingly, searches of library catalogs (such as for the National Diet Library or in CiNii) reveal that *Yasenkanna* was widely reprinted in early-twentieth century Japan.

points—that the goal of Zen practice is to realize the nonduality of all phenomena.

Moreover, Suzuki consistently promotes the notion that kōan practice is uniquely suited to help the practitioner to “come into contact with the universal reason or life which animates all things.”<sup>24</sup>

Suzuki frequently speaks of kōan practice and awakening in the abstract or in the (idealized) context of legendary Chan or Zen masters, although he also touches upon the lived reality of his contemporaries when providing a nutshell of Rinzai monastic life in *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk* (originally published in 1934). There, as mentioned in chapter 4, Suzuki discusses the ritualized process for a would-be monastic trainee who is entering the monastery; soon upon gaining admission, the monk (or “*unsui*” 雲水, literally meaning “cloud and water”) goes to encounter the master, where he “the Rōshi is likely to ask the monk concerning his name, native place, education, etc.” According to Suzuki, this contrasts with the monks of yore, for whom “even the initial interview between a new arrival and the master went directly into the heart of the matter,” and the new arrival’s responses to questions like “where are you from?” functioned to illustrate his understanding of Zen.<sup>25</sup>

Contrasting with such legendary anecdotes and with Suzuki’s description of contemporaneous monasteries is Iizuka’s description of the layperson’s (*koji*’s) first

---

<sup>24</sup> Suzuki Daisetz Teitaro, “The Zen Sect of Buddhism,” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society: 1906–1907*, ed. by T. W. Rhys Davids (London: Oxford University Press, 1907), 26–27. It should be noted that while Suzuki frequently depicts this ideal role that Rinzai practice—and kōan practice in particular—can potentially play, he also acknowledges the potential pitfalls of kōan practice, particularly as they are manifested in modern Japan. This topic is discussed at greater length in chapter 4.

<sup>25</sup> Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, 12.

interview with the Rōshi, in which the Rōshi immediately questions the layperson as to his, or her, motivations (*dōki* 動機) for practicing Zen.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, the importance of one's motivation for practicing Zen is a significant thread in Iizuka's work. For the most part, *Sanzen no shiori* is a concise description of practicing Zen as a layperson at Engakuji, and Iizuka does not interject many opinions. However, his opinions on the goals of Zen practice are clear; moreover, they are in line with conventional Zen ideals and most likely reflect Engakuji masters' teachings. Iizuka critiques not only an overly intellectual approach to practice but also his contemporaries' tendency to practice in order to attain improved health and longevity. For Iizuka, the ideal reason to practice Zen was not to attain health and riches or to chew on empty intellectual theories, all of which Iizuka sees as myopic trends of the day, even while he maintains optimism that those popular trends may be shifting course toward an integrated path of practice and academic study.<sup>27</sup> Like Suzuki, Iizuka ascribes a high value to having a deep aspiration as the fuel for Zen practice—that is, the motivation of great *satori*, or enlightenment.<sup>28</sup>

For these practitioners, the true purpose of Zen practice was enlightenment, attainable for a rare few through kōan practice. Here, Iizuka discerns between, on the one hand, a shallow experience of “seeing the nature” (*kenshō* 見性)—perhaps attained through practicing a preliminary kōan—and, on the other hand, “the mysterious realm of

---

<sup>26</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 10–11.

<sup>27</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 50.

<sup>28</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 49–53.

the great, thoroughgoing, enlightenment.”<sup>29</sup> In this way, Iizuka connects such ideal aspirations toward enlightenment with those of his spiritual forebears, and he asks rhetorical questions: “for what purpose did Śākyamuni leave his house...[and] for what purpose did the Second Patriarch cut off his arm...?”<sup>30</sup> These questions point to two layers of the ancestors’ practice, as understood by Zen practitioners. Not only did the illustrious patriarchs go to extremes to realize the dharma for the sake of all beings, but they also, on an individual level, shared a desperate yearning for enlightenment (and understanding the root of their being) that prompted such radical action. Scholars have established that such stories have dubious historicity and are likely mythical.<sup>31</sup> However, these stories, these legendary figures, and their lineage became integral to Chan identity and conventional narratives. Moreover, masters continue to invoke these legendary figures in the practice context to motivate practitioners: not only because of these figures’ ideal qualities (zeal for practice, depth of awakening, and so forth), or because of the ways in which fervent practitioners can empathize with Śākyamuni’s and Huike’s motivation and desperation (to some degree), but also because they have the capacity to experience enlightenment that is fundamentally no different from the ancestors’ enlightenment.

Iizuka answers his own question, echoing the words on the *han* (wooden block) outside the monks’ hall: “It says in the scriptures, ‘Great is the matter of birth and death;

---

<sup>29</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 23. 「大悟徹底の妙域」

<sup>30</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 49. Here, Iizuka refers to Śākyamuni’s leaving home and family for years of rigorous asceticism, and to Huike’s (the second patriarch’s) ostensibly cutting off his arm to become a disciple of Bodhidharma, who is considered to be the first patriarch of Chan.

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, McRae, *Seeing through Zen*.

impermanence is swift'; and as for the place where we transcend and eliminate both birth and death, isn't this awakening? Indeed, this is awakening! It is true awakening."<sup>32</sup> Thus, Iizuka lays bare what is at stake for practitioners (that is, a transformed, "unfettered" existence through the experience of enlightenment).<sup>33</sup>

Despite the centrality of such goals in normative Zen teachings and ideals, it is extremely rare, in practice, for laypeople to express such lofty goals in their accounts of Zen practice in early twentieth-century Japan. These ideal goals are even rarer among university students whose accounts are captured in *Tetsu nyoi* and other group histories. As Iizuka observes, even rarer are those practitioners who managed to "penetrate deeply" (*tetteiteki ni* 徹底的に) into Zen—that is, to realize enlightenment beyond a superficial glimpse into the nature of reality.<sup>34</sup> For the average practitioner, it is far more common to express other reasons for practicing Zen (such as practicing as a form of personal cultivation for the sake of the nation, or to improve their *kendō* skill).

---

<sup>32</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 50–51.

<sup>33</sup> To describe awakening, Iizuka offers descriptions of more than one dozen characteristics, including metaphors ("as a bright light, penetrating the ten directions and three worlds") and other attributes ("free and unfettered"; Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 51). Iizuka also quotes Eihei Dōgen's meditation manual, *Fukanzazengi* 普勸坐禪儀: "Look at the Buddha himself, who was possessed of great inborn knowledge—the influence of his six years of upright sitting is noticeable still. Or Bodhidharma, who transmitted the Buddha's mind-seal—the fame of his nine years of wall sitting is celebrated to this day. Since this was the case with the saints of old, how can people today dispense with negotiation of the Way? You should therefore cease from practice based on intellectual understanding, pursuing words and following after speech, and learn the backward step that turns your light inward to illuminate your self. Body and mind will drop away of themselves, and your original face will manifest itself. If you wish to attain suchness, you should practice suchness without delay"; see translation in Dōgen, *The Heart of Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō*, translated by Norman Waddell and Masao Abe (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002), 3.

<sup>34</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 40. In line with Suzuki's contemporaneous assessment, Iizuka comments that such practitioners were "exceedingly rare."

### 5.2.3 “Traditional” Zen Motives and Lay Zen: Tsuji Sōmei 辻双明 (1903–1991)

One exceptional figure is Tsuji Sōmei, whose autobiography describes his deep-seated motivations for practicing Zen in line with many of the ideals that Hakuin, Iizuka, and Suzuki depict, even while being a man of his times and profoundly shaped by his historical circumstances.<sup>35</sup> To this day, Nyoidan members and practitioners at Engakuji commonly speak of Tsuji Sōmei—an illustrious Nyoidan alumnus—as a *koji*.<sup>36</sup> However, he ultimately received dharma transmission from Furukawa Gyōdō (who is discussed in chapter 4) while he was still a layman, ordained as a priest, and ultimately served as master of various Zen assemblies. Tsuji started practicing under Gyōdō at Engakuji in 1925 at the age of 22. From his earliest years of practice, he aspired to become a priest. His memoirs, published when he was about 55 years old, express the decades-long tension that he experienced between his householder life (replete with job, wife, and children) and his desire to renounce them and dedicate himself to the dharma as a Rinzai priest. He ordained at the age of 46 and lived briefly as a mendicant before returning to reside in an Engakuji sub-temple with his wife and daughters. In a sense, he defied the trends of his Tokyo Higher Commercial School classmates in the 1920s in his eventually

---

<sup>35</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 126. For *Three Ages of Zen* (1993 and 2017 editions), Trevor Leggett selected and translated excerpts from Tsuji’s autobiography, *Zen no michi*, that pertained to Zen practice. When I cite both Leggett’s translation and Tsuji’s Japanese original, I am using Leggett’s translation, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>36</sup> D. T. Suzuki also calls Tsuji “Old Layman” (*rōkoji* 老居士), even after Tsuji receives dharma transmission; this expression also appears in Suzuki’s preface in Tsuji Sōmei 辻双明, *Gaitō no zen* 街頭の禅 (Tokyo: Tōyō Keizai Shinpōsha, 1955), 1.

serious, “do-or-die” attitude toward Zen, decades-long practice, and idealization of the monastic path.<sup>37</sup>

As with many of his contemporaries, Tsuji initially practiced with Nyoidan then joined a student *sesshin* at Engakuji’s Saiin’an (later Kojirin).<sup>38</sup> Tsuji foreshadows his later articulation of the Zen practice ethos in battle and swordsman metaphors in recounting his first *sesshin* at Engakuji: “During that first week I was impressed at the sight of the young monks working. To see them sweeping the extensive grounds with bamboo-twig brooms, in perfect silence and with full attention, put me in mind of the intensity of fencers practicing, and I felt a sort of reverence for them.”<sup>39</sup> Establishing his Zen practice, he read books—one after the other—by Shaku Sōen, Takeda Mokurai 竹田黙雷 (1854–1930; a Rinzai master who widely taught the laity in Kansai), and D. T. Suzuki. Alongside his reading, Tsuji also started commuting to Engakuji and participating in the monthly three-day *sesshin* that Gyōdō was then giving in Tokyo at Shidō’an 至道庵.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 88. On the other hand, Tsuji resembled his classmates—that is, student-practitioners who expressed their goals for pursuing Zen practice in primarily practical concerns—in his reply to Gyōdō’s first question, “Why have you come here?” Tsuji answered, “Because I can’t sleep well.” To this, Gyōdō replied, “That’s because you bother yourself over idle thoughts even when you’re in bed”—and followed this with laughter (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 88).

<sup>38</sup> Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 6.

<sup>39</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 95; Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 6. Tsuji describes his initial experiences at Engakuji and with Gyōdō in *Zen no michi*, 6–9.

<sup>40</sup> Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 8.



Tsuji's subsequent years brought marriage, three children, and an accounting job at Kokura Oil Company for nearly a decade.<sup>41</sup> Having still not attained *kenshō*, he became inspired by his former classmate whose *kenshō* experience followed a period of intense zazen during which he (the classmate) practiced "as if mad."<sup>42</sup> Soon thereafter, in November 1936, Tsuji went to sesshin "with do-or-die resolution to see my inmost nature at any cost." During sesshin, he experienced true absorption and bliss, but Gyōdō Rōshi told him, "While you feel ecstatic, you have not yet gotten there."<sup>43</sup> After this, Tsuji intensified his practice, and Gyōdō urged him ever more strongly to penetrate his *kōan*; he commuted from Tokyo to Engakuji daily for *sanzen* and meditated during his spare time at work. That same November, Tsuji recounts:

I was in the interview room presenting my understanding of the koan: "Why is it called Mount Sumeru?" As the teacher spoke, a cry burst from me with the realization throughout my whole being that my true nature was no nature, that the limited and relative self is in fact unlimited and absolute. It was a realization of infinite self in direct experience. It was knowing nothingness to the limit of negation. At that moment of that day, in the Poisonous Wolf Cave, I felt I had been reborn. From that time onward, when koans were

---

<sup>41</sup> Leggett notes that Tsuji's first "wife contracted tuberculosis and died early, leaving him with the children to look after. He later married again" (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 87). See Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 43–50, for a description of the role of spiritual faith—and of the bodhisattva Kannon in particular—during his first wife Michiko's 道子 illness and death. Tsuji recounts: "For a hundred days after my wife's death I chanted sutras, and repeated the invocation for a considerable time morning and evening" (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 91).

<sup>42</sup> Leggett identifies this master as "Ashikaga Shogan," but Tsuji's original work identifies him as Ashikaga Shizan 足利紫山 (1859–1959); see Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 53 (c.f. Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 90). The translation is mine.

<sup>43</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 94–95.

set, I often found solutions to the bubbling up spontaneously within me, to pass me through.<sup>44</sup>

Gyōdō verified this “seeing the nature,” or *kenshō*, experience, and soon conferred upon Tsuji the lay name Sōmei 雙明, meaning “Bright One.”<sup>45</sup> Tsuji further intensified his practice, moving to Kita-Kamakura—down the road from Engakuji—so that he could attend both morning and evening sittings.<sup>46</sup> His new teaching job in Yokohama allowed him summer vacations; so one summer, he spent forty days residing at Kojirin while doing zazen in Engakuji’s sub-temple Ōbai’in.<sup>47</sup>

Practice under Gyōdō was characterized by ferocity, at least in one’s early days. Tsuji recalls Gyōdō’s words: “For Seeing the Nature, it has to be fierce as a lion, but after that realization, the practice has to go slow like an elephant.”<sup>48</sup> As foreshadowed by Tsuji’s impressions of monks-as-fencers upon his first visit to Engakuji, and as discussed at greater length later in this chapter, Tsuji frequently uses metaphors of battle and war—

---

<sup>44</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 97. See Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 57, for the original. Tsuji notes (in the original) that “Poisonous Wolf Cave” is another name for Gyōdō (Rinzai priests typically have many names, used in different contexts). Mount Sumeru is the sacred mountain at the center of the world, per traditional South Asian Buddhist cosmology.

<sup>45</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 97. “Sōmei” was his lay name (*kojigō* 居士号); Tsuji also notes that Gyōdō also gave him a full dharma name (*hōmyō* 法名) of Layman “Daiki’in Sōan Sōmei Koji 大機院雙明雙暗” (which Leggett translates as “The Dark-Bright Pair in the Hall of Great Power”), a reference to a verse in Case 51 of the *Hekiganroku*. As mentioned in chapter 3, it was conventional for Rinzai masters to confer a *koji* name upon the practitioner once he or she passed his or her first *kōan*.

<sup>46</sup> Tsuji also switched jobs—leaving his accountant job at Kokura Oil Company for a job teaching accounting and bookkeeping at Yokohama College—in order to attend morning and evening sittings and sesshin more consistently (Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 60–61).

<sup>47</sup> Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 61–62; Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 98.

<sup>48</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 102. The original reads, “見性するときは、獅子のように烈しく、悟後の修行は象のようにユツタリとやらなくては駄目だ” (Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 65).

in line with Engakuji leadership's teachings—to depict practice, particularly “inside the room” (*shitsunai* 室内—that is, the Rōshi's quarters) for *sanzen*. There,

...the disciple confronts his master man-to-man, presenting his answer to the koan riddle for the master's judgment and engaging in question-and-answer with him. The interview is also termed *hossen*, or spiritual warfare. It is the most important and solemn occasion in Zen training. Masters' particular ways of training [] and their spiritual attainments are manifested through their words and actions “inside the room.”

As Tsuji experienced it, Gyōdō's “way of training” (*kafū* 家風; literally, “house wind”) was one of “calmness” and quiet. However, when Gyōdō said “That won't do” (“*sore ja dame da* それじゃ駄目だ”) in response to Tsuji's presentation of his understanding of a kōan, it felt to Tsuji like a slap, and “there was a feeling of severity and something terrifying.”<sup>49</sup>

From his earliest years of practice, Tsuji had aspired to ordain as a Zen priest.<sup>50</sup> He describes one encounter with Gyōdō—around age 26—in which he declared his intention to “leave home” (*shukke suru* 出家する) and become a priest. However, Gyōdō replied, “If you haven't had *kenshō*, even if you leave home, [ordaining] won't do any good.”<sup>51</sup> Tsuji's longing to ordain persisted for decades and was often at odds with his worldly responsibilities. Gyōdō, as his teacher, didn't hesitate to challenge Tsuji on this topic. For example, when Sōmei intensified his practice prior to his *kenshō* experience—commuting daily between Tokyo and Engakuji (and spending half the nights at

---

<sup>49</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 101–102; Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 62.

<sup>50</sup> See especially the chapter entitled, “Harboring the Intention to Leave Home” (“*Shukke no kokorozashi o idaku* 出家の志を抱く”), in Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 36–38.

<sup>51</sup> Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 36. 「見性もできないものが出家しても駄目だ。」

Engakuji)—Gyōdō remarked, “You come here so often to see me. But are your children well cared for? Even the best medicine should be taken in moderation.”<sup>52</sup>

Tsuji’s desire to ordain as a priest and propagate Buddhism only grew with time, as he increasingly perceived the world’s need for Zen. He had previously wrestled with the relationship between individual practice and broader benefits for society and the nation, particularly after the February 26 incident of 1936.<sup>53</sup> However, this concern reached a new peak with Tsuji’s war-related experiences. He was drafted into the military in 1941, before which he had been spending most of his spare time at Engakuji and in Zen practice, moving steadily through the *kōan* collections; he passed through all one hundred cases of the *Hekiganroku* and through case 37 of the *Mumonkan*.<sup>54</sup> Upon his conscription, Tsuji initially attempted to do *sanzen* with Gyōdō from afar, by letter, but stopped after two or three such letters. In 1943, he was sent to a North Kurile island. Life there was desolate, but he meditated and studied Buddhist texts, borrowing copies of the *Lotus Sūtra*. To that, he added the practice of *battō jutsu* 拔刀術 (“the craft of drawing out the sword”).<sup>55</sup> With the sense that Americans could arrive anytime, there was “an

---

<sup>52</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 95.

<sup>53</sup> Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 52–53. The February 26 incident was an attempted *coup d’état* that resulted in increased military control of the government.

<sup>54</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 108–109. Upon Tsuji’s military conscription, Gyōdō wrote in calligraphy, “這裡無生死 ... 勇猛精進” (Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 70), which Leggett translates as “No life-and-death for this one / Indomitable courage.” Leggett also notes: “The first comes from a phrase of the founder of Myōshinji in Kyoto, the great Kanzan, one of whose names was Egen: ‘No life-and-death for this Egen’” (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 109).

<sup>55</sup> Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 76. Tsuji studied Miyamoto Musashi’s 宮本武蔵 *Five Rings* (*Gorinsho* 五輪書).

atmosphere of grim desperation”; Tsuji and his compatriots “...were given preparatory exercises for a final battle in which all were to die in action, with no one surrendering.”<sup>56</sup>

One day in 1944, Tsuji had a deep enlightenment experience—deeper than his initial “seeing the nature”—in which he “...realized the real meaning of the phrase, ‘Cold stands the sword against the sky,’ and [he] saw that [he] had never really understood it.”<sup>57</sup> This realization brought a new depth of understanding to kōans through which Tsuji had previously passed: “Now I felt that I had penetrated into their very marrow.”<sup>58</sup> New hardships faced Tsuji following the war, when he was taken as prisoner-of-war by the Soviet Army for over two years, but he persisted in meditating, chanting, and studying any Buddhist text he could get his hands on. After he was repatriated in 1947, he resumed kōan practice with Gyōdō, eventually “pass[ing] through the whole training.” In 1949, Gyōdō gave him a hermitage name (*shitsugō* 室号), Fuko-an 布鼓庵, meaning “the hermitage of the Cloth Drum.”<sup>59</sup> Simultaneously, Gyōdō gave Tsuji dharma transmission,

---

<sup>56</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 109–110.

<sup>57</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 113. The original reads: “一剣、天に寄って寒じ” (Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 78).

<sup>58</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 114.

<sup>59</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 119. Leggett’s translation and what he precisely means by the “whole training” is unclear; the original also is vague: “Then I ‘wholly’ completed the ‘investigation in the [master’s] room’ (そして「室内での調べ」を「一通り」了り...)” (Tsuji, *Zen no michi*, 92; this is my translation). Most likely, this means that Tsuji completed the formal kōan curriculum, per Furukawa Gyōdō, although as discussed elsewhere, what the kōan curriculum entailed may have differed for lay and monastic trainees, according to teacher and temple. Rinzai lineage charts confirm Tsuji Sōmei as a successor to Furukawa Gyōdō, but it is not clear when he became considered a dharma heir and whether he was a *koji* at the time. Completing the kōan curriculum (and one’s training), and even being sanctioned to teach Zen, is not the same as becoming the successor or dharma heir (*hassu* 法嗣) of one’s master, although it is a preliminary step in Rinzai.

placing him into the rare company of *koji* like Yamaoka Tesshū 山岡鉄舟 (1836–1888) who were sanctioned as the dharma heirs of Rinzai masters.<sup>60</sup>

As mentioned in chapter 2, with regard to his mission, Tsuji had made a resolution while en route to the Russian labor camp in 1945:

It seemed to me that Japan, after losing this war, would have no political or economic power, and the only contribution Japan could make to world culture would be in the field of Buddhism.... I resolved then that if I should return, I would devote the remainder of my life to the cause of Buddhism.... “I do not begrudge my body or life for love of the Supreme Way,” says the *Lotus Sutra*, and indeed, unless there are some who are really to put the meaning of this verse into practice, the Supreme Way might easily die out.”<sup>61</sup>

Indeed, when Tsuji was traveling back to Japan, this resolution was affirmed. He felt acutely that for priests, “the mission to propagate Zen Buddhism” was paramount. Here, he follows in his teacher’s footsteps, as he recalls Gyōdō frequently saying, “The first duty of a priest is to spread the religion. But nowadays there are few of them who will exert themselves in this way.”<sup>62</sup> It was in this spirit—aspiring not only to study and practice Zen but also to spread it—that Tsuji finally ordained as a priest under Ueki Kendō 植木 憲道 (1871–1967) at Unganji 雲巖寺; this ceremony (*shukke tokudo* 出家得度) took place in 1949, three months after his dharma transmission. Although he continued for some months to live at home with his wife and children while working, he

---

<sup>60</sup> Tsuji’s brief biography in *Kōza Zen* states that he received the hermitage name of Fuko-an in May 1949 and, at the same time, became Furukawa’s dharma heir, or *hassu* 法嗣. See Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治, ed., *Zen no jissen* 禅の実践, vol. 2 of *Kōza Zen* 講座禅 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1967), 320–321.

<sup>61</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 116–117.

<sup>62</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 123.

renounced his home life in 1950 and headed to Kyoto for a mendicant's life.<sup>63</sup> The outbreak of the Korean War affirmed his dedication to the mendicant lifestyle, "continuously praying for peace, leaving [his] own welfare entirely to chance."<sup>64</sup> Thus, Tsuji embraced traditional ideals even while being shaped by the exigencies of his time.<sup>65</sup>

However, Tsuji's role as priest soon evolved, as he grappled with the physical demands of the begging (*takuhatsu* 托鉢) lifestyle. Others prodded him to question the ideal role of a Buddhist priest in modern Japan. For example, D. T. Suzuki, in a letter, wrote: "Mendicancy is all very well, but can you not devise some modern substitute for the traditional way?" The lay teacher and Zen modernizer Hisamatsu Shin'ichi said to Tsuji "...that there was a need of a Zen master who renounced not only the layman's life but also that of a priest."<sup>66</sup> Soon thereafter, in 1951, Tsuji left behind the beggar's life and returned to the world as a Rōshi, living the daily life of someone who was "neither monk

---

<sup>63</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 128. Tsuji reveals a persistent feeling of wanting to renounce home: "Often I thought to myself that I really ought to dedicate myself wholly to Buddhism without regard to my wife and children, and that the suffering which this would bring could be taken as a high sacrifice before the altar of the Way" (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 127).

<sup>64</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 132.

<sup>65</sup> With regard to traditional ideals in line with Hakuin, it is worth noting that in his writings, Tsuji draws more on Hakuin, Hakuin's master Shōju, and Shōju's master Shidō Munan than on any other Zen master. Their words reverberate through Tsuji's autobiography and other writings, particularly on the topics of zeal for practice and the importance of post-enlightenment practice. Tsuji also features Hakuin's teachings in his *Gaitō no Zen*, a work that targets a lay audience. For example, Tsuji includes an extensive section on "Zen and Health," focusing primarily on Hakuin's Introspective Meditation ("*naikan no hō* 内観の法"; see Tsuji, *Gaitō no Zen*, 37–53). In introducing the section in "Zen on Health," Tsuji is careful to include the caveat that "we absolutely do not practice Zen for the sake of physical health..." even while he acknowledges the benefits of Introspective Meditation and, implicitly, its accessibility to modern lay practitioners (Tsuji, *Gaitō no Zen*, 31).

<sup>66</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 135. This was not the first time Suzuki had expressed such sentiments to Tsuji. Earlier, when Tsuji was discussing his plan to ordain with Suzuki, the latter responded: "In my opinion you need not enter the priesthood. But I admit priesthood has a certain prestige attached to it" (Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 2017, 121).

nor layman” (“*hisō hizoku* 非僧非俗”).<sup>67</sup> He established two Zen assemblies, Fuji Zenkai 不二禅会 and Kiichi Kyōkai 帰一教会, and, in 1963, officially founded and became the master of “Not Two Zendō” (Fuji Zendō 不二禅堂) in Yoyogi, Tokyo.<sup>68</sup> He authored numerous books, many targeted toward the laity, and dedicated himself to teaching “Street Zen,” or “*gaitō zen* 街頭禅.”

### 5.3 Self-Cultivation and Lay Zen

#### 5.3.1 *Shūyō*: “‘Spiritual Self-Cultivation’ Had Become the Era’s Slogan”

Tsuji Sōmei’s *alma mater*, Tokyo Higher Commercial School, fostered its students’ Zen practice for different reasons than what resonated for Tsuji. The author of Nyoidan’s “Organization History” unequivocally situates Nyoidan’s founding amidst popular interest in *shūyō*. Of the group’s inception in 1906, the author recounts, twenty-five years later:

Originally, at that time, our nation had put our nation’s unity (*kokuren* 國連) at stake in the great Russo-Japanese War and had achieved a brilliant success. Our citizens were charged with self-awareness, and at the same time, it was an era when the spirit of

---

<sup>67</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan 一橋如意団, *Tetsu nyoi* 鉄如意 (Tokyo: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1957), 81. From his vantage point of 1957, Tsuji states: “As a result of various experiences and thinking through which I have gone, now, in the realm of the ‘non-duality of real and conventional,’ I live a life of ‘neither monk nor layman’... (いろいろな体験と思索を経た結果、現在わたくしは「真俗不二」の境涯で「非僧非俗」の生活を送り).” As Jaffe elucidates, with the decriminalization of clerical marriage in 1872, it became standard practice for Japanese Buddhist priests in most sects to marry and thus be characterized as “neither monk nor layman” (Jaffe, *Neither Monk nor Layman*).

<sup>68</sup> See Tsuji’s biography: Nishitani, ed., *Zen no jissen*, 320–321. Note: this Fuji Zendō 不二禅堂—which is still active today, although it has not met continuously since Tsuji’s time—is different from Shakamunikai’s Fuji Hannya Dōjō 不二般若道場, located in Shizuoka Prefecture.



*bushidō*-style national purity (*kokusui* 國粹) was drawing the world's attention, and "spiritual self-cultivation" ("seishin shūyō 精神修養") had become the era's slogan. Above all, the way of Zen—as the most straightforward means of doing self-cultivation—became a means by which the entire nation could return home (*chōya no kikyō* 朝野の帰郷); it was a situation in which the dharma flag was raised and fluttered everywhere, Zen-style (*zenpū* 禅風).<sup>69</sup>

Here, the unnamed author (or authors) makes bold assertions, suggesting that Zen practice played a central role amidst several other interconnected dimensions of early twentieth-century Japan: patriotic fervor following the Russo-Japanese War, identifying the "way of the warrior" (*bushidō*) with national ideals and myths of Japanese purity and uniqueness, the centrality of "spiritual self-cultivation" to the era (and as a means of "homecoming," or returning to one's birthright), Zen as a (superior) means of self-cultivation, and the proliferation of "Zen style" throughout Japan. The latter two points—that is, Zen's superiority as a means of *shūyō* and Zen's ubiquity—might be understood as a common rhetorical strategy, unique neither to Zen nor to the modern era: claiming that one's tradition is both superior and undergirding everything. From another perspective, however, the author's narrative reflects many facets of the era's discourse and ethos.

This chapter attempts to sort out those different threads (nation and Japaneseness, *bushidō* and purity, *shūyō* and Zen practice), and this section focuses on *shūyō* in

---

<sup>69</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 35. 「抑抑当時我國は日露の大戦に國連を賭して赫々の功を収め、國民の自覺大いに昂ると共に武士道的國粹の精神が世界の視聽を集めた時であつて、『精神修養』は時代の標幟となり、就中禅道は其の最も端的なる修養法として朝野の歸嚮する所となり、法幢隨處に鵲翻として禅風大いに揚るといふ情勢であつた。」

particular. I ask the following questions: What did “*shūyō*” mean to the Japanese people of late Meiji, Taishō, and early Shōwa Japan, and how did *shūyō*’s valences shift over time? How did popular interest in *shūyō* intersect with, and contribute to, lay Rinzai’s popularization during this period? Is this author’s assertion of Zen-style *shūyō* as “the most straightforward means of doing *shūyō*” representative of common perceptions, both for practitioners and their teachers? How do practitioners of *shūyō* (and Zen-style *shūyō* in particular) ostensibly contribute to a strong nation, and to what degree was practicing nation-centered *shūyō* a motivation for practicing Zen?

In this section, I explore a few main definitions of *shūyō*—particularly as they relate to lay Zen practice—before providing an overview of *shūyō*’s intellectual history and connection to broader practice paradigms in the modern era. This overview sets the stage, then, to explore how “*shūyō*” was understood and used in conjunction with lay Zen practice by three different groups: administrators (or others expressing institutional stances), lay Zen practitioners, and Rinzai masters who instructed laypeople.

One of the presuppositions here is that “*shūyō*” was one of the key buzzwords of the era—not only for lay Zen practitioners but for the institutions (e.g., educational) in which they were enmeshed. In a certain sense, the term “*shūyō*” can often be vague, encompassing a breadth and diversity of phenomena that renders the term less than ideal as an academic category. On the other hand, its role as a buzzword, and the frequency with which lay practitioners used it in conjunction with their descriptions of beginning practice—for example, as a spur for beginning Zen practice, considered to be one form of *shūyō* among many—signal its importance for understanding the ethos of an era. Through

the lens of “*shūyō*,” we can begin to interrogate and unravel the overlapping endeavors of lay Zen’s modernization and popularization, self-cultivation movements that often transcended the boundaries of individual religions, and the goal of strengthening the nation, as well as the overlapping ideal of *bushidō* and the practice of *kendō*, which was also a chief motivator for practice among the laity.

### 5.3.2 Defining *Shūyō*

As a compound, “*shūyō* 修養” is composed of the characters for “修,” signaling religious practice, training, and cultivation; and “養,” indicating cultivation, nourishment, and rearing. Together, the characters have an ethical valence: “cultivating moral character.”<sup>70</sup> As discussed below, “*shūyō*” was constructed as a category in the early Meiji period, alongside related categories of “religion” and “education.” Over time, the ethical dimension of “*shūyō*” shifted in its nuances, and “*shūyō*” increasingly became associated with practices that were extracted or decontextualized from their original—and often “religious”—contexts. Moreover, these practices increasingly emphasized health and healing, and were increasingly associated with cultivating health and healing for broader social benefits and a strong nation.

In terms of how “*shūyō*” is used in the context of early twentieth-century lay Zen practice, there is a wide variety of usage by institutions, practitioners, and their teachers. However, I propose that there are two main trends in terms of popular usage: as an

---

<sup>70</sup> *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, s.v. “*shūyō* 修養,” retrieved January 26, 2020. In this entry, *shūyō* is noted as being synonymous with *shutoku* 修徳 (also *shūtoku*), meaning “cultivating virtue.”

umbrella category that both transcends and includes individual traditions and comprises a range of concrete, personal cultivation practices; or as adjacent to, but distinct from, established religious traditions like Zen, and involving distinct rhetoric and purposes (e.g., distinct from those of Zen). For those embracing the first trend, “*shūyō*” comprises such contexts as established traditions (such as Zen or Neo-Confucianism), New Religious Movements, and healing movements that may have elements of established religions but are considered to be more physical or psychological than religious (e.g., types of “*seishin ryōhō* 精神療法,” or “spiritual therapies”).<sup>71</sup> For example, some lay practitioners and even a few Rinzai masters use the term “*shūyō*” interchangeably with the word term typically used in Zen monastic settings for “training” (“*shugyō* 修行 or 修業”); many such practitioners consider “*sanzen* 参禅” (in the sense of Zen practice, as opposed to the private encounter with the master) to be a form of “*shūyō*.”

