

Dharma Transmission in Soto Zen. Manzan Dohaku's Reform Movement

Author(s): William M. Bodiford

Source: *Monumenta Nipponica*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (Winter, 1991), pp. 423-451

Published by: [Sophia University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2385187>

Accessed: 19-10-2015 06:27 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Sophia University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Monumenta Nipponica*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Dharma Transmission in Sōtō Zen

Manzan Dōhaku's Reform Movement

WILLIAM M. BODIFORD

THE Zen school places great importance on the master-disciple relationship. According to modern descriptions of this discipleship, the master's goal is to cause his disciple to re-create through his own training the same intuitive cognition of reality that the master himself experiences. When the master successfully leads him to a level of understanding that has the same content as his own experience, the minds of the teacher and student are said to become one. Traditionally referred to as the 'transmission' of the teacher's mind to the disciple, this technique has been termed the crucial 'pivot of the Zen teaching method'.¹ In this method both the enlightenment and the transmission are essential. An enlightenment experience in and of itself (*mushi dokugo* 無師独悟, that is, one attained without a master's guidance) is usually considered suspect since the risk of self-delusion or 'fake-Zen' is always high.

To guarantee that his experience of the truth of Buddhism is genuine, the Zen disciple relies upon his teacher to authenticate and formally acknowledge his enlightenment. According to Zen adherents, 'This acknowledgment implies the recognition of the disciple as an authentic heir not only of the Dharma of his master and his master's line but of the Dharma of the continuous line of Zen teachers reaching back to Bodhidharma, and thence to Shakyamuni Buddha.'² There are many Buddhist technical terms for this formal acknowledgment, but in Japanese Sōtō 曹洞 Zen it is usually referred to as *inshō* 印証 (or *inka shōmyō* 印可証明, '[granting] the seal of approval to a realization of enlightenment'). The ritual process by which the disciple thereby inherits (*shihō* 嗣) his master's Dharma (*hō* 法) lineage is known as *shihō*.

The form of *shihō* described above, the so-called wordless transmission of mind by mind (*ishin denshin* 以心伝心) represents only the idealized religious

THE AUTHOR is an assistant professor in the School of Religion, University of Iowa.

¹ Ruth F. Sasaki, *Zen Dust*, Harcourt Brace & World, New York, 1966, p. 231, n. 3.

² Sasaki, pp. 230–31, n. 3.

aspect of the Dharma transmission process. Zen master and disciple may evoke this mystical paradigm through ritual ceremony in the master's room (*shitsunai* 室内), but other, more mundane institutional concerns can govern the actual selection and promotion of Dharma 'heirs'. At one time in the Sōtō school the normative form of *shihō* was for a monk to inherit the Dharma lineage of the temple at which he resided. In this institutional form of transmission, known as *garanbō* 伽藍法 (temple Dharma [lineage]), if a monk resided at temple 'A' he would inherit the Dharma lineage of the founder of that temple. If he himself later became abbot of temple 'B' that had a different founder, he would replace his previous *shihō* with a new lineage that would connect him to the founder of temple 'B' and each of its subsequent abbots. This would be done even if the monk in question had never met any of the former abbots of temple 'B'. For any given temple the Dharma lineage of its abbots would always be the same (*garanbō*), but with regard to any individual abbot, his Dharma lineage would change every time he was appointed to a new temple that was of a different lineage faction. In other words, depending (*in* 因) upon the temple (*in* 院) that a monk presided over, he would change (*eki* 易) his lineage (*shi* 嗣), a process known as *in'in ekishi*. The institutional requirement of *in'in ekishi* appears to have been widespread during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It remained normal Sōtō practice until 1703, when a faction of monks led principally by Manzan Dōhaku 叡山道白, 1636–1714, succeeded in having the Tokugawa bakufu prohibit it.

The prime source for studying the reform movement that led to the bakufu's ruling is *Shūtō Fukkoshi* 宗統復古志, 1760, a hagiographical history of Manzan's campaign compiled by his disciple Sanshū Hakuryū 三洲白龍, 1669–1760.³ As the title of this work suggests, the goal of Manzan and his partisans was to revive (*fukko*) the traditional conception of the master-disciple Dharma lineage (*shūtō*) supposedly taught by the founder of the Japanese Sōtō Zen school, Dōgen 道元, 1200–1253, in his *Shōbō Genzō* 正法眼藏. According to Sanshū's account, Manzan first resolved to reform the *shihō* practices of the Sōtō school when he was twenty-seven years old upon reading for the first time the *Shōbō Genzō* chapters titled 'Shisho' 嗣書 ('Succession Certificate') and 'Menju' 面授 ('Face-to-face Transmission'). *Shūtō Fukkoshi* compares Manzan's successful fulfillment of this vow with the noted successes of two other Japanese monks: Kōkei 公慶, 1648–1705, who campaigned for the restoration of the Great Buddha Hall at Tōdaiji 東大寺, and Tetsugen Dōkō 鉄眼道光, 1630–1682, who campaigned for the publication of the Buddhist canon in Japan.⁴

Later Sōtō historians have accepted this comparison as valid and agreed with Manzan's own evaluation of his accomplishment.⁵ In 1703, the bakufu

³ Two fascicles, reprinted in *Zoku Sōtōshū Zensho* 続曹洞宗全書 [ZSZ], Sōtōshū Shūmuchiō, 1975, 1, 'Shitsuchū' 室中, pp. 553–602.

⁴ Fasc. 1, sections 1–2, in ZSZ 1, pp. 539–40.

⁵ For example, Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助, *Nihon Bukkyōshi* 日本仏教史, Iwanami, 1954, 9, p. 450, and Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆, 'Tenkei Denson no Shisō' 天桂伝尊の思想, in *Dōgen Zenji to sono Monryū* 道元禅師とその門流, Seishin Shobō, 1961, p. 83.

prohibited the practice of *in'in ekishi*—but did Manzan's *shūtō fukko* movement actually succeed in replacing this with the *shihō* practices taught and transmitted by Dōgen? The answer to this question is not so easy to verify as is the construction of a Buddha Hall or the printing of the Buddhist canon. Without attempting to reach a definitive conclusion, the present article will examine Manzan's campaign to reform the Sōtō Zen Dharma transmission in an attempt to shed light not only on the relationship between Zen ideology and institutional practices, but also on the doctrinal issues related to Zen lineage transmission. We will focus on three topics: (1) how *shihō* had been practiced in Sōtō Zen prior to Manzan; (2) the circumstances of the seventeenth century that stimulated the perceived need to reform Sōtō Zen; and (3) the events that led to the government's acceptance of Manzan's appeal.

Shihō Prior to Manzan

The nature of *shihō* practices in early Japanese Sōtō Zen is not clear. Until recently the interpretation of the extant evidence was dependent largely upon whether one belonged to a faction that supported or opposed Manzan's conception of *shihō*. Manzan believed that the correct transmission of the Dharma entailed two conditions: that a monk should inherit only a single Dharma lineage bequeathed from a single master (*isshi inshō* 一師印証), and that this transmission must be based directly upon the face-to-face contact between the master and disciple (*menju shihō* 面授嗣法). Manzan further held that these two conditions describe the *shihō* that Dōgen had learned in China and that Dōgen's heirs faithfully practiced for fifteen generations down to the time of Kōkoku Shungyoku 光国舜玉, 1477–1561.⁶ Leaving aside for the time being an examination of the full implications of the concepts of 'a single master' and 'face-to-face transmission', we must note the existence of numerous early examples of Dharma lineages having been bequeathed under circumstances in which these conditions apparently were not fulfilled. A few of the more prominent of these are presented below.

Manzan derived his concept of single-master affiliation from key passages in Dōgen's writings, but the details of Dōgen's biography do not necessarily support this interpretation. In other words, Dōgen himself might have held more than one lineage affiliation. His writings consistently refer to only two people by the title *senshi* 先師 ('former teacher'), namely, Rujing 如淨 (J. Nyojō), 1163–1228, his Chinese master, and Myōzen 妙全, 1184–1225, his Japanese master.⁷ Dōgen had studied Zen under Myōzen for eight years, 1217–1225, but

⁶ *Shūtō Fukkoshi* [SF], fasc. 1, sec. 1, in zsz 1, p. 539.

Manzan apparently based this belief on his reading of the biographies of Sōtō masters collected in *Nichiiki Tōjō Shosoden* 日域洞上諸祖伝, 1694, a work that describes the accomplishments of seventy Sōtō monks beginning with Dōgen and concluding with Kōkoku Shungyoku. None of these biographies contains details of switched lineages, although, as described below, other evidence suggests that the practice of *in'in ekishi* had become common by the end of the fifteenth century.

⁷ Nakaseko Shōdō 中世古祥道, *Dōgen Zenjiden Kenkyū* 道元禪師伝研究, Kokusho Kankōkai, 1979, pp. 140 & 157–58, nn. 1 & 2.

under Rujing for only two years.⁸ The Sōtō school in Japan represented Rujing's line, yet medieval Sōtō monks believed that Dōgen had inherited Myōzen's Rinzai 臨濟 lineage as well. For example, *Sandaison Gyōjōki* 三大尊行狀記, an early Sōtō history known for its wealth of detail and accuracy, describes Dōgen as the tenth generation of the Ōryū (Ch. Huanglong) 黃龍 line of Rinzai Zen.⁹ Likewise, the fifteenth-century Sōtō history written by Kenzei 建掣 goes as far as to provide the exact date that Dōgen became Myōzen's heir.¹⁰ These statements clearly imply that Dōgen first had inherited Myōzen's line and then replaced it with the new lineage that he had inherited from Rujing. Modern Sōtō historians, however, unequivocally reject any such interpretation. The extant evidence cannot settle this issue, since contemporaneous documents do not describe the exact nature of Dōgen's discipleship under Myōzen. But no ambiguity surrounds the dual Rinzai and Sōtō affiliations held by Dōgen's disciple, Gikai 義介, 1219–1309.

Gikai was a major figure among Dōgen's disciples, serving under him in the important positions of Monastery Cook (*tenzo* 典座) and Monastery Supervisor (*kansu* 監寺). After Dōgen's death, Gikai studied under Ejō 懷奘, 1198–1280, Dōgen's foremost Dharma heir, from whom he eventually inherited Dōgen's Dharma lineage and robe—a powerful symbol of authority. Gikai also became the third-generation abbot at Dōgen's monastery, Eihei-ji 永平寺, in Echizen. What is significant about Gikai's prominence within Dōgen's community is that he also was a leading member of the Darumashū 達磨宗, a Zen group that claimed Rinzai affiliation. Moreover, Gikai's role within the Darumashū continued after he became Dōgen's disciple, apparently with Dōgen's full knowledge and approval.

The Darumashū had a brief and curious history.¹¹ It was founded in the late twelfth century by a self-enlightened (*mushi dokugo*) Zen teacher, Nōnin 能忍, who later obtained a Dharma lineage from the Chinese master Fozhao Deguang (J. Busshō Tokkō) 仏照徳光, 1121–1203. Deguang had conferred his Dharma lineage upon Nōnin without ever meeting him—a process known as *yōfu* 遥附 (bestowing the Dharma at a distance)—based upon the understanding demonstrated by one of Nōnin's poems that was sent to him in China. Yet Nōnin's new Chinese lineage failed to insure the Darumashū more than a precarious existence. Upon the death of Nōnin's Dharma heir, Kakuan 覚晏, the Darumashū followers were scattered and eventually many of them

⁸ Nakaseko, pp. 136–58, and Kagamishima Genryū, 'Dōgen Zenji no Zaisōchū no Gyōjitsu 道元禪師の在宋中の行実', in Furuta Shōkin 古田紹欽 *et al.*, ed., *Dōgen Zenji to sono Shūhen* 道元禪師とその周辺, Gakujutsu Sōsho: Zen Bukkyō, Daitō, 1985, pp. 312–15 & 325.

⁹ In *Sōtōshū Zensho* 曹洞宗全書 [sz], 1929–1935, rev. ed., Sōtōshū Shūmuchō, 1970–1973, 16, 'Shiden' 史伝, p. 12.

¹⁰ That is, 15th day, Ninth Month, 1221. See Kawamura Kōdō 河村孝道, *Shohon Taikō Eihei Kaisan Dōgen Zenji Gyōjō Kenzeiki* 諸本対校永平開山道元禪師行狀建掣記, Taishūkan, 1975, p. 11.

¹¹ For a detailed account, see Bernard Faure, 'The Daruma-shū, Dōgen, and Sōtō Zen', in MN 42:1 (Spring 1987), pp. 25–55.

joined Dōgen's small community of followers. Among those who did so were Kakuan's Dharma heir, Ekan 懷鑑, d. 1251?, and Ekan's disciple, Gikai—both of whom joined Dōgen's community in 1241. After ten years of studying Zen under Dōgen, in 1251 Ekan, who was probably near death at the time, bestowed his Darumashū lineage upon Gikai.¹² Later, when Dōgen asked Gikai about the articles of succession in the Darumashū, Gikai told him that the document that he received from Ekan was not called a succession certificate (*shisho*), but was known as the 'Bloodline Transmitted by the Patriarchs' (*soshi sōden kechimyaku* 祖師相伝血脉). Thereupon Dōgen reportedly assured Gikai that the Darumashū document was a real succession certificate, regardless of its name or format, and congratulated Gikai on his good fortune in having received it.¹³

Even after Gikai succeeded to the Sōtō lineage, he in no way considered Nōnin's *inshō* from Deguang to be illegitimate. In a letter dated the Eighth Month, 1306, Gikai informed his disciple and Dharma heir, Keizan Jōkin 瑩山紹瑾, 1264–1325, that all buddhas must inherit the Dharma and in doing so they must possess a succession certificate (*shisho*) as specified in Dōgen's 'Shisho' chapter, which Gikai cited by name. He further stated that he possessed both Rinzaï and Sōtō succession certificates, the first representing Nōnin's lineage through Ekan and the second representing Dōgen's lineage through Ejō.¹⁴ In another document dated to the Third Month of the same year, Gikai entrusted Keizan with the Rinzaï succession certificate, sacred relics, and other items that had been sent to Nōnin from China and handed down to Gikai. He told Keizan to use these Rinzaï articles of transmission as evidence for proving the authenticity of the Sōtō succession certificate that Gikai had bestowed upon him earlier.¹⁵ In both of these documents Gikai refers to Nōnin's succession to Deguang's Dharma lineage as one of *yōfu*, occurring without the two ever meeting. He accepted the legitimacy of this type of *shihō*. Clearly Gikai did not abandon his Rinzaï lineage when he inherited his Sōtō lineage. It was not a case of the second lineage being more real and thereby replacing or superseding the former.

Gessen Ryōin 月泉良印, 1319–1400, also appears to have inherited his Dharma lineage by means other than those approved by Manzan. According to Ryōin's biography in *Empō Dentōroku* 延宝伝灯録, 1678, he originally had been a Dharma heir of Gasan Jōseki 峨山韶碩, 1275–1365, who in turn was one of the most important of Keizan Jōkin's Dharma heirs. Later when another of Gasan's Dharma heirs, Mutei Ryōshō 無底良韶, 1313–1361, died without producing a disciple to inherit his Dharma lineage and temple, Gasan summoned

¹² *Sandaion Gyōjōki*, in SZ 16, pp. 16b–17a.

¹³ *Eihei Kaisan Goyuigon Kiroku* 永平開山御遺言記録; retitled 'Eihei Shitsuchū Monjo' 永平室中聞書, in Ōkubo Dōshū 大久保道舟, ed., *Dōgen Zenji Zenshū* 道元禪師全集 [DZZ], Chikuma, 1969–1970, 2, pp. 496–97.

¹⁴ 'Gikan Fuhōjō' 義鑑附法狀, in Ōkubo Dōshū, ed., *Sōtōshū Komonjo* 曹洞宗古文書, Chikuma, 1972, 2, pp. 408–09.

¹⁵ 'Gikai Fuhōjō' 義介附法狀, in *Sōtōshū Komonjo*, 1, p. 526.

Ryōin and asked him to inherit Mutei's lineage. In accordance with his teacher's wishes, Ryōin went to Mutei's temple, Shōbōji 正法寺, in Mutsu, and by performing a ritual offering of incense (*shikō* 嗣香) inherited a new Dharma lineage from the deceased Mutei.¹⁶ This type of Dharma transmission, known as *daifu* 代附 (the bestowing [of a Dharma lineage] by a representative) was not a Japanese innovation. In the Chinese Caodong (J. Sōtō) lineage that was inherited by Dōgen, a similar case had occurred involving Touzi Yiqing (J. Tōsu Gisei) 投子義青, 1032–1083.

Yiqing had attained enlightenment under the guidance of a Linji (J. Rinzai) master, Fushan Fayuan (J. Fuzan Hōen) 浮山法遠, 991–1067.¹⁷ In spite of his Linji affiliation, Fayuan had once studied under a Caodong master named Dayang Jingxuan (J. Taiyō Keigen) 太陽警玄, 942–1027. When Jingxuan died, he entrusted to Fayuan his portrait, robe, and a verse that expressed his teaching, and instructed Fayuan to pass them on to a suitable successor. More than thirty years later Fayuan selected his own disciple, Yiqing, to become a posthumous heir of Jingxuan. Yiqing had spent six years under Fayuan's supervision: three years before his enlightenment experience and three more afterward. When Yiqing took leave of Fayuan, however, he carried away nothing by which to remember his own teacher. Instead, he received Jingxuan's portrait, robe, and verse, and the command to carry on Jingxuan's Dharma lineage.¹⁸ In this way, even though Yiqing was born five years after Jingxuan died and had studied under a master of the Linji lineage, he was able to inherit Jingxuan's Caodong lineage. Touzi answered criticisms of his indirect succession by asserting: 'Mothers and fathers are not the parents of the buddhas; the Dharma is their parent.'¹⁹ Touzi claimed, in other words, that his spiritual parent was the intangible Dharma taught by Jingxuan, not the physical father, that is, Fayuan, who instructed him in it.

It was Yiqing's line of Caodong that was inherited by Dōgen, seven generations later, and transmitted to Japan as Sōtō Zen. Dōgen knew that Yiqing had studied under Fayuan, not Dayang Jingxuan. In the standard versions of Dōgen's writings, however, all direct references to Yiqing's indirect succession have been eliminated. A recently discovered early draft of the *Shōbō Genzō* chapter 'Daigo' 大悟, or 'Great Enlightenment', for example, discusses Yiqing and Fayuan. But this entire passage is missing from the traditional version of this chapter.²⁰ Likewise, Dōgen wrote a verse commentary on the kōan

¹⁶ Fasc. 7, in ZSZ 10, 'Shiden', p. 690.

¹⁷ For a detailed biography of Touzi Yiqing, see Ishii Shūdō 石井修道, *Sōdai Zenshūshi no Kenkyū* 宋代禪宗史の研究, Gakujutsu Sōsho: Zen Bukkyō, Daitō, 1987, pp. 210–33.

¹⁸ Zijue 自覺 (d. 1117), ed., *Touzi Yiqing chanshi yulu* 投子義青禪師語錄, fasc. 2, reprinted in *Dai-Nihon Zoku Zōkyō* 大日本統藏經, Zōkyō, 1905–1912, 2:29, pp. 238a–b.

¹⁹ 'Touzi-Qing Heshangyu' 投子青和尚語, in *Xukai qu zunsu yuyao* 統開古尊宿語要, 1218, fasc. 2, in *Dai-Nihon Zoku Zōkyō*, 2:23, p. 449b.

²⁰ These texts are reproduced in their entirety in Kawamura Kōdō, *Shōbō Genzō no Seiritsu Shiteki Kenkyū* 正法眼藏の成立史的研究, Shunjūsha, 1987, pp. 536–91, esp. p. 582.

Kawamura believes that Dōgen was personally responsible for these changes since he lectured on 'Daigo' twice, first in 1242 and again in 1244, when he probably revised the text.

dialogue between Yiqing and Fayuan, in which he made a clear poetic allusion to Fayuan's name and role as an intermediary. But in the text of the kōan itself, the name 'Fayuan' has been replaced by 'Dayang', thereby rendering the verse meaningless.²¹ The odd relationship between the words of Dōgen's verse and the names in the koan suggests that the original text was altered after Yiqing's Dharma transmission had become a major issue.²² Keizan's *Denkōroku* 伝光録, or 'Transmission of Enlightenment', that is, biographies of the Sōtō patriarchs, however, does present a clear account of Yiqing's indirect inheritance. In his commentary Keizan treats *daifu* as a perfectly legitimate means of *shihō* and cites the relationship between the Linji (Rinzai) master Fayuan and the Caodong (Sōtō) master Jingxuan to argue that there should not be any rivalry between the different lines of Zen.²³

These examples suggest a radically new interpretation of Dharma transmission. From its first nascent awareness of a separate identity, the Chan/Zen tradition has never hesitated to fabricate idealized lineages that could be projected backward onto the sages of the past. Yet these transmission lineages, whether real or imagined, always presupposed the existence of an existential relationship between teacher and student, a significant encounter that, in retrospect at least, could be recognized as having established a bond between the two patriarchs. In the successions of Touzi Yiqing and Gessen Ryōin, however, the concept of 'Dharma transmission' no longer referred just to this special intangible quality in a personal relationship; it had been objectified and externalized in a manner that allowed it to be manipulated for ideological or sectarian reasons by third parties and institutions. Based on these precedents, the ritual manipulation of Dharma transmission attained its most extreme expression in the institutionalization of Sōtō temple Dharma lineages (*garanbō*).