In terms of people using “*shūyō*” interchangeably with “*shugyō*,” at least in the context of specific practices like *zazen*, it is worth noting that most authors have referred

---

<sup>71</sup> For a discussion of the development of spiritual therapies (*seishin ryōhō*) in the Meiji period and later, see Yoshinaga Shin’ichi, “The Birth of Japanese Mind Cure Methods,” in *Religion and Psychotherapy in Modern Japan*, edited by Christopher Harding, Iwata Fumiaki, and Yoshinaga Shin’ichi, 76–102 (London and New York: Routledge, 2015); and Yoshinaga, Introduction in Kurita et al., eds., *Kingendai Nihon*, 3–23. Yoshinaga translates “*seishin ryōhō*” as “mind-cure methods,” as does Hirano; see Hirano Naoko, “The Birth of Reiki and Psycho-Spiritual Therapy in 1920’s–1930’s Japan: The Influence of ‘American Metaphysical Religion,’” *Japanese Religions* 40, no. 1 & 2 (2016): 65–83. I follow Justin Stein in translating *seishin ryōhō* as “spiritual therapies.” Stein points out that *seishin*, when it first was used in the modern period, referred to both mind and spirit, but later—particularly in Japan’s postwar period—this term narrowed in scope to refer only to psychotherapy. See Justin B. Stein, “Hawayo Takata and the Circulatory Development of Reiki in the Twentieth Century North Pacific,” Dissertation, University of Toronto, 2017, 79.

to “*zazen*” and “*sesshin*”—and even *sanzen* (in the sense of “Zen practice”) generally—as “*shūyō*.” However, authors do not generally refer to *teishō*-listening (or monastic practices like rituals) referred to as “*shūyō*.” We could say that replacing “*shugyō*” with “*shūyō*”—with its clear emphasis on the individual and self-improvement, even while individual self-improvement is linked to the larger body (e.g., the nation)—shifts the emphasis of Zen practice.

This first trend—of *shūyō* as an all-embracing category (involving, for example, the equation of “*shugyō*” and “*shūyō*”)—is common among institutions such as Tokyo Higher Commercial School, whose administrators promoted various forms of “religious” and “spiritual” personal cultivation practices in the form of clubs, and promoted the (Neo-Confucian) notion that such personal cultivation directly contributes to broader society. In practitioners’ (and masters’) accounts, however, much more common than this is the second tendency: that is, suggesting that “*shūyō*” is distinct from “traditional” Zen practice. For example, some people speak entirely in terms of *shūyō* and not at all in terms of Zen or Buddhism, and some speak entirely in terms of *sanzen* and *shugyō* and do not allude to *shūyō* in the context of Zen training (even if *shūyō* was an initial motivation for starting Zen practice). Others speak alternately in terms of “*shūyō*” and also in conventional Zen terms, but to different audiences and in different contexts; for them, “*shūyō*” and conventional Zen terms are idioms with clearly different valences. Examples of all of these will be provided below.

In terms of changing terminology, various incarnations of “*seishinteki shūyō* 精神の修養” and just “*shūyō* 修養” were used frequently in Nyoidan’s earliest editions of

*Tetsu nyoi* (the commemorative histories from 1931 and 1937, respectively).<sup>72</sup> However, by the time Nyoidan’s fiftieth-anniversary history was published in 1957, “*shūyō* 修養” was used far less frequently and was supplanted by *shugyō* and other terms conventionally used to describe Zen practice. In all volumes, Zen practitioners most frequently used Zen-specific words to refer to their Zen practice: *sanzen* 参禅 (“practicing Zen”) and *sanrō* 参籠 (“sequestering [oneself] and practicing”) were the most common terms.<sup>73</sup> To refer to practice, Nyoidan members also used the expression “practicing zazen” (“*zazen o kumu* 坐禅を組む,” literally meaning “crossing [one’s legs] in zazen”), and they also used terms that generally indicated spiritual training and were frequently used in the Zen context, such as *kufū* 工夫 (“intense seeking”), *shugyō* 修行 or 修業 (“applying oneself in practice”), *tanren* 鍛錬 (“training,” literally meaning “tempering” or “forging”), and so forth.

### 5.3.3 *Shūyō* and Lay Zen: Historical Context and Genealogy

With regard to the overlapping of health and healing, religion and supra-religiosity, and education and morality that are involved in modern Japanese self-

---

<sup>72</sup> In particular, Nyoidan’s twenty-fifth anniversary commemorative history—published in 1931—illuminates and emphasizes the group’s earliest years.

<sup>73</sup> As described in chapter 3, “*sanzen*” was used both to describe meeting individually with the *rōshi* and to refer to Zen practice in general; this was the most common term used in contemporaneous journals and popular books to indicate Zen practice. *Sanrō*, on the other hand, was used by many Nyoidan members but not commonly in other contemporaneous publications; it indicates sequestering oneself in a temple (籠) and practicing Zen (参). *Sanrō* does not appear in many Buddhist dictionaries (e.g., ZGDT), although there are short entries in both KBDJ (p. 612) and OBDJ (p. 670), which contain similar definitions. In short, the term generally indicates enclosing oneself in a shrine, temple, or other religious facility for a fixed number of days and engaging in fervent religious practice, supplication, and so forth.

cultivation—lay Zen-related self-cultivation and other forms—and with regard to the transitions from *kyōyō* 教養 to *shūyō* 修養 to *chiryō* 治療 from early Meiji onward: these threads are complicated, intertwined, and difficult to tease apart. However, I would suggest that from a certain angle, the nation is at the nexus of all of this.

This story begins prior to the Meiji period. As discussed elsewhere in the dissertation, Janine Sawada has demonstrated convincingly that paradigm centering on Neo-Confucian-style personal cultivation and practicality began emerging in the late Tokugawa period and flourished in early Meiji Japan, directly paving the way for the rise of lay Zen at Engakuji in the 1870s and 1880s. This paradigm emerged partly from increasing attention on practicality—and ambivalence toward texts and language alone—in the Confucian world, as early as the eighteenth century. Sawada focuses on the “common mental grammar”—articulated as “personal cultivation” (*shūshin* 修身) and “learning” (*gakumon* 学問)—that transcended the boundaries of individual religious traditions and education. This “common mental grammar” was reflected in the practices and formulations particularly, though not only, of Buddhist priests, Neo-Confucian scholars, and those embracing elements of both Buddhism and Confucianism. Significantly for my study, it was epitomized by practitioners of Sekimon Shingaku 石門心学 who eventually took up lay Rinzai practice at Engakuji in the late nineteenth century, as well as by their teacher, the Rinzai master Imakita Kōsen (teacher of Shaku

Sōen).<sup>74</sup> Kōsen had studied Confucian texts deeply before turning to Zen, ultimately finding that years of Zen practice and personal cultivation helped him to grasp Confucius's words.<sup>75</sup>

Forms of personal cultivation that would be recognizable to the modern Japanese—and might be taken for granted by the time of lay Rinzai's broader popularization in the early twentieth century—had been developing for well over a century. However, it was in the early Meiji period that “*shūyō*” emerged as a distinct conceptual framework, as Kurita Hidehiko elucidates.<sup>76</sup> Kurita illustrates how the notion of “*shūyō*” developed alongside such other concepts as “religion” (*shūkyō*) and “education” (e.g., *kyō* 教, *kyōiku* 教育, or *kyōka* 教化).<sup>77</sup> During these latter decades of

---

<sup>74</sup> Regarding the trend toward practicality, see especially Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 10–12. Sekimon Shingaku—often known simply as Shingaku—was founded by Ishida Baigan 石田梅岩 (1685–1744) in early eighteenth-century Japan (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 23). By the late nineteenth century, it had become an integration of Neo-Confucianism and Rinzai Zen. Regarding Shingaku's emergence and eventual transformation into an “unofficial lay group” in the late nineteenth century, see Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 23–27, 84–87, and 169–175.

<sup>75</sup> Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 19, 27. For Kōsen, it was Zen practice—and understanding that was grounded in personal cultivation—that helped him truly understand Confucius's teachings.

<sup>76</sup> Kurita Hidehiko, “The Notion of *Shūyō* and Conceptualizing the Future of Religion at the Turn of the Twentieth Century,” translated by Eric H. Swanson, *Religious Studies in Japan*, vol. 4 (2018): 65–90. This article was originally published in Japanese as Kurita Hidehiko 栗田英彦, “Meiji sanjūdai ni okeru ‘shūyō’ gainen to shōrai no shūkyō no kōsō 明治三〇年代における「修養」概念と将来の宗教の構想,” *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 89, no. 3 (2015): 51–74.

<sup>77</sup> Jason Josephson investigates the “invention” of “religion” (*shūkyō* 宗教) in Japan, showing how Japanese ideologues constructed the category of “religion” after they were confronted with the Western notion of religion from 1853 onward—for example, in the context of treaty revisions predicated on the Meiji state guaranteeing “freedom of religion.” Thus, the formation of “*shūkyō*” as a concept in Japan was motivated by legal and diplomatic exigencies, and it was originally not primarily a scholarly, theological, or anthropological category (Jason Ānanda Josephson, *The Invention of Religion in Japan*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2012). On the other hand, Hans Martin Krämer suggests that “reconception” is a more useful framework than “invention” for approaching the reformulation of religion in modern Japan, as it better



the nineteenth century, Buddhism, too, saw transformation and new formulations.<sup>78</sup>

Eventually, Kurita asserts, “*shūyō*” came to represent the convergence of religion and ethics, transcending both categories and encompassing expressions and influences of a vast range of religious traditions, including diverse Buddhist schools.

Kurita traces the genealogy of “*shūyō*” in relation to the social-historical context and to central debates of the early and mid-Meiji period—namely, those pertaining to education, religion, and the relationship between the two. In this context, Kurita argues, thinkers like Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944) “...attempted to construct a...practice-based form of ‘ethical religion’ under the conceptual framework of *shūyō*, in which insights and ideals expressed by religious figures and founder figures, as well as concrete practices such as *zazen*, were emphasized.”<sup>79</sup> According to Kurita’s narrative, such discourses surrounding “*shūyō*” eventually had practical ramifications, bearing significant influence on religious reformers and proponents of “New Religion.”<sup>80</sup> It was during this period—particularly during the first decade of the twentieth century—that

---

reflects the “complex negotiation between Western knowledge, political and social agendas, and indigenous traditions” that were involved in defining “*shūkyō*” (Krämer, *Shimaji Mokurai*, 3).

<sup>78</sup> See, for example, Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs*. Ketelaar discusses how Meiji Buddhists used different definitional strategies to appropriate early Meiji critiques of Buddhism and then redefine (and modernize) Buddhism as universal, transsectarian, transnational, and cosmopolitan. The 1893 World Parliament of Religions in Chicago was a key turning point, as Japanese Buddhists were able to promote their visions of reform and modernization on a world stage.

<sup>79</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 65.

<sup>80</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 75.

“zazen as a method of *shūyō*” became popular.<sup>81</sup> Thus, the surge of lay Rinzai groups from around that time coincides with Kurita’s timeline.

Kurita describes three early phases of the concept’s development: from 1868 until 1890, when the Imperial Rescript on Education was issued; from 1890 until 1899, religious education was prohibited; and from 1899 until 1905, which saw the end of the Russo-Japanese War and beginning of Japan’s “*shūyō* boom.”<sup>82</sup> Particularly during the first two phases, both Christianity and anti-Christian sentiment played crucial roles in discourse about *shūyō*, just as they played crucial roles in defining “religion” in the first place.<sup>83</sup> According to Kurita, the first period (from 1868 until 1890) was characterized by what he calls “*shūyō* for the establishment of an independent mind” (*jiritsu shin no shūyō*

---

<sup>81</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 81–83. Other *shūyō* practices that emerged during this period and that were adjacent to Zen include, for example, Fujita Reisai’s 藤田霊斎 “Method of Harmonizing the Breath and the Mind” (*sokushin chōwa hō* 息心調和法; this translation was taken from Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 83). Another example is the Sōtō Zen priest and Buddhist scholar Hara Tanzan 原坦山 (1819–1892), who justified his novel theory of consciousness and illness through a combination of Buddhist notions (especially based on Yogacara thought and the text, *The Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*) and Daoist and Dutch medical notions. For the latter, see Yoshinaga, “The Birth of Japanese Mind Cure Methods,” 79–84, as well as Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, “Hara Tanzan no shinrigakuteki Zen: sono shisō to rekishiteki eikyō 原坦山の心理学的禪：その思想と歴史的影響,” *Jintai kagaku* 人体科学 15, no. 2 (October 2006): 5–13; and Justin B. Stein, “Psychosomatic Buddhist Medicine at the Dawn of Modern Japan: Hara Tanzan, ‘On the Difference Between the Brain and the Spinal Cord’ (1869),” in *Buddhism and Medicine: An Anthology of Modern and Contemporary Sources*, edited by C. Pierce Salguero, 38–44 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019). Yoshinaga (particularly in his 2006 work) explores Hara Tanzan’s thought at the nexus of modern Sōtō Zen and psychotherapy.

<sup>82</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 67–68. Kurita also points out that in 1899, permission for mixed residence was enacted (i.e., foreigners were permitted to live and conduct commerce in Japan).

<sup>83</sup> Jason Josephson shows clearly how Eurocentric, hegemonic presuppositions are embedded in the Japanese term “*shūkyō*”—that is, that Christianity is the prototypical “*shūkyō*.” At the same time, however, this category was not merely foisted on the Japanese people in a uni-directional way; Japanese ideologues shaped “*shūkyō*” for their own purposes as well (Josephson, *The Invention of Religion in Japan*).

自立心の修養). *Shūyō*, here, focused on social success and independence; the term “was used in the context of Christianity, which was understood as inseparable from politics and morality, and was also closely associated with the notion that the independence of the individual would lead to the prosperity of the nation.”<sup>84</sup> It should be noted that at that time, the concept of “*shūyō*” still lacked cohesiveness given the fluidity of the concepts of “religion” and “education.”

In the subsequent period (from 1890 until 1899), in response to anti-Christian discourse, Christians and Christian sympathizers sought to demonstrate Christianity’s compatibility with values such as loyalty and filial piety that were enshrined in the Imperial Rescript on Education. This shifted the “*shūyō*” discourse, prompting an emphasis on, per Kurita, “*shūyō* for the virtuous mind” (*dōtoku shin no shūyō* 道徳心の修養), emphasizing interior morality as a goal.<sup>85</sup>

During the period from 1899 until 1905, then, Buddhists were increasingly involved not only in producing *shūyō* discourse but also in formulating and promoting practical expressions of *shūyō*.<sup>86</sup> Kurita attributes Buddhists’ participation in this

---

<sup>84</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 68–69.

<sup>85</sup> With regard to the interiority of “*shūyō*” during this period, as well as the complementarity of “*shūyō*” and morality with other esteemed virtues of the period (i.e., loyalty and filial piety), Kurita draws from the similar views expressed in Wang Cheng 王成, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘shūyō’ gainen no seiritsu 近代日本における「修養」概念の成立,” *Nihon kenkyū* 日本研究 (December 2004) 117–45; and Wasaki, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘hanmon seinen.’”

<sup>86</sup> Kurita discusses the following Buddhist expressions of *shūyō*: Chikazumi Jōkan 近角常観 (Jōdo Shinshū priest; 1870–1941), who advocated practical religion (as opposed to Inoue’s abstraction) and a “personified Buddha” who could inspire character development (ibid., 80); Kiyozawa Manshi 清沢満之 (Jōdo Shinshū priest and reformer; 1863–1901), who saw “internal contemplation” as a crucial component of *shūyō*; and Katō Totsudō 加藤咄堂 (Buddhologist;

discourse to the development of the notion of “religion,” to its relegation to the private sphere, and to the separation of religion and education—thus motivating thinkers and religionists to bridge religion and ethics in new ways.<sup>87</sup> This is commensurate with others’ analysis of a general shift toward interiority in this period, as per David McMahan’s analysis of Buddhism’s modernity and a European Protestant-influenced definition of religion that presumed interiority and the separation of religion from public spheres (discussed in the introduction). It was also during this period that D. T. Suzuki—ostensibly alongside Shaku Sōen—wrote “A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting,” prescribing *zazen* for Japan’s youth (discussed later in this chapter).

Until around 1890, there was a lack of consensus among thinkers about what “*shūyō*” meant—not unsurprisingly, given that the concepts of “religion” and “education” had only crystallized by the end of the 1870s.<sup>88</sup> By the first decade of the twentieth century, however, “*shūyō*” ultimately:

...was viewed as a term that went beyond the category of “religion,” incorporated a hierarchy based on the theory of

---

1870–1949), who wrote about meditation (*meisō* 瞑想) in a wide variety of traditions and advocated *zazen* as method of *shūyō* (Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 80–82).

<sup>87</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 83.

<sup>88</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 68. With regard to the development of the concept of “education” in the modern period, Sawada shows how prior to the Meiji period, “*gakumon* 学問”—which connoted Confucian studies—emphasized personal cultivation. Following the Meiji Restoration, “practical” learning (*jitsugaku* 実学) came to mean Western academic disciplines, such as math, geography, physics, and even philosophy. The 1890 Imperial Rescript on Education reintegrated Confucian moral training and took the stance that learning was identified with “the harmony of the family and the success of the nation” (Sawada, *Practical Pursuits*, 102). Moreover, “religion” (*shūkyō* 宗教) was defined in opposition not only to politics, science, and cultural enlightenment, but also to education and learning.

religious evolution, had a worldview based on the notion of “phenomenon-as-reality,” and held as its ideal form the union between the ethical and religious. Through *shūyō* discourse, these ideas were expressed with an emphasis on self-motivated practice...and a call for a harmony between the pursuit of the ideal and a practice grounded in reality.<sup>89</sup>

As for the latter point—that is, the relationship between ideals and practical reality—Kurita posits that the earlier phase of more abstract ideals gave rise to more concrete religious reforms, as some religious leaders critiqued the abstraction of Inoue Tetsujirō’s notion of “ethical religion” (*rinriteki shūkyō* 倫理の宗教) and put forth more concrete, practical means of personal cultivation.

In terms of the relationship between discourse and practice, Kurita suggests that the development of “*shūyō*” as a concept significantly influenced the realm of practice, contributing to religious reforms (e.g., the decontextualization of religious practices as “*shūyō*”) and their popularization. He makes a point that might be counter-intuitive to those emphasizing the popularity of nation-protecting *shūyō* following the Russo-Japanese War: “The *shūyō* discourse of the Meiji 30s, far from being a response to some sort of existential crisis, was rather one that developed through a strategic articulation by religionists who were responding to contemporary issues related to ethical education.”<sup>90</sup> Kurita makes important points about the power of discourse to shape practice and about the strategy involved in formulating such discourse, although from another angle, this top-down approach—that is, arguing that the elite intellectuals and religionists’ debate, strategy, and rhetoric spawned the reforms—can obscure what was happening “on the

---

<sup>89</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 84.

<sup>90</sup> Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*,” 83.

ground” and should be viewed in conjunction with the concerns and practices of ordinary people.

Regardless of causation, there is broad scholarly consensus that the Russo-Japanese War represented a turning point with regard to popular interest in self-cultivation practices that transcended religious boundaries and encompassed numerous permutations of Buddhist and non-Buddhist practices, including some explicitly deemed “religious,” others that had been extricated from originally religious contexts. This *shūyō* “boom” (*buumu* ブーム) or “trend” (*ryūkō* 流行) was fueled significantly by the surge of patriotism and explicit links between self-cultivation and contributing to the Japanese nation, and to which there was ascribed special importance for Japan’s youth (*seinen* 青年). In other words, as Wasaki Kōtarō demonstrates, popular opinion held that *shūyō* was all the more valuable for young people, Japan’s future citizens.<sup>91</sup>

As far as the explicit links between popular interest in “*shūyō*” and popular interest in Zen, Wang Cheng also connects the “*shūyō*” trend to the “Zen study and Zen practice boom” that occurred roughly concurrently and had become prominent after the

---

<sup>91</sup> Wasaki Kōtarō 和崎光太郎, “Seinenki jiko keisei gainen toshite no ‘shūyō’ ron no tanjō 青年期自己形成概念としての〈修養〉論の誕生,” *Studies in the History of Education* 50, no. 0 (2007), 38–41. Also see Wang, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘shūyō’”; and Wang Cheng 王成, “Nitobe Inazō to kindai nihon no ‘shūyō’ 新渡戸稲造と近代日本の「修養」,” *Arutesu riberaresu: Iwate Daigaku jinbun shakaika gakubu kiyō* アルテスリベラレス：岩手大学人文社会科学部紀要, no. 102 (June 2018): 175–83. Wasaki refers to the post-Russo-Japanese War period as a “boom” and also notes that Wang Cheng describes “the trend of *shūyō*” (“‘*shūyō*’ no ‘*ryūkō*’ 「修養」の「流行」”) that occurred during the middle of the third decade of Meiji (i.e., c. 1905) in Wang, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘shūyō.’” In this context, Wang emphasizes the “trend” of “*shūyō*” primarily as a concept or a word. For his analysis, Wang draws on Buddhist scholar and educator Murakami Senshō’s 村上専精 (1851–1929) views on *shūyō* (Wang, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘shūyō,’” 120–121).

first Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895).<sup>92</sup> This correlates with my research; as discussed in chapter 2, from the seeds planted at Engakuji in the 1870s and 1880s, and from the efforts of other Rinzai masters open to teaching laypeople (particularly but not only in the Tokyo area), lay Zen movements and “Zen style” (“*zenpū* 禅風”) started picking up steam in the 1890s, accelerating by the last decade of the Meiji era.

Understanding the ethical dimension of “*shūyō*” discourse and practice—and its connection to nation-building—is thus key to understanding its increasing importance among late Meiji educators, religionists, and politicians. Another critical dimension is that of health and the physical body, whose relationship to the Meiji state Susan Burns documents.<sup>93</sup> As Japanese citizens’ physical health was increasingly connected to the well-being of the “national body” (*kokutai* 国体), many forms of “*shūyō*” also increasingly emphasized physical health and came to be dominated by “spiritual therapies” or “mind-cure methods” (*seishin ryōhō* 精神療法). Yoshinaga Shin’ichi provides a periodization of the development of “spiritual therapies” (*seishin ryōhō* 精神療法), which would largely be considered “*shūyō*” (at least from the late nineteenth

---

<sup>92</sup> Wang discusses a certain image—expressed in the Zen-oriented journal, *Shūyō* 修養 (published from 1907 onward)—in which “*shūyō* is Zen practice”; he points to the post-Russo-Japanese War interest in *bushidō* as a factor. See Wang, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘shūyō,’” 136; also see Wang, “Nitobe Inazō.”

<sup>93</sup> See Susan L. Burns, “Constructing the National Body: Public Health and the Nation in Nineteenth-Century Japan,” in *Nation Work: Asian Elites and National Identities*, edited by Timothy Brook and Andre Schmid, 17–50 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000). George Figal also documents the concerns held by Inoue Enryō 井上円了 (1858–1919) about superstitions (*meishin* 迷信; associated with folk healing methods) and the danger that they can pose to the Japanese populace. Inoue insisted that Japanese society must eradicate superstition for “healthy, modern Japanese state”; see George A. Figal, *Civilization and Monsters: Spirits of Modernity in Meiji Japan* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999), 87.

century until around the 1920s).<sup>94</sup> Whereas Kurita and Wang focus on the development of the concept of *shūyō*—with Kurita emphasizing its position vis-à-vis the “religious” landscape and Wang speaking from a perspective of intellectual history more broadly—Yoshinaga’s overview provides a summary of the major movements, figures, and characteristics of each of five periods between 1868 and 1945.<sup>95</sup>

Period One (1868–1903), which Yoshinaga calls the “Germination Period,” was characterized by “decontextualization of religious techniques” (i.e., separating religious practices from the religious context) and the introduction of hypnotism. Key figures included Sōtō priest Hara Tanzan, who formulated the “equiprimordiality of delusion and illness” (*wakubyō dōgenron* 惑病同源論), and Buddhist reformer Inoue Enryō, whose advancement of hypnotism (*saiminjutsu* 催眠術) is noted here.<sup>96</sup> During Period Two (1903–1908), the “Early Phase of Spiritual Therapies,” spiritual therapies (*seishin ryōhō*) in general developed and proliferated, while breathing practices and hypnotism in particular spread; hypnotism became regulated. Key figures included the aforementioned Okada Torajirō (known for popularizing “quiet sitting,” particularly for improving one’s health) and Fujita Reisai (best known for his “Way of Harmonizing Breath and Body”), alongside hypnotists and other spiritual healers. Subsequently, Period Three (1908–1921),

---

<sup>94</sup> See Yoshinaga, Introduction in Kurita et al., eds., *Kingendai Nihon*, 3–23.

<sup>95</sup> Yoshinaga, Introduction in Kurita et al., eds., *Kingendai Nihon*, 13–16. Yoshinaga summarizes these periods as follows: 1868–1903, 1903–1908, 1908–1921, 1921–1930, and 1930–1945. See Kurita, “The Notion of *Shūyō*”; and Wang, “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘shūyō.’”

<sup>96</sup> Here, I adopt James Mark Shields’s translation of Hara Tanzan’s “*wakubyō dōgenron*” from Sueki Fumihiko, “Building a Platform for Academic Buddhist Studies: Murakama Senshō,” translated by James Mark Shields, *The Eastern Buddhist* 37, no. 1–2 (2005), 9–10. Yoshinaga also discusses this core contribution of Hara Tanzan in Yoshinaga, “Hara Tanzan,” and Yoshinaga, “The Birth of Japanese Mind Cure Methods.”



the “Middle Phase of Spiritual Therapies,” saw the height of spiritual therapies’ popularity and a significant shift toward emphasizing the physical body. In Japan, this period saw the spread of psychical research (*shinrei kenkyū* 心霊研究), *chinkon kishin* 鎮魂帰神 (a form of spirit mediation), Western-influenced spiritualism, and breathing practices, alongside the resurgence of extending-life discourse from the early modern period, such as the Rinzai master Hakuin Ekaku’s *Yasenkanna* (discussed below in the context of Katsumine Daitetsu’s teachings).<sup>97</sup> During Period Four (1921–1930), the “Late Phase of Spiritual Therapies,” spiritual healing was established as a career, and the healing efficacy of these techniques was emphasized over the dimension of self-cultivation (per Yoshinaga, Period Four saw the transition “from *shūyō* to *chiryō* 治療,” or healing).

With regard to the relationship between Zen and *shūyō*, the first four periods are particularly relevant, the similar trajectory of Rinzai Zen’s popularization and the areas of overlap, discussed in the next sections. It is also worth mentioning another significant area of overlap: the practicing demographic. Wu discusses the demographic of those pursuing breathing practices in the 1910s, such as those promoted by Fujita Reisai (1868–1957) and others; that demographic sounds remarkably similar to early twentieth-century lay Rinzai Zen. Wu states:

Unlike most other alternative treatments, which found their customers mainly among rural or lower-class people, breathing

---

<sup>97</sup> For an explanation of the “*chinkon kishin* boom” within the New Religion Ōmotokyō, see Dana Catherine Mirsalis, “Modernizing Ōmoto: Legitimacy, Authority, and Gender in Ōmoto’s *Chinkon Kishin* Boom (1916–1921),” M.A. thesis, Harvard University, 2014.

exercise won over a considerable number of old nobles, elite bureaucrats, intellectuals, and professionals. Among those who regularly practiced breathing exercise were members of the imperial family, faculty staff of Waseda University, influential politicians, and social activists, and a large number of students of the most prestigious Tokyo Imperial University and First Higher School.<sup>98</sup>

As discussed in chapters 2 and 3, lay Rinzai groups' makeup also included both old and new elite; members' occupations ranged from education to politics, and the student contingent largely came from these and similarly prestigious institutions.

#### **5.3.4 Personal Accounts from the “Era of Self-Cultivation”**

Kurita's and Yoshinaga's genealogical analyses—particularly in conjunction with broader accounts of the emergent cultural orthodoxy—are helpful for understanding what “*shūyō*”—as “self-discipline” or “self-cultivation”—signifies for many early twentieth-century intellectuals and religionists who prescribed idealized forms of “*shūyō*.” A question then arises: to what degree did these prescriptions accord with the on-the-ground reality of the post-1905 surge of nationalism and popular participation in various practices that were being formulated around that time? Although a thorough examination of how the populace understood “*shūyō*” is beyond the scope of this study, this chapter will examine what “*shūyō*” signified for a range of lay Zen practitioners amidst, and after, the post-1905 *shūyō* boom.

---

<sup>98</sup> Yu-Chuan Wu, “A Disorder of Qi: Breathing Exercise as a Cure for Neurasthenia in Japan, 1900–1945,” *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 71, no. 3 (August 15, 2016), 333.

To discern how ideals connected to reality, in the next few sections, I am drawing from the accounts of three groups of people: first, the authors of Nyoidan-related accounts in *Tetsu nyoi*—including teachers, mentors, or other narrators—who describe the institutional rhetoric and “school atmosphere” (*kōfū* 校風) at Tokyo Higher Commercial School from 1906 onward; second, the Zen practitioners whose accounts are in *Tetsu nyoi* and other contemporaneous practitioners; and third, their teachers from the Rinzai Zen establishment. In these accounts, I highlight how the narrators describe *shūyō* at different points (and its relation to Zen practice and manifestations in their lives) and observe any notable discrepancies among the different accounts in order to deduce what practitioners’ concerns actually were and the degree to which they converged with the ideals being depicted by Rinzai teachers and school administrators.

#### 5.3.4.1 Institutional Messages

In terms of the top-down messages coming from the Tokyo Higher Commercial School as an institution (e.g., the educational ideals promoted by school administrators and how they were reflected in student activities), the time of Nyoidan’s founding (i.e., circa 1906) was clearly a time of multiple *shūyō* organizations (called, for example, *shūyō kikan* 修養期間), and Nyoidan was one such organization among many, considered to be a “religious-type *shūyō* organization.”<sup>99</sup> Moreover, such organizations

---

<sup>99</sup> Sawayanagi Masatarō, discussed below, alludes to the university’s various modes of “spiritual self-cultivation.” This is congruent with others’ descriptions of Nyoidan as a “self-cultivation organization” (*shūyō dantai* 修養団体 or *shūyō kikan* 修養機関) or the equivalent (e.g., a “spiritual organization,” or *seishin dantai* 精神団体). For example, Nyoidan member Uhara Yoshitoyo refers to Nyoidan as a “Zen self-cultivation organization” (*zengaku shūyō dantai* 禅学

were clearly depicted as functioning in service to the nation. The references by Nyoidan-connected individuals in leadership positions—including Sawayanagi Masatarō 澤柳政太郎 (1865–1927)—attest to the links between lay Zen, *shūyō*, and broader social benefits. The anonymous authors of Nyoidan’s history similarly depict “school spirit” or a “school atmosphere” (*kōfū* 校風) that was intimately connected with thriving and numerous *shūyō* organizations, which trained students to contribute to Japan’s strength and economic development. The latter is notable given Tokyo Higher Commercial School’s significant role in the realm of industry and business.<sup>100</sup> In this sense, Zen is considered a form of *shūyō*.

Sawayanagi Masatarō 澤柳政太郎 (1865–1927), a one-time Hitotsubashi University president who practiced Zen under Imakita Kōsen when he was a university student, speaks to Nyoidan’s practices vis-à-vis the university’s broader culture of “spiritual self-cultivation” (*seishinteki shūyō*):

As for the existence at our school of religious groups like Nyoidan, like Fukuda Sensei conveyed just now, they were a place of joy for me, too. This is not simply because I had a relationship [with it] because of having tried zazen; rather, I think it was the fact of everyone in the group recognizing those benefits and practicing (engaging in) self-cultivation (*shūyō* 修養) very fervently. This organization made our school’s “spiritual self-cultivation”

---

修養団体; Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 264); and alumnus Suga Reinosuke 菅禮之助 repeatedly calls Nyoidan a “self-cultivation organization” (“*shūyō kikan* 修養機関”; Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 256–257).

<sup>100</sup> See Nyoidan’s “Group History” (“*Danshi* 團史”) in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 35–54. As discussed in chapter 3, prominent economists and businesspeople were among Nyoidan’s alumni.

(“*seishinteki shūyō* 精神的修養”) the center of its activity, so the beneficial aspects were not just limited to the group members— [rather] I believe that with its influence exerted [in places] outside of the organization, there were extremely great benefits, and this truly brings me joy.<sup>101</sup>

Here, Sawayanagi is not only speaking as a university administrator promoting “spiritual self-cultivation” in line with one of the school’s, and state’s, central missions of the era; he is also speaking as Zen practitioner. He is clear in his convictions that the benefits of this particular form of *shūyō* (that is, *zazen*) reverberate far beyond the group itself, echoing others’ sentiment (and the Confucian notion) that through individuals’ personal cultivation, society will flourish. The group’s unified, “fervent” practice, moreover, strengthens such benefits.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Sawayanagi discusses *shūyō* when musing about his early Zen practice: “Some way or another, I passed through five or six *kōan*, but looking back, the degree to which this was *shūyō*, and the degree to which I had truly understood Zen, is unclear.”<sup>102</sup> Here, he seems to distinguish between the self-cultivation dimension of Zen practice and “true” Zen understanding; he insinuates that *shūyō* (e.g., simply doing *zazen* without Zen-style enlightenment or realization) is lower on a practice hierarchy than, and somehow qualitatively different from, Zen practice springing from an enlightenment mind. On the other hand, referring to the three core dimensions of Buddhist practice—that is, morality, meditation, and wisdom—Sawayanagi suggests that

---

<sup>101</sup> From “Young People and Zen (*Seinen to zen* 青年と禪),” in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 321. This was a lecture given by Sawayanagi; the volume does not mention the lecture’s original date.

<sup>102</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 322.

Zen practice is skewed, given its emphasis on “*furyū moji* 不立文字” (“not relying on words and letters”); and that only through realizing morality, meditation, and wisdom, a person’s “*shūyō*,” or self-cultivation, is “complete.”<sup>103</sup> This suggests that for Sawayanagi, “*shūyō*” can also be an umbrella term encompassing all dimensions of a “complete” spiritual practice.

#### 5.3.4.2 Practitioners’ Accounts

Above, we focused on accounts that express the “top-down” messages that students at Tokyo Higher Commercial School received with regard to Zen as *shūyō*, *shūyō* as a means of contributing to the Japanese nation, and the proliferation of *shūyō* organizations at the university. What, then, of the students and other practitioners themselves? As explored below, the practitioners’ stances toward *shūyō* varied considerably: some echoed administrators in drawing connections (albeit vague) between patriotic zeal and school spirit, and between school spirit and *shūyō*; while others spoke more in more personal terms—e.g., experimenting with different forms of *shūyō* (e.g., Okada-style quiet sitting or Fujita Reisai’s breathing practices, both mentioned above) before landing on Zen (as a different form of *shūyō*). An example of the latter is Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎 (1884–1934; discussed in chapter 4), whose interest in personal cultivation practices gave rise to, and laid the groundwork for, Zen practice.