The roots of *garanbō* lie in the medieval organization of Sōtō temples into sectarian factions based on the regulated succession of abbots at a central head monastery. The Sōtō leaders Tsūgen Jakurei 通幻寂靈, 1322–1391, and Baisan Monpon 梅山聞本, d. 1417, initiated this type of sectarian organization at their major monasteries, particularly Sōjiji 総持寺 (in Noto), Yōtakuji 永沢寺 (in Settsu), and Ryūtakuji 龍沢寺 (in Echizen), and thereafter it soon became the model for most Sōtō factions in Japan.²⁴ Lineage constituted a key feature of these temple networks since all the temples founded by the disciples of any given master would be ranked below the main temple founded by that master. This lineage structure produced a tight-knit association of temples, arranged hierarchically in a pyramid-like organization. All branch temples within the

²¹ 'Juko' 頌古, in *Eihei Kōroku* 永平広録, fasc 9, koan 33, in DZZ, 2, p. 173.

²² See Ishii Shūdō, "'Giun Oshō Goroku" no In'yō Tenseki ni tsuite' 「義雲和尚語録」の引用典籍について, in Kumagai Chūkō 熊谷忠興, ed., *Giun Zenji Kenkyū* 義雲禅師研究, Sosan Sanshōkai, Fukui, 1984, pp. 88–90.

²³ Patriarch 44; in Azuma Ryūshin 東隆真, ed., *Kenkon'inbon Denkōroku* 乾坤院本伝光録, Rinjinsha, 1970, pp. 90–94.

²⁴ I discuss these developments at length in 'The Growth of the Sōtō Zen School in Medieval Japan', doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1989.

faction were required to provide steady contributions for memorial services at the main temple ranked above them, which were conducted in the name of the founder of their own branch lineage. Likewise, they were required to nominate and sponsor monks from their own temple to serve successive terms as abbot at the temples located higher in the organization. This system assured major temples of a steady supply of able officers as well as constant financial support from the local temples, which essentially functioned as sources of income.

Garanbō also insured the continual dominance of larger lineages over smaller ones. It is not a coincidence, therefore, that Manzan, the monk who fought to overthrow *garanbō*, came from Daijōji 大乘寺, in Kaga, a temple affiliated with the numerically small Meihō 明峰 lineage faction. Today Manzan is remembered as a doctrinal reformer, but clearly he acted on behalf of narrowly defined institutional interests. Before Manzan's reform movement, no matter how many outstanding disciples a Zen master might produce, the number of monks who could advance up the hierarchy and become Zen teachers would be limited by the number of positions open within the network of temples affiliated to his lineage. Lineages with a large network of temples always had more openings than those limited to only a few temples. Moreover, lineages that lacked many temples experienced difficulty maintaining themselves because they often lost outstanding monks who attained teaching positions at monasteries affiliated with other sectarian factions. When faced with an opportunity to become the new abbot of a wealthy or famous temple few monks seem to have hesitated or resisted accepting a new lineage. After all, any abbot who did not share the same Dharma lineage as the temple's founder would violate his sacred memory.²⁵ Yet by the late fifteenth century changing lineages had become so widespread that it had already attracted criticism.²⁶

Manzan identified five problems caused by the practice of changing lineages upon entering a different temple (*in'in ekishi*):

1. Because the Dharma lineage is attached to institutions rather than to individuals and transmitted by *daifu*, it is not unusual for monks to become the nominal disciple and Dharma heirs of masters who have never met them nor much less heard their name, or even disciples of masters who have been dead ten or twenty years.
2. Even in cases of *daifu*, Dharma transmissions sometimes are made without any personal contact between the new disciple and the supposed representative.
3. Because a monk's Dharma lineage changes whenever he is appointed to a post in another temple, the master under whom he had studied prior to the appointment becomes overnight a persona non grata. The greater a monk's ability and accomplishment, the more often he will be asked to serve at major temples

²⁵ Kagamishima Genryū, '*Edo Jidai no Tenkai: Shūgi*' 江戸時代の展開: 宗義, in Kagamishima Genryū, ed., *Dōgen Zen no Rekishi* 道元禪の歴史, Kōza Dōgen 2, Shunjūsha, 1980, pp. 160–61.

²⁶ For example, Shōdō Kōsei 松堂高盛 (d. 1505), *Entsū Shōdō Zenji Goroku* 円通松堂禪師語録, fasc. 3, in sz 5, '*Goroku*', pp. 451a & 459a.

and thus the more jumbled his Dharma relationships will become. Even if a monk resolves not to move, in the end he usually cannot avoid doing so.

4. Because lineages are confused in this way, it is difficult to draw up clear lineage charts, leaving Sōtō monks open to ridicule by others and making it difficult to promote or spread Sōtō teachings.

5. If there are monks who desire to uphold the principle of receiving only a single face-to-face transmission from their own master so as to avoid other corrupt *shihō* practices, they often convert to Rinzai. On the other hand, if these upright monks choose to remain in the Sōtō school, they are then faced with the dilemma of either keeping their own accomplishments secret and thereby not attaining a position from which they can contribute to the welfare of others, or striving to convert and teach others and thereby attaining appointments that will force them to change their lineage.²⁷

In describing the predicaments faced by conscientious monks who opposed the practice of *in'in ekishi*, Manzan was probably speaking from experience. He himself had been chided by a close friend, the Ōbaku 黄蘗 monk Chōon Dōkai 潮音道海, 1625–1695, for remaining in the Sōtō school, which according to Chōon had fraudulent lineages and lacked knowledgeable teachers.²⁸

The Awakening of Sōtō Scholasticism

The emergence of an intellectual climate hostile to traditional Sōtō *shihō* practices coincided with the consolidation of the Tokugawa political order. New social circumstances encouraged Sōtō monks to begin critical scholastic examinations of their religion (*shūgaku* 宗学). In brief, the three most important social stimuli were: (1) the unification and centralization of the Sōtō school ordered by the Tokugawa bakufu, (2) the promotion of learning both by the bakufu and by major Sōtō temples, and (3) the arrival of Chinese Chan monks.²⁹

Between 1608 and 1615 the office of the shogun handed down a series of regulations (*hatto* 法度) that placed all religious institutions, including the Sōtō school, under strict administrative supervision. The cumulative effect of these regulations reveals the underlying themes that constituted the bakufu's main goals.³⁰ Foremost among these was the government's desire to simplify the task of controlling Buddhist institutions. This objective was achieved by limiting the number of sects and enforcing greater centralization within each sect, so that a single head temple (*honji* 本寺) would exercise authority over all branch and provincial temples.³¹

The bakufu-ordered centralization disrupted the smaller lineage factions

²⁷ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 1, in ZSZ 1, pp. 538–39. It should be noted that Manzan's remarks were paraphrased, not translated.

²⁸ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 3, in ZSZ 1, p. 541.

²⁹ Kagamishima Genryū, '*Nihon Zenshūshi: Sōtōshū*' 日本禅宗史: 曹洞宗, in Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治, ed., *Zen no Rekishi: Nihon* 禅の歴史: 日本, Chikuma, 1967, pp. 115–16.

³⁰ Tsuji, 8, p. 226.

³¹ Tsuji, 8, p. 226.

within the Sōtō school.³² On the one hand, the Tokugawa regulations of 1615 recognized the particular Sōtō institution of two separate head temples: Sōjiji and Eiheiiji.³³ But, on the other, all other independent temple factions had to claim affiliation to one of these two monasteries. Sōjiji expanded its already extensive temple network to include the Mutei line, centered at Shōbōji, as well as the various temples founded by Gennō Shinshō 源翁心昭, 1329–1400. Eiheiiji gained administrative jurisdiction over several independent temple factions, such as the Kangan 寒巖, centered at Daijiji 大慈寺 in Higo, the new Kōshōji 興聖寺 monastery in Kyoto, and the Meihō-line temples of Yōkōji 永光寺 in Noto and Daijōji 大乘寺. Even with these additions, however, Eiheiiji claimed the allegiance of only about three percent of all Sōtō temples.³⁴ In deference to the historical importance of Eiheiiji, the monastery founded by Dōgen, the bakufu declared that all Sōtō temples must conform to its regulations and practices (*kakun* 家訓).³⁵ The bakufu also designated three main administrative temples in the central Kantō region (*kan sansetsu* 関三刹) and ordered them to promote abbots to Eiheiiji, instead of Sōjiji.

Administrative centralization naturally focused greater concern on the sectarian identity, doctrine, and history of the Sōtō school as a whole.³⁶ At the same time, the bakufu's policies inadvertently exposed the arbitrary nature of the Sōtō *garanbō* system. Not everyone in the Sōtō school was happy with the way in which temple lineages had been rearranged. A major controversy erupted after the bakufu appointed the abbot of Sōneiiji 総寧寺, one of the three administrative temples, to the abbotship at Eiheiiji in 1652. The government's next order directed the monk Shōton 松頓 to leave his temple and fill the vacant abbot's post at Sōneiiji, but Shōton refused. The abbots of Sōneiiji belonged to one Dharma lineage, the abbots of Eiheiiji belonged to another. Shōton refused to receive Sōneiiji's Dharma lineage from a former abbot who had already switched to Eiheiiji's lineage. Moreover, he could not accept the former abbot's new Dharma lineage without converting Sōneiiji's lineage affiliation to Eiheiiji. In Shōton's opinion, the name of the former abbot should have been stricken from Sōneiiji's lineage (and memorial hall for former abbots) as soon as he switched to another lineage.

The bakufu, however, totally rejected Shōton's position. In 1657 it ruled, first, that every Sōtō temple lineage by definition represented Dōgen's Dharma line. In the eyes of bakufu officials, Shōton was wrong to draw a distinction between Sōneiiji and Eiheiiji, especially since the latter, as Dōgen's monastery, must be seen as the Sōtō school's overall head temple. Second, the bakufu

³² Kagamishima, '*Nihon Zenshūshi: Sōtōshū*', p. 115.

³³ See '*Eiheiiji Shohatto*' 永平寺諸法度 and '*Sōjiji Shohatto*' 総持寺諸法度, in *Sōtōshū Komonjo*, 1, pp. 20–21 & 83–84.

³⁴ For details, see Kagamishima Sōjun, ed., *Enkyōdo Sōtōshū Jiin Honmatsuchō* 延享度曹洞宗寺院本末牒 (1760), rev. ed., Meicho Fukyūkai, 1908.

³⁵ '*Eiheiiji Shohatto*', in *Sōtōshū Komonjo*, 1, p. 20.

³⁶ Kagamishima, '*Nihon Zenshūshi: Sōtōshū*', p. 115.

found Shōton's opposition to Eihei-ji a violation of the government's declaration that all temples must follow Eihei-ji's *kakun*. For these faults, the authorities exiled Shōton to Tsugaru in the north.³⁷

The religious regulations promulgated by the bakufu also sought to promote learning and seniority among the clergy. Within the Sōtō school, the government limited promotion to high office to senior monks and stipulated that only monks with at least twenty-five years of training could become Zen masters.³⁸ In addition, the bakufu increased the income of temples that had strong education programs.³⁹ As in other schools of Buddhism, the Sōtō responded to these policies by quickly establishing academies for the scholastic training of its monks.

The most influential of these was the Sentanrin 梅檀林 founded at Kichijō-ji 吉祥寺 in Edo. This temple's tradition of education dates back to its founding in the mid-sixteenth century, but the founding of the Sentanrin can be dated to about 1657 when, with the construction of a new academic complex capable of housing more than one thousand students, the academy became a leading center for the scholastic study of Buddhism. Its curriculum varied depending upon the expertise of the available faculty, but in general the monks concentrated on four areas: (1) Zen studies, (2) Buddhist studies other than Zen, (3) Chinese literature, and (4) Chinese composition.⁴⁰ The Sentanrin trained many outstanding Sōtō leaders, including Manzan and the other principal members of the reform movement. This academic background must have helped to raise their estimation of the value of scholastic learning vis-à-vis the traditional Zen reverence for established custom and religious experience.

The third major stimulus to the development of both Sōtō Zen scholarship and the reform movement came from outside Japan in the form of Chinese Chan monks who began arriving in the second half of the seventeenth century. The propagation of the so-called Ming-dynasty Chan and the subsequent founding of the Ōbaku school produced strong reactions both in the Rinzai and in the Sōtō schools, with some factions welcoming and others opposing Chinese influence. For monks of either faction, whether they desired to preserve

³⁷ Kuriyama Taion 栗山泰音, *Sōjijishi* 総持寺史, Dai-Honzan Sōjiji, 1980 reprint, pp. 569–86.

³⁸ 'Sōtōshū Hatto', in *Sōtōshū Komonjo*, 2, p. 341.

³⁹ Tsuji, 8, pp. 219–24.

⁴⁰ Yokozeki Ryōin 横関了胤, *Edo Jidai Tōmon Seiyō* 江戸時代洞門政要, Tōyō Shoin, 1977 reprint, p. 825.

The author lists the following texts as constituting a typical curriculum at the Sentanrin:

1. Zen studies: monastic regulations (*shingi* 清規), koan collections, and the writings of Zen patriarchs.

2. Buddhist studies: scriptures such as *Yuimagyō* 維摩經, and treatises such as *Kishinron* 起信論.

3. Chinese studies: classics such as *Rongo* 論語, *Mōshi* 孟子, and *Sōshi* 莊子.

4. Chinese composition: poetry collections such as *Tōshisen* 唐詩選.

According to Yokozeki, the faculty tended to be more knowledgeable in Chinese studies than in Zen literature.

Japanese Zen traditions or wished to learn from the Chinese émigrés, the vitality of Ming-dynasty Chan forced them to re-examine and practice their own tradition with increased vigor. In the Rinzai school those who wished to preserve the traditional practices and characteristics of Japanese Rinzai were the most hostile toward Ming Chan, while the progressives who desired to reform and adopt Rinzai practices to the new social conditions often studied with Chinese masters. In the Sōtō school this situation was just the reverse. The monks who sought to restore ‘ancient practices’ and the ‘true’ Zen of the Sōtō patriarchs were the ones most heavily influenced by Chinese practices.⁴¹ Manzan and his master Gesshū Sōko 月舟宗胡, 1618–1696, for example, borrowed Ōbaku models and vocabulary in their attempts to revive the strict observance of the monastic regulations (*shingi* 清規) written by Dōgen and Keizan.⁴²

In addition to Manzan, many other Sōtō monks who actively campaigned to reform the *in’in ekishi* type of Dharma transmission were also influenced by Chinese masters. Dokuan Genkō 独庵玄光, 1630–1698, one of the severest critics of Sōtō *shihō* practices, studied for almost eight years under the Linji master Daozhe Chaoyuan (J. Dōsha Chōgen) 道者超元, d. 1660.⁴³ Renzan Kōeki 連山交易, 1635–1694, one of the reform movement’s earliest supporters, had close ties to the Caodong master Xinyue Xingchou (J. Shin’etsu Kōchū) 心越興俣, 1639–1696. Tokuō Ryōkō 徳翁良高, 1649–1709, who helped to present the reform movement’s appeal to the bakufu, had studied under several Ōbaku masters, including Muan Xingtao (J. Mokuan Shōtō) 木庵性瑫, 1611–1681, and was a life-long friend of Muan’s disciple, Chōon Dōkai.⁴⁴

Chōon influenced Manzan a great deal, not only because he was a close friend but also because of his strong views against *shihō* abuses within the Ōbaku school. As later was to be the case with the Sōtō school, Chōon and other leading Ōbaku monks had lodged a formal appeal with the bakufu to prohibit disciples from renouncing their original Dharma lineage and changing masters, a practice termed *hanhō* 反法 in the Ōbaku school. Chōon strove to eliminate *hanhō* and denounced other variant Dharma transmission practices, such as *yōfu* (Dharma transmission across distances of time or space) and *daifu* (Dharma transmission made on behalf of a deceased master).⁴⁵ As mentioned above, Chōon had criticized the Sōtō school’s *shihō* practices and had advised Manzan to become a disciple of Muan.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Kagamishima, ‘*Edo Jidai no Tenkai: Shūgi*’, pp. 159–60.

⁴² Kagamishima, ‘*Nihon Zenshūshi: Sōtōshū*’, pp. 123–25.

⁴³ For a discussion of Daozhe’s influence on Japanese Zen, see Furuta Shōkin, ‘*Dōsha Chōgen no Raichō to sono Eikyō*’ 道者超元の来朝とその影響, 1964, reprinted in *Furuta Shōkin Chosakushū* 古田紹欽著作集, Kōdansha, 1981, 2, pp. 343–65.

⁴⁴ Furuta Shōkin, ‘*Tokuō Ryōkō ni okeru Shūhei Kaikaku Shisō no Engen*’ 徳翁良高における宗弊改革思想の淵源, 1964, in *Furuta Shōkin Chosakushū*, 2, pp. 491–507.

⁴⁵ Furuta, ‘*Tokuō Ryōkō*’, pp. 495–96.

⁴⁶ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 3, in ZSZ 1, p. 541.

Manzan's 'Shūtō Fukko' Movement

In 1663, when he was only twenty-seven years old, Manzan Dōhaku had reportedly vowed to correct the Sōtō school's errant *shihō* practices and to restore the strong master-disciple bonds advocated in Dōgen's *Shōbō Genzō*. He did not begin to act on his vow, however, until thirty-three years later.⁴⁷ In 1692, when Renzan Kōeki had retired from his position as Registrar General of Monks (*tenka dai-sōroku* 天下大僧録), he had urged Manzan to succeed him to the office so that Manzan would be able to implement his reforms.⁴⁸ But Manzan declined the offer. While Manzan tended to be self-righteous, he also possessed enough political awareness to know that any reform could succeed only after gaining broad support. He felt that the time was not ripe for such a fortuitous result. Two years later Manzan freed himself of all teaching and administrative responsibilities when he retired to a small hermitage at Takagamine, just north of Kyoto.

In 1696 opportunity finally arose with the arrival of two monks, Ekō 慧光 and Sokugen 即現, d. 1714. They brought word from their teacher, Dokuan Genkō, requesting Manzan to join forces with him in an attempt to outlaw *garanbō*. Manzan was delighted to find an ally as distinguished as Dokuan (who had succeeded in restoring several temples), but he remained cautious. While he and Dokuan stayed in Kyoto to discuss strategy, they sent Ekō and Sokugen ahead to Edo to present the case for reform before the ecclesiastical and secular authorities. Manzan wanted to know what kind of reaction to expect before he and Dokuan journeyed to Edo.⁴⁹

Ekō and Sokugen dutifully set out for Edo, but Ekō fell ill before their trip had hardly begun and was forced to return to Kyoto. Alone, Sokugen managed as well as he might. The response of the first Sōtō official was simple and direct:

What is this? Are Dokuan and Manzan so haughty that when they present an appeal on such a major issue they come not themselves but merely send a common monk as their messenger? You! Get out of here and don't come back.

In a similar vein, another official informed Sokugen that because Dharma transmission occurred only in the sect's inner sanctums (*shūmon shitsunai* 宗門室内) it was not an issue that could be addressed by a common monk such as himself. He added: 'If you, and your two teachers for that matter, think that

⁴⁷ Except where noted, the following account is based on Sanshū Hakuryū's account in SF.

⁴⁸ At the time of Manzan's *shūtō fukko* movement, three separate offices of the Registrar General of Monks were responsible for administering the Sōtō school. These offices, located in the three administrative temples of the Kantō region (*kan sansetsu*) reported directly to the bakufu's Agency of Temples and Shrines (*jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行), which was responsible for supervising all religious establishments.

The three main Registrars General of Monks, in turn, monitored local registrars (*sōroku* 僧録) responsible for regional temple networks. By 1681 a total of 147 regional registrars had been established in Sōtō monasteries throughout Japan.

⁴⁹ *Shūtō Fukkoshi*, fasc. 1, sec. 5-6, in ZSZ 1, pp. 542-43.

garanbō is wrong, then switch to Rinzai or Ōbaku.’ But Sokugen would not be deterred. When he had exhausted all channels within the Sōtō school, he began addressing officials within the bakufu. His fortitude won him respect, but nothing more. Manzan and Dokuan decided to bide their time. Then suddenly in 1698 Dokuan, who had always been sickly, died and the first phase of Manzan’s reform movement came to an end.⁵⁰

Opportunity again arose two years later when Abe Masataka 阿部正喬, 1672–1750, received an appointment to the bakufu’s Agency of Temples and Shrines (*jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行).⁵¹ Manzan had known Masataka’s father, Masatake 正武, 1649–1704, for many years, during which time Masatake had risen to the position of counselor (*rōjū* 老中). Now that his son Masataka had been appointed to the *jisha bugyō*, Manzan knew that there would be at least two officials who would give his case a favorable hearing. He immediately began searching for an ally to take the place of Dokuan. Many Sōtō abbots were consulted until finally Baihō Jikushin 梅峰竺信, 1633–1707, accepted the task. In the Fifth Month of 1700 Manzan, now sixty-four years old, and Jikushin, sixty-seven, arrived in Edo.⁵²

Two months later the two monks met with the three registrars general of the Sōtō school and requested that they submit to the bakufu a formal appeal for *shihō* reform. They told the registrars that a true Sōtō Zen monk should have only one lifelong master, and advocated that the government should be requested to promulgate regulations to that effect. The gist of their arguments for this position consisted of four points:

1. Originally Dharma transmission in the Sōtō school conformed to the same principle as in the Rinzai school, namely, that a disciple should receive the acknowledgment (*inshō*) and lineage of only one master (*isshi*).

2. But recently this principle has gradually become disregarded and replaced by the custom of changing a monk’s lineage each time he becomes an abbot of a different temple. This type of corrupt *shihō*, which is not found in any other school of Zen, completely disregards the original form (*hongī* 本規) of the correct transmission of the Buddhas and patriarchs (*busso shōden* 仏祖正伝).

3. As the registrar general should be well aware of, Dōgen’s *Shōbō Genzō* chapters titled ‘*Shisho*’ and ‘*Menju*’ contain the codes (*kakun*) regulating *shihō* in Sōtō Zen. According to these two chapters, the only acceptable *shihō* is a face-to-face transmission bequeathed by a monk’s own individual master (*isshi menju*).

⁵⁰ *Shūtō Fukkoshi*, fasc. 1, sec. 7, in ZSZ 1, pp. 543–44, and Furuta, ‘*Dokuan Genkō no Shisō*’, p. 463.