Suga Reinosuke 菅禮之助, who graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1905, was one of Nyoidan’s earliest members. For Suga, the historical context

---

<sup>103</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 322.

was indelibly connected to Nyoidan's founding. He launches his account by pointing out that for his contemporaries and himself, the Sino-Japanese War (from 1894–1895) took place when they were in elementary school and the Boxer Rebellion (from 1899–1901) took place when they were in middle school. By that point, “the Japanese people’s pride was sufficient; and on top of that, ...when encountering the success of the Russo-Japanese War, [the Japanese people] were ecstatic, rejoiced, self-reflected, and roused [themselves].”<sup>104</sup> Suga suggests that part of the postwar “rousing” (*funki* 奮起) was the creation of self-cultivation organizations at universities, akin to Nyoidan's creation at the Tokyo Higher Commercial School. In a sense, Suga states, universities were microcosms of the “nation” (*kokka* 国家), and “love of one’s school” (*aikō*) was absolute and unconditional.<sup>105</sup> As mentioned in chapter 3, Nyoidan alumnus Shimada Hiroshi 島田宏 (who graduated in 1908) also speaks in terms of “ferocity” (*mōretsu*), connecting it to “igniting the flame of love for school and country” and fierce engagement in spiritual self-cultivation (*seishinteki shūyō* 精神的修養) and all other daily activities.<sup>106</sup> Referring to the establishment of self-cultivation organizations, Suga puts Nyoidan's emergence in context with what he calls “the rapid establishment of the various intellectual-type and ethical-type self-cultivation organizations” and “activities for building school spirit.”<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 236–237. Suga composed his account in 1931.

<sup>105</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 238.

<sup>106</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 256–257.

<sup>107</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 239. 「知識的・道德的な諸修養機関の急設」 and 「校風樹立運動」, respectively.

Notably, Suga also distinguishes between school-spirit building (“*kōfū no juritsu* 校風樹立”) and individual *shūyō* practice.<sup>108</sup>

Reflecting the broad array of self-cultivation practices that were accessible to and popular among people in modern Japan, alumnus Masumoto Yoshitarō 増本芳太郎 speaks of his interests in various other types of *shūyō*.<sup>109</sup> Like his classmates, Masumoto began Zen practice while a student at Tokyo Higher Commercial School, although (apparently) unlike many of his classmates, he had a wide-ranging interest in, and experimentation with, personal cultivation practices that ranged from Okada-style quiet sitting to Fujita’s “Method of Harmonizing the Breath and Mind,” alongside his Zen practice. His Zen practice as a university student was serious; as noted in chapter 4, he “suffered” with Hakuin’s “One Hand Clapping” *kōan* for more than one-and-a-half years and attended many *sesshin* at Kaizenji; he particularly notes the “ferocity” (*mōretsu* 猛烈) of Rōhatsu 臘八 *sesshin*.<sup>110</sup> Initially, Masumoto commuted to *sesshin*, and eventually he came to reside with fellow *sesshin* participants in the so-called “Strenuous Effort Dorm” (*Jikyōryō* 自疆寮) at Kaizenji.<sup>111</sup> This room had formerly served as the *inryō* 隱寮 (inner quarters, usually reserved for the abbot or retired abbot) and was named

---

<sup>108</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 245.

<sup>109</sup> “Memories of Kaizenji” (“*Kaizenji no omoide* 海禪寺の思ひ出”) in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 273–275. Masumoto graduated in 1912.

<sup>110</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 273. As mentioned in chapter 4, *Rōhatsu sesshin* commemorates the Buddha’s enlightenment. In most monasteries and lay-centered practice contexts, *Rōhatsu sesshin* is particularly rigorous: for example, sometimes participants are required to abstain from sleeping for the entire duration.

<sup>111</sup> See photograph in Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 123.



“Strenuous Effort Dorm” by Shinjō Rōshi, expressing the fierce effort characterizing ideal practice.

Signaling his orientation toward physical practices, Masumoto’s account is particularly laden with notes of the physical elements of sitting. For example, he focuses on the physical body (*nikutai* 肉体), muscles (*kinniku* 筋肉), and lower belly (*kafuku* 下腹) in his descriptions of zazen more than most of his Rinzai-practicing contemporaries.<sup>112</sup> During university, Masumoto eventually moved from Kaizenji to a Tokyo-area YMCA boarding house, where he lived with a fellow, fervently-practicing Zen practitioner; he suggests that his roommate Nakamura Kyūji engaged in the Okada-style quiet sitting that was “trending” (*ryūkō*) at the time, and that Nakamura’s belly—having been trained in zazen (which also involved placing power in the lower belly)—“distended as if in the shape of a praying mantis.”<sup>113</sup> Seven years after graduating from university, in 1919, Masumoto speaks of his experiences engaging in the “Way of Harmony,” or “*chōwahō* 調和法”: shorthand for the breath-based personal cultivation practice aiming to harmonize breath and mind that Fujita Reisai 藤田靈齋 (1868–1957) had introduced circa 1908.<sup>114</sup> Although Masumoto notes that he had been sturdy (*jōbu* 丈

---

<sup>112</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 274. Compared to those in the Rinzai school of Zen, practitioners in the Sōtō school more strongly emphasize physical forms of practice.

<sup>113</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 275. It is not clear from Masumoto’s description whether he, too, practiced this form of quiet sitting alongside Nakamura. For more on Okada’s form of breathing practices, see especially Kurita, “Shinshū sōryo,” and Wu, “Straighten the Back to Sit.” Note that Masumoto’s description of Okada-style breathing practice resembles Suzuki’s description in “A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting.”

<sup>114</sup> Masumoto Yoshitarō 増本芳太郎, “*Yo ga chōwahō ni taisuru kansō* 余が調和法に対する感想,” *Yōshin* 養眞, no. 98 (1919), 37–44. For more background on neurasthenia, see Wu, “A

夫) and healthy during his younger years, he developed neurasthenia (his “most despised illness”). This condition led him to Fujita’s practice, through which he successfully recovered, “completely attaining the moral character of his health” in the process.<sup>115</sup> In Masumoto’s trajectory, then, Zen practice was one form of *shūyō* among multiple forms; to some degree, he sought out different forms for different purposes, but one unifying factor undergirding his experience with zazen and the other practices was his orientation toward the physical dimension.<sup>116</sup>

### 5.3.5 Rinzai Zen Teachers and *Shūyō*

Thus far, this chapter examined the top-down messages that student lay Zen practitioners received at Tokyo Higher Commercial School, which prescribed *shūyō* for the sake of Japanese society and promoted *shūyō* organizations of many forms, including

---

Disorder of Qi.” For more background on Fujita Reisai and his unique, pioneering self-cultivation practice, see especially Kurita Hidehiko 栗田英彦, “Fukushiki kokyū no kindai: Fujitashiki sokushin chōwadō o jirei toshite 腹式呼吸の近代—藤田式息心調和法を事例として,” *Ronshū* 論集 43 (2016), 1–24. Fujita’s method is known primarily as the “Way of Harmonizing the Breath and Mind” (*sokushin chōwa hō* 息心調和法).

<sup>115</sup> Masumoto, “*Yo ga chōwahō*,” 37–39 (「健康の徳性を完全に得て」). Interestingly, in his discussion of *shūyō*, Masumoto hardly references Zen, other than citing a *kōan* from the *Mumonkan* to illustrate a *shūyō* teacher’s teaching on the “Great Death” (Masumoto, “*Yo ga chōwahō*,” 41). There, he quotes: “Hanging from a cliff, let go” (“*kengai ni te o tessuru* 懸崖に手を徹する”); this comes from *Mumonkan*, Case 32, “An Outsider Questions the Buddha.” This translation is from J.C. Cleary in *Linji* (Rinzai), Wumen Huikai, and Seng-can, *Three Chan Classics: The Recorded Sayings of Linji, Wumen’s Gate, and the Faith Mind Maxim*, translated by J. C. Cleary and Yoshida Osamu (Berkeley Calif.: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1999), 96–97.

<sup>116</sup> We must not, however, discount the possibility that Masumoto’s later experiences with *shūyō* practices such as Fujita Reisai’s techniques colored his narration of his early Zen experiences (circa 1908–1912), as he presumably composed his account in Nyoidan’s twenty-fifth anniversary commemorative history in or around 1931.

but not limited to Zen; and I considered some ways in which “*shūyō*” played into lay practitioners’ lives and concerns—some, like Suga, spoke of “*shūyō*” more from the organizational standpoint (echoing administrators and emphasizing the ways in which “*shūyō*” can benefit the group), and others, like Masumoto and Shimokawa, spoke of “*shūyō*” more from the standpoint of individual practice (e.g., expressing the intersections of Zen with other forms of *shūyō*, or showing how interest in *shūyō* laid the groundwork for Zen practice in a more traditional sense, replete with long-term *kōan* practice). What, then, did Rinzai teachers say about Zen’s relationship to “*shūyō*,” and how did *shūyō*—if at all—play into the ideals that Rinzai teachers were promoting?

In terms of the degree to which Rinzai masters embraced the notion and practice(s) of *shūyō*, there was a significant range. On one end of the spectrum were those who did not speak at all in terms of *shūyō* (I am not examining them here); in the middle of the spectrum, there were the masters of Nyōidan’s members, including Shaku Sōen, Sakagami Shinjō, and Furukawa Gyōdō, each of whom addressed *shūyō* in some fashion, although it did not take a central place in their teachings and, in some cases, was distinguished from “*sanzen* 参禅” in the all-encompassing “Zen practice” sense; and on the other end of the spectrum was Rinzai master Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹 (Daitetsu Dōrin 大徹道廓; 1828–1911), the one-time abbot of Nanzenji who advocated Daoist-inflected meditation practices to the laypeople who practiced under him—for health and other benefits—alongside more “conventional” Rinzai practices of *sesshin* and listening to *teishō*. In this section, I will highlight teachings from Sōen, Shinjō, and Furukawa that

express their views on the relationship between *shūyō* and Zen, and explore Katsumine's teachings in greater detail, given the centrality of *shūyō* in his practice and thought.

For Rinzai masters Sakagami Shinjō (1842–1914), Shaku Sōen (1860–1919), and Furukawa Gyōdō (1872–1961), speaking in the language of “*shūyō*” served as a type of “skillful means”: that is, adapting their teaching methods and language according to audience and era so that their students may most effectively receive and internalize the teaching. Together, they expressed various stances on “*shūyō*.” Of these three, Shinjō had the broadest message for Nyōidan students in his approach to “spiritual self-cultivation” and its application to daily life.<sup>117</sup> For example, he characterizes practices of “spiritual self-cultivation” (*seishin shūyō* 精神修養) as “simple” (*kantan* 簡単), and he advocates extending this simple practice—Zen-style, of course—to life's more “complicated matters” (*fukuzatsuna mono* 複雑な物): “What I am always thinking about is this: how we can possibly do simple spiritual self-cultivation, and then, through that pure thought [that you] attained, apply it to complicated matters, and after simplifying that complicated reality, you must jump into all matters in this way.”<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> It should also be noted that the views expressed by Shinjō in Nyōidan's twenty-fifth anniversary commemorative history (published in 1931) were articulated much earlier than 1931. Shinjō's teachings that appear in this commemorative history (published as “Night Talks at the Not-Two Hermitage,” or “*Fuji'an yawa* 不二庵夜話,” in Hitotsubashi Nyōidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 2–16) were originally published in a special issue of *Zendō* that was dedicated to Shinjō after his sudden death in 1914; see *Zendō*, no. 47 (June 1914), 48–69.

<sup>118</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyōidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 5. 「俺は常に思うて居るのは、一体我々は簡単な精神修養を為して、夫れで得た単純な思想を以て、複雑なる物に当り、其の複雑したる事実を単純化して後、凡べて其の事物をはねばならないと考へてをる。」

Furukawa Gyōdō—who, as one of Shinjō’s successors as (longtime) Nyoidan leader, wrote much later than Shinjō—is more direct than Shinjō both in identifying traditional forms of Zen practice as “*shūyō*” and connecting such “*shūyō*” to patriotic missions.<sup>119</sup> Although *Tetsu nyoi*’s target audience is ostensibly Nyoidan alumni, Furukawa seems to be addressing a general audience in his explanatory article on *zazen* with his simple definitions of Zen practice, *zazen*, *kōan* work, *kenshō* 見性, and so forth.<sup>120</sup> Here, Furukawa envisions “self-cultivation” (*shūyō* 修養) in conventional Zen practice terms, employing it where the term “*shūgyō* 修行” (training) might ordinarily be used. For example, he speaks of “post-enlightenment cultivation” (“*gogo no shūyō* 悟後の修養”)—more typically expressed as “post-enlightenment training” (“*gogo shūgyō* 悟後修行”) in conventional Zen texts—as being more important than “gaining an initial glimpse into one’s nature (*kenshō no me o ete* 見性の眼を得て).”<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> Furukawa’s words quoted here are from an article, “Zazen 坐禪,” that appears to have been composed expressly for Nyoidan’s commemorative history, published in 1931. See Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 27–29.

<sup>120</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 27–29.

<sup>121</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 28. Iizuka also occasionally substitutes “*shūyō*” for “*shūgyō*,” in the context of post-enlightenment practice (“*gogo shūyō* 悟後修養”; Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 24). In this context, Iizuka is referring to the intensive practice undertaken by Rinzai master and Myōshinji founder, Musō Daishi 無相大師 (Kanzan Egen 關山慧玄; 1266–1360) for the decade after he received *inka* at the age of 53; during this decade, according to Iizuka, Musō Daishi raised cattle for the sake of his post-enlightenment practice (悟後修養). As another example of Zen masters who view “*shūyō*” as encompassing “traditional” Zen practice and may see Zen-style practice as one type (among many) of *shūyō*, master Harada Sogaku launches a two-part series of articles on *sesshin* by asserting: “Among [types of] *shūyō*, there is nothing like *sesshin* (*shūyō ni ha, sesshinkai ni gotoku mono ha nai* 修養には、摂心会に如くものはない);” see *Daijō Zen*, vol. 7, no. 1 (January 1930), 2.

Furukawa then affirms the connection between Zen-as-self-cultivation and nation when he states that the ultimate purpose of Zen-style self-cultivation is to extinguish the ego (which is a conventional teaching) for the sake of one's nation (which is a contemporary concern): "Zen self-cultivation is extinguishing the small self—that is, the ego—and devoting oneself entirely to the large Self—that is, for the sake of society and the nation. That is Zen."<sup>122</sup> Here, he invokes the rhetoric of self-sacrifice that had become cultural orthodoxy in interwar Japan.

Shaku Sōen, on the other hand, suggests that "*shūyō*" is distinct from "traditional" Zen practice. One glimpse into Sōen's views on *shūyō* comes from "A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting" ("*Seiza no susume* 静坐のすすめ"), authored by Suzuki but based on Sōen's ideas.<sup>123</sup> As described in the last chapter, Suzuki's (and Sōen's) purpose in this short essay is to encourage character cultivation; to cultivate the concrete, "outward form of the practice"; and to attain "greater peace of mind." At the same time, however, Suzuki upholds what for him represents the ultimate end-goal of practice (discussed earlier in this chapter): to "penetrate to the 'true original face' of religion." In other words, Suzuki (and Sōen) is promoting character cultivation to save the depraved youth (*seinen* 青年) of the day, but he is hopeful that this may prepare the ground for greater "religious insight."<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 29. 「禅の修養は小我即ち己を盡す、而して大我即ち社会国家の為に没頭するのである。之が禅の本分である。」

<sup>123</sup> See Jaffe's introduction to Suzuki, "A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting," in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 1.

<sup>124</sup> Suzuki, "A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting," 8–10.

Another clue to Sōen's approach to the benefits of self-cultivation practice is found in Sōen's *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot* (1906).<sup>125</sup> Here, Sōen discusses the *samatha*, or tranquility, dimension of *dhyāna* (which Sōen equates here with *zazen*) and highlights the benefits of such practice on practical, spiritual, and moral levels. For example, speaking to the “overstretched nervous system” of the modern person, Sōen suggests that *zazen* counteracts the harm that this causes:

*Dhyāna* is physiologically the accumulation of nervous energy; it is a sort of spiritual storage battery in which an enormous amount of latent force is sealed—a force which will, whenever demand is made, manifest itself with tremendous potency. A mind trained in *dhyāna* will never waste its energy, causing its ultimate exhaustion.<sup>126</sup>

In other publications, Sōen promotes *shūyō* in specific contexts, such as for members of the military (*gunjin* 軍人) and for the purpose of moral education, (*tokuiku* 徳育).<sup>127</sup> In this vein, Sōen published *Shūyō no shiori* 修養の枝折 in Manchuria in 1913; this appears to be his only monograph focused on *shūyō*.<sup>128</sup> In this work, he emphasizes

---

<sup>125</sup> Shaku Soyen (Shaku Sōen), *Zen for Americans*, translated by Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1913), 152. This was originally published as *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot: Addresses on Religious Subjects* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1906).

<sup>126</sup> This is quoted in Suzuki Daisetz Teitarō, “The Zen Sect of Buddhism,” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society: 1906–1907*, ed. by T. W. Rhys Davids, London: Oxford University Press, 1907, 37–38.

<sup>127</sup> See, for example, Shaku Sōen 釋宗演, vol. 1 of *Shaku Sōen zenshū* 釋宗演全集, edited by Matsuda Takenoshimabito 松田竹の嶋人 (Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1929), 45–52 (section entitled “Self-Cultivation for Soldiers,” or “*Gunjin no shūyō* 軍人の修養”), and 174–179 (section entitled “Self-Cultivation for Moral Education,” or “*Tokuiku no shūyō* 徳育の修養”).

<sup>128</sup> Shaku Sōen 釈宗演, *Shūyō no shiori* 修養の枝折 (Minamimanshū Tetsudō Shomuka 南満洲鉄道庶務課, 1913). The book, which was “not for sale,” was published in Manchuria by the South Manchuria Railway Company (南満洲鉄道株式会社). This work primarily comprises talks that Sōen gave in Manchuria; it also includes a forward by the chairman of the company

traditional Rinzai content far less prominently than in almost all of his other works, though mentions of Rinzai Zen were not entirely absent. This suggests that Sōen may have emphasized the concept of “*shūyō*” for different audiences than for those who already practiced Zen.

#### 5.3.5.1 Katsumine Daitetsu’s *Shūyō*

As mentioned previously, Rinzai master Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹 (1828–1911) was a contemporary of Imakita Kōsen and fellow trailblazer in teaching modern Japanese laity. Katsumine’s embrace of Daoist-tinged *shūyō* in his teaching matched the modern Japanese public’s appetite for *shūyō*, while also reflecting the complementarity of Rinzai Zen and such personal cultivation practices since the time of Hakuin Ekaku 白隠慧鶴 (1686–1769). These attributes, in conjunction with Katsumine’s role founding Kōzen Gokokukai (one of the Tokyo area’s earliest lay Zen groups, discussed in chapter 2), make Katsumine a significant figure in modern lay Rinzai Zen.<sup>129</sup>

According to remembrances of Katsumine published in the journals *Seikō* and *Zendō* shortly after his death in 1911, “Demon Daitetsu” (Oni Daitetsu 鬼大徹) was a

---

(*sōsai* 総裁), Nakamura Yoshikoto 中村是公 (1867–1927), as well as “A Monk’s Diary in Manchuria and Korea” (“*Mankan unsui nikki* 滿韓雲水日記”) by Sōen’s dharma heir, Shaku Daibi 釈大眉 (1882–1964).

<sup>129</sup> It is worth noting that Katsumine does not frequently use the term “*shūyō*” per se. However, what he describes in terms of the health and other benefits of doing *naikanhō*—alongside his emphasis on the physical body—is clearly in line with *shūyō* movements of the era.



force of nature in the Meiji Zen world.<sup>130</sup> He was a fierce yet unassuming figure, dedicated to protecting the dharma (and his Ise-area temple) during the material destruction of temples in the early Meiji period. He was thoroughly of the Rinzai establishment—at the peak of his fame, he was chief of the Nanzenji branch of Rinzai Zen—yet a man of his times. His teachings reflect the popularization of self-cultivation practices during his lifetime, as well as his abiding interest in teaching lay practitioners, particularly in the last two decades of his life.<sup>131</sup> Unlike Imakita, Katsumine taught laypeople in smaller parish temples, rather than on the grounds of a major monastic training hall.<sup>132</sup> According to one obituary, it was precisely during Katsumine’s time

---

<sup>130</sup> Sources for Katsumine’s biographical information include the following: Kōzen Gokokukai, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi*, 2002; Kōzen Gokokukai 興禅護国会, *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi* 興禅護国会史 (Tokyo: Kōzen Gokokukai, 1992); ZGDJ, s.v. “Katsumine Dōrin 勝峰道林”; “Daitetsu Dōrin (大徹道林),” in Kishida Kinuo 岸田絹夫, ed., *Hōmyaku: Gendai Zenshō retsuden* 法脈：現代禅匠列伝 (Kyoto: Chūgai Nippōsha, 1973), 432–434; archival materials compiled by a former abbot of Katsumine’s home temple, Kongōshōshi 金剛證寺 (Kongōshōji 金剛證寺, vol. 5 of *Kongōshōji oyobi sannai jiin sedai* 金剛證寺及山内寺院世代, n.d.); Enomoto, “*Meiji Zenkai iketsu*”; and Katsumine Seikan, “*Daitetsu Rōshi jireki*.” Some of these sources conflict with regard to dates and even names (e.g., there is even inconsistency with regard to the master from whom Katsumine received *inka*). When in doubt, I follow the Kongōshōji archival documents.

<sup>131</sup> Katsumine’s extant works demonstrate the gamut of his teaching range. For example, in *Naikanhō* (1908) and *Zen to chōjuhō* 禅と長寿法 (*Zen and the Way of Longevity*), he integrates *zazen* and Daoist-tinged self-cultivation practices; see Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹, *Zen to chōjuhō* 禅と長寿法 (Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1907). On the other hand, he also offers more “traditional” Zen-style lectures on classical texts, as per his lectures on the *Record of Rinzai*; see Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹 and Linji Yixuan, *Rinzairoku kōgi* 臨濟錄講義 (Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1909).

<sup>132</sup> In 1890, Katsumine retired from Nanzenji and continued living in the Ise area, teaching laypeople. He moved to Tokyo in 1892, becoming head priest (*jūshoku* 住職) of Kō’onji 廣園寺 in Hachioji; while at Kō’onji, he restored the temple’s finances and taught lay practitioners. Then in 1893 at the age of 66, he founded Kōzen Gokokukai; the group first met in central Tokyo at Kōtokuji 廣徳寺. He retired to Mugean 無礙庵 in Dōzaka, Tokyo, in 1900, but seems to have continued teaching actively. At the end of the Meiji era, on February 16, 1911, he passed away at the age of 84.

teaching in the Tokyo area that Zen began to boom. According to one obituary, in 1891, Katsumine still lamented the lack of “Zen style” (*zenpū* 禅風) in Tokyo; but from the time that he founded Kōzen Gokokukai (c. 1893), interest in Zen and membership increased markedly, drawing famous figures like Ōishi Masami, Kōno Hironaka, and Hosokawa Junjirō. According to this account, Zen started to boom between 1892 and 1911 (when Katsumine died), and the number of Kōzen Gokokukai participants during this period reached “one thousand and some hundreds.”<sup>133</sup>

Katsumine’s books on various topics related to *shūyō* were published after the Russo-Japanese War, in the last decade of his life.<sup>134</sup> *Naikanhō* in particular—in which Katsumine promotes the Way of Introspective Meditation (*naikanhō* 内観法) to meditation novices and seasoned Zen practitioners alike—was a meditation manual for his era. It is emblematic of late Meiji and Taishō Japan’s “*shūyō* boom,” exemplifying the general public’s burgeoning interest in *shūyō* for the purpose of health and worldly success.<sup>135</sup> Katsumine first instructs beginners in establishing a solid basis of breath-counting meditation, or *sūsokukan* 數息觀, before proceeding to Introspective Meditation.

---

<sup>133</sup> Enomoto, *Meiji Zenkai iketsu*, 9. This obituary—and other sources—names several famous individuals as being among Katsumine’s students. These famous *koji* included the following: Ōishi Masami 大石正己 (1855–1935), Kōno Hironaka 河野廣中 (1849–1923), Hosokawa Junjirō 細川潤次郎 (1834–1923), and Nakae Chōmin 中江兆民 (1847–1901; Enomoto, *Meiji Zenkai iketsu*, 9–10).

<sup>134</sup> See especially Katsumine, *Naikanhō*, and Katsumine, *Zen to chōjuhō*. Both of these works appear to have been compendia of Katsumine’s talks.

<sup>135</sup> I am relying on Norman Waddell’s translations of *naikan* and other terms that appear both in Katsumine’s *Naikanhō* and Hakuin’s *Yasenkanna*. See Hakuin Ekaku, “Hakuin’s Yasenkanna,” translated by Norman Waddell, *The Eastern Buddhist*, vol. 34, no. 1 (2002), 79–119; and Hakuin 白隠, *Yasenkanna* 夜船閑話, edited by Yoshizawa Katsuhiko 芳澤勝弘 (Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo, 2000).

The purpose here is learning to place one's "power" (chikara 力) and mind (kokoro 心) in the lower abdomen (tanden 丹田): a cornerstone of practicing Introspective Meditation and of health itself.<sup>136</sup>

Here, Katsumine primarily emphasizes "*seishinteki yōjō* 精神的養生" (spiritual nourishing of life) and on the myriad physical and mental benefits that Introspective Meditation practitioners can attain through assiduous practice. He lists many ailments: diseases of the brain and lungs, insomnia, perpetual anxiety, weak character, and neurasthenia (*shinkei suijaku* 神經衰弱).<sup>137</sup> According to Katsumine, such ailments are caused by imbalance of the body's elemental properties (fire and water) and stagnation of "vital energy" (*genki* 元氣). Through Introspective Meditation, practitioners learn to circulate their vital energy, bring "fire" energy downward, and restore bodily balance, thereby transforming their characters, recovering their physical and mental health, and even achieving longevity.

Katsumine's own practice of Introspective Meditation began early, at the age of thirteen, paired indelibly with traditional Rinzai training. His first master Renkei-oshō 聯溪 introduced Katsumine to the practice of Introspective Meditation (*naikanhō* 内観法); and according to his own account, Katsumine did not miss a day of practice in the

---

<sup>136</sup> For a discussion of the centuries-long importance of the *hara* 腹 (abdomen) in traditional Japanese medicine, as well as ways in which hara-centered practices were modernized in the late Meiji, Taishō, and early Shōwa periods, see especially Wu, "Straighten the Back to Sit," 453–459.

<sup>137</sup> Wu demonstrates how neurasthenia (*shinkei suijaku* 神經衰弱) became especially prevalent in modern Japan (Yu-Chuan Wu, "A Disorder of Ki: Alternative Treatments for Neurasthenia in Japan, 1890–1945," Ph.D. dissertation, University College London, 2012).

ensuing nearly-seventy years.<sup>138</sup> This practice—which could be considered a variety of Daoist-inflected Zen (or even Zen-inflected Daoism)—is centered on physical practices and health. Such practices might seem at odds with Japanese monastic Zen were it not for Hakuin’s influence on Rinzai monastics (and the public at large) for two centuries and the precedent that Hakuin set with his interest in these practices. In other words, these two threads (“traditional” Rinzai Zen or Linji Chan training methods and Daoist-inflected meditation practices) have co-existed in Rinzai monasteries to some degree since the time of Hakuin.

In *Naikanhō*, Katsumine borrowed liberally from Hakuin’s *Yasenkanna* in terms of both rhetoric and content, echoing Hakuin nearly verbatim.<sup>139</sup> *Yasenkanna* (Idle Talk on a Night Boat) recounts Hakuin’s own struggles with “Zen sickness” (*zenbyō* 禅病), his ostensible visit to an old hermit in the Kyoto-area mountains, Hakuyū-shi 白幽子, and Hakuyū’s instructions in Introspective Meditation (*naikan*): that is, the way for Hakuin to

---

<sup>138</sup> At age eight, Katsumine became a novice monk under Renkei-oshō 聯溪 at Kongōshō-ji 金剛證寺 in Ise, undergoing ordination (*tokudo* 得度) at age fifteen. He trained under Renkei-oshō until age eighteen, spending ten years there “breathing mist and eating fog” (Enomoto, *Meiji Zenkai iketsu*, 7).

<sup>139</sup> I am emphasizing the significant similarities here between *Naikanhō* and *Yasenkanna*, although it is worth noting that *Naikanhō* diverged from *Yasenkanna* in terms of intended audience (e.g., Katsumine aimed at beginners, whereas *Yasenkanna* appears to have been aimed at more seasoned practitioners). Other differences between the two works include, first, *Naikanhō*’s inclusion of certain context-specific allusions (e.g., Katsumine’s allusions to modern conditions like *shinkei suijaku* or to localized religious practices specific to his hometown of Ise), and, secondly, Katsumine’s drawing freely from the various traditions without defending the boundaries of Zen versus other traditions (in contrast to Hakuyū’s active insistence in *Yasenkanna* that he is not a “Daoist”).

cure his meditation sickness.<sup>140</sup> Through the figure of Hakuyū (whose historicity has long been challenged by scholars), Hakuin weaves together Daoist practices of internal alchemy, Chinese medical explanations, Buddhist principles, and Confucian understandings of the relationship between individual self-cultivation and a healthy nation. Grounded in numerous classical Buddhist texts, yet diverging from them, *Yasenkanna* seems to have been a “bestseller” in its time and, moreover, its teachings have been integrated into standard practices in many Rinzai Zen temples to this day.<sup>141</sup> Given Hakuin’s status within monastic Rinzai and popular Zen, his personal and pedagogical use of Daoist-inflected practices likely legitimized these practices in the Rinzai Zen context and serve as a significant connection between the *shūyō* and traditional Rinzai dimensions of Katsumine’s Zen.

#### **5.4 “The Unity of Sword and Zen”: The Role of Kendō in Modern Lay Rinzai**

What, then, of the many laypeople who came to Zen practice through their university *kendō* club (*kendōbu* 剣道部)? To what degree did the battlefield ethos articulated (and idealized) by numerous modern Zen masters and practitioners reflect a historical relationship between Japanese Rinzai Zen and martial arts, and how did it relate to the rising tides of Japanese militarism, nationalism, and imperialism? Moreover, how

---

<sup>140</sup> See Ahn, “Malady of Meditation,” for an examination of Hakuin’s “malady of meditation” and its roots in Buddhist scriptures and premodern Chinese Chan, particularly in the thought of Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089–1163).

<sup>141</sup> As mentioned earlier in the chapter, Yoshinaga Shin’ichi points out that there was a resurgence of popular interest in *Yasenkanna* in the 1910s (Yoshinaga, Introduction in Kurita et al., eds., *Kingendai Nihon*, 13).

did the relationship between Rinzai Zen and swordsmanship shape the development of lay Zen in modern Japan? As suggested elsewhere, there are myriad connections—rhetorical, material, and on the level of Rinzai Zen spiritual ethos—between modern lay Zen practitioners and the sword.

Although a thorough examination is beyond the scope of this dissertation, this section will provide historical context, identify the major strands and implications of this relationship, and present evidence from practitioners’ accounts that indicate that—regardless of whether the relationship between Zen and the sword was an “invented tradition” of modern Japan—it was a real, and physical, relationship for modern lay Zen practitioners. This included not only the early Meiji Rinzai Zen practitioners who were born into samurai families, but also many lay practitioners of late Meiji, Taishō, and early Shōwa Japan, and this relationship was embodied by the post-1928 Kojirin meditation hall (*zendō*) that was physically a *kendō* training hall (discussed in chapter 3).

#### **5.4.1 Historical and Religious Background**

In short, this relationship is complex: a motley mixture of historical precedent and contemporaneous need, of invented traditions and popular imagination, of rhetoric and visceral embodiment. For the sake of brevity, I will provide an overview of three layers of this relationship: first, the battle metaphors and rhetoric that has pervaded “traditional” Rinzai Zen (as used by historic teachers, as physically embodied through *kōan* practice, and so forth); second, modern Japan’s “*bushidō* boom” (and scholarship critiquing this as

an “invented tradition”); and third, Imperial-Way Zen, referring to Zen’s complicity with Japanese militarism in the decades leading up to and during the Fifteen Years War.<sup>142</sup>

#### 5.4.1.1 “Traditional” Rinzai and Warrior Zen

According to Trevor Leggett, Zen during the Kamakura period (1185–1333) “...was for those who might be called upon to die at any moment, and both teacher and pupils had to have tremendous spirit.”<sup>143</sup> Leggett—whose idealized narratives about Kamakura Zen (and “warrior Zen”) exemplify the *bushidō*-Zen rhetoric of the twentieth-century—summarizes the ethos as follows:

Kamakura Zen begins with “one word” and ends with absorption in “one Katzu!” Its main koan is the Katzu! and unless one could display Zen action at the turning point of life and death, he was not passed through. Sometimes a naked sword was at the center of the interview (in later centuries the sword was represented by a fan).<sup>144</sup>

In the modern period, however, it was far more common for Rinzai Zen practitioners—masters, students, and popularizers alike—to invoke Edo Rinzai master Takuan Sōhō 澤庵宗彭 (1573–1645) than Kamakura-era teachers. Although Takuan was eminent during his lifetime as abbot of Daitokuji, he was best known in modern Japan for swordmanship. As such, Takuan was a frequent subject of early twentieth-century articles in *Zendō* and *Daijōzen*, often discussed in connection to the military realm.<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> Ives extended the term “Imperial-Way Buddhism” (*Kōdō Bukkyō* 皇道仏教) to Zen (Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen*).

<sup>143</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 19.

<sup>144</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 18.

<sup>145</sup> Regarding the popularity of writings about Takuan and his connection to the military realm, see, for example, Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助, “Takuan Oshō to Shōgun Iemitsu 澤庵和尚と将軍家光,” *Zendō*, no. 8 (March 1911), 26–31.

#### 5.4.1.2 Modern Japan's *Bushidō* Boom

Instigators of the “*bushidō* boom” in late Meiji and Taishō Japan (e.g., Nitobe Inazō)—and others attempting to define what is inherent to the Japanese “spirit” and culture (e.g., D. T. Suzuki)—have suggested that the relationship between Rinzai Zen and the sword in modern Japan is simply the continuation of a powerful relationship between Rinzai Zen and swordsmanship that has endured, unchanged, for centuries (e.g., as embodied by Takuan). Scholars such as Oleg Benesch and Yamada Shōji (discussed below) have established that this latter narrative—of an unchanging, strong relationship between Zen and the sword, or even that the “way of the sword” is inherently undergirded by Zen in the first place—is a myth that is closely related to historical developments. Such scholarship illuminates how *bushidō* 武士道, or “the way of the warrior,” and its relationship to Zen were, to a large extent, an “invented tradition” (and precursor to full-fledged *nihonjinron* rhetoric), newly prominent in modern Japan as an emblem of the Japanese nation and culture.

One component of this is cultural imperialism and *nihonjinron*, which Sharf defines as “a popular discursive enterprise devoted to the delineation and explication of the unique qualities of the Japanese, which invariably touts the cultural homogeneity as well as the moral and spiritual superiority of the Japanese vis-a-vis other peoples.”<sup>146</sup> In this context, teachers and thinkers such as Nitobe Inazō, Okakura Kakuzō, and D. T. Suzuki “argued that the roots of Japanese culture, Japanese spirituality, Japanese morality,

---

<sup>146</sup> Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism,” 34–35.



and Japanese aesthetics are all to be found in the Zen experience.”<sup>147</sup> Sharf also notes that Sōen’s “Western lectures on Buddhism also reveal an interest in a quintessential *nihonjinron* theme, the difference between ‘Oriental’ and ‘Occidental’ mentalities.”<sup>148</sup>

In particular, Oleg Benesch explores *bushidō* as a Meiji-era “invented tradition”: directly related to the new cultural orthodoxy discussed earlier in this chapter. He interrogates the relationships among Zen, samurai, *bushidō*, and other martial arts prior to, and during, Japan’s imperial period (1868–1945), and he explores different phases of the “*bushidō* boom.”<sup>149</sup> Benesch presents compelling evidence that modern Japanese intellectuals deliberately constructed and promoted narratives about Zen’s historic influence on *samurai*:

Like martial artists, Buddhists came to use bushido to establish a connection with patriotically sound “native” traditions. Meiji Buddhists often had their patriotism and devotion to the national cause called into question, and many came to rely on bushido to prove their “Japaneseness.”<sup>150</sup>

Benesch also illuminates the adjacent discourse pertaining to the ostensibly historical, and intimate, connection between Zen and martial arts (claimed, for example, by Eugen

---

<sup>147</sup> Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism,” 35. Sharf sees these ideas as being particularly conveyed through Nitobe Inazō’s *Bushidō*, published in 1900, and Okakura Kakuzō’s *Book of Tea*, published in 1906 (Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism,” 6). See especially Nitobe Inazō 新渡戸稲造, *Bushidō* 武士道, 7th ed. (Tokyo: Teimi Shuppansha, 1908), and Nitobe Inazō, *Bushidō: The Classic Portrait of Samurai Martial Culture* (New York: Tuttle Publishing, 2004).

<sup>148</sup> Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism,” 10.

<sup>149</sup> Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*. Here, Benesch examines the construction of “*bushidō*” ideology in the early Meiji period (Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*, 42–75), links the “early *bushidō* boom” to the first Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895; Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*, 76–110), and considers the “late *bushidō* boom” to last from the end of the Russo-Japanese War until 1914 (1905–1914; Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*, 111–149).

<sup>150</sup> Benesch, “Reconsidering Zen,” 11, 15–16.

Herrigel), though he acknowledges that this relationship is more complicated than the Zen-samurai narratives.<sup>151</sup>

On the one hand, Benesch directly challenges the *bushidō* discourse claims themselves, and the ways in which the Zen-bushido connection was widely espoused by a range of established Buddhist figures. On the other hand, his emphasis on the intellectual history dimension downplays the material dimension of the connections among Zen, *bushidō*, and martial arts and how, for example, such connections were embodied by the large number of Zen practitioners who also practiced *kendō*, and by Engakuji's Kojirin itself: the largest lay Rinzai Zen training hall in East Japan.<sup>152</sup>

With regard to D. T. Suzuki's role promoting the links among Zen, *bushidō*, and Japanese culture, we can see that he embraces such links not only in his later writings (e.g., in the 1930s and early 1940s)—the background of which was Japan's intensified nationalism—but also in his early writings. For example, he speaks of the connection

---

<sup>151</sup> Also see Yamada Shōji 山田奨治, *Shots in the Dark: Japan, Zen, and the West*, translated by Earl Hartman (Chicago and Kyoto: The University of Chicago Press and International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2009), 30–72; and Yamada Shōji 山田奨治, “The Myth of Zen in the Art of Archery,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 28, no. 1/2 (Spring 2001): 1–30. In these publications, Yamada shows that the intimate relationship depicted by Eugen Herrigel in *Zen in the Art of Archery*—which, in the postwar period, led to the widespread association in the postwar period between Japanese Zen and *kyūdō* 弓道 (archery)—arose in part because of translation issues between Herrigel and his Japanese *kyūdō* master, Kenzō Awa 阿波研造 (1880–1939). At the same time, Yamada acknowledges that “during the Zen boom from the Taishō period (1912–1926) through the beginning of the Shōwa period (1926–1988) there was a movement to explain archery using Zen terminology” (Yamada, *Shots in the Dark*, 44–45). For Herrigel's original work, see Eugen Herrigel, *Zen in the Art of Archery*, translated by R. F. C. Hull (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953).

<sup>152</sup> As discussed in chapter 3, after a fire took place in 1926 at Engakuji, destroying the lay practice hall, Saiin'an, a *kendō* master in the Yagyū School—many of whose disciples were members of the university student groups that practiced at Engakuji—donated his actual training hall to serve as the laypeople's meditation hall.

among Zen, *bushidō*, and Japanese culture as early as 1907.<sup>153</sup> When we consider critiques of the close links that D. T. Suzuki draws among Zen, *bushidō*, and Japanese culture, we should remember that Suzuki probably did zazen in the former *kendō* training hall at Engakuji (from 1928 onward), amidst a sea of other contemporaneous connections between Zen and *bushidō*.

#### 5.4.1.3 The Rinzai School and “Imperial-Way Zen”

One potent theme in recent scholarship on Japanese Zen—and a significant component of the historicization and de-mythologizing of Zen in the modern period—has been the relationship of twentieth-century Zen figures to nationalism, imperialism, and wartime violence.<sup>154</sup> In Christopher Ives’s 2009 work that was largely based on the critique of Ichikawa Hakugen 市川白弦 (1902–1986; a Rinzai priest, scholar, and activist), Ives seeks to explain twentieth-century Zen leaders’ complicity with Japanese imperialism, nationalism, and militarism—despite being ostensibly grounded in Buddhist values like compassion.<sup>155</sup> In short, Ives argues that *Kōdō Bukkyō* 皇道仏教 (Imperial-Way Buddhism) contributed actively to Japanese nation-building and imperialism, and

---

<sup>153</sup> See, for example, Suzuki, “The Zen Sect of Buddhism,” 34. Jaffe notes in his introduction to Suzuki’s essay, “Dōgen, Hakuin, Bankei: Three Types of Thought in Japanese Zen,” that during the war years, Suzuki primarily worked in two veins: the distinctiveness of Japanese spirituality and an intellectual history of Zen in China and Japan (Suzuki, *Selected Works of D. T. Suzuki*, 68–69).

<sup>154</sup> See particularly Sharf, “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism”; Victoria, *Zen at War*; Victoria, *Zen War Stories*; and Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen*.

<sup>155</sup> Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen*. Ives also asks in this book whether there are Buddhist values that could have prevented such complicity at that time, and could now provide grounds for Buddhist social reform; and he explores the ways in which postwar Zen leaders embarked on self-reflection and taken responsibility for wartime complicity (asking, for example, whether they have gone far enough to reflect and reform Zen so as to avoid repeating history).

that it entailed reshaping Buddhist practices and teachings to be congruent with imperial ideology. In Ives's account, the groundwork for Imperial-Way Buddhism (and Imperial-Way Zen) was laid in the Meiji period but developed most fully from early Shōwa onward. Countering Brian Victoria's assertion that Zen leaders' complicity with militarism spurred Japanese imperialism, Ives argues that Imperial-Way Zen was continuous with a traditional Buddhism-rulership relationship seen for centuries in Japan.

One key factor in the development of Imperial-Way Zen was that Buddhists sought to make Buddhism relevant in the modern era—combatting persecution, internal critique, and the threat of Christianity—by making itself “useful” (*goyō*) to the state: e.g., through becoming disseminators of state ideology. Factors conducive to the development of Imperial-Way Zen included: epistemological, metaphysical, sociological, and historical factors.<sup>156</sup>

In a sense, Ives's depiction of the state's top-down rhetoric about “Imperial Way Zen” resembles the top-down messages from the Tokyo Higher Commercial School as an institution (e.g., promoting a “school atmosphere” conducive to *shūyō* organizations and a means for students to contribute to the nation). Accordingly, it is crucial to consider not only this sort of top-down rhetoric but also what was happening on the ground.

---

<sup>156</sup> According to Ives's account, epistemological and metaphysical factors included the Zen (and, generally, the Mahāyāna Buddhist) emphasis on transcendence, which could lead to passivity vis-à-vis the state in a practical sense (Ives, *Imperial-Way Zen*, 79); *anjin shugi* 安心主義 (the doctrine of peace of mind), which entails cultivating “becoming one with things” (*narikiru* 成り切る) and acceptance, which can preclude social-historical critique or questioning; and *sokuhi* 即非 logic (that is, “the static and passive logic of ‘absolute negation is none other than absolute affirmation’”), which can also lead to ethical problems. Sociological-historical factors included, for example, Zen's conservative interpretation of karma and view of attachment, as well as the traditional Japanese emphasis on harmony and indebtedness.

Additionally, it is important to distinguish among different degrees and iterations of nationalism. For example, Alice Freeman points out a spectrum of nationalism expressed by leading Rinzai Zen figures, ranging from D.T. Suzuki's "cultural imperialism"—as expressed in his work, *Nihonteki reisei*—to Ōmori Sōgen's ultra-nationalism.<sup>157</sup>

In the context of the post-Russo-Japanese War surge of interest in *bushidō* and its development as an "invented tradition," Rinzai masters who were actively involved with teaching laity frequently participated in the rhetoric. For example, in 1911, a lecture given by Mineo Daikyū (discussed elsewhere in this dissertation; one-time Kōzen Gokokukai *shike*) was reprinted in *Zendō*; it was entitled "Teaching the Way of Zen (*Zendō no kyōka* 禅道の教化)."<sup>158</sup> Daikyū frames his talk by directly likening the "power of the Zen study and practice of the Kamakura-era warriors" to the late Meiji phenomenon of "gentlemen...and students endeavoring to practice Zen."<sup>159</sup> Daikyū

---

<sup>157</sup> Alice Freeman, "Zen Buddhism in Japan-US Relations, 1941–1973: The Politics of Culture from the Pacific War to the Vietnam War" (lecture, Duke University, April 4, 2019). Also see Freeman, "Zen Buddhism in Japan-US Relations," 30–54. It is also important to ascertain changes in individuals' stances and expressions over time, such as Asahina Sōgen's transformation from prewar nationalist zealot to postwar advocate of peace.

<sup>158</sup> *Zendō*, no. 8 (March 1911), 15–21. Mineo Daikyū trained at Engakuji for a total of fifteen years, under first Imakita and then Shaku Sōen; he was one of Imakita's dharma heirs (see, for example, the lineage chart in Ōmori 1996, 277). Daikyū ran a Rinzai monastic training hall for nearly three decades at Heirinji 平林寺, became chief abbot of the Myōshinji branch of Rinzai in his late seventies, and was one-time head of the Rinzai sect when—in mid-Meiji—the thirteen Rinzai schools were unified. He widely taught the laity; among other positions, he served as master of Kōzen Gokokukai and on the editorial board of *Zendōkai* (which published the journal *Zendō*). He was one of the main teachers of lay practitioner Shimokawa Yoshitarō, who was discussed earlier.

<sup>159</sup> *Zendō*, no. 8 (March 1911), 15. 「近時議員教育実業家等の一部の人士殊に第二の国民たるべき学生諸君が禅道修業に心懸くるやうになりたるは喜ぶべき現象であつて、恰も彼の鎌倉時代の武門武士が禅学修行の力を以て、政治に教育に殖産に工藝に活用した時代と彷彿してゐる。」

quotes extensively from classical Zen records such as the *Record of Bukkō* in order to illustrate the “courage” of Kamakura-era military commanders and warriors (“*bushō bushi* 武将武士”) who were also lay practitioners of Zen.<sup>160</sup>

Daikyū also alludes extensively to the “emperor’s virtue” (*teitoku* 帝徳) and discusses one mission of the Rinzai school: teaching those who dwell in Japan’s “new territories” (*shinryōdo* 新領土) that the monastic community firmly believes that in a land that is characterized by the notion that “Buddhist law is no other than imperial rule, and imperial rule is no other than Buddhist law,” the citizenry must rely on the “Great Way, which is no other than the Zen Way.”<sup>161</sup> In other words, Daikyū is equating imperial rule with not only Buddhist law (the dharma) but with the Zen Way. Thus, in Japan’s empire the colonized and colonizers alike are compelled to follow Zen, which—he suggests—brings tremendous benefit to all.

#### 5.4.2 *Kendō* as Motivation for Engakuji Practitioners: Accounts

Here, I discuss the specific connections between Engakuji members and leaders and the sword, the military, and nationalism. As recounted earlier in this chapter, *koji*-turned-ordained-master Tsuji Sōmei regularly invoked the “dharma combat” (*hossen* 法戦) involved in facing one’s master in *sanzen* 参禅.<sup>162</sup> Such battlefield metaphors went

---

<sup>160</sup> *Zendō*, no. 8 (March 1911), 16–18. 「当時の武将武士が勇猛精進」

<sup>161</sup> *Zendō*, no. 8 (March 1911), 20–21. 「今日差当たり新領土を教化するには、仏法即王法、王法即仏法なる天地の大道、即ち禅道に依らねばならぬと山僧は堅く信ずるのである。」

<sup>162</sup> Leggett, *Three Ages of Zen*, 1993, 101. Reflecting the Rinzai context as well as the socio-historical context, Leggett translates “*hossen*” as “spiritual warfare,” and Tsuji calls it “the most

beyond rhetorical expressions of ferocity, extending to physical connections among practitioners, swordsmanship, and the military. One of the most striking embodiments of this connection, of course, is the aforementioned Kojirin, whose rebirth from the ashes of the fire in 1926 meant that lay meditators at Engakuji now did zazen in a *kendō* training hall, a photo of the Yagyū School master who enabled the donation of the hall mounted on the wall to this day. As a separate example, Nyoidan’s diary also notes that a *sesshin* was held in in a *kendō* training hall) in 1930.<sup>163</sup> Finally, Shōzokukai member Nosaka Jinrō 野坂二郎 recounts that during the Pacific War, *koji* were called to battlefields, factories, or other sites to support the war effort, and during this period, Engakuji’s Kojirin served as facilities for the Japanese navy.<sup>164</sup>

Beyond these material connections between Zen practice and the Japanese empire, there was a discursive connection; for example, just as authors promoted “*shūyō*” as a means to strengthen the nation, others identified a link between Zen practice and broader social benefit. For example, authors of Nyoidan’s thirtieth anniversary history—which was published in 1937, at the height of Japan’s nationalism—take for granted a causal

---

important and solemn occasion in Zen training.” On the other hand, reflecting the term’s use in the Sōtō Zen context, Griffith Foulk defines it as “a metaphor for the exchange of ‘questions and answers’ 問答 between a Zen teacher and someone who tests or challenges his/her understanding of the Dharma” (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* entry for “法戰,” retrieved on March 24, 2019).

<sup>163</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 226. Here, the author particularly notes members’ zeal (“*nesshinsa* 熱心さ”) in their Zen practice.

<sup>164</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 18. As discussed in chapter 3, Gakushūin University’s Shōzokukai—another student group with close connections to Engakuji—was founded in 1950. For more information about Kojirin’s use as navy facilities, see Tamamura and Inoue, *Engakuji shi*, 757.

relationship between Japan's increased engagement abroad, fascism, and sense of social crisis, and conscientious young people's desire to cultivate, via Zen practice, readiness for action. In a section of Nyoidan's history entitled "Four Years on the Rise," the unnamed author attributes the notable growth in Nyoidan's membership to a variety of "incidents" abroad and to the development of fascism in Japan:

Alongside the Manchurian Incident of Shōwa 6 [1931] was the Shanghai Incident of Shōwa 7 [1932]; in the same year, the League of Blood Incident, the May 15 Incident, and others occurred in succession; Japan's rapidly rising fascist movement appeared before our eyes, making social conditions once again perilous, and making the conscientious young people [*kokoro aru seinen* 心ある青年] keenly aware of [how much] they are cultivating the ability to get things done. We could say that [the number of] our group members increased markedly from Shōwa 7–8 [1932–1933].<sup>165</sup>

Corresponding with such broad observations are individuals' recounting their own respective relationships between Zen and the sword. For many university students, this relationship was direct: entering Zen practice through *kendō*, often in order to improve one's *kendō* abilities. The first generation of Nyoidan practitioners included many such students. For example, Uhara Yoshitoyo 宇原義豊 (born in 1885 and graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1911) states that his "motivation for starting Zen practice" ("*Zen ni haitta dōki* 禅に入った動機") stemmed from various factors. However, he primarily entered Zen through *kendō*, which he practiced from middle

---

<sup>165</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1937, 24.



school; he was a student of Yamada Jirōkichi, as was his fellow Nyoidan member Shimada Hiroshi 島田宏 (who graduated in 1908).<sup>166</sup>

Other early Nyoidan members Tasaki Masayoshi 田崎仁義 (1880–1976; graduated in 1905) and his classmate Suga Reinosuke, discussed earlier in this chapter, also allude to the overlap between the *kendō* and Zen worlds. Tasaki started as a *kendō* practitioner, finding his way to Nyoidan and Engakuji, and eventually becoming a very “fervent” practitioner immersed in the “world of koan.”<sup>167</sup> Suga Reinosuke praises the “way of the sword” followed by the *kendō* club and his classmate, Tasaki, with whom he regularly practiced at Nyoidan events. Suga affirms *kendō* as a form of *shūyō*, and he contrasts Hitotsubashi’s *kendō* club with the *jūjutsu* 柔術 club; in the latter, Suga says, there was no “feeling of *shūyō*.”<sup>168</sup>

Saiindan’s members, too, refer to the plethora of *kendō* practitioners who found their way to Zen practice. Saiindan’s wartime generation included Shiragami Eizō 白上英三 (1921–2001; graduated from Waseda in 1946), who explains his affinity for Zen through his experiences with *kendō* and having grown up during the Fifteen Years War.<sup>169</sup> First, Shiragami recounts that he had learned *kendō* from his father—a *kendō* practitioner—from the time he was a young child, “seeking the wondrous realm of

---

<sup>166</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 261. See Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 256–257, for Shimada’s account of his involvement in *kendō*.

<sup>167</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 253–254.

<sup>168</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 243–244. *Jūjutsu* is a broad term that denotes several forms of Japanese martial arts, ranging from traditional techniques that samurai used in battle (employing weapons) to aikidō and karate as we know them today.

<sup>169</sup> This appears to be the same person as Shiragami Ikkuken 白上一空軒, who had various connections to the world of *kendō* and related publications.

Yamaoka Tesshū's unity of sword and Zen (*kenzen ichinyo* 剣禅一如).” Secondly, Shiragami feels that having grown up amidst war (since he was in elementary school), he had long sought to remain calm in the face of death or formidable enemies; for this reason, he says, he was strongly attracted to Zen practice—that is, “sitting alone, quietly, and feeling the *keisaku* on [his] back.”<sup>170</sup>

### **5.5 Lay Rinzai Zen and Gender: Shūyō, Martial Arts, and Japanese Masculinity**

On ferocity, masculinity, and Japaneseness in the Rinzai Zen training context, Victor Hori observes: “The Zen monastery has a reputation for fierce discipline. For those associated with it, it embodies the essence of Japanese manhood, fierce samurai loyalty, unswerving dedication, and strength of character.”<sup>171</sup> This image of Rinzai monasteries is both widespread and long-running, stemming from an assortment of related factors, and bearing implications for practitioners of all genders. Moreover, modern Rinzai Zen's ideals of masculinity were closely related to practitioners' various motivations that I have explored earlier in this chapter. Thus, in this section I present a brief overview of modern Rinzai Zen's construction of ideal masculinity, its religious and historical context, and examples of modern Zen teachers' gendered teachings that relate directly to *shūyō* and nation-building.

While Japan built its empire following the 1868 Meiji Restoration, Rinzai monastic leaders reformulated Zen for a new era. This meant shifting away from gender-

---

<sup>170</sup> Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, *Saiin*, 1967, 89–90.

<sup>171</sup> Hori, “Teaching and Learning,” 11.

normative monasticism toward practice that was ostensibly open to anyone. However, despite modern Rinzai Zen's increased accessibility to laypeople, including unprecedented numbers of women, its androcentrism ran deep. Modern masters still embraced a "rhetoric of heroism," and practitioners' main form of religious practice remained kōan practice, in which practitioners embodied the masculine ideals of heroism, ferocity, and determination so intimately associated with Zen patriarchs and other Buddhist exemplars.<sup>172</sup> Moreover, modern Rinzai Zen's ideals of masculinity converged with other trends: a broad-based Japanese interest in *shūyō* practices that were often gendered and tied to nation-building, and the masculinities promoted by *kendō* ("way of the sword") discipline and *bushidō* ("way of the warrior") rhetoric, both of which many lay Zen practitioners embraced (as discussed in the last section of this chapter). The primary sources highlighted below suggest that the ideals of masculinity pervading modern Rinzai Zen rhetoric and practice were distinctly compatible with modern Japan's masculine ideals. Therefore, at least for lay male practitioners, this was likely one component that drew them to practice Rinzai Zen and contributed to Rinzai Zen's popularization in the modern period.

### 5.5.1 Religious Context: Rinzai Zen and the "Great Manly Hero"

As discussed above, in line with the development of "Imperial-Way Zen"—namely, Zen leaders' complicity with the Japanese state's militant imperialism—early twentieth-century Rinzai leaders and practitioners frequently employed the language of

---

<sup>172</sup> For an examination of premodern Linji Chan's "rhetoric of heroism," see Levering, "Lin-Chi (Rinzai) Ch'an and Gender." This work is discussed in greater depth below.

heroism and warfare, both literal and metaphorical. Concerning Rinzai Zen’s “rhetoric of heroism,” Miriam Levering’s pioneering work on the male-centered ideals of Song-era Linji Chan (Rinzai Zen) and Kevin Buckelew’s in-depth genealogy of the concept both shed light on the heroic ideals of masculinity—embodied by the *dazhangfu* 大丈夫 (Jp. *daijōbu*), or “great man”—that continue to inflect modern Japanese Rinzai Zen practice with strongly gendered language and ideas.<sup>173</sup> Although scholars have extended Levering’s analysis to other East Asian contexts, masculinity in modern Japanese Buddhism (both lay and monastic) remains relatively understudied.<sup>174</sup>

Miriam Levering was the first scholar to interrogate premodern Chan’s ostensible gender equality by juxtaposing the “rhetoric of heroism” with the “rhetoric of equality” that pervades Buddhist texts. By “rhetoric of equality,” Levering refers to many Buddhists’ insistence that from the ultimate (enlightened) perspective, the gender binary is transcended and is, moreover, irrelevant: essentially, anyone can practice and become

---

<sup>173</sup> Levering, “Lin-Chi (Rinzai) Ch’an and Gender,” and Kevin Buckelew, “Inventing Chinese Buddhas: Identity, Authority, and Liberation in Song-Dynasty Chan Buddhism,” Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 2018. For illumination of the “great man” ideal and the “gender of Buddhahood” in Song-era Chan, see Buckelew, “Inventing Chinese Buddhas,” 242–258.

<sup>174</sup> For an examination of the “rhetoric of heroism” in diverse contexts, see the following: for seventeenth-century women Chan masters, see Beata Grant, “*Da Zhangfu*: The Gendered Rhetoric of Heroism and Equality in Seventeenth-Century Chan Buddhist Discourse Records,” *NAN NÜ* 10, no. 2 (January 1, 2008): 177–211; for contemporary Taiwanese nunneries, see Hillary Crane, “Becoming a Nun, Becoming a Man: Taiwanese Buddhist Nuns’ Gender Transformation,” *Religion* 37, no. 2 (June 2007): 117–32, and Ching-ning Wang (Chang-shen Shih), “A ‘Great Man’ Is No Longer Gendered: The Gender Identity and Practice of Chan Nuns in Contemporary Taiwan,” in *Buddhist Feminisms and Femininities*, edited by Karma Lekshe Tsomo, 107–36 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019); and for thirteenth-century Japanese monasteries, see Lori Meeks, *Hokkeji and the Reemergence of Female Monastic Orders in Premodern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010).

enlightened.<sup>175</sup> The “rhetoric of heroism,” on the other hand, elevates such characteristics as “courage, strength of will, and determination” as crucial to the endeavor of awakening.<sup>176</sup> These qualities are embodied by the “*dazhangfu*”: translated variously as “great hero,” “great gentleman” or “great man,” and “great manly person.”<sup>177</sup> Levering draws on twelfth-century Chan patriarchs Yuanwu and his disciple Dahui to demonstrate that this ideal is “inescapably masculine” and, accordingly, that female Chan exemplars (e.g., those described as “great heroes”) were depicted as exceptional.<sup>178</sup> Moreover, the *dazhangfu* ideal reflected the degree to which “Chinese Buddhism remained shaped by men as the primary participants, by their imagination and their language.”<sup>179</sup> Ultimately, Levering concludes that “the rhetoric of equality cannot stand up against the rhetoric of

---

<sup>175</sup> It is important to note that there were many competing salvation theories within premodern East Asian Mahāyāna Buddhism, many of which were incommensurate with this “rhetoric of equality.” For example, one central question was whether transformation into a male (Jp. *henjō nanshi* 変性男子) was required in order for women to attain full enlightenment, as per the “Dragon Girl” chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*. In Japan, for example, this notion became dominant from the Heian period (794–1185) onward; see Barbara R. Ambros, *Women in Japanese Religions* (New York: NYU Press, 2015), 66. Also see Miriam L. Levering, “The Dragon Girl and the Abbess of Mo-Shan: Gender and Status in the Ch’an Buddhist Tradition,” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 5, no. 1 (January 1, 1982): 19–35.

<sup>176</sup> Levering, “Lin-chi (Rinzai) Ch’an and Gender,” 143.

<sup>177</sup> As for translations of “*dazhangfu*/daijōbu 大丈夫,” “great hero” comes from Levering, “Lin-chi (Rinzai) Ch’an and Gender,” 141; “great gentleman” and “great man” come from Grant, “*Da Zhangfu*,” 177 and 179, respectively; and “great manly person” comes from Meeks, *Hokkeji*, 105.

<sup>178</sup> Levering focuses particularly on the Song-era Chan patriarch Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (1063–1135) and his disciple Dahui Zonggao 大慧宗杲 (1089–1163), both of whom promoted the *dazhangfu* as exemplary—the ideal Chan student—while ostensibly affirming gender equality with regard to the possibilities of practice and enlightenment. Levering cites several texts and even a sermon from Dahui (who had female disciples) describing the unusual female practitioner, too, as “*dazhangfu*.”

<sup>179</sup> Levering, “Lin-chi (Rinzai) Ch’an and Gender,” 143, 151.

masculine heroism, when the latter is supported by gender distinctions so ‘real’ to the culture and remain unambiguous.”<sup>180</sup>

In short, understanding how the *dazhangfu* ideal has functioned in premodern and contemporary East Asian Buddhist settings is important because the clearly gendered (masculine) ideals embodied by the *dazhangfu* also describe the ideal Chan, or Zen, practitioner. Moreover, even though women can theoretically become *dazhangfu* (and occasionally do so in practice), they are deemed exceptional, and the qualities that reflect their attainment of the *dazhangfu* are the opposite of stereotypically feminine characteristics. In other words, the *dazhangfu* is defined partly by the practitioner’s lack of “feminine” qualities.

The ethos of ferocity and heroism embodied by Dahui, Yuanwu, and the ideal *dazhangfu* has continued to resonate in early modern and modern Japanese Rinzai Zen.<sup>181</sup> As per the many examples in this chapter and the last one, early twentieth-century Japanese Rinzai Zen leaders and practitioners frequently used the language of war and warriors, of swords and battlefields, of heroism and ferocity to describe Zen practice: both its ideals and as people (lay and monastic alike) experienced it.

---

<sup>180</sup> Levering, “Lin-chi (Rinzai) Ch’an and Gender,” 151.

<sup>181</sup> This is not to suggest that the “*dazhangfu*/*daijōbu*” ideal has been invoked in the same manner for centuries, or employed in the same fashion in China, Taiwan, and Japan. The precise use of “*daijōbu*” in premodern and modern Japanese Rinzai deserves further study. However, it is safe to say that there are significant continuities between the androcentrism of premodern Linji Chan and modern Japanese Rinzai.

### 5.5.1.1. Kōan Performance and Gender in Rinzai Zen

Modern Zen practitioners' autobiographical accounts and groups' histories suggest a variety of important ways of communicating, embodying, and otherwise reinforcing ideals of masculinity. Such methods included Zen sermons, meditation intensives, and popular literature that prescribed self-realization through Zen practice as a means of enhancing the Japanese nation's power and authority. Below, I will focus on kōan practice as one of the key modes of embodying and reinforcing these ideals, as it hinges on performing encounters between legendary masters and disciples, nearly all male.

In order to understand the gender performativity dimension of kōan practice, we must first examine the dimension of ritual performativity. Here, Robert Sharf offers a helpful lens, proposing to understand the Chan master's performance of enlightenment—whether in large public Ascending the Hall rituals or in private encounters with his disciples—in terms of “play.”<sup>182</sup> According to Sharf, “in ritual the form/content,

---

<sup>182</sup> Robert H. Sharf, “Ritual,” in *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez Jr. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 253–257. It is worth noting Sharf's definition of ritual as “the extensive use of scripting, repetition, and highly mannered modes of speech and movement, all of which distinguish an event from the course of daily life, would appear to be central to our conception of ritual” (Sharf, “Ritual,” 248). Sharf follows anthropologist and systems theorist Gregory Bateson's use of play, in which “...‘play marks a step forward in the evolution of communication—the crucial step in the discovery of map-territory relations. In primary process, map and territory are equated; in secondary process, they can be discriminated. In play, they are both equated and discriminated” (Sharf, “Ritual,” 256). Here, “map and territory” alludes to Jonathan Z. Smith's “Map Is Not Territory.” In a similar vein, Sam Gill defines “play” as humans' ability “...to find a meaningful way to hold together at once two or more irreconcilable positions and to do so without smoke and mirrors and without forced or too easy difference-denying solutions”; see Sam D. Gill, “Play,” in *Guide to the Study of Religion*, edited by Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon (London and New York: Cassell, 2000), 451–452.

subject/object, and self/other dichotomies are intentionally confounded, creating a transitional world...that is neither inside the ‘mind’ nor ‘outside’ in the ‘objective world.’”<sup>183</sup> The notion of “play” can accommodate the Mahāyāna Buddhist paradox of ontological differentiation and emptiness, of discursive bifurcation and unity, as well as in not perpetuating the thought/action divide that has doomed both the “reading rituals as texts” (i.e., hermeneutic) approach and many performance theories. In particular, Sharf highlights an “as if” component of play that does not concern “belief”: “One does not believe that the wafer is flesh, nor that the icon is buddha; belief has little to do with it. One simply proceeds as if it were the case.”<sup>184</sup>

If we extend these notions to the *dokusan* or *sanzen* context, it is not only the Rinzai master who is performing buddhahood (or enlightenment). The Zen student working on a kōan, too, seeks to become one with the kōan and, therefore, one with the enlightened perspectives expressed in the kōan or commentary. For example, in Case 66 from the *Blue Cliff Record*, often known as “Getting Gantō’s Sword,” the main case reads:

Gantō [巖頭] asked a monk, “Where are you coming from?” The monk said, “From the Western Capital.” Gantō said, “After the rebel Kōsō [黃巢] passed through there, did you pick up his sword?” The monk said, “I did.” Gantō approached with his neck outstretched and hollered, “Yaa!” The monk said, “The master’s head has fallen.” Gantō roared with laughter.

Later the monk went to Seppō [雪峰]. Seppō asked him, “Where are you coming from?” The monk said, “From Gantō.” Seppō

---

<sup>183</sup> Sharf, “Ritual,” 257.