⁵¹ As explained in n. 48, above, the Agency of Temples and Shrines regulated all religious establishments. The agency normally had four commissioners (although only two were in office for the entire three-year period of Manzan’s appeal), and a large staff distributed among several departments.

Every religious establishment had its own particular administrative office (such as the Sōtō’s school *Tenka Dai-sōroku*) that reported to this agency and was responsible for implementing its rulings.

⁵² SF, fasc. 1, sec. 9–10, in ZSZ 1, pp. 545–46.

4. The bakufu regulations (*hatto*) state that a man must have at least twenty-five years of training as a monk before he is allowed to succeed (*shihō*) to his master's Dharma lineage, wear a colored robe (denoting special status), or be promoted to the office of abbot of the head temple, that is, Eihei-ji. The regulations further state that all branch temples must conform to the same standards (*kakun*) as the head temple. Therefore both government regulations and Dōgen's admonitions (*ikai* 遺戒) stipulate the principle of *isshi inshō*. Yet current abbots replace their lineages in open violation of these stipulations—a practice that cannot but ruin the Sōtō Zen school.⁵³

Manzan and Jikushin's arguments were to no avail. The registrars general refused to take up the reform case before the bakufu's Agency of Temples and Shrines. Part of their reluctance was due to timidity for they could not gauge the government's reactions. But their refusal represented mostly their conservative concern for order: if the bakufu did approve the reforms, the current organization of temple factions would be thrown into confusion. Without the support of the registrars general, Manzan and Jikushin knew that a direct appeal to the government would have little hope of success. At the same time they realized that the registrars would not provide that support no matter how many times they were asked to do so. Unable to decide on the best course of action, Manzan suggested that he and Jikushin divine their fortune by drawing a lot. They did so, interpreted the lot as favorable, and immediately took their case to the Agency of Temples and Shrines.⁵⁴

The arguments for reform that the two monks presented to the agency were the same as the ones discussed above that had failed to move the three Sōtō registrars general. Manzan and Jikushin took care to ensure that the commissioners at the Agency of Temples and Shrines would be able to understand the issues in question. They briefly outlined the traditional account of the Zen teachings being transmitted from buddhas to patriarchs, from India to China, placing emphasis on Dōgen's role as the Japanese patriarch of Sōtō Zen. They compared the master-disciple bond to the Confucian relationships between lord and minister, father and son. Manzan and Jikushin declared that the switching of Dharma lineages in order to become abbot of a temple was practiced by monks who 'upon seeing profit, forget righteousness' (*ri wo mi, gi wo wasuru* 見利忘義), and they likened this to a scion of the imperial family who constantly switched back and forth between the Genji, Taira, Fujiwara, and Tachibana lines of descent. The two monks argued that while such a person might acquire great wealth, his family fortune was not founded upon the proper samurai virtues of administration and martial arts, but upon the merchandising skills of a townsman.⁵⁵

Opposition to Manzan and Jikushin appeared within only a few weeks. First, the three local Edo Sōtō registrars appealed to the commissioners not to

⁵³ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 12, in ZSZ 1, pp. 549–49.

⁵⁴ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 12–13, in ZSZ 1, pp. 549–50.

⁵⁵ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 13, in ZSZ 1, pp. 550–53.

disrupt a *shihō* practice that the Sōtō school had maintained for more than two hundred years without incident. Then someone expressed an opinion to Matsudaira Shigeyoshi 松平重栄, 1646–1720, one of the commissioners, that to restore the *shihō* practices that Manzan and Jikushin advocated would amount to establishing a new religious practice (*shimpō* 新法), an act prohibited by law. Finally one of the shogun's counselors, Akimoto Takatomo 秋元喬朝, 1647–1714, recommended against the proposed reforms. The commissioners had no choice but to tell Manzan and Jikushin to suspend their appeal.⁵⁶

Having already committed themselves thus far, Manzan and Jikushin were not willing to give up so easily. Instead they directed their attention away from the official channels. Attempting to stir up a broad base of popular support, they wrote letters and published essays that presented their arguments not only to members of the Sōtō hierarchy but also to the literati in other schools of Buddhism and the government at large. In this new round of advocacy, Manzan and Jikushin concentrated on issues concerning the religious importance of Dharma transmission rather than questions of bakufu regulations. They argued that the current Sōtō practice of switching Dharma lineages to accord to temple lineages was contrary to Zen tradition in general and in violation of Dōgen's teachings in particular. The key passages in Dōgen's *Shōbō Genzō* upon which Manzan based his interpretation were cited (in Manzan's own Chinese rendition) in one of his letters as follows:⁵⁷

If even a single buddha, or a single patriarch, or a master, or a single disciple did not participate in a face-to-face transmission, then they would not be the buddhas and patriarchs. . . . Not even one generation [can be lacking]. If one does not see into a master's mind, then one is not his disciple. If one does not see into a disciple's mind, then one is not his master. They must see each other. When they see each other, then comes the face-to-face transmission and the inheriting of the Dharma and lineage, and the Way of patriarchal face-to-face transmission is fully actualized.⁵⁸

In the past, present or future, is there any buddha or patriarch who transmits the Dharma unless both master and disciple see each other?⁵⁹

[In China] there are those who, when they join an admirable master's assembly, will earnestly ask for a copy of the master's portrait or an example of his calligraphy, and then assume that [the granting of their request] represents an acknowledgment that they have inherited the Dharma. Among these people there are some, like dogs, who in their old age bribe government officials to have a temple [established for them]. When they are appointed as its abbot, even though they did not inherit the Dharma of the master whose portrait or calligraphy they possess, they bequeath that Dharma lineage to current celebrities, to kings and ministers and to their close friends. [The Dharma is bequeathed] not with regard

⁵⁶ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 14, in ZSZ 1, pp. 553–54.

⁵⁷ This letter, written near the end of 1700 and addressed to the Zen monk Enmei 円明 at Eihei-ji, appears in SF, fasc. 1, sec. 14, in ZSZ 1, pp. 554–55.

⁵⁸ See Dōgen, *Shōbō Genzō*, 'Menju', in DZZ, 1, pp. 447–40.

⁵⁹ See DZZ, 1, p. 451.

to whether or not it has been attained, but only because these abbots desire fame. How sad that in this evil age of the declining Dharma these kinds of heterodox practices exist. Among these abbots there is not one who even in a dream has ever seen or heard of the Way of the Buddhas and patriarchs.⁶⁰

Presently in China, among those who are referred to as abbots, there are some who, depending on which temple at which they reside, change their lineages. How pitiful! In not properly transmitting the Dharma of buddhas and patriarchs they are not admirable [masters] but beasts. How were they ever admitted into the ranks of monks?

Manzan interpreted these passages as admonitions that Dōgen had left to warn his Dharma heirs against the practice of *in'in ekishi*. Significantly, the last passage—the only direct criticism of changing lineages cited by Manzan—cannot be found in Dōgen's known writings.⁶¹ Evidently Manzan was not above manufacturing quotations to get his point across. But while Dōgen represented the final authority for Manzan, most other Zen monks, even within the Sōtō school, paid more heed both to precedent and to the sayings of more famous Chinese masters. To reach these monks, in the summer of 1700 Jikushin wrote and published *Tōmon Gekitan* 洞門劇譚 ('A Dramatic Talk about the Sōtō School'), in which he used events from the lives of eleven Chinese masters to argue that once a Zen monk has inherited one Dharma lineage he must not inherit another.⁶² Jikushin rarely appealed to philosophical arguments, but at one point he treated Dharma lineages as being similar to quasi-material entities that permeate the Dharma heir's body so that a second lineage would always struggle against the first as if a person had divided his body into two opposing halves.⁶³

This new campaign was successful in making the practice of *garanbō* and the nature of *shihō* topics of debate both within and outside of the Sōtō school. Initially much of the reaction was critical of Manzan and Jikushin, not so much because of their views but because of their forceful tactics. *Shūtō Fukkoshi* offers four examples of these criticisms:

1. Because Manzan and Jikushin are a part of and a product of the Sōtō school's traditions, they are in no position to claim before the government that those traditions are wrong.
2. Even if the Sōtō tradition is corrupt, they should not have exposed the school to ridicule by publicizing that corruption.
3. Because Dharma transmission is a religious affair of great secrecy, it was undignified to subject the interpretation of its proper practice to the judgment of a secular body.

⁶⁰ Dōgen, *Shōbō Genzō*, 'Shisho', in 1, p. 341.

⁶¹ Manzan claimed to be paraphrasing from a section of *Shōbō Genzō* titled '*Jūsan*' 住山, but no evidence suggests that such a section ever existed.

⁶² Facsimile in *Eihei Shōbō Genzō Shūsho Taisei* 永平正法眼藏菟書大成 [ESG], Taishūkan, 1977, 20, pp. 505–26.

⁶³ ESG 20, p. 517.

4. They should not have created a disturbance over a matter that individual monks can decide for themselves.

Manzan and Jikushin referred to their supporters as the ‘single-Dharma-lineage side’ (*isshi inshō no hō* 一師印証ノ方) and to their opponents as the ‘temple-lineage side’ (*garan sōzoku no hō* 伽藍相統ノ方). The dissension between the two groups was so fierce that even among adolescent monks (*kozō* 小僧) supporters of one side would not associate with those of the other.⁶⁴ Listing the names of individuals and temples that helped the single-Dharma-lineage side convince the government to prohibit *in’in ekishi* occupies several pages of *Shūtō Fukkoshi*. The list includes more than thirty prominent laymen, as well as monks from the Tendai, Shingon, Jōdo, Rinzaï (especially the Myōshinji 妙心寺 branch), Ōbaku, and, of course, Sōtō schools. More than one hundred temples are cited.⁶⁵

The strongest opposition to Manzan and Jikushin’s proposed reform came from within the Sōtō school. Although it is impossible to gauge the numerical strength of this opposition, the arguments used against the proposed reform have been preserved, in what must be their fullest expression, in the writings of Jōzan Ryōkō 定山良光, d. 1736. Jōzan was the abbot of Shōbōji, the temple founded by Mutei Ryōshō and inherited after Mutei’s death by Gessen Ryōin. Jōzan interpreted Manzan and Jikushin’s views as a direct insult to Shōbōji. According to Jōzan, the tradition of *garanbō* originated and maintained at Shōbōji was not a corrupt practice, but the true teaching of the buddhas and patriarchs. He claimed that Shōbōji preserved documents written by Rujing, Dōgen’s master, that proved this. Because Shōbōji is located in northern Japan, at first Jōzan’s views reached Edo only indirectly.⁶⁶ This changed in 1701 when, in response to Jikushin’s *Tōmon Gekitan*, Jōzan wrote a polemical essay titled *Shōbō Tekiden Shishi Ikkushū* 正法嫡伝獅子一吼集 (‘The Lion Roar of the Proper Heirs of Shōbō Temple’). One year later his essay was published in Edo.