<sup>184</sup> Sharf, “Ritual,” 257.



asked, “What did he say?” The monk told the foregoing story.  
Seppō hit him thirty blows with his staff and drove him out.<sup>185</sup>

This kōan is then followed by a verse by Setchō (Ch. Xuedou Zhongxian 雪竇重顯; 980–1052) that includes the line, “Thirty blows of the mountain cane is still getting off lightly; to take the advantage is to lose the advantage.”<sup>186</sup> Here, the Zen student must intuit—and embody viscerally—every element of the kōan, from the significance of the sword to the significance of Seppō’s thirty blows (a common trope in kōans), and particularly the words of each of the masters and narrators. He or she then must—“as if” Gantō, Seppō, or Setchō—display this understanding physically in the dokusan room, embodying the ethos that, in this case, is explicitly violent. Needless to say, the student—regardless of his or her gender—performs the normative masculinity of swords, simulated decapitation (which spurs uproarious laughter), shouts, and dozens of blows; or, at least, the student channels, and performs, the respective intentions behind each of these acts. This example from the *Blue Cliff Record* may be more overly violent than the content of some kōans, but the point remains: the patriarchs’ records and kōan collections, which are essential

---

<sup>185</sup> The title of the kōan, “巖頭什麼處來,” literally means “Gantō’s ‘Where are you coming from?’” This translation comes from Thomas Cleary in Tenkei Denson and Hakuin Ekaku, *Secrets of the Blue Cliff Record: Zen Comments by Hakuin and Tenkei*, trans. by Thomas Cleary (Boston: Shambhala, 2000), 346–350 (formatting adapted). See also Engo Kokugon 圓悟克勤, *Hekiganroku* 碧巖錄, edited by Iriya Yoshitaka 入矢義高 et al., vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko, 1994), 301–309.

<sup>186</sup> Cleary, trans., *Secrets of the Blue Cliff Record*, 349. Engo, *Hekiganroku*, ed. by Iriya et al., vol. 2, 307–308.

tools in Rinzai Zen practice for helping the student attain a state of nonduality and enlightenment, are filled with such normatively masculine figures, acts, and ethos.<sup>187</sup>

Against the notion that kōan practice inherently or inevitably reproduces “Chan patrilineage,” Ben Van Overmeire proposes an alternative, re-examining encounter dialogues (kōan practice)—and, in particular, the dimension of gender—through the lens of performance theory and “reenactment.”<sup>188</sup> Ultimately, he suggests that reenactment may be a strategy to “understand how the homosocial rhetoric of patrilineage that remains central to Zen Buddhist authority structures can be subverted and appropriated by those denied access to it.” Such strategies could thus expand Chan’s accessibility to those who are not elite male monastic lineage-holders.

For his interpretation, Van Overmeire looks creatively beyond the content of kōan practice itself to the dimension of affect and ethos, of the master’s and disciple’s approaches to teaching and practice, respectively. He draws from Norman Fischer’s discussion of different approaches to kōan practice: the “grasping way” (confrontational between master and disciple) and the “granting way” (more characterized by compassion

---

<sup>187</sup> Moreover, as is often pointed out, even the language used to describe kōan practice—exerting a crescendo of energy, reaching a climax of understanding that may be characterized by bliss, and penetrating kōans—heartily invokes male sexuality.

<sup>188</sup> Ben Van Overmeire, “Mountains, Rivers, and the Whole Earth”: Koan Interpretations of Female Zen Practitioners,” *Religions*, vol. 9, no. 4 (2018), n. pag. Here he draws on Robert Sharf’s approach to ritual performativity as well as Rebecca Schneider’s concept of “reenactment” as “a theoretical framework that values creatively re-doing something as equal to the original performance (an original that, in Schneider’s view, does not exist, as it is always already caught within a web of repetition).” Victor Hori and Erez Joskovich also use ritual theory and a performative framework for their investigations of kōan work and *teishō* performance, respectively; see Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō,” and Joskovich, “Playing the Patriarch.”

and collaboration).<sup>189</sup> His interpretation suggests that we cannot assume that the androcentric ideals and rhetoric are essential or inherent to kōan practice, and that if practitioners (and their teachers) opt to reenact the masters' dialogues in a "granting way," they can potentially transcend even the most androcentric content. Although Rinzai Zen practice in early twentieth-century Japan could arguably be characterized, across the board, as the "grasping way" (sometimes in the extreme), Van Overmeire's interpretation is instructive not only in highlighting the role of the teacher (and the teacher's style or training atmosphere, or "*kafū* 家風," as it is known in Japanese temples) but also the degree to which androcentrism is embodied in practice and how dynamic this can be.

### 5.5.2 Historical Context: Ideals of Masculinity and *Bushidō* in Modern Japan

With Japan's modernization came transformed gender roles. Barbara Ambros summarizes key changes with regard to ideal gender roles in post-Meiji Restoration Japan, in which a central state goal was "building a strong nation populated by physically robust subjects."<sup>190</sup> In order to do so, the Meiji state promoted Confucian ideals of filiality to the emperor and harmony among spouses (e.g., through the Imperial Rescript on Education,

---

<sup>189</sup> Norman Fischer, an American Sōtō Zen priest, discusses this in his preface to Florence Caplow and Susan Moon, eds., *The Hidden Lamp: Stories from Twenty-Five Centuries of Awakened Women* (Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2013), xi. Fischer describes the two approaches: "The grasping way, the withholding way, gives you nothing because there is nothing to give. Whatever there is to be gotten must be hard-won through struggle. This is the way of the solitary hero. The granting way is the kindly way of clear and helpful teaching, in which even your confusion and suffering is part of the path" (Caplow and Moon, eds., *The Hidden Lamp*, xi). Van Overmeire provides one key example from *The Hidden Lamp*: Zen teacher Sunya Kjolhede's description of transforming her practice of the kōan Mu, from the male imagery typically employed to imagining Mu as a lover—that is, transforming her practice from a "grasping" to a "granting" way (Van Overmeire, "Mountains, Rivers, and the Whole Earth").

<sup>190</sup> Ambros, *Women in Japanese Religions*, 116.

promulgated in 1890). Hand in hand with such notions of marital harmony was the motto “good wife, wise mother” (“*ryōsai kenbo* 良妻賢母”), which ultimately became emblematic of women’s ideal gender roles during Japan’s imperial era and a key influence in women’s education during that period.<sup>191</sup> Ideal masculinities, on the other hand, ran the gamut from “a ‘feminized’ masculinity centered on the image of the Japanese gentleman” to “its antithesis represented by a ‘masculinized’ masculinity that rejected Western material culture,” according to Jason Karlin.<sup>192</sup> Karlin presents compelling evidence that “in modern Japan, gender identity became closely intertwined with the processes of national consolidation and mobilization.”<sup>193</sup>

Gender ideals were communicated, enacted, and reinforced in multiple realms, including education and religion (both newly defined), as well as through the practice of and rhetoric about martial arts.<sup>194</sup> Given the overlap among modern Japanese ideals of masculinity with “way of the warrior” (*bushidō*) ideals, Rinzai Zen, and Japan’s

---

<sup>191</sup> Ambros notes that the term “*ryōsai kenbo*” was coined in 1875 by Nakamura Masanao (1832–1891), a member of the Meirokusha (Meiji Six Society) who “argued for women’s education so that they could better support their husbands and provide religious and moral instruction for their children” (Ambros, *Women in Japanese Religions*, 118). It should be noted that even while these ideals were related to increasingly rigid and bifurcated gender roles, there were considerable examples of people subverting these ideals. Also see Kathleen Uno, “Womanhood, War and Empire: Transmutations of ‘Good Wife, Wise Mother’ before 1931,” in *Gendering Modern Japanese History*, edited by Barbara Molony and Kathleen Uno, 493–519 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005).

<sup>192</sup> Karlin, *Gender and Nation in Meiji Japan*, 20.

<sup>193</sup> Karlin, *Gender and Nation in Meiji Japan*, 21.

<sup>194</sup> For discussion of Meiji-era women’s training in *jūdō* and other forms of martial arts, see Simona Lukminaitė, “Women’s Education at Meiji Jogakkō and Martial Arts,” *Asian Studies* 6, no. 2 (2018): 173–88.

burgeoning militarism, I will focus here on the masculinity of *bushidō* ideals, particularly as it intersects with Zen and modern Japan's nation-building.

In Benesch's article, "Myths of Masculinity in the Martial Arts," he highlights the role of politician and journalist Ozaki Yukio 尾崎行雄 (1858–1954) in "recovering" and promoting an "ancient warrior ideal" as an ideal form of masculinity in the 1880s, in the wake of the Meiji Restoration, as samurai lost power and prestige.<sup>195</sup> Thus "*bushidō*" was born anew as the "traditional" samurai code (which had not previously existed as a stable entity), and it gathered considerable momentum following the first Sino-Japanese War (1894–1895), in symbiosis with the popularization of martial arts during this period. Accordingly, "a new 'national' masculine ideal of the Japanese soldier who also embodied ancient martial virtues" emerged.<sup>196</sup>

As for what constituted "*bushidō*" masculinity, I will briefly highlight the views expressed in Nitobe Inazō's 新渡戸稲造 (1862–1933) *Bushido: The Soul of Japan*, which was first published in English in 1900 and became a bestseller internationally, particularly after Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War; the work was considered an early work of *nihonjinron*. Although the work was critiqued by contemporaneous intellectuals such as Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944)—another vociferous

---

<sup>195</sup> Oleg Benesch, "Myths of Masculinity in the Martial Arts," in *The Routledge Companion to Gender and Japanese Culture*, edited by Jennifer Coates, Lucy Fraser, and Mark Pendleton, 261–69 (Abingdon Oxon and New York, NY: Routledge, 2020). Benesch also points out that Ozaki promoted *bushidō* masculinity as, in part, an indigenously Japanese counterpart to the English "gentleman" (Benesch, "Myths of Masculinity," 264–265). Also see Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*, 45–56.

<sup>196</sup> Benesch, "Myths of Masculinity," 265.

proponent of *bushidō* ideology—it is worth examining given its role as an “international bestseller” and degree to which Nitobe became associated with *bushidō*.<sup>197</sup>

Above all, Nitobe associates *bushidō* with masculinity, and therefore highlights the contrast of *bushidō* ideology with many of women’s “intrinsic” qualities, though this does not dissuade him from defining the ideal qualities of a samurai woman. He asserts: “Bushido being a teaching primarily intended for the masculine sex, the virtues it prized in woman were naturally far from being distinctly feminine.”<sup>198</sup> What, then, were those “virtues it prized in woman?” First, Nitobe perceives a seeming paradox in *bushidō* ideals for samurai women—at least, tension between their “domesticity and Amazonian traits.”<sup>199</sup> However, he resolves this tension by proclaiming that “the domestic utility of her warlike training was in the education of her sons...”—a sentiment that reflects “good wife, wise mother” (*ryōsai kenbo*) ideology and the value placed on women’s foremost role to raise and educate her children (namely, her sons).<sup>200</sup>

---

<sup>197</sup> Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*, 90–97. In particular, Japanese critics focused on the generalizations, lack of historical specificity, conflation of “*bushidō*” with “soul of Japan” (given that “*bushidō*” was associated with one particular social class), idealization of samurai, contradictory statements, and overlooking key reference works. Benesch notes that “Nitobe’s insecurity regarding the content of *Bushido: The Soul of Japan*, combined with the harsh reviews it received in Japan, kept him from publishing a Japanese translation of the work for almost a decade, by which time his book had been translated into many other languages, including Marāthī, German, Bohemian, Polish, Norwegian, and French” (Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*, 96). For a description of Inoue Tetsujirō’s *bushidō*, see Benesch, *Inventing the Way of the Samurai*, 97–103.

<sup>198</sup> Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 2004, 96.

<sup>199</sup> Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 2004, 95.

<sup>200</sup> Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 2004, 96. As other practical benefits of women’s training, Nitobe also notes that it could be useful to protect themselves from would-be assailants or, in order to prevent (sexual) assault and protect their virtue, to commit suicide, given that “chastity was a preeminent virtue of the samurai woman, held above life itself” (Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 2004, 97).

As for the ideal samurai woman's values, Nitobe highlights sacrifice, self-denial, and "dependent service"—though he also notes that self-sacrifice is a central ideal for men as well.<sup>201</sup> On the theme of self-sacrifice, Nitobe draws parallels between women's and men's respective forms of self-surrender: "Woman's surrender of herself to the good of her husband, home, and family was as willing and honorable as the man's self-surrender to the good of his lord and country."<sup>202</sup> Finally, he offers a disclaimer after discussing the practical ways in which samurai women's training could be useful: "It would be unfair to give my readers an idea that masculinity alone was our highest ideal for woman. Far from it!" He goes on to describe how literature, music, and dance were important accomplishments for women, though on a hierarchy of value, "accomplishments were ever kept subservient to moral worth."<sup>203</sup>

### 5.5.3 Convergence of Lay Zen, Nation, *Shūyō*, and Gendered Ideals: Iida Tōin

Zen master Iida Tōin had a different agenda from that of Nitobe, but they shared in common a prescription of distinct roles for men and women, based on essentialized notions of gender. Tōin's views on the intersections between Zen, *shūyō*, the nation, and distinct gender roles are reflected in the lengthy section on "Zen for Women" (*nyonin Zen* 女人禪) that appears in *Tōin's Collected Talks on Zen* (*Tōin zenwashū* 檀隱禪話集),

---

<sup>201</sup> Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 2004, 99.

<sup>202</sup> Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 2004, 100.

<sup>203</sup> Nitobe, *Bushidō*, 2004, 98.

published in 1930.<sup>204</sup> In his view, which clearly evokes Neo-Confucian notions about the connection between self-cultivation and national well-being, Tōin asserts first that Zen is the best means of self-cultivation (“*shūyōhō* 修養法”) there is. He elaborates as follows: Zen practice produces the “best kind of person” who, in turn, can build a “correct and beautiful family,” a peaceful society, and the “finest nation” (“*saikō naru kokka* 最高なる国家”). Tōin specifies that women bear a particularly great responsibility, given that “the home is the root of practice” and the “woman is master of the home”; in women, Tōin says, the very root or fountainhead (“*engen* 淵源”) of *shūyō* exists. He goes even farther to say explicitly that Zen-style self-cultivation produces excellent character in a person. This, in turn, produces an exemplary home, allowing exemplary people and homes to gather and create an exemplary nation, thus “contributing to the most wise and beneficent Emperor.”<sup>205</sup> In other words, Tōin contends that Zen-style *shūyō* allows men and women to fulfill their respective and distinct roles in the name of serving the Japanese nation and Emperor.<sup>206</sup> However, he also asserts that ultimately, “in Buddha nature, there is no distinction between men and women.”<sup>207</sup> This “rhetoric of equality”—

---

<sup>204</sup> Iida, *Tōin Zenwashū*, 173–248. As discussed elsewhere, Iida Tōin was a physician and lay Zen practitioner who became a priest at age 60 (ordaining at Hosshinji 発心寺, in the Sōtō sect, under Harada Sogaku) after decades of Buddhist practice in both Rinzai-shū and Sōtō-shū (as with his teacher, Harada), as well as Shingon and Tendai. Among other leadership positions, he served as the *shike* of Kōzen Gokokukai from 1927–1932; and he was extremely active in the Zen-related publishing world as a contributor to and editor of *Daijō Zen* (1924–), alongside Harada Sogaku.

<sup>205</sup> Iida, *Tōin Zenwashū*, 174–175.

<sup>206</sup> Iida also suggests that one “mission” of “women’s Zen” is to encourage men, while men help women (Iida, *Tōin Zenwashū*, 176).

<sup>207</sup> Iida, *Tōin Zenwashū*, 175. 「仏性に男女の別はない」



an age-old strategy among Buddhists to assert nonduality on the level of ultimate truth—thus contradicts the gender-specific roles that Tōin endorses.

## 5.6 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the diverse motives that university students and other practitioners had for pursuing lay Rinzai Zen in modern Japan. Some lay practitioners were spurred by “traditional” Zen motives per normative Rinzai Zen—for example, “seeing the nature” (*kenshō*) or realizing the “great matter of birth and death,” drawing inspiration from figures such as Hakuin. Others engaged in Zen practice as a form of “*shūyō*”: as one form of *shūyō* among many, and fueled by specific motivations, ranging from improved health and character to strengthening the nation through Zen-style personal cultivation practices. Still others—amidst a *bushidō* boom—initiated their Zen practice as a way to improve their *kendō* practice.

As we have seen, these diverse motivations have several implications, some of which garner further investigation. One possibility is that there are three (or more) groups that are distinct—to some degree—whose members engaged with Zen masters, teachings, practice venues, and fellow practitioners in distinct ways. For example, we have seen the same masters alternate between speaking to their audience in conventional Zen terms (e.g., with enlightenment as the aspiration, and in traditional Zen idioms) with speaking to their audience in terms of *shūyō* or practical benefits.

From this perspective—that is, of different audiences and teachings—there were multiple forms of “modern lay Rinzai Zen.” Divided thus, the first group, whose motives aligned more closely with “traditional” Zen, seems to have represented a smaller group

than the others and, more than the others, its members dwelled in the interstice between monk and layman (or laywoman). As indicated in the plethora of first-hand practice accounts, it appears that the second and third groups were larger than the first, and their members engaging more readily with the “practical benefits” (*genze riyaku*) characterizing Japanese religion more broadly.

On the other hand, these different messages from the same Rinzai master could signal a gap between religious ideals and the actual practice that modern Japanese people wanted to pursue—a gap between prescription and description, between masters’ teachings (e.g., in *teishō*, *kōen*, and publications) and what happened on the ground. Masters’ diverse messages and practitioners’ diverse motives could also indicate a multifaceted practice that could meet multiple, shifting needs during a time of social transformation.

Speaking of social transformation, this chapter has also demonstrated that modern Rinzai Zen masculinity converged with dominant forms of masculinity during Japan’s imperial era—namely, *bushidō* and military masculinity—contributing both to Rinzai Zen’s increased popularity among lay practitioners and to Japan’s imperial aggression. On the other hand, this chapter has also shown how modern Rinzai Zen’s ideals of masculinity contradicted Zen’s rhetoric of equality, as female practitioners continued to experience limited access to practice opportunities and spiritual and institutional advancement. Such ideological exclusions of women and femininity may help explain why lay Rinzai Zen—despite some degree of popularization—never became a mass

movement in modern Japan; and these exclusions continue to have implications for Rinzai Zen practitioners worldwide today.

.

## 6. Conclusion: Lay Rinzai in Modern Japan and Beyond

### 6.1 Reprise: Summary of Arguments

In these pages, I first presented the broader lay Rinzai landscape as it developed in modern Japan, particularly from the 1890s onward, illustrating that the scale of the movement is far larger than research until this point suggests, in terms of numbers of groups and practitioners, as well as the proliferation of popular literature. The diverse Rinzai-type lay groups that emerged during this period must be studied further; provisionally, I have proposed a typology to highlight the qualitative differences among the groups, which ranged from more “traditional” (e.g., Engakuji’s Kojirin) to more radically divergent from normative Rinzai Zen, at least ideologically (e.g., Shakamunikai). Factors such as modern Japan’s print culture and an interest among modern Rinzai masters to “spread the teachings” enabled the dissemination of Rinzai Zen teachings to an unprecedented audience, and lay Rinzai was undisputedly popularized to some degree. However, markers of “serious” practice—such as participating in *sesshin* and working on kōan practice under the guidance of a master—remained the province of the relatively elite, which comprised a growing middle class.

This growing population of lay Rinzai practitioners—disproportionately male, educated, and of the middle or upper classes—was epitomized by the university Zen groups, such as Nyoidan, the Engakuji-related Zen group at Tokyo Higher Commercial School that was founded in 1906. Chapter 3 demonstrated that Nyoidan members and other young people played sizable and significant roles in modern lay Rinzai Zen, while defying the stereotypical characteristics of contemporaneous youth through their

“ferocious” practice, in line with normative Rinzai Zen ideals. Students constituted a prominent contingent of modern Rinzai lay practitioners, and they exerted outsized influence, as in the creation of Engakuji’s “Layperson Grove” in the early 1920s. In establishing the first major training hall for lay Rinzai practitioners in modern Japan—moreover, on the grounds of a large training monastery—they succeeded where previous groups of laypeople had not.

In chapter 4, I investigated the practitioners’ activities, illustrating that even as early twentieth-century lay Rinzai-type groups diverged in their formulations of Zen and notions about lay Buddhism in modern Japan, a specific pattern of activities became standard among such groups. This pattern centered on *zazen* and *kōan* practice, encountering the master one-on-one in *sanzen*, dharma discourses such as *teishō*, and practice intensives such as *sesshin*. Moreover, this pattern functioned to increase an emphasis on personal experience generally and on *kōan* practice in particular, contributing to what I call the “*kōanization*” of Rinzai Zen in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, to be highlighted further below. Through practitioners’ accounts, I explored the ethos of lay Rinzai Zen practice, which was characterized by battlefield tropes, a continued idealization and mirroring of the monks’ hall to some degree, and a culture of secrecy. Indeed, breaching the prescribed secrecy of the *sanzen* room became a form of critique of modern Zen, as discussed below.

Finally, through investigating practitioners’ motivations as expressed in their accounts of early twentieth-century lay practice, I established that practitioners like Tsuji Sōmei, whose motivations echoed eminent Zen practitioners of yore, were far and few

between. Many, if not most, practitioners pursued Zen for some form of “this-worldly benefits,” in line with the era’s *zeitgeist*: whether for personal improvement (e.g., of health or character), as a means of strengthening the Japanese nation, or as a means of improving one’s *kendō* abilities. These accounts, moreover, strongly suggest an overlap among ideals of normative Rinzai Zen, modern Japanese masculinity, protecting the nation through *shūyō*, and embodying *bushidō*: an early twentieth-century “invented tradition” whose surge of popularity coincided with both the *shūyō* boom and the lay Zen boom. While these overlapping ideals likely attracted practitioners and contributed to a sense of Rinzai Zen’s relevance in the modern era, the androcentrism of such ideals—embodied through *kōan* practice—may have also been a limiting factor with regard to women’s participation on a broad scale.

## **6.2 Lay Rinzai Zen in Broader Japanese Context**

Stepping back from these developments within the realm of modern Japanese lay Rinzai Zen, it is worth taking a brief look at ways in which lay Rinzai connected to its broader Japanese context, if only to point to promising areas of future research. First, I highlight two areas of modern Rinzai practice that involve tension and critiques, and which shed light on changes that modern Rinzai Zen was undergoing or should undergo, according to various authors.<sup>1</sup> These two sometimes-contentious domains are the

---

<sup>1</sup> On lay Zen and critiques of modern institutional Zen, Jørn Borup notes that for many reformers in the modern era, “Lay Zen is...in itself a slogan, a rhetorical means with which to legitimate changes or to maintain status quo” (Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 94). As mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, there was a long legacy of critiques in Rinzai. For example, Hakuin lamented the degradation of Zen in his time: “At present, this country is infested with a race of smooth-tongued, worldly-wise Zen teachers who feed their students a ration of utter nonsense”

relationship between Zen and academia or the intellect (especially among lay practitioners) and kōan practice in modern Japan (both lay and monastic). Subsequently, I raise questions on lay Zen practice in the modern Japan religious context more generally.

## 6.2.1 Modern Rinzai Zen: Tensions and Critiques

### 6.2.1.1 Intellectualized Zen and Academia

As mentioned in chapter 1, Buswell points out a Western myth: that Sōn (and Zen) monks are “radically bibliophobic.”<sup>2</sup> Countering that notion, Buswell notes that most Korean monks engage in extensive doctrinal study. Likewise, Hori affirms that “Zen seeks not freedom from language by rejecting it, but freedom in language by mastering it.”<sup>3</sup> In other words, both Buswell and Hori portray language as an integral dimension of Zen as it is practiced, even within a tradition that ostensibly does “not rely on words and letters” (*furyū moji* 不立文字), per the Zen slogan mentioned in chapter 4. The question becomes: what was the role of words, letters, academic study, and the intellect in modern lay Rinzai Zen, particularly given the disproportionate number of highly educated young Japanese people in the community of lay practitioners? Practitioners’ accounts reveal different attitudes toward the relationship between study and Zen, including critiques of overly intellectualized practice, a perception of harmony and complementarity between

---

(Hakuin, *The Essential Teachings of Zen Master Hakuin*, 24). Similarly, Nantenbō lamented the plight of Rinzai monasticism in early Meiji: “Since the demise of Hakuin, each passing year has seen a degradation of the true style of the patriarchs; all monasteries (*dōjō*) are falling to the depths of desolation” (Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools,” 195).

<sup>2</sup> Buswell, *The Zen Monastic Experience*, 217–218.

<sup>3</sup> Hori, *Zen Sand*, 89–90.

academic study and Zen, and tension between academia and intensive Zen engagement on a practical level.

The authors of Nyoidan's history state that the group's slogan in its early years was: "Hitotsubashi's Zen is living Zen; it must not be lifeless Zen."<sup>4</sup> Although not articulated in identical words, this distinction between "lifeless Zen" (or "dead Zen") and "living Zen" are reminiscent of Rinzai monk Bassui Tokushō's 拔隊得勝 (1327–1387) distinction between "dead words" and "living words": a longtime Zen trope that can be seen throughout Zen classics, such as in the *Hekiganroku*.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, Iizuka Iwao distinguishes between doing "living Zen" (*katsuzen* 活禪) and "dead Zen" (*shizen* 死禪). He urges people to practice Zen as opposed to pursuing solely its academic study: "...even if we listen to lectured explanations (*kōsetsu* 講説) for one hundred years and read one thousand books on Zen, [we] do not escape the slander of [practicing] 'lifeless

---

<sup>4</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 42. 「一橋の禪は活禪也、死禪たる勿れ。」

<sup>5</sup> Bassui instructs: "You should know that in the past as well as the present those who have not clarified the great dharma have all aroused these kinds of discriminating feelings, staining the living words of the patriarchs. Though it may be a dead phrase, if a 'living being' were to work with it, it would immediately become a live phrase. This is what is meant when it is said: 'If you understand how to treat it, even a dead serpent will come to life again'"; see Bassui, *Mud and Water: A Collection of Talks by the Zen Master Bassui*, translated by Arthur Braverman (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1989), 107–108. It seems that the terms "living phrase" (*kakku* 活句) and "dead phrase" (*shiku* 死句) are more common in canonical Zen and Chan literature than "living Zen" and "dead Zen." Variations on the phrase "他参活句不参死句" appear numerous times in writings related to Bassui's predecessor Yuanwu Keqin 圓悟克勤 (Jp., Engo Kokugon, 1063–1135); they are found several times in Yuanwu's records (*Engo Bukka zenji goroku* 圓悟佛果禪師語録) and in the *kōan* collection, *Hekiganroku*, which, in its present form, features Yuanwu's commentary. In the *Hekiganroku*, see, for example, T. 2003.48.177c03–c04; T. 2003.48.179a25; T. 2003.48.190a05; T. 2003.48.195a22; T. 2003.48.214a20–a21; T. 2003.48.218c03; T. 2003.48.221c08.



Zen [死禪]’ that is without value and is not ‘living Zen [活禪].’”<sup>6</sup> Iizuka follows this by reiterating that “Zen must be actually practiced, actually studied, actually realized.” In other words, Iizuka is contrasting “empty academic theories”—which he sees as characterizing much of “Zen research” (*Zen no kenkyū* 禪の研究)—with practice.<sup>7</sup> In this way, Iizuka affirms that practice and experience are central and warns against dwelling solely in the intellectual realm of “lifeless Zen.” The fact that both Nyoidan practitioners and Iizuka voiced this stance suggests that it may have been a common refrain at Engakuji in the early twentieth century.<sup>8</sup>

It is worth noting that several accounts reflect excessively intellectual approaches to kōan—for instance, grappling with the kōan and presenting one’s understanding to the rōshi in philosophical or reasoned terms. This was certainly the case with the intellectual approach that Motora Yūjirō took, per his account in “*Sanzen nisshi* 参禪日誌,” as discussed in chapter 4. This was the case, too, with Shimokawa Yoshitarō during his early days of practice, although Shimokawa’s post-*kenshō* records indicate that he moved away from this tendency.

---

<sup>6</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 2.

<sup>7</sup> Iizuka, *Sanzen no shiori*, 50. 「机上の空論」 As mentioned in chapter 5, Iizuka also expressed the view that his contemporaries were at a transitional crossroads with regard to self-cultivation practice in general and Zen practice in particular. He expressed optimism that they were moving toward “uniting knowledge and practice”—that is, toward a more balanced integration of practice and study—although the source of his optimism is unclear.

<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, as discussed elsewhere, Nantenbō critiqued the overly academic approach at Engakuji (Mohr, “Japanese Zen Schools”).

Many who came from the realm of academia did not see Zen practice and academic study as being at odds with each other.<sup>9</sup> For example, Nyoidan alumnus Mogi Tomokazu 茂木知二 (1889–1960), who graduated from Tokyo Higher Commercial School in 1912, recalls the reflections of his then-mentor and professor, Fukuda Tokuzō 福田徳三: “Western scholarship is planar [i.e., in two dimensions], but Zen is three-dimensional; seeing things in this three-dimensional [way] is actually crucial to all scholarship; we must look at things with extreme directness.”<sup>10</sup> Although Fukuda intimates that Zen’s three dimensions are superior to academia’s two dimensions, he sees no inherent conflict between Zen and academia. In fact, for Fukuda these two approaches are complementary in that Zen practice—and the breadth of view achieved through Zen practice—enhances academic endeavors.

Like Fukuda, Sawayanagi Masatarō 澤柳政太郎 (1865–1927)—two-time president of Tokyo School of Commerce and Zen practitioner, having started practice at Engakuji under Imakita Kōsen when he was a college student—sees Zen practice as playing a helpful role for those in academia. Sawayanagi speaks of the “goals of zazen” in line with normative Rinzai Zen: that is, ultimately achieving a state of “no conceptualization” (*munen musō* 無念無想) and therefore awakening to one’s true

---

<sup>9</sup> It is worth pointing out that many authors—including members of *Zendō*’s editorial board—used the following terms interchangeably, despite their different valences: “the study of Zen” (“*zengaku* 禅学”), “Zen meditation” (“*zazen* 坐禅”), and “Zen practice” (“*sanzen* 参禅”).

<sup>10</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 277. 「泰四の学問は平面的であるが、禅は立体的である、此の立体的に物を見る事が、実は総べての学問に必要な事で、我々は端的に物を直視しなければならぬ。」

buddha nature (“seeing the nature,” *kenshō* 見性).<sup>11</sup> However, he also values the benefits of meditation for today’s students, even if practitioners fall short of attaining these ultimate goals. Such benefits include, for example, the ability to reflect on matters and think for oneself. In Sawayanagi’s opinion, this reflective ability was particularly difficult for students of his era to cultivate, amidst the study of myriad subjects and the demand to read myriad books, as well as the educational tendencies to value listening and memorization over thinking.

Interestingly, two Nyoidan alumni recounted conversations with Sakagami Shinjō, one of Nyoidan’s earliest leaders, in which Shinjō discouraged them from Zen practice, given that they were university students and presumably devoted to their studies. In his account, Hayashi Nobuyoshi 林信吉 conveys an early conversation in which Shinjō asks rhetorically: “If students are studying wholeheartedly, that is good; why, then, is necessary to do zazen on top of that?”<sup>12</sup> This, Shinjō suggests, is reason to deny Hayashi permission to do private interviews with him in *sanzen*. When Hayashi entreats him strongly, Shinjō assents, saying: “In that case, you should do zazen in your free time [from studies]. However, you [young] people have the role of [engaging in] industry. You should remember that you are not a monk (*sōryo* 僧侶).”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 323–324.

<sup>12</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 278. 「学生は専一に勉強して居ればよろしい、何ぞ更に坐禅の必要あらんや」

<sup>13</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 278. 「然らば学業の餘暇に坐禅すべし。されど兄等の本分は実業にあり。僧侶にあらざる事をよく記すべし。」 Until Shinjō’s death in 1914, Hayashi continued to participate in monthly sesshin and had some daily contact with him.

In similar fashion, Masumoto Yoshitarō 増本芳太郎 reminisces about his experiences working under Shinjō. Masumoto had been practicing for some time when Shinjō discouraged him from continuing his Zen practice and encouraged Masumoto to focus on his academic studies. Masumoto recounts: “I received the kōan, ‘One Hand Clapping,’ and suffered with it for one and a half years; finally, I was told by the rōshi, ‘It is good if students conduct their scholarship at school, so I suppose it’s better [for you] to quit Zen.’”<sup>14</sup> However, like Hayashi, Masumoto persevered with his practice and ultimately expresses profound gratitude to Shinjō and his teaching methods.

Of course, it is possible that in Hayashi’s and Masumoto’s cases, Shinjō’s discouragement of their simultaneous Zen practice and academic endeavors stemmed not from some inherent incompatibility between the two but, rather, from practical issues. In other words, being a student—enmeshed in words and logic—was not necessarily at odds with a practice helping them to transcend words and logic but, rather, was at odds with intensive practice (in the sense of competing needs for someone “in the world”). It is worth probing such points of tension and contradiction further.

#### **6.2.1.2 Critiquing Modern Kōan Practice: Lay and Monastic**

As mentioned above, Sawayanagi views the relationship between intellectual endeavors and Zen practice as being largely harmonious. However, he critiques aspects of Zen practice in his day, contrasting it with past generations of practice, such as under

---

<sup>14</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 274. 「学生は学校で学問をして居れば良いのであるから、禅などやめた方がよかろう。」

Hakuin Ekaku.<sup>15</sup> He believes that coveting to pass through many kōan is unnecessary; and that Zen teachers' instigation to help students pass kōans quickly—as noted in chapter 4—is not helpful. By his account, in the past, it often took seventeen years or even decades to solve a single kōan, and “now” (i.e., c. 1915 or prior), people typically solve their first kōan in two to three years.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, practitioners in previous generations could experience mind-to-mind transmission and thoroughgoing *kenshō* from penetrating one kōan, and according to many masters, it was unnecessary to solve many kōan. Sawayanagi implies that the Zen practice of his day has a certain superficiality; he links this to students' being spread thin in their multiple fields of study, failing to penetrate any single subject thoroughly. He discerns between academia and Zen practice, distinguishing students' intellectual pursuit of listening to lectures with the wisdom that comes through zazen and kōan practice.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, he likens previous Zen practitioners' emphasis on a single kōan to the more general pursuit of a single principle: the commonality being that once someone fully penetrates and comprehends this principle, he or she can apply it in a wide variety of circumstances—for example, in the

---

<sup>15</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 321–324. Here, Sawayanagi speaks with the authority of a practitioner, stating that he passed through five or six kōan under Kōsen Rōshi. However, from his standpoint as of the time of writing, he questions the degree to which his practice equated with true *shūyō* and understanding of Zen. Sawayanagi's account is based on a lecture he gave, “Youth and Zen” (“Seinen to Zen 青年と禪”), at an unidentified time; it was most likely delivered in or before 1915, as he mentions working on kōan 22–23 years previously under Imakita Kōsen, who died in 1892.

<sup>16</sup> Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 324.

<sup>17</sup> Sawayanagi also mentions how uneducated people sometimes penetrate kōan far faster than educated people—this is not a surprise, he explains, given how knowledge can give rise to a multitude of interpretations, which can be a hindrance in passing a kōan (Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, *Tetsu nyoi*, 1931, 323).

realm of economics. Thus, he says, there is great potential value in Zen practice for today's students.

Sawayanagi's critique—of the superficiality of the era's kōan practice, relative to an idealized past—did not stand alone. As suggested elsewhere in the dissertation, Japanese Zen clerics and popularizers alike criticized the kōan system—for example, as being constrictive and over-formalized. Such an examination is beyond the scope of this study, given my emphasis on practitioners' experiences and accounts. However, critics' visions of kōan reform are an integral dimension of modern Rinzai Zen's transformation, even as the critics themselves varied in their Buddhist training background, position in relation to institutional Rinzai Zen and the public, appraisal of the future of Japanese Buddhism and its "salvific" potential for the ailing modern world, and solutions to the problems they perceived. Below, I mention a few such figures.

For example, according to D. T. Suzuki, "Hakuin Zen is koan Zen through and through." In his view, this kōan Zen entails benefits, such as the convenience of kōans as tools for awakening, as well as pitfalls: namely, that kōan practice can lend itself to artificiality and formalization in the sense of performing kōans mechanically without penetrating them in a sincere or thoroughgoing manner.<sup>18</sup> As Suzuki states in 1934:

---

<sup>18</sup> Suzuki, "Dōgen, Hakuin, Bankei: Three Types of Thought in Japanese Zen," in Suzuki, *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, 90 (note: this essay was originally published in Japanese in 1943). With regard to raising Great Doubt, which was a critical ingredient of Hakuin's Zen (as in Dahui's Chan), Suzuki draws on Bankei's critique of this doubt-raising as artificial. Suzuki cites a potential danger of this artificiality: "when the doubt is merely something received from someone else that is brought to bear on a koan, surely the abuses the koan system has within it become intolerable" (Suzuki, "Dōgen, Hakuin, Bankei," 92). Richard Jaffe also

The koan exercise is no doubt a great help to the understanding of Zen, but at the same time it is liable to lower the spiritual quality of the students who come to study Zen. Systematisation in one sense means popularisation, for things become easier to comprehend by being put in order. But this democratic diffusion tends to kill the chance for originality and creativeness, and these are the characteristics of the religious genius. System does not permit irregularities, they are generally excluded from it. But in Zen these irregular leapings are the thing most needed, although the koan exercise is a very flexible system and by the judicious use of it the master is able to educate his students in full accordance with the real spirit of Zen.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, Suzuki's critique stems from a place of concern about diminishing "the spiritual quality" of Zen students and the potential for true transformation, which necessitates "originality and creativeness."

Other voices of critique include author Hau Hō'ō 破有法王 (mentioned in chapter 4), who overtly rebelled against Rinzai Zen tradition by publishing a collection of "answers" to kōan in his *Critique of Present-day Pseudo-Zen* (*Gendai sōji zen hyōron* 現代相似禪評論).<sup>20</sup> As the title suggests, Hau Hō'ō breach of Rinzai Zen's culture of secrecy stemmed from a broader critique of modern Rinzai Zen. This book caused waves, generating, for example, a response from Harada Sogaku (discussed elsewhere). Harada, a Sōtō cleric who was deeply involved in teaching lay practitioners for decades, had completed his kōan training under a Rinzai master and sought to reform Sōtō Zen by, in

---

discusses Suzuki's critique of the kōan system in his introduction to the same volume (Suzuki, *Selected Works of Suzuki, Volume 1: Zen*, liv-lvi).

<sup>19</sup> Suzuki, *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*, xii.

<sup>20</sup> Hau Hō'ō, *Gendai sōji Zen*. The first half of this work was translated as Hau Hō'ō, *The Sound of the One Hand*. Hau Hō'ō 破有法王 was a pseudonym for Tominaga Shūho 冨永秀甫.

part, incorporating Rinzai-type kōan practice.<sup>21</sup> In 1917, shortly after Hau Hō'ō published his critique, Harada published a response to Hau Hō'ō, calling it, “A Critique of the Critique of Present-day Pseudo Zen.”<sup>22</sup>

Other critiques by popular authors include a series of articles in *Daijōzen* from April through May of 1927 by Imanari Kakuzen 今成覺禪 (1884–1963). The articles contain a nearly identical title to that of Hau Hō'ō's indictment; the title also translates as “A Critique of Present-day Pseudo-Zen” but with different characters for “Critique” (i.e., he uses *hihan* 批判論, rather than *hyōron* 評論).<sup>23</sup> The same year, another article of critique appeared, this time critiquing the Rinzai Zen monks' hall: Nagao Daigaku 長尾大學 penned an article entitled, “A Chronicle of Critiques of the Rinzai Monks' Hall” (“*Rinzai-shū sōdō hihanki* 臨濟宗僧堂批判記”).<sup>24</sup>

Various clerics articulated forms of critique. For example, in 1921, Hiramatsu Ryōkyō 平松亮郷—a Rinzai Zen priest who practiced under Nantenbō—wrote an article entitled “The Era of Zen's Revolution” (“*Zen no kakumei jidai* 禪の革命時代”). In this article, Hiramatsu contrasts modern Zen practitioners (called “*zengakusha* 禪学者”) with

---

<sup>21</sup> In these reform efforts, Harada thus laid the groundwork for the integration of Rinzai and Sōtō practice that became formalized in the organization founded by his disciple, Yasutani Hakuun.

<sup>22</sup> This is a chapter in Harada's *Questions and Answers for the Study of Zen*, or *Zengaku shitsugi kaitō*; see Harada Sogaku 原田祖岳, *Zengaku shitsugi kaitō* 禪學質疑解答, vol. 6 of *Harada Sogaku chosakushū* 原田祖岳著作集 (Tokyo: Harashobō 原書房, 2006), 99–126. This work was originally published in 1917.

<sup>23</sup> The series is entitled “*Gendai sōji Zen hihanron* 現代相似禪批判論.” It appears in *Daijō Zen*, vol. 4., no. 4 (April 1927), 52–58; *Daijō Zen*, vol. 4, no. 5 (May 1927), 56–61; *Daijō Zen*, vol. 4, no. 6 (June 1927), 46–53; and *Daijō Zen*, vol. 4, no. 7 (July 1927), 82–89.

<sup>24</sup> *Daijō Zen*, vol. 4, no. 10 (October 1927), 62–65. From this article, the author Nagao Daigaku (at least at the time of publication) appears to be a Rinzai lay practitioner.



those of old. Hiramatsu compared the ferocity, determination, and great enlightenment of the monks of yore with today's practitioners, stating: "...As for modern practitioners, they have a mind that is strongly dependent; they are ghosts hungry for kōan (*kōan no gaki* 公案の餓鬼)."<sup>25</sup>

## 6.2.2 Meaning of Lay Practice in Modern Japan

With regard to the role of lay Rinzai Zen's popularization in modern Japan (and its legacy in contemporary Japan) more broadly, there are numerous lines of query, including how the popularization of lay Rinzai compares to that of contemporaneous Buddhist and other religious movements.<sup>26</sup> One key question is: to what degree did lay Zen's intersections with the early-twentieth *shūyō* boom contribute to the overall trajectory of twentieth-century Zen? For example, was there a broader, tangible move in twentieth-century Zen toward "therapeutic Zen" ("*byōkinaoshi no zen* 病気治しの禅"), as embodied by Katsumine Daitetsu's Zen (explored in chapter 5)? Particularly in the context of contemporary new religious movements, scholars have noted various ways in which religious organizations and practitioners have come to fill crucial gaps for the Japanese public with regard to therapy and healing.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> *Zendō*, no. 128 (May 1921), 32–33. "*Gaki* 餓鬼" means "hungry ghosts," who are thought to occupy one of six realms of unenlightened existence per traditional Buddhist cosmology.

<sup>26</sup> As an example of a religious practice that was more "democratized" than lay Rinzai practice in modern Japan, see, for example, Dana Mirsalis's study of how access to spirit mediation (via *chinkon kishin*) was democratized in the Taishō era in the context of Ōmoto-kyō (Mirsalis, "Modernizing Ōmoto").

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Levi McLaughlin, "What Have Religious Groups Done After 3.11? Part 2: From Religious Mobilization to 'Spiritual Care,'" *Religion Compass* 7, no. 8 (2013): 309–325.

Also as discussed in chapter 5, “therapeutic Zen” in the modern period has a history even among legendary Rinzai figures like Hakuin Ekaku, who explicitly advocated therapeutic Zen and also longevity practices (*chōseihō* 長生法) alongside rigorous kōan-style practice, for his disciples, both monastic and lay. On the other hand, as suggested by such twentieth-century Zen figures as Shaku Sōen and D. T. Suzuki, there remained a hierarchy of valuation, ultimately prizing normative Zen goals (i.e., enlightenment) over this-worldly benefits like personal improvement (e.g., as per Suzuki’s “A Recommendation for Quiet Sitting,” in contrast with most of Suzuki’s oeuvre that encourages zazen for the sake of awakening).<sup>28</sup>

Relating to questions of *shūyō*’s broader interactions with Zen and the persistence of normative Zen ideals is the question of monastic ideals: to what degree did monastic ideals persist among lay Rinzai Zen practitioners in modern and contemporary Japan, even as lay-clerical relationships have been reconfigured and redefined? The final of the ten ox-herding pictures mentioned in chapter 3 in the context of Shaku Sōen’s serialized *teishō* in *Zendō* (published from July through December 1910) famously depicts—as the

---

<sup>28</sup> Later in the twentieth century, Sanbōkyōdan’s 三宝教団 (now Sanbō Zen’s 三宝禅) Yasutani Hakuun made the distinction between these motivations for practicing Zen, suggesting that therapeutic Zen was shallow and inferior to practicing for the purpose of awakening; see Yasutani’s “The Five Varieties of Zen,” translated in Philip Kapleau, *The Three Pillars of Zen: Teaching, Practice, and Enlightenment* (New York: Anchor Books, 2000; originally published in 1965), 48–53. As Peter Gregory has pointed out, Yasutani’s framework of the five types of Zen (i.e., “ordinary zen” or “*bompu zen* 凡夫禅,” “non-Buddhist zen” or “*gedō zen* 外道禅,” “small vehicle zen” or “*shōjō zen* 小乘禅,” “large vehicle zen” or “*daijō zen* 大乘禅,” and “highest vehicle zen” or “*saijōjō zen* 最上乘禅”) roughly corresponds to—and likely draws from—the similar framework of Tang-era Chan master Zongmi 宗密 (780–841; Peter Gregory, “Yasutani’s Five Types of Zen and Keihō-Zenji,” presented at The Philip Kapleau Papers [symposium]: Zen Buddhism in Post-World War II Japan and the United States, Duke University, October 12, 2019).

culmination of Zen practice—the practitioner “returning to the marketplace.”<sup>29</sup> This signifies the importance of integrating one’s spiritual practice with daily life and, ultimately, working for the benefit of all sentient beings. In a sense, this suggests the unique potential of lay Zen practitioners to manifest a fully mature religious practice, so long as they are able to balance their lives “in the home” with deep Zen practice; indeed, many twentieth- and twenty-first Zen teachers have promoted lay Zen for this reason.

Jørn Borup affirms this “returning to the marketplace” as a core ideal: “...both traditional Mahayana Buddhist sources as well as contemporary voices insist that the proper *shukke* [“home-leaver”] must return to social life. The return, however, is ideally not a return to ‘basics,’ but a return to life outside the monastery with a different mind, status, and social and institutional capacity.”<sup>30</sup> As we know, however, ideals can exist in tension with practiced reality. Here, Borup also points to enduring monastic ideals, even with the hereditary priesthood system (*sesūsei* 世襲制), which hinges on the majority of priests marrying:

Most persons from the Zen clergy still prefer a dichotomy in which there are essential differences between *shukke* [出家] and *zaike* [在

---

<sup>29</sup> The ten ox-herding pictures (*jūgyūzu* 十牛圖) are thought to have been penned by the twelfth-century Chan master Kakuan Shion 廓庵師遠; each picture represents a different stage of Zen practice, with the ox symbolizing the buddha-nature with which each sentient being is endowed. The ten verses—appended to each picture, respectively—are as follows: “searching for the ox” (尋牛); “seeing the traces” (見跡); “seeing the ox” (見牛); “catching the ox” (得牛); “taming the ox” (牧牛); “riding home on the ox” (騎牛歸家); “the ox forgotten, the self remains” (忘牛存人); “forget both self and ox” (人牛俱忘); “return to the origin, back to the source” (返本還源); and “entering the marketplace with extended hands” (入廛垂手). These translations are from Yamada Mumon, *Lectures on the Ten Oxherding Pictures*, translated by Victor Sōgen Hori (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2004).

<sup>30</sup> Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 55.

家]. Laypersons can theoretically become dharma-heirs (*hassu* [法嗣]) within the institution, but no matter how wise or spiritually developed they might be, in the eyes of many of the clergy they will always remain lay persons.<sup>31</sup>

This continuing tension and implicit hierarchy within Rinzai Zen must be studied further; it is particularly relevant in the context of gender issues in modern and contemporary Rinzai Zen, as discussed below.

### **6.3 Japanese Lay Zen in Its Global Context**

The field is also ripe for research that interrogates modern Japanese lay Zen vis-à-vis other lay Buddhist contexts in Asia: both in terms of interaction and mutual influence (particularly in the case of Japan's former colonies and occupied territory), and in terms of comparative analysis. In the East Asian context, it is necessary, first of all, to examine the conversations among Buddhist leaders in the modern period.<sup>32</sup> Given Rinzai Zen's traction in Korea relative to that of Sōtō Zen, it is also worth comparing whether similar forces were at play with regard to issues of lay Rinzai Zen's popularization—rather than a more full-fledged democratization—and the “elite” nature of kōan practice that Suzuki and Sōen have suggested. Along these lines, Buswell makes observations about kōan practice in the Korean Sōn context: “Sōn monastic life suggests that the technique of *kanhwa* Sōn was never seriously intended for the laity, but instead targeted those few

---

<sup>31</sup> Borup, *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism*, 95. Even earlier, Jaffe highlighted the persistence of monastic ideals in the context of clerical marriage (Jaffe, *Neither Monk Nor Layman*).

<sup>32</sup> Thanks to Hwansoo Kim for pointing out to me that Rinzai provided a unifying ideology among East Asian Zen Buddhists and that Rinzai was more prominent than Sōtō Zen in the broader East Asian context. Of the latter point, Kim notes that the strength of Rinzai in the broader East Asian context was surprising, given that the Japanese Sōtō sect's size far exceeded that of Rinzai with regard to the numbers of temples and clerics (in Japan and Korea, for example) and in terms of financial resources.

monks with the fortitude to endure many years of ascetic training in the meditation hall.”<sup>33</sup>

In terms of comparisons with lay Zen in China in early twentieth-century China, J. Brooks Jessup has done extensive research on *kojirin* 居士林 (Ch. *jushilin*)—which he defines as “householders’ grove”—particularly in the period after 1920.<sup>34</sup> China’s “householders’ groves” have certain parallels with Japan’s *kojirin*, such as serving as a meeting spaces for social and political élite. On the other hand, there are significant differences not only with regard to activities, function, and identity but also with regard to scale. For example, unlike *kojirin* in Japan, which never become mainstream or sites for the masses, the *jushi* 居士 movement in Republican China expanded exponentially: Jessup identified one hundred eighty different *jushilin* that arose between 1920 and 1949 throughout the country.<sup>35</sup>

In terms of contemporaneous Buddhist reform movements that shared in common with lay Rinzai the centrality of meditation, there is need for a nuanced comparison with the rise in colonial Burma of the innovative form of insight meditation taught by Ledi

---

<sup>33</sup> Buswell, *The Zen Monastic Experience*, 222. In general parlance, “*kanhwa* meditation” can be interchangeable with *kōan* practice but is technically not the same. “*Kanhwa* meditation” equates with *kanna* (or *kanwa*) *zen* 看話禪, which literally means “watching-the-phrase meditation.” The term refers to the aspect of *kōan* practice—popularized by Dahui Zonggao—of focusing on a key word or phrase (e.g., the word “*Mu*” in the *Mu* *kōan*) as a means for penetrating the *kōan* and achieving insight into one’s true nature.

<sup>34</sup> James Brooks Jessup, “The Householder Elite: Buddhist Activism in Shanghai, 1920–1956,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2010; and J. Brooks Jessup, “Buddhist Activism, Urban Space, and Ambivalent Modernity in 1920s Shanghai,” in *Recovering Buddhism in Modern China*, edited by J. Brooks Jessup and Jan Kiely, 37–78 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016). In the latter chapter, Jessup focuses especially on the World Buddhist Householder Grove (WBHG, *shijie Fojiao jushilin* 世界佛教居士林).

<sup>35</sup> Jessup, “Buddhist Activism,” 68.

Sayadaw, as examined by Erik Braun.<sup>36</sup> The differences in context were stark, given Burma's status as a British colony and Japan's status as an imperial aggressor.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the scale of meditation practice differed wildly. As noted elsewhere, lay Rinzai Zen never became a mass movement in Japan, even as it was popularized to some degree, while insight meditation did become such a mass movement in colonial Burma. From another perspective, however, the two cases share significant parallels, given that they were both modern lay Buddhist movements that arose in response to dramatic changes in educational structure and opportunities, the political landscape, the rise of the middle class, and related social ferment.

In terms of examining modern lay Japanese Rinzai Zen vis-à-vis the development of Zen outside of Asian contexts, there are many angles to pursue. Below, I highlight one dimension: the legacy of lay Zen's new paradigm, which—as this dissertation demonstrates—emerged and developed in Japan's modern era amidst a unique set of historical circumstances. The example I discuss, Yasutani Hakuun's Sanbō Kyōdan 三宝教団 (now Sanbō Zen 三宝禅), may appear to be a strange choice to follow my analysis of lay Rinzai-type groups in modern Japan. As mentioned elsewhere, the group incorporates dimensions of Rinzai and Sōtō traditions and, partly for this reason, has maintained a marginalized position with regard to institutional Japanese Zen. However,

---

<sup>36</sup> Braun, *The Birth of Insight*.

<sup>37</sup> It should be noted that Japan's status in late nineteenth-century East Asia was complicated. It certainly was the colonizer and aggressor, particularly after 1894. However, it also had a history of being subjected to unequal treaties, and its rapid social transformation was fueled, in part, by fear of being colonized and determination to end up on top of the world's stage. This dynamic played into the ways in which "religion" was constructed as a category, Buddhism was redefined, and *shūyō* became a widespread means to support the nation and empire.

given the centrality of Rinzai-style kōan practice within Sanbō Kyōdan, it qualifies, by my definition, as a “Rinzai-type” groups.

Moreover, its seemingly anomalous status—given its relative marginalization in Japan, and as characterized by Robert Sharf in his 1995 article—make it a good case, in certain respects, to demonstrate the pervasiveness of the “new lay Zen paradigm” described in this dissertation, particularly given the Sanbō Zen’s disproportionate influence in Western Zen.<sup>38</sup> In other words, the distinct pattern of activities that emerged among early twentieth-century lay Zen groups was shared even by the groups that appear to be radical or otherwise marginal vis-à-vis the Rinzai Zen establishment. This pattern is familiar to Zen practitioners today, both in North America and Japan, and may be taken for granted. However, I wish to emphasize that the decades following the formation of Ryōbō-sha 両忘社 in 1875 (under Engakuji’s Imakita Kōsen) saw the establishment of these activities as the norm.

I suggest, from the perspective of the establishment of this new paradigm, that we re-examine twentieth-century groups like Sanbō Zen. In his influential article on Sanbō Kyōdan (discussed in chapter 1), Sharf depicts the group as an anomaly among Japanese Zen groups: not only for being outside the orthodoxy of both the Sōtō and Rinzai sects, but also, and especially, for emphasizing zazen and kōan work, while downplaying the importance of other dimensions of traditional Rinzai Zen monastic training: liturgy, ritual,

---

<sup>38</sup> Sharf, “Sanbōkyōdan.” Sanbō Kyōdan has since changed its name to Sanbō Zen; I refer to Sanbō Zen as such when discussing it in the present, and use “Sanbō Kyōdan” to refer to the group historically, as in Sharf’s examination.

and the literary dimensions of advanced kōan work.<sup>39</sup> For Sharf, this amounted to a marked oversimplification of—and modern divergence from—traditional Zen, signifying common ground that Sanbō Kyōdan shares with Japan’s New Religious Movements. Ultimately, Sharf stops short of asserting that Sanbō Kyōdan should be classified as such; but he makes clear that Sanbō Kyōdan is marginal, even among Buddhist lay movements in Japan.

Against this portrayal—and against the narrative that Zen which emphasizes kōan practice, experience, and *kenshō* is primarily a Western product—I suggest that we also view Sanbō Zen in context with the dozens of other lay groups that emerged in the preceding decades: appreciating its differences with other groups (which there certainly are), while also highlighting its similarities with myriad other Zen groups that emerged in the modern period. In other words, over the course of an eighty-year history, dozens (if not hundreds) of groups across Japan set a precedent for such “oversimplification”: that is, emphasizing zazen, kōan work, and personal experience, while downplaying the traditional elements of ritual, liturgy, and the literary dimensions of advanced kōan training. Sanbō Zen, too, emerged from this context, as did groups ranging from Kojirin to Shakamunikai.

## **6.4 Yet More Future Avenues of Research**

Throughout this dissertation, I have made note of many additional threads that deserve closer examination in order to grasp more clearly Zen’s transformation in modern

---

<sup>39</sup> For a full list of Sharf’s other points of critique (e.g., an overemphasis on *kenshō*) that—to him—suggest similarities with Japan’s New Religions, see notes in chapter 1.



Japan. These threads include the following: lay Zen's relationship with twentieth-century imperialist expansion, not only per masters' rhetoric but in terms of the pervasiveness of nationalism within practitioners' thought and practice; the "kōanization" of Rinzai Zen (i.e., how and why kōan practice came to dominate Rinzai Zen's image and practice, particularly in the West) and how it relates to the early and mid-twentieth-century critiques of kōan practice in Japanese Zen; and the full, quantitative picture of the reach of lay Zen's popularization in modern Japan. On this note, the growth of Rinzai-style *zenkai* should be compared to that of Sōtō-style *zenkai*, and the overlap of Rinzai and Sōtō practices—which appears to have been more common in the twentieth century than sectarian narratives allow—should also be studied in further detail. Additionally, the intellectual history dimension of modern lay Rinzai Zen movements—such as the subtle (and overt) ways in which modern leaders appropriated classical teachings—is beyond the scope of the current study but is closely connected. Investigation of this dimension (beyond the handful of figures already studied) will further illuminate the phenomenon.<sup>40</sup>

Beyond these threads, one of the most compelling needs for further research is the dimension of gender in modern (and contemporary) lay Rinzai Zen. Throughout this dissertation, I have discussed small pieces of the puzzle, such as women's presence in lay practice contexts at Engakuji and elsewhere amidst a male-dominated practice community (chapter 3), and the intersections among lay Rinzai Zen, rhetoric and practices pertaining to *bushidō* and nation-building, and modern Japanese ideals of

---

<sup>40</sup> Michel Mohr also calls for more "more works focused on precise case studies, integration within wider frameworks, and investigation of marginal figures" (Mohr, "Plowing the Zen Field," 121); I concur with this.

masculinity. Both dimensions—women’s participation in lay Zen and masculinity in modern Japanese Rinzai Zen—must be explored further to understand how gender functioned within modern Rinzai Zen, which bore a legacy of deeply androcentric rhetoric and practice that extended back centuries and persists to this day.

With regard to the role of women in modern Zen, scholars have increasingly researched women (primarily monastics and temple wives) in the Sōtō Zen sect in the modern period.<sup>41</sup> Few, however, have examined contemporaneous women in the Rinzai Zen sect. One reason for this has undoubtedly been the decreasing number of Rinzai nuns and the disappearance of Rinzai Zen nunneries.<sup>42</sup> In order to understand how gender has mediated women’s religious roles in the lay Rinzai context, it is imperative to study the gender makeup of the groups, highlight the (few) known voices of female practitioners, interrogate the relative absence of female monastics and leaders in these lay groups, and

---

<sup>41</sup> See, for example, Noriko Kawahashi, “‘Jizoku’ (Priests’ Wives) in Soto Zen Buddhism: An Ambiguous Category,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 161–183; and Paula Kane Robinson Arai, *Women Living Zen: Japanese Sōtō Buddhist Nuns* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012). For discussion in a context outside of Zen, see, for example, Jessica Starling, *Guardians of the Buddha’s Home: Domestic Religion in the Contemporary Jōdo Shinshū* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2019).

<sup>42</sup> As of 1994, when Victor Hori wrote his article, there appeared to be no Rinzai training monasteries for women in Japan (Hori, “Teaching and Learning in the Rinzai Zen Monastery,” 10). However, Stephen Covell notes that as of 2004, in the Rinzai Myōshinji branch’s 3,389 temples (with 3,461 total priests), there were 102 women serving as head priests (3% of total head priests) and 135 women serving as priests (3.9% of total); this was comparable to women’s overall percentages in the Sōtō sect: 4.3% of the 16,621 priests were female head priests, although the number of total female priests was unknown (Covell, *Japanese Temple Buddhism*, 130–131). In 2018, I met a Rinzai nun who confirmed that there was a period of time recently with no active Rinzai nunneries. However, she said that about fifteen years previously (i.e., c. 2003), a Rinzai nuns’ training hall (*nisōdō* 尼僧堂) was established at the temple Tenneiji 天衣寺 in Gifu Prefecture; this nun trained there for many years. There is no female rōshi at the nuns’ hall, so a (male) rōshi from the nearby Zuiryōji 瑞龍寺 comes regularly to the nuns’ hall for teaching-related activities.

examine modern Rinzai Zen's continued male-centeredness against the gender norms and gendered ideals of modern Japan. Such research is relevant given the multitudes of female Zen practitioners in the West and relatively large influence of Rinzai-derived Zen traditions in the development of Zen in the West. Drawing from Levering's similar question in the premodern Chinese context, I ask: how do we reconcile the growing number of female practitioners with the continued androcentrism of modern Rinzai Zen's rhetoric and practice (and, in Japan, of Rinzai training opportunities)?<sup>43</sup>

As mentioned above, Buddhist ideals and rhetoric of soteriological equality continue to exist alongside, and contradict, Rinzai Zen's world and religious opportunities in which there are tangible lines, starkly drawn according to gender. Indeed, this tension represents—and is related to—core tensions in modern and contemporary lay Rinzai Zen, such as the persistence of monastic ideals.

---

<sup>43</sup> Levering, "Lin-Chi (Rinzai) Ch'an and Gender."

## Appendix A: Lay Sesshin Guidelines (Engakuji, 1918)

Translator's note: these "Lay Sesshin Participation Guidelines" (*Koji sesshinkai sanko kokoroe* 居士接心會參會心得) and "Guidelines for Encountering the Master" (*Sanzen no kokoroe* 参禪の心得) were published together in *Zendō* in August 1918, prior to a *sesshin* (meditation intensive) for laypeople at Engakuji to be held later that month.<sup>1</sup> Below, I retain original formatting and place the translations immediately after each bullet point to allow a line-by-line comparison with the original text. The in-text parentheses come from the original; my own clarifications are in brackets.

### **"Lay Sesshin Participation Guidelines" ("Koji sesshinkai sanko kokoroe" 居士接心會參會心得)**

- 一、前号所載の如く、本月十六日より五日間円覚寺内に於て夏期接心會を開催致します。As was indicated in the last issue [of *Zendō*], this month, from the sixteenth day, we will hold a five-day summer-period *sesshinkai* within [the grounds of] Engakuji.
- 一、五日間聴講・参禪者以外に一日乃二・三日参會の希望者も歓迎します。但し其際は一応幹部まで御届下さい。Aside from auditors and Zen practitioners who will [be there for] five days, we also welcome people who wish to come for one, two, or three days. However, in that case, please notify the upper management.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Zendō*, no. 97 (August 1918), 59.

一、宿泊者は本月十五日午後三時頃までに到着のこと。携帯品は前号所報通り。

通参者は成るべく十六日午前七時まで。People staying overnight should arrive by around 3:00 in the afternoon on the fifteenth day of this month. The personal effects [that you bring] should be in accordance with information in the last issue [of *Zendō*]. Commuters [should arrive], if possible, by 7:00am on the sixteenth.

一、猶ほ参會者の御便宜を謀り十五日中は大船駅に馬車の支度を致します。

Additionally, to provide convenience for participants, we will make preparations for a horse-drawn carriage at Ōfuna Station during the day on the fifteenth.

一、参禅者にして御不案内の事は如何なることでもお尋ね下さい、出来るだけの

御回答は致します。For participants, if there is something with which you are unfamiliar, please ask; we will answer to the degree that we can.

一、講本臨濟録及び坐禅用座具御所有の方は成るべく御携帯のほどを願ひます。

For those who have the *kōhon* [book used for *teishō*], the *Record of Rinzai*, as well as sitting implements, we ask that you bring them with you if possible.

### “Guidelines for Encountering the Master (*Sanzen no kokoroe* 参禅の心得)”

一、相見 禅師を拝して弟子の盟を為すの礼。 *Shōken* [literally, “meeting and

seeing”]: The ritual of paying respects to the Zen master and establishing the disciple’s vow.

一、参禅 禅師の室に入り自己が工夫せる公案（問題）の見解を呈するなり。

*Sanzen*: Entering the master's room and presenting one's view and understanding of the kōan (problem) on which one is working.

一、坐禅 坐禅には厚き座布団を布き結跏趺坐右の足を左の股の上に安じ左の掌を右の掌の上に安じ大拇指相拄へ脊梁骨を直立して後徐に気を臍下丹田（下腹）に籠め禅師より授かりし公案を拈提（工夫）すべし務めて頭腦を空虚ならしむること学者の要心なり。 *Zazen*: For *zazen* [sitting meditation], spread out a thick *zabuton* [cushion]; for full lotus posture, stabilize your right foot on top of your left thigh, and set your left palm on top of your right palm; bring together and curve your thumbs; erect your backbone [so that it is] straight up; then you should deliberately put your vital energy [*ki* 気] in the *tanden* (the lower abdomen) and devote yourself to the kōan that you received from the master ([with] intense seeking); work on this and make your mind empty; this is the necessary mental attitude of the student.

一、止静 学者禅堂に入り唯一に修禅する時なり（撃拆一聲鳴磬四聲此間出入談笑を禁ず）。 *Shijō* [literally, “stopping and quieting down”]: The student enters the meditation hall, and it becomes the time for solely practicing Zen (between the single strike of the wooden clappers and four strikes of the *meikin* [bell], it is forbidden to leave, enter, talk, or laugh).

一、経行 止静の後休憩時間鳴磬一聲拆二聲此間雑用を辨ず。 (*Kinhin* [walking meditation]: After quieting down [i.e., sitting meditation], [there is] break time;

between the one strike of the *meikin* [bell] and two strikes of the wooden clappers, [you can] use it for various purposes.)

一、参禅の喚鐘鳴らば止靜經行を問はず速かに入室すべし、未だ工夫純熟せずして猥りに入室すること勿れ。If the bell for *sanzen* rings, regardless of whether it is [time for] sitting or *kinhin* [walking meditation], you should quickly enter the [master's] room, and you must not enter the room carelessly or without engaging fully in practice.

一、入室の時は入る時合掌出る時又手當胸師の七尺前に於て三拝し師の前に於て一拝すべし三拝するは三世諸仏を拝し一拝するは師を拝するなり禮拜は佛足を頂くの心を以て綿々密々決して輕忽なること勿れ。Entering the room, do *gasshō* [i.e., place your hands palm to palm], and when you leave, again do *gasshō* in front of your chest; seven feet in front of the master, you should do three prostrations, and in front of the master, do one prostration. Doing three prostrations pays reverence to the buddhas of the three worlds, and doing one prostration pays reverence to the master. Paying obeisance means having the mental state of receiving the Buddha's feet, and you must not ignore that this [paying obeisance] is continuous and secret.

一、師の前に就て見解を呈する時は恰も勇士の戦陣に臨み両刃相交ゆるの時にして決して師に譲らず臆念すること勿れ。Before the master, when you present your insight and understanding, it is as if you are facing a warrior's battlefield and exchanging swords; without surrendering to the master, you must not be timid.

一、師の垂誡は心耳を淨ふして謹聽すべし室内のことは何事に因らず決して他に

漏すことを嚴禁す。As for the master's instructions, you should purify your mind and ears and listen attentively; no matter what happens in the room, it is strictly prohibited for anything to leak out.

厚く三寶に歸依して身心清淨ならんことを要す。Taking deep refuge in the Three Treasures; needing to seek to purify the body and mind.



## Bibliography

### *Periodicals Consulted*

Bukkyō Gakkai 仏教学会. *Bukkyō* 仏教. Tokyo: Nōjunsha 能潤社, 1889–1902.

Bukkyō Taimusu-sha 仏教タイムス社. *Bukkyō Taimusu* 佛教タイムス. Bukkyō Taimusu-sha 仏教タイムス社, 1946–present.

Chūō Bukkyōsha 中央仏教社. *Chūō Bukkyō* 中央仏教. Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha 中央仏教社, 1917–1944.