Jōzan believed that:

In’in ekishi is the face-to-face transmission of the buddhas, the patriarchs, and their proper heirs. Since ancient times and in the present, it is the Dharma wheel [the true teaching] of the Unsurpassed Vehicle.⁶⁷

Jōzan could therefore not allow Manzan and Jikushin to go unchallenged. *Shishi Ikkushū* attacks the two monks’ concept of face-to-face transmission and their doctrine of only a single Dharma lineage on the grounds that they had failed to understand (1) the nature of Dharma transmission explained in *Shōbō Genzō*, (2) Zen history, and (3) the importance of maintaining lineages.

⁶⁴ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 15, in ZSZ 1, pp. 556–57.

⁶⁵ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 17, in ZSZ 1, pp. 562–65.

⁶⁶ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 16, in ZSZ 1, p. 550.

⁶⁷ *Shishi Ikkushū* [SI] (1702), fasc. 1, leaf 32b, in ESG 20, p. 544.

To demonstrate how Manzan and Jikushin had misread *Shōbō Genzō*, *Shishi Ikkushū* begins with a paragraph-by-paragraph commentary on the *Shōbō Genzō* chapters ‘*Juki*’, ‘*Shisho*’, and ‘*Menju*’, all reproduced in Dōgen’s own idiomatic Japanese (instead of the unambiguous Chinese used by Manzan). The term *juki* 授記 usually refers to predictions by the Buddha that assure a disciple of his future attainment of buddhahood. Jōzan, however, cites Dōgen to argue that the prediction of enlightenment that Shakyamuni Buddha gave to his direct disciples is the Dharma transmitted by Zen masters. The ‘special transmission outside the scriptures’ (*kyōge betsuden* 教外別伝) and the ‘incomprehensible mind of nirvana’ (*nehan myōshin* 涅槃妙心) is none other than Shakyamuni Buddha’s *juki*.⁶⁸ Jōzan asserted that this interpretation is what Dōgen meant when he wrote: ‘What the Buddha and patriarchs transmit from heir to heir is just *juki*.’⁶⁹ According to Jōzan, Manzan and Jikushin had failed to understand the fundamental atemporal nature of this transmission. The Dharma inherited by the disciple is always Shakyamuni Buddha’s Dharma; the disciple’s true master (*honshi* 本師) is always Shakyamuni Buddha. Jōzan cites Dōgen’s statement that at the same time that Shitou Xiquian (J. Sekitō Kisen) 石頭希遷, 700–790, had inherited the Dharma from Qingyuan (J. Seigen Gyōshi) 青原行思, d. 740, Mahakasyapa (the Dharma heir of Shakyamuni Buddha according to Zen legend) had also inherited the Dharma from Qingyuan. He proceeds to ridicule Jikushin’s comment about opposing Dharma lineages dividing one’s body.⁷⁰ He rhetorically asked whether Mahakasyapa had to return his original lineage to the Buddha.⁷¹ Jōzan asserted that Dōgen taught that a monk always inherits the Dharma directly from Shakyamuni Buddha.

Jōzan argues, therefore, that the term ‘face-to-face transmission’ does not refer to a physical ‘flesh-and-blood’ (*kechiniku* 血肉) face, but to ultimate reality revealing itself through buddha face (*butsumen* 仏面), patriarch face (*somen* 祖面), sun face (*nichimen* 日面), moon face (*gachimen* 月面), mirror face (*kyōmen* 鏡面), water face (*suimen* 水面), form face (*gyōmen* 形面), shadow face (*yōmen* 影面), and so forth.⁷² According to Jōzan, all these faces are the face of Shakyamuni Buddha, as indicated by the following statement in the ‘*Menju*’ chapter of Dōgen’s *Shōbō Genzō*:

Even with a gap of a thousand years, ten thousand years, one hundred eons, or one hundred million eons [separating the disciple from the Buddha], face-to-face transmission is the transmission of the actualization of Shakyamuni Buddha’s face.⁷³

⁶⁸ SI, leaf 1a-b, ESG 20, p. 528.

⁶⁹ SI, leaf 3a, in ESG 20, p. 529. See Dōgen, *Shōbō Genzō*, ‘*Juki*’, in DZZ 1, p. 195.

⁷⁰ SI, leaf 8b, in ESG 20, p. 529. See Dōgen, *Shōbō Genzō*, ‘*Juki*’, in DZZ 1, p. 197.

⁷¹ SI, leaf 9a, in ESG 20, p. 532.

⁷² SI, leaves 24b-27a, in ESG 20, pp. 540–41.41.

⁷³ SI, leaf 27a, in ESG 20, p. 541. See DZZ 1, p. 448.

Based on this doctrine, Jōzan argued that a disciple can change his lineage an infinite number of times and have an infinite number of teachers because ultimately there is only one Dharma. Again attacking Jikushin's remark about two lineages in one body, Jōzan replied that this statement proved that Manzan and Jikushin failed to understand that Dharma transmission exists through the realization of the unobstructed body, words, mind, and actions (*muge shin go i gō* 無礙身語意業) of ultimate reality.⁷⁴

Having argued that Manzan and Jikushin were mistaken on doctrine, Jōzan then attempted to prove that their knowledge of Zen history was equally misinformed. He devoted a major part of *Shishi Ikkushū* to detailed examinations of the training of each of the eleven Chinese masters used as examples in *Tōmon Gekitan* in order to argue that, contrary to what Jikushin stated, all of them had inherited more than one lineage.⁷⁵ To amplify this point, Jōzan then offered sixteen of his own examples, beginning with Ananda, one of the Buddha's direct disciples, in India and ending with the second patriarch of Shōbōji, Gessen Ryōin.⁷⁶ Jōzan cited some of the same historical episodes mentioned at the beginning of the present article, namely, Dōgen's relationship with Myōzen and Gikai's letter to Keizan. Finally he explained how Gessen Ryōin prevented Mutei Ryōshō's lineage from ending. According to Jōzan's account, the so-called ceremonial inheritance of the Dharma by making obeisance at the deceased master's ossuary (*haitō shihō* 拝塔嗣法) that Gessen had performed at Shōbōji was 'the origin of the Japanese practice of maintaining a temple's lineage by assuming it after [the abbot's] decease.'⁷⁷ Jōzan argued that without this ceremony, many temple communities would suffer the distress (*uree* 患) of having their founder's lineage cut off. *Shishi Ikkushū* concludes with a long harangue on the inherent superiority of Japanese Buddhism over that of China and India, with *garanbō* being both more suited to Japanese Buddhism and an improvement over Chinese practice.

Manzan and Jikushin remained unperturbed when they first heard of Jōzan's claims. A few of the supporters of the reform movement, however, were concerned enough to sneak into Shōbōji and clandestinely copy the documents said to have been written by Dōgen's master, Rujing. After Manzan and Jikushin received this copy, they co-authored a Chinese verse titled 'Upon Seeing Twelve Documents Preserved at a Certain Temple in Northern Japan' (*Ran Tōō Bōji Shitsunai Kirikami Jūnitsū* 覽東奧某寺室內切紙十二通) that ridiculed Jōzan. This poem asserted that the twelve documents were later forgeries composed in the style of mixed Chinese and Japanese.⁷⁸ They were convinced that Jōzan offered no threat to their reform proposals.

⁷⁴ SI, fasc. 2, leaf 14a-b, in ESG 20, p. 559.

⁷⁵ SI, fasc. 1, leaves 42b-47, in ESG 20, pp. 549-51.

⁷⁶ SI, fasc. 2, leaves 1-10a, in ESG 20, pp. 552-57.

⁷⁷ SI, fasc. 2, leaf 10a, in ESG 20, p. 557.

⁷⁸ SF, fasc. 1, sec. 16, in ZSZ 1, p. 560.

By 1702, when *Shishi Ikkushū* was first printed, the lines between supporters and opponents of Manzan's reform movement were already so clearly drawn that Jōzan's arguments were too late to have much impact. Nevertheless both Manzan and Jikushin quickly wrote several short refutations of his key points and distributed copies to officials in the bakufu. Interestingly, the first (1704) published work to attack *Shishi Ikkushū* was written by a Rinzai monk, Keirin Sūshin (or Sōchin) 桂林崇琛, and not by a member of Manzan's Sōtō reform movement.⁷⁹ The lack of direct reply by Sōtō monks indicates that the issues raised by Jōzan remained sensitive topics within the school even after the government ruled in favor of Manzan's appeal in 1703. According to *Shūtō Fukkoshi*, the bakufu eventually ordered the distribution of *Shishi Ikkushū* stopped and its printing blocks destroyed.⁸⁰

Several of Manzan's letters and short essays written during this period of controversy were collected by his disciple Sanshū Hakuryū and published in 1711 under the title *Manzan Oshō Tōmon Ejoshū* 円山和尚洞門衣裾集 ('Master Manzan's Tattered Robe for [Admonishing] the Sōtō School').⁸¹ This collection of brief arguments reveals Manzan's response to Jōzan's assertions and the main components of Manzan's own conception of *shihō*. He rejected outright the possibility that Gessen had switched masters or inherited Mutei's lineage only after Mutei's death. In Manzan's view any documents that might suggest otherwise were 'surely later fabrications' (*kore kesshite gonin no gisen* 是決後人偽撰).⁸² Likewise Manzan dismissed as faulty history the accounts that Touzi Yiqing had inherited his Sōtō lineage from a Rinzai teacher.⁸³ Manzan carefully sidestepped the problem of Gikai's dual lineages. On the one hand he freely admitted that past Zen students had changed masters in the course of their search for enlightenment (*ihō ekihō* 以法易法), but asserted on the other that the practice of changing lineages to conform to temples was a completely different matter. Manzan argued that Gikai never had a true enlightenment experience under his first teacher and therefore his earlier lineage, being too immature, had been replaced by his later one.⁸⁴

⁷⁹ According to SF, fasc. 1, sec. 16, in ZSZ Keirin sent copies of his refutations (titled *Shōbō Tekiden Shishi Ikkushū Benkai* 正法嫡伝獅子一吼集弁解, facsimile in ESG 20, pp. 576–601) to Manzan and Jikushin.

Regarding Keirin's influence on Sōtō doctrines, see Kagamishima Genryū, 'Keirin Sūshin ni tsuite: Kinsei Tō-Zai Kōshōshi no Issetsu' 桂林崇琛について:近世洞済交渉史の一節, in *Dōgen Zen-ji to sono Monryū*, pp. 195–213.

⁸⁰ Fasc. 1, sec. 16, in ZSZ 1, p. 561.

⁸¹ Facsimile in ESG 20, pp. 602–17.

⁸² 'Mutei Gessen Dōsō Onajiku Gasan wo Tsugu ni Kangae' 無底月泉道雙同嗣峨山考, in *Manzan Oshō Tōmon Ejoshū* [MO], 1711, p. 22a, in ESG 20, p. 614.

⁸³ 'Taikyaku Zuihitsu' 対客隨筆, in MO, pp. 8b–9b, in ESG 20, p. 607. After Manzan, leading Sōtō monks such as Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方, 1683–1769, repeatedly argued against the validity of the Chinese historical sources regarding Touzi's indirect succession.