———. *Daijō Zen* 大乘禪. Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha 中央仏教社, 1924–present.

Dai Nihon Fujin Shūyōkai 大日本婦人修養會. *Fujin to shūyō* 婦人と修養. Tokyo: Fujokaisha 婦女界社, 1932–1937.

Daihōrinkaku 大法輪閣. *Daihōrin* 大法輪. Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku 大法輪閣, 1934–present.

First Zen Institute of America. *Zen Notes*, 1954–present.

Kojirin 居士林. *Kojirin sōdan* 居士林叢談, 1876–1877.

*Nihon shūkyō* 日本宗教. Nihon Shūkyōsha 日本宗教社, 1895–1897.

*Rikugō zasshi* 六合雜誌. Tokyo: Tōkyō Seinenkai 東京青年会, 1880–1922.

Rinzaishū Daigakunai Zengaku Kenkyūkai 臨濟宗大學禪學研究會. *Zengaku Kenkyū* 禪學研究. Rinzaishū Daigakunai Zengaku Kenkyūkai 臨濟宗大学内禅学研究会, 1925–present.

*Seikō: risshi dokuritsu shinpo no tomo* 成功—立志獨立進步之友. Tokyo: Seikō Zasshisha 成功雜誌社, 1902–1916.

Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会. *Zenmi* 禅味. Tokyo: Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会, 1955–present.

Shinjinsha 眞人社. *Shinjin* 眞人. Tokyo: Shinjinsha 眞人社, 1910s–1918.

Shōhōrin Kyōkai 正法輪協會. *Shōhōrin* 正法輪. Kyoto: Shōhōrin Kyōkai 正法輪協會, 1891–present.

*Shūyō* 修養. Shōrinkai 少林会, 1907–1913.

*Tsūzoku Bukkyō Shinbun* 通俗佛教新聞. Tokyo: Bukkyō Shinbunsha 佛教新聞社, 1894.

Yōshinkai 養眞會. *Yōshin* 養眞. Tokyo: Yōshinkai 養眞會, 1918–1922.

Yōshinkai 養眞會, and Chōwadō Kyōkai 調和道協會. *Chōwa* 調和. Tokyo: Yōshinkai Shuppanbu 養眞會出版部, 1922–1932.

*Zaike bukkō* 在家佛教. Tokyo: Zaike Bukkyō Kyōkai 在家佛協會, 1952–present.

Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo 禪文化研究所. *Zen bunka* 禪文化. Hanazono Daigaku Zen Bunka Kenkyūkai 花園大学禪文化研究会, 1955–present.

*Zen no seikatsu* 禪の生活. Aoyama Shoin 青山書院, 1922–1944.

*Zen no tomo* 禪の友. Tokyo: Zen'yūkai 禪友會, 1936–1944.

Zen Sekai-sha 禪世界社. *Zen sekai* 禪世界. Zen Sekai-sha 禪世界社, 1908–1915.

*Zen* 禪. Tokyo: Kōyūkan 光融館, 1900–1901.

*Zendō* 禪道. Zendōkai 禪道會, 1910–1923.

*Zengaku* 禪學. Tokyo: Kōyūkan 光融館, 1895–1900.

Zenkisha 禪機. *Zenki* 禪機, 1917–1919.

*Zenshū* 禪宗. Zenjō Kutsu 禪定窟, 1894–1921.

### **Other Primary and Secondary Sources**

Abe Masao. “Hisamatsu’s Philosophy of Awakening.” *The Eastern Buddhist* 14, no. 1 (1981): 26–42.

Ahn, Juhn Young. “Malady of Meditation: A Prolegomenon to the Study of Illness and Zen.” Dissertation, University of California-Berkeley, 2007.

Akiyama Goan 秋山悟庵. *Seinen to Zen* 青年と禪. Tokyo: Bunseisha, 1910.

———. *Seinenkatsu Zen* 青年活禪. Tokyo: Rangaidō Shoten, 1913.

———. *Zen to bushidō* 禪と武士道. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1907.

- . *Zen to ei'yū* 禅と英雄. Tokyo: Chūō Shoin, 1914.
- . *Zen to shūyō* 禅と修養. Tokyo: Tōadō Shobō, 1908.
- Akizuki Ryōmin. “A Zennist’s Vision of the Time for Dharma (Religious Truth) to Become Manifest.” Translated by Nobuhara Tokiyuki. *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 14 (1994): 23–32.
- . *New Mahāyāna: Buddhism for a Post-Modern World*. Translated by James W. Heisig and Paul L. Swanson. Berkeley, Calif.: Asian Humanities Press, 1990.
- . “Patriarch Zen and the Kōan: An Introduction to Zen Training.” Translated by Jeff Shore. *Chanoyu Quarterly*, no. 72 (1993): 12–30.
- Akizuki Ryōmin 秋月龍珉. *Kōan: jissenteiki Zen nyūmon* 公案: 実践的禅入門. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 2009.
- . *Shin daijō: Bukkyō no posuto-modan* 新大乘一仏教のポスト-モダン. Tokyo: Suzuki Shuppan, 1988.
- . *Zen no hito: watakushi no deatta jinsei no shitachi* 禅の人: 私の出会った人生の師たち. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1982.
- Ambaras, David R. *Bad Youth: Juvenile Delinquency and the Politics of Everyday Life in Modern Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- . “Social Knowledge, Cultural Capital, and the New Middle Class in Japan, 1895–1912.” *Journal of Japanese Studies* 24, no. 1 (1998): 1–33.
- Ambros, Barbara R. *Women in Japanese Religions*. New York: New York University Press, 2015.
- Anderson, Janica, Sean Murphy, Steven Z. Schwartz, and Joan Watts. *Zen Odyssey: The Story of Sokei-an, Ruth Fuller Sasaki, and the Birth of Zen in America*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2018.
- Arai, Paula Kane Robinson. *Women Living Zen: Japanese Sōtō Buddhist Nuns*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Asahina Sōgen 朝比奈宗源. “Seisetsu Oshō o omou 誠拙和尚を憶う.” *Zen bunka* 禅文化 60 (1971): 4–9.
- . “Zen no kōan 禅の公案.” In *Zen 禅*, vol. 3. Tokyo: Yuzankaku, 1941.

- Auerback, Micah. "A Closer Look at Zen at War: The Battlefield Chaplaincy of Shaku Sōen in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905)." In *Buddhism and Violence: Militarism and Buddhism in Modern Asia*, edited by Vladimir Tikhonov and Torkel Brekke, 152–71. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Baroni, Helen J. *Love, Rōshi: Robert Baker Aitken and His Distant Correspondents*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012.
- . *Obaku Zen: The Emergence of the Third Sect of Zen in Tokugawa Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.
- Bassui. *Mud and Water: A Collection of Talks by the Zen Master Bassui*. Translated by Arthur Braverman. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1989.
- Benesch, Oleg. *Inventing the Way of the Samurai: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Bushidō in Modern Japan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- . "Myths of Masculinity in the Martial Arts." In *The Routledge Companion to Gender and Japanese Culture*, edited by Jennifer Coates, Lucy Fraser, and Mark Pendleton, 261–69. Abingdon, Oxon, and New York: Routledge, 2020.
- . "National Consciousness and the Evolution of the Civil/Martial Binary in East Asia." *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Studies* 8, no. 1 (2011): 129–71.
- . "Reconsidering Zen, Samurai, and the Martial Arts." *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 14, no. 17 (Issue 17, Number 7) (September 2016): 1–23.
- Bielefeldt, Carl. "Ch'ang-Lu Tsung-Tse's *Tso-Ch'an I* and the 'Secret' of Zen Meditation." In *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, edited by Peter N. Gregory, 129–61. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 4. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986.
- . *Dōgen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Blackburn, Anne M. *Locations of Buddhism: Colonialism and Modernity in Sri Lanka*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Bodiford, William M. *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993.
- Borup, Jørn. "Contemporary Buddhist Priests and Clergy." In *Handbook of Contemporary Japanese Religions*, edited by Inken Prohl and John Nelson, 107–32. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012.

- . “Easternization of the East? Zen and Spirituality as Distinct Cultural Narratives in Japan.” *Journal of Global Buddhism* 16 (2015): 70–93.
- . *Japanese Rinzai Zen Buddhism: Myōshinji, a Living Religion*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008.
- . “Zen and the Art of Inverting Orientalism: Buddhism, Religious Studies and Interrelated Networks.” In *New Approaches to the Study of Religion, Volume 1: Regional, Critical, and Historical Approaches*, edited by Peter Antes, Armin W. Geertz, and Randi R. Warne, 451–87. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Braun, Erik. *The Birth of Insight: Meditation, Modern Buddhism, and the Burmese Monk Ledi Sayadaw*. Buddhism and Modernity. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Buckelew, Kevin. “Inventing Chinese Buddhas: Identity, Authority, and Liberation in Song-Dynasty Chan Buddhism.” Dissertation, Columbia University, 2018.
- Burns, Susan L. “Constructing the National Body: Public Health and the Nation in Nineteenth-Century Japan.” In *Nation Work: Asian Elites and National Identities*, edited by Timothy Brook and Andre Schmid, 17–50. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Buswell, Robert E. *The Zen Monastic Experience: Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Korea*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Caplow, Florence, and Susan Moon, eds. *The Hidden Lamp: Stories from Twenty-Five Centuries of Awakened Women*. Somerville, Mass.: Wisdom Publications, 2002.
- Cleary, Thomas F. *Minding Mind: A Course in Basic Meditation*. Boston and London: Shambhala, 1995.
- . *Training the Samurai Mind: A Bushido Sourcebook*. Boston: Shambhala, 2009.
- Collcutt, Martin. “Buddhism: The Threat of Eradication.” In *Japan in Transition: From Tokugawa to Meiji*, edited by Marius B. Jansen and Gilbert Rozman, 143–67. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- . *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1981.
- Courtois, Flora. *The Way That Extends in All Directions*. Los Angeles and Tokyo: Zen Center of Los Angeles (in US) and Shūjō Kenkyūkai (in Japan), 1971.

- Covell, Stephen G. *Japanese Temple Buddhism: Worldliness in a Religion of Renunciation*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.
- Crane, Hillary. "Are Buddhist Nuns Men at Heart?" *Magistra; Atchison* 6, no. 2 (Winter 2000): 31.
- . "Becoming a Nun, Becoming a Man: Taiwanese Buddhist Nuns' Gender Transformation." *Religion* 37, no. 2 (June 2007): 117–32.
- Davis, Winston. *Japanese Religion and Society: Paradigms of Structure and Change*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- DiNitto, Rachel. "Return of the 'Zuihitsu': Print Culture, Modern Life, and Heterogeneous Narrative in Prewar Japan." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 64, no. 2 (2004): 251–90.
- Dōgen. "Dōgen's Fukanzazengi and Shōbōgenzō Zazengi." Translated by Norman Waddell and Masao Abe. *The Eastern Buddhist* 6, no. 2 (October 1973): 115–28.
- Dogen. *Shōbōgenzō: The True Dharma-Eye Treasury (Taisho Volume 82, Number 2582), Vol. 4 Nishijima, Gudo Wafu*. BDK English Tripitaka Series; Berkeley, Calif. Numata Center for Buddhist Transl. and Research, 2008.  
dBET\_T2582\_Shobogenzo4\_2008\_0.pdf.
- Dōgen. *The Heart of Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō*. Translated by Norman Waddell and Masao Abe. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Dubuisson, Daniel, and William Sayers. *The Western Construction of Religion: Myths, Knowledge, and Ideology*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Eido Shimano. *Gold Wind: Zen Talks*. Edited by Janis Levine. Tokyo: Japan Publications, Inc., 1979.
- Engakuji 圓覺寺. *Gyōten Zazen: Engakuji Gyōten Zazen kai gojū shūnen kinenshi* 暁天坐禪・円覺寺暁天坐禪会五十周年記念誌. Kamakura, Japan: Engakuji, 2014.
- . "Koji shōken meibo 居士相見名簿." Handwritten name register (original). Kamakura, Japan, 1958–1975.
- . "Koji shōken meibo 居士相見名簿." Handwritten name register (original). Kamakura, Japan, 1975–2016.
- . "Koji shōkenbo: shoshoken 居士相見簿：初相見." Handwritten name register (original). Kamakura, Japan, 1916–1917.

- . “Koji shōkenkaku 居士相見覺.” Handwritten name register (original). Kamakura, Japan, 1943–1944.
- . “Kojichō 居士帳.” Handwritten name register (original). Kamakura, Japan, 1944–1958.
- . “Kojirin Kijō 居士林規定.” Handwritten copy of wooden placard mounted on wall. Kamakura, Japan, n.d.
- . “Kojirin Kijō 居士林規定.” Wooden placard mounted on wall of Kojirin. Kamakura, Japan, 1928.
- , ed. *Shaku Sōen to kindai nihon: wakaki Zensō, sekai o kakeru: Shaku Sōen onki hyakunen kinen tokubetsu ten* 釈宗演と近代日本：若き禅僧、世界を駆ける：釈宗演遠諱 100 年記念特別展. Kamakura, Japan: Engakuji, 2018.
- Enko Kokugon 圓悟克勤. *Hekiganroku* 碧巖錄. Edited by Iriya Yoshitaka 入矢義高, Mizoguchi Yūzō 溝口雄三, Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, and Itō Fumio 伊藤文生. 3 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko, 1992–1996.
- Faure, Bernard. “Chan and Zen Studies: The State of the Field(s).” In *Chan Buddhism in Ritual Context*, edited by Bernard Faure, 1–35. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- . *Chan Insights and Oversights: An Epistemological Critique of the Chan Tradition*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- . “From Bodhidharma to Daruma: The Hidden Life of a Zen Patriarch.” *Japan Review*, no. 23 (2011): 45–71.
- . *The Power of Denial: Buddhism, Purity, and Gender*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- . *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Ferguson, Andy. *Zen’s Chinese Heritage*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2000.
- Figal, Gerald A. *Civilization and Monsters: Spirits of Modernity in Meiji Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999.
- Foulk, T. Griffith. “‘Rules of Purity’ in Japanese Zen.” In *Zen Classics: Formative Texts in the History of Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 137–69. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

- . “The Zen Institution in Modern Japan.” In *Zen: Tradition and Transition*, edited by Kenneth Kraft, 157–77. New York: Grove Press, 1988.
- Freeman, Alice. “Zen Buddhism in Japan-US Relations, 1941–1973: The Politics of Culture from the Pacific War to the Vietnam War.” Dissertation, Christ Church, University of Oxford, 2016.
- . “Zen Buddhism in Japan-US Relations, 1941–1973: The Politics of Culture from the Pacific War to the Vietnam War.” Lecture, Duke University, April 4, 2019.
- Fujita Reisai 藤田靈齋, Reisai. *Fujita-shiki shūyō sokushin chōwahō chūden* 藤田式修養息心調和法中伝. 20th ed. Tokyo: San’yūdō Shoten, 1920.
- . *Shinshin kyōken no hiketsu: jikken shūyō* 心身強健之秘訣: 実験修養. Tokyo: San’yūdō Shoten, 1908.
- Fujiyoshi Jikai 藤吉慈海. *Zensha Hisamatsu Shin’ichi* 禅者久松真一. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1987.
- Fukao Hiroshi 深尾浩. “Daigaku no zenkai: Gakushūin Daigaku Shōzokukai 大学の禅会「学習院大学正統会」.” *Zen bunka* 禅文化, no. 41 (1966): 48–49.
- Fukuda Tokuzō Sensei Kinenkai 福田徳三先生記念会. *Fukuda Tokuzō Sensei no tsuioku* 福田徳三先生の追憶. Tokyo: Fukuda Tokuzō Sensei Kinenkai, 1960.
- Furuya Tesseki (Keisei) 古屋鉄石 (景晴). *Zazen dokushū hō: nijū seikishiki zazen hō* 坐禅独修法: 二十世紀式坐禅法. Tokyo: Seishin Kenkyūkai, 1909.
- Gainty, Denis. *Martial Arts and the Body Politic in Meiji Japan*. Routledge Studies in the Modern History of Asia. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu 学習院大学坐禅部. *Shōzoku: Daisangō* 正續: 第三号. Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu Shōzokukai, 1962.
- . *Shōzoku: Daiyongō* 正續: 第四号. Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu Shōzokukai, 1963.
- , ed. *Zazen techō* 坐禅手帳. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Tokyo: Gakushūin Daigaku Zazenbu, 2012.
- Gakushūin Ōyūkai 学習院桜友会. “Omoide sākuru meguri (sono ni): zazenbu 思い出サークルめぐり<その2>: 坐禅部.” *Oblige*, no. 34 (November 25, 2001): 22–23.



- Geng, Song. *The Fragile Scholar: Power and Masculinity in Chinese Culture*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2004.
- Gill, Sam D. "Play." In *Guide to the Study of Religion*, edited by Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon. London and New York: Cassell, 2000.
- Gluck, Carol. *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Grant, Beata. "Da Zhangfu: The Gendered Rhetoric of Heroism and Equality in Seventeenth-Century Chan Buddhist Discourse Records." *NAN NÜ* 10, no. 2 (January 1, 2008): 177–211.
- Gregory, Peter. "Yasutani's Five Types of Zen and Keihō-Zenji." presented at the The Philip Kapleau Papers: Zen Buddhism in Post-World War II Japan and the United States, Duke University, October 12, 2019.
- Gregory, Peter N., ed. *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1987.
- , ed. *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism 4. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986.
- Habito, Ruben L. F. "In Memoriam: Yamada Kōun Rōshi (1907–1989)." *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 10 (1990): 231–37.
- Hakuin Ekaku. *Hakuin's Precious Mirror Cave: A Zen Miscellany*. Edited by Norman Waddell. Berkeley, Calif.: Counterpoint, 2009.
- . "Hakuin's Yassenkanna." Translated by Norman Waddell. *The Eastern Buddhist* 34, no. 1 (January 2002): 79–119.
- . *The Essential Teachings of Zen Master Hakuin: A Translation of the Sokkō-Roku Kaien-Fusetsu*. Translated by Norman Waddell. Boston, MA: Shambhala, 1994.
- . *The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings*. Translated by Philip B. Yampolsky. Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies 86. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971.
- . *Wild Ivy: The Spiritual Autobiography of Zen Master Hakuin*. Translated by Norman Waddell. Boston: Shambhala, 2001 (originally published in 1999).
- Hakuin 白隠. *Yassenkanna* 夜船閑話. Edited by Yoshizawa Katsuhiro 芳澤勝弘. Vol. 4 of *Hakuin Zenji hōgo zenshū* 白隠禪師法語全集. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo 禪文化研究所, 2000.

Hakuin 白隠 and Shaku Dokutan 釈毒潭. *Hakuin Zenji no gongyō* 白隠禪師の言行. Tokyo: Ōshima Seishindō, 1915.

Hakusan Dōjō Jikishinkai 白山道場直心会. *Hakusan Dōjō kaitan hyakunenshi* 白山道場開單百年史. Tokyo: Hakusan Dōjō Jikishinkai, 2000.

Harada Sogaku 原田祖岳. *Hakuin Zenji zazen san kōwa* 白隠禪師坐禪讃講話. 2nd ed. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1979.

———. *Hakuin zenji zazen san kōwa* 白隠禪師坐禪讃講話. 7th ed. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 2009.

———. *Shōshū kokushi hakuin zenji zazen san kōwa* 正宗国師白隠禪師坐禪讃講話. Dōai Sōsho 同愛叢書 4. Tokyo: Shōshin Dōaikai, 1931.

———. *Tadashii zazen no kokoroe* 正しい坐禪の心得. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 2008.

———. *Zazen no shikata: Shin fukan zazengi* 坐禪の仕方: 新普勸坐禪儀. Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha, 1926.

———. *Zengaku shitsugi kaitō* 禅学質疑解答. Vol. 6 of *Harada Sogaku chosakushū* 原田祖岳著作集. Tokyo: Hara Shobō, 2006.

Hardacre, Helen. *Kurozumikyō and the New Religions of Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986.

———. *Religion and Society in Nineteenth-Century Japan: A Study of the Southern Kantō Region, Using Late Edo and Early Meiji Gazetteers*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002.

———. *Shintō and the State, 1868–1988*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Haskel, Peter. *Sword of Zen: Master Takuan and His Writings on Immovable Wisdom and the Sword Taie*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Hasumi Shunpō 蓮実俊峯. *Shishirin yoei* 獅子林余影. Nishinasuno-mura, Tochigi 西那須野村 (栃木県): Unshōji, 1929.

Hau Hō'ō. *The Sound of the One Hand: 281 Zen Koans with Answers*. Translated by Yoel Hoffmann. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975.

Hau Hō'ō 破有法王. *Gendai sōji Zen hyōron* 現代相似禪評論. Revised. Tokyo: Taiheiyō Shuppan, 1971 (originally published in 1916).

- Hayashi Makoto, Ōtani Eiichi, and Paul L. Swanson, eds. *Modern Buddhism in Japan*. Nagoya, Japan: Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, 2014.
- Heine, Steven. “A Critical Survey of Works on Zen since Yampolsky.” *Philosophy East and West* 57, no. 4 (October 2007): 577–92.
- . *Chan Rhetoric of Uncertainty in the Blue Cliff Record: Sharpening a Sword at the Dragon Gate*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Heine, Steven, and Dale S. Wright, eds. *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- , eds. *Zen Masters*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- , eds. *Zen Ritual: Studies of Zen Buddhist Theory in Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Heisig, James W., and John C. Maraldo, eds. *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School, & the Question of Nationalism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1995.
- Herrigel, Eugen. *Zen in the Art of Archery*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. 7th ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Hirano Naoko. “The Birth of Reiki and Psycho-Spiritual Therapy in 1920’s-1930’s Japan: The Influence of ‘American Metaphysical Religion.’” *Japanese Religions* 40, no. 1 & 2 (2016): 65–83.
- Hiratsuka Raichō. *In the Beginning, Woman Was the Sun: The Autobiography of a Japanese Feminist*. Translated by Teruko Craig. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.
- Hiratsuka Raichō 平塚らいてう. *Genshi josei wa taiyō de atta: Hiratsuka Raichō jiden* 元始、女性は太陽であった：平塚らいてう自伝. Tōkyō: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1992.
- Hisamatsu Shin’ichi. *Critical Sermons of the Zen Tradition: Hisamatsu’s Talks on Linji*. Translated by Christopher Ives and Gishin Tokiwa. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002.
- Hitotsubashi Daigaku 一橋大学. “Tōkyō Shōka Daigaku No Kikōzu 東京商科大学の機構図.” Accessed April 22, 2018.  
<https://web.archive.org/web/20180422012442/https://www.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/pr/tenji/kikaku/2009/pdf/chart2.pdf>.

- Hitotsubashi Nyoidan 一橋如意団. *Tetsu nyoi: Hitotsubashi nyoidan hachijisshūnen kinenshi* 鉄如意: 一橋如意団八十周年記念誌. Kodaira: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1988.
- . *Tetsu nyoi: Hitotsubashi nyoidan hyakushūnen kinenshi* 鉄如意: 一橋如意団百周年記念誌. Kunitachi: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 2008.
- . *Tetsu nyoi: Hitotsubashi nyoidan kyūjishshūnen kinenshi* 鉄如意: 一橋如意団九十周年記念誌. Kunitachi: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1998.
- . *Tetsu nyoi* 鉄如意. Tokyo: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1931.
- . *Tetsu nyoi* 鉄如意. Tokyo: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1937.
- . *Tetsu nyoi* 鉄如意. Tokyo: Hitotsubashi Nyoidan, 1957.
- Hori, G. Victor Sōgen. “Kōan and Kenshō in the Rinzai Zen Curriculum.” In *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 280–315. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Teaching and Learning in the Rinzai Zen Monastery.” *Journal of Japanese Studies* 20, no. 1 (1994): 5–35. <https://doi.org/10.2307/132782>.
- . “Zen Kōan Capping Phrase Books: Literary Study and the Insight ‘Not Founded on Words or Letters.’” In *Zen Classics: Formative Texts in the History of Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 171–214. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hori, Victor Sōgen. “The Nature of the Rinzai (Linji) Koan Practice.” In *Sitting with Koans*, edited by John Daido Loori, 117–30. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2006.
- . “The Steps of Koan Practice.” In *Sitting with Koans*, edited by John Daido Loori, 131–48. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2006.
- . “The Study of Buddhist Monastic Practice: Reflections on Robert Buswell’s The Zen Monastic Experience.” *The Eastern Buddhist* 29, no. 2 (1996): 239–61.
- . *Zen Sand: The Book of Capping Phrases for Kōan Practice*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i, 2003.
- Hur, Nam-lin. “Han Yong’un (1879–1944) and Buddhist Reform in Colonial Korea.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): 75–97.

- Iida Tōin 飯田櫟隱. *Fukan zazengi ichikeisō* 普勸坐禪儀一茎草. Takatsuki (Osaka): Shōrinkutsu Dōjō, 1933.
- . *Hekiganshū teishōroku* 碧巖集提唱錄. Tokyo: Morie Shoten, 1932.
- . *Kaian gokoku teishōroku* 槐安國語提唱錄. 7 vols. Edited by Okada Kenji 岡田乾兒 and Nakadate Chōzaburō 中館長三郎. Tokyo: Okada Kenji and Nakadate Chōzaburō, 1920.
- . *Mumonkan sansui* 無門関鎖鑰. Tokyo: Morie Eiji, 1924.
- . *Sanzen hitsuwa* 參禪秘話. Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha, 1931.
- . *Sanzen manroku* 參禪漫錄. Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha, 1934.
- . *Tōin Zenwashū* 櫟隱禪話集. Tokyo: Chūō Bukkyōsha, 1930.
- Iizuka Iwao 飯塚巖. “Kamakura Engakuji ni koji sen’yō no dōjō o mōketaru shimatsu 鎌倉圓覺寺に居士専用の道場を設けたる仕末.” *Zendō* 禪道, no. 119 (August 1920): 35–43.
- . *Sanzen no shiori* 參禪のしをり. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1920.
- Iizuka Shinjin 飯塚真人. “Daigaku no Zenkai: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan 大学の禪会 早稲田大学済蔭団.” *Zen bunka* 禪文化, no. 43 (1967).
- Ikeda Eishun 池田英俊. *Meiji Bukkyō kyōkai kesshashi no kenkyū* 明治仏教教会結社史の研究. Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō, 1994.
- . *Meiji no Bukkyō: sono kōdō to shisō* 明治の仏教: その行動と思想. Tokyo: Hyōronsha, 1976.
- . *Meiji no shin Bukkyō undō* 明治の新仏教運動. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1976.
- . “Teaching Assemblies and Lay Societies in the Formation of Modern Sectarian Buddhism.” Translated by Clark Chilson. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 11–44.
- Imakita Kōsen 今北洪川. *Zenkai ichiran* 禪海一瀾. Tokyo: Hakujuisha, 1987.

Inoue Zenjō 井上禅定. *Shaku Sōen den: Zen o "ZEN" to tsutaeta Meiji no kōsō* 釈宗演 伝一禅をZENと伝えた明治の高僧. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo, 2000.

Ishikawa Rikizan 石川力山. "Transmission of Kirigami (Secret Initiation Documents): A Sōtō Practice in Medieval Japan." In *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Itō Kokan 伊藤古鑑. *Kōan Zenwa: Zen, satori no mondōshū* 公案禅話：禅・悟りの問答集. Tokyo: Daihōrin-kaku, 1976.

———, ed. *Rinzaishū nōto* 臨濟宗衲韻. Kyoto: Kichūdō, 1963.

———. *Zen to kōan* 禅と公案. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1970.

Ives, Christopher. *Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen's Critique and Lingering Questions for Buddhist Ethics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.

———. "True Person, Formless Self: Lay Zen Master Hisamatsu Shin'ichi." In *Zen Masters*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale Stuart Wright, 217–38. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

———. *Zen Awakening and Society*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992.

Jaffe, Richard M. "Buddhist Material Culture, 'Indianism,' and the Construction of Pan-Asian Buddhism in Prewar Japan." *Material Religion* 2, no. 3 (November 2006): 266–92.

———. "Editor's Introduction: Religion and the Japanese Empire." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): 1–7.

———. *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

———. *Seeking Śākyamuni: South Asia in the Formation of Modern Japanese Buddhism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2019.

———. "Seeking Śākyamuni: Travel and the Reconstruction of Japanese Buddhism." In *Defining Buddhism(s): A Reader*, edited by Karen Derris and Natalie Gummer, 252–80. London: Equinox Publishing, 2007.

———. "Ungo Kiyō's Ōjōyōka and Rinzai Zen Orthodoxy." In *Approaching the Land of Bliss: Religious Praxis in the Cult of Amitābha*, edited by Richard K. Payne and Kenneth K. Tanaka, 202–35. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.

- Jaffe, Richard, and Michel Mohr. "Editors' Introduction: Meiji Zen." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 1–10.
- James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature; Being the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion Delivered in Edinburgh in 1901–1902*. London and New York: Longmans Green, 1904.
- Jessup, J. Brooks. "Buddhist Activism, Urban Space, and Ambivalent Modernity in 1920s Shanghai." In *Recovering Buddhism in Modern China*, edited by J. Brooks Jessup and Jan Kiely, 37–78. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Jessup, James Brooks. "The Householder Elite: Buddhist Activism in Shanghai, 1920–1956." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2010.
- Josephson, Jason Ānanda. *The Invention of Religion in Japan*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- . "When Buddhism Became a 'Religion': Religion and Superstition in the Writings of Inoue Enryō." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33, no. 1 (2006): 143–68.
- Joskovich, Erez. "Laypeople Zen in Contemporary Japan: The Case of the Ningen Zen Association." Dissertation, Tel Aviv University, 2013.
- . "Playing the Patriarch: Representation and Transformation in the Zen Sermon." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 85, no. 2 (June 1, 2017): 470–93.
- . "Relying on Words and Letters: Scripture Recitation in the Japanese Rinzai Tradition." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 46, no. 1 (March 22, 2019): 53–78.
- Joskovich, Erez Hekigan. "The Inexhaustible Lamp of Faith: Faith and Awakening in the Japanese Rinzai Tradition." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 42, no. 2 (2015): 319–38.
- Kapleau, Philip. "Report from a Zen Monastery: 'All Is One, One Is None, None Is All.'" *The New York Times*. March 6, 1966, sec. *The New York Times Magazine*.
- . *The Three Pillars of Zen: Teaching, Practice, and Enlightenment*. New York: Anchor Books, 2000 (originally published in 1965).
- Karlin, Jason G. *Gender and Nation in Meiji Japan: Modernity, Loss, and the Doing of History*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014.

- . “The Gender of Nationalism: Competing Masculinities in Meiji Japan.” *Journal of Japanese Studies* 28, no. 1 (2002): 41–77.
- Katō Shōshun 加藤正俊. “‘A Lineage of Dullards’: Zen Master Tōjū Reisō and His Associates.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 151–65.
- Katō Totsudō 加藤咄堂. *Meisōron* 冥想論. Tokyo: Tōadō, 1905.
- . *Shūyōron* 修養論. Tokyo: Tōadō 東亜堂, 1909.
- Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峯大徹. *Naikanhō* 内觀法. Edited by Mucha Hōshi 無茶法師. 1928.
- Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹. *Naikanhō: Kioku chōju oyobi tanryoku zōshin no yōketsu* 内觀法: 記憶長寿及胆力増進之要訣. Tokyo: Seikō Zasshisha, 1908.
- . *Zen to chōjuhō* 禪と長寿法. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1907.
- Katsumine Daitetsu 勝峰大徹 and Linji Yixuan. *Rinzairoku kōgi* 臨濟錄講義. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1909.
- Kawahashi Noriko. “‘Jizoku’ (Priests’ Wives) in Soto Zen Buddhism: An Ambiguous Category.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 161–183.
- Keeler, Ward. *The Traffic in Hierarchy: Masculinity and Its Others in Buddhist Burma*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2017.
- Keiō Gijuku Bukkyō seinenkai 慶応義塾仏教青年会, ed. *Keiō Gijuku Bukkyō Seinenkai Hyakunenshi* 慶応義塾仏教青年会百年史. Keiō Gijuku Bukkyō Seinenkai, 1990.
- Ketelaar, James Edward. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Kim, Hwansoo. “The Adventures of a Japanese Monk in Colonial Korea: Sōma Shōei’s Zen Training with Korean Masters.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 36, no. 1 (2009): 125–65.
- . “‘The Future of Korean Buddhism Lies in My Hands’: Takeda Hanshi as a Sōtō Missionary.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): 99–135.
- . “Seeking the Colonizer’s Favors for a Buddhist Vision: The Korean Buddhist Nationalist Paek Yongsōng’s (1864–1940) Imje Sōn Movement and His



- Relationship with the Japanese Colonizer Abe Mitsuie (1862–1936).” *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 14, no. 2 (2014): 171–93.
- Kim, Hwansoo Ilmee. *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877–1912*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2012.
- . “Strategic Alliances: The Complex Relationship Between Japanese and Korean Buddhism, 1877–1912.” *Harvard Theological Review* 100, no. 4 (October 2007): 508.
- . *The Korean Buddhist Empire: A Transnational History, 1910–1945*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2018.
- King, Richard. *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and “the Mystic East.”* London and New York: Routledge, 1999.
- King, Sallie B. “Awakening Stories of Zen Buddhist Women.” In *Buddhism in Practice*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 513–24. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- . “Egalitarian Philosophies in Sexist Institutions: The Life of Satomi-San, Shinto Miko and Zen Buddhist Nun.” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 4, no. 1 (1988): 7–26.
- Kinsei zensōden* 近世禪僧伝. Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1982.
- Kirchner, Thomas. “Modernity and Rinzai Zen: Doctrinal Change or Continuity?” *Zen Buddhism Today: Annual Report of the Kyoto Zen Symposium* 13 (1996): 39–54.
- Kirchner, Thomas Yūhō, trans. *Entangling Vines: Zen Koans of the Shūmon Kattōshū*. 1st ed. Kyoto: Tenryū-ji Institute for Philosophy and Religion, 2004.
- Kishida Kinuo 岸田絹夫. *Hōmyaku: Gendai Zenshō Retsuden* 法脈：現代禪匠列伝. Kyoto: Chūgai Nippōsha, 1973.
- Komazawa Daigaku nai Zengaku Daijiten Hensanjo 駒澤大學内禪學大辭典編纂所, ed. *Zengaku Daijiten* 禪學大辭典. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten, 1985.
- Kongōshōji 金剛證寺. Vol. 5 of *Kongōshōji oyobi sannai jiin sedai* 金剛證寺及山内寺院世代. n.d.
- Kōno Taitsū 河野太通. *Hakuin zenji zazen wasan o yomu* 白隱禪師坐禪和讃を読む. Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha, 1989.

Kōzen Gokokukai 興禅護国会. *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi* 興禅護国会史. Tokyo: Kōzen Gokokukai, 1992.

———. *Kōzen Gokokukai-shi* 興禅護国会史. Tokyo: Kōzen Gokokukai, 2002.

Kraft, Kenneth, ed. *Zen Teaching, Zen Practice: Philip Kapleau and The Three Pillars of Zen*. New York: Weatherhill, 2000.

———, ed. *Zen: Tradition and Transition*. New York: Grove Press, 1988.

Krämer, Hans Martin. *Shimaji Mokurai and the Reconception of Religion and the Secular in Modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.

Kurita Hidehiko. "The Notion of *Shūyō* and Conceptualizing the Future of Religion at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." Translated by Eric H. Swanson. *Religious Studies in Japan* 4 (2018): 65–90.

Kurita Hidehiko 栗田英彦. "Fukushiki kokyū no kindai: Fujitashiki sokushin chōwadō wo jirei toshite 腹式呼吸の近代—藤田式息心調和法を事例として." *Ronshū* 論集, no. 43 (2016): 1–24.

———. "Meiji sanjūdai ni okeru 'shūyō' gainen to shōrai no shūkyō no kōsō 明治三〇年代における「修養」概念と将来の宗教の構想." *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 89, no. 3 (2015): 51–74.

———. "Okadashiki seizahō to kokkashugi: Futara Yoshinori o tsūjite 岡田式静坐法と国家主義—二荒芳徳を通じて." *Ronshū* 論集, no. 37 (2010): 1–24.

———. "Shinshū sōryo to Okadashiki seizahō 真宗僧侶と岡田式静坐法." *Kindai Bukkyō* 近代仏教, no. 21 (August 2014): 116–44.

Kurita Hidehiko 栗田英彦, Yoshinaga Shin'ichi 吉永進一, and Tsukada Hotaka 塚田穂高, eds. *Kingendai Nihon no minkan seishin ryōhō: okaruto enerugi no shosō* 近現代日本の民間精神療法: 不可視なエネルギーの諸相. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 2019.

Leggett, Trevor. *Samurai Zen: The Warrior Koans*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

———. *The Spirit of Budo: Old Traditions for Present-Day Life*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 1998.

———. *The Warrior Kōans: Early Zen in Japan*. London and Boston: Arkana, 1985.

- . *Three Ages of Zen: Samurai, Feudal and Modern*. Rutland, Vt.: C.E. Tuttle, 1993.
- . *Three Ages of Zen: Samurai, Feudal and Modern*. London: The Buddhist Society, 2017.
- Levering, Miriam. “Lin-Chi (Rinzai) Ch’an and Gender: The Rhetoric of Equality and the Rhetoric of Heroism.” In *Buddhism, Sexuality, and Gender*, edited by José I. Cabazón, 137–56. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Levering, Miriam L. “The Dragon Girl and the Abbess of Mo-Shan: Gender and Status in the Ch’an Buddhist Tradition.” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 5, no. 1 (January 1, 1982): 19–35.
- Linji (Rinzai), Wumen Huikai, and Seng-can. *Three Chan Classics: The Recorded Sayings of Linji, Wumen’s Gate, and the Faith Mind Maxim*. Translated by J. C. Cleary and Yoshida Osamu. Berkeley Calif.: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1999.
- Linji Yixuan. *The Record of Linji*. Edited by Thomas Yūhō Kirchner. Translated by Ruth Fuller Sasaki. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009.
- . *The Record of Linji: A New Translation of the Linjilu in the Light of Ten Japanese Zen Commentaries*. Translated by Jeffrey L. Broughton. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Loori, John Daido, ed. *Sitting with Koans: Essential Writings on Zen Koan Introspection*. 1st ed. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2006.
- Louie, Kam. *Theorising Chinese Masculinity: Society and Gender in China*. Cambridge and Oakleigh, Vic.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Louie, Kam, and Morris Low. *Asian Masculinities: The Meaning and Practice of Manhood in China and Japan*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Lukminaité, Simona. “Women’s Education at Meiji Jogakkō and Martial Arts.” *Asian Studies* 6, no. 2 (June 1, 2018): 173–88.
- Masu Nobuo 升信夫. “Meiji chūki ‘shūyō’ no ruikeika 明治中期「修養」の類型化.” *Tōin Hōgaku* 桐蔭法学 22, no. 1 (2015): 93–136.
- Masuzawa, Tomoko. *The Invention of World Religions, or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

- Matsuo, Kenji, and Fumihiko Sueki. *Kindai kokka to Bukkyō* 近代国家と仏教. Tōkyō: Kōsei Shuppansha, 2011.
- Maxey, Trent Elliott. *The “Greatest Problem”: Religion and State Formation in Meiji Japan*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014.
- McLaughlin, Levi. “Sōka Gakkai in Japan.” In *Handbook of Contemporary Japanese Religions*, edited by John K. Nelson and Inken Prohl, 269–307. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012.
- . “What Have Religious Groups Done After 3.11? Part 2: From Religious Mobilization to ‘Spiritual Care.’” *Religion Compass* 7, no. 8 (2013): 309–325.
- McMahan, David L. *The Making of Buddhist Modernism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- McRae, John R. *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2003.
- . “The Antecedents of Encounter Dialogue in Chinese Ch’an Buddhism.” In *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 46–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Meeks, Lori. *Hokkeji and the Reemergence of Female Monastic Orders in Premodern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010.
- Mineo Daikyū 峯尾大休. *Hakuin Zenji Kaien fusetsu kōwa* 白隠禪師開筵普說講話. Tokyo: Shigensha, 1934.
- Mirsalis, Dana Catherine. “Modernizing Ōmoto: Legitimacy, Authority, and Gender in Ōmoto’s Chinkon Kishin Boom (1916–1921).” Harvard University, 2014.
- Miura Isshū and Ruth Fuller Sasaki. *Zen Dust: The History of the Koan and Koan Study in Rinzai (Linji) Zen*. Melbourne & Basel: Quirin Press, 2015.
- Miyajima Sukeo 宮島資夫. *Zen ni ikuru* 禅に生くる. 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Tokyo: Daikyūkaku, 1932.
- Mohr, Michel. *Buddhism, Unitarianism, and the Meiji Competition for Universality*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014.
- . “Emerging from Nonduality: Kōan Practice in the Rinzai Tradition since Hakuin.” In *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, 244–79. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- . “Hakuin.” In *Buddhist Spirituality, Vol. II: Later China, Korea, Japan, and the Modern World*, edited by Takeuchi Yoshinori, 307–28. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1999 (originally published in 1990).
- . “Japanese Zen Schools and the Transition to Meiji: A Plurality of Responses in the Nineteenth Century.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 167–213.
- . “Monastic Tradition and Lay Practice from the Perspective of Nantenbō: A Response of Japanese Zen Buddhism to Modernity.” *Zen Buddhism Today: Annual Report of the Kyoto Zen Symposium* 12 (1996): 63–89.
- . “Plowing the Zen Field: Trends since 1989 and Emerging Perspectives.” *Religion Compass* 6, no. 2 (February 2012): 113–24.
- . “The Use of Traps and Snares: Shaku Sōen Revisited.” In *Zen Masters*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale Stuart Wright, 183–216. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- . *Traité sur l’Inépuisable Lampe Du Zen: Tōrei (1721–1792) et sa vision de l’éveil*. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1997.
- . “Zen Buddhism during the Tokugawa Period: The Challenge to Go beyond Sectarian Consciousness.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21, no. 4 (1994): 341–372.
- Moriya Tomoe 守屋友江. “Social Ethics of ‘New Buddhists’ at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: A Comparative Study of Suzuki Daisetsu and Inoue Shūten.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 32, no. 2 (2005): 283–304.
- Motora Yūjirō 元良勇次郎. “Sanzen nisshi 参禅日誌.” *Nihon shūkyō* 日本宗教 1, no. 2 (1895): 91–94.
- . “Sanzen nisshi 参禅日誌.” In vol. 6 of *Motora Yūjirō chosakushū* 元良勇次郎著作集, 349–57. Tokyo: Kress Shuppan, 2014.
- . “Zen to shinrigaku to no kankei 禅と心理学との関係.” *Nihon shugi* 日本主義, no. 1 (1897): 56–64.
- Mukyū-an Shujin 無休庵主人. *Kamakura sanzen kochū no shōsoku* 鎌倉参禅個中の消息. Tokyo: Tekka Shoin, 1900.
- Nagao Sōshi 長尾宗軾. *Banbutsu mina tatakao* 万物皆戦ふ. Tokyo: Hitorisha, 1923.

- . *Sōen Zenji no menmoku* 宗演禪師の面目. Tokyo: Ryūbunkan, 1920.
- Nakahara Shūgaku 中原秀嶽, ed. *Ikke goyō* 一華五葉. Tokyo: Rinzaishū Enjōkai Seinenbu, n.d. (probably 1910).
- Nakahara Tōshū 中原鄧州. *Nantenbō angyaroku* 南天棒行脚錄. Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha, 1984.
- . *Nantenbō Zenwashū* 南天棒禪話集. Tokyo: Chūō Shuppansha, 1927.
- Nathan, Mark A. *From the Mountains to the Cities: A History of Buddhist Propagation in Modern Korea*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018.
- Nishida Hiroshi 西田寛. "San ni ichi pēji: Meiji 41 ikō kōninkan shukeika shikan 参拾壹頁：明治41年以降任官主計科士官." Accessed February 20, 2020. <http://admiral31.world.coocan.jp/pp58.htm>.
- Nishimura Eishin 西村恵心. "Saïke no kaze (kōenkai) 済家の風（講演会）." *Zen kenkyūjo kiyō* 禅研究所紀要, no. 18/19 (March 31, 1991): 69–86.
- Nishimura Eshin 西村恵信. *Taishū Zen no jidai* 大衆禅の時代. Osaka: Tōhō Shuppan, 1983.
- Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治, ed. "Busshin shūhōmyaku 佛心宗法脈." In *Kōza Zen* 講座禅. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1967.
- , ed. *Zen no jissen* 禅の実践. Vol. 2 of *Kōza Zen* 講座禅. 8 vols. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1967.
- Nishiyama Kasan 西山禾山. *Kinben shigai* 金鞭指街. Kyoto: Izumoji Bunjirō, 1890.
- Nitobe Inazō. *Bushidō: The Classic Portrait of Samurai Martial Culture*. New York: Tuttle Publishing, 2004.
- Nitobe Inazō 新渡戸稲造. *Bushidō* 武士道. 7th ed. Tokyo: Teimi Shuppansha, 1908.
- . *Shūyō* 修養. Tokyo: Jitsugyō no Nihonsha, 1911.
- Nukariya Kaiten. *Religion of the Samurai: A Study of Zen Philosophy and Discipline in China and Japan*. London: Luzac & Co., 1913.

- Oguri Takahiro 小栗隆博. “A Study of the Mysterious Zen Monk Imai Fukuzan.” *Komazawa Daigaku Daigakuin Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūkai* 駒沢大学大学院仏教学研究會, no. 43 (May 2010): 176–156.
- Okada Torajirō. *The Okada Method of Seiza Culture for Mind and Body*. Los Angeles, California: Okada Science Society, 1919.
- Ōmori Sōgen. *Sanzen Nyūmon: An Introduction to Zen Training*. Translated by Dōgen Hosokawa and Roy Yoshimoto. London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 1996.
- Ōmori Sōgen 大森曹玄. *Sanzen nyūmon* 参禅入門. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1986.
- Osaka Kōryū 苧坂光龍, ed. *Seisō Jōkō* 聖僧定光. Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1955.
- . *Zaike no Zen: Osaka Kōryū-shū* 在家の禅：苧坂光龍集. Part 5, Number 8, in *Shōwa Bukkyō Zenshū* 昭和仏教全集. Tokyo: Kyōiku Shinchōsha, 1968.
- . *Zaike Zen nyūmon* 在家禅入門. Vol. 4 of *Daizō Sensho* 大蔵選書. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1969.
- Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, *Kindai Bukkyō to iu shiza: sensō, Ajia, shakai shugi* 近代仏教という視座：戦争・アジア・社会主義. Tokyo: Perikansha, 2012.
- Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, and Kondō Shuntarō 近藤俊太郎, eds. *Kindai Bukkyō sutadizu: Bukkyō kara mita mō hitotsu no kindai* 近代仏教スタディーズ：仏教からみたもうひとつの近代. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2016.
- Patessio, Mara. *Women and Public Life in Early Meiji Japan: The Development of the Feminist Movement*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2011.
- . “Women Getting a ‘University’ Education in Meiji Japan: Discourses, Realities, and Individual Lives.” *Japan Forum* 25, no. 4 (December 1, 2013): 556–81.
- Reader, Ian, and George J. Tanabe, Jr. *Practically Religious: Worldly Benefits and the Common Religion of Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1998.
- Reitan, Richard M. *Making a Moral Society: Ethics and the State in Meiji Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2010.
- Rinzaikai 臨済会, ed. *Shōwa, Heisei, zensōden* 昭和・平成, 禅僧伝. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2000.

Rochester Zen Center. *Chants & Recitations*. Rochester, NY: Rochester Zen Center, 2005.

Satō Giei 佐藤義英. *Unsui nikki: e de miru Zen no shugyō seikatsu* 雲水日記: 絵で見る 禅の修行生活. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo, 2015 (originally published in 1972).

Satō Giei and Nishimura Eishin. *Unsui: A Diary of Zen Monastic Life*. Edited by Bardwell L. Smith. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1973.

Satō Kōji 佐藤幸治, ed. *Zenteki ryōhō • naikanhō* 禅的療法 • 内観法. Tokyo: Bunkōdō, 1972.

Satomi Myōdō. *Passionate Journey: The Spiritual Autobiography of Satomi Myōdō*. Translated by Sallie B. King. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Sawada, Janine Anderson. *Confucian Values and Popular Zen: Sekimon Shingaku in Eighteenth-Century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993.

———. "Political Waves in the Zen Sea: The Engaku-Ji Circle in Early Meiji Japan." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (1998): 117–50.

———. *Practical Pursuits: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004.

Schlütter, Morten. *How Zen Became Zen: The Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-Dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

Shakamunikai Shūmukyoku 釈迦牟尼会宗務局, ed. *Shakamunikai gojū nenshi* 釈迦牟尼会五十年史. Tokyo: Nippon Infomeeshon Shuppan Kyoku, 1970.

Shakamunikai 釈迦牟尼会. *Zaike Zen no kyoshō osaka kōryū* 在家禅の巨匠苧坂光竜. Tokyo: Shakamunikai, 1997.

Shaku Sōen 釋宗演. *Shaku Sōen zenshū* 釋宗演全集. Edited by Matsuda Takenoshimabito 松田竹の嶋人. 10 vols. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1929–1930.

———. *Shūyō no shiori* 修養の枝折. Minamimanshū Tetsudō Shomuka 南満洲鉄道庶務課, 1913.

———. *Zazen wasan zokuge* 坐禅和讃俗解. Tokyo: Keisei Shoin, 1898.

———. *Zenkai ichiran kōwa* 禅海一瀾講話. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1918.



- Shaku Sōen 釋宗演 and Hakuin 白隱. *Zazen wasan kōwa* 坐禪和讃講話. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1912.
- Shaku Sōen 釋宗演 and Hōjō Tokiyoshi 北条時敬, eds. *Sōryūkutsu nenpu* 蒼竜窟年譜. Tokyo: Ōkura Yasugorō, 1894.
- Shaku Sōen 釋宗演 and Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙. *Seiza no susume* 静坐のすすめ. Tokyo: Kōyūkan, 1899.
- Shaku Soyen (Shaku Sōen). *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot: Addresses on Religious Subjects*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1906.
- . *Zen for Americans*. Translated by Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki. La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1913.
- Sharf, Robert. “Sudden/Gradual and the State of the Field.” presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion, Chicago, November 1, 2008.
- Sharf, Robert H. “Buddhist Modernism and the Rhetoric of Meditative Experience.” *Numen* 42, no. 3 (October 1995): 228–83.
- . “Experience.” In *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, edited by Mark C. Taylor, 94–116. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- . “Ritual.” In *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 245–70. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- . “Sanbōkyōdan: Zen and the Way of the New Religions.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22, no. 3–4 (1995): 417–58.
- . “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism.” *History of Religions* 33, no. 1 (August 1993): 1–43.
- Shibayama Zenkei 柴山全慶. *Hakuin Zenji Zazen wasan zenwa* 白隱禪師坐禪和讃禪話. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1974.
- Shigetsu Sasaki Rōshi. “On Sokatsu Shaku Rōshi.” *Wind Bell*, vol. 8, nos. 1–2 (Fall 1969): 9–14.
- Shillony, Ben-Ami. “Universities and Students in Wartime Japan.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 45, no. 4 (1986): 769–87.
- Shimada Hiroshi 島田宏. “Shin’yū Jiken to Kendōbu 辛酉事件と剣道部.” *Hitotsubashi Kendōbu sanjūnenshi* 一橋剣道部三十年史, 1932.

- Shimada Hiroshi 島田宏 and Yamada Jirōkichi 山田次朗吉. *Ittokusai Yamada Jirōkichi den* 一徳齋山田次朗吉傳. Kunitachi: Hitotsubashi Kendōkai, 1976.
- Shimokawa Yoshitarō 下川芳太郎. *Koji Zen* 居士禪. Edited by Matsuoka Yuzuru 松岡讓. Tokyo: Shimokawa Kōryū, 1935.
- Shore, Jeff. “Kōan Zen from the Inside.” *Hanazono Daigaku Bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要, no. 28 (1996): 1–52.
- Silberman, Bernard S., and H. D. Harootunian, eds. *Japan in Crisis: Essays on Taishō Democracy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Starling, Jessica. *Guardians of the Buddha’s Home: Domestic Religion in Contemporary Jōdo Shinshū*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2019.
- Stein, Justin B. “Hawayo Takata and the Circulatory Development of Reiki in the Twentieth Century North Pacific.” Dissertation, University of Toronto, 2017.
- . “Psychosomatic Buddhist Medicine at the Dawn of Modern Japan: Hara Tanzan, ‘On the Difference Between the Brain and the Spinal Cord’ (1869).” In *Buddhism and Medicine: An Anthology of Modern and Contemporary Sources*, edited by Salguero C. Pierce, 38–44. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019.
- Stirling, Isabel. *Zen Pioneer: The Life & Works of Ruth Fuller Sasaki*. Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker & Hoard, 2006.
- Stone, Jackie. “A Vast and Grave Task: Interwar Buddhist Studies as an Expression of Japan’s Envisioned Global Role.” In *Culture and Identity: Japanese Intellectuals During the Interwar Years*, edited by J. Thomas Rimer, 217–33. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Stone, Jacqueline I. *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999.
- Sueki Fumihiko. “Building a Platform for Academic Buddhist Studies: Murakama Senshō.” Translated by James Mark Shields. *The Eastern Buddhist* 37, no. 1–2 (2005): 8–27.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末本文美士. *Kindai Nihon no shisō saikō* 近代日本の思想・再考. 3 vols. Tokyo: Toransubyū, 2004.
- Sueki Fumihiko 末本文美士, Hayashi Makoto 林淳, Yoshinaga Shin’ichi 吉永進一, and Ōtani Eiichi 大谷栄一, eds. *Budda no henbō: kōsakusuru kindai Bukkyō* ブッダの変貌: 交錯する近代仏教. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2014.

- Sugano Noriko. "State Indoctrination of Filial Piety in Tokugawa Japan: Sons and Daughters in the Official Records of Filial Piety." In *Women and Confucian Cultures in Premodern China, Korea, and Japan*, edited by Dorothy Ko, JaHyun Kim Haboush, and Joan R. Piggott, translated by Sherri Bayouth, 170–89. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Suwa Yasunari 諏訪恭也. "Sezoku no naka no satori: Tsuji Sōmei Rōshi to no deai 世俗の中の悟り—辻雙明老師との出会い." *Shunjū* 春秋, no. 460 (July 2004): 17–20.
- Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙. *Gekidōki meiji no kōsō: Imakita Kōsen* 激動期明治の高僧：今北洪川. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2001.
- . "Nihon ni okeru kōan Zen no dentō 日本における公案禪の傳統." In vol. 1 of *Suzuki Daisetsu zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集, 233–302. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980.
- . *Nihonteki reisei* 日本的靈性. Vol. 8 of *Suzuki Daisetsu Zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1999.
- . *Zendō no shugyō to seikatsu* 禪堂の修行と生活. Tokyo: Morie Shoten, 1935.
- . *Zendō seikatsu* 禪堂生活. Translated by Yokogawa Kenshō 横川顕正. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2018.
- Suzuki Daisetsu 鈴木大拙, Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎, and Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽, eds. *Zen no kōan to mondō* 禪の公案と問答. Vol. 3 of *Zen no kōza* 禪の講座. Tokyo: Shun'yōdō Shoten, 1985.
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro. *An Introduction to Zen Buddhism*. Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1934.
- . "On the *Hekigan Roku* ('Blue Cliff Records'): With a Translation." *The Eastern Buddhist* 1, no. 1 (September 1965): 5–21.
- . *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume I: Zen*. Edited by Richard M. Jaffe. Oakland, Calif.: University of California Press, 2015.
- . *Selected Works of D.T. Suzuki, Volume III: Comparative Religion*. Edited by Jeff Wilson and Tomoe Moriya. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2016.
- . *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk*. Boston: C.E. Tuttle, 1994 (originally published in 1934).

- . “The Zen Sect of Buddhism,” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society: 1906–1907*, ed. by T. W. Rhys Davids, London: Oxford University Press, 1907.
- Takahashi Shinkichi 高橋新吉. *Sanzen zuihitsu* 参禅随筆. Tokyo: Hōbunkan, 1958.
- Takei Kengo 武井謙悟. “Kindai nihon ni okeru zenkai no fukyū ni kansuru kōsatsu: *Zendō, Daijōzen* no kiji o chūshin toshite 近代日本における禅会の普及に関する考察—「禅道」・「大乘禅」の記事を中心として.” *Kindai Bukkyō* 近代仏教, no. 26 (May 2019): 51–74.
- Takizawa Toshiyuki 瀧澤利行. *Yōjōron no shisō* 養生論の思想. Yokohama: Seiri Shobō, 2003.
- Tamamura Takeji 玉村竹二 and Inoue Zenjō 井上禅定. *Engakuji-shi* 圓覺寺史. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1964.
- Tanabe Yukinobu 田鍋幸信, ed. *Nishiyama Kasan: Denki shiryō* 西山禾山 : 伝記資料. Tokyo: Bunchidō Shoten, 1978.
- Tanaka, Stefan. *Japan’s Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1993.
- Tani Shidō 谷至道. *Sanzen* 参禅. Tokyo: Bungaku Shobō, 1941.
- . *Zen ni yori shinshin o renmaseru ei-yū* 禅により心身を錬磨せる英雄. Tokyo: Chūō Shuppansha, 1926.
- . *Zen no katsuyō rentanjutsu: Zen ni yori shinshin o renmaseru ei-yū* 禅の活用錬磨術: 禅により身心を錬磨せる英雄. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1999.
- Teeuwen, Mark, and Fabio Rambelli, eds. *Buddhas and Kami in Japan: Honji Suijaku as a Combinatory Paradigm*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- Tenkei Denson, and Hakuin Ekaku. *Secrets of the Blue Cliff Record: Zen Comments by Hakuin and Tenkei*. Translated by Thomas Cleary. Boston: Shambhala, 2000.
- Thomas, Julia Adeney. “Naturalizing Nationhood: Ideology and Practice in Early Twentieth-Century Japan.” In *Japan’s Competing Modernities: Issues in Culture and Democracy, 1900–1930*, edited by Sharon A. Minichiello, 114–32. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1998.

- Tōkyō Daigaku Ryōzenkai 東京大学陵禅会. *Meian sōsō: Tōkyō Daigaku Ryōzenkai rokujū nenshi* 明暗雙々：東京大学陵禅会六十年史. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Ryōzenkai Kōenkai, 1995.
- Tōkyō Shōka Daigaku Kendōbu 東京商科大学剣道部. *Hitotsubashi kendōbu sanjū nenshi* 一橋剣道部三十年史. Yahomura (Tokyo): Tōkyō Shōka Daigaku Kendōbu, 1932.
- Tomida Hiroko. *Hiratsuka Raichō and Early Japanese Feminism*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Tsuchiya Taimu 土屋大夢. *Kioku o tadorite* 記憶を辿りて. Edited by Miyazato Tatsushi 宮里立士 and Satō Norihiko 佐藤哲彦. Tokyo: Kabushiki Kaisha Yumani Shobō, 2012.
- Tsuji Sōmei 辻雙明. *Gaitō no zen* 街頭の禅. Tokyo: Tōyō Keizai Shinpōsha, 1955.
- . *Zen no michi o tadorinikite* 禅の道をたどり来て. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1958.
- Tsutsui Kiyotada 筒井清忠. *Nihongata “kyōyō” no unmei: rekishi shakaigakuteki kōsatsu* 日本型「教養」の運命：歴史社会学的考察. Tokyo: Iwanami Gendai Bunko, 2009.
- Tweed, Thomas A. “Night-Stand Buddhists and Other Creatures: Sympathizers, Adherents, and the Study of Religion.” In *American Buddhism: Methods and Findings in Recent Scholarship*, edited by Duncan Ryūken Williams and Christopher S. Queen, 71–90. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 1999.
- Uchino, Kumiko. “The Status Elevation Process of Sōtō Sect Nuns in Modern Japan.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 10, no. 2/3 (1983): 177–94.
- Uno, Kathleen. “Womanhood, War and Empire: Transmutations of ‘Good Wife, Wise Mother’ before 1931.” In *Gendering Modern Japanese History*, edited by Barbara Molony and Kathleen Uno, 493–519. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005.
- Van Overmeire, Ben. “‘Mountains, Rivers, and the Whole Earth’: Koan Interpretations of Female Zen Practitioners.” *Religions* 9, no. 4: 125 (2018): n. pag.
- . “Reading Chan Encounter Dialogue during the Song Dynasty: The Record of Linji, the Lotus Sutra, and the Sinification of Buddhism.” *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 37 (2017): 209–21.
- Victoria, Brian (Daizen). *Zen at War*. New York: Weatherhill, 1997.

- . *Zen War Stories*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- Vining, Elizabeth Gray. *Return to Japan*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1960.
- Vlastos, Stephen. *Mirror of Modernity: Invented Traditions of Modern Japan*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1998.
- Wang Cheng 王成. “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘shūyō’ gainen no seiritu 近代日本における「修養」概念の成立.” *Nihon kenkyū* 日本研究 (December 2004): 117–45.
- . “Nitobe Inazō to kindai nihon no ‘shūyō’ 新渡戸稲造と近代日本の〈修養〉.” *Arutesu riberaresu: Iwate Daigaku jinbun shakaika gakubu kiyō* アルテスリベラレス : 岩手大学人文社会科学部紀要, no. 102 (June 2018): 175–83.
- Wang Ching-ning. “A ‘Great Man’ Is No Longer Gendered: The Gender Identity and Practice of Chan Nuns in Contemporary Taiwan.” In *Buddhist Feminisms and Femininities*, edited by Karma Lekshe Tsomo, 107–36 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019).
- Wasaki Kōtarō 和崎光太郎. “Kindai nihon ni okeru ‘hanmon seinen’ no saikentō: 1900 nendai ni okeru ‘seinen’ no hen’yō katei 近代日本における「煩悶青年」の再検討: 1900年代における<青年>の変容過程.” *Nihon no kyōiku shigaku* 日本の教育史学 55 (2012): 19–31.
- . *Meiji no “seinen”: risshi, shūyō, hanmon* 明治の〈青年〉: 立志・修養・煩悶. Kyoto: Mineruva Shobō, 2017.
- . “Seinenki jiko keisei gainen toshite no ‘shūyō’ ron no tanjō 青年期自己形成概念としての〈修養〉論の誕生.” *Studies in the History of Education* 50, no. 0 (2007): 32–44.
- Waseda Daigaku Saiindan 早稲田大学済蔭団. *Saiin: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan sōritsu kyūjū shūnen kinenshi* 済蔭 : 早稲田大学済蔭団創立九十周年記念誌. Edited by Chiba Yōsuke 千葉洋介. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, 2015.
- . *Saiin: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan sōritsu rokujūgo shūnen kinenshi* 済蔭: 早稲田大学済蔭団創立六十五周年記念誌. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, 1986.
- . *Saiin: Waseda Saigaku Saiindan sōritsu shijūgo shūnen kinenshi* 済蔭: 早稲田大学済蔭団創立四十五周年記念誌. Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Saiindan, 1967.

- Welter, Albert. *The Linji Lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan's Records of Sayings Literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Williams, Duncan Ryūken. *The Other Side of Zen: A Social History of Sōtō Zen: Buddhism in Tokugawa Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Wu, Yu-Chuan. "A Disorder of Ki: Alternative Treatments for Neurasthenia in Japan, 1890–1945." Ph.D. dissertation, University College London, 2012.
- . "A Disorder of Qi: Breathing Exercise as a Cure for Neurasthenia in Japan, 1900–1945." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 71, no. 3 (August 15, 2016): 322–44.
- Wu, Yu-chuan. "Straighten the Back to Sit: Belly-Cultivation Techniques as 'Modern Health Methods' in Japan, 1900–1945." *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry* 40, no. 3 (February 5, 2016): 450–74.
- Yamada Mumon. *Lectures on the Ten Oxherding Pictures*. Translated by Victor Sōgen Hori. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.
- Yamada Mumon 山田無文. *Zazen wasan kōwa* 坐禪和讃講話. Kyoto: Myōshinjiha Shūmu Honjo Hanazonokai Honbu, 1960.
- Yamada Shōji 山田奨治. *Shots in the Dark: Japan, Zen, and the West*. Translated by Earl Hartman. Chicago and Kyoto: The University of Chicago Press and International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2009.
- . "The Myth of Zen in the Art of Archery." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 28, no. 1/2 (Spring 2001): 1–30.
- Yashima Rinzō 矢島隣三 and Iida Tōin 飯田櫟隠. *Hakuin zenji zazen wasan kosui* 白隱禪師坐禪和讃鼓吹. n.d.
- Yasutani Hakuun 安谷白雲. *Mumonkan: Zen no shinzui* 無門関: 禪の心髓. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2008.
- Yoshinaga Shin'ichi. "The Birth of Japanese Mind Cure Methods." In *Religion and Psychotherapy in Modern Japan*, edited by Christopher Harding, Iwata Fumiaki, and Yoshinaga Shin'ichi, 76–102. London and New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Yoshinaga Shin'ichi 吉永進一. "Hara Tanzan no shinrigakuteki Zen: sono shisō to rekishiteki eikyō 原坦山の心理学的禪: その思想と歴史的影響." *Jintai kagaku* 人体科学 15, no. 2 (October 2006): 5–13.

———. *Nihonjin no shin · shin · rei: Kindai minkan seishin ryōhō sōsho* 日本人の身 · 心 · 霊: 近代民間精神療法叢書. Tokyo: Kuresu Shuppan, 2004.

Yuanwu. *The Blue Cliff Record*. Translated by Thomas Cleary and J. C. Cleary. Boston & London: Shambhala, 2005.

Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo 禅文化研究所. *Gōko hosshiki bonbaishō* 江湖法式梵唄抄. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo, 1998.

———. *Meiji no Zenshō* 明治の禅匠. Kyoto: Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo, 2009 (originally published in 1981).

Zhiyu and Hakuin. *Every End Exposed: The 100 Koans of Master Kidō: With the Answers of Hakuin-Zen*. Translated by Yoel Hoffmann. Brookline, Mass.: Autumn Press, 1977.

Zonggao. *Swampland Flowers: Letters and Lectures of Zen Master Ta Hui*. Translated by J. C. Cleary. Boston & London: Shambhala, 2006.

———. *The Letters of Chan Master Dahui Pujue*. Translated by Jeffrey L. Broughton and Elise Yoko Watanabe. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.



## Biography

Rebecca's journey into the study of Japanese Buddhism began while she was studying abroad as an undergraduate, living in Buddhist temples and experiencing the dynamic complexities of modern Japanese religious life. After graduating with a B.A. in Religion from Oberlin College in 2003, Rebecca served on staff at the Rochester Zen Center, where she engaged in quasi-monastic Zen practice in a Japanese lineage. As a Duke University M.A. student in Religious Studies since 2011 and Ph.D. student in the Graduate Program in Religion since 2012, she has deepened her inquiry into the modern Japanese roots of the worldwide Zen boom, spending a total of three years studying and conducting research in Japan. She received her A.M. in Religious Studies from Duke in 2016 and expects to receive her Ph.D. in May 2020.

Rebecca's graduate education at Duke, Japanese language studies, research, and writing have been generously supported by the following grants and organizations, in chronological order: Foreign Language and Area Studies fellowships, both summer and academic year (U.S. Department of Education); Gurney Harriss Kearns Summer Research Fellowships; William R. Poole Summer Research Fellowship; Nippon Foundation Fellowship; Oberlin Alumni Fellowship; Fulbright IIE Graduate Research Fellowship; Bass Instructional Fellowship; and The Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation Program in Buddhist Studies, Dissertation Fellowship.