⁸⁴ 'Taikyaku Zuihitsu', in MO, p. 8a, in ESG 20, p. 607.

Although Gikai is not mentioned by name in this passage, he is the subject of the question to which this passage is addressed (see p. 2b, in ESG 20, p. 604).

This line of argument, however, contradicts another key point of Manzan's general conception of *shihō*, namely, that Dharma transmission can occur whether or not a disciple has an enlightenment experience (*go migo shihō* 悟未悟嗣法).⁸⁵ As Kagamishima Genryū has pointed out, this startling idea that even an unenlightened disciple can succeed to his master's lineage seems to have resulted from Manzan's conviction that in his own age—as opposed to the age of Dōgen and Gikai—the quality of the people studying Zen had declined to such an extent that few could attain true enlightenment.⁸⁶ Unlike Jōzan, who accepted multiple lineages on the grounds that face-to-face transmission represented the intangible realization of Shakyamuni Buddha's face, Manzan taught that since modern disciples were incapable of that kind of atemporal experience, they should instead concentrate on maintaining the principle of a physical face-to-face transmission.⁸⁷

Manzan argued that as long as master and disciple fulfill the condition of a personal relationship, then Dharma transmission 'with either an enlightened or an unenlightened disciple are both equivalent in [maintaining] the true tradition' (*go migo onajiku kore shōden nari* 悟未悟同是正伝也).⁸⁸ In support of this interpretation, Manzan cited (in his own Chinese rendition) Dōgen's statement:

. . . even if the one word [that expresses enlightenment] is not yet fully perceived, even if the half verse is not yet clearly grasped, once the master has already seen the disciple from within and once the disciple has already paid obeisance to the master from below, then this is face-to-face transmission of the true tradition. In this manner, one must venerate face-to-face transmission.⁸⁹

As a corollary to his doctrine that even unenlightened disciples can inherit Dharma lineages, Manzan also rejected the possibility of self-enlightened Zen masters. In his view, even if such an enlightenment experience had really occurred, it cannot embody the Truth taught by Buddhism unless a monk also receives the Dharma transmission from a legitimate master. Without this transmission, he would fall into the grave error of rejecting causality (*tennen gedō* 天然外道). Regardless, therefore, of how great or deep an enlightenment a monk may experience, he must always visit an enlightened master (*myōshi* 明師) to attain his acknowledgment in a personal face-to-face transmission (*menju shinshō* 面授親承). Manzan argued that if this requirement were not met, increasing numbers of arrogant monks would attempt to get their own self-proclaimed understanding recognized as genuine.⁹⁰ Likewise, if monks

⁸⁵ 'Taikyaku Zuihitsu', in MO, in ESG 20, p. 606.

⁸⁶ Kagamishima, 'Tenkei Denson no Shisō', p. 90.

⁸⁷ 'Shōbō Genzō Menju no Maki no Nochi ni Daisu' 題正法眼藏面授卷後, in MO, p. 7b, in ESG 20, p. 606.

⁸⁸ 'Taikyaku Zuihitsu', in MO, p. 7b, in ESG 20, p. 606.

⁸⁹ 'Taikyaku Zuihitsu', in MO, p. 7b, in ESG 20, p. 606. See Shōbō Genzō, 'Menju', in DZZ 1, p. 448.

⁹⁰ 'Shōbō Genzō Menju no Maki no Nochi ni Daisu', in MO, p. 19b, in ESG 20, p. 612.

were not required to receive their lineage from a living master, then it would be possible for anyone who has had an enlightenment experience upon reading the sayings of some famous master of the past, or even sayings attributed to some legendary buddha, to deceive people by claiming that lineage as his own.⁹¹

The fact that both Manzan and Jōzan fitted historical facts to their own preconceived notions and that both read their own narrow interpretations into Dōgen's writings demonstrates that neither was motivated solely by the desire to remain true to Dōgen's teachings—whatever these might have been. Today we cannot know how Dōgen might have reacted to this controversy, involving as it did institutional rivalries non-existent in his time. The contradictory implications of Dōgen's statements and the ambiguous historical record suggest that earlier concepts of dharma transmission had been more fluid and dynamic than either Manzan or Jōzan dare admit. What does seem clear, however, is that, by the mid-Tokugawa period, for many Sōtō monks the ritual ceremony of dharma transmission could no longer successfully evoke a spiritual bonding with an absent teacher or an abstract Shakyamuni Buddha. Manzan's interpretation exploited this apparent gap between ritual intention and religious content. Jōzan's metaphysical position, in contrast, lacked the simplicity and tangible appeal of a concrete relationship that could be physically sensed and objectively verified.

By the summer of 1702, the 'single-Dharma-lineage' side could already count many prominent monks and lay officials among their supporters. Manzan and Jikushin began to hold secret strategy meetings to obtain advice from other selected supporters, including Dennō Gyūho 田翁牛甫, d. 1724, the abbot of Rurikōji 瑠璃光寺 in Edo. During the Sixth Month, Matsudaira Shigeyoshi sent word to Manzan and Jikushin that the government seemed likely to consider a new appeal with favor. But Manzan preferred to wait cautiously. In his view the time was still not ripe and the movement was still too weak to risk another negative judgment. The protests of the other leaders could not convince him that waiting too long might be just as risky. Two months later, Jōzan's *Shishi Ikkushū* appeared in print for the first time. Two months after that, in the Tenth Month, perhaps because he feared that the reform movement's current favor with the government might be threatened by *Shishi Ikkushū*, Gyūho suddenly issued his own appeal to the government.⁹²

Gyūho's appeal was similar to the one issued two years earlier by Manzan and Jikushin. It began with a short history of the earlier attempts at reform by Dokuan, Sokugen, and Manzan. Using Confucian concepts, Gyūho argued that maintaining temple lineages is unfilial (*fukō* 不孝) and unrighteous (*fugī* 不義) because it results in monks discarding their true teacher, and forgetting

⁹¹ 'Shōbō Genzō Menju no Maki no Nochi ni Daisu', in MO, pp. 19b-20a, in ESG 20, pp. 612-13.

⁹² SF, fasc. 2, sec. 18-19, in ZSZ 1, pp. 566-67.

their proper obligations (*on* 恩).⁹³ He insisted that Dharma lineages must be maintained by monks even if it meant that when the proper people were lacking, the lineage would come to an end. While conceding that bequeathing the Dharma to the ‘wood and stone’ of a temple might prevent it from dying out, Gyūho argued that such practices are just like discarding one’s own flesh-and-blood father and replacing him with a wooden puppet. From generation to generation, is anything actually maintained?⁹⁴

In contrast to the ease with which the Agency of Temples and Shrines had been pressured into dismissing the previous appeal, this time its officials could not be deterred from conducting a thorough, time-consuming investigation. During the Third Month, Manzan and Jikushin appeared before the agency for a series of detailed cross-examinations on all aspects of Sōtō Dharma transmission. In addition, the two monks were ordered to disclose the names and residences of all their disciples because someone had charged that they were using the reform movement as a means to attract as many Dharma heirs as possible—heirs who in the event of a ruling favoring the reform would never be able to accept another lineage.⁹⁵ During the Fourth Month, the agency interviewed leading monks from the Tendai, Shingon, Jōdo, Nichiren, Rinzaï, and Ōbaku schools. According to *Shūtō Fukkoshi*, every eminent monk questioned responded in favor of eliminating *garanbō*.⁹⁶ Finally, during the Fifth Month, the agency turned its attention to the ecclesiastical authorities of the Sōtō school. One by one, the abbots of the two head temples, the three Kantō regional registrars general, the three Edo registrars, and the abbots of about fifteen major regional temples were summoned to Edo for questioning.⁹⁷

If the sample dialogues recorded in *Shūtō Fukkoshi* accurately reflect the cross-examinations, the commissioners were both informed and discerning in questioning the Sōtō prelates. When one of the prelates tried to argue that, even though it was incorrect, *garanbō* should not be prohibited because any attempt to reform the custom of two hundred years would lead to squabbling between regional head temples, thereby disturbing the peace of the realm, one of the commissioners responded that prohibiting evil practices (*heiaku* 弊惡) and establishing righteousness (*shōbō* 正法) was the policy that preserved domestic peace. One of the prelates attempted to argue that *daifu* was a legitimate practice, attested to by numerous Chinese examples, and that Dōgen’s rejection of it was an aberrant opinion (*shigen* 私言) that should be rejected by the govern-

⁹³ Reportedly, he stood ready to sacrifice his monastic standing and his life if need be. See SF, fasc. 2, sec. 18–19, in ZSZ 1, pp. 566–69.

⁹⁴ SF, fasc. 2, sec. 20, in ZSZ 1, p. 575.

⁹⁵ SF, fasc. 2, sec. 20, in ZSZ 1, pp. 576–78.

According to SF, at this time Manzan had acknowledged only nine Dharma heirs. By the time of Manzan’s death, however, he had acquired more than thirty Dharma successors. See Sanshū Hakuryū *et al.*, ed., *Daijō Rempōshi* 大乗聯芳志, in SZ 16, p. 580b.

⁹⁶ SF, fasc. 2, sec. 21, in ZSZ 1, p. 580.

⁹⁷ SF, sec. 22, in ZSZ 1, pp. 580–81.

ment. To this, a commissioner responded that every social group must conform to its own norms (*kakun*): samurai must practice swordsmanship, Hossō monks must follow the doctrines of the Hossō school, Tendai monks must follow the teachings of Saichō 最澄, and Sōtō monks must follow the teachings of Dōgen. When a prelate tried to argue that Manzan and Jikushin were distorting Dōgen's views, a commissioner asked whether Dōgen had not written that monks who change lineages were beasts or dogs. Then when the same prelate proposed that Dōgen's words merely represented one of the particularities of Zen language, similar to calling the Buddha a dried shit stick (*kanshiketsu* 乾屎橛), the commissioner reminded him of the distinction between paradoxical language intended to lead a disciple to enlightenment and caveats intended to direct behavior.⁹⁸

Two months later, on the 5th day of the Seventh Month, the agency ordered the Sōtō leaders to state the school's official position either approving or protesting any government proposal to abolish temple lineages. The prelates convened several times, but no matter how much they debated the issue, a consensus could not be reached. The abbot of Sōjiji led the faction favoring government action, while the abbots of Eiheiji and the three administrative temples of the Kantō region (*kan sansetsu*), where the offices of the registrar general were located, led the opposition.

It is not surprising that Eiheiji fought for the continuation of *garanbō*, while Sōjiji favored abolishing it. Eiheiji had benefited most from the government-ordered rearrangement of Sōtō temple lineages. Without *garanbō*, Eiheiji could not command the loyalty of the new temple factions it had acquired. Sōjiji, on the other hand, would remain head of the largest temple faction regardless of whether *garanbō* was abolished or not. With these two head temples opposing each other, the question of approval or protest became subordinate to the overall rivalry between the two institutions. The prelates of neither temple would give in to those of the other.

To break the deadlock, Manzan and Jikushin proposed a compromise that could establish the principle of inheriting only a single Dharma lineage (*isshi in-shō*) while also allowing temple Dharma lineages (*garanbō*) to continue to exist in modified form. This was done by making an arbitrary distinction between the nature and function of the three documents of succession (*sanmotsu* 三物) handed down during the secret Sōtō Dharma transmission ritual.

There are various theories about the origins and orthodox interpretations of these documents. The following descriptions have avoided as many of the unsettled issues as possible and as a result are necessarily somewhat subjective.⁹⁹ The format of the succession certificate (*shisho*) that has been used since

⁹⁸ SF, sec. 23, in ZSZ 1, pp. 582–84.

⁹⁹ For a detailed presentation of orthodox Sōtō views, see Okada Gihō 岡田宜方, *Zengaku Kenkyūhō to sono Shiryō* 禅学研究法と其資料, Meicho Kankōkai, 1969, pp. 482–91 & 534–52.

at least the sixteenth century depicts the names of all the buddhas and patriarchs (legendary and historical) down to the present master and disciple, arranged in a large circle around Shakyamuni's name, which occupies the center. An unbroken, wavy red line winds circles through and connects all the names. The circular arrangement depicts not so much a linear, historical transmission from one generation to the next, but rather the simultaneous enlightenment of all beings with Shakyamuni.¹⁰⁰ The second document, the blood lineage (*kechimyaku*) chart, records the genealogical transmission of the mystical Zen precepts (*zenkai* 禪戒) that embody enlightenment. Here all the patriarchs are listed in sequential fashion, one after the other. The third chart, known as the 'Great Task' (*daiji* 大事), a reference to the statement in the Lotus Sutra that all buddhas appear in the world for the sole task of leading beings to enlightenment, is the most problematical of the three documents. Its appearance and format vary widely, even among versions bestowed by the same master. Usually it consists of geometric diagrams that symbolize the wordless content of Zen enlightenment.

In Manzan's proposed compromise, the succession certificate alone would represent a monk's single true Dharma lineage and as such it would never be changed or discarded (*isshō fueki* 一生不易). The *kechimyaku* (Blood Lineage) and *daiji* (Great Task) would remain attached to individual temples, so that each new abbot would receive that temple founder's *kechimyaku* and *daiji* lineages.¹⁰¹ In this way, monks would receive five documents (*gomotsu* 五物): their original set of three plus two more from each new temple. The three succession documents traditionally had been handed down as a single unit (*san soku ichi* 三即一), but Manzan believed that only the succession certificate had been bestowed on Dōgen by Rujing. In his view, it was Dōgen who had initiated use of the 'Blood Lineage' chart, while the 'Great Task' was a later innovation that had nothing to do with the succession process.¹⁰² The latter two documents, therefore, were mere auxiliaries that could be handled differently from the *shisho*. He explained this point as follows:

What is used to attest that one has inherited the Dharma is the same in both China and Japan, and in both the Rinzai and Sōtō schools. It is only the single *shisho* document. . . .

¹⁰⁰ The *shisho* attributed to Rujing and Dōgen, now stored at Eihei-ji and designated as a National Treasure, is the prime example of this genre. In spite of its exalted status, however, the version now stored at Eihei-ji probably dates from the sixteenth century.

See Ōkubo Dōshū, *Shūtei Zōho Dōgen Zenjiden no Kenkyū* 修訂増補道元禪師伝の研究, Chikuma, 1966 rev. ed., pp. 340 & 453.

¹⁰¹ SF, fasc. 2, sec. 26, in ZSZ 1, pp. 588–90.

¹⁰² 'Taikyaku Nihitsu' 対客二筆, in *Manzan Oshō Tōmon Ejoshū*, pp. 14a–15a, in ESG 20. pp. 609–10.

Regarding the use of similar certificates in present-day Chinese Buddhism, see Holmes Welch, 'Dharma Scrolls and the Succession of Abbots in Chinese Monasteries', in *T'oung-Pao*, 50:1–3 (1963), pp. 93–115.

[The fact] that in Eihei [Dōgen's *Shōbō Genzō*] there is not even half a phrase or a single word that concerns the [other] two documents, the *kechimyaku* and *daiji*, means that these need not be related to Dharma succession. The *kechimyaku* delineates one's precept-transmission lineage; it does not attest to one's Dharma-transmission lineage. The *daiji* [attests] to one's oral initiation to the *kechimyaku*; it, too, does not attest to one's Dharma-transmission lineage. Merely because masters have traditionally placed these two documents into the same cover as the *shisho*, they are conventionally referred to as the three [succession] documents. This is not at all the Founder's [Dōgen's] original intention.¹⁰³

In their three years of effort, Manzan and Jikushin still had not overcome the Sōtō school's conservative opposition to their proposed abolition of temple lineages. But after so much labor, they could not afford to be unyielding. Without accepting some compromise with the supporters of temple lineages, the reform movement would not have succeeded in even partially establishing the principle of only a single, life-long Dharma lineage. Manzan and Jikushin therefore petitioned the Agency of Temples and Shrines to allow the Sōtō authorities to accept the above compromise. On the 17th day of the Twelfth Month, the abbots of Eiheiji, Sōji, the three Kantō temples, and six other major temples formally approved the compromise proposal.¹⁰⁴ On the 7th day of the following month, 1703, Manzan and Jikushin finally achieved the goal for which they had worked so long. On that day the bakufu handed down a ruling with three main provisions:

1. In order to become abbot of a temple a monk must have had at least twenty-five years of training and be nominated by the master from whom he inherited the Dharma.

2. The principles of face-to-face transmission (*menju*) and inheriting only a single Dharma lineage (*isshi inshō*) are part of Dōgen's codes (*kakun*). From this day forward every Sōtō monk shall keep throughout his entire life the first set of the three succession documents that he has received, regardless of where else he serves as abbot. Moreover, the practice of using representatives outside of the master-disciple relationship to bestow lineages [that is, the practice of *daifu*] is prohibited.

3. In regard to the transmission of the temple Dharma lineages, a new abbot shall be allowed to inherit more than one *kechimyaku* and *daiji* (but not the *shisho*) so that he can succeed to the same temple lineage as the former abbot.¹⁰⁵

Manzan and Jikushin had won. True, the last vestiges of *garanbō* were not eliminated until 1875, when the Sōtō school finally prohibited monks from inheriting more than one *kechimyaku* and one *daiji*.¹⁰⁶ But Manzan and Jikushin succeeded in establishing the primacy of individual relationships (Zen

¹⁰³ 'Taikyaku Nihitsu', in *Manzan Oshō Tōmon Ejoshū*, pp. 12b-13a, in ESG 20, p. 609.

¹⁰⁴ SF, fasc. 2, sec. 27, in ZSZ 1, pp. 588-93.

¹⁰⁵ SF, fasc. 2, sec. 27, in ZSZ 1, pp. 593-94. Note: this is a summary of the ruling, not a translation.

¹⁰⁶ Yokozeki, pp. 804-05.

masters and disciples) over institutional relationships (Zen temples) to an extent that was radical in the context of the Tokugawa age.¹⁰⁷ Lifting the constraints of *garanbō* had an immediate restorative effect on the smaller lineage factions. Kuriyama Taion has demonstrated the numerical results of the reform ruling by comparing the number of Dharma heirs attributed to the abbots of Daijōji, a monastery in the small Meihō lineage.¹⁰⁸ Seventeen successive abbots before 1704 are credited with having produced a total of only nineteen disciples, but the next seventeen abbots of Daijōji produced (and retained) 404 Dharma heirs.¹⁰⁹ Even contemporaries of Manzan and Jikushin recognized that the 1704 bakufu ruling would be a turning point in the history of Japanese Sōtō. Sonnō Shūeki 損翁宗益, 1649–1705, for example, praised Manzan and Jikushin as the revivers (*chūkō* 中興) of the Japanese Sōtō school.¹¹⁰

Yet no one could fully anticipate the reverberations of this ‘revival’. More than just institutional organization was at stake. Arguments for and against Manzan’s reform had hinged on the resolution of basic ideological issues. The bakufu *hatto* of 1615 had stipulated that Eihei-ji’s standards (*kakun*) must be the rule for all Sōtō monks. At that time, the legal implications of the term *kakun* (literally, house rules) were not clearly defined. Probably it referred to the customs and precedents established by tradition at Eihei-ji. With the government’s 1704 ruling in favor of Manzan’s appeal, however, ‘Eihei-ji’s *kakun*’ thenceforth would be interpreted as Dōgen’s writings. Textual interpretation would take precedence over established habits. The Sōtō hierarchy, no doubt afraid of what other radical reformers might find in Dōgen’s *Shōbō Genzō*, a work open to a variety of interpretations, immediately took steps to restrict access to this traditional symbol of sectarian authority. Acting at the request of the Sōtō prelates, in 1722 the government prohibited the copying or publication of any part of *Shōbō Genzō*.¹¹¹ But this regulation proved to be too little, too late. The search for the historical Dōgen had begun and could not be stopped.

Ultimately the ideological implications of Manzan’s reform movement proved more important than its institutional effects. Implicit within Manzan’s general idea of *fukko* (restoration) was the notion that the Sōtō practices of his day represented degenerate conventions that had deviated from the true teachings of Dōgen. Not only *garanbō*, but all traditional Sōtō teachings and practices fell under suspicion unless they could be justified by direct reference to Dōgen’s writings. As a result, many practices that had developed during the

¹⁰⁷ Kagamishima, ‘*Edo Jidai no Tenkai: Shūgi*’, pp. 166–67.

¹⁰⁸ *Gakuzan Shiron* 岳山史論, Dai-Honzan Sōjiji, Yokohama, 1980 reprint, pp. 322–28.

¹⁰⁹ See *Daijō Rempōshi*, in SZ 16, pp. 577–94.

¹¹⁰ *Sonnō Oshō Gyōjō* 損翁和尚行狀 (1751), in SZ 17, ‘*Shiden*’, p. 373b.

¹¹¹ Regarding *Shōbō Genzō Kaihan Kinshi no Rei* 正法眼藏開版禁止令, see Yokozeki, pp. 909–12.

medieval period, such as the system of secret initiations into Sōtō teachings (for example, *kirikami kuketsu* 切紙口訣), gradually fell into disrepute.¹¹² Re-examination of Sōtō traditions ushered in new vitality, but also new weaknesses. As scholarly monks increasingly emphasized the scholastic interpretation of Dōgen's writings, Sōtō teachings left less room for the traditional religious authority of the 'Zen Master' and his freedom to express Zen enlightenment in terms of personal experience. Finally, Manzan's devaluation of the enlightenment experience (for instance, his doctrine of *go migo shihō*) helped to open the door to the eventual secularization of the Sōtō priesthood, in which qualifications for advanced rank required neither practice nor realization.¹¹³

¹¹² For example, Menzan Zuihō, *Dembō Shitsunai Mitsuji Monki* 伝法室内密示聞記, in sz 15, pp. 176b-77a.

¹¹³ For an insightful examination of modern Sōtō, see Ian Reader, 'Zazenless Zen? The Position of Zazen in Institutional Zen Buddhism', in *Journal of Japanese Religions*, 14:3 (December 1986), pp. 7-27